THE DOCTRINES & PRACTICES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME

Truly Respresented in Answer to a Book Entitled "A Papist Misrepresented and Represented" by Gother



Edward Stillingfleet
1635-1699, D.D., Bishop of Worcester

1845 Edition

A Hail & Fire REPRINT
www.hailandfire.com

"The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome Truly Represented: in Answer to a Book Entitled A Papist Misrepresented and Represented" by Edward Stillingfleet, D.D. (1845 Edition), is here reprinted by Hail & Fire, 2009.

Category: Christian, Protestant, Apologetical Work

Rev. Edward Stillingfleet, D.D., 1635-1699**,** Bishop of Worcester

Copyright 2009 Hail & Fire

This book is made available online in downloadable PDF format from www.hailandfire.com and may be downloaded for non-profit, personal uses only.

If you have obtained this book in PDF format, please be notified that it is not licensed for printing, distribution or re-publication in any form whatsoever without prior written consent from Hail & Fire.

A URL link to Hail & Fire (www.hailandfire.com) may be freely published in order to encourage online reading of this book.

~

See companion volumes under Protestant Sermons and Books online at www.hailandfire.com:

"The Touchstone of Sincerity or Trial of True and False Religion" (1814 edition)
by John Flavel

"The Works of the English Reformers: William Tyndale and John Frith (1831 Edition in three Volumes)
by William Tyndale (Martyr) & John Frith (Martyr)

"A Collection of Several Treatises Concerning The Reasons and Occasions of the Penal Laws." (1675 Edition)
by Sir William Cecil, Lord Burleigh (1520-1598), Counsellor to Queen Elizabeth I of England

"An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue" (Originally published 1531; 1850 Edition)
by William Tyndale

"The Almost Christian Discovered; or the False Professor Tried and Cast" (1661; 1819 Edition)
by Matthew Mead

"Religious Affections" (1746)
by Jonathan Edwards

"Real Christianity or Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians, in the Middle and Higher Classes in this Country, Contrasted with Real Christianity" (1797 Edition)
by William Wilberforce

"The Benefit of Christ's Death" (Originally published 1543 in Italian; English & Italian Editions)
by Aonio Paleario (Antonio della Paglia, 1500-1570, Martyr)

"Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners, in a faithful account of the life and death of John Bunyan"
by John Bunyan (1628-1688)

~

The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly Represented:

in answer to a book entitled 'A Papist Misrepresented and Represented,' by Gother

Edward Stillingfleet, D.D.
1635-1699, Bishop of Worcester

1845 Edition

HAIL & FIRE REPRINTS
2009

PREFACE

to the Protestant Reprint of

"The
Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly Represented"
by Edward Stillingfleet

by Hail & Fire

PROTESTANT APOLOGETICA

In this age of ecumenism, when the lines have been blurred between the two major denominations and the world itself speaks of the Pope as head of all Christians, we join with so many to call to remembrance the truth of the Gospel and of those who, in times past, both well-known and unknown, answered a good answer for a pure and Gospel faith against the traditions of men. The intention of Hail & Fire is to make available Gospel and Reformed Theology in the works, sermons, exhortations, prayers, and apologetics of those who have maintained the Gospel and expounded upon the Scripture as the Eternal Word of God and the sole authority in Christian doctrine.

The Protestant Apologetica have been placed online so that those of a Protestant and Gospel faith might have these rare and historical resources readily available, and that those of a Catholic faith may have access to the same, that some might, by comparing and contrasting the traditions and dogmas of the Church to the Word originally preached, come thereby to choose the witness of Jesus Christ over all these. In the words of John Frith (Protestant Martyr, 1533), "I thought it expedient therein to write my mind, trusting, by that means, to bring again the blind hearts of many unto the right way, and I doubt not but that the elect and chosen of God that know their Shepherd's voice, and have the spirit to judge all things, shall easily perceive whether this be conformable to their master's voice, and shall hereby be admonished to leave their wandering in the dark and loathsome ways which lead unto death, and to walk without stumbling in the comfortable light."

THE

DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES

OF THE

CHURCH OF ROME

TRULY REPRESENTED:

IN ANSWER TO A BOOK ENTITLED

"A PAPIST MISREPRESENTED AND REPRESENTED."

BY

EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, D.D.,
BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

WITH A PREFACE AND NOTES,

BY

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND CHURCH HISTORY, NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

A NEW EDITION, REVISED.

EDINBURGH
JOHN JOHNSTONE, HUNTER SQUARE.
LONDON: R. GROOMBRIDGE & SONS.

MDCCCXLV.

Edinburgh: Printed by JOHN JOHNSTONE, 104, High Street.

CONTENTS.

		Page
Preface by the Editor		7
An Answer to the Introduction		59
CHAPTER I.	Of Praying to Images	70
	NOTE on Chapter i.	78
" II.	Of Worshipping Saints	81
	NOTE on Chapter ii.	89
" III.	Of Addressing more Supplications to the Virgin Mary than to Christ	92
	NOTE on Chapter iii.	98
" IV.	Of paying Divine Worship to Relics	103
	NOTE on Chapter iv.	106
" V.	Of the Eucharist—Adoration of the Host—Transubstantiation	108
	NOTE on Chapter v.	119
" VI.	Of Merits and Good Works	128
	NOTE on Chapter vi.	133
" VII.	Of Confession	135
	NOTE on Chapter vii.	138
" VIII.	Of Indulgences	145
	NOTE on Chapter viii.	148
" IX.	Of Satisfaction	155
	NOTE on Chapter ix.	157
" X.	Of Reading the Holy Scripture	159
	NOTE on Chapter x.	162

		Page
CHAPTER	XI. Of Apocryphal Books	168
	NOTE on Chapter xi.	171
"	XII. Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible	173
	NOTE on Chapter xii.	174
"	XIII. Of the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith	176
	NOTE on Chapter xiii.	177
"	XIV. Of the Interpretation of Scripture	181
	NOTE on Chapter xiv.	183
"	XV. Of Tradition	191
	NOTE on Chapter xv.	192
"	XVI. Of Councils	199
	NOTE on Chapter xvi.	200
"	XVII. Of Infallibility in the Church	204
	NOTE on Chapter xvii.	207
"	XVIII. Of the Pope	215
	NOTE on Chapter xviii.	218
"	XIX. Of Dispensations	225
	NOTE on Chapter xix.	229
"	XX. Of the Deposing Power	239
	NOTE on Chapter xx.	245
"	XXI. Of Communion in one Kind	253
	NOTE on Chapter xxi.	257
"	XXII. Of the Mass	265
	NOTE on Chapter xxii.	267
"	XXIII. Of Purgatory	281
	NOTE on Chapter xxiii.	288
"	XXIV. Of Praying in an Unknown Tongue	300
	NOTE on Chapter xxiv.	303
"	XXV. Of the Second Commandment	306
	NOTE on Chapter xxv.	307
"	XXVI. Of Mental Reservations	312
	NOTE on Chapter xxvi.	314
"	XXVII. Of a Death-bed Repentance	315
	NOTE on Chapter xxvii.	316
"	XXVIII. Of Fasting	318
	NOTE on Chapter xxviii.	320
"	XXIX. Of Divisions and Schisms in the Church	322
	NOTE on Chapter xxix.	324

Page

CHAPTER XXX. Of Friars and Nuns 327
NOTE on Chapter xxx. . . . 328
" XXXI. Of Wicked Principles and Practices . 331
NOTE on Chapter xxxi. . . . 332
" XXXII. Of Miracles 335
NOTE on Chapter xxxii. . . . 337
" XXXIII. Of Holy Water 339
NOTE on Chapter xxxiii. . . . 341
" XXXIV. Of Breeding up People in Ignorance . 343
NOTE on Chapter xxxiv. . . . 344
" XXXV. Of the Uncharitableness of the Papists . 348
NOTE on Chapter xxxv. . . . 350
" XXXVI. Of Ceremonies and Ordinances . . 357
NOTE on Chapter xxxvi. . . . ib.
" XXXVII. Of Innovations in matters of Faith . 359
Note on Chapter xxxvii. . . . 362
An Answer to the Conclusion 366

PREFACE.

THE system of Popery occupies a prominent place in the New Testament. Not only are there abundant materials in the Word of God for establishing the erroneous and dangerous character of its tenets individually, but the system, as a whole, is there delineated so fully and plainly, that it seems to be scarcely possible to mistake it. It is predicted as a great apostasy from the true faith, which was to prevail extensively in the professing Church, and to be attended with the most injurious consequences. It is expressly ascribed to the peculiar agency of Satan; and, indeed, the very reason why it forms the subject of so many of the predictions of the New Testament, is because it was Satan's great scheme for frustrating the leading objects of Christianity—for depriving men of the important advantages, connected both with this world and the next, which the preaching of the Gospel was intended to convey; and was to be very successful in effecting these ends. When God created man after his own image, Satan resolved to tempt him to commit sin; and was permitted to succeed. Since man fell, there

have been three leading forms of the true religion, all embodying the same fundamental principles — the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian. The great enemy of mankind having secured a most important advantage in man's fall, has exerted himself to corrupt and pervert each of these forms of the true religion, and to make them subservient to the accomplishment of his own purposes. He has displayed his cunning in this respect, by adapting his measures, not merely to the leading features of man's depraved nature, but likewise to the particular circumstances in which men in these different periods were placed, the degree of light which they enjoyed, and the character of the dispensation under which they lived. Under his agency the Patriarchal religion degenerated among the mass of mankind into Paganism; the Mosaic into that state of things which is described in the Gospel history, and which, for want of a better word, may be called Pharisaism; and the Christian religion into Popery. There is a very remarkable resemblance among these three corruptions of the true religion, which might be traced at once in their leading principles, and in many minute points of detail, and especially in the singular conformity between the rites and ceremonies of Paganism and of Popery.*

* The resemblance between Paganism and Popery has been often adverted to by writers on the Popish controversy, but the chief works devoted expressly to the illustration of it are the following :—Du Pré's Conformity of Ancient and Modern Ceremonies; Stopford's Pagano-Papismus, or an Exact Parallel between Rome-Pagan and Rome-Christian, in their Doctrines and Ceremonies, published in 1675; Εικων του θηριου, or the Image of the Beast, by Delaune, the well-known nonconformist, 1684; Middleton's Letter from Rome, Showing an Exact Conformity be-

Men must have something in the shape of religion; and the object of their great enemy is to provide that they shall have as little as possible, and that what they have shall be inconsistent with the great principles which God has revealed as regulating his intercourse with fallen man. The leading feature of Paganism is idolatry; that is, worshipping those who are no gods, or worshipping God by images. This was addressed to that feature in the character of fallen man which prompted our first parents to hide themselves among the trees of the garden, and to that evil heart of unbelief which inclines all their posterity to depart from the living God. This very idolatry, although in a more mitigated form, corresponding to the greater light of the Christian dispensation, is still a leading feature of Popery, and serves to a large extent, among its deluded votaries, the object of withdrawing men from contemplating God, and holding communion with the Father of their spirits. The Jewish religion, in many of its provisions, was specially intended to guard the chosen people of God from the idolatry that prevailed among the rest of mankind; and it effected that important object to a great extent, especially during the latter period of that dispensation; for it is well known that there was no open idolatry among the Jews after the return from the Babylonish captivity.

tween Popery and Paganism or the Religion of the Present Romans Derived from that of their Heathen Ancestors, fourth edition, 1741; Popery the Religion of Heathenism, by Ignotus, published in 1818, which contains, along with a summary of the conformity of Popery to Ancient Paganism, a full proof of its similarity to Modern Hinduism; Poynder's Alliance between Popery and Paganism.

The state of religion among the Jews in the time of our Saviour, however, was such as to afford abundant proof of the ingenuity and activity of the great enemy of God and man. Pharisaism was a complete perversion of the true religion as revealed by God through Moses, and had a very striking resemblance to Popery, especially in these important particulars: That it was founded not upon the written Word of God, but upon the traditions of men; that the true ground of a sinner's hope was obscured, if not overthrown, by a principle of self-righteousness; that personal religion was supposed to consist in the observance of outward rites and ceremonies, rather than in genuine holiness of heart and life; and that to a considerable extent the authority of the divine law was made void by human traditions. The Sadducees may be fitly regarded as representing that Infidelity which, in certain circumstances, has been generally the fruit of the prevalence of Popery; and the union of the Pharisees and Sadducees, in opposing the Lord Jesus Christ, bears a striking resemblance to the combination of Papists and Infidels in the present day in opposing the true Protestantism of the Bible.

Popery is expressly ascribed in Scripture to the agency of Satan, and it might easily be shown to bear a striking resemblance to his two former schemes of Paganism and Pharisaism, and to embody in a more deceitful form, and under a more specious disguise, the leading principles of both. The history of the rise and progress of Popery in the world, independently altogether of its connection with true religion

and the salvation of souls, exhibits a very extraordinary series of events, which could not easily be explained, except by means of the information given us upon the subject in Scripture. The most obvious reflections—which must occur even upon a superficial examination of the history of Popery, and which can only be confirmed by more extensive acquaintance with the subject—are, that the Church of Rome pursued with unwearied zeal and perseverance the grand object of the entire subjugation of the Christian world to her sway—the possession of an absolute control over the consciences and the property of men; that she displayed singular skill and ingenuity in taking advantage of every circumstance which could promote her end, and in accommodating her plans to the situation in which she found herself placed; and that she never scrupled to trample upon the laws of God and man, whenever this seemed to be for the time expedient. This view of Popery, which a mere survey of its history obviously suggests, is fully confirmed by an examination of the system itself, which, in all its doctrines, rites, and ceremonies, is plainly intended and admirably adapted to make men the abject slaves of their spiritual superiors, and to elevate the priest to an influence which no human being ought to possess over another.

All this is in full accordance with the information given us in the Sacred Scriptures, which unfold also the bearing of Popery upon the spiritual welfare of men, and its fitness to serve the purposes of him to whose agency it is ascribed, and whose zeal and activity, operating upon the depraved hearts of men, who

must have some religion, but hate the true one, can alone account for its extraordinary success. It is described by the Apostle Paul in the following remarkable words (1 Tim. iv. 1–3): "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth."* The first verse gives a general description of an apostasy from the faith, under which men would yield to the influence of deceitful spirits and doctrines of devils, or rather doctrines concerning demons—that is, dead men made objects of worship; and Popery is certainly, if there be any meaning in words, or a possibility of ascertaining God's will from the Bible, a deviation from the faith once delivered to the saints, in the production and diffusion of which many deceitful spirits were actively engaged, and one leading feature of which was the introduction, in imitation of Paganism, of demons, or dead men to share in the honour and worship due to God alone. The second

* So anxious were some Papists to avoid the obvious application of this prediction to the Church of Rome, that they had recourse to the following bold expedient:—In 1686, immediately after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, when great efforts were making to convert the Protestants in France, a translation of the New Testament was published at Bourdeaux, with the authority and approbation of the archbishop, in which the passage was translated as follows:—"Some will separate themselves from the Roman faith, ... condemning the sacrament of marriage, the abstinence from meats which God hath created," &c.—See *Cramp's Text-Book of Popery.* London, 1831. P. 55.

verse describes the means through which the apostasy from the faith was to be carried on, and to gain an ascendency, namely, fraud, falsehood, and hypocrisy, which, it is plainly intimated, would be exhibited to such an extent as to show that the restraining power of conscience was utterly lost; and it can be easily proved that the use of these means has in all ages been, and still is, a leading characteristic of Popery. To identify this apostasy still more decidedly with Popery, the third verse specifies two of its particular features—namely, the prohibition of marriage and of meats—well known to be characteristic of the Church of Rome; and these are selected, as an old writer well observes, "not because they are the worst, but the most palpable—not because they are the most impious, but the most easily recognised."

This prediction fully warrants us to expect to find in the history of Popery, fraud, falsehood, and hypocrisy to an awful extent, exhibited and employed for the promotion of its success.

A full and minute prediction of the Popish system is to be found in 2 Thess. ii. 3–13—a passage which should be carefully studied by all who wish to understand what Popery is. Every particular mentioned in these verses has been fulfilled in the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome; but at present we wish specially to notice the account given here of the means by which it was to gain an influence in the world. First, it is directly ascribed to the working of Satan, and the influence of signs and lying wonders. The system is characterized as a mystery of iniquity,

which was displaying itself even in the apostles' days —a statement which warrants us to expect in its fuller development an incalculable amount of villany, and to discover more wickedness the more fully we become acquainted with its secret workings. Its progress is to be marked by all deceivableness of unrighteousness; that is, by every species of fraud, fitted and intended to deceive men. The conduct of its miserable victims is described as a strong delusion, leading them to believe lies. All these predictions are fulfilled in the history of the Church of Rome; and if it be indeed the Popish system which the apostle here describes under the designation of the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition—which cannot reasonably be doubted—then the Word of God expressly warrants us to expect, in the conduct of those who are engaged in promoting the cause of Popery, every kind and degree of iniquity, fitted and intended to deceive; to cherish the strongest abhorrence of the system, and the deepest commiseration for its wretched victims; and to employ the strongest language in denouncing it.

It is of great importance that Protestants should form their views of Popery from the Word of God, that thus they may be guided to feel and act aright in regard to it, and to those who are under its sway. We mean, however, at present, merely to illustrate the "deceivableness of unrighteousness" of Popery; and we refer to these passages as affording ground to expect that we shall find every species of fraud and iniquity manifested in its history, and to prove that we may lawfully use the strongest language in

denouncing it, without justly exposing ourselves to the charge of illiberality or violence.*

We shall now give a few illustrations of the deceivableness of unrighteousness that has been exhibited by Papists, in order to secure the subjection of the Christian world to the Bishop of Rome; and these shall be drawn, not from isolated facts, or from the minor peculiarities of the Popish Church, but from her conduct in regard to her authorized standards, which determine and mark out the main features of her character.

1. Every Popish priest swears, at his ordination, that "he will never interpret Scripture except according to the unanimous consent of the fathers;" an oath which it is impossible to keep, except by abstaining wholly from interpreting the Bible. They profess to find all the peculiar doctrines of Popery in the writings of the early fathers. That they cannot derive effectual support from this quarter, even if the opinions of these fathers were to be admitted as authoritative, has been fully established by Protestant divines; but in order to get some appearance of support for their heresies and corruptions in the works of primitive writers, they have deliberately and extensively corrupted them. The chief Protestant work upon this

* The following is the title of a Treatise subjoined by Willet to his Synopsis Papismi, and though the language is strong, its justice is fully established by the facts which he adduces: "Tetrastylon Papisticum—that is, the Four Pillars of Papistry; the first, containing their railings, slanders, forgeries, untruths; the second, their blasphemies, flat contradictions to Scripture, heresies, absurdities; the third, their loose arguments, weak solutions, subtle distinctions; the fourth and last, the repugnant opinions of new Papists with the old—of the new one with another—of the same writers with themselves—yea, of Popish religion with and in itself."

subject is "James' Corruption of the Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers, by the Church of Rome," in which he proves that no fewer than one hundred and eighty-seven treatises have been forged by Papists, and ascribed to the different fathers of the Church, all containing statements favourable to the doctrines and practices of Popery. He shows that Cardinal Bellarmine, the great champion of Popery, in his work, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, admits that many of these treatises are forged; while yet in his other works he produces extracts from them to support the supremacy of the Pope, transubstantiation, purgatory, the invocation of saints, &c. He proves likewise, by the production of the authorized *Indices Expurgatorii*, that the Church of Rome extensively corrupted the genuine writings of the fathers, by omitting many passages which were opposed to her pretensions. —(See also *Coci Censura quorundam Scriptorum veterum.*)

2. Every Popish priest is sworn to maintain every doctrine defined by the General Councils and Sacred Canons. The earlier councils, however, could not be allowed to speak for themselves, without injuring the cause of the Church of Rome, and therefore they have been extensively corrupted by a series of the most extraordinary forgeries. In a very learned work of Dr Comber, Dean of Durham, republished in Bishop Gibson's "Preservative against Popery," and entitled, "Roman Forgeries in the Councils during the First Four Centuries," this position is proved by incontrovertible evidence, confirmed in many instances by the

admission of the most learned Papists. He proves that, in the authorized editions of the Councils by Binius, and also by Labbe and Cossarte, there are inserted the accounts of councils which never assembled, or which never issued the canons ascribed to them—that the canons of some real councils are altogether suppressed, and that in many more cases they are extensively corrupted by mutilations and additions, all directed to the object of supporting the claims of the Church of Rome.

Indeed, Richier, a learned Roman Catholic writer, and a doctor of the Sorbonne, in his History of General Councils, book i. cap. 2, § 6, having occasion to refer to a forged letter from the Council of Nice to the Pope Sylvester, requesting him to confirm their decrees, makes the following remarkable statement: "Indeed, I am forced to say, with the deepest grief, that there are no books in which so many fictitious and forged writings may be read as in the volumes of the Councils—*Equidem cum maximo animi mœrore dicere cogor nullos extare libros, in quibus tot tantaque fictitia et adulterina scripta quam in tomis Conciliorum legantur.*"

3. The Sacred Canons, to which every Popish priest is sworn to adhere, are taken, to a considerable extent, from the Decretal Epistles of the Popes. Now, what are these? They are a series of letters, ushered into the world, by the Church of Rome, about the year 800, professing to be written by the Popes (nearly forty in number) from the time of Clement, the immediate successor of the apostles, down to Siricius,

who lived about the end of the fourth century, and containing statements in which many of the doctrines and practices of Popery are approved of, and in which these Popes assumed to themselves, upon the ground of divine and apostolic authority, absolute supremacy —the most extensive jurisdiction which the most insolent Pontiffs have ever claimed. Of course, they are forgeries; and yet they were constantly cited for about seven hundred years by councils, and by the Popes and their champions, to justify the usurpations and defend the corruptions of the Church of Rome— to determine causes, and to decide controversies in religion. The forgery, however, was so gross and clumsy, that it could not stand the light which the Reformation introduced, and it is now acknowledged by all learned Papists, as we are informed by Dens in his Theology.*

4. Another illustration of the deceivableness or unrighteousness which the Church of Rome has always exhibited, may be found in the *legends*, especially in regard to false miracles, which she invented and published to deceive men, and promote her great object. Signs and lying wonders are expressly mentioned in Scripture as one of the means by which Popery was to be propagated in the world, and every one acquainted with history must know that this

* Notandum Epistolas Decretales, quæ præcedunt Siricium Papam, a Baronio, Bellarmino, Petavio, Schelstratio, et omnibus nunc eruditis haberi ut suppositias, non quod aliquid a fide vel moribus alienum contineant (of course not, for they contain nothing worse than the Popery of more modern times), sed quod non sint illorum Pontificum quorum nominibus insigniuntur.—*Dens*, tom. ii. p. 280.

prediction was fully verified. The Church of Rome still claims the power of working miracles, and pretends even yet occasionally to exercise it, although she is now much more cautious in the display of this power than in former ages. It may be alleged that the great mass of legends and lying wonders invented and propagated by the Church of Rome in former ages is to be ascribed chiefly to the ignorance and darkness which then generally prevailed in the world; and this allegation might have some plausibility, if it were not for the scriptural predictions upon this very point, and the fact of the constant adaptation of all these legends and miracles to promote the ascendency of the Church of Rome, which not only warrant, but require us to regard them as inherent features of Popery.*

Besides, to a certain extent, these legends and miracles have received the sanction of the Church of Rome in such a way that she must bear the responsibility of them. We refer particularly to the lying wonders recorded in the acts of the Second Council

* "Reformers' Library," No. V., p. 181. This work, called "The Reformers' Library," does not derive its name from any reference to the Reformation from Popery. It is published by a Society of Radical Reformers, who profess to be aiming at the political improvement of the community, but who, like honest Radicals, have a cordial detestation of Popery. The series of works which they have published or republished is chiefly political; but No. V., published at London in 1833, is entitled "Popery as Opposed to the Knowledge, the Morals, the Wealth, and the Liberty of Mankind." It is an original work, written with very considerable talent, and containing a great amount of information; and although we would not guarantee the soundness of its statements upon the more theological parts of the subject, we think it eminently fitted to be useful in diffusing right views of the injurious bearing of Popery upon social and domestic happiness.

of Nice, and in the Roman Breviary, or priests' prayer-book.

The Second Council of Nice, held in 787, is regarded by all Papists as general, and, of course, infallible, and its decrees are quoted by the Council of Trent as an unquestionable authority for the worship of images; yet that infallible council embodied in its acts, professedly as satisfactory warrants for the worship of images, many stories of miracles of the most absurd, and, in some cases, of the most immoral description; and to the truth of these, surely, the infallible authority of the Church of Rome is pledged.*

The Roman Breviary, or the prayer-book of the Popish clergy, was prepared in consequence of a decree of the Council of Trent, and was sanctioned by Pope Pius V. in 1566, by Pope Clement VIII. in 1602, and by Pope Urban VIII. in 1631. It contains a lesson or office for every day of the year, which all Popish ecclesiastics of both sexes are still bound to repeat each day, on pain of mortal sin, and the repetition requires about an hour and a half. The daily offices consist partly of small portions of Scripture, but principally of the Lives of the Saints; and these lives consist chiefly of narratives of miracles of the most ridiculous and contemptible description, and frequently of a very injurious tendency.† British Papists are now heartily ashamed of the Breviary, and

* Phillpotts' Letters to Butler, Letter iii.

† A very interesting account of the character and contents of the Breviary, with a considerable number of extracts in the original Latin, is to be found in the Rev. Blanco White's valuable work, entitled "Practical and Internal Evidences against Catholicism," p. 158-216.

commonly maintain that they are not bound to believe its narratives of miracles, although all their bishops, in their Declarations published in 1826, referred to it as indicative of the character of the Church of Rome in one particular which they professed to consider as honourable to their Church, namely, that a portion of the daily office was taken from Scripture. We are satisfied that the great body of the Popish priests in enlightened countries do not believe the mass of miracles which they are obliged daily to repeat; and it would be an insult to their understanding to suppose it possible that they did. But surely the Church of Rome must be held responsible for the truth, as well as the utility, of the contents of a book which she commands all her clergy daily to peruse, on pain of mortal sin; and it is plain that the necessity imposed upon them, by the authority of their Church, to read daily, as useful and edifying, a mass of trash of the most despicable description, which they cannot possibly believe, has a most direct and powerful tendency, either to make them Infidels, or at least to make them utterly regardless of any distinction between truth and falsehood. At any rate, the unquestionable fact, that all these signs and lying wonders were fabricated by the Church of Rome, and were at one time propagated as realities, is a striking illustration of the "deceivableness of unrighteousness" which has generally characterized the means by which she gained her ascendency.

This subject might be further illustrated by a long detail of facts, but we propose now to confine ourselves

to one branch of it, namely, the falsehood, fraud, and hypocrisy, which have been exhibited by the Church of Rome in accommodating the statement of her doctrines and practices to the circumstances in which she happened to be placed, and to their probable bearing upon her schemes at the time.

The Church of Rome claiming infallibility, is, of course, unchangeable in all matters of faith and practice. While her friends among pseudo-Protestants claim for her the credit of having changed, and while she is very willing to enjoy the benefit of this allegation, she is bound in consistency to maintain that it is unfounded. But it is very easy to prove that many of her principal defenders, with the concurrence or connivance of her highest authorities, have given erroneous and fraudulent, as well as contradictory, accounts of her doctrines, according as seemed to suit best the age or the country for which they were intended. We shall give some illustrations of the fraud and dishonesty which were exhibited by the Church of Rome in framing what is now the acknowledged standard of her faith, and of her attempts to impose upon Protestants an erroneous and fallacious statement of her doctrines, in defiance of the standards which she had solemnly sanctioned.

The great standard of Popish doctrine is the Council of Trent, to all whose canons and decrees every Popish priest is solemnly sworn to adhere. This council was assembled in 1545, and continued, with various prorogations, till 1563. It was called chiefly because several Popish princes, and especially the

Emperor of Germany, urgently demanded it, in the hope that it might introduce such reforms into the Church of Rome—which was then, beyond all question, in a state of extreme and scandalous corruption—as might bring back the Protestants to her communion.

The Court of Rome manifested a strong reluctance to call a general council, and when at last obliged to yield, determined to make every effort to keep the council in entire subserviency to the Pope, and to prevent anything like an honest or vigorous reformation of abuses. We have a full and minute history of the Council of Trent by Father Paul Sarpi, who was a Roman Catholic; and his statements are confirmed by the private letters and despatches of the Spanish ambassadors and bishops, which have been obtained from the library of the King of Spain, and of which an account is given, with copious extracts, in Blanco White's Evidences against Catholicism, Appendix No. I. From these authentic sources it plainly appears that the Council of Trent was, from beginning to end, a mere farce played by the Court of Rome to deceive the world. A great proportion of the bishops who attended the council were Italians, the mere creatures of the Pope, many of whom had been made bishops for the express purpose of attending the council and upholding the Pope's interest, and were living at the time on his bounty. Some of the bishops, especially those who came from Spain, although thorough Papists in doctrine, were honestly bent on reforming abuses; and the Pope's legates, who presided, were in consequence obliged to have recourse to

bribery, to threats, and to every species of fraud and manœuvring, in order to prevent anything being done that was offensive to their master. The General Council of Basle in 1439 denounced Pope Eugenius IV. as "a notorious scandalizer of the universal Church—as guilty of simony, perjury, and obstinate heresy;" and on these grounds deposed him from the Papacy; while his Holiness returned the compliment by denouncing the fathers of that council "as schismatics and heretics, and as a den of robbers," and imprecated upon their heads the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The Popes were on better terms with the Council of Trent, as they succeeded in keeping it in entire subjection to themselves. But it might have been said with perfect truth, that Pope Paul III. and Pope Julius III., under whom principally the Council of Trent was held, were, like many other Popes, monsters of depravity, and that the great body of the fathers who constituted the council were despicable creatures, who had neither integrity nor decency. Yet this council always professed to be guided by the Holy Ghost—which, as was remarked at the time by the French ambassador, and many others, was regularly sent down from Rome in a portmanteau—and its decrees have been ever since received as infallibly true by the Romish Church. The *chargé-d'affaires* to the Spanish ambassador who attended at Trent, used often to repeat that he deserved much credit for being a Christian, after having been present at two elections of Popes, and at a council; and it certainly affords an interesting indication of the character of the Church

of Rome, that the formation of the infallible standard of her doctrines should have been accompanied and influenced by such a mass of fraud and iniquity as was exhibited at Trent.

With regard to the system of doctrines established by the Council of Trent, it is to be observed, that its decrees sanctioned almost all the erroneous doctrines which had sprung up in the Church of Rome during the dark ages, and that some of these, although generally held by the Popish clergy, had not, till that occasion, been formally sanctioned as the authoritative doctrines of the Church. The council condemned most of the scriptural truths which had been proclaimed by the first reformers, and forbade any one to hold them, under pain of damnation. At the same time, the exposure which the reformers had already made of the doctrines generally taught among Popish writers previous to the Reformation, as well as the differences of opinion upon some important points that existed even among the members of the council, required the application of considerable caution and cunning in framing their decrees; and it is certain that, on these accounts, some of the decrees of the council were intentionally expressed in ambiguous or equivocal language. They employed all that cunning and dexterity for which the Church of Rome has ever been distinguished, in expressing some of their decrees in such language as seemed fitted to evade, to a certain extent, the force of Protestant arguments; and it can be easily proved that ever since that period the general strain of doctrine inculcated by the leading

Roman Catholic authors *on some points* has been more palpably, if not more really, inconsistent with scriptural truth than the Jesuitical decrees of the last infallible council.* And in this way the conduct of the Church of Rome in framing the infallible standard of her doctrines, affords an illustration of the deceivableness of unrighteousness which the Scriptures ascribe to her, since, with all the advantage of infallibility, she did not dare to speak plainly and honestly upon some subjects, but had recourse to statements intentionally equivocal; while it is also true, that in regard to many important topics, she has spoken out so fully and distinctly, that a comparison of the doctrines of the Council of Trent with the statements of Scripture, makes it quite certain that the Church of Rome has fearfully apostatized from the faith once delivered to the saints.

There had long been disputes in the Church of Rome between the Dominicans and the Franciscans on some important points connected with free will, and the powers of nature and grace. Soto, a Dominican, and Vega, a Franciscan, who were both present at the Council of Trent, published each a work upon this subject in 1548, when the council was prorogued, maintaining opposite opinions upon these points, while

* The doctrine of justification by works, for example, is more openly and explicitly taught in the Popish reply to the Confession of Augsburg (prepared, under the authority of the emperor, by the leading Popish divines of Germany, and read in the Imperial Council in 1530), and likewise in the writings of Cardinal Bellarmine, who died in 1621, than in the canons of the Council of Trent, although there is enough even in these canons to prove that the Church of Rome has corrupted and perverted the fundamental principles of the Gospel.

both claimed for their contradictory statements the sanction of the council, and appealed, in support of them, to the decrees of the fifth and sixth sessions, in the concoction of which they had both taken a part. To guard against such awkward occurrences, Pope Pius IV., in his bull confirming its canons and decrees, forbade all, upon any pretext whatever, and under pain of excommunication, and the wrath of Almighty God and of his holy apostles Peter and Paul, to publish in any way commentaries, glosses, annotations, scholia, or any sort of interpretation upon the decrees of the council, without Papal authority; and directed that, if any one found anything in the decrees that was obscure or needed explanation, he should go up to the place which the Lord had chosen, namely, the Apostolic See, the mistress of the faithful.*

It is to be feared that not a few Popish writers have incurred the anathema by which this prohibition was sanctioned, as there have been many disputes among themselves about the meaning of the decrees of the Council of Trent. A curious illustration of this is to be found in the eighth volume of Dens' Theology, published with the express and admitted approbation of Dr Murray, the Popish archbishop of Dublin, p. 311–317, where an extract is given from a work of Pope Benedict XIV., in which his Holiness narrates the contradictory opinions entertained by Popish authors in regard to the meaning of the decree of the Council of Trent as to the *intention* on

* Sacr. Concil. Trident. Canones et Decreta, p. 319, 320. Par., 1823.

the part of the priest that was necessary to give validity to the administration of sacraments; and being afraid, apparently, to exercise his own infallibility upon the point, leaves the controversy where he found it, and prudently concludes with declaring, that any disputes which may arise upon the subject *must be referred to himself to be decided.*

Before quitting the Council of Trent we have to mention that in two different editions of its proceedings published at Paris and Antwerp, in 1564, it was stated, that three members of the council dissented from the resolution to request the Pope to confirm its decrees—an important fact, which was omitted in the edition published at Rome, and is not to be found in any modern editions. Richier, himself an adherent of the Church of Rome, who narrates this fact, adds: "Whence it is evident that the Court of Rome was determined to suppress and abolish all those acts which were unfavourable to her usurped rights."

Notwithstanding the cunning and dishonesty which had been employed in framing the decrees of the infallible council, it was soon proved that it had explicitly sanctioned many doctrines and tenets which not only had no warrant from Scripture, but were opposed to its statements, and to the tenets of the early fathers. Papists themselves seemed to feel that this was the case, especially after the publication of Chemnicius' great and valuable work, entitled "*Examen Concilii Tridentini,*" and with their usual deceivableness of unrighteousness, introduced the practice of explaining away their most absurd and offensive doctrines, and

glossing them over with fallacious explanations and evasions. This could not, indeed, be attempted with any success during the life of the first reformers, or the generation which succeeded them; for the true character of Popish doctrines was then too well known to render it politic in their supporters to misrepresent them; and accordingly we find, that during the sixteenth century, Popish controversialists seldom complained of being misrepresented, but endeavoured to defend their real doctrines as well as they could. They succeeded, however, so ill in this work, that they soon found it expedient to allege, that Protestants misunderstood and misrepresented their tenets, and at the same time attempted to soften their absurdity by subtle and insidious explanations.

One of the first attempts of this kind with which we are acquainted, is to be found in a work published in 1634, entitled "*Deus, Natura, Gratia*," &c., by Franciscus a Santa Clara, who was a professor in the University of Louvaine, but had resided a long time in England as confessor to the wife of Charles I. One object of his book is to show that there is no very material difference in doctrine between Protestants and Papists; and with this view he goes over the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, endeavouring to show, in regard to those of them which are plainly levelled against Popish tenets, but where Popery is not expressly mentioned, that the Popish doctrine, when rightly understood—that is, by the help of his subtle glosses and Jesuitical explanations —did not substantially differ from that of the Church

of England; and in regard to those of them in which Popish doctrines are expressly condemned by name, that the compilers of the Articles did not correctly understand what the doctrine of the Church of Rome on these points was—that they condemned only an imagination of their own; and that, if they had known the true Popish doctrines upon these topics, they would have characterized them in a different way.*

Bishop Hall, in his "Censure of Travel," gives a very striking and graphic account of the fraud and manœuvring employed by Popish priests to entrap Englishmen whom they found travelling upon the Continent.† It appears from his statement, that the art of softening and modifying the offensive tenets of Popery had not yet found its way into Popish books, but was extensively employed in conversation. He tells us that "Popery spoken and written are two things," and "that in discourse nothing is more ordinary than to disclaim some of their received positions, and to blanch (whitewash) others, and to allege that it is the malice of an enemy that misreports them." "They deliver," he says, "the opinion of their Church with such mitigation and favour as those that care to please, not to inform; forming the voice of the Church

* This curious work was here referred to, simply as an illustration of the conduct of Papists in putting an unfair gloss upon their obnoxious opinions. It has subsequently been brought under public notice in a different aspect, viz., as an exact model of the sentiments, spirit, and objects, of the celebrated Tract, No. 90. See the Preface to Goode's very learned and valuable work, entitled "The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice"—a work which has thoroughly demolished the arguments, the authorities, and the character of the Tractarians.

† Works, pp. 650-652.

to the liking of the hearer—not the judgment of the hearer to the voice of the Church. Resolved to outface all evidence, they make fair weather of their foulest opinions, and inveigh against nothing so much as the spitefulness of our slanders. It is not possible that any wise stranger should be in love with the face of the Church if they might see her in her own likeness, and, therefore, *they have cunningly masked one part of it and painted another.*" The arts, which in Bishop Hall's time were employed only in conversation, have been since extensively introduced by the Papists into their writings; and his description, above quoted, applies with singular accuracy to many of their productions in more modern times, and especially in the present day.

Perhaps, the most celebrated Popish work directed to the object of representing Popish doctrines in a fraudulent and insidious way, is Bossuet's "Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in Matters of Controversy;" and, probably, we could not produce a more striking illustration of the dishonesty of Papists in representing their doctrines, than by mentioning some facts in the history of this celebrated production. But before proceeding to this instructive and melancholy narrative, it may be proper to mention the light in which modern Papists regard Bossuet's Exposition.

Mr Butler, in his Book of the Roman Catholic Church (p. 10), mentions Bossuet's Exposition as a book in which a correct and authentic statement of Popish doctrine is to be found; and in his vindication of the preceding work (p. 8) he makes the following

assertion in regard to it: "Roman Catholics have but one opinion of it—all without exception acknowledge it to be a full and faultless exposition of the doctrines of their Church. I could not, therefore, have referred Protestants to a more authentic exposition of the Catholic creed." Dr Murray, the Popish archbishop of Dublin, in his famous letter to his "beloved fellow-Christians, the Protestants of Great Britain," in regard to Dens' Theology, thus addressed them:—"Take the trouble of making yourselves acquainted, through authentic sources, with the real differences between us and you. You will find them in a little book which I pray you to read over; it is a short explanation of the Roman Catholic faith by Bossuet." Let us attend, then, to some of the circumstances connected with this "full and faultless exposition" of the creed of Popery, derived chiefly from the prefaces to Archbishop Wake's "Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England," and to his two Defences of it, where they are established by incontrovertible evidence.* Bossuet's Exposition was published in 1671, when great efforts were making to convert the Protestants in France. It had the approving attestation of eleven bishops, and when it was fully printed, and just about to issue from the press,

* Wake's Exposition, and the two Defences of it, are very valuable and important works on the Popish controversy. His "Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England" was a reply to Bossuet's "Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church." A very competent judge says of him, "that of all the great divines who stood forward in defence of the Church of England in that protracted and memorable contest, he, after Stillingfleet, was at once the most profoundly skilled in the learning, the most acute, solid, and judicious in the argument, of his cause."—*Phillpot Letters to Butler*, Appendix, p. 345.

its author sent a copy of it to the Faculty of the Sorbonne, who, instead of approving it, marked for correction not a few passages in which the author, with the view of softening the harsh tenets of Popery, had misrepresented the real doctrines of the Church. Bossuet immediately suppressed this edition, and in a few months published another, in which he availed himself to some extent of the censure of the Sorbonne, although even this he could never prevail upon that learned body to approve. Many Papists disapproved of the book, as an unfaithful statement of Popish doctrine, and as going too far in the way of accommodation to Protestant prejudices. The reigning Pope, Clement X., positively refused to sanction it, though importuned to do so for a period of five years; and it was not till after three years of reiterated importunity that his successor, Pope Innocent XI., was at last prevailed upon, in 1679, to recommend it "as eminently fitted to promote the Catholic faith, on account of its doctrine, method, and *prudence;*" while, on the very same day, his Holiness issued another brief, approving a book which taught a different and opposite doctrine from that of Bossuet and the Gallican Church, on the subject of Papal authority. Imbert, a Doctor of Divinity in Bourdeaux, was accused of heresy in 1683, and although he proved that his doctrine upon the point was exactly the same as that contained in Bossuet's Exposition, he was condemned and imprisoned for it by his archbishop. Witt, a Popish priest in Mechlin, was also accused of heresy in 1685, and though he supported his opinion by the authority of

Bossuet, in his Exposition, yet the Faculty of Louvaine condemned it as scandalous and pernicious. Cardinal Capisucchi, master of the Sacred Palace, and Cardinal Bona, whose recommendations of the Exposition are prefixed to the later editions of it, taught, in their own works, published about the same time, doctrines on the worship of saints and images, opposed to that of the book which they recommended, and more in accordance with the tenets of the Church of Rome.

When these facts were published by Wake, Bossuet came forward, and publicly denied the existence of any edition which had been censured by the Sorbonne, and suppressed by himself. Wake providentially had procured a copy of it when he was chaplain to the British ambassador at Paris, and submitted it to public inspection. Bossuet then asserted that it had been printed without his knowledge, but Wake produced unquestionable evidence that this too was a falsehood. He at the same time convicted Bossuet of two other deliberate lies—one an assertion that he did not know of a book of Father Crasset's, in which his doctrine about the worship of the Virgin Mary was censured; and the other a statement in his pastoral letter to the new converts of his diocese, in which he told them, that "not one of them had suffered violence, either in his person or his goods," although he knew well that they had been subjected to severe persecution, which he supported both in theory and in practice.* The fact that Bossuet's

* The details of this second falsehood are given in M'Gavin's excellent and valuable work, "The Protestant," vol. iii. pp. 202, 203, 206, 207.

Exposition was recommended by the Pope, was adduced by the doctors of the Sorbonne in 1717, as a proof *that a diversity of opinion upon some points is tolerated in the Church of Rome.**

Such is the history of the book which Butler, who has published a life of Bossuet, and who must have known many of these facts, tells us, "all Roman Catholics, without exception, acknowledge as a full and faultless exposition of the doctrines of their Church;" such was the man to whom Dr Murray refers us for an honest and authentic statement of Popish doctrine. This statement, in all its parts, affords a striking illustration of the fraud of the Church of Rome, in accommodating the representation of her doctrines to her interests at the time, and should convince all men of the hopelessness of getting an honest and correct account of the doctrine of Papists from themselves, except, indeed, by the actual perusal of those standards to which they have sworn to adhere.

Gother's "Papist Misrepresented and Represented, or a Twofold Character of Popery," is a work of substantially the same character as Bossuet's Exposition, having been intended to explain away all that is offensive and loathsome about Popery, by casting a fallacious and insidious colouring over its tenets. It was published in 1685—the very year in which a Papist ascended the throne of Britain—a period when Papists had more influence in this country than they have since possessed, until the present day. At that

* J. F. Buddaei Miscellanea Sacra, P. ii. pp. 186, 187, 195, 196.

time, they cherished the hope of regaining their ascendency in Britain, just as in our own day they are confidently expecting soon to have the undivided dominion of Ireland. And to aid them in this, it was thought expedient to adopt the same line of policy which they are at present pursuing, by concealing the real tenets of their Church, and putting forth a modified and mitigated view of their principles. This was the object of Gother's book. It proceeds throughout on the supposition that Protestants misunderstand and misrepresent Popery, and it is constructed upon the principle of putting forth, first, what he calls the misrepresentation of Popery—that is, the unfounded and exaggerated view of Popish tenets which he supposed Protestants in general to entertain; and then, secondly, the representation of Popery—that is, the view of its tenets which he wished to be regarded as correct, and by which he wished Protestants to judge of it. The direct object of the book was not so much to defend Popery, as to represent it, and to contrast what is put forth as the correct representation with the misrepresentation said to be usually given of it by Protestants. But most of the arguments ordinarily employed to defend Popish tenets are mixed up with the pretended representation; and as the book is written with great skill and cunning, though with an utter want of truth and honesty, it has been always a great favourite with Papists, and it is certainly well fitted to serve their purposes.

The Popish controversy was raging in England at

the time when Gother published this work. It had been revived in the latter part of the reign of Charles II., partly in consequence of the prospect of a Popish successor to the throne. The Church of England contained then, as it has always done, men of great talent and consummate learning, ready and willing to contend for the cause of truth; and the works then produced by the divines of the Church of England not only constitute a very important department of the literature of the Popish controversy, but form one of the noblest monuments of talent and learning which any Church has ever erected in any one generation of its history. Besides many large treatises, in which particular subjects in the controversy between Protestants and Papists were elaborately discussed, an immense number of smaller discourses were published, in which every topic bearing upon the points in dispute was illustrated with great success. Most of these were afterwards collected together by Dr Gibson, bishop of London, and published in three folio volumes, under the title of "Preservative against Popery," which is a complete storehouse of valuable materials upon every department of the controversy. Dr Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester, is generally acknowledged to have occupied the very first place among these illustrious men, who, in that important crisis of our history, brought great talents and prodigious learning to bear upon the exposure of Popery; and among other works upon the subject, of much greater bulk and value, he published, under the title of "The Doctrine and Practices of the Church of

Rome Truly Represented," the answer to Gother's "Papist Misrepresented and Represented"—to a new edition of which these remarks are intended as introductory. The direct object of Stillingfleet's work, like that to which it was an answer, was to describe accurately what Popery is; but it contains, likewise, a great deal fitted to expose the errors of the Popish system; and, besides, the mode in which Papists in the present day defend their Church, renders it specially important to ascertain, upon each point, what its tenets are. Although literally an answer to a particular work, and although some of its statements may not be so fully understood without reference to the work that occasioned them, it is still well adapted for giving a general view of the true character of Popery, and of the arts usually employed by its defenders. Gother replied to Stillingfleet's work, and a succession of answers and rejoinders followed. The dispute was conducted on the Protestant side by Dr Clagett; two of whose pamphlets, giving an able view of the whole controversy, are republished in the third volume of Gibson's Preservative. Gother's reply showed that he was utterly unable to meet his antagonist fairly; for that, as well as his subsequent pamphlets, consisted chiefly of shuffling evasions or trifling cavils on little points, having scarcely any connection with the leading features of the question. But Gother's work has always continued to be in great repute among Papists. It was republished in an abridged and *expurgated* form by their great champion, Bishop Challoner, who was Vicar Apostolic

of the London district from 1741 to 1780. We have not ascertained the exact time when Challoner republished it, but we have some reason to think that it was near the end of his life, at a period when Papists were making great efforts to get some of the laws against them repealed, and, with that view, were acting upon the same policy which they are pursuing at the present day, namely, trying to conceal the real character of Popery, and to present it to the British public in a fallacious guise. It has been often reprinted since, and the twenty-eighth edition was published at London in 1832.

The editor had occasion to quote it in a speech at a meeting of the "Protestant Association" in Edinburgh, in December, 1835, when he described it as "a very clever pamphlet," and likewise as being "full of misrepresentations from beginning to end"—as a "Jesuitical gloss upon all their doctrines and opinions." After having given an extract from it, setting forth, in the usual style, the unity, sanctity, apostolicity, and catholicity of the Church of Rome, he added these words: "The above statement in regard to Popery, as every one who has the slightest knowledge of history knows very well, is just a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end." Soon after, a prospectus of a new edition of Gother's "Papist Misrepresented and Represented," was printed, and extensively circulated from house to house. It was written in such a style, that it was scarcely possible to discover from it whether the intended publication was in favour of Popery or against it; but it gave great prominence to

the editor's character of the work as "a very clever pamphlet," and omitted everything else he had said about it. The work was soon after published, with notes by a Mr Smith, who had gained some notoriety in Edinburgh as a champion of Popery,* and was advertised in newspapers and by placards, with the editor's recommendation of it as "a very clever pamphlet." It was this that first suggested to him the republication of Stillingfleet's answer, which he has been induced to carry through, not so much for the purpose of counteracting the effects of Gother's work, as for the more general object of giving a view of the true character of Popery—an object of very great importance in the present state of public opinion.

Gother's cunning misrepresentation of Popery is exposed by Stillingfleet with great ability. In some instances, Gother has put into the misrepresentation, which he alleges Protestants usually give of it, statements which no intelligent Protestant ever made; and still more frequently, he has put into his representation of Popery statements inconsistent with the standards of the Romish Church, or has kept back much that was necessary for giving a fair and complete view of her doctrines. One of his leading artifices is to mix up with the misrepresentation, or the alleged Protestant account of Popery, the inferences which Protestants draw from the acknowledged tenets of the Church of Rome; as if these inferences were a part of their account of what she

* This is the same person, it is believed, who is now secretary to the "Catholic Institute" in London.

holds, and then denying them in his representation. Thus, for example, under the eucharist, he says: "The Papist misrepresented believes it lawful to commit idolatry, and makes it his daily practice to worship and adore a breaden god;" and then begins his representation by asserting, that "the Papist truly represented, believes it abominable to commit any kind of idolatry, and most damnable to worship or adore a breaden god." It is evidently a mere fraud to put forth this as a difference between Protestants and Papists *in representing Popery*. No Protestant ever alleged that Papists reckon it lawful to commit what they consider idolatry, or to adore what they regard as bread; and, on the other hand, no Papist denies that his Church requires him to adore as God what appears only as bread to men's senses. The difference is not in *representation*, but in *argument*. Papists acknowledge that they worship the consecrated wafer. Protestants maintain that the wafer is nothing but bread, and that it is idolatry to worship it. Papists assert that the wafer is God, and that, though they do worship it, this is not idolatry. The difference, therefore, is not in the representation of what the Church of Rome teaches, but in the judgment formed, or in the inferences drawn from what she unquestionably maintains. Indeed, except in those cases in which he puts into the mouth of Protestants what no intelligent Protestant ever asserted, and in which he gives a view of Popish doctrine at variance with the standards of the Romish Church, there is commonly no substantial

difference between the alleged misrepresentation by Protestants and his own representation of Popery. In most instances, his representation will be seen, by a careful reader, to be just a repetition of the substance of the alleged Protestant misrepresentation; the great *apparent* difference being occasioned chiefly, with the exceptions above referred to, by the strong qualifying phrases and epithets with which he has plentifully garnished the alleged misrepresentation, and by the denial, in the representation, of the inferences which Protestants deduce from the admitted doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, and of the validity of the arguments which they found upon them.

Gother's "Papist Misrepresented and Represented" thus furnishes a striking example of "the deceivableness of unrighteousness," the "speaking lies in hypocrisy," by which, according to the scriptural predictions, the Church of Rome has always been characterized; and the frequent publication of the work proves that this feature of their system is still fully exhibited in the present day. Indeed, the fallacious misrepresentation of their own opinions, with the view of concealing their deformity, has been more extensively practised in this than in any former age. The truth of this position might be illustrated by many recent examples, such as the approbation and subsequent condemnation by the Papal authorities at Rome, in 1816–18, of Gandolphy's Defence of the Ancient Faith—the condemnation being obtained through the exertions of the English bishops, because the work gave too honest and correct an exposition of Popery

for British ears, as detailed in Note F. to Blanco White's Evidences against Catholicism; the conduct of the Irish bishops, and especially of Drs Troy and Murray, in regard to the publication of the Rhemish Testament, as illustrated in Mr M'Ghee's speeches at Glasgow and Edinburgh; and their procedure in regard to Dens' Theology, with their shuffling and inconsistent denials and admissions respecting their connection with it. The same fallacious misrepresentation of the doctrines of Popery was attempted by the Popish ecclesiastics who were examined before Parliament in 1825. Their conduct upon that occasion, and especially that of their great leader, Dr Doyle, has been consigned to immortal infamy in the Letters and Supplemental Letter to Mr Butler, by Dr Phillpotts, the present distinguished Bishop of Exeter. We would strongly recommend the study of this admirable work, as one of the most valuable contributions that have been made for a long period to the Popish controversy. It is characterized by great talent, learning, dignity, vigour, and controversial skill.* It establishes, by conclusive evidence, what are the true doctrines of the Church of Rome upon many of those points which they are now anxious to gloss over, or to explain away; and contains a fearful exposure of the deceivableness of unrighteousness which, in our own day, they have employed for

* I have allowed this passage to stand unchanged, because I still believe the work deserves the praise here bestowed upon it; but I must say, that the recent conduct of this prelate has not been fitted to secure for him the respect and commendation of true Protestants.

that purpose. The Declarations published by the Popish bishops in 1826, for the express purpose of imposing upon the British public, afford examples of the same quality. We shall select one. In the "Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their coadjutors in Great Britain," signed by all of them, ten in number, there is the following statement (sect. iii.):—"There never was a general law of the Catholic Church, prohibiting the reading of authorized translations of the Scriptures; but, considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, *the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective pastors.*" Now, we venture to assert that the Catholic Church—that is, the Church of Rome—never made such a regulation as is here described. This Declaration was signed by the late Bishop Cameron, and the late Bishop Patterson, then his coadjutor. We challenge their successors, Bishop Carruthers and Bishop Gillis, to produce the regulation if they can. If the statement refer, as it seems to do, to the fourth rule of the Congregation of the Index, they must know that it is incorrectly described.

Amid all the deceivableness of unrighteousness that has been exhibited in the history of Popery, there is not to be found a grosser case of "speaking lies in hypocrisy," than the support which our Popish countrymen are now professing to give to the cause

of civil and religious liberty, and especially the assertion of the rights of conscience. The unchangeable principles of Popery provide distinctly and expressly for giving to fellow-sinners lordship over the conscience, which is the prerogative of God alone; and the whole history of the Church of Rome affords ground to fear that she will exercise this lordship whenever she can. It is one of the leading characters given of the Church of Rome in the Word of God, that she is drunk with the blood of the saints; and there is good reason to believe (Rev. xviii.) that her intolerant and persecuting spirit will continue until her final destruction. No Papist can profess to advocate the rights of conscience, unless he be either grossly ignorant of the principles and history of his own Church, or have his conscience "seared as with a hot iron;" and it is a plain proof that the sorceries of Babylon are still deceiving the nations, when Protestants can be duped into a belief in the sincerity of such professions; especially when it is notorious that, so lately as 1832, the present Pope, in his "Encyclical Letter to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops," denounced, in the strongest language, the liberty of the press and liberty of conscience.

This practice on the part of the Papists, of giving a fallacious and insidious view of the tenets of their Church, is not confined to this country. It is practised with at least equal zeal and recklessness in the United States of North America, where it is well known that Popery has of late years been making

such progress as to alarm most of the staunch friends of true religion. And it is an interesting fact, that the Protestants of New York, in order to counteract the exertions of Papists in glossing over and concealing all the offensive features of the system, have taken the strong step of republishing there, in 1834, the Rhemish Testament, with the original annotations in all their purity, and free from those omissions and modifications which Papists have introduced into them, to adapt them to modern times. We have procured a copy of this American reprint, and believe that it is scarcely possible in any other way to get an *unexpurgated* edition of the Rhemish Notes, which, as the American editors say in their preface, "exhibit a genuine, minute, and strikingly exact portraiture of the Papacy, delineated by their own master artists." The reason they assign for taking upon themselves the responsibility of publishing such a mass of heresy, falsehood, and intolerance, as the original Rhemish Notes contain, is this, "that the American people, and particularly the Churches of Christ in the United States, until *recently*, have displayed a morbid incredulity in reference to the Papal system, and an almost settled determination not to be convinced of the damnable heresies and soul-killing abominations of Popery."

But many people in our own country, who, like the Americans, seem determined to believe nothing unfavourable of Popery, are in the habit of alleging, that Papists must know better than Protestants what are the tenets of their own Church, and that it is not fair

to ascribe to any man the belief of doctrines which he disclaims or abjures. Upon these allegations we would submit the following remarks:—

First, We do not dispute the Papists' knowledge of the doctrines of their Church; but we have very great doubts of their integrity in representing them correctly. From the character given of Popery in the Sacred Scriptures, and from the illustrations of that character which we have produced from its history, it is quite plain that it would be absolute folly to attach even the smallest weight to any account which Papists might give of the tenets of their own Church, or, indeed, to anything they might assert connected with the interests of Popery. Their statement might be true or it might be false; but no one acquainted with the history of Popery can ever regard it as affording even a presumption of the truth of any assertion bearing upon the interests of the Church of Rome, that it has been made by Papists, however great their number, and however extensive their knowledge of the subject to which the assertion referred. We concur in the following statement of Mr M'Gavin in the "Protestant" (No. 53, vol. ii., p. 17):—

"There are some persons who are surprised by the explicitness with which I charge lying upon Papists as a body, and who think I would do better to abstain from the use of such language. Such persons are not acquainted with the people I have to deal with, or with their writings, else they would be convinced that I could not do them justice without speaking of them as they are, in broad plain English. Papists themselves know that I do them no injustice by accusing

them of lying; and they would laugh at my simplicity if I were to affect to think otherwise of them. I refer not merely to the instances of falsehood which have come under my own observation, and which attach to individuals only, without being justly chargeable upon the general body—I speak of the system of Popery, which is built upon falsehood, is supported by falsehood, and is, in fact, nothing but fraud and falsehood throughout. I do not say that there are not individuals attached to the Church of Rome who have a regard to truth, who would abide by it in their dealings with their neighbours, and who are, therefore, better than their religion; but I do not hesitate to affirm, that it is impossible for any man to be an active promoter or defender of Popery, without having recourse to lying and imposition."

Second, The point to be ascertained is not the opinion of individuals, but the doctrine of the Church of Rome, which can be learned only from her own standards. We wish to ascertain what it is that the Church of Rome teaches; and in order to this, we must have recourse to the sources from which she herself tells us that her tenets are to be learned. The Church of Rome has authoritative standards embodying her doctrines. These are as accessible to us as to her own priests; we are just as capable of understanding them as they are. It would be utter folly to receive their account of the meaning of these standards in opposition to the plain import of the words in which they are expressed; just as foolish as to receive implicitly the Church's interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures.

We are very willing to *discuss* with them the meaning of their standards, if any dispute should arise about their import; but we cannot concede to them the exclusive privilege of interpreting the Sacred Canons and the Decrees of Councils, merely because they have sworn to adhere to them, and thus to renounce our own right, as rational beings, to judge for ourselves of the fair meaning of any statement to which our attention may be called. This is a sound principle, and one on which we would be entitled to act, even if fraudulent misrepresentation of their own standards had not been habitually practised by Papists, when it seemed fitted to serve their purposes. There is the less reason why we should take our view of the meaning of the standards of the Romish Church from individuals or bodies of men among Papists, because, in regard to the Decrees of the Council of Trent, which may be considered as the chief part of their authorized standards, all ecclesiastics, even bishops, are forbidden, as has been already observed, by the bull of Pius IV. to publish any sort of interpretation of them, under the penalty of the "wrath of Almighty God, and his blessed apostles Peter and Paul."

We cannot trust the integrity of Papists, even when they profess to be giving translations of their own standards, and we may mention one curious instance of their mode of management in this respect. The Catechism of the Council of Trent is acknowledged as one of the authoritative standards of Popish doctrine. After asserting (Pt. i. art. 9. sect. 12) that "heretics and schismatics are not in the Church," it

adds: "Non negandum tamen quia in ecclesiæ potestate sint ut qui ab ea in judicium vocentur, puniantur, et anathemate damnentur." This passage is very annoying to modern Papists, who have found it expedient to abjure the doctrine of their Church with respect to the persecution of heretics; and it is remarkable that in two different translations of the Catechism into English, the passage, while differently translated in each, is in both fraudulently perverted, with the obvious view of concealing the support which it gives to the principle of persecution. In a translation of the Catechism published at Dublin in 1816, the word *puniantur* in the above passage was not translated at all, but omitted; and in the translation published by Donovan, one of the professors at Maynooth in 1829, it is translated, "visited with spiritual punishments"—the word "spiritual" being gratuitously inserted, without any warrant from the original.

We must, then, examine for ourselves the authorized standards of Popish doctrine in the original language, and not take our views of their meaning implicitly either from Popish representations or translations.

