






BX  
5133  
.C52  
1864  
v. 3





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015

NICHOL'S SERIES OF STANDARD DIVINES.

PURITAN PERIOD.

---

With General Preface

BY JOHN C. MILLER, D.D.,

LINCOLN COLLEGE; HONORARY CANON OF WORCESTER; RECTOR OF ST MARTIN'S, BIRMINGHAM.

---

THE

WORKS OF DAVID CLARKSON, B.D.

VOL. III.

## COUNCIL OF PUBLICATION.

---

W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D.D., Professor of Theology, Congregational Union, Edinburgh.

JAMES BEGG, D.D., Minister of Newington Free Church, Edinburgh.

THOMAS J. CRAWFORD, D.D., S.T.P., Professor of Divinity, University, Edinburgh.

D. T. K. DRUMMOND, M.A., Minister of St Thomas's Episcopal Church, Edinburgh.

WILLIAM H. GOOLD, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Church History, Reformed Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh.

ANDREW THOMSON, D.D., Minister of Broughton Place United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh.

*General Editor.*


REV. THOMAS SMITH, M.A., EDINBURGH

# THE PRACTICAL WORKS

OF

DAVID CLARKSON, B.D.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF CLARE HALL, CAMBRIDGE.



VOL. III.


EDINBURGH: JAMES NICHOL.

LONDON: JAMES NISBET AND CO. DUBLIN: G. HERBERT.

---

M.DCCC.LXV.

EDINBURGH:  
PRINTED BY JOHN GREIG AND SON  
OLD PHYSIC GARDENS.



# CONTENTS.

---

## SERMONS, &c.

	PAGE
THE LOVE OF CHRIST. . . . . EPH. V. 2. . . . .	3
CHRIST'S SACRIFICE. . . . . EPH. V. 2. . . . .	47
CHRIST'S DYING FOR SINNERS. . . . . ROM. V. 8. . . . .	63
CHRIST TOUCHED WITH THE FEELING OF OUR INFIRMITIES. . . . .	HEB. IV. 15. . . . . 81
OF COMING BOLDLY UNTO THE THRONE OF GRACE. . . . .	HEB. IV. 16. . . . . 110
OF CHRIST'S MAKING INTERCESSION. . . . .	HEB. VII. 25. . . . . 143
BELIEVERS' COMMUNION WITH THE FATHER AND SON. . . . .	1 JOHN I. 3. . . . . 165
PUBLIC WORSHIP TO BE PREFERRED BEFORE PRIVATE. . . . .	PS. LXXXVII. 2. . . . . 187


---

THE PRACTICAL DIVINITY OF THE PAPISTS DISCOVERED TO BE DE- STRUCTIVE OF CHRISTIANITY AND MEN'S SOULS. . . . .	1
CONTENTS OF THE PRECEDING TREATISE. . . . .	264
GENERAL INDEX (WITH THE ' ALPHABETICAL TABLE ' OF THE ORIGINAL EDITION INCORPORATED). . . . .	i
INDEX OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS. . . . .	xii



SERMONS, &c.





## THE LOVE OF CHRIST.

---

*And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice, &c.—EPI. V. 2.*

HERE is the greatest duty of the law, 'Walk in love;' and the greatest pattern of the gospel, 'as Christ also hath loved us.' It is this latter, as the most alluring and enforcing motive to the former, I shall insist on in this discourse. This love of Christ is what this apostle always admired, since the first day its warmth thawed his cold frozen pharisaical spirit: 1 Tim. i. 14, 'The grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus.' And here in the context, after twenty-two years' study, chap. iii. 19, he says, 'it passeth his knowledge' still, passeth all natural knowledge, passeth the knowledge of ordinary Christians that enjoy and use the telescope of faith, passeth apostolical, passeth angelical; ver. 10, 'might be known by the church.' When saints are perfect in heaven, 2 Thes. i. 10, they admire Christ and his love still, ver 18. He gives a reason of its incomprehensibleness, because it exceeds natural dimensions. Nature knows but three measures for solid quantity, length, breadth, and depth, but here height also; and since it knows no standard but itself, he compares it with itself; because he cannot measure itself, he measures by its effects, offerings, and sacrifices. The *Teruma*, the wave-offering, went in its significant pointing as low as hell and as high as heaven, to relieve us from the lowest dungeon of misery, and to exalt us to the glory of the highest heaven. The *Tenupha*, the wave-offering to and fro, points at the breadth and length of this love, either in the four points of the mediatorial office,—the undertaking it from eternity; the performance in time, by his assuming our nature and laying it down a sacrifice for us; the love whereby he woos and espouseth us to himself in effectual calling; the love by which he loves them to the end, from eternity to everlasting,—or four corners of the earth, to shew the extensiveness of it. There is no kind of person but what shall be saved, or kind of sin but what shall be forgiven, through the love of him who 'hath given himself for an offering and sacrifice.'

The two most considerable things in that part of the words I propose for the ground of the ensuing discourse are, 1, The ardency of this all-governing affection, as immanent in Christ's breast, 'hath loved us;' 2, That incomparable method of his expressing it towards us, that never had either, or can admit, precedent or copy, 'and hath given himself for us, an offering and sacrifice.'

The first proposition upon which I will discourse shall only take in Christ's love with its object.

*As Christ also hath loved us.* You can look upon no place of evangelical Scripture where this may not be proved, either directly or by consequence. Take one for all: 1 John iv. 16, 'God is love.' Love is one of his most eminent attributes. Now Christ, Heb. xiii., is called 'the brightness of his Father's glory,' *i. e.* the bright manifestation of his Father's glorious attributes. These all meet in Christ, and are there united as the beams in the sun. But amongst them all there is no beam so bright and conspicuous as love. The love of God was always the same in itself, but not always the same to us. It was a long time clouded from the world, and shined but with a weak obscure ray, till the Sun of righteousness did arise; but since, the brightness of this love, of this glory, shines in the face of Christ, and we may see it with open face; we may see with open face this ray of glory, this love of God in Christ, who is the brightness of his Father's glorious love. Christ is also called, 'the express character of his person.' All divine perfections were imprinted upon Christ in an express manner; but (if there be any inequality) that which made the deepest impression, and appears in the most legible character, is love, Col. i. 15. He is called 'the image of the invisible God.' There was clear discoveries of some divine attributes before Christ, Rom. i. 19, 20; but divine love was never made so visible till it was represented to the world in this image.

But how doth it appear that Christ loves us?

1. By amorous expressions. Christ acts the highest strains of a lover in the Song of Songs. See what amorous compellations he treats his spouse with: 'My love, my dove, my fair one, my undefiled.' Read his love songs, and see how affectionately he sets out the beauty of his beloved, Cant. iv. 1-3, &c., and then concludes, 'Thou art all fair, my love, there is no spot on thee;' and complains, ver. 9, 'Thou hast ravished my heart with one of thine eyes,' &c.; and chap. vi. 4-6, &c., 'Turn away thine eyes from me, for they have overcome me;' ver. 10, 'Who is she that looketh out as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun;' so chap. i. to ver. 10. Hear how he woos: 'Rise up my love, my fair one, and come away,' chap. ii. 10; and iv. 6, 'My dove, &c., let me see thy face, let me hear thy voice: for sweet is thy voice, and thy countenance is comely.' See his love posture, how he embraces: Cant. ii. 6, 'His left hand is under my head, and his right hand doth embrace me.' He condescends to set out his love by such expressions as we can best judge of, though it transcends all.

2. By his thoughts. Thoughts and affections are mutual causes one of another. Thoughts give life to affection, and affection begets thoughts. Where is much affection, there will be many thoughts; and where there is strong affection there will be high thoughts of what we affect. Christ's thoughts of us are many and high. He had thoughts of love to us from eternity, and we were never one moment out of his mind since then. We are graven on the palms of his hand, Isa. xlix. 16; nay, we are written in his heart, and there he wears us, as the high priest the names of the ten tribes upon his breast. He has set us as a seal upon his heart, as a signet upon his arm, Cant. viii. 6. We can never be out of his sight, and so never out of his mind. It is as impossible he should cease to think of us, as it is for a mother to forget her sucking child, which is always in her arms, or on her knee, or in her bosom, Isa. xlix. 15. Nay, 'she may forget,' but Christ will not, cannot.

Also he hath high thoughts of us. We are his jewels, Mal. iii. 17; precious to him, not only in life, but death, Ps. cxvi. 15; his treasure, his peculiar

treasure, Exod. xix. 5 ; and where his treasure is, there will his heart be also. As the most rich and precious stones, the stones of a crown, Zech. ix. 16, he accounts us his joy, John xvii. 13, his glory, 2 Cor. viii. 23, a crown of glory and a royal diadem, Isa. lxii. 3 ; yea, an eternal excellency, Isa. lx. 15. He has preferred us before the rest of men, though in all worldly respects to be preferred before us. He has chosen us, the foolish, weak, and base, despised things of this world, and rejected the wise, mighty, and noble, 1 Cor. i. 26-28. He has preferred us before the angels fallen ; for when we were both involved in the same misery, those, sometime gay morning stars, are reserved in everlasting chains of darkness ; but he has lifted up our heads and crowned us with glory and dignity ; nay, he has in some respect preferred us before himself, for he loved us and gave himself for us.

3. But this flame, where it is, cannot be confined to the breast and thoughts, but will break forth into action. And so does the love of Christ appear to us, by what he has done for us. He has made us rich, fair, honourable, potent, yea, one with himself. We are by this love enriched. The Lord is our portion, Ps. xvi. 5, and this is incomparably more than if we had heaven and earth ; for all the earth is but as a point compared with the vastness of the heavens, and the heavens themselves are but a point compared with God. What a large possession have we, then ! There is no confiscation of it, no banishment from it. Our portion fills heaven and earth, and is infinitely above heaven and below earth, and beyond both. Poor men boast and pride themselves of a kingdom, but we have more than all the kingdoms of the world and the glory thereof. Christ has given us more than the devil could offer him.

He has made us beautiful ; decked our souls with rays of his own beauty, made us partakers of the divine nature, filled us with the fulness of God, conformed us to himself, who is the brightness of divine glory. And now we are all glorious within ; the King delights in our beauty. There is a brighter lustre on our souls than shone in Moses's face when he had been talking with God, or sparkled in the habit of Christ and his glorious companions when they were transfigured. If the beauty of a sanctified soul could be made visible to the world, the sun would be no longer esteemed a glorious creature, nor the fairest face lovely. Indeed, it was no easy matter to beautify such deformed souls. Christ tells us what it cost him in the text: he loved us and washed us from our sins with his blood. Otherwise his pure eye could never have beheld us with such complacency, his heart could never have been ravished with us.

He has made us honourable. See what titles we bear. We are his servants. The angels count this their honour, to be ministering spirits. But it is the lowest of our titles. We are his friends, his favourites, John xv. 15, 'Henceforth I call you not servants,' &c., 'I have called you friends,' yea, intimate friends, such as he entrusts with his secrets. 'All things that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you.' We are not only friends, but brethren : Heb. ii. 11, 'He is not ashamed to call us brethren ;' sons of the same Father : 'What manner of love is this, that we should be called the sons of God,' 1 John iii. 1 ; nay, not only sons, but 'heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ :' Rom. viii. 17, who is 'appointed heir of all things,' Heb. i. 2. There is no such love amongst men as for an heir to admit another co-heir with him. Nay, we are kings and priests in the text ; conquerors, yea, more than conquerors, Rom. viii.

He has made us potent. No such potentates on earth, as these whom Christ loves : Philip. iv., 'I can do all things through Christ strengthening me.' What ! A creature omnipotent, able to do all things ? Yes, by a bet-

ter reason than Cato proved the Roman women ruled all the world. Christ can do all things, but these whom he loves can prevail for all that he can do. For he hath promised: John xiv. 12, 13, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do;' Hosea xii. 3, 4.

These are large expressions of love indeed. But the proper act of love is union; love is ever accompanied with a strong inclination to unite with its object, which, by some secret and powerful virtue, as it were by the emission of some magnetical rays, attracts the lover with a restless solicitation, and never ceases till they meet and unite, as intimately as their nature will permit. The grossness of the matter in corporeal parts will not admit of such intimacy and penetration as love affects; but souls, they can mix, twine about each other, and twist into most strict oneness. We see this effect in Christ's love. His affection moved him to union with us; and one degree of his union was the assuming our nature, by which Christ and we are one flesh. He may say to us as Adam, 'Thou art bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh' Nay, we are not only one flesh, but one spirit: 2 Cor. vi. 17, 'He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit.' O transcendent love! As if some man, out of love to a worm, should take upon him the form and nature of that irrational, contemptible creature. Hence David (in that a type of Christ) calls himself 'a worm, and no man,' Ps. xxii. Yet Christ's love, in being incarnate, is infinitely more; as the disproportion betwixt him and us is infinitely greater than between us and worms. This was greater love, greater honour, than ever he would vouchsafe to angels: 'He took not upon him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham.' But the love of Christ would not rest here; he thinks us yet not near enough, and therefore holds forth a more intimate union in such resemblances as these: John xv. 5, 'I am the vine, ye are the branches.' We are united as closely to Christ as the branches to the vine. More than this: Eph. i. 22, 23, 'gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body.' We are united to Christ, as the body to the head. Each of us may look upon ourselves as a part of Christ; so that whatever glory and happiness shines in our head, reflects upon us; and whatever dignity and injury is cast upon us, it reaches our head.

But the union which importeth most love, is that betwixt man and wife. Christ expresses his love and our union by this: Isa. liv. 5, 'Thy Maker is thy husband,' ver. 6. He has 'taken thee, a woman forsaken, a wife of youth:' Isa. lxii. 9, 'As a bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee.' No such love amongst mortals as betwixt man and wife; nor is this love and complacency at any time so vigorous and conspicuous as in the day of marriage. Yet such a love is Christ's, he is our husband, and we shall ever be in his account as a wife of youth, as beautiful, as delightful; and eternity shall be but a continued marriage-day, as full of joy and triumph. Oh happy souls that have interest in his love; you whom the Lamb has chosen to be his bride; you who must taste the sweetness of those joys, and must be the object of that complacency and delight; you who must be kissed with the kisses of that mouth, and folded in the arms of such a bridegroom! Oh how unsavoury may the joys of earth be to you, how contemptible the choicest beauties in the world! The creature can reach no higher either in desires or conceits; but the love of Christ goes above both, and expresses itself in a nearer union than this. A conjugal union is very intimate; yet not so near, as that the terms thereof should denominate one another; the husband cannot be called the wife, nor the wife the husband. Yet so near is our union with Christ, that it grounds such a denomination; for we are called Christ: 1 Cor. xii. 12, 'So also is Christ,'

*i. e.* Christ mystical. We are not only Christ's, his members, his spouse; but Christ, in the apostle's phrase. Yet further, the wife is not said to be in the husband, yet Christ is said to be in us; 'that Christ might dwell in your hearts by faith,' Eph. iii. 17, Gal. ii. 19. Here is not only a cohabitation, but inhabitation.

Yet further, to add one consideration, which advanceth the intimacy of this union above all those mentioned. The branch may be said to be in the vine, but not reciprocally the vine in the branch; yet Christ is both in us, and we in him: John xiv. 20, 'At that day ye shall know that I am in the Father, and you in me, and I in you.' What more intimate mixture is there in the world, than that of light and air? Yet here is not this reciprocation; though the light be in the air, yet is not the air said to be in the light. What nearer conjunction is there than betwixt the soul and the body? Yet here, though the soul be in the body, yet is not the body in the soul. Sure, when Christ is said to be in us, and we in him, here is some intimacy intended more than ordinary union; some mystery for which we want a name, so far are we from reaching its nature. The apostles themselves here knew it not, as the words imply, propounded in the future, *ye shall know*. They could not apprehend it, till that extraordinary effusion of the Spirit, to which this place refers; and then, it is probable, rather apprehend, than comprehend it. And if ever those most comprehensive creatures, the angels, had need to bend themselves downward, and stretch out their necks (as the word used by Peter implies), to pry into a gospel mystery, sure it is the mystery of Christ's love, in mixing himself thus intimately with us.

It is true, indeed, while we are in the body, we are absent from the Lord. There is some distance betwixt us, which, though it dissolves not the union, yet hinders the comfortable effects of it. And Christ is sensible of this; his love will not long endure it; he cannot abide that those whom he loves so dearly, should be so far from him. He longs for that happy time when we shall meet never again to part. He is gone to prepare the place; and now that it is ready, hear how he woos us: Cant. ii. 10, 'Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away; for lo, the winter is past,' &c. And, as though he wondered at our slowness to meet our happiness, he calls again, ver. 13, 'Arise, my love, my fair one, and come away.' And when he sees we stay, and call for him to meet us, how cheerfully does he reply, 'Behold, I come quickly;' and, in the mean time, with all importunity solicits his Father: John xvii. 24, 'Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me, that they may behold my glory;' and urges the Father, as he loves him, to do it. That is his argument: 'For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.' And why is he so importunate? See it, ver. 21, 22, 23, where we have the project of Christ's love four times repeated in three verses, 'That they all may be one;' 'that they may be one in us;' 'that they may be one, even as we are one;' 'that they may be made perfect in one.' You have the union in all three: the pattern and exemplar of the union in ver. 22, 'that they may be one, as we are one;' and ver. 21, 'that they may be in us, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee.' Not only as the branch is in the vine, or a member in the body, or the light in the air; these are too low resemblances of so high a mystery; but 'that they may be in me, as I, Father, am in thee,' &c. I say not that it is the same union with that betwixt the Father and the Son. It is infinitely distant from it; but, as those expressions import, it has some resemblance. And, lastly, the motive inducing this, ver. 23, 'That the world may know that thou hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.' See here, and wonder, an union, that resembles the highest, most mysterious, and incomprehensible union, the

unity of the Father with the Son, proceeding from a love, which is the highest, most stupendous, and inconceivable love, the love of the Father to the Son. Such is the union wherewith Christ has united us to himself, and such is the love which moved him so to unite us. What nearer union than this? What greater love than this?

4. The love of Christ appears by what he has given us; his love-tokens. Whatever we have, for being or well-being, spring from his love. It is love that opens those infinite treasures of goodness, which had else been eternally locked up from the creatures. And though, in these showers of mercy, some drops fall upon the wicked, and so seem common, yet the fountain of love, from whence they issue, is not common. There is a vast difference betwixt the provision which a man makes for his wife, and for his servants. Every mercy we enjoy is a drop from the ocean of his special love. Let us ascend, by some degrees, to the height of this bounteous love.

He gives us plenty of mercies. This love daily loads us with benefits, Ps. lxxviii. 19, 1 Tim. vi. 17. He gives us nothing but what is good. The wicked have some good things, and some bad; those which are materially good in themselves, yet are formally evil to them, both in God's intention and in the event. Their table is a snare, the word is the savour of death, and sacraments seals of condemnation; but Christ's love makes that which is materially evil in itself, yet formally and finally good to us; for all the ways of God are mercy, Ps. xxv. He curses their blessings, but he blesses our curses; temptations, afflictions, sin and death, prove all good to us. Even all his ways; and not only all the ways of God, who loves us in Christ, but all the ways of those who hate us, whether reprobates or devils. For 'all things shall work for the good of those that love God,' Rom. viii. This is the great privilege of those whom Christ loves; nothing shall befall them, but what shall prove good for them. They may conclude, in whatever condition they are, it is the best for them; and if it had not been so, they had never come into it; and whenever they shall cease to be so, they shall be removed out of it. It is the sweetest privilege, yet the most difficult to believe at all times, since there is often great opposition both of sense and reason, yet it is most true. And the reason is, the love of Christ making a sweet connection betwixt his glory and our good; so that whatever advanceth the one must promote the other. Now every thing must tend to his glory, therefore to our good; these two cannot be separated.

Besides, Christ's love gives us whatever is good. 'He gives grace and glory, and no good thing will he withhold,' &c., Ps. lxxx. We shall want no good thing, Ps. xxxiv. 10. Take a survey of heaven and earth, and all things therein; and whatever upon sure grounds appears good, ask it confidently of Christ; his love will not deny it. If it were good for you that there were no sin, no devil, no affliction, no destruction, the love of Christ would instantly abolish these. Nay, if the possession of all the kingdoms of the world were absolutely good for any saint, the love of Christ would instantly crown him monarch of them. But if you yet doubt of the bounty of Christ's love, see here a further consideration that will satisfy.

Christ's love will give you whatever you can desire. For what reasonable man can desire that which is not good? This is included in the former. Now all that is good the promises have already assured to you. But lest this limitation should seem to straiten this large privilege, it is propounded absolutely (though indeed it were no privilege if this condition was not implied). 'Delight thyself in the Lord, and he will give thee thy heart's desire,' Ps. xxxvii.: John xvi. 23, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you'; and ver. 15, 17, 'Ye shall ask what ye will,

and it shall be done unto you.' The reason is, ver. 9, 'As the Father has loved me, so have I loved you.' But if this satisfy not, if you still question what is this *what you will*, and fear lest you should desire too little, though this be a rare fault, behold the love of Christ will fully satisfy you; he tells you 'All is yours,' 1 Cor. iii. 21-23. And will you have more? 'All things are yours: whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or to come; all are yours.' See here the extent of this *all*; the world, and all the world is yours. Yea, but alas! I shall not live long to enjoy it; fear not that, for life is yours, you shall live till you be fit to take possession of a greater, a better world. And then death is yours, to convey you from the enjoyment of things present, to the fruition of things to come; from this present world to the world which is to come. See here, no less than two whole worlds is yours. If, as Alexander, thy vast desires cannot be filled with one world, here are two, both thine; one present, one to come. Oh the wonderful love of Christ, the wonderful bounty of this love! It was a royal offer of Ahasuerus to Esther, and a sign of great love: Esther v. 3, 'What is thy request? it shall be given thee to the half of the kingdom.' Ay, but Christ not only offers, but gives, not half, but whole kingdoms, yea, whole worlds. But you will say, This is but a chimera, an empty notion: for we see there are none enjoy less of the world than those whom you say Christ loves. I answer, the world is not able to judge of true enjoyments. There are none that have a more real, and advantageous, and a less troublesome and dangerous enjoyment of the world than saints. And I prove it thus. We may be most truly said to enjoy that which we reap the greatest emolument from, and get the greatest benefit by, that can be imagined; but there are none that improve the world to such a real advantage as the saints: for the love of Christ has so ordered the world, and everything in it, as it tends to their happiness, Rom. viii. And what greater benefit imaginable than happiness? On the contrary, we cannot be said truly to enjoy that by which we get no benefit; but the wicked (those who seem to have engrossed the world to themselves) get no benefit by it: for both it and all things in it tend to make them miserable. There is no more reason to deny the saint's interest in the world, because it seems to be possessed by others, than to deny a merchant has interest in his estate, because it is in the hands of mariners and factors, whenas it is but committed to them, that it may be the better improved for the true owner. And so is the world in the hands of others, for the saints' best advantage, which they receive, as a landlord from his tenants, without trouble or hazard. It is evident then that this present world is ours. And for the world to come, there is no question. So that we need not wonder at Jacob, who, when he was the poorer man in the world's account, conceived himself richer than Esau: Gen. xxxiii. 9, Esau says, 'But I have enough;' but Jacob says (as it is in the original) 'I have all.' And so may every one whom Christ loves say, 'I have all;' all that I stand in need of, all that is good for me, yea, all that I can desire. This is enough, sure. Who can imagine more? Ay, but Christ's love has provided more than we can desire. See 1 Cor. ii. 9, compared with Isa. lxiv. 4, 'As it is written, eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for those that love him.' What is there in the vast circuit of the world that eye hath not seen? Yet more is prepared for us than eye hath seen from the beginning. There is no man whose ear has not heard more than his eye ever saw; yet is there more prepared for us than ear ever heard. But there has more entered into the heart of man, than ever was offered either to his eye or ear; yet the vast and unlimited thoughts of man

could never conceive what great things are prepared for us. Here then is more than the largest desire can reach ; for no man can desire that which his heart could never conceive. That which never entered into the mind of man to be the object of his knowledge, never entered into his heart to be the object of his desires. Christ has given more than heart can think, more than heart can desire ; nay, more than the angels can conceive, whose apprehensions are widest and highest. There is a word in Isaiah upon which we may ground this : 'For since the beginning of the world men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither has eye seen, O God ! besides thee, what he has prepared for him that waiteth for him.' None besides thee, O God, whose apprehensions are infinite, can conceive. Not the glorified saints, not the glorious angels, none besides thee. Nothing but infiniteness can comprehend what the incomprehensible love of Christ is. It is true indeed, it is said that God has revealed them to us by his Spirit, ver. 10, and the Spirit given to this end, that we might know the things that are freely given us of God. But this knowledge is not proportionable to the dignity of the object, but to the capacity of us the subjects ; for if the Spirit should raise his style as high as the glorious expressions of Christ's love, he must use such words as Paul heard when he was rapt into paradise, 2 Cor. xii. 14 ; unspeakable words, that cannot be spoken, that cannot be understood by us in the body. The glorious riches of Christ's love cannot be expressed but in the language of paradise ; cannot be understood but by a transported soul, a spirit rapt into the third heaven. The expressions which the Spirit uses to us in the body are such as may rather signify despair of full apprehending them, than lead us to a comprehensive knowledge of them ; such as these : he tells us of joy, but which is unspeakable, 1 Peter i. 8 ; of peace, but such as passeth all understanding, Philip. iv. 7 ; of love, but such as passeth knowledge, Eph. iii. 19 ; of riches, but such as are unsearchable, Eph. iii. 8.

But we are not yet come to the height of Christ's love. These unspeakable, unconceivable, unsearchable favours are but streams or drops of love ; Christ has given us the fountain, the ocean : these are but sparks and beams ; he has given us the sun, the element of love. The love of Christ gives us interest in the glorious Trinity.

The holy and uncreated Spirit is ours. How often does he promise to give the Comforter ? See one for all, John xiv. 16. The Spirit is ours, and his graces and comforts, those dawnings and glimmerings of glory, those irradiations of the divine nature, those joys, and that peace, which cannot be spoken, cannot be understood.

The Father is ours : John xx. 17, 'I ascend to your Father, and my Father ; to your God, and my God.' The Father, and all that he is, all his glorious attributes, are ours, his all-sufficiency, wisdom, power, mercy, justice, truth, and faithfulness, &c. All that he does is ours, for us. His decrees, they are the spring of our happiness, Eph. i. 4, 5. His providence, the acts of it are as so many streams, which carry us with full sail into the ocean of glory, Ps. xxv. All that he has made : heaven, that is our home, our inheritance ; earth, that is our inn, to accommodate us in our pilgrimage, in our journey homewards ; angels, they are our guard, Mat. iv. 6 ; inferior creatures, they are our servants, Gen. i. 28. For Christ has renewed that charter which we then forfeited. Yea, the reprobates, the devils, and hell itself, are made so ours by the love of Christ, as they shall increase our happiness, and illustrate the freeness of his love ; their temptations and persecutions, whatever they intend, shall have no worse effect than, as Dan. xi. 35, and xii. 10, to make us white, more lovely in the eye of our bride-

groom. And how will this endear the love of Christ to us, that he should reject so many fallen angels and men to choose us! That we shall be those two who must enter into Canaan, when two hundred thousand of our fellow-travellers are shut out and perish in the wilderness! What thoughts shall we have, when, sitting in the bosom of him whom our souls love, we shall see the greatest part of the world tormented in that flame! The tortures of that lake will sweeten those rivers of pleasures in which we shall eternally bathe our souls. That dismal place shall be as a beauty-spot to make our glory more glorious.

And now, what is there in heaven and earth that the love of Christ has not made ours? There is nothing of all left but himself. And, alas, what would all these things profit, if we want him? Without Christ, earth would be hell, and heaven would not be heaven. He is the hope of earth, and the glory of heaven. See here, then, the height of his love; he has given us himself, and all with himself. He is our husband; heaven and earth is our jointure. He deals not with us as some husbands, who, out of more providence than love, instate their wives in part of their wealth, and reserve the rest for they know not what posterity; no, his love hath withholden nothing from us. No, let him take all, saith he, as Mephibosheth; all that I have by inheritance, and all that I have by purchase. His person is ours, he has married us; his offices are ours, he is our king, our priest, our prophet; his sufferings are ours, his merits, resurrection, ascension, intercession—all, all is ours that Christ hath, or doth, or suffereth. His love would let nothing be detained from us; not his life, he gave his life a ransom for us, Mat. xx. 28; not his blood, he washed us in his blood, as in the text; no, not his glory: John xvii. 22, 'And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them.' O boundless love! O the unsearchable riches of Christ's love! O happy souls that have interest in this love, in these riches! How may we condemn the pride of such as account themselves great and rich in the world! Your large domains and greatest possessions are but as a point compared with ours, whose poverty you despise. If the map of our worlds were set before you, how would you be ashamed, with the Athenian gallant, to see your imagined vast estates shrink there into nothing! We have riches that you know not of. We have more than you can desire, though your desires were as wide as hell. We have more than you can imagine, though your thoughts were stretched out to the wideness of angelical apprehension. There is no valuing of our revenues, no measuring of our possessions, no bounds of our inheritance; it is infinite; God, and heaven, and earth is our portion. The love of Christ hath done this for us, has given these to us.

5. Take an estimate of the love of Christ from his sufferings. Consider how and what he suffers by us, with us, for us.

(1.) His love makes him patiently suffer many things by us. It puts up many affronts, and indignities, and undervaluings; many acts of unkindness and disloyalty. See the provoking nature of sin, what a grievance and pressure it is to Christ: Isa. xliii. 24, 'Thou hast made me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities;' Isa. i. 24, 'Ah, I will ease me of mine adversaries.' Implying sin is an oppressing burden: Amos ii. 3, 'Behold, I am pressed under you, as a cart is pressed that is full of sheaves;' Ezek. vi. 9, 'I am broken with their whorish heart.' There is nothing so provoking, so injurious to man, as sin is to Christ; for what higher provocations amongst men than treason, adultery, murder? Now, every sin against Christ involves in it the heinousness of these crimes. Sin is high treason against Christ, would depose him, and advance itself and

Satan into his throne ; he says, ' I will not have this man to rule over me,' and ' Who is Jesus Christ, that I should obey him ?' Sin is an act of spiritual whoredom and adultery, a defiling of the marriage bed, a violation of our conjugal vow to Christ, when it carries away the heart from Christ, as in covetousness and sensuality ; hence such expressions, ' How is the faithful city become an harlot !' Isa. i. 21. That sin has murdered Christ needs no proof ; nay, it strikes not only at his life, but at his being ; would annihilate him, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from us, Isa. xxx. 11. ' The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.' Oh, then, what manner of love is this, which makes Christ willing to bear with such a thing as sin, and to continue so tenderly affectionate to those who have so frequently committed it ! What king ever so loved a subject as to continue his love to him after he be found an enemy to his crown and dignity ? What man could ever be friend to him that seeks his life ? It is great love in a husband to bear with the frowardness, unkindness, and ordinary infirmities of his wife ; but who ever could bear with whoredom ? No love but the love of Christ, that love which has no bounds, no example, no parallel.

But, lest you should think the sins of saints deserve not to be compared with such heinous crimes, consider that the sin of one whom Christ loves is more heinous, more provoking than the sin of any damned reprobate ; for those sins are most grievous that are against clearest light and greatest love. Now, the light which is in reprobates is darkness, Mat. vi. 23, compared with ours ; their knowledge is ignorance ; and therefore all theirs are sins of ignorance in comparison of ours. And for love, they were never the objects of it, it was never assured to them ; whereas we are both beloved of Christ, and know it, and yet sin. Sure there are no sins so heinous as these, nor any that Christ so much resents, Hosea iv. 15 ; Deut. xxxii. 19, ' When the Lord saw it, he abhorred them, because of the provokings of his sons and of his daughters.' No provokings like the provokings of sons and daughters, nor any love like that which these cannot exasperate. Such is the love of Christ.

(2.) This love makes him willing to suffer with us. ' In all our afflictions he is afflicted.' He remembers his in bonds, as though he were bound with them ; and those that are afflicted, as though he also were afflicted in the body. He knows by experience what it is to be poor, despised, slandered, persecuted ; he bare infirmities, that he might pity us under the burden : Mat. viii. 17, ' Himself took our infirmities, and bore our sicknesses,' that he might sympathise with us : Heb. iv. 15, ' We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are.' He is intimately touched with them, even as the head with the pain and torture of a member : 1 Cor. xii. 26, ' And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it,' especially the head, which, being the fountain of sense, must be most sensible. This love occasions such a reciprocation of interests as he accounts what is done for us is done for him, and what is done against us is done against him, Mat. xxv. 40-45. He thinks himself hungry and thirsty, when we want meat and drink ; a stranger, when we are banished ; restrained, when we are in prison ; and not well, when we are sick ; as is evident, ver. 35, 36. Those that persecute us persecute him, Acts ix. 5 ; and those that touch us touch the apple of his eye, Zech. ii. 8.

(3.) His love made him willing to suffer for us. And for us he has suffered all miseries that all our sins had deserved, and cruelty could inflict. He who with one word caused the vast fabric of heaven and earth to start out of nothing, who was King of kings and Lord of lords, who had heaven for his

throne and earth for his footstool, was, out of love to us, content to take upon him the form of a servant, and to live in such a poor condition as he had not a cradle when born, nor a place to lay his head while he lived, nor a sepulchre to bury him when he died. He who was the King of glory, the splendour of whose glory dazzled the eyes of seraphims, nay, whose glory is above the heavens, was, out of love to us, willing to be 'despised and rejected of men,' Isa. liii. 3; to be accounted as 'a worm, and no man, a reproach of men and scorn of the people,' Ps. xxii. 6, 7. He who was adored by the glorious host of heaven, was the object of their eternal praises, yea, and 'counted it no robbery to be equal with God,' was, out of love to us, content to be 'numbered amongst transgressors,' to be reviled and slandered as a wine-bibber, a glutton, a Sabbath-breaker, a blasphemmer, a mad-man, and possessed with the devil. He in whose presence was fulness of joy, and from whose smile spring rivers of pleasures, was, for love of us, willing to become 'a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief,' yea, and it seems with nothing else; we never read that he laughed. He whose beauty was the glory of heaven, the brightness of his Father's glory, the sight whereof transports those happy spirits that behold it into an eternal rapture, was, for love to us, by his suffering so disfigured as he seemed to 'have no form nor comeliness in him, nor beauty that any should desire him;' 'he gave his back to the smiters, and his cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; he hid not his face from shame and spitting,' Isa. l. 6. He in whose sight the heavens are not clean, who was of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, was, out of love to us, content to 'bear our sins on his body upon the tree,' to be 'wounded for our transgressions,' and to have all our iniquities laid upon him. This love made God, blessed for ever, willing to be made a curse, the glorious Redeemer of Israel to be sold as a slave, and the Lord of life to die a base, accursed, and cruel death. And, which is above all, he who was his Father's love and delight, who was rejoicing before him from eternity, and in whom alone his soul was well pleased, did, out of love to us, bear the unconceivable burden of his Father's wrath,—that wrath which was the desert of all the sins of the elect, which would have sunk the whole world into hell, the weight whereof made his soul heavy unto the death, and was a far greater torture to him than ever damned soul felt in hell (if we abstract sin and eternity from these torments), the burden whereof pressed from him that stupendous bloody sweat, and made him, in the anguish of his oppressed soul, cry out to heaven, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' and cry out to earth, 'Oh! have ye no regard, all ye that pass by? See if there be any sorrow like my sorrow, wherewith the Lord has afflicted me in the day of his fierce wrath.' No, Lord, there was no sorrow like thy sorrow, no love like thy love. Was it not enough (dearest Saviour) that thou didst condescend to pray, and sigh, and weep for us, perishing wretches? Wilt thou also bleed and die for us? Was it not enough that thou wast hated, slandered, blasphemed, buffeted? but thou wilt also be scourged, nailed, wounded, crucified. Was it not enough to feel the cruelty of man? Wilt thou also undergo the wrath of God? or if thy love will count nothing a sufficient expression of itself, but parting with life, and shedding that precious blood, yet, was it not enough to die once, to suffer one death? Wilt thou die twice, and taste both first, and something of the second death, suffer the pains of death in soul and body? Oh the transcendent love of Christ! heaven and earth are astonished at it. What tongue can express it? what heart can conceive it? The tongues, the thoughts of men and angels are far below it. Oh the height, and depth, and breadth, and length, of the love of Christ! All the creation is nonplussed; our thoughts are swallowed up in this depth,

and there must lie till glory elevate them, when we shall have no other employment but to praise, admire, and adore this love of Christ.

But further, to set out this love of Christ, consider some properties by which the Spirit describes it. It is free, unchangeable, incomprehensible.

1. Christ loves us *freely*. He loved us when we had neither love nor beauty to attract his affections. The time of his love was when we lay trodden under foot, or polluted in our blood, Ezek. xvi. 6; when we had torn off the veil of light and beauty wherewith our souls were at first invested, and clothed them in Josadech's habit, Zech. iii. 3, filthy or (as the original is) excrementitious garments; when we were wallowing in sin, more filthy than the puddle of a sow, and besmeared our souls with that which is more loathsome than the vomit of a dog. When the image of God was withdrawn, the life of holiness expired, and our souls were dead, putrifying and stinking as an open sepulchre. And what think you, could Christ love us in this condition? Will any of us set our affections on a worm, take a toad into his bosom? But Christ embraceth us in the arms of love, when we had made ourselves worse than the beasts that perish. Oh the freeness of this love!

Nor had we more love than beauty when Christ loved us. We were enemies to him, and all that were of his alliance. When we hated his person, scorned his love, rejected his offers with disdain, trampled upon his favours, and preferred our base lusts and his deadly enemy Satan before him. When we told him, we saw more reason to entertain the devil's offers than his, and rather be damned than beholden to his love for heaven. And could Christ love us now? Yes: Rom. v. 8, 'When we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' No greater enemies to Christ than sinners, no freer love than love of enemies, no higher expression of free love than to die for enemies.

2. It is *unchangeable*, John xiii. 1. No act of unkindness or disloyalty of ours can nonplus it; no, not that which admits of no reconciliation amongst men, adultery: Jer. xxxi., 'Thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return unto me, saith the Lord.' See that full place, Rom. viii. 35 to the end, 'I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers,' &c., 'shall be able to separate me from the love of Christ.' Death shall not, for that conveys us to a full enjoyment of this love; nor life, for that is a preparatory to this enjoyment; nor angels, good or bad; not bad, for if they separate us, it will be by accusing of us to Christ, shewing him our deformity or disloyalty, to make us seem unworthy of so great love; but Christ will hear no such thing: Zech. iii., 'The Lord rebuke thee, Satan;' nor good angels, for if there be any danger, it is because they are more lovely, more excellent creatures than we, and so might withdraw the heart of Christ from us to them as the more worthy objects, but this could not hinder Christ at first from loving us, and therefore cannot hinder him from continuing to love us; nor principalities, nor powers, *i. e.* no princes or potentates, by acts of cruelty or tyranny, expressed verse 35, 'Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine?' &c. No; these are so far from separating us from the love of Christ, as they occasion sweeter expressions of Christ's love. The saints find by experience never more consolation than in tribulation. They are never more enlarged than when distressed, never more affectionately embraced than when persecuted, never sweetlier feasted than in famine, &c.: 'In all these we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us.' Those things which they intend for our ruin, are by the love of Christ made our triumph. We are more than conquerors, and may more than triumph, in this unchangeable love of Christ.

3. It is an *incomprehensible* love: Eph. iii. 19, 'Love of Christ, which

passeth knowledge.' There was great love betwixt David and Jonathan : 1 Sam. xx. 17, Jonathan 'loved him as his own soul.' It is a tenderer affection which a mother bears to her sucking child, the son of her womb, Isa. xlix. 15. There is yet a stronger love than this, viz. a conjugal love between husband and wife, as is implied in Elkanah's speech to Hannah : 1 Sam. i. 8, 'Am I not better to thee than ten sons?' But the highest strain of love we meet with is that of Moses and Paul to the Israelites, which made one of them contented to be blotted out of the book of life, the other to be accursed from Christ, for them. These are all high degrees of love indeed, but such as were in the breasts of men, and therefore not beyond their knowledge. Yea, but the love of Christ passeth knowledge. He is the pattern and subject of all relations ; and the love of all relations is centred in his breast, and unspeakably more. His love to us is many degrees higher than the love which flows from all relations would be if united in one soul ; and therefore when he would express it, he goes higher than the world for a resemblance of it, even to infiniteness itself : John xv. 9, 'As the Father hath loved me, even so love I you.' This is such a love as we can neither express nor conceive ; we must supply the defect of both with admiration. And this should have been the,

1. Use. To admire the love of Christ.
2. To admire the happiness of those whom Christ loves.
3. To move us to love Christ with all, for all, above all.
4. To move us to love one another.

*Use 1.* Admire the love of Christ. Heaven and earth never beheld, angels and men never considered, anything so wonderful, so apt to astonish, as Christ's love to men. It is wonderful in the eyes of glorified creatures ; angels and saints do, and will, admire and adore it to all eternity. And it is wonderful in the eyes of all considering men on earth ; nothing more, nothing so much. *Wonderful* is Christ's attribute, Isa. ix. 6 ; due to him in all respects, but above all in this, and in all other for this. All will confess it, if they consider the grounds of this admiration, whom, who, and how.

1. Consider *whom* he loves. How unfit, unworthy, unlovely. It was not, it could not be, in the thoughts of any, whose thoughts are not infinite, to imagine that ever man, of all creatures, should be the object of Christ's love. For,

(1.) How vile and contemptible is man in Christ's account ! What is man but dust and ashes, breathing dust and enlivened clay ? Gen. xviii. 27. What more despicable creature than a worm ? The best of men, compared with Christ, are no more, nay, not so much in his sight, as a worm in ours : Job xxv. 6, 'How much less man that is a worm, and the son of man which is a worm ?' He is more indeed absolutely, but not so much comparatively. The highest on earth is farther below Christ than a worm is below a man. Man, so considered, is not so much as a worm, he is but as a moth : Job xxvii. 18, 'He builds his house as a moth ;' nay, he is inferior to this small contemptible creature : Job iv. 19, 'Crushed before the moth.' Yet there is something on earth more inconsiderable than a moth ; as small in quantity, and far inferior, as being inanimate, a drop, an atom. Yet man is not so much, compared with Christ, as one of these : Isa. xl. 15, 'All the nations.' If all the earth, all the inhabitants of the earth, be but as one drop, what is one man ? Imagine a drop, a mote, divided into as many millions of parts as there are people on earth, how small would one of those parts be, even beyond imagination ! It would be as nothing. Nay, but all nations are 'less than nothing,' ver. 17. Oh what, then, is one man ! Oh what a wonder that Christ should love such a thing, such a nothing, as man !

Oh that Christ should embrace a worm, and take a moth into his bosom ! That he should delight in and rejoice over a drop, a mote, and set his heart upon that which is not ! Ps. viii. 4.

(2.) How impotent ! Man can do nothing to engage or deserve love, nothing to please or honour such a lover ; and was so considered when Christ had intentions of love, therefore it is admirable. It is a wonder that any should love a creature whose being is despicable ; but if it be considerable in acting, it takes off from the wonder. But man is despicable, not only as to his being, but actings. As he is nothing comparatively, so he can do nothing ; nothing to glorify Christ, much to dishonour him ; nothing to please Christ, much to provoke him. As an impotent slave has no power to be serviceable to his prince, much to dishonour him by treasonable speeches or practices. An affront from a slave is a greater provocation than from an equal. How can one that is halt, lame, or maimed, walk or work ; one that is dead, act ? Such were men, so represented to Christ, when he entertained thoughts of love ; without active principles, faculties, or qualities. And when Christ has bestowed these, yet cannot he act but as he is acted ; it is not he works for Christ, but Christ that works all his works for him. He cannot act but in Christ's strength, cannot move except he be drawn, cannot walk except Christ lead him, cannot stand except Christ uphold him. Yea, when he is empowered to act, yet are not his actings more valuable than his being. *Operari sequitur esse.* As he is no more, compared with Christ, than a worm, moth, mote, so his best actions, most glorious performances, are of no more advantage to Christ than the crawlings of a worm, the acting of a moth, the motion of an atom, the falling of a drop. As these are to us, so we to Christ ; when we have done all, but unprofitable servants. What a wonder that Christ should love those in whose being he can take no pleasure, and by whose acting he can get no glory, no advantage ! Who amongst us would love or marry one who could not stand but while supported, nor rise but as lifted up, nor move a finger but as moved ? Such a lame, sick, impotent, dead creature was man, when Christ first thought of love, Rom. v. 6.

(3.) How poor ! No such poverty as man's. He is nothing, can do nothing ; nay, and hath nothing. Who poorer than he who has neither food, nor raiment, nor money, nay, and in debt besides ? Man is in a starving condition, a famished soul ; must needs be so, wanting Christ the bread of life. He feeds on nothing but wind and husks, the vanities and brutish pleasures of the world please his senses, his soul languisheth, consumes, and is at the gate of death. He has not so much as will cover his nakedness ; though he think, with Laodicea, he is rich, and stands in need of nothing, yet he is poor and naked, Rev. iii.

The poor, forlorn condition of man, when Christ intended love, is described Ezek. xvi. 6 ; lay polluted in his blood, and no eye pitied him. A degree below misery, below pity ; yet this was 'the time of love.' He has no money, nothing to purchase meat or clothes. Those whom Christ entreats with loving invitation to participation of himself, are such as have no money, Isa. lv. 1. He not only wants all things, but owes more than ever he had, more than he is worth. He cannot, upon a just account, say his soul is his own ; he has given his soul to Satan, sold himself to work wickedness ; and Satan leads him captive, has taken possession ; the strong man armed keeps the house. He has forfeited not only his soul, but his very being to God ; a greater debt than men can owe one to another. The least sin is such a debt as all the riches in the world cannot discharge ; nothing can cancel the handwriting which is against us but Christ's blood.

What a wonder, that Christ should love such poverty! No such love amongst men. If a great prince, such as Cyrus or Alexander, should set his love on one he finds in the highway, poor, famished, and naked, it would be the astonishment of all that should hear of it; much more this, Christ's state being infinitely greater, and man's spiritual poverty unspeakably more.

(4.) How deformed! Poverty alone cannot hinder love, especially if there be beauty; but who can love deformity? Man not only wants beauty, but is covered with ugly and loathsome deformity. He was created fair and lovely, his ornament was the beauty of heaven, the image of God; but, alas! that is razed out, and the deformed image of Satan drawn in its place. His light is turned into darkness; the fair, and sometimes faithful soul, is become a filthy harlot: and, as Isa. iii. 24, 'Instead of a sweet smell, there is stink; and instead of well-set hair, baldness; and burning instead of beauty.'

There is no lovely complexion, no comely proportion left in man's soul, nothing that can please the eye of Christ. The surface of it defiled as with a menstruous rag. It is overspread with a filthy leprosy, and full, as David's bones, of loathsome diseases, that break forth into rotten ulcers and putrefying sores, as Isa. i. 6. Nothing is to be seen in the face of the soul but fretting cankers, and spreading gangrenes. Sin has made the soul as unlovely as Lazarus's body, whose sores the dogs licked; or as Job's, full of sore boils, when he sat in the ashes and scraped himself. And who can be in love with such a soul?

The soul is no less deformed in respect of proportion. It is perverted, crooked, and, as that woman, bowed down with a spirit of infirmity, all broken, and out of joint. It is defective in those parts that should make it lovely; it is lame, and maimed, and blind. The eyes, no less an ornament to the soul than to the body, are put out: 'The God of this world has blinded' natural men, 2 Cor. iv. 4. Mislocation is a monstrous deformity in the body, when the feet are where the head should be, or the thighs in place of the arms, or breast where the back, &c. There is such a mislocation on the soul. That which should be lowest is highest; the appetite and fancy above the mind and will; that which should obey commands; that which should rule is enslaved. A woful deformity! That which should be supreme is subordinate; and that which should be subject is supreme. What mother would love a child whose parts were so monstrously displaced? A dislocation in the soul is as odious a deformity in Christ's eye, as that of the body in ours.

But that which makes the soul most unlovely is this, it is dead. When the life of the soul expired, all its beauty expired with it. A dead soul is as unlovely to Christ as a dead body is to us. Abraham loved Sarah dearly while she lived, but when she was dead he could not endure her sight; he desired a place to bury his dead out of his sight. That which is pleasing and amiable when it is living, is a ghastly and fearful spectacle when it is dead. The soul of every son of Adam is dead, dead in sins and trespasses, dead of a noisome and contagious disease. This removes it at a greater distance from love, has lain long rotting in a grave. How wonderful is Christ's love! Who but Christ would entertain thoughts of love towards such an ugly, loathsome, deformed, monstrous, dead creature, as man is made by sin?

(5.) How hated! Not only hateful, but hated; hated of all. Who would love him, whom none loves, who has no friends, who can meet with

none in the world but enemies? A natural man is hated of God; he hates all workers of iniquity: and the natural man works nothing else, Gen. vi. 5. He is born a child of wrath, it is his inheritance, entailed upon him, the wrath of God. And will Christ love what his Father hates?

The angels hate him. These are the immediate attendants and subjects of the King of heaven, and have the same friends, the same enemies with their sovereign. The seraphims, well rendered *φλοξπύρος*,\* have their name, not from the order of their love, but of their anger, as appears Isa. vi., the only place where angels have that name. For there the Lord is represented as an incensed judge, and they as ministers of his anger, kindled with his indignation. What the saints in heaven do, we may judge by the saints on earth: Ps. cxxxix. 21, 'Do not I hate them that hate thee? Am I not grieved?' &c.

Nay, all the inferior creatures are at enmity with man. And good reason, since by the corruption of man it is brought into woful bondage, groaneth and travaileth in pain under it, Rom. viii. 20-22. The whole creation is at enmity with man. He cannot meet any creature, but harbours a secret hatred, and would be ready to manifest it at God's command. What a wonder, that Christ will love that which all hate!

(6.) What enmity! Man is not only hateful, and hated, but a hater of Christ, with such a hatred as would exclude all love from the breast of any creature; a hatred so extensive, that he hates Christ and all that is his, all that is like him; all his offices, especially that which is most glorious, his royal office; keeps Christ out of his throne as to himself, and would do it in others. Nay, it reaches to any resemblance of Christ, hates him so much, as his heart rises against the image of Christ. Herein man manifests the height of his hatred against Christ, in that he hates his very image, that which does but resemble him, holiness wherever it is, in his people, in his ordinances, in his ways.

*Causeless.* It is a wonder if any hatred meet with returns of love, but above all causeless hatred. In this respect David was a type of Christ, in that so many hated him without a cause, Ps. lxxix. 4. There is not in Christ the least occasion of hatred, he is all glory, all beauty, altogether lovely, nothing else. Nor doth he give the least cause: for all his administrations are gracious or righteous; and as his goodness is to be feared, so even his justice is to be loved. It is lovely in itself, being a divine, an infinite perfection, and should be so to men. Christ may say to all men, as to the Jews, John x. 31, 'Many good works have I shewed, &c.; for which of these do ye hate me?' Though none have cause, yet all hate. That Christ should requite any hatred with love, is a wonder; but to return love for causeless hatred, is an astonishment!

*Perfect* hatred, without any mixture of love, Rom. viii. 7. His heart is as full of hatred, as a toad of poison, or hell of darkness. He hates Christ more than any man on earth ever loved him; for love is but imperfect here, and mixed with much unkindness; but there is no mixture of love, not the least degree of it, not the least desire, inclination, or tendency to it. Oh that Christ should love those with perfect love who hate him with perfect hatred, who have no inclinations to love him.

*Mortal* and deadly. What more than that which murders what it hates, and delights to do it? Those that delight in sin, delight to murder Christ, for it was sin that murdered him. Who is there that has not delighted in sin? Eternal love for deadly hatred!

*Implacable.* It is not a disposition easily removed, but a habit so firmly

\* Qu. *φλοξ πύρος*, referring to Heb. i. 7?—Ed.

rooted in the heart, as it can never be plucked up, till the heart itself be taken out; and therefore when God roots out his hatred, and plants love, he quite takes away the old heart, Ezek. xi. 19.

Oh what enmity is here! It is a wonder that any creature should so far degenerate as to turn enemy to its Creator and Redeemer. Oh what a wonder that Christ should love such enemies.

Enemies in their *minds*, who have hard, low, base, dishonourable thoughts of Christ; think Christ a hard master, a tyrant; think his yoke an intolerable grievance, an insupportable burden, and therefore plot how they may break his bonds.

In their *hearts*. Every motion there is rebellious, quite opposite to Christ; hate that which he most loves, love that which he most hates, delight in that which grieves him, &c.

In their *lives*. Every action an act of rebellion, and their whole life (till conversion) a continued fight against Christ. This is the cause of the quarrel: 'We will not have this man to rule over us.'

Oh wonder that Christ should love enemies, such enemies, with such love! Rom. v. 10; love them better than his life, who hated him to the death! love them unchangeably, who hated him implacably! love them against all provocations and discouragements, who hated him without a cause! love them with superlative love, who hated him with perfect hatred! Behold what manner of love! behold, and wonder! So God loved the world, so Christ loved man, so as none can express, none can choose but admire.

(7.) What hase dispositions, what ill conditions, after Christ's love hath overcome their hatred, and by his infinite power [infused] some degrees of love; yet they continue so froward, unkind, undervaluing, disobedient, ungrateful, jealous, disloyal; as it must needs be a wonder Christ can love them. How cross, froward, perverse, almost always complaining of and quarrelling with Christ, though he give not the least occasion; quarrel with him for his words, though he express himself never so sweetly. Why was not this promise made more particular? Why clogged with such conditions? It belongs not to me, I can get no comfort from it; he might as well have spoken nothing as spoke thus. And at his actions; why is his promise no sooner performed? Why hears he not my prayers? Why want I that which others have? Why thus afflicted? In vain am I innocent, Ps. lxxiii. 12, 13.

How unkind. How seldom visit him. With how little delight and affection. How few thoughts of him. How seldom, how coldly entertain him. It was Christ's spouse who would suffer his head to be wet, before she would wet her foot, and would not stir to the door to let him in, though he wooed her with all sweet importunity. Prefer sinful ease and pleasure before communion with Christ. How often do they stop their ears when he speaks, refuse when he offers, give no answer when he calls, turn their backs when he would embrace!

How do they undervalue him. The highest thoughts of angels do not reach him, the best thoughts of men fall infinitely short of him. What then do those low, hard, disparaging thoughts of Christ, more frequent than those that are better? How do they slight his tokens, prefer the husks of the world before the jewels and dainties of heaven. Who would love such a one, as knows not how to esteem of love, or any expressions of it?

How disobedient. Omit many things that he commands, but do nothing at all as he desires; fail in time, manner, end, &c. Who would endure such a servant as will do nothing as he is commanded? Who would choose such a friend as will do nothing as he is desired? Who would love such a wife as will do nothing as her husband would have her? Yet such a ser-

vant, a friend, a spouse, has Christ of man ; yet he loves more, unspeakably more, than men ; here is the wonder.

How ungrateful. Though Christ give all that is good for them, more than they make use of, more than they desire or can conceive, yet they think they have not enough, they murmur, complain : What, but a drop of comfort, but a dram of grace ? And which is more provoking, for worldly things, they often will not so much as acknowledge they have received what Christ has given in possession ; judge that counterfeits which has the stamp of an heaven and the picture of Christ on it. What more ingratitude than this ! What more odious than ingratitude ! Who can love an unthankful person !

How jealous. Not only an unkind but cruel affection. Suspect Christ does not love, when his love is writ with characters of his own blood, when he has bestowed himself and all on them ; suspect he will not be constant, notwithstanding all pledges, promises, asseverations, oaths ; thinks, upon no ground, that Christ affects others more, because of common favours ; misinterprets his expression, thinks that is sent in hatred which is given in love ; think he uses them as enemies, when he chastens them as children ; when he withdraws for trial, they conclude he has forsaken, forgotten, with Zion, Isa. xlix. 14, forgot to be gracious, Ps. lxxvii. 9.

How disloyal. Many inclinations to spiritual whoredom, after they are espoused to Christ. Too much eye the world, lust after disavowed vanities ; too high thoughts of, and eager affections to, those things that are Christ's rivals. If to look upon a woman to lust after her, be enough to make one guilty of adultery in a carnal sense, then to look upon sin and the world, with delight, desire, &c., will bring the guilt of adultery in a spiritual sense. And then how much cause has Christ to complain, that those whom he loves, and has espoused, do play the harlot with many lovers ! How often do these forsake the guide of their youth, and embrace the bosom of strangers. How much are whoredoms multiplied, Ezek. xvi. 25. And those that pass for the spouse of Christ are, ver. 32, as a wife that committeth adultery, and taketh strangers instead of her husband. O wonder ! will Christ's love be carried to one who runs a whoring from him !

How disingenuous. To venture more freely upon what is sinful or doubtful, because the Lord is so ready to pardon. To grow remiss, negligent, indifferent as to endeavours after growth in grace, through mortification, entire self-denial, strict, watchful, holy, fruitful, exemplary walking, because they think themselves sure of heaven. How disingenuous to grow worse by mercy, turn grace into wantonness, presumptuous security.

(8.) How pre-engaged to his deadly enemies, sin and Satan. Who will love one for a wife, who is contracted to another, given her heart and self into his possession, and has long continued so ? Such is a man's state, married to sin, in league with Satan, and brings forth fruit, not unto God, but unto them. Fruit unto death, this is the issue of that woful marriage, described, Rom. vii. from 1 to the 5 ; these have his first love, Christ has but the leavings ; they the first fruits, Christ many times but the gleanings ; they have the strength of the body and vigour of the soul, Christ but a decrepit body and languishing affections ; they have the spirits of the soul and its acting, Christ but the dregs. And will it not astonish any that Christ should be content with these ? Is it not a wonder that Christ can love and marry a soul, who has prostituted itself a long time to that ugly fiend Satan, and that which is more ugly, sin ?

(9.) How miserable. Nothing on earth more, or so much. Who would woo misery, or match himself with wretchedness ? As there is a strange

propensity in every one to happiness, so a strong antipathy and averseness to misery; the very approach of misery begets dread and horror, passions at a great distance from love. You may take an estimate of man's misery from the former particular, not only deprived of beauty, strength, riches, favour, &c., but also of liberty; enslaved to sin and Satan, in bonds and fetters, laden with sins, the chain of darkness, bound in affliction, and in that which is worse than iron; and the poor soul is bowed down under the weight of it, though insensible.

Nay, he is under the sentence of condemnation. The Judge of heaven and earth has passed sentence: 'He that believes not is condemned already,' John iii. 8; not only worthy, or in danger to be condemned, or will be condemned hereafter.

Nay, the execution is begun, the sentence is part executed: 'The wrath of God abides on him;' wrath, wrath of God, abiding wrath. He that is under wrath is half in hell. This makes hell and wrath, here and there, differ but in degrees. Oh what misery! Involuntary misery attracts pity, and there is some love in pity; but wilful misery can expect no pity, and none more wilful than these. He involved himself in it, and is unwilling to be delivered; he had rather have his sin with misery, than happiness as the gospel offers it. Let these meet in your thoughts, consider how despicable, &c.; any one of them render Christ's love wonderful, altogether an astonishment.

2. Ground of admiration, is, *who, the lover*. That Christ should! It would be a wonder if an angel, if any creature, could love such a thing as fallen man, so despicable, decrepit, hateful. Oh! but that Christ should love him, is an astonishment; from six considerations.

(1.) How excellent is Christ! The highest excellency in heaven, and the chiefest excellency on earth, meet in his person. He is 'fairer than the children of men,' Ps. xlv. 2; nay, fairer than the sons of God. So the angels are called, Job i. 6. That beauty that shines in the angelical nature is not so much as a glow-worm to the sun, when it comes in comparison with Christ. The lustre of it shines so bright, as it dazzles their eyes, and they cover their faces; and all the heavenly company lie prostrate at his feet, adoring, admiring that beauty which they cannot behold.

It is his beauty that makes heaven a glorious place. The sight of it, though it cannot be seen as it is, makes all those both happy and glorious that behold it. This is the blissful vision, which makes the angels blessed. This is it which makes the saints glorious, transforming them from glory to glory.

Imagine that all the beautiful accomplishments, and lovely excellencies, that ever the world saw or heard of, were united in one person; imagine that innumerable more than ever eye saw, or ear heard, or heart can conceive, were added to and mixed with the former; imagine that every of these excellencies were screwed up to the *nil ultra* of infiniteness; imagine these, and infinitely more than can be imagined, to meet and shine in one person: and this is Christ. All the rays of beauty which are dispersed in heaven and earth are united in him, as in the sun. Every spark of beauty in Christ is an excellency, such as heaven and earth cannot match. And every excellency in him is infinite. See how many wonders! And can such excellency deign to love such baseness? The bright morning star unite itself to a dunghill? Will such beauty love such deformity? One so fair, us so ugly? Will so great a king, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, marry such a slave? The most high God the basest and most wretched creature? Will happiness and glory match itself with misery and

vileness, and infiniteness stoop to that which is nothing? Will he, whose purity cannot behold sin, cast an eye of love upon sinners; and he, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, set his heart upon a worm, a mote? Would you not wonder to see a peerless beauty espouse a deformed hag?

(2.) How glorious. In Christ is not only all beauty, that which is the perfection of beauty, excellency; but that which is the highest degree of excellency, glory. What glory, see Heb. i. 3, 'the brightness of his glory.' Here is glory, and brightness of glory, and brightness of his Father's glory, *i. e.* of infinite glory. So that Christ is infinitely glorious. And to that which is infinite nothing can be added. Whatever man can do, he cannot add to the glory of Christ. And since he can get no glory by him, why does he love him? Man's goodness upon this account is no advantage to Christ, as Eliphaz expresses it, Job xxii. 2.

It is true, relative glory may be increased or diminished, that is, when essential glory is manifested or acknowledged. But this is extrinsecal to Christ; he had been infinitely glorious if no creature had ever seen or acknowledged his glory. Besides, if desire of this might be an engagement of Christ's love, yet it is a wonder that man, of all creatures, should be beloved out of this respect; for there never was any one man upon earth but did more dishonour Christ, than all the creatures on earth besides, from the beginning of the world to the dissolution of it. One man does more dishonour to Christ than the whole creation.

If Christ have any honour by man, yet he has much more dishonour; therefore it is a wonder Christ should love man, for it will be hard to conceive how respect to his glory engages him to it. While man is unregenerate, his whole life is a continual impeachment of his glory. And after he is regenerate, in the services which tend most to Christ's glory, he seems to be more dishonoured than glorified. For there is no one act, but has many sins mixed with it. And do not many sins more impair his glory than one good act illustrates it?

What wonders are here! Will infinite glory love that which is the shame of the whole creation? Will Christ, whose glory is himself, love that which most impairs his glory? Will he pass by them who dishonour him, and set his heart upon those who do nothing else? Who would not wonder to see a king in his glory embrace a toad, and cherish it in his bosom; or run into the embraces of a slave, a traitor to his crown and dignity? But when the King, the Lord of glory, for love to such a one, becomes 'the reproach of men, and shame of the people,' Ps. xxii. 6; that glory should be content to be covered with shame, and divine excellency to be clothed with ignominy and reproach; what a wonder is this!

(3.) How happy. Christ was perfectly, infinitely happy, before the creation, and had been so to eternity if no man had ever been created. Men love, that they may be more happy, that they may have more delight, or contentment, or abundance, or assistance. Christ stood in need of none of these; men and angels could not contribute more of these to Christ than he enjoyed. His happiness was in the enjoyment of the eternal Father and divine Spirit. To this nothing can be added, from it nothing detracted. For it is himself, and so infinite, *et infinito non datur majus*. Man is of no use to Christ, as to his happiness. If there had been a million of worlds of men, Christ had been never the happier. If no man had been created, or all men had perished, Christ had not been, could not be, one jot less happy. Man cannot add so much to Christ as a spark to the sun, or a drop to the ocean, or a point to the vast frame of heaven and earth.

Christ is not only πάνταρκης, but ἑαυταρκης; not only all-sufficient, but self-sufficient. The creature's sufficiency is from him, his is from himself. The Lord declares how little need he has of man, Ps. l. 9-12. 'The eyes of all wait upon him, and he satisfies the desires of every living thing,' Ps. cxlv. 15, 16. But he is infinitely satisfied in looking upon himself; for in himself dwells all fulness satisfactory to him, and more than sufficient to all his. He stands in no more need of man than the heavens stand in need of a gnat to move them, or the earth of a grasshopper to support it, or the sea of a mote to confine it to its bounds. Fulness emptied! Blessedness cursed! What a wonder! Infinite happiness unite itself to extreme misery! Why does Christ mind that which is useless to him? But, oh why should he love him? Christ is all-sufficient, and perfectly happy without man; why should he shew himself unsatisfied till man be happy? Christ was infinitely, fully satisfied, in the enjoyment of his Father; why would he do, suffer so much, to bring wretched vain man into that blissful enjoyment? Christ had lost nothing if man had perished. Why should he expose his person to so many hazards to save him? Christ had suffered nothing, if man had suffered to eternity; why would he suffer so much to free him from suffering?

(4.) How knowing. Christ is omniscient. He knows all things that may discourage him from love, and nothing is to be known in man but may discourage, and all things that are hateful meet in man. If one that hath nothing lovely can conceal or hide what is hateful, can make fair shows when there are foul deformities, it is less wonder if any be surprised with love of such an one. But when there is nothing lovely in man, and all things that are hateful, and Christ knows this distinctly, exactly, better than man himself, this makes his love a wonder. But so it is, not the least part of man's unloveliness was, or could be, concealed from Christ, Heb. iv. 13, Jer. xxiii. 23, 24. All the former particulars, and more than we can number, were from eternity presented to Christ at once; not one after another, as to us, but he saw them at one view, and he saw them, sees them always actually. His knowledge is not, as ours, habitual, but actual. His eye is always fixed on them, they are never forgotten, never laid aside, but always present, continually presented to his thoughts; for in him *cognoscere et cogitare idem sunt*.

This consideration adds as much wonder to Christ's love as any. Does he know man's frame, and considers he is but dust; and will he count such a base thing his jewel, his peculiar treasure? Does he weigh man, and find him lighter than vanity; and will no other expression satisfy his love, but 'weight of glory'? He foresaw man would fall, and shatter the beautiful frame of his soul into pieces, and so make himself lame, blind, maimed, impotent, decrepit, unable to do anything pleasing; and would he do and suffer so much for him, who could do nothing for him, so much against him?

He knew he was poor, beggarly, naked. Oh why did he not disdain to look upon so forlorn a wretch? Or if he would shew some pity, would nothing serve to cover that nakedness but his own robe; to relieve that poverty but unsearchable riches, his own fulness? His pure eye saw nothing lovely in man, had a distinct view of all his deformities, his loathsome complexion, and monstrous dispositions. He saw that in him alone of all the earth that his soul hated, and would he love him more than all the earth? He saw he had made himself worse, more deformed than the beasts that perish, and would he so love him as to equal him with angels? He saw man had forsaken God, and was cast off by him and all his, and would his soul cleave to him? He knew man alone, of all his creatures on

earth, did hate him, and would he pass by them who loved him, to love man who only hated him? Would Christ suffer his friends to perish, and save his mortal enemy?

Christ not only knows that man's disposition is froward, unkind, rebellious, disingenuous, ungrateful, and disloyal, but he saw from eternity every froward look, every unkind gesture, every rebellious motion, every disingenuous act, every ungrateful return, every disloyal inclination. He knows, and knew, the hearts and reins, 2 Chron. vi. 30, Ps. vii. 10; every heart and every motion of it was as visible to him from eternity as our faces to us when we look most stedfastly one upon another, and infinitely more. He who takes notice of every hair of our heads did take more notice of that which more concerns him, the disposition and inclination of our hearts; if those are numbered, surely these are. He tells not only tears, but wanderings; they are in his book, Ps. lvi. 8. Would he be kind to those who he knew would be froward? so indulgent to one so rebellious? multiply favours upon such ungrateful wretches, so disingenuous? would he engage himself to one who he knew would play the harlot? He knew how long he would resist before, and how treacherous after. Why would he pity wilful misery, and be at such expenses to make him happy, who he knew had rather be miserable? Why would he love that which he knew was more in love with sin, and accept of that which Satan had so long possessed, and espouse Satan's strumpet?

(5.) How free and independent. There was no necessity, no motive, no engagement upon Christ to love any creature. He enjoyed more liberty than is to be found in the creatures. It was in his choice whether any creatures should have a being, much more whether any should be the objects of his love. There was no necessity he should create anything, none sure that he should love any. The Lord was infinitely satisfied in the enjoyment of himself, and none but himself could be an object meet, proportionable to his love, worthy of it. Why then did he think of making, much more of loving, anything else? Or if he would not confine his love to his own breast, yet in the expressions of it to those other creatures before man, or any men before those that are chosen, as at his liberty. He amongst us, who may love whom he pleases, and enjoy whom he loves, will choose the best, or else it is a wonder.

Here is the wonder of Christ's love, that it does fix upon the worst of creatures, man, yea, and upon the worst of men in some respects.

Christ has not loved those that are most lovely, nor those who can make the best returns, otherwise he had chosen the fallen angels rather than fallen man. The angelical nature is more excellent, and comes nearer to the divine nature, being spiritual. They had more power to answer his love, as being more intelligent and more active, yet when Christ had his choice, see what a wonderful determination his will made: Fallen angels I will hate, but fallen man I will love. He leaves them where they fell, to lie in chains of eternal darkness; but he lifts up man's head, and crowns it with glory and dignity.

Nay, since Christ is so free as he might love whom he pleases, it is a wonder he did not respect the inferior creatures rather than man. For why? They never offended, never dishonoured him, but constantly declare his glory and execute his will. But man is the only offender, the only guilty creature on earth; none else dishonour and offend Christ. Yet when Christ had his choice, see his resolution, and wonder. I will give him eternal life who has dishonoured me; I will suffer them to perish who never offended me!

But if man must be the object of Christ's love, it is yet a wonder he did

not love other men rather than those whom he has chosen. Christ has not chosen men of choicest parts, and sweetest dispositions, or greatest ability; not those that might have been more able and more willing to answer his love and do him service. It is a wonderful distinction his love made; the apostle tells us, 1 Cor. i. 26-28, not the wise, but the foolish; not the mighty, but the weak; not the noble, but the base, despised, nothings, things which are not. We may see it and wonder. Earth will wonder at it while there are men on earth, and heaven while there are saints and angels in heaven.

(6.) How powerful. 'All power is given to him in heaven and earth,' Mat. xxviii. 18, that as Mediator; but as God, he is coequal with his Father, and so omnipotent. He could have created more lovely, more excellent creatures than any [that] are in being. He did not act as natural agents, *ad extremum virium*; but with as much ease as he made the world could have formed creatures innumerable degrees more excellent than the most excellent piece of his creation, the angels. There is a vast, an unconceivable distance betwixt the angelical nature and infiniteness, therefore there is room enough for variety of creatures inconceivably more lovely than angels, and such as might have been incomparably more serviceable.

Now since man is so extremely deformed and unserviceable, and therefore so unfit, so unworthy to be beloved, it is a wonder that Christ would take notice of man, and not rather think of forming some creatures more meet to be objects of his love. Since man had made himself equal, if not inferior, to the beasts that perish, Christ might have suffered him to perish with them without further regard of him, and chosen a more noble, a more lovely object to please himself withal. It is more a wonder than if a curious florist, having choice of the rarest flowers on earth, should please himself with such weeds as grow in every field; or than if an exact lapidary, being acquainted with the richest mines in the world, and having power to possess himself of what precious stones he list, should content himself with pebbles, and such stones as are to be found in every street; or if one, having that imaginary philosopher's stone, and power to turn every metal into gold, should be satisfied with lead or iron. What a wonder would this be! Much more wonderful is Christ's love, which chooses those who are unspeakably more inferior to the creatures he could have formed than lead is to gold, or a stinking weed to the sweetest and fairest flower. How should we wonder, in the words of the Psalmist, Ps. viii., 'Lord, what is man?' Thou mightest have made creatures unspeakably higher than both, yet thou wouldst not prefer these before man; suffer these to sleep in their abhorred state of nonentity, and give man a being, and so as to be the object of his love.

(7.) How absolute. The sovereignty of Christ makes his love a wonder. Christ might, without any prejudice to his glory, have annihilated all men if they had continued innocent, and might have justified the act upon the bare account of his sovereignty. Shall not I do with mine own as I list? Mat. xx. 15, 'Is it not lawful?' But after sin, he might have executed the sentence of death upon all mankind in that very moment they received life; and, as he threatens Ephraim, Hosea ix. 11, might have made the glory of man to fly away as a bird, from the birth, the womb, and the conception. He might have crushed these cockatrices in the egg, and never let them grow up into fiery flying serpents. And this he might have done with advantage to his glory, and thereby much prevented that dishonour which he suffers by their lives. It is the Lord's mercy that every man in his infancy is not consumed. What a wonder of mercy is it that he is loved! What a wonder, when Christ might with so much glory to his justice, power, wisdom,

sovereignty, have destroyed man, he should rather choose to love him. When there was, as it were, a contest betwixt mercy and justice, love and hatred, and when there was so much more reason for hatred, so little or none from man for love, yet Christ should interpose his sovereignty rather than man should perish, and, when there was no other reason, love him because he would love him, Deut. vii. 7, 8, Exod. xxxiii. 19. And as if the Lord should say, There is no reason in men why I should love any one of them; I see many weighty reasons why I should hate him; my hatred will be justified before all the world, and my justice much glorified thereby: yet for all this, though there be much reason from my own glory, and all the reason in the world from man utterly to hate him and all his posterity, yet I will not hate him, nay, I will love him.

3. *How Christ loves man.* This is a ground of much admiration. Its transcendency makes it transcendently wonderful. It is a wonder man has a being, that more excellent creatures did not supply; it is a wonder he is not cut off from the birth, hated; it is a wonder, if Christ should but carry himself indifferently as to the inferior creatures, if Christ did but vouchsafe the least degree of love imaginable to him, in the highest degree hateful. But that he should be so far from destroying, as to glorify him; so far from hating him, as he should love him superlatively, transcendently; not only love him positively, but comparatively!

(1.) Christ loves men more than the best of men love one another. There is more love in Christ than is to be found in the sons of men. There is no human breast can contain so much love as moves in the heart of Christ. The dearest, the most affectionate relation on earth, affords not so much love as is in Christ. Nay, there is as much love in him as in all relations united; nay, there is more love in him than in all relations together. Single out that relation, which of all on earth does most engage, and does usually afford, the most love, and this will fall far short of the love of Christ. Amongst all the examples of love which all generations have afforded, choose that which is most eminent, and rises higher than all the rest, as not to be paralleled; yet even this will fall far below the love of Christ. We may take Christ's testimony in this case, though it be his own: John xv. 13, 'Greater love hath no man, than that a man lay down his life for his friend.' But Christ's love was greater than the greatest love of men, he laid down his life for enemies. To die for such, and such a death, makes his death a nonsuch. His love is as far above man's as his thoughts. Love is proportionable to thoughts. But how high are his thoughts above men's? Isa. lv. 89, 'As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.' And those high thoughts were thoughts of love, thoughts of mercy and pardon, ver. 7.

His love comprises, and eminently contains, the love of all relations. The sparks of love, which are found dispersed in several relations, are laid together in Christ's breast, and there break out into a flame, such a flame as many waters cannot quench, Cant. viii. 6, 7. The love of all relations meet in him, and therefore he is held forth under all relations, that the defect which is in one may be supplied by another, and so his love represented to us as perfect and entire: Mat. xii. 50, I will love, as if endeared to me by all relations. He calls us his 'friends,' John xv. 15; 'brethren,' Heb. ii. 11, 17, John xx. 17; he is a 'father,' Isa. viii. 18; 'I, and the children,' &c., Heb. ii. 13; a 'mother,' Isa. xl. 11, Mat. xxiii. 37, 'As a hen gathereth her chickens,' &c.; 'a husband;' and to shew the strength and vigour of his love, 'a bridegroom.' In Christ there is the faithful love of a friend, the careful love of a brother, the provident love of a father, the indulgent, com-

passionate love of a mother, the intimate love of a husband. Christ's love is so abundant, as it runs forth in every relation, and supplies and answers the office of all. He answers the engagements of all, better than the best of men can answer any. He has the love of a friend; this made him willing to become our surety, counsellor, intercessor. His love is a brotherly love; this makes him willing to advise, comfort, sympathise; a paternal love, so he provides, instructs, corrects; a mother's love, so he does nourish and embrace, with complacency, with passion; a conjugal love, so he vouchsafes his presence, his estate, his person, his honours, his secrets, and his guard. Christ's love is propounded as an example. His does perfectly supply all, is not defective in any, as men are. A man may be a loving friend, but an unkind father; an indulgent father, but an unfaithful husband, as David; an affectionate husband, but an unkind brother, as Solomon. But Christ's love is large enough to reach all. No such friend, father, &c., as he.

Christ's love is more than the love of all relations. His love amounts to more than all these summed up together. No such friend as Christ, who would die to make men his friends. No such brother as Christ, who makes all his brethren co-heirs. No such father as Christ, who, to bring his children to life, would die himself. No such husband as Christ, who will love his spouse though she play the harlot. Christ's love is stronger than the united love of all relations. His soul, his heart is more capacious. All the love of the creatures will scarce fill a corner of his heart; it is widened by glory and hypostatical union. His love is stronger, because he has stronger engagements to love; not from us, but from his Father: the strength of a law, a law of God, a law written in his heart, Ps. xl. 8. It binds us as much, but is not so much obeyed, because we are not so apprehensive of the strength of the obligation as Christ. He is as much more loving, as he is more apprehensive than we. He is as loving as he is obedient, and his love exceeds ours as much as his obedience. As he fulfilled all righteousness in the highest degree, so he performs all acts of love without the least defect.

His love is perfect. It is not a passionate love, but a perfect love, that deserves the name of strong. He is free from all imperfection, that might abate the heat, and eclipse the light of this pure flame. His love is without folly, hypocrisy, selfishness, alteration, diminution, inordinacy, defect, excess. There is a double exercise of love in Christ, but one in the creatures; so it exceeds not only the love of men, but angels. He loves as God, he loves as man. Christ has two natures, and so two wills, both seats of love. The divine will, that is infinite; and so his love is unspeakable, passing knowledge; this fountain of love has no banks, no bottom. The human will, that is shallower indeed; but the streams of love that issue from it are so strong, so pure, as the love of the creatures is but as a drop, a polluted drop, compared with it; for the human nature is glorified, so it is perfect, and all its acts, and this of love. This holy fire flames as high, and burns as pure, as any created flame in heaven. What is earth to it? But besides, it is assumed into union with the Godhead, and so this love transcends both the love of angels and glorified saints. The love of Christ is both the love of an infinite God, and the love of a most perfect glorious man. No wonder if, having such springs, it fill the channel of every relation; but most wonderful that all these streams should run towards man. Oh that Christ should love an enemy with a greater love than any friend! should be more indulgent to a rebel than any father to his son! should be more affectionate to sin and Satan's offspring than any mother to her sucking child!

(2.) Christ loves man more than man loves himself. The love of Christ is more than self-love in man; therefore it is wonderful. The philosopher tells

us that self-love is the ground of all love. The reason why man loves others is because he loves himself, therefore it is the greatest love; for *quod efficit tale est magis tale*. If man loves others because he loves himself, the love of himself must transcend his love to others. This love exceeds all others; but Christ's love exceeds it, therefore wonderful.

Besides, self-love is propounded by Christ as a pattern, an example, to which our love to others must be conformed, Mat. xxii. 39. That which is chosen for example is eminent. No love like self-love amongst men. How wonderful then is Christ's love, which is stronger than this, and exceeds it in many respects!

A natural man loves his body, not his soul, and so not himself; for *animus cujusque, is est quisque*; Christ loves both. Nor does he love his body in reference to eternity, but time only; the love of Christ has a sweet eternal influence on both. He desires no more than sensual happiness, or rational at most; Christ desires he should be spiritually, eternally happy. He satisfies himself with outward enjoyments; Christ gives himself to enjoy. He seeks but corn, wine, oil; Christ would vouchsafe the light of his countenance. He loves death; Christ purchases life. Man cannot truly love himself till he have a spiritual principle of love; this he cannot have but from Christ; wretched man cannot love himself till Christ enable. Now he that makes man love himself, does love man more than he loves himself.

After a man is spiritualised, yet in some respects Christ loves him better. His love of himself is imperfect; Christ's is without defect. Man desires some good things, some bad; Christ purchases and bestows nothing but what is good. Man would be content with some; Christ gives all. Nay, what man can be found who would do so much, part with so much, suffer so much, for his own salvation, as Christ hath? It would be a wonder if Christ, considering the premises, should be willing to love man as much as man loves him. Oh what wonder that Christ should love him as much as he loves himself! Who would expect or desire any more than that he should love him as much as he loves himself? That there should be more love is unreasonable to expect, and wonderful where it is found. It is so in men, much more in Christ.

(3.) Christ loves man more than he loves the angels, in divers respects. It is evident in that distinction his love has made betwixt both fallen by sin. Not one of the fallen angels have, or ever shall taste of his love; but innumerable companies of men are restored to his favour. Those, sometimes bright morning stars, Job xviii. 7, are thrown into eternal night and utter darkness; and poor pieces of earth, men, are fixed in their sphere of glory. Herein that saying of Christ, by his distinguishing love, is verified, 'The first shall be last, and the last first.' The angels, the first-born of Christ's love, are disinherited; and man, the least of creatures capable of happiness, put in possession. The angels, first in excellency and glory, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power, as Jacob of Reuben, Gen. xlix. 3, now banished from their father's presence, and must never see his face more. Yet men, inferior in all things but rebellion, are reconciled and made his favourites. These nobles of his court are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, Jude ver. 6; and men, his poorest peasants, though equally guilty, are restored into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

It is evident also in the hypostatical union. He preferred men before angels, in that he chose rather to unite the human nature to himself personally than the angelical: Heb. ii. 16, 'He took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham.' It is wonderful he seemed to love man so much as to neglect his honour, that which we account honour. If the

Lord had a mind to disguise himself in the shape of a creature, why did he not rather clothe himself with the robes of angelical perfection than the rags of humanity? Their nature would have been a pavilion of glory, ours but tabernacles of clay. What reason has poor man to say, with the centurion, 'Lord, I am unworthy thou shouldst come under my roof'? Why would he bear the image of the earthly, rather than the image of the heavenly? Why did he not appear rather in the glory of a star than the baseness of red clay? Oh that he should have such respect to the lowliness of wretched man, to respect him so, as if he seemed not thereby to disrespect himself, yet to neglect the angels!

Oh, there was wonderful love which caused such a strange condescension. He never stooped so low for their sakes, though he might have done it at an easier rate. Their nature does more resemble him; their excellency is more akin to divinity, though many degrees removed. Why did he not appear in the shape of spirit, rather than in the likeness of sinful flesh? They are called gods, Ps. lxxxvi. 8. And the Chaldee reads it, 'Among the high angels,' 1 Sam. xxviii. 13, Ps. lxxxii. 6. But man, poor man, is a worm. We would say a king forgot himself if he should but speak with his hat off to a servant. Oh what did the King of glory when he became flesh, a worm! Elizabeth said with wonder, when Mary came but to visit her, Luke i. 43, 'Whence is this to me!' How may man with wonder cry out, Whence is this, that the Lord himself should come unto me; should come, not to see me, but to be one with me! Where union is affected, there is love; and where the nearest union, the greatest love. No union so near as this in heaven and earth, but that whereby God is one with himself. Nothing is more one with Christ than man but Christ himself. No union so intimate as the hypostatical, but only the essential, *ένωσις άκρά*. Angels were never so nearly united, and therefore never so much beloved. The reason of this union is a demonstration of this truth. Why did Christ take our nature? The apostle tells us, Heb. ii. 17, 'He was made like his brethren, that he might be merciful.' More like, that he might be more loving; that he might be more tenderly affectionate, more feelingly compassionate. Likeness is the mother of love; and where there is more likeness, there is more love. Christ is now more like to men than angels, therefore in this respect he loves man more, Heb. iv. 15. He is not one that cannot be touched,' &c., *μη δυναμένος συμπαθησαι*. He became a man, that he might love as man; and had experience of man's necessities, that the expressions of his love might be conformable thereto. But how can he sympathise with angels? Unlikeness in qualities and dispositions makes love keep a distance, much more a total unlikeness in nature. However Christ be affected to angels, as he is God, he is more affectionate to us, as he is man; he is more *φιλόανθρωπος* than *φιλάγγελος*. It is a wonder he should love man more in any respect, who is in all respects more unlovely.

(4.) Christ loves man more than heaven and earth, more than the kingdom of heaven, more than all the kingdoms of the earth and the glory of both, more than the whole world.

For earth, it is evident: Mat. iv. 8-10, 'The devil taketh him up into a mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then Jesus saith unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan.' As if Satan had said, If thou wilt put thyself into an incapacity of redeeming man, and so lay aside thoughts of loving him, all this will I give thee. But Christ rejects the motion with indignation, 'Get thee behind me,' &c. So I love man, as all the kingdoms of the world are not so valuable in

my account as man's salvation ; so I love man, as I will not for all the world that he should miscarry ; his soul is more dear to me than all the kingdoms of the earth. What will it profit me to gain the whole world if man lose his soul ? Heaven and earth shall pass away, rather than one jot of my love shall fade, one soul whom I love should perish.

He loved man more than heaven. It is true, no motion or alteration can be properly attributed to the second person. But since the Scripture ascribes that to the person of Christ which was proper to one nature, we may warrantably use such expressions of Christ as Mediator. Christ forgot his kindred and Father's house, and came to sojourn amongst strangers, amongst enemies. He came from the height of glory to the lowest step of shame and misery, where, instead of the joys of heaven, the sorrows of hell encompassed him, Ps. cxvi. 3. He exchanged a life of infinite blessedness with a cursed death ; and, instead of the praises and adoration of angels, he was entertained with the reproaches and contradiction of sinners. Now, what is heaven but life, glory, joy, happiness ? What is hell, but death, shame, sorrow, misery ? Christ exchanged heaven for hell, that he might purchase man. His love made him willing to part with heaven, rather than man should be excluded from it ; to enter the gates of hell (sufferings equivalent), rather than man should be tormented in it. He feared not hell ; he loved not heaven, so much as he loved man. Oh what wonderful love, that would prefer a poor parcel of dust before the glory of the whole world, the happiness and glory of heaven and earth ! As man, he lived out of heaven all the time that he had lived on earth ; whereas he had right and title to heaven as soon as he was born into the world.

(5.) Christ loves man as himself, in some respect more. Christ loves man more than himself, as man. I do not say Christ as God, or absolutely ; but as man, and in some respects. With these cautions, it is a truth, that Christ loves his people as himself.

[1.] He is obliged to it by virtue of that law which himself proclaims : Mat. xxii., 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' For this law binds Christ as well as men ; for he was 'made under the law,' Gal. iv. 4. He acknowledges it his duty to fulfil all righteousness, Mat. iii. 15. And for this end he came, to fulfil the law, Mat. v. 19. Christ is bound by the law to love his neighbour ; but his people are his neighbours, 'a people near unto him,' Ps. cxlviii. 14. No such vicinity or nearness on earth. They live not only near him, but with him, in him, John xiii. 4, 5 ; and he near, in, with them. They are not only neighbours, but inmates ; not only *vicini*, but *propinqui*, *cognati* ; allied to him, one with him ; so intimately as he and his make but one Christ mystical, 1 Cor. xii. 12. They are his neighbours, and he is bound to love such as himself ; and none ever answered the law's obligation so punctually, so perfectly, as he. He that was so observant of the ceremonial law, as appears in his circumcision, but as a beggarly rudiment, would much more obey the royal law, as this is called, James ii. 8. If he would not transgress that law which enjoined sacrifices, he would not neglect that law of love which is 'better than all whole burnt-offerings,' Mark xii. 33. He that submitted to positive institutions, as baptism, would not disobey moral commands, as this is. He that was so punctual in observing every tittle of the law, would not neglect that which is *instar omnium*, the whole law ; so this is called, Gal. v. 14. Nay, this doth virtually contain both law and prophets, Mat. xxii. 40. If Christ should not thus love, &c., he would violate the whole law, and run cross to all the prophets, which are to the law as comments on the text. This cannot be imagined without blasphemy. Christ should sin if he should not love his people. He should

disobey the law which obliges him, and neglect that which he condescended, by becoming man, to make his duty, if he did not love, &c.

[2.] He advances them to the like state with himself, so far as man is capable. He bestows upon them all things that himself hath, so far as they are communicable. The same natures. He consists of divine and human, and so does man in some sense. That Christ might be like them, he took human nature; that they might be like him, he communicates the divine nature, 2 Peter i. 4. Not that it is altogether the same, but that it most resembles it. There is in them *θειότης*, though not *θεότης*, some divinity, not a deity; *θεία φύσις*, not *θεῦ φύσις*, not substance, but quality. The offices. He is king, priest, and prophet; so are they, in the text, 'kings and priests.' Prophets, 'all taught of God.' The same privileges. Union, as he is one with the Father, so they with him, with both, John xvii. 21; a kind of *περιχώρησις*, a reciprocal union. Birthright, Christ is 'first-born,' Col. i. 15, 18. They constitute 'the church of the first-born,' Heb. xii. 23. Heirship, Christ is 'heir of all things,' Heb. i. 2. They are 'co-heirs,' Rom. viii. 17. Heirs of the world, as Abraham, Rom. iv. 13. The same enjoyments. The Lord gave Christ all things, John iii. 35; and Christ has given them all, 1 Cor. iii. 21, 2 Cor. iv. 15. His own joy, John xv. 11, the best of all; not only joy, peace, &c., but his own: John xvii. 3, 'My joy fulfilled in them.' His own peace: John xiv. 24, 'My peace'; 'the peace of God,' Philip. iv. His own righteousness, Jer. xxiii. He is made so to us, 1 Cor. i., the righteousness of God, Philip. iii. 9. His own grace: John i. 18, 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.' He would have it with them. The fulness of God. His own glory, John xvii. 22; his own throne, Rev. iii. 21. Where there is such a community, love makes all common. Where no distinction in expressions, we may conclude some equality in affections. When Christ does for all them as for himself, we may say, he loves them as himself. The difference as to accidental happiness arises not from want of love in Christ, but for want of capacity in man; there is love enough in him to vouchsafe more, if we were capable.

[3.] Christ takes what is done to his people as done to himself. He punishes what any do against them, as though they acted against himself; and rewards what is done for them, as though it were done for him. Nor has he only this account of actions, but of what is less, words, and thoughts, and intimations; he resents all as his own concernments, nay, he takes notice of all omissions of what is due to them, and interprets all neglects of them, as neglects of himself. The people of Christ are parts of Christ, as *uxor est pars mariti*, bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh. The head and members make but one body; so also Christ. The intimacy of this union causes a reciprocation of interests. 'In all their afflictions he is afflicted,' as the head suffers when the body is tormented. Christ accounts the least injury done to them as done to himself: 'He that toucheth you, toucheth me.' You cannot touch them but Christ feels.

He is as sensible of words. There is a verbal persecution, such as that of Esau's. Christ counts himself wounded, when the tongues of the wicked are sharp swords to his people, Ps. lvii. 4. Christ is persecuted in all their persecutions: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' and this is one kind; nay, affections, though concealed. If any hate a saint in his heart, though he never manifest it, Christ looks on such an one as a hater of himself, 1 John iv. 20; so of anger, rage, Isa. xxxvii. 29. Intimations; putting out the finger, Isa. lviii. 9; lifting up the eyes in derision or contempt, the Lord counts himself derided and contemned thereby, Isa. xxxvii. 23; nay, Christ puts this interpretation upon thoughts, though they seem not consider-

able. He that has low thoughts of Christ's people, in his account has low thoughts of him, Luke x. 16, 1 Thes. iv. 8. He owns and rewards what is done for them, as done for himself; he accounts himself clothed, when their nakedness is covered; feasted, when their hunger is satisfied; relieved, when their necessities are supplied; entertained, when they are harboured, Mat. x. 40, xxv. 39, 40. He rewards the least kindness to them as royally as the greatest that is done to himself, Mat. x. 42.

Nay, he has this account, not only of kind actions, but even of every kind look, Mat. xxv. 36. When they but lend an ear and hear them, in his account they hear him, Luke x. 16.

[4.] Christ does for them what he would have done for himself, and nothing else. He loves another as himself, who is thus despised. Take an instance of it, Luke xx., where, ver. 27, having laid down the rule of loving others as ourselves, he explains it in a parable, ver. 30, in which we are directed both to the object and measure, who, and how. He that does demean himself to others, as the Samaritan to that traveller, loves him as himself. But Christ comes up to, nay, goes far beyond this instance. This traveller is a figure of every man by nature, fallen among thieves, the powers of darkness, and his own lusts; stripped of the image of God, knowledge, righteousness, and holiness; wounded by sin, so as there is nothing in his soul but wounds; half dead, his soul dead, deprived of spiritual life, Eph. ii.; forsaken of all the world, who could neither relieve nor pity him.

The Samaritan is a figure of Christ. He sees and pities fallen man; has compassion on him, shews it in curing and accommodating him. Went to him, yea, he came from heaven to shew his love; bound up his wounds, yea, he was willing to be wounded, Isa. liii.; pours wine and oil, yea, he poured out his blood to wash and cleanse our wounds, applied that for cure; sets him on his own beast; yea, he charges the angels with him, his own ministering spirits; defrays the expenses; he lays down all that law and justice could demand; defrays all at his own charge, though it cost him his life and soul. If the Samaritan, by doing so little, be said to love the distressed man, how did Christ love, who did much more?

[5.] Christ honours man with those relations which engage to as much. A man must love his wife as himself, Eph. v. 33, as his own body, ver. 28. A man should sin if he do otherwise. Christ will be far from failing; this love in its highest degree is exemplary in him: ver. 25, 'As Christ loved the church.' Why, how did he love it? He tells, ver. 28, from whence it follows, that when husbands love their wives as themselves, they love as Christ loves. Besides, man loves his members, his flesh, his bones, as himself, but Christ accounts us so, vers. 29, 30.

(6.) Christ, in some respects, loves man better than himself. These are many.

[1.] Christ would suffer, rather than man should suffer; rather undergo all that man had deserved, than man undergo any. We may imagine Christ's love expressing itself thus: Is poor man in so forlorn a condition, as none in heaven and earth will pity him? I will take to me the bowels of a man; I have seen his misery, and will sympathise with him. Is man reduced to this woful strait, as either he must suffer, or he that is God, for him? I will fit myself with a body for his sake; I will give my back to the smiters, &c., rather than man shall bear the burden of infinite wrath, rather than the weight of it shall sink him into eternal torments; let it fall upon me, I will bear it, though it make my soul heavy unto death. Rather than man shall drink the cup of the Lord's indignation, oh let it be put to

my head! I will drink it, even the dregs of it, though the bitterness of death be in it. Rather than man shall be cast into that place of torments, to spend eternity in weeping and gnashing of teeth, I will be content to become a man of sorrows, yea, let the sorrows of death encompass my soul. Is the sentence of eternal death passed upon man? Can none else procure pardon or reprieve? Is he, and must he indeed be condemned? Why, righteous is the Lord, but let that dreadful sentence be executed upon me, let me die for him, so as poor man may escape. Will nothing else purge man from that woful pollution which makes him odious to my Father? I will open a fountain in my heart, I will wash him in my blood. Must all the curses of law and gospel fall upon wretched man? Alas! what will become of him? The least of them will sink the whole creation. Let them rather fall upon my soul and body; I will become a curse for man, I will bear it, though it be the curse both of first and second death. Is the vengeance of eternal fire man's portion? Oh, how can he dwell with everlasting burnings! rather let the flame be turned upon me, though it scorch both body, and torture my soul. Will nothing satisfy the avenger of blood, nothing satisfy justice but blood? Every part of me shall bleed for you; lo, here is my head, my heart, my whole body; let me be scourged, nailed, pierced; yea, let my heart send out its last drop of dearest blood, if man may escape.

[2.] He prayed more for men than himself. Prayer is the pulse of love, by it we may know its strength or weakness. Fervent and frequent prayers are symptoms of strong and ardent affections. Those that pray much, love much; and them most, for whom they most pray. Christ hereby makes it known that he loves his own, not the world; because he prays for them, not for that, John xvii. 9. And as it is a positive sign, so also comparatively. As by this we know whom Christ loves, whom not; so whom he loves more, whom less. By all his prayers recorded in Scripture, it appears he prayed more for man than himself. Nor was this because Christ had less need to pray for himself. For who had so much need, so great extremities, so many infirmities, temptations, dangers, necessities, afflictions? Who has more need to pray, than he who has most of these? Yet, behold the love of Christ! When all these were rushing in upon him, when God and man, men and devils, death and hell, were at once falling upon soul and body, when he had most need to pray for himself, then he prays most for men. See John xvii., the prayer made immediately before his sufferings; twenty parts of that chapter are taken up with petitions for men, but one verse or two for himself. He desires many things for them, but one for himself. He importunes his Father for union, joy, holiness, perseverance, glory for them; he desires nothing but glory for himself, vers. 1-5. Nor does he desire this for himself alone, but for their sakes; he begs glory of the Father that he may give it them, ver. 22. Oh that Christ should be so mindful of them as he seems to forget himself! That his thoughts should be more taken up with them, than with his own grievous sufferings, that he knew were then approaching, and his apprehension of them most quick and piercing!

[3.] He expressed more joy for their welfare, than himself as man. Love is proportionable to joy; for as desire is love in its motion, so joy is love in its triumph. Joy is as it were the smile, the blossom of love; it is a sign love is well rooted in the heart, when joy breaks forth in outward expressions. We love that best in which we take most pleasure, most rejoice. Desire is love in pursuit, so joy is love in possession. Desire is a sign of

some love, but joy of more. Now Christ seems to rejoice more for men, than himself as man. He never took pleasure in anything below, so much as in advancing man's happiness; and never manifested more grief and indignation than when any would hinder or dissuade. What was that wherein he took as much delight as nature does in meat and drink? It was the conversion of souls, John iv. 34. But with what indignation does he rebuke Peter, dissuading him from grievous sufferings, sufferings upon which man's happiness depended: 'Spare thyself,' Mat. xvi. 22, 23; 'Be it far from thee.'

It is true, indeed, we seldom find Christ rejoicing in the whole history of his life. He was 'a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief,' and scarce with anything else, a stranger to joys. But when we meet him rejoicing, the occasion is usually, if not always, some advantage to men. We read he rejoiced, John xi. 15, *χαίρω δι' ὑμῶν*, it was for man's sake. He says not, he was glad because he should get glory by the miracle, because he should get the honour and repute of one that could work miracles; but *ἵνα πιστεύσητε*, more that it would make them happy, than bring him honour and reputation. See Luke x. 21, we find Christ in an ecstasy, almost transported with joy, *ἠγαλλίασατο τῷ πνεύματι*, his spirit leaped within him, and as though he had been rapt into heaven, adds praises, his joy breaks forth into thanks. But what is the occasion of both? Not that the devils were subject through his name, not that Satan fell, &c., but that it pleased the Father to make known the mysteries of salvation to despised men. Christ seemed to make man, of all earthly things, his chief joy on earth; this was it which revived him, joyed his heart in the midst of his sorrows and sufferings, that man should be thereby made happy.

[4.] He gave himself for men. This is held forth as an expression of a transcendent love, Gal. ii. 20, Eph. v. 2, 25. In giving himself for man, he seems to love man more than himself; so we judge in transactions with men. A wise man in purchasing, accounts the things he buys as good, or better than the price; he values, he loves that which he purchaseth more than what he parts with. Christ seemed to make more account of man than himself, when he gave himself for man, when he made himself the price to purchase man. And his affliction is answerable to his apprehension; whom he esteems more, he loves more. 'We are bought with a price,' 1 Cor. vi. 20. Himself is the *λύτρον*, Mat. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6; the price of redemption, Lev. xxv. 51. The Lord, as a sign of his love to Jacob's seed, promiseth, Isa. xliii. 3, 4, 'I will give men for thee, and people for thy life,' &c.; therefore, he valued, he loved Israel more than Egypt, Ethiopia. He that sold all to buy the pearl, valued it more than all that he had, Mat. xiii. 46.

Oh how did Christ value man, when he gave himself for him, when he delivered himself into the hands of sinners, enemies, murderers, justice, revenging justice! It had been much if Christ had but given his word, and engaged his person for performance; if he had become a pledge, a surety, hostage; more, if he had given himself to be prisoner, captive for man. But oh! that he should give himself to the death, to die, after he had exposed every member to torture, hands and feet, head, side, heart, face, his whole body! that he should give his body to death, separated from his soul! nay, not only his body, but give his soul too, Mat. x. 45; an offering, Ps. liii. 10, a burnt-offering, scorched with wrath, his soul to worse torments than death; his whole man.

[5.] He parted with his dearest concernment, as man, for man's sake. Does not he love that party more than himself, who will part with what is dearest to him for his sake? Christ, as man, did thus. What is dearer to

men, what so dear to Christ, as his honour? He made nothing of this when he 'made himself of no reputation,' when he was content to be 'numbered amongst transgressors.' It must needs be more grievous to Christ to lie under the suspicion of the least guilt than man of the greatest; yet did he lie under such suspicions all his life, and in the conclusion was content to be accounted worse than a thief, to have Barabbas preferred before him. Man was more dear to Christ than his honour; but is nothing dearer? Job determines this: Job ii. 4, nothing so sweet, so dear as his life; we will part with all, rather than this. But man was dearer to Christ than his life. He loved not his life so much as man. Ay, but is there nothing dearer, better than life? Yes; David tells of one thing better: Ps. lxxiii. 3, 'Thy loving-kindness is better than life.' This is it I pitch on as the dearest, the sweetest thing that Christ as man, or any creature ever enjoyed. Those that have tasted the ravishing pleasures that spring from this, will part with life, body, soul, all, rather than it. We have instances of some who have been willing to suffer, to part with all; but none that ever would forego this. The world has had worthies who were content to wander in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth; to be separated from the comforts of all enjoyments and relations, Heb. xi. 38, rather than part with this; willing to wander in sheep skins, goat skins, to be destitute, afflicted, tormented, as ver. 37, of all, by all, in all. Such as have undergone trials of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, of bonds and imprisonment, ver. 36, not counted their lives dear, willing to be stoned, sawn asunder, slain with the sword, tortured to death in flames, and would not accept of deliverance; counted nothing too dear to part with, too cruel to undergo. But if you should come to any of these and ask, You are willing indeed to part with all that man can take from you, and suffer all that the cruelty and malice of men can inflict on you; oh, but will you part with this sense of God's love? will you undergo the weight of his wrath? you would have them answer, Oh, no; let me rather be annihilated; let me rather die ten thousand deaths; let me rather endure all the torments that men, that devils can invent.

Oh, but though this was dearer and sweeter to Christ than ever it was to any saint or angel, yet, for man's sake, he parted with it. The light of God's countenance was even totally eclipsed, when he cried out, 'My God, my God!' And what mountains of wrath did oppress his spirit, when he complained so sadly, 'My soul is heavy unto the death!'

[6.] He advanced man's interest (with submission) more than his own. What more advantage to man than himself? He so disposed of his life and death as whatever he did and suffered was more advantageous to man than himself. You will say,

*Obj.* Did not Christ get much glory by the work of redemption? Was not this the most glorious administration that ever the world was witness of?