Third, But while we can place no reliance upon the correctness of the accounts which Papists give of the doctrines of their Church, and must insist upon examining her standards for ourselves, we acknowledge that no man should be charged with holding doctrines which he has not himself professed to maintain. We cannot, indeed, admit that a mere disclaimer of certain tenets is, in all cases, sufficient of itself to free a man from the imputation of maintaining them; because it is

quite possible, and is, indeed, actually exhibited in the conduct of our Popish countrymen, that men may, by one act, disclaim doctrines, and by another act may afford good ground for believing that they hold them. We profess to act upon the principle of imputing to no Papist tenets which he has not himself professed to maintain; and although we might be entitled to charge upon Papists whatever we can prove to be a doctrine of that Church whose authority they acknowledge, we are perfectly willing to abandon all charge against Popish laymen founded upon tenets which they disclaim, because we cannot bring home to them a direct and explicit profession of these doctrines, and are therefore, perhaps, called upon to receive their dis claimer. The case, however, is very different with Popish priests. They have all taken an oath, binding them to adhere to everything contained in the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and especially in the Council of Trent; and until this oath be formally and explicitly annulled or revoked—*i. e.*, until they cease to be Popish priests—we are fully entitled to charge upon them all the tenets embodied in the standards which they have so solemnly acknowledged. We are quite willing to take their disclaimer, for themselves individually, of any tenets which we cannot prove to be contained in those standards to which they swore, at their ordination, to adhere; and, on the other hand, we consider ourselves fully warranted in imputing to them all that we can prove to be sanctioned by these standards, even although they may have disclaimed or abjured it, unless they have, at the same

time, abjured their ordination vow, and ceased to officiate as ministers of the Church of Rome. If Popish priests disclaim, upon oath, tenets which can be proved to be contained in their acknowledged standards, to which they have sworn to adhere, this only proves that they are guilty of perjury; but so long as they continue priests of the Church of Rome, they are to be regarded as every day repeating their ordination vow, and, of course, may be every day justly charged with maintaining all the tenets to which, by that vow, they are pledged. Whether or not certain tenets are contained in these standards, is a question of fact and evidence, to be decided, in each instance, upon its own special grounds; but none, surely, will deny the soundness of the general principle, that we are entitled to charge upon Popish priests, in virtue of their uncancelled ordination vow, all the doctrines which we can prove to be contained in their acknowledged standards, even although they may have been subsequently disclaimed or abjured.

Mr Smith, in his new edition of Gother, has introduced a considerable number of notes, intended, of course, to confirm and illustrate Gother's positions. He inserts several extracts from Bossuet's Exposition, which certainly do not contribute to anything like an honest and correct statement of Popish doctrine. He has not taken the translation of his extracts from Bossuet, either from the Popish version, published in 1686, or from that in common use among Papists in the present day, as published by Keating and Brown in 1825; and has therefore, in all likelihood, made it for

himself. In several instances he mistranslates Bossuet, so as to carry the misrepresentation of Popish doctrine further even than Bossuet ventured to do; and this, too, without any countenance from either of the previous translations of the Exposition, although both of them were made and published by Papists. He has taken the trouble of copying some of those passages which Popish controversialists have been in the habit of adducing as testimonies of adversaries in favour of Popish doctrines. Papists have been always in the habit of boasting of the concessions of adversaries in their favour; and, indeed, Bellarmine makes this one of the marks of the true Church. They have not a great deal to boast of in this way, although they have done much to increase it, by mutilations and interpolations practised upon Protestant authors; and even though they had much more, it would be nothing to the purpose. The argument, besides, admits of being retorted with far greater force against themselves. Brierly published, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, what he called "The Protestants' Apology for Catholics," in which he collected everything he could find in Protestant writers that seemed to afford an admission in favour of Popery, or any of its tenets. This occasioned the publication in 1610, of Bishop Morton's very learned and valuable work, entitled "A Catholic Appeal for Protestants out of the Confession of Roman Doctors," which contains a great deal of matter fitted to be very useful in controversy.

Mr Smith has more testimonies in favour of Popish principles from Luther, and Bishop Montague, than

from any other authors. It is easy to produce a few testimonies from Luther in favour of some of the less important peculiarities of Popery, but they were published before he attained to a full discovery of the mystery of iniquity. Bishop Montague has, perhaps, made more concessions in favour of Popery than almost any distinguished Protestant author; and yet Dr Doyle, not satisfied with his actual concessions, has been guilty of a gross fraud, in putting into his mouth a statement which he never made. (Phillpotts' Supplemental Letter, pp. 394–398.) To dispose of the authority of Montague, it is sufficient to state, that, in 1627, the House of Commons declared that "the scope and end of his book was to give encouragement to Popery, and to withdraw his majesty's subjects from the true religion established."

The editor has added copious notes to this new edition of Stillingfleet. The chief objects which he has kept in view, in the composition of the notes, are these:—

1*st*, To bring down the proofs and illustrations of the doctrines and practices of Popery to modern times.

2*d*, To give a brief summary of the general argument upon the point, especially when Stillingfleet, in the corresponding chapter, has confined his attention, in a great measure, to a mere exposure of Gother's misrepresentations.

3*d*, To answer whatever seemed worth answering in Mr Smith's notes to the new edition of Gother. And,

4th, To point out, to those who may be desirous to prosecute their studies on this subject, the sources whence full information upon all the topics of controversy may be procured.

His leading object, indeed, is to incite to the study of the Popish controversy, and to point out the sources from which sound views and full information upon the subject may be derived; and although the nature of the work did not admit, either in the text or in the notes, of lengthened quotations from documents, or of elaborate criticisms upon Scripture texts, it may yet be regarded as a brief manual of the controversy—a summary of the evidence by which the real doctrines of the Church of Rome may be established, and of the facts and arguments by which they may be refuted.

It is quite evident, from the signs of the times, that the Popish controversy must be fought over again. Care will be taken, that the most insidious views of the doctrines of Popery, and the most plausible arguments in support of them, shall be brought before the minds of the Protestant community. It is incumbent upon the ministers of the Gospel to prepare themselves for the contest, by giving more time and attention to the study of the Popish controversy than it has generally received for several generations.

There is no department of theological literature which affords finer displays of talent and learning than the controversy with the Church of Rome, and none which furnishes fuller scope for the exercise of the intellectual powers. Many men seem to suppose that

Popery is, in every point of view, such a mass of downright absurdity, that it would be mere trifling and waste of time to read, with attention, what has been written for or against it. Such persons, however, only manifest their ignorance, and would be very likely themselves to fall a prey to the arts of Popish priests. The controversy between Protestants and the Church of Rome is full of interest and importance; and, as it must obviously be discussed again, it is the duty of all who are preparing for the office of the ministry to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the leading topics in dispute, and with the principal works in which they are examined. The subjects of dispute between Papists and Protestants extend over the whole field of divine revelation. In almost every department of scriptural truth, with regard either to doctrine or duty, there is some Popish heresy or corruption which should be refuted and exposed. A mere inspection of the works of the systematic divines who flourished soon after the Reformation establishes the truth of this position. It may be sufficient to refer, as an example, to that most magnificent monument of sanctified talent and learning, Calvin's "Institutions of the Christian Religion," into which the author has interwoven, without straining, and without turning aside from his direct object of giving a comprehensive and connected view of Christian truth, an examination of almost all the peculiarities of Popery.

There is, indeed, no controversy which has been so thoroughly exhausted, and so completely settled in

argument, as that against the Church of Rome. This, however, is no reason why ministers should not now make themselves well acquainted with the subject, and thus be prepared, not only to refute the established doctrines of Popery, and answer the arguments by which they have in all ages been defended, but also to expose the varying aspects, and the fallacious dresses which Papists may now find it convenient to assume. The editor would earnestly recommend to students of divinity, to probationers, and the younger clergy, to study the Popish controversy with zeal and diligence; and he is persuaded that they will find it at once one of the most interesting and most useful departments of theological literature to which they can turn their attention.

In Gother's time, the adherents of the Church of Rome had not begun to affect to consider the word *Papist* as a nickname, with the use of which they had reason to be offended; and notwithstanding the outcry which they now make upon this point, the editor has regularly employed it, not meaning it as a nickname or term of reproach, but because it was constantly used by the Reformers, and because *it is the only correct designation* he knows, for men who are distinguished from all other denominations of professing Christians by this leading peculiarity, that they assert the supremacy of the Pope, as the vicar of Christ and the monarch of the Church.

EDINBURGH, *April* 14, 1837.

THE

DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES

OF

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

AN ANSWER TO THE INTRODUCTION.

THE introduction consists of two parts:—

I. A general complaint of the Papists being misrepresented among us.

II. An account of the method he hath taken to clear them from these misrepresentations.

I. As to the first, whether it be just or not, must be examined in the several particulars. But here we must consider whether it serves the end it is designed for in this place—which is, to gain the reader's opinion of their innocency; not merely because they complain so much of being injured, but because the best men in all times have been misrepresented; as he proves at large in this introduction, from several examples of the Old and New Testament, but especially of Christ and his apostles, and the primitive Christians. But it is

observable, that when Bishop Jewel began his excellent Apology for the Church of England, with a complaint much of the same nature, and produced the very same examples, his adversary would by no means allow it to have any force, being, as he called it, *exordium commune*, which might be used on both sides, and therefore could be proper to neither. And although it be reasonable only for those to complain of being misrepresented who, having truth on their side, do, notwithstanding, suffer under the imputation of error; yet it is possible for those who are very much mistaken, to complain of being misrepresented; and while they go about to remove the misrepresentations of others, to make new ones of their own. And as the best men and the best things have been misrepresented; so other men have been as apt to complain of it, and the worst things are as much misrepresented when they are made to appear not so bad as they are;—for evil is as truly misrepresented under the appearance of good, as good under the appearance of evil; and it is hard to determine whether hath done the greater mischief.

So that if the father of lies be the author of misrepresenting (as the introduction begins), we must have a care of him both ways; for when he tried this black art in Paradise (as our author speaks), it was both by misrepresenting the command, and the danger of transgressing it. He did not only make the command appear otherwise than it was, but he did very much lessen the punishment of disobedience; and by that means deluded our first parents into that sin and misery under which their posterity still suffer. Which ought to be a caution to them, how dangerous it is to break the law of God under the fairest colours and pretences; and that they should not be easily imposed upon by false glosses and plausible representations, though made by such as therein pretend to be angels of light.

But although the father of lies be the author of misrepresenting, yet we have no reason to think but that if he were to plead his own cause to mankind, he would very much complain of being misrepresented by them; and even in this respect, when they make him the father of those lies which are their own inventions. And can that be a certain argument of truth, which may as well be used by the father of lies?

And the great instruments he hath made use of in deceiving and corrupting mankind, have been as forward as any to complain of being misrepresented. The true reason is, because no great evil can prevail in the world, unless it be represented otherwise than it is; and all men are not competent judges of the colours of good and evil; therefore, when the designs of those who go about to deceive begin to be laid open, they then betake themselves to the fairest representations they can make of themselves, and hope that many will not see through their pretences.

If I had a mind to follow our author's method, I could make as long a deduction of instances of this kind; but I shall content myself with some few examples of those who are allowed on both sides to have been guilty of great errors and corruptions.

The Arians pleaded they were misrepresented, when they were taken for enemies to Christ's divinity; for all that they contended for, was only such a moment of time as would make good the relation between Father and Son.

The Pelagians, with great success, for some time (and even at Rome), complained that they were very much misrepresented, as enemies to God's grace; whereas they owned and asserted the manifold grace of God, and were only enemies to men's idleness and neglect of their duties.

The Nestorians gave out, that they never intended to make two persons in Christ, as their adversaries

charged them; but all their design was to avoid blasphemy, in calling the blessed Virgin the mother of God; and whatever went beyond this, was their adversaries' misrepresentations, and not their own opinions.

The Eutychians thought themselves very hardly dealt with, for saying there was but one nature in Christ. They did not mean thereby (as they said) to destroy the properties of the human nature, but only to assert that its subsistence was swallowed up by the divine; and of all persons, those have no reason to blame them who suppose the properties of one substance may be united to another.

Even the Gentile idolaters, when they were charged by the Christians that they worshipped stocks and stones, complained they were misrepresented, for they were not such idiots to take things for gods which had neither life, nor sense, nor motion in them. And when they were charged with worshipping other gods as they did the Supreme, they desired their sense might not be taken from common prejudices, or vulgar practices, but from the doctrine of their philosophers; and they owned a sovereign worship due to him that was chief, and a subordinate and relative to some celestial beings, whom they made application to as mediators between him and them.

Must all these complaints, now, be taken for granted? What, then, becomes of the reputation of general councils, or the primitive Christians? But as, if it were enough to be accused, none would be innocent; so none would be guilty, if it were enough to complain of being misrepresented. Therefore, in all complaints of this nature, it is necessary to come to particulars, and to examine with care and diligence the matters complained of, and then to give judgment in the case. I am glad to find our author professing so much sincerity and truth without passion; and I do assure him I shall follow what he professes; for

the cause of our Church is such as needs neither tricks nor passion to defend it; and, therefore, I shall endeavour to state the matters in difference with all the clearness and calmness that may be, and I shall keep close to his method and representations, without digressions or provoking reflections.

II. But I must declare myself very much unsatisfied with the method he hath taken to clear his party from these misrepresentations. For,

1. He takes upon him to draw a double character of a Papist; and in the one he pretends to follow a certain rule, but not in the other; which is not fair and ingenuous.

As to the one, he saith, he follows the Council of Trent, and their allowed spiritual books and catechisms; and we find no fault with this. But why must the other part, then, be drawn by fancy, or common prejudices, or ignorant mistakes? Have we no rule, whereby the judgment of our Church is to be taken? Are not our Articles as easy to be had and understood as the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent? I will not ask how the Council of Trent comes to be the rule and measure of doctrine to any here, where it was never received. But I hope I may, why our representations are not to be taken from the sense of our Church, as theirs from the Council of Trent. If he saith, his design was to remove common prejudices and vulgar mistakes; it is easy to answer, If they are contrary to the doctrine of our Church, we utterly disown them. We know very well there are persons who have so false a notion of Popery, that they charge the rites and customs of our Church with it; but we pity their weakness and folly, and are far from defending such misrepresentations. But that which we adhere to, is the doctrine and sense of our Church, as it is by law established; and what representations are made agreeable thereto I undertake to

defend, and no other. But if a person take the liberty to lay on what colours he pleases on one side, it will be no hard matter to take them off on the other, and then to say, How much fairer is our Church than she is painted! It is an easy, but not so allowable a way of disputing, for the same person to make the objections and answers too; for he may so model and frame the arguments, by a little art, that the answers may appear very full and sufficient; whereas, if they had been truly represented, they would be found very lame and defective.

2. He pretends to give an account why he quotes no authors for his misrepresentations, which is very unsatisfactory, namely, "that he hath described the Papist therein, exactly according to the apprehension he had of him when he was a Protestant." But how can we tell what sort of Protestant he was; nor how well he was instructed in his religion? And must the character now supposed to be common to Protestants be taken from his ignorant, or childish, or wilful mistakes? Did ever any Protestant that understands himself, say, "that Papists are never permitted to hear sermons which they are able to understand," or, "that they hold it lawful to commit idolatry," or, "that a Papist believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all angels," &c.? Yet these are some of his misrepresentations. Did he in earnest think so himself? If he did, he gives no good account of himself; if he did not, he gives a worse; for then, how shall we believe him in other things, when he saith, "he hath drawn his misrepresentations exactly according to his own apprehensions?" It is true, he saith, "he added some few points, which were violently charged on him by his friends;" but we dare be bold to say, this was none of them. But let us suppose it true, that he had such apprehensions himself — are these fit to be printed as the character of a party? What would

they say to us, if a Spanish convert should give a character of Protestants, according to the common opinion the people there had of them; and set down in one column their monstrous misrepresentations, and in another what he found them to be since his coming hither; and that in good truth he saw they were just like other men? But suppose he had false apprehensions before he went among them, why did he not take care to inform himself better before he changed? Had he no friends—no books—no means to rectify his mistakes? Must he needs leave one Church, and go to another, before he understood either? If this be a true account of himself, it is but a bad account of the reasons of his change.

3. The account he gives of the other part of his character affords as little satisfaction; for although, in the general, it be well that he pretends to keep to a rule, yet,

(1.) He shows no authority he hath to interpret that rule in his own sense. Now, several of his representations depend upon his own private sense and opinions, against the doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himself; and what reason have we to adhere to his representation, rather than to theirs? As, for instance, he saith, the Pope's personal infallibility is no matter of faith; but there are others say it is, and is grounded on the same promises which make him head of the Church. Why, now, must we take his representation rather than theirs? And so, as to the deposing power, he grants it hath been the opinion of several Popes (and councils too), but that it is no matter of faith. But whose judgment are we to take in this matter, according to the principles of their Church? A private man's, of no name, no authority; or of those Popes and councils? But suppose the question be about the sense of his own rule,* the Council of Trent, what authority hath

* Bulla Pii IV. super Confirm. Concil. Tridentini.

he to declare it, when the Pope hath expressly forbidden all prelates to do it, and reserved it to the apostolical see?

(2.) He leaves out, in the several particulars, an essential part of the character of a Papist since the Council of Trent; which is, that he doth not only believe the doctrines there defined to be true, but to be necessary to salvation. And there is not a word of this in his representation of the points of doctrine, but the whole is managed as though there were nothing but a difference about some particular opinions; whereas, in truth, the necessity of holding those doctrines, in order to salvation, is the main point in difference. If men have no mind to believe their own senses, we know not how to help it; but we think it is very hard to be told we cannot be saved unless we renounce them too. And this now appears to be the true state of the case, since Pius IV. drew up and published a Confession of Faith, according to the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent, wherein men are not only required "to believe their traditions as firmly as the Bible, the seven sacraments, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, invocation of saints, worshipping of images, indulgences, supremacy," &c., but they must believe, "that without believing these things, there is no salvation to be had" in the ordinary way; for, after the enumeration of these points, it follows:— "*Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*, &c. This is the true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved;" that is, the belief of these things is thereby declared as necessary to salvation, as of any other articles of the creed. But it may be objected: "The subscribing this profession of faith is not required of all members of that Church." To which I answer, that to make a man a member of it, he must declare that he holds the same faith which the Church of Rome holds; and this is as

much the faith of the Roman Church as the Pope and Council of Trent could make it. And it is now printed in the Roman Ritual at Paris, set forth by Paul V. as the confession of faith owned by the Church of Rome. And, therefore, this ought to have been a part of the "True Representation" as to the doctrinal points; but when he comes to the thirty-fifth head, he then owns, "that unless men do believe every article of the Roman faith they cannot be saved; and he that disbelieves one, does in a manner disbelieve all." Which may as well reach those who disown the deposing power, and the Pope's personal infallibility as us, since these are accounted articles of faith by the ruling part of their Church, to whom it chiefly belongs to declare them; and the former hath been defined both by Popes and councils.

(3.) He never sets down what it is which makes any doctrine to become a doctrine of their Church. We are often blamed for charging particular opinions upon their Church; but we desire to know what it is which makes a doctrine of their Church—that is, whether frequent and public declaration, by the heads and guides of their Church, be sufficient or not to that end. Our author seems to imply the necessity of some conditions to be observed; for, besides "the Pope's authority," he requires "due circumstances, and proceeding according to law." But who is to be judge of these circumstances and legal proceedings? And he never tells us what these circumstances are. And yet, after all, he saith: "The orders of the supreme pastor are to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or not."* And this now brings the matter home: The Popes, he confesses, "have owned the deposing doctrine, and acted according to it;" and others are bound to obey their orders, whether in fallible or not; and consequently, they are bound by the doctrine of their Church to act, when the Popes

* See Note, end of Section.

shall require it, according to the deposing power. But he seems to say, in this case, that a doctrine of their Church is to be judged by the number; for, saith he, "there are greater numbers that disown this doctrine." I will not at present dispute it; but I desire to be informed whether the doctrines of their Church go by majority of votes or not? I had thought the authority of the guides of the Church ought to have overbalanced any number of dissenters; for, what are those who refuse to submit to the dictates of Popes and councils, but dissenters from the Church of Rome? The distinction of the Court and Church of Rome is wholly impertinent in this case; for we here consider, not the mere temporal power which makes the Court, but the spiritual capacity of teaching the Church. And if Popes and councils may err in teaching this doctrine, why not in any other? I know there are some that say, universal tradition is necessary to make a doctrine of their Church. But then no submission can be required to any doctrine in that Church, till the universal tradition of it, in all times, and in all parts of the Christian Church, be proved. And we need to desire no better terms than these, as to all points of Pope Pius IV. his creed, which are in dispute between us and them.

(4.) He makes use of the authority of some particular divines, as delivering the sense of their Church, when there are so many of greater authority against them. Whereas, if we proceed by his own rule, the greater number is to carry it. Therefore, we cannot be thought to misrepresent them, if we charge them with such things as are owned, either by the general and allowed practices of their Church, or their public offices, or the generality of their divines and casuists; or, in case of a contest, with that side which is owned by the guides of their Church, when the other is censured, or which was approved by their canonized

saints, or declared by their Popes and councils, whose decrees they are bound to follow. And by these measures I intend to proceed, having no design to misrepresent them—as indeed we need not.

And so much in answer to the introduction.

NOTE.

The extraordinary position of Gother, that the orders of the Pope are to be obeyed whether he be infallible or not, was omitted by Bishop Challoner, and is not found in modern editions; but it was maintained in substance by Cardinal Bellarmine (De Pontif, lib. iv. cap. 5) and by Dr Troy, the late Popish archbishop of Dublin, in his Pastoral Instruction, although it is in flat contradiction to a leading principle of Papists, namely, that infallibility is the only proper ground on which to assume authority in religious matters, and that men cannot be reasonably required to obey unless they are certain that obedience will infallibly direct them in the right path. The truth is, that the infallibility of the Pope forms a natural and necessary part of the general scheme of Popery; and if Papists will deny it, as most of them do in modern times, except in Italy and Spain, they must fall into inconsistency.

CHAPTER I.

OF PRAYING TO IMAGES.

In this and the other particulars, where it is necessary, I shall observe this method:—

1. To give a clear and impartial account of the state of the controversy in as few words as I can.

2. To make some reflections on what he saith in order to the clearing them from misrepresentations.

As to the state of this controversy as it stands since the Council of Trent, we are to consider,

1. We must distinguish between what persons do in their own opinion, and what they do according to the sense of the divine law. It is possible that men may intend one thing, and the law give another sense of it, as is often seen in the case of treason: although the persons plead never so much they had no intention to commit treason, yet if the law makes their act to be so, their disavowing it doth not excuse them. So it is in the present case. Men may have real and serious intentions to refer their final, ultimate, and sovereign worship only to God; but if the law of God strictly and severely prohibits this particular manner of worship by images, in as full, plain, and clear words as may be, and gives a denomination to such acts taken from the immediate object of it, no particular intention of the persons can alter that denomination, or make the guilt to be less than the law makes it.

2. There can be no misrepresenting as to the lawfulness of many external acts of worship, with respect to images, which are owned by them. But it doth not look fairly to put the title, "Of Praying to Images," for the question is about the worship of images; whereas this title would insinuate as though we did directly charge them with praying to their images, without any further respect—which we are so far from charging them with, that I do not know of any people in the world, who are not like stones and stocks themselves, who are liable to that charge. The Pundits in the East Indies are fully cleared from it by Thevenot,* as well as Bernier; and it would be hard we should not allow the same to our fellow-Christians. I do therefore grant what our author saith, namely, that all the veneration they express before images, whether by kneeling, praying, lifting up the eyes, burning candles, incense, &c., is not at all done for the image, but is wholly referred to the things represented, which he intends to honour by these actions; but I hope now it is no misrepresenting for us to say, that they do kneel, pray, lift up their eyes, burn candles, incense, &c., before their images, which is all I charge them with at present.

3. To perform these acts before images, without a design to worship the images by them, is declared by great divines of the Church of Rome to be next to heresy. The case was this: There were, before the Council of Trent, several persons who lived in communion of that Church, but by no means approved the worship of images—such as Durandus, Holcot, Picus, Mirandula, and others. Now, these persons thought fit to comply in these external acts, but declared they intended not to worship the images, but the objects before them. Since the Council of Trent decreed images were to be worshipped, this case hath

* Thevenot Voyage des Indes, p. 188; Bernier Memoirs, tom. iii. 172.

been debated by the divines and casuists of greatest reputation among them; and Suarez saith: "This way of Durandus is dangerous, rash, and savours of heresy;"* and he saith further from Medina,† that it was Victoria's opinion that it was heretical; but he adds, that his own opinion, that images were truly and properly to be worshipped, was generally received by their divines; and therefore I need name no more.

4. It is granted by their divines and casuists, that the people, in the worship of images, may easily fall into idolatry.

(1.) If the worship do not pass from the image to the thing represented; and so Aquinas himself determines, that no irrational creature is capable of worship, but as it hath respect to a rational being. But here lies the difficulty, how an extrinsical relation to an object of worship, where the thing is confessed to deserve none, can give any reason for its being properly worshipped; but they all grant, if the worship stop at the inanimate part, it can be no other than the worship of stocks and stones.

(2.) If the worship be given to the image, which is proper to God alone. This Bellarmine is forced to grant,‡ because the evidence is so clear in antiquity, that the Gnosticks were condemned for some worship which they performed to the image of Christ. Now, we cannot think that these Gnosticks were such sots as to take the image of Christ to be Christ himself; and, therefore, whatever worship it was, it must have been relative—that is, given to the image for the sake of Christ represented by it.

(3.) If the people believe any divinity to be in the images, or put any trust or confidence in them, then the Council of Trent itself owns such to be like the Heathen idolaters.§ Now, how shall it be known when

* Suarez in 3 part, qu. xxv. disp. 53.
† Sect. 3. 2do principaliter et sect. 5.
‡ Bellarmin de Imag. i. ii. c. 24.
§ Concil. Trident. sess. 25.

the people believe divinity to be in images, but by some more than ordinary presence or operation in or by them?—by their having a greater opinion of one image than of another of the same person?—by their going long pilgrimages to certain images in hopes of relief, when they might easily cause images to represent them at home?

And that such are no extravagant imaginations is known to all who have heard of Loretto, or Compostella, or other places nearer home. I need not mention the complaints of Polydore Virgil, Cassander, or Wicelius, to this purpose, who died all in the communion of the Church of Rome; for the same is very lately complained of by a considerable person in that communion, who saith,* the greatest part of the devotion of the people of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, consists in prostrating themselves before images, and going in pilgrimage to them, and hoping for remission of their sins by so doing; and another very lately yields, that to avoid the peril of idolatry, to which, he saith,† the people is evidently exposed by the use of images, it would be necessary to take them away from the altars, and by no means to have them allowed for the objects of religious worship.

The question now is, Whether the Council of Trent hath taken any effectual course to prevent these abuses? If not, What misrepresenting is it to charge the abuses upon the doctrines and practices allowed by it?

The remedies prescribed by the council are these:—

1. Declaring that there is no divinity or virtue in them for which they should be worshipped; and that nothing is to be desired of them, nor any trust or confidence to be put in them.

2. Expressing their earnest desire, that if any abuses have crept in, they may be removed.

* Moyens Surs et Honestes pour la Conversion de tous les Heretiques, tom. ii. p. 115.

† Entretiens de Philalethe et Philerene, 2d part, p. 157.

But in the meantime, the council decrees the images not only to be useful to be set up in churches, but to have due honour and worship given them there, for the sake of those they represent—as not only putting off the hat, but falling down before them; and the Roman Catechism* declares, that this worship is very beneficial to the people, and so much is to be told them; and that images are to be in churches, not merely for instruction, *sed ut colantur*, that they may be worshipped.

But what could the council do more than to desire all abuses may be taken away; and is it not, then, the fault of others, and not of the council, if they be not?

I grant the council doth desire abuses may be taken away, if any such be; but then it enumerates those abuses, "in heterodox images, in making gain of images, in painting them too wantonly;" but besides, it doth say "that all superstition be removed in the sacred use of images;" but it doth not say "in the worship of them," and so it may relate to magic and divination. But that the council could not prevent, or design to prevent, the abuses mentioned in the worship of images, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of Trent allows the highest relative worship to be given to them—it setting no bounds to it, so it be for the sake of the prototypes.

2. It allows a worship to be given to the images themselves too; for it confirms the second Council of Nice, which decreed an inferior adoration to be given to them.

3. It disapproves no customs then practised among them in the worship of images; which were all known and by many complained of, both as pilgrimages to them, and the carrying of them about in procession, and the solemn consecration of them—the form whereof is not only inserted, but enlarged in the new Pon-

* Catechis. Rom. part iii, c. 2, s. 39, 40.

tifical since the Council of Trent. And it is to be observed, that in the old Pontifical (A.D. 1511), there is no form for consecrating an image. In that of Paul III. it is inserted, but out of Durandus; but in that of Clement VIII. it is put in more largely, and as authentically as if it had been always there; and is not this the way to reform the worship of images?

To come now to our author's reflections on the misrepresentation he says has been made as to this point.

1. A Papist represented, believes it damnable to worship stocks and stones for gods—to pray to pictures or images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, or any other saints.

These expressions are capable of a double sense, and therefore this is not fair representing.

(1.) To worship stocks or stones for gods may signify two things. 1*st*, To believe the very stocks and stones to be gods; and this we do not charge them with. 2*d*, To give to images made of wood and stone the worship due only to God; and so, by construction of the fact, to make them gods, by giving them divine worship. And if they will clear themselves of this, they must either prove that external adoration is no part of divine worship (notwithstanding the Scripture makes it so, and all the rest of mankind look upon it as such, even Jews, Turks, and Infidels); or that their external adoration hath no respect to the images (which is contrary to the Council of Trent); or that divine worship being due to the being represented, it may be likewise given to the image. And how then could the Gnosticks be condemned for giving divine worship to the image of Christ, which Bellarmine confesses, and is affirmed by Irenæus, Epiphanius, St Augustine, and Damascen?

(2.) To pray to images of Christ, or the blessed Virgin, may likewise be taken in two senses. 1*st*,

To pray to them, so as to expect to be heard by the mere images; and so we do not charge them with it. 2*d*, To pray to them, so as to expect to be rather heard by themselves for praying to them by their images. And if this be not so, to what end are the prayers made in the consecration of images, for those that shall pray before them? To what purpose do so many go in long pilgrimages to certain images, if they do not hope to be better heard for praying there? But he goes on.

2. He keeps them by him, indeed, to keep in his mind the memory of the things represented by them. And is this all in good truth? We will never quarrel with them, if this be true representing. No; that he dares not say. But,

3. He is taught to use them. But how? By casting his eye upon the pictures or images, and thence to raise his heart to the prototypes. And is this all yet? No. But,

4. He finds a double conveniency in the use of them. (1.) They represent at one glance; and men may easily make good reflections, as upon the sight of a Death's head, or old Time painted with his forelock, hour-glass, and scythe. And will he undertake that images shall be used in churches for no other end? Was the picture of old Time ever consecrated, or placed upon the altar, or elsewhere, that it might be worshipped? as the Roman Catechism speaks of their images. (2.) They cure distractions; for they call back his wandering thoughts to the right object. What is this right object?—the image, or the person represented? And that must be either a creature, or God himself. If it be a creature, doth not this imply that it is made a right object of worship? If God himself, how doth an image cure our distraction in the worship of an infinite, invisible being, when the very image is most apt to distract our thoughts by drawing them down from his divine and adorable

perfections to the gross and mean representations of an image? But are we yet come to the utmost use of them? No. But,

5. He cannot but love, honour, and respect the images themselves, for the sake of those they represent. Will this content them? and will he promise to go no farther? It is hard to part upon terms of mere respect and decent regard, where there is no encroachment upon divine worship; and here we are at a stand. But he goes farther,

6. And so he is come at last to veneration *before* images. And is this all? Dares he deny veneration *to* images, when the Council of Trent hath determined it: *Eisque venerationem impertiendam?* What, is this veneration before images only? Bellarmine hath a chapter on purpose to prove that true and proper worship is to be given to images; and was he a misrepresenter? Suarez says it is an article of faith that worship is to be given to them; but if the veneration be only before them, why are they consecrated, and set up in places proper for adoration? But,

7. To satisfy any one that he is far from making gods of his images, he is ready to break them into a thousand pieces. What! a consecrated image? Dares he take a crucifix from the altar and tear it in pieces? This doth not look like the love, honour, and respect, he mentioned before, not to name veneration; and I am afraid this is a strain beyond true representing. Yet at length he hath found some pretty parallels for the veneration of images themselves; and so we are come at last to the main point. But this is not directly owned; yet in the way of his representing, it is fairly insinuated by his parallels.

1. A Christian loves and honours his neighbour, because he bears the image of God in his soul. But doth he therefore take him and set him before him when he kneels at his devotion, to raise his mind and cure his distractions? Would he set him upon the

altar, and burn incense before him, because of the image of God in him? Is there no difference between the object of Christian love, and of divine worship? nor between a spiritual, invisible, divine image in the souls of men, and a material and corporeal representation?

2. We may kiss and esteem the Bible, because it contains and represents to us God's word; but when we kiss and esteem the Bible, we remember the Second Commandment is in it; and we dare not break God's law when we pretend to honour his word. But we think there is some difference between reverence and respect to the Bible, and falling down before an image. The circumstances of the one declare it to be mere respect and a religious decency; and if the other be not external adoration, we know not what it is.

3. A good preacher is loved, because he minds men of their duty; but what should we say to him that should therefore kneel down and say his prayers, and burn candles and incense before him, out of a respect to his good doctrine? Did St Peter or St Paul like this when men would have worshipped them? A good preacher would tell them their duty, as they did; and take men off from the worship of any creature, animate or inanimate, and direct them to worship God alone, who made heaven and earth.

NOTE TO CHAPTER I.

The second Council of Nice, which is regarded by Papists as infallible, did surely ascribe some virtue to images, since it certified their power of working miracles. (See Phillpotts' Letters to Butler, p. 78.) An official account has been published, with the approbation of the Master of the Sacred Palace, of a great

many miracles wrought by images in Italy in 1796 and 1797 (see Phillpotts' Supplemental Letter, pp. 401–415); and this account was translated into English, and published in London, under the patronage of many of the Popish bishops in this country.

Bellarmine tells us (De Imag. Sanct. c. xx. lib. 2), that there are three different opinions among Popish writers as to the sort of worship with which images are to be honoured. (See Edgar's Variations of Popery, c. xiii.) De la Hogue, whose treatises form the text-book at Maynooth College, admits that there was no public worship of images in the Church during the first three centuries (De Myster. Trin. Appendix, p. 265), although Bellarmine tries to trace the use of them to the apostolic age, and refers, among other proofs, to images of the Virgin Mary still extant, and said to have been made by the Evangelist Luke.

Mr Smith, as if he thought that Bossuet had not gone far enough in softening down the doctrines of his Church upon this point, gives the following as a translation from him:—"This is the *sole* foundation of the honour we pay to images," although there is no warrant for the word *sole* in the original, and it is not found in the two former Popish translations of the Exposition.

There is an elaborate and interesting account of the worship of images, viewed both doctrinally and historically, in Forbes' Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ, lib. vii., a very valuable work—perhaps the most important contribution that has been made to the cause of theological literature by the Scottish Episcopal Church; and a masterly exposure of the attempts of Papists to escape from the explicit testimony of Scripture upon this point, in Episcopius' Reply to Wadingus, de Cultu Imaginum Opera, pt. ii., p. 151.

There is a full statement and refutation of the Popish arguments from reason, and the supposed advantages of image-worship, in Dr Francis White's Reply to the Jesuit Fisher's Answer to certain questions propounded to him by James VI., sect. 15.

CHAPTER II.

OF WORSHIPPING SAINTS.

For the clear stating this controversy, these things are to be premised:—

1. We do not charge them that they make gods of dead men—that is, that they believe the saints to be independent deities; for this, our author confesses, were a most damnable idolatry.

2. We do not say that the state of the Church of Rome, with respect to the worship of dead men, is as bad as Heathenism. For we acknowledge the true saints and martyrs to have been not only good and virtuous, but extraordinary persons, in great favour with God, and highly deserving our esteem and reverence as well as imitation; whereas the Heathen deified men were vile and wicked men, and deserved not the common esteem of mankind, according to the accounts themselves give of them; and we own the common doctrine and advantages of Christianity to be preserved in the Church of Rome.

3. We do not deny that they do allow some external acts of worship to be so proper to God alone, that they ought to be given to none else besides him. And this they call *Latria;* and we shall never dispute with them about the proper signification of a word, when the sense is agreed, unless they draw inferences from it which ought not to be allowed,

To this *Latria* they refer not only sacrifice, but all that relates to it, as temples, altars, and priests; so that, by their own confession, to make these immediately and properly to the honour of any saint, is to make a god of that saint, and to commit idolatry.

4. They confess, that to pray to saints to bestow spiritual or temporal gifts upon us, were to give to them the worship proper to God, who is the only giver of all good things. For else I do not understand why they should take so much pains to let us know, that whatever the forms of their prayers and hymns are, yet the intention and spirit of the Church is only to desire them to pray for us, and to obtain things for us by their intercession with God. But two things cannot be denied by them.

(1.) That they do use solemn invocation of saints in places of divine worship, at the same time they make their addresses to God himself, with all the circumstances of external adoration—with bended knees, and eyes lifted up to heaven; and that this practice is according to the Council of Trent, * which not only decrees a humble invocation of them, but declares it to be impiety to condemn mental and vocal supplication to the saints in heaven.

(2.) That they do own making the saints in heaven to be their mediators of intercession, but not of redemption, although Christ be our mediator in both senses.

And upon these two points this controversy depends,

Let us now see what our representer saith to them.

1. " His Church teaches him, indeed, and he believes, that it is good and profitable to desire the intercession of the saints reigning with Christ in heaven; but, that they are either gods, or his redeemers, he is nowhere taught, but detests all such doctrine."

There are two ways of desiring the intercession of others for us.

* Session 25.

(1.) By way of friendly request, as an act of mutual charity; and so, no doubt, we may desire others here on earth to pray for us.

(2.) By way of humble supplication, with all the external acts of adoration; and we cannot think St Peter or St Paul, who refused anything like adoration from men, would have been pleased to have seen men fall down upon their knees before them, and in the same posture of devotion in which they were praying to Almighty God, to put their names into the middle of their litanies, and so pray them then to pray for them.

But how are we sure that their Church teaches no more than this? I have read over and over the Council of Trent, and the Roman Catechism about it, and I can find no such limitation of their sense there, where, if anywhere, it ought to be found. The Council of Trent mentions both the prayers and the help and assistance of the saints which they are to fly to. If this help and assistance be no more than their prayers, why is it mentioned as distinct? Why is their reigning together with Christ in heaven spoken of, but to let us understand they have a power to help and assist? For what is their reigning to their praying for us? But I have a further argument to prove the council meant more—namely, the council knew the common practices and forms of invocation then used and allowed, and the general opinion, that the saints had power to help and assist those who prayed to them. If the council did not approve this, why did it insert the very words upon which that practice was grounded? They likewise very well knew the complaints which had been made of these things; and some of their own communion cried shame upon some of their hymns. Wicelius saith:* One of them, *Salve Regina*, &c., is full of downright impiety and horrible superstition, and that others are

* Wicel. in Elencho Abusuum.

wholly inexcusable. Lud. Vives had said:* He found little difference in the people's opinions of their saints in many things from what the Heathens had of their gods. These things were known, and it was in their power to have redressed them, by declaring what the sense of the council was, and that whatever forms were used, no more was to be understood by them, but praying to them to pray for them. Besides, the Council of Trent, in the very same session, took care about reforming the Missal and Breviary; why was no care taken to reform these prayers and hymns, which, they say, are not to be construed by the sense of the words, but by the sense of the Church? There was time enough taken for doing it, for the Reformed Missal was not published till six years after the Council, nor the Breviary till four. In all that time, the prayers and hymns might easily have been altered to the sense of the Church, if that were truly so. But, instead of that, a very late French writer cries out of the necessity of reforming the Breviaries as to these things, wherein he confesses,† many hymns are still remaining wherein those things are asked of saints which ought to be asked of God alone; as being delivered from the chains of our sins, being preserved from spiritual maladies and hell-fire, being inflamed with charity, and made fit for heaven. In good conscience, saith he, is not this joining the saints with God himself, to ask those things of them which God alone can give? And whatever men talk of the sense of the Church, he confesses the very forms and natural sense of the words do raise another idea in men's minds, which ought to be prevented.

"But doth not the Roman Catechism explain this to be the sense of the Church?" I have examined that too, with all the care I could, about this matter;

* Vives in Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 8, c. 27.
† Entretiens de Philalethe et Philerene, part ii, p. 160, 163, 165.

and I cannot find any necessity from thence of putting this sense upon them. I grant in one place, where it explains the difference of the invocation of God and saints,* it saith: "We are to pray to God as the giver, and to saints that they would obtain things of God for us;" and then it adds: "The forms differ; that to God is *miserere nobis* and *aud inos;* that to saints is, *Ora pro nobis.*" Very well! And is there, then, no other form owned or allowed in the Church of Rome to saints besides this? Hold a little, saith the Catechism, for "it is lawful to make use of another form;" and that is, "we may pray to saints too, *Ut nostri misereantur.*" And how doth this now differ from that to God, but only in number? But it adds, "that the saints are very pitiful;" then, surely, we are encouraged to pray to them for "help and pity." Yes, saith the Catechism, "we may pray to them, that, being moved with pity towards us, they would help us with their favour and intercession with God." But yet this doth not clear the matter; for elsewhere the Roman Catechism† attributes more to saints than mere intercession; and we may pray to them for what is in their power; for where it undertakes to give an exact account of the reason of invocation of saints and angels, it there parallels them with magistrates under a king, and saith, they are God's ministers in governing the Church: *Invocandi itaque sunt quod et perpetuo Deum intuentur, et patrocinium salutis nostræ libentissime suscipiunt.* What is this *patrocinium salutis nostræ?* Is it only praying and intercession with God? That cannot be; for it instances presently in deliverances by angels, and Jacob's praying to the angel to bless him, and not merely to intercede for him. But though this is

* Catech. Rom. part iv., c. 6, n. 2-4.

† Catech. Rom. part iii., c. 2, n. 18, 19: Cum præsint nobis sancti et rerum nostrarum curamg erant.—*Bellarm. de Sanct. Beatit.* l. i. c. 20. Non solum ab angelis sed etiam a spiritibus beatorum hominum regi et gubernari fideles viventes.—Id. ib. c. 18.

spoken of angels, yet, from hence, it infers the invocation of saints too. But what need we insist more on this, since they do own the ministry of saints as well as angels with respect to the Church, and do canonize saints for particular countries, as lately S. Rosa for Peru; and where there is such a particular protection supposed, what incongruity is it to interpret the form of their prayers, according to a doctrine so received and allowed? But of this more under the next head.

2. "He confesses that we are all redeemed by the blood of Christ alone, and that he is our only mediator of redemption; but as for mediators of intercession, he doth not doubt but it is acceptable with God we should have many."

I would ask concerning this distinction, the question which Christ asked concerning John's baptism: "Is it from heaven, or of man?" No doubt there may be such a distinction of mediators, if God please to make them. But who hath authority to appoint mediators with him besides himself? Is it not usurping his prerogative, to appoint the great officers of his kingdom for him? Would any prince upon earth allow this, namely, when he hath absolutely declared his pleasure, that his own son should present petitions to him, that others shall take upon them to set up masters of requests themselves? Can anything be plainer in the New Testament than that God hath appointed the mediator of redemption to be our mediator of intercession?* and that his intercession is founded upon his redemption, as the high priest's going into the Holy of Holies to intercede for the people, was upon the blood of the sacrifice of expiation, which he carried in with him. If there was no revelation in this matter, there might be some reason for it; but since the revelation is so clear in it, this distinction looks just like the Socinian's distinction of

* John xiv. 13, 14, 16, 23, 24; Heb. vii. 25, ix. 7, 24; 1 John ii. 1.

a God by nature and a God by office, which was framed on purpose to avoid the plain texts of Scripture which called Christ God. So doth this look as if it were intended to avoid that clear text which saith: "There is but one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus;"* which is presently answered with this distinction, although there be not the least ground in that or any other text for it.

Yes, saith our author, Moses was such a mediator for the Israelites; Job for his three friends; Stephen for his persecutors; the Romans were desired by St Paul to be his mediators, and the Corinthians and Ephesians; so almost every sick person desires the congregation to be his mediator—that is, to be remembered in their prayers.

But is there no difference between men praying for one another, and desiring others to pray for them here on earth, and an humble invocation of the saints in heaven to be our mediators of intercession with God there? There is a threefold disparity in the case.

1. Here upon earth we converse with one another as fellow-creatures, and there is no danger of our having an opinion thereby that we are able to assist one another any other way than by our prayers. But the case is very different as to the saints in heaven, who, by being addressed there by such solemn invocation, may too easily be conceived to have the power of bestowing such blessings upon those who call upon them.

2. Heaven is looked on by all mankind, who direct their devotions thither, as the particular throne of God, where he dwells, and discovers himself after another manner than he doth upon the earth. And we are directed to pray to our Father in heaven, where he is represented as infinitely above all his creatures; and the great concernment of religion is, to

* 1 Tim. ii. 5.

keep up the apprehension of this distance between him and them. Now, it is hardly possible to keep it up, if, in the public offices of religion, in the solemnest postures of devotion, with eyes lifted up to heaven, they do make addresses both to God and to his creatures.

3. Men are sure, when they pray to others on earth to pray for them, that they do no more than they can justify in point of discretion, when they speak or write to those that can understand what their desire is; but no man on earth can be certain that the saints in heaven can do it; for it is agreed they cannot do it without a revelation, and no man can be assured there is a revelation; and it is not reasonable to expect it, for they pray to saints to pray to God for them; and they cannot tell what they pray for, unless God, to whom they are to pray, reveal to them what it is they must pray to him for. Is it not, then, the better, the safer, the wiser way, to make our prayers to him who, we are sure, is able to hear and help us, and hath promised to grant what we ask in his Son's name? But there is no other name, either under heaven or in heaven, whereby we can be saved, or our prayers accepted, but his alone.

But our author saith: "It is no part of his faith, how the saints in heaven know the prayers and necessities of such who address themselves to them."

But how comes it to be any part of his faith that they know them? However, he doth not doubt but God can never want means of letting the saints know them. And is this a sufficient ground for solemn invocation of saints? God doth not want means to let the Emperor of Japan know a request any one here hath to make to him; but is this a reasonable ground for him at this distance to make it to him? God doth not want means to let the Pope know what a mighty service it would be to the Christian world, to make a wise and truly Christian reformation in the Church;

but would this be a ground sufficient for me, at this distance, to make a speech to him about it? I knew a man who understood not a word of Latin, but yet would needs go hear a Latin sermon. Some asked him afterwards what he meant by it? and the chief reason he gave was much like this: God did not want means to let him know what the preacher meant.

But after all, suppose God should make known to the saints what is desired of them, I ask, whether this be sufficient ground for solemn invocation? When Socinus was not able to defend the invocation of Christ himself, supposing that he could know our hearts only by revelation, he had nothing material to say, but only that there was a command for it, which can never be so much as pretended in this case.

As to what he alleges of the elders falling down before the Lamb, having vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints (Rev. v. 8), it must be strained hard to be brought to this purpose, when both ancient and modern interpreters take it for a representation of what was done upon earth, and not in heaven. And if it were in heaven, prophetical visions were never intended for a measure of our duties. If the angels do pray for mankind (Zech. i. 12) doth it therefore follow we must pray to them? But we say as the angel did to St John (Rev. xix. 10) in a like case: "See thou do it not; worship God."

NOTE TO CHAPTER II.

Mr Smith, in quoting Bossuet's Exposition upon the subject of the invocation of saints, has represented, him as saying that the doctrine of the Church is, that "it is *lawful* to address ourselves to saints"—the

French word which he translates *lawful* being *utile*. Bossuet, it is true, insinuates that the Church merely teaches that it is *useful* to pray to saints, without requiring it as an imperative duty; but even he had not the hardihood to make such a statement as that which Mr Smith has ventured to put into his mouth. Dr Milner, the great English champion of Popery in the last generation, speaks a little more plainly on this point than Bossuet, and tells us (End of Controversy, p. 252) that "it was inferred, from the decree of the Council of Trent, that there is no positive law of the Church, incumbent upon all her children, to pray to the saints," and intimates his concurrence in this opinion; which, however, has been conclusively proved to be a fraudulent misrepresentation by Dr Phillpotts. (Letters, pp. 21–26.) In the Roman Catechism (pt. iii. cap. 2. sect 24) it is declared, "that God bestows many benefits upon us through the merit and grace of the saints."

In the authorized devotional books of the Romish Church, repeated instances occur in which God is asked to grant spiritual blessings through the *merits* of the saints. (Wake's Exposition, p. 17.) And it should not be forgotten that there are saints venerated and worshipped in the Church of Rome who never existed (Middleton's Letter from Rome, preface and p. 169), and that not a few have been canonized by the Pope who were fanatics and knaves. (Stillingfleet on the Fanaticism of the Church of Rome; Blanco White's Evidences, pp. 201–216.)

The Popish bishops of England and Scotland, in their Declaration, published in 1826, besides the common evasions, seem to insinuate that modern Papists, though retaining the old words of *adoration* and *worship*, do not use them in the same sense in which they may have been formerly employed.

It is certain, and has been confessed by learned Papists, that there is no example of publicly invocat-

ing saints till about the fourth century. It was not introduced into the public service and litanies of the Church till the seventh century. (See White's Reply to Fisher, sect. 16; and Freeman's Discourse concerning the Invocation of Saints.)

CHAPTER III.

OF ADDRESSING MORE SUPPLICATIONS TO THE VIRGIN MARY THAN TO CHRIST.

THERE is no need of further stating the question, this only relating to the extraordinary service of the blessed Virgin; and, therefore, we are presently to attend his motions.

"He believes it damnable to think the Virgin Mary more powerful in heaven than Christ, or that she can in anything command him."

But in good earnest, is it not damnable, unless a man thinks the blessed Virgin more powerful than Christ? Suppose one should think her to have an equal share of power with Christ, is this damnable or not? Is it not setting up a creature equal with God?

But what thinks he, then, of those who have attributed an universal dominion to her, over angels, men, and devils? What thinks he not only of psalters, but of a creed, litany, and all the hymns of Scripture being applied to her?* All which was done by a canonized saint in their Church; and the books printed out of the Vatican manuscripts, and dedicated to the Pope. And there we find something more than an "*Ora pro nobis*" in the litany; for there is "*Parce nobis, Domina*—Spare us, good Lady;" and, "*Ab*

* S. Bonavent. Opusc., tom. i. *ad fin.*

omni malo, libera nos, Domina—From all evil, good Lady, deliver us."

What thinks he of another canonized saint,* who said these two propositions are both true: "All things are subject to God's command, even the Virgin;" and: "All things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God?" Was this damnable in a canonized saint?

What thinks he of the noted hymn,

"O felix puerpera nostra pians scelera,
Jure matris impera redemptori!"†

Was not this damnable? And I have not only seen it in the old Paris Missal, but Balingham,‡ a Jesuit, saith it was in the Missals of Tournay, Liege, Amiens, Artois, and the old Roman. I could produce many other passages cited by him out of the old offices to the same purpose, but I forbear.

But I cannot omit the approbation given to the blasphemous saying of S. Bernardin by Mendoza§ (who endeavours to prove the blessed Virgin's kingdom, not to be a metaphorical, but a true and real kingdom); and by Salazar,‖ another noted Jesuit, who saith, her kingdom is as large as her Son's. And we have lately seen how far this divinity is spread, for not many years since this proposition was sent from Mexico,

"Filius non tantum tenetur audire matrem, sed et obedire—¶

The Son is bound, not only to hear, but to obey his mother." And is it still damnable to say she commands him?

But our author saith, whatever esteem they have for her, they own her still as a creature. Is he sure of that? What thinks he of another saying which Mendoza approves of, namely, of Christ's saying to

* S. Bernardin, Sen. apud. Bernardin a Bustis Marial, part xii. serm. 2.
† "O happy mother, expiating our guilt, by a mother's right command the Redeemer."
‡ Balingham Parnass. Marian, p. 208.
§ Mendoza Virid. Sacr. lib. ii. probl. 1. et 4.
‖ Salazar. pro Immac. Concept. cap. xxii.
¶ Hier. Peres de Nutros Lapicidina Sacra tr. i. sec. 12, n. 148.

his mother: "As thou hast communicated humanity to me, I will communicate my deity to thee."* But it may be said, we are by no means to judge the sense of a Church by some men's extravagant sayings. I grant it; but I have something considerable to reply, namely, that we may easily judge which way the guides of that Church incline by this following passage: About ten years since, a gentleman of that communion published a book called "Wholesome Advice to the Worshippers of the Blessed Virgin;" and the whole design of it, being printed in Latin and French, was to bring the people of that Church to a bare *Ora pro nobis* to the blessed Virgin. But this was so far from being approved, that the book was condemned at Rome, and vehemently opposed by the Jesuits in France; and a whole volume published against it.†

Here, I have reason to inquire whether the Virgin Mary, then, according to the sense of the Church of Rome, be only a mediatrix of intercession or not, since so large power and dominion is attributed to her? And why should not her supplicants go beyond an *Ora pro nobis*, if this doctrine be received, as it must be if the contrary cannot be endured? For that author allowed her intercession, and prayer to her on that account; but he found fault with those who said she had a kingdom divided with her Son; that she was the mother of Mercy, or was a co-saviour or co-redemptrix, or that she was to be worshipped with *Latria*, or that men were to be slaves to her.‡ Now, if these things must not be touched without censure, and no censure pass on the other books, is it not easy to judge which is more agreeable to the spirit of the guides of that Church?

But we have a fresh instance of this kind at home,

* Viridar. Sacr. lib. ii. probl. 2, n. 11.

† La Veritable Devotion envers la S. Vierge Etablie et Defendu, par le Pere Crasset, à Paris, A.D. 1679.

‡ Monita Salutaria B. V. Mariæ ad Cultores suos indiscretos, sec. iii. n. 56, sec. iv.

in a book very lately published, *permissu superiorum.** There we are told in the epistle, that not only the blessed Virgin is the empress of seraphims —the most exact original of practical perfection which the omnipotency of God ever drew—but that, by innumerable titles, she claims the utmost duty of every Christian, as a proper homage to her greatness. What can be said more of the Son of God in our nature? In the book itself she is said to be queen of angels, patroness of the Church, advocate of sinners; that the power of Mary, in the kingdom of Jesus, is suitable to her maternity, and other privileges of grace; and, therefore, by it she justly claims a servitude from all poor creatures. But wherein doth this special devotion to her consist? He names several particulars.

1. "In having an inward, cordial, and passionate value of the maternity of Mary, and all other excellences proper to, and inseparable from, the mother of God."

2. "In external acts of worship, of eminent servitude towards her, by reason of the amplitude of her power in the empire of Jesus." And can we imagine these should go no further than a poor *Ora pro nobis?* He instances in these external acts of her worship—(1.) Frequent visiting holy places dedicated to her honour. And are not those her temples, then? which Bellarmine confesses to be a peculiar part of the worship due to God.† And the distinction of Basilicæ cannot hold here, because he believes the assumption of the blessed Virgin; and he will not pretend that "*to her honour*" is only for discrimination. (2.) A special reverence towards images representing her person. (3.) Performing some daily devotions containing her praises, congratulating her excellency, or imploring her mediation; and by oft calling upon the sacred name of Holy Mary, &c.

* Contemplations on the Life and Glory of Holy Mary, the Mother of Jesus, A.D. 1685.

† Bellarmin, de Cultu Sanct. lib. iii. cap. 4, init.

3. "In having a firm and unshaken confidence in her patronage amidst the greatest of our inward conflicts and outward tribulations; through a strong judgment of her eminent power within the empire of Jesus, grounded upon the singular prerogative of her divine maternity." I have not patience to transcribe more, but refer the reader to the book itself; only the eighth particular of special devotion is so remarkable that it ought not to be passed over, namely, "Entering into a solemn covenant with Holy Mary, to be for ever her servant, client, and devotee, under some special rule, society, or form of life, and thereby dedicating our persons, concerns, actions, and all the moments and events of our life to Jesus, under the protection of his divine mother, choosing her to be our adoptive mother, patroness, and advocate; and intrusting her with what we are, have, do, or hope, in life, death, and through all eternity." And is all this no more than an *Ora pro nobis?* And it follows: "Put yourself wholly under her protection." What a pitiful thing was the old Collyridian cake in comparison of these special acts of devotion to her! But there are some extraordinary strains of devotion afterwards, which it is pity to pass over. As: "I will ever observe thee as my sovereign lady, adoptive mother, and most powerful patroness, relying on thy bowels of mercy, in all my wants, petitions, and tribulations of body and mind." Could anything greater be said to the eternal Son of God? And in the praise:—

"*Vers.* Open my lips, O Mother of Jesus.
Resp. *And my soul shall speak forth thy praise.*
Vers. Divine Lady, be intent to my aid.
Resp. *Graciously make haste to help me.*
Vers. Glory be to Jesus and Mary.
Resp. *As it was, is, and ever shall be.*"

Then follows the 8th psalm, applied thus to her:—

"Mary, Mother of Jesus, how wonderful is thy name, even unto the ends of the earth!

"All magnificence be given to Mary, and let her be exalted above the stars and angels.

"Reign on high as queen of seraphims and saints; and be thou crowned with honour and glory," &c.

"Glory be to Jesus and Mary," &c.

In the next page follows a cantique in imitation of the *Te Deum*:—

"Let us praise thee, O Mother of Jesus! Let us acknowledge thee our sovereign lady.

"Let men and angels give honour to thee, the first conceived of all pure creatures," &c.

I think I need mention no more; only three things I shall observe: (1.) That this is now printed *permissu superiorum;* and we thank them for the seasonableness of it, in helping us in true representing what their allowed doctrines and practices are. (2.) That this is published in English, that our people as well as theirs may be convinced how far we have been from unjust charging them as to such things as these. (3.) That at the same time they plead for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the people; wherein their discretion is so far to be commended, since the Scripture and this new scheme of devotion can never stand together; there being not one word in the Bible towards it, but very much against it; and the psalms and hymns must be burlesqued to sound that way.

But what saith our author to their rosaries, wherein there are ten Ave Maries to one Paternoster, which is accounted a special piece of devotion? and great things are said of the effects of it by Alanus de Rupe, and many others.

1. As to the Ave Maries, he saith, there is no more dishonour to God in reciting the Angelical Salutation,

than in the first pronouncing it by the angel Gabriel and Elizabeth. But it may not be altogether so pertinent. But doth he really think they said the whole Ave Maria, as it is used among them? Did the angel and Elizabeth say: "*Sancta Maria, mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc et in hora mortis nostræ?*" If not, to what purpose are they mentioned here?

2. As to the repetition, that, he saith, is no more an idle superstition than David's repeating the same words twenty-six times in the 136th psalm. But what is this to the question: Why more supplications to the blessed Virgin than to Christ? And not one word of answer is given to it. But Alanus de Rupe* answers it roundly: "Because the blessed Virgin is our mediatrix to Christ, the mother of mercy, and the special patroness of sinners." This is, indeed, true representing.

NOTE TO CHAPTER III.

An Ave Maria, or Hail Mary, is in these words (Doyle's Catechism, p. 3): "Hail Mary, full of grace! the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Hail, Mary, Mother of God! pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of death—Amen;" the first part being taken from the salutation of the angel to Mary (Luke i. 28), and the latter added by the Popish Church.

Gother insinuates, though he did not dare to assert, that an Ave Maria consists only of the angel's salutation, which is merely the first part of it, and which was certainly not used by him as a prayer, while Papists are enjoined to use it daily as a part of their devotional exercises. (Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, published by authority for England, edition of

* Alanus de Rupe de usu Psalterii, lib. i. cap. 6.

1831, pp. 25, 56, 59.) A similar fraud is practised in most Popish catechisms, where it is commonly called the "Angelical Salutation."

The devotional books in common use among Papists, even in the present day, contain prayers to the Virgin Mary, which go a great deal beyond asking her to pray for us, and which are indeed full of blasphemy. In the "Devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, including the Devotion of the Sacred Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary, with an Appendix" (by Dr Milner, Vicar Apostolic,) "and the Indult of his Holiness Pope Pius VII. in favour of it, for the use of the midland district" (12th edition, published in 1821, and still in general use in England), Papists are taught, and that, too, as it is pretended, upon the authority of the Virgin herself, to pray to her that "she would, in the hour of death, illustrate and strengthen their souls with the knowledge of the true faith, and instil into them the sweetness of divine love." They are taught to address her, also, in these awful words: "Hail, Mary! Lady and Mistress of the world, to whom all power has been given both in heaven and in earth." (P. 206.)

In the Catechism of the Most Rev. Dr Reilly, published in 1834 by R. Coyne, publisher to the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, Papists are taught to address her, among many other blasphemous titles, as "the ark of the covenant, the gate of heaven, the morning star, the health of the weak, the refuge of sinners, the comfort of the afflicted, the queen of angels, of patriarchs, of prophets, of apostles, of martyrs, of confessors, of virgins, and of saints;" and to pray to her in these words: "We fly under thy protection, O holy Mother of God; despise not our prayers in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O glorious and blessed Virgin." (Pp. 10, 11.) The present Pope, in his Encyclical Letter, published in the Laity's Directory for 1833, p. 14,

styles her "our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope."

The more ancient devotional books sanctioned and authorized by the Church of Rome, contain, in regard to the Virgin Mary, her parents, her conception, her birth, her miracles, her assumption into heaven, her power and glory, and the worship and honour that are due to her—a mass of absurdity, falsehood, and blasphemy which has never been equalled, and which affords a most melancholy exhibition of the corruption of depraved human nature. A full account of this is given in a work of Bishop Patrick, entitled "The Virgin Mary Misrepresented by the Roman Church, in the traditions of that Church concerning her life and glory, and in the devotions paid to her as the Mother of God." It is republished in the third volume of Gibson's "Preservative against Popery." It contains also a curious account of the disputes which have prevailed in the Church of Rome on the subject of the immaculate conception of the Virgin; *i. e.*, the question whether or not she ever had original sin—a point which *seems* to be decided by the Council of Trent (sess. 5), when they declared, that "they did not mean to comprehend, in their decree about original sin, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, the Mother of God," but which has since occasioned great contentions among Papists, and which the Pope has never yet dared to settle by an authoritative judgment, although two successive kings of Spain, in the seventeenth century, sent embassies to Rome for the express purpose of getting a decision, as it was occasioning violent contentions in that country. The history of the disputes about the immaculate conception of the Virgin affords a striking illustration at once of the falsehood of the common allegation about the unity of the Romish Church, and the fraud and manœuvring often exhibited by Popes, when it was not safe or convenient to exercise their infallibility. The most com-

plete history of the life of the Virgin Mary, according to Popish legends, and of the worship and honour that are paid to her in the Church of Rome, is to be found in Rivet's Apologia pro Sanctissima Virgine Maria, Opera, tom. iii.