*Ans.* Yes. Yet the glory the Son of God got hereby was an inconsiderable advantage to him, compared with the benefits thereby purchased for man. The Son of God had lost nothing, if he had wanted this; this did not add any degree of glory to that which he enjoyed from eternity. He was infinitely glorious before the foundation of the world, and nothing can be added to that which is infinite. If he had never assumed man's nature, he had been as glorious as he is now; that glory which accrued to him by this great undertaking is nothing but the manifestation of his infinite glory to men, or the acknowledgment of it by men. Now, what is this or that to the Son of God? what does it add to him? He gets no more real glory *de novo* by it than the sun gets new light by shining, or honey gets more sweet-

ness by being commended for its sweetness. The sun would be as full of light if no eye saw it, and honey as sweet in itself if no palate tasted it. He might have been without this glory, and yet have been, nevertheless, glorious through want of it. What advantage, then, is it to him, since he might have wanted it without any disadvantage? Oh, but man got real advantages by Christ's undertaking; he was thereby freed from sin, wrath, misery; he thereby recovered the favour of God, the divine image, perfect happiness, and eternal glory. See here, then, how Christ advanced man's interest more than his own, and hereby judge of his love. He got but one advantage; man gets many. That one was but small, and almost inconsiderable; these were great, and of highest concernment. He might have been as well without this; man had better never been than wanted these. He had not been the least jot less happy or glorious without it; man had been eternally wretched and miserable without these. He got nothing that he had any absolute necessity to desire; man got all that he can desire. Oh how evident is it that Christ manifested in this more love to man than himself! And who can consider this without wonder and astonishment?

(7.) As the Father loves him, so does he love man. We can go no higher, nor durst have used such an expression, but that Christ himself uses it, John xv. 9. Christ would have this made known to the world, chap. xvii. 23-26. He loves men, as the Father loves him; I say not with the same love, but such a love. *As* is not a note of equality or identity, but of similitude and resemblance. A love like to that, in respect of duration, perfection, expression.

[1.] *Permanency.* The Father's love to the Son is everlasting, eternal, unchangeable, like himself, without variableness or shadow of change. So is Christ's to men; he loves them to the end, he loves without end; his love is everlasting, and so is the bond of it, the covenant. It is like the covenant of day and night, Jer. xxxiii. 20. Night and day shall cease before this; nay, night shall become day, and day night, before his love become hatred. It is like the covenant with Noah, Isa. liv. 8-10. As nothing can separate Christ from his Father's love, so nothing can separate man from Christ's, Rom. viii. 25, &c.

[2.] *Perfection.* It is *amor ardentissimus*, as Piscator calls it; *Dilectio absolutissima*, as Aretius, without flaw, defect, alteration, diminution; free from these imperfections and gross mixtures which deaden and darken the flames of love in creatures. God's love to Christ is incomprehensible, and Christ's to man passes knowledge, Eph. iii. 19.

[3.] *Expressions.* Christ vouchsafes to express his love to man, as the Father expresses his love to him. To love is *βούλεσθαι τ' αγαθα*. The Father wills as much good to Christ, as man, as he is capable of; and Christ wills as much to men as they are capable of. As the Father is one with Christ, so Christ has made man one with himself. Christ desires the like union to evidence the like love, John xvii. 21-23. Christ is his Father's Son, and believers are Christ's sons, Isa. viii. 18; he is the Father's delight, Isa. xlii. 1, they are Christ's, Ps. xvi. 3; he is the Father's glory, Heb. i., and they are Christ's, 2 Cor. viii. 23; God is Christ's head, 1 Cor. xi. 3, Christ is their head, *ibid.*; he always hears Christ, John xi. 42, and Christ them, John xv.; all power is given to Christ, Mat. xxviii. 18, and by Christ to them, Philip. iv. 13, John xiv. 12; he has committed all judgment to Christ, John v. 22, Christ makes them his assessors, 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; not only Israel, Luke xxii., but the world; not only men, but angels; Christ is the Father's joy, and they are Christ's: 'That my joy may remain in you,' *i. e.* that I may rejoice in you; he has exalted Christ to be a prince, and

they are princes : Ps. xlv. 16, 'Instead of thy fathers, shall be thy children;' Christ is anointed, ver. 7, so they : Ps. cv. 14, 'Touch not mine anointed.'

*Quest.* 1. Whether Christ's love be universal, extended to all men ; or particular, restrained to some ?

*Ans.* No. The Scripture holds forth a restrained, a distinguishing love. The contrary opinion is against the stream of Scripture, and makes Christ's love less endearing, less free, less engaging. The text evinces this ; he loves only those who are washed in his blood ; all are not washed ; those who are made kings and priests, all are not such.

Besides, Christ only loves his own, John xiii. 1, those that are given him by his Father. All are not his ; he knows his, and is known of them, John x. 14, 27 ; but some he professes he knows not, Luke xiii. 27. It is the church that he loves, Eph. v. 25 ; but all belong not to the church, the most are not in the church, the greatest part in it are not of it. He gives his life for those he loves, Eph. v. 2 ; but he lays not down his life for all. This act of love is restrained to those whom he calls his sheep, John x. 11. All are not sheep, for who are those that will be found at Christ's left hand ? Christ's flock is a little flock ; he intercedes for all whom he loves, John xvi. 26, 27, and xvii. 20. He prays not for all ; there is a world that he prays not for, John xvii. 9 ; he expresses it when he loves, gives love-tokens ; manifests himself, John xiv. 21-23, not to all, ver. 22, draws near them, abides with them, gives consolation, good hope, peace, 2 Thes. ii. 16, victory, Rom. viii. 37. The Lord hates some, Ps. v. 5, Hos. ix. 15, Mal. i. 3. There is a common love, which bestows common favours, outward and spiritual ; and a special love.

*Quest.* 2. Who are those whom Christ loves ?

*Ans.* Those that are washed and made kings and priests.

*Washed.* If so, then you are

(1.) Clean from guilt ; sin pardoned ; are washed in the fountain, Ezek. xxxvi. 25 ; not the outside only, Luke xi. 39 ; you are free from pollution, John xiii. 8, 9 ; your filthy garments taken away ; your hearts are no more a nest for unclean birds ; cleansed in mind and heart ; no unclean thoughts, projects, affections ; not so many, so frequent, so well entertained.

(2.) Fearful of being again defiled : 'I have washed my feet, how can I defile them ?' Cant. v. 3. Look upon sin as the greatest, most loathsome, contagious, dangerous pollution ; fearful of it as of a leprosy, a filthy dungeon, a poisonous ulcer, a miry pit, an infectious disease, a putrefying sore. 'How can I do this great evil, and sin against' Christ his blood ? defile that which Christ has taken such pains, and been at such cost, to wash.

(3.) High, endeared thoughts of Christ's love : thankfulness both for the benefit and the price it cost ; to be made clean, beautiful, lovely, glorious, the benefit ; his own blood the price. It cost not Christ only some words ; yet, why should Christ speak for us ? he stands in no need of us ; nor prayers only, though an inducement ; nor tears, why should he concern himself to weep ? but blood, his own blood, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. Oh who would not love thee ? O king of saints ! God of love ! what thankfulness can answer such love as this ? what expressions can manifest such thankfulness as is due for such a favour, of such value, procured at such a rate ? The resentment of this is the occasion of the text, the doxology which concludes it. How unworthy shall I shew myself, if I return not love, for such a love as would cleanse me when I was all loathsome, and do it, when nothing else would do it, with his own blood ?

*Kings.* In respect of, 1, state ; 2, power ; 3, spirit. Free, not slaves to

sin, not obey it in the lusts thereof; it has not dominion, it rules not, they resist its motions; Satan does not work them, Eph. ii. Plentiful, glorious, conquerors, victorious kings; they conquer the world, sin, Satan. The world is cast down in their minds, out of their heart, cast off in the life.

(2.) Disposition; raised, generous; not low designs, below them, confined to this world, above the serpent's curse. Public, not for private, interest; prefer the designs, the glory of Christ, before private; mind the things of Christ, and not their own.

*Priests.* They do the act, execute the office of priests, which is, 1 Pet. ii. 5, to offer spiritual sacrifice; sacrifice threefold: (1.) acts of charity to the body, Heb. xiii. 16; we think it best to receive good, but to do good is the best sacrifice; (2.) to the soul; acts of piety, prayer, praise, Heb. xiii. 15; much in prayer, and spiritual; not offer the sacrifice of fools, the calves of the lips only, but the mind and heart; (3.) the whole man an holocaust, Rom. xii. 1; he looks not upon himself as his own, he is bought with a price; and why? to glorify God; and how? by offering and devoting the body and spirit.

*Quest. 3.* Whether Christ's love be personal? whether it respect some sort of men, viz., believers, infinitely and in general, or descends to, and fixes upon, this and that believer in particular, as John, Peter?

*Ans.* It is personal, whether we consider it in the streams or in the spring; in time or from eternity. By love in the stream, I mean the expressions of his love, those peculiar favours which in time he bestows on those whom he chose from eternity. Love, so taken, must needs be personal; for though the designment of favours (amongst short-sighted men) may be indefinite, yet the actual collation must be personal, both with God and men; for this is an action, *et actio est suppositi*, which is true both in respect of agent and subject; it must be an individual both that acts and receives the act.

Love in the spring. The eternal act of Christ, together with the Father, choosing some to be the objects of his love, the same really with the decree of election, is personal. This is most controverted. I prove it.

(1.) We have one clear instance proving this love to be personal; therefore we may conclude it universally, because the decree is uniform, not partly indefinitely, partly personal. The instance is brought by Paul, Rom. ix. 13, out of Mal. i. 2, 'Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated;' so Jer. i. 5.

(2.) If Christ loves, *i. e.* chooses men by name, then his love, his decree, is personal; for there can be no more personal designment than that which is by name. But he chooses men by name; for the Scripture describes election by writing the names of the elect in a book; by a metaphor, taken from those who list soldiers, chosen out for military service, by writing their names in a muster-roll. Luke x. 20, the disciples' names were written in heaven, chosen by name, and enrolled, listed, registered, from eternity; Paul testifies the same of his fellow-labourers: Philip. iv. 3, their names writ in the book of life; and John, Rev. xiii. 8, says the names of all that worship not the beast were written in the Lamb's book of life from the foundation of the world, and Rev. xxi. 27.

(3.) If Christ choose not particular men, he knows not particularly who are, or shall be, his; because the knowledge of futures, in our apprehension, follows the decree, and depends on it, and is conformable to it; if no decree, no knowledge. But Christ knows his by name, personally, distinctly, 2 Tim. ii. 19; he 'calleth his sheep by name,' John x. 3; ver. 14, 27. They say, he knows who are believers; ay, but he cannot know who will continue so, if, as they say, perseverance depend upon their will, left free from all necessity both of Christ's decree and influence; for this granted, the perseverance of

a saint in heaven will be uncertain, and so not certainly known to Christ himself; for to apprehend a thing certain which is uncertain is an error.

(4.) Certain men are ordained to condemnation, Jude 4, *ergo* certain men to salvation; but indefinite is uncertain.

*Quest.* 4. How can Christ be said to love those to whom he denies so many temporal blessings, and visits with such variety of grievous afflictions?

*Ans.* 1. These outward dispensations were never a sign of love or hatred; much less under the gospel, which promises fewer outward mercies, and bids expect more afflictions. The names of legal and Old Testament spirits have been of late abused, misapplied; but if they belong to any, it is to those who expect more outward blessings and fewer afflictions, and judge men by these. Solomon's rule is true here: Eccles. ix. 1, 2, 'No man knows either love or hatred, by all that is before him. All things come alike to all,' &c. Ye cannot conclude that Christ hates you because he afflicts; nor that he loves because you are blessed in temporals. The least drachm of grace is a surer sign of Christ's love than all the kingdoms, all the glory, all the pleasures of the earth, if in one man's enjoyment; and victory over the least lust, than freedom from all outward pressures; otherwise, we might say, Dives was loved, Lazarus hated, and Festus in more favour with Christ, than Paul; nay, Christ himself might conclude he was hated of God, since none more afflicted, or less encouraged, with temporals.

*Ans.* 2. Wants and afflictions are so far from being arguments of Christ's hatred, as they are many times evidences of his love. For afflictions it is evident, Heb. xii. 6-8, Christ thereby conforms us to himself, and makes us partakers of his image, holiness, ver. 10, 11. And for wants I thus prove. The people of Christ want nothing but that which is not good, for he has promised to withhold no good thing. Why does a father envy his child that which is not good for him, but because he loves him? From wants outward you should conclude the employment\* of what you want is not good, rather than the want of what you would enjoy is from hatred. It is no defect of love in Christ, but defect of goodness in what you want, that makes you want it.

*Quest.* 5. Whether is love properly attributed to Christ, or metaphorically?

*Ans.* Both: metaphorically as he is God, properly as he is man.

(1.) Love, as it is a human affection, cannot be properly ascribed to Christ, as he is God, because it includes imperfection. That rule is true, *Nihil est in intellectu, quod non fuit prius in sensu*, our understandings apprehend nothing but what is first some way offered to our senses. Now, God being an entity at the furthest distance from sense, it follows that our apprehensions of God, taking their rise from things sensible, are not only inadequate, falling infinitely short of comprehensiveness, but improper and analogical, and no otherwise true but by analogy. Now, the Scripture, speaking *linguâ humanâ*, and condescending to our capacities, describes the spiritual essence of God by things sensible, and so uses many metaphors taken from things we are best acquainted with. Sometimes an *ἔθιοπία*, † 1 Kings xxii. 19, Ps. lxxviii. 38; an *ἀνθρώποπαθεία*, ‡ when it ascribes hands, eyes, feet; an *ἀνθρώποπαθεία*, when it attributes passions to him, as joy, anger, sorrow, jealousy, hatred, love. So that when we hear any of these ascribed to God, we must not conceive them to be in him as in us, but must rectify our apprehensions according to the old rules, *per viam negationis*, separating all imperfections from them, *et per viam eminentiæ*, attributing to him whatsoever is purely excellent without any mixture of imperfection. So love

\* Qu. 'enjoyment'?—ED. † Qu. 'ἔθιοπία'?—ED. ‡ Qu. 'ἀνθρώπομορφεια'?—ED.

in God is not a passion, a perturbation, accompanied with any corporeal motion of blood and spirits, but a pure, perfect, eternal act, whereby he wills good to us.

(2.) Love may be properly ascribed to Christ as he is man; for so he has soul and body, will and affections, blood and spirits, as well as we. Only we must give him a large allowance of pre-eminence; the human nature and the grosser part of it, the body, being not only made glorious and spiritual, as the bodies of the saints shall be, but also assumed into union with God-head, and so elevated to perfections many degrees above the glorified saints. So that love is properly in Christ's human nature as in ours, both in respect of its rise and operations, beings and workings. It differs from our love in respect of the manner of its existence and operations, *quoad modum*, without, *Inordinacy*. Being guided not only by the dictates of right reason, but infinite wisdom without reluctancy.

*Perturbation.* It is no grievance, no pressure to him, as sometimes to us, but a sweet, quiet, regular motion of his perfect human will.

*Detriment.* Though it move blood and spirits, yet it inflames not that, nor wastes or impairs this. Its motions are innocent, serene, pacate, and spiritual, in that sense as his body is spiritual, and not as in infirm men.

*Quest. 6.* Whether Christ's love be infinite?

*Ans.* Christ's love may be considered four ways: (1.) in its prime act, (2.) in its termination, (3.) its manifestation, (4.) its duration.

(1.) The prime act of divine love, *velle bonum*, Christ's good will, willingness to do good. It is an act of the divine will, an immanent act, and so in God. *Quicquid est in Deo, est Deus.* God is infinite, therefore love is infinite. In this sense God is love, and love is the same really with God, and therefore infinite.

(2.) As it is terminated to its object. We considered it before simply and precisely in itself without its object, but here as it is determined to it; not simply as good will, but as good will to this or that creature. In respect of this termination, it is not infinite, for that which is infinite is essential and necessary to God; but this is not necessary, but an act of liberty; for it was in God's choice whether he would make any creature, and consequently whether he would love any creature. Whatever is contingent is not God, nor infinite. Indeed, Christ's love was necessarily terminated upon his Father, and so his love to the Father is infinite in both respects, act and termination; but to us in the former respect only.

(3.) In the manifestation, in respect of the expressions of it. The expressions of Christ's love are not infinite, for they are transient acts, and so not in God; and whatsoever is not in God is not absolutely infinite. Besides, they are actually received by us, therefore not infinite; for that which is finite (as we are) is not capable of what is infinite.

*Obj.* But this is one expression, to give himself; and he is infinite, therefore expression is so.

*Ans.* This giving of himself is the cause, not of identity, but of interest only. The creature is not the *terminus* or object of that act of giving himself, but God's paternal authority as founded on the law of nature; the creature only enjoys the effects of offering or sacrifice. He is infinite in excellency and value, but our enjoyment of him is not infinite. All the acts of enjoyment are finite; he gives no more actually than we enjoy; we enjoy no more than we are capable of.

Christ's love is infinite, yet he loves not infinitely. There may be *infinitus amor*, and yet it does not *infinite amare*; even as he hath *infinitam potentiam*, and yet doth not *infinite agere*; has infinite power, and yet does not act infinitely. If he should act infinitely, he should act *ad ultimum sui posse*, as

natural agents do. Every act is from infinite power, but the actings of that power are limited by his will as to the existence of things; and in his actings towards things existing, he limits or accommodates himself to the nature and capacity of those things, so that the actings and effects are not infinite, though the principle be. Semblably he loves infinitely, but does not express that love infinitely; the objects are not capable of infinite expressions. The reciprocal expressions of love betwixt the Father and Son are infinite, but not betwixt Christ and the creatures. That must be infinite to which love makes infinite expressions.

(4.) In duration it is infinite. It is eternal, without beginning, without end, and so has no limits as to continuance, Eph. i. 4, Mat. xxv. Isa. liv. 8, Jer. xxxi. 3, 'everlasting light,' Isa. lx. 19, 20, 'everlasting joy,' Isa. li. 11, 'everlasting salvation,' Isa. xlv. 17, 'everlasting covenant,' Jer. xxxii. 40; so that in two respects Christ's love is infinite, viz. as to act and duration; in two respects not infinite, as to termination and manifestation.

*Quest.* 7. What must we do to render us capable of Christ's love? What will make us lovely in his eye?

*Ans.* 1. You must be like him. Likeness is the greatest attractive of love, *ὁμοίότης τῆς φιλίας μήτηρ*, that which brings forth and nourisheth love. Christ likes none but those that are like him. The more likeness, the more love. This was the first act of eternal love: Rom. viii. 29. 'Predestinated to be conformable to the image of his Son.' And this is the first expression of love in time, makes us like him. And both are in order to all the expressions of love that must continue to eternity. Till you have his likeness, you are not capable of his love. There may be *amor benevolentia*, good will, before, but not *amor amicitia* or *complacentia*. He will not use you as friends, nor can his soul take pleasure in you till you be like him.

But what will make you like him? How shall we resemble him? Holiness, this is Christ's resemblance, likeness, his image: Col. iii. 10, 'Renewed after the image,' &c. What this renewing is you find, Eph. iv. 23, 24. Holiness is the image of Christ. The apostle mentions two images, one whereof every man bears, 1 Cor. xv. 49, earthly and heavenly; that of the first, this of the second Adam. Christ is the image of the invisible God, and holiness is the image of Christ. He that is holy is a living image of Christ. Christ sees himself in a holy soul, and cannot but love it; he is *Χριστοῦ ἐικῶν ἔμψυχος*, a lively portraiture of Christ.

It is true nothing finite is properly like to Christ, as he is God; for likeness is founded in proportion, and there is no proportion where the distance is infinite. But of all things in heaven and earth, nothing more resembles divinity and God himself than holiness; therefore it is called 'the divine nature,' 2 Peter i. 4. But consider Christ as he is man, and that holiness which is the glory and ornament of his soul is the same *in specie*, in nature, with that which is in his people, differs only in degree. No created being is so like Christ as he that is holy; he sees nothing in man or angels so beautiful, so lovely.

If then you would have Christ to love you, you must be like him; if like him, you must be holy. Holy thoughts, this is the way to have the same mind in you, Philip. ii. 5; holy affections, so your heart will resemble Christ; holy speeches and actions, so holy as he was in all conversation, 1 Peter i. 15. Set Christ before you as a pattern, strive to imitate him, express his virtues, 1 Peter ii. 9; set the life of Christ before you as a copy, and draw your lives after it; eye it in every act, and strive to bring them to conformity; meekness, Mat. xi. 29, no passionateness; patience, 1 Peter ii. 20, 21, Isa. liii. 7, returning not evil, reviling, hatred; self-denial, Philip. ii. 3, &c. Be his disciples, learn it by his doctrine and example. Humility,

Mat. xi. 29, Zech. ix. 9, in the lowest condition, or worst accommodation; activeness, Acts x. 38, John iv. 34, delightfully, constantly; love, Eph. i. 1, 2; spiritualness, or making spiritual use of common things: these graces are the sparks of holiness, let them shine. Those that hate, contemn, jeer holiness, under what name or pretence soever, shall never taste Christ's love; nay, those that are without it, though they never arrive at such a height of wickedness as to contemn it, shall never see God, Heb. xii. 14. They shall be so far from partaking of the intimate expressions of his love, as they shall not be admitted into his presence, not so much as to see him. Be sensible of the want, bewail the neglect; love it, thirst after it, endeavour by all means to perfect it, 2 Cor. vii. 1; hear, John xv., meditate, pray, and prefer it, as Solomon did wisdom, 2 Chron. i. 10, 11.

*Ans. 2.* Avoid all that Christ hates. If you love, approve, entertain that which is hateful to Christ, how can he love you? What is that which Christ hates? The psalmist, Ps. xlv. 7, tells us, making it one of Christ's attributes, to hate wickedness. The lusts of your hearts, and sins of your lives, is that alone which is hateful to Christ. Sin is the only object of Christ's hatred; he hates nothing but sin, or nothing but for sin. He loves many things, but this is that one thing which he hates. The world had never known any thing but love in Christ, had it not been for sin. If the devil himself were without sin, Christ would love him; but if the most glorious angel in heaven sin, Christ will hate him. Christ has much reason to hate sin, for it murdered him, exposed him to the dreadful wrath of his Father, and is the only, the greatest, the most odious deformity, that his pure eye sees in the world. It is more hateful than a toad to us, more loathsome than the vomit of a dog, more noisome than the stench of an open sepulchre. Therefore while you let sin lodge in your hearts, while you stain your lives with it, Christ will not, cannot love you. So long as you harbour malice, pride, averseness to God, contemn the gospel, neglect ordinances, profane Sabbaths, covetousness, contention, intemperance, uncleanness, deceit, never expect any love from Christ, nothing but dreadful expressions of hatred. No love from Christ, till at enmity with sin, till you fight against, endeavour to mortify it, have continual war with it. As Christ hates iniquity, so the workers of iniquity, Ps. v. 5. You must not love them, so as to be intimate with them, delight in the company of evil doers, openly profane, scorers of godliness, obstructers of the power of it, 2 Cor. vi. 14-18. If you love so near relations to wicked men, Christ will have no relation to you. If you would have communion with Christ in sweet acts of love, you must have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, nor those that act them.

*Ans. 3.* Comply with his will, obey his commands. This is a powerful inducement amongst men, compliance, observance, officiousness; and Christ engages both his and his Father's love upon this account, John xiv. 21, 23. That you may comply with his will, you must be careful to know it. He is as odious to Christ who will not know what he should do, as he who will not do what he knows. It is as provoking disobedience to refuse to know Christ's will, as to refuse to do it; equally threatened, 2 Thes. i. 8, 9. Wilful ignorance is so far from excusing, as it aggravates sin; brings a double guilt, guilt of disobedience, and guilt of the most provoking ignorance. Ignorance is wilful, when the means of knowledge are offered, but neglected.

Ignorance excuses none who have the means and the use of reason. How little ignorance is there amongst us, that is not wilful and inexcusable; do not know, because they will not use the means?

Nor will use of means suffice ; it must be with all diligence, Prov. ii. 3. Careless use is little better than neglect. There is contempt in this, when Christ speaks to you, to hear as though you heard not ; when Christ writes to you, to read as though you read not, this is to affront Christ ; and will he love those that affront him to his face ?

But suppose you know Christ's will by the use of means ; yet if you close not with what you know, you are as far from Christ's love. He that knows, and does not, shall be beaten, Luke xii. 47 ; he must expect no other expressions of love. Christ loves the truth so well, as he will not love those that imprison it. You may see how Christ resents disobedience against knowledge in Saul, 1 Sam. xv. 23 ; it is as witchcraft or idolatry. Where there is this disobedience, there is a covenant with hell and death, a league with Satan ; there is an idolising ourselves, preferring our will to God's, idolatry. To disobey the gospel, is to be disobedient to the heavenly call, it is to neglect salvation. Oh what madness is it to prefer a lust before your own salvation ! To prefer a lust before the love of Christ, before Christ himself ! What a heinous provocation, to love sin more than Christ, to prefer sin, the vilest and [most] abominable thing in the world, before God blessed for ever ! How can Christ love such, who love that more than him which murdered him, and will damn them ? Yet this you do in disobedience. The least jot of Christ's will is of more value than heaven and earth, and you prefer that which is the worst thing in hell before it.

The way to win Christ's love, is to use all means to know his will, that you may obey it ; and to obey it as soon as you know it, immediately, impartially, cheerfully. He loves a cheerful doer, as a cheerful giver. That which comes by constraint is servile, unacceptable. Expect not the love of sons, while you act as slaves, and serve him not but from fear or force, unless it be that of love. Immediately, consult not flesh and blood, with carnal interests, with base lusts, with outward disadvantage or respects ; then your obedience will be partial, not do what Christ commands, but what these advise. As good not obey at all, as not obey in all ; you must not leave a hoof ; you must be more respecters of duties than of persons. It is universal obedience that engages Christ's love. Obey in all, especially the principal commands of Christ and the gospel, faith and repentance.

*Ans.* 4. Converse much with Christ. Be much in his company. Labour to be, as David, continually with him : ἀπροσηγορία πολλὰς τὰς φιλίας δίδυσε. Estrangement, neglect of converse, dissolves friendship, occasions a consumption of love amongst men, and so it will be with Christ. There is both an assimilating and an attractive virtue in communion. It will make you like Christ, and so make you capable of loving expressions ; and it will engage, attract, kindle Christ's love, and so make you actually partakers of it. Delight then to walk with him, to meet him, to view his beauty, to hear his voice, to taste his sweetness. And since Christ delights to see the face and hear the voice of his spouse, Cant. ii. 14, therefore you must take all occasions to present yourselves before him, in the most lovely and delightful posture, that the King may take pleasure in your beauty, that your eye be fixed on him, he may be ravished with your eye.

But where shall we meet with Christ ? Where may we converse with him ? Even in his ordinances ; where these are, there is Christ's presence-chamber ; prayer, hearing, reading, meditating. When you attend on the word preached, you see him, and hear his voice. Here are those sweet interviews and colloquies, wherein Christ vouchsafes to manifest his love familiarly. He has writ his mind, yea, his heart, in the Scriptures, and there you may read the sweetest strains of love that ever the world knew ;

and when you read those heavenly lines, you should look upon them as a letter of love sent from Christ. In meditation, there you may have a full gaze at Christ, and if your minds be fixed, you may see every lineament of him who is altogether lovely, whose beauty ravishes the angels, makes them seraphims, flames of love.

When you are using these ordinances, you are in Christ's banqueting-house; he spreads over you the banner of his love; there he feasts his people, stays them with flagons; there he admits them to familiar embraces, kisses them with the kisses of his mouth, and vouchsafes such manifestations of his love as are better than wine, sit down under his shadow with great delight. Ordinances are the mirrors wherein Christ makes himself visible; herein, as in a glass, we may see the glory of Christ, and no other way, till in heaven, where we may see him face to face. These are as Zaccheus's tree: when we get our hearts raised, our souls climb up, and with advantage see Jesus; and there he will spy you, come feast with you, and bring salvation to your house.

Delight in ordinances, and manifest it by being frequent in them. Be much in prayer; be not satisfied in ordinances, without his presence, except you may see and enjoy him. Depart not out of his presence, till he smile, till he speak kindly, speak to your heart, till he testify his presence by impressions, light, heat, enlargement; expressions, the still voice speaking peace, accepting. That you may enjoy his presence, that he may delight to meet you, you must put your souls into that dress that is most lovely; come with inflamed affections, with acted graces, so you will appear in the beauty of holiness. This is the beauty wherein Christ delights. Nothing so lovely as a soul of a gracious, a spiritual complexion waiting on him; to him will he look.

*Ans. 5.* Take heed of unkindnesses. There is so much affinity betwixt love and kindness, as they are often joined in Scripture. Love, amongst men, will not endure unkind returns; how much less Christ, who hath infinite reason to expect the best requitals?

(1.) You are unkind when you undervalue Christ. Contempt is the greatest unkindness. You contemn Christ when you set him at nought. He is then *ἐξουθενήθεις*, set at nought, when you prefer that before him which is worse than nought, sin. When you set little by him, that is properly *ὀλιγωρία*, when you have a higher esteem of that which is little worth, outward enjoyments, relations, interests; when these have more of your thoughts, more of your affections, than Christ. He is contemned when anything is more loved, desired, delighted in, feared, than Christ; when any object is more lovely, any happiness more desirable, any enjoyment more delightful, any suffering more fearful, than Christ's absence or displeasure.

(2.) When you refuse his offers. He has writ, not a letter, but a large volume of love; will you cast it behind your back? He sends ambassadors to woo, to beseech you to be reconciled to his Father, and accept of him for your husband; you will not give audience, much less obedience; despise both messengers and message. He sends his Spirit to solicit you, makes many motions of love to your hearts (how often have you had experience of it?) you quench the Spirit, reject his motions. He comes and knocks at your hearts, and stands till his head be filled with dew, and his locks with the drops of the night, Cant. v. 2. You will not open, send him away without admission, while sin is welcome, has quiet possession, and kind entertainment. He stretches out his hands all the day long, and stands with open arms, entreating you to come and be embraced; but you refuse, delay, and weary him out with unkind denials or excuses. He sends his servants

to invite you to the marriage-feast of the Lamb, tells you all things are provided for your delight and happiness, all is ready, and stays for your coming; but you are so busily employed in the world, you cannot, you will not come; and force him to that sad complaint, 'Ye will not come to me.' Oh how often are you guilty of this!

*Ans.* 6. Get and keep up love to him. Love is attractive of love. Christ condemns those as worse than publicans that return not love for love, Mat. v. He will be far from that which he condemns us for. He that could think thoughts of love to those that had no affection for him, will not fail to love those who love him, Prov. viii. 17. Those who shew they love him by seeking him diligently, as we are wont to seek that which our heart is on, shall find him ready to express his love to them. His nature, so gracious, so affectionate, so compassionate, might assure us of this, without his word; but to give us all assurance of it, he has engaged himself by promise again and again, John xiv. 21. He will manifest himself to him in all the riches of his love, ver. 23. Both Father and Son will shew that they love such an one, by visiting him with loving-kindness, coming to him for that purpose, and staying with him, as we would do with those whom we most love. He promises here such expressions of love on earth, as he vouchsafes in heaven, though not in the same degree. For how does he express his love to the saints in heaven, but by abiding with them, and manifesting himself to them? The love of Christ should be both the pattern and the motive of our love to him. We should labour to love him as he loved us, and be constrained to love him because he so loved us. Endeavour to love him in all that is his. That is the way to have his love reach us in all our concerns.

In his person; for the infinite excellencies and loveliness of Christ. To love him only for the advantages we have by him, is such a love as we ourselves care not for from others. We value not his love, who only affects us for his own sake, for what he may get by us. That is a selfish love, and comes short of the love of true friendship. He is not a friend indeed who loves you not for yourself, but only for what he expects from you. Christ challenges the Jews for something like this, Luke vi. 26. They followed him, not because they had seen the miracles, whereby he had discovered the excellency of his person; they loved him not, but for the loaves. If Christ had not loved us, but for what he expected from us, what advantage he might have by us, he had never loved us at all.

In his offices. Though we must not love him only for the happiness we expect from him, yet we must love him for that too, and shall be most inexcusable if we do not. The spring of those blessings he enriches us with, is his offices, and the execution of them.

Love him as he is a priest for ever. A priest who made himself a sacrifice for you, to expiate your guilt, satisfy justice, and deliver you from wrath; who washed you, &c., in his own blood, and is still presenting it; he ever lives to make intercession.

Love him as he is a prophet. To discover himself, to make known his will, to shew the way to life, as ready to guide you by his counsel.

Love him as a king. One who will rescue you from your spiritual enemies, subdue your iniquities, conquer your hearts for himself, bring you under his government, so as in all to make you more than conquerors.

Love him in all ways: those wherein he proceeds towards you, and those wherein you should walk with him; the former, whether they be pleasing or afflictive. When his ways are apparently mercy, the goodness, the sweetness of them should command love from you, Cant. i. 3, Ps. i. 16. When

they are afflictive, they are mercy too, though sense will not always let you discern it. There is love in them, when they make you smart, such love as made the apostles triumph : Rom. viii., 'In all these things we are more than conquerors.' Why more than conquerors ? Because the love of Christ was in them. Yea, when there is some anger in them, there is love also, Rev. iii. 19. We are slow to believe this, and that may be the reason it is so oft repeated in the Old and New Testament, Prov. iii. 11, Heb. xii. 5. As he shewed his love by being afflicted for us, so also by afflicting us. And that love he shews should engage us to love him, even in the furnace of affliction, there should our love to Christ flame out, even when the waves and the billows go over us. The opposition should fortify love, many waters should not quench it.

And love him too in the ways wherein we should walk with him,—the ways of holiness, self-denial, mortification. These are not grateful to the flesh ; but they are the ways of Christ, the ways of him that loved us. And, therefore, he made them our ways, and leads us into them, because he loves us ; and, therefore, in despite of our corruptions, they should be lovely to us. They should be 'ways of pleasantness,' because they are 'paths of peace,' Prov. iii. 17. His commandments are the paths of life, none of them should be grievous. It is the yoke of Christ, his burden which seems heaviest : he lays it on us, because he loves us ; and shall not that consideration make it light and easy ? When he came into the world for us, if he had declined that which was grievous to flesh and blood, that which was difficult, and expensive, and hazardous, and meddled with nothing for our sakes but what was cheap, and easy, and safe, and pleasing, oh what had become of us, our redemption had never been effected ! Oh, but his love to us made him count nothing too costly, too difficult, too grievous ! Let us likewise shew our love to Christ, in counting no part of his ways, no part of our duty, too hard, or too expensive, or too hazardous, or too grievous. How can we say that we love him, if we be so disaffected to any part of the good, and perfect, and acceptable will of Christ, who loved us ? Let us resolve to subdue our own wills, to cross our carnal inclinations, to quit our worldly interest, to oppose our own humours ; to follow him in painful, and costly, and reproached, and hazardous services ; to abate him nothing of what he expects, to spare ourselves in nothing that he requires of us. Then shall we shew that we love him indeed, and find that he loves us ; otherwise we are in danger to be found no better than pretenders to Christ and his love, and such as he will not know, nor own.

Love him in his people. In them all who have anything of his image and likeness, however sullied with weaknesses and infirmities, or blotted with distasteful carriages, or soured with the crabbedness of an unhappy temper, or varying from you in some particulars of practice or opinion, 1 John iv. 10, 11, 20, 21 ; say not, they are cross, and froward, and peevish, and selfish, and every way unworthy, and every way disobedient ; how can I love such ? Oh, but might not Christ have said this of you, and much worse ? If he had refused to love you on this account, what had your condition been ? And if he would not be hindered from loving you, when there was unspeakably more in you to forbid his love, shall some little things (little in comparison of what Christ might have objected against you), how great soever you think them, hinder you from loving Christ in his members ? Say not, I cannot think them his members, they are so unlike him ; for if you look well into your own hearts and ways, may not you see much to make you think yourselves not like him ? May not Christ see therein much more to make him judge you very unlike ? Take heed you venture not to dismember

Christ, out of any little pretences or prejudices. He will take it better at your hands to love those as his, who are not, than not to love any who are his indeed, though they seem not so to you. You love not Christ, if you love not his people; and if you love not him, you cannot expect love from him.

*He gave himself for us.* The next thing considerable in the text is the expression of Christ's love; he gave himself for us, &c. To open this, and offer it to you distinctly and clearly, take notice of the several words and parts of the expression.

1. *He gave.* Gifts are expressions of love. We judge of love by the quality or value of the gift. He that loves heartily gives freely, and he that loves much gives much, if he have much to give. We conclude with reason that he who gives us things of great value, and gives freely, loves us answerably, has a great love for us. Now what did Christ give?

2. *He gave himself,* nothing less than himself; and that is more, incomparably more, than if he had given all the angels in heaven, all the treasures on earth for us; more than if he had given all the works of his hands. It is more than heaven and earth together; as much more than the whole world as the whole world is more than the drop of a bucket, and the small dust of the balance; for the disproportion is greater betwixt the Son of God and the whole world, than betwixt the whole world and the drop of a bucket. The small dust of the balance is as nothing to the universe, and the universe is as nothing compared with the Son of God. And it is *himself* that he gave; not so little a thing as the whole creation, but, that which is infinitely more and greater, himself. That word comprises more than ten thousand worlds amount to.

It is exceeding much that the apostle says is given us; and it will appear, if we view the several parcels of the gift, in the account we have thereof, 1 Cor. iii. 22. Not only Paul, &c.; not only life and death, but the world; not only the world, but that which is to come, things present and things to come. No less than two worlds! Could the heart of man desire more? Oh but he has given more, infinitely more! When he gave himself, he gave more than ten thousand worlds. *All is yours.* Ay, but that all, and the great contents thereof, are nothing compared with himself, and he gave no less than himself.

3. How did he give himself? He did not give himself as we are wont to give, nor did he give himself as he gives other things. But as the gift was extraordinary and transcendently great, so was his way of giving it. As the greatness of the gift, so the manner of giving it, expresses a great, a transcendent love. He gave himself, not in the common way of giving; but, as the text shews, his giving was an offering of himself. 'He gave himself an offering for us.' But then,

4. How did he give himself as an offering for us? What kind of offering did he make himself? There are several sorts of offerings mentioned in Scripture. We meet with offerings that were not sacrificed, and also with offerings that were sacrificed.

Offerings that were not sacrifices. Such were the persons and things which were devoted or dedicated unto God for the service of the tabernacle and of the temple. Thus the vessels and utensils given up and set apart for the service and ministration under the law are called offerings, Num. vii. 10, and those offerings are specified, ver. 13, &c. Silver chargers, bowls, and spoons; and not only things, but persons are called offerings when set apart; for thus the legal ministry, Num. x. 10, 11, 13. The other sort of offerings were

sacrifices, such as were offered so as to be consumed and destroyed, and to be deprived of life, if they were things that had life. So that there is a great difference betwixt these offerings: the former were offered so as to be preserved, the latter were offered so as to be killed or consumed. For that is the true notion of a sacrifice; it is an offering daily consumed. And such an offering was Christ, such an offering as was a sacrifice, as the text shews. He gave himself to be sacrificed for us. 'He was led as a lamb to the slaughter.' He was slain, and his blood shed and poured out. It had been much for the Son of God to give himself for us as an offering in any sense, though not one drop of his precious blood had been shed, though he had not suffered in the least. Oh what manner of love was it, that he would offer himself as a sacrifice for us; that he would be slain, and so far destroyed for us as the sacrifices who lost their lives in the offerings! But,

5. What kind of sacrifice was it? There were several sorts of sacrifices under the law. They are commonly reduced to two heads.

(1.) Some were eucharistical, sacrifices of thanksgiving, offered as thankful acknowledgments of deliverances, or other mercies obtained.

(2.) Others were propitiatory, sacrifices for expiation, to make atonement, to expiate guilt, and procure pardon and reconciliation. Now Christ offered himself a sacrifice, not of thanksgiving; none have entertained, or can give any reason, for such a conceit. But he gave himself for us a sacrifice for expiation, to expiate the guilt of our sin, to procure pardon, and make our peace with God. And this appears by the phrase which the apostle here uses to explain and illustrate it; it was offered to God for a sweet-smelling savour, which is an expression by which propitiatory sacrifices are wont to be described in Scripture. In the first place, where we meet with it, it is applied to Noah's sacrifice, Gen. viii. 21. This was a sacrifice for propitiation; for upon the offering it the Lord declares himself appeased, and that though the imaginations of man's heart be evil, yet he will not again curse the earth; which words express that God was atoned with the sacrifice which Noah offered. The word signifies a 'savour of rest;' for though the Lord was moved with anger against the world, so as to bring a deluge upon it, yet now he would rest from his anger, his wrath did cease. And this is the proper effect of a propitiatory sacrifice, when it prevails and is accepted. And elsewhere also these sacrifices for expiation are set forth by this expression, Lev. i. 9, 15, 17. That the sacrifices or burnt-offerings prescribed in this chapter were piacular is plain, ver. 4. To make atonement was the proper end and design of sacrifices for expiation.

The Socinians, [who] will not upon any terms allow the death of Christ to be such a sacrifice, and so strive to illude\* every text which we allege to prove it, do use this evasion here. They say the phrase is used of free-will offerings; these are the sacrifices which are commonly said to be a sweet savour. But there is no reason in this, for sacrifices for expiation were free-will offerings, as much as those for thanksgiving; and those sacrifices particularly which I have instanced and proved to be piacular, viz., that of Noah; for it was not offered at a time determined by God, for anything appears, and that is it which makes the difference between free-will offerings and the solemn stated sacrifices. And for those, Lev. i., the text is express, ver. 3.

Or if they should allege that this phrase is applied to peace-offerings, yet this would not serve their turn; for peace-offerings for the congregation had something of expiation in them, Lev. xxxv. 16. And this appears, not only because what is required in propitiatory sacrifices is found in peace-offerings,

\* Qu. 'elude?'—ED.

viz., the slaying of the beast, the sprinkling of the blood, and the consuming some part of it upon the altar, Lev. ix. 18, 19, but also because what is proper and ascribed to sacrifices designed for expiation is ascribed to peace-offerings, Ezek. xlv. 15, 17, where peace-offerings, amongst the rest, were to make reconciliation for the people; and this is the proper and special end of sacrifices for expiation. To turn away the Lord's anger, and appease his wrath, was the main design of propitiatory sacrifices. And David, when the Lord's anger was kindled and consuming the people, he offers peace-offerings, 2 Sam. xxiv. 21. And this was the issue of it, the plague was stayed, God's anger was appeased, ver. 25. So that, whatever the Socinianists object against the text, who, by denying the death of Christ to be a propitiatory sacrifice, would raze the foundations of all our hopes and comforts in the gospel, we have made it clear and firm, that the sacrifice which the text says Christ offered for his people in offering himself, was a sacrifice for expiation.

*Obs.* Christ offered himself a sacrifice of expiation for his people.

To give you distinctly the evidence which the Scripture affords for this great and fundamental truth, take it in these severals.

1. He offered himself, Heb. vii. 27; 'He offered up himself,' Heb. ix. 14 and 28.

2. He offered himself a sacrifice, 1 Cor. v. 7, Heb. ix. 26. Those things which were necessary and requisite to a real and proper sacrifice concurred in this sacrifice of Christ.

(1.) The person offering was to be a priest; it was the peculiar office of the priest under the law, Heb. v. 1. So Christ, that he might offer this sacrifice, was called to that office, and made an high priest, ver. 5, 6, 10.

(2.) The things offered were to be of God's appointment, otherwise it had been, not a true and acceptable sacrifice, but will-worship; and no more a sacrifice in God's account than the cutting off a dog's neck, or offering swine's blood, as appears by the laws given by God to Moses concerning free-will offerings, Lev. i. In the free-will offerings, though the precise time for offering them was not determined, yet things to be offered were appointed. So that what\* Christ offered was appointed and prepared by God, Heb. x. 5. He prepared him a body, that he might offer that for a sacrifice; and that he offered, ver. 10. It was a living body that he prepared for him, a body animated, enlivened with a soul, which soul was separated from his body in the offering; and therefore he is said to make his soul an offering, Isa. liii. And soul and body constituting his human nature, and making up himself, he is said to offer himself, Heb. ix. 26, 14.

(3.) That which was offered for a sacrifice was to be destroyed. This is essential to a sacrifice; it is *oblatio rite consumpta*, an offering duly consumed. Those things that had life, that they might be offered as sacrifices, they were killed, and their blood poured out; and the other parts of them, besides the blood, were burned, either wholly or in part.

Thus was Christ sacrificed; his dying and bleeding on the cross answered the killing and bloodshed of the Levitical sacrifices, and his sufferings (expressed by the pains of hell) were correspondent to the burnings of the sacrifices, Heb. xiii. 12, 13; his sufferings without the gate are held forth here, as answering the burning of the sacrifices without the camp.

(4.) The person to whom they were offered was God, and him only. Sacrificing was a divine honour appropriated to God. To offer sacrifice to any else was gross idolatry, Heb. v. 1. What were those things, τὰ πρὸς

\* Qu. 'So what'?—Ed.

των Θεδν? Oblations and sacrifices. And this sacrifice Christ offered unto God, Heb. ii. 17. He performed the office of a merciful and faithful high priest, in offering to God what belonged to him. What were those things? Why, such as made reconciliation, *i. e.* in offering to God a propitiatory sacrifice.

The Socinians will have Christ to offer this sacrifice, not to God, but to us, that they may deny it to be a real and proper sacrifice. But here they offer plain violence to Scripture; the text is express, he offered to God, not to us, Heb. ix. 14.

By these particulars we see, that what was necessary to constitute a real and proper sacrifice is found in this sacrifice of Christ.

3. He offered himself a sacrifice of expiation. And this is it I intend to insist on. That his death was such a sacrifice may be made evident in general by this one consideration, that the propitiatory sacrifices under the law were figures and shadows, whereby this great sacrifice of Christ was typified; for if the figures and shadows had something of expiation in them, that which was the substance of them, and was typified by them, must have it also, else there would not be so much in the substance as in the shadow, and the thing typified would not answer that which prefigures it, nor would the things which the Lord appointed to resemble one another bear a resemblance.

Now, that those sacrifices under the law did prefigure and shadow out this great sacrifice of expiation in Christ's death, appears, because the apostle declares them to be figures and shadows, Heb. ix. 9 and x. 1. Those expiatory sacrifices had some resemblance of this, as the shadow has of the body, though obscure and imperfect; they were but shadows, the substance and perfection of expiation was in the sacrifice of Christ, Col. ii. 17.

And if we come to particulars, and view the several sorts of them under the law, we may find, that whatever sacrifices were then offered to make expiation, they all prefigured and signified this of Christ. And we have ground to conclude so, from other places of Scripture, applying them to this great sacrifice. *Vid. Sermon or Homily 58.*

And let not this discourse seem tedious to you, or not worth your best attention here, or your serious consideration in private, for there is scarce any subject I can insist on either more profitable or more necessary; for without understanding this point I am upon, that Christ is a sacrifice of expiation, you cannot fully understand either the law or the gospel. We shall but understand the law as the blind Jews do, who, in all the laws about sacrifices, see nothing of Christ; and we shall but understand the gospel as the Socinians do, who quite deface and utterly subvert it.

I have given you some evidence in what is already said, that Christ in his death gave himself for his people, not only a proper and real sacrifice, but also a sacrifice for expiation.

I proceed now to some particulars, which will both explain and confirm this weighty point, and withal clear up divers main truths of the gospel, of very great consequence for our comfort and establishment; which, for some seeming difficulty and obscurity in them, are mistaken by some and rejected by others, though the gospel itself signify little to us without them.

If this point, Christ's being a propitiatory sacrifice for us, were well understood, there would remain little or no difficulty concerning our sin being imputed to Christ, or satisfaction made by him for us, or the imputation of that satisfaction to us, or his performing it in our stead.

All these, and others of this nature, would be clear, so as to be entertained and believed without doubt or difficulty, if this was but clear, that Christ gave himself a sacrifice for expiation.

And this I shall endeavour to make plain to you, by shewing in some particulars that whatever is essential to a propitiatory sacrifice, and is required in such a sacrifice under the law, is to be found in the sacrifice of Christ.

But let me first premise this one thing: by the judicial law (which was to the Jews their civil or statute law, by which they were governed as a commonwealth or body politic) corporal death was the penalty of all disobedience to God, Deut. xxvii. 26. The curse is death, death corporal in the civil or political sense of it; death eternal in the spiritual sense, as the apostle applies it, Gal. iii. 10. Now, the Lord, who was the King and Lawgiver of Israel, relaxed the laws as to many offences; and instead of the corporal death of the person offending, accepted of the death of a sacrifice.

Let this be minded and remembered all along; for much of what follows will be mistaken, or not well understood without it. And so I go on to the particulars mentioned, which will shew that the sacrifice of Christ was fully correspondent to the propitiatory sacrifices under the law, in all points that are essential or necessary to such a sacrifice.

1. The sin of the offender, whether a particular person or the people, was laid upon the sacrifice, imputed to, or charged on it. The sin of the offerer was in a manner transferred to the sacrifice, so as it became responsible for it, and was made liable to answer or suffer for it, as if itself had contracted the guilt. As when the debt is charged on the surety, or he takes it on himself, he is as much obliged to pay it, to be answerable for it, as if himself had contracted it. The sacrifice was looked on as under guilt, and treated as a guilty thing; not as having sinned, but as if it had sinned.

Hence the word used for such a sacrifice does signify sin itself. And the sacrifices are said to bear the iniquities of the people, Lev. xvi. 22, and x. 17, because the people's sins were laid on them. For this we have further evidence, by their laying hands on the head of the sacrifice, Lev. i. 4, iv. 4. And it is observed, that in all the propitiatory sacrifices for the whole congregation this rite was used, and in no sacrifices for them, but those. And because all the people could not lay on their hands, some other representing them did it for them; sometimes the elders, Lev. iv. 15, 2 Chron. xxix. 22-24, sometimes the high priest, Lev. xvi. 21. When they laid their hands on the sacrifices, they confessed their sins over them. This the text calls a putting their sins upon the head of the sacrifice. Hereby was signified, as the Hebrew doctors observe, that the iniquities of the people were laid upon the head of the sacrifice, and the guilt transferred from themselves unto the victim that was sacrificed for them. Hereupon the scape-goat, and all those sacrifices, whose blood was carried unto the holy place, and whose bodies were burnt without the camp, because the sins of the people were laid on them, they were looked on as if they were polluted and defiling things, and accounted execrable and polluted; insomuch, as those who did but touch them, contracted such pollution, that they were not to be admitted into the congregation till they were purified, Lev. xvi. 26, xxviii. 24. The Hebrew doctors say\* this was the reason, because the scape-goat and those other sacrifices were charged with so much guilt, such a multitude of sins being laid on them.

And as sin was charged upon the legal sacrifices and imputed to them, so was our sins charged upon Christ, the great sacrifice, and imputed to him, 2 Cor. v. 21. The righteousness of God here is the righteousness of him who is God, the righteousness of Christ, that righteousness which he performed in being obedient unto death. What is said of Christ's right-

\* Vid. Outram, 271.

eousness in reference to us, that is said of our sin in reference to Christ ; we are made righteousness, he is made sin. But how was his righteousness made ours, how was our sin made his? Why, by imputation only. We were far from being righteous in ourselves, but his righteousness is imputed to us. He was far from being a sinner, but our sin was imputed to him. But what is it to be imputed? If we will speak exactly of this, we must speak differently of them, according to the different nature and quality of the things imputed, which are good or evil. That which is evil, is said to be imputed to us, when it is charged on us. Good is said to be imputed to us, when it is accepted for us. When evil is said to be charged on any, so as he is to suffer for it, though he committed it not, we say it is imputed to him. And when good is accepted for another, so as he has the advantages of it, though he performed it not, but another for him, and in his stead, then it is said to be imputed to him.

Thus the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, when it is accepted for us, so as we are entitled to the advantages of it, though we performed it not, but Christ in our stead. And thus our sin was imputed to Christ, when it was charged on him, so as he was to suffer for it in our stead, though we only committed it. And thus was sin imputed to sacrifices under the law, in that sin was charged on them, so as they were to suffer for it, though they were not the transgressors.

So a debt is imputed to a surety, when he takes the debt upon himself, and is thereby obliged to pay, though he never contracted it.

And this not only clears the nature of the act, but also the justice and equity of it. It may seem unjust, that one who is innocent should be charged with the sins of another. But there is indeed no unrighteousness herein. It was the righteous act and appointment of God, that the sins of the people should be laid on the sacrifice ; and it was his act and appointment, that our sins should be laid on Christ the great sacrifice. And there is no unrighteousness with God in this act, more than in the other ; to say nothing that the practice of the world justified it in all their particular sacrifices. Nay, there is more to be pleaded for charging sin on Christ, than in that of the other legal sacrifices ; for *volenti non fit injuria*, there is no injury where there is consent. But sin was laid upon the other sacrifices, when they were not capable of consenting to it. But Christ gave his consent to have our sins laid on him. The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all, but he was willing they should be laid on him ; and it was in reference hereto that he said, Heb. x. 7. He himself bare our sins, he took upon him the burden of our guilt freely. It was his own voluntary act, so there was no more unrighteousness in it, than in charging the debt upon the surety, who freely and out of choice takes a debt upon him and thereby engages himself to discharge it. Never did any surety so freely charge himself with a debt, as Christ charged himself with our sins.

It may be objected, that, if our sins were charged on Christ and laid upon him, then he was under guilt ; and the most innocent Son of God, who was holy, harmless, and separate from sinners, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his lips, must be counted a guilty person ; nay, the most guilty of all others, as having upon him the sins of all his people.

I answer, there are two sorts of guilt ; a culpable and a penal guilt. He is under culpable guilt, who himself committed the offence. He is under penal guilt, who is obliged to suffer for the offence, though he committed it not : for this guilt is no more than an obligation to punishment. Now Christ, as our sacrifice, was only under this penal guilt. The offences that he was charged with were committed by us, not by him ; only by undertaking

to be a sacrifice for us, he came under an obligation to suffer for us, as if he had sinned, though we only were the transgressors.

And thus it was in those legal sacrifices, which were shadows of Christ. We need go no further to clear it. In them it appears that these two sorts of guilt may be separated; so that he who is not culpably guilty, may be penally guilty, and may justly suffer, though he did not personally sin: for those peculiar\* sacrifices, the sins of the people being laid on them, were under penal guilt, and did justly suffer as if they had sinned; and yet they were not culpably guilty, for they neither had sinned, nor were capable of sinning.

And in respect of this penal guilt, it may be granted that it was under more guilt than any, as the sacrifice for the whole congregation was under more guilt, being charged with more sin than any sacrifice offered for a particular person.

The text insisted on is a sufficient proof of this point. Christ was 'made sin for us.' Those who hereby understand a sacrifice for sin, say the same thing in consequence that I have said, for if Christ was made a sacrifice for sin, that must be granted of him which necessarily belongs to every sacrifice for sin; that the sin of those for whom it was offered was laid on it, or, which is all one, imputed to it.

This is also signified by those scriptures, where Christ is said to bear our sins, Isa. liii. 6, 11, 12, Heb. ix. 28, 1 Peter ii. 24. For the bearing of our punishment is hereby commonly understood.

Yet his being charged with our sin must necessarily be included; for punishment could not have been justly inflicted, nor would his sufferings have been penal, but that our sin was charged on him, or imputed to him. For punishment is never duly inflicted, but where sin is some way charged.

2. The penalty due to the transgressor under the law was inflicted on the sacrifice offered for him. The sinner deserved temporal death and destruction; and the sacrifice was slain or destroyed. So it was with the sacrifices for the high priest and the whole congregation. A bullock is appointed to be brought as a sin-offering for the high priest, and that was to be killed, Lev. xvi. 11; a goat was the sin-offering for the people, and that is ordered to be killed, ver. 15; and the scape-goat, sent into the wilderness, was so sent in order to its destruction one way or other.

So it was likewise with sin-offerings for private persons. If it was a lamb or a kid, they were killed, as other beasts offered for sacrifice, Lev. v. 6; if they were turtle-doves or young pigeons, their heads were to be wrung off from their necks, ver. 8; and when not able to bring doves and pigeons, they were to offer fine flour, and this was to be consumed, a handful of it was to be burnt, vers. 11, 12.

The sinner deserved to be killed or destroyed, that was the penalty due to him by the law; and so the sacrifice that was offered, and thereby suffered for him, was killed or destroyed. The transgressor's sin being transferred to the sacrifice, and laid on it by the institution of God, signified by the imposition of hands on the head of the sacrifice: hereupon being supposed to be under guilt, and guilt being an obligation to punishment, the sacrifice was obliged to suffer, and did suffer, the penalty which the offender deserved.

This is further cleared by the words which they used when they brought a sacrifice: Let this be כפרתי, my expiation; the meaning of which, as they generally agree, is this, What evil I have deserved, let it fall upon the head of my sacrifice.

Thus it was with propitiatory sacrifices, or sin-offerings under the law.

\* Qu. 'piacular'?—Ed.

And thus it was with Christ the great sacrifice, shadowed out by them; and thereby it is manifest that he was such a sacrifice. The punishment which was due to our sins was inflicted on Christ; he suffered what our sins deserved, 1 Peter ii. 24. As the sacrifice bare the sin of him for whom it was offered, and thereupon bare the penalty due to him, so Christ bare the sins of his people, and thereupon bare the punishment due to their sins. This expression includes both; both his taking our sins upon him, which sins were the meritorious cause of punishment, and his bearing the punishment, which was the effect of our sins, that which they deserved. The sacrifices, by having the sins of the people laid on them, became liable to undergo the penalty, and did actually undergo it. So Christ, by taking our sins on him, became liable to the punishment, and did actually suffer it. We have them joined together, Isa. liii. 12. As the life of the sacrifices was poured out unto death in the pouring out of their blood, so was Christ's life poured out in the shedding of his blood.

And why was his life poured out, and death inflicted on him? Because he was reckoned amongst transgressors, our transgressions being laid on him by the will and counsel of God. He was reckoned amongst transgressors, not by the Jews only, but by God himself. The Jews reckoned him a transgressor upon his own account; the Lord reckoned him so upon our account. And so he bare the sins of many; he having taken our sins, bare the punishment of our sins. This is plainly expressed, ver. 5. As the sacrifices were wounded and slain for their sins for whom they were offered, so was Christ wounded, and bruised, and killed for the transgressions of his people. What the sacrifice suffered, was the punishment due to the offender for whom it was offered; so what Christ suffered was the punishment which the transgressions of his people deserved. These expressions here used by the prophet, are proper to sacrifices for sin, and so applied to Christ as such a sacrifice, ver. 10. He was wounded, he was punished for our transgressions, in making himself an offering for sin.

The Socinians would have no more understood by these phrases of Christ bearing our sins, but only that he took away our sins; and so no more than when God the Father is said to take sin away. But the expressions here used will not endure such a sense. For the Father takes away sin so as not to suffer for it; but it is plainly expressed here, that Christ so bare our sins, as to suffer for them. He bare our griefs, our sorrows; he was wounded, bruised, he poured out his soul unto death, he was offered up, he bare our sins as a sacrifice. The punishment due to our sin was suffered by him, as the penalty due to transgressors was inflicted on the sacrifice.

3. The sacrifice under the law suffered instead of the sinner. There was a substitution of the sacrifice in the room of the transgressor. This is evident by the former head last insisted on; for to suffer in one's stead, is nothing else but to suffer for another what himself should have suffered. Observe what it is to be in one's stead; for not only the doctrine of the law concerning particular sacrifices, but the great doctrines of the gospel concerning Christ's satisfaction and our justification thereby, depend on it, and will be mistaken, or not understood without it. To be punished in another's stead, is to undergo for him the punishment due to him, that he may escape. And so the sacrifice did; when the transgressor deserved death, the sacrifice suffered death for him, that he might not die. Thus the sacrifice died in his stead, the life of it went for his life. That there was such a substitution of the sacrifice in place of the offender, the life of the sacrifice being taken away instead of his life, is apparent also in Scripture, Lev. xvii. 11. The life is in the blood, the blood is the vehicle of life; when the blood goes,

the life goes; and because the life is in the blood, therefore was it given for atonement for them that they might not die. And so the blood, which is the life, being offered to save their life, the life of the sacrifice went instead of the life of the offender.

So the Jewish writers understand it, who yet will understand nothing of Christ in their sacrifices. When, say they, the guilty person deserved that his blood should be shed, and his body should be burned, the Lord in mercy accepted of a sacrifice as a thing substituted in his room; so that the blood of the sacrifice was shed instead of his blood, דָּמוֹ תַחַת דָּמוֹ, and the life of the sacrifice went instead of his life, נַפְשׁ תַחַת נַפְשׁ. *Vide* Outr. 274, Buxtorf. in Stilling. 359.

And whereas, when they brought a sin-offering, they were wont to say, Let this be my atonement, כִּפְרֹתִי; it is all one, they tell us, as if he had said, Let this be substituted in my stead.

Answerably, Christ suffered in our stead; and it is so plain, by that substitution in the other sacrifices, that we need wish for nothing more to make it clearer. Those that will grant him to be a sacrifice, do not leave themselves the least reason to doubt but he suffered in our stead, and not only for our good and advantage.

When he made himself, his soul, an offering for our sin, he was substituted in our room; he died and suffered, not only for us, but in our stead. For to suffer in our stead, is nothing else but to suffer what we deserved to suffer, that we might escape. And thus he suffered; he did undergo what was due to us, that it might not be inflicted on us.

That he bare the punishment due to us, is sufficiently proved in the former head. And there needs no more to prove that he suffered in our stead, to those who will understand what it is to suffer in our stead.

The nature of a piacular or propitiatory sacrifice requires this. The sacrifice was always supposed to suffer instead of those for whom it was offered. The Scriptures declare this, the Jews acknowledge it, the heathen did not question it. None can deny it in reference to Christ, but those who, against all evidence of Old and New Testament, will deny that Christ was such a sacrifice.

But besides, there is abundant evidence in Scripture that he suffered in our stead, Rom. v. 6, 1 Peter iii. 18. In that he suffered for sin, he suffered as a sin offering, and that was instead of the sinner, the just for the unjust, as the innocent sacrifice instead of the unrighteous transgressor, so 1 Peter ii. 6, Mat. xx. 28. As the life of the sacrifice was a ransom for the life of the transgressor, *i. e.* instead of his life, λύτρον, the word here used is the same with the Hebrew, כִּפָּר, which is the word in use amongst the Hebrews for a propitiatory sacrifice, Mat. xxvi. 28. He speaks of his blood, just as of the blood of a sacrifice for sin. Such a sacrifice for the whole congregation, the blood of it was shed for many, it was shed instead of many. It was shed that they might be forgiven, and that is here for remission of sins. Not only the words here used in these Scriptures, ὑπέβη and ἀντι, but the things spoken of and referred to, do declare a substitution of Christ in the place of sinners, and that he died and suffered in our stead; even as the proper sacrifice for expiation died and suffered instead of those for whom they were offered.

Finally, in all those places wherein Christ is said to die for us, since he died as a sacrifice, the sense must necessarily be the same, as when the sacrifice died for a sinner; but the word *for*, here, in the sense of the Jews, of the Gentiles, of all the world, is to die in the stead of the sinner.

4. The sacrifice made satisfaction to God for the sinner. Both the words

כִּפָּר and נָסַח, used in the Old Testament for expiatory sacrifices, and expiation by them, do import satisfaction; so Gen. xxxi. 39, 'I bare the loss,' *i. e.* I made it good. The word is נָסַח, which, in other places, is to expiate by a sacrifice; the sense is here, I did make the satisfaction for it; for to make good what is lost, is to make satisfaction for it. So 2 Sam. xxi. ver. 3, 'What shall I do to satisfy you? wherewith shall I make atonement?' both expressions signify the same thing; to make atonement, is to make satisfaction, אָכַפֵּר, wherewith shall I atone, *i. e.* wherewith shall I satisfy? The word is, in other places, wherewith shall I atone or expiate? the sense is here, wherewith shall I make satisfaction?

And in our translation, the same word which, in some places, is atonement or expiation (which is the proper effect of propitiatory sacrifices), is in other places satisfaction, and so rendered, Num. xxxv. 31 32; ye shall take no כִּפָּר, no sacrifice for expiation shall be offered in this case. That sacrifice which would make satisfaction in other cases, shall not be accepted for satisfaction in this. To satisfy for another, is to undergo for him the penalty of the law, incurred by his transgressing it; it is the suffering the punishment which his sin deserves.

The offender under the law had deserved death, temporal death (that was the penalty of the law, speaking, as we do now, of civil guilt); this death was inflicted on the sacrifice which died for him. So the law had its execution upon the sacrifice instead of the sinner, and justice was satisfied, this being what it required.

There was mercy in appointing and accepting the sacrifice for the sinner. But justice had satisfaction too, in that the penalty of the law was so far inflicted.

More distinctly, there are several things required, that satisfaction may be made by sacrifice.

That which is satisfactory in this case, must, 1, be some affliction and suffering. 2. Not only so, but the suffering must be penal; not any kind of affliction or calamity, but something threatened by the law, and deserved by the sinner. Justice, that it may be satisfied, requires the execution of the law; and therefore to satisfy justice, not only that which is afflictive must be suffered, but the penalty of the law must be inflicted, or what is equivalent to it; it must be something penal. 3. Not only so, but it must be suffered for him, and in his stead by another; if one suffer for himself, and on his own account, that can be no satisfaction for another; he must suffer for him, and in his stead for whom he satisfies.

Now all these concurred (as was shewed before) in the death of a sacrifice. 1. It was a suffering; the sacrifice was killed, and death is one of the most grievous sufferings. 2. It was penal, that which the law threatened; the penalty of the law was death. 3. This was suffered by the sacrifice, not for itself or on its own account, but instead of the transgressor.

These particulars may be further cleared by an instance. A murderer under the law was to suffer death, that was the penalty of the law, Num. xxxv. 30, and in case he was not put to death, the land was polluted with blood, and the people liable to suffer for it, ver. 33. But when justice could not be done upon the murderer, because he was not to be found, the Lord found out an expedient to satisfy his law and justice, so as the land, the people should not suffer, Deut. xxi. 1-9. So that, though no satisfaction was to be taken for the life of the murderer, yet here was satisfaction to be made for the people amongst whom it was committed, that they might not suffer for it. And this was made by the heifer that suffered, and suffered the penalty, was put to death; and this not on its own account, but

instead of the people, that they might be quitted, and blood-guiltiness might not be charged on them. There was satisfaction made on behalf of the people by the death and suffering of the heifer; and therefore the guilt of innocent blood put away, as the text expresses it, which was the proper design and effect of satisfaction.

Answerably, thus did Christ our sacrifice make satisfaction to justice for us; he suffered, and that which he suffered was penal, and he suffered it for us and in our stead.

1. He suffered. He was a man of sorrows and sufferings; his whole life was a state of humiliation, and his humiliation was a continued suffering. But near and in his death he was made perfect through sufferings; there was the extremity of his sufferings, there he became a perfect sacrifice, Heb. ii. 9, 10, and v. 9. Christ wanted something to make him perfect in his office, till he had satisfied his Father's justice; and this he did, and so was perfected, by suffering death as a complete sacrifice.

2. What he suffered was penal; it was that which sin deserved, and the law threatened.

His sufferings had a respect to sin in the meritorious cause of them; and that is plainly signified, as any, but such as will be blind, may see, when he is said to suffer for our sins. If we will consult with common sense, what is it to suffer for sin, but to suffer for the desert of sin? what to suffer for our sin, but to suffer what our sin deserved? This he is still said to suffer, Isa. liii., Rom. iv. 25.

He suffered the penalty of the law, not a mere calamity, but a punishment; for what was the penalty of the law but death? Gen. ii. 17, and the curse, Gal. iii. 10. And he suffered death, 1 Pet. v. 6, 1 Cor. xv. 3, not on his own account, but ours; not for our good only, but in our stead. And he was made a curse for us, Gal. iii. 13. The enemies of Christ's satisfaction cannot deny, but the curse in the former clause is the penalty of the law, the punishment which it threatens; and why it should not be so in the latter clause, they can give no colour of reason.

3. Thirdly, he suffered this in our stead. We made that plain before. The mere understanding of the expression puts that out of the question. He that suffered what we deserved, that we might go free, did unquestionably suffer in our stead.

Put all together, and we have clear and unanswerable evidence, that Christ made satisfaction to divine justice for us. If Christ suffered for us, and in our stead, did bear the penalty of the law, the punishment due to us, so that the law had its execution upon him, then did he satisfy justice for us, and tendered that which it required. But, &c.

*Obj.* If it be objected that satisfaction is not made, unless the self-same thing be suffered which the offender did deserve, and which the law threatened; but Christ did not suffer the same thing which was in the sentence of the law, and our sins deserved. For we deserved eternal death; and it was not only the first, but the second death, that the law threatened; therefore the death of Christ, which was but the first, but temporal death, did not make satisfaction to law or justice for us.

*Ans.* For the making of satisfaction, it is not necessary that what is suffered for another should be the same thing every way, and in all respects. It will be enough if it be the same in kind and substance, though it be not just the same, but only equivalent in other respects and circumstances. And this is very plain by the matter before us. The sacrifice made satisfaction for offenders, so that they suffered not according to law; and for this it was enough that the sacrifice was put to death, as the offenders should,

though it was not the very same death in all respects and circumstances, not the same sort of death. The throats of the sacrifices were cut, their bodies flayed and dissected, and part, or all of them, consumed with fire; whereas the malefactors were to be stoned to death, or hanged on a tree, or beheaded. Here was the same punishment in kind and substance, death, but not the same sort of death, but very different in circumstances.

4. Whereas it is said, that the second death, eternal death, was in the sentence of the law, and this Christ suffered not (*vide* Serm. I. on Rom. v. 7, and conclude). Satisfaction may be made by the same sufferings in substance, and equivalent in other respects. So it was in the sacrifices under the law, and so it was in the great sacrifice in Christ's death.

5. The sacrifice pacified, appeased the Lord, made atonement, turned away his anger. That was the principal end and effect of expiating sacrifice, to make atonement, and so expressed in all sorts of them. In sin-offerings, whether the matter of them was beasts, Lev. v. 6, or fowl, ver. 7, 10, or flour, 11, 13; also in trespass-offerings, Lev. vi. 6, 7, it is ascribed to both of them together, Lev. vii. 7.

Likewise the burnt-offerings, whether the time for offering them was determined, as in their stated solemn sacrifices; or not determined, but left to their arbitrament, as in free-will offerings, Lev. i. 4, i. 6, vi. 9.

To make atonement is to pacify, to make his peace with one that was wroth with him, Prov. xvi. 14. And it is conceived by some, not without ground, that peace-offerings were for this end; and therefore they have the name שְׂרִפִּים, because the design and effect of them was to make peace between God and those for whom they were offered. Answerably the word כִּפֵּר, rendered to atone, is to appease and turn away anger or wrath, Gen. xxxii. 20. And this was the end why David offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, 2 Sam. xxiv. 21, and this was the effect of it, ver. 25.

Sometimes it is expressed by reconciling, or rendering propitious, Lev. vi. 30. And this is expressed to be the design of burnt-offerings and sin-offerings, 2 Chron. xxix. 24, and the end of peace-offerings amongst others, Ezek. xlv. 15, 17. And because the Lord was thereby rendered propitious or well-pleased, therefore those sacrifices are said to be a sweet-smelling savour, in the phrase in the text, Lev. i. 5, 9, 13, 17; and in Noah's sacrifice, a savour of rest, because when the Lord is pacified and well pleased, his anger does rest, Ezek. xvi. 42. Thence these sacrifices are called *ἱλαστικὰ*, propitiating sacrifices, or propitiatives. So that propitiation, reconciliation, appeasing, pacifying, and atonement, whereby the end and the effect of those sacrifices is expressed, are terms of the same import, and signify the same thing.

Now these same ends and effects are ascribed to the death and blood, *i. e.* to the sacrifice of Christ, and expressed by the same terms.

As the legal sacrifices made atonement, and they received it for whom they were offered, so did the sacrifice of Christ make atonement, and they are said to receive it, Rom. v. 11, and that was the death of his Son, ver. 10.

Propitiation is the very same thing with atonement. As the Lord was rendered propitious by those offerings called propitiatory sacrifices; so is Christ, by his sacrifice, a propitiation, 1 John ii. 2, *i. e.* a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, 1 John iv. 10, Rom. iii. 25, a propitiation through the blood of his sacrifice. The Lord did not only shew himself propitiated and appeased, but it was this blood, this sacrifice, that appeased and propitiated him; as those sacrifices were not to shew that the Lord was atoned, but to make atonement or propitiation. And so the mercy-seat, called *ἱλαστήριον* (the word here used by the apostle), by virtue of the blood of the sacrifice, was a propitiatory.

As the sacrifice did appease and turn away the anger of God, which they were liable to in reference to the temporal effects of it, as they did pacify him and make their peace with him, so by the sacrifice of Christ wrath is turned away, Rom. v. 9; our peace is made with God, Eph. ii. 12, &c. By the blood of Christ, the great sacrifice, peace was made not only between Jew and Gentile, but between God and them, Isa. liii. The chastisement of our peace, *i. e.* those sufferings by which our peace was made, he suffered as a sacrifice that we might have peace with God, Col. i. 20.

And as the legal sacrifices were to make reconciliation for transgressors, so was the death and sacrifice of Christ, Rom. v. 10, Col. i. 20–22, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, and how, ver. 21.

To evade these plain texts, they say the phrases used by the apostles are for reconciling us to God, not reconciling God to us, and so will have the reconciliation to be on man's part only, as if none at all were needful on God's part, when yet it is he that is the party offended; as though the end of the death and sacrifice of Christ were only to gain sinners' favour for God, and not at all to procure God's favour for sinners; as if it were to make God's peace with us, and to make our peace with God. But this, as it is intolerable in the very sound of the expressions, and plainly against the sense of the phrases in Scripture about reconciliation, Mat., Cor.\* so it destroys the correspondence between the legal sacrifices and this of Christ. For none will imagine that the Israelites offered sacrifices to turn away their own anger from God, but to turn away his anger from them. And these being types and figures of Christ's sacrifice, how can it be imagined that the end of it should be to divert men's wrath from God, and not to divert his wrath from us? Both were to 'make reconciliation for iniquity,' Dan. ix., so as sin should not be imputed. Now there can be no such reconciliation but by pacifying the party provoked by iniquity; and whether that be God or man, let the adversaries themselves judge.

6. These sacrifices put away guilt (civil guilt), released the sinner from the obligation to temporal punishment, procured forgiveness for him. This was the effect of them when they were accepted, sin was forgiven them for whom they were offered. And so it is frequently expressed that forgiveness was the effect of them, whether they were offered for particular persons or for the whole congregation, Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35, and for the whole congregation, Num. xxv. 26.

Sin is loathsome and offensive to a holy God, and so liable to the effects of his displeasure, which are punishment; accordingly it is set forth in Scripture as uncleanness, Lev. xvi. 16, as a defilement and pollution, Ps. cvi. 39, Ezek. xx. 31. Becoming guilty they were defiled; by contracting guilt, the sinner defiles and pollutes himself and becomes unclean, and when guilt is removed, he is said to be cleansed, purged, purified. Answerably, the taking away guilt by sacrifice is expressed by cleansing, purging, purifying.

By cleansing, Lev. xvi. 30.

By purging, Heb. ix. 13. The blood was sprinkled for that end, and sometimes with hyssop, Lev. xiv. 6, 7, Num. xix. 6; in reference to which, David begging freedom from guilt, does it in these terms, Ps. li. 7.

By purifying, Heb. ix. 13. And so these expiating sacrifices are styled by other authors *ἀγνιστικά*, purifying sacrifices, and *καθαριστικά*, sacrifices for purgation or lustration; because they were supposed to purge them from guilt, to make them clean and pure from that guiltiness which was their pollution.

And this was the effect of the great sacrifice of expiation in Christ's death.

\* Probably the texts alluded to are Mat. v. 24, 2 Cor. v. 19.—ED.

Thereby we are freed from guilt, and have forgiveness of sins. And it is expressed in the same terms, to signify that it was procured in the same way by that grand expiatory sacrifice, John i. 29. How did he take away sins? As a lamb sacrificed; he was the Lamb slain and sacrificed. That is here sufficiently intimated, but it is plainly expressed elsewhere, Heb. ix. 26; and it is signified where we are said to have forgiveness by his blood, Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Rom. iii. 25, Mat. xxvi. 28.

As under the law, so under the gospel, without blood no remission, Heb. ix. 22. No remission of sin, no expiation of guilt, but by the death and blood of a sacrifice. And the expiation of guilt, by the sacrifice of Christ, is set forth in the same terms as the expiation by other sacrifices. It is expressed by the washing, sprinkling, cleansing, purging, purifying, and so expressed by the same reason; because sin is an unclean thing in the eye of an holy God, 2 Cor. vi. 17, Mat. xv. 18, 20. He that contracts guilt defiles himself; the defiling guilt cannot be done away but by the blood of this great sacrifice; this and this alone can wash, and cleanse, and purge, and purify guilty souls; these are sacrificial terms, which refer to sacrifices for sin, and denote the expiation of its guilt. Let me instance in those several phrases, whereby the Holy Ghost in the New Testament holds forth the sovereign virtue and efficacy of that precious blood, and inestimable sacrifice for the taking away our guilt; hereby you may more clearly understand both the expressions, and the things what they signify and refer to. The removing of guilt by the blood and sacrifice of Christ, is expressed sometimes by washing, Rev. i. 5, and vii. 14; by sprinkling, Heb. x. 22, and xii. 24. The blood of the propitiating sacrifices, on the great day of expiation, was to be sprinkled on and before the mercy-seat, Lev. xvi. 14, 15. Hereby might be signified, that this seat, which would otherwise be a throne of justice, was a mercy-seat, that there was pardoning mercy to be found at his mercy-seat, which was Christ in a type; and that through his blood, signified by the blood there sprinkled. The people, then, were kept at a distance from the mercy-seat; they might not come and see this blood, sprinkled. But, says the apostle, 'Ye are come to the blood of sprinkling.' That which was the mercy-seat in the Old Testament, is the throne of grace in the New Testament; and we may come boldly to the throne of grace, with confidence that we shall find pardoning mercy, through the blood of sprinkling, by virtue of which it is becoming a throne of grace, a mercy-seat, without any veil interposing, without anything to debar us from it. We may find the expiating virtue of that blood of sprinkling flow freely in upon our souls for the cleansing of them from guilt. Washing and sprinkling was in order to cleansing, and that is another word used to signify this great effect. It is expressed by cleansing, 1 John i. 7, καθαρίσει; that is ascribed to the blood of Christ which is proper to sacrifices for expiation. And to be cleansed from sin, is to be forgiven, ver. 9. Cleansing from guilt is expressed by forgiveness.

By purging, Heb. i. 3, by himself, *i. e.* by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix. 13, 14. Purging from guilt, *i. e.* free from all the obligation to eternal death which wicked works lay on it. When an Israelite committed an act, to which the law threatened temporal death, his conscience told him he was liable to death, till the sacrifice appointed for his expiation was offered; but thereby he was freed from the obligation, and his conscience freed from the sense of it.

By sanctifying, Heb. x. 10. Sacrificed\* in a sacrificial sense, as expiating sacrifices do sanctify, *i. e.* by cleansing from guilt, Heb. xiii. 11, 12. It is

\* Qu. 'sanctified'?—Ed.

a sanctifying by his blood, not by his Spirit; such as is proper to the blood of sacrifices for expiation, which took away guilt; whose peculiar efficacy was not in working holiness, but in procuring forgiveness.

By purifying, Heb. ix. 22, 23, καθαρῖζουσαι. The sacrifices under the law did in their way purify from guilt; but the sacrifice of Christ, as far excelling those as heavenly things do earthly, purifies in a far more excellent way.

*Use.* For information. 1. Hereby we may discover the horrid wickedness of the sacrifice of the mass, which yet, with the papists, is the chief part of their religion. By what we have said of a sacrifice, it will appear that their doctrine and practice as to the sacrifice of the mass does both destroy Christ himself, and destroys the sacrifice of Christ.

That thereby they destroy Christ, the man Christ Jesus, will appear if you take notice of these three particulars.

1. They teach that Christ, not only as he is God, but as he is man, his whole human nature, soul, and body, is in their mass sacrament, and there really and substantially.

To open this a little. In their mass, which they use instead of the Lord's Supper, after the Epistle and Gospel, and some short collects, they have a longer prayer, which they call the canon of the mass, in which are the words of consecration, 'This is my body, this is my blood;' by virtue of which words they say, the bread and wine, which the priest consecrates, loses its substance; the substance of both vanishes, and the accidents of bread and wine only remain; the quantity and quality, the figure, colour, and taste, and not the least substance of either; but in the room thereof the substance of Christ's body and blood is brought or produced. So that under the forms or accidents of bread and wine, there is really and substantially the whole body of Christ, flesh, blood, and bones, and his soul too. It is the living body of Christ, his body enlivened with his soul, which the priest holds in his hands, and puts into his mouth. This monstrous change, of this substance of bread and wine into the substance of the real body and blood of Christ, has a monstrous name; they call it transubstantiation, a change of substance. I pass by the multitude of absurdities, contradictions, impossibilities, which they must swallow who believe this, and which none can digest but those whom the spirit of delusion has bereaved both of the use of sense and reason. It is enough for my purpose that they will have whole Christ to be there, body and soul. And the council of Trent, of so great authority with them that it is to be reckoned the standard of their faith, curse those who do not believe this in these words: 'If any shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore whole Christ; or shall say that he is there only in sign, or figure, or virtue; let him be anathema.' They will have all to be cursed as heretics, and burnt too, when they are in their power, who will not believe that whole Christ, soul and body, his living body, to be in the mass.

2. They determine, and will have it believed as an article of faith, that Christ is truly and properly sacrificed in the mass; his body and blood is there offered, his living body is there made a true and proper sacrifice.

There are some things are called sacrifices, but are not so indeed; they have not the true nature of a sacrifice, but only some little resemblance, therefore have the name. So praise, Heb. xiii. 15; doing good, ver. 16; giving up our bodies, ourselves, to God, Rom. xii. 1; such are called spiritual sacrifices, 1 Peter ii. 5. They have not the true nature, but only some likeness of a sacrifice; and therefore are not truly and properly sacrifices, but

only metaphorically. But they will have Christ, as offered in the mass, to be not a spiritual or metaphorical, but a true and proper sacrifice; not so called because of some resemblance, but because it has the nature and essentials of a sacrifice, and therefore truly and properly so. The Council of Trent decrees, 'If any shall say that in the mass there is not offered a true and proper sacrifice, let him be accursed.' They will have it to be as true a sacrifice as the paschal lamb was, yea, as any propitiatory sacrifices were under the law; they maintain that it is a propitiatory sacrifice both for the living and the dead.

3. In every true and proper sacrifice, that which is sacrificed is really destroyed. There is all sorts of evidence for this. It is essential to a sacrifice to be destroyed. The definition of it declares this; it is *oblatio rite consumpta*, an oblation duly consumed. And this is the difference betwixt an oblation and a sacrifice. That which is offered unto God, and preserved for holy uses, is an oblation. That which is offered, so as to be destroyed, is a sacrifice.

Thus it was with all sacrifices under the law; if they were things without life, they were some way consumed; if they were living things, they were killed, put to death. Thus it was, especially in sacrifices for expiation (of which sort they will have the sacrifice of the mass to be), when they were for particular persons, Lev. v. 6; when they were for the whole congregation, the consumption was greater, Lev. xvi. 27.

Nay, this themselves acknowledge, their doctors of greatest repute, not only Cardinal Bellarmine, but the most eminent followers of their angelical doctor, determine it to be essential to a true sacrifice, that it be killed, and put to death.

Put these together. Christ, his living body, is in the mass; he is truly and properly there sacrificed; that which is truly sacrificed, is really killed and destroyed. The inference from hence is clear as a day the sun shined, that Christ is really killed and destroyed in the mass. This, many of them acknowledge in plain terms; take only the words of Bellarmine, instead of many others who might be produced. Either in the mass, says he, there is a true and real killing and slaying of Christ, or there is not; if there be not, then there is no true and real sacrifice; for a true and real sacrifice does require a true and real killing, because the essence of the sacrifice consists in the killing of it. Where he not only affirms that Christ is killed in the mass, but proves it by such an argument as can never be answered by those who will have the mass to be a real sacrifice. Nor can they possibly find out any shift, to excuse their killing of Christ in the mass, without denying that it is a true and real sacrifice; and if they deny this, they abandon their whole religion, and must acknowledge that they have no religion at all amongst them; for they say, there is no religion at all where there is not such a sacrifice. Yet this may seem a less inconvenience; for who would not count it more tolerable to have no religion at all, than such a one as consists principally in destroying or murdering of Christ?

And if they deny this, viz. a real sacrifice, they overthrow the foundation of their faith and church, the infallibility of popes and general councils, who have decreed this to be an article of faith, to be believed by all, under pain of damnation.

And they must acknowledge that they have murdered all those whom they have put to death, and burnt alive, because they would not believe the mass to be such a sacrifice.

## CHRIST'S DYING FOR SINNERS.

---

*But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us—ROM. V. 8.*

THE apostle having proved at large that we are justified by faith, in the former chapters, in this and the following, he draws several instances from that doctrine. First, for comfort to those that are justified, giving an account of the several comfortable effects of this privilege.

Ver. 1. Having pardon of sin and title to heaven, hereby we know the Lord is appeased and reconciled, &c.

Ver. 2. By Christ we have admission to this gracious state in which we are established, and rejoice in hope of a more glorious condition.

Ver. 3. We not only rejoice in our present happy state, and hopes of future glory, but even glory in our sufferings. Tribulation being sanctified, helps us to the exercise of patience, which, as other graces, grows and is increased by exercise, &c.

Ver. 4. Experience; in the exercise hereof we have experiments of the grace of God in us and toward us, of his favour and our own sincerity, and this raises and increases our hope.

Ver. 5. That hope which will not disappoint us, especially having our hearts replenished by the Holy Ghost, with the sense of the love of God in Christ.

Ver. 6. Which love was herein expressed wonderfully, that when we were in a state of sin and damnation, without any power to free ourselves from this misery, in the fulness of time Christ died, even for those who were without God and opposite to him.

Ver. 7. This was greater love than is to be found amongst men, for if perhaps one may be found who would die for a merciful, an obliging, an useful or public-spirited man, yet none can be found that would lay down his life for any other, though he were a just and righteous man. But who would die for those that are useless, or odious, as contrary to him, as sinners are to God?

But this is the glory and triumph of divine love. Ver. 8. By this the love of God appeared in its highest exaltation, that when we were so far from being good or righteous, that we were sinners; when useless and impotent, when loathsome and hateful, when enemies and haters of God; when there was nothing in us, that might move in the least to love us, when we were full of that which might oblige him to express his hatred and indig-

nation against us, even then he vouchsafed the very highest expression of love ; then he gave his Son, even then Christ exposed himself to death for us. Herein both the greatness and freeness of his love appeared, to the wonder and astonishment of all that duly consider it.

Of the love of Christ in dying, I have spoken on another subject. It is his death I shall now consider, in these words, which offer this observation.

Christ died for sinners. This is the sum of the gospel, the foundation of Christianity, the root and spring of all our comforts and hopes, of all our happiness here and hereafter.

For explication, we shall inquire, 1, what death it was he died ; 2, what the particle *for* imports.

As to the former, 1. It was a real death. He died not in appearance, but indeed ; Christ himself, not another taken for him. An old impostor, Basilides, in the primitive times, held that it was not Christ who was crucified, but Simon of Cyrene in his stead ; and thence inferred, that none are to believe in him that was crucified. Mahomet took up the conceit after him, and delivered it in his *Alcoran*, that it was not Christ but one of his disciples that the Jews crucified. This is an impudent fable, against the types and prophecies in the Old Testament, and the history of the New Testament, which, with the evidence of miracles too, declares that Christ himself was really put to death. He gave Thomas a sensible demonstration that he really suffered, John xx. 25. Hereby Thomas was convinced that he suffered indeed. And it was death that he suffered. Life is the result of the union betwixt soul and body. This union was really dissolved, and the soul separated from the body ; though both, in the state of separation, continued united in the person of the Son of God.

2. A violent death. It is true he suffered willingly, Heb. x. 6, 7 ; John x. 18. The sacrifices under the law were led to the altar ; but he offered himself to those who made a sacrifice of him.

When I call it violent, I mean, it was not natural. The thread of his life was cut off when nature might have spun it out much longer, Dan. ix. 26 ; and when he was at the point of death, he did not dismiss his soul out of the body, as he had power to do, but it was forced out by the pain of death. The violence which he suffered, destroyed the vital disposition in the body, which is needful to continue it in union with the soul, and hereupon life did not so much expire as it was expelled. It is true, it was in his power to have secured himself from that violence ; but having willingly submitted to it, it had its effect upon him, and sooner than upon those who suffered with him, Mark xv. 44 ; John xix. 32, 33.

3. A cruel death, full of exquisite pain and torture ; he was crucified. Tully calls it *crudelissimum supplicium*, the most cruel punishment. Nails were forced through the hands and feet, which, being the most nervous, are the most sensible parts, though least vital. The body was distended upon the cross with such pains as when all the bones are out of joint. That in the psalmist is meant of Christ, Ps. xxii. 14-17. In this torturing posture they continued on the cross, which made no quick despatch ; the pain was prolonged. It was a lingering death, such a death as cruelty itself would have one die, *ut sentiat se mori*, that he might have all the sense of the pains of death, both a quick and lasting sense thereof. Such a sense Christ had of it, and was willing to have, and shewed it by refusing the wine mixed with myrrh and other poisonous ingredients, if they be right who think that this potion was given him to stupefy sense, or hasten death.

4. A shameful death. Crucifying was thought fit for none amongst the Romans but the vilest persons, for slaves, renegadoes, the worst of malefac-

tors, such as were counted pests of the earth. It was thought too ignominious a death for the meanest person that was a free man. When they would choose a death to shew their greatest abhorrence and detestation of any creature, this was it; therefore the dogs, that by their silence betrayed the capitol, were crucified.

Christ, the Lord of glory, was willing to die such a death for sinners. There was a concurrence of pain and shame in it; when he endured the cross, he endured the shame too, and made nothing of it, Heb. xii. 2.

5. A cursed death, Gal. iii. 13, 14. It refers to Deut. xxi. 23. He that was hanged is said to be accursed of God, not only because the sentence of the law (called a curse) was passed and executed upon him, but also to prefigure what was to befall Christ, who was to be crucified, as if he had been a cursed malefactor. The legal curse was a signification of that real curse which Christ was to undergo.

6. The same death, as to the main, which was due to us. The same death was threatened in the law as to the substance of it; and as to the circumstances, that which was equivalent. The first and second death was the sentence of the law, and Christ tasted both.

The worm of conscience, indeed, did not touch him; for that is the effect, not of imputed sin, but of personal guilt, wherewith he was not in the least tainted. Eternal sufferings are in the sentence of the law, not absolutely, but with respect to a finite creature, who could not suffer all that was due in less than eternity. But Christ being God, his temporary sufferings were equivalent to eternal; he could pay down the whole sum at once; what it wanted in duration was made up in the value. His sufferings for a time was of more weight and worth than the eternal sufferings of sinners; and it was far more for the Son of God to suffer for a while, than for all creatures to suffer everlastingly.

But as to the substance, he endured the pains of the second death, so far as was consistent with the perfection of his nature. The sufferings of that death are punishments of loss and of sense. Punishment of loss is separation from God. Of this he complains, Mat. xxvii. 46, Ps. xxii. The personal union was not dissolved, but the sense and effects of divine love and favour were withheld. His Father appeared as a severe and incensed judge, and dealt with him, not as his Son, but as an undertaker for sinners.

Then for the punishment of sense, how grievous were his inward sorrows! They were equivalent to the sorrows of the second death, Mat. xxvi. 38.

It was not the sense of his outward sufferings that so much burdened his soul; it was immediately the wrath due to our sins, which were then laid upon him, Isa. liii. 10.

How comes it that Christ expressed a greater sense of these his sufferings than many of the martyrs did, when yet their outward torments were more grievous? It was not because they could not endure\* more, but because they suffered far less; no bitterness of the second death was in their sufferings. That which Christ endured in soul was incomparably more grievous than all outward tortures.

Thus much for the first thing propounded, what death this was. We are highly concerned to set it out in all its aggravations, that the greatness of Christ's love, and the horrid nature of sin, may be more apparent, and upon other accounts; of which in the application.

Come we to the second: what is the import of this word *for*? Hereby it will appear that the death of Christ was for satisfaction to divine justice.

\* Qu. 'could endure'?—ED.

A truth denied by too many, who, under the name of Christians, strike at the root of Christianity, and agree with the Jews and Turks, change together with the gospel the foundation of our faith and hopes, comfort and happiness.

When it is said Christ died for us, *for* denotes, not only that he died for our good or advantage, but in our stead. He died, not only to confirm his doctrine, and induce us to believe it, and to imitate his graces, but he suffered death in our stead, *i. e.* he suffered what we had deserved, that we might not suffer it. There was a substitution of Christ in our place; he, by compact with the Father, undertaking to suffer what should have been inflicted on us, that we might escape.

This the word  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$ , here used, commonly denotes, so twice, ver. 7; when a good or righteous man is liable to death, scarce will any one die to save his life, *i. e.* die in his stead: 2 Cor. v. 15, 'If one died for all, then all died;' all died in the death of one, because that one died in stead of all, 1 Peter ii. 21, and iii. 18, and iv. 1. He suffered what we had deserved, that we might not suffer; that is to suffer in our stead. The just suffered what unjust deserved, &c., Heb. ii. 9. The cup of God's wrath, which our sins had filled, and which we should have drunk, was by the grace of God taken out of our hands, and put into Christ's, and he drank it up, when the bitterness of death was in it, that we might not taste it, *i. e.* he tasted death in our stead.

The word *for*, in all these, and many other places, signifies the same that it does in that expression of David, 2 Sam. xviii. 33, Would God I had died in thy stead, so that thou mightest have lived. So Pythias would have died for Damon, and Terentius for Brutus, *i. e.* instead of him, that his friend might live, *Valer. Magn. lib. iv. cap. 7.*

' $\text{ἀντι}$ ' is another word which the Holy Ghost uses in this business, which always signifies substitution, acting or suffering in another's stead, Mat. xx. 28, paid that which they were obliged to, did it in their stead, 1 Tim. ii. 6; so it is used, Mat. xvii. 27,  $\text{ἀντι ἑμοῦ}$ , pay this in my stead; and so it is rendered, Mat. ii. 22,  $\text{ἀντι Ἡζώδου}$ .

That we may understand more clearly and distinctly what the design of Christ's death was, let us observe those notions wherein the Scripture represents it. Three are commonly taken notice of: 1, as the punishment of our sin; 2, the price of our redemption; 3, a sacrifice for sin. In all which, satisfaction for us by his death is evident, though the word be not used.

1. Christ's death was the punishment of our sin. Christ in dying was punished for our transgressions. To clear this, let me shew, 1, the notion of punishment; 2, what evidence there is in Scripture that Christ in dying was punished for our sin; 3, how the proceeding was just and righteous, that Christ, though innocent, should be punished for those that were guilty.

The notion of the punishment will appear in the matter, form, and ends of it. Of which briefly.

(1.) In punishment there is an inflicting of some evil or suffering. That is the matter of punishment; it is something afflictive, whether in being deprived of something that is good, or undergoing something that is grievous. Christ suffered both ways; privatively, in the loss of what was most desirable; and positively, in bearing what was most intolerable and grievous.

(2.) Punishment is a suffering inflicted for some offence deserved by some sin. That is the form of it. If it be not upon the account of sin, it may be a calamity, but not a punishment. Christ's death was properly a punishment in this respect, because he suffered death for sin. Not his own; he

had none to deserve death, by the testimony of Pilate, Mat. xxvii. 18, 19, 23, but ours.

(3.) The end of punishment is the common good; the same with the end of laws and government, the good of the community, rulers and subjects. Partly in deterring and restraining persons from breaking the laws (and so securing the rights of all sorts, which good laws provide for) when they see that such as transgress must suffer the penalty. This is the proper end of those punishments, which are called *παράδειγματα*, exemplary.

Partly in asserting and maintaining of the honour and interest of those who have suffered by the breach of the laws, which is the end of satisfactory punishment.

Answerably, in the death of Christ, the severity there used is to restrain and deter all from transgressing the laws of God. In that respect it was exemplary punishment; and thereby the honour and interest of God, as he is lawgiver and governor of the world, was to be vindicated and asserted, and a compensation made for the injury and dishonour he had by sin. In that respect his punishment was satisfactory.

But then, negatively, the end of Christ's death was not to satisfy the anger of God, as anger signifies a desire of revenge, and as revenge is taken for a pleasing one's self in the evils which another suffers, merely because they are grievous to him whom we are angry at; for such a revengeful humour is not tolerable in men, much less is it to be ascribed unto God.

Now, of these particulars, it is the second we must\* stick at, who are against the satisfaction of Christ. They do not deny that he suffered grievous things; they cannot deny, but if that he suffered the punishment which our sins deserved, his death would be satisfactory; but they deny that his death was the punishment of our sins. And it is the second thing I propounded to shew, what evidence there is in Scripture, that his death was the punishment of our sins. Let me, for a more distinct view thereof, reduce it to some heads.

1. It is said, 'He bare our sins,' 1 Peter ii. 24, 25. To bear sin is to undergo the punishment due to sin, whether he be said to bear his own sin, or the sins of others, Lev. xix. 5, *i. e.* he shall be punished for it, Lev. xx. 17, where 'bearing his iniquity,' is to be punished, *i. e.* expressly to be cut off, ver. 18, 19, and ver. 20, to 'bear sin,' is to be punished for it, and the punishment specified by *childless*.

So to bear the sins of others is to be punished for others' sins, Num. xiv. 33, *i. e.* they shall suffer the punishment of your fornications, Num. xxx. 15; Ezek. xviii. 20, he shall not bear the punishment of his father's sins, *i. e.* as it is expressed, he shall not die; so that when the apostle says, 'He bare our sins,' if we will understand it as the Holy Ghost leads us, by the constant use of the phrase, the meaning is, he bare the punishment of our sins when he died; our sins were imputed to him, and so the punishment was transferred from us to him.

Answerable to this of the apostle is that of the prophet, Isa. liii. 6, 11, 12; that which is *iniquities* here, is *punishment*, ver. 4; that which he suffered, in being stricken, smitten, afflicted, bruised, wounded, slain, cut off. By all these phrases, and more, are his punishments expressed; and that it was the desert of our sins, is clear in the connection. The Jews thought him stricken of God, justly punished for his own sins, such as they unjustly charged him with, ver. 4; but the meritorious cause of the punishment inflicted on him was indeed our sins, ver. 5; so that no other sense can be put upon this

\* Qu. 'they most'?—ED.

phrase, but what is contrary to the natural and perpetual use thereof in Scripture.

(2.) Christ is said to be made sin and a curse for us, which do plainly import that he was punished for us, 2 Cor. v. 21; he was charged with our sin, and so punished as if he had been a sinner; he was made sin for us, as we are made the righteousness of God in him; his righteousness being imputed to us, the Lord rewards us as those that are righteous; and our sins being imputed to him, the Lord punished him as a sinner. Not for his own guilt, but for ours, was he punished; as not for our own righteousness, but for his, are we saved. The sacrifice that was slain, and so punished instead of the sinner for whom it was offered, is called by the name of sin, Lev. xliii. 29, Ps. xl. 6. The same word the prophet uses, speaking of Christ, Isa. liii. 10. Answerable to which is the apostle's expression, when he says Christ was made sin for us; he died and was therein punished instead of those whose sin he bare; as the sacrifice was killed, and so suffered instead of him whose sin was laid on it.

So he is said to be 'made a curse for us,' Gal. iii. 13. The curse of the law, in the former clause, is confessed to be the punishment of sin; and no reason is, or can be, given why it should not be in the latter. To be made a curse for us, is to be punished for us, as such malefactors were who are accursed of God.

(3.) He is said to suffer for our sins, Rom. iv. 25. He was delivered up to death for our sins. To suffer for sin, deserving it, is in a proper sense to be punished; and the particle *for*, when joined with sin and sufferings, does still denote the meritorious cause of sufferings, Eph. v. 6, Lev. xxvi. 28, Deut. xviii. 12, 1 Kings xiv. 18.

That Christ was punished for our sins, is likewise signified by those other expressions, 1 Cor. xv. 3, 1 Pet. iii. 18, Gal. i. 4; these plainly denote that sin was the cause of his suffering. And how can sin be the cause of sufferings, but as deserving them? and sufferings deserved by sin are properly punishments. This is enough to make it evident that Christ's death was the punishment of our sins.

3. As to the justice of the proceeding. Is it not unjust that an innocent person should be punished for the offences of others?

(1.) It is not unjust for the innocent to be punished for others' sins, when there is a conjunction betwixt the sufferer and the offender; such as is betwixt parents and children, princes and subjects; for in this case the Lord, the righteous judge of heaven and earth, punishes relatives for sins which not they but their relations acted; he threatens it, Exod. xx. 3. And this is not to be understood only in case they imitate their fathers' sins: for if they imitate them, God visits their own sins upon them, not their fathers'; so Ham's sons were cursed for his sin, Gen. ix. 25; and Saul's sons punished for his offence, 2 Sam. xxi. 8, 14; and Achan's children for his crime, Josh. vii. 24.

So he punishes subjects for the sins of their rulers: thus Judah is punished, in Josiah's time, for the sins of Manasseh, though then they were reformed, 2 Kings xxiii. 24; and the abominations taken away, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 33; and the people before for David's sin, when he declares they were innocent, 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, 17.

Now, if the proceeding was just, upon the account of conjunction, in these cases, why not in this before us; when there was such a near conjunction betwixt Christ and those for whom he suffered; when he was not only of the same nature, but a king, a father, a head to many of them actually, to all of them in God's design?

(2.) It is just in case of consent ; when he that is punished has power to dispose of that wherein he suffers, and puts himself freely under an obligation to be punished therein, and admitted by him who has power to punish. In these circumstances, by the verdict of God and mankind, it is righteous to punish a person for the offences of others, which yet he is not guilty of. Now there is a concurrence of these in the case.

[1.] Christ freely consented to die and undergo what was due to us. To compel one that is innocent to suffer for another's offences, when he has no mind to it, may be an injury ; but in this case there was no constraint, no need of it. Christ offered himself willingly to become our surety, he freely came under the obligation, and became responsible to all that was due from us. He was not only willing, but earnestly desirous to suffer and die in our stead, Luke xii. 50, as desirous to see the travail of his soul, what pangs soever it cost him, as a woman near her time is to be delivered, Ps. xl. 7, 8 ; Cant. ii. 8.

[2.] Christ had absolute power to dispose of what he suffered in. One reason why a man is not allowed to lay down his life for another that deserves death, is because his life is not his own to dispose of. But Christ was absolute Lord of his life, and had full power to keep it, or lay it down, as he pleased, John x. 18.

[3.] The Father admitted Christ as our surety. He was content that his sufferings should stand for ours, and that we thereupon should be discharged. It was his will that Christ should undertake for us, Ps. xl. 7. They agreed in the design, and upon the way and means of our deliverance, Zech. vi. 13. The Father loves him, because he consented to it, John x. 17. So that in a case where all parties concerned had power, all were satisfied, none had cause to complain of injury ; and so there was nothing of injustice.

[4.] Let me add another thing : Christ's loss in suffering was not irreparable ; it was fully compensated. If an innocent person suffer for a malefactor, the community loses a good man, and may suffer by sparing of an evil member, and the innocent sufferer cannot have his life restored, being once lost. Though David wished it in a passion, yet it had been great wrong and damage to himself and the public if he had suffered death instead of Absalom.