On the worship of images and saints, and especially of the Virgin Mary, is mainly founded the charge of idolatry, which Protestants have adduced and fully established against the Church of Rome. Papists have exerted all their skill and ingenuity in trying to evade this weighty charge; but without success. The leading considerations to be kept in view upon this subject are these: That it is enough that the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome on these points have no foundation in Scripture, and of course are condemned there as *will worship;* that the second commandment forbids the making of images, with a view to worship them, and prohibits bowing down to them; that the Scriptures plainly teach that religious worship is to be given to God alone, to the exclusion of every creature; that angels and the most eminent saints are recorded to have refused the outward marks of worship when offered to them, upon the ground that God alone was entitled to them; that the common Popish distinctions of direct and relative, of supreme and inferior worship, have no warrant whatever from Scripture, and therefore can have no weight in setting aside an express Scripture precept, or a plain Scripture principle; that these distinctions, and the common Popish arguments derived from reason, as to the propriety and advantages of the worship of saints and images, are equally available for defending the unquestionable idolatry of the Jews and the Heathens, and that, in substance, they were actually alleged by the defenders of Paganism against the primitive fathers; and, finally, that the gross corruptions and abuses which, by the confession of Papists, have often flowed from the worship of saints and images, and the danger

of idolatry attending it, which, even according to their own view of the matter, can be avoided only by means of subtle distinctions which the mass of the people cannot comprehend, form quite a sufficient reason for putting an end to practices to which the Word of God gives no sanction, and from which it affords no ground to expect any benefit.

The worship of saints and images in the Church of Rome is just a new edition of Satan's old scheme of Pagan idolatry, adapted to the circumstances of the Christian dispensation.

We do not deny that the Church of Rome condemns what she reckons idolatry; but we maintain, that she teaches and practises what the Word of God condemns as idolatry; and that, on this account, it is positively sinful to acknowledge her authority, or to join in her worship.

Calvin, Instit. lib. i. cap. 11; Zanch. tom. iv. cap. 17, sect. 5. The fullest exposure of the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome on these points, and the most conclusive proof of the charge of idolatry, are to be found in Stillingfleet's different treatises on the idolatry of the Church of Rome, in Wake's Discourse on the Nature of Idolatry, and in the second part of his Second Defence of his Exposition. See likewise Sherlock's Discourse of the Object of Religious Worship, or a Scripture Proof of the Unlawfulness of giving any Religious Worship to any other being besides the One Supreme God.

There is also a very able summary of the argument on this point in F. Turretine's Treatise de Necessaria Secessione nostra ab Ecclesia Romana, Disput. ii. iii. iv.

CHAPTER IV.

OF PAYING DIVINE WORSHIP TO RELIQUES.

For the right understanding this controversy, we are to consider,

1. That there is a due veneration to the bodies of saints and martyrs allowed on both sides; and there is an undue worship of them, which is disowned on both sides. The due veneration is a religious decency to be observed towards them, which lies in avoiding anything like contempt or dishonour to them, and using all such testimonies of respect and decency, which becomes the remains of excellent persons; provided we are satisfied of their sincerity, without having recourse to divine omnipotency to prove them, which Ferandus the Jesuit* runs so much to, to prove the truth of many reliques worshipped in the Church of Rome, in many places at once. But that it is possible to exceed in the worship of true reliques even Bellarmine confesseth, who says that God took away the body of Moses, lest the people should give divine worship to it. And St Jerome,† as hot as he was against Vigilantius, yet he utterly denied giving any adoration to the reliques of martyrs. It seems, then, it is very possible to exceed that way.

2. The question, then, is, Whether those acts of

* Ferandi Disquisitio Reliquiaria.
† De Imag. Sanct. lib. ii. cap. 4.

worship which are allowed in the Church of Rome do not go beyond due veneration? For it is unreasonable to suppose those who give it do believe those reliques to be gods; and, therefore, it must be such a worship as is given to them supposing them to be only reliques of such persons. The Council of Trent decrees honour and veneration to be given to them, but never determines what is due, and what not; it forbids all excesses in drinking and eating, in the visiting of reliques, but not a word of excesses in worshipping of them, unless it be comprehended under the name of superstition. But superstition lies in something forbidden, according to their notion of it; therefore, if there be no prohibition by the Church, there can be no superstition in the worship of them. And if they had thought there had been any in the known practices of the Church, they would certainly have mentioned them; and because they did not, we ought in reason to look on them as allowed. And yet not only Cassander* complains of the great superstition about them, but even the Walenburgii lately confess, that the abuses therein have not only been offensive to us, but to themselves too.

But what saith our representer to them?

"He believes it damnable to think there is any divinity in the reliques of saints, or to adore them with divine honour." But what is this adoring them with divine honour? A true representer ought to have told us what he meant by it, when the whole controversy depends upon it. Is it only saying mass to reliques, or believing them to be gods? Is there no giving divine honour by prostration, burning of incense, &c.? Nothing in expecting help from them? Yes, "if it be from any hidden power of their own." But here is a very hard question: If a man doth not believe it to be an intrinsic power in the reliques, may a man safely go to them, *Opis impetrandæ causa*, as

* Cassand. Consult. art. xxi. tract. special. 4, controv. 4.

the Council of Trent saith, in hopes of relief from them? Is it not possible for the devil to appear with Samuel's true body, and make use of the relique of a saint to a very bad end? Then, say I, no reliques can secure men against the imposture of evil spirits, who, by God's permission, may do strange things with the very reliques of saints.

"But God hath visibly worked by them," saith our author, "by making them instruments of many miracles; and it is as easy for him to do it now." This is the force of all he saith. To which I answer —1. It is a very bold thing to call in God's omnipotency, where God himself hath never declared he will use his power; for it is under his own command, and not ours. But there is no reason to deduce the consequence of using it now, because he hath done it formerly. And that they may not think this is cavilling in us, I desire them to read Père Annat's answer to the Jansenist's pretended miracle at Port Royal,* namely, of the cure wrought by one of our Saviour's thorns. There he gives another account of such miracles than would be taken from us. But where he saith: "It is as much for the honour of God's name to work such miracles now," their own authors will tell him the contrary, and that there is no such reason now as in former times, when religion was to be con firmed by them, and when martyrs suffered upon the sole account of the truth of it; and, therefore, their reputation had a great influence upon converting the unbelieving world. 2. Suppose it be granted, yet it proves not any religious worship to be given to them. For I shall seriously ask an important question— Whether they do really believe any greater miracles have ever been done by reliques than were done by the brazen serpent? And yet, although that was set up by God's own appointment, when it began to be worshipped after an undue manner, it was thought fit

* Rabat. Joy de Jansenists, A.D. 1656.

CHAPTER V.

OF THE EUCHARIST.

THERE are two material points under this head, which are to be examined, because our author endeavours to set them off with all the advantage he can, namely, adoration of the host and transubstantiation.

I.—OF THE ADORATION OF THE HOST.

1. The question is far enough from being, whether it be lawful to commit idolatry, as our representer puts it; for the misrepresenter saith, "that a Papist believes it lawful to commit idolatry;" and to clear this, our author gravely saith, "he believes it unlawful to commit idolatry"—as though any man ever owned it to be lawful; which is as if the question were, whether such a man committed adultery, and he should think to clear himself by saying, he believed it unlawful to commit adultery.

2. The question is not, whether Christ may be lawfully adored by us in the celebration of the eucharist, which we are so far from denying, that our Church requires our receiving it in the posture of adoration.

3. The true question is, whether the body of Christ, being supposed to be present in the host by transubstantiation, be a sufficient ground to give the same adoration to the host which they would do to the person of Christ?

And that this is the true state of the question will appear by these things:—

1. The Council of Trent first defined transubstantiation, and from thence inferred adoration of the host, as is most evident to any one that will read the fourth and fifth decrees of the thirteenth session: *Nullus itaque dubitandi locus*, &c.; that is, if transubstantiation be true, then adoration follows. It is true the sixth canon only speaks of Christ being there worshipped; but that ought to be compared with the first, second, and fourth canons, where the doctrine of transubstantiation is fully set down as the foundation of that adoration.

2. The adoration is not fixed on the person of Christ, as separate from the host, but as making one object of worship together with it. And so the Council of Trent declares in the sixth decree, when it saith: "The sacrament is not the less to be adored because it was instituted to be received." This cannot be otherwise understood than as relating to the sacrament, and so that, whatever it be, must be granted to be the object of adoration. "By the sacrament," saith Cardinal Pallavicini,* "is understood the object made up of the body of Christ, and the accidents." The worship, then, being confessed to be adoration, which is due to God alone, and that adoration directed to the sacrament as its proper object, the question now is, whether such a supposition in the sacrament doth justify that adoration?

Our author saith, "he accounteth it most damnable to worship or adore any breaden god, or to give divine honour to any elements of bread and wine."

Then I say, by his own confession, if it be only bread, he commits idolatry; for the adoration he cannot deny. But our representer loves ambiguous expressions, which, to the people, sound very well, but have no sincere meaning; for what is it he under-

* Pallavicin. Hist. Concil. Trident., lib. xii. cap. 6.

stands by his breaden god? If it be, that he worships a god which himself supposes to be nothing but bread, we do not charge him with it; but if it be, what we believe it to be, the substance of bread, but himself believes to be turned into the body of Christ, then he cannot deny his adoration to be given to it.

All that can excuse them is the supposition; and whether that will or not is now to be considered.

1. If it be not true, themselves grant it to be idolatry. The testimonies of Bishop Fisher and Costerus * are so well known to the purpose, that I shall not repeat them. And Catharinus,† a divine of note in the Council of Trent, confesses it is idolatry to worship an unconsecrated host, although the person, through a mistake, believes it consecrated. And he quotes St Thomas and Paludanus for his opinion, and gives this reason for it: "Because Christ is not worshipped simply in the sacrament, but as he is under the species; and therefore, if he be not so present, a creature hath divine worship given it. As those were guilty of idolatry who worshipped any creatures of old, supposing God to be there, as that he was the soul of the world; they were not excused, saith he, that they thought they worshipped but one God, because they worshipped him as present in such a manner as he was not." And this book of his, he saith, in the review of it, "was seen and approved, by the Pope's order, by their divines at Paris."

2. If the bread were taken to be God, our author doth not deny it would be idolatry; for that were to worship a breaden god. Yet here would be a mistake, and a gross one; yet the mistake would not excuse the persons committing it from most damnable idolatry, as he confesses. Why, then, should the other mistake excuse them, when they suppose the substance of the bread not to be there, but the body of

* Roffens. c. Oecolamp, lib. i., cap. 2; Coster Enchirid., cap. viii., n. 10.
† Catharin. in Cajet, p. 133, &c., ed. Paris, 1535.

Christ to be under the species? "Yes," say they, "then no creature is supposed to be the object of worship." But when the bread is supposed to be God, it must be supposed not to be a creature. There is no answer to be given in this case, "but that the bread really is a creature, whatsoever they imagined;" and if this mistake did not excuse, neither can the other.

II.—OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Three things our author goes upon, with respect to this.

I. He supposes Christ's words to be clear for it.

II. He shows the possibility of it, from God's omnipotency.

III. He argues against the testimony or evidence of sense or reason in this case, from some parallel instances, as he thinks.

I. "He believes Jesus Christ made his words good, pronounced at his last supper, really giving his body and blood to his apostles; the substance of bread and wine being, by his powerful words, changed into his own body and blood—the species only, or accidents of the bread and wine, remaining as before. The same he believes of the eucharist consecrated now by priests."

This is a very easy way of taking it for granted that the words are clear for transubstantiation; and, from no better ground, to fly to God's omnipotency to make it good, is as if one should suppose Christ really to be turned into a rock, a vine, a door, because the words are every jot as clear, and then call in God's omnipotency, which is as effectual to make them good. I confess these words are so far from being clear to me for transubstantiation, that if I had never heard of it, I should never have thought of it, from these or any other words of Scripture; that is, not barely considering the sound of words, but the Eastern idioms of speaking; the circumstances of our Saviour's real

body at that time when he spake them; the uncouth way of feeding on Christ's real body, without any objection made against it by his disciples; the key our Saviour elsewhere gives for understanding the manner of eating his flesh; and withal, if these words be literally and strictly understood, they must make the substance of bread to be Christ's body, for that is unavoidably the literal sense of the words. For can any man take "this" to be anything but "this bread," who attends to the common sense and meaning of words, and the strict rules of interpretation? Yet this sense will by no means be allowed; for then all that can be inferred from these words is, that when Christ spake these words, the bread was his body. But either Christ meant the bread by "this," or he did not; if he did, the former proposition is unavoidable in the literal sense; if he did not, then, by virtue of these words, the bread could never be turned into the body of Christ; for that only could be made the body of Christ which was meant when Christ said, "This is my body." This seems to me to be as plain and convincing as any demonstration in Euclid, which hath often made me wonder at those who talk so confidently of the plain letter of Scripture being for this doctrine of transubstantiation. But several divines of the Church of Rome have understood themselves better, and have confessed that this doctrine could not be drawn out of the literal sense of these words, as it were easy to show, if it had not been lately done already. It is enough here to observe, that Vasques * confesseth it of Scotus, Durandus, Paludanus, Ockam, Cameracensis; and himself yields that they do not, and cannot signify expressly the change of the bread and wine into the body of Christ; for how can *this is my body* literally signify *this is changed into my body?* If that proposition were literally true, *this is my body*, it overthrows the

* Vasq. in 3 part, Disc. clxxx. q. 75, art. 2, c. 5.

change; for how can a thing be changed into that which it is already?

II. "He believes Christ, being equal to his Father in truth and omnipotency, can make his words good." We do not in the least dispute Christ's omnipotency, but we may their familiar way of making use of it to help them out, when sense and reason fail them. And, therefore, Cajetan * well said: "We ought not to dispute about God's absolute power in the doctrine of the sacraments, being things of such constant use; and that it is a foolish thing to attribute to the sacrament all that God can do."

But we must consider what he saith against sense and reason: "For the believing this mystery he does not at all think it meet for any Christian to appeal from Christ's words to his own senses or reason, for the examining the truth of what he hath said; but rather to submit his senses and reason to Christ's words in the obsequiousness of faith." What! whether we know this to be the meaning of Christ's words or not? And thus we shall be bound to submit to every absurd interpretation of Scripture, because we must not use our senses or reason for examining the truth of what is said there. Can anything be plainer said in Scripture, than that God hath eyes, and ears, and hands? Must, now, every man yield to this in the obsequiousness of faith, without examining it by principles of common reason? And we think we are therefore bound to put another sense upon those expressions, because they imply a repugnancy to the divine perfections. Why not, then, where something is implied which is repugnant to the nature of Christ's body as well as to our senses? But the question about judging in this matter by our senses is not as our author is willing to suppose, namely, Whether our senses are to be believed against a clear and ex-

* Cajetan in 3 part, q. lxxv. art 1-3.

press divine revelation? but, Whether the judgment of our senses and reason is not to be made use of for finding out the true sense of this revelation? And we think there is great reason for it.

1. Because we have no more certain way of judging of the substance of a body than by our senses. We do not say our senses go beyond the accidents, but we say our senses, by those accidents, do assure us of the bodily substance, or else it were impossible for us to know there is any such thing in the world.

2. Because Christ did himself appeal to the judgment of his disciples' senses concerning the truth of his own body after the resurrection: "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."* Now, we think we have reason to allow the same criterion which Christ himself did about the very same body, unless he had then told his disciples that there was to be another supernatural manner of existence of the same body, concerning which their senses were not to be judges.

3. Some of the most important articles of the Christian faith do suppose the judgment of our senses to be true. As about the truth of Christ's body, whether he had really a body, or only the outward accidents and appearance of a body; if he had not, he did not really suffer upon the cross, and so the sacrifice of propitiation there offered up to the Father for the sins of mankind is lost. There was a great controversy in St John's time, and afterwards, whether Christ had any real body? Those who denied it, brought revelation for it; those who asserted it, proved it by their senses, as St John himself: "That which we have seen and heard, and our hands have handled," &c.† He doth not tell men, they must submit their senses and reason to the pretence of revelation; but they ought to adhere to the judgment of their senses

* Luke xxiv. 39. † 1 John i. 1, 3.

concerning the reality of Christ's body. Since, therefore, Christ himself appealed to it, and the apostles made use of it, without any caution or limitation, we have great reason to rely still on the judgment of our senses concerning the same object, namely, the body of Christ.

III. But we must now consider his instances to overthrow the judgment of our senses and reason in this point.

1. "He believes Christ to be God, though to senses he seemed nothing but man." Do we ever pretend to judge of Christ's divinity by our senses? How, then, can this be pertinent, when our only dispute is about judging of his body and the substance of bread and wine by them? and yet the senses were of great use as to the proof of his divinity by the miracles which he wrought, which, if they had been like the pretended miracles in transubstantiation, could have convinced no man, because they could never see them.

2. "He believes the Holy Ghost descended on our Saviour, though senses or reason could discover it to be nothing but a dove." If there were no reason to judge otherwise, the judgment of sense were to be followed; but since the Scripture declares it was the Holy Ghost descending as a dove, we have no reason to question that revelation; for we do not pretend that our senses are so far judges of divine appearances as to exclude the possibility of God's assuming the shape and figure of his creature when he pleases, by moulding the substance of a real body into such a representation. Thus we do not deny the possibility of an appearance of the Holy Ghost under bread and wine, if God thought fit, any more than under a dove; and in this case we do not pretend that our senses can exclude the presence of a spirit under the elements; but that is very different from the present case; for here the substance is supposed to be gone, and nothing

but accidents remaining, and no spiritual presence of Christ is denied, but that of his body—the very same body which suffered on the cross.

3. "He believes the man who appeared to Joshua (Josh. v. 13), and the three men to Abraham (Gen. xviii. 2), were really and substantially no men, notwithstanding all the information and evidence of sense to the contrary, from their colour, features, proportion, talking, eating, and many others." And what follows from hence, but that spiritual invisible substances may be under the appearance of bodies, and that our senses cannot be judges of them? Which is not our question, but, Whether bodies can be so present after the manner of spirits, as to lose all the natural properties of bodies? and, Whether a material substance can be lost, under all the accidents proper to it, so as our senses cannot be proper judges of one by the other?

But our author seems to grant this in a natural way of the existence of a body, but he saith: "Christ gives to his body a supernatural manner of existence, by which, being left without extension of parts, and rendered independent of place, it may be one and the same in many places at once, and whole in every part of the symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal contingencies."

This is to me a mystery beyond all comprehension by sense or reason; and there is certainly a great difference between governing our understandings and giving them up, as we must do if this doctrine hold good; for it overthrows any fixed principles of reason in mankind concerning the nature and properties of bodies. For,

(1.) We must still suppose the body of Christ to be the very same individual body which suffered upon the cross; but if it have no extension of parts, and be reckoned independent upon place, it ceaseth to be a body. It is granted, that after a natural way of existence, a body cannot be in more places than one;

but let the way of existence be what it will, if it be a body, it must be finite; if finite, it must be limited, and circumscribed; if it be circumscribed within one place, it cannot be in more places, for that is to make it circumscribed and not circumscribed—undivided from itself and divided from itself—at the same time, which is a manifest contradiction, which doth not depend only on quantity or extension, but upon the essential unity of a body.

(2.) If it be possible for a body to be in several places by a supernatural existence, why may not the same body be in several places by a natural existence? Is it not because extension and circumscription are so necessary to it that, in a natural way, it can be but in one place? Then it follows that these are essential properties of bodies, so that no true body can be conceived without them.

(3.) This supernatural existence doth not hinder the body's being individually present in one place. My meaning is this: A priest consecrates an host at London, and another at York; is the body of Christ at London so present there, by virtue of consecration, as to be present at York too, by this supernatural existence? What, then, doth the consecration at York produce? If it be not, then its presence is limited to the host where the consecration is made; and if it be so limited, then this supernatural existence cannot take off its relation to place.

(4.) The same body would be liable to the greatest contradictions imaginable; for the same body, after this supernatural way of existence, may not only be above and below, within and without, near and far off from itself; but it may be hot and cold, dead and alive; yea, in heaven and hell at once.

(5.) What is it that makes it still a body after this supernatural way of existence, &c., if it lose extension and dependency on place? If it be only an aptitude to extension, when that supernatural existence is taken off,

then it must either be without quantity or with it. If it be without quantity, how can it be a body? If with quantity, how is it possible to be without extension?

(6.) This confounds all the differences of greater and less, as well as of distance and nearness. For upon this supposition, a thing really greater may be contained within a less; for the whole original body of Christ, with all its parts, may be brought within the compass of a wafer; and the whole be in every part without any distance between head and feet.

(7.) This makes Christ to have one body, and yet to have as many bodies as there are consecrated hosts. No, saith our author, "this supernatural manner of existence is without danger of multiplying his body, or making as many Christs as altars." But how this can be is past all human understanding; for every consecration hath its effect—which is supposed to be the conversion of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ. Now, when a priest at London converts the bread into the body of Christ there, he doth it not into the body of Christ at York, but the priest there doth it; therefore, the body of Christ at London is different from that at York; or else the conversion at London would be into the body as at York. But if not, what is the substantial term of this substantial change, where nothing but an accidental mode doth follow? If there be any such term, whether that must not be a production of something which was not before?—and if it be so, Christ must have as many new bodies as there are consecrations.

(8.) This makes that which hath no particular subsistence of its own, to be the subject of a substantial change; for this is the condition of Christ's body, whatever its manner of existence be, after the hypostatical union to the divine nature. For, when Bellarmine, Petavius,* and others of their greatest divines, under-

* Bellarm. de Incarn. lib. iii., ch. 8; Petav. de Incarnatione, p. vi., ch. 1, sec. 3.

take against Nestorius, to explain the hypostatical union, they tell us it consists in this, that the human nature loseth its proper subsistence, and is assumed into the subsistence of the divine nature. From whence I infer that the body of Christ, having no proper subsistence of its own, there can be no substantial change into that which hath no proper subsistence, but into that which hath; and consequently, the change must be into the divine nature principally; from whence it will follow, the elements losing their subsistence upon consecration, the divinity must be united hypostatically to them as to the human nature; and so there will be as many hypostatical unions as there are consecrations. And so this doctrine not only confounds sense and reason, but the mysteries of Christ's incarnation too, which, I think, is sufficient for this head.

NOTE ON CHAPTER V.

There is no pretence for alleging that Papists have been misrepresented in regard to the eucharist; but they frequently misrepresent the doctrine of Protestants upon this subject. In defending the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation, they commonly begin with proving the *real presence* of Christ in the sacrament, which no Protestant Church ever denied—the dispute being, not as to the *reality*, but the *mode*, of the presence of Christ; Papists holding that he is present in a corporal and carnal manner to the senses of all communicants; and Protestants, that he is present in a spiritual manner to the faith of worthy receivers. Having established the real presence, they then either assert, as Dr Milner does, that Protestants do not hold it, and, of course, are in error upon this

point; or, acknowledging, as Bossuet does, that they do hold it, try to show that this requires them, in consistency, to admit the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation. The latter is the course commonly adopted by Popish controversialists, and it is followed substantially by Mr Smith, in his note on this chapter. He asserts, that "the Church of England, up to the time of Charles II., held the doctrine of the real presence;" while the fact is, that the Churches both of England and Scotland have always held it, and do so at this day. Presuming that he made this statement from nothing worse than ignorance, we recommend him to read Phillpotts' Twelfth Letter to Butler. He further asserts, that "the real presence being established, the doctrine of transubstantiation, which is neither more nor less than the real presence properly understood, follows as a necessary consequence." Protestants, however, understand and explain the real presence differently, and require that the connection between it and transubstantiation should be proved, and not assumed. Papists, conscious that it is very seldom that the Word of God even appears to be on their side, boast very much of having the express literal assertion of Scripture in favour of the doctrine of transubstantiation, in our Saviour's words, "This is my body." Stillingfleet, however, shows here, that the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation implies a departure from the literal meaning of these words, at least as great as the Protestant doctrine. According to the natural, literal meaning of the words, the pronoun "this" must have been intended to describe or demonstrate the bread, which our Saviour had just taken and broken; and it seems plain that Papists are compelled, by their own principles, to admit this; for it is their doctrine that our Saviour, by pronouncing these words: "This is my body," changed the bread into his flesh (and they ascribe the same power to the pronunciation of these

words by every Popish priest); so that what was bread before these words were pronounced, ceased, after they were uttered, to be bread, its substance being annihilated, and there remaining then only the body of Christ under the appearance of bread. From this it follows, that the Popish doctrine requires that Christ's words, "This is my body," be understood to mean, "This is changed into my body;" whereas Protestants commonly understand them as meaning, "This represents my body"—a smaller departure from the literal meaning, and much more in accordance with the principles that must be applied to the interpretation of many other scriptural statements.

The Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, as defined by the Council of Trent (sess. 13, can. 1), is, that "in the sacrament of the most holy eucharist there are contained, truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, along with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and therefore whole Christ." Is there any scriptural statement that bears a resemblance to this? The "soul and divinity" here are an impious fabrication; and as to the blood, we are informed that Christ said, that "the cup was his blood," and also, that "the cup was the new testament." How can Papists interpret either, or both, of these statements literally? No wonder, then, that many learned Papists have acknowledged that transubstantiation cannot be proved from the words of Scripture, especially as it is unquestionable that the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. x. and xi.) repeatedly calls the elements bread and wine after consecration, when, according to the Church of Rome, they were no longer bread and wine, but the "body and blood, along with the soul and divinity, of Christ."

There are evidently many shocking absurdities involved in the considerations that men, even the profane and profligate, eat and drink, corporally and literally, the flesh and the blood of Christ; that after

the consecration, the bread and wine having been transubstantiated, continue to be the flesh and blood of Christ, and not bread and wine, so long as they retain a separate subsistence; and that, of course, the body and blood of the risen Redeemer may thus be subjected to degrading and offensive treatment. Some provision, indeed, has been made for this in the following direction, contained in the Roman Missal prepared by the authority of the Council of Trent, and sanctioned by Pope Pius V.: "If the consecrated host (which, be it remembered, is 'the body and blood, along with the soul and divinity, of Christ') should disappear by any accident, as, being taken away by the wind, or a miracle, or a mouse, or any other animal, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated, and let the animal be taken if possible, and killed, and his ashes cast into a consecrated place, or under the altar." * But, independently of all these offensive absurdities, and the utter want of scriptural authority for this monstrous doctrine, there are two conclusive objections against it,

1. The impossibility of the actual occurrence of what is alleged to take place.

2. The impossibility of proving it, even supposing it possible to be effected.

1. Christ's body being material, and an object cognizable by the senses, must necessarily be defined and circumscribed in place, so that it may be said of it, that it is *here* and not *there;* and thus, even if we were in utter ignorance where Christ's body and blood are, and had not been expressly assured that the heavens must receive him till the time of the restitution of all things, we would be warranted in asserting, that it is not possible that the body and blood of Christ, whatever may be the case with his soul and divinity, can be materially and substantially present, at one and the same time, in all the different places

* Protestant Penny Magazine, p. 361.

where Popish priests may have pronounced the words of consecration through which this stupendous change is effected. The thing is impossible, because it involves a direct contradiction. But,

2. Supposing it possible that the body and blood of Christ should be corporally and substantially present at once in all places where the Lord's supper is celebrated, it is not possible that the alleged change upon the bread and wine can ever be proved to have taken place; because our senses give us precisely the same information as to the elements, before and after consecration. They distinctly assure us, that the consecration has produced no substantial change whatever, and that what was bread and wine before, continues bread and wine still. Let the experiment be repeated ever so often—let the circumstances be indefinitely varied—let every precaution be adopted to guard against mistake, and the result will still be the same —the clear, decided, harmonious, and unvarying testimony, not of one, but of several senses, that they are still bread and wine, and nothing else. We cannot have any reason for believing in transubstantiation, which should counteract the clear and decided testimony of our senses, telling us that no such change has occurred.

Transubstantiation cannot be true, unless there be a constant miracle, such as is not possible even to God, for it involves a contradiction; and it cannot be believed, unless God, by a constant exercise of his almighty power upon our minds, should compel us to believe it, in defiance of all the ordinary laws of our mental constitution. The primitive Christians had, as the ground of their faith in Christ, just the testimony of their senses to the miracles which Jesus wrought; and we have as good, indeed the same, ground for disbelieving transubstantiation, which the apostles had for believing in the reality of Christ's resurrection. The Popish doctrine upon this point,

therefore, overthrows every ground of certain knowledge, saps the very foundation of the evidence of Christianity, and paves the way for universal scepticism. Papists have never scrupled to undermine the authority and sufficiency of God's Word, and to pour contempt upon the doctrines of Scripture, when anything of this kind seemed expedient for promoting their cause. And accordingly, in addition to the direct and obvious tendency of their doctrine of transubstantiation to overthrow the foundation of the Christian evidence, it is well known that they have often alleged that other doctrines of the Scriptures, especially the mystery of the Trinity, are as irreconcilable with reason as this is. For an exposure of this pretence, we refer to Stillingfleet's "Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation Compared, as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition." It is sufficient here to remark, that, besides the great difference in the character and amount of the scriptural evidence for these two doctrines respectively, there are two important distinctions between them. 1*st*, The doctrine of the Trinity cannot be shown to involve, as transubstantiation does, a contradiction, since it is not contended that God is three and one in the same sense, and in the same respect. 2*d*, That our senses do not, and cannot, give us any information about the Trinity, and, of course, interpose no obstacle to our believing the plain statements of God's Word upon the subject; whereas the clear and decided testimony of our senses, assuring us that the bread and wine continue unchanged as to their substance after consecration, renders it impossible for any intelligent person to believe the doctrine of transubstantiation.

We cannot believe that any Popish priests, except, perhaps, those who are sunk in brutish ignorance, do really hold the doctrine of their Church upon this point, notwithstanding all their oaths and professions. It is not possible that men, who are capable of reflec-

tion, can really believe, in spite of the evidence of their senses, that the bread and wine in their hands have been changed into flesh and blood. And accordingly, Cardinal Cajetan, a distinguished Popish writer, makes the following statement upon this point (par. iii. ch. 75, art. 1): "The conversion of the bread and wine into Christ's body and blood all of us do teach in words; but, indeed, many do deny it, thinking nothing less." And Mr Nolan, a converted Popish priest, assures us, in his second pamphlet (pp. 7–9), that most intelligent Papists do not believe this doctrine without reserve, and that almost all priests, even the most ignorant, have expressed doubts of its truth. It has likewise been asserted, that one sin which priests are in the habit of acknowledging in confession is, the impossibility of satisfying their own minds of the truth of this absurdity.

If the doctrine of transubstantiation be false, then, according to the confession of Papists themselves, the adoration of the host must be idolatry, or giving divine worship to a creature; and the fact of their believing it to be Christ's body and blood, and worshipping it as such, will not exempt them from the guilt of idolatry in the sight of God, who will hold them responsible for this erroneous opinion, and all its sinful consequences. Besides, even upon their own principles, there is very great danger of idolatry, since they admit that there is no transubstantiation, and that of course there is idolatry in the adoration of the host, where the consecration has not been rightly and validly performed, and that there are many circumstances which prevent the validity of the consecration. These are enumerated in the Roman Missal. They are such as, in many instances, cannot be ascertained beforehand, and the presence of any one of them invalidates the consecration, and makes the adoration of the host idolatry; as, for example, if the bread be made of anything but wheat, if the wine be sour, or

made of unripe grapes, if the priest make even a slight mistake in pronouncing the words of consecration, if he had not a right intention, and if he had not been properly baptized and duly ordained. Any one of these circumstances, according to the Roman Missal, invalidates the consecration, prevents the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and, by the confession of Papists themselves, involves the adorers of the host in what is materially idolatry.

Another species of argument was formerly employed to defend transubstantiation and the adoration of the host, which, though just as satisfactory as any others which have been adduced, is now generally laid aside, except, perhaps, in Italy and Spain, as not suited to the spirit of the age, namely, miracles. There are thirteen legends recorded by Popish writers, several of them by Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius, of miracles, in which the bread and wine after consecration really appeared to men's senses as actual flesh and blood. They are all quoted in Bishop Morton's "Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ" (pp. 154–157), and used to be adduced by Papists as proofs of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

A book was published by Toussain Bridoul, a Jesuit, and certified by the competent authority at Lille in 1672, to be "taken out of Catholic authors, and to contain nothing contrary to faith or manners," entitled "A Collection of Miracles of the Consecrated Wafer, grounded on the respects and acknowledgments which beasts, birds, and insects on several occasions have rendered to it." It consists of a long series of most ridiculous stories, taken from Popish authors, some of them canonized, of miracles wrought by, or in connection with the host. It was then reckoned sound logic, that since bees, spiders, and frogs, hens, ducks, and pigeons, lambs, goats, and wolves, asses, horses, and elephants, had all adored the host—as was, of

course, satisfactorily proved and devoutly believed—men should follow their example. See also Gavin's Master-key to Popery, vol. iii. pp. 123–163.

When we charge any Popish tenet with falsehood, its defenders are in the habit of challenging us to point out the time when it was first broached, and to show the opposition it met with. This demand is quite unreasonable, for, independently of the scriptural warning that heresies would be brought in *privily*, it is quite enough if we can prove that a doctrine was not taught by Christ and his apostles. But it so happens, that, in regard to transubstantiation, we can trace its history fully and distinctly, and prove that it was not broached till the ninth century, and was not made an article of faith till the Lateran Council, under Pope Innocent, in 1215. See Bishop Cosins' very learned work, entitled "The History of Popish Transubstantiation;" the book of Bertram, or Ratramnus, concerning the body and blood of the Lord, with the historical dissertation prefixed to the English translation of it in 1686; Claude's "Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist;" and Edgar's "Variations of Popery," c. xii.

Upon this subject we would recommend, in addition to the works already referred to, Tillotson's famous discourse against transubstantiation, Payne's discourse on the Adoration of the Host (both republished in Gibson's Preservative); Ames' Bellarminus Enervatus (a work of very great value and singular controversial skill and acuteness), tom. iii. lib. 4; and Forbes' Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ, lib. xi.

Bishop Morton's "Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ," is a very full, learned, and scholastic discussion of this whole subject, including also the sacrifice of the mass.

CHAPTER VI.

OF MERITS AND GOOD WORKS.

For the true stating of this controversy, we are to observe—

1. That we do not charge those of the Church of Rome, "that they believe Christ's death and passion to be ineffectual and insignificant, and that they have no dependence on the merits of his sufferings, or the mercy of God, for attaining salvation, but that they are to be saved only by their own merits and good works," as the misrepresenter saith.

2. We do not charge them with denying the "necessity of divine grace in order to merit; or with asserting that they can merit independently thereupon."

3. We do by no means dispute about the necessity of good works, in order to the reward of another life; or assert that Christ's merits will save men "without working out their own salvation," but do firmly believe that "God will judge men according to their works."

The question, then, is, Whether the good works of a just man, as our author expresses it, are truly meritorious of eternal life? which he affirms, but qualifies with saying, "that they proceed from grace, and that, through God's goodness and promise, they are truly meritorious." But the Council of Trent * denounces

* Concil. Trident., sess. 6, can. 32.

an anathema against those who deny the good works of justified persons to be truly meritorious of the increase of grace, and of eternal life.

Here, then, lies the point in difference, (1.) Whether such good works can be said to be truly meritorious? (2.) Whether those who deny it, deserve an anathema for so doing? As to what relates to God's acceptance and allowance, and his goodness and promise, we freely own all that he saith about it; and if no more be meant, what need an anathema about this matter? There must, therefore, be something beyond this, when good works are not only said to be truly meritorious, but we are cursed if we do not say the same.

To make anything truly meritorious, we must suppose these conditions requisite:—

1. That what we pretend to merit by, be our own free act.

2. That it be not defective.

3. That there be an equality between it and the reward due to it.

4. That there be an obligation in point of justice, to give that reward to him that doth it.

And from these considerations, we deny that the good works, even of justified persons, can be truly meritorious.

1. It is granted by themselves, that what is truly meritorious must be a free act of the person who doth it.* Now, the good works of justified persons cannot be said to be their own free acts, if the power of doing them depend upon divine assistance, and there was an antecedent obligation upon them to perform them; so that they can do nothing but what they are bound to as God's creatures; and their very power of doing it is from the grace of God. If men pretended to merit at another's hand by what God gives, there were

* Meritum est actio libera cui merces debetur ex justitia.—*Coster. Enchirid. de Meritis bon., oper.* c. 7.

some colour for it; but to merit from God himself by what he gives us, seems very incongruous.* If I owe a man an £100, and another, knowing me unable to pay it, gives me so much to pay the debt, this is no more than what may be called strict payment, as to the creditor; but if the creditor himself gives me this £100 to pay himself with, will any man call this strict payment? He may call it so himself if he pleases, but that only shows his kindness and favour; but it doth not look very modestly or gratefully for the debtor to insist upon it as true, legal payment. Just so it is in good works done by the power of God's grace, which we could never have done without it; and therefore such cannot be truly meritorious.

2. What is truly meritorious must not be defective, because the proportion is to be equal between the act and the reward due to it, which being perfect, requires that there be no defect in the acts which merit it. But this can never be said of good works of justified persons, that they have no defects in them. We do not say they are not good works, but they are not exact and perfect; for although the grace of God, as it comes from him, be a perfect gift, yet as it acts upon men's minds, it doth not raise them to such a degree, but that they have imperfections in their best actions. And whatever is defective is faulty; whatever is faulty must be forgiven; whatever needs forgiveness cannot be truly meritorious. But not only their good works are defective, but if they would merit, they ought to have none but good works; whereas the mixture of others renders the good incapable of being meritorious, because there is so much to be pardoned, as takes away all claim of merit in the good they perform. And themselves do not pretend that men can merit the grace of remission; but

* In quantum homo propria voluntate facit id quod debet, meretur apud Deum, alioquin reddere debitum non esset meritorium.—*Aquin.* i. 2, qu. 114, artic. 1, resp. ad. 1.

it is very strange that those who cannot deserve to be forgiven, should deserve to have an infinite reward bestowed upon them.

3. There must be an exact proportion between the act and the recompense;* for to merit, is to pay a price for a thing; and in such acts of commutative justice, there must be an equality of one thing with another.† But what equality can there be between the imperfect good works of the best men and the most perfect happiness of another world, especially when that consists in the fruition of the beatifical vision? For what proportion can there be between our acts towards God and God's acts towards the blessed in heaven? Let the acts be of what person soever, or of what nature soever, or from what principle soever, as long as they are the acts of finite, imperfect creatures, it is impossible there should be any equality, or exact proportion between them and the eternal favour of God, which is the reward promised.

4. Where acts are truly meritorious, there follows an obligation of strict justice, to pay the recompense due to them. But what strict justice can there be between the Creator and his creatures, to recompense the service they are bound to perform, when their very being, power to act, assistance in acting, and recompense for it, are all from his bounty and goodness? But our author would avoid all this, by saying, that though good works are truly meritorious, yet it is through the merits of Christ, and as they proceed from grace, and through his goodness and promise, that they are so; that is, they are truly meritorious because it appears from all these things they neither are nor can be meritorious. For,

(1.) How come the merits of Christ to make good

* Meritum se habet ad præmium sicut pretium ad illud quod emitur. —*Altisiodor.*, l. 3, tr. 12.

† Absoluta æqualitas inter mercedem et meritum ponitur per modum justitiæ commutativæ.—*Bell. justif.* l. 5, ch. 14.

works truly meritorious? Are the merits of Christ imputed to those good works? Then those good works must be as meritorious as Christ's own works, which, I suppose, he will not assert. Or, is it that Christ hath merited the grace whereby we may merit? But even this will not make our personal acts truly meritorious; and the nature of merit relates to the acts, and not to the power.

(2.) How comes the power of grace to make them truly meritorious; when the power of grace doth so much increase the obligation on our side? If it be said, that the state of grace puts men into a capacity to merit, we might more reasonably infer the contrary—that it puts them out of a capacity of meriting; because the remission of sins and the favour of God are things for which we can never make any recompense.

(3.) How comes a divine promise to make acts truly meritorious? For God's promise is an act of mere kindness, which is very different from strict justice; and although, by the promise, God binds himself to performance, yet how come those acts to be more meritorious of heaven than the acts of repentance are of remission of sins? Yet none will now say, that there can be any acts meritorious of that. Yet certainly there is as clear a promise of pardon upon repentance, as there is of heaven upon good works; and if the promise in the other case doth not make repentance meritorious of pardon, how can it make good works truly meritorious of eternal life? But notwithstanding, we do not deny God's fidelity to his promise may be called justice, and so God, as a righteous judge, may give a crown of righteousness (2 Tim. iv. 8) to all that follow St Paul's example, without making good works to be truly meritorious.

NOTE TO CHAPTER VI.

Gother distinctly admits, that it is the doctrine of the Church of Rome that the good works of a just man are truly meritorious of eternal life. Bossuet, in his chapter on this subject, although he makes several extracts from the decrees of the Council of Trent, does not venture to quote the statement to which chiefly Protestants object. It is in these words (sess. 6, can. 32): "If any one shall say that the good works of a justified man are the gift of God, in such a sense that they are not also the good merits (*bona merita*) of the justified man himself; or that a justified man, by the good works which are done by him through the grace of God and the merit of Christ, of whom he is a living member, does not truly deserve (*vere mereri*) increase of grace, eternal life, and the actual possession of eternal life if he die in grace, and also an increase of glory, let him be accursed." The simple question is, Is it consistent with scriptural statements, and accordant with scriptural language, to assert, as the Church of Rome does, that the good works of a justified man do truly merit or deserve eternal life and an increase of grace and glory? In spite of the anathema of this infallible Church, we venture to say that it is not. While the Scriptures contain many testimonies to the necessity and importance of good works, and their acceptableness to God through Christ, they wholly exclude, both by particular statements and general principles, the idea of their being meritorious. The only plausible thing which Papists have to allege upon this subject is, that heaven is represented as a reward conferred upon those who have finished their course and kept the faith. But this need not, and therefore should not, be interpreted so as to be inconsistent with the great scriptural principle, that eternal life is the gift of God,

especially when we can distinguish between a reward that is of debt and a reward that is of grace—a distinction which, unlike most Popish ones, has the express sanction of the apostle. (Rom. iv. 4.) The Popish doctrine of the true and proper merit of good works is inconsistent with scriptural views of man's relation to God, the ground of his acceptance, and the foundation of his eternal happiness; and it is the basis of some other Popish tenets which are injurious to men's souls, but most favourable to the wealth and influence of the priesthood, such as works of supererogation, purgatory, and indulgences. Even the Unitarians have not ventured to describe good works as meritorious, although the scope and tendency of their whole scheme of doctrine is to exalt the powers of man, and to overthrow the grace of God. See Willet's Synopsis, b. iv. con. 19, pp. 1000–1011; Ames' Bellarminus Enervatus, tom. iv. lib. 7; and a very valuable, but unfinished work of Stillingfleet's, entitled "The Council of Trent Examined and Disproved by Catholic Tradition," sect. iv.

CHAPTER VII.

OF CONFESSION.

1. We do not charge the Church of Rome, that, "in the power of absolving, they make gods of men," as our misrepresenter pretends.

2. We do not deny "that Christ gave to the bishops and priests of the catholic Church authority to absolve any truly penitent sinner from his sins" (which he, therefore, needlessly proves out of Scripture), "and that such absolution is ratified in heaven."

3. We are glad to find that our author declares, "that no man receives benefit by absolution, without repentance from the bottom of his heart, and real intentions of forsaking his sins"—by which we hope he means more than attrition.

But yet there are some things which stick with us, as to the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome in this matter, which he takes no notice of.

1. That secret confession of sins to a priest is made so necessary to salvation, that an anathema is denounced against all that deny it,* when they cannot deny that God doth forgive sins upon true contrition; for the Council of Trent doth say,† "that contrition, with charity, doth reconcile a man to God before the sacrament of penance be actually received." But then

* Sess. 14, c. 6. † Sess. 14, c. 4.

it adds, "that the desire of confession is included in contrition," which is impossible to be proved by Scripture, reason, or antiquity. For so lately as in the time of the Master of the Sentences and Gratian (in the twelfth century), it was a very disputable point whether confession to a priest were necessary.* And it is very hard for us to understand how that should become necessary to salvation since, which was not then. Some of their own writers confess† that some good Catholics did not believe the necessity of it. I suppose the old canonists may pass for good Catholics; and yet Maldonat saith, "that all the interpreters of the decrees held that there was no divine precept for confession to a priest;" and of the same opinion he grants Scotus to have been. But he thinks "it is now declared to be heresy, or he wishes it were." And we think it is too much already, unless there were better ground for it.

2. That an anathema is denounced against those who do not understand the words of Christ: "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted," ‡ &c., of the sacrament of penance, so as to imply the necessity of confession; whereas there is no appearance in the words of any such sense; and themselves grant that, in order to the remission of sins by baptism (of which St Matthew and St Mark § speak in the apostles' commission), there is no necessity of sacramental confession, but a general confession is sufficient. And from hence the elder Jansenius || concludes, "that the power of remission of sins here granted doth not imply sacramental confession." Cajetan ¶ yields, "there is no command for confession here." And

* Lomb. l. 4, dist. 17; Grat. de Pœnit., dist. 1, c. 90, Quidam.
† Greg. de Valentia, De Necessit. Confess., c. 2; Maldonat. Oper. tom. ii. De Pœnit., c. 2. 3.
‡ John xx. 23.
§ Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16.
|| Jansen. Concord. Evang., c. 147.
¶ Cajetan. in loc., ed. Paris, 1540.

Catharinus * adds, "that Cajetan would not allow any one place of Scripture to prove auricular confession." And as to this particular, he denies that there is any command for it; and he goes not about to prove it, but says that Cajetan contradicts himself elsewhere, namely, when he wrote school divinity before he set himself to the study of the Scriptures. Vasquez † saith, "that if these words may be understood of baptism, none can infer from them the necessity of auricular confession." But Gregory de Valentia ‡ evidently proves, that this place doth relate to remission of sins in baptism, not only from the comparison of places, but from the testimonies of St Cyprian, St Ambrose, and others.

3. That it is expressed in the same anathemas that this hath been always the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church from the beginning. We do not deny the ancient practice, either of canonical confession, as part of the discipline of the Church for public offences, nor of voluntary confession, for ease and satisfaction of the perplexed minds of doubted or dejected penitents; but that which we say was not owned nor practised by the Church from the beginning, was the sacramental confession as necessary to the remission of sins before God. It is therefore to no purpose to produce, out of Bellarmine and others, a great number of citations to prove that which we never deny; but if they hold to the Council of Trent, they must prove from the fathers, that sins after baptism cannot be forgiven without confession to men—which those who consider what they do will never undertake—there being so many testimonies of undoubted antiquity against it. And it is observable, that Bonaventure § grants, that before the Lateran decree of Innocentius III., it was no heresy to deny

* Catharin. in Cajetan. 1. 5, p. 444.
† Vasquez in 3 part, Th., tom. iv. qu. 90, art. 1, dub. 2, num. 2.
‡ Greg. de Valent. in Thom., tom. iv. disp. 7, qu. 9, punct. 2, p. 284.
§ Bonavent. in 1. 4, sent., dist. 17, part 2.

the necessity of confession; and so he excuses those who, in the time of Lombard and Gratian, held that opinion. And all other Christians in the world, besides those of the Church of Rome, do to this day reject the necessity of particular confession to a priest in order to remission, as the writers of the Church of Rome themselves confess. So Godignus * doth of the Abyssinians; Phillipus a SS. Trinitate,† of the Jacobites; Clemens Galanus ‡ of the Nestorians, who saith: "They made a decree against the use of confession to any but God alone;" and Alexius Meneses of the Christians of St Thomas in the Indies. The Greeks believe confession only to be of positive and ecclesiastical institution, as the late author of the Critical History of the Faith and Customs of the Eastern Nations, § proves. And the very form of their absolution declares that they do not think particular confession of all known sins necessary to pardon; for therein the priest absolves the penitent from the sins he hath not confessed through forgetfulness or shame. And now let any one prove this to have been a Catholic tradition by Vincentius' rules, namely, "that it hath been always received everywhere, and by all."

NOTE TO CHAPTER VII.

Although Gother entitles this chapter "Of Confession," yet it contains no explanation of the Popish doctrine of confession, and treats only of absolution. Papists, indeed, are in the habit of inferring the necessity of confession from the alleged authority of

* Godign. de rebus Abyssin. l 1, c. 8.
† Itinerarium Orientale, l. 5, c. 8.
‡ Galan. Concil. Eccles. Armenæ, tom. ii. p. 605.
§ Histoire Critique de la Creances et des Coutumes des Nations du Levant, ch. viii. p. 105; ch. i. p. 14; resp. 1. Jerem. Patriarch. ad Theolog. Wirtemberg, p. 87; Arcud. de Concord. Ecclesiæ Occident. et Orient. in 7 sacram, l. 4, c. 3, Goar in Eucholog., p. 681.

priests to absolve; but this is a very insufficient ground for so important a part of their system, especially as the power of absolving, in the Popish sense, would seem to require a more thorough knowledge than can be gained merely from the confession of the penitent. There is not even the slightest ground in Scripture for the Popish doctrine of confession; and it will not be surprising that many learned Papists should have acknowledged this, when it is considered what that doctrine is.

The Church of Rome holds, that sins committed after baptism can be pardoned only in the sacrament of penance, which they have fabricated for the purpose, and which the Council of Trent requires all, under pain of damnation, to believe was instituted by our Saviour upon the occasion described, John xx. 23. This sacrament consists of three parts as its matter, viz., contrition, confession, and satisfaction—acts of the penitent; and of the absolution pronounced by the priest, as its form. The Word of God requires faith and repentance as necessary to pardon, while the Church of Rome requires contrition, which does not include the whole of scriptural repentance, and auricular confession—that is, confession into the ear of a priest—of the importance or necessity of which there is not a vestige of evidence in Scripture.

Contrition is the same as godly sorrow for sin, and perhaps may be regarded, notwithstanding the inaccuracy of the language, as comprehending substantially evangelical repentance; and if the Church of Rome had indeed required contrition as indispensable to pardon, it might, perhaps, have been admitted that there was thus a good foundation laid, even although stubble and straw were built upon it in the shape of auricular confession and personal satisfaction. She has found out, however, an easier method of salvation, which, in exact conformity with the general character of her scheme, is fraught with

greater danger to men's souls, and with greater influence and emolument to the priesthood. Upon the ground that very few could hope for pardon if contrition were necessary (Catech. Rom., pt. ii., c. 5, § 46), they have invented what they call attrition, or imperfect contrition, which springs merely from a consideration of the baseness of sin and the fear of hell, implying a present wish to sin no more, and a hope of pardon (Concil. Trident., sess. 14, c. 4,) and which thus resembles rather the sorrow of the world, which worketh death, than the godly sorrow which worketh repentance. The Council of Trent, however, has so far done homage to truth in this matter, as to admit that perfect contrition reconciles a man to God, even before the sacrament be actually received—that is, before confession and absolution; and tries to evade the obvious inconsistency, by the pretence, that perfect contrition implies a wish for the sacrament, and a determination to receive it if possible. Attrition cannot procure pardon, without actual confession to a priest, and absolution by him; but it is quite sufficient to render the absolution of the priest valid for the remission of the sins confessed. Thus they distinctly make the mere outward acts of the penitent confessing to a priest, and of the priest pronouncing the words of absolution, to serve as a substitute for a state of mind and heart which God's Word requires, and that, too, in a matter directly bearing upon men's everlasting condition.

The Church of Rome teaches that no mortal sin committed after baptism—that is, according to the common catechisms, no act of pride, covetousness, lust, anger, gluttony, envy, or sloth—can be forgiven, unless it be confessed to a priest, except in the case of perfect contrition, above described. The necessity of sacramental confession of all mortal sins to a priest, has not a shadow of foundation in the Word of God, and it can be regarded in no other light than as a

shameless experiment upon the credulity of mankind —a nefarious imposture, contrived for the express purpose of gaining a knowledge of all men's actions, and thus exercising a ruinous tyranny over their consciences and their conduct. Not only are Papists bound, under pain of damnation, to confess, at least once a-year, all their mortal sins, even the most secret, to a priest, but the priest is bound to inquire into their sins with all their circumstances; and in doing so, he is directed, as we find in Dens' Theology—that safe guide for Irish priests—to address to his penitents questions full of the most disgusting obscenity —a familiarity with which is an indispensable part of the preparation for becoming a confessor, and which, when brought before the mind in the confessional, must have a most polluting and injurious effect, even though the priests should abstain from any direct attempt to lead their penitents to commit sin. The Trent Catechism tells us, "that the preservation of holiness, piety, and religion, in the Church, was to be ascribed, in a great measure, to confession" (pt. ii., c. 5, § 45); but impartial history gives us very different information, and proves that the confessional, more, perhaps, than any other part of Popery, has produced materials which fully justify her scriptural designation of "the mother of harlots and abominations."

Popes have often been obliged to issue severe denunciations against confessors, who attempted to seduce their female penitents, and to make special provision for discovering and punishing them; and, upon one occasion (M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii., No. 93), in Spain, when a bull of Pope Paul IV. required all women who had any charge of this kind to make against their confessors, to give in their accusations to the inquisitors, the number was so great that it was found impossible to investigate them, and the matter was entirely dropt. In 1745, Pope

Benedict XIV., finding it needful to adopt strong measures to check this abomination, enjoined that, in addition to all other penalties formerly provided, a priest guilty of this offence should be incapable thereafter of celebrating mass. (Dens, vol. viii. p. 417.) The Reformers, who knew well the nature and effects of confession, used to call it "carnificina conscientiarum—the slaughter-house of consciences."

The form or essence of the sacrament of penance, is the absolution pronounced by the priest, and certainly followed, wherever it has been preceded by attrition and confession, by the remission of the guilt and the eternal punishment of all mortal sins. The Trent Catechism, in explaining this matter, says, that "no one is admitted into heaven, unless the doors be opened by the priests, to whose care God hath committed the keys." (Pt. ii., c. 5, § 57.)

This is an assumption of power to save or damn men's souls, which has not only no warrant from Scripture, but is directly opposed to its statements. It is not, indeed, pretended that the priest can pardon sin without attrition and confession on the part of the sinner; but it is plainly implied, in the Popish doctrine upon this subject, that attrition and confession, which are insufficient of themselves, do secure pardon, when followed by the priest's absolution, and that it is only perfect contrition—which the Trent Catechism says can be attained by very few—which holds out any chance of pardon without absolution. This fully warrants us to charge the Church of Rome with claiming for her priests the power of pardoning sins, which God has reserved for himself.

In common practice, absolution is bestowed by the priest, after confession, almost as a matter of course, except when he has some nefarious purpose to serve by frightening the applicant; and in this way its natural tendency and habitual effects are, to destroy the sense of moral responsibility, and to persuade men that

they need never be seriously afraid of perishing. The Rev. John Burnett, an Independent minister, formerly of Cork, and now of Camberwell, when examined before the House of Lords on the state of Ireland in 1825, declared, that "the confidence of the people in their absolution which follows confession, was such as completely to destroy in their minds any fear of future punishment—that no Roman Catholic of the lower orders had any dread of final perdition—that he had spoken to them frequently on the subject, and never found one of them that supposed he could go to hell." Thus has the Church of Rome, in order to lay a foundation for acquiring a knowledge of all men's actions, and gaining a tyrannical control over their consciences, made deliberate provision for sending her unhappy victims down to hell with a lie in their right hand.

Papists are in the habit of alleging that Protestants likewise hold the doctrine of absolution, merely because they are generally of opinion that the power of loosing or retaining sins, which Christ conferred upon his apostles, was not, *in every sense*, restricted to them. In the Popish sense of absolution, as an act certainly ratified in heaven, Protestants generally think that this power was confined to the apostles; but, at the same time, most of them do not scruple to regard our Saviour's language here referred to, as including that ordinary power or jurisdiction which, of necessity, must be exercised in all ages by ecclesiastical office-bearers, in admitting to, or excluding from, the outward communion of the visible Church. This power Protestants and Papists concur in styling the "power of the keys;" but, while they use the same scriptural language in describing it, they have very different ideas of its nature and effects. This difference is very happily explained in the following extract from the Helvetic Confession, which was sanctioned by many of the Reformed Churches: "Concerning the keys

of the kingdom of God, delivered by the Lord to the apostles, many prate wonderful things, and out of them forge swords, lances, sceptres, and crowns, and full power over the greatest kingdoms, and over men's souls and bodies: but we, judging simply according to the Word of God, say, that all ministers lawfully called, possess and exercise the power of the keys, when they preach the Gospel; that is, instruct, exhort, console, and reprove the people committed to their care, and retain them in discipline." (Ch. xiv.)

There is a full account of the ancient discipline of the Church, contrasted with all the corruptions which Popery has introduced and still preserves, in Forbes' Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ, lib. xii.

For a distinct statement of the doctrine of the Church of England upon this subject, as contrasted with that of the Church of Rome, see Phillpotts' 9th Letter to Butler; and for an exposure of shameless fraud and falsehood on the part of Dr Doyle on this point, see his Supplemental Letter, p. 424–448.

On the subject of confession and absolution, we would recommend Calvin's Instit., lib. iii. ch. 4; Melancthon's Apologia Confessionis Augustinæ, ch. v. and vi.; Ames' Bellarminus Enervatus, tom. iii. lib. 5; Stillingfleet's Council of Trent Examined, sec. vi.; Goodman on Auricular Confession, and Allix on Penance, both republished in the second volume of Gibson's Preservative against Popery; M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii. p. 281–353.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF INDULGENCES.

1. THEY must be extremely ignorant, who take the power of indulgences to be "a leave from the Pope to commit what sins they please; and that by virtue thereof they shall escape punishment for their sins, without repentance, in another world." Yet this is the sense of the misrepresentation which, he saith, is made of it. And if he saith true in his preface, "that he hath described the belief of a Papist exactly according to the apprehension he had when he was a Protestant," he shows how well he understood the matters in difference, when I think no other person besides himself ever had such an apprehension of it, who pretended to be anything like a scholar.

2. "But now he believes it damnable to hold that the Pope, or any other power in heaven or in earth, can give him leave to commit any sins whatsoever; or that, for any sum of money, he can obtain any indulgence or pardon for sins that are to be committed by him, or his heirs hereafter." Very well! But what thinks he of obtaining an indulgence, or pardon, after they are committed? Is no such thing to be obtained in the Court of Rome for a sum of money? He cannot but have heard of the tax of the Apostolic Chamber for certain sins, and what sums are there set upon them. Why did not he as freely speak against

this? This is published in the vast collection of tracts of canon law, set forth by the Pope's authority, where there are certain rates for perjury, murder, apostasy,* &c. Now what do these sums of money mean? If they be small, it is so much the better bargain; for the sins are very great. And Espencæus† complains, that this book was so far from being called in, that he saith: "The Pope's legates renewed those faculties, and confirmed them." It seems, then, a sum of money may be of some consequence towards the obtaining pardon for a sin past, though not for a license to commit it. But what mighty difference is there whether a man procures with money a dispensation or a pardon? for the sin can hurt him no more than if he had license to commit it.

3. "He doth believe there is a power in the Church to grant indulgences, which," he saith, "concern not at all the remission of sins, either mortal or venial, but only of some temporal punishments remaining due after the guilt is remitted." Here now arises a material question, namely, whether the Popes or the representer be rather to be believed. If the Popes, who grant the indulgences, are to be believed, then, not only the bare remission of sins is concerned in them, but the plenary, and most plenary, remission of sins is to be had by them. So Boniface VIII., in his bull of jubilee, granted *Non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam veniam peccatorum.*‡ If these words had no relation to remission of sins, the people were horribly cheated by the sound of them. In the bull of Clement VI., not extant in the Bullarium, but published out of the Utrecht manuscript, not only a plenary absolution from all sins is declared to all persons who died in the way to Rome, but he commands the angels of paradise to carry the

* Tractat. Tractatuum. to. xv. part 1, f. 368.
† Espens. in Ep. ad Tit. c. i., digress. 2.
‡ Bullar. Cherubin. in to. i. p. 20, 4.

soul immediately to heaven;* and, I suppose, whatever implies such an absolution as carries a soul to heaven, doth concern remission of sins. Boniface IX. granted indulgences, *a pœna et a culpa;*† and those certainly concerned remission of sins, being not barely from the temporal punishment, but from the guilt itself. Clement VIII., whom Bellarmine ‡ magnifies for his care in reforming indulgences, in his bull of jubilee, grants a most plenary remission of sins; and Urban VIII., since him, not only a relaxation of penances, but remission of sins; and so lately as A.D. 1671, Clement X. published an indulgence upon the canonization of five new saints, wherein he not only grants a plenary indulgence of sins, but upon invocation of one of these saints *in the point of death, a plenary indulgence of all his sins.* And what doth this signify, *in the point of death*, if it do not concern the remission of sins?

4. "Indulgences," he saith, "are nothing else but a mitigation or relaxation, upon just causes, of canonical penances, which are, or may be, enjoined by the pastors of the Church on penitent sinners, according to their several degrees of demerits." If by canonical penances, they mean those enjoined by the penitential canons, Greg. de Valentia§ saith: "This opinion differs not from that of the heretics, and makes indulgences to be useless and dangerous things." Bellarmine‖ brings several arguments against this doctrine: "1*st*, There would be no need of the treasure of the Church, which he had proved to be the foundation of indulgences. 2*d*, They would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the Church would deceive her children by them. 3*d*, They could not be granted

* Prorsus mandamus angelis paradisi, quantum animam illius a purgatorio penitus absolutam in paradisi gloriam introducant.—*Bulla Clem.* VI. *Ultrajecti.* A.D. 1653.