But in this case all is quite otherwise. Christ laid down his life, but so as he took it up again, John x. 17, 18. He continued not under the power of death for ever, nor as others who suffer death must do, till the general resurrection ; but rose again the third day ; death was swallowed up in victory. By dying he ' prolonged his days,' Isa. liii. 10 ; his loss of life for a while was countervailed and outweighed by infinite advantages.

Then also those offenders, in whose stead he suffered, are, by virtue of his death, reclaimed, effectually changed, made useful and serviceable to God and man.

Briefly, here was no injury to any party whatever ; not to those for whom he died : they have unexpressible advantage thereby. Not to the person suffering ; he was willing, and endured nothing without his consent ; he had that in prospect which made up all, Heb. xii. 2, and ii. 9. Not to God, nor any concerned in his government, for by Christ's death the ends of his government were all secured. His honour was hereby vindicated, the authority of his law preserved, and his subjects, by such an instance of severity in his own Son, deterred from violating it.

So that, upon the whole, in Christ's being punished for sinners, here is no appearance of injury to any, and so nothing at all of injustice upon any account.

This for the first consideration of Christ's death proposed in Scripture, as the punishment of our sins.

2. His death is also represented in Scripture as the price of our redemption. Redemption in general is a delivering of one from a calamity by a ransom, *i. e.* some valuable consideration, which comes under the notion of a price. To understand the nature of it more distinctly, as it is ascribed to Christ's death, and to free us from the misconstructions put upon it by the opposers of redemption by Christ, take notice of three particulars.

(1.) Man, by disobedience to God, was brought into misery, such misery as the Scripture often expresses by captivity. The Lord, for our rebellions, being the supreme judge and governor, did, as it were, commit us, deliver us to Satan, leave us under the power of sin and the world. Satan, as the gaoler, leads us captive at his will; he makes use of sin and the world as fetters to increase and continue this misery.

(2.) We could not be redeemed from this misery, but by a ransom. Where there is freedom from a calamity without a price, it is deliverance simply, but it is not properly redemption. Our deliverance from this misery is still in the New Testament ascribed to a price, a valuable consideration, which, tendered to the Lord, and he being satisfied with it, does grant a discharge. The word ἀπολύτρωσις, used for redemption, 1 Cor. viii. 20, and vii. 23, signifies deliverance by a ransom. Hence the delivery of the Israelites from Egypt, though it be called redemption, as being a type of that great deliverance from spiritual bondage and misery, yet it is not redemption properly, because it was not procured by ransom.

(3.) The price, upon consideration of which we are delivered, is the sufferings, the death, the blood of Christ, Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14. The price by which we are acquitted is the blood of Christ. Also Rom. iii. 24, 25, Heb. ix. 12, 1 Peter ii. 18, 19. The price, by which we were redeemed, was not so mean things as silver and gold, but that which is infinitely more precious and valuable. That is a price, by the laying down of which something is acquired; and when it is laid down for deliverance from misery and slavery, it is a ransom. So Christ's laying down his life is our ransom, Mat. xx. 28, Mark x. 45.

(4.) This price Christ paid in our stead. His sufferings were the price; and he suffered what we should have suffered, or what was equivalent thereto, that we might be delivered, 1 Tim. i. 6. Ἀντίλυτρον signifies a price or ransom paid instead of another, for ἀντί (as was shewed before) denotes substitution, when one is put in the place of another; and, in this case, not a thing instead of a person, but the sufferings of one person instead of the sufferings of others. Ἀντίλυτρον is such a ransom, in which the redeemer undergoes some such thing as the redeemed were liable to, which is fully expressed by the apostle, Gal. iii. 13. He redeemed us, how? by paying the ransom in our stead, *i. e.* by undergoing the curse which we should have undergone, and thereby discharging us from it.

(5.) The price was paid to God. Those that would have all that was done for us by Christ to be only a metaphorical redemption, confess that it would be properly redemption, and properly a price, if the price were paid to any; but since Satan detains us, it should be paid to him, if to any; and seeing it is absurd to have it paid to him, it is paid to none at all. We say it is God to whom it is paid, for the price is the blood or the death of Christ. This is sometimes set forth as a price, sometimes as a sacrifice. These are but one and the same thing, under several notions. Now the sacrifice was offered to God, and therefore the price, being the same thing, was paid to God, Eph. v. 2.

It is the great God, the supreme governor of the world, that detains sinners in this misery. Satan is but the instrument of his justice. It was for

the injury done to God that we are cast into this misery. The injury is transgressing of his law; the law cannot be satisfied, nor the injury repaired, but by suffering the death which it threatens. Christ suffered death in our stead, thereby the injury done to God is repaired, the law of God satisfied; and the Lord accepting of this, which the Scripture calls a price, tendered for his satisfaction, it was clearly paid to him, Rev. v. 19, which may as well denote that the price was paid to God, as that the people were purchased for him.

3. The death of Christ is proposed in Scripture as a sacrifice of expiation. So that, when he is said to die for sinners, we are to understand that he died as a sacrifice to expiate their sins. Now that ye may the better apprehend what a sacrifice for expiation is, and how his death is such a sacrifice, take serious notice of some particulars.

(1.) There were some sorts of sacrifices under the law, to which all those in use may be reduced.

[1.] Eucharistical sacrifices of thanksgiving, which were offered to signify their gratitude for mercies received of God; as acknowledgments of their own unworthiness, and his bounty and goodness to them. Such a sacrifice the death of Christ was not, it had another design and end, and was of another nature.

[2.] Propitiatory sacrifices for expiation. These were to atone God offended by their sin, to divert his wrath, and the punishment due to sin, when was offered what, by way of satisfaction, might appease God, and procure pardon of him, and favour or reconciliation with him, Lev. iv. 26, 31, 35. The design of these sacrifices in reference to God, was to make atonement, *i. e.* to appease him when he was provoked, to render him propitious when he had cause to shew his wrath. And in reference to the sinner, to obtain forgiveness, and prevent the punishment which his sin deserved. And such a sacrifice was the death of Christ, of this nature, and for this end.

(2.) Those sacrifices under the law did prefigure and shadow out the great sacrifice of expiation in Christ's death. The apostle so speaks of them, as of other things belonging to that administration, Heb. viii. 5, and ix. 9, x. 1. Those expiatory sacrifices had some resemblance of this, as the shadow has of the body, though obscure and imperfect. They are but shadows, the substance and perfection of expiation was in this sacrifice of Christ's death, Col. ii. 17. Whatever sacrifices were then offered for expiation,

[1.] They all prefigured and signified this of Christ, those especially which were sacrificed on the great day of expiation, of which there is an account, Lev. xvi. The apostle instances in those as figures, Heb. ix. 7-9, shewing how far the virtue of the sacrifice signified did transcend that of the signs and legal figures, vers. 11, 12, &c.

[2.] Likewise the trespass-offerings and sin-offerings did signify the same;  $\text{זָּבַח}$ , the word used for a sin-offering, is applied to Christ by the prophet, Isa. liii. 10.

[3.] The same was typified by the burnt-offerings of all sorts; whether they were stated, and the time for them determined by the law, or occasional, and such as they called free-will offerings, for both were for expiation, or, which is all one, for atonement, Job i. 5, Lev. v. 10; both the voluntary, Lev. i. 4, and the prescribed, Lev. xvi. 6, 10, 16, 18, &c. And burnt-offerings with the sin-offerings are reckoned by the apostle amongst those which were shadows of this most perfect sacrifice, Heb. x. 1, 6, 8. Both burnt-offerings and sin-offerings (expressly applied to Christ) were for expiation, with this difference, that the sin-offering was to expiate one sort of sin, specified; burnt-offerings were to expiate all sins.

[4.] The peace-offerings for the congregation seem to have been for expiation, and so of the like typical signification with the rest, because what is required in expiatory sacrifices is found in them, Ezek. xlv. 15, 2 Sam. ii. 10; the slaying of the beast, the sprinkling of the blood, and consuming some part of it upon the altar, Lev. ix. 18, 19.

[5.] The paschal lamb had something of expiation in its first institution. The blood of it secured the Israelites from wrath and punishment, which they had deserved, and the Egyptians suffered, Exodus xii. 13, Heb. xii. 24, 28. Through the blood of Christ, typified by that of the paschal lamb, the Lord is propitious and favourable to his people, so as not to destroy them, as he did the first-born in Egypt. The passover is referred to Christ by the apostle, 1 Cor. v. 7.

[6.] The lamb offered in the daily sacrifice was a burnt-offering; and burnt-offerings, as was said before, were for expiation, Lev. i. 4, and xvi. 24; to make atonement, to remove guilt, to cleanse from moral and legal impurities too, Lev. xiv. 12, Num. vi. 12, Lev. v. 6. In reference to lambs thus sacrificed for expiation under the law, Christ is styled, Rev. xiii. 8, the Lamb sacrificed, John i. 29, by whose blood the guilt of sin is taken away, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

So that all sorts of propitiatory sacrifices are referred to Christ, and shadowed out that most perfect expiation which we have in the sacrifice of himself. The most material resemblances betwixt them will appear in what follows. I have stayed the longer here, because it is a most delightful and comfortable prospect to one in love with Christ, to see him in those parts of the Old Testament which give an account of these sacrifices, which otherwise may seem dark, jejune, and useless to us.

(3.) That which was offered as a sacrifice for expiation was to be destroyed. Being a living creature, first it was slain, and the blood, part of it, sprinkled upon the horns of the brazen altar, or round about it, sometimes before the veil of the sanctuary, and some of it put upon the horns of the altar of incense; all the rest of the blood the priests poured out at the foot of the altar, Lev. iv. 18. The other parts of it besides the blood were sometimes partly burnt on the altar, partly eaten by the priests, sometimes wholly burnt upon the altar, Lev. i. 8, 9, as in the whole burnt-offering; or burnt without the camp, as in the sin-offering for the high priest and the whole congregation, Lev. iv. 11, 12.

Now the sufferings of Christ were correspondent to the burnings of those sacrifices, Heb. xiii. 11, 12, and his death to the blood of them. Indeed, it is the blood to which expiation is peculiarly ascribed, Lev. xvii. 11. It is the blood that makes atonement; and why so? The reason assigned is this, 'the life is in the blood,' repeated ver. 14. That sin might be expiated, the life of the sacrifice was to go for the life of the sinner; and the blood being shed, the life which is within the blood was given, and so the blood made expiation. Hence the apostle, to shew the necessity of Christ's blood to make atonement, Heb. ix. 22. Without blood there was no expiation, under the law or under the gospel; and all the effects of expiation are expressly ascribed to the blood of Christ, Rom. iii. 25, Eph. ii. 13, 14.

(4.) The sacrifice for expiation was slain instead of the sinner that offered it. There was a substitution here, one being put to death in room of the other, and suffering, that he might escape. This is of great consequence, to clear the nature and design of Christ's death, in opposition to those who would nullify it. Therefore I will insist on it a little, and shew what evidence there is for it.

Let me premise this, which is the observation of many. By the judicial

law, which was to the Jews their civil or common law, by which they were governed as a commonwealth or body politic, corporal death was the penalty of all disobedience to God, Deut. xxvii. 26. The curse is death, death corporal in the civil or political sense of it; death eternal in the spiritual sense, as the apostle applies it, Gal. iii. 10. Now the Lord, who was the king and lawgiver of Israel, relaxed the law as to many offences; and instead of the corporal death of the offender, accepted of the death of a sacrifice. Now that there was such a substitution, the life of the sacrifice being given for the life of the sinner, one suffering instead of the other, appears divers ways.

[1.] In that the blood is said to make atonement, Lev. xvii. 11. The reason why the blood was for atonement, is because the life was in the blood; and therefore when the blood was offered to make atonement for the offender, the life of the sacrifice was supposed to be given instead of his life.

[2.] The offender, bringing a beast for a sacrifice, was to lay his hand upon the head of it, Lev. i. 4, whereby is signified that he offered it in his stead; and so, says the text, it was accepted for him, *i. e.* in his stead, to make atonement, *i. e.* to satisfy for him, as suffering in his stead.

[3.] The sacrifice is said to bear the iniquity of the people, Lev. x. 17; and to bear iniquity is to be punished for it, which is to suffer what the offender should have suffered, to suffer death instead of them.

[4.] The sins of the people were confessed over the goat in the day of expiations, Lev. xvi. 21, which signified that the sin and punishment of the people were transferred to the goat, and upon his head, that he might bear them in their stead.

[5.] A heifer was to be slain when the murderer could not be found, and so to suffer in his stead, and secure the land from being defiled with blood, as if justice had been done upon the murderer, and himself had suffered, Deut. xxi. 1-4, 8, 9. The guilt that was to be put away by the death of the murderer, was put away from the land by the death of the heifer killed instead of him.

In short, the Hebrew doctors, as Buxtorf observes, lay it down as a general rule, that wherever it is said, Behold, I am for expiation, it is to be understood, Behold, I am in the place of another, to bear his iniquities.

Now this substitution of the sacrifice in the room of the sinner under the law, typified the substitution of Christ in our stead, in that great sacrifice of expiation when he offered himself on the cross. He was offered in our stead, he bare our sins, our guilt was transferred to him; he bore our punishment, and suffered it instead of us. His life went for ours. He died, that the death threatened in the law might not be inflicted on us; as the sacrifice was slain that the sinner might live. In this sense is he said to die for sinners in the text, as a sacrifice for them, suffering death in their stead. And that is the sense of the expression wherever he is said to die for us. It still implies substitution. Many instances I have given, to which add Luke xxii. 19, 20, John xi. 50-52.

(5.) The sacrifices for expiation were offered to God, and had an immediate respect to him. They were to atone God, and obtain forgiveness of him, as is frequently expressed, and had that effect, Num. xvi. 46, 2 Sam. xxiv. 25. I mention this particular, because the opposers of Christ his sacrifice and death contend that his death had no respect to God immediately, but only to man. It did not make our peace with God, nor incline him to pardon, but only disposed us for pardon of sins past, by leading us to amendment of life. And so they leave nothing of a priest to Christ, nothing of a sacrifice in his death. Whereas the apostle tells us, Heb. v. 1, gifts and sacrifices are things appertaining to God, being offered to him.

And so Christ our high priest offered himself for a sacrifice to God, Eph. ix. 14. What the effect of his death was in reference to God, shall be shewed hereafter.

(6.) The animal designed for expiation was sacrificed, not in the sanctuary, but at the door of the tabernacle, Lev. i. Indeed, part of the blood was sometimes carried into the sanctuary, sometimes into the most holy place; but that was not for sacrifice, but the application of the blood of the victim already sacrificed.

This I add, because the adversaries will have no sacrifice of Christ on earth; and though they make show of one in heaven, yet they assign nothing there which is like either sacrifice or expiation. Christ was sacrificed when he was put to death, and his blood shed. The Lamb of God was made a sacrifice when he was slain. If they make a sacrifice of him in heaven, either he was not sacrificed on earth, or he will be sacrificed more than once, contrary to all evidence of Scripture, Heb. vii. 27, and ix. 14, 25-28, and x. 10-12.

(7.) The effects of expiatory sacrifices, and answerably of the death of Christ, are divers. We may take notice of the virtue and efficacy thereof, in reference to sin, to God, and the sinner.

[1.] The efficacy thereof in reference to sin is to expiate the fault, or, which is all one, to satisfy for the offence. *Piare* is *luere* (as Grotius), to expiate is to bear punishment, to undergo the punishment due to the sin; the very same, or what is equivalent, is to satisfy. When this is suffered, the law is satisfied, and that which justice requires is done, whether it be suffered by the offender himself, or by one legally admitted in his stead. Satisfaction was made by the sacrifice, substituted in place of the sinner, suffering what was due to him. The offender deserved to be punished, the sacrifice bare the punishment; the offender deserved to die, the sacrifice was put to death in his stead. Hence the sacrifice is said to bear his sin, Lev. x. 17. To bear their iniquity, is to bear the punishment due to them. In correspondence hereto the apostle says, Christ bare the sins of those for whom he was offered, Heb. ix. 28. In being sacrificed, he bare their punishment, suffered what was due to them for their sins, and so satisfied for their offences, which is to expiate their sin.

Both the words used in the old Testament for expiation, כפר and חטא, import satisfaction, 2 Sam. xxi. 3; atonement, אכפר, the word is, 'Wherewith shall I expiate?' the sense is, Wherewith shall I make satisfaction? so Gen. xxxi. 39, 'I bare the loss,' is, I made it good. The word is חטא, I did expiate; the sense is, I made the satisfaction for it. This was the end of Christ's death, this was the effect of it, to expiate sin, to satisfy for it. What God lost by sin, Christ made it up; what injury he had by sin, Christ gave satisfaction for it by being made a sacrifice for expiation.

[2.] The efficacy of those sacrifices in reference to God is to atone him, *i. e.* to appease him and divert his wrath. Making atonement is frequently ascribed to the legal sacrifices that were for expiation, Lev. i. 4. Answerably we have atonement by Christ, Rom. v. 11, *i. e.* by his death, ver. 10, by virtue of his sacrifice.

Upon this account those sacrifices are said to be a sweet savour unto the Lord, as being thereupon well pleased, no more angry, Lev. vi. 31. Such a sacrifice was Noah's, a placatory sacrifice, and the effect of it so expressed, Gen. viii. 20, 21; it is rendered *odor quietis*, a savour of rest, a word which comes from נח, used, ver. 4, where the ark is said to rest, and denotes that the Lord's anger did now rest; he ceased to be angry; he would no more let out his wrath against the world in such a way.

Such was the effect of Christ's death and sacrifice, and so expressed by the

apostle, Eph. v. 2. The Lord was well pleased with Christ, and upon the account of this sacrifice well pleased with those for whom it was offered. Now he says, 'Fury is not in me.' By virtue of the blood of this sacrifice the Lord becomes propitious and gracious; hence Christ is said to be set forth, Rom. iii. 25. He exhibits himself as on the mercy-seat, on the throne of grace, to which we may come with confidence, &c., 1 John ii. 2.

[3.] The effect of these sacrifices, in reference to the sinner, is forgiveness of sin and freedom from guilt; hence it is often said upon the offering of such a sacrifice, it shall be forgiven him, Lev. v. 10, 13, 18, Num. xv. 27, 28.

Answerably by the blood of Christ sacrificed for us, we are said to have forgiveness. Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Mat. xxvi. 28. It is by virtue of this sacrifice that we are said to be freed from guilt in variety of expressions. Hereby we are 'purged,' Heb. i. 3, Heb. ix. 22, 26, guilt is uncleanness, Lev. v. 2, 'washed,' Rev. v. 11, 'cleansed,' 1 John i. 7, 9, 'sprinkled,' Heb. x. 21, 22, which are such expressions as other authors, Greek and Latin, use for their expiations.

Both these sacrifices procured freedom from guilt; but there is a great difference in this respect betwixt the expiations by the legal sacrifices and that by the death of Christ. Which that we may understand, there are three sorts of guilt to be taken notice of, civil, ceremonial, and spiritual. Guilt is an obligation to punishment. To be guilty is to be bound over or made liable to some punishment or other, which being various, guilt is accordingly distinguished.

1. Civil guilt, when an Israelite was liable to corporal death for some transgression of the law, for which death was to be inflicted, Deut. xxi. 9.

2. Ceremonial guilt, when he was to be debarred from the tabernacle, and joining with the congregation in the ceremonious worship then authorised, for some legal pollution, Lev. v. 2, 3. Spiritual guilt, when one is liable to eternal death for some sins against God, who has made eternal death the wages of sin. Now, the legal sacrifices might free those under the law from the two former sorts of guilt; but the death of Christ and his sacrifice alone frees from the third, spiritual guilt.

1. The legal sacrifices might and did free those for whom they were daily offered from civil guilt, and saved them from corporal death; for when this is supposed to have been due for disobedience to God, and was to be inflicted by the magistrate, the Lord (as was said before) relaxed the law, and admitted the death of the sacrifice which he appointed instead of the death of the offender, so that the offering of such sacrifice dissolved the obligation to this penalty, cleared the delinquent from this guilt, and freed him from corporal death.

But, then, a sacrifice would not quit the sinner in all cases from civil guilt and penalty. There were some crimes for which no sacrifice was appointed, none would be admitted: such were, wilful idolatry, murder, adultery, &c. Accordingly some understand Ps. li. 16. Those crimes of David were of that nature that no sacrifice could expiate. Such were wilful sins, done in contempt of the law, as the apostle intimates, Heb. x. 26-28; and herein the sacrifice of Christ far transcends the legal sacrifices, expiating those sins spiritually which those sacrifices could not expiate (or procure pardon for) so much as civilly, Acts xiii. 38.

2. Those legal expiations could free them from ceremonial guilt. If he had contracted some legal uncleanness, he was not suffered to come to the tabernacle till he was cleansed, and that impurity expiated; but having made use of the means prescribed for expiation in such cases, he was freed from this ritual guilt, and admitted to join in public worship with the congregation

at the tabernacle, or afterwards at the temple ; an instance we have hereof, Num. xix. 13, 16. If one had touched a dead body, or one slain, or a bone, or a grave, he was unclean, contracted such guilt thereby that his coming to the tabernacle before it was expiated (or, as the Dutch render it, before he unsinned it), was counted a defiling it. The way of unsinning or expiating such uncleanness is described there : a red heifer burnt to ashes, water was put to the ashes, and with hyssop sprinkled upon the unclean, ver. 17, 18. David refers to it, Ps. li. 7 ; and this the apostle calls a ' sanctifying to the purifying of the flesh,' Heb. ix. 13, an external sanctification, an expiating of them only as to the flesh, not as to the soul and conscience, and so comes infinitely short of that expiation which is to be had by the blood of Christ, as he shews in the next verse.

3. The legal sacrifices could not free them from spiritual guilt, could not secure them from eternal death, to which they were for sin bound over by the sentence of the law. The life of a beast, or of many, was not of sufficient value to satisfy for men's sins, which deserved everlasting wrath and endless sufferings ; these could not be a compensation for the injury sin had done to God ; this could not vindicate the holiness, truth, justice, authority of God, which all suffered by the violation of his law, which yet must all be fully asserted and vindicated, or else the Lord was engaged in justice to execute the sentence of the law, and inflict eternal death on transgressors. Nothing less than the death of the Son of God could do this, whose blood was of infinite value. The legal sacrifices were of no such value, of no considerable worth or virtue, for such an effect. Hence the apostle : Heb. x. 4, ' Impossible they should take away sin ' as to spiritual guilt ; not possible they should free the sinner from the obligation he was under to suffer eternal death. The same he signifies Heb. ix. 9. They could not perfectly satisfy the conscience that sin was pardoned, the spiritual guilt removed, and the sinner secured from everlasting death by such offerings. The conscience could not have any sufficient or perfect ground of assurance that justice was satisfied by such sacrifices ; and the sinner, being conscious that he is exposed to the justice of God, cannot be perfectly satisfied by anything but that which will satisfy justice.

But did these legal sacrifices only respect civil and ceremonial guilt ? Were they not at all considerable as to spiritual guilt ? The apostle shews how far they were considerable as to this, when in this verse he calls them figures. They did prefigure that which would remove this spiritual guilt ; they themselves did not, could not remove it. They freed the sinner from civil and ritual guilt really, but they only typified that which was alone sufficient to free from spiritual guilt. They had no virtue of themselves to do it, but only signified and shadowed out the sacrifice of Christ, by which it was perfectly done, ver. 13, 14. These legal expiations, which cleansed them from ceremonial impurities, signified that the sacrifice of Christ would do more ; this being of infinite value, since it was offered ' by the eternal Spirit,' *i. e.* by virtue and power of his own Godhead, would ' purge the conscience from dead works,' *i. e.* free the soul from spiritual guilt, the guilt of those acts whose desert was eternal death. Thus you see the difference betwixt the legal expiations and that by Christ : the one freed but from temporal death, the other wrought eternal redemption ; the former cleansed from legal impurities, the latter purges the conscience, &c. ; the former did but typify that expiation as to spiritual guilt, which the latter did really effect.

*Use.* 1. This should teach us to admire the love of God, who gave his Son, the love of Christ, who gave himself to die for sinners. This is the use the text leads us to in this, &c.

Here the glory of this love shines forth most admirably, both in the greatness and freeness of it; the greatness of it, in that he died; the freeness of it, in that he died for sinners.

1. The greatness of this love, that appears wonderful in the expression of it. What greater expression of love was the world capable of, than that the Son of God should die for sinful men? What greater expression of love could the great God vouchsafe, than to deliver his Son unto death? What greater expression could Christ make of his love to us than to die for us, and to die such a death, and in such a capacity, in our stead, in the stead of the vilest malefactors? How wonderful is it that God should become man, when man at his best estate is but vanity; that he should take the nature and innocent weakness of man, who is but a worm, and the son of man that is but a worm; that he should become man, not to enjoy any comforts of human life, but to undergo all the sorrows and sufferings of life and death; that he who gave life and being to all things, and sustains all in life and being by the word of his power, should die; that infinite glory should suffer a shameful death, should endure the cross, and despise the shame; that God blessed for ever should become a curse, and die a cursed death, the death of accursed malefactors, hanging on a tree; that he who was the God of all consolation, the fountain of all comfort and happiness, should expose himself to the rage and cruelty of men, and the incensed wrath and justice of his Father; should suffer most exquisite pains and tortures in body and soul from men, and God too; the pains and sorrows both of first and second death!

That he who was the righteous lawgiver, the supreme judge, the almighty governor of the whole world, should not only suffer, but be punished in our stead, and bear the punishment of our crimes in his body too!

That he who was more valuable than ten thousand worlds should give himself a ransom for us, and not think his life, his blood dear, but lay it down freely as a price of our redemption from hell and wrath!

That he to whom angels, men, and all creatures owe themselves a sacrifice, should sacrifice himself to expiate our guilt, should make his soul a sin-offering, that he should love us, and wash us from our sins in his own blood!

Oh how is everything herein—every notion, every consideration of Christ's love expressed in his death—astonishing and full of wonder! that which may amaze heaven and earth, that which may transport the angels, that which we should never speak of, never think of but with admiration! Oh the height and depth, &c., Rev. v. 9-13. Heaven and earth owes all honour to Christ for his wonderful love; and those that have any sense of it will be giving him the honour due to his name, to his love. And this is one special way to honour him for it, by admiring it.

2. Not only the greatness, but the freeness of this love is most wonderful; that which we should eternally admire, as being, of all things that the mind of man can consider, most worthy of admiration. That love is most free which is expressed to those that are most unworthy; but of all creatures in the world, none so unworthy of any love from Christ as sinners. And yet, which the text shews, it was sinners that Christ loved, it was sinners to whom Christ expressed his love, and gave the greatest expression of it that was possible, so as to die for them. Sinners are to Christ the most unworthy of love; for in that they are sinners, they are impotent and worthless; have nothing, can do nothing to deserve love, nothing any way to engage his affection, or to move him in the least to express any love to them. In that they are sinners, they are hateful to him, and were so far from deserving any love, as they on this account deserved all his hatred.

3. In that they are sinners, they are haters of God; and upon that ac-

count so far from expecting any sign of love that there remained nothing for them but a fearful expectation of acts of wrath and enmity. Now, he that could love such as these must love freely; his love expressed to sinners must be wonderfully free.

(1.) Sinners are impotent. Sin has divested them of the image of God, primitive holiness and righteousness, which was both the strength and beauty of their souls; and so they have nothing, can do nothing to excite love. This impotency implied here is expressed ver. 6. When they were 'without strength' either to relieve themselves, though extremely miserable, or to apply themselves to him for relief; when they did not so much as expect to\* desire it, he was found of those that sought him not; when they had no strength to make any answerable return for his love, any considerable acknowledgment of it; when they could do nothing, speak nothing worthy of his love, and such an expression of it. He that loves such creatures as these must do it freely; yet so impotent were sinners when he loved them, and so expressed his love as to die for them.

(2.) Sinners are hateful to Christ, the only objects of his hatred in the whole world. All other things, as being the works of his hands, are good, and so he likes them, and is pleased with them; but sinners, as such, are evil, and so hateful to him; they deserve his hatred and nothing else, as being contrary to him who is holiness itself. And they are actually hated by him: Ps. xlv. 7, v. 5. Now, could he love that which is hateful, that which he is of purer eyes than to behold without loathing and detestation? It is true, he could not delight in them as such, but he would bear them good will and pity them; and had such compassion on them, as to expose himself to wrath and misery, yea to death itself, a cruel, a cursed death, for their sake. Sure such love, to those who were so hateful, must needs be free, wonderfully so.

(3.) Sinners, as such, are haters of God, enemies to Christ, hate him, as David complains, 'cruelly,' Ps. xxv. 19, 'wrongfully,' Ps. xxxviii. 19, 'without a cause,' Ps. xxxv. 19, which is the most provoking and intolerable kind of hatred.

It is strange for any to love those that are hateful, but more wonderful if that hatefulness be accompanied with hatred. Yet there was a concurrence of these in sinners, when Christ loved them and died for them, Rom. v. 10. He would die to make our peace with God when we were enemies to him. Oh what manner of love was this! John xv. 13. Greater love than this the world never knew, till Christ appeared in it; but in him the world had an instance of greater love than this, a love more free, more wonderful, when Christ laid down his life for enemies, when he loved those more than his life, who hated him. No love can be more free, more wonderfully free, than the love of Christ to sinners; so weak and impotent, so hateful and loathsome, yet so much enemies to him. Oh give him the honour due to this love, by admiring it, by adoring him for it.

*Use 2.* This engages us to love Christ. This shews we are infinitely obliged to it. Shall we not love him who loves us? That is an intolerable, an inhuman temper, that will not return love for love. The worst of sinners will do this in reference to one another, Mat. v. 46. The return of love for love is so due, that it deserves no thanks, no rewards; the very publicans, counted the worst of men, will do this. And shall we be worse than they? Shall we deal more disingenuously, more unworthily with Christ, than the worst of men do with one another?

2. Shall we not love him, whose love has prevented ours? John iv. 19.

He does not require that we should love him upon any other terms, but because he loved us first. If he had resolved not to love us, till first we loved him, he should never have loved us; for we would never have begun to him. But since he begun to us, and propounds it as a motive to love him, that he loved us first; how great will our sin, how great will our condemnation be, if we do not answer the love of Christ with a return of love, 1 John iv. 10. Herein was the height of his love, and not to answer it with affection will be the highest provocation, and that which ourselves count most intolerable from others.

3. Shall we not love him who loved us freely, when we were sinners, when we were so far from deserving any love, as we deserved all hatred? Did he love us when we were utterly unworthy of it, and shall we not love him who infinitely deserves all our affection; him who is not only altogether lovely, entirely, infinitely amiable, but is as affectionate to us as he is lovely in himself, and has expressed his love to us in such a way as is most obliging; by dying for us that we might live, when the sentence of eternal death was passed upon us, that we might be happy in the eternal enjoyment of the fruits and expressions of his love? Did he love us when sinners, when we had nothing in the least to engage him to it? and shall we not love him, when he has laid infinite engagements upon us to do it? If we would not fall under the greatest and most inexcusable guilt, the heaviest and most dreadful condemnation, let us love Christ with,

(1.) An ardent love. Such was his love to us, a love strong as death, Cant. viii. 6, 7. Death itself could not give any check to it, he would love us though he died for it. Many waters could not quench it, the sorrows of death could not extinguish it, nor any floods or sufferings abate the fervour of it, though all the waves and billows thereof went over him, and seemed to overwhelm him. Oh, can we be content, that our love to Christ should be weak and remiss? No; let us have such an affection for other things, the things of the world; let us love them, as though we loved them not. But let us not deal so with him who loved us so as to die for us. Let it be a greater shame and affliction to us, that we have so little love for Christ, than that we have little worldly wisdom, little wealth, little power, little interest, little respect, or little of any thing that men naturally desire. Let little in any thing be more tolerable to us, than little affection to Christ, to him who loved us so much as to die for us, and suffer the pains of first and second death in our stead. Kindle this love by all means. And that it may kindle effectually, bring it to the flame, lay your hearts under the serious consideration of this love of Christ; if this will not influence them, they are hearts of stone.

(2.) A transcendent love. Love him more than all persons, than all things; love him above all, for so he loved you. He loved you more than he did the sinning angels; they tasted not of redeeming love, this run out in full streams to sinful men.

He loved you more than that which is dearest to you, and which naturally is most loved. He loved you more than riches, 2 Cor. viii. 9, more than honour and repute, Philip. ii. 7, exposed himself to scorn, reproach and shame.

More than the comforts of life: he became a man of sorrows, and lived a life of sorrows, afflictions, and sufferings.

More than his own blood, Rev. i. 5.

More than his life: he 'counted not his life dear,' but laid it down as the price of your redemption, Matt. xx. 28.

More than blessedness: would be made a curse, Gal. iii. 13.

More than his own body: he gave up that to be scourged, pierced, wounded, crucified, hanged on a tree.

More than his soul, Isa. liii. 10.

More than himself, Gal. ii. 20; 1 Tim. ii. 6. When he had no greater thing to give, he gave himself.

After all this, shall any thing, any person whatever be loved more than Christ, or equally with him? Your own hearts must needs pass sentence against this, as most accursed ingratitude, as that which is worthy of the dreadfulest curse, 1 Cor. xvi. 22. If any man love not him above all, for to love him less, is not to love him at all.

When any thing would come in competition with Christ, or take place of him in mind or heart, throw it down with indignation; say, This place is reserved for one more worthy, for him who loved me so as no creature ever loved; who did that for me, who has given that to me, who purchased, suffered that for me, which none in all the world, which no man or angel, can or will do.

(3.) An effectual love, 1 John iii. 18. Christ loved indeed. He shewed the reality of his love by such expressions, as may be the astonishment of heaven and earth. He counted nothing too dear to part with, nothing too grievous to suffer for us. Shew that you love Christ by real expressions. He requires nothing that need seem great or grievous to us. It is only this, to comply with his will in order to our own happiness. When Christ was to do his Father's will, not in order to his own, but our happiness, he applied himself as cheerfully to it, as a hungry man would do to his meat and drink, John iv. 34. Shall not we be willing to do the work of Christ, and do it cheerfully, when the end of it will be eternal life? If we love Christ indeed, we must do his will, John xiv. 15, 21. When obedience is proposed in general, every one will be ready to profess a compliance, God forbid that I should not obey Christ. But when it comes to particular instances, and some duty is pressed on us that seems difficult, or chargeable, or reproachful, or hazardous, here is the trial of our love. Then he that loves Christ indeed, will say with David, 'Shall I serve the Lord with that which costs me nothing?' Oh if Christ had done thus in reference to me and other lost sinners, what had my condition been? If he had been willing to have undertaken some small and easy things, but declined that which was difficult, and reproachful, and hazardous, and painful, he had never been obedient to the death of the cross, he had never died for me, and then I had never been pardoned, I had never been saved, I had been a child of wrath now and for ever, I had been a son of eternal death, I had been without hope to escape it, nothing had remained for me but a fearful expectation of judgment, &c.

But did Christ think nothing too hard, nothing too grievous to perform for me? And when he calls me to a duty, which intrenches upon my ease, or repute, or estate, or safety, shall I stick at it? shall I decline it? shall I spare myself in opposition to Christ's will, and neglect of his command, as the flesh and the world would have me? Oh, then, how can I say that I love Christ? Indeed, those that accustom themselves to do thus, let them say what they will concerning their love to Christ, their practice confutes their sayings.

*Use 3.* This engages us to live unto Christ, not to others, not to ourselves. This was the end of his death, and we are as much concerned to live unto him, as we are not to defeat his design in dying, 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. He 'died that we might live.' Therefore we owe our life to him, it is his, and should be employed for him. We were sentenced to die, he ransomed us from death. His blood, his death was the price which bought and purchased our life. Therefore we and our lives are his, as that which he has bought and paid for, 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.

## CHRIST TOUCHED WITH THE FEELING OF OUR INFIRMITIES.

---

*For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, &c.—HEB. IV. 15.*

THE apostle's design, in this epistle, is to establish the Hebrews who professed Christ in that profession; so as they should neither quit it, nor abate anything of it, for the love of the Mosaical rites, or fear of persecution.

In order to that end he displays before them the excellencies of Christ, and shews how far he transcends the angels, chap. i. 2; how far Moses, chap. iii.; how far the high priest. Afterwards he enters upon the comparison betwixt Christ and the high priest, chap. iv. ver. 14. He proposes his main design, that which he pursues all along.

*Let us hold fast.* Let us neither quite relinquish it, nor hold it loose, by lukewarmness or indifferency, remitting anything of our zeal and stedfastness therein: since there is more encouragement to stick to this, than the former legal administration; since we have a greater high priest, and one from whom we may expect far greater advantages.

He calls Christ a *high priest*, because he did that really which the legal high priest did typically. He makes reconciliation, and he makes intercession for the people.

He calls him a *great high priest*, insinuating that the other high priesthood was little, and of small value, in comparison of Christ's. What Aaron and his successors did but in figure and shadow, Christ does really and effectually; whatever they did by sacrifice, or interceding for the people, had no virtue or efficacy, but what depended on, and was derived from, the sacrifice and intercession of Christ, the great high priest indeed.

He says, he is 'passed into the heavens;' intimating, that what he does there, is as far to be preferred before what the high priest did in the most holy place, as heaven is above earth, or that lower tabernacle or temple on earth. The high priest, on the day of expiation, after he had offered sacrifice, took the blood of it, and with it passed into the most holy place; this was but a shadow of what Christ did, and is now doing for us. After he had offered himself a sacrifice on earth, he, with the virtue of his blood,

is passed into the heavens, there to carry on and accomplish the remainder of his office, as he is our great high priest.

And so he calls him Jesus a Saviour; one who, by virtue of his office, and his executing of it in earth and heaven, can save his people from their sins, which the other high priest could not do.

He calls him 'the Son of God.' He was not a mere man, as the other high priest, but God as well as man. The Son of God, not for his conception, or unction, or resurrection, or exaltation; but his Son by eternal generation; being begotten of the substance of the Father, and so of the same nature and essence with him. Equal in power, glory, and all excellencies; and therefore a perfect and all-sufficient Saviour, 'able to save to the uttermost all that come,' &c. And hereby in such a height of exaltation, as the other high priest cannot come into any competition with him in the least wise. Yea, one who is not only able, but willing, to save; being not only the all-glorious, almighty, and all-sufficient God, but also gracious, merciful, and compassionate: 'For we have not,' ver. 15.

We need not be discouraged that we have an high priest that is so transcendently excellent; who is so great, as there was none in the world ever like him; who is so far beyond us, so remote from us, passed into the heavens, yea, higher than the heavens; who is infinitely above us, being the Son of God, when we are but the children of men, dust and ashes. Since, as he is great, and high, and glorious, he is also gracious, merciful, and compassionate; no weakness of ours, wherein he does not shew himself so: 'For we have not,' &c.

*Obs.* Christ our high priest is touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

For the explaining of this let me shew, 1, what it is to be our high priest; 2, what those infirmities are, with the feeling of which he is touched; 3, what it is to be touched with the feeling of them.

1. For the first, his office, as high priest, may be best known by the acts of it. The acts of his office are principally two.

(1.) Sacrificing for us to make reconciliation, chap. ii. 17. Reconciliation was made by offering sacrifice; this the high priest did under the law, chap. v. 1. Thus did Christ, our high priest, he offered sacrifice for sin, for the expiating and removing the guilt of it. A 'better sacrifice,' chap. ix. 23; a wonderful sacrifice, Isa. liii. 'His soul;' yea, soul and body, himself, chap. ix. 14, 26.

(2.) By interceding. The typical high priest, on the day of expiation, after he had offered the appointed sacrifice, took the blood of it with him into the most holy place, and there, burning incense withal, sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, Lev. xvi. 14.

Heb. ix. 7, 25, Thus the high priest under the law appeared for the people; and this was a shadow of Christ's interceding in heaven for us, chap. ix. 12, xi. 24.

He appears for us in our nature: as one who has shed his blood to expiate and cleanse us. The virtue of that blood is as fresh as if it were there poured out and presented, it cries.

And he appears as one whose will and desire it is, that all the advantages of his purchase may be bestowed on his people. This is more than if, as man, he should offer up strong cries with tears, as he did, chap. v. 7. Thus he intercedes, chap. vii. 26, and acts as our high priest, ver. 26.

2. What those infirmities are, with the feeling of which he is touched.

Infirmities here, are whatever our weak and frail condition makes us subject to suffer by. The apostle takes infirmities in this latitude, 2 Cor., latter part of the xi. and the former part of the xii. chapter, comprising his

wants, weaknesses, inward and outward; his perils and dangers, his temptations and trials, his afflictions and sufferings, under the notion of infirmities.

All that our Lord Jesus, taking our frail nature upon him, was exposed to, or exercised with; particularly, either such as concern the outward man, as want, or poverty, hunger, cold, nakedness, weariness, *vide* 2 Cor. xi. 27; also pain, sickness, or death itself. Not only such as are natural, but adventitious, through the injustice, cruelty, or other sin of men; as contempt, disgrace, reproach, slander, hatred, opposition, exile, imprisonment; or that which sometimes more troubles us, the unkindness, unfaithfulness, unaffectionateness, desertion of friends and relations.

Or, 2, such as concern the soul, viz. grief and anguish, trouble and perplexity, fear and terror, spiritual desertion, sense of God's displeasure or wrath, temptations from Satan, and horrid suggestions. All these, and such like, we may understand by infirmities. All these in a manner was Christ exercised with, or exposed to; and he is touched with the feeling of all and every of these, when his people are under them. But,

3. What is it to be touched with the feeling of our infirmities? The word is *συμπαθεῖν*, which signifies to condole with one, or to suffer with him. As one member is in pain or distress, the other members suffer with it, which the apostle expresseth by the same word, 1 Cor. xii. 26.

But this requires a more distinct and particular account. Take it thus,

(1.) He knows all our infirmities. He knows them actually, he sees them. He knows them all, none of them escape his notice. There is none of them so small, as that he should think them not worth his notice. None of them so great, as that he will be loath to concern himself therein. That is true still which David speaks of the Lord, before our nature was assumed, Ps. lvi. 8. All his troublesome motions, when he was forced from home, and in a sad wandering condition, the Lord took a particular account of it; he had them in numeration, as we have things which we count or tell one by one. We may think our afflictive infirmities more than we can number; but he counts them exactly, and has the account always in his eye. He takes not less notice of them, since he took our natures and infirmities, than he did before. As he is God, he is no less able. As he is man, we cannot imagine him less willing to do it; he is now doubly willing, both as he is God and man too.

(2.) He knows them experimentally. For he has tried what they are, he has himself been exercised with them. For *tempted*, in the latter end of this verse, some copies have *πειρασάμενον*. He found by experience what they are, Mat. vii. 18. He took our infirmities, and bare them; and so knows how heavy they are by his own feeling. He knows what weight, or smart, or trouble, or afflictiveness there is in any of our infirmities, for he himself hath felt it all; he himself was under, and perfectly remembers what he suffered by it, and so he knows feelingly and to the life what we suffer by any of them. He does not only know what it is to be poor, in want and necessities, as one who having always lived in plenty himself, has an account of the poor and necessitous condition of others, but he himself was poor, 2 Cor. viii. 9.

He knows by experience what it is to be in such necessities, as not to have whereon to ride, whereon to feed, whereon to lay his head, Mat. viii. 20.

He knows what it is to be in pain, not only as one who having been at ease all his days, hears but others complain of it, but as one who himself has felt it, and that in extremity.

He knows what it is to be despised and set at nought, to be abused and

reproached, to be hated, and persecuted, and despitely used. He knows the sorrows of life, and the pangs of death; not as the angels know them, by sufferings of others, but by his own experience, as one that has suffered all these himself.

He knows what it is to be tempted to sin, troubled with horrid suggestions from Satan; what it is to be deserted of friends, of all men; yea, what it is (as to sense) to be forsaken of God. For this was his own case, he himself was thus tempted and tried, thus deserted and forsaken. All his disciples forsook him and fled; yea, the sense of his Father's love was withdrawn from him, when he cried out, 'My God,' &c. He knows all this by his own sense and suffering; he knows how grievous and afflictive this is, and what pity it calls for, and what succour and relief it stands in need of. He became like us in all these, that he might know this by experience, as chap. ii. 17, 18.

(3.) He is affected with our infirmities, he feels them, he is touched with the feeling of them. He has a sense thereof which touches his soul, and makes some impression on it; as one who not only has suffered what others feel, but suffers with them in what they feel. As when one member is under some grievance, not only the other members suffer with it, but the soul is affected therewith; affected with grief arising out of love, attended with desire to give or get relief, and anger and indignation against that which brought the grievance, or continues it, and hinders relief. In like manner is Christ affected with the infirmities of his people.

[1.] He pities, has compassion on them. This the word here used signifies, and may be read thus, We have not an high priest which cannot have compassion, &c. The same word is used, Heb. x. 34. Though they were not in bonds with the apostle, yet they suffered with him, being touched with a compassionate sense of his sufferings and bonds, as if they had been bound with him. So, though Christ labour not under these infirmities, as once he did, yet he is not without sense thereof; it touches his soul, so that he does *συμπαθεῖν*, suffer with us therein, having a compassionate sense of what we thereby suffer.

[2.] And this pity and compassion, it is not without the motions and acts of love. Indeed, this is the rise of it. It is out of such a love as made him willing to humble himself so low as to take our weaknesses and infirmities upon him. He would know what they were, and what it was to labour under them, by his own feeling and experience, that he might know the better how to pity those that are encompassed with them. He would in all things, in all soul-infirmities, be made like to us, that he might be, with more advantage, a merciful, a compassionate high priest, chap. ii. 17, 18. This was out of a wonderful and astonishing love; this fitted him for compassionateness, and excites it.

[3.] This is attended with desire, accompanied with an inclination to succour, relieve such, whose condition is to be pitied; to do that which is best for them in such a condition. That which wants this is no pity indeed. It is that which is most advantageous and desirable in this affection; it is all that we must understand by compassion, when the Scripture ascribes it to the Lord; and when we conceive it to be in Christ as God, in the divine nature, it is not in him a troublesome or passionate grief. That is an imperfection not to be ascribed to him; nor would it be any advantage to us if he were liable to it. But it is a willingness in him to help and succour those whose state calls for pity or commiseration. It is an inclination to do that which is good, which is best for us under our infirmities, Mark i. 41, ix. 22.

[4.] This is accompanied with zeal and anger, or indignation, against those who occasion the grievance, or would make it worse and heavier. Christ hath left us an instance of this before he took our nature and infirmities, Zech. iii. 1, 2. Joshua, and those whom he represented, had infirmities enough, were covered, clothed with them, ver. 3. Satan makes use of them as matter of accusation, would have had the Lord severe against them, instead of pitying and relieving them. Hereupon Christ is moved with zeal and indignation against him, and expresses it, ver. 2; and has such a sense of his people's infirmities as raises his zeal and indignation against those who will have no compassion for them while they are under infirmities.

[4.] He is affected with our infirmities as a man; for he is not only God, but man. Herein the comparison holds betwixt Christ and the Levitical high priest, as the apostle expresseth it, Heb. v., and ii. 14. He assumed our nature, and so our affections; as he has a human nature, so he has human affections. He has such love, pity, compassion for his people in their infirmities, as are in the hearts of the children of men, the weaknesses excepted. They are in him properly, and not as they are attributed to God, to whom such affections are only ascribed metaphorically. When Scripture says, the Lord loves and pities, we must not conclude that he is affected as we are, but such acts and motions as we feel are ascribed to God from some little resemblance, a very remote likeness, whereas the difference is infinite. And we know no more what they are in God than the brutes know what these affections are in us; the distance is incomprehensibly greater. They do no more properly belong to God than a human soul, or the members of a body, belong to him, which yet are spoken of him in Scripture. But what is spoken after the manner of men must be understood in a way suitable to the excellency and perfection of God.

But these affections are not only ascribed to Christ after the manner of men, but they are truly and properly in him as he is man. He has truly and properly the heart and affections of a man; a heart that can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, even as you feel your hearts affected with the sufferings of a very dear friend. He has such compassion as a parent has for the weaknesses of a beloved child, Ps. ciii. 13, Judges x. 16, Jer. xxxi. 20. This is ascribed to God very improperly; but it is true of Christ as he is man, in a most proper sense. There is no such grief and pity in God as there is in us, he is infinitely above them, &c.

It may be said that there is a great difference betwixt these affections as they are in Christ, and as they are in us, both in respect of the personal union of the human nature with the Godhead, and because of his now perfect and glorified state.

It must be confessed there is a difference upon these accounts, but it is such a difference as does nothing lessen the advantage, or abate the comfort, we may have from this particular.

*First,* For as [to] the personal union, this is not inconsistent with such affections as are in us, no, nor the sinless weakness of them; for Christ had and expressed such affections while he was on earth; and yet that union was then the same that it has been since, and will be for ever.

To instance but in one, his compassion; that which is most pertinent, and which seems to import more weakness than some other affections, as love, joy, desire. We find him shewing his compassions frequently, upon all occasions offered, Mat. ix. 36, and xiv. 14, and xv. 32, Mark i. 41, Luke vii. 13; yea, such was the tenderness of his compassions, as he often expressed it in tears. The motion of this affection was not confined to his soul, but wrought upon the body also; and made more impression there,

than it will do upon every temper, Luke ix. 41, 42, John xi. 33, 35, Heb. v. 7.

So that though he was God-man, yet his affections were like those of a mere man, only without sin. This affection did not prevent reason or disturb it, or hunger him into any irregularities, as inordinate passions do sinful men. And such calm, untainted affections in him, are of far more advantage and comfort to us than turbulent and excessive passions would be.

*Secondly*, As to his glorified state, the difference as to his affections is this, that they are perfected, freed from some weakness and imperfections, which, though they were in him without sin, yet were the effects of man's sin, and by the sin of man brought upon man's nature; which nature, so weakened, the Lord our Redeemer assumed, and continued under those innocent weaknesses during the state of his humiliation. But now being exalted to the height of perfection and glory, he is freed from those weaknesses, and all shadow of imperfection is vanished. There is no inward disquiet of his soul by grief or pity, as John xi. 33; no outward disturbing commotion of humours or spirits in his glorified body; no tears or weeping, as in the days of his flesh, which may be included in his being made perfect, Heb. v. 9; nothing remains which imports weakness, or suffering, or imperfection, 2 Cor. v. 16.

But we lose nothing by this alteration in his state and in his affections. The difference seems but to be this, now he has perfect affectionateness to his people in their infirmities; he perfectly pities and sympathises with them; his compassion and sympathy is without weakness or imperfection; not only without sinful weakness, which he never had, but without innocent weakness, which attended him in his love and suffering condition.

So that he still hath human affections to us, retaining still the human nature; he still has love, pity, compassion for us, not only such as are ascribed unto God, but such as are in the heart of a man (which we being better acquainted with, are more familiar and obvious encouragements and supports to us), only they are more perfect affections than are in the heart of any other man on earth or in heaven. There is less weakness in them; he more perfectly loves and pities us, and is more perfectly touched with the feeling of our infirmities, as man, now that he is in heaven, than when he was upon earth.

[5.] Christ is affected with our infirmities, as one concerned in us very much and nearly. A good man, when he sees another in wants, distress, misery, will be moved with it, though he be a stranger to him. Oh, but if he be one in whom he is concerned, one who is nearly related or much endeared to him, he will be much more affected, and more feelingly touched with his condition, Luke x. 30, 33. He did this for a stranger, what for a friend, brother, child? Christ is not affected with the infirmities of his people, as if they were strangers to him, and he no otherwise concerned in them than a stranger; but as one that has interest in them, that is related to them, that counts himself one with them and them one with him.

He is touched with the sense of our grievances, as one that has interest in us and we interested in him. This is intimated in the text; we have an high priest, he is ours and we are his; so that he is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, not as of those who belong not to him, but of those who are his own. Christ himself requires that we should have bowels of compassion for those who belong not to us, when their condition requires it; much more for those that are our own; and he himself will perfectly answer what he enjoins us in this particular.

As one related to us, nearly and many ways related, by all sorts of rela-

tions, those that are most endearing, and most oblige the heart to affectionateness and sympathy.

As a friend, John xv. 14, 15. Now, Job vi. 14, pity should be shewed to a friend; pity should be shewed to a servant, to a stranger, much more to a friend. Christ shewed great compassion to his enemies, what has he then for his friends, those that were dearer to him than his life?

As a brother, Heb. xii. 11, 12; Joseph's brethren, Gen. xlii. 21.

As a father with the grievances of his children, chap. ii. 13. Christ as a father presents himself and his little ones to the Lord as a pleasant sight. Now what a quick sense has a parent of the pain or wants of a dear child? Jer. xxxi. 20.

As a husband with the wants or sufferings of the wife of his own bosom, 2 Cor. xi. ver. 2. The covenant wherewith he married them to himself, is founded in his own blood; they were dearer to him than his own heart blood. How would a husband of such love (if there were any had such love) be touched with the feeling of what is grievous to his wife? So is Christ touched with the sense of his people's infirmities; he is not affected with them as though they were aliens, but as those whom he owns in the nearest and most obliging relations.

Yea, he is touched, &c., as one united to us, as counting himself one with us. The nearness of this union is expressed by that of head and members, Eph. i. 22, 23; and this is laid down as the ground and reason of the sympathy, 1 Cor. xii. 26, 27. When one member suffers, all the rest are sensible; but especially the head, which is the foundation of sense. Christ being the head, from whence spiritual sense is derived from its members, by which they sympathise with one another, he himself is sensible of what is grievous to the members in particular; on this account, in all their afflictions he is afflicted.

He being one with them, he counts their sufferings his; he is afflicted with their want, pain, suffering, as if it were his own. The troubles which Saul gave the primitive saints, he resents it as a persecuting of himself, Acts ix. 5; he that touches them, touches the apple of his eye; yea, any neglect to relieve the least of them in their infirmities, he is sensible of it as a neglect of himself, Mat. xxv. He is affected with their infirmities, as one greatly concerned, no less than if it were his own concernment.

[6.] He is affected with them really and to purpose; he is touched with the feeling of them effectually. It is not an ineffectual sympathy, a fruitless pity, like that censured by the apostle, James ii. 15, 16; but it is active, that which is really advantageous to us every way: to give what we want, to secure us from what we fear, to ease us of what is grievous, or to do for us that which is as good or better.

It includes a readiness in Christ to accommodate himself to all our infirmities, according to the exigence of them, so as to give ease, relief, supply, deliverance; so far as is needful, as soon as it is seasonable, whenever it will be good for us.

It makes him ready to shew mercy and grace in time of need; so ready, as we may be confident of it. It is the ground of what is held forth in the next verse; 'in that he is touched with the feeling,' &c. We may have help and relief under all infirmities; we may have whatever of this nature will be a mercy to us; all that is mercy we may obtain, and this is all that is desirable. We may have it freely, from grace; we may find grace, which gives without money or price; we need but come to find it, we need but ask to obtain it. We may have it in abundance from him who sits upon the throne to shew himself gracious; whose glory it is to give like himself, the

King of kings ; to give royally, liberally, bountifully. We may have it all whenever we need it, whenever it will be seasonable ; and we may be confident of all this, because he has such a sense of our infirmities ; this leaves us no occasion in the least to doubt of it. We may have all that heart can reasonably desire, in such kind, in such way, in such measure, and at such times, as is most desirable. We may be sure, because he is touched with the feeling, &c. He has a more effectual sense of them than any other, men or angels, yea, or we ourselves have ; for he has such a sense thereof as will assuredly bring relief, which neither we ourselves, nor men or angels for us, can do in many cases.

[7.] It is an extensive sympathy, it reaches all our infirmities. He has compassion on us in all our weaknesses, all that we suffer by, in all that has anything of misery or activeness in it. This is plain by the latter end of this verse : he 'was in all points tempted,' &c. He is touched with the feeling of all those infirmities wherewith himself was tempted or exercised ; but he was exercised in all points with all our weaknesses, but those that are without sin.

Oh, but it may be said, this exception does exclude the greatest part of our infirmities from this sympathy, and us from the comfort and advantage of it, in those points too which stand in most need of it ; for those infirmities which proceed from sin, or are mixed with it, and sin itself especially, are our greatest misery, make our present state most lamentable, and so stand in most need of pity and relief. If Christ be not touched with the feeling of these (which are worst of all), so as to have compassion on us, and be ready to succour us, we are to seek in our greatest pressures and grievances, where we have most necessity of relief and pity ; as *e.g.*,

1. In those infirmities which are from sin, the effects of sin, which are many and great, is he not touched with the feeling, &c. ?

I answer, Yes, he is touched, &c. These are not excluded by the expression. He himself laboured under these ; for such infirmities as are from sin may be sinless, though they be the effects of sin, yet they may be innocent in themselves, and without sin ; and all that are without sin he himself was exercised with. He was tempted in all points, exercised with all infirmities, even those which are the effects of sin, as we are ; only they were in him without sin, as they are not in us. For,

Let it be observed, that Christ took not our nature, as it is now in the glorified saints, who are not only freed from sin, but from all the sad effects of it ; nor as it was in our first parents, in the state of innocency, before they had sinned, and before sin had made any breach upon human nature, and brought those weaknesses and infirmities upon it which they afterward and we now suffer under. But he took the nature of fallen man, as it was bruised and rendered infirm by the fall ; he took our nature as weakened by sin, though not as defiled by it ; there was no sin in his human nature, but there was those weaknesses and infirmities which were the sad issues of sin. These he laboured under, and so knows how to pity and sympathise effectually with those that are yet under them. He was not exempted from those infirmities which are part of the curse brought upon our nature by sin, but only exempted from what was sinful in them, Rom. viii. 3, where *likeness* refers not only to *flesh* (for that in him was not only like, but the same with ours), but to *sinful* flesh. He assumed our nature, not as it is glorified, or as it was innocent, but as it is sinful, as it is under the effects of sin. The meaning is, he had a human nature just such as that of sinful man ; as frail, as infirm, as mortal, as corruptible as that of sinful man,

altogether like it in those infirmities which are the effects of sin, but without sin in him.

*Obj.* It may be said, there are some infirmities in us which are the effects of sin, which Christ was not exercised with, as painful distempers and sicknesses; yet these are grievous and afflictive to us, and so need his compassions and relief. But how can he be touched with the feeling of them, since he never felt them, never was tempted or exercised with them?

*Ans.* Those infirmities (the issues of sin) which Christ took on him, were such as are natural, common to the nature of man and all mankind; not such as are personal and proper to some only, as those be which are instanced in; but though he did not suffer by these, yet the grievance and afflictiveness that is in them he suffered. He endured as much trouble, and more, than any fever can afflict us with, in that agony, which forced from him a bloody sweat; he endured as much pain as any man in the most acute sickness or distemper, when nails were driven through his hands and feet. And so he knows by experience what pity and relief such anguish and pain calls for, and thereby is disposed to sympathise with his people therein, as effectually as if himself had been exercised with those particular and personal distempers which are so afflictive to nature. That, Mat. viii. 17, holds true in respect of his effectual sympathy with us, in sickness and painful distempers.

The grounds which may assure us of the truth of this are such as these:

(1.) This was one end why he took our nature, and became man. It was not only that he might suffer *for* us, but also that he might suffer *with* us, by a compassionate feeling of what we suffer. He was to be like the Levitical high priest, Heb. v. 1, taken from among men. And why so? Ver. 2, that he might be the more disposed to have compassion on his people in their infirmities; even those that are sinful, and are so less or more, Heb. ii. 16, 17. He took man's very nature, the seed of Abraham, and was made in all things like unto us in our nature, in its parts, properties, infirmities, in all. Wherefore? Why, that he might be merciful; that he might have the mercies and compassions, not only of God, but of a man also. Such mercies and compassions as angels have not for us, yea, such as God alone could not have had for us; not only those of God, but those of man too. He might have had the mercies of angels for us, if he had taken the nature of angels; he might have had the mercies of God for us, if he had not taken our nature; but he could not have the mercies and compassions both of God and also of man for us, unless he had become man; and therefore it behoved him to be made like us, that there might be in him a concurrence both of the mercies of God and of man also; that he might not only be merciful to us as God, but compassionate us as one man does another; and that he might pity us too out of experience, as one that had been exercised with the feeling of the very same weaknesses and grievances that we feel, ver. 18. He became man, that he might be exercised with such weaknesses and grievances as the children of men are; and was actually tempted or exercised with them, that his own experience might render him ready and forward to pity and succour us under them.

Now, this being the end why he became man, it is no more to be doubted of than that he took our nature. As sure as he was taken from among men; as sure as he was born of a woman; as sure as he is the man Christ Jesus; as sure as he has the nature, the soul of a man; as sure as he has the affections of a human soul: so sure it is that he is touched with the feeling, &c.; with such a feeling as is collected from Scripture.

(2.) This was the end of his sufferings, Heb. ii. 18. All that he suffered, by our weaknesses, our sins, was that he might succour those that

suffer by them, that he might be touched effectually with the sense of what we are exercised with. As by his sufferings he learned obedience, Heb. v. 8, so thereby he learned compassionateness to his people. Indeed, this was one part of that obedience which he was to learn thereby. The Father would have him to be a compassionate high priest; and himself suffering by our infirmities, and for our sins, he learnt by experience how to pity those that suffer.

Now, this being the end of his sufferings, as sure as he would not suffer so many things in vain, as sure as he would not lose the end of his suffering, so sure it is that he is touched, &c.

(3.) It is his office, as he is high priest. This office required it. He being called to this office, must be faithful in the discharge of it. He could not have been faithful herein if he had not been merciful. These are conjoined by the apostle, chap. ii. 17. Compassionateness was required in the Levitical high priest to the faithful discharge of his office, chap. v. 1, 2. Two things are necessary in every one who has this office: one in reference to God, to offer sacrifice for reconciling him; the other in reference to the people, that he can have compassion on them, that he be touched with the compassionate sense of their infirmities, as one who himself has suffered by and under them.

Now, Christ far excelled all other high priests in both these; as in the former, so in the latter. He answered the office herein perfectly, as none else could. It behoved him so to do, vers. 8, 9. Made perfect, how? 'By the things which he suffered,' ver. 8; 'by sufferings,' chap. ii. 10. Though he had all perfection in his person, yet he could not be made perfect in his office without suffering. For his office was both to satisfy God, and to have compassion on man; and by suffering he came to do both perfectly. Thereby he satisfied divine justice, and thereby he learnt experimentally compassions to his people. So that, without this latter, a compassionate feeling of his people's infirmities, he had not been perfect in his office. As sure as Christ is faithful, as sure as he perfectly discharged his office, so sure is he touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

2. But in sinful infirmities, what relief is there hereby for them? Christ was not touched with any that were sinful, and how can he be touched with the feeling of them? *e. g.* the people of Christ have much ignorance and darkness, and many spiritual wants; they are sinfully defective, both in knowledge and holiness; and these are in themselves, and to those that are duly sensible of them, greater miseries than poverty, or sickness, or other outward afflictions and sufferings.

I answer, Christ had something of these, though nothing of the sinfulness of them; so much of these, as that he can sympathise with his people under them.

He wanted much knowledge of many things; he wanted some spiritual gifts, yea, and some exercise of grace, in some parts of his life, while he was upon earth. He came not to perfection in these, but by degrees, and till then was under some defect and imperfection, though not any that was sinful. For he wanted none that he ought to have had, or that his present state was capable of; yet, wants, defects, and inward weaknesses, without sin, he was really under, Luke ii. 40, 52. Hereby it seems plain, that he had not at first that measure of knowledge, and of the Holy Ghost, as afterwards. He knew not so much, nor had that exercise of grace in his infancy or childhood, as at perfect age. His faculties were not capable of full perfection herein till they came to full maturity; he grew but up herein by degrees, as he grew in stature, and consequently was without

some degrees of what he after attained; and till then, under defects and wants, though sinless. So that he knows by experience what it is to be under defects and wants, and so knows how to pity those who labour under them. In this the comparison holds betwixt him and the Levitical high priest, chap. v. 2.

3. Oh, but he was never touched with sin, chap. i. 16, and this is our greatest misery, the sting of all grievances, that which makes all other to be heavy and grievous. If he be not touched with the feeling of our sin, we are at a loss where we have most need.

I answer, There are four things considerable about sin, the offence, temptation to it, guilt of it, punishment for it. Now there are none of these but Christ was touched with them, but the first only. He was without fault; there was nothing in him, nor acted by him, which was an offence to God, 1 Peter ii. 23. He was perfectly innocent; and if he had not been so, he had not been capable of bringing us any relief as to sin; he could neither have been a high priest nor a sacrifice for sin.

But (1.) he was tempted to sin; tempted much and long by Satan, and to the most horrid sin, chap. ii. 18. In that he was tempted, he is disposed, he is both able and willing to, &c.; in that he 'suffered by being tempted,' he can pity, and so is ready to succour those that suffer by temptation. He was not overcome when tempted, though he suffered by it, but he knows hereby what it is to be overcome; for the sense of that kept him from yielding, and so he knows how to have compassion on those that are overcome by temptation.

(2.) The guilt of sin, of our sin, was upon him, 2 Cor. v. 21. Sin was imputed to him; he was by imputation a sinner, though he never sinned personally. Our guilt was laid on him. Guilt is an obligation to the penalty. Christ came under this obligation, and so under guilt; not by his own sin, but by his own consent he became our surety, and so was bound to pay the debt. Guilty so far, as to be bound to endure what sin had deserved, and sinners were worthy to suffer.

So far he was touched with the guilt of sin; so far he knows what it is to be under guilt, and so knows what pity and relief they need who are under it. So far he is touched with the sense of their condition who are guilty, chap. v. 2.

(3.) As to the punishment of sin, he was not only exposed to it, and bound to bear it, but actually endured it, Isa. liii. 4-6. 'The iniquities,' *i. e.* the punishment of them, all the punishment that was due to all; the whole curse was inflicted on him, so he is said to be 'made a curse,' Gal. iii. 13.

So that he had a greater sense of sin than any of his people ever had. We may hear him cry out under the weight of it, Lam. i. 12. The whole penalty and curse was upon him, part of which made his soul heavy unto death.

So that, though he was without sin, yet he was touched, or rather oppressed with such a sense of sin, as is enough abundantly to move him to all compassionateness to any of his people under the burden. It is an extensive sympathy; such as reaches not only infirmities that have no respect to sin, but those that are from sin, as its effects, and those that are sinful formally, yea, sin itself; he is touched with the feeling of all.

[8.] It is a proportionable sympathy; a compassion which is exactly answerable to the nature and quality of every infirmity; fully commensurable to it, whatever it be. As it is not more than it needs, so it is not less than it requires, how much compassion and relief soever it calls for. This is ex-

press, chap. v. 2, *δυνάμενος μετρίοπαθεῖν*, rendered 'who can have compassion; but the word signifies, a compassion or sympathy answerable to the occasion. *Quantum satis est*, so much as is sufficient for it. Not only when the grievance of it is less, but when it is more; proportionable to the actual afflictiveness of it at present, and the danger of it for the future; to what we do suffer by it, or what we may suffer.

This was the duty of the Levitical high priest, with whom Christ is there compared. He did thus sympathise with the people in their infirmities, in proportion to their ignorances and wanderings, when he was faithful in answering his office. But Christ herein excelled him, as the apostle shews, ver. 7. He shewed his compassions in strong cries and tears, and does it still; though not in such expressions, yet as effectually, and more perfectly. We may be apt to measure Christ by ourselves, and to think that small grievances he will overlook and pass by without regard or resentment, and that he will not trouble himself with those that are greater, according to the exigence of them. But he has a sense of every infirmity, proportionable to the grievance or danger of it. The least he slights not, the greatest he waives not; turns not aside, as the priest and Levite did, as if a resentment answerable to it would be troublesome to him. He is not like us, who have no sense of others' grievances when but small, or but little sense of them when they are great. But he has a compassion for all, and more for those which need and require more. He has a due sense of all, and that which is sufficient for our relief and comfort; not only in the least, but the greatest.

9. A constant and perpetual sympathy. It continues without any intermission so long as he is high priest, or so long as our infirmities continue; so long as we are under any weakness, inward or outward; so long as we are in any danger or peril; so long as we are exposed to any trouble or suffering.

This is one thing wherein the faithful discharge of his priestly office consists. And he is a priest for ever, Ps. cx. 4, repeated often in this epistle, chap. v. 6, and vii. 17, 21.

It is true, one principal part of his office, as priest, the offering himself as a sacrifice as priest, the offering himself as a sacrifice for sin, is already finished and discharged. And sin being fully expiated by that once offering of himself, there is no need of repeating it. But this efficacy of it does still continue; and in the virtue of it his intercession (the other part of his office as priest) is still effectual, and will be for ever, chap. vii. 25. There will be some alteration also as to this part of his office. Now he intercedes for relief and comfort to his people under infirmities, and for deliverance from them. And when full deliverance is obtained, there will be no need, no occasion to intercede either for succour in, or freedom from, them; but even then he will intercede for the continuance of that happy deliverance. And both his sacrifice and intercession will have an influence upon, and be effectual for the everlasting continuance of that blessed freedom.

So that, though there be some change in the acts, yet the office of Christ as high priest continues for ever; and is, and will be exercised in acts suitable to the state of his people.

Now, while his people are compassed with infirmities, he shews himself a merciful and faithful high priest, in effectual pity and compassionate sympathy. And so he will continue while they are under weaknesses, *i. e.* so long as ever there is any occasion for it, and his people have any need thereof. But when they are fully delivered, and their weaknesses end in perfection, then joy will succeed compassion, and the conflict, with the succour therein, will end in an everlasting triumph.

Thus much to explain this truth. Something should be added for confirmation of it. It is so great and wonderful a condescension in Christ to be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, that some may be apt to question it, very ready to doubt of it, too slow to deliver\* it. Faith may want some grounds to support it, and encourage it in the belief of a truth so strange to reason, so far above all expectation, beyond all we could ask or think. And there are grounds for it sure and stedfast, which the apostle lays down in this epistle.

*Use 1.* For instruction. This truth leads the people of Christ to many duties, and strongly obliges to the performance of them.

1. To admire Christ; to employ your minds in high, adoring, admiring thoughts of Christ. He is wonderful; it is his attribute, Isa. ix. Wonderful every way, in his person, natures, offices, and the execution of them; but especially wonderful in this, that he would be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. And this will appear wonderful in our eyes, if we consider who he is that is thus touched, and what was required that he might be capable of this sense, &c., and what such a sense thereof imports.

For the first, Christ, as to his divine nature, is God; the great, blessed, glorious, and all sufficient God, infinite in happiness and all excellencies; farther above us, and the noblest piece of the creation, unconceivably farther above the highest, than the most excellent creatures are above the vilest thing on earth, the meanest thing imaginable. He could expect nothing from us, no advantage by us; not the least degree of glory or happiness, being in the perfect possession of infinite glory and happiness without us. He had lost nothing if we had perished in our sin without pity, and sunk under the weight of our infirmities. We had nothing to oblige him to concern himself in our weaknesses and miseries; why then would he bring himself under the sense of them? How wonderful it is that he would do it!

2. That he might be capable of the sense of our infirmities, he was to take upon him both our nature and our infirmities, and it is highly wonderful that he would meddle with either.

It was requisite that he should assume a created nature. And if this nature had been that of the angels, this had been a wonderful condescension; infinitely more wonderful than if the most glorious angel should have been willing to take the form of the vilest creeping thing; for the distance is infinitely greater betwixt God and such an angel, than betwixt such an angel and any creeping thing we tread on.

But he was to take the nature of man, so much lower than that of the angels; more wonderful than if the most glorious potentate on earth should be willing to live in the form of a beast, or to take the shape of a worm; the glorious God stooped lower when he took the nature of man.

Yea, he was to take the nature of sinful man. The 'likeness of sinful flesh,' Rom. viii. 3. As if a man should be willing not only to take the likeness of a worm, but the likeness of a toad, though without poison, for which our nature has a greater averseness and abhorrence. This would be an astonishment. Oh, but the infinitely holy God had a greater averseness to sinful flesh than we have to a toad, and yet took the likeness of sinful flesh; he assumed it as it was abased by sin, as the effects of the venom and poison of sin was upon it, though without the sin of it. How wonderful is this!

Yea, he was to take our infirmities also. Not only the excellencies in our natures singled out for him, as divers there were wherein we excelled the inferior creatures, but the weaknesses, the blemishes, the debasements of

\* Qu. 'believe'?—ED.

our nature, as it was sullied, and bruised, and crazed by the fall; under all the defects, and maims, and disadvantages it had suffered by sin, sin itself only excepted, he declined none else. He took, he bare all, he laboured under all, that [he might] have a compassionate sense of all, the vilest, the worst of all, by his own feeling. It may well seem a debasement of such a glory to unite our nature to him in its best state, as it was innocent, or as it is glorified. How wonderful is it that he would assume it when it was at worst, with all its specks, and flaws, and cracks, all its rags and vileness, all its bruises and weaknesses; nothing excluded, not the effects of sin, but only sin itself!

It is infinitely below that glorious majesty of God, to be clothed with the sun, as he was clothed with flesh. What a wonderful condescension would it be for him to be covered over with clay, with mud! We would think it so in a person of honour, though the mud were without stench; and yet our nature was viler to Christ, as he is the God of glory, than any clay or mud is to us. Oh that he, the King of glory, should clothe himself with so vile a thing, should appear and live in such a covering that he might learn to pity us! What an astonishment is it! If our minds were duly exercised with the thoughts of these things, how would they strike our souls with wonder and admiration!

3. For the import of it, this being touched with the feeling, &c., is a kind of suffering with us. It includes compassion, a motion of the heart which is taken to have more weakness in it than other affections.

Now, that the God of glory should have such respect to contemptible creatures, as not only to suffer for, but also to suffer with them;—

That he should have compassions on us in infirmities, which are the effects of sin, or in themselves sinful, and shew compassion and tenderness where there is just and proper occasion for his anger, indignation, and severity;—

That he should concern himself, not only in those cases where common friends will stand by us, but in our weaknesses, where others will be ashamed of us; in dangers and sufferings, where others will be afraid; in the sad circumstances of our lives, when others withdraw, and where his own best friends on earth deserted him;—

That he should have such regard for those who are infinitely below him, and whom he might pass by with as much disregard as we do flies or grasshoppers; for we are incomparably less to him than these are to us;—

If these things were in our thoughts, what occasion of wonder will they offer to us! How admirable is Christ hereby represented to us! how worthy of all admiration, both from heaven and earth, both now and everlastingly!

2. To love Christ. There is no greater attractive of love to an ingenious temper than love. Now in that Christ is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, you have a most evident demonstration that he loves you; and with such a love as is most obliging, such as is most proper and powerful to command, excite, and draw out your affections to him. For hereby it is very clear what his love to you is.

(1.) A great love, and most extensive; that can reach all conditions and circumstances which you are or may be in, even such as the love of others will not touch, will not come near: a love that will shew itself in all cases, even where it could be least expected; a love that will surmount and overflow all discouragements. No want, no weakness, no hazard, no suffering, is able to quell or stop it. It breaks forth in all, for he is touched with an affectionate sense of all these.

(2.) A free love. This is an evidence he can love freely; he can love those who are all made up of defects and imperfections, who are covered with specks and blemishes, who are compassed with infirmities; not only with those that are sinless, which might move him to despise us, but those that are sinful, which might provoke him to hate us. He is affectionately touched with the feeling of all.

He can love those souls that are crazy and sickly, that are lame and maimed, that labour under many weaknesses and infirmities, such as hinder them from being duly serviceable to all,\* and honouring him in the world, or expressing any love to him answerable to his. Though they be poor and in want, though their parts be low, though graces be weak, and their affection to him small, very small in comparison of what they owe, yea, nothing in comparison of what he deserves; though they can do little for him, and suffer less, this is so far from withholding his love, that it runs out the more in a compassionate sense of their weaknesses.

He can love his people, though they have nothing to oblige him to do it; yea, though there is little in them but what might disoblige him. Their infirmities of all sorts, which might estrange him, meet with a tender resentment, in that he is affectionately touched with the feeling of them.

(3.) A lasting, a constant love, such as all the waters cannot quench, nor the floods drown. It cannot be nonplussed, it abides the sorest trials. When his people are low and weak, when poor and despised, when reproached and hated, when cast off by all, when overwhelmed with all that extinguish love amongst men, it abides the same, not in the least cooled: 'Who can separate,' &c., Rom. viii. All these are comprised in the notion of those infirmities wherewith Christ is affectionately touched. His love flames forth even in the waters, which quench the love of others. Instead of withdrawing his affection in such cases, he expresseth it more, and suffers with them, being touched with the feeling of those infirmities by which they suffer.

(4.) A peerless love. It cannot be matched. There is no such thing to be found in heaven or earth, but in Christ only. The text shews that, as he is high priest, he is touched with the feeling, &c. Therein his love appears. Now, as he is high priest, he is both God and man; and so his love to us is both the love of God and also the love of man in one person. No instance of such a love can be given in the whole world. There is no such love in the angels, how much soever they affect the people of Christ, for theirs is neither the love of God nor the love of men. There had been no such love in God alone; his was the love of God only, not of man. But Christ's affection to us is both the love of God and the love of man in one person.

Look over heaven and earth, and you will never find two springs of love in one subject, whether it be finite or infinite. There is but one in an angel, there is but one in man, there is but one in God. The angel has but one nature, man has but one heart, God has but one will, each of these a single spring. Oh, but in Christ, and in him alone, there is a double fountain of love, each sending forth its proper streams, both meeting upon his people. The divine nature is one fountain; there springs the love of God to us. The human nature is another; there springs the love of man to us; and both these in one person, in one Christ.

It is true, the love of God alone is infinite, too much for us, or the most excellent creatures. There is infiniteness and incomprehensibleness in it, that which may astonish and transport us eternally; but there is not that

\* Qu. 'him'?—Ed.

suitableness in it to our natures or apprehensions, as there is in man's love (not through any defect in it, but through our weakness); and though we should be more taken with it, because it is so much as we cannot apprehend, yet we are subject to be less moved with that which we apprehend not, or are less acquainted with. Whereas human love, such as is in the heart of man, is both co-natural to us, and we are well acquainted with it. We know not by experience what it is to love as God loves; such a love was never seated, nor ever moved in the heart of man; but we know by experience what it is to love as men do; we have felt the motions of such a love in our own breasts.

Now such is the love of Christ to his people, in that he is touched with the feeling of their infirmities. Hereby it appears that he has the love, pity, compassions of a man for us, not that love of God only. There is both infiniteness, incomprehensibility in his love, and likewise suitableness, co-naturalness also; that which may not only transport us, but make the most impression on our hearts, and move our affections in the most suitable and kindly way. The love of God is hereby brought down to our capacity, to our experience, to our feeling; in that he who is God would not only love us like himself, with the love of God, but as man also, with such a love as is in the heart of a man.

Oh what a way has he made for our love to him! He loved us as God; and if that be above us, if that will not prevail with us as it should do, this love made him become man, that he might love us with such a love as most suits us, and we are most apprehensive of, not only with the love of God, but of man also. Herein his love is matchless; and so will our stupidity and ungratefulness be, if we love him not again.

Moreover, it is peerless love upon another account; not only because the love of God and the love of man meet in one person, but also because the love of all relations meet in his human nature, and that to each of his people. Not as it is with us, who have but the love of one relation for one, and of another for another, but not the love of all for any one. But Christ has the love of all relations, as much as all require, for every one that belongs to him. Jonathan had the love of a friend for David, and Joseph of a brother for Benjamin, and Jacob that of a father for Joseph, and Abraham that of a husband for Sarah, and Rachel that of a mother for her children; but none of them had the love of all these for any one. If these several streams which did run in divers channels had been united, and run in one current towards any one, it had been a matchless love, such as could not be paralleled on earth.

Now such is the love of Christ. He has the love of a friend, a brother, a father, a husband, of all relations, for every one of his people, Mat. xii. 48-50. He owns such in all relations, and thereby declares himself obliged to have the love of all relations for every of them.

And his sympathy, his pity, and compassions, which proceed from this love, are answerable to it. He is as affectionately and as effectually touched with the feeling of his people's infirmities as if every one of them were every way related to him; as if they were both his friends, his brethren, his sisters, his mother, his children, and his spouse. He has the compassions, and so the love, not only of one relation for one, and another relation for another, but of all relations together for every one of his.

(5.) It is a cordial love, not in show or appearance only, not in outward acts and expressions, but such as springs from his heart, and affects that. He is touched, *i. e.* his heart is touched with the concerns of his people; he is touched with the feeling of their infirmities, *i. e.* his heart feels. It is his

love that makes him inwardly, feelingly, heartily sensible of what they suffer. This excites inward motions, stirs up compassions, and all affections that depend thereon; not only delight, which is an affection of enjoyment, to which therefore the nature of man is more inclinable, but pity and compassion, which (as I said before) is some kind of suffering to which our nature is more averse.

His glorified body is now above suffering, but his heart suffers still, so far as perfect compassionateness is a suffering. His love is such that the grievances of his people touch his heart as if they were his own. Paul calls his suffering the 'filling up of that which remains of the afflictions of Christ,' Col. i. 24. The afflictions of his mystical body are resented by his love as if they were his own. Paul learnt this of Christ before; he expressed such a heart-resentment of his people's grievances when he suffered by Saul, Acts ix. 4, 5. Saul trod but on the feet, and the head complains. He would not have complained that himself was persecuted, but that himself some way suffered. His glorified body suffered not; this was above the reach of persecution. What then suffered? Why, his heart. The injuries reached not his body, but they touched his heart. This was touched, not with a painful but with a compassionate sense, which is the touch in the text, and is expressed by *συμπαθεῖσαι*, a co-suffering, a suffering in mind or heart with those who suffer otherwise.

You will say he loves you heartily, whose heart and soul suffers with you, when his body cannot. Such is the love of Christ; hereby it appears to be such, in that his heart is touched with the feeling, &c. He lays to heart the wants, weaknesses, dangers, grievances of his people. His heart is on them, or else that which touches them would not reach his heart.

(6.) An all-sufficient love. That which is sufficient for us whenever our condition is exigent, and in any need, and sufficient for all that we need or can reasonably desire in such a condition, is all-sufficient.

Now, such is the love of Christ, and such it is represented to be in the text. This love shews itself in all our infirmities, and these comprise all the exigencies of our present condition in this world. Therein are included our weaknesses, our wants, our dangers, our troubles, whether inward or outward. This is the sum of all that our frail condition is subject to or labours under. Now, the love of Christ reaches all these, and us in and under them all, in that he has an affectionate sense of all our infirmities.

And it is sufficient for all that our condition requires in all or any of these, for all that we need desire under them is but pity and relief. These two comprise all that is needful or desirable for us, and the love of Christ affords both, assures us both in that he is touched with the feeling of our condition. For that which the text gives us in these terms here is expressed by compassion and succour in this epistle; by compassion, chap. v. 2; by succour, chap. ii. 18; and both together in the verse after the text.

That is an all-sufficient love which will let you want nothing. But when your condition is saddest and most necessitous, you want nothing but pity and help. These are abundantly enough in the greatest, in any time of need; and these the love of Christ will not let you want. He gives all assurance of it, in that he is touched with the feeling of your infirmities.

Hereby you see what love Christ has for his people, what love he has for you, if ye be his indeed. It is most evident by this truth that he has a greater love.

Now what does this call for? Deep calls to deep. The love of Christ, such a love calls aloud, calls importunately for love again. Will you deny

the importunity of love, of Christ's love, of a love so obliging? No renewed heart, no ingenuous spirit, no soul that has anything of an evangelical temper, can resist it; it will kindle into love, a love that will stir and act and sparkle at the view of the love of Christ, that will be ashamed of its own weakness, coolness, inactiveness, and shew it by diligence in the use of all means to get inflamed affections to Christ.

Oh, if the love of Christ, such a love, will not constrain you to love him again, what is there in heaven or earth can have any power upon your hearts? If you can hear and believe that Christ is thus touched with the feeling of your infirmities, and this prevails not with you to love him, your hearts are stone.

Shall love amongst men be judged worthy of a requital with love, and shall the love of Christ, in comparison of which all the love of the children of men is nothing, want this return?

If you return not love to him for this love of his, you are worse than publicans, Mat. v. 46. If you love those that love you, this is not thank-worthy; it is due debt, even the publicans will pay it. If you love not Christ after such love expressed to you, ye are worse than they, worse than the most ill-natured, the most selfish, the most disingenuous, the most odious sinners; worse to Christ than these are to one another; as much worse to Christ, as the love of Christ is greater than any that is to be found in the hearts of men.

3. Another duty which this truth calls for and engages us to is to hold fast our profession. This is the use which the apostle makes of it; this is the end why he lays down this great and comfortable truth, viz. to encourage and oblige them to continue in their profession of Christ, and hold it fast; to engage them neither to abandon it nor to abate anything of it, neither to quit it in whole nor in part: ver. 14, 'Let us hold,' &c. Why so? What reason, what motive, what encouragement have we to do it? Much every way, that which is abundantly sufficient, says he, for, ver. 15, 'since we have such an high priest,' &c. let us hold our profession of Christ, and hold it fast. Let our judgments be established in the truth we profess, else we shall not hold it. Let our hearts clasp about it and embrace the goodness of it, else we shall not hold it fast.

Let us hold it *firmly*, stedfastly, without wavering, else we hold it but with a palsy hand. Hold it without indifferency; not, as the Israelites of old, halting between two, 1 Kings xviii. 21; nor as some of the Jews in the apostle's time, who halted between law and gospel, betwixt their former legal profession and the profession of Christ; not walking uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, Gal. ii. 14; or as others now, halting betwixt Christ and antichrist, betwixt popery and pure religion. And as those judaizing Christians made a medley of law and gospel, so do these a hotch-potch of popery and true profession, in doctrine, worship, or government; shewing themselves to be indifferent, in many points, to either, and thereby tempting others to be indifferent in all, and to be determined as their interest may require. This is not to hold fast, but to be fast or loose as occasion serves; to be fast to nothing, but their carnal or worldly interest, James i. 8.

Let us hold it *resolutely*, without timorousness or cowardice. Not like those represented to us by the stony ground, Mat. xiii. 21. We had need look to it, having reason enough to expect greater and sorer trials, as to our profession, than this age has exercised us with, or that before it our ancestors. If we be found amongst the cowardly and fearful here, we shall have our place with them hereafter, Rev. xxi. 8, *inter omnes, imo ante omnes, timidis.*

Let us hold it *affectionately*, with zeal, delight, and love for Christ, his truths and ways, without remitting any degree of affection or fervour. He that grows cool lets go his hold, or the fastness of it. We hold not fast our profession, but when our hearts are fastened to it, and that is by affection. These are the strings and cords that fasten our hearts to it; when these are slacked, our hold is loosened.

Let us hold it *openly*, without fear or shame. It is not a thing of that nature that we should either be afraid or ashamed of. These make men shrink or draw back, and he that draws back sticks not fast to his profession. The apostle would not allow the Hebrews, even in the midst of the reproaches and hazards wherewith they were encompassed, to hide their heads, contenting themselves with a secret or concealed profession, and withdrawing from their assemblies, Heb. x. 25. Those that forsook their assemblies were such as had already deserted their profession, or were not (if they yet held it) like to hold it fast.

Hold it *entirely*, extensively, in all the parts and acts, all the truths and duties, which belong to your profession. He that lets go any, has not fast hold of the whole. He that will hold only the safe, and cheap, and easy parts of his profession, lets go his hold where he is most tried, where it should be fastest.

Thus we should hold fast our profession. And we have great encouragement from this truth to do it; it affords that which strongly obliges us, neither to quit it of our own accord, nor to suffer anything to force it from us. It offers enough to arm us against temptations we may meet with of such a tendency.

That which may tempt us, either to quit our profession or to abate anything of it, is either the difficulties in it, or the hazards of it. Now, in that Christ is touched, &c., we are secured, we are encouraged, we are fortified against both these, both as to what may seem hard or difficult in it, and what we may hazard or suffer by it.

1. As for the difficulties. There are some acts, some duties of our profession, are too hard for us. Our infirmities and weaknesses cannot reach them, or make us drive on heavily in them. This may make us weary, or tempt some to give over.

But against this, in that Christ is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, we have these encouragements.

(1.) Christ expects not that from his people, which their infirmities and weaknesses cannot reach. He is our high priest; ours by virtue of an office which requires all tenderness and compassionateness. He expressed it, and perfectly answers it, in being touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

A master that is merciful will not press that upon a sickly servant which his distemper will not suffer him to do. If he be careless and slothful, indeed he may be angry; but in that which he falls short of, merely because he is sick, he will shew pity rather than rigour.

Christ is a merciful high priest. He knows that weaknesses and inward distempers are the sickness of the soul. He would not have us slothful, indulgent to carnal ease; that will displease him. But he looks not for more than a sickly temper can afford. 'If there be a willing mind,' 2 Cor. viii. 12; if he see there is really a willing mind to do more and better, that which we cannot do will not be expected. That which we do, though it fall far short of what is due, will be accepted.

A parent that has any tenderness will not look for that from an infant, or weak child, that he expects from another. He will be pleased with a little

done by a weakling, out of affection and sense of duty. What cannot be done through weakness, will be passed by with pity.

We have a high priest that is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, who has the compassions of God, of man, of a father, of all relations : Ps. ciii. 13, 14, 'He knows our frame,' of what a frail and infirm composition it is ; he knows it by experience, and learned compassionateness thereby. And in that he is touched with the compassionate sense of our weaknesses, he will not rigorously exact what through infirmity we cannot reach.

(2.) He will not be severe for failings, such as are the issue of our infirmities. He has a tender sense of our weaknesses, pities us under them ; and such a compassionate tenderness excludes severity, leaves no occasion to fear it. We have a pregnant instance hereof in the days of his flesh, Mat. xxvi. 37-41. His soul was under great affliction ; he desires his disciples to watch with him a little while ; they, instead thereof, fall asleep. He might have resented this heinously, that they would not attend him watchfully for one hour, for so little a while, and that too when he was in so great extremity, when his soul was so exceeding sorrowful even unto death. They could not but condemn themselves for this ; but he, instead of condemning them, or making any severe or sharp reflection upon them for it, finds out an excuse for them, 'The spirit is willing,' &c. He takes gracious notice of a willingness within, when no such thing appears without, when it was quite overpowered with weakness, and gives the weakness itself a merciful allowance.

(3.) He will succour you. In that he is touched with the feeling of your infirmities, you may be sure he is ready and willing to do this to relieve you, either by lessening the difficulty or the infirmity ; either by making the burden less, or healing the sore which makes it uneasy. In that he has such a sense of our infirmities, we may conclude, as the apostle does, that we shall 'find grace to help in time of need,' as much as is sufficient. He assures him of it, 2 Cor. xii. 9. The perfection of his strength appears most in the weak. This made Paul bear up under all difficulties, to such a height, as he could rejoice, yea, glory, in the hardest circumstances that encountered him, ver. 9, 10. Nor was this a privilege peculiar to the apostle ; there is a promise offering it to all Christ's people, Isa. xl. 31. Since Christ has such a feeling of our infirmities, we might be sure he would relieve and strengthen, though he had not promised it. It is some ease to those who do but suffer with others, by way of sympathy and fellow-feeling, to have them eased. Christ himself some way suffers, till his people be relieved. It is through him, and mercy through him, that the promise is made. Now that it is promised, both his faithfulness and compassionateness insure the performance.

If Christ have such a sense of the difficulties we labour under, they need not discourage us ; he will take care we shall not sink under them. He himself is concerned in the pressure, and has a feeling of it.

2. As for dangers and sufferings which attend the profession of Christ, they need be no discouragement. For in that Christ is touched with the feeling of our infirmities (sufferings amongst the rest), he suffers with his people therein ; and so they are upon this account (as they are upon others also) his sufferings ; therefore he will order them as his own. Hence we may conclude they will do us no hurt, they shall do us good.

Christ will take care they shall not hurt us ; he will secure us from the evil of them ; and being secured from the evil of them, there is nothing in them to be feared ; nothing to fright us from our profession, any part or degree of it ; nothing to discourage us from persisting in it, and holding it fast.

There is a threefold evil in sufferings : legal, moral, natural.

(1.) A legal evil, and that is the curse. Afflictions, that which we suffer by since the fall, were deserved by sin, threatened by the law, executed by divine justice, to satisfy for the injury sin had done him ; so they become a curse. Christ has freed his people from the curse, by suffering for them, Gal. iii. 13 ; and even those that are chastisements, are now freed from the curse. They are not destructive penalties, they are not from vindictive wrath, they are not to satisfy justice ; and if sufferings for sin be secured from this dreadful evil, sufferings for the profession of Christ are at far further distance from it.

(2.) A moral evil. And that is the sin that sufferings expose us to, which may be occasioned thereby, which those are usually tempted to who are under sufferings.

Now Christ himself, in the days of his suffering, was tempted to sin ; that was one of those infirmities he laboured under, and was exposed to, for our sakes ; and for this end, that he might be touched with the feeling of their condition who are tempted, that he might sympathise with them in the hour of temptation, that he might know by experience their danger and distress, and so both pity and relieve them, Heb. ii. 18. He is hereby every way sufficient, both able and willing to succour the tempted.

He shewed a compassionate sense of their danger of sin under sufferings, and how desirous he is to have them secured from it, by his prayer on earth. It was his petition a little before his death, John xvii. 15. He would not have them taken out of the world, nor freed quite from troubles and sufferings in it ; but freed from the evil, that is, the sin of them. Though troubles continue, though this serpent will live, and be upon us now and then while we are on earth ; yet he takes care that it be disarmed, that the sting be pulled out, that the mortal venom of it may not seize on his suffering saints ; and then there is nothing in it to discourage or make them afraid.

(3.) A natural evil. And that is the smart, the grievance, the pain, and afflictiveness of it to the flesh. This nature is most afraid of ; but the fear and discouragement of this may be quite overcome by a due consideration and belief of this truth. Christ himself suffered this ; he knows by experience what the pain and afflictiveness of sufferings is. He would feel it himself, that he might be touched with the feeling of what his people suffer by it. He knows what relief and compassion it calls for ; and as he would not have been denied it when the case was his, so he will not deny it to his people. Indeed, the case is still his in some sense, seeing he suffers with them, not by a painful, but by a compassionate feeling of their sufferings. Hence we may conclude,

[1.] He will let no more befall us than is tolerable, than we may well endure. He knows the weight and grievance of sufferings ; himself bore it. He knows our weakness and infirmity ; himself was under our weaknesses. He has experience of both, so he knows what degree of pain or grievance would be too much or too heavy ; and since he is touched with the feeling hereof, to be sure he will not suffer us to feel more than we can bear. His compassions are too great to let any grievance be too heavy. If he were not, as we may say, a fellow-sufferer with us, if he had not the compassions of a man for us, yet his faithfulness as God would prevent this, 1 Cor. x. 13. But there is a concurrence of both ; he is both a merciful and faithful high priest.

[2.] He will make what befalls us comfortable. He that cannot fail to pity us will not fail to comfort us. It is so amongst men. He that is heartily touched with the feeling of another's grievances, and really pities his condition, will comfort him if he can. Now Christ, who has such a feeling

of his people's pressures, and has such transcendent compassions for them, he can accordingly comfort them. When sufferings most abound, he can make comforts superabound, 2 Cor. i. 5. He can pour in such comforts as will drown the sense of what is most sharp and afflictive in outward sufferings, 1 Cor. vii. 4; such as will make what is otherwise grievous to the flesh to be exceeding joyous, occasion of more joy than the greatest occasions of rejoicing in the whole world, Rom. viii. 35, 37. What joy like that of a conqueror in the day of his victory or of his triumph? Even in the worst of sufferings, &c., Christ affords more joy than that of conquerors; he makes his suffering people more than conquerors, and so gives more occasion of joy and triumph; they have it through Christ that loves them, that has an affectionate sense of their sufferings.

[3.] He will make what befalls them profitable, highly advantageous. That shall be the issue of the smart and grievance of outward sufferings. This also we may be assured of, in that he is touched with the feeling of our infirmities. He is, as I shewed, touched effectually with the feeling. Now such an effectual sense will afford the best relief, the most advantageous, such as is expressed by riches of grace and glory, and what is most desirable, advantage every way.

*First.* Temporal, Mark x. 30. In this time he shall have an hundredfold advantage; in kind, if that be best for him; or else what is better:

*Secondly.* Spiritual advantage. The increase of holiness, and the fruits of it, which is more precious than gold, Heb. xii. 10. That we might more richly partake of his holiness, than without sufferings we would do, that we might be more filled with the fruits of it, ver. 11. The apostle found it true by experience, 2 Cor. iv. 16. Holiness was daily increased in his soul by daily sufferings, such as threatened the ruin of the outward man.

*Thirdly.* Eternal advantage, ver. 17. For affliction, glory; as if one for bearing a cross word patiently should be crowned a king. For light affliction, a weight of glory; as if one, for the loss of a farthing, should have millions of gold. For a moment's affliction, eternal glory; as if one, for the pain of a minute, should have all prosperity and happiness imaginable for thousands and thousands of ages, for ages without end, and that without intermission. But no comparison can reach it. It is ὑπερβαλλον, &c., exceeding more, far more exceeding. Put them together in the balance, and that scale wherein the weight of glory is will make the other fly up, as if there were nothing at all in it. The heaviest afflictions are no more a counterpoise to this weight of glory, than the small dust of the balance is to an hundred thousand weight. Christ's feeling of his people's sufferings for their profession, gives assurance of such weighty and rich advantages by the worst they can suffer for holding it fast.

What encouragement then is here to hold fast our profession! No difficulties or sufferings can be any just occasion for discouraging us. Nothing can be pretended but the evil of them; and Christ is ready, not only to secure his people from all kind of evil, but to turn it into good; not only to render it tolerable, but very comfortable, richly advantageous, with the highest advantages that earth or heaven, time or eternity, can afford. All this we may be assured of, in that he is touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

4. Another duty which this truth calls and obliges us to, is to sympathise with one another. If Christ be thus touched with the feeling of our infirmities, then ought we to be touched with the sense of our brethren's infirmities. If the head be thus sensible, shall the members have no sense? 1 John iv. 11, 'If Christ so loved us,' &c. This is propounded not only for

our comfort and encouragement, but also for our imitation, 1 John i. 7. We have not fellowship with one another, as Christ has with us, unless we have a fellow-feeling of what others suffer.

It is due upon this account, and frequently called for: 1 Peter iii. 8, *ὁμόφρονες*. There should be an union of souls amongst those who are one in Christ. They should be compassionate, *συμπαθεῖς*, should sympathise together; feel what lies heavy on others, and suffer by compassion what others suffer otherwise. Else they are not *φιλάδελφοι*; they have not that love for their brethren, which the love of Christ obliges them to have. They should be pitiful, *ἐυσπλαγχνοί*; their bowels should be troubled for that which troubles them, and shew it by being *φιλόφρονες*, ready to relieve. The same word, Acts xxviii. 7, such sympathy, with the acts or parts of it (pity and readiness to succour); and this out of love, as those that are concerned, as being all one, of one mind and soul, we should have for one another, because Christ has it for us, Col. iii. 12, 13. We should sympathise with them in all infirmities; so does he with us.

(1.) In outward infirmities, weaknesses, wants, dangers, sufferings. We should be touched with what others feel herein, 2 Cor. xi. 29. He calls Timothy to partake with him in his danger and restraint, 2 Tim. i. 8. The Hebrews sympathised with him in his bonds. Heb. x. 34, *συνεπαθήσατε*, ye suffered with me, &c. He would have them (and us in them) so to suffer with all the members of Christ, Heb. xiii. 3, have that sense of their condition as if it were your own, such a sense as you would others have if the case were yours; and this not only for bonds, but any adversity, 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26. If the foot be in pain, the head feels it; if the back be naked, the breast will be sensible of it; if the belly be pinched with want, or the stomach be sick, the other parts will feel it. So should it be with the members of the mystical body. We shall want one main evidence that we are parts of that body whereof Christ is head, if there be not some sense in us of what fellow-members feel. It is schism; you divide yourselves from the rest of the body when you have not a joint sense of what other members suffer. This is to be schismatics in the apostle's sense.

(2.) Inward infirmities. When they are tempted, sympathise with them, considering ourselves, lest we also be tempted. When dejected, 1 Thes. v. 14. And those that are weak, ready to fall; not only bear with them, but bear them up, take part of the pressure upon yourselves, that they may not sink under it. So does Christ for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps.

When weak in judgment, Rom xv. 1, 3. Ye that understand the doctrine of Christ, that in particular concerning Christian liberty, ought to bear the weakness of those who are not so apprehensive of it; and not to please yourselves with reflecting upon the strength of your own judgment, or clearness of your own apprehensions. And so imitate Christ, ver. 3, counting their concerns yours; as he did the concerns of his Father, was as tender of what reflected on him, as if it had fallen on himself.

(3.) In sinful infirmities, 2 Cor. xi. 29. 'Who is offended,' *i. e.* who falls into sin; for that is the true notion of being offended in the New Testament. So giving of offence is explained, Rom. xiv. 13. Who falls into sin, 'and I burn not,' says he. Such falls were grievous to him, he had a quick and painful feeling thereof; he both suffered by, and with such. Falling into sin is like falling into the fire; not only the offenders, but the apostle, was scorched thereby. So should it be with us, Gal. vi. 1, 2. Do not burden him more, by censuring and aggravating his fault; but ease him, by suffering with him, counting his fall your own burden.

We should sympathise with our brethren, even in infirmities that are not without sin; whether they be apprehensions or acts, opinions or practices (being but weaknesses incident to those whom Christ owns, and sympathises with); we should learn of him to have compassion on them, and affectionately endeavour to succour them.

The consideration of this, that Christ is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, is enough to remove whatever may hinder us from a compassionate sense of others' infirmities.

*Obj.* 1. It is a plain truth wherein he differs from me; it is evident to me, and seems clear as the light, yet he will not yield to me. If it was obscure and difficult, if it were doubtful and disputable, and had probable reasons both for it and against it, such as might puzzle a common understanding, then I might pity and bear with him.

*Ans.* It seems clear to thee, but is it so in itself, or so to him? If it were plain to him, it would be rather wilfulness than infirmity in him not to yield. But is it not possible that you may be mistaken as well as he? Are you infallible? Have you not found by experience, that what once you have judged a clear truth, you have afterwards discerned to be a mistake and error? Who is there that makes any diligent inquiry after truth, that has not found this by experience? Now, were not you to be pitied in those misapprehensions, wherein you now discover a pitiful weakness? What if the world had agreed with you, yielded to you in this, in those first opinions, wherein you now see reason to differ from yourselves? Did you not need Christ's compassions in such weaknesses? And will you have no tenderness for others, in such cases where you need it yourselves.

But, further, Do not you differ in some points from Christ himself? Are your judgments perfectly conformable to his in all things? May there not be some particulars, which to you seem clear truths, which yet he knows infallibly to be mistakes and erroneous apprehensions? It would argue intolerable pride, and unacquaintedness with the darkness and weakness of our own understanding to question this. Now, would you not have Christ to pity and bear with you, in points wherein you dissent from him? Would you not have Christ to judge, that in all things where you are not of his mind (which yet are clear to him beyond all possibility of mistake), your mistake is out of wilfulness, not infirmity, and so should have no pity for you? Oh, if he did so, you were undone! Miserable must we all be, if Christ were not touched compassionately with the feeling of our weakness, in varying from his judgment as to those things that are most clear and certain truths to him. And do we expect compassion from him, where we have no forbearance for others? Are we disciples of Christ, and will not learn of him?

*Obj.* 2. But it is not a few things wherein he crosses my persuasion. If he differed but from me in one or two points, it might be borne; but he runs counter to my way and judgment in many.