† Gobel. Person. Cosmogr. æt. 6, cap. 86, p. 278.

‡ Bellar. to. iii. p. 74, to. iv. p. 86.

§ Greg. de Valent. De. Indulg., cap. 2.

‖ Bell., De Indulg., lib. i. cap. 7.

for the dead. *4th*, They who receive indulgences do undergo canonical penances. *5th*, The form of them doth express that they do relate to God, and not only to the Church." And this, I think, is sufficient to show how far he is from truly representing the nature of indulgences; for we do not dispute the Church's power in relaxing canonical penances to penitent sinners upon just causes.

NOTE TO CHAPTER VIII.

The language of Papal bulls, here referred to by Stillingfleet, which represents the forgiveness of sin as a fruit of indulgences, has been employed also in more modern times. See Bull of Pope Benedict XIV. in 1747 (Dens' Theology, vol. viii. p. 425), and the Bull of "Indiction for the Universal Jubilee" in 1825, published in the Laity's Directory for that year, in which his Holiness granted "a plenary indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins to all the faithful of Christ," upon certain conditions. Dens, indeed (vol. vi. p. 418), having given the common account of the doctrine of the Romish Church upon this subject, refers to the language of Papal bulls as seeming to prove more in regard to the effect of indulgences than Papists usually admit, and gets quit of the objection by charging the language with impropriety, as being a metonymy of the cause for the effect. It is rather strange that Christ's vicars should, for a succession of ages, have combined in giving a blundering account of the nature and effects of their own indulgences; and even if we are not to regard their language as a proof of what the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject is, we may at least consider it as an illustration of what is very common among Popish priests, namely, a wish to insinuate into the minds of their

ignorant votaries what they cannot defend when controverted. But if the Popes have often erred, by ascribing too much to their indulgences, most modern champions of Popery have gone into an opposite extreme. The statement of Bossuet and Gother, which represents indulgences merely as the relaxation of the canonical censures or penances, imposed by the Church in the exercise of discipline, is a deliberate fraud; as is conclusively proved, not merely by many Papal bulls, but by the Council of Trent, the ordinary Popish catechisms in constant use, and the evidence given by the Popish prelates before Parliament in 1825. Dr Kelly, indeed, the late Popish archbishop of Tuam, gave the same fraudulent account of indulgences before the Committee of the House of Commons; but then it was contradicted by his colleagues, Drs Doyle and Murray, not because they were honester men than he, but because they knew that such a misrepresentation, though sanctioned by Gother and Bossuet, was too gross to be of any real service to their cause. Indeed, the Popish prelates examined upon that occasion do not seem to have been at sufficient pains to arrange beforehand to what length they were to concur in fraudulently misrepresenting the doctrine of their Church upon the subject of indulgences; for Dr Kelly, Dr Doyle, and Dr Murray, gave different accounts of the Popish doctrine, as to their nature and effects—Doyle letting out a little more of the truth than Kelly, with Gother and Bossuet, and Murray a little more than Doyle, although even Murray was far from saying all that candour required. (Phillpotts' Supp. Let., p. 416–426). As the gross abuses practised or sanctioned by the Pope, in regard to indulgences, had been instrumental in originating the Reformation, the Council of Trent acted very cautiously upon this point, and forbade altogether the sale of indulgences. It decreed (sess. 25 contin.), that "Christ had given to the Church the power of granting indulgences, and

that the use of them was very beneficial to the Christian people," and anathematized all who should deny this; but it did not define what indulgences are, except by calling them the "heavenly treasures of the Church." (Sess. 21, De Ref., c. 9.) Dr Murray asserts, and Dr Doyle denies, that an indulgence averts the wrath of God, with respect to the temporal punishment of sin. Dr Murray's doctrine upon this point is that of the Romish Church. It is maintained, not only by Bellarmine, but by Dens, vol. vi. p. 418; by Delahogue in the Maynooth Text-book, De Penitentia, p. 334; and by Pope Pius VI., in a bull published in 1794. (Dens, viii. p. 374.)

The doctrine of indulgences, as commonly stated in Popish catechisms, is, that they are not merely a relaxation of the canonical penances enjoined by the Church, but a remission of the temporal punishment with which God visits the sins of men, after their guilt and liability to eternal punishment have been taken away by the sacrament of penance; and this temporal punishment may be endured either in this life or in purgatory. Accordingly, the Church of Rome teaches, that indulgences relieve men from purgatory; a fact which should be remembered, as not only exposing the pretence that they are merely the relaxation of canonical censures, but as likewise overthrowing another common allegation of Papists, namely, that indulgences can avail only those who truly repent, while they do not pretend that there is any repentance in purgatory.

Fisher, bishop of Rochester, who suffered for his Popish views, declared that "all regard for indulgences depended upon purgatory;" but modern Papists wish to conceal this connection, as it brings out, fully and clearly, the true nature and ground of indulgences, which now-a-days they rather shrink from explaining. What they are chiefly anxious to conceal is, that the whole ground and foundation of indul-

gences, is the existence of a treasure, composed of the superabundant merits of Christ, and the supererogatory works of the saints; that is, the good works they have wrought over and above what was necessary to merit heaven for themselves. Of this treasure the Pope, as Christ's vicar, keeps the key, and doles out to the faithful as much merit as may be necessary to avert the wrath of God, and to save them, wholly or in part, from the temporal punishment due to their sins in this life or in purgatory. This treasure of merits, and the Pope's control over it, are so utterly destitute of any appearance of scriptural authority—the whole matter is so obviously, in all parts, a scheme of deliberate fraud and imposture—it proceeds upon a principle so diametrically opposed to Scripture, namely, that men may perform works of supererogation—and it involves an idea so offensive and impious, namely, the mixing up in one mass the merits of Christ and of the saints, that modern Papists do not like to undertake to defend it, and try either to keep it in the background, or deny altogether that they hold it. There is, however, satisfactory proof that the Church of Rome must bear the responsibility, as she has long had the benefit, of this treasure. The Council of Trent calls indulgences "the heavenly treasures of the Church." (Sess. 21, De Ref., c. 9.) Bellarmine (De Indulg., lib. i. c. 8) says, that an indulgence is a judicial absolution from liability to punishment, given without a sacrament, by the application of the satisfactions which are contained in the treasures of the Church. It was declared by Pope Leo X., in his bull against Luther, and by Pope Pius VI., in a bull published in 1794, "that the treasures of the Church, out of which the Pope grants indulgences, are the merits of Christ and the saints." (Dens, c. viii. p. 374.) The existence of this treasure is asserted, and its advantages are set forth, in a bull of Pope Benedict XIII. in 1724, and in another of Benedict XIV. in 1747; both republished by Dr

Murray in the eighth volume of Dens, pp. 429–436. The same doctrine is explicitly taught by Dens himself (vol. vi. p. 417), who, indeed, introduces the mention of this treasure into his formal definition of an indulgence, and says that "it is the foundation or matter of indulgences." It is inculcated likewise in Dr Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed, p. 108. Delahogue, in his Treatise de Penitentia (p. 334), which is the text-book on this subject at Maynooth College, says expressly that indulgences "derive their efficacy from the treasure of the Church." He describes this treasure "as composed of the merits and satisfactions of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints," as being under the control of the Church, and compares it to "a bank or deposit (depositum), out of which disbursements may be made for the common benefit of the faithful." The substance of this doctrine is taught in the catechisms in common use in Ireland, although the mention of the word *treasure* is avoided. See the Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, *permissu superiorum*, p. 96; Butler's Catechism, recommended by the four archbishops, pp. 65, 66; and Doyle's General Catechism, pp. 49, 50. And, finally, the true Popish doctrine upon this point is taught plainly and honestly in a catechism published in Edinburgh in 1834, and used in the Popish schools of this city, entitled "Instructions for the Sacrament of Penance;" where, at p. 33, under the head of indulgences, and in answer to the question, "From what fund does the Church draw this remission which she grants to penitent sinners?" it is said: "From the treasure of the infinite satisfaction of Jesus Christ, and of the superabundant satisfaction of the saints, which she has the power of dispensing for the good of her children, according to the rules of Christian prudence and charity."

Before the light of the Reformation dispelled, to some extent, the darkness of Popish abominations, indulgences were openly sold, and they were then

declared and considered to mean full absolution or pardon for sin. Tax-tables were prepared and printed by authority, stating the different sums at which absolution might be purchased for all actual or imaginable crimes; and as men were thus told beforehand that the payment of a specified sum would procure them absolution from any crime which they might feel disposed to commit, it might be said, with substantial truth, that the Church of Rome had established a system of selling licenses to commit iniquity. For a full account of these infamous productions—"The Tax-Tables of the Apostolical Penitentiary"—see "The Spiritual Venality of Rome," second edition, 1836, by the Rev. Joseph Mendham, who has made several most valuable and learned contributions to the Popish controversy.

It is admitted that, from a pretty early period of the Church, indulgences have been sometimes granted by ecclesiastical authority; but then these were merely relaxations of the canonical censures or penances which the Church had imposed in the exercise of discipline. The canon of the Church of England authorizing the commutation of canonical penances or ecclesiastical censures, for the payment of a sum of money, to be given for pious or charitable purposes, although improper, affords no countenance whatever to Popish indulgences. (Phillpotts' Letters to Butler, p. 195.) The allegation of Mr Smith, in his note, that the Church of Scotland sanctions and approves of a similar commutation of the endurance of ecclesiastical censure, for a pecuniary fine, is utterly groundless. Mr Smith must know, at least, that he does not know of any ground for his assertion; and we are sure there is none. We have, indeed, heard it alleged, that cases have occurred in which kirk-sessions have accepted a pecuniary fine, to be given to the poor, as a substitute for public censure; but it is certain that this has no warrant in the laws of the Church, and

would not be sanctioned by any of the higher judicatories.

On indulgences and works of supererogation, see Luther's various discussions in the first volume of his Works; Willet's Synopis, fourteenth controversy, and especially the Appendix to it, in the last edition; White's Reply to Fisher, sect. 21; Du Moulin's Defense de la Foi Catholique, lib. ii. art. 15; Stillingfleet on Indulgences, being the sixth chapter of his Discourse on the Idolatry of the Church of Rome; Phillpotts' Letters, Let. viii., and Supp. Let. pp. 414–434.

CHAPTER IX.

OF SATISFACTION.

1. "He believes it damnable to think anything injuriously of Christ's passion;" but then he distinguishes the eternal and temporal pain due to sin. "As to the guilt and eternal pain, the satisfaction," he saith, "is proper to Christ; but as to the temporal pain, which may remain due by God's justice, after the other is remitted," he saith, "that penitent sinners may, in some measure, satisfy for that by prayer, fasting, alms," &c.

2. "These penitential works," he saith, "are no otherwise satisfactory than as joined and applied to Christ's satisfaction, in virtue of which alone our good works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight."

But for right apprehending the state of the controversy, we must consider,—

1. That they grant both eternal and temporal pain due to sin to be remitted in baptism; so that all the satisfaction to be made is for sins committed after baptism.

2. We distinguish between satisfaction to the Church before absolution, and satisfaction to the justice of God for some part of the punishment due to sin which is unremitted.

3. We do not deny that truly penitential works are pleasing to God, so as to avert his displeasure; but

we deny that there can be any compensation in way of equivalency, between what we suffer and what we deserve.*

The matter in controversy, therefore, on this head, consists in these things:—

1. That after the total remission of sins in baptism, they suppose a temporal punishment to remain, when the eternal is forgiven—which the penitent is to satisfy God's justice for; and without this being done in this life, he must go into purgatory for that end. Of which more under that head.

2. That this satisfaction may be made to the justice of God after absolution is given by the priest; so that, although the penitent be admitted into God's favour by the power of the keys, according to their own doctrine, yet the application of the merits of Christ, together with the saints, in the sentence of absolution (according to their form), doth not set him so free but he either wants a new supply from the treasure of the Church—that is, from the same merits of Christ and the saints—or else he is to satisfy for the temporal punishment by his own penances.

3. That these penitential works are to be joined with the merits of Christ, in the way of proper satisfaction to divine justice. And however softly this may be expressed, the meaning is, that Christ hath merited that we may merit, and by his satisfaction we are enabled to satisfy for ourselves. And if the satisfaction by way of justice be taken away, the other will be a controversy about words.

4. That these penitential works may not only be sufficient for themselves, but they may be so overdone that a great share may be taken from them to make up the treasure of the Church, for the benefit of others who fall short, when they are duly applied to them in the way of indulgences. And about these points we must desire greater proof than we have ever yet seen.

* Catech. Rom. part ii. cap. 5, n. 52, 56.

NOTE ON CHAPTER IX.

Satisfaction, according to Dens (vol. vi. p. 13), is an integral, but not an essential, part of the sacrament of penance; so that the mere non-performance of the satisfaction enjoined by the priest in the confessional does not necessarily deprive men of the benefits of absolution, but may be compensated by some additional suffering in purgatory. It is the express doctrine of the Church of Rome (Catech. Rom., pt. ii. c. 5, s. 109, 110), that one man may satisfy for another, by paying fully what is due by him, in the way of temporal punishment for sin, after its guilt has been removed.

The Popish doctrine of satisfaction is in direct opposition to the great scriptural principles, that when the guilt of sin is forgiven, the whole punishment due to it is also remitted; that when a man is once justified by faith, none of God's subsequent dealings with him are possessed of a strictly penal character; and that no sufferings or obedience of sinful men, and nothing but the sufferings and obedience of Christ, can satisfy divine justice, or be regarded as the payment of what God's law demands, so as to satisfy its claims. According to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, works of satisfaction or penance are chiefly prayer, fasting, and almsgiving (Catech. Rom., pt. ii. c. 5, s. 105); and these, according to their definition of satisfaction (ib., s. 85), constitute a compensation paid to God for sins committed—that is to say, the performance of the prayers, fastings, and almsdeeds, enjoined by the priest in confession, is the endurance of the temporal punishment which God inflicts upon the sins of his people after their guilt has been remitted; and this sore punishment may be mitigated by means of an indulgence, which imparts the benefit of the sufferings—that is, the prayers, fastings, and

almsgiving of others—a doctrine at once unscriptural and most preposterous. See works recommended under the two preceding chapters, and F. Turretine's Treatise de Satisfactione Christi, disp. xi. and xii., where the whole subject is discussed with great ability.

CHAPTER X.

OF READING THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

1. "He believes it damnable in any one to think, speak, or to do anything irreverently towards the Scripture, or by any means whatsoever to bring it into disrepute or disgrace;" but not being contented with this, he adds: "That he holds it in the highest veneration of all men living." Now, here we must desire a little better representation of this matter. For certainly, those who derive its authority from the Church, who set traditions in equal esteem with it, who complain so much of its obscurity, can never be said to hold it in equal veneration with those who maintain its independent authority, its sufficiency, and perspicuity. And these are known and material points in controversy between us and them; therefore, let them not say they hold it in the highest veneration of all men living; though those thought themselves thorough Catholics, who have compared it to a nose of wax, to a Lesbian rule, to a dead letter, unsensed characters, and to other things, not fit to be repeated. But we are well pleased to find them express such veneration for it. Wherefore, then, are the people to be kept from reading it?

2. He saith: "It is not out of disrespect to it." But why, then? 1*st*, "Because private interpretation is not proper for the Scripture." (2 Pet. i. 20.) One

would think the Scripture were kept only from the people, by such a sense being put upon it; for any one that would but consider that place, will find it must relate to the prophets themselves; and doth he think the prophets were to be debarred from reading the Scriptures? But this is playing with Scripture, and not reasoning from it. 2*d*, "Because in the epistles of St Paul are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable deprave, as also the rest of the Scriptures, to their own perdition." (2 Pet. iii. 16.) Now, in my opinion, such men deserve more to be debarred from meddling with the Scripture, who make such perverse inferences from it, than ordinary readers. And if they use all other places as they do this, they cannot be excused from depraving it. It is granted, there were then unlearned and unstable men, who misunderstood or misapplied the writings of St Paul and other Scriptures. And what, then? There are men of all ages who abuse the best things in the world, even the Gospel itself, and the grace of God. Doth it hence follow that the Gospel must not be preached to them, or the grace of God made known to them, for fear of men making ill use of it? If this had been the just consequence, would not St Peter himself have thought of this? But he was so far from making it, that he adviseth those persons he writes to, to have a mighty regard to the Scriptures, even to the prophetical writings, as to a light shining in a dark place. (1 Pet. i. 19.) According to this way of deducing consequences, St Peter should have argued just contrary. The prophetical writings are dark and obscure; therefore meddle not with them, but trust your guides. Whereas the apostle, after he had told them what the apostles saw and heard, adds, "that they have a more sure prophetical word," as the Rhemists translate it. How could that be more sure to them, unless they were allowed to read, consider, and make use of it? 3*d*,

"Because God hath given only some to be apostles, some prophets, other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors." (Eph. iv. 11.) Doth it hence follow that the people are not to read the Scriptures? In the universities, tutors are appointed to interpret Aristotle to their pupils; doth it hence follow that they are not to read Aristotle themselves? It is, no doubt, a mighty advantage to have such infallible interpreters as the apostles and prophets; and all Christians are bound to follow their sense, where they have delivered it. But suppose the question be about the sense of these interpreters, must their books not be looked into, because of the danger of error? This reason will still hold against those who go about to deliver their sense, and so on, till by this method of reasoning, all sorts of books and interpretations be rejected, unless any such can be found out which is not liable to be abused or misunderstood; and if there be any such to be had, they are much to blame who do not discover it. But as yet we see no remedy for two things in mankind—a proneness to sin and to mistake. But of all things, we ought not to take away from them one of the best means to prevent both—namely, a diligent, and careful, and humble reading the Holy Scriptures. But,

3. He denies "that all persons are forbid to read the Scriptures, but only such as have no license, and good testimony from their curates; and, therefore, their design is not to preserve ignorance in the people, but to prevent a blind, ignorant presumption." These are plausible pretences to such as search no further; but the mystery of this matter lies much deeper. It was no doubt the design of the Church of Rome to keep the Bible wholly out of the hands of the people; but upon the Reformation they found it impossible, so many translations being made into vulgar languages; and therefore care was taken to have translations made by some of their own body; and since

the people of better inclinations to piety were not to be satisfied without the Bible, therefore they thought it the better way to permit certain persons they could trust, to have a license to read it; and this was the true reason of the fourth rule of the Index, "Libr. prohibit.," made in pursuance of the order of the Council of Trent, and published by Pius IV., by which any one may see it was not an original permission out of any good-will to the thing, but an after-game to get the Bible out of the hands of the people again, and therefore absolution was to be denied to those who would not deliver them to their ordinaries when they are called for; and the regulars themselves were not to be permitted to have Bibles without a license. And as far as I can understand the addition of Clement VIII. to that fourth rule, he withdraws any new power of granting such licenses, and saith they are contrary to the command and usage of that Church, which, he saith, is to be inviolably observed;* wherein I think he declares himself fully against such licenses; and how inferior guides can grant them against the command of the head of the Church, is a thing not very agreeable to the unity and subordination they boast of.

NOTE ON CHAPTER X.

Gother acknowledged that, according to the Church of Rome, no one is allowed to have a copy of the Bible in his possession "without a license;" but Challoner omitted this, and it does not appear in modern editions. It is, however, unquestionably the law of the Church of Rome, and must continue to be so until there be a repeal, by competent authority, of the fourth rule of the Index concerning prohibited books, prepared by authority of the Council of Trent,

* Quod quidem inviolate servandum est.—*Clem.* VIII., *ad reg.* 4, *Indicis Roman.*

and sanctioned by a bull of Pius IV. in 1564, and by many of his successors down even to the present age, that no Papist is allowed to read or have in his possession a copy of the Bible in the vernacular tongue, without a written license from the bishop or inquisitor; that this license is to be given only to those with regard to whom these authorities, after consulting with their priest or confessor, shall be satisfied that they will derive from the reading of the Bible, not injury, but increase of faith and piety; and that no one who shall presume to have a Bible in his possession, without this written permission, can get absolution of his sins till he give up the book to the bishop. Papists, indeed, in modern times, and in our own country, have found it impossible to enforce this law; that is, they see that it would probably do more harm to their cause to attempt to exercise such an odious and impious tyranny, than to connive at the violation of the rule. But while the Popish authorities do not, in Scotland at least, interfere to prevent their people from reading the Bible, they are greatly puzzled what to make of the fourth rule of the Index. They cannot directly deny its authority, but they sometimes represent it as merely a temporary regulation, which is now unnecessary, and has been therefore cast aside. This is evidently a mere pretence, which has no foundation to rest upon. Pope Pius IV., in his bull sanctioning the Index and the accompanying rules, prohibits the violation of them under pain "of mortal sin, and severe punishment, at the discretion of the bishops;" and it must surely require at least equal authority to secure any who may disobey, against these awful consequences. If this regulation was but temporary, when and by what authority was it repealed? It has been sanctioned by many successive Popes. (See two bulls of Pius VII., in Blair's Revival of Popery, Let. 20, 21.) Pope Leo XII., in his Encyclical Letter, in 1824, in which he denounced the Protestant Bible as

"the Gospel of the devil," and as "deadly pastures," enjoined bishops to adhere strictly to the rules of the Congregation of the Index, adopting their statement, that "if the Sacred Scriptures be indiscriminately read, more evil than good would arise from it;" and the Popish bishops of Ireland published, immediately thereafter, a Pastoral Instruction, in which they expressed their concurrence in the Pope's letter, and declared their intention to act upon the injunction of their master.

Many Popish writers have spoken, not only with disrespect, but with contempt, of the Sacred Scriptures, without being censured for it. But when Quesnel, the celebrated Jansenist, taught that "it is useful and necessary, at all times and places, and for all classes of persons, to study and know the spirit, piety, and mysteries of the Sacred Scriptures," and "that the reading of the Sacred Scriptures is for all," Pope Clement XI., in the famous Bull Unigenitus, published in 1713, condemned these propositions, with many others taken from Quesnel's writings, and enjoined all bishops and inquisitors to punish all who held them, "calling in, if necessary, the assistance of the secular arm." Now, Dr Murray has declared that the Bull Unigenitus is in force in Ireland, and has published it in the eighth volume of Dens. It is the universal doctrine of Papists, even of those who deny the personal infallibility of the Pope, that they are bound to submit to all the decisions of the Pope in matters of faith, which are assented to, or not dissented from, by the majority of bishops over the Church. (See Dr Troy's Pastoral Instruction.) And Dens assures us, that "no Papal bull was ever so expressly and solemnly accepted in the Church as the Bull Unigenitus," and that "it is the dogmatical law of the universal Church; and is therefore deservedly called a rule of faith; and that those who dissent from it are heretics." (Vol. ii. pp. 130, 131.)

Papists are in the habit of quoting, upon this point, a rescript of Pius VI. in 1778, to Martini, archbishop of Florence, commending him for publishing a translation of the Bible in Italian; but they usually omit to mention, that Martini's work was a commentary in twenty-three quarto volumes, and therefore not likely to be extensively circulated; and that his Holiness commended it chiefly for this reason, because "he had enriched it by expositions drawn from tradition, accurately and religiously observing the rules prescribed by the Sacred Congregation of the Index." (See Craig's Second Address to Roman Catholics, p. 15; and Blair on the Revival of Popery, pp. 105, 135.) Mr Smith, in his note on this chapter, parades a list of Popish translations of the Bible into modern languages, made previous to the Reformation, or the publication of Protestant versions in the same language; but he will scarcely venture to assert, that these translations were intended for general circulation, or that the laity would then have been allowed to use them, especially as he must be aware that the authors of the first Popish translation of the Bible into English acknowledged that they had been induced to prepare it, in consequence of the general circulation of Protestant versions.

It is not unworthy of remark, that Father Simon, a very learned Popish writer, informs us that no translation of the Bible into any of the modern languages, before the time of Luther, had been made from the original Hebrew and Greek; and that even the Popish versions, which had been made before the Reformation, were prepared for the purpose of counteracting previous heretical translations. (Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament, pp. 370, 371, 595–598.)

The Popish bishops of this country, in their Declaration published in 1826, asserted, "that the Catholics in England, of mature years, *had permission* to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scrip-

tures, with explanatory notes." They could not have asserted that the Catholics in Italy or Spain had permission to do this. Granting permission implies a power of withholding it; and the Popish prelates are thus convicted, by their own statement, of the audacity of assuming a discretionary control over the enjoyment of a privilege which God has freely conferred, and of interfering, if they choose, with the discharge of a duty which he has imposed.

The Popish bishops of Great Britain, forsooth, are graciously pleased to permit their subjects to do what God has enjoined, and to enjoy what he has conferred upon them! while the conduct of Popish authorities in other countries proves that this permission is granted here only because it could not be safely withheld. And even here the permission is not to read the Word of God as he has given it, but only when "accompanied with explanatory notes." A consistent Papist, before he avails himself of this permission, should take care to ascertain when and by whom it was granted, and on what authority it rests, lest he should incur the guilt of mortal sin, denounced by Pope Pius IV. against all who transgress the rules of the Index; that is, who have a copy of the Bible in the vernacular tongue without a written permission from the bishop. In Ireland it is not uncommon, even at the present day, for Popish priests to stir up persecution against those who merely read the Scriptures to the Papists—to wrest copies of the Bible from their flock, and to destroy them. Dr Doyle, in the Letters of J. K. L., p. 179, declared that he "greatly admired the orthodoxy of a man who had taken a Protestant Bible with the tongs, lest he should defile his touch with it, and buried it in the earth;" and in his examination before Parliament in 1825, he said, "that he would be highly amused by such a proceeding, and would reward a man for it." Papists generally allege that they object only to the use of the Protestant version,

and that upon account of its want of accuracy and fidelity; but this is a mere pretence, for all Papists of competent learning must know, that it is at least as correct and faithful as their own, which is only a translation of a translation. It is particularly interesting to observe, that the language of the Popish translation has been considerably altered since it was first published, and that the alterations have approximated it, in many instances, to the authorized Protestant version; nay, more, that in an edition of the Popish Bible published a few years ago at Dublin, by Dr Murray, the very words of the Protestant version were, in some instances, adopted, even in passages where it had been denounced as unfaithful in Ward's "Errata of the Protestant Bible"—a work which had been republished by the Popish authorities in Ireland, bound up with an edition of the Scriptures, so lately as 1818. (See Protestant Penny Magazine, No. viii. p. 116.) There can be no doubt that the Romish Church would exclude her subjects, in this country, from all access to the Word of God, if she could, or dared, just as she does in Italy and Spain; and the whole history of her procedure upon this point affords abundant evidence that she hates the light, because her deeds are evil; and that she is very willing to be the agent of the god of this world, in doing all she can to prevent the light of the glorious Gospel of divine grace from shining into men's hearts.

See Archbishop Usher's Historia dogmatica Controversiæ inter Orthodoxos et Pontificios de Scripturis et sacris vernaculis; Stillingfleet's Council of Trent Examined and Disproved, sec. 3, and Appendix; J. F. Buddæus' Defensio Doctrinæ Orthodoxæ de omnibus concedenda Scripturæ Sacræ Lectione, occasione Bullæ anti-Quesnellianæ Miscellanea Sacra, Pt. iii. Diss. 8; Blair on the Revival of Popery, pp. 103–111, 128–157; and Phillpotts' Supplemental Letter, pp. 458–469.

CHAPTER XI.

OF APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

1. We do not charge the Church of Rome with making what additions to Scripture they think good, as the misrepresenter saith, but we charge them with taking into the canon of Scripture such books as were not received for canonical by the Christian Church, as those books himself mentions, namely, Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and Maccabees.

2. We do not only charge them with this, but with anathematizing all those who do not upon this declaration believe them to be canonical,* since they cannot but know that these books never were in the Jewish canon, and were left out by many Christian writers. And if the Church cannot add to the Scripture, and our author thinks it damnable to do it, how can it make any books canonical, which were not so received by the Church? For the Scripture in this sense is the canon, and therefore, if it add to the canon, it adds to the Scripture; that is, it makes it necessary to believe some books to be of infallible authority, which were not believed to be so, either by the Jewish or Christian Church, as appears by abundant testimonies to that purpose produced by a learned bishop of this Church,† which ought to have been considered

* Concil. Trident. sess. 4. Decr. de Canon. Script.
† Bp. Cosins' Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture.

by the representer, that he might not have talked so crudely about this matter.

But, however, I must consider what he saith.

1. He produces the testimony of Greg. Nazianzen,* who is expressly against him, and declares but twenty-two books in the canon of the Old Testament. But how doth he prove that he thought these books canonical? He quotes his oration on the Maccabees,† where I can find nothing like it, and instead of it he expressly follows, as he declares, the book of Josephus on the Authority of Reason, concerning them. So that if this proves anything, it proves Josephus his book canonical, and not the Maccabees.

2. He adds the testimony of S. Ambrose,‡ who in the place he refers to, enlarges on the story of the Maccabees, but saith nothing of the authority of the book; and even Coccius § himself grants, that of old Melito Sardensis, Amphilochius, Greg. Nazianzen, the Council of Laodicea, S. Hierom, Ruffinus, and Gregory the Great, did not own the book of Maccabees for canonical.

3. Innocentius ad Exuperium speaks more to his purpose; || and if that decretal epistle be allowed, against which Bishop Cosins hath made considerable objections, then it must be granted that these books were then in the Roman canon; but that they were not received by the universal Church, appears evidently by the canon of the Council of Laodicea, c. 60, wherein these books are left out, and this was received in the code of the universal Church, ¶ which was as clear a proof of the canon then generally received as can be expected. It is true, the Council of Carthage took them in, and St Augustine seems to be of the same opinion; but, on the other side, they are left out

* Greg. Nazianzen, in Carmin. vol. ii. p. 98.
† Orat. de Maccab. vol. i. p. 398.
‡ Ambros. de Jacob et Vitæ Beat. lib. ii. cap. 10-12.
§ Cocci. Thes. Catho. lib. vi. act. 18.
‖ Scholastical History, n. 83. ¶ Euseb. lib. v. cap. 24.

by Melito, bishop of Sardis, who lived near the apostles' times; Origen,* Athanasius,† St Hilary,‡ St Cyril of Jerusalem,§ Epiphanius,‖ St Basil,¶ Amphilochius,** St Chrysostom,†† and especially St Jerome, who hath laboured in this point so much, that no fewer than thirteen places are produced out of him to this purpose, by the forementioned learned bishop of our Church, who clearly proves that there was no tradition for the canon of the Council of Trent, in any one age of the Christian Church.‡‡ But our author goes on.

4. It is of little concern to him, whether these books were ever in the Hebrew copy. I would only ask whether it be of any concern to him, whether they are divinely inspired or not? He saith it is damnable to add to the Scripture, and by the Scripture we mean books written by divine inspiration: can the Church make books to be so written, which were not so written? If not, then all it hath to do, is to deliver by tradition what was so, and what not. Whence should they have tradition, but from the Jews? and they owned no divine inspiration after the time of Malachi. How then should there be any books so written after that time? And he that saith in this matter, as he doth, "it is of little concern to him whether they were in the Hebrew canon," doth little concern himself what he ought to believe, and what not, in this matter.

5. "Since the Church's declaration," he saith, "no Catholics ever doubted." What doth he mean by the Church's declaration? That of Innocentius and the Council of Carthage? Then the same bishop hath showed him, that since that time there have been very many, both in the Greek and Latin Church, of

* Orig. præf. in Psalm.
† Athan. in Synopsi.
‡ Hilar. præf. in Scal.
§ St Cyril. Catech. 4.
‖ Epiph. Hær. viii. 76.
¶ Basil. Philocal. cap. 3.
** Amphil. Epist. Canon. ad Seleuc.
†† Chrys. hom. 4 in Gen.
‡‡ Scholastical History, n. 71.

another opinion. And but a little before the Council of Trent, Catharinus* saith, that a friend of his, and a brother in Christ, derided him as one that wanted learning, for daring to assert these books were within the canon of Scripture; and it is plain, Card. Cajetan could never be persuaded of it; but if he means since the Council of Trent, then we are returned to our first difficulty, how such a Council can make any books canonical, which were not received for such by the Catholic Church before? for then they do not declare the canon, but create it.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XI.

The chapter of Gother to which this is a reply, is omitted altogether by Challoner, and, of course, is not found in modern editions. The probable reason of the omission, was the peculiar grossness of the fraud practised by Gother, in pretending the authority of Gregory Nazianzen and Ambrose in favour of the Apocrypha, and in perverting the opinion of Jerome, as here exposed by Stillingfleet.

Indeed, many of the most learned men in the Church of Rome denied the divine authority of the Apocryphal Books down to the time of the Council of Trent. (See Field on the Church, b. iii. appen. c. 2, pp. 224–232, and Stillingfleet's Council of Trent Examined, sect. 2.) The decree asserting their divine authority, and accompanied, as usual, with an anathema against all who should reject it, was passed in the fourth session of the council, when not more than fifty bishops were present, a considerable minority of whom opposed it. Almost all truly learned Papists are ashamed of it; but of course they are all bound to maintain it as infallibly true. Some learned Papists, finding it

* Cathar. Adv. Cajet. p. 48, ed. Paris, 1535.

quite impossible to defend the decree of the Trent Council upon this subject, have invented an absurd distinction of proto-canonical and deutero-canonical, claiming for the Apocryphal Books only the second of these characters, which amounts in substance to a confession that they are not canonical at all.

The reason which probably induced the majority of the fifty bishops who sat in the fourth session of the Trent Council, to assert the divine authority of the Apocrypha, was, that it contains two or three statements which countenance some of the corruptions of the Romish Church; and also, that if it were acknowledged to be the Word of God, they might derive from its absurdities and contradictions, a plausible pretext for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the laity. Certain it is, that Popish writers have often tried to show that, on the ground of internal evidence, there is as much reason to reject the Word of God as the Apocrypha.

The external evidence against the divine authority of the Apocryphal Books is fully adduced in Cosins' very learned work, referred to by Stillingfleet, entitled "Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture," which no Papist ever attempted to answer; and there is a good summary of the internal evidence to the same effect in Horne's "Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures," vol. i. appendix, p. 495.

CHAPTER XII.

OF THE VULGAR EDITION OF THE BIBLE.

1. We do not dispute about the vulgar edition, whether it may not be preferred before modern Latin editions because of its great antiquity in some parts of it, and its general reception since the time of Gregory I. But our dispute is, whether it be made so authentic since the Council of Trent, that no appeals are to be made to the originals? that is, whether that council, by its authority, could make a version equal to the originals out of which it was made? Especially since, at the time of that decree, the vulgar edition was confessed to be full of errors and corruptions by Sixtus V., who saith, he took infinite pains to correct them, and yet left very many behind, as appeared by Clement VIII. who corrected his Bibles in very many places, and grants some faults were left uncorrected still.* Now, how was it possible for the Council of Trent to declare that edition authentic which was afterwards so much corrected? And whether was the correct edition of Sixtus V. authentic or not, being made in pursuance of the decree of the council? If not, how comes Clemens his edition to be made authentic, when the other was not, since there may be corruptions found in that as well as the other? and no one

* In hac Vulgata editione visa sunt nonnulla mutanda, quæ consulto mutata non sunt.—*Clem.* VIII. *in bulla.*

can tell but it may be reviewed and corrected still, as some of their own writers confess it stands in need of it.*

2. Our controversy is not so much about the authority of the vulgar Latin above other Latin versions, to those who understand them; but whether none else but the Latin version must be used by those who understand it not?† And here our representer saith, "that he is commanded not to read any of these translations" (speaking of Tindal's and that in Queen Elizabeth's time); "but only that which is recommended to him by the Church." If this relate to the vulgar Latin, then we are to seek, why the common people should have none to read but what they cannot understand; if to translations of their own, then we doubt not to make it appear, that our translation allowed among us, is more exact and agreeable than any they can put into their hands.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XII.

Gother's chapter on the Vulgate, or common Latin translation of the Bible, is also omitted by Challoner; and, indeed, Papists feel this to be rather a perplexing subject. The fifty bishops, the majority of whom, in the fourth session of the Council of Trent, introduced the Apocryphal Books into the canon of Scripture, and few of whom probably knew much of Greek or Hebrew, decreed also, that the "Vulgate Latin was to be regarded as authentic in all public readings, disputations, preachings, and expositions, and that no one, upon any pretence, should dare or presume to reject it." The meaning of this decree has been a subject of great controversy among Papists themselves

* Luc. Brugens. in variis lect.
† Nat. Alexand. dissert. de Vulg. vers. quæst. 6.

(Simon's Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament, liv. ii. c. 9, 14), the most learned men among them contending, apparently in opposition to the natural meaning of the words, that it was not intended to hold up the Vulgate Latin as the only authoritative standard of God's written Word, but merely as superior to all other translations, although even this is far from being true. Papists, besides, do not like to be reminded of the awkward circumstances here referred to by Stillingfleet, and fully established by James, in his "Bellum Papale," and in the third part of his "Corruption of Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers"—namely, that Pope Sixtus V. having taken great pains to make a correct text of the Latin Vulgate, and revised every sheet himself, published it in 1590, with a bull prefixed, in which, "of his certain knowledge, and fulness of apostolical power," he decreed, that "this was to be held as the only authentic edition of the Vulgate"—"that it was to be received as true, lawful, authentic, and undoubted"—forbidding, in all time to come, the publication of any edition which should vary in any respect from his, under the penalty of incurring "the wrath of Almighty God, and his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul;" while, in two years after, Clement VIII., who equally had "certain knowledge, and fulness of apostolical power," published another edition, virtually superseding that of Sixtus, and varying from it in no fewer than two thousand passages. These facts entirely overthrow the common Popish doctrine, that it belongs exclusively to the Church to determine what is Scripture, and that there is no safe or certain way of ascertaining this but by believing what she tells us on the subject. See Hody's famous and most learned work, "De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, Versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata," lib. iii. pt. 2, and especially c. 14, 15.

CHAPTER XIII.

OF THE SCRIPTURES AS A RULE OF FAITH.

THE only thing insisted on here is, "that it is not the words but the sense of Scripture that is the rule, and that this sense is not to be taken from men's private fancies, which are various and uncertain; and, therefore, where there is no security from errors, there is nothing capable of being a rule."

To clear this, we must consider:—

1. That it is not necessary to the making of a rule, to prevent any possibility of mistake, but that it be such that they cannot mistake without their own fault; for certainty in itself, and sufficiency for the use of others, are all the necessary properties of a rule; but, after all, it is possible for men not to apply the rule aright, and then they are to be blamed, and not the rule.

2. If no man can be certain of the right sense of Scripture, then it is not plain in necessary things; which is contrary to the design of it, and to the clearest testimonies of antiquity, and to the common sense of all Christians, who never doubted or disputed the sense of some things revealed therein—as the unity of the Godhead—the making of the world by him—the deluge—the history of the patriarchs—the captivity of the Jews—the coming of the Messias—his sending his apostles—his coming again to judgment, &c. No

man who reads such things in Scripture, can have any doubt about the sense and meaning of the words.

Where the sense is dubious, we do not allow any man to put what sense he pleases upon them; but we say, there are certain means whereby he may either attain to the true sense, or not be damned if he doth not. And the first thing every man is to regard, is not his security from being deceived, but from being damned; for the truth is made known in order to salvation; if, therefore, I am sure to attain the chief end, I am not so much concerned as to the possibility of errors, as that I be not deceived by my own fault. We do not, therefore, leave men either to follow their own fancy, or to interpret Scripture by it; but we say: "They are bound, upon pain of damnation, to seek the truth sincerely, and to use the best means in order to it;" and if they do this, they either will not err, or their errors will not be their crime.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XIII.

Protestants and Papists concur in teaching that no statement, either as to doctrine or duty, is to be received as authoritative, unless it be proved to come from God; and that the Bible, being God's Word, contains a correct revelation of his will, and is to be received as a rule of faith. Protestants hold that the Word of God is the only rule of faith. Papists deny this; and, in accordance with the decree of the Council of Trent, consider unwritten tradition as an equally authoritative and certain mean of ascertaining the divine will.

It might have been supposed, that the Church of Rome had gone far enough in corrupting the rule of faith, when she decreed that unwritten tradition, delivered by the Church, was to be received with the

same reverence as the written Word, and claimed to the Church the sole right of interpreting the Scriptures; as these positions, when established, would enable her to invent and to impose any doctrines she pleased. But from hatred to the Word of God, recklessness about the cause of truth, provided the interests of Popery prevail, and consciousness of the weakness of their direct arguments in support of the divine authority of unwritten tradition, and the Church's right to interpret the Bible, most Popish writers, and Gother among the rest, have been led to speak of the Scriptures in a way scarcely consistent with regarding them as a rule of faith at all. Let them assert if they choose, and prove if they can, that God has revealed truths important to be known, which have not been committed to writing, and can be learned only from the tradition of the Church. Let them try to show, that the Church alone has a right to interpret Scripture. But why, in addition to all this, have a separate chapter, as Gother has, on the Scripture as the rule of faith? And why do Popish controversialists, in general, enlarge so much upon the unfitness and insufficiency of Scripture to be a rule of faith, and exert themselves to prove that, in point of fact, it has utterly failed in serving that purpose? How can this be explained, except by their hatred to the Word of God, and their determination, *per fas aut nefas*, to promote the cause of Popery? We are not speaking here of their authorized doctrines—for we have already admitted that the Church of Rome formally acknowledges that the Word of God is a rule of faith, though not the only one—but of the general strain of her writers, whose statements upon this point convey the impression, that, practically and substantially, they do not honestly believe the Word of God to be a rule of faith at all, or regard it as, in any measure, fitted or intended to serve that purpose. Let them, if they choose, dwell upon the different and inconsistent inter-

pretations which have been put upon scriptural statements, with the view of showing the necessity of an infallible interpreter, and establishing the Church's right to hold that office; but why do they bring forward the subject of these inconsistent interpretations in such a mode and connection as naturally to lead to the conclusion, that, in no sense, and to no extent, was the Word of God fitted or intended to be a rule of faith and manners? It is in precisely the same spirit that Mr Smith, in his note upon this subject, brings forward a passage from the Infidel Bolingbroke, in support of the Popish doctrine upon this point. Papists, indeed, have done their utmost to serve the cause of Infidelity, by disparaging the usefulness and sufficiency of the Sacred Scriptures, and showing their unfitness to guide men in matters of faith and practice; and some distinguished Popish writers—that is, men who lived and died in the communion of the Romish Church—have carried this so far, that it is scarcely possible to read their works without being impressed with the conviction that they were concealed Infidels.

The question as to the use and intention of the Sacred Scriptures, the purpose which they were intended to serve, and their fitness to effect it, must be decided, in the first instance, by an appeal to the Scriptures themselves; and if they contain any information upon this point, it must be decisive, since both parties acknowledge that they are the Word of God, and that all their statements are true. And it can be easily proved, from the Word of God, that it was his intention that his Word should be men's rule of faith, and that it is amply sufficient, and fully adapted, to serve all the purposes which he intended to effect by a revelation of his will to men.

Our Saviour delivered many discourses before the multitude of the Jews, and why should any be prevented from perusing them when they have been com-

mitted to writing? The apostolic epistles were addressed indiscriminately to all the members of the Churches, and were commanded to be read. (Col. iv. 16.) The fitness and sufficiency of the Scriptures to be a rule of faith and manners, is plainly asserted in the following, among other passages: Isa. viii. 20; Acts xvii. 11; Deut. iv. 1, 2; John xx. 30, 31; 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16; Rev. xxii. 18.

These passages satisfactorily establish, in opposition to the common allegations of Popish writers, that the Word of God was intended by its Author to be the rule and standard of men's faith and practice, and that, when rightly used by them, it is fully adapted to serve that purpose. Papists may endeavour to elude their force, but they can give them no solid or satisfactory answer. The editor once heard a Popish priest, in a public controversial lecture—a man of some talent and learning—dispose of them in a very summary way, by broadly asserting, that the Scripture could not be heard in its own cause, or be allowed to give testimony to itself; as if Papists did not acknowledge that it is the Word of God, and that all its statements are true. This is another curious illustration of the Infidel spirit in which Papists usually treat this subject.

If it be true, and Papists will not venture formally and expressly to deny it, that the Word of God was intended to be a rule of faith, then, to argue from the inconsistent interpretations which have been put upon its statements, against the propriety of its being employed as a rule, is just to charge God foolishly, and to argue against the use of a thing from the abuse of it. It is quite sufficient, that God has given us his Word as a rule of faith, and that its character is such, that all who use it aright may be sure of attaining to the knowledge of all necessary truth; and these are positions which are fully established by the express statements of the Scriptures themselves.

CHAPTER XIV.

OF THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

1. THE question is not, Whether men are not bound to make use of the best means for the right interpretation of Scripture, by reading, meditation, prayer, advice, a humble and teachable temper, &c.; that is, all the proper means fit for such an end? but, Whether, after all these, there be a necessity of submitting to some infallible judge, in order to the attaining to the certain sense of Scripture?

2. The question is not, Whether we ought not to have a mighty regard to the sense of the whole Christian Church in all ages since the apostles, which we profess to have? but, Whether the present Roman Church, as it stands divided from other communions, hath such a right and authority to interpret Scripture, that we are bound to believe that to be the infallible sense of Scripture which she delivers?

And here I cannot but take notice how strangely this matter is here misrepresented; for the case is put,

1. As if every one who rejects their pretence of infallibility, had nothing to guide him but his own private fancy in the interpretation of Scripture.

2. As if we rejected the sense put upon Scripture by the whole community of Christians in all ages since the apostles' times. Whereas we appeal, in the matters in difference between us, to this universal

sense of the Christian Church, and are verily persuaded they cannot make it out in any point wherein we differ from them. And themselves cannot deny, that in several we have plainly the consent of the first ages, as far as appears by the books remaining, on our side—as in the worship of images, invocation of saints, Papal supremacy, communion in both kinds, prayer, and Scripture in known tongues; and, I may safely add, the sufficiency of Scripture, transubstantiation, auricular confession, public communions, solitary masses; to name no more.

But here lies the artifice: we must not pretend to be capable of judging either of Scripture or tradition, but we must trust their judgment as to what is the sense of Scripture, and what hath been the practice of the Church in all ages, although their own writers confess the contrary; which is very hard.

But he seems to argue for such a submission to the Church:—1*st*, "Because we receive the books of Scripture from her, therefore from her we are to receive the sense of the books." An admirable argument! We receive the Old Testament from the Jews, therefore from them we are to receive the sense of the Old Testament; and so we are to reject the true Messias. But this is not all: If by the Church they mean the Church of Rome in distinction from others, we deny it; if they mean the whole Christian Church, we grant it; but then the force of it is quite lost. But why is it not possible for the Church of Rome to keep these writings, and deliver them to others, which make against herself? Do not persons in law-suits often produce deeds which make against them? But there is yet a further reason: it was not possible for the Church of Rome to make away these writings, being so universally spread. 2*d*, Because the Church puts the difference between true and false books, therefore she must be trusted for the true sense of them; which is just as if one should

argue the clerks of the rolls are to give an account to the court of true records; therefore they are to sit on the bench, and to give judgment in all causes. The Church is only to declare what it finds as to canonical books, but hath no power to make any book canonical which was not before received for such. But I confess Stapleton saith: "The Church, if it please, may make Hermas his Pastor, and Clemens his Constitutions canonical;"* but I do not think our author will therein follow him.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XIV.

The Council of Trent (sess. 4) enjoins, that "no one shall dare to interpret the Sacred Scriptures in opposition to that sense which Holy Mother Church, to whom it belongs to judge of the sense and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures, has held, and does hold, or against the unanimous consent of the fathers;" and in accordance with this principle, Dr Milner protests against the right of Protestants to argue from Scripture, and broadly declares "that he might quash every objection that might be drawn from any passage in it by this short reply: *The Church understands the passage differently from you, therefore you mistake its meaning.*"

God has made his Word public property—he has put it into men's hands, and commanded them to use it, that from understanding its statements they may learn his will; and in these circumstances the presumption certainly is, that men are not only warranted, but bound, to exert their faculties, and to use all natural and appropriate means for the purpose of understanding it. If any deny this, the *onus probandi* must lie upon them; that is, they must prove that God has positively interdicted men from using the natural and

* Controv. v. qu 4, art. 2.

appropriate means of understanding the Scriptures which he has enjoined them to search, and from relying upon the results to which the use of these means may lead them; and also, that he has expressly commissioned, and fully qualified, some individual or body of men to give interpretations of Scripture which shall be infallibly true, and authoritatively binding. Before the Papists can call upon us to admit these positions, they must establish them from the Sacred Scriptures; for we can receive them on no authority but that of God himself; and of the meaning of those scriptural statements by which they attempt to establish the Church's exclusive right to interpret, we must, of course, judge in the proper use of ordinary means. The proof which they commonly adduce, that God has interdicted private individuals from interpreting the Scriptures for themselves, is 2 Pet. i. 20. The passage is a somewhat difficult one. It is not very easy to determine certainly what is its precise meaning, and we are not aware that even the Church of Rome has ever given an interpretation of it, although many Popish writers have done so. It is plain, however, that it does not serve the purpose for which they commonly adduce it; because it applies only to the prophetical Scriptures. It is deduced as an inference from the fact that they are inspired by the Holy Ghost, and must therefore equally respect all men, whether individually or collectively—whether in a public or a private capacity. Papists commonly try to make a handle of the use of the word *private* in our authorized version; but their own authentic Vulgate Latin, which they are forbidden to reject upon any pretence, does not use the word *private*, and conveys a different meaning. (See Horsley's Sermon on the passage.) Papists do not pretend to produce any statement of Scripture, in which God has commissioned the Church authoritatively and infallibly to interpret his Word; and the absence of an express divine com-

mission to that effect is conclusive against her claim. Their general doctrine of the infallibility of the Church in matters of faith, as commonly stated and defended, does not necessarily imply a right to pronounce infallibly upon the meaning of every statement in the Word of God.

The argument derived from the fact of the different and contradictory interpretations put upon many scriptural statements, to prove the necessity of an infallible interpreter, is equally fitted to prove that God should have made his Word of such a character as at once and certainly to have suggested the same ideas to the minds of all men, which yet we know he has not done; or at least, that this infallible interpreter should have been pointed out in Scripture so clearly that he could not be mistaken, and that his office and prerogatives must have been distinctly understood, and universally acknowledged. Every consideration commonly adduced by Papists to prove that there must be an infallible interpreter of Scripture, equally proves the necessity of a statement distinctly asserting that the Church, and the Church of Rome, has been invested with that office; because, as matters stand, we have the Word of God put into our hands, and we are enjoined to use it so as to ascertain its meaning, while we have not a vestige of evidence that we must take its meaning from the Church of Rome, or any other Church. The right of the Church of Rome to interpret infallibly the Scriptures, must be founded upon the express testimony of God, else it cannot be received: and as no such testimony can be produced, the pretended right of that Church to interpret Scripture has, in point of fact, just as completely failed in guiding men to correct and harmonious views of God's revealed will, as the exercise of the right of private judgment.

The Popish attempts to prove the necessity of an infallible interpreter of Scripture directly impeach the divine wisdom, since God has assured us of the suf-

ficiency of his Word, told us nothing whatever of an interpreter, and has neither qualified nor authorized any man, or body of men, infallibly to explain its meaning. However desirable we might imagine an infallible interpreter to be, God has not been pleased to provide it, and has given us not even a hint of its existence or necessity. It is enough that his Word is able to make men wise unto salvation; and that all who have it in their hands, and use that privilege aright, will certainly be guided to heaven.

It is commonly objected, that unless there be an infallible interpreter of Scripture, every man must be left to his own judgment in explaining it, and that this is making each individual's fancy the rule of faith. But if God has put his Word into men's hands, and commanded them to search it, while he has not given a single hint of an infallible interpreter, they must do what they can in the use of all proper means to understand it, and they must of necessity be guided in their opinions and conduct by their own conscientious conviction as to the meaning of the Divine Record. They are not at liberty to indulge their own fancy in the matter; they must take the Divine Word as their rule, and use all proper means to ascertain what it really declares and enjoins. They are accountable to God for the use they make of his Word, and by that Word he will one day judge them; but he has given none of their fellow-men dominion over their faith; and as none can stand between us and the sentence of God, so it is at once an act of tyranny and absurdity for any human being to demand that we shall understand the Word of God, not according to our own conscientious conviction as to what its meaning is, but according to the sense which has been put upon it by some other person.

But while the Church of Rome thus claims to herself the sole right of interpreting Scripture—that is, of bringing out of the Word of God, and imposing upon

men's consciences whatever she chooses—she has been graciously pleased to prescribe a rule to herself, to guide her in the exercise of this right, namely, "the unanimous consent of the fathers." God has not told us to be guided in interpreting his Word by the consent of the fathers; and, therefore, this consent, if it exist, and could be ascertained, would not be binding upon us. The Council of Trent (sess. 4) merely prohibited men to interpret Scripture "*against* the unanimous consent of the fathers;" but in the creed of Pope Pius IV., every Popish priest swears, at his ordination, that he will "never receive or interpret Scripture, *except according* to the unanimous consent of the fathers." The difference between these two statements is important. Had the matter stood on the footing on which it was left by the decree of the council, it would have been lawful for Popish priests to have gone on interpreting Scripture, in subjection to the authority of the Church, until they were stopped by the unanimous consent of the fathers adduced against them; whereas, by the creed of Pope Pius IV., and their own ordination vow, they are confined within much narrower limits, and have positively precluded themselves from interpreting any passage, without, first of all, ascertaining the unanimous consent of the fathers as to its meaning; and this, when once ascertained, they are bound to follow. Whenever, therefore, a Popish priest proceeds to interpret a text, we are entitled, in terms of his oath, to insist that he produce to us the unanimous consent of the fathers as to its meaning; and if he cannot do this, he is sworn to abstain from interpreting it altogether.

But the truth is, there is no such thing as the unanimous consent of the fathers, in regard to the meaning of any of the texts whose import is a subject of controversy. There is as much diversity of opinion among the fathers in regard to the interpretation of Scripture, as there is among Protestant commentators.

With respect to the meaning of almost all the passages usually discussed in the controversy between Protestants and the Church of Rome, all Papists of learning are fully aware that the fathers are not agreed. When Papists, therefore, boast of the unanimous consent of the fathers, they are guilty of deliberate fraud; and the oath which all Popish priests have taken, "never to interpret Scripture, *except according* to the unanimous consent of the fathers," can be kept only by their abstaining wholly from interpreting any portions of the Bible, except those in the interpretation of which all men of sane mind are unanimous.

We have said that there is as much diversity of opinion among the fathers, in regard to the meaning of controverted texts, as among Protestant commentators; and it should also be added, that there is more nonsense and absurdity in the interpretation of Scripture to be found in the writings of the fathers, than among any authors who have been generally esteemed in any of the Protestant Churches. This is fully established by Whitby, in his "Dissertatio de Scripturarum Interpretatione, secundum Patrum commentarios;" in which, after a long preface, containing much valuable matter connected with the subject of this note, he begins with the Book of Genesis, and goes over the whole Bible, exhibiting in succession the egregious folly and trifling which many of the most eminent fathers have displayed in interpreting even very important passages.

Another important consideration on this subject is, that while the Church of Rome claims the sole right of interpreting Scripture, and pretends that she can give infallibly the meaning of God's Spirit, she has never, in point of fact, given an authoritative interpretation of a single chapter of the Bible. She declaims much upon the evils arising from different and inconsistent interpretations. She knows that these incon-

sistencies are not confined to Protestants, but are to be found in the works of her own authors; yet she has never exercised her power of infallible interpretation upon any three consecutive verses. Popes, indeed, have in their works interpreted many portions of Scripture; but no intelligent Papist will venture to assert that all Papal interpretations are infallible, as it could be easily proved that many of them are remarkable only for their absurdity.*

Let the Church of Rome, if she dare, give us an authoritative interpretation of any one book of the New Testament, and then we shall be better able to judge of her fitness for the office which she claims. In the meantime, we defy the Papists to produce an interpretation of a single chapter of the Bible made by the Church of Rome, and regarded by her subjects as infallible. If Papists are forbidden to interpret the Bible for themselves, upon the ground that this would lead them into error, they are surely entitled to demand that the Church should give them a correct interpretation, else what use can they make of the Sacred Scriptures?

The alleged right of the Church of Rome to interpret the Sacred Scriptures is thus clearly proved to be a deliberate imposture, resting upon no evidence whatever; and has been assumed, not for the purpose of guiding men to the knowledge of the truth, but with the express design of keeping them in ignorance, and rendering the Word of God of no effect.

Stapleton, here quoted by Stillingfleet, was a very distinguished Popish controversialist, who flourished in the latter part of the sixteenth century. His principal antagonist was Whittaker, Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, whose works contain a great mass of most valuable matter on the Popish controversy; especially his "Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura," in the first volume of his works, and his treatise "De Auto-

* See Bishop Bedell's Letter to Waddesworth, c. iii. pp. 24-37.

ritate Sacræ Scripturæ," in the second volume (the latter being a reply to Stapleton's answer to the former, and embodying, according to a practice common in those times, nearly the whole of Stapleton's work), contain a very able and learned discussion of the whole subject of the rule of faith.

CHAPTER XV.

OF TRADITION.

1. THE question is not about "human traditions supplying the defects of Scripture," as he misrepresents it; but whether there be an unwritten Word, which we are equally bound to receive with the written Word? Although those things which pass under that name are really but human traditions, yet we do not deny that they pretend them to be of divine original.

2. We do not deny but "the apostles might deliver such things by word as well as by epistle, which their disciples were bound to believe and keep;"* but we think there is some difference to be made between what we certainly know they delivered in writing, and what is now impossible for us to know, namely, what they delivered by word without writing.

3. We see no ground why any one should believe any doctrine "with a stedfast and divine faith," which is not bottomed on the written Word; for then his faith must be built on the testimony of the Church as divine and infallible, or else his faith cannot be divine. But it is impossible to prove it to be divine and infallible, but by the written Word; and, therefore, as it is not reasonable that he should believe the written Word by such a divine testimony of the Church, so if any particular doctrine may be received on the

* 2 Thess. ii. 15.

authority of the Church without the written Word, then all articles of faith may, and so there would be no need of the written Word.

4. The faith of Christians doth no otherwise stand upon the foundation of the Church's tradition, than as it delivers down to us the books of Scripture; but we acknowledge the general sense of the Christian Church to be a very great help for understanding the true sense of Scripture; and we do not reject anything so delivered; but what is all this to the Church of Rome? But this is still the way of true representing.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XV.

The fifty bishops who sat in the fourth session of the Council of Trent decreed, in spite of the opposition of a minority, that the will of God as to doctrine and discipline was "contained in written books and in unwritten traditions, which, received from the mouth of Christ by the apostles, or from the apostles under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, have been handed down, and have reached us;" and declared that "they received and venerated these traditions with equal piety and reverence as the written Word." The Sacred Scriptures do not enjoin us to attend to tradition as a certain and authoritative mode of conveying to us the divine will, and therefore it possesses no authority.

Tradition is an old contrivance of Satan. It was employed by him as the principal means of corrupting and rendering of none effect God's ancient revelation contained in the Old Testament Scriptures; and as exhibited in the principles and conduct of the Pharisees, it called forth the severe censure of our Saviour. It might easily be shown, that Popish traditions produce all the injurious results which Christ charged

upon the Pharisaic ones. Papists commonly adduce, in support of tradition, the command of the apostle (2 Thess. ii. 15) to hold fast the traditions which they had been taught, whether by word or by his epistle. But the answer is obvious and conclusive, namely, whatever can be proved to have been delivered by the apostle as public instruction to the Churches, whether orally or in writing, should certainly be received as divinely inspired; and we only want proof, as the Thessalonians had, that any statement came from the apostle, to constrain us to submit to it. We can prove that he wrote the epistles which bear his name, and therefore we receive them as authoritative. Let the Church of Rome produce any doctrines or precepts whatever, and prove that they came from Christ or the apostles, and we will at once receive them as a part of our rule of faith. The Church of Rome has not proved, and cannot prove, that any one of the traditions, not contained in the written Word, which she has propounded, as to doctrine, duty, discipline, and government, can be traced to Christ or his apostles, or had their sanction; and till this be done, we are not only warranted, but required by our allegiance to Christ, to reject them. Protestants have access to the works of early writers, in which these oral statements of Christ and his apostles, if they ever existed, must have been preserved. They are just as capable as Papists are of understanding their meaning, and estimating the strength of the evidence on which the information they contain is founded; and yet they have often offered to rest the controversy between them and the Church of Rome on the concurrent testimony of the writers of the first three centuries; and have proved, that even with this as the standard, they can command a decided victory. If Papists had not been conscious that ancient tradition was opposed to their pretensions, they would not have taken such pains to mutilate and interpolate the writ-

ings of the fathers, and to forge works in their name which they never wrote.