*Ans.* But does he differ from you in more, or as many particulars, as you dissent from Christ in? I am much mistaken if this be not true; that even the sincere lovers of Christ and his truth differ in far more points from Christ, than they differ one from another. This leads me to judge so; there are many things that we know not; the best, most knowing, are ignorant of far more than they understand; and those things that we have any knowledge of, we know but in part, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, and viii. 2; we partly know it, and partly are ignorant of it, 1 Cor. xiii. 12; we see but darkly, *i. e.* we know but ignorantly, as children do, ver. 11.

Now, where there is ignorance (if the mind come to any positive judg-

ment), there will be error and mistake; so that, being wholly ignorant of many things, and partly ignorant of all, we are subject to err more or less in all things. Hence it comes to pass, that the errors of our minds are like those of our ways for multitude: Ps. xix. 12, 'They are so many, we cannot know them. Our mistakes are in number like the hairs of our heads.

Now, so many ways as we mistake and err, so many ways do we dissent from Christ, and run cross to his judgment and persuasion. And has Christ compassion on thee and all these? Is he touched with the feeling of thy weakness in all? And wilt thou not forbear thy brother in some differences? What though they seem many, they are but few really, in comparison of those wherein thou dissentest from Christ; and wherein, if thou meetest not with pity and succour from him, thou art lost.

*Obj.* 3. But those opinions wherein he differs from me are of very ill consequence. They are not mere notions, or speculative errors, but practical mistakes, such as lead him out of the way wherein I walk, and Christ would have him walk; and may mislead others into wanderings and by-paths. And though they be not paths pernicious and destructive, but such as those who, for the main, are under the conduct of the Spirit of Christ, may slip into, yet they are not without some sin and great danger. Erroneous speculations may be better borne with than practical errors.

*Ans.* Christ has compassions for those who not only err notionally, but practically, so as to step out of the way, and wander too. Herein he is compared with the Levitical high priest, of whom it was required, Heb. v. 2. Christ herein transcends him. He can more pity, both ἀγνοοῦσι and πλανωμένοις; both those who are in the dark, and apt to wander, not discerning betwixt light and darkness in their notions; and those also who mistake their way, turn aside, and are actually wandering out of the path.

Now, does Christ compassionately sympathise with thee and others, when out of the way by practical mistakes; and wilt thou have no tenderness, no forbearance for thy brother in the like case? Shall he have compassionate sympathy, proportionable to the wandering (so the word there signifies) as great as the mistake is; and wilt thou think it too great for thine? What if Christ should measure to thee what thou metest to others?

*Obj.* 4. But he is sour, cross, froward, peevish, wilful, puts a bad construction upon my forbearance and condescensions, makes ill returns, gives great provocations when I give him no occasion, and every way disoblige me. This calls for severeness, or rougher passions than pity. Who can affectionately sympathise with such a one? Who can shew compassionate tenderness towards him? It is unreasonable to expect it, it is impossible to do it; who ever did, who can do it?

*Ans.* Who can do it? dost thou ask. Why, Christ does it for thee.

(1.) When thou carriest thyself worse towards him than thy brother does to thee. There is not any one in the world shews himself so sour, cross, &c., so disingenuous, so provoking, so ungrateful, so every way disoblige, as thou hast shewed thyself to Christ. There is not the most perverse, the most cross-grained person, that ever thou hadst anything to do with, that has demeaned himself worse to thee, than thou hast done to Christ. Thou art woefully blinded by self-love; thou art one of no consideration, of no sense, if not sensible of this. Thou knowest not Christ, thou knowest not thyself, thine own heart and ways, if thou wilt not acknowledge this.

(2.) Yea, take them altogether, that ever dealt ill with thee, all that ever thou hast had any occasion to complain of; and thou alone hast dealt worse with Christ, and done more against him, than all of them together have done against thee.

(3.) Where thou hast had one provocation from any, Christ has had an hundred from thee. You disoblige Christ more in one day, than others do you in a whole year.

(4.) And provocations of Christ are not only more in number, but greater, and of a higher nature; as much higher as the heavens are above the earth; as much greater, as God is greater than man; for the height of the provocation rises from the transcendency of the person provoked. He that provokes you is but a man like yourselves, but Christ is not only man, but God, and we are less to him than flies and gnats are to us. And the less we are in his eye, the greater and more insufferable is every provocation from us.

(5.) And all this thou doest when he gives thee not the least occasion to deal ill with him, when all his ways are mercy, when he is every moment obliging thee, and does so much to oblige thee as no creature in the world can or will do.

Now, put all these together. Have you been worse to him than any other has been to you? Have you more disobliged him than you have been disobliged by all the persons in the world put together? Has he had a thousand provocations from you for one you have had from any? Are your provocations incomparably greater and higher than any you have met with from others? And do you provoke him without a cause, when he gives you not the least occasion imaginable to do it? And yet notwithstanding all this, does he not only bear with you, but pity you? Has he tender affections, when he has so much occasion for indignation and severity? Is he touched with the feeling of your infirmities? Has he a compassionate tenderness for you after all this? And will you not have sympathy and tenderness for your brethren? Oh this example of Christ will leave us without excuse herein; we have nothing to plead, but this will silence us. Nothing at all left us, I say not to justify, but in any degree to extenuate, the sinfulness of this neglect.

You see all that may hinder us from sympathising with our brethren is quite removed by Christ's own example, here set down before us in the text. Let us see what it affords to enforce this duty on us further.

(1.) Hereby you will be like to Christ, and to be like to Christ is the highest excellency we can attain; it is the sum of all our duty, and so should be the end and scope of all our endeavours, the great design and business of our whole life.

What higher excellency can we aspire to than a likeness to Christ? Revenge is that indeed wherein the world glories, to do evil for evil, and come even with those who affront or wrong them; but this they learn of the devil, not of Christ. It is a devilish deformity; they have it of their father, and are herein as like him as they can look. But the glory of a Christian is to do good for evil, to pity those they suffer by, and to sympathise with such as disoblige them. This is glorious indeed; this is to be like to Christ himself; it is his glory, and shines in the text; it is the excellency of his office, as he is High Priest, Philip. ii. 5. While the same mind is in others that is in the world, that is in the devil, it will be our glory to have 'the same mind in us that was in Christ,' by having a sense of others' wants, weaknesses, dangers, sufferings, as Christ has of ours.

It is our great duty also. Christ calls us to it: Mat. xi., 'Learn of me.' It is essential to a disciple of Christ to learn of him; if we refuse it, whatever we pretend to, we really disclaim, renounce our relation to him, Mat. xvi. 24. If we will be his disciples, we must follow him; we must imitate him, follow his example, for he has left us his example on purpose, 1 Peter

ii. 21. This is one of the paths wherein he went before us. We see in the text the steps which we must follow : Eph. iv. 32 and v. 1, 2, ' tender-hearted,' *ἑυσπλαγγχτος*.

That is the compassionateness the text calls for ; shew it in such acts as he has done. Be ye followers, imitators of him herein ; walk in love. How ? Even as Christ. Christ shews his love in being touched, &c. ; so do ye. This is to follow God ; this is to learn of Christ effectually. So he begins the exhortation to the duties following, and this particularly, chap. iv. 20, 21. Ye have not so learned Christ ; ye do not follow him, ye are not like him, if ye do not this ; ye have not put on the new man, which is Christ's resemblance, ver. 24. If this be wholly wanting, Col. iii. 12, 13, put on *σπλάγγνα ἰκτιρμοῦ*, bowels of compassion. Shew it as Christ did ; let him be your example ; let no *μομφή*, nothing that you can blame or find fault with in those who want your compassion, hinder you, ver. 14. Love to others, founded in the love of Christ to you, is the bond of perfectness ; the most perfect bond, that which most strongly binds and obliges you to this ; to all mercifulness and compassionateness, in imitation of Christ.

*Use 2.* For comfort to the people of Christ. Here is ground of great consolation in every condition ; in the worst, the most grievous circumstances that you can be compassed with in this world. All grievances whatsoever are comprised under infirmities ; and this affords comfort as to everything that can be a grievance to you, especially taking in the ground of it in the next words, ' But was in all things tempted,' or exercised, like unto us.

Art thou poor, wantest conveniences, and sometimes (it may be) necessities ? Why, Christ is touched with the feeling of a poor condition ; it was once his own case, 2 Cor. viii. 9 ; poor in relations, Philip. ii. 7. As to friends, a few fishermen ; as to estate, he had not wherewith to pay a small tribute, but what he got by miracle ; as to accommodations, worse provided for than the inferior creatures, Mat. viii. 20. Christ is touched with the sense of thy poor condition, for he himself felt it ; he will relieve thee, for therefore did he feel it, that he might be ready to do it.

Art thou tempted to sin, buffeted by Satan, afflicted with horrid suggestions ? Christ is touched with the feeling of a tempted soul ; he himself was exercised with temptation. Satan assaulted him both invisibly and visibly ; he tried him with variety of temptations. And what more horrid suggestion than that, to fall down and worship the devil ? Mat. iv. Yea, Christ was so far in his power, and at his disposal, in the hour of temptation, that Satan carried him from place to place in the air, from the wilderness to the temple at Jerusalem, and from thence into a high mountain, Mat. iv. 1, 5, 8.

Art thou despised, hated, reproached, despitefully used ? He is touched with the sense of this ; it was his own case. He was reviled as a glutton, a wine-bibber, an impostor, a blasphemer, and one that dealt with the devil. He knows what it is to be overwhelmed with shame and reproach, his own experience makes him sensible of it.

Is this world a vale of trouble and tears to thee ? Is thy life a life of sorrows and sufferings ? Dost thou suffer from all sorts, not only from professed enemies, but those whom thou seekest most to oblige ? Art thou in anguish of spirit, heaviness of soul, forsaken of men, and to sense deserted of God ? Why, thus it was with him, he himself felt all this. So there is no doubt but he is touched with the feeling of it. He was a man of sorrows, acquainted with griefs, with all sorts of grief. He suffered from all sorts ; not only his enemies, but his friends, were a trouble to him. Even his disciples forsook him in his greatest distress. He was afflicted with outward

pain and soul-trouble both at once; his soul was heavy, exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death; and when he was in the hands of cruel and bloody men, he cries out in the anguish of his soul, as one forsaken of God.

Briefly, whatever thy trouble or grievance be, here is a spring, a well of comfort opened to thee in the text, from whence thou mayest draw streams of joy and refreshment in all the sad circumstances of thy life, for hence thou hast ground to conclude assuredly,

(1.) That the Lord delights not in your grievances. He takes no pleasure to afflict you, or to let others do it; he 'afflicts not willingly,' Lam. iii. 33; he delights not in that which he has such a compassionate sense of; he takes no pleasure in that which is afflictive to you, for he himself feels it.

How comes it then to pass that the troubles of the righteous are so many? Why, there is some necessity for it; it is not but 'if need be,' 1 Peter i.; there is some great advantage to be had by it, and this is the method which infinite wisdom counts best for the attaining of it. Otherwise, if it were not necessary, if it were not good, he would not suffer it, since he some way suffers by it; it is not the suffering that pleases him, the same thing cannot in the same respect be the object both of delight and commiseration. Christ has compassions on you herein, so far as he suffers with you. He takes no pleasure in what is grievous to you, for himself feels it. Acts vii. 34, 'I have seen, I have seen,' says the Lord; I have felt, I have felt, says Christ, the affliction, &c.

(2.) You are not alone in any condition, in any grievance, be it want or weakness, danger or suffering; you will always have one by you to sympathise with you, one who stands for more than all the world. This was the comfort wherewith Christ comforted himself, when he was like to be left destitute of all outward comforts and comforters, John xvi. 32. This is it which will secure you against the evil of any want, or weakness, or trouble, how great soever; yea, against all fear of it, Ps. xxiii. 4, Isa. xli. 10, &c. That which need not be your fear need not be your trouble. You need fear nothing if Christ be with you. And this the text assures you of, he will be with you; not only as a spectator, but as a co-sufferer; as one that not only will see, but will feel, what you want, or what you endure. Oh what comfort is it to consider this! While I am in want, in pain, in distress, labouring under weaknesses, or conflicting with outward troubles, inward temptation; while I am complaining and bemoaning myself, Christ is pitying me. His bowels yearn towards me, he feels what pinches me, he is affectionately touched with the feeling of it.

(3.) You shall have his affection in every state, under all infirmities. The mind and heart of Christ will be upon you in every condition, under all weaknesses, in all wants, in all grievances. For this is a proposition of eternal truth, Christ is touched with the feeling of our infirmities. This will hold true in every moment of your lives, Christ's compassions fail not; and while he has compassions, he has love, and all the affections that depend on love. So that, whatever you want, Christ will never want love for you; you will never want his love. And what need you more? What want is there in the world that his love will not make up? Whatever you suffer, you will not lose his love; and there is enough in his compassion, in his love, to make any grievance better than freedom from it; to make any condition, how necessitous, weak, afflictive soever, more comfortable, more advantageous, more desirable, than any exemption from it, when this is not from love. Will he love you less, because you are compassed with infirmities? Will he not shew more love? The more compassion is shewed, the more love appears. And he shews most compassion where there is most need; and who need more than they that labour under most infirmities?

4. You shall have that which is best for you in your infirmities ; and nothing can be more comfortable than to be assured of what is best for you. If it be best to have your infirmities, the burdened lessened, he will do it. If it be best that they be continued, with support under them, you shall have that. If it be better to have a holy and fruitful improvement of them, than to be freed from them, you shall have that. If it be best to have deliverance from them, he will work it ; as soon as it is so, he will not delay it. This you may be sure of, because he is touched, &c. For this is not the pity of a weak man, who may wish well to him he pities, but cannot help ; may be willing to do what is best for him, but is not able ; but it is the compassion of him, who is the mighty God. Indeed, he is both God and man, who is thus touched with the sense of our condition. And so it is the compassion of a man, for the tenderness of it, but the compassion of God, for the mighty power and efficacy of it.

This assures us that he is both able and willing to afford the best relief, and this is by doing that which is best for us.

## OF COMING BOLDLY UNTO THE THRONE OF GRACE.

---

*Let us therefore come boldly to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.*—HEB. IV. 16.

THESE words are a most comfortable conclusion drawn from what is premised in the former verse. Since we have an high priest, one who has reconciled us to God, and does intercede for [us]; such an high priest who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities; one who is so compassionate to us, and so ready to relieve us under all infirmities whatever; therefore let us come boldly.

To open the words a little. Here is an act or motion, with the manner, and term, and end of it.

*Let us.* This may denote, it is both our privilege and duty to come, and thus to come. We may do it, it is our privilege, our happiness. We ought to do it, it is our duty. We have not only leave to do thus, but it is enjoined us; the Lord has made that our duty, which is our happiness. Indeed, he enjoins us nothing but what tends to make us happy. Such a Lord we have, as requires nothing of us, but in order to our own happiness. This is true in all the instances of our duty, though it do not so plainly appear in some of them; but in this before us it is both true and evident; it is clearly our happiness, a most blessed privilege, to do that which he calls for.

*Come.* Let us make our addresses to him. Let us apply ourselves to the Lord in all the ways he has appointed, in all his ordinances, all acts of worship, and prayer particularly.

*Boldly.* Here is the manner of the address, *μετὰ παρρησίας*. A word frequently used, and denotes several things. Let us take notice of such as may be here pertinent. It signifies,

1. Liberty without restraint. You may be free, as those that are assuredly welcome. You may use freedom of speech. So used, Acts ii. 29, and iv. 13. You have liberty to speak your minds freely, to speak all your heart; to declare all your ails, and wants, and fears, and grievances. As others should not restrain and fetter you, in speaking to God, prescribing what things you should seek, what words use, and no other; so you need not restrain yourselves, but speak all that your condition requires, freely. It is your privilege to be free, Christ has made you welcome.

(2.) Security, without fearfulness. You need not fear that you shall be slighted, or repulsed, or disappointed, John xi. 54, *παρρησία*, as one secure. We may come openly, as those that have the greatest security, and not the least occasion to be fearful.

(3.) Authority. Without question whether this belong to us, whether we have warrant for it, so used, Heb. x. 19. As the high priest had authority (and he alone under the law) to enter into the holiest, so has every believer warrant now to do it; he has that which will bear him out in it, his warrant is the blood of Jesus. We may come with such authority as none can question; Christ hath authorised us to do it, he will bear us out in it.

(4.) Confidence, 'without doubting.' Such faith as assures us of acceptance and success, 1 John iii. 21, and v. 4. This includes all the former; we may come with confidence, as those who have security, liberty, authority to come. We may come, with all assurance that we shall obtain, &c. We have encouragement, sufficient ground from the premises to come in faith, with full assurance of faith; *μη δισταζοντες* (says Chrysostom *in loc.*), not doubting. So that, to come boldly, is to come as those that have security, liberty, authority; and which is the sum of all, to come in faith, with assurance to obtain what they come for.

*To the throne of grace.* That is the term of this notion. The Lord is represented as having two thrones: one a throne of judgment, where he shews his justice and severity; the other a throne of mercy, where he shews himself gracious and compassionate. It is a dreadful thing to appear before the throne of judgment. Sinners, when they are awakened, will think the weight of rocks and mountains more tolerable than this, Rev. vi. 15, 16, Dan. vii. 9, 10. But to be admitted to the throne of mercy is the most comfortable and happiest privilege that the children of men are here capable of, as will appear by a fuller account of it in the sequel. And this is the happiness in the text, *Θρόνος χάριτος ἐστίν, οὐ Θρόνος κρίσεως*. Not where everlasting destruction will be awarded, 2 Thes. i., but where mercy and grace will be obtained. This follows,

*That we may obtain mercy and find grace.* This is the end why we are to come. The favour of God through Christ is sometimes called mercy, sometimes grace, indifferently. What difference there is betwixt them seems not to be real, but respective. Mercy respects misery in the object, as grace does unworthiness. Mercy is favour shewed to the miserable, and grace is favour to the unworthy, freely shewed to such as have no reason from themselves to expect it; nothing to deserve it, nothing to oblige the Lord, nothing to move him to vouchsafe it.

*To help in time of need.* A general term, indefinitely laid down, but is equivalent to an universal. All kind of relief, suitable to the necessities and various circumstances of every condition. Help, as to our wants, our weaknesses, our straits, our difficulties, our dangers, our temptations, our sin and guilt, our troubles and sufferings, outward and inward; help for all, and all that will be helpful, all that can be needful. And as relief in all, so the best relief, *εὐκαιρὸν βοήθειαν*; the best help, when it will be best, when it will be most opportune, most seasonable. Help, when it comes too soon, or when it comes too late, proves not helpful; but this shall come just in its season, just in the nick of opportunity, when it will be helpful to the best advantage. The people of Christ may come to the throne of grace, with assurance to find grace and mercy for such help as this; for relief in all cases, and that when it will be best of all.

Observations.

1. There is a throne of grace, which believers may come to.

2. They may come boldly, with confidence, to this throne; they have liberty to do so, they have security in doing it, they have authority to do it, and so may do it with confidence.

3. This is the way to obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.

I shall handle the first of these as the doctrine, and make use of the other by way of application.

To proceed with the former clearly and profitably, I will endeavour to shew what a throne of grace here imports and signifies; what it declares to us concerning the Lord, whom we may approach as upon such a throne. Now I do not find that a throne of grace is anywhere else mentioned in the New Testament; but that which is equivalent to it in the Old Testament very frequently. The apostle, speaking of the throne of grace, alludes to the mercy-seat in the tabernacle and temple. The Lord's throne of grace, and his mercy-seat, differ not in sense, but in sound. A *seat* and a *throne*, referred to God, are both one; and *grace* and *mercy* differ very little. The mercy-seat (as you may see, Exod. xxv. 17, 18, 21) was the golden cover of the ark; at each end of it was a cherub, and between the cherubims is the Lord said to sit, and so is represented as sitting, or residing on the mercy-seat as on a throne. This was the throne of grace under the law. And in allusion to this does the apostle speak of him as upon a throne of grace under the gospel.

So that by understanding what the mercy-seat signified concerning God, we may come to understand what the throne of grace imports concerning God, both what he is to himself and what he is to his people, what apprehensions of him we are led to when we are to come to the throne of grace.

1. Let us see what it declares the Lord to be in himself. His throne of grace signifies these severals—

(1.) That he is a God of glory, of a glorious majesty. Here was the most glorious and majestic appearance of God amongst his people of old. Upon the mercy-seat he appeared in glory. The ark, whereof this very mercy-seat was a part, the most rich and splendid part, is called his glory, Ps. lxxviii. 61. Here he vouchsafed his special presence, as upon his throne. When they were deprived of this by the Philistines, the glory was departed, 1 Sam. iv. 22. The cherubims, which were part of the mercy-seat in the tabernacle, are called 'cherubims of glory,' Heb. ix. 5. As it is a throne, it speaks him glorious, 1 Sam. ii. 8. Thrones are for persons of great glory on earth, and so is ascribed to him who is the most glorious majesty of the world. When the prophet represents him upon a throne, Isa. vi. 1, it is said, ver. 3, 'One cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory.' Thus we should approach the Lord, thus we should apprehend him when we come to the throne of grace; the notion of a throne obliges us to it.

(2.) That he is a God of dominion and sovereignty, that he rules and reigns and is supreme governor, Ps. xcix. 1, 2. He reigns, that appears by his throne. He sits between the cherubims. As so represented, the mercy-seat was his throne. Upon this account, greatness, supremacy is ascribed to him, ver. 2, and from hence Hezekiah declares his sovereignty over all kingdoms, 2 Kings xix. 15. Thou art placed upon the mercy-seat as a throne, &c. From the mercy-seat, as his throne, he gave law to his subjects (and legislation is the chief act of sovereignty); he appoints Moses to expect his laws from thence, Exod. xxv. 22; and accordingly, here he exercised his legislative power, Num. vii. 8, 9. The particular laws here enacted are in the chapter following.

And without reference to the type, a throne denotes sovereignty. Thrones

are for sovereign rulers, Job xxxvi. 7, 1 Sam. ii. 8 ; so it is applied to the Lord, who not only makes laws, but passes judgment, Ps. xciv. 7, 8. His throne is terrible to wicked men, a throne of justice ; so it is a comfort and relief to his people, a throne of mercy, ver. 9. Very frequently in Scripture throne is used for sovereign government, Gen. xli. 40, 2 Sam. vii. 13, 16, and applied to God, Ps. ciii. 19.

Thus we should draw near to God with such apprehensions of him as sovereign Lord of the world, as King of kings and Lord of lords, supreme governor of all kingdoms, who has all creatures in heaven and earth under him as his subjects, gives law, passes judgment, does execution as he sees cause. The mention of a throne minds us of this.

(3.) That he is a God of power and might, of almighty power. When he is spoken of as upon his throne, the mercy-seat, he is called the Lord of hosts, one who has all the power in the world, 1 Sam. iv. 4, 2 Sam. vi. 2. And the ark, whereof the mercy-seat was a principal part, is called the strength of God, Ps. lxxviii. 61, and cxxxii. 8 ; because, as it was a testimony of his presence, so a symbol of his strength and power, ready to be engaged for his people. Hence the church, having addressed herself to the Lord, as upon the mercy-seat between the cherubims, Ps. lxxx. 1, adds, ver. 2, 'Before Ephraim, and Benjamin, and Manasseh, stir up thy strength, and come and save us.' The expression has reference to the form of the Israelites encamping about the ark (the throne of God) in their marches toward Canaan. They were disposed in four squadrons, under four principal standards. This of Ephraim, with Benjamin and Manasseh, encamped on the west behind the tabernacle. Judah, with other two tribes under his standard, encamped on the east, and had the front, Num. ii. 3, 18, x. 25. So that when the ark was taken up in order to a march, it was before Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh. In allusion to which they pray, 'Stir up thy strength,' *i. e.* the ark (with the mercy-seat on it, the throne of God in that representation) being a sign of God's power or strength engaged for them. It is like that prayer which they used when the ark set forward, Num. x. 35. Answerable to which is David's prayer at the removal of the ark, Ps. cxxxii. 8. Hence that petition, Ps. xx. 2, 'Send the help from the sanctuary,' which is all one as if he had said, 'Send the help from the mercy-seat, or from the throne of grace. Thus should we come to the throne of grace, with apprehensions of his almighty power.

(4.) That he is a God of holiness, Ps. xcix. 5. To worship at his footstool is to worship towards the mercy-seat, ver. 1, between the cherubims. That was a symbol of his special presence. There he resided as a God of holiness. And upon that account every part of the temple, yea, the hill where it was seated, was counted holy, ver. 9. But above all, that part where the mercy-seat was, that was the most holy place, or, as it is in Hebrew, the holiness of holinesses, Exod. xxvii. 23. The mercy-seat was the throne of his holiness, Ps. xlvii. 8 ; and giving oracles from thence, it is called the oracle of holiness, Ps. xxviii. 2.

So the throne of grace is the throne of holiness. Thus we should come to the throne of grace with apprehensions of the holiness of God, that he is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, that he is holy in himself, and will be sanctified of all that draw near him.

(5.) That he is a God of wisdom, who sees and knows all things, to whom nothing is hid, or obscure, or difficult. From the mercy-seat he gave oracles ; he made discoveries to his people of such things, which otherwise they could not come to the knowledge of. They were to inquire here of him for resolu-

tion in their most intricate doubts, and greatest difficulties, and weightiest undertakings, Ex. xxv. 22. Thus they were directed to do, and thus they were wont to do, when they were at a loss and wanted the conduct of divine wisdom, Judges xx. 27, 28, 1 Chron. xiii. 3. This was the oracle they consulted with, the oracle of God, 2 Sam. xvi. 23. Hence the place of the mercy-seat, from whence the Lord gave those divine discoveries of his wisdom and testifications of his will, is called the oracle, 1 Kings vi. 5, 16, 19. The word is רַבִּיר from רַבַּר, to speak, because the Lord from hence gave divine answers when they inquired of him. Symmachus and Aquila read it *χρησματοιστήριον*, as an oracle was called amongst the gentiles, the place from whence they expected divine answers. And with the apostle *χρησματοισμός* is the answer of God, Rom. xi. 4. And as the place, so the answers of God are called oracles, Rom. iii. 2; oracles, *i. e.* divine revelations and directions proceeding from infinite wisdom, and so of the greatest certainty, truth, and authority. Such oracles did the Lord give from the mercy-seat, and so he declared himself to be the God of wisdom.

But this is not all. In that representation of the Lord upon the mercy-seat was wrapped up the manifold wisdom of God in a mystery, those riches, those wonders of mercy which are now unfolded in the gospel, where he appears upon this throne of grace, and which the angels learn and are instructed in by the discoveries made thereof to the church, Eph. iii. 10. And while it was hid in a mystery, they were prying into it then, 1 Peter i. 12. They do *παρυκύναι*, stoop, bend their faces downward, as having an object before them which they earnestly desire to take special notice of. They shew the earnestness of their desire by their posture. And where is this to be seen? Why, in the posture of the cherubims' faces towards the mercy-seat (to which we may well suppose the apostle's expression has reference), Exod. xxv. 20. Towards the mercy-seat! There was Christ in a type; there was the marrow of the gospel, and the sum of the riches of divine wisdom and goodness in a mystery; and the faces of the cherubims were towards it, as Mary's face was towards the sepulchre when she looked for Christ there, John xx. 11, *παρέκλυεν*; the same word which the apostle useth to express how the angels look into this gospel mystery.

It was then a mystery hidden and kept secret, while the mercy-seat was a representation of it, for there was no ark, no mercy-seat in the second temple, and in the first temple it was reserved in the most secret part of it; none was to see it but the high priest only, and he but once a year.

But now the throne of grace is openly exposed, all the people of Christ have access to it, for the temple is opened, and the ark, and so the mercy-seat, is seen, Rev. xi. 19. If the temple had been opened, yet there was a veil betwixt the holy place and the ark, which hindered the sight of the mercy-seat. But now the veil also is rent, Mat. xxvii. 51, so that we all with open face may behold the glory, both of the goodness and wisdom of God. There is no veil now before the throne of grace; Christ the mercy-seat (*ἰλαστήριον* the apostle calls him, Rom. iii. 34) is set forth openly, and in him all riches of grace and wisdom.

(6.) In fine, the mention of the throne of grace minds us of the wisdom of God, that we should draw near him as one that knows our state, yea, our hearts, and understands all the ways and means how to help us, and do us good; as one that knows all our doubts and fears, how to satisfy them; all our perplexities of spirit, how to unravel them; all our wants, how to supply them; all our weaknesses and distempers, how to cure them; all our corruptions, how to subdue them; all our afflictions and troubles, how to deliver us. He whose wisdom could find out a way to save and deliver us,

when his truth and justice was engaged to destroy us, his wisdom can never be nonplussed. And this is that depth which was held forth by the mercy-seat as in a type of mystery, but now by the throne of grace more clearly and conspicuously, which will appear with more evidence by the

2nd Head, What the throne of grace declares the Lord to be unto us. Take it in these particulars. It signifies and offers him to us, as the mercy-seat did of old (for that which the apostle alludes to, we shall still make use of to direct us all along).

(1.) As a God in Christ. Since sin entered into the world, God is not to be approached by the children of men, with any acceptance, with any success, with any hopes of either, but in and through Christ. Sin has made man miserable, his misery is his separation from God. He cannot be happy but by access to God again. There is no access to God for sinners but by a mediator. No other mediator could be sufficient, but such an one as was both God and man as to his natures, and both prophet, king, and priest by office. Such a mediator is Christ, and he only. The Lord upon the mercy-seat, and so upon the throne of grace, offers himself to us in Christ as such a mediator. The mercy-seat shews forth both natures and offices of Christ, and so represents to us God in Christ, as in an all-sufficient mediator. God is said to dwell or reside upon the mercy-seat, and the fulness of the God-head dwells in Christ, Col. ii. 9, John i. 14. The Word was made flesh, there is both his natures, and dwelt amongst us; ἐσκήνωσε, a word not much differing from the Hebrew word כִּסֵּי־יְהוָה, by which they express the glory of God appearing or dwelling on the mercy-seat. God dwelt there as in shadow, but in Christ bodily, substantially.

The Lord spake and declared his mind from the mercy-seat. He speaks to us by his Son, and by him gives divine revelations and directions. There is his prophetic office, Heb. i. 1. God sits on the mercy-seat, as a king on his throne. This, as the throne of grace, θρόνος βασιλικός, with Chrysostom. He rules his people by Christ, whom he has appointed king of his people: Ps. ii. 6, 'Yet have I set my king upon Zion, the hill of my holiness.' The holiness of that, and of the whole temple, was from the residence of God upon the mercy-seat: and this is spoken in reference to David's bringing the ark thither; and his residing there, is, with Theodoret, δυνατῶς βασιλεύειν, to reign potentially.

The throne of grace is 'the throne of God and of the Lamb,' Rev. xxii. 3. The throne of God alone is not to be approached by us; but the throne of God and the Lamb is the seat of mercy, the throne of grace. He not only gives law to his people, but makes provision for them, that their souls may have plenty, ver. 1 with Ezek. xlvi., and he protects his subjects too. As the wings of the cherubims (parts of the mercy-seat) overshadowed and covered the holy things, so does he cover and overshadow his holy ones.

His priestly office is likewise held forth by the mercy-seat. The very name of it denotes this. It is the propitiatory, and that speaks satisfaction, one chief act of his priesthood. And this satisfaction was made by his blood, which was typified by the blood sprinkled on the mercy-seat, Lev. xvi. 14. As his intercession, the other act of his priesthood, was foreshadowed by the cloud of incense which was to cover the mercy-seat, ver. 13. That this was a figure of his intercession, we learn, Rev. viii. 3. 4.

So that to come to the throne of grace, is to come to God in Christ, to apply ourselves to the Lord through the mediation of Christ. Otherwise there is a throne of God indeed, but none that sinners can or dare approach to, unless they will venture to rush upon a consuming fire. There is no throne of grace, but through Christ; no mercy-seat for us, but by his mediation.

The throne of God in Christ is the throne of God and the Lamb, so it is a throne of grace indeed. The throne of God alone is like his appearance on mount Sinai, Heb. xii. 18. There is no other throne for sinners without Christ but that of justice, shadowed out by the burning mount; all black and dark, all dreadful and terrible, as smoke, and storm, and fire, and death, can render it. If you will find a throne of grace, you must seek it in Christ; approach to God through him, and come, as ver. 24, to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant.

(2.) As a God reconciled. It signifies that his justice is satisfied, his wrath appeased: not now incensed against his people, but well pleased and propitious. The name of the mercy-seat declares this. It is *ἰλαστήριον*, a propitiatory. So it is called by the Seventy in the Old Testament; and so it is called by the apostle in the New Testament, Heb. ix. 5. And Christ being that which was prefigured in the mercy-seat, he has this very name given him by the apostle, Rom. iii. 25. The word is *ἰλαστήριον*, it is rendered propitiation, because it is Christ by whom the Lord becomes propitious or reconciled. But how was this offered? By his blood, he made his soul an offering for sin, he offered up himself as a propitiatory sacrifice. His blood was shed for the satisfying of justice: and so the Lord became satisfied, well pleased, reconciled, propitious, through his blood.

And this was shadowed forth by the mercy-seat of old, as I intimated before from Lev. xvi. 14. The blood of the sin-offering was to be sprinkled upon the mercy-seat seven times, signifying, that by the blood of Christ the justice of God was fully and perfectly satisfied. And blood upon the mercy-seat denotes a meeting, a reconciliation of justice and mercy; justice will not now hinder, but that the Lord may be propitious to his people.

So that this is it which the throne of grace signifies to us, that the Lord through the blood of Christ is atoned, sin is expiated, wrath appeased, justice satisfied, mercy glorified, the sinner reconciled, and the Lord every way well pleased. The Lord's voice from the throne of grace is, I am appeased, I am satisfied, 'Fury is not in me;' I am at peace with you, I am reconciled.

(3.) As a God of forgiveness. As graciously pardoning the sins of his people. When he is represented to us upon the mercy-seat, he is set forth as a God that has found out a way to hide our sins out of his sight (which in Scripture phrase is to pardon them), for observe, in Exodus xxv., the tables of the law were in the ark, ver. 16, 21, and Heb. ix. And these are called the tables of the testimony, because they testify against those who do not keep the law, Deut. xxxi. 26, 28. It being evidence against transgressors, as those that are guilty, and so should be condemned and proceeded against, as those that break the laws of God, and will not demean themselves as his subjects. But now this dreadful testimony, that bears witness of our sin and guilt, it is put into the ark, and there covered by the mercy-seat, Exod. xxv. 21. By the Lord's gracious appointment, there is a mercy-seat upon it, to hide and cover it. There is a mercy-seat between him and the condemning law, between him and our guilt. So that in this posture, wherein the Lord would have himself represented to us, our sins are hid and covered out of his sight, *i.e.* pardoned. That of the psalmist, probably, has reference hereto, Ps. xxxii. 1, lxxxv. 2. It is a blessed state to have sin covered, *i.e.* pardoned, so as they shall not appear for our condemnation; but a woful condition not to have them covered, Nehem. iv. 5.

Observe that expression: Ps. lxxv. 3, 'As for our iniquities, thou shalt purge them away.' The כַּפֵּר, the same which is rendered to cover in the fore-cited places. And hence that very word, which is translated the mercy-

seat, כַּפֹּרֶת, of very near affinity with our English word *covereth*. So that when the Lord is set forth to us as on the mercy-seat, or the throne of grace, mercy is between him and our sins, Christ is between him and our guilt (for the mercy-seat was Christ in a type) there is a mediator between him and the condemning law. He looks not upon the guilt of his people, and the accusation of the law, but through mercy, the mercy-seat is interposed; but through a mediator, Christ, the expiation of sin is interposed. This is next his eye; sin is at a further distance, it is removed out of his sight, hid in the ark, there covered. So, no matter of provocation being in his eye, no guilt exposed to his view; we are not bound over to punishment, not liable to condemnation, but fully pardoned. If he be of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, he shews, by representing himself on the throne of grace, that he has taken a course not to behold it, so as to condemn for it, but so as to pass it by, and pardon it. Thus comfortably did the Lord set forth himself, as on the mercy-seat of old, and on the throne of grace now. And the mention of a throne of grace minds us thus to draw near him as a God covering our guilt, pardoning iniquity, transgression, and sin, removing them out of his sight.

(4.) As a God in covenant. The ark (whereof the mercy-seat was the chief and most significant part) is called the ark of the covenant, Num. x. 33, and Heb. ix. 4. And the apostle insinuates the reason why it is so called: in it was the tables of the covenant. This was the end and use of the ark, 1 Kings viii. 4. Now the mercy-seat being the golden lid or cover of the ark, it was to secure, it did preserve, the covenant, Exod. xxv. 2.

But this is not all. The mercy-seat (which signified Christ) being interposed betwixt the Lord above and the covenant within the ark, may signify that he was the mediator of the covenant; as he was indeed the mediator of the covenant of grace, both in the legal administration of it under the law, and in the new administration of it under the gospel. So he is called, Heb. ix. 15, a mediator; one by whose interposal, as the covenant was first made, so it shall stand firm and be made good, for all ends and purposes to which it was designed.

But how does he effect all this? By his death and blood, as the apostle shews, ver. 15 to 22. It was by virtue of his blood that the covenant is made, ratified, and accomplished. But what does this concern the mercy-seat? Why, the apostle has reference to the blood sprinkled upon the mercy-seat in the day of expiation, Lev. xvi. 14. This signified the blood of Christ, and it is called 'the blood of the Testament,' or covenant, Heb. ix. 20, 21, Heb. xii. 24; so that the mercy-seat, with this blood of sprinkling, signifies that the Lord, by virtue of the blood of Christ (the Mediator of the New Testament), is in covenant with his people, and will make good that gracious covenant in all the parts and articles, in all the promises and branches of it.

God is in covenant with his people through the mediation of Christ. This was signified by the mercy-seat. That was but a type, a shadow. The truth and reality which it shadowed out is expressed: Heb. viii. 1, The throne of the majesty in the heavens, Christ sitting there at the right hand of the Father: it is the throne of God and of the Lamb; it is the throne of grace. There Christ appears as Mediator of the covenant, as is declared, ver. 6. The administration of the covenant of grace under the law is called the first covenant, ver. 7. It was inferior to the administration of the covenant of grace under the gospel, this being more clear, more full, more free; and therefore this latter is called the better covenant, consisting of better promises. These are specified in the following verses: it promises more holi-

ness, ver. 10, clearer light, ver. 11, and full pardon, ver. 12. The sum of all, 'I will be to them a God.' This covenant, these promises, are through Christ yea and amen; through his mediation they stand firm, and shall be made good to the full. He undertakes to see all performed, and sits on the right hand of the throne of God for this purpose. There is the throne of grace, and, this it signifies. We may come to the throne of grace, we may apply ourselves to the Lord as a God in covenant. He has entered into covenant with his people, and has found out a way, notwithstanding their weakness and unsteadfastness, to secure the blessings of a gracious and everlasting covenant to them. If anything be objected against it, Christ is there ready to answer it, there to remove whatever may hinder it. The Lord's voice from the throne of grace is, I am thine, thy God, thy Father, thy portion, thy exceeding great reward. What I am in myself, I am to and for thee. I am God all-sufficient, and will be so to thee; my wisdom, power, goodness, truth, faithfulness, is all for thee, and shall be so for ever.

(5.) As a God that will have communion with his people; as one who will admit dust and ashes to have fellowship with him. He offers there to meet them, to commune with them, to discover and communicate himself to them. He admits his servants to communion with him when he vouchsafes to meet them. And the mercy-seat was the place of meeting which the Lord appointed for Moses, Exod. xxx. 36. He will meet with him as we meet with a friend, whom we desire and delight to converse with. He would meet his servants there to discover himself to them. The LXX render it, 'I will be known to thee from thence.' He did make known himself as a man to his friend. There he did commune with them, Exod. xxv. 22. It is not the special privilege of some particular persons only to come to the mercy-seat as of old, but all the people of Christ may have access to the throne of grace. There we may meet with God; there he is willing to commune with us; there is he ready to reveal himself unto us, to cause his goodness to pass before us; there our fellowship may be with the Father and the Son. Offering himself to us on the throne of grace, he offers the greatest happiness; for communion with himself is the greatest happiness on earth or in heaven. There is a gradual difference, but the substance of it here and hereafter lies in communion with the Father and the Son.

And this gracious posture offers the continuance of this communion. He was represented of old as residing constantly on the mercy-seat, as dwelling between the cherubims; not as standing, for so a passenger may do, whose business is to be gone; nor as sitting, for so a stranger may do upon occasion; nor as sojourning, as one who turns but in for a night or for a few days; but as dwelling there. It was his resting-place, 2 Chron. vi. 41, Ps. cxxxii. 8, 14. This is true of the throne of grace, without limitation. The mercy-seat (the shadow of it) did not continue always, but this throne is for ever, Ps. xlv. 6, Heb. i. 8. It is spoken of the throne of Christ the mediator, through whom the throne of majesty in the heavens is a throne of grace, and so for ever; and so consequently offers this happy communion without intermission, without end, everlastingly.

(6.) As a God that hears prayer, and will answer the petitions and supplications of his people. The Lord gave answers from the mercy-seat; and this may be the reason why their posture of old in worshipping and praying was towards the mercy-seat, Ps. xxviii. 2. That was the place where the mercy-seat was. Called the oracle, because the Lord from the mercy-seat gave answers; and so it is rendered by some, 'the answering place'; so Ps. v. 7. The temple was not then built; but he means the tabernacle, and the mercy-seat in it, where the Lord hath declared himself present, ready to answer

those who worshipped him. And when Solomon had built the temple, and seeking the Lord to give audience to his people, it is for prayers directed towards that place, 2 Chron. vi. 20-26, &c. And the Lord promises to answer accordingly, chap. vii. 15, 'To the prayer of this place,' *i. e.* made in or towards it. Yea, when the temple was burnt and the ark lost, yet Daniel observed this posture still, Dan. vi. 10. For the place was destroyed, yet the promise was in force still.

When the Lord offers himself upon the throne of grace, he gives assurance that he will hear prayer, and give gracious answers. The *παρρησία*, the boldness or confidence in the text, has respect to this particular. Being upon a throne of grace, we are at liberty to present all our petitions, and we may present them with confidence that we shall have gracious answers. It is the confidence which the apostle speaks of, 1 John v. 14, 15. When he exhibits himself as upon a throne of grace, then is the season, the opportunity, to make our requests, and to have them granted. Those that will have their petitions to great persons succeed, observe the season which appears to be most favourable. And this is the season for us to make known all the desires of our souls unto God, such an opportunity as assuredly promises success.

When he is upon the throne of justice, then he is for passing sentence, and executing judgment according to his threatenings; but when he is upon the throne of grace, that is the season for granting petitions. His voice from the throne of grace is like Solomon to Bathsheba from his throne, 1 Kings ii. 20. Whatever our request be, if it be fit for him to give, if it be good for us to receive, he will not say us nay. That which is good for us is all that heart can desire. This is satisfaction to the utmost, unless we will question whether infinite wisdom know what is good for us.

The season for access to Ahasuerus was when the golden sceptre was held forth. Esther comes in to him then, and the answer is, Esth. v. 3, 'What is thy request? it shall be given thee to the half of the kingdom.' This seems a great offer, but it is nothing to what the Lord, in his gracious posture, signifies himself ready to grant: Rom. viii. 32, He will give us all things.

His being on the throne of grace is not in order to the executing his threatenings, but for the making good his gracious promises; and these are large and free, without restriction, larger than that of Ahasuerus. He promises all things to those who seek him. When he is on the throne of grace, he will deny nothing: his posture assures us that he will grant everything, which it becomes infinite graciousness to bestow, Mat. xxi. 22, John xv. 7, and xvi. 23, 24, Mat. vii. 7. When we address ourselves to the Lord on the throne of grace, it is but ask and have. We may come boldly with all confidence of this, since it is a throne of grace we come to.

(7.) As a God that is present with his people. It signifies he is a God with them. The Lord was set forth as residing on the mercy-seat; when that was with his people of old, it signified the Lord was with them. And so they bewailed the loss of the ark as the loss of God's presence, that being the symbol of it. When that was gone, the glory was departed. The signification of the mercy-seat was, *God with us*; as this was the name of Christ, of whom the mercy-seat was a type. The Lord speaks of himself as abiding there, and promises to shew himself there to give signs of his presence, Lev. xvi. 2, so when the tabernacle (wherein was this symbol of the divine presence) was with that people, the Lord is said to be with them, Ezek. xxxvii. 26, 27, 'I will be their God,' *i. e.* a God with them; so it is represented, Rev. xxiv. 3; so the throne of grace signifies. The Lord is with his people, he is very near them; so near, as they may have access to him,

and so may be with him whenever they will. He is still to be found on the throne of grace, still present.

More particularly, this denotes,

[1.] An intimate presence. He is in the midst of his people. So he was while he was on the mercy-seat, so he will be while that remains, which this did but typify; while the throne of grace, while the mediation of Christ continues, who is king and priest for ever. How can he be more intimately present than by residing in the midst of his people? And thus he is represented. The tabernacle was in the midst of the camp, Num. ii. 17, and the ark was in the midst of the tabernacle, 2 Sam. vi. 17; and the cherubims being at each end of the mercy-seat, and the Lord between them, he is set forth in the mercy-seat as in the midst of the ark. And so the Lord shewed himself to be in the midst of Israel, Num. v. 3; and to walk in the midst of them (to be active), Deut. xxiii. 14. This shews the Lord will be intimate with his people, intimately present; even within them, in the midst of them.

[2.] A special, a gracious presence. He was not present here only as he is in the rest of the world, but in a more special way, as upon a mercy-seat, from which others were far removed, so as they could have no access to the propitiatory, no advantages by it. Thus, when he exhibits himself as on a throne of grace, he shews he is in the midst of his people in a gracious manner; present with them through Christ's mediation and interposal, that is a gracious, a special presence.

[3.] A glorious presence. As the mercy-seat upon which the Lord appears is a throne of grace, so is it a throne of glory: Jer. xvii. 12, and xiv. 21, 'Do not disgrace the throne of thy glory.' As if they had said, Suffer not the ark, the mercy-seat (whereon thou art set forth as gloriously enthroned), to be disgracefully used. The Lord residing there, as a glorious king on his throne, is said to be the glory of his people in the midst of them, Zech. ii. 5, as the presence of the sun is the glory of the firmament.

[4.] An all-sufficient presence. Sufficient to secure them from all things dreadful, and to supply them with all things desirable. This is the security of his people, Ps. xlv. 5, 'God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved.' The Lord upon the mercy-seat, and so upon the throne of grace, is in the midst of his people; this is their safety and establishment, therefore they shall not be moved.

It is all-sufficient also to help us to all things desirable. The waters, in Ezek. xlvi. 1, issuing out of the temple, are described to be plentiful for their measure, ver. 2-5, and for their virtue to be quickening and healing, ver. 9, and fructifying, ver. 10. Those waters, Rev. xxii. 1, are said to proceed 'from the throne of God and the Lamb.' The throne of God in the temple was the mercy-seat; the throne of God and of the Lamb is the throne of grace. The influences which flow and stream from the presence of God with his people are quickening, healing, and fructifying influences; they stream forth in such plenty as is sufficient abundantly to refresh and satisfy them to the utmost. There is a 'river of pleasure,' Ps. xlv. 4; 'in thy presence is fulness of joy,' Ps. xvi. 11.

[5.] A continuing presence. He is said to dwell on the mercy-seat. In reference thereto is his promise, 1 Kings vi. 13, 'I will dwell among the children of Israel.' The throne of grace denotes no less: Rev. vii. 15, 'He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them.' Here he is, and here he abides. We need never suffer through his absence. Have recourse to him on the throne of grace, and we need never be at a loss. He is always here to be found, here he dwells; here we may find him whenever we

have occasion ; here he is always as a 'very present help in time of trouble,' as a very present supply in time of want, as a very present security in time of fear, as an all-sufficient portion ; one who is all in all to his people, and always present for his purpose.

[6.] As a God that will shew himself merciful and gracious to his people, that will deal mercifully and graciously with them. Now, when he thus represents himself, they may find grace and mercy. We need go no further for this than the text, and it is so plainly there held forth, that we must not pass it by. Since he is upon a throne of grace, we may find mercy and grace to help in time of need. Take the import hereof more distinctly in these particulars.

*First*, He is ready to shew mercy and grace. He is willing to shew himself gracious and merciful. When he shews himself on the mercy-seat, he shews he is ready for acts of mercy ; when he is upon the throne of grace, he declares that he is ready for acts of grace. His posture declares that he is now willing to let his people find that he is indeed merciful and gracious. When may grace be expected from him, when is he willing, ready for acts of grace, if not when he offers himself as upon a throne of grace, a seat of mercy ?

If he presented himself upon a judgment-seat, a tribunal of justice, we might conclude he was ready to do justice, willing to execute judgment ; the seat and posture would be a plain signification of it. And therefore when he presents himself upon a throne of grace, we may conclude he is ready for acts of grace, willing to shew mercy. This is a plain signification of it, and the Lord gives us no signs that are fallacious, that will deceive us. When he signifies anything to us, the sign will be answered with a reality, he will not delude us ; when he appears in a gracious posture (as he does upon a throne of grace), he is ready for acts of grace. He would not appear to be willing if he were not so really ; he would make no show of grace or mercy if he were not willing to act accordingly. If he was backward, and not inclined to acts of grace, he would not set forth himself in a gracious posture.

*Secondly*, He will certainly shew mercy and grace. His people shall surely find it so. There is not only some probability, but a certainty for it. It is not only probable that he may, or more likely that he will, than that he will not ; but it is certain that he will shew mercy, we may be sure of it. The apostle would have the people of Christ bold and confident herein, 'Let us come boldly,' &c., *i. e.* with confidence and assurance that we shall obtain mercy, &c. He is a God gracious and merciful in himself, essentially, infinitely so ; but he is at liberty when and how he will express his mercy and grace, till he oblige himself by declaring it ; but when he offers himself as on a throne of grace, he declares, and so obliges himself to express it now at this season, and shew it thus in this way. Now, if ever, will he shew that he is actually gracious ; in this way, in this posture coming to him, they shall surely have mercy. Grace and mercy is to be found, that is certain ; but it will never be found if not when he is on the throne of grace, therefore now, when he thus presents himself, we may be sure and confident of it. If we should fall short of his grace here, if his mercy should fail us now, if we should not find and obtain it at the throne of grace, if he should not vouchsafe it when he presents himself to us on that throne, the Lord would prove otherwise than he has declared himself to be ; we should not find him such a one as he has obliged himself to be found ; his throne would not prove what he calls it, it would not be what the Lord has said it is, a throne of grace.

*Thirdly*, He will shew this in all variety, in all acts of favour; both mercy and grace, as is express in the text. All the acts of divine love and goodness run in these two streams, mercy and grace; and these streams will meet upon us when we come to the throne of grace. There we shall meet with both, they both flow from the throne of God and of the Lamb. The throne of grace is the fountain, the spring-head wherein they issue, where they break out; there these sweet currents encompass those who have access to the Lord on this throne.

All that we can expect from infinite goodness is to free us from misery, and to make us happy. And here is both offered and ensured to us; both mercy to free us from misery, and grace to advance us to the height of happiness. Mercy will deliver us, but grace will exalt us; not only lift us out of the pit, but advance us to the throne; not only deliver us from the wrath to come, and then leave us in a middle state, but crown us too with glory. Mercy will not suffer us to be ruined, but grace will have a triumph for us. This assures us we shall not only obtain mercy to help us out of misery, but find grace to help us far above it.