The subjects of the last five chapters form the substance of what is usually discussed under the head of the rule of faith—a point of vital importance, as it affects the standard of faith and practice. In viewing this subject generally, it must be borne in mind, that the question is not, What was the rule of faith in patriarchal or in apostolical times? but, What is our rule of faith in the actual circumstances in which Providence has placed us?—that is, What means has God given us of certainly ascertaining his will? It is nothing to the purpose to adduce, as Papists commonly do, the fact, that for many ages few could have access to the Word of God, and that many still in Christian countries cannot read it, even in their own tongue. This concerns only the sovereignty of God, who gives to men whatever kind or degree of religious privileges he chooses, and who has been pleased to place many in a situation in which they are dependent upon the intelligence and integrity of others for an acquaintance with his revealed will. In order to settle the question, What is our rule of faith? we must take the case of men who are possessed of every advantage, and have all the opportunities of ascertaining the will of God which any of their fellow-men enjoy, and then inquire what standard they are bound to follow in everything connected with religion. All Protestants maintain, that the only rule of faith, the only certain means we have of learning the divine will, is the written Word of God. Papists acknowledge that the Word of God is a rule of faith, though not the only one; but they cannot prove that there is any other certain or authorized method of ascertaining what God would have us to believe and to do. Both parties maintain, that all that is contained in the Sacred Scriptures was dictated by God for the instruc-

tion of men; and we defy the Church of Rome to produce any statement not contained in the Bible, which, by competent evidence, they can trace to God or to his inspiration. They commonly allege, that we cannot prove that the Scriptures are the Word of God, except by tradition. Supposing that this were true, it would certainly not follow that tradition could or did convey to us from God truths not contained in his Word. Whatever means God may take to convey to us his message, we have to do only with the evidence that it does come from him, and with its meaning or import. Let us receive all that is proved to come from God, but nothing more. It is very injudicious in the Papist to stir the question of the grounds by which the divine authority of the Scriptures may be established; because, if a Protestant and a Papist were each to give an account of the outline of the argument by which they would try to convince an intelligent Infidel of the truth of Christianity and the authority of the Scriptures, it would clearly appear, that the Papist must either take up the same ground, and urge the same proofs as Protestants have commonly done, or else betray the cause by the inconclusiveness of his arguments, and more especially by falling into the sophism of reasoning in a circle. And accordingly, Huet, in his valuable and learned work, entitled "Demonstratio Evangelica," proves the divine authority of the Bible, exactly as a Protestant would do. It is true, that one branch of the Christian evidence consists in proving, by a series of quotations from successive writers, that the contents of the Scriptures have, in all ages, been the same as they now are, and were written by the persons whose names they bear; and that Huet and other Papists call this tradition. But this is a mere quibble. The writings of these authors are equally accessible to Protestants, Papists, and Infidels; the application that is made of them in the Christian evidence, rests upon principles

which commend themselves to all men of sound understanding, independently of any respect to scriptural or ecclesiastical authority, and which are equally applicable to the writings of profane authors, as has been finely illustrated in Taylor's very valuable works on the Transmission of Ancient Books, and the Process of Historic Proof.

The alleged right of the Church of Rome to interpret the Scriptures is a mere fabrication, which has not a shadow of evidence to support it; and, besides, it has never been brought into exercise. That Church has never given the world an interpretation of the Bible, or of a single chapter of it. The unanimous consent of the fathers as to the meaning of Scripture has no existence, and cannot be produced upon a single passage usually discussed in the controversy between Protestants and Papists. And laying the pretence to *unanimity* aside, there is not even a traditionary sense of any considerable number of controverted texts that can be proved to have been *generally* held in early ages. How, then, are men to employ the Scriptures which God has put into their hands? They must exert themselves in the use of their natural faculties, with the application of all the helps which their situation affords, and with fervent prayer for the teaching of the Holy Spirit to understand their meaning; and all who persevere in the use of these means may be assured that they will, through the divine blessing, attain to the knowledge of all necessary truth. God has given them no human infallible interpreter, but he has so formed his Word, and he has promised so to dispense the influences of his Spirit, that those who have his Word in their hands, will fail of attaining to that knowledge which is eternal life only through their own sin.

The differences existing among Protestants on religious matters have been greatly exaggerated by Papists; and the argument derived from the existence

of differences admits of being retorted against themselves, and with far greater effect, in consequence of their pretensions to unity and infallibility. If we exclude the Unitarians, who are not entitled to be called Christians, the differences among Protestants respect only matters of subordinate importance, while there is a great harmony among them in regard to all the leading doctrines of Christianity, as must be well known to every one who has perused the Confessions of the Reformed Churches.

The Church of Rome pretends that it is only from her that men can learn what is the Word of God, and what is its meaning. But what has she done in these respects? She has added nothing, to say the least, in her peculiar character as a Church, or by anything she has done in that capacity, to the evidence for the divine authority of the Scriptures. She has corrupted the canon, by putting apocryphal fables on a level with the Inspired Record. She has, to a considerable extent, made the Word of God of none effect by her traditions. She has never even pretended to give a correct text of the Hebrew or Greek original, but has substituted in their place a Latin translation of no great accuracy. She has not given even an authorized edition of that translation; for conscientious Papists must be greatly puzzled whether to adopt the text of Sixtus or of Clement as authentic. She will not allow men to interpret the Bible for themselves. She has restricted, by an oath, her own priests from interpreting it, except in accordance with a standard which she knows has no existence; and yet she has never given the world an authorized interpretation of a single chapter. In short, she has acted exactly like the Pharisees of old: "She has taken away the key of knowledge. She has not entered in herself, and them that were entering in she has hindered." (Luke xi. 52.)

On the subject of the rule of faith, besides the

works already referred to, we would recommend Episcopius de Regula Fidei, and his Responsio ad Dilemmata decem Pontificii alicujus Doctoris. Bishop Davenant's (one of the very best and ablest divines the Church of England has ever produced) Praelectio de Judice Controversiarum—in which the respective provinces of Scripture, of ecclesiastical authority, and of private judgment, are very ably explained and illustrated. F. Turretine de Authoritate Sacræ Scripturæ, Oper. v. disp. 2, 3. Stillingfleet's Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, part i. c. 6, 7; and his Council of Trent Examined and Disproved, sect. 1, 2. Tillotson's Rule of Faith. Burnet's Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, art. 6. Discourses, by Archbishop Tenison, on a Guide in Matters of Faith; by Dr William Sherlock, on the Protestant Resolution of Faith; and by Bishop Patrick on Tradition—all contained in Gibson's Preservative; and in a Collection of Discourses, by Divines of the Church of England, against the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, published in Edinburgh in 1687.

CHAPTER XVI.

OF COUNCILS.

1. We are glad to find so good a resolution as seems to be expressed in these words, namely, that he is obliged to believe nothing besides that which Christ taught, and his apostles; and if anything contrary to this should be defined, and commanded to be believed, even by ten thousand councils, he believes it damnable in any one to receive it, and by such decrees to make additions to his creed. This seems to be a very good saying, and it is a pity anything else should overthrow it; but here lies the misrepresenting—he will believe what Christ and his apostles taught, from the definitions of councils; and so all this goodly fabric falls to nothing; for it is but as if one should say: If Aristotle should falsely deliver Plato's sense, I will never believe him; but I am resolved to take Plato's sense only from Aristotle's words. So here, he first declares he will take the faith of Christ from the Church; and then he saith, if the Church representative should contradict the faith of Christ, he would never believe it.

2. We dispute not with them the right and necessity of general councils (upon great occasions), if they be truly so, rightfully called, lawfully assembled, and fairly managed; which have been, and may be, of great use to the Christian world for settling the faith,

healing the breaches of Christendom, and reforming abuses. And we further say, that the decrees of such councils ought to be submitted to, where they proceed upon certain grounds of faith, and not upon unwritten traditions, which was the fatal stumbling at the threshold in the Council of Trent, and was not to be recovered afterwards; for their setting up traditions equally with the written Word made it easy for them to define, and as easy for all others to reject their definitions, in case there had not been so many other objections against the proceedings of that council. And so all our dispute concerning this matter is taken off from the general notion, and runs into the particular debate concerning the qualifications and proceedings of some which were called free general councils, but were neither general nor free, and, therefore, could not deliver the sense of the Catholic Church, which our author requires them to do.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XVI.

Papists scarcely pretend that there is any scriptural authority for the infallibility of general councils, independently of the texts which they produce for the supremacy of the Pope and the infallibility of the Church—subjects to be afterwards considered; and as reason certainly does not tell us that a body of men, who are all of them fallible singly and separately, are infallible when they are met together, and determine a point of faith, perhaps by a majority of votes, we cannot be expected to admit the infallibility of general councils, unless it be proved that Christ promised to guide them infallibly by his Spirit. The earliest general councils professed to be guided in their decisions solely by the Holy Scriptures; but the

history of many of the more recent ones, the character of the men who composed them, the influences under which they acted, and the manner in which they proceeded, as well as the manifest contrariety of some of their decrees to the plain statements of the written Word, afford abundant evidence that they were not guided by the Holy Ghost. All Popish priests are sworn to the infallibility of the Council of Trent in matters of faith; and yet the whole history of its proceedings shows that it should be regarded in no other light than as a synagogue of Satan.

Every Popish priest is sworn to believe and maintain "everything delivered, defined, and declared by the œcumenical councils;" and yet the very men who take this oath differ in opinion as to the councils which were œcumenical and infallible. Most Papists reckon eighteen general and infallible councils; but they differ materially among themselves as to the particular councils which should be included in the list. Among the eighteen general councils received as infallible, the Italians and immediate adherents of the Pope include the Councils of Lyons, Florence, and the fifth Lateran; while the French commonly deny that these were general councils, and assert the infallibility of the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, whose claim to that character is not admitted on the other side of the Alps.

When the Popish priests of this country swear to maintain all things defined by the œcumenical councils, whether do they mean to follow the French or the Italian list? De la Hogue, in his Treatise de Ecclesia, which is the text-book at Maynooth (Appen. 2), adheres generally to the Italian list in his enumeration of the eighteen general councils, except that he seems to substitute the Council of Constance in place of the fifth Lateran, quoting, in regard to this last, the statement of Bellarmine (who, however, himself held it to be œcumenical), that it still re-

mained a question among Catholics, whether it were general or not. Dens (vol. ii. pp. 144, 145) omits the Council of Constance, which, he says, the French reckon œcumenical, and inserts in his list the fifth Lateran. Bellarmine has a chapter entitled "Concerning General Councils that are Rejected," and another "Concerning General Councils partly Approved and partly Disapproved." He enumerates eighteen general councils which are approved, eight which are rejected, and six which are partly approved and partly not. His professed reasons for the distinction which he makes among them are generally so trifling and insignificant, that they could not be supposed to constitute or produce the difference between fallible and infallible—to determine the absence or the presence of the presiding agency of the Holy Ghost; and they thus afford good ground for suspecting that the Popish doctrine of the infallibility of general councils is a mere pretence, and that Papists deal with them very much as Protestants do—that is, judge of the soundness of their decisions by some other standard, and regulate their estimate of the respect that is due to them in that way. This view of the policy of the Church of Rome in the matter of general councils, is confirmed by Bellarmine's mode of dealing with the Council of Pisa, of which he says, that "it seems to be a general council neither approved nor disapproved." If Bellarmine had found it convenient, he could just as easily and as certainly have determined whether or not this council was infallible as any others; but here was the difficulty—the Council of Pisa deposed two Popes, Gregory and Benedict, for schism and heresy, and elected Alexander to fill the chair of Peter. If the council were admitted to be infallible, then this established the doctrine of the Councils of Constance and Basle as to the superiority of a council over a Pope. If its authority were denied, then the appointment of Alexander would be invalid; and

thus, as there happened at that time to be no other person claiming the Popedom (a state of things rather unusual about that period), the series of the successors of Peter would have been broken, and could never again be restored. For these reasons, Bellarmine thought it expedient to make a distinct head for the Council of Pisa, and to leave its infallibility undetermined.

There has been much controversy among Papists, not only as to the particular councils which should be reckoned œcumenical, but also as to the marks or notes by which their right to that character should be determined. Papists have shown their consciousness of the impossibility of rendering the decrees of general councils consistent with each other, and with the pretensions of their Church, by having recourse to a very extensive and unscrupulous use of mutilation, interpolation, and forgery, in this matter, as is fully established in Comber's Roman Forgeries in the Councils. See also Field on the Church, pp. 642–677; Stillingfleet's Rational Account, part iii. cap. 1–3; A Treatise on the Authority of Councils and the Rule of Faith, by a person of quality, published in 1687; Jenkin's Historical Examination of the Authority of General Councils, published in the third volume of Gibson's Preservative; Richier's Histoire des Conciles; Grier's Epitome of the General Councils; Edgar's Variations of Popery, c. 2.

CHAPTER XVII.

OF INFALLIBILITY IN THE CHURCH.

1. He doth not pretend this belongs to the pastors and prelates of his Church, who may fall, he saith, into heresy and schism; but that the whole Church is secured by divine promises from all error and danger of prevarication; which he proves from the promises of the New Testament, Matt. xvi. 18, xxviii. 20; John xiv. 16, 26. But however the former seems to take away infallibility from the guides of the Church, yet that this is to be understood of them separately, appears by what follows.

2. The like assistance of the Holy Ghost he believes to be in all general councils, which is the Church representative; by which they are specially protected from all error in all definitions and declarations in matters of faith.

Now here are two sorts of infallibility tacked to one another by virtue of these general promises, which ought more distinctly to be considered.

(1.) To preserve Christ's Church so as it shall never cease to be a Church, is one thing; to preserve it from all error is another. The former answers the end of Christ's promises as to the duration of the Church, and the latter is not implied in them.

(2.) The promise of "teaching them all truth" (John xvi. 13) is not made to the whole Church, but

to the apostles; and their case was so peculiar and extraordinary, that there can be no just inference, from the assistance promised to them, of what the Church should enjoy in all ages.

3. If the diffusive Church have no infallible assistance promised, then no infallible assistance can from thence be proved for the Church representative; so that some particular promises to the guides of the Church as assembled together, are necessary to prove the infallibility of councils.

4. It by no means proves following councils to be infallible, because the apostles said (Acts xv. 28): "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us." Our author doth not doubt but the same may be prefixed to all determinations, in point of faith, resolved on by any general council lawfully assembled since that time, or to be held to the world's end. But what reason he had for not doubting in this matter I cannot see. The assistance, he saith, being to extend as far as the promise; but shall assistance imply infallibility? Then there must be good store, as long as the promises of divine grace hold good; but this assistance of councils is very different from the assistance of grace; for the Church may subsist without councils, but cannot without grace. What general council was there from the meeting Acts xv. to the Council of Nice? Were not Christ's promises fulfilled to his Church all that time, when it increased in all parts against the most violent opposition?

5. No parity of reason from the Jewish Church can be sufficient proof for infallibility in the Christian. But our author argues thus: "If God's special assistance was never wanting to the Church of the Jews, so as to let it fail in the truth of its doctrine or its authority, why should not he believe the same of the Church of Christ, which is built on better promises?" What special assistance was it which Israel had, when it is said, that for a long time Israel had been "with-

out the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law?"* And as to Judah, was there no failing in point of doctrine in our Saviour's time? It is true, they had the law entire; and that was all that was good among them; for their teachers had corrupted themselves and the people, and made the law of no effect among them. If there were infallibility anywhere, it must be in the high priest and Sanhedrim; but is it possible for any Christian to think them infallible, when they were so grossly mistaken about the main article of their faith as to the Messias, and pronounced him worthy of death? Is not this a fine argument for the infallibility of the guides of the Christian Church? But the Church of Christ hath better promises: no doubt of it—greater promises of grace and mercy in this world, and in that to come; but what is all this to infallibility in councils?

6. Christ's command of obedience to those who sat in Moses' chair (Matt. xxiii. 2) doth not prove the infallibility of those who sat there; yet this is alleged to that purpose, and that men ought not to doubt of the reasonableness of the commands of their superiors. But St Chrysostom† saith: "Our Saviour speaks of the things commanded by the law of Moses." "*Per cathedram doctrinam legis ostendit*," saith St Jerome.‡ "Not their own doctrine, but that of Moses," saith Isidore; and so Hilary§ and Theophylact.‖ Maldonate confesseth, our Saviour's words are to be understood, not of their own doctrine, but of that of the law; and therefore he yields, the obedience here required is to be restrained to that. "All things," saith Cajetan, "which they teach out of Moses' chair." "Not all their doctrines, but as far as they were conformable to the law," saith Ferus. Now, can any one hence infer, that no man ought to

* 2 Chron. xv. 3.
† Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 72.
‡ Hieron. in loc. Caten. Gr. in loc.
§ Hilar. canon 24.
‖ Theophylact in loc.

dispute any commands of superiors, when it is supposed that there is a rule and standard for them to speak according to? And our Saviour elsewhere doth suppose these very men to teach things contrary to the law, as in the case of Corban.* Would our Saviour contradict himself, or require a blind obedience in things repugnant to the law? We do not deny a due submission to our superiors in the Church; yea, we allow them a power to determine things not forbidden, and think obedience due in such things by virtue of their authority; but yet this is far enough from infallibility, or an unlimited, implicit obedience, which would overthrow the force of all our Saviour's reasonings against the Scribes and Pharisees, as to their misinterpreting the law, and the superstitious practices they imposed upon the people.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XVII.

The infallibility of the Church is the answer constantly given by Papists to all objections to their doctrines which they cannot answer in any other way. And it is quite reasonable that when the infallibility of the Church has been once established, every one should implicitly submit to all her decisions; but before any rational man can submit his understanding implicitly to the Church, he must have the most satisfactory evidence that she cannot and will not mislead him. If the infallibility of the Church be true, it in a certain sense supersedes all other truths; and as, when once admitted, it must settle all doubts and determine all controversies, so its truth must be established by evidence of no ordinary strength and clearness. As the Popish doctrine of infallibility puts the Church in the room of God, no evidence can

* Matt. xv.

establish it but the direct and explicit testimony of God himself; for we cannot, on any authority but his, be required or expected to receive the decisions of any man, or set of men, as if they came from him.

We do not believe in the infallibility of any Church in the Popish sense, and, least of all, in the infallibility of the Church of Rome; and we can never admit her claim, unless it be clearly established from the Word of God. But Papists commonly allege, that it is only from the testimony of the Church that we can know certainly what is the Word of God, and what is its meaning; and thus they are inextricably involved in the sophism of reasoning in a circle; that is, they profess to prove the infallibility of the Church by the authority of Scripture; while, at the same time, they establish the authority of Scripture, and ascertain its meaning, by the testimony of the Church, which cannot err. They have no clear and independent ground or first principle on which they can erect an argument, either for the authority of the Scriptures or for the infallibility of the Church. But men cannot reason together unless they have some principles in common; and, therefore, if they really wish to convince Protestants of the infallibility of the Church, they must, even at the expense of some inconsistency, condescend to establish it from the Sacred Scriptures, all the statements of which are admitted by both parties to be true. Conscious of the inadequacy of the Scripture evidence they can advance upon the point, they commonly begin with asserting the necessity of a living, visible, and infallible judge in religious matters; trusting, that if this were once established, the Church's claim to the office would not be disputed. The reasonings of men, as to what God ought to do, are presumptuous and uncertain, and the only safe course is to ascertain, as far as possible, what he has done. The alleged necessity of a permanent infallible judge in religious matters is in-

consistent, not only with the ordinary principles of God's dealings with men, but also with the information which he has himself communicated to us concerning his Word, and the purposes which it was fitted and intended to serve. One thing is obvious, that whatever consideration is adduced to show that there must or should be a permanent infallible judge, equally proves that God should have given most explicit intimation of his appointment to the office, and full and exact directions which might have constrained all men to submit to his authority. The alleged infallibility of the Church has, in point of fact, just as completely failed in securing unity of opinion, as the study of the Scriptures. And there is no presumption in saying, what even Papists will admit, that if God had wished to provide for securing that object, and had thought proper to adopt the means which they have prescribed to him as necessary, he could very easily have inserted in his Word a plain statement, which would have obliged all who acknowledged the inspiration of the Bible to submit to the authority of the Church of Rome.

There is no scriptural evidence for the infallibility of the Church in the Popish sense. There is proof that the Church of Christ will never fail upon earth —that his presence will be always with it, and that the substance of his truth will ever be preserved in it. There is proof that all true believers in Christ will, in every age, be guided to substantially the same views of Christian doctrine. This has been promised, and it has been fulfilled. But Christ did not promise that he would certainly guide all whom he intended to prepare for heaven into a perfect uniformity in matters of religious belief; and we cannot doubt that there are many now before the throne who, while on earth, belonged to different communions, and maintained opposite opinions on some points of inferior importance. He never promised that there would be any

one visible Church or society, which would always maintain his truth pure and uncorrupted. He has given no promise the fulfilment of which will secure any portion of his visible Church from falling into error; and, on the contrary, he has given us distinct intimation that error and sin would creep into his visible Church, and would extensively prevail. And notwithstanding all that Papists generally allege about the certainty and necessity of a visible Church upon earth, which shall always correctly hold up the truth to the world, some distinguished Popish controversialists have been compelled, by the force of argument, to acknowledge that Christ's promises may be fulfilled, while yet all the clergy may fall into error, and the true Church be preserved only in laymen; nay, that the apostasy in the visible Church may be so general, that the true Church may subsist for a time only in a single individual. (Incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome, pp. 21, 22.) This concession plainly overthrows the foundation of the whole cause. But granting, what cannot be proved either from Scripture or history, that there must always be upon earth a visible Church or society which shall correctly maintain the whole truth of Christ, on what ground can we be called upon to believe that this must necessarily be, or certainly is, the Church of Rome, when that Church assuredly is not mentioned in Scripture, in connection with those statements and promises on which this claim to infallibility rests; and when, on the contrary, it can be clearly proved that it is expressly predicted in Scripture that that Church would apostatize? In order to establish her claim to infallibility, the Church of Rome must prove from Scripture, not only that Christ must always have a visible Church upon earth, which cannot err, but that she is the only Church of Christ; or, as it is in the creed of Pope Pius IV., that she is the mother and mistress of all Churches.

In addition to the promises of Christ, which secure the indefectibility of his Church, and the constant presence and agency of his Spirit with her in all ages, Papists are in the habit of quoting upon this point the scriptural statements by which the due authority of the office-bearers of the Church, in the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, is established, and the ordinary members of the Church are required to pay them obedience; and having thus proved certain positions, in which almost all Protestants concur with them—namely, that Christ has appointed office-bearers, who are entitled to exercise authority in the regulation of the affairs of his visible Church, and to whom obedience is due—they then infer that this authority cannot be rightly exercised unless there be infallibility in those who are invested with it. If this proves anything, it must prove a great deal too much, and therefore it proves nothing at all. It would prove that this infallibility should be enjoyed by all the pastors of the Church, or, at any rate, by all the bishops, and most certainly by the Pope; and yet even this last doctrine is denied by many Papists, while none maintain the two former. But, in truth, there is nothing whatever in the argument. All the authority which Christ has conferred upon the office-bearers of his Church, may be rightly and properly exercised without any assumption of infallibility by those in whom it is vested. The office-bearers of the Church must exercise their authority upon the same principles, and under the same responsibility, as they regulate their personal conduct in the matter of their own salvation. They may discharge fully their duty in the one as in the other of these cases without infallibility. At the best, this argument is a mere inference, which God's Word does not warrant, and it is wholly abandoned by those Papists who maintain that the Pope is to be obeyed whether he be infallible or not. (See p. 69.)

Challoner has prudently omitted Gother's argument

for the infallibility of the Christian Church, derived from the alleged infallibility of the Jewish one; and the cause of this probably was, not only the weakness of the argument itself, but also the fact, that some eminent Popish controversialists who employed it, have not scrupled to admit, what necessarily results from it, namely, that the Jewish priesthood did right in pronouncing our Saviour worthy of death (Poole's Nullity of the Romish Faith, pp. 26–31)—another proof that Papists do not shrink from any blasphemy, however atrocious, if it seem fitted to serve their cause.

But what renders the Popish doctrine of the infallibility of the Church unspeakably ludicrous, deprives it of all right to be refuted by sober argument, and entitles us to treat it only with ridicule as an absurdity, or with indignation as a deliberate imposture, is the fact, that Papists cannot tell, and are not agreed among themselves, where this pretended infallibility is lodged. One party strenuously contend that this infallibility is lodged in the Pope, who is the Church virtual, as being its head; while another maintain that it is lodged in a general council, which is the Church representative; and a third party assert that the proper subject of this infallibility is the Pope and a council together—that is, a general council confirmed by the Pope. This last view is a mere contrivance to evade the felt difficulty, and is plainly a groundless pretence, as there can be no infallibility among men, except through the presiding agency of the Holy Spirit, and this gift must, upon Popish principles, have been conferred either upon the Pope or upon a general council. If a general council, while sitting in deliberation, is not infallible, in virtue of the presiding agency of the Holy Spirit, no subsequent event, such as the Pope's confirmation, can give it that character; and if the Pope himself is not infallible, he may err in confirming the decrees of a council, as well as in anything else. To say that the concurrence of

Pope and council increases the chances of truth, is no evidence of infallibility. The question, therefore, still remains: Whether the pretended infallibility is lodged in the Pope or in a general council? and this is still a matter of dispute among Papists themselves. The Council of Constance, which is received as infallible by the French Church, decreed that a council was superior to the Pope, while the fifth Lateran Council, confirmed by Leo X., and reckoned infallible by the Italians, decreed that the Pope was superior to a council. De la Hogue tells us that the Church has not chosen to settle this controversy: "De hac controversia nihil definire voluit ecclesia." (Tract. de Eccles. p. 50.) What does the word *Church* mean in this statement of De la Hogue's? Why did she not wish to decide it? Because, in whatsoever way, and by whatsoever authority it had been decided, there would have been many Papists who would not have submitted to the decision. All the pretended advantages of infallibility are utterly lost, unless it be quite certain where this property is lodged, and what is the quarter to which men must apply when they want an infallible decision; and, in common decency, the Church of Rome ought to decide this for her own subjects, before she call upon Protestants to cast aside the Word of God, and to submit their understandings to all her contradictory and erroneous decrees.

The most satisfactory evidence that a Church can err, is the proof that she has erred; and if the Bible be the Word of God—if it was intended, and in any measure fitted, to make known his will—if there be a possibility of understanding the meaning of its statements—then it is certain that the Church of Rome has apostatized from the true faith, and does now teach grievous error in regard to many of the most important doctrines of Christianity.

There are Popes opposed to Popes—councils opposed to councils—the Church of one age or country

against the Church of a different age or country; and there is no certain ground on which a man can take his stand—on which, consistently with his duty to God and himself, he can venture his salvation, except the Word of God, which is clear and easy in all things necessary to be known and believed—which all who have it are bound to search and study for themselves—by which men are one day to be judged—and which will assuredly conduct all who use it aright to the everlasting enjoyment of God's presence.

See Episcopius's Labyrinthus, sive Circulus Pontificius, oper. part ii. p. 148; F. Turretine de Circulo Pontificio, oper. tom. iv.; Chillingworth's famous work, The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation; Field on the Church, b. iv.; Stillingfleet's Rational Account, pt. i. c. 8, 9; and his Vindication of the Answer to some late Papers, concerning the Unity and Authority of the Catholic Church; Poole's Nullity of the Romish Faith (a very valuable book, containing perhaps the best view of the whole subject in a short compass); The Incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome, translated from the French of La Placette, by Archbishop Tenison, and published in 1688 (a very interesting and important work, both from its argument and its learning); Claude's Réponse au livre de M. de. Meaux (Bossuet), intitulé Conference avec M. Claude; Burnet on the Thirty-Nine Articles, art. 19; Blanco White's Evidences against Catholicism, let. iii. and iv.; Edgar's Variations of Popery, c. 4.

CHAPTER XVIII.

OF THE POPE.

1. We do not charge them with believing the Pope to be God, which it seems himself did, if we believe the misrepresenter in his preface; but there is some reason to doubt whether they do not at sometimes give him greater honour than becomes a man. I instance in the adoration after his election,* when the new Pope is placed upon the altar to receive the submissions of the cardinals; but the altar themselves do confess to be sacred to God alone, and there they profess to worship Jesus Christ, as present in the host; this, therefore, looks too much like assuming the place of Christ, and not becoming the distance between God and man.

2. The question is, Whether Christ hath appointed the Pope or Bishop of Rome to be pastor, governor, and head of his Church, under him? This, he saith, he believes, and this he knows we deny, and therefore had reason to expect some proof of it. But instead thereof, he tells us how they look on themselves as obliged to show him the respect due to his place, which he knows is not the matter in question. Two things, however, he saith, which seem to justify his title.

(1.) He is the successor of St Peter, to whom

* Cerem. sect. 1, cap. 2.

Christ committed the charge of his flock. But how far is this from proving the Pope to be the head of the Church under Christ? for, how doth it appear that Christ ever made St Peter head of the Church, or committed his flock to him, in contradistinction to the rest of the apostles? This is so far from being evident from Scripture, that the learned men of their Church are ashamed of the places commonly produced for it, it being impossible ever to justify the sense of them according to their own rules of interpreting Scripture, namely, by the unanimous consent of the fathers. For, 1*st*, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church,"* is interpreted by many of the fathers, both Greek and Latin, of St Peter's confession, and not of his person; so by St Chrysostom, † St Ambrose, ‡ St Augustine, § St Basil of Seleucia, || St Hilary, ¶ St Gregory Nyssen, ** and Theodoret; †† all great and considerable persons in the Christian Church, whose words are plain and full to that purpose; and so they can never produce the unanimous consent of the fathers for St Peter's supremacy out of these words. 2*d*, "And unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,"‡‡ are interpreted by the fathers of St Peter in common with the other apostles; so Origen, §§ St Cyprian, ||| St Hilary, ¶¶ St Hierom, (*) and St Augustine, (†) as they are all owned by a member of the Roman communion. And, 3*d*, For these words, "Feed my

* Matt. xvi. 18.
† Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Pentec. tom. v. ed. Savil. p. 979.
‡ Ambros. de Incarnat. Dom. Sacramento. cap. 5.
§ Aug. de verbis Dom. ad Evang. secund. Matth. Serm. 13, tract. in Joh. 124.
|| Basil Seleuc. Orat. 25, ad fin.
¶ Hilar. de Trinit. lib. vi.
** Greg. Nyssen de advent. Domini. cap. ult.
†† Theodoret Epist. 77, 146.
‡‡ Matt. xvi. 19
§§ Orig. Comment. in Matt. Gr. Lat. p. 275.
||| Cyprian, de Unit. Ecclesiæ.
¶¶ Hilar. de Trinit. lib. vi.
(*) Hier. c. Jovin. lib. i. cap. 14, in Matt. xvi.
(†) Aug. in Joh. tr. 118, 124, in Epist. Joh. to. 10.

sheep," a late learned doctor of the Sorbonne shows, that if they prove anything peculiar to St Peter, they must prove him sole pastor of the Church—which was the thing St Gregory disputed against so warmly. But that there was nothing peculiar to St Peter, above or beyond the rest of the apostles, he shows at large from St Chrysostom, St Cyril, St Augustine, and others, to whom I refer the reader, and to the former authors. But suppose it were made to appear that St Peter was head of the Church, how doth the Bishop of Rome's succession in that headship show itself?* To that he saith,

(2.) That there hath been a visible succession of above two hundred and fifty bishops, acknowledged as such in all past ages by the Christian world.† As such—what is that? As bishops of Rome?—That is not of weight enough to put it upon trial. As heads of the Catholic Church?—That, he knows, is not only denied by us, but by all the Greek, Armenian, Nestorian, Abyssin Churches; so that, we dare say, it was never allowed in any one age of the Christian Church. But we need not insist on the proof of this, since the late mentioned authors of the Roman communion have taken so great pains, not only to prove the Pope's supremacy to be an encroachment and usurpation in the Church, but that the laying it aside is necessary to the peace and unity of it. And until the divine institution of the Papal supremacy be proved, it is to no purpose to debate what manner of assistance is promised to the Pope in his decrees. Our author is willing to decline the debate about his personal infallibility, as a matter of opinion, and not of faith; and yet he saith, he doubts not but God doth grant a special assistance to the high priest, for the good of the whole flock, under the

* Moyens surs et honestes,, p. 34, &c.; Entretiens de Philaleth et Philerene, p. 121.

† Joh. Launoi. Epist. part. 5, Reim. Formentino, et part. 2, Epist. 5, p. 47, &c.

new law, as he did under the old; and produces the instance of Caiaphas. (John xi. 51.) This is a very surprising way of reasoning; for if his arguments be good from Scripture, he must hold the Pope's personal infallibility as a matter of faith: and yet one would hardly think he should build an article of faith on the instance of Caiaphas; for what consequence can be drawn from God's overruling the mind of a very bad man, when he was carrying on a most wicked design, to utter such words, which in the event proved true in another sense than he meant them, that therefore God will give a special assistance to the Pope in determining matters of faith? Was not Caiaphas himself the man who proposed the taking away the life of Christ at that time? Was he assisted in that counsel? Did not he determine afterwards Christ to be guilty of blasphemy, and therefore worthy of death? And is not this a rare infallibility which is supposed to be consistent with a decree to crucify Christ? And doth he in earnest think such orders are to be obeyed, whether the supreme pastor be infallible or not? for so he concludes: "That his sentence is to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or no."

NOTE ON CHAPTER XVIII.

Challoner has omitted, in the corresponding chapter of Gother, not merely his assertion, that the orders of the Pope are to be obeyed whether he be infallible or not (see p. 69), but likewise his argument in support of the Pope's enjoying the special assistance of the Holy Ghost, derived from the fact of Caiaphas' prophesying when high priest.

It cannot be proved to be a doctrine of the Church of Rome that the Pope is personally infallible, although many Papists maintain it; and it is the natural result

of Popish principles when fully applied, and of the arguments by which they commonly attempt to establish his supremacy. The Irish Popish bishops, in their Declaration published in 1826, asserted, in conformity with the oath imposed upon Papists in 1793, that "it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are they thereby required to believe, that the Pope is infallible." They make no declaration here as to their own belief; and the reason why they were so anxious to rescue the Church of Rome from the imputation of holding the Pope's infallibility, was a fear lest the supposed belief of this tenet should be thought to establish the danger of giving them any political power. It is of no consequence, so far as that point is concerned, whether or not all Papists are required to believe in the infallibility of the Pope, since, according to Archbishop Troy, his "decrees on doctrinal points of faith and morals are respected by all Catholics, whether they consider him as infallible or not;" since every Popish priest swears, at his ordination, that he will give "true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the vicar of Jesus Christ;" and since the oath which all bishops take at their consecration binds them down as the abject slaves of his Holiness, and pledges them "to preserve, defend, augment, and promote the rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and of his successors."

The Pope has often assumed to himself, and has received from his followers, "names of blasphemy." The gloss upon the canon law, which is often referred to by Popish writers as authoritative, calls him "our Lord God the Pope;" and Bellarmine (De Pontif. lib. iv. c. 5) declared, that "if the Pope were to err in commanding vices and forbidding virtues, the Church would be bound to believe that vices were good and virtues bad."

All Papists acknowledge the Pope to be the vicar

of Christ, and the supreme head of the universal Church upon earth; and it is the belief of this peculiarity (by which they are distinguished from all other denominations of professing Christians) that constitutes a reasonable ground for marking them out by the name of Papists. When the Popes claim to be received as the vicars of Christ, they must produce his commission authorizing them to govern the Church in his name; and accordingly they refer, in proof of their supremacy, to certain passages of Scripture; from the benefit of which, however, as Stillingfleet shows, every Popish priest is precluded by his ordination oath, since it can be incontrovertibly proved that many of the fathers understood them in a different sense from the Church of Rome.

Isaac Barrow

The proof of the Pope's supremacy over the universal Church, as Christ's vicar (on which, Bellarmine says, the whole of Christianity hangs), depends, as Dr Isaac Barrow shows, upon the truth of the following positions:—

1*st*, "That St Peter had, by our Lord's appointment, a primacy, implying a sovereignty of authority and jurisdiction over the apostles.

2*d*, "That the rights and prerogatives of this sovereignty were not personal, but derivable, and transmitted to successors.

3*d*, "That St Peter was bishop of Rome.

4*th*, "That St Peter did continue bishop of Rome after his translation, and was so at his decease.

5*th*, "That hence, of right, to the bishops of Rome, as St Peter's successors, a universal jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ doth appertain.

6*th*, "That, in fact, the said bishops, continually from St Peter's time, have enjoyed and exercised this power.

7*th*, "That this power is indefectible—such as by no means can be forfeited or fail."

If any one of these positions is false, then the foun-

dation of Papal supremacy is overthrown; and before Papists can ask us to admit this fundamental doctrine of their scheme, they must establish every one of them by satisfactory evidence. Now, not one of these positions can be proved to be true, and almost all of them may be shown to be false.

There is no scriptural authority to prove that Peter had a supremacy of power or authority over the other apostles, while there is much to disprove it. It might at least as easily be proved from Scripture that John or Paul had a supremacy over their brethren. There is no scriptural evidence that Peter was bishop of Rome; and, descending to the ground of ecclesiastical history, and weighing the evidence of this, as of any other matter of fact, it cannot be certainly proved that Peter ever was at Rome; and it can be shown that he was not the first bishop of that city. It can be proved, by unquestionable historical evidence, that, in the early ages of Christianity, the notion of the bishop of Rome being the vicar of Christ and the monarch of the Church was utterly unknown; that when first broached it was decidedly resisted; and that, for many centuries, being in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not thought necessary to being in the communion of the catholic Church. (See Stillingfleet's Vindication of the Answer to some late Papers.) One of the first attempts of the Bishop of Rome to establish his supremacy over the Church, was made in the beginning of the fifth century, by producing some canons, which he falsely ascribed to the Council of Nice (Poole's Nullity, pp. 186, 187); and the whole history of the subsequent proceedings of the Popes, by which they attained at length to a complete despotism over the whole Western Church, exhibits the most surprising and melancholy display of successful villany which the world has ever witnessed. It can be proved that many Popes have contradicted each other in matters of faith, and that several have been publicly convicted

of heresy; that for long periods there have been two, and even three, pretenders to the Popedom, of whom it was impossible for any man to determine which was the true successor of Peter; that not a few of the Popes have been monsters of iniquity—the most detestable wretches that ever disgraced the human form; and that many secured their election to the Papal chair by the most atrocious means—by force and fraud —by murder and bribery, and the assistance of prostitutes; and yet all these must be acknowledged as the vicars of Christ, entitled to exercise dominion over the consciences and the conduct of all his followers!

This fundamental doctrine of Popery has no foundation in Scripture, reason, or antiquity, and should be regarded as one of the most shameful impostures ever practised upon the credulity of mankind.

Well might Bishop Hall say, in his Serious Dissuasive from Popery, that it was a religion "which depended wholly upon nice and poor uncertainties, and unprovable supposals. That Peter was bishop of Rome; that he left any heirs of his grace and spirit, or, if any, but one, in a perpetual and unfailable succession at Rome; that he so bequeathed his infallibility to his chair, as that whosoever sits in it cannot but speak true; that all who sit where he sat, must, by some secret instinct, say as he taught; that what Christ said to him absolutely, ere ever Rome was thought of, must be referred, yea, tied to that place alone, and fulfilled in it; that Linus, or Clemens, or Cletus, the scholars and supposed successors of Peter, must be preferred, in the headship of the Church, to John, the beloved apostle, then living; that he whose life, whose pen, whose keys, may err, yet, in his pontifical chair, cannot err; that the golden line of this apostolical succession, in the confusion of so many long desperate schisms, shamefully corrupt usurpations and intrusions, yielded (acknowledged) heresies, neither was nor can be broken;—deny any of these,

and Popery is no religion. Oh, the lamentable hazard of so many millions of poor souls, that stand upon these slippery terms, whereof, if any be probable, some are impossible! Oh, miserable grounds of Popish faith, whereof the best can have but this praise, that perhaps it may be true!" (Works, pp. 596, 597.)

Mr Smith, in his note to this chapter, refers to the opinion of Melancthon, as if he had been willing to concede the Pope's supremacy as a mean of preserving unity in the Church; and Melancthon certainly, upon one occasion, did make a statement to that effect. But it is to be observed, that the first Reformers came gradually to see the corruptions of Popery in their full enormity, and that it was some time, especially, before they discovered that all the parts of that mystery of iniquity were indissolubly linked together, and that anything like a reformation of the Church of Rome was hopeless. Melancthon, besides, when he made this admission, was for confining the power of the Pope within much narrower limits than most Papists would approve of. And, finally, it is certain that he came ultimately to be decidedly of opinion, with the rest of the Reformers, that any reformation of the Church of Rome was utterly hopeless, and that the Pope was Antichrist, the Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition, who is expressly doomed in Scripture to destruction. (See Maresii Concordia Discors, et Antichristus Revelatus, lib. i. pp. 452–458.)

Mr Smith quotes also a statement of Grotius to the same effect; but it is well known that Grotius (whom we once heard a Popish priest, in a public lecture, call a celebrated *Calvinist*) was led, by his unscriptural love of peace, into grievous error; and that, under that perverting influence, he made large concessions both to Papists and Socinians. In regard to Popery in particular, his love of peace led him, not only to deny that the Pope was Antichrist, in opposition to the unanimous opinion of Protestants, and the clearest

scriptural evidence, but to gloss over and to palliate most of the corruptions of the system, very much in the style of Bossuet, Gother, and the Papists of the present day. (See his Appendix ad Interpretationem locorum de Antichristo, subjoined to his Annotations on the Gospels, and especially pp. 58–66.) His views and conduct in this respect are fully exposed in the valuable work of Maresius (or Des Marets), above referred to.

Luther, alluding to the utter want of scriptural evidence for the supremacy of the Pope, jestingly asked: "Where is it written, except perhaps at Rome, in St Peter's, upon the chimney with a coal?"

This subject is fully discussed, and indeed exhausted, by the gigantic intellect and prodigious learning of Barrow, in his treatise of the Pope's Supremacy. See also Calvin's Instit. b. iv. c. 6, 7; Whittaker's Prælectiones in Controversiam de Romano Pontifice; Du Moulin's Defense de la Foi, liv. ii. art. 23; Field on the Church, b. v. c. 23, 24, and c. 32-44; Forbes' Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ, lib. v. xv. xvi.; Stillingfleet's Rational Account, pt. ii. c. 5-7; F. Turretine De Necessaria Secessione nostra ab Ecclesia Romana, disp. 5; Leslie's Case Stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, pp. 3-11; Gavin's Master-Key to Popery, vol. ii. pt. 1; Dean Kipling's Reply to certain Accusations of Irish Papists, in which Archbishop Troy's arguments upon this point are refuted; Edgar's Variations of Popery, c. 1, 3.

CHAPTER XIX.

OF DISPENSATIONS.

HERE the misrepresenter saith: "That a Papist believes the Pope hath authority to dispense with the laws of God, and absolve any one from the obligation of keeping the commandments." On the other side, the representer affirms: "That the Pope has no authority to dispense with the law of God, and that there is no power upon earth can absolve any one from the obligation of keeping the commandments." This matter is not to be determined by the one's affirming and the other's denying, but by finding out, if possible, the true sense of the Church of Rome about this matter. And there are three opinions about it:—

1. Of those who assert that the Pope hath a power of dispensing in any divine law, except the articles of faith.* The gloss upon the canon law saith, that where the text seems to imply that the Pope cannot dispense against the apostle, it is to be understood of articles of faith; and Panormitan saith this exposition pleases him well, for the Pope may dispense in all other things: *Contra apostolum dispensat*, saith the gloss on the decree; and the Roman editors, in the margin, refer to 34 Dist. c. Lector. to prove it; and there, indeed, the gloss is very plain in the case: *Sic*

* De Concess. Præbend. è proposuit Abb. c. proposuit de Conc. Præbend. cap. xv. q. 6, c. Auctoritate.

ergo Papa dispensat contra apostolum; and the Roman correctors there justify it, and say it is no absurd doctrine as to positive institutions; but the former notable gloss, as Panormitan calls it, sets down the particulars wherein the Pope may dispense. As, (1.) Against the apostles and their canons. (2.) Against the Old Testament. (3.) In vows. (4.) In oaths. The Summa Angelica saith: "The Pope may dispense as to all the precepts of the Old Testament."* And Calvasius founds this power upon the plenitude of the Pope's power, according to that expression in the Decretal mentioned, that he can, *ex plenitudine potestatis de jure supra jus dispensare;* and without such a power, he saith, God would not have taken that care of his Church which was to be expected from his wisdom. Jacobatius† brings several instances of this power in the Pope, and refers to the Speculator for more. Jac. Almain saith,‡ that all the canonists are of opinion that the Pope may dispense against the apostle, and many of their divines, but not all; for,

2. Some of their divines held that the Pope could not dispense with the law of God, as that implies a proper relaxation of the law, but could only authoritatively declare that the law did not oblige in such a particular case; because an inferior could not take away the force of a superior's law; and otherwise there would be no fixed and immutable rule in the Church; and if the Pope might dispense in one law of God, he might dispense in the rest; and of this opinion were some of the most eminent school divines, as Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Major, Soto, and Catharinus§, who at large debates this question, and denies that the Pope hath any power to dispense with God's law; but then he adds, that the Pope hath a kind of prophetical power to declare in what cases the law doth oblige, and in what not; which he

* Sum. Angelic. v. dispensatio. † Jacobat. de Conciliis, lib. v. p. 215.
‡ Almain. de Potest. Ecclesiæ, cap. 13. § Catharin. c. Catejan. vi. p. 524.

parallels with the power of declaring the canon of Scripture; and this he doth, not by his own authority, but by God's. He confesseth the Pope cannot dispense with those precepts which are of themselves indispensable, nor alter the sacraments; but then, saith he, there are some divine laws which have a general force, but in particular cases may be dispensed with, and in these cases the law is to be relaxed, so that the relaxation seems to come from God himself. But he confesses this power is not to be often made use of; so that he makes this power to be no act of jurisdiction, but of prophetical interpretation, as he calls it, and he brings the instance of Caiaphas to this purpose; and he adds, that the difference between the divines and canonists was but in terms; for the canonists were in the right as to the power, and the divines in the manner of explaining it.

3. Others have thought this too loose a way of explaining the Pope's power, and therefore they say, "that the Pope hath not a bare declaratory power, but a real power of dispensing in a proper sense in particular cases; for, say they, the other is no act of jurisdiction, but of discretion, and may belong to other men as well as to the Pope; but this they look on as agreeable to the Pope's authority and commission, and a bare declaratory power would not be sufficient for the Church's necessity; as Sanchez * shows at large, and quotes many authors for this opinion—and Sayr more; and he saith the practice of the Church cannot be justified without it; which Suarez † much insists upon, and without it, he saith, the Church had fallen into intolerable errors: and it is evident, he saith, the Church hath granted real dispensations, and not mere declarations. And he founds it upon Christ's promise to Peter: "To thee will I give the keys," and the

* Sanchez. de Matrim. lib. viii. disp. 6, n. 5. Sayr. Clavis. Reg. lib. vi. cap. 11.

† Suarez. de Vot. lib. vi. cap. 9, n. 7-9, 17.

charge to him: "Feed my sheep." But then he explains this opinion, by saying that it is no formal dispensation with the law of God, but the matter of the law is changed or taken away.

Thus I have briefly laid together the different opinions in the Church of Rome about this power of dispensing with the law of God; from which it appears that they do all consent in the thing, but differ only in the manner of explaining it.

And I am therefore afraid our representer is a very unstudied divine, and doth not well understand their own doctrine, or he would never have talked so boldly and unskilfully in this matter.

As to what he pretends, that their Church teacheth that every lie is a sin, &c., it doth not reach the case; for the question is not, Whether their Church teach men to lie? but, Whether there be no such a power in the Church as, by altering the nature of things, may make that not to be a lie which otherwise would be one? as their Church teaches that men ought not to break their vows, yet no one among them questions but the Pope may dissolve the obligation of a vow, although it may be made to God himself. Let him show, then, how the Pope comes to have a power to release a vow made to God, and not to have a power to release the obligation to veracity among men.

Again: we do not charge them with delivering any such doctrine as that men may have dispensations to lie and forswear themselves at pleasure; for we know this dispensing power is to be kept up as a great mystery, and not to be made use of, but upon weighty and urgent causes of great consequence and benefit to the Church, as their doctors declare. But as to all matters of fact, which he alludes to, I have nothing to say to them; for our debate is only, whether there be such a power of dispensation allowed in the Church of Rome, or not?

NOTE ON CHAPTER XIX.

The whole history of the Church of Rome proves, that it has always been at least a practical principle with her rulers, that anything might be done which seemed fitted, in the circumstances, to promote the interests of the Church, however inconsistent with the law of God, or with the most solemn obligations undertaken to men. This principle has been practically exhibited in the whole history of the Papal apostasy; and, in substance, it has been asserted and defended by many of her authors, whose works were never censured, expurgated, or prohibited. This, of itself, is sufficient to expose the pretensions of the Church and Pope of Rome to holiness, and it warrants us in regarding that Church as a synagogue of Satan, and under the guidance of the father of lies. But further, we assert, that the doctrine of the Church's right to dispense with promises and oaths, and of the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics, is maintained by the Church of Rome, and is laid down in the standards sworn to by every Popish priest at his ordination; so that no disclaimer of these tenets made by a Popish priest, even upon oath, is to be received or regarded, unless he at the same time renounce his ordination vows. The Popish bishops, in their Declaration in 1826, in conformity with the oath of 1793, assert, that "they reject and detest that unchristian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with heretics and infidels." Now, this is not a denial of the precise charge commonly adduced by Protestants against them. We do not charge the Church of Rome with holding that oaths or promises made to heretics are *ipso facto* null and void, and that they should never be kept, but be in all cases broken (although she has made declarations very like this) —and yet this, perhaps, is all that the words of the

Popish disclaimer necessarily imply; but we do charge the Church of Rome with the doctrine, that there are cases in which promises and oaths, especially when made to heretics, may be broken, and that the Pope, or supreme ecclesiastical authority, has the right of determining when this may be done, and of relaxing from, or dispensing with, the obligation in such cases. We are the more inclined to suspect some fraud in this part of the oath and declaration, because, at a former period, when an oath embodying a clause to the same effect was proposed to the Irish Papists, the legate of Pope Benedict XIV. in 1768, in a letter addressed to the Irish archbishops, declared that this doctrine (which it was proposed should be abjured) "was defended and contended for by most Catholic nations, and had been frequently followed in practice by the Holy See; and, in consequence, forbade them to sanction the oath." (Reformers' Library, No. v. p. 330.)

The proof that the Church of Rome holds the doctrine of the right of ecclesiastical authorities to dispense with the obligation of an oath or promise, and of the lawfulness in some cases of breaking faith with heretics, is full and conclusive. Many Popes have asserted their right to free men from the obligation of their oaths when made to heretics and excommunicated persons, and have issued forth their injunctions that these oaths should be violated, declaring that men were not bound by them. This will not be disputed; and need not, therefore, be proved by a detail of evidence. It is expressly laid down in the sacred canons, to which every Popish priest is sworn, "that all promises are not to be kept;" "that sometimes it is not expedient to keep a solemn engagement;" "that the Pope's power absolves from an oath of fidelity;" and "that they are not to be called oaths, but perjuries, which are attempted in opposition to the interests of the Church." The third Lateran Council, acknow-

ledged by all Papists to be infallible, and, of course, sworn to by all priests at their ordination, laid down in their sixteenth canon precisely the same doctrine as that contained in the last extract from the sacred canons, and afterwards, in the twenty-seventh canon, applied it to practice. The fourth or great Lateran Council, likewise universally acknowledged as infallible, absolved from their oath of allegiance the subjects of all those princes who embraced heresy.

The Council of Lyons, reckoned infallible by the Italians, and the Council of Pisa, reckoned infallible by the French, asserted their own right, as the supreme ecclesiastical authority, to free men from the obligation of their oaths; and they put it in practice.

The Council of Constance, reckoned infallible by the French, and admitted, as Bellarmine says, to be infallible by all Papists, except in its first sessions, in which it defined a general council to be superior to the Pope, and deposed John XXIII. for gross heresy, and many other crimes, both laid down the general principle, that faith need not be kept with heretics, and might be broken in obedience to ecclesiastical authority, and exemplified this detestable doctrine in practice, by procuring and sanctioning the murder of John Huss, the Bohemian Reformer, who had come to the council under the protection of a safe-conduct which had been granted by the Emperor Sigismund, and which that prince was reluctantly persuaded by the importunity of the holy fathers to break.

And, finally, the Council of Trent gave their sanction to this doctrine, when, in their safe-conduct offered to Protestants (sess. 15), they suspended "for that occasion," "*pro hac vice*," the decree of the Council of Constance in favour of the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics; which plainly implied that they regarded the principle as a sound one, and held it binding on all occasions thereafter.

When, therefore, Popish priests, who have sworn to maintain all things defined in the sacred canons and general councils, disclaim the doctrine of the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics, and of the right of the supreme ecclesiastical authority to absolve men from their engagements, and accompany this disclaimer with an oath, they are just exhibiting, in its most aggravated form, the very enormity which they profess to abjure; and the fact that so many of them now-a-days do make this disclaimer upon oath, can be accounted for only by the supposition that they do really hold the doctrine which they abjure, and that, of course, they may sometimes say or swear anything they find convenient.

The Tax-Tables of the Apostolic Chancery and Penitentiary show that, before the Reformation, it was common for the Popes to sell dispensations for breaking the laws both of God and man; but in modern times they have become, from necessity, more cautious both in the assertion and in the exercise of this power.

The Council of Trent (sess. 24, can. 3) denounced an anathema against all who should deny the power of the Church to grant dispensations for the celebration of marriages forbidden in the Mosaic law on account of consanguinity. The canon law, indeed, forbids marriage on this account to a much greater extent than the Word of God, as if for the very purpose of rendering dispensations necessary; and the Church of Rome does not scruple to grant dispensations in this respect for what the Word of God condemns, allowing special privileges to great princes. (Sess. 24, De Ref., c. 5.) The Council of Trent, likewise, denounces an anathema against all who deny that either of the parties solemnly betrothed may break their engagement, if they choose to make a solemn profession of religion (*i. e.*, to become monks or nuns), even although the other party should not onsent; and we learn from Dens (vol. vii. p. 175),

that many Popish writers are of opinion that the Pope may grant a dispensation to free a betrothed person from his engagement, even though there be no intention of making a religious profession. The Council of Trent enjoined, that dispensations should be given gratuitously; but then, as Dens tells us (vol. ii. p. 350), this does not prohibit the paying of the expenses, or the imposition of a certain compensation —an alms, or even a fine.

It is the general doctrine of Popish writers, founded upon the declarations of the canons and the decrees of councils formerly referred to, that the Pope, as the supreme ecclesiastical authority, can grant dispensations from the obligation of vows and oaths; and, notwithstanding the caution with which they are aware that such a doctrine should be declared, there are not wanting assertions and practical exhibitions of it, even in modern times.

Bailly, whose treatises, along with De la Hogue's, form at this day, by the selection of the Popish hierarchy in Ireland, the text-book for the education of students at Maynooth, says expressly that "there exists in the Church a power of granting dispensations in vows and oaths;" and Dens asserts the same doctrine, in all its grossness, as matter of unquestionable certainty.

A dispensation of a vow he defines (vol. iv. pp. 134–5) to be "a relaxation" (or loosing the obligation) "of a vow, made by a lawful superior in the room of God for a just cause;" and adds, that "the efficacy of a dispensation is founded upon divine remission; that is, the superior, as the vicar or commissary of God, does, in the room and name of God, remit to a man the debt of the promise which he has made, or pardons to him the promise made to God." This statement he applies to vows made to God, and he asserts the same principles with respect to oaths made to men; and in proof of the right of the Church

to grant dispensations from vows to God and oaths to men, he appeals, 1*st*, To the practice of the Church in granting them; and, 2*d*, To the declaration of our Saviour in Matt. xvi. 19—proofs which can have no weight, except with those who are already convinced that the Church of Rome cannot commit iniquity, and that she may impose any meaning upon Scripture which she finds convenient.

He further asserts, not only that the Pope has full power of granting dispensations in vows and oaths, but that bishops have it too in their own dioceses; and he carries this detestable impiety so far as to assert (vol. ii. p. 347), that the man who can grant a dispensation to his subjects, may grant a dispensation in the same matters to himself! No wonder that the Popes have been so habitually guilty of falsehood, fraud, and perjury, and that the Popish bishops in Ireland should deny, upon oath, to be the doctrines of their Church, tenets which they swore at their ordination to defend and which they are still teaching, through the medium of Bailly and Dens, to the students and priests under their charge.

To keep up an appearance of something like decency, Dens tells us (vol. iv. p. 138), "that a dispensation of a vow" (and the same principle is afterwards applied to an oath) "even by the Pope is invalid, if given without a just cause;" but when he explains what just causes are, the whole difficulty vanishes. "They are," says he, "of many kinds—the honour of God, the necessity or utility of the Church, the greater spiritual good of the person vowing, &c. It is likewise reckoned a just cause, if the matter of the vow be difficult to be performed—if the observance of the vow should by accident hinder the obligations of official duty, or if a dispensation should contribute to the common good. A dispensation is also allowed on account of the frailty of the person vowing, or the danger of his committing sin."

It must be an extraordinary case that does not admit of being brought under one or other of these heads.

Dens, likewise, lays down a principle which affords a key to much of the jugglery usually practised by Papists upon this subject.

After having proved that the Church has power to relax the obligation of vows and oaths, he adds (vol. ii. p. 346): "It is not, however, properly called a dispensation, but the matter is changed, inasmuch as God, by the superiors of the Church, renounces his right, and thus the obligation ceases of its own accord."

In treating of vows, he proposes this objection to his own doctrine of the Church's right to grant dispensations (vol. iv. p. 135): "No one can dispense with the law of nature, and, therefore, not with a vow, because the obligation of a vow is founded on the law of nature." This seems a very formidable objection—but Popish casuists have great resources, and Dens answers by "denying the consequent"—that is, admitting that no one can dispense with the law of nature, and admitting that the obligation of a vow is founded on that law, he replies, "that the obligation of a vow rests upon the law of nature as long as the vow and its acceptance" (by the person to whom it is made) "continue, and no longer; but by the dispensation, God's acceptance of the vow ceases, because it is relaxed (or annulled) in God's stead." He applies the same principles to an oath (vol. iv. p. 216), where, having stated the same objection to the Church's right to dispense with oaths as he had done in regard to vows, he answers it in this way: "That the dispensation effects that that which fell under the oath no longer falls under it; and thus nothing is done against the oath." He adds, also, that "in every oath this condition is implied, *salvo jure superioris;*" that is, that a man is to keep his oath only in so far as it may be kept without interfering with the rights of his bishop or Pope.

The substance of his doctrine is this, and it is aid down unequivocally as the general doctrine of Papists, that the Church does not properly grant permission to break an oath or vow, while that oath or vow continues to exist and to bind; but that, acting in God's stead, she undoes the obligation altogether, so that the oath or vow is annihilated, or ceases to exist; and, of course, whatever may be done thereafter, cannot be called a violation of the oath or vow, because, at the time when it was done, the oath or vow had no existence. It is only by means of this principle, worthy of the father of lies, that the Popish prelates, who took the oath required of them previous to 1829, can give even a shadow of a defence of themselves from the charge of being guilty of explicit perjury in their sworn disclaimer; and if they come forward and plead it, by all means let them enjoy the full benefit of it.*

Innumerable examples of the interference of the Pope, in not merely permitting but requiring men to break their oaths—or rather, to use the more correct language which Dens has taught us, of their interposing in God's stead to annihilate the existence and obligation of an oath, so that it could not thereafter be broken, because it had no existence—might be collected from history; but we shall refer only to one which occurred in the present century.

In 1800, Pius VII. announced his election to the chair of Peter to Louis XVIII. as the lawful king of

* This principle is fully and explicitly inculcated by Bellarmine, and is unhesitatingly applied by him to explain and defend the right of the Pope to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance to their temporal sovereign. According to Bellarmine, the Pope does not authorize subjects to break their oath of allegiance while the oath continues to exist and to bind —he *merely* excommunicates and deposes the king; and, as he has a right to do this, and, of course, can do it validly, the king has ceased to be a king *de jure*, and to have any of the rights and claims of a sovereign, *before* the people are called upon to throw off their allegiance to him. When the king has been validly deposed by a competent authority, the oath of allegiance is *ipso facto* annihilated; and what is usually called absolving subjects from their oath of allegiance is, in principle and substance, just an authoritative declaration by the Pope that the sovereign has been validly deposed, and that, of course, all obligations undertaken to him as sovereign have ceased to exist, or have been annihilated.

France; and, in a year or two after, when it seemed to serve the interests of the Papal See, he absolved the people of France from their oath of allegiance to Louis, thereby making it lawful for them, notwithstanding their oath, to renounce his authority, and authorized them to take the oath of allegiance to the First Consul. It cannot be doubted, that if matters should ever come to such a state as that it might be fitted to promote the interests of Popery, his Holiness would not scruple to absolve the people of Ireland from their oath of allegiance to Queen Victoria, and authorize them to take an oath of allegiance to somebody else; and there can be as little doubt, that many Irishmen would reckon a bull of his Holiness a very sufficient warrant for transferring their allegiance.

In 1808, Dr Lanigan, a Popish bishop in Ireland, being convicted of breaking a solemn promise, publicly defended himself by principles substantially the same as those propounded by Dens. (See M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. i. p. 225.) All the Popish members of Parliament in our own day have taken an oath, in which they "disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure, any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by law within this realm," and "swear that they will never exercise any privilege to which they are, or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion, or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom." This oath is required only of Papists; and it is quite evident that all those of them who voted for what is called the Appropriation Clause broke it, and were guilty of perjury. This has been proved beyond the possibility of evasion, by Mr Æneas Macdonnell, who was for many years agent for the Irish Papists in London, and who is still himself a Papist, in his two valuable pamphlets on this subject. Charity would lead us to hope that these men were misled by their spiritual guides, and honestly believed that, in accordance with the principles of their Church,

the obligation of that oath had been taken away by their ecclesiastical superiors acting in God's stead. But, in whatever way it is to be explained, what a frightful scene of iniquity does it exhibit! how naturally does it flow from the principles of Popery! and how strikingly characteristic is it of that power which is described in Scripture as the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition, who exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped!

See Downam's Treatise concerning Antichrist, b. i. c. 5; Maresii Antichristus Revelatus, b. i. c. 24, 29; Stillingfleet's Rational Account, part ii. c. 3; Grant's Dissertations on Popish Persecution and Breach of Faith, published in 1771; Edgar's Variations of Popery, c. 7; Reformers' Library, No. v., part 4, c. 3, s. 2; Mendham's Spiritual Venality of Rome.

CHAPTER XX.

OF THE DEPOSING POWER.

To bring this matter into as narrow a compass as may be, I shall first take notice of his concessions, which will save us a labour of proofs.

1. He yields, "that the deposing and king-killing power hath been maintained by some canonists and divines of his Church, and that it is in their opinion lawful, and annexed to the Papal chair."

2. "That some Popes have endeavoured to act according to this power."

But then he denies "that this doctrine appertains to the faith of his Church, and is to be believed by all of that communion." And more than that, he saith: "The affirming of it is a malicious calumny—a downright falsity."

Let us now calmly debate the matter, whether, according to the received principles of the Church of Rome, this be only a particular opinion of some Popes and divines, or to be received as a matter of faith. The question is not,

Whether those who deny it do account it an article of faith? for we know they do not; but, Whether, upon the principles of the Church of Rome, they are not bound to do it?

I shall only, to avoid cavilling, proceed upon the principles owned by our author himself, namely:—

1. "That the sense of Scripture, as understood by the community of Christians in all ages since the apostles, is to be taken from the present Church."

2. That by the present Church, he understands the pastors and prelates assembled in councils, who are appointed by Christ and his apostles for the decision of controversies; and that they have infallible assistance."

3. "That the Pope, as the head of the Church, hath a particular assistance promised him, with a special regard to his office and function."

If, therefore, it appear that Popes and councils have declared this deposing doctrine, and they have received other things as articles of faith upon the same declarations, why should they, then, stick at yielding this to be an article of faith as well as the other?

It is not denied, that I can find, that Popes and councils for several ages have asserted and exercised the deposing power; but it is alleged against these decrees and acts—1. That they were not grounded upon universal tradition. 2. That they had not universal reception.

Now, if these be sufficient to overthrow the definitions of councils, let us consider the consequences of it.

1. Then every man is left to examine the decrees of councils, whether they are to be embraced or not; for he is to judge whether they are founded on universal tradition: and so he is not to take the sense of the present Church for his guide, but the universal Church from Christ's time; which overthrows a fundamental principle of the Roman Church.

2. Then he must reject the pretended infallibility in the guides of the Church, if they could so notoriously err in a matter of so great consequence to the peace of Christendom as this was; and consequently their authority could not be sufficient to declare any articles of faith, and so all persons must be left at liberty to believe as they see cause, notwithstanding the definitions made by Popes and councils.

3. Then he must believe the guides of the Roman Church to have been mistaken, not once or twice, but to have persisted in it for five hundred years; which must take away, not only infallibility, but any kind of reverence to the authority of it. For whatever may be said as to those who have depended on princes, or favour their parties against the guides of the Church, it cannot be denied that for so long time the leading party in that Church did assert and maintain the deposing power; and therefore Lessius* truly understood this matter when he said, "that there was scarce any article of the Christian faith the denial whereof was more dangerous to the Church, or did precipitate men more into heresy and hatred of the Church, than this of the deposing power; for," he says, "they could not maintain their Church's authority without it."

And he reckons up these ill consequences of denying it:—

1. That the Roman Church hath erred, for at least five hundred years, in a matter fundamental as to government, and of great moment: which is worse than an error about sacraments, as penance, extreme unction, &c.; and yet those who deny the Church can err in one, hold that it hath erred in a greater matter.

2. That it hath not only erred, but voluntarily and out of ambition—perverting out of design the doctrine of the primitive Church and fathers concerning the power of the Church, and bringing in another contrary to it, against the right and authority of princes, which were a grievous sin.

3. That it made, knowingly, unrighteous decrees, to draw persons from their allegiance to princes; and so they became the causes of many seditions and rebellions, and all the ill consequences of them, under a show of piety and religion.

4. That the Church's decrees, commands, judg-

* Discussio Decreti Magni Concil. Lateran. p. 89.

ments, and censures, may be safely contemned as null, and containing intolerable errors; and that it may require such things which good subjects are bound to disobey.

5. That Gregory VII. in the canon "Nos Sanctorum," &c., Urban II., Gregory IX., the Councils of Lateran under Alexander III. and Innocent III., the Councils of Lyons, of Vienna, of Constance, of Lateran under Leo X. and of Trent, have all grievously and enormously erred about this matter; for that it was the doctrine of them all he shows at large; and so seven general councils lose their infallibility at one blow.

6. That the gates of hell have prevailed against the Church; for the true Church could never teach such pernicious doctrine as this must be, if it be not true. And if it erred in this, it might as well err in any other doctrine; and so men are not bound to believe or obey it.

7. That princes and all laymen have just cause to withdraw from their Church, because it showed itself to be governed by a spirit of ambition, and not by the Spirit of God; and not only so, but they may justly prosecute all that maintain a doctrine so pernicious to government, if it be not true.

Let us now see what our author saith to clear this from being a doctrine of the Church of Rome.

1. "That for the few authors that are abettors of this doctrine, there are of his communion three times the number that publicly disown all such authority."

If this be true, it is not much for the reputation of their Church that there should be such a number of those who are liable to all these dreadful consequences, which Lessius urges upon the deniers of it; but is it possible to believe there should be so few followers of so many Popes, and seven general councils, owned for such by the disowners of this doctrine, except the Lateran under Leo X.?* The poor Eastern Chris-

* Discuss. discuss. part. iii. sect. 3, p. 1.

tians are condemned for heretics by the Church of Rome, for refusing to submit to the decrees of one general council—either that of Ephesus or of Chalcedon; and they plead for themselves, that there was a misinterpretation of their meaning, or not right understanding one another about the difference of *nature* and *person* which occasioned those decrees.* I would fain know whether those Churches which do not embrace the decrees of those councils, are in a state of heresy or not? If they be, then what must we think of such who reject the decrees of seven general councils, one after another, and give far less probable accounts of the proceedings of those councils in their definitions, than the other do?

2. He saith: "Those who have condemned it, have not been in the least suspected of their religion, or of denying any article of faith." Let any one judge of this by Lessius his consequences. And the author of the first treastise against the oath of allegiance saith, in plain terms, "that the opinion that the Pope hath no such power is erroneous in faith, as well as temerarious and impious."† And he proves it by this substantial argument, because they who hold it must suppose that the Church hath been for some time in a damnable error of belief, and sin of practice. And he not only proves that it was defined by Popes and councils, but for a long time universally received; and that no one author can be produced, before Calvin's time, that denied this power absolutely, or in any case whatsoever. "But a few authors that are abettors of it," saith our representer; "Not one total dissenter for a long time," saith the other. And which of these is the true representer? "The deniers of it, not in the least suspected of their religion," saith one; "Their opinion is erroneous in faith, temerarious and

* Philip. a SS. Trinit. Itiner. Orient. lib. v. cap. 5, Clem. Galan. Concil. Eccl. Arm. qu. 2, SS. 3, p. 92.

† Jesuits' Loyalty, first treatise, p. 1, &c

impious," saith the other. And a professor of Louvain, now living, hath undertaken to show that the number is far greater of those who assert this doctrine than of those who deny it.

3. If we charge their Church with this opinion, may not they as well charge ours with the like; since propositions as dangerous were condemned at Oxford, July 26, 1683, as held not by Jesuits, but by some among ourselves?* This is the force of his reasoning; but we must desire the reader to consider the great disparity of the case. We cannot deny that there have been men of ill minds and disloyal principles, factious and disobedient enemies to the government both in Church and State; but have these men ever had that countenance from the doctrines of the guides of our Church which the deposing doctrine hath had in the Church of Rome? To make the case parallel, he must suppose our houses of convocation to have several times declared these damnable doctrines, and given encouragement to rebels to proceed against their kings, and the University of Oxford to have condemned them; for this is truly the case in the Church of Rome: the Popes and councils have owned, and approved, and acted by the deposing principle; but the universities of France, of late years, have condemned it. How come the principles of the regicides among us to be paralleled with this doctrine, when the principles of our Church are so directly contrary to them, and our houses of convocation would as readily condemn any such damnable doctrines as the University of Oxford? And all the world knows how repugnant such principles are to those of the Church of England; and none can be rebels to their prince, but they must be false to our Church.

As to the personal loyalty of many persons in that

* Auctoritas Sedis Apostolicæ vindicata adversus Natal. Alexand. per Francisc. D. Enghein Colon. A.D. 1684.

Church, as I have no reason to question it, so it is not proper for me to debate it, if I did; since our business is not concerning persons, but doctrines; and it was of old observed concerning the Epicureans, that though their principles did overthrow any true friendship, yet many of them made excellent friends.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XX.

The discussion of this subject of the temporal power of the Pope—that is, of his right to interfere in the regulation of civil or secular matters, to depose kings, and to absolve subjects from their allegiance—shows the difficulty which sometimes occurs in ascertaining what are truly the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Some Popish authors have contended, that the doctrine of the Pope's temporal power is not only true, but is an article of faith, and necessary to be believed; others deny its truth altogether; while a third party assert its truth, but deny that it is a necessary article of the Catholic faith. Popes have, in many instances, claimed the right of deposing kings, and disposing of their kingdoms, and have exercised this right with effect. This claim has been asserted for a succession of many ages, down to the present century. Popes have defined, in their bulls, that this right belonged, by divine authority, to the Papal See; and as their decrees upon these points were not dissented from by the majority of bishops, they should, according to Dr Troy's principle, be binding upon all Papists. Bellarmine tells us, that there are three opinions to be found among Catholic authors upon this point:—1*st*, That the Pope is the lord of the world, and has directly and immediately a right to govern all its affairs; 2*d*, That the Pope has no temporal power, either direct or indirect—an opinion which he regards as

bordering upon heresy; 3*d*, That the Pope has, indirectly, and in order to spiritual good, supreme power in disposing of the temporal affairs of all Christians. This is his own opinion, and that, he says, of the great majority of Catholic authors; and as the Pope, of course, is the only judge when spiritual good may be promoted by his interference in secular matters, it gives him as much temporal power as he may desire, or find it convenient to exercise. Every instance in which the Pope excommunicated a prince, and absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance, involved the assumption and exercise at once of the dispensing and the deposing power.

The sacred canons declare, that "the Papal authority absolves from an oath of fidelity," and that "our lord the Pope can depose a secular prince for heresy." Several general councils assumed and exercised the right of deposing princes, and absolving their subjects, upon the ground of the superiority of the ecclesiastical over the temporal power. The fourth, or great Lateran Council, acknowledged by all Papists to be general and infallible, decreed, "that the secular powers should be admonished, and if necessary, compelled by ecclesiastical censures, to swear that they will, to the utmost of their power, strive to exterminate from their territory all heretics, declared to be such by the Church; and further, that if any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge his territory from all taint of heresy, he shall be excommunicated by the metropolitans and other provincial bishops; and if he contemptuously omit to give satisfaction within a year, it shall be signified to the holy Pontiff, in order that he may thenceforth proclaim his vassals absolved from fealty to him, and may expose to Catholics his territory, to be occupied by them, who, having exterminated the heretics, may possess the same without contradiction." This canon is decisive evidence that the Church of Rome, and the

Pope as the head of it, claims temporal power, and asserts the duty of exterminating heretics.

No authority which can be fairly considered as representing the Church of Rome, has ever abjured the doctrine of the temporal power of the Pope. The abjuration of this tenet by British Papists is entitled to little weight, as it has been made only recently, without authority from the Pope, and to serve political purposes; and whatever it may prove in regard to themselves, it certainly proves nothing in regard to the Church of Rome, except that there is a diversity of opinion among her members upon a point which is of the greatest practical importance, and which surely Papists will take care to get settled as soon as it is determined where there pretended infallibility is lodged.

The most important historical fact connected with the diversity of opinions among Papists on this point is, that, after a long period of controversy, the clergy of France, in 1682, adopted four articles, commonly called the Gallican Liberties, in which the temporal power of the Pope was denied, and the superiority of a council over a Pope asserted. These views had not been always entertained by the French Church; for in 1615 a convocation of the clergy, under the authority of Cardinal Perron, refused to approve of a declaration to the same effect, when proposed by the third estate, and received the thanks of the Pope for their conduct in rejecting it. It is somewhat remarkable, that the chief argument employed by Cardinal Perron to persuade the clergy of France to reject the denial of the Pope's temporal power, was this (Maresii Antichristus Revelatus, p. 43), that as it was unquestionable that the Popes had often claimed and exercised this power, it followed that, if they had indeed no right to it, the Papal See must be regarded as heretical and Antichristian. We would like to see some of our Popish countrymen, who have disclaimed upon oath the Pope's temporal power, try to answer the Cardinal's argument.

The assertion of the Gallican Liberties has been always considered peculiar to the French Church, and is not to be regarded as affording evidence of the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Dens says, that it is enough for him that the Pope has disapproved of the Gallican Liberties; and Dr Milner says (See Phillpotts' Letters to Butler, p. 306): "There is not a single prelate in England or Ireland who is not firmly resolved to reject the four articles of the Gallican Church, commonly called the Gallican Liberties;" one of these four articles being merely a denial of the Pope's dispensing and deposing power.

The reigning Pope, indeed (Innocent XI.), was so enraged at the declaration of the Gallican Liberties, that he refused to grant institution or investiture to the bishops appointed to vacant sees in France; and no fewer than thirty-five dioceses were vacant when the very decided and energetic conduct of the Parliament of Paris, in 1688, induced his Holiness to yield, although not without some concessions to his dignity. The Papal See has always refused to sanction these articles, and Pius VII. refused to do so in 1811.

Dr Doyle, in his examination before Parliament in 1825, characterized the Pope's claim to temporal power as "obsolete." At the same time, he had the effrontery to declare upon oath, that "the Church has *uniformly, for nine* centuries—by her Popes themselves, by her practice, by her doctrines, and by her academies—maintained that the Popes have no right whatever to interfere with the temporal sovereignties or rights of kings or princes"—an assertion which Dr Doyle, of course, never believed, and which no schoolboy can be ignorant enough to credit. He had previously, when before the House of Commons, declared that "the case of Naples is the only one in which the Popes of Rome have, for the last *three* centuries nearly, interfered in any way, directly or indirectly, with the temporal concerns of any State in Europe"—a state-

ment which, though less extravagant, is just as false as the other. Its falsehood must have been well known to Dr Doyle, and has been fully exposed by Dr Phillpotts, in his Supplemental Letter to Butler, pp. 469–485.

We shall refer only to those instances of Papal interference in temporal matters which have occurred in the present century. But we must first notice the famous bull, commonly called In Cæna Domini, because it was annually promulgated, in every church at Rome, on the Thursday before Easter. The bull is given at length in the Appendix to Leslie's Case Stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, where there is also an extract from the Registers of the Parliament of Paris, in which it is said, with perfect truth, "that, by this decree, the Popes declare themselves sovereign monarchs of the world," and "that if it be reckoned valid, the royal majesty will then depend upon their humour, all our liberties will be abolished, the secular judges will no longer have the power to try the possession of benefices, nor the civil and criminal causes of ecclesiastical persons, and we shall quickly see ourselves brought under the yoke of the Inquisition." This bull, containing all these extravagant pretensions to temporal power, continued to be read annually in every church at Rome, till near the end of last century, when, as we are told by Cardinal Erskine, "the most holy auditor of his Holiness," its publication was discontinued, out of compliment to some princes, to whom parts of it were obnoxious. (Phillpotts' Supp. Let., p. 482.) He informs us, however, at the same time, "that though the formality of its publication is now omitted, it is, nevertheless, implicitly in full vigour in all its extension, and is likewise observed in all cases where there is no impediment to the exertion of the Pope's authority; and, therefore, it must be legally looked upon as a public declaration to preserve his rights." And,

accordingly, the Pope has claimed, and tried to exercise, power in temporal matters even in the present century. In 1800, he acknowledged Louis XVIII. as the lawful king of France. In 1801, he absolved the French from their oath of allegiance to Louis, and authorized them to take the oath of allegiance to the First Consul. In 1809, he excommunicated and anathematized Bonaparte; and in his bull upon that occasion, thundered away very much in the style of his predecessors in the dark ages; as, for example: "Let our persecutors learn, once for all, that the law of Jesus Christ has subjected them to our authority and our throne; for we also bear the sceptre, and our power is far superior to theirs."

In 1803, the Diet at Ratisbon introduced some considerable changes in regard to ecclesiastical property in Germany. This led to a great deal of correspondence with the Pope, who, in an instruction to his nuncio at Vienna, in 1805, laid it down in the plainest terms, as the unquestionable law of the Church, "that heretics should be punished with the loss of all their goods," and "that the subjects of heretical princes were absolved from all their obligations to obedience;" asserted the rights of the Church in the style of his most insolent predecessors; and lamented that "her right of deposing heretics from their principalities, and of declaring them to have forfeited their possessions, could not now be exercised."

In February 1808, the Pope addressed a circular letter to the cardinals, in which, with reference to an article in Bonaparte's code of laws for France, granting a toleration to all religious sects, he said: "This article was rejected by us, as contrary to the canons, to the councils, and to the Catholic religion."

In 1815, the Popish bishops in Belgium addressed a remonstrance to their king, setting forth, that "the existence and privileges of the Catholic Church in this part of the kingdom are inconsistent with an article

of the plan of the new constitution, by which equal favour and protection are promised to all religions." On the 1st of February 1836, the present Pope addressed to the Spanish bishops an "allocution," passed in "Secret Consistory," in which he pronounced to be null and void all the arrangements of the Spanish Government with respect to ecclesiastical property, as if he had anything to do with the houses and lands of Spain, and as if his sanction were necessary to give effect to the proceedings of the civil government.

There can be no reasonable doubt, then, that the temporal power of the Pope is one of those principles which, as Southey says, "the Papal Church has proclaimed whenever it had no motive for concealing them, and has acted upon whenever it had the power." Indeed Bellarmine, in his Recognitio Librorum, speaking of the deposing power, says expressly, "that the Church does not always exercise this right—either because it has not sufficient strength, or does not think it expedient." As it is not always expedient to exercise this power, neither is it always expedient to claim it, or acknowledge that it is claimed; and from all that we know of Popery, we are warranted in regarding this as an adequate explanation of the recent disclaimer, upon oath, of the Pope's deposing power by the Papists of this country.

It should not be forgotten, that the right to take possession of Ireland was conferred upon Henry II. by a bull of Pope Adrian IV., who also compelled the Emperor of Germany to hold his stirrup while he mounted on horseback. Adrian, in his bull by which he invested the King of England with the possession of Ireland, claimed to himself, as the vicar of Christ, "all islands which had been enlightened by the Sun of Righteousness;" and in this respect he was more moderate in his pretensions than one of his successors, Alexander VI.—a most detestable monster,

who, claiming possession of the whole world, gave America to Spain, and India to Portugal!

As Ireland was originally conferred by the Pope upon the King of England, we may be sure that, if ever the time come when his Holiness can interfere in this matter with effect, he will not scruple to revoke the grant of his predecessor, to withdraw Ireland from our Protestant sovereign, and confer it upon some one who will confess his sins, and submit his conscience, or at least his influence, to a priest.

See Du Moulin's Defense de la Foi Catholique, liv. i.—Des Usurpations des Papes sur les Rois, and especially c. 5, 6; Downam on Antichrist, pt. i. c. 5; Maresii Antichristus Revelatus, lib. i. c. 30; F. Turretine de Secessione ab Ecclesia Romana, disp. 5; White's Answer to Fisher, sect. 22; Leslie's Case Stated, pp. 66–78, and Appendix; Phillpotts' Letters to Butler, let. xiv. and Sup. Let. pp. 469–492, 509–539; Edgar's Variations of Popery, c. 5; Reformers' Library, No. v. pt. 1, c. 3—pt. 4, c. 4—pt. 5, c. 4; Horne's Romanism Contradictory to the Bible, sect. 11; O'Sullivan's Doctrines of the Church of Rome, and Disorders of Ireland, published in 1836.

CHAPTER XXI.

OF COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.

For our better proceeding in this controversy, I shall set down the state of it as clearly as I can:—

1. The question is not, Whether the first institution of the sacrament of the eucharist by Jesus Christ were in one kind or two? for all confess it was under both kinds.

2. It is not, Whether both kinds are not still necessary for the due celebration of it? for it is granted that both kinds are necessary to be upon the altar, or else there could be no complete sacrifice.

3. It is not, Whether the people may be wholly excluded from both kinds, and so the sacrifice only remain? for they grant that the people are bound to communicate in one kind.

4. It is not concerning any peculiar and extraordinary cases, where no wine is to be had, or there be a particular aversion to it, or any such thing, where positive institutions may be reasonably presumed to have no force; but concerning the public and solemn celebration and participation of it in the Christian Church.

5. It is not concerning the mere disuse or neglect of it, but concerning the lawfulness of excluding the people from both kinds by the Church's prohibition, notwithstanding the institution of it by Christ in both

kinds, with a command to keep up the celebration of it to his second coming.

Here now consists the point in controversy: Whether the Church, being obliged to keep up the institution in both kinds, be not equally obliged to distribute both, as our Saviour did, to as many as partake of it? Our author, not denying the institution, or the continuance of it, saith: "Our Saviour left it indifferent to receive it in one kind or both." And that is the point to be examined.

1. He saith: "Christ delivered it to his apostles, who only were then present, and whom he made priests just before; yet he gave no command that it should be so received by all the faithful."

But were not the apostles all the faithful then present? I pray, in what capacity did they then receive it? As priests? How did they receive the bread before the *hoc facite?* As priests, or as faithful? It is ridiculous to suppose the *hoc facite* changed their capacity; and if it did, it only relates to consecrating, and not to receiving; but if Christ gave it only to the apostles as priests, then, for all that I can see, the people are not at all concerned in one kind or other, but it was intended only for priests. If the people be concerned, how came they to be so? Where is there any command but what refers to the first institution? And it had been more plausible, according to this answer, to exclude the people wholly, than to admit them to one kind, and to debar them the other.

2. "Christ attributes the obtaining life everlasting, the end of the institution, sometimes to receiving under both kinds, sometimes under one. (John vi. 51, 57, 58.)" He could not easily have thought of anything more against himself; for our Saviour there makes it as necessary to drink his blood as to eat his flesh: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." If this be understood of the

sacrament, as he saith, how is it possible for him to make the cup indifferent—unless it be indifferent whether the people be saved or not?

3. "Christ himself administered the sacrament to some of his disciples under one kind only. (Luke xxiv. 30.)" But is he sure Christ did then administer the sacrament to them? or that, if he did, the cup was not implied, since breaking of bread, when taken for an ordinary meal in Scripture, doth not exclude drinking at it? But St Augustine, he saith (l. 49, De Consensu Evangel.), understands that place of the sacrament. If he doth, it cannot be where he saith; for St Augustine wrote but four books of that subject: but (l. 3, 25) he doth say something towards it; yet St Augustine, in another place, supposes that these disciples did both eat and drink:* "The disciples did not know him but in the breaking of bread; and truly he that doth not eat and drink judgment to himself, doth in the breaking of bread own Christ;"—where it is plain that he applies both to the breaking of bread here spoken of.

4. He saith, "it was the custom of the primitive Christians to give it under one kind to children, the sick, and to men in a journey." I would he had produced his authorities to prove these things; for I can bring several to prove the direct contrary as to children, and sick persons, and travellers—and not only ancient writers, but the most learned of their own Church. And, therefore, I cannot but wonder to find him saying, "this was attested by all ancient writers and modern historians." But I have ever found those have been most mistaken who produce all writers and historians, when, it may be, there is not one that speaks home to the business. At least, we have here none mentioned, and, therefore, none to examine; and it would be too hard a task to search all.

5. He adds to this extravagancy, in saying, "that

* Tract. 2, in Epist. St John.

receiving in one or both kinds was indifferent for the first four hundred years;" when the contrary is so manifest that the most ingenuous of their own writers confess it. If any persons did carry home one kind (which is very questionable, for Baronius and Albaspinæus say they carried both kinds) to receive it, in times of persecution, at what season they thought fit afterwards, this ought not to be set up against the general and constant rule of the Church, which is attested not only by Cassander and such like, but even by Salmero, Ruardus, Tapperus, and Lindanus, who make no scruple of saying "the public celebration in the primitive Church was in both kinds." But then, how is it possible for us to judge better what they thought themselves bound to do than what they constantly observed in all their public celebrations? The Church is not accountable for the particular fancies or superstitions of men; but what was observed in all public offices, we have reason to think the Church thought itself obliged so to do, out of regard to the institution of Christ. And to show how universal this observation was in the Church, those who give account of the Eastern Churches say, that the Greeks, Nestorians, Armenians, Maronites, Cophtites, and Abyssinians, do all observe it still, namely, that the public communicants do partake of both kinds;* and not one of all these Churches but think themselves bound to observe it, out of regard to the institution of Christ; and why, then, should any think the primitive Church thought it indifferent?

6. "The first precept of receiving under both kinds was given to the faithful by Pope Leo, A.D. 443, and confirmed by Gelasius, A.D. 490." This is a great mistake; for Leo gave no precept about it, but only told the people how they might certainly discover the Manichees, for they would conform in other things, but they would not taste of the wine; which argued

* Cotovic. Itiner; Hierosolymit. lib. ii. cap. 6; Hist. Critique, p. 14.

that all communicants did then partake in both kinds. Gelasius not only confirms the custom then used, but he saith, "that it is sacrilege to divide that holy mystery." And surely he did not account sacrilege an indifferent thing.

7. Lastly, he saith, "that those who receive in one kind, are truly partakers of the whole sacrament." This is a new way of concomitancy. We used to hear of whole Christ under either species, and that whole Christ was therefore received; but how comes it to be the whole sacrament, which consists of two distinct parts? And if it be a sacrifice, the blood must be separated from the body, else the blood of Christ is not considered as shed, and so the notion of the sacrifice will be lost; which is our next head.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXI.

There is, perhaps, no corruption of Popery which more clearly and explicitly contradicts the authority of Scripture than communion in one kind, or the positive prohibition of the use of the cup in the Lord's supper to all but the officiating priest. Indeed, it would almost seem as if special provision had been made in Scripture to guard against this abuse; for it cannot be regarded as unintentional, that our Saviour, in instituting the Lord's supper, should have expressly enjoined all to drink of the cup, while there is no express command to all to eat of the bread. It is unquestionably taught as an article of faith by the Church of Rome, and is required to be believed by the Council of Trent, under the penalty of an anathema (sess. 21, can. 1), that there is "no command of God requiring all the faithful of Christ to receive the sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds," although it is as plain as words can make it, that there is as

express an injunction to receive the cup as to receive the bread, or to celebrate the ordinance at all. The Council of Trent acknowledged (sess. 21, can. 1), that "Christ instituted and delivered to the apostles the sacrament in both kinds—the bread and the wine;" and as they could not allege that our Saviour or his apostles have sanctioned or directed any alteration in the mode of celebrating the Lord's supper, they rested their right to prohibit and exclude the use of the cup merely upon the authority of the Church; and in proof of the authority of the Church to make such a prohibition, these infallible expounders of divine truth quote 1 Cor. iv. 1, apparently understanding the word *dispensator*, by which οἰκονόμος is translated in the Vulgate, as meaning a person who is entitled to *dispense* or to grant dispensations from obedience to Christ's laws.

Christ expressly commands all his followers to drink of the cup, as well as to eat of the bread. The Church of Rome declares that there is no obligation upon the body of the faithful to receive the cup. Which of these two authorities is to be believed and obeyed? The Church of Rome not only denies the command, and consequent obligation incumbent by the express words of our Saviour upon all Christians, to receive the communion in both kinds, but, moreover, decrees that none of her subjects shall be allowed to communicate in both kinds, except the officiating priest. In doctrine, she merely defines that the Word of God leaves it indifferent to the faithful to communicate in one or in both kinds; and supposing that this were true, although it is in direct opposition to Scripture, the natural inference would seem to be, that since Christ has left it a matter of indifference, the Church has no right to take away the liberty which he has bequeathed. But the Church of Rome has deprived the people of her communion of a privilege which, according to her own confession, Christ left them at

liberty to enjoy, and which, according to the plain statements of Scripture, he commanded them to use and to improve.

Papists commonly attempt to evade the obligation of our Saviour's command at the institution of the Lord's supper, enjoining all to drink of the cup, by alleging, that by pronouncing the words "Do this" (*hoc facite*), Christ instituted the sacrament of holy orders, and ordained all the apostles priests, so that the subsequent command in regard to the cup only requires all priests to drink of it, as there were none but priests present when the command was given. In addition to Stillingfleet's excellent exposure of this most frivolous argument, it should be observed, that the Church of Rome plainly does not herself believe in its soundness; because, if she did, she would at least permit all priests who might be present at the celebration of the Lord's supper to partake of the cup; whereas the law of the Church is, that none but the officiating or consecrating priest shall partake of the cup, even though many priests should be present in the congregation, nay, although the whole congregation should consist of priests. This circumstance proves that the common Popish answer to the argument in favour of communion in both kinds, derived from the express injunction of our Saviour, is a dishonest pretence, of the futility of which they are themselves fully aware, and which they bring forward merely in order that they may have the appearance of having something to say.

To evade the charge of depriving the people of a privilege which Christ has, even by their own confession, left them at liberty to enjoy, they assert (sess. 21, c. 3, and can. 3), that "whole and entire Christ and a true sacrament is received under one kind only," so that nothing is lost by the prohibition of the cup. It is enough to say, that the Lord's supper in the Church of Rome is not celebrated according to Christ's

appointment, and that the people are not permitted to do what he has enjoined them, from a regard, of course, to their own spiritual welfare, to do. Besides, the allegation that whole and entire Christ is received under the species of bread alone, is a consequence deduced from the doctrine of transubstantiation, being founded upon the consideration that the body comprehends or contains the blood, and of course it must fall to the ground with that most shocking and incredible absurdity. The Roman Catechism (p. ii. c. 4, s. 35) declares, "that whole Christ is contained not only in each species, but in any one particle of each species." And why, then, does not the Church, in addition to the prohibition of the wine, give only a single particle of the bread to communicants, since whole Christ is contained in it?

The Council of Trent pronounced an anathema against all who should say "that the Holy Catholic Church had not been induced by just causes and reasons to give the communion only in one kind to laymen, and to priests when not consecrating, or that she erred in doing so." In their decrees and canons they specified no reason for the prohibition, except the authority of the Church; but the reasons are given in detail in the Catechism published by their authority, and they are of such a kind as to afford the strongest confirmation of the sinfulness and absurdity of the practice of communion in one kind. The reasons there assigned, by authority, for the prohibition of the cup (p. ii. c. 4, s. 71), are, the danger of the blood of the Lord being spilled—of the wine becoming sour when kept for the sick—the alleged facts that many cannot bear the taste or smell of wine, and find it injurious to their health—that in many countries it is difficult, if not impossible, to procure wine; and lastly, and principally, the cup was prohibited for the purpose of overthrowing the heresy of those who denied that whole Christ existed under each kind.

Unless the Church of Rome can contrive some more satisfactory reasons for changing the primitive and apostolic practice, and depriving the people of the use of the cup, than the very frivolous and irrelevant considerations quoted from the Roman Catechism, she had better let this practice rest solely upon her own assumed right to dispense with the authority of Christ, and to alter laws and customs, without assigning any reasons. The last reason is a historical falsehood—a sort of *usteron proteron*. It is quite certain, and is confessed by all learned Papists, that for many centuries after the apostles, not only was there no prohibition of the use of the cup, but that the general law and the ordinary practice of the Church were to communicate in both kinds. This continued till the twelfth century, as Dens acknowledges (vol. v. p. 337), and also De la Hogue (De Euch. p. 214); and as, by that time, the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation was pretty extensively received, and the practice of communicating in one kind was creeping in, the doctrine of transubstantiation was employed to furnish an answer to an objection which was brought against the new practice, as a mutilation of the sacrament, by showing that whole Christ was contained not only in each species, but in any one particle of each species. It is historically false that the Church was led to prohibit the use of the cup to the laity in order to overthrow the heresy of those who denied that whole Christ is contained in either kind; the fact, on the contrary, being, that the preposterous doctrine that whole Christ is contained in each kind was deduced from transubstantiation, for the purpose of evading a natural, obvious, and conclusive objection to the practice of communicating in one kind, which was previously beginning to prevail, namely, that it was a mutilation of the sacrament as instituted by Christ.

Communion in one kind is a natural enough result

of the belief of transubstantiation, and it is in perfect keeping with one leading object of Popery, namely, the undue elevation of the clergy above the laity—the holding up the priests as objects of superstitious veneration to the people. That the promotion of this object was intimately connected with the prohibition of the cup, is confirmed by the fact, that the Popes did sometimes, as marks of special favour, give permission to laymen to communicate in both kinds; and, more particularly, that the kings of France had a special license to use the cup. (Dens, vol. v. p. 338.) Whether the Pope transferred this privilege, along with the allegiance of the people of France, from Louis XVIII. to Napoleon; and whether it was enjoyed for the last few years by Charles X. or Louis Philippe, or by both, or by neither, we cannot say; but it is certain, and the fact is curious, that it was enjoyed by their predecessors on the throne of France.

While the Council of Trent were unanimous in deciding the point of doctrine, that there is no divine command, and no necessity requiring all the faithful to communicate in both kinds, they differed greatly as to the matter of discipline, namely, whether, in point of fact, the use of the cup should be conceded to the laity or not. The ambassadors of the Emperor of Germany, the King of France, and the Elector of Bavaria, strongly urged the concession of the cup to the laity, and enforced it by the considerations, that the inhabitants of Bohemia (who, after the Council of Constance, carried on an open war, and fought many bloody battles, for a period of thirteen years, in defence of their right to the use of the cup, and at last received express permission from the Council of Basle to retain it) and some other parts of Germany had always used the cup, and would not now be persuaded to abandon it, and that this concession would tend to conciliate many whose respect for the authority of the Church was beginning to waver, but who

had not fully embraced the opinions of the Reformers. This proposal was supported by a considerable party in the council; but when, after debating ten days, they came to a division, it was found that there were no fewer than six different views of the best mode of disposing of the question. This diversity of opinion the Pope's legates, with their usual cunning, were careful to improve, and at length they succeeded in getting a decree passed (sess. 22), referring the decision of the matter to the Pope, who has not yet been pleased to grant any concession.

Mr Smith, in his note, refers, apparently in justification of the Popish practice on this point, to a provision made in England at the time of the Reformation, that men might communicate in one kind, or use only the bread, "in case of necessity;" and to a similar regulation adopted by the second Synod of the Reformed Church in France, in 1560; but there is plainly no analogy between a permission to communicate without the use of the cup in extraordinary instances, and on the ground of necessity, and the positive prohibition of the use of the cup in all cases, without any shadow of reason, and without any pretence of necessity. It should also be mentioned, that the Synod of the Reformed Church in France did, after more mature deliberation, in 1567, retract this permission, and declare, "that it was not advisable that those should receive the bread at the Lord's table who could not receive the cup." (Quick's Synodicon, p. 71.)

It is quite evident, that the reasons commonly assigned by Papists for the prohibition of the use of the cup, are mere pretences invented to defend the practice after it had been introduced, and that the practice itself is a direct interference with the authority of Christ; and as it prevents his followers from discharging a duty which he has imposed, and enjoying a privilege which he has conferred, it is of itself quite

a sufficient reason for abandoning the communion of the Romish Church.

See Du Moulin's Defense de la Foi, liv. ii. art. 10; White's Reply to the Jesuit Fisher, sect. 20; Bishop Morton's Institution of the Sacrament, b. i. c. 3; Bishop Burnet on the 30th Article; Leslie's Case Stated, pp. 166–175; Cramp's Text-Book of Popery, c. 10, 11.

CHAPTER XXII.

OF THE MASS.

UNDER this head, which is thought of so great consequence in the Roman Church, I expected a fuller representation than I here find; as, about the *opus operatum*—(that is, how far the mere act is effectual)—about their solitary masses, when no person receives but the priest—about the people having so little to do or understand in all the other parts of the mass—about the rites and ceremonies of the mass, how useful and important they are—about reconciling the present canon of the mass with the present practices—about offering up masses for the honour of saints. All which we find in the Council of Trent, but are omitted by our representer, who speaks of the mass as though there were no controversy about it, but only concerning the sacrifice there supposed to be offered up, and which he is far from true representing; for the Council of Trent not only affirms a true, proper propitiatory sacrifice to be there offered up for the quick and dead, but denounces anathemas against those that deny it.* So that the question is not, Whether the eucharist may not, in the sense of antiquity, be allowed to be a commemorative sacrifice, as it takes in the whole action? but, Whether in the mass there be such a representation made to God of Christ's

* Sess. 22, cap. 2, can 1-3, &c.

sacrifice, as to be itself a true and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead?

Now, all that our representer saith to the purpose is,—

1. "That Christ bequeathed his body and blood at his last supper, under the species of bread and wine, not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice." I had thought it had been more proper to have offered a sacrifice than to have bequeathed it; and this ought to have been proved, as the foundation of this sacrifice, namely, that Christ did at his last supper offer up his body and blood as a propitiatory sacrifice to God; and then what need his suffering on the cross?

2. "He gave this in charge to his apostles, as the first and chief priests of the New Testament, and to their successors, to offer." But where, when, and how? for we read nothing at all of it in Scripture. Christ, indeed, did bid them do the same thing he had there done in his last supper; but did he then offer up himself, or not? If not, how can the sacrifice be drawn from his action? If he did, it is impossible to prove the necessity of his dying afterwards.

3. "This sacrifice was never questioned till of late years." We say, it was never determined to be a propitiatory sacrifice till of late. We do not deny the fathers interpreting Mal. i. 11, of an offering under the Gospel; but they generally understand it of spiritual and eucharistical sacrifices; and although some of them, by way of accommodation, do apply it to the eucharist, yet not one of them doth make it a propitiatory sacrifice, which was the thing to be proved; for we have no mind to dispute about metaphorical sacrifices, when the Council of Trent so positively decrees it to be a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXII.

The sacrifice of the mass is the great idol of Popery, and may be considered as a kind of concentration of the corruptions of the apostasy. It is founded upon the doctrine of transubstantiation. It is in itself blasphemous and idolatrous; and, in its accompanying circumstances, and in the objects which it is alleged to serve, it exhibits most fully the great characteristic features of Popery, in leading men to build their hopes for eternity upon a false foundation, enslaving them in ignorance, and defrauding them of their money. The sacrifice of the mass is defined by Dens (vol. v. p. 358) to be "an outward offering of the body and blood of Christ, sensibly exhibited under the appearances of bread and wine, by a lawful minister, made to God in acknowledgment of his supreme dominion, with such accompanying prayers and ceremonies as the Church has prescribed, for the greater worship of God and edification of the people." The Council of Trent denounces an anathema (sess. 22) against all who deny "that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead." And every Popish priest, at his ordination, makes a solemn profession to the same effect.

The doctrine of the Church of Rome, then, on the subject of the mass, is this, that the officiating priest offers up to God the real body and blood of Christ, corporally and carnally present, in virtue of the words of consecration; and that this offering is truly and properly a sacrifice—and not merely so, but a propitiatory sacrifice; that is, that it does actually make atonement before God for the sins of those, whether dead or alive, for whom it is offered. It is evident, from this account of the nature of the sacrifice of the mass, that if the doctrine of transubstantiation be unfounded, the mass must fall to the ground; because,

if the body and blood of Christ be not corporally and carnally present upon the altar, they cannot be offered up by the priest; whereas, even if transubstantiation be true, it does not follow that the sacrifice of the mass must be admitted, because even if the body and blood of Christ were present, it would require additional evidence, of no ordinary strength, to prove that any priest was warranted to offer them up to God as a sacrifice, and that by doing so he certainly expiated the sins of the living and of the dead. The Popish doctrine of the mass, as a true propitiatory sacrifice, is plainly in direct opposition to many express statements of Scripture with regard to the sacrifice of Christ—to all that we are told there of its complete perfection and efficacy—of its being offered but once, and thereby expiating fully the sins of the world. There is scarcely any truth more plainly taught in Scripture than this, that under the Gospel dispensation there is no priest, properly so called, but Christ, and no sacrifice for the expiation of sin but that which he once offered upon the cross. It is an express assertion of Scripture, that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin; and as Papists call the mass an unbloody sacrifice, it follows that it cannot be propitiatory, or have the effect of expiating transgression. The Council of Trent (sess. 22, can. 4) pronounced an anathema against all "who should assert, that the sacrifice of the mass is in any way derogatory to the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross;" but it is quite evident, that the Popish doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass not only contradicts the statements of Scripture in regard to the sacrifice of Christ, but holds forth an unauthorized and blasphemous ceremony, as serving the purposes which the Scripture ascribes only to the shedding of Christ's blood, and thereby virtually charges his sacrifice with imperfection, introducing something else to supply its deficiency.

Papists, in establishing their doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, first try to prove the truth of the doctrine of transubstantiation; and, having effected this to their own satisfaction, they then lay down, as the main ground of their case, the position, that, at the institution of the Lord's supper, our Saviour did offer up himself to God as an unbloody but propitiatory sacrifice, and commanded the apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, to do the same thing to the end of the world. Indeed the Council of Trent (sess. 22, can. 2) requires all men, under pain of damnation, to believe "that when our Saviour said, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' he appointed the apostles priests, and ordained that they and other priests should offer his body and blood." Admitting that our Saviour on that occasion enjoined that the substance of what he then did should be repeated by his followers in all ages, the question remains, Did he then offer up to God his body and blood as a propitiatory sacrifice? In the history of the institution of the Lord's supper, as recorded in the New Testament, there is not a vestige of anything like evidence that Christ then and there offered up a sacrifice of himself to God—it is certain, from the express testimony of Scripture, that he offered himself but once, and that he did it upon the cross. The whole foundation of the Popish doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is thus overthrown; for their common arguments, from the conduct of Melchizedek (Gen. xiv. 18), and the prediction of Malachi (i. 11), are too ridiculous to deserve an answer.

The ministers of the New Testament are never in Scripture called priests; and yet this name is universally assumed by the Popish clergy, upon the ground that in the mass they offer up Christ to God in sacrifice, as an atonement for sin. Indeed, an essential part of the celebration of the sacrament of holy orders is, that the bishop addresses the person to be or-

dained a priest in these words: "Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God and celebrate mass, as well for the living as for the dead, in the name of the Lord." (Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed, p. 132.)

Popish controversialists have not been able to agree upon a definition of a sacrifice which might apply to, and include, the sacrifice of the mass; neither have they settled among themselves what is the act, or what are the acts, of the priest in celebrating mass, in which the sacrifice consists, and on which the propitiatory or atoning effect depends. All the different acts of the priest or sacrificer, involved in the celebration of the mass, have been denied by distinguished Popish divines to be essential to the sacrament. (Morton's Institution of the Sacrament, part ii. p. 9.) And Dens, after manifesting considerable perplexity upon this point, determines (vol. v. p. 365) "that the more probable opinion is, that the essence of the sacrifice consists solely in the consecration of the two species"—an opinion evidently preposterous in itself, and not very consistent with other Popish principles. According to the Church of Rome, the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ is effected by the words of consecration, and this they consider necessary to the right use of the eucharist as a sacrament; but then, they are in the habit of asserting, that the eucharist is not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice; and they are bound, therefore, to exhibit some *other* act on the part of the sacrificing priest which may entitle it to that appellation. Bellarmine is just as much puzzled in discussing that point as Dens; and indeed Popish priests, while they profess to be habitually offering up Christ as a sacrifice to his Father, are quite unable to tell when or by what act or acts of theirs it is that this sacrifice is effected.

The mass is the great Diana of the Popish priests

—the craft by which mainly they have their living—and they will never renounce it; but some Papists have shown a great desire to explain away the doctrine of the Council of Trent upon this point. Bossuet, in his Exposition (c. 14), explains the sacrifice of the mass in such a way as to exclude the idea of its being a propitiatory sacrifice, and, in substance, resolves it into the intercession of Christ, personally present on the altar, under the appearances of bread and wine. He says, that "it wants nothing to be a true sacrifice"—a statement sufficiently cautious, but which, in the first or suppressed edition of his work, was thus expressed: "It may be very reasonably called a sacrifice."

He swore, at his ordination, that it was not only a true, but a proper and propitiatory sacrifice; while, in his Exposition, he explains away this statement.

Gother, in his representation of the doctrine of the Church of Rome upon this point, while he contends that in the mass there is a sacrifice, says nothing of the most important feature of the controversy, namely, that this sacrifice of the mass is defined by the Popish Church to be *propitiatory*. Protestants generally admit, that there is a certain figurative or improper sense in which the mass, considered as comprehending the whole service of the celebration of the Lord's supper, may be called a sacrifice. Some Protestants contend that the mass, or Lord's supper, may be properly called a sacrifice (see Hickes' Treatise, entitled "The Christian Priesthood Asserted," and especially the Appendix, No. 7); but they all deny it to be a propitiatory or atoning sacrifice; and yet this, the main subject of dispute, Bossuet, in his Exposition, explains away, and Gother, in his Representation, entirely omits.

Another attempt has been made by Popish controversialists to escape from the doctrine upon this point to which they are all sworn; thus betraying a consci-

ousness that that doctrine is, in its plain honest meaning, incapable of defence. It is set forth in Professor Brown's Supplement to the Downside Discussion (pp. 44, 45), published in 1836, as affording a conclusive answer to Protestant objections. It is in substance this, that a sacrifice may be called propitiatory in two different senses: *first*, As being actually satisfactory to divine justice, and paying the price of our redemption; and, *second*, As making application to us of the benefits purchased by Christ. In the first sense, the death of Christ on the cross is the only propitiatory sacrifice, and it is only in the second sense that the mass is called by that name. But this is evidently a mere evasion. To say that the benefits of one sacrifice are applied to us by means of another sacrifice of a different kind, is surely very like nonsense. A propitiatory sacrifice, in the fair and honest meaning of the words, can be nothing else than a sacrifice which expiates sin, by satisfying divine justice, and paying the price of our redemption. If the Council of Trent taught merely that the Lord's supper is one of those means of grace by which the benefits purchased by Christ's propitiatory sacrifice are applied to men individually, no Protestant would object to it; but if this had been their meaning, they would never have defined the mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice—which, according to the established use of language, ascribes to it a far higher efficacy. The great body of Popish writers are in the habit of asserting, in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent, that the sacrifices of the cross and of the mass are one and the same sacrifice; but if it be true, as the pretence which we are exposing implies, that the sacrifice of the cross is a propitiatory sacrifice in one sense, and that the sacrifice of the mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice in the same, but only in a different sense, then surely they cannot possibly be one and the same sacrifice.

While the great substance of Popish doctrine upon

this point is thus utterly destitute of scriptural authority, opposed to the plain statements of God's Word, and incapable even of being rationally and consistently explained, there are various other notions and practices connected with it, which clearly manifest the motives that led to the invention and establishment of such a heresy.

The Council of Trent anathematizes those "who say that masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally are unlawful, and therefore to be abrogated," and that "the sacrifice of the mass benefits only him who partakes in it." And, accordingly, it is quite common in the Church of Rome for the body and blood of Christ to be offered in sacrifice in the public congregation, without any of the people partaking even of the bread, and for priests to celebrate mass in secret, without a single person to behold it. The object of the first of these practices, namely, the public celebration of mass without any one communicating but the priest—a practice obviously inconsistent even with the scriptural names of the ordinance, the communion, and the Lord's supper—is plainly to fill the people with superstitious veneration for the clergy, and the ordinance which they administer. The people are carefully instructed in the duty of being present at mass, and they are taught that they derive benefit—including, of course, forgiveness of sin—merely from their personal presence, although none but the officiating priest should communicate. The practice of celebrating mass in secret, or pretending to do so, was evidently introduced for the purpose of increasing the emoluments of the priests, who must be paid whenever they celebrate mass by those that are to get the benefit of it, and who, by this cunning contrivance, manage to be paid for many masses which they never perform. Popish writers tell us, that whenever mass is celebrated, benefit is certainly and necessarily derived from it by all the faithful present, and

by the officiating priest; and also, that the priest has the power of specially applying the benefits of any particular mass which he may celebrate to any particular individual whom he may choose. The priest, of course, on whose discretion in this matter everything depends, must be paid for making a special application to individuals of the benefit of a public mass, or for celebrating a private mass wholly for the special benefit of one or more. Dens asserts the propriety of priests taking pay for the celebration of masses, and appeals in support of it to the practice of the Church over the world. (Vol. v. p. 390.) Popish casuists used to discuss the following curious question: Supposing that A paid a priest to celebrate mass for his benefit, that the priest took the money, but in celebrating the mass, did in his mind fraudulently apply the benefit of it to B, whether would A, who paid for the mass, or B, to whom the intention of the priest applied it, actually get the benefit of it? (Morton's Institution, pt. ii. p. 71.)

These views develop the final cause of the Popish doctrine of the mass, and of the results which are ascribed to the celebration of it. Papists represent the celebration of the mass as fraught with benefits to all for whom it is offered, in order that men may be willing to make any submission, and pay any fees they can afford, to the priest, to have the sacrifice offered for them. Dens tells us (vol. v. p. 378), that the common sense of the Church approves of the custom of the faithful in requesting that the sacrifice of the mass should be specially offered for them; and it is well known that no request of that kind is attended to unless it be accompanied with a sum of money. But lest the people should disregard the spiritual benefits flowing from the sacrifice of the mass, or not value them so highly as to be willing to pay for special masses for themselves or their friends, the Church of Rome has extended the benefits of the

mass, by representing it as not only the great means of delivering men from the pains of purgatory, but as fitted to avert temporal evils, and to procure temporal blessings. In Roman Catholic countries, and in Ireland among the rest, the priests make the people believe, that by the sacrifice of the mass—that is, by their offering up to God the body and blood of Christ—they can cure barrenness, heal the diseases of cattle, prevent mildew in grain; and much money is every year paid for procuring masses to effect these and similar purposes. Men who obtain money in such a way, and upon such pretences (and this is a main source of the income of Popish priests), should be regarded and treated as common swindlers.

The sacrifice of the mass is plainly a scheme of deliberate imposture and extortion. The whole theory of it has been invented, and the whole practice is regulated, with a distinct reference to the leading objects of Popery, namely, increasing the influence and filling the pockets of the priests: and in order to effect these objects, the Church of Rome has not scrupled, in the erection of this her great idol, to dishonour God, by introducing into his worship what is not only unwarranted, but idolatrous; to pour contempt upon the sacrifice of Christ, and insult him by a profane mockery of his death; and to lead men to build their hopes of pardon upon a false foundation.

The Council of Trent was solicited by some Popish princes to reform the public service for the celebration of mass, or the administration of the Lord's supper; but they refused to do so; and conscious, apparently, that their public service could not be defended, they denounced an anathema (sess. 22, can. 6) against all "who should say that the canon of the mass contained errors." And yet it is quite certain that the public service for the celebration of the mass, in constant use to this day in Popish Churches, does contain blunders, falsehoods, and inconsistencies; and, more

particularly, that it contains some passages extracted from more ancient liturgies, composed before the faith of the Church was so extensively corrupted, which, in their original and natural meaning, cannot be reconciled with the present doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome. (See Appendix to the third book of Field on the Church, pp. 184–224; and Nolan's second Pamphlet, pp. 17–45.)

Mr Smith, in his note upon this chapter, quotes a statement of a learned Protestant (Dr Grabe), to the effect that the primitive Church and the apostolic fathers regarded the blessed sacrament as the sacrifice of the new law; and it is quite true that Dr Grabe did make a statement to that effect. It is likewise true that the fathers were early in the habit of applying the word *sacrifice* to the Lord's supper, and that they soon began to write in a mystical and unintelligible manner about the subject of the sacraments; but it has been fully established, that the early fathers of the Church afford no countenance to the Popish doctrine of the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. The Popish doctrine of the mass could not, indeed, have been invented until after transubstantiation was generally received. Transubstantiation was not broached till the ninth century, and was not established by public authority till the Council of Lateran in 1215. The mass was never defined by the Church to be a proper propitiatory sacrifice till the Council of Trent; and in the interval between these two councils, there were distinguished writers in the Church of Rome who did not regard it as possessing that character. For proof that the Popish doctrine of the mass derives no countenance from the early fathers, see Fulke's Confutation of the Rhemish Testament, on Luke xxii., 1 Cor. x. and xi., and Heb. vii., ix., and x.; Bishop Morton's Catholic Appeal for Protestants, b. ii. c. 7, pp. 164–189; and especially J. F. Buddaeus's Dissertatio de Origine

Missae Pontificiæ (Miscellanea Sacra, pt. i. pp. 1–64), which is peculiarly directed against the assertion of Grabe.

Mr Smith has two other assertions in his note, which may be very easily disposed of.—1*st*, That the sacrifice of the mass is recognised in the Confession of Augsburg; and, 2*d*, That Luther, by his own statement, was instigated by the devil to abolish the sacrifice of the mass. Now, as Luther and all his followers adhered to the Confession of Augsburg as the confession of their faith, it is scarcely possible that both these assertions can be true, but it is quite possible that they may both be false—and this is actually the case.

The common allegation of Papists, that Luther acknowledged that the devil instigated him to abolish the mass, and taught him his arguments against it, bears absurdity upon the face of it. It is founded upon a gross perversion of Luther's meaning, and though its falsehood has been often exposed, yet Papists continue unblushingly to repeat it. (See Blanco White's Preservative against Popery, pp. 36–40.)

Mr Smith's assertion, that the "sacrifice of the mass" is recognised in the Confession of Augsburg, is utterly destitute of foundation. His quotation, indeed, from that document, asserting that "they had not abolished the mass, but retained it, and celebrated it with great reverence," is substantially correct. But Mr Smith cannot surely be so ignorant as not to know that the *mass* just means the service for the celebration of the Lord's supper, and that in that sense every Protestant Church retained it. In the First Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, published in the reign of Edward VI., the service for the celebration of the eucharist is entitled "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." We are charitable enough to believe that Mr Smith never read the Confession of

Augsburg. If he had, he would have known that while it approves of the mass—that is, of a public service for the regular celebration of the Lord's supper —it does not, as he asserts, recognise the "*sacrifice* of the mass," and that it denounces Popish errors upon this point, both in doctrine and in practice, just like the other Confessions of the Reformed Churches. He should have known that the Popish confutation of the Confession of Augsburg, which was prepared under the authority of the emperor by the leading divines of Germany, keenly controverted its doctrine upon the subject of the mass as heretical and injurious, and that Melancthon, in his Apology for the Confession, written in the name of the Lutheran body, defended it fully against the Popish confutation, and explained and illustrated its statements in accordance with the common views of Protestants. (See Spieker's work, entitled "Confessio Fidei," &c., published at Berlin in 1830, which contains the three works just referred to, and especially Confess. Aug. P. II. c. 3, pp. 58–64; Confut. Pontif. P. II. c. 3, pp. 184–190; and Apolog. Conf. c. 12, pp. 481–523.) It should likewise be mentioned that Melancthon, who prepared both the Confession and the Apology, concurred with Luther in thinking that the difference between Protestants and Papists on the subject of the mass was irreconcilable. (Spieker, p. 505, note.)

The mass which the framers of the Confession of Augsburg retained, was substantially the same as that which was used by the Messrs Crotty of Birr, after they had abandoned the Church of Rome in Ireland, and which has been thus described by one of them: "On this day (June 5, 1836) we have celebrated the ceremony of the mass in the vernacular tongue. The people were highly edified and delighted, and, as they left the chapel, were heard to exclaim, 'Pray, God, forgive the priests for having so long kept us in the dark. We never heard a mass

until to-day.' It may be right to mention, that we have reformed the Roman Missal, and expunged exceptionable passages, such as prayers to saints and for the dead, with many other parts of the canon. We have also changed the *substance* of the mass. In the Church of Rome it is offered as a sacrifice propitiatory for sin; but we offer it as it was offered by the early fathers of the Church—' in commemoration of the death and passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in thanksgiving for all the favours and blessings we have obtained through the merits of the same Jesus Christ our Lord.' It may be right also to mention, that we have expunged the ceremony of the elevation, together with all the other nonsensical mummery and criss-crosses of the Romish mass. Our intention is not to form a new religion, but to retrench the novelties and superadditions of men, and revive the old religion of Jesus Christ." (Protestant Penny Magazine, vol. ii. pp. 13, 14.) Mr Smith has dealt with the Confession of Augsburg much in the same way as if some one should take the above letter of Mr Crotty, quote the first clause: "On this day we have celebrated the ceremony of the mass," omit all the rest, and thus prove him and his cousin to be sound Papists.

Besides the works already referred to upon particular points, we would recommend John Knox's notable Sermon, or Confession, upon the Mass, and his reasoning with the Abbot of Crossraguel; Calvin's Instit. lib. iv. c. 18; Perkins' Reformed Catholic (a work deserving of special commendation, for the singular precision and perfect accuracy with which it states the differences between Protestants and Papists), sect. 11, pp. 204–221; Du Moulin's Anatomy of the Mass (translated by Shanks), and his Defense de la Foi, liv. ii. art. 9; De Rodon's Funeral of the Mass; Bishop Morton's Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ, by some called the

Mass of Christ, b. vi. and viii.; Davenant's Determinationes Quæstionum Theologicarum, Quæst. 13; Payne's Discourse on the Sacrifice of the Mass, republished in Gibson's Preservative; Gavin's Master-Key to Popery, vol. i. p. 3, chap. i.; Cramp's Text-Book of Popery, c. 11; Dalton's Doctrine of the Cross compared with the Sacrifice of the Mass; Downside Discussion, published in 1836, P. ii.

CHAPTER XXIII.

OF PURGATORY.

HERE our author begins with proving from Scripture and antiquity, and then undertakes to explain the doctrine of purgatory from substantial reasons.

I. As to his proof from Scripture.

1. Is that from 2 Macc. xii., where he saith: "Money was sent to Jerusalem, that sacrifices might be offered for the slain; and it is recommended as a holy cogitation, to pray for the dead."

To this, which is the main foundation of purgatory, I answer—(1.) It can never prove such a purgatory as our author asserts; for he supposes a sinner reconciled to God, as to eternal punishment, before he be capable of purgatory; but here there can be no such supposition, for these men died in the sin of Achan, which was not known till their bodies were found amongst the slain. Here was no confession, or any sign of repentance; and, therefore, if it proves anything, it is deliverance from eternal punishment, and for such as die in their sins without any show of repentance. (2.) We must distinguish the fact of Judas from the interpretation of Jason or his epitomizer. The fact of Judas was according to the strictness of the law, which required in such cases a sin-offering, and that is all which the Greek implies: Ἀπέστειλεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα προσαγαγεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτίας θυσίαν. And so Leo

Allatius confesses all the best Greek copies agree, and he reckons twelve of them.* Now, what doth this imply, but that Judas, remembering the severe punishment of this sin, in the case of Achan, upon the people, sent a sin-offering to Jerusalem? But, saith Leo Allatius, "it was the sin of those men that were slain." I grant it. But the question is, Whether the sin-offering respected the dead or the living? for the law in such a case required a sin-offering for the congregation.† And why should we not believe so punctual a man for the law as Judas did strictly observe it in this point? But the author of the Book of Maccabees understands it of those that were slain. I do not deny it; but then, (3.) We have no reason to rely upon his authority in this matter, which I shall make appear by a parallel instance. He doth undoubtedly commend the fact of Razias in killing himself (2 Macc. xiv. 42), when he saith he did it (Ἐυγενῶς) like a brave man; and if he had thought it a fault in him, he would never have given such a character of it, but he would have added something of caution after it. And it is no great advantage to purgatory for him that commends self-murder to have introduced it. The most probable account I can give of it is, that the Alexandrian Jews, of whose number Jason of Cyrene seems to have been, had taken in several of the philosophical opinions, especially of the Platonists, into their religion, as appears by Philo; and Bellarmine‡ himself confesses that Plato held a purgatory; and they were ready to apply what related to the law to their Platonic notions. So here the law appointed a sin-offering with respect to the living; but Jason would needs have this refer to the dead, and then sets down his own remark upon it, that it was a "holy cogitation to pray for the dead," as our author renders it. If it were holy with respect to the law, there

* Leo. Allat. de Purgat. p. 889. † Lev. iv. 13.
‡ Bellar. de Purgat. lib. i. cap. 8.

must be some ground for it in the law; and that we appeal to, and do not think any particular fancies sufficient to introduce such a novelty as this was, which had no foundation either in the law or the prophets: and it would be strange for a new doctrine to be set up, when the spirit of prophecy was ceased among them.

But St Augustine held these books for canonical, and saith, "they are so received by the Church." (l. 18, De Civit Dei.) To answer this, it is sufficient to observe not only the different opinions of others before mentioned as to these books, but that, as Canus * notes, it was then lawful to doubt of their authority. And he goes as low as Gregory I., whom he denies not to have rejected them. And I hope we may set the authority of one against the other, especially when St Augustine † himself, being pressed hard with the fact of Razias, confesses—(1.) "That the Jews have not the Book of Maccabees in their canon, as they have the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to whom our Lord gave testimony, as to his witnesses;" which is an evident proof he thought not these books sufficient to ground a doctrine upon which was not found in the other. (2.) "That, however, this book was not unprofitably received by the Church, if it be soberly read and heard;" which implies a greater caution than St Augustine would ever have given concerning a book he believed truly canonical. But, saith Bellarmine, ‡ his meaning is only to keep men from imitating the example of Razias; whereas, that which they pressed St Augustine with, was not merely the fact, but the character that is given of it. "Sanctarum scripturarum auctoritate laudatus est Razias," are their very words in St Augustine; and, therefore, the caution relates to the

* Can. lib. ii. cap. 10, ad. 4.
† Aug. cont. ad Epist. Gaudent, lib. ii. cap. 23.
‡ De Purgat. lib. i. cap. 3.

books, and not merely to his example. And he lessens the character given by the author, when he saith: "He chose to die nobly: it had been better," saith he, "to have died humbly. But the other is the eulogium given in the Heathen histories, and better becomes brave Heathens than true martyrs." Can any one now think St Augustine believed this writer divinely inspired, or his doctrine sufficient to ground a point of faith upon? And I wonder they should not every jot as well commend self-murder as an heroical act, as prove the doctrine of purgatory from these words of Jason or his epitomizer; for the argument from the authority of the book will hold as strongly for one as the other. And yet this is the Achilles for purgatory, which Natalis Alexander* (whom our author follows in this matter) saith "is a demonstrative place against those that deny it." But I must proceed.