*Fourthly*, He will do this affectionately. The mercy in the text speaks this also. Mercy is love shewed to the miserable; so mercy is love in the rise of it, and it is compassion in the workings of it towards a pitied object. When Christ would give an instance of such love as he requires, he does it in the Samaritan, Luke x., who had mercy on the spoiled and wounded man, ver. 37; and that is expressed by having compassion on him, ver. 33. There is both love and compassion in mercy, and these are the sum of all affectionateness; and this the Lord assures us of, by setting forth himself as on a throne of grace. We shall find mercy from him, and love and compassions, and so all affectionateness. Here is love offered to us, the love of God in Christ; a peculiar love, a transcendent love, such as passeth knowledge; the acts, expressions, embraces of such a love. Here is compassion insured to us, the compassions of God, which as far transcend those of the best and sweetest tempered men, (for the efficacy thereof, though there be no compassionateness therein), as the heavens are above the earth.

Here is tender love. For such is mercy, it is love which is compassionate, called 'tender mercy,' Ps. lxxix. 8, James v. 11; 'bowels of compassion,' Isa. lxiii. 15, Jer. xxxi. 20. The Lord presenting himself on a throne of grace, offers to meet us there with such affectionateness; without the weakness of affections in us, but with infinite more virtue and advantage. There we may find mercy, such mercy, and all the expressions which so great, so tender a mercy can afford. He that sits upon this throne is the God of love, the Father of mercies; whose being is goodness, whose nature and essence is mercy, whose bowels are compassion, and whose glory it is to shew mercy, and express love to such as have access to his throne. It is the glory of his throne that it is a mercy-seat.

*Fifthly*, He will do it freely. It is a throne of grace that we come to. It is grace that is offered, grace that we find there. And grace is free goodness, that which puts forth all acts and expressions freely; that which looks for no desert, overlooks all unworthiness; that which stays not till it be obliged, but engages itself, and will not be hindered by that which is most disobliging; that which moves, when it has nothing to move it but itself; this is grace. When the Lord is on the throne of grace, he gives, he does not owe; it is grace, not debt. These are opposite, Rom. iv. He gives, we do not purchase. There was a purchase, indeed, but we who have the possession had no hand in it. We have it freely; we have all for nothing; we have it for coming for, though we come without money and without price;

it costs us nothing but the acceptance, Isa. lv. 1. Upon these terms we may come and be welcome to the throne of grace ; so we may come, and so freely. We may have all the riches of grace ; we come not to a market where we must pay for what we have, but to a throne of grace ; and it is the glory of him that sits on this throne, that all we have of him is free gift. All his acts are acts of grace ; he gives, looking for nothing again ; he knows that all we return will be as good as nothing ; he will not be one jot the better for it all, either in point of glory or happiness. Not the least scruple, the least degree, can be added to either, by all that men or angels can return. Our sinfulness, unworthiness, weakness, nothingness, need be no discouragement ; for we come to a throne of grace, a throne where grace rules and is sovereign, where grace is enthroned, and is, and will be, all and all ; before which angels and saints should cast their crowns, and cry, *Grace, grace* ; giving the glory of all they have received, of all they enjoy, unto that to which they owe it all, and from which they had it freely.

*Sixthly*, He will do this royally, magnificently, as becomes him who sits on the throne. His throne speaks him a king, and he is a great king, Ps. xlvii. 27, and xcv. 3, and he will do for his people accordingly. When he exhibits himself upon a throne, he would have us with confidence expect from him what is correspondent to his greatness. He encourages us to look for great things from his hand, and much of them, in great quantity, 2 Sam. xxiv. 23. Since he sets forth himself on a throne, and is represented as a king, and would have us come to him as on his seat of majesty, he assures us he will give like a king ; not so few, nor small things, as other persons, but such as are answerable to his greatness and magnificence. Those that have thrones, shew their greatness and magnificence by their gifts, presents, rewards ; it is a disparagement to them not to act herein like themselves. Hiram gives to Solomon, 1 Kings ix. 14, and the queen of Sheba, 1 Kings x. 10. The value of the gold alone is reckoned at four hundred and fifty thousand pounds in our accounts ; a great sum, if gold was so much scarcer in those times than it is now, as is commonly thought. Such gifts are for enthroned persons. They give such things as others cannot, either for value or excellency, or greatness and quantity.

The Lord has a throne, and he will have us come to him there, as on his throne ; this intimates he has a design to shew his greatness. He will have those that come to him here, expect what is answerable to his throne and dignity. This Chrysostom observes, *φιλοτιμία γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ ἐστὶ καὶ δωρεὰ βασιλική*. The Lord will shew his magnificence ; he will give royally. The honour of his throne is concerned. We disparage him, if we be not confident to have that of him which will be answerable to such a majesty ; that which none else can give, things of greater value, and those of greater quantity, Ps. lxxxiv. 11. Grace, the least dram of it is of greater value than all the gold in the world ; and glory, that is a kingdom, in comparison of which all the kingdoms of the earth are but mole-hills. But this is not all, 'No good thing will he withhold,' &c. He would have us expect from him no less than all that is good, no less than all that heart can desire ; he assures us of no less than all this, Rom. viii. 32, 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22, Rev. xxi. 7, Mat. vi. 33. The Lord will deal royally with his people ; we dishonour him if we do not expect it ; it is the glory of his throne to do it. We may be confident he will do for us what becomes so great a king, when it is his design to shew his greatness, when he sets forth himself as upon his throne.

*Seventhly*, He will do it effectually ; he will shew himself gracious and merciful, so that none shall hinder, all shall promote it. This is signified

also, in that he is represented as on a throne. That tells that all are his subjects, all are at his command; he can order anything, everything, to be the instruments of his grace, and make all things serve the designs of his mercy which he has for his people: for he has the throne, all are subject to him, at his beck, he can order all to do his pleasure.

Or if any would resist or hinder him in his acts of grace and mercy, he can crush them. As he is upon the throne, they are under his feet; and he can use them as his footstool, and trample on them, crush them as easily as we can crush the worms or snails that are under our feet, Zech. iv. 7. He can take a course that none shall so much as mutter against his gracious proceedings, or move a tongue in order to the hindrance thereof: Zech. ii. 13, 'Be silent before the Lord, for he is raised up out of his holy habitation.' By holy habitation, some understand the temple, and it was a shadow of heaven, the other habitation of his holiness. It is called his habitation, because he was there set forth on the mercy-seat as on a throne. When he is said to sit there, it signifies his presence; when he is said to rise up, it denotes his readiness to exercise his power and authority. The power and authority of him who sits on the throne, when exercised, is enough to strike all flesh, all the creatures in the world, mute; this makes all hush, they shall not so much as by a word give impediment to his gracious designs expressed in the promises foregoing.

And as it is enough to quash the opposition of enemies, so likewise to silence the unbelief of weaklings, as doubting that what they desire or stand in need of, is too much to be expected, or too hard to be accomplished. Is anything too much or difficult for him who sits upon the throne, and so has all things in his power? The throne is his, and so the kingdom, and glory, and power; what, then, can hinder him? What can resist him? He will do all his pleasure, all that his power and mercy will have done, and none can say unto him, What dost thou?

Thus I have opened to you the great import and pregnancy of this expression. I have stayed the longer on it, because I found it useful to clear up many passages in Scripture. And you will find it further useful practically in the application.

*Use.* Since there is a throne of grace for the people of Christ to come unto, let us come unto it; take this encouragement to make our addresses to him who thus exhibits himself to us. And so come to him, as we may find it to be a throne of grace to us; and that we may find it to be so, let us come in such a manner as the import of the expression, already opened, directs us. What direction it affords us, let me shew in some particulars. I shall touch upon several, but most insist on that which is plain in the text, and principally intended by the apostle.

1. Let us come with holiness of heart and life. The mercy-seat, and so the throne of grace on which the Lord offers himself, is a throne of holiness, as was shewed before. And this calls for holiness in those that come to it, Heb. x. 22, a place parallel to the text, they explain one another: 'Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' Hearts sprinkled, &c. The mercy-seat was a throne of grace by virtue of the blood of sprinkling. Those that come to the throne of grace, and would find it so to them, must, through the efficacy of that blood, get their hearts cleansed from whatever makes the conscience evil, *i. e.* not only from the guilt, but the pollution of sin. And to inward purity, that of the heart, should add outward holiness, that of the life. 'Their bodies washed with pure water,' *i. e.* their conversations cleansed from blots and stains of sin by

the Spirit of sanctification. The legal rite signified this. Aaron and his sons were to wash their bodies when they went into the tabernacle of meeting, Exod. xxx. 17, 18, 19, &c., 29. This was to signify the real holiness which we should labour for, that we may come to the throne of grace, that we may be capable of meeting with the Lord there. The Lord upon the mercy-seat, upon the throne of grace, shews himself to be a holy God, therefore we should approach him in holiness: 'Holiness becomes thy house for ever,' Ps. xciii. 5. Holiness becomes the presence of God; get it into a lively exercise when you draw near him. The Lord communed with Moses from between the cherubims; if you would do so, observe the Lord's method: 'Isa. i. 'Wash ye, make ye clean,' and then come, let us commune together. He appears here in his holiness, and will be sanctified of all that draw near him; therefore, sanctify yourselves, get mind and heart raised to a holy strain.

2. Let us come with fear and reverence. The Lord on the mercy-seat, and so on the throne of grace, appears in his glory. A glory that should make such worms as we, whose habitation is in the dust, and who are crushed before the moth, to fear before him, and approach with reverence. Those who are most holy, have most communion with God, are most after his own heart (as David was), owe him as much reverence and fear as any; and the nearer they are to God, the more will they count themselves obliged to shew this: Ps. v. 7, 'In thy fear will I worship toward thy holy temple.' Their worship towards the temple was with respect to the mercy-seat. It was upon the account of the Lord's residence there that their posture in worshipping was towards the temple, and this obliged them to fear: Ps. xcix. 1, 'The Lord reigneth, let the people tremble: he sitteth between the cherubims, let the earth be moved.' It is fit that dust and ashes should tremble before the God of glory. How was the holy prophet struck with the sense of his own vileness, when he saw the Lord upon a throne, and the seraphims above it, Isa. vi. 2, 3. Though the Lord do not present himself there to our eyes, yet our faith may always have such a vision of God; yea, he is thus presented to our sense; we hear, though we do not see, that the Lord sits upon 'a throne, high and lifted up,' between the cherubims, yea, with thousands of seraphims about him. And will neither faith nor sense strike us with the trembling sense of our own vileness? The Lord expects it, and encourages us to it. He that dwells between the cherubims of glory, will dwell also in that heart that trembles at his word. He looks that we should tremble, not only when we see him, but when we hear of him, Isa. lvii. 15, 16: 'Wherefore,' as the apostle advises, Heb. xii. 28, 'let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear.'

3. Let us come with sincerity. The Lord upon the mercy-seat shewed himself to be a God that knows all things, all secrets, and so the secrets of hearts. When they were concerned to know those secrets (as David was to know the inward inclinations of the men of Keilah), here they inquired, as is before shewed. He hereby declares that there is nothing secret to, nothing hid from, him, with whom we have to do. This obliges us to deal uprightly with him, and to come before him with sincere hearts.

The apostle, shewing how we should draw near to the throne of grace, requires this particularly: Heb. x. 22, 'Let us draw nigh with a true heart,' &c. He loves truth in the inward parts, and hates the contrary, and knows whether it be there or no. It is madness to dissemble with him who knows all things, and hereby declares it; he 'searches the heart,' &c. It is madness to make a shew of the good that is not in us, or to go about to hide any evil that is in us. The apostle warns us of this, before he advises us to

come to the throne of grace : Heb. iv. 13, there is nothing good or evil, how secret soever we may think it, but is manifest in his sight. Whatever is covered, and shut up close from the eyes of others, is naked and open to him. He, with whom we have to do at the throne of grace, is a discoverer of the thoughts and intents, ver. 12 ; and, therefore, when we come to the throne of grace, let us be careful to bring nothing, no, not in the secrets of our minds and hearts, but what we would have him to see. Let us bring no thought nor motion, no disposition nor inclination, no aim or end, no desire or intention, but what we would have exposed to the eye of him that sits on the throne. When we are before him, his eye penetrates the inwards of our minds and hearts as if they were a globe of crystal ; they are more transparent to him than crystal is to the sunbeams. Oh take care that the posture of our souls be upright before him, that it be not crooked and sinister ; but without carnal aims, worldly designs, selfish reflections ; that, though we cannot get rid of all iniquity, yet we may regard none in our heart ; that, though he see us far short of perfection, yet we may be sincere in his sight,

4. Let us come with subjection. When he is set forth as upon a throne, this signifies that he is sovereign, and we are subjects ; he is, though a gracious, yet an absolute sovereign, and we must come to him, as those who are wholly subjected to him, and resolved to shew ourselves absolutely subject, ready to be ordered by his wisdom, and ruled by his will, and subservient to his interest, and to have what we are, and what we have, and what we desire or hope for, disposed of as he thinks fit. His sovereignty and dominion calls for this, and his throne shews his dominion and sovereignty.

We must be ordered by his wisdom, not our own ; when our wisdom agrees not with his, we must account it folly, and not follow its dictates, how specious soever ; his will must be our will, it must be a law to us, as it is in itself ; and, when it crosses our will, we must yield to it, comply with it, as holy, and just, and good ; it must be observed as good, and perfect, and acceptable, even when it lies thwart to our wills and inclinations.

We must be ready to do whatever he would have us do. None of his commands should be grievous ; we should have respect to them all, else we may be ashamed to profess ourselves his subjects, or approach his throne, Ps. cxix. 6 ; willing to forsake whatever he would have us to abandon, even every false way, Ps. cxix. 104 ; every way of sin, how pleasant or advantageous soever it seem ; willing to resist whatever he would have us oppose ; not only temptations from without, but our own humours, appetites, passions, inclinations, so far as they please not him ; willing to part with what he would have us to lose, though it be endeared relations and enjoyments, Luke xiv. 33 ; willing to suffer what he would have us endure, though it be that which flesh and blood thinks grievous.

If he be our sovereign, his interest must be sovereign ; we must make our own and all stoop to it ; we must own none, but what will serve it, and all that we have must be at the service of it ; we must look upon ourselves and enjoyments as not our own, but his, and to be employed for him, when, and as he calls for it ; even all, when no less will serve to uphold his interest ; we must submit our desires and hopes to him, when we come to his throne ; be willing to be denied in what he thinks best to deny us, and to be delayed in what he thinks fit to defer us. The throne we are to come to, minds us that we are to come resolved for such subjection.

5. Let us come with love and affectionateness. As it is a throne, it calls for subjection ; as it is a throne of grace, it calls for love, and all the affections that depend thereon. The Lord offering himself to us on the throne of grace, is presented to us as the most amiable object, and in the most

delightful and desirable posture ; when should we draw near him with all affectionateness, but when he holds forth all affectionateness to us ? and this he does, in a most rich and ample manner, on the throne of grace. When should we come to him with inflamed love, with ardent desires, with greatest delight and rejoicing, but when he displays the riches of his grace and mercies, and opens to us the treasures of his love, as he does on this throne ?

(1.) When he appears on the throne of grace, then love is on the throne ; mercy and grace appear in their sovereignty and exaltation, they are set forth all in their glory ; and does not this call for, and oblige us to, the highest love, the most raised affection ? Will some little love, some small degree of affection, be a suitable answer to such an obliging appearance ? will a poor, cool affection be fit for us to meet him with, when he is ready to meet us with the riches and greatness of an enthroned love ? Shall we leave so much reason for sorrow and shame, to supply the defect of better affections ? Shall not his love, when it is represented to us as on a throne, in its greatest power, constrain us to love him, and love him more and more, every time we draw near him ? Shall we not delight to be in a gracious presence, a presence which is gloriously gracious ? Such is the presence on the throne of grace : there grace appears in its glory, and all the royalty and magnificence of the King of kings. Another throne we may dread ; but this sure should be our delight and joy when we draw near it. Shall not our desires be excited and drawn out when the riches of grace and mercy offer themselves freely to those that are desirous ; when the throne of God declares that he will give like a king to those that desire it ? Oh, why does covetousness run so low and feed on mud, when here it might be entertained at a throne, and satisfied with royal riches ?

(2.) Here all streams of goodness meet us ; both mercy and grace, both compassion and love. And does not this call for all acts, all expressions of affection, when we draw near ?

(3.) Here love resides ; here grace reigns ; here mercy keeps the throne. And this should keep up our affection ; we should not be off and on, up and down. Decays and declinings should be hateful to us. Delight should be constant : love still sparkling, desire always upon the wing, when we come to the throne of grace, while we may find the Lord there ; and he is never off, his people may find him ever upon his throne.

6. Let us come in faith, come believing that we shall have access, acceptance, and success ; come with confidence of this, as those who may be bold to expect it ; as those who have all freedom and liberty to come, without any restraint, who have security to do it, and need not fear it ; who have warrant to do it, and need make no question of it.

This is plain and open in the text. It is that which the apostle expressly requires in these words. Let us come boldly with confidence, with such a faith as prevails against fears, doubts, suspicions, jealousies, and rises up to full assurance. And he calls for it afterwards in that parallel place, Heb. x. 19, 20, 22, where his expressions refer to the mercy-seat, the throne of grace in a type, and, which I have shewed all along, helps us to understand what it signifies to us. ' Having boldness,' *παρρησία*, the same word which we have in the text ; ' into the holiest,' that was the place of the mercy-seat, the most holy part of the sanctuary ; ' by the blood,' the high priest might not approach the mercy-seat without blood, which signified the blood of Jesus, ver. 20 ; ' through the veil : ' the way to the mercy-seat was through a veil, which parted the holy and most holy place. The apostle shews there is now a way for us, we may now come to the throne of grace shadowed out by these expressions. And how we may and ought to come,

he tells us, ver. 22, in full assurance of faith, ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως. There is nothing to stop or retard us, we may come with full sail; there is nothing to discourage us, we may come without any distrust or doubting, with all assurance, a fulness of it. We have sufficient encouragement for such a faith, such an exercise of it.

Now this being the duty of the text, I shall insist on it the more; taking in here the usefulness of the other observations which the words afford, that I may not stay too long upon this subject.

Since it is a throne of grace we come to, here is great encouragement to come in faith, with an emboldened faith, a faith encouraged unto confidence. More distinctly, let me shew, 1, in what particulars we have this encouragement for faith and confidence; 2, how all discouragements may be hereby removed; and 3, what positive supports are hereby offered to our faith.

1. For the first; we may come in faith to the throne of grace in all cases that require help or relief. Whosoever we need help, whatever the need be, grace and mercy is to be found for help, without limitation. Particularly,

(1.) In sense of guilt. When sin troubles the soul, stings the conscience, disquiets the heart, makes us fear it will rise up before the Lord against us, that it is set in the light of his conscience, and that he will judge us for it, the throne of grace gives assurance this shall not be. When he offers himself to us upon a throne of grace, he makes it evident he is not willing to judge his people for their sins; he has no design to arraign, or condemn, or punish them for past transgressions. If he intended this, he would shew himself upon another throne; not his mercy, but his judgment-seat. The throne of grace is his mercy-seat, and that, I shewed you, signified that sin was covered, hid from his sight; so that he would not see it, nor take notice of it as a judge. The mercy-seat (signifying Christ) was betwixt the Lord and the condemning law, which bears witness of our sin and guilt. That was hid in the ark and covered, which shewed the Lord on the mercy-seat, and so on the throne of grace (shadowed out thereby) has found out a way through Christ to cover our sins, *i. e.* to pardon them, Ps. lxxxv. 1-3.

Oh, but though sin be covered, so as he will not take notice of it, to condemn me for it hereafter, yet he may deal severely with me for it here; I may feel the effects of his wrath in grievous afflictions, I tremble at the apprehension of that.

But when sin is covered and forgiven, the wrathful effects of it cease, as the psalmist shews; when their sin was forgiven, their captivity was brought back, vers. 1, 2, and all wrath taken away. Though he may chastise whom he pardons, yet not as a judge, to satisfy law and justice, but as a father, out of love and grace. The throne of grace ensures this; no afflictions for sin come from thence, but such as, whatever they seem to be, will really prove to be acts of grace, *i. e.* of love and mercy, not of enmity or penal wrath. Believers may be hereby assured their pardon will be both free and full: free, because it is of grace; and full, because from grace in its exaltation, when it has the throne.

(2.) In wants and necessities this assures us of supply. We come to the throne of grace for all we want, whether it concern soul or body, and be confident we shall have it; and confident because it is a throne of grace we come to. For he that sits upon the throne can supply all our wants. The throne signifies he has all things in his power, and at his disposing. There is no doubt but this great King can supply the poorest body, the poorest soul that belongs to him. And that he is ready to do it, we may be sure, because it is a throne of grace where he offers himself, and to which we are

invited. This declares him gracious, ready to supply our necessities, and that freely, Rev. vii. 15, 16; by hunger and thirst, all wants whatever are signified. Here is assurance that all wants shall be supplied, and the ground of it expressed, ver. 16. The throne of God, through the Lamb in the midst of it, becomes a throne of grace; hence flow all supplies to the people of Christ, in heaven and on earth. They shall not hunger, the Lamb in the midst of the throne, he feeds them; they shall not thirst, he leads them to living fountains. Here is a free, a full, a lasting and continuing supply, as from a fountain that runs freely, that affords not drops or draughts, but streams, many streams, and that continually. It is not a vessel or a cistern, but a fountain, a spring; a spring that is never dry, a living fountain; till this fail, we can never want supplies.

*Obj.* Oh, but do not we see many of those in want who come before this throne?

*Ans.* You may see many things that they have not, but nothing that they want. They that have all that is good for them, though there be many things which they have not, yet properly they want nothing. Want is something to be complained of; but none in reason can complain because he is without that which is not good for him; he wants it not, unless it may be said he wants a calamity, that which would be bad for him; that is such a want of which none but a madman would have a supply. The people of Christ may have all that they want, because they may have all that is good; the throne of grace makes them sure of this. There the Lord sets forth himself as infinitely gracious, and so ready to make good all that he has graciously promised, and he has promised all that is good, Ps. xxxiv. 9, 10, and lxxxiv. 11.

*Obj.* But I cannot think but such a thing which I have not would be good for me.

*Ans.* The question here is, Whether the Lord or thyself can best judge what is good for thee? yet methinks this should be no question.

(3.) In weakness, inward or outward, public or personal. Hence we are encouraged to expect strength and assistance; hence it comes, even from the mercy-seat, from the throne of grace: Ps. xx. 2, 'Send thee help from the sanctuary.' Why from the sanctuary, but because the Lord presented himself there as upon the mercy-seat? The sanctuary was in Zion, the mercy-seat was in the sanctuary, the Lord was in the mercy-seat, he would have himself set forth as residing there. Herein they pray, and pray in faith, for help and strength.

Thou wantest strength to subdue corruption, to resist temptation, to overcome the world, to master self, to bear the cross, to perform hard duties, to improve ordinances and gracious opportunities, to walk exemplarily, to live serviceably, to persevere thus doing. Alas! says the soul, sensible of its own weaknesses, where shall I have strength for all this? Where? why at the throne. If he that sits on the throne will strengthen and assist thee, nothing will be too hard for thee, Phil. iv. 13. And he is ready to do it, for he that has all power, as being upon the throne, is all gracious, as being upon the throne of grace.

Then as to the public, where shall there be help, when all seems running to ruin, when the interest of Christ seems sinking in all countries round about us, where it is not sunk already; when it is sinking in the midst of us? What help can stay it, or be any support to it, when we see it pushed headlong? What strength can raise it, when it seems so low, so like to be buried, beyond hopes of a resurrection; when all that look

about them, and have a due sense of such concerns, find their hearts failing them for fear, and for 'looking after those things that are coming on the earth,' Luke xxi. 26; when they say with trembling hearts, By whom shall Jacob arise, for he is small? What help or strength shall secure the gospel, and the interest of Christ (which depends on it) to these parts of the world, ready to be over-run with antichristian darkness and violence? What hope in such circumstances that seem hopeless? Why, this: the Lord reigns, he has the throne still; there is help and strength enough there. Oh, but what is that to those who have utterly disoblged him, who have forfeited the gospel, as much as any that ever lost it? Why, the Lord here shews himself gracious, and who knows but the unworthiest may find him so? As it is a throne of power, so a throne of grace we come to; and grace acts freely, and may appear for the relief of those who have no reason from themselves to look for any such thing. If the throne of grace were duly plied by those who have interest there, there might be hope concerning this thing; there, and there only, is help to be found in such a time of need. There is no need so great, but help for it may be had at this throne; none so unworthy but may meet with it freely, for it is a throne of grace.

(4.) In fears and dangers, here you may have security, Ps. xxvii. 5, Ps. xxxi. 20. The secret of the tabernacle was the holy of holies, the place of the mercy-seat. And this is called the secret of his presence, because he exhibited his presence on the mercy-seat. Thus David was confident to be secured, as if he had been hid with God, as if he had been covered with the wings of the cherubims, which overshadowed the mercy-seat, and so made it the secret of the divine presence. To come to the throne of grace is the way to get into the secret of the Lord's presence. For any to assault you there will be to offer violence to the throne of God; he that sits upon the throne will never endure it. If you take sanctuary here, you are safe. You are invited to come, to fly to it in time of danger. He that offers his own throne for a sanctuary will not suffer it to be violated. He that touches you there touches the apple of his eye, for it is the secret of his face. So the words signify which are translated the secret of his presence, Ps. xxxi. 20, סֵתֶר פָּנָי, the secret or covering of thy countenance. What will become of those who will venture to strike at the face of God? How safe are they that are hid under this covering, who are secured in the secret of his countenance! This is the security which the throne of grace offers you. The horns of the altar were nothing to such a sanctuary. Joab was plucked from thence, but none can reach you here. It is the throne of God, he can secure you; and a throne of grace, he will do it. It was the ground of that confidence, Ps. xxvii.

(5.) In troubles and calamities this is the surest way to deliverance. In the great calamity and desolation of the church, lamented Ps. lxxx., she applies herself to the Lord as dwelling on the mercy-seat, ver. 1, 2. So did Hezekiah, when he and all the people of God were in great distress, ready to be overcome and ruined by Sennacherib: 2 Kings xix. 15, 'Thou residest on the mercy-seat,' &c. The throne of grace is now our mercy-seat, there we may be sure to find deliverance, *ἐνκαιρῶν βοήθειαν*, 'relief in season;' deliverance whenever it will be, as soon as ever it is seasonable. Oh but we may stay long first, have not many done so? You shall stay no longer for it than yourselves desire, for you will not desire it till it be good; and it will not be good till it be seasonable. If it come too soon, it is as bad as if it come too late. It is never good, never desirable, but when it is in season; and when it will be seasonable, the throne of grace in the text assures you of it. Whenever deliverance will be a mercy, whenever it will be an act of

grace, you shall have it assuredly; and it is madness to wish it before. The text bids you be confident of it; anything that is mercy, you may find; whatever will be an act of grace, you may obtain. You may be sure of it, because it is a throne of grace you come to, Ps. lvii. 1, lxiii. 4.

I might add many other particulars. In straits and perplexities you may have direction here, as from an oracle; in grievances you may have ease and support: what sweeter and stronger support than the throne of grace? In desertion and despondency, you may have comfort; it is from this throne the Lord will shew himself so gracious as to wipe all tears from his people's eyes, Rev. vii. 17. In distance and estrangement from God, by coming to his throne you get near him, Ps. xci. 1.

2. The next thing propounded is to shew how all discouragements to faith may be hereby removed. And indeed there is scarce anything that tends to discourage faith, or to puzzle it with doubts and fears, or to weaken it in its actings and exercise, but may be hereby dispelled. There is no objection that unbelief can make, or a distrustful heart suggest, but may be taken off by eyeing God as represented on the throne of grace, and viewing those perfections and excellencies which he holds forth to us in this posture. To instance in some particulars.

(1.) The difficulty of what we need, of what we would have, sometimes puzzles faith. So it did not only, 2 Kings vii. 19, but in Moses, otherwise strong in faith: Num. xi. 21, 'The people are six hundred thousand footmen; and thou hast said, I will give them flesh that they may eat a whole month.' So it did in Martha: John xi. 39, 'By this time he stinketh, for he hath been dead four days.' As though time might prescribe to the Lord, or as if the grave would not deliver up one so long detained, at the word of Christ's power. Faith often staggers here. How can such a danger, such a calamity, be prevented? How shall antichristianism, coming in upon these parts of the world as a mighty flood, be stopped, when all things in view threaten, all seem to conspire to make way for it, and no means visible to divert it? How can such an evil, hanging over person or family, be repelled? How can such a loss be made up, such a relation, such a comfort? How can such a lust be subdued, which I have been struggling so long with to so little purpose; that which is rooted in my temper and constitution, and has revived so often when I have looked on it as subdued and suppressed? What escape out of such a strait, when no way visible to escape, no passage, no chink, to let out of it? How shall the gospel, our liberties, comforts, be secured to us, when no wisdom, no power of man, appears for the effecting of it?

Yea, but consider, the Lord appears here as a God almighty. So he did on the mercy-seat, so he does on the throne of grace, as before. And is anything too hard for God? Is anything too difficult for him that sits on the throne, to whom those things that seem utterly impossible to us are things of greatest ease? 'Is the Lord's hand shortened?' So he answers Moses, Num. xi. 23.

What does the throne here mentioned signify?

[1.] He rules and reigns over the world. All creatures, from the highest to the lowest, are absolutely subject to him. He can order all the creatures in the lower world, whatever is on the earth, or in the sea, or in the air; yea, the stars in the firmament, and all the angels in heaven, to do whatever he pleases. He can bring them in altogether for the help of his servants, will force the meanest of them rather than fail. If all the hosts of the lower world were not sufficient, he has innumerable legions of angels, many and many myriads of them at his beck. They are about his throne, and stand

there as the attendants of this great King, ready to receive his orders, and to execute them in the behalf of his people, the weakest of them, the little ones, Mat. xviii. 10. What cannot he do for you, whose throne declares that he can raise all the powers of the world to do his pleasure ?

[2.] But there is no need of all this. Since he has the throne, he can empower any one thing to do for you whatever you need ; since he has the throne, he has the power, all power is at his disposing. He is the God, the king of power. Since the kingdom is his (which a throne signifies), the power is his, 1 Chron. xxix. 11, Mat. vi. 13, Rev. v. 13. All creatures ascribe all power to him that is on the throne. And he that has dispersed this power unto several creatures, he can unite it all in one ; or as much of it in any one as will be enough for your relief, whatever your case be. He can convey power into any ordinance to comfort, quicken, or strengthen you ; so as you may prevail against any lust, resist any temptation, bear any cross whatsoever. He can enable any creature to supply any want, make up any loss or breach, even such as you are apt to think can never be repaired. He can empower any instrument, how crooked, or weak, or broken, or insufficient soever it seem, to do that for you which you see no means or instruments able to do. He has the throne, the power is his ; he can dispose of it as he pleases ; he can convey so much of it into anything as will serve your turn, and answer your need, whatever it be.

[3.] If there were no creature, no instrument in the world to help, yet would you not be at a loss in time of need ; for he that is on the throne could do it alone. He can do all that ever you need, without any means or instruments. His bare word is sufficient, all-sufficient, for it, whatever it be, how great, how difficult, how impossible soever it seem. Such a power there is even in the word of the great King, Ps. xlv. 4. There needs no more to deliver you, to deliver his people anywhere, how deep soever plunged ; but only the command of him that sits on the throne. If the gospel, the interests of Christ, in these parts of the world, and the dear concerns of our souls, and the souls of posterity, were all as dry bones, in a more forlorn and hopeless condition than they are, he could make all live with a word. He that is our king, that sits upon the throne, can command life into that which seems as far from living as a dry bone. While he keeps the throne, it is a senseless heart that fails through distrust of power, even when all visible power and help fails.

(2.) Some may say, The Lord is able enough ; I do not doubt of his power ; but is he willing to help, to strengthen, to deliver me from inward or outward dangers ? Here faith is often at a stand : Mat. viii. 2, ' If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.' The leper did not question Christ's power to cleanse him, but his willingness. Many who believe his power, yet question his will. Here it usually sticks : Is he willing ?

Why, yes. The Lord upon the mercy-seat appeared as a God of mercy. And what is mercy, but a willingness, a readiness to pity and help. When will the Lord shew mercy, if not here, if not now, when he exhibits himself as on the mercy-seat ? When the Lord offers himself on a throne of grace, this gives assurance that grace is then to be found. He bids us now come with confidence to find grace ; and when he bids us be confident, can there be any doubt that he will fail us ? Will he let those whom he bids trust in him for this thing be ashamed and miss of it ? An ingenuous man will not do so, much less the gracious God. Upon this throne he appears gracious in a solemn, a glorious manner. He will not frustrate the expectation that such an appearance, such a manifestation of himself, raises. It is not for his honour to defeat those hopes that himself hereby excites and encour-

ages in such a manner. It would be a blot, a great disparagement to this throne, if it should not prove what himself styles it. His throne is a pledge that he is willing. You have a pledge no less considerable than the throne of God to assure you that you shall find him gracious; and to be gracious, is to be freely willing.

(3.) It is true, you may say, the Lord is gracious and merciful, and so he may be willing to help and pity others, and freely so; but how does it appear that he is willing to do it for me? Faith is here often at a stand.

Why, consider the Lord on the mercy-seat, and so on the throne of grace, is a God under promise, as I shewed before. And promises are for particular application; they speak the Lord willing to do this, and the other; and, in a word, whatever thou needest, whatsoever is good to thee; they offer all the great and precious things which are the contents of these great and precious promises to thee in particular.

To go no further, the words of the text, though propounded in form of an exhortation, yet they are indeed a promise virtually, and so to all effects and purposes, as many other expressions are in Scripture, so that a great part of Scripture are promises in effect, though not so taken notice of. This here may be resolved (as there is good ground to resolve it) into this form: Those that come to the throne of grace shall find mercy, &c. And then, you see, it is a most gracious promise; and to whom is it made? To the people of Christ that are in need; and so it belongs to thee if thou pertain to Christ, and art in need. If it be a time of need with thee, either as to inward or outward state, here is mercy and grace for thee in particular; thou hast a promise of it, which thou mayest apply particularly to thyself.

(4.) Oh, but though I may apply this or that promise, yet there are many promises that I think are not fit or proper, or intended for me. Many seem particular to some eminent saints, and divers of them were made upon special occasions, which restrains them from me; and, which concerns the matter before us, those in particular which were made to Moses and his successors, touching the Lord's meeting them, and communing with them from the mercy-seat. And this in the text, it is for those that can come with confidence and assurance.

In answer to this, consider: the Lord upon the mercy-seat, or the throne of grace, appears a God in covenant, as I shewed in the application. Now, all the promises are but several articles of that covenant. He that is in covenant with God is included in all the articles of it; every promise belongs to him, so far as his condition makes him capable, and requires it. The Lord upon the throne of grace is a God to us in Christ. Now, in Christ all the promises are yea and amen. He being the mediator of this covenant, and all the promises being ratified and confirmed by his blood, they are yea and amen in him; and that constantly; not *yea* to his people formerly and *noy* to his people now, but *yea* always. And they are all so in Christ, 2 Cor. i. 20, true and firm. The covenant is as a cluster of grapes, the several promises are as particular grapes in that cluster, Christ is as the branch or stalk that holds them all. He that lays hold on Christ hath the stalk in his hand, and so holds the whole cluster, and every particular grape. If Christ be thine, thou hast laid hold on the covenant; the whole cluster of promises is in thine hand.

The Lord here offers grace and mercy; he is upon the throne for this purpose. It is therefore called a throne of grace. Now, he who has grace and mercy offered has all the promises made over to him; for mercy and grace is the sum of them all; all that they contain or hold forth is mercy or grace.

And as for promises made upon special occasion, we find the Holy Ghost applying them to others afterward, upon occasions far differing from those upon which they were first made, *e. g.* that promise, Josh. i. 5, 'I will not fail thee nor forsake thee.' It was made to Joshua in particular, and upon a special occasion, when he was going to conquer Canaan, and to get possession of another land. And yet this the Holy Ghost applies to the faithful in common, and that as a motive to be contented with their present condition and enjoyments; an occasion very different, if not opposite, to that which was its first rise, Heb. xiii. 5.

If we be not in the same circumstances with Moses, when the Lord made those promises to him, there may be some circumstantial difference as to the performing of them to us, but the substance of them will be made good to his people in all ages. Though he will not speak to his servants now, and commune with them now in an audible voice, as he did with Moses from the mercy-seat, yet he will meet his people at the throne of grace, and admit them to communion with him, and give them divine answers in a way suitable to gospel times; and for this may these promises now be made use of.

(5.) Oh, but I fear I want the condition of the promise, and then what encouragement can there be for me to apply the promise for this? I intend no encouragement but for believers; for it is faith that the text leads me to encourage; and where there is faith, here is great encouragement, though there be great weaknesses and defects as to other qualifications. For when the high priest appeared before the Lord, presenting himself upon the mercy-seat, what was he required to bring into the most holy place? Why, only incense and the blood of sprinkling, Lev. xvi. 12-14. These signified the intercession and satisfaction of Christ. Now, these are already prepared to thy hand, and held forth to thee by the throne of grace; for by virtue hereof it is a throne of grace. If, therefore, faith lay hold on these, that will give thee access to the mercy-seat, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant; to the covenant of promise, and to all the promises of the covenant; and to him who is upon the throne of grace, as a God in covenant.

(6.) Oh, but if I have faith, it is very weak; so weak as I know not whether it be alive in me; I doubt whether it have a being there. And it is a strong faith that the text calls for, such as is strengthened into confidence, and rises up to assurance. Those that are to come are such as can come boldly.

The apostle does not say that none may come before this throne but those that can come with assurance and confidence. But the design of this expression is to shew that all the people of Christ, even the poorest weaklings, such whose faith is weakest, have encouragement to come boldly. Here is enough in this representation to strengthen the weak hands and the feeble knees, to put spirits and strength into a fainting, a languishing faith; enough to quash its fears, satisfy its doubts, scatter all jealousies, and support it in its tremblings. So that here is no reason at all to stay away, because you are weak; but the rather to come, that you may be strong in faith; for the throne of grace offers grace and mercy, is a ground of assured hope that you may obtain mercy, &c. Now, what is the property, the office of mercy, but to pity weaknesses and relieve them? And what does grace import, but that the Lord upon this throne will do it freely? If it were not so, grace were no grace; it would be a throne of something else, not of grace. Both grace and mercy are for help, says the text, and for help in time of need; and so they are most for those who are in most need. And those who are weakest are in most need; and therefore weaklings have as much encouragement as any to come boldly. Mercy and grace is as much designed

for thee as (if not more for thee than) any, and offered here to answer all thy needs, supply defects, strengthen thee in weaknesses, and out of weaknesses to make thee strong.

(7.) Oh but I have more to discourage me than mere weakness! I have sinned, I have disobliged the Lord who sits upon the throne, and have dealt too unfaithfully in the covenant.

I suppose thou dost not allow thyself in any evil way, in any known sin; thou bewailest thy proneness to sin; thou watchest and resistest, and strivest against it. If this be thy case, here wants not encouragement; sin in such circumstances does not disoblige the Lord, so as he will not remember his covenant. Remember what I said in the opening of the point in hand. The Lord is upon the mercy-seat; and consequently, as upon the throne of grace, is a God reconciled, a God pardoning sin, covering it out of his sight. Christ, the covering, the mercy-seat, is interposed betwixt him and the condemning, the accusing law, to hide sin and guilt from his eye. As he is upon the throne of grace, he 'sees no iniquity in Jacob,' &c; he will not take notice of it so as to be disobliged. The Lamb is said to be 'in the midst of the throne,' Rev. v. 6, and vii. 17. It is through him that it is a throne of grace, and it is that Lamb that takes away the sin; so that coming to the throne of grace, there you may see the Lamb in the midst of it, and so may conclude sin taken away. It is gone, it cannot disannul the covenant. You may see that in the throne of grace, which declares the Lord has taken a course to make the covenant everlasting; though it be made with sinners, the mediation and interposal of Christ, who is in the midst of the throne, will secure it.

(8.) But the Lord is long ere he perform his promise. I want help, and it comes not. I cry unto him for it, and he answers not. He delays; my soul fails in waiting for him.

*Ans.* There may be mistakes here. Either he performs his promise and answers your desires, and you observe it not, or else it is not best for you that he should do it yet. The throne of grace holds forth ground of assurance that you shall have help as soon as you can reasonably desire it (and what would you have more?). You cannot reasonably desire it but when it will be best for you; it will not be best for you but when it is seasonable, and when it is seasonable you are here assured of it. This is expressly in the text; coming to the throne you shall obtain mercy, and find grace for seasonable help, *ἕως ἔυκαιρον βοήθειαν*, for help when it is seasonable. It is not good till then, and so till then you cannot in reason desire it. As soon as the finding of it will be a mercy, as soon as the obtaining of it will be an act of grace (and before, it cannot be in season, it is not to be desired). 'He that shall come will come, and will not tarry;' he will not stay one jot longer. His posture upon the mercy-seat (to which the throne of grace answers) signifies all speed and celerity, when the wisdom of him who charges the angels with folly can see fit and good for you. He was upon the mercy-seat as his chariot; there he was presented as sitting between the cherubims. The word *Cherub* is most probably derived from *Rechab*, a chariot. That of the psalmist refers to this representation: Ps. lxxxvi. 17, 'The chariots of God are twenty thousand, thousands of angels multiplied.' The two cherubims upon the mercy-seat were an emblem of these two myriads. 'The Lord is among them; as in Sinai, so in the holy place.' These signified his special presence in both. Here he sets forth himself as on a throne, or in a chariot. It is called the 'chariot of the cherubims,' 1 Chron. xxviii. 18. The Lord will be as quick and speedy in bringing help to his people when it is good and seasonable and desirable, as if he

came in a chariot drawn with cherubims, Ps. xviii. 10 ; and this chariot is swifter than the wings of the wind. So he came for David's deliverance ; so he will come for yours when it is seasonable. You cannot desire it sooner, unless you would have it before it be good, before it is to be desired.

3. The last thing propounded is to shew what positive supports are hereby offered to our faith. Having set before you how our eyeing the Lord as on the mercy-seat, as on the throne of grace, serves to remove all discouragements that faith may meet with, I shall now let you see positively how the Lord, thus represented to us, affords all encouragement that is requisite to strengthen and support our faith in all addresses.

The Lord here shews himself both able and willing to be unto his people whatever they can desire, and to do for them whatever they need. And where the Lord declares himself both able and willing, there faith hath all the encouragement that it can possibly have to strengthen and embolden it. The Lord is not hindered or disabled by any of those defects which may disable others from helping us, for he appears here as always present, as unconceivably wise and infinitely powerful.

(1.) This may persuade us, assure us of his presence. I shewed you in the explication how the Lord in the mercy-seat, and consequently on the throne of grace, offers his presence to his people, and what a presence it is that is here exhibited in divers particulars. Let me but add one text wherein we have them all together, Ezek. xliii. 7.

[1.] Here is an intimate presence. He will be not near them or with them only, but in them, in the midst of them.

[2.] A special presence. He will be in them, not only as he is in the rest of the world, but in a more peculiar manner, with a gracious presence, such as the mercy-seat held forth there and the throne of grace now ; present in a way of mercy, in a gracious manner.

[3.] A glorious presence. He will be with them as on his throne, where he appears in his glory and majesty. See ver. 5.

[4.] An all-sufficient presence. To secure them from what they fear, and give what they desire. ' My holy name shall they no more defile.' His presence shall keep them from sinning against him ; and that which keeps us from sin secures us from all that is dreadful, for there is nothing dreadful but sin and the effects of it. There will be no more effects of sin when they no more defile his name ; and so far as they are kept from sin, so far the way is open for all good things, all we can desire, for it is sin only that stops the way and withholds good things from us.

[5.] A continuing presence. It is not, I will come to them, I will visit them, I will stay with them for a while, but ' I will dwell with them.' That denotes a settled, a constant abode. And ' dwell with them for ever.' Thus will the Lord be present with his people when the place of his throne is amongst them. Such a presence the throne of grace imports. It is true, the Lord's throne is said to be in heaven, because his glory in a peculiar manner appears there. But throne is a figurative expression, and denotes his reign or empire ; and so, wherever the Lord reigns and rules, there is his throne, Ps. ciii. 19, ' His kingdom ruleth over all.' He rules everywhere. His throne is where his kingdom is, and that is, as over all, so within his people : Luke xvii. 21, ' The kingdom of God is within you.' There is an intimate presence. And as his throne is everywhere, so it is everywhere a throne of grace to his people ; and so, wherever they are, they have his gracious presence. And though he appear most glorious in heaven, yet wherever he is, wherever his throne is, he is glorious ; so that, being in the midst of his people, he is the glory in the midst of them. It is a glorious presence.

And it will afford help in need ; all help that is needful, and that is as much as we need desire ; help in season, and that is as good as we can wish. So far it is an all-sufficient presence, and it will continue while his grace continues, and that is for ever. It will be a throne of grace while his grace and mercy endures, and this endures for ever.

So that upon the whole, there is not the least occasion of distrust or doubt that we shall suffer by reason of his distance from us, that he will fail us any moment by reason of his absence, since the throne of grace insures his presence with his people, and such a presence as is most desirable.

(2.) This may persuade us of his wisdom ; for from the mercy-seat did the Lord manifest his infinite wisdom by giving them a resolution of their greatest difficulties, such as were too hard for any created understanding. Here they asked counsel of the Lord, and he answered them according to the judgment of *Urim* : Num. xxvii. 21, ' Before the Lord,' *i. e.* with their faces towards him, as presenting himself on the mercy-seat ; for when they were to ask counsel, the priest, putting on the breast-plate of *Urim* and *Thummim*, set his face towards the mercy-seat, and the Lord from thence gave him answers, either by an audible voice or by secret inspiration, which answers when the priest had declared to the people, the stones and letters in the breast-plate shined (as is conceived) with some extraordinary lustre and brightness. and thereby the people had assurance that the answer was from the Lord. And the priest being herein a type of Christ, who carries his people in his heart before the Lord, as the priest did the names of the twelve tribes upon his breast. To the brightness shining in the breast-plate that expression of the apostle may have reference : 2 Cor. iv. 6, ' God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ.' However, in this representation of the Lord upon a throne of grace, the light of the glorious knowledge of God does appear shining in the face of Christ, with a brighter and more conspicuous lustre. Here we may see with open face, without any veil interposed, without any shadow of obscure types, that *πολυπεικιλδς σοφία*, as the apostle calls it, Eph. iii. 10, that admirable variety of infinitely wise contrivances and dispensations for the saving of Jew and gentile, the depths of which the angels cannot sound, though they do their endeavour, diving into it with earnest desire of fuller discoveries, and great admiration of what they see.

Here he shews men and angels that his wisdom has found out a way to reconcile justice and mercy, through the mediation and interposal of Christ, the Lamb that is in the midst of the throne. Here we have a view of that wisdom which could find out a way to shew mercy to sinners, when his justice had condemned them, and was obliged to do severe execution upon them. All the wisdom of men and angels could never have found out an expedient for this difficulty ; they had been to seek (as we had been lost) eternally, if anything but infinite wisdom had been put upon this discovery. And is he not able, in point of wisdom, to do anything, to do everything for us ; to find out ways and means to relieve us in any case or exigent whatsoever, whose wisdom could find out a way to do that which was too hard for the wisdom of angels to discern how it could be done ?

(3.) This may persuade us of his power. Faith may hence grow confident that he is not disabled, cannot fail his people, for want of power. For he appears on the throne as one that has all power, which I made clear to you before. Let me but add one expression, frequently used in Scripture, and very pregnant for this purpose. The Lord's appearing from the mercy-seat, for the help of his people, is expressed by shining : Ps. lxxx. 1, ' Thou that

dweldest on the mercy-seat, shine forth.' The greatest works that ever the Lord did for his people are thus set forth. It is deliverance from the captivity that they pray for here in these terms. And their deliverance out of Egypt is thus expressed: Dent. xxxiii. 2, 'The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran,' &c. And the same expression is used with respect (as is probably conceived) to the great work of redemption by Christ, Ps. 1. 2. The words in the original run thus: From Sion, from the perfection of beauty, the Lord will shine. As the Lord shined from the mercy-seat, which was seated in mount Sion, and where the Lord most perfectly manifested his beauty or glory, so in Sion the true light, the Messiah, appeared, and from thence diffused the true light of the gospel through the world. All the Lord's most signal works are thus set forth by shining. And the Lord upon the throne of grace is represented as shining; for there he appears in the greatness and exaltation of his grace and mercy; and the lustre of these appearing is his shining forth, his manifesting himself on the throne of grace, where the glory of his throne, the beams of his majesty, are mercy and grace; this is shining forth. And by this expression, faith may discover how able he is, who sits upon the throne, to do whatever we stand in need of. Hence it appears he can do all things for the help of his people, easily, instantly, irresistibly, and advantageously. He is able to do anything, everything, for our relief.

[1.] Easily. Without any toil or trouble. It costs him no more pains to do all you need or can desire, than it costs the sun to shine forth. He can supply all wants, resolve all doubts, subdue all corruptions, secure from all calamities, those which most threaten us, as easily as the sun can shine. He can as easily scatter all your doubts, fears, dangers, lusts, as the sun can scatter the thinnest cloud; it is no more to him than shining forth.

He can as easily do all you can think or desire, as you can turn an eye, or move a hand, or speak a word; for with as much ease does the sun dart forth his light and beams; and it is no more for the Lord to put forth his power, than to shine forth. If that which you desire would put the Lord to any pains, or toil, or trouble, you might doubt whether it would be done; but here is the encouragement of faith, the Lord can do all with the greatest ease; let him but shine forth, and it is done.

[2.] Instantly. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, as soon as the light diffuses itself through the air: Mat. xxiv. 27, 'As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of man be.' The lightning is so quick in its motion, that it is in the east and west at once, and in a moment. So quickly can the Lord do all you can desire; he can make the outgoings of his power like the goings forth of the light; let him but shine forth, and it is done. Those lusts that you have been wrestling and tugging with for many years, he can subdue in a moment. Those doubts, obscurities, perplexities that have puzzled you so long, and through which your understandings cannot make their way, he can clear up in a moment. Those clouds of antichristian darkness that are gathering thick about us, he can quickly scatter; let him but shine forth, and they will vanish. If what you need or desire would cost the Lord any expense, or time, or prove tedious to him, you might doubt whether it would be done; but he can do all with as quick a motion as that of the light, all in an instant.

[3.] Irresistibly. Nothing can stop him or give him any impediment. Men and devils can no more obstruct what his power is engaged in, than you can hinder the sun from rising with your hand, or stop it from going forth in its strength and lustre when it is risen. If the Lord could be hindered, faith might be at a stand. But here is the encouragement of faith, he can do

what you would have him, irresistibly, and break through all impediments, as the light passes through the clear air, without the least stop or stay.

[4.] Advantageously. Without any loss or prejudice to himself; nay, with advantage as to his own glory. The sun loses nothing by shining forth; nay, the more it shines, the more does it display its beauty and glory. The Lord loses nothing by employing his power for his people; nay, the more he puts it forth, the more glorious he appears. When the sun goes forth in its full strength, it goes forth in the brightness of its glory; so when the Lord puts forth the greatness of his power for his people, he shines forth in the brightness of his glory. If the Lord suffered any loss, or prejudice, or disadvantage, by doing for you what you stand in need of, you might doubt that it would not be done; but this is faith's encouragement, the Lord gains glory by employing his power for you; the more he doth, the more his glory shines forth. His appearing for you from between the cherubims is a shining forth.

So you see that faith may here discern that the Lord is able, and thus able, to do whatever you need or desire. And that is one of the two principal supports and encouragements that faith has in all its actings. Now if we may be assured that he is willing too, then faith has all the encouragement that we can wish. And herein, in the

Second place, we may be persuaded that he is willing likewise. When faith can have assurance that the Lord is not only able, but willing to help in time of need, to give all relief that is needful, then there is no place left for the least distrustful fears or doubts. Faith, by these two supports, may raise itself up to the height of confidence; and so may come boldly to the throne of grace, without any question or scruple, but that whatever is needful or desirable will be obtained, will be granted by him who sits