2. "Purgatory is plainly intimated by our Saviour (Matt. xii. 32): 'Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come;'—by which words Christ evidently supposes that some sins are forgiven in the world to come." I am so far from discerning this plain intimation, that I wonder how any came to think of it out of this place. "Well! but doth it not hence follow that sins may be forgiven in the world to come?" Not near so plainly as that sins will not be forgiven in the world to come. "Not that particular sin, but others may." How doth that appear? — what intimation is there that any sins not forgiven here shall be forgiven there? or that any sins here remitted as to the eternal punishment, shall be there remitted as to the temporal? And without such a kind of remission, nothing can be inferred from hence. "But if there be a remission in another world, it can be neither in heaven nor hell,

* Natal. Alex. sec. 4, diss. 4.

therefore it must be in purgatory." But those who own a remission of sin in another world, say it will be on the day of judgment; for the actual deliverance of the just from punishment may be not improperly called the full remission of their sins. So St Augustine, whom he quotes, plainly saith: "Si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo novissimo," &c. (c. Julian, l. 6, c. 5); where it is evident St Augustine takes this place to relate to the day of judgment; and so in the other. (De Civit. Dei, l. 21, c. 24.) But as he supposed a remission, so he did a purgation as by fire in that day: "In illo judicio pœnas quasdam purgatorias futuras." (De Civit. Dei, l. 20, c. 25.) And so he is to be understood on Ps. xxxvii., to which he applies 1 Cor. iii. 15. But our author was very much out, when he saith St Augustine applied 1 Pet. iii. 15, to some place of temporal chastisement in another world, when Bellarmine * sets himself to confute St Augustine about it, as understanding it of this world; and, therefore, he hath little cause to boast of St Augustine's authority about purgatory, unless he had brought something more to the purpose out of him. His other testimonies of antiquity are not worth considering, which he borrows from Natalis Alexander. That of Dionysius Areopag. (Eccl. Hierarch. c. 7) is a known counterfeit, and impertinent, relating to a region of rest and happiness. And so do Tertullian's oblations for the dead (De Cor. Milit. c. 3); for they were eucharistical, as appears by the ancient liturgies, being made for the greatest saints. St Cyprian (Ep. 66) speaks of an oblation for the dead; and he there mentions the Natalitia of the martyrs; but by comparing that with his Epist. 33, it will be found that he speaks of the anniversary commemoration of the dead, which signifies nothing to purgatory, for the best men were put into it: and St Cyprian threatens it as a punishment to be left out of the diptychs; but

* Bell. de. An. Christi, lib. iv, cap. 13.

surely it is none to escape purgatory. Arnobius (l. 4) only speaks of praying for the dead, which we deny not to have been then used in the Church, not with respect to any temporary pains in purgatory, but to the day of judgment. And therein lies the true state of the controversy with respect to antiquity; which is not, Whether any solemn prayers were not then made for the dead? but, Whether those prayers did relate to their deliverance out of a state of punishment before the day of judgment? for whatever state souls were then supposed to be in before the great day, if there could be no deliverance till the day of judgment, it signifies nothing to the present question.

As to the vision of Perpetua concerning her brother Dinocrates, who died at seven years old, being baptized, it is hardly reconcilable to their own doctrine to suppose such a soul in purgatory. I will not deny that Perpetua did think she saw him in a worse condition, and thought likewise that by her prayers she brought him into a better; for she saw him playing like little children, and then she awaked, and concluded that she had given him ease; but is it, indeed, come to this, that such a doctrine as purgatory must be built on such a foundation as this? I do not call in question the acts of Perpetua, nor her sincerity in relating her dream; but must the Church build her doctrines upon the dreams or visions of young ladies, though very devout? for Ubia Perpetua was then but twenty-two, as she saith herself. But none are to be blamed who make use of the best supports their cause will afford.

II. It is time now to see what strength of reason he offers for purgatory:—1. He saith: "When a sinner is reconciled to God, though the eternal punishment due to his sins is always remitted, yet there sometimes remains a temporal penalty to be undergone, as in the case of the Israelites and David." But doth it hence follow that there is a temporal penalty that

must be undergone either here or hereafter, without which there will be no need of purgatory? Who denies that God in this life, for example's sake, may punish those whose sins he hath promised to remit as to another world? This is, therefore, a very slender foundation. 2. "There are some sins of their own nature light and venial." I will not dispute that; but suppose there be, must men go, then, into purgatory for mere venial sins? What a strange doctrine doth this appear to any man's reason!—that God should forgive the greater sins, and require so severe a punishment for sins in their own nature venial; that is, so inconsiderable in their opinion that no man is bound to confess them—which do not interrupt a state of grace—which require only an implicit detestation of them—which do not deserve eternal punishment—which may be remitted by holy water or a bishop's blessing, as their divines agree.* 3. "That for all sins some penalty is due to the justice of God." And what follows from hence, but the necessity of Christ's satisfaction? but how doth it appear that after the expiation of sin by Christ, and the remission of eternal punishment, there still remains a necessity of further satisfaction for such a temporal penalty in another world? 4. "That, generally speaking, few men depart out of this life, but either with the guilt of venial sins, or obnoxious to some temporal punishment." No doubt all men are obnoxious by their sins to the punishment of another world; but that is not the point, but, Whether God hath declared, that although he remits the eternal punishment, he will not the temporal; and although he will forgive thousands of pounds, he will not the pence and farthings we owe to him? But if mortal sins be remitted as to the guilt, and venial do not

* S. Th. part. iii. q. 87, art. 3. in Cor. v. Marsil. Column. Hydragiolog. sect. 7, cap. 3, n. 32, sect. 3, c. 2, n. 15, 29, c. 3, n. 1; Bell. de Cultu. Sanct. lib. iii. cap. 7, sect. secundo.

hinder a state of grace, what room is there for vindictive justice in purgatory?

Yet this is the doctrine which so much weight is laid upon, that Bellarmine saith: "They must go directly to hell who do not believe purgatory."* If this be true, why was it not put into the representation, that we might understand the danger of not believing so credible, so reasonable a doctrine as this? But we believe it to be a much more dangerous thing to condemn others for not believing a doctrine which hath so very slender a pretence either to Scripture or reason.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXIII.

Purgatory is the chief medium through which the Popish doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is applied to the purpose of raising money. Papists are carefully taught that many, even of those who are to be finally admitted into heaven, must spend some time after death in a place of suffering, that the celebration of mass for the benefit of those who are tormented in purgatory has certainly the effect of shortening their period of endurance, and that a mass may always be procured for a sum of money; and on these grounds, which must be powerfully persuasive if really believed, they are exhorted to make bequests in order to secure the celebration of masses for themselves after death, and to pay money that their deceased relatives may have the benefit of the same all-powerful ceremony. The Church of Rome has been cautious in defining purgatory. The Council of Trent (sess. 25) merely asserted its existence, and decided, "that souls detained there are assisted by the suf-

* De Purgatorio, lib. i. cap. 15.

frages of the faithful, and especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar;" and that (sess. 6, can. 30), after the guilt of mortal sin and liability to eternal punishment have been removed, there still remains a liability to temporal punishment, which must be endured either in this life, or afterwards in purgatory. The catechism of the council declares the existence of "a purgatorial fire," which is the immediate source of the punishment. The council (sess. 25), however, plainly intimated that there is much more than this which is to be carefully inculcated as sound doctrine; and from the general strain of the writings of the most approved Popish authors, as well as from the daily practices of Popish priests, we learn that the following is a correct view of what is generally taught in the Church of Rome upon this subject: There is a place somewhere in the neighbourhood of hell, to which the great majority of believers, even all who have died stained with venial sin, or before they have fully satisfied for the temporal punishment remaining due to their mortal sins, are consigned at death, where they are tormented, through the agency of fire, until they have endured enough to expiate their venial sins, or to pay the temporal punishment which they had deserved, unless their period of endurance be shortened by the sacrifice of the mass being offered for them, or by the suffrages—that is, "the prayers, alms, and other works of piety"—performed in their stead by those on earth who take an interest in their welfare.

Now, the alleged existence of such a place is plainly an imposture, having no foundation to rest upon, and intended chiefly for the purpose of practising upon men's fears and sympathies, and swindling them out of their money.

Bellarmine says, that no one who denies the existence of purgatory will ever get the benefit of it, but will be sent straight to hell. It is evident, however,

that a belief in the existence of purgatory has a most powerful tendency to lead men to neglect to make their calling and election sure, and thus sink them in irretrievable misery; and, in that way, the doctrine of purgatory, like most others in the Popish scheme, serves at once the purposes of Satan, its great author, and of the human agents whom he employs. While the priests are pocketing money for masses to hasten men's escape from purgatory, Satan has the satisfaction of seeing them securely lodged in hell—a result to which their reliance upon purgatory has not a little contributed. Bellarmine derives his arguments in support of purgatory from four sources—Scripture, the fathers, reason, and apparitions of persons who have been in purgatory, and have afterwards appeared in dreams or visions to give an account of it. Of course, modern authors omit the last head of argument, although it is just as solid as any other which they can adduce, and is in perfect keeping with the character of fraud and imposture which is stamped upon the whole subject. Reason cannot possibly afford of itself any positive ground for believing in the existence of purgatory, although, when fairly exercised upon the information given us in Scripture, it may afford conclusive evidence against it. In regard to Scripture, their principal arguments are derived from 2 Macc. xiii. 42–45; Matt. xii. 32; 1 Cor. iii. 13-16. The first is no authority with Protestants, and merely proves that, in the opinion of the author of that book, it was right to pray for the dead. The Second Book of Maccabees, so far from being canonical, is full of blundering and absurdity, and is by no means deserving of the same respect as the First Book, which is the work of a different author; but Papists have not, even in favour of purgatory, the opinion of the author of Second Maccabees; for he expressly founds his conviction of the propriety of praying for the dead, not upon the fact that they were

for a time tormented in purgatory, but that they were afterwards to rise again.

In regard to the second passage (Matt. xii. 32), Bellarmine himself admits that it affords no proof of purgatory, according to the rules of logic, but only according to the rules of prudence; that is, he thinks that our Saviour in making this statement, cannot be supposed to have spoken with due caution, unless it were true that some sins not forgiven in this world were remitted in the next, although it can be easily proved that, according to ordinary Scripture usage, the words do not convey any such meaning.

With respect to the only remaining passage (1 Cor. iii. 13–16), it may be sufficient, as an *argumentum ad homines*, to remark, that Papists cannot produce anything like the consent of the fathers as to its meaning; that Bellarmine acknowledges (De Purgat. lib. i.) that it is a very difficult passage; that there are five great difficulties in the interpretation of it, and that upon all these five points the fathers entertained a variety of opinions.

But while there is thus nothing in Scripture in favour of purgatory, and while this of itself is quite a sufficient reason for rejecting it, there is a great deal of most conclusive evidence against it. The Scriptures uniformly represent the period of men's death as determining irrevocably everything connected with their relation to God, to his law, and eternity—as conclusively freeing the soul from all the direct effects of sin, at least from all suffering, or else involving it for ever in the awful punishment which sin deserves. It is plainly taught in Scripture, that at death the souls of believers, being made perfect in holiness, do immediately pass into glory; while the Church of Rome, admitting that they are at death made perfect in holiness (for she does not pretend that there is repentance, or growth in grace, or merit, in purgatory), maintains that most of them do immediately pass into purga-

tory, where they are severely punished on account of their past sins, for an indefinite length of time. The principles which form the foundation of the Popish doctrine of purgatory, namely, that men may, by their personal suffering, expiate the guilt of their venial sins—that there is a temporal punishment due for sin after the liability to eternal punishment has been taken away—that God continues to inflict suffering upon his own people simply as a punishment, even when it cannot serve any salutary purpose connected with the improvement of their character—that the prayers, alms, and other works of piety performed by men on earth (the performance of which the Church of Rome considers as being the endurance of penal suffering, see p. 157), will be accepted by God instead of the actual endurance of the pains of purgatory by others—are utterly opposed to the plain statements of God's Word concerning the fulness of Christ's satisfaction, the ground of a sinner's acceptance, and the principles which regulate God's dealings with his fallen creatures.

But Papists rest their defence of purgatory mainly upon the authority of the Jews and the fathers—very insufficient grounds for such doctrine, even if there had been nothing in Scripture opposed to it. Purgatory, like many other parts of Popery, was plainly of Pagan origin; and Papists can produce much stronger testimony in support of it from Heathen authors than from the Jews or the fathers. Our Saviour does not, certainly, give us any encouragement to adopt the opinions of the Jews, except in so far as they accorded with Scripture; and it is well known that the Christian fathers early began to indulge in groundless theories and fancies about the state of departed spirits. Origen, for example, the most learned of them all, who flourished about the beginning of the third century, held the doctrine of universal restoration; but still, in order to get some appearance of countenance

even from the Jews and the fathers, Papists are in the habit of keeping in abeyance the true nature of their doctrine of purgatory, and putting forth two misrepresentations upon the subject :—

1. They often speak of the doctrine of purgatory as implying merely the existence of a middle place, or intermediate state, which is not heaven, into which the souls of good men go at death; and, whenever they find a statement in any author which countenances the idea that the souls of the righteous, at death, do not go straight to heaven, they immediately put him down as a supporter of purgatory. Popish purgatory, however, is not merely a middle place, or intermediate state, as they commonly misrepresent it. An essential element in the Popish purgatory is, that it is a place of punishment, where penal suffering is inflicted, the duration of which depends upon the amount of guilt to be expiated, or the exertion of friends on earth. A considerable number of fathers held the notion that the souls of believers, at death, were not admitted to heaven, but dwelt in an intermediate state, where, free from all sin and suffering, and in the enjoyment of exalted happiness, they waited for the resurrection of their bodies. This fancy is essentially different from the Romish purgatory; and yet Papists commonly try to confound them, and produce all those fathers who held the one as supporting the other. Papists, when engaged in controversy, may now find it convenient to rest in the vague generality of a middle place or intermediate state; but they formerly manifested a much more minute acquaintance with the unseen world than their modern advocates are willing to take credit for. Dens (vol. vii. p. 348) lays it down as the general doctrine of Papists, that the souls of the righteous were not admitted to heaven before our Saviour's ascension, but dwelt in an intermediate state, where there was no suffering, but much happiness, called the

limbus patrum. This *limbus patrum* was abolished when heaven was opened to the souls of the righteous by our Saviour's ascension; so that there were three receptacles for the souls of the departed before Christ's ascension—namely, *limbus patrum*, purgatory, and hell; and an equal number after that event—heaven taking the place of the *limbus*, and purgatory and hell remaining as before. Dens, however, has omitted another place, the existence of which is maintained by many Popish authors—namely, the *limbus infantum*, to which all children dying without baptism are consigned. Some Popish writers, indeed, consign all unbaptized infants to hell at once; but the more compassionate have invented this *limbus* for them, which is not quite so bad as hell—it being an article of faith in the Romish Church, that no infant dying unbaptized can be admitted into heaven.

2. Another artifice generally employed by Papists, in order to procure an appearance of countenance to their doctrine of purgatory from the fathers, is to represent the practice of praying for the dead as implying a belief in the doctrine of purgatory, and upon that ground producing every father who approved of the former as supporting also the latter. Now, it can be established by unquestionable evidence, that the practice of praying for the dead prevailed in the Church before the Popish doctrine of purgatory; that many approved of the one, who knew not, or who rejected the other; and that the early fathers who approved of praying for the dead, rested this practice upon grounds not only different from, but inconsistent with, the Popish doctrine of purgatory. The Greek Church still retains the practice of praying for the dead, but denies the existence of purgatory. There have been some in almost all ages, and even among Protestants, who practised the one while they scouted the other. There is not a vestige of evidence in Scripture in favour of praying for the dead; and it is, therefore,

unwarrantable and improper. We admit that the practice was very early introduced into the Christian Church; but we maintain, that neither in the nature of the case, nor in the estimation of those who in early times prayed for the dead, was there any connection between that practice and the Popish doctrine of purgatory; and that, of course, it is nothing better than fraud in Papists to produce the evidence of the early prevalence of the practice of praying for the dead as proof of the equally early adoption of the doctrine of purgatory.

By keeping these considerations in mind, it will be clearly seen, that most of the testimonies commonly produced by Papists from the works of the fathers upon this point are quite irrelevant. The testimonies produced from the fathers of the first four centuries apply only to an intermediate state, which was not a place of suffering; or to prayer for the dead, who were prayed for, though not supposed to be tormented; or to a sort of purgatorial fire, through which some of the fathers supposed that all men must pass at the day of judgment. It is certain that the Popish doctrine of purgatory was not broached till the beginning of the fifth century, nor generally received till six centuries later. The following striking testimony to this effect is given by Fisher, bishop of Rochester, in his book against Luther:—"No orthodox person now doubts whether there be a purgatory; and yet by those ancients there was not any mention made of it whatever, or, if any, the rarest possible; nay, by the Greeks, even to the present day, the very existence of purgatory is disbelieved. Let any one who will, read the commentaries of the Greek fathers, and he will find that they never, if I mistake not, or, at any rate, as seldom as possible, speak of purgatory. Nor even did the Latins all at once receive this truth." "Since, then, purgatory was so late in being known and admitted by the universal Church, can any man

wonder, that of a practice connected with the belief of it there was no instance to be found in the early ages of the Church?"

Mr Smith's note on Gother's chapter on purgatory refers almost exclusively to prayer for the dead, in support of which he brings forward the authority of the Jews, and two or three Protestants. It is true that modern Jews pray for the dead; but that, surely, is no sufficient reason why Christians should do it. He says, "that the doctrine of a middle state was always held by the Jews." To what periods of their history he means this *always* to extend, he has not informed us; but the assertion seems to have been intended to mislead, unless it is to be ascribed to ignorance. The circumstance of the author of the Second Book of Maccabees approving of prayer for the dead, affords no evidence of the extent to which that practice then prevailed. We have no other evidence on the subject applicable to that period; and the practice, as sanctioned by that author, being expressly referred to the resurrection, affords no evidence whatever of the belief in a middle state. There is some evidence (Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, liv. ii. c. 19) that many of the Jews, even before our Saviour's time, believed in a sort of metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls; and although the proof of the prevalence of this notion before the Christian era is not quite conclusive (Findlay's Vindication of the Sacred Books, pp. 352–365), yet it is certain that a notion of this sort prevailed among their doctors in later times. Indeed, many foolish fancies have been current among the Jews since our Saviour's time in regard to the state of departed spirits; of which an account is given in Basnage's History, b. v. c. 17–20. Among others, they seem to have invented a sort of purgatory quite as early as the Christian fathers; and to the benefit of their authority the Church of Rome is cordially welcome. But it should be mentioned, to

the credit of the Jewish doctors, that they have not introduced the system of making their purgatory a mean of raising money, as the Popish priests have done, and that they have limited the abode of departed spirits there to a period of twelve months; while the Church of Rome has taken care to make it indefinite, that there may be no limit to her exaction of money for masses for the dead.

Mr Smith quotes, also, a passage from Jeremy Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying, in which that distinguished writer is made to urge the argument in favour of praying for the dead, derived from the practice of the Jews, and to confirm it by the fact of our Saviour not censuring this among the rest of their errors. In the passage quoted, however, Taylor is not delivering his own sentiments, but speaking in the name of a Papist; and to make the statement available for his purpose, Mr Smith has omitted from the first clause, the words, "says the Romanist," which, of course, give it a totally different character. But as this fraudulent mutilation of Taylor's statement has been repeatedly employed before by Popish controversialists, and even by Dr Challoner (Catholic Christian Instructed, p. 124), we are willing to believe that Mr Smith borrowed it from them, without being himself aware of the fraud which he was practising in quoting it.

He quotes, likewise, not in support of purgatory, but merely of prayer for the dead, the practice of Dr S. Johnson, and the testimony of Dr Forbes. Dr Johnson, notwithstanding all his great talents and acquirements, is well known to have been the slave of superstition; and, if we recollect aright, he prayed for his deceased wife only conditionally, in so far as it was lawful and proper. Dr Forbes, from whom a strong testimony is quoted in favour of the antiquity and propriety of praying for the dead, is said by Mr Smith to have been a bishop of the Church of England. The fact is, that he

was the first bishop of Edinburgh, and was appointed to that office in 1634; but as Mr Smith plainly knows nothing about him, and gives no reference to the book from which his quotation is made, he was probably not aware that Dr Forbes' statement in favour of praying for the dead is accompanied by the following testimony upon a kindred subject: "An endless number of most learned men—Greeks, Romanists, and Protestants—have most clearly demonstrated that the purgatory of the Romanists cannot be at all proved from the prayers and offerings for the dead which were sanctioned by the fathers."

Mr Smith adds, that "our Saviour himself must have frequently sanctioned this practice (praying for the dead) by his presence both in the temple and in the synagogues." We do not remember to have seen it asserted before, by any Popish controversialist, that prayer for the dead formed a part of the public service in the temple and in the synagogue in our Saviour's time, and the assertion is utterly unfounded. Dr Lightfoot was probably better acquainted with this matter than Mr Smith; he has written a work for the express purpose of describing "the temple service as it stood in the days of our Saviour," and he makes no mention of prayer for the dead.

The great practical purpose to which the Popish doctrine of purgatory is applied by the priests is, to extort money for saying masses for delivering the souls of the faithful from its torments; and this fraud is still practised to a melancholy extent in every Popish country. Papists have even taken advantage of the modern principle of association to effect this object more extensively. Purgatorial societies exist in Ireland, under the sanction of the Popish clergy, similar in their arrangements to friendly or benefit societies; the members of which, in virtue of a small annual contribution, are entitled to have so many masses for the deliverance of their souls from purga-

tory paid for at the society's expense. Protestants, in similar circumstances, contribute to societies with the view of securing some provision for sickness, for the expenses of their funeral, or for the support of their widows and children; while Papists, in virtue of their principles, are bound to provide in this way, if they cannot in any other, for their own deliverance from the fires of purgatory. Their priests will say mass for none, however poor, unless they are paid for it; and they show in this, as in many other respects, their resemblance to the Pharisees of old: "They devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers."

Besides the works already referred to in this note, see Du Moulin's Defense de la Foi, art. 21; Bishop Morton's Catholic Appeal, pp. 14–22, 188-195, 360–366, 492-499; Ames's Bellarminus Enervatus, tom. ii. lib. 5; Forbes's Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ, lib. xiii.; Stillingfleet's Rational Account, part iii. cap. 6; Archbishop Wake's Discourses on Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead; M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. ii. pp. 193-236; Phillpotts' Letters to Butler, Let. 5–7; Edgar's Variations of Popery, c. 14; Dalton's Release from Purgatory.

CHAPTER XXIV.

OF PRAYING IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE.

THE question, in short, is, Whether the Church service, at which persons are bound to assist, ought not to be in a language understood by those who are bound to assist?

For our author grants "that a Papist is bound to assist at the Church service, and to hear mass;" but he is not bound to understand the words there spoken.

This is a plain state of the case, and one would have thought St Paul's discourse about edification in the Church service, and a known tongue, and the primitive practice, had deserved a little consideration; but not a word is said to either of them, and the whole is so managed, as though there had been no rule, or any appearance of practice to the contrary; but I must consider what he doth say.

1. The mass is a sacrifice. And what then?—have they no other Church service but the mass? What, then, becomes of their breviaries, litanies, and all other offices? But suppose the priest's office in the mass be to offer the sacrifice, are there no prayers in the canon of the mass wherein the people are concerned? Why must not they understand what they are required to assist in prayer for? If they have English books, as he saith, to teach them every part and ceremony of the mass, why not as well the prayers

in the mass wherein they are to join? They tell us, "it is unseasonable then for the people to say their beads, and other devotions;" and I suppose as unseasonable to talk or think of other matters. Why, then, should not they know what it is they are to do, and what petitions they are then to make to God? Are there no responses to be made?—no lessons to be read?—no creed to be professed? Doth not the priest speak to the people to pray, and they answer him? Is there no thanksgiving after the communion which the people is concerned in? We are as much for their devout affections as they can be, but we think they are not hindered by understanding what they are about. We cannot but wonder that any man should say, "that it nothing concerns his devotion that the mass is in Latin," if he understand it not. Is it no part of devotion to join in the public prayers, not merely by rote, but from a due apprehension of the matter contained in them? He requires "that they accompany the priest in prayer and spirit," and why not in understanding also? "But the Church hath so ordered it;" and that is the thing we complain of, as done against St Paul—against the primitive Church—against the natural sense of mankind, who think it is fit for them to know what they do, especially in the worship of God. "But it is to preserve unity." Methinks, however, unity in spirit with understanding is better than without it. "There are other good reasons." I know not one good one; with if there were more, he would have produced them. "The greatest part is said in a low voice, that it is not possible he should hear it." And to what purpose should it be spoken louder, if they are not to understand it? But why so low in public? Yet the people might have books, and join, if they understood what was said. But why should not the rest be understood, which is spoken as if it were?

2. As to other offices, he saith, "he is taught that

he may perform them in a language which he understands not, with great benefit to his soul and the acceptance of God, if at those occasions he endeavours to raise his thoughts to heaven, and fix his heart upon his Maker." But the question is not, Whether a man may not have devout thoughts at that time? but, Whether he can perform his part in the public offices with true devotion, without understanding? for the public offices of devotion were designed for the uniting the hearts and desires of the people in the same things. It is not, Whether one man may not pray for heaven, and another for fair weather, and another for pardon of his sins, and a fourth for patience, and so on, in the same place, and at the same time? for all this might be done as well in a silent meeting, where not a word is spoken; but there being one form of praying for all to join together in, that, with the united force of the whole congregation, their petitions may go up to heaven, the matter now in dispute is, Whether it be not necessary, in order to this united devotion, that the people all know what they pray for? And one would think nothing need be said to prove this; but what our author adds in justification of this overthrows all public devotion; for he saith: "It is not necessary to have attention on the words, or on the sense of prayers, but rather purely on God;" which is to make all public forms unnecessary, and to turn all devotion into prayer of contemplation; for if this be true, all forms whatsoever are not only useless, but burdensome, and by stinting the spirit, do hinder the nimbler flights of the soul in pure silence towards God; and this principle must lead men to enthusiasms and unintelligible unions, and make them despise forms as a mean and dull dispensation.

But at last he saith: "A petitioner may accompany his petition with an earnest desire of obtaining it, though the language in which it is written be un-

known to him." Very true, if he indited the matter of the petition, and trusted another to put it into that language, which the person to whom he makes it doth understand, but not his own; but all languages are alike to God's infinite wisdom, and so there can be no pretence, on that account, to keep only to some particular tongues, though unknown to the party; and if it were so to all men, no man would have a petition presented in a language which he did not know; but in prayer to God, the design of it is not to acquaint him with something which he knew not, but to excite the hearts and affections of men to an earnest desire of the things which are fit for them to ask. Now, let any man undertake to prove that men's affections are as easily moved by words they do not understand as by those they do, and I will give up this cause.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXIV.

The Popish practice of having the prayers in the mass and other departments of the public worship of God said by the priest in Latin, which the body of the people do not understand, is inconsistent with the principles laid down by the apostle in the 14th chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, and with every view suggested by Scripture and reason of the objects and ends of public worship, and of the way in which, according to the appointment of God and the constitution of man, these ends can be accomplished. To have public prayers said in a language which the body of the congregation do not understand, is to refuse to treat them like rational beings, and to ascribe a sort of magical efficacy to the pronunciation of unknown sounds; and the universal prevalence of this practice in the Church of Rome satisfactorily proves that

their famous maxim, that ignorance is the mother of devotion, is still reckoned perfectly orthodox.

The Armenian, Russian, Syrian, and Ethiopian Christians, have the whole of their public religious service in a language understood by the common people; while the Church of Rome alone, in defiance of Scripture and common sense, has continued to adhere to the Latin, after it had ceased to be generally understood.

Papists are in the habit of alleging, in vindication of their usual practice in this respect, that a considerable portion of the prayers, which in the public congregation are said in Latin, are to be found in the hands of the people translated into the vernacular tongue, and that in this way they are enabled to understand them; but if, as they allege, the translation of portions of the public service into the vernacular tongue enables the people to understand them, why should not the whole be translated? especially as the only positive arguments adduced in favour of the use of a Latin liturgy—namely, that the language of the public service of the Church is preserved identical in different countries, and unaffected by the changes which are gradually taking place on all languages in common use—might still be urged with the same force, even if the whole service were translated. If there be no reason why the body of a congregation should understand the public service, why translate any part of it? and if they should understand it, and cannot do so without having a translation in their hands, why not translate it all?

The statements of the apostle in the 14th chapter of First Corinthians are decisive upon this question; and the only pretence by which Papists attempt to answer the argument derived from these statements is by the assertion that the apostle was not there speaking of a public liturgy—just as if he did not plainly lay down principles which distinctly apply

to the whole public service of the Church. See Fulke's Confutation of the Rhemish Testament on 1 Cor. xiv.; White's Reply to the Jesuit Fisher, sec. 17; Hamilton's Tracts on some Leading Errors of the Church of Rome, pp. 45–52, "Latin Prayers not fit for Irishmen."

CHAPTER XXV.

OF THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

THE dispute about this is not,

Whether the second commandment may be found in any of their books, but, By what authority it comes to be left out in any? as he confesses it is in their short catechisms and manuals—but not only in these, for I have now before me the Reformed Office of the Blessed Virgin, printed at Salamanca, A.D. 1588, published by order of Pius V., where it is so left out; and so in the English Office, at Antwerp, A.D. 1658. I wish he had told us in what public office of their Church it is to be found; but himself pleads for the leaving it out, when he saith: "The people are in no danger of superstition or idolatry by it, since the first commandment secures them from it; and there is nothing in this but what is virtually contained in the first, and is rather an explanation than a new and distinct precept." But is this so plain and clear, that a man's conscience can never make any just and reasonable doubt concerning it? There is a terrible sanction after it; and men had need go upon very good grounds in a matter of such moment. Hath God himself anywhere declared this to be only an explication of the first commandment? Have the prophets, or Christ and his apostles, ever done it? How, then, can any man's conscience be safe in this matter? for it

is not a trifling controversy, whether it be a distinct commandment or an explication of the first, but the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the worship of images depends very much upon it; for if it be only an explication of the first, then, unless one takes images to be gods, their worship is lawful—and so the Heathens were excused in it, who were not such idiots; but if it be a new and distinct precept, then the worshipping any image or similitude becomes a grievous sin, and exposes to the wrath of God in that severe manner mentioned in the end of it; and it is a great confirmation that this is the true meaning of it, because all the primitive writers of the Christian Church not only thought it a sin against this commandment, but insisted upon the force of it against those Heathens who denied that they took their images for gods; and, therefore, this is a very insufficient account of leaving out the second commandment.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXV.

Upon the subject of the second commandment there are two charges usually adduced against the Church of Rome,—1*st*, That she has wholly omitted what Protestants call the second commandment, in most of the catechisms ordinarily used in the instruction of the young; 2*d*, That she makes what Protestants call the second commandment to be only an appendage to the first, and not a separate commandment. The first charge is substantially admitted by Gother, and defended upon the ground that there is no necessity for the second commandment, as the substance of it is contained in the first, of which Papists profess to think it an explanation. The same admission, as to the matter of fact, was made, and similar reasons in defence of it were adduced, by Dr

Doyle, in his examination before Parliament in 1825, as appears from the following extract:—

"You are aware that the second commandment, as it stands in the Catechism of the Established Church, is taken verbatim from the established version of the Scripture? *Ans.* Yes; I believe it is. *Ques.* Is there not, in the Douay version of the Scriptures, a similar portion, though somewhat differently expressed? *Ans.* There is. *Ques.* Is that portion inserted at all in the decalogue? *Ans.* Yes; it is in our larger Roman Catholic Catechism; *but in those in general use* we seek to abridge all the doctrines of Christianity, leaving, at the same time, sufficient to convey to the tender mind *exact notions of the truths which we wish to have conveyed to them. Ques.* In point of fact, are the children of the peasantry in Ireland instructed in any catechism which contains any portion of the Scriptures now referred to? *Ans.* We have four sizes of catechisms—the first size, the second size, and the third size, and what we call the Abridgment of Christian Doctrine. *In the three smaller ones I do not find the entire words*, which we find in Exodus, put down at length; but I find that the substance of them is clearly put down in the larger or third size, and in the Abridgment; but I am not certain that the commandments are given at full length except in the Abridgment. *Ques.* Have the goodness to state the words which you conceive convey the substance of the passages which are omitted in the smaller catechisms? Are they any other but 'I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other gods but me?' *Ans. No, I believe not; these are quite sufficient. Ques.* You consider these words are commensurate with the second commandment, according to the authorized version? *Ans.* Certainly I do; for that latter part of the commandment is rather a ceremonial part, than one founded upon the law of nature. The law of nature and the positive law of God forbid idolatry,

but the very making of images seems to have been prohibited to the Jewish people, on account of their propensity to idolatry. Now, when idolatry had ceased throughout the greater part of the earth, and the religion of Christ was established in its place, there was no necessity for inculcating that ceremonial part on a new people, who had been far removed from the revolting idea of worshipping things made by the hands of man. Therefore, that part which is founded on the law of nature is retained, *and that part which was more ceremonial than derived from the nature of man or the wisdom of God, is left out, because no longer necessary for the new people.* Therefore, I conceive that the commandment, in its present shape, contains all the doctrine necessary to be conveyed to the people of God in these our times, *and that the addition respecting the making of images is quite unnecessary now as a matter of instruction in the faith.*"

In Dr Butler's Catechism, which is in general use in Ireland, there is not a vestige of the second commandment, although it contains (edition of 1831) about sixty pages. The more general introduction of the second commandment into modern Popish catechisms is to be ascribed solely to the public exposure of their conduct in omitting it; and the cause of its general omission is obviously and certainly the palpable inconsistency of the prohibition which it contains with the Popish practice of using images in the worship of God. Mr Godkin, a converted Papist, and now pastor of a Congregational Church at Armagh, although he had been instructed in the common Popish catechisms, declares, that he was greatly surprised when he first found the second commandment in the Douay Bible.

The other charge against the Church of Rome relates to the mode of dividing the decalogue. Protestants, and indeed the great body of divines in all ages, have divided the first table of the law,

which contains a declaration of our duty to God, into four commandments; and the second table, which contains our duty to men, into six; while Papists divide the first table into three, joining together as one what Protestants reckon the first and second, and the second table into seven, dividing into two what we call the tenth.

The object of this Popish division is to afford a pretence for omitting the second, as being merely an appendage to the first, and to give an appearance of greater plausibility to their view of its meaning, as directed not against any use of images in the worship of God, but merely against the use of the images of strange or false gods. The actual meaning of the words of the prohibition, indeed, is not affected by the mode of arrangement; but the Popish division obviously affords some facilities for making their perversion of the meaning of the second commandment more plausible to ignorant and unreflecting persons.

The reasons for preferring the Protestant division of the decalogue are these :—1. The general consent of almost all, except Papists and one or two of the fathers. 2. The reasonableness of there being one command in regard to the *object* of worship, and a separate one in regard to the *mode* of worship, as there is a separate command regarding God's name and another regarding God's day. 3. The great awkwardness and absurdity of dividing the tenth commandment into two, which was plainly intended for one. Papists are so sensible of this awkwardness, that they commonly, in their catechisms, consider them together as the ninth and tenth, instead of explaining each of them separately, as they do in regard to all the rest.

To the commandments of God, the Church of Rome has added what she calls the commandments of the Church, which are explained and enforced in most of her catechisms. They are binding under

penalty of mortal sin, and the violation of any one of them is considered to be as sinful and dangerous as a transgression of the moral law of God. The commandments of the Church are commonly said to be six in number, although they are differently arranged and expressed in different catechisms. The fullest account of the commandments of the Church which we have met with, is to be found in the catechism of the Most Rev. Dr Reilly, published at Dublin, by Richard Coyne, publisher to the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, in 1834, where they are classed under eight heads, and embellished with all the beauties of poetry, thus (p. 26):—

1. Sundays and holidays mass thou shalt hear.
2. All holidays sanctify through the year.
3. Lent, Ember-days, and Vigils thou shalt fast.
4. Fridays and Saturdays flesh thou shalt not taste.
5. In Lent and Advent nuptial feasts forbear.
6. Confess your sins at least once every year.
7. Receive your God about great Easter-day,
8. And to his Church neglect not tithes to pay.

See Calvin's Instit., lib. ii. c. 8. s. 12; Zanchius de Statu Peccati et Legali, lib. i. c. 11, sect 3; Bishop Andrew's Exposition of the Ten Commandments, pp. 88, 521, 522; M'Gavin's Protestant, vol. i. Nos. 17, 48; Godkin's Guide from the Church of Rome to the Church of Christ, Let. 16.

CHAPTER XXVI.

OF MENTAL RESERVATIONS.

UNDER this head he denies two things:—

1. That they are ever taught to break faith with heretics.

2. That their Church doth allow any equivocations or mental reservations.

1. As to the former, I am sincerely glad to find a principle so destructive to all human society so utterly disowned, when he saith: "He is taught to keep faith with all sorts of people, of whatsoever judgment or persuasion they be, and to stand to his word, and observe his promise given or made to any whatsoever;" and whatever opinions and practices there may have been of that kind formerly, we hope there will never be occasion given to revive that dispute.

2. As to the second, we embrace his declaration against it, and hope there is no equivocation or mental reservation in it. But there are some things which must here be taken notice of.

(1.) He cannot deny that there are authors in communion with his Church, who may be charged with teaching another doctrine; and these not a few, nor inconsiderable, who not only allow the practice of mental reservations and equivocations, but say with great confidence, it hath been received in the Roman

Church for no less than four hundred years, and that in some cases they are still agreed in it. See Parson's Treatise of Mitigation, cap. 7, sec. 2, 3; cap. 10, sec. 1.

(2.) We do not deny that Innocent XI. hath condemned equivocations and mental reservations in swearing, as at least scandalous and pernicious in practice, and therefore we cannot charge the Pope with abetting this doctrine; but we cannot but reflect on what our author said about the deposing doctrine—that although Popes had believed it, and acted by it, yet the greater number opposed it. And what shall we say in this case, if the generality of their casuists in some cases approve it, and think it no lie or perjury, as in that of confession? But if it be really so in any one case, then it may be some other fault, but it is not a lie or perjury in any other, when a man doth not think himself bound to speak all he knows.

(3.) That as we highly commend the Pope's condemning such doctrines and practices now, so we have reason to think the contrary did not once want the encouragement and approbation of the Roman See;—as may be found in the resolution of some cases by Pius V., relating to some missionaries who were to be sent hither; and then it was declared, that if they were summoned before our judges, they might *sophistice jurare, et sophistice respondere;* and that they were not bound to answer according to the intention of the judges, but according to some true sense of their own—that is, which was made true by the help of a mental reservation.* But it is very well that now the very same things are condemned at Rome as scandalous and pernicious in practice.

* Apud. G. Abbot de Mendacio, &c., in Præf. p. 6, &c.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXVI.

It is a matter of unquestionable certainty, that the propriety of mental reservation—that is, the lawfulness of falsehood and perjury—has been more openly taught, and more generally acted upon, by men in communion with the Church of Rome, than by any other class of men that ever existed in any age or country, or under any form of religion, whether true or false, whilst yet that Church claims to herself pre-eminently the character of holiness. The Jesuit authors, especially, have asserted principles upon this point immeasurably worse than any that have ever been sanctioned by Heathen authors. Gother boasts of the condemnation of equivocation and mental reservation by Pope Innocent XI., in 1679. But it should be remembered, that that Pope, though shamefully ignorant, was a much more respectable man than most of those who, for some centuries, have filled the chair of Peter; that he was disgusted with the Jesuits, and was favourable to the Jansenists; that his bull upon the subject was occasioned by a public representation made to him by the Jansenists of principles taught in the writings of the Jesuits, so infamous that no man, whose conscience was not seared as with a hot iron, could hesitate to condemn them; and that the Jansenists complained of the tameness of his sentence, in condemning them only as "scandalous and pernicious in practice."

See Bishop Morton's Reply to Parsons; Pascal's Provincial Letters; Parallel of the Doctrine of the Pagans with the Doctrines of the Jesuits, translated from the French by Whately, 1726, c. 9; Bishop Burnet's History of the Rights of Princes, Preface and Appendix.

CHAPTER XXVII.

OF A DEATH-BED REPENTANCE.

We have no difference with them about this matter, as far as they hold to these points:—1. "That men are strictly obliged to work out their salvation with fear and trembling in time of health." 2. "That it is very dangerous to defer their repentance to the last." 3. "That if any are surprised, they ought in charity to have all possible assistance, to put them into the best way for their salvation."

But yet there may be some particular doctrines owned in the Church of Rome, which may give men too much encouragement to put off true repentance; as—

1. The easiness of being put into a state of grace by the sacrament of penance; for which no more is required than removing the impediment, as appears by the Council of Trent (sess. 7, can. 6); and afterwards it defines, "that bare attrition doth sufficiently dispose a man to receive grace in that sacrament." (Sess. 14, cap. 4.) So that, although a man hath led a very bad life, if he hath but this attrition for his sins when he doth confess them, he is put into a state of grace by this sacrament. And what can any man expect more, and what can he do less? I do not mean a bare natural attrition, the sufficiency whereof is condemned by Innocent XI. in the same proposi-

tion (fifty-seventh), but that which the Council of Trent calls imperfect contrition—that is, a good motion in a man's mind to forsake his sins for fear of punishment. If really no more be required for a state of grace but this, it is no wonder if men put off the doing of that which may be done at any time so easily by the help of a priest.

2. The treasure of the Church is another thing which is very apt to hinder men's speedy repentance; for by that they believe there is a stock ready of so many merits and satisfactions of others, if duly applied to them by indulgences, that they need not be at such pains to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. When a man, by the sacrament of penance, is put into a state of grace, the eternal punishment is discharged, and nothing remains but some temporal pains; and to ease him of these he hath many helps, but especially the treasure of the Church, which the Pope hath the dispensing of, as he is bound to believe; and by indulgence he may easily get off some thousands of years of purgatory pains; and if these should fail him, there is another help yet left, which is leaving a stock for prayers for his soul when he dies; which, even our author assures him, are very available towards his speedier release out of purgatory.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXVII.

We learn from Scripture that Popery, in its formation and its operation, is to be ascribed to the agency of Satan; and his object in the whole matter is, of course, to ruin men's souls. Accordingly, the whole scheme of Popery is so formed as to be fitted to deaden men's sense of moral responsibility, to lead them to neglect the salvation of their souls, or to persuade them to trust to false grounds of hope. The

doctrines of penance, purgatory, and extreme unction, have all an obvious and powerful tendency to lead men to trust to a death-bed repentance, without regard to the work of Christ as the only foundation of a sinner's hope, or to a radical change of nature as the only preparation for heaven. The sum and substance, indeed, of Popery is, that the Church or the priest undertakes for men's salvation, upon condition that they give themselves up as the abject slaves and tools of their spiritual superiors.

This vicarious responsibility of the Church or the priest for men's salvation is taught in De la Hogue's Treatises—which are the text-book at Maynooth College. In the "Reasons which Induced the Duke of Brunswick to Embrace the Roman Catholic Religion"—a work in general use among Papists, and highly recommended by Dr Milner—his concluding reason is stated in the following terms: "The Catholics, to whom I spoke concerning my conversion, assured me, that if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves—an assurance I could never extort from the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion."

CHAPTER XXVIII.

OF FASTING.

THE question here is, Whether a man doth not observe their Church's command about fasting, who forbears all forbidden things, but takes liberty in those which are not forbidden?

It is not, Whether they may not break the commands of God against gluttony and drunkenness? but, Whether they break the law of the Church about fasting? And notwithstanding what our author hath said, I see no reason for the affirmative. I do not deny—1. That it is a very indifferent sort of fasting, to abstain from flesh, unless all other sorts of excesses at the same time be carefully avoided. 2. That excesses on such days are more scandalous, because there is a pretence of fasting. 3. That God's command doth at all times forbid intemperance. Which are the chief things he insists upon. But yet this doth not reach the point, which is about their Church's command. For their casuists distinguish fasting into —1. Natural, which is total abstinence; and this is required only to receive the eucharist. 2. Moral, which is the same with temperance, or fasting for health. 3. Ecclesiastical, which is defined by them to be an abstinence from food forbidden by the Church. And if this definition be true, it cannot be broken but by eating what the Church hath prohibited.

And, therefore, their casuists, as far as I can find, are agreed in these things:—

1. That a man may eat a full meal of what is not forbidden, and not break the Church's precept of fasting, provided vespers be first said. And the later casuists blame Covarruvias for making any scruple about it. "If a man's excess comes to be a mortal sin, yet for all that," saith Reginaldus,* "he shall not be judged as a breaker of his fast." Nay, Lessius goes farther, and saith: "He doth not lose the merit of fasting."† "Quamvis aliquis multum excedat non solvit jejunium," saith Card. Tolet. And Paulus Zacchias saith: "This is the common opinion;"‡ and he thinks the intention of the Church is sufficiently answered. And so doth Pasqualigus in his Praxis of fasting.

2. A man may drink wine or other drink as often as he pleaseth, without breaking his fast. He may "toties quoties bibere," saith Diana. Zach. Pasqualigus, who hath written most fully on this subject, shows "that it is the general opinion, that no quantity of wine or other drink, though taken without any necessity, is a violation of the precept of fasting—no, not although the wine be taken for nourishment; because the Church doth not forbid it; but this last," he saith, "is not the general, but the more probable opinion."§

3. A man may eat something when he drinks, to prevent its doing him hurt—besides his good meal, he may take what quantity he pleases of sweatmeats or fruit—he may have a good refection at night; and yet not break this strict precept of fasting: "for the eating as often as one drinks, it is the common opinion," saith the same casuist (who was no Jesuit), "that it

* Reginald. Praxis, l. iv. c. 14, n. 163.
† Less. de Justit. l. iv. c. 2, Dub. 2, n. 10. Instruct. Sacerd. l. vi. c. 2, n. 4.
‡ P. Zacch. Qu. Medico. legales. l. v. tit. 1, Qu. 1, pp. 29-31.
§ Pasqual. Decis. 120, n. 5. Dian. Sam. v. Jejun. n. 7. Zach. Pasqualigi. Praxis Jejunii Eccles. Decis. 116, n. 3, Dec. 117, 1-3.

is not forbidden, because it is taken by way of a medicine;"* and he quotes a great number of their casuists for it. "A collation at evening is allowed,"† saith he. And Lessius saith: "There is no certain rule for the quantity of it."‡ And Card. Tolet saith: "Very large ones are allowed at Rome by the Pope's connivance;" § "even in the court of Rome," ‖ saith Reginaldus. And now I leave the reader to judge of the severity of fasting required in the Church of Rome.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXVIII.

Protestants recommend fasting just as it is recommended in the Sacred Scriptures. Papists regard it as being directly and immediately a part of divine worship, imperatively obligatory upon each individual on the occasions which the Church has determined, and possessed of a meritorious efficacy in the sight of God. Protestants regard it as no direct part of the worship of God, imperatively binding upon all, but merely as a useful auxiliary in the work of sanctification, to be practised by individuals according to their discretion, and with a due respect to their circumstances, capacities, and necessities.

Papists are in the habit of boasting much of the great holiness and self-denial exhibited by those of their communion in the practice of fasting. But, besides that fasting, when professedly practised as an act of direct worship, can be regarded only as will-worship, and therefore offensive to God, and that it is often made by Papists, as it was by the Pharisees of old, to serve as a substitute for the weightier matters of the law, it is certain, as Stillingfleet has satisfac-

* Decis. 119, n. 2.
† Decis. 86, n. 3, 4.
‡ Less. ubi sup. n. 11.
§ Tolet, ubi sup.
‖ Regin. ubi sup. n. 18.

torily proved, that in the principles commonly taught in their approved authors upon this point, there has been abundant provision made for lightening the hardships of fasting, and converting it, in the case of all who have the desire and the means, into an occasion for luxurious indulgence.

The Church of Rome claims the power of forbidding all her subjects to do any work on certain holidays, and to eat flesh at certain seasons, and on certain days of the week, under pain of damnation; which is a most odious and offensive exercise of tyranny over the consciences of men. And the absurdity of such prohibitions is strikingly exhibited in this respect, that the Church claims and exercises the power of increasing or diminishing these holidays and days of abstinence, according to her discretion. A few years ago, the Pope was graciously pleased to diminish the number of holidays to be observed by Papists in this country; and in virtue of his bull upon that occasion, what was previously sinful and deserving damnation, became immediately lawful.

See Calvin's Instit. lib. iv. c. 12, sect. 14–22; Willet's Synopsis Papismi, Cont. 19, part 5; Perkins' Reformed Catholic, sect. 12.

CHAPTER XXIX.

OF DIVISIONS AND SCHISMS IN THE CHURCH.

Two things he saith upon this head:—

1. "That they are all agreed in matters of faith."

2. "That they only differ in some school points;" from whence he infers, that they have no schisms or separations among them.

But that this is no just consequence, will appear by the schisms and separations among us, made by such who profess to agree in all matters of faith. Yet let us see how he proves that they agree in all matters of faith—because they agree to submit equally to the determinations of the Church.

Now, this very way evidently proves that they do not all agree, because they do not equally submit to the Church's determinations; for,

1. Some say they are bound to submit to the Church's determinations, as it represents the universal Church; others say no, but as the Church's power is virtually lodged in the guides of it. Now, this is a very material difference: for if it be on the former account, then not the Pope's and council's declarations are to be regarded, but as they express the sense of the universal Church; and so the majority of votes and numbers in the representative and diffusive Church is chiefly to be regarded. And on this ground some reject the deposing power, though plainly decreed by

Popes and councils; but they unhinge their Church's authority by it. Now, how is it possible for them to agree about matters of faith who differ fundamentally about the way how any things come to be matters of faith? If they be decreed by Popes and councils, say some; and so the deposing power is become an article of faith. No such matter, say others; for a greater number in the diffusive Church oppose it, as in the Gallican Church, and elsewhere. Very well! but how, then, can these parties be said to agree in matters of faith, and an equal submission to the determinations of the Church?

2. Some, again, say that it is not the consent of the present Church which can make any article of faith, but there must be an universal tradition from the apostles' times. And so they tell us the deposing power can never be an article of faith, because it wants the consent of all the ages before Gregory VII. So that, upon this ground, there can be no article of faith which cannot be proved to be thus delivered down to us. Others, again, say that this is in effect to give up their cause, knowing the impossibility of proving particular points in this manner; and, therefore, they say the present Church is wholly to be trusted for the sense of the foregoing.

Now, these differences are still on foot in their Church; and from these do arise daily disputes about matters of faith, and the seat of infallibility—whether in the guides or the body of the Church; if the former, whether in the Church representative or virtual; whether the personal infallibility of the Pope be a matter of faith or not. Our author saith, not; others say, yes; and yet he saith they are agreed in matters of faith. So that by his own confession they differ about other things than mere school points.

But suppose they were agreed in articles of faith, can there be no schisms or divisions in their Church? What thinks he of all the schisms between Popes and

Popes?—of all the schisms between the Popes' and the emperors' parties? which were as notorious, and scandalous, and mischievous, as ever were in the world. What thinks he of the schisms between the bishops and the regular orders, which were as cross and peevish towards the bishops and secular clergy as our Dissenters themselves? And among the regular orders, what heats and contentions have been, not about the practice of a devout life, I assure him, but about matters of doctrine, and which both parties severally plead to be matters of faith! as in the noted controversies of this last age, about the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, the power of grace, and the Pope's personal infallibility; and they cannot say they are as yet agreed about these things.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXIX.

There is nothing of which Papists boast more than of the unity which is alleged to prevail in their Church in matters of faith and practice. Indeed, they are in the habit of setting forth this unity as one of the marks of the true Church, and allege that it can apply only to the Church of Rome. But all learned men among them must be aware that this is a mere pretence, and that the differences in matters connected with religion among members of the Church of Rome are about as numerous and as important as those which prevail among Protestants; nay, that the subjects of controversy among Protestants and among Papists respect chiefly the same kinds of topics, namely, the decrees of God, grace and free will, and the external government of the Church. There is no difference of opinion among Protestants which, either theoretically or practically, can be regarded as so important as the controversy among Papists about the

seat of infallibility. The differences of opinion among Protestants may be explained in substantially the same way as Gother explains the disputes among Papists, namely, by distinguishing between matters of faith and points of scholastic disputation or of external order—in other words, between things fundamental and not fundamental. The great body of Protestants agree in all fundamental or necessary points of faith and practice, as must be well known to all who have ever perused the Confessions of the Reformed Churches. The only apparent exception to this position is the case of the Socinians or Unitarians, who certainly differ from the great body of Protestants on points of fundamental importance. But then it should be observed, 1*st*, That the great body of Protestants do not regard the Unitarians as entitled to the name of Christians; and, 2*d*, That it has been conclusively established, that there is a much closer resemblance between Unitarianism and Popery, than between Unitarianism and any of the leading divisions of the Protestant Churches. See Jameson's learned work, entitled "Roma Racoviana, et Racovia Romana."

While the differences of opinion among Papists are as numerous and important as among Protestants, the argument derived from the existence of these differences tells far more powerfully against Papists than Protestants, because the Church of Rome pretends to infallibility, and holds forth her alleged unity as a proof that she is the only true Church, and because all the differences among Papists exist in one Church, and are, therefore, fairly laid to the charge of that Church; whereas it is utterly unfair to represent the body of Protestants as if they were substantially one communion, like the Church of Rome, and to regard each section of the Protestant body as in any way responsible for all the differences of opinion to be found among the Protestant Churches. The Church of Rome, notwithstanding her claim to infallibility and

universal dominion, would refuse to bear the responsibility of all the differences of opinion and practice that prevailed among all the Churches of professing Christians (in Greece and the East) previous to the Reformation; and it would be much more unfair to lay upon the Church of England or the Church of Scotland the responsibility of all the differences that prevail among those who are ranked under the general name of Protestants.

Bishop Hall, in his "Serious Dissuasive from Popery," collected, under the title of "The Peace of Rome," from the works of two Popish authors, Bellarmine and Navarrus, proofs of the existence of three hundred controversies among Papists themselves, on important points of faith and practice.

See Barrow's Discourse on the Unity of the Church, and especially Edgar's Variations of Popery, a work of prodigious research, and one to which it is perfectly impossible for any Papist, though he combined in his own person all the talent and learning of the Church of Rome, to produce anything like a plausible answer. Blanco White's Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism, Let. 4.

CHAPTER XXX.

OF FRIARS AND NUNS.

Our dispute is not about the lawfulness of retiring from the world by such persons who are rendered unfit for doing service in it; and the more they spend their time in devotion and contemplation so much the better.

But it lies in these things:—

1. Whether the perfection of a Christian state of life lies in being cloistered up from the world, or labouring to do good in it? for this was the great snare made use of to draw men into it, because they represented this as the most perfect state; whereas, according to the doctrine and example of Christ and his apostles, the active life of doing good is far beyond it.

2. Whether, although such a retirement be allowed, it be a thing pleasing to God to tie such persons up by indispensable vows, whatever their circumstances may be, not to alter that state of life, who, either in youth, or through force, passion, or discontent, have entered into it? And this may be so much rather questioned, because those who assert the Pope may dispense, go upon this ground: Because circumstances may alter the obligation of a vow; and when a greater good is to be attained it ceaseth to oblige; which, to my apprehension, doth not prove the Pope's

power to dispense, but the dispensable nature of the vows themselves.

3. Whether all things of this nature being liable, in continuance of time, to great degeneracy and corruptions, and the numbers of such places being unserviceable either to Church or State, it be not in the power of the king and states of the kingdom to dissolve and reduce them to ways more suitable to the conveniences of both?

As to what he discourses about "councils of perfection, the distractions of the world, the corruptions of the best things," &c., they reach not the main points, but are only general topics, which we are not concerned to debate.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXX.

The original institution of monasteries and nunneries, into which men and women retired from the world, professing to devote themselves to religious exercises, was, perhaps, to be traced merely to superstition and to erroneous views of duty. Originally there were no vows connected with retiring into a convent; and the introduction and universal adoption in Popish countries, of the imposition of a solemn vow, to continue for life in the same profession and condition, was a sinful restraint upon Christian liberty, laid a fearful snare for men's consciences, and has proved the source of the most shocking corruptions and abuses. It has been thoroughly established, that monasteries and nunneries have, in all ages and countries where Popery prevailed, been cages of every unclean beast—the constant scenes of every crime and abomination which the depraved heart of man has contrived. They have not been surpassed in this respect even by the idolatrous and impure rites of the

ancient Pagans; and there is good reason to believe that nunneries have been chiefly encouraged and principally employed as brothels for the gratification of the licentious passions of priests, and of persons who had solemnly sworn to renounce the world and all its enjoyments. Blanco White, who knew well the state of nunneries in Spain, describes them as "European jungles, where lurks everything that is hideous and venomous."

On that memorable occasion (June, 1835) when a nunnery was opened in Edinburgh, the first in Scotland since the Reformation, Bishop Murdoch, in his sermon, had the audacity to declare: "That Scotland was once happy in her numerous monasteries and convents, from whence issued a sweet odour of virtue, that attracted multitudes around to the faithful service of the world's Creator!" and that "their ruins still point to heaven, and bid us think of the many faithful souls which they sent up to the mansions of everlasting bliss!" There were Protestants *liberal* enough to be present on that occasion, but not one of them surely could be ignorant enough to believe this.

It was discovered and thoroughly established at the time of the Reformation, that almost all these nunneries were habitually the scenes of enormities which could be paralleled only in the history of those cities which God burned up with fire from heaven, or of the nations of Canaan when their iniquity had reached its height. So it has been, and so it will always be, where Popery has the ascendency, and can safely manifest her tendencies. The Memoirs of Scipio Ricci, bishop of Pistoia, written by himself, furnish conclusive proof of the general prevalence of fearful enormities in the nunneries of Italy, in the latter part of last century, and of the unwillingness of the Court of Rome to make any attempt at reforming them. And in our own day it has been ascertained, that in the Popish convents in Canada and the

United States shocking immoralities are habitually practised.

If Bishop Murdoch's anticipations should be realized, and monastic institutions should increase in Scotland, there can be no doubt, from the experience of all past ages, that they will become nests of iniquity, moral nuisances, spreading pollution around them, and likely to call down the judgments of God upon our country. As it is a matter of certain historical truth, that convents and nunneries, wherever they have become general, and where Popery had the ascendency, have been the constant scenes of murder, and of other shocking crimes which human laws punish with death, there is at least fair ground for doubting whether they ought to be tolerated in a Protestant country. At any rate, no one who is acquainted with the history of monastic institutions, can contemplate a nunnery without feelings of the strongest disgust and abhorrence.

See Calvin's Instit. lib. iv. c. 13, sect. 8–21; Willet's Synopsis Papismi, Controv. 6; Gavin's Master Key to Popery; Blanco White's Evidences, let. 5; Reformers' Library, No. v. p. 2, c. 3, and p. 5, c. 2.

CHAPTER XXXI.

OF WICKED PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES.

THE misrepresenter charges the Church of Rome with many horrid practices—as the French and Irish massacres, the murders of two kings of France, the Holy League, the gunpowder treason, &c.; and charges these as being done according to the principles of that Church.

But in answer to this he saith: 1. "In general, that the doctrine of it is holy, teaching the love of God and our neighbour, and that none can be saved by faith alone," in which doctrine we heartily concur with them. 2. "That although many uncertain things pass for certain, and false for true, yet he cannot deny that all ranks and degrees of men have been corrupted among them, being scandalous in their lives, wicked in their designs, without the fear of God in their hearts, or care of their own salvation." This is a general acknowledgment, but no particular answer to the things objected. 3. "That the whole Church is not to be charged for the sake of such villanies." Very true, unless some doctrine owned in that Church gave encouragement to them: as suppose any should ever have fallen into rebellion upon the belief of the deposing power, is not that doctrine chargeable with the consequences of it? They are extremely to blame who charge a Church with what her members do in

direct opposition to her doctrine; but it is quite another case when the main ground they allege for their actions is some allowed principle in it. 4. "They are not accountable for the actions of every bishop, cardinal, or Pope; for they extend not their faith beyond the declaration of general councils." But suppose general councils have declared such doctrines, and Popes act but according to them, is not their Church then accountable for their actions? 5. "There is more praying, and fasting, and receiving the sacraments, more visiting the prisoners and the sick, more alms-giving, in any of our neighbouring Popish towns—as Paris, Antwerp, Ghent, &c.—than in any ten towns of the Reformation." And is there more charity too? It doth not appear, if they be as ready to censure others and admire themselves as our author, who so freely gives his judgment about a matter it is impossible for him to know.

We see no reason to admire or imitate the manner of their praying, and fasting, and receiving the sacraments; for to pray without understanding, to fast without abstinence, to receive a maimed sacrament, are things we do not envy them for; but, although our devotion be not so pompous and full of show, yet we may pray and fast in secret, according to our Saviour's directions, far more than they do. However, our people are mightily to blame if they do not understand what they pray for, if they do not receive more of the sacrament than they; and we verily believe, there are as great and remarkable instances of true charity among those of the Church of England as among any people in the world.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXXI.

It is well observed by Buddæus (Miscellanea Sacra, pt. i. p. 511), "that it would not be easy to decide

whether the severest wounds had been inflicted upon the Romish Church by those who, following Bellarmine, and its other champions, step by step, have refuted all their arguments, and demolished all their errors, or by those who, by narrating the history of Popery, have laid open to the eyes and minds of men the abominations of that Antichristian scheme, and the mysteries of its iniquity." It is plain that the history of the wicked principles which have been promulgated in the writings of Popish authors, and of the wicked practices which have been exhibited by the adherents of the Papacy, with a view to the promotion of its cause, afford a striking contrast to the holiness which the Church claims as her peculiar distinction, and establishes the propriety of applying to that system the strong language of Scripture, when it speaks of the Mystery of Iniquity, the Man of Sin, and the Son of Perdition! Not to speak of the abominations that have so extensively resulted from the celibacy of the clergy, the necessity of auricular confession, and the prevalence of monastic institutions, history shows that the one great practical rule which has ever guided the Church of Rome is, that every thing was lawful which seemed expedient at the time for promoting her purposes; and acting upon this principle, she has never scrupled to practise, to encourage, or to connive at, falsehood, perjury, treason, persecution, and murder, whenever these crimes seemed fitted at the time to advance her interests.

Papists are fond of dwelling upon the sins and shortcomings of those who may have contributed to effect the Reformation, and to advance the cause of Protestantism, not scrupling to invent or to exaggerate when necessary; and likewise upon every case in which irreligion or infidelity may have sprung up in any department of the Protestant Church. The first of these points has been laboured by Dr Milner in his Letters to a Prebendary, and in his End of Re-

ligious Controversy; and the second by Dr Doyle in the first appendix to his Reply to a Charge of Archbishop Magee. Mr Smith has also attempted something of the kind in his last note to Gother. Drs Milner and Doyle, at least, must have been well aware that it would be very easy to retort such charges with infinitely greater effect against the Church of Rome, by materials taken from the history of the Popes and their principal supporters, and from the state of religion and morality in those countries where the tendencies of Popery have been most fully developed. In particular, the direct and powerful tendency of Popery to produce infidelity could be easily established, both from argument and fact—both from reason and experience.

See Downam on Antichrist; Henry More's Mystery of Iniquity; Mornay's History of the Papacy; Parallel of the Doctrines of the Pagans with the Doctrine of the Jesuits, translated from the French by Whately, 1726, in which it is proved that the Jesuit authors have advanced infamous principles in regard to almost every department of duty, which had been denounced even by Heathen writers.

CHAPTER XXXII.

OF MIRACLES.

1. Our author saith: "He is not obliged to believe any one miracle besides what is in Scripture."

2. "He sees no reason to doubt the truth of many miracles, which are attested by great numbers of eye-witnesses, examined by authority, and found upon record, with all the formalities due to such a process."

Now, how can these two things stand together? Is not a man obliged to believe a thing so well proved? And if his other arguments prove anything, it is, that he is bound to believe them; for he thinks there is as much reason to believe miracles still, as in the time of the old or new law. If he can make this out, I see no reason why he should not be as well obliged to believe them now, as those recorded in Scripture. But I can see nothing like a proof of this. And all persons of judgment in their own Church, do grant there is a great difference between the necessity of miracles for the first establishing a religion, and afterwards. This is not only asserted by Tostatus, Erasmus, Stella, Andradius, and several others formerly, but the very late French author * I have several times mentioned saith it in express terms. And he confesses the great impostures of modern miracles, which he saith, "ought to be severely punished; and that

* Moyens Surs et Honestes, &c., tom. ii. p. 149.

none but women and weak people think themselves bound to believe them." And he cannot understand what they are good for: not to convert heretics, because not done among them—not to prove there are no corruptions or errors among themselves, which is a thing incredible; with much more to that purpose; and so concludes, with Monsieur Paschal, "that if they have no better use, we ought not to be amused with them."

"But Christ promised that his apostles should do greater miracles than himself had done." And what then? Must, therefore, St Francis, or St Dominic, or St Rosa, do as great as the apostles had done? What consequence can be drawn from the apostles' times to later ages? We do not dispute God's omnipotency, or say his hand is shortened; but we must not from thence infer, that everything which is called a miracle is truly so, or make use of God's power to justify the most incredible stories—which is a way will serve as well for a false as a true religion; and Mohammed might run to God's omnipotency for cleaving the moon in two pieces, as well as others for removing a house over the seas, or anything of a like nature.

But, he saith, "their miracles are not more ridiculous and absurd than some in the Old Testament;" which I utterly deny. But I shall not run out into the examination of this parallel, by showing how very different the nature, design, and authority of the miracles he mentions are from those which are believed in the Roman Church. And it had been but fitting, as he set down the miracles of the Old Testament, so to have mentioned those of the Roman Church which were to vie with them; but this he was willing to forbear, for certain good reasons. "If most of poor man's impossibles be none to God," as he concludes, yet everything is not presently true which is not impossible; and by this way of arguing

there can be nothing objected against the most absurd and idle fictions of the Golden Legend, which all men of understanding among themselves not only reject for want of authority, but of credibility.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXXII.

It is not alleged that Papists are bound to believe, as matters of faith, all the absurd and immoral stories of miracles to be found in the works of their approved authors; but there are three charges upon the subject of miracles which have been adduced and established against the Church of Rome:—1. That she still claims to herself the power of working miracles, and still pretends occasionally to exercise it. 2. That she has pledged herself to the truth of many miracles so contemptible in their nature and in their evidence, that no man of sound mind, who investigates the subject, can believe them, and which no educated Papist would pretend to believe, were it not that the infallible authority of the Church would be endangered by denying them. We allude especially to the stories of miracles recorded in the acts of the second Council of Nice, as proofs of the lawfulness of image-worship, and those which have been engrossed in the Roman Breviary, which forms the daily manual of the priesthood. (See Preface.) 3. That the immense body of contemptible and fraudulent legends of miracles, which, though not formally sanctioned by the Church, have been invented and propagated by her priests, and generally believed by her subjects, must be regarded as a fulfilment of the scriptural predictions with respect to the great apostasy, which is to be "after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders;" and that the invention and propagation of such a mass of lies is to be reckon-

ed an important and peculiar feature in the character of the Romish Church, a leading department in that marvellous system of fraud and falsehood which she has constantly employed for the accomplishment of her purposes.

Dr Milner, in his End of Controversy, published in 1817, declared (let. xxiii.), "that God has wrought many incontestable miracles in favour of the Catholic Church, and her doctrines and practices, from the age of the apostles down to the present age;" and at the same time he gravely records two cases of miraculous cures performed—one in 1805, and the other in 1809, —at St Winefrid's Well, and another of a similar description performed in 1814 by the hand of a priest who had been executed two hundred years ago. All have heard of the still more recent lying wonders of Prince Hohenlohe, which have been attested, promulgated, and boasted of, by the leading Popish authorities.

See Bishop Morton's Catholic Appeal for Protestants, b. iii. c. 17–19; Stillingfleet's Second Discourse in Vindication of the Grounds of the Protestant Faith, c. 3; Patrick's Devotions of the Church of Rome, p. 75; Grier's Reply to Milner's End of Controversy; Blanco White's Evidences, Let. 6.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

OF HOLY WATER.

THE misrepresenter charges him with approving superstitious uses of inanimate things, and attributing wonderful effects to them; as holy water, candles, oil, bread, &c. In answer, our author,

1. Declares: "That the Papist, truly represented, utterly disapproves all sorts of superstition." But if he had designed to have represented truly, he ought to have told us what he meant by superstition, and whether any man who observes the commands of the Church can be guilty of it.

2. He saith: "That these things are particularly deputed by the prayers and blessing of the priest to certain uses, for God's glory and the spiritual and corporal good of Christians."

This is somewhat too general; but Marsilius Columna, archbishop of Salerno, who hath taken most pains in this matter, sums them up:—

"1. As to spiritual, they are seven:—(1.) To fright devils. (2.) To remit venial sins. (3.) To cure distractions. (4.) To elevate the mind. (5.) To dispose it for devotion. (6.) To obtain grace. (7.) To prepare for the sacrament.

"2. As to corporal:—(1.) To cure barrenness. (2.) To multiply goods. (3.) To procure health. (4.) To purge the air from pestilential vapours."*

* Hydragiolog., sect. 3, chap. 2-12, p. 45.

And now, as our author saith, "What superstition in the use of it!" He names several things of God's own appointing to parallel it; as the waters of jealousy, the shew-bread, the tables of stone; but the first was miraculous, the other had no such effects that we ever heard of. Elisha's salt for sweetening the water was undoubtedly a miracle. Is the holy water so? As to the liver of the fish for expelling the devil, in the Book of Tobit, he knows that book is not owned for canonical by us; and this very place is produced as an argument against it; there being no ground from Scripture to attribute the power of expelling devils to the liver of a fish, either naturally or symbolically. Vallesius* offers as the only probable account of it, that it must be a divine power given to it, which the angel Raphael did not discover; and yet it is somewhat hard to conceive how this liver should have such power to drive away any kind of devil, as it is there expressed, unless by a devil there no more be meant than some violent disease, which the Jews generally believed to arise from the possession of evil spirits. But, however, here is an angel supposed, who made this known to Tobit; but we find not Raphael to discover the virtue of holy water against devils. As to Christ using clay to open the eyes of the blind, it is very improperly applied, unless the same miraculous power be supposed in it which was in Christ himself; and so is the apostle's laying on of hands, and using oil for miraculous cures, unless the same gift of miracles be in every priest who consecrates holy water which was in the apostles; and Bellarmine himself confesses, "that no infallible effect doth follow the use of holy water, because there is no promise of God in the case, but only the prayers of the Church."† "But these are sufficient to sanctify the water," saith our author. And to what end? For

* Valles. Sacr. Philosoph., chap. 28, p. 229.
† De Cultu Sanct., lib. iii. chap. 7.

all the spiritual and corporeal benefits before mentioned? Is no promise of God necessary for such purposes as those? How can any Church in the world dispose of God's power without his will? It may appoint significant and decent ceremonies, but it can never appropriate divine effects to them; and to suppose any divine power in things which God never gave them is, in my opinion, superstitious; and to use them for such ends is a superstitious use. St Cyril, whom he quotes, speaks of the consecration of the water of baptism (Catech. 3); St Augustine only of a consecrated bread which the catechumens had (De Peccat. Merit. et Remiss. lib. ii. cap. 26), but he attributes no divine effects to it. Pope Alexander's Epistle is a notorious counterfeit. Those passages of Epiphanius, Theodoret, and St Jerome, all speak of miraculous effects; and those who had the power of miracles, might sometimes do them with an external sign, and sometimes without, as the apostles cured with anointing and without. But this is no ground for consecrating oil by the Church, or holy water, for miraculous effects. If these effects which they attribute to holy water be miraculous, then every priest must have not only a power of miracles himself, but of annexing it to the water he consecrates; if they be supernatural, but not miraculous, then holy water must be made a sacrament to produce these effects *ex opere operato;* if neither one nor the other, I know not how to excuse the use of it from superstition.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXXIII.

Gother's arguments or testimonies on the subject of holy water, derived from the Book of Tobit, St Augustine, and the forged Epistle of Pope Alexander, which are here exposed by Stillingfleet, were omitted

by Challoner, and do not, of course, appear in modern editions. There is not a vestige of ground from Scripture, reason, or experience, for expecting any benefit whatever from the use of holy water, far less such benefits as the poor deluded victims of Popery are taught to expect from it; and, therefore, the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome upon this subject are to be regarded as characterized at once by sinful superstition and shameful imposture.

The use of holy water, like many other Popish ceremonies, was borrowed from Paganism. See Middleton's Letter from Rome, pp. 136–143, and preface to the fourth edition, pp. 12–20.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

OF BREEDING UP PEOPLE IN IGNORANCE.

THE misrepresenter charges them with this, on these accounts:—1. By keeping their mysteries of iniquity from them. 2. By performing divine service in an unknown tongue. 3. By an implicit faith. To which the representer answers:—1. That they give encouragement to learning; and he instances in their universities and conventual libraries; but what is all this to the common people? But their *Indices Expurgatorii*, and prohibiting books so severely which are not for their turn (as we have lately seen in the new one of Paris), argues no great confidence of their cause, nor any hearty love to learning. And if it could be rooted out of the world, their Church would fare the better in it; but if it cannot, they must have some to be able to deal with others in it. 2. As to the common people, he saith: "They have books enough to instruct them." Is it so in Spain or Italy? But where they live among heretics, as we are called, the people must be a little better instructed to defend themselves, and to gain upon others. 3. "If the people did know their Church offices and service, &c., they would not find such faults, since the learned approve them." Let them try the experiment, and put the Bible and their Church offices everywhere into the vulgar tongues; but their severe prohibitions

show how much they are of another opinion. What made all that rage in France against Voisin's translation of the Missal?—such proceedings of the assembly of the clergy against it?—such complaints both to the king and the Pope against it, as though all were lost if that were suffered?—such an edict from the king?—such a prohibition from the Pope, in such a tragical style, about it?—such a collection of authors to be printed on purpose against it? * Do these things show, even in a nation of so free a temper, in comparison, as the French, any mighty inclination towards the encouraging this knowledge in the people? And since that, what stirs have there been about the Mons Testament! What prohibitions by bishops!—besides a bull from this very Pope against it. What vehement opposition by others!—so that many volumes have already been written on the occasion of that translation. And yet our author would persuade us, "that if we look abroad, we shall find wonderful care taken to keep the people from ignorance;" but we can discern much greater to keep them in it.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXXIV.

The charge usually adduced against the Church of Rome of breeding up the people in ignorance, is not to be answered or evaded by producing lists of distinguished authors in various branches of literature and science who have belonged to that communion, or by enlarging upon the zeal of the Church in former ages in establishing universities. All this is quite irrelevant, having nothing to do with the question of the interest exhibited by the Church in the instruction of the mass of the community, and the extent to

* Collectio Authorum Vulg. Versionem damnantium, Jussu ac Mandato Cleri Gallicani edita. Lutet.—Paris, 1661.

which, with her countenance, that instruction was actually carried.

The truth of the charge may be proved by a reference to their doctrine of implicit faith—their well-known maxim, that ignorance is the mother of devotion—their opposition to the general use and free circulation of the Sacred Scriptures—the practice of having the public service of the Church in a language unknown to the body of the people—the ten rules concerning prohibited books, prepared by authority of the Council of Trent, and established by Pope Pius IV.—and the Indexes Prohibitory and Expurgatory, which have been ever since issued from time to time by the Papal authorities.

The whole history of the Church of Rome proves that she is desirous, *as much as possible*, to breed up the people in ignorance. This might be illustrated by a reference to such facts as these: That gross and universal ignorance prevailed over Christendom during the middle ages, when the Church of Rome had complete dominion, was at full liberty to develop her tendencies and to accomplish her purposes, and might have done anything she chose for promoting the instruction and forming the character of the people; that there was a close connection between the Reformation and the revival of letters; that even at the present day the grossest ignorance prevails, not only among the people, but the priests, in those countries (such as Italy and Spain) where Popery has the complete ascendency; and that in other countries where Popery and Protestantism come into contact, the Church of Rome has invariably made it her object to convey to her subjects only as much instruction as might be necessary or expedient for preserving them under the bondage of her own system, and has never encouraged the education and instruction of the community, unless when, and except in so far as, the circumstances of the case seemed to show that it

was probably the least of two evils, with a view to her own interest, to do so.

Mr Smith, in his note on the corresponding chapter of Gother, boasts that "the avidity with which the priesthood of the Irish people are seconding the efforts of Government to promote the cause of education among their flocks, will form a standing refutation of the calumny, that the clergy of the Catholic Church wish to keep the people in ignorance." Their conduct, however, in regard to education in Ireland, only proves that they will do nothing for the instruction of the people until they are forced to do it; that is, until they see that, in the circumstances of the case, it is the least of two evils, and that they can contrive to make it available for the accomplishment of their purposes. It is notorious, that the Popish priesthood in Ireland were doing nothing to promote the general education of the people until, in the early part of this century, benevolent Protestants formed associations and commenced exertions with that view. There was so strong a desire for education on the part of the people, that the priesthood soon saw that it would not be safe or expedient openly and decidedly to resist the attempt to introduce it. Under the influence of this feeling, some of them even countenanced for a time the Kildare Street schools, which had long the assistance of a Government grant, and were conducted upon the principle of excluding all attempts at proselytizing, while at the same time the Scriptures were regularly read in them without note or comment. But they soon began to see that the reading of the Scriptures in the schools would certainly prove injurious to the cause of Popery. In 1820, the Pope published a bull, forbidding the use in Catholic schools of the New Testament, even with note and comment, and even though the Catholics wished it to be used. On these accounts, the Papists, after making an unsuccessful attempt to persuade the Kildare Street

Society to abandon the practice of enforcing the reading of the Scriptures, gave up all connection with it, denounced it as a scheme for proselytizing, and at the same time (in 1820), contrived and propounded a scheme of education, substantially the same as that which has now been put in operation in Ireland. For proof of these important facts, see the documents quoted in M'Gavin's Protestant, Nos. 95–98, published in May, 1820, vol. ii., pp. 359–382. The Scriptural schools, notwithstanding all the exertions and denunciations of the Popish priests, continued to flourish and to be attended by increasing numbers of Papists. Their success was so great, and their prospect of increasing success so encouraging, that two of the Commissioners on Irish Education declared, in 1827, that nothing was likely to interfere with their progress except some interposition on the part of the Government. At length, in an evil hour, and in avowed concession to Popish principles and Popish influence, the Government did interpose, and the present system of national education was introduced into Ireland. It is no wonder, then, that Popish priests are doing what they can to promote the success of the present system of national education in Ireland, *since it was plain that they could not prevent the spread of education in some shape or other, and since this scheme had been contrived by themselves for the express and avowed purpose of superseding and counteracting the far greater evil of scriptural education.*

See Mendham's Literary Policy of Rome; Blanco White's Evidences against Catholicism, Let. 6; Reformers' Library, No. 5, part v., chap. 1; Rev. J. G. Lorimer's Lecture, entitled "Popery the Enemy of Knowledge," being No. 7 of the admirable Series of Lectures on Popery, delivered in Glasgow at the request of the Protestant Association; Mr J. E. Gordon's admirable Letters to Mr (now Lord) Stanley, on Irish Education.

CHAPTER XXXV.

OF THE UNCHARITABLENESS OF THE PAPISTS.

THE misrepresenter (as he is called) charges this point home, "because they deny salvation to those who believe all the articles of the Christian faith in the Apostles' Creed, and lead virtuous and good lives, if they be not of their communion."

To this the representer answers in plain terms: "That this is nothing but what they have learnt from the mouth of Christ and his apostles." And to this end he musters up all their sayings against infidels, false apostles, Gnosticks, Cerinthians, as though they were point blank levelled against all that live out of the communion of the Church of Rome.

But "this is no uncharitableness, but pure zeal, and the same as the primitive Church showed against heretics, such as Marcion, Basilides, and Bardesanes, who were condemned in the first age for denying the resurrection of the dead," &c. What, in the first age! Methinks the second had been early enough for them; but this is to let us see what learning there is among you. But do we deny the resurrection of the dead? or hold any one of the heresies condemned by the primitive Church? What, then, is our fault which can merit so severe a sentence? "We oppose the Church:" What Church? The primitive apostolical Church? The Church in the time of the four gene-

ral councils? I do not think that will be said, but I am sure it can never be proved. What Church, then? The present Church? Is it, then, damnable to oppose the present Church? But, I pray, let us know what you mean by it: The universal body of Christians in the world? No, no, abundance of them are heretics and schismatics as well as we—*i. e.*, all the Christians in the eastern and southern parts, who are not in communion with the Church of Rome; so that two parts in three of Christians are sent to hell by this principle; and yet it is no uncharitableness. But suppose the Church of Rome be the only true Church, must men be damned presently for opposing its doctrines? I pray, think a little better on it, and you will change your minds. Suppose a man do not submit to the guides of this Church in a matter of doctrine declared by them, must he be damned? What if it be the deposing power? Yet his principle is, if a man do not hold the faith entire, he is gone. But Popes and councils have declared this to be a point of faith; therefore, if he doth not hold it, he must be damned. There is no way of answering this, but he must abate the severity of his sentence against us. For, upon the same reason, he questions that we may question many more. And all his arguments against us will hold against himself; "for," saith he, "he that disbelieves one article of Catholic faith, does, in a manner, disbelieve all." Let him, therefore, look to it as well as we. But he endeavours to prove the Roman Catholic Church to be the true Church, by the ordinary notes and marks of the Church. Although he is far enough from doing it, yet this will not do his business; for he must prove that we are convinced that it is the true Church; and then, indeed, he may charge us with obstinate opposition, but not before. And it is a strange thing to me, that when their divines say that Infidels shall not be damned for their Infidelity where the Gospel hath

not been sufficiently proposed to them, and no Christian for not believing any article of faith till it be so proposed, that we must be damned for not believing the articles of the Roman faith, which never have been, and never can be, sufficiently proposed to us. Methinks such men should study a little better their own doctrine about the sufficient proposal of matters of faith before they pass such uncharitable and unlearned censures.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXXV.

Papists in modern times, and especially in our own day, when it has been thought expedient that Popery should assume the garb of liberalism, have attempted to escape from the odium of the offensive doctrine, that none can be saved out of the communion of the Church of Rome. It can be incontrovertibly established, that the doctrine of exclusive salvation is taught by the Church of Rome; and there is, perhaps, no one of the points in regard to which they have attempted to deceive Protestants, where they have greater difficulty in giving plausibility to their statements than when they attempt to escape from the odium of holding such a tenet.

In 1793, it was proposed to introduce into the oath required of Papists, by the bill of that year, an abjuration of this doctrine of exclusive salvation; but the Popish hierarchy in Ireland refused to sanction the proposed abjuration, as inconsistent with the doctrines of their Church.

The British and Irish Popish bishops, in their Declarations in 1826, consider the charge usually brought against the Romish Church of holding the doctrine of exclusive salvation; and while they make several

shuffling Jesuitical statements, plainly intended to lead unsuspecting Protestants to believe that they did abjure it, they do not, in point of fact, disclaim the doctrine in the sense in which they knew well that it is understood by the objectors.

We recommend the study of the two Declarations upon this point as a curious specimen of Jesuitical fraud.

But while the bishops did not dare to abjure the doctrine of exclusive salvation, although they write as if they wished to have the credit of doing so, yet not a few Popish writers have fairly attempted to rescue their Church from the odium of holding so offensive a tenet; and it may, therefore, be proper to refer briefly to the proof that the doctrine in question is really chargeable upon the Church of Rome.

It is notorious that in all ages Papists have been in the habit of employing an argument against Protestants to this effect: All Protestants acknowledge that salvation is possible, and that some men are actually saved, in the Church of Rome; Papists deny that men can be saved who die Protestants; and, therefore, it is safer to be in communion with the Church of Rome, where, as both parties admit, salvation is quite possible. This has been at all times a favourite argument with Papists; and the use of it proves, out of their own mouths, that they hold the doctrine of exclusive salvation, and that Protestants do not. This argument was employed by Bishop Challoner in his "Reasons why a Roman Catholic cannot conform to the Protestant Religion," and by Bishop Milner in the conclusion of his "End of Religious Controversy," published in 1817.

A decree was published by Pope Boniface VIII., and never dissented from, in these words: "We declare, assert, define, and pronounce, that it is necessary to salvation for every human being to be subject to the Pope of Rome." This declaration was after-

wards embodied in a decree of the third Lateran Council, which is regarded by Papists as infallible. Every Popish priest, at his ordination, swears to maintain and promote "this Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved" (*extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*).

"This Catholic faith," of course, comprehends the whole of the creed of Pope Pius IV., to which the declaration is subjoined. There is no possibility of explaining away the meaning of it; and we are entitled to regard every Popish priest as sworn to the belief that no man can be saved unless he believe in all the articles of Pope Pius' Creed, which contains an explicit statement of the leading peculiarities of Popery. De la Hogue, in the Maynooth text-book de Ecclesia, says expressly, that "it is most certain that schismatics and heretics do not belong to the Church, and are out of the way of salvation."

And this doctrine, indeed, is taught in almost all Popish catechisms, under the head of the unity of the Church; so that Dr Troy, the late archbishop of Dublin, declared in his Pastoral Instruction, published in 1793: "Catholics, however divided on the question of Papal infallibility, are unanimous in asserting the doctrine of exclusive salvation in the one true faith and Church;" and Dr Doyle, in his examination before Parliament in 1825, admitted that this doctrine is generally taught by the Popish priests in Ireland.

There can be no doubt, then, that the doctrine of exclusive salvation, within her own communion, is taught by the Church of Rome, and solemnly sworn to by all her priests; and, therefore, whenever a Popish priest pretends to address us poor heretics as "beloved fellow-Christians," which is not unfrequently done in these liberal days, he should be told, with all plainness, that such language in his mouth can be regarded only as a proof of hypocrisy and fraud, and

that before he is entitled to use it he must renounce his ordination vow, to which it is directly opposed.

Some Popish divines have attempted to modify this offensive doctrine by introducing an exception from the sweeping destruction in which it involves all schismatics and heretics, namely, the case of what they call "invincible ignorance." Thus Dr Milner, in the conclusion of his "End of Controversy," says, "that no divine of the Catholic Church, consistently with her characteristical unity, and the constant doctrine of the holy fathers, and of the Scripture itself, can allow that salvation is to be found out of this communion, except in the case of invincible ignorance."

Now, upon this exception of "invincible ignorance," we observe—

1. That there is no such exception in the decree of Boniface and the Lateran Council, or in the ordination vow of Popish priests; and, therefore, it is wholly unwarranted.

2. That the nature and extent of this exception cannot be very clearly understood, or very distinctly described, and that Papists can thus make it as wide or as narrow as they find it convenient.

3. That this exception of "invincible ignorance," *as usually explained*, is not sufficient to admit of the possibility of the salvation of almost any Protestant in this country. In the "Protestant's Trial by the Written Word," of which an edition was published in 1832, with the express and formal approbation of Dr Kyle, Vicar-Apostolic of the Northern District of Scotland, this matter of invincible ignorance is thus explained (p. 198):—

"But may not invincible ignorance excuse many from the guilt of heresy and schism, who are engaged in it through mere mistake and a wrong education, and are in no capacity of undeceiving themselves? I answer, that if any such there are among sectaries

who are absolutely idiots—who scarce have sense or education enough to know there are any other pastors or Church but their own, and pretend not to pass their judgment at all upon other religions for want of capacity to do it, and, indeed, are in no capacity of knowing anything about religion but what their own pastor pleases to teach them, having no learning to examine into such matters—*such*, by their invincible ignorance, may escape the guilt of heresy and schism, because their infidelity is purely negative, and God will not impute it to those who *have not the power to avoid it*. Now, whether such invincible ignorance is to be found in those parts of the world where the true Church is ever visible, I leave others to determine; certain it is, that gentlemen and gentlewomen who have had a liberal education, as also tradesmen and others who are in a capacity of being better informed, and know well enough where that spiritual authority is to which they owe their subjection, are not comprehended in this case with idiots."

Gother, in like manner, exempts from the sentence of damnation which the Church of Rome pronounces upon all who are out of her communion, only those whose being out of it "is owing purely to their being deprived of the means of knowing the truth, which they would gladly embrace if they knew it."

And with these explanations, this exception of "invincible ignorance" is not fitted to afford Protestants any great comfort.

But Papists, conscious that they cannot answer the conclusive proof that the Church of Rome holds the doctrine of exclusive salvation within her own communion, sometimes attempt to retaliate, and to show that Protestant Churches hold this as well as they. Mr Smith has attempted this in his note, and has produced, with that view, extracts from the standards of several Protestant Churches, including those of England and Scotland. This attempt involves a mis-

representation of the doctrines of Protestants too gross to be made honestly by any Papist of learning. The allegation is in flat contradiction to the argument formerly quoted, as used by Papists in all ages, founded upon the fact that Protestants admit that men may be saved in the Church of Rome, while Papists deny that any can be saved out of it. All distinguished Protestant writers admit that men may be saved in the Church of Rome, even while they hold that Popery, in its own nature, and where its principles are fully imbibed and acted upon, is not only injurious but ruinous to men's souls.*

The statements usually quoted from the Confessions of Protestant Churches, to show that they hold the doctrine of exclusive salvation, merely set forth the great scriptural principle, that there is no salvation except through Christ; that men cannot be saved without the knowledge of him, and an interest in him; or, what is substantially the same thing, that, as the Westminster Confession says: "Out of his visible Church there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." They hold that different Churches, which may differ somewhat from each other in minor matters, may be component parts of this one visible Church. Papists think this opinion erroneous; but still Protestants sincerely hold it, and it is obviously inconsistent with the doctrine of exclusive salvation. Indeed, there does not seem to be any medium between this Protestant principle, that the true Church may subsist in different communions, somewhat distinguished

* Mr Smith, in his note, quotes an extract from a newspaper of this city, in which the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee is charged with "denying that Catholics have any claim to a common Christianity, and consigning them at once, and without exception, to perdition." It is scarcely necessary to say that this is a slander, and that Mr M'Ghee never said anything to warrant the allegation that he consigned all Papists, without exception, to perdition. No one who forms his views of men and things from the Sacred Scriptures, and has had any opportunity of knowing Mr M'Ghee, can entertain a doubt that, though unpolluted by that spurious and Antichristian charity about which the most infidel and unprincipled portion of the legislators and journalists of the present day are so much in the habit of canting, his heart is filled, and his conduct is regulated, in no ordinary degree, by that love which is the fulfilling of the law.

from each other in minor points of belief and practice, and the Popish tenet of exclusive salvation in their own communion. The difference between Protestants and Papists on this subject is broad and palpable. Papists substitute the Church of Rome for the Church of Christ, and the Pope for the Saviour of sinners; and apply to the Pope and to his Church what Protestants and the Sacred Scriptures apply to Christ and to his Church. Protestants maintain that there is no ordinary possibility of salvation out of the visible Church of Christ; Papists, that there is no ordinary possibility of salvation out of the Church of Rome. Protestants hold that there is no other name given under heaven whereby men can be saved, but that of Jesus only; Papists, that no man can be saved unless he be subject to the authority of a fellow-sinner who has assumed the title of Christ's Vicar.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

OF CEREMONIES AND ORDINANCES.

His discourse on this head is against those who refuse to obey their superiors in things not expressed in Scripture, which is no part of our controversy with them. But yet there are several things about their ceremonies we are not satisfied in; as—1. The mighty number of them, which have so much muffled up the sacraments, that their true face cannot be discerned. 2. The efficacy attributed to them, without any promise from God; whereas we own no more but decency and significancy. 3. The doctrine that goes along with them, not only of obedience, but of merit; and some have asserted the *opus operatum* of ceremonies as well as sacraments, when the power of the keys goes along with them; *i. e.*, when there hath been some act of the Church exercised about the matter of them; as in the consecration of oil, salt, bread, ashes, water, &c.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXXVI.

Gother's chapter on ceremonies and ordinances was omitted by Challoner, and is not found in modern editions. In addition to Stillingfleet's observations on this subject, we would merely insert, from the

original edition of Gother, what he calls the misrepresentation of Popery on this point, but which can be proved to be, in all respects, a correct account of it:—"His Church, upon the presumption of being apostolical and commissioned by Christ, has brought in such an infinite number of unnecessary superstitions and ceremonies, that the whole exercise of her religion consists in nothing but a vain pomp and empty show. And whereas Christians are commanded by the apostle to serve the Lord in spirit and truth, she has made void this precept; and, neglecting both spirit and truth, has restored the heavy yoke of Jewish rites without the least authority of the Word of God; but rather, in express opposition to it, has made these her human inventions take place of the divine law. And, then, besides her ceremonies, what an endless amount is there of other ordinances, institutions, precepts, to which she obliges all in her communion! How many are her fast-days—Rogation and Ember-days! How many her festival and holidays! How many her injunctions on several degrees of people!—that priests shall not marry—that whosoever is in orders shall be obliged to the reciting or singing such and such offices—that marriage shall not be permitted but at some set times; and a multitude of other such respective commands, which have no grounds in Scripture, and no other authority for them besides the decrees of some Popes, who, for some private ends, and the making themselves great, thought fit to lay these burdens upon the people—some being first instituted by Pope Telesphorus, as the Fast of Lent; some by Pope Calixtus, as the Ember-days; some by Pope Nicholas, as the prohibition of marriage; and so all the rest. And yet, forsooth, all these must be observed under pain of eternal damnation, as if God and the Pope commanding were but all one, and had heaven and hell equally at their disposal."

CHAPTER XXXVII.

OF INNOVATIONS IN MATTERS OF FAITH.

THE substance of his discourse on this head may be reduced to these things:—1. That the Church in every age hath power to declare what is necessary to be believed, with anathema to those who preach the contrary; and so the Council of Trent, in declaring transubstantiation, purgatory, &c., to be necessary articles, did no more than the Church had done before on like occasions. 2. That if the doctrines then defined had been innovations, they must have met with great opposition when they were introduced. 3. That those who charged those points to be innovations might as well have laid the scandal on any other article of faith which they retained.

These are things necessary to be examined, in order to the making good the charge of innovation in matters of faith, which, we believe, doth stand on very good grounds.

1. We are to consider whether the Council of Trent had equal reason to define the necessity of these points, as the Council of Nice and Constantinople had to determine the point of the Trinity, or those of Ephesus and Chalcedon the truth of Christ's incarnation. He doth not assert it to be in the Church's power to make new articles of faith, as they do imply new doctrines revealed, but he contends

earnestly that the Church hath a power to declare the necessity of believing some points which were not so declared before. And if the necessity of believing doth depend upon the Church's declaration, then he must assert that it is in the Church's power to make points necessary to be believed which were not so, and, consequently, to make common opinions to become articles of faith. But I hope we may have leave to inquire in this case, since the Church pretends to no new revelation of matters of doctrine; therefore, it can declare no more than it receives, and no otherwise than it receives. And so nothing can be made necessary to salvation but what God himself hath made so by his revelation. So that they must go, in their declaration, either upon Scripture or universal tradition; but if they define any doctrine to be necessary without these grounds, they exceed their commission, and there is no reason to submit to their decrees, or to believe their declarations. To make this more plain by a known instance: It is most certain that several Popes and councils have declared the deposing doctrine, and yet our author saith: "It is no article of faith with him." Why not, since the Popes and councils have as evidently delivered it as the Council of Trent hath done purgatory or transubstantiation? But he may say there is no anathema joined to it. Suppose there be not; but why may it not be, as well as in the other cases? And if it were, I would know whether, in his conscience, he would then believe it to be a necessary article of faith, though he believed that it wanted Scripture and tradition? If not, then he sees what this matter is brought to, namely, that although the Council of Trent declare these new doctrines to be necessary to be believed, yet, if their declaration be not built on Scripture and universal tradition, we are not bound to receive it.

2. "As to the impossibility of innovations coming

in without notorious opposition," I see no ground at all for it, where the alteration is not made at once, but proceeds gradually. He may as well prove it impossible for a man to fall into a dropsy or hectic fever, unless he can tell the punctual time when it began. And he may as well argue thus: Such a man fell into a fever upon a great debauch, and the physicians were presently sent for to advise about him; therefore, the other man hath no chronical distemper, because he had no physicians when he was first sick;—as, Because councils were called against some heresies, and great opposition made to them, therefore, where there is not the like, there can be no innovation. But I see no reason why we should decline giving an account by what degrees and steps, and upon what occasions, and with what opposition, several of the doctrines defined at Trent were brought in; for the matter is not so obscure as you would make it, as to most of the points in difference between us; but that is too large a task to be here undertaken.

3. There is no colour for calling in question the articles of faith received by us on the same grounds that we reject those defined by the Council of Trent; for we have the universal consent of the Christian world for the Apostles' Creed, and of the four general councils for the doctrines of the Trinity and the incarnation, who never pretended to determine any point to be necessary which was not revealed in Scripture —whose sense was delivered down by the testimony of the Christian Church from the apostles' times. But the Council of Trent proceeded by a very different rule; for it first set up an unwritten word to be a rule of faith, as well as the written, which, although it were necessary in order to their decrees, was one of the greatest innovations in the world, and the foundation of all the rest, as they were there established.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XXXVII.

Papists are in the habit of setting forth, as the marks of the true Church, the qualities of unity, sanctity, apostolicity, and catholicity, and alleging that these marks can apply only to the Church of Rome. We have already had occasion to expose their pretensions to unity and sanctity, and this chapter leads us to advert to their claims to the other two marks. Papists constantly assert that all their articles of faith were taught by the apostles, and have ever since been professed and maintained by the great body of the Christian Church. The best, and, indeed, the only authentic, evidence of what the apostles taught, is to be found in their own writings; and these writings satisfactorily prove that the apostles were decidedly opposed to all the leading peculiarities of Popery. Protestants have, moreover, asserted and proved that the chief peculiarities of Popery derive little or no countenance from the writings of the fathers who flourished for several centuries after the Christian era, but were innovations introduced, gradually and successively, at later periods. Bishop Jewel, in his famous sermon at Paul's Cross, enumerated twenty-seven of the leading doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, and pledged himself to become a Papist if they could produce "any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor, or father, or general council, or Holy Scripture, or any one example in the primitive Church, whereby it might be clearly and plainly proved that any of them was taught during the first six hundred years." The challenge was accepted by Harding; but Jewel, in his Defence, showed that he had failed in his attempt to produce sufficient authorities and proofs.

When Bossuet, in expressing his admiration of one of the works of Bishop Bull, stated also his surprise

that one who was so thoroughly versant in the writings of antiquity, and who had so much respect for its authority, should continue out of the communion of the Catholic Church, Bull, in reply, undertook to prove, and did prove, "that the Church of Rome hath quite altered the primitive ecclesiastical government, the primitive canon or rule of faith (system of doctrines), and miserably corrupted the primitive liturgy, or form of divine worship!" Papists have plainly manifested their consciousness of the impossibility of proving that the peculiarities of Popery were generally held during the first centuries, by the extensive series of forgeries and interpolations which they have executed in regard to the writings of the fathers (see Preface); and yet all of them continually boast that their Church is apostolical—that all her doctrines were taught by the apostles, and have been ever since generally professed in the Church. No historical truth has been more completely demonstrated, than that the leading peculiarities of Popery were no part of the faith of the Church during several of the first centuries of its existence, but were the inventions of later periods; and that some of them were not authoritatively promulgated, even in the Romish Church, until the Council of Trent. It should be observed, however, that the investigation of the alleged apostolicity of the Romish Church, or the determination as to whether or not the present creed of the Church of Rome has been handed down without change from the time of the apostles, involves inquiries and researches much more lengthened, laborious, and intricate, and much more beyond the sphere of the great body of mankind, than are necessary for deciding the simple question, whether the present creed of the Romish Church corresponds with the doctrine of the apostles, as exhibited in their own writings. The Greek Church has at least as good a claim to apostolical succession, and to everything com-

monly adduced as a proof of conformity to apostolical appointment, as the Church of Rome; and yet she is opposed to some of the leading peculiarities of Popery, while she cannot be proved from Scripture, or any other standard, to be more guilty of deviation from the primitive faith and practice than the Church of Rome is.

It has been proved, that of the whole body of professing Christians scattered over the world at the period immediately preceding the Reformation, a large proportion held views decidedly opposed to many of the doctrines that were soon after established in the Council of Trent.

It has been likewise conclusively demonstrated, that the Christianity which was originally introduced into Great Britain and Ireland, was materially different from the modern Popery of the Council of Trent; nay, more, that the religion of Pope Gregory the Great, and of Augustine the monk, whom that Pope sent over to Britain in the beginning of the seventh century, and whose exertions contributed to the propagation of Christianity in this country, held, and of course promulgated, doctrines on some important points, differing materially from those of the modern Church of Rome.

The Mystery of Iniquity, indeed, began to work in the days of the apostles, but Popery, in all its systematic completeness, and in all its ruinous tendencies, was not fully formed till many centuries afterwards; and as its formation and development were subsequent to the general propagation of Christianity, so we know from the Word of God that its destruction will precede and usher in "the glory of the latter days."

See Bishop Jewel's Defence of his Challenge and Apology against Harding; Fulke's Confutation of the Notes to the Rhemish Testament; Archbishop Usher's Answer to a Jesuit, and his Treatises on the Origin

and Antiquity of the British Churches; Bishop Morton's Catholic Appeal for Protestants; Pagitt's Christianography, or a Description of the Multitude and Sundry Sorts of Christians in the World not subject to the Pope; Stillingfleet's Origines Britannicæ, and Vindication of the Answer to some late papers, part ii. pp. 70-79; Bishop Bull's Corruptions of the Church of Rome, in answer to Bossuet; Two Letters by Dr Burgess, the late Bishop of Salisbury—the first entitled "Christ, and not Peter, the Rock of the Christian Church, and St Paul the founder of the Church in Britain;" and the second, "On the Independence of the Ancient British Church of any Foreign Jurisdiction."

AN ANSWER TO THE CONCLUSION.

HAVING thus gone through the several heads which our author complains have been so much misrepresented, it is now fit to consider what he saith in his Conclusion, which he makes to answer his Introduction, by renewing therein his doleful complaints of their being misrepresented, just as Christ and his apostles, and the primitive Christians were. I hope the former discourse hath shown their doctrines and practices are not so very like those of Christ and his apostles, and the primitive Christians, that their cases should be made so parallel; but as, in his Conclusion, he hath summed up the substance of his representations, so shall I therein follow his method, only with this difference, that I shall first set down his own representations of Popery, and then the reasons, in short, why we cannot embrace them.

Popery Represented.—1. In using all external acts of adoration before images, as kneeling, praying, lifting up the eyes, burning candles, incense, &c., not merely to worship the objects before them, but to worship the images themselves, on account of the objects represented by them; or, in his own words: "Because the honour that is exhibited to them, is referred to the prototypes which they represent."

Answer 1. "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in heaven or earth," &c. "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." Which being the plain, clear, and ex-

press words of the divine law, we dare not worship any images or representations, lest we be found transgressors of this law, especially since God herein hath declared himself a jealous God, and annexed so severe a sanction to it; and since he that made the law is only to interpret it, all the distinctions in the world can never satisfy a man's conscience, unless it appear that God himself did either make or approve them; and if God allow the worship of the thing represented by the representation, he would never have forbidden that worship absolutely which is unlawful only in a certain respect.

Rep. 2. In joining the saints in heaven together with Christ in intercession for us, and making prayers on earth to them on that account.

Ans. 2. "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John ii. 1); "and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. ii. 5.) "For Christ is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." (Heb. ix. 24.) And, therefore, we dare not make other intercessors in heaven besides him; and the distance between heaven and us breaks off all communication between the saints there and us upon earth; so that all addresses to them now for their prayers are in a way very different from desiring others on earth to pray for us; and if such addresses are made in the solemn offices of divine worship, they join the creatures with the Creator in the acts and signs of worship, which are due to God alone.

Rep. 3. In allowing more supplications to be used to the Blessed Virgin than to Christ; for he denies it to be an idle superstition to repeat ten Ave Marias for one Pater Noster.

Ans. 3. "Call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." (Ps. l. 15.) When we pray to our Father in heaven, as our Saviour commanded us, we do but what both

natural and Christian religion require us to do; but when men pray to the Blessed Virgin for help and protection now and at the hour of death, they attribute that to her which belongs only to God, who is our helper and defender; and although Christ knew the dignity of his mother above all others, he never gives the least encouragement to make such addresses to her; and to suppose her to have a share now in the kingdom of Christ in heaven, as a copartner with him, is to advance a creature to divine honour, and to overthrow the true ground of Christ's exaltation to his kingdom in heaven, which was his suffering on the cross for us.

Rep. 4. In giving religious honour and respect to relics; such as placing them upon altars, burning wax candles before them, carrying them in processions, to be seen, touched, or humbly kissed by the people; which are the known and allowed practices in the Church of Rome.

Ans. 4. "And no man knoweth of the sepulchre of Moses unto this day." (Deut. xxxiv. 6.) Why should God hide the body of Moses from the people, if he allowed giving religious honour and respect to relics? Why should Hezekiah break in pieces the brazen serpent, because the children of Israel did burn incense to it (2 Kings xviii. 4), especially when it was a type or representation of Christ himself, and God had wrought many miracles by it?

Rep. 5. In adoring Christ as present in the eucharist, on the account of the substance of bread and wine being changed into that body of Christ which suffered on the cross.

Ans. 5. "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things." (Acts iii. 21.) And, therefore, in the eucharist we adore him, as "sitting on the right hand of God;" but we dare not direct our adoration to the consecrated host, which we believe to be the substance of bread and wine

(though consecrated to a divine mystery), and there fore not a fit object for our adoration.

Rep. 6. In believing the substance of bread and wine, by the words of consecration, to be changed into his own body and blood, the species only, or accidents of bread and wine, remaining as before.

Ans. 6. "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) This is spoken of the bread after consecration, and yet the apostle supposes it to be bread still, and the communion of his body is interpreted by the next words: "For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread" (ver. 17); which is very different from the bread being changed into the very body of Christ, which is an opinion that hath no foundation in Scripture, and is repugnant to the common principles of reason which God hath given us, and exposes the Christian religion to the reproach and contempt of Jews, Turks, and Infidels.

Rep. 7. In making good works to be truly meritorious of eternal life.

Ans. 7. "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." (Luke xvii. 10.) And, therefore, in no sense can our best works be truly meritorious of eternal life; which, consisting in the enjoyment of God, it is impossible there should be any just proportion or due commensuration between our best actions and such a reward.

Rep. 8. In making confession of our sins to a priest, in order to absolution.

Ans. 8. "And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight." (Luke xv. 21.) Where confession to God is required, because the offence is against him; but it is impossible for any man upon earth to forgive those whom God

doth not forgive; and he alone can appoint the necessary conditions of pardon, among which true contrition and repentance is fully declared; but confession to a priest, although it may be useful for the ease of the penitent, is nowhere in Scripture made necessary for the forgiveness of sin.

Rep. 9. In the use of indulgences for taking away the temporal punishments of sin, remaining due after the guilt is remitted.

Ans. 9. "I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." (Ps. xxxii. 5.) If God doth fully forgive the guilt of sin, there remains no obligation to punishment; for wherever that is, the guilt remains. It is true, God may not sometimes fully pardon; but he may reserve some temporal punishment here for his own honour, or the chastisement of a penitent sinner; but then, what have any men to do to pretend that they can take off what God thinks fit to lay on? Can any indulgences prevent pain or sickness, or sudden death? But if indulgences be understood only with respect to canonical penances, they are a most notorious and inexcusable corruption of the discipline of the ancient Church.

Rep. 10. In supposing that penitent sinners may, in some measure, satisfy by prayer, fasting, alms, &c., for the temporal pain which, by order of God's justice, sometimes remains due after the guilt and the eternal pain are remitted.

Ans. 10. "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." (Rom. v. 10.) And therefore no satisfaction to the justice of God is now required from us, for the expiation of any remainder of guilt. For if Christ's satisfaction were in itself sufficient for a total remission, and was so accepted by God, what account then remains for the sinner to discharge, if he performs the

conditions on his part? But we do not take away hereby the duties of mortification, prayer, fasting, and alms, &c.; but there is a difference to be made between the acts of Christian duties and satisfaction to divine justice for the guilt of sin, either in whole or in part; and to think to join any satisfactions of ours together with Christ's, is like joining our hand with God's in creating or governing the world.

Rep. 11. In thinking the Scripture not fit to be read generally by all, without license, or in the vulgar tongues.

Ans. 11. "Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another," &c. (Col. iii. 16.) How could that dwell richly in them which was not to be communicated to them, but with great caution? How could they teach and admonish one another in a language not understood by them? The Scriptures of the New Testament were very early perverted; and if this reason were sufficient to keep them out of the hands of the people, certainly they would never have been published for common use, but as prudently dispensed then as some think it necessary they should be now; but we esteem it a part of our duty not to think ourselves wiser than Christ or his apostles, nor to deprive men of that invaluable treasure which our Saviour hath left to their use.

Rep. 12. In allowing the Books of Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and Maccabees to be canonical.

Ans. 12. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." (2 Tim. iii. 16.) "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. i. 21.) Therefore, where there is no evidence of divine inspiration, those books cannot be made canonical; but the Jewish Church, to whom the oracles of God were committed, never delivered these books as any part of them, being written when inspiration was ceased

among them; and it is impossible for any Church in the world to make that to be divinely inspired, which was not so from the beginning.

Rep. 13. In preferring the vulgar Latin edition of the Bible before any other, and not allowing any translations into a mother tongue to be ordinarily read.

Ans. 13. "But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." (Rom. x. 18.) Therefore, the intention of God was, that the Gospel should be understood by all mankind; which it could never be, unless it were translated into their several languages. But still the difference is to be observed between the originals and translations; and no Church can make a translation equal to the original; but among translations, those deserve the greatest esteem which are done with the greatest fidelity and exactness. On which account, our last translation deserves a more particular regard by us; as being far more useful to our people than the vulgar Latin, or any translation made only from it.

Rep. 14. In believing that the Scripture alone can be no rule of faith to any private or particular person.

Ans. 14. "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." (Ps. cxix. 105.) Which it could never be, unless it were sufficient for necessary direction in our way to heaven. But we suppose persons to make use of the best means for understanding it, and to be duly qualified for following its directions; without which the best rule in the world can never attain its end. And if the Scripture hath all the due properties of a rule of faith, it is inconceivable why it should be denied to be so; unless men find they cannot justify their doctrines and practices by it; and therefore, are forced to make tradition equal in authority with it.

Rep. 15. In relying upon the authority of the present Church for the sense of Scripture.

Ans. 15. "Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." (Luke xi. 52.) From whence it follows, that the present guides of the Church may be so far from giving the true sense of Scripture, that they may be the chief means to hinder men from right understanding it. Which argument is of greater force, because those who plead for the infallibility of the guides of the present Church, do urge the promises made to the Jewish Church at that time; as our author doth from those who sat in the chair of Moses, and from Caiaphas his prophesying.

Rep. 16. In receiving and believing the Church's traditions as the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, and assenting to them with divine faith, just as he doth to the Bible.

Ans. 16. "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed." (2 Pet. i. 19.) And yet here the apostle speaks of something delivered by the testimony of those who were with Christ in the holy mount. From whence we infer, that it was not the design of Christ to leave us to any vocal testimony, but to refer us to the written Word, as the most certain foundation of faith. And it is not any persons assuming the title of the Catholic Church to themselves, can give them authority to impose any traditions on the faith of Christians, or require them to be believed equally with the written Word; for, before any traditions can be assented to with divine faith, the Church's authority must be proved to be divine and infallible, either by a written or unwritten Word; but it can be done by neither, without overthrowing the necessity of such an infallibility in order to divine faith, because the testimony on which the Church's infallibility is proved must be received only in a way of credibility.

Rep. 17. In believing that the present guides of

the Church, being assembled in councils for preserving the unity of the Church, have an infallible assistance in their decrees.

Ans. 17. "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts xx. 30.) Which being spoken of the guides of the Christian Church, without limitation of number, a possibility of error is implied in any assembly of them; unless there were some other promises which did assure us that, in all great assemblies, the Spirit of God shall always go with the casting voice, or the greater number.

Rep. 18. In believing the Pope to be the supreme head of the Church under Christ, being successor to St Peter, to whom he committed the care of his flock.

Ans. 18. "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith," &c. (Eph. iv. 11–13.) Now, here being an account given of the officers Christ appointed in his Church, in order to the unity and edification of it, it had been unfaithfulness in the apostle to have left out the head of it, in case Christ had appointed any; because this were of more consequence than all the rest, being declared necessary to salvation to be in subjection to him. But neither this apostle nor St Peter himself give the least intimation of it. Which it is impossible to conceive should have been left out in the apostolical writings, upon so many occasions of mentioning it, if ever Christ had instituted a headship in the Church, and given it to St Peter and his successors in the See of Rome.

Rep. 19. In believing that communion in both kinds is an indifferent thing, and was so held for the first four hundred years after Christ, and that the first precept for receiving under both kinds was given to the faithful by Pope Leo I., and confirmed by Pope Gelasius.

Ans. 19. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. xi. 26.) The apostle, speaking to all communicants, plainly shows that the institution of Christ was, that all should partake of both kinds, and so to continue to do as long as this sacrament was to show forth the death of Christ, namely, till his second coming. And there no is colour for asserting the Christian Church ever looked on observing Christ's institution in this matter as an indifferent thing, no not for a thousand years after Christ. Although the practice and the obligation are two things, yet when the practice was so agreeable to the institution, and continued so long in the Church, it is hardly possible for us to prove the sense of the obligation by a better way than by the continuance of the practice. And if some traditions must be thought binding, and far from being indifferent, which want all that evidence which this practice carries along with it, how unreasonable is it in this case to allow the practice, and to deny the obligation?

Rep. 20. In believing that the doctrine of purgatory is founded on Scripture, authority, and reason.

Ans. 20. "And whom he justified, them he also glorified." (Rom. viii. 30.) But whom God justifies, they have the remission of their sins as to eternal punishment. And if those who are thus justified must be glorified, what place is there for purgatory? for there is not the least intimation of any other state of punishment that any who are justified must pass through before they are admitted to glory. We grant they may, notwithstanding, pass through many intermediate trials in this world; but we say, where there is justification, there is no condemnation; but where any part of guilt remains unremitted, there is a condemnation remaining so far as the punishment extends. And so this distinction as to eternal and temporal pains, as it is made the foundation of pur-

gatory, is wholly groundless; and, therefore, the doctrine built upon it can have no foundation in Scripture or reason.

Rep. 21. In believing that to the saying of prayers well and devoutly, it is not necessary to have attention on the words, or on the sense of prayers.

Ans. 21. "I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also." (1 Cor. xiv. 15.) What need this praying with the understanding, if there were no necessity of attending to the sense of prayers? for then praying with the spirit were all that was required, for that supposes an attention of the mind upon God. And I can hardly believe any man that thinks with understanding, can justify praying without it; especially when there are exhortations and invitations to the people to join in those prayers, as it is plain there are in the Roman offices.

Rep. 22. In believing that none out of the communion of the Church of Rome can be saved, and that it is no uncharitableness to think so.

Ans. 22. "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Acts x. 34, 35.) Whereby we perceive that God doth not limit the possibility of salvation, under the Gospel, to communion with the See of Rome; for, if St Peter may be believed, the capacity of salvation depends upon men's fearing God and working righteousness; and it is horrible uncharitableness to exclude those from a possibility of salvation whom God doth not exclude from it.

Rep. 23. In believing that the Church of Rome, in all the new articles defined at Trent, hath made no innovation in matters of faith.

Ans. 23. "That ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints."

(Jude 3.) Therefore, all necessary doctrines of faith were at first delivered; and whatever articles cannot be proved to have been delivered by the apostles, can never be made necessary to be believed in order to salvation. Which overthrows the additional creed of Pius IV. after the Council of Trent; and puts them upon the necessity of proving the universal tradition of those doctrines from the apostolical times: and when they do that, we may think better of them than at present we do; for, as yet, we can see neither Scripture, nor reason, nor antiquity for them.

Thus I have represented that kind of Popery which our author (who complains so much of misrepresenting) allows; and I have, in short, set down how little ground we have to be fond of it; nay, to speak more plainly, it is what we can never yield to without betraying the truth, renouncing our senses and reason, wounding our consciences, dishonouring God and his holy Word and sacraments; perverting the doctrine of the Gospel as to Christ's satisfaction, intercession, and remission of sins; depriving the people of the means of salvation which God himself hath appointed, and the primitive Church observed; and damning those for whom Christ died.

We do now, in the sincerity of our hearts, appeal to God and the world, that we have no design to misrepresent them, or to make their doctrines and practices appear worse than they are. But take them with all the advantages even this author hath set them out with, we dare appeal to the judgments and consciences of any impartial man, Whether (the Scripture being allowed on both sides) our doctrine be not far more agreeable thereto than the new articles of Trent, which are the very life and soul of Popery? Whether our worship of God be not more suitable to the divine nature and perfections, and the manifestations of his will, than the worship of images

and invocation of fellow-creatures? Whether the plain doctrine of the necessity of repentance and sincere obedience to the commands of Christ, do not tend more to promote holiness in the world than the sacrament of penance, as it is delivered and allowed to be practised in the Church of Rome—that is, with the easiness and efficacy of absolution, and getting off the remainders by indulgences, satisfactions of others, and prayers for the dead? Whether it be not more according to the institution of Christ to have the communion in both kinds, and to have prayers and the Scripture in a language which the people understand? And lastly, Whether there be not more of Christian charity in believing and hoping the best of those vast bodies of Christians who live out of the communion of the Church of Rome, in the eastern, southern, western, and northern parts, than to pronounce them all incapable of salvation on that account? And therefore, out of regard to God and the holy religion of our blessed Saviour—out of regard to the salvation of our own and others souls—we cannot but very much prefer the communion of our own Church before that of the Church of Rome.

But, before I conclude all, I must take some notice of his anathemas; and here I am as much unsatisfied as in any other part of his book, and that for these reasons:—

1. Because he hath no manner of authority to make them, suppose they were meant never so sincerely; and if we should ever object them to any others of that Church, they would presently say: "What had he to do to make these anathemas? It belongs only to the Church and the general councils to pronounce anathemas, and not to any private person whatsoever." So that if he would have published anathemas with authority, he ought to have printed those of the Council of Trent, namely, such as these:—

"Cursed is he that doth not allow the worship of images.

"Cursed is he that saith saints are not to be invocated.

"Cursed is he that doth not believe transubstantiation, purgatory," &c.

2. Because he leaves out an anathema in a very material point, namely, as to the deposing doctrine. We do freely and from our hearts anathematize all such doctrines as tend to dissolve the bonds of allegiance to our sovereign, on any pretence whatsoever. Why was this passed over by him without any kind of anathema? Since he seems to approve the Oxford censures, why did he not here show his zeal against all such dangerous doctrines? If the deposing doctrine be falsely charged upon their Church, let us but once see it anathematized by public authority of their Church, and we have done; but instead thereof, we find in a book very lately published, with great approbations, by a present professor at Louvain, Fr. D'Enghien, all the censures on the other side censured and despised, and the holding the negative as to the deposing doctrine, is declared by him to be heresy: * "The censure of the Sorbon against Sancterellus," he saith, "was only done by a faction, and that of sixty-eight doctors there were but eighteen present;" and the late censure of the Sorbon, he saith, "was condemned by the Inquisition at Toledo, January 10, 1683, as erroneous and schismatical; and so by the clergy of Hungary, October 24, 1682."

We do not question but there are divines that oppose it, but we fear there are too many who do not; and we find they boast of their own numbers, and despise the rest as an inconsiderable party. This we do not misrepresent them in, for their most approved books do show it.

However, we do not question but there are several

* Auctoritas Sedis Apostolicæ in Reges, pp. 374, 408, ad 430.

worthy and loyal gentlemen of that religion of different principles and practices; and it is a pity such be not distinguished from those who will not renounce a doctrine so dangerous in the consequences of it.

3. Because the anathemas he hath set down are not penned so plainly and clearly as to give any real satisfaction; but with so much art and sophistry as if they were intended to beguile weak and unwary readers, who see not into the depths of these things, and, therefore, may think he hath done great matters in his anathemas, which, if they be strictly examined, they come to little or nothing; as,

(1.) "Cursed is he that commits idolatry." An unwary reader would think herein he disowned all real idolatry; but he doth not curse anything as idolatry but what himself thinks to be so. So again: "Cursed is he" (not that gives divine worship to images, but) "that prays to images or relics as gods, or worships them for gods." So that if he doth not take the images themselves for gods, he is safe enough from his own anathema.

(2.) "Cursed is every goddess worshipper"—*i. e.*, that believes the Blessed Virgin not to be a creature. And so they escape all the force of this anathema. "Cursed is he that honours her, or puts his trust in her more than in God." So that if they honour her and trust in her just as much as in God, they are safe enough. "Or that believes her to be above her Son." But no anathema to such as suppose her to be equal to him.

(3.) "Cursed is he that believes the saints in heaven to be his redeemers—that prays to them as such." What if men pray to them as their spiritual guardians and protectors? Is not this giving God's honour to them? Doth this deserve no anathema?

(4.) "Cursed is he that worships any breaden god, or makes gods of the empty elements of bread and wine," namely, that supposes them to be nothing but

bread and wine, and yet supposes them to be gods too. Doth not this look like nonsense? And yet I am afraid our author would think it a severe anathema in this matter to say: "Cursed is he who believes nonsense and contradictions."

It will be needless to set down more, since I have endeavoured, by clear stating the several controversies, to prevent the reader's being imposed upon by deceitful anathemas. And yet after all, he saith,

"Cursed are we, if in answering and saying amen to any of these curses, we use any equivocations or mental reservations, or do not assent to them in the common and obvious use of the words."

But there may be no equivocation in the very words, and yet there may be a great one in the intention and design of them—there may be none in saying amen to the curses so worded; but if he would have prevented all suspicion of equivocation, he ought to have put it thus:—

Cursed are we if we have not fairly and ingenuously expressed the whole meaning of our Church as to the points condemned in these anathemas, or if we have by them designed to deceive the people;—and then, I doubt, he would not so readily have said, Amen.

THE END.

~

See companion volumes under Protestant Sermons and Books online at www.hailandfire.com:

"The Touchstone of Sincerity or Trial of True and False Religion" (1814 edition)
by John Flavel

"The Works of the English Reformers: William Tyndale and John Frith (1831 Edition in three Volumes)
by William Tyndale (Martyr) & John Frith (Martyr)

"A Collection of Several Treatises Concerning The Reasons and Occasions of the Penal Laws." (1675 Edition)
by Sir William Cecil, Lord Burleigh (1520-1598), Counsellor to Queen Elizabeth I of England

"An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue" (Originally published 1531; 1850 Edition)
by William Tyndale

"The Almost Christian Discovered; or the False Professor Tried and Cast" (1661; 1819 Edition)
by Matthew Mead

"Religious Affections" (1746)
by Jonathan Edwards

"Real Christianity or Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians, in the Middle and Higher Classes in this Country, Contrasted with Real Christianity" (1797 Edition)
by William Wilberforce

"The Benefit of Christ's Death" (Originally published 1543 in Italian; English & Italian Editions)
by Aonio Paleario (Antonio della Paglia, 1500-1570, Martyr)

"Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners, in a faithful account of the life and death of John Bunyan"
by John Bunyan (1628-1688)

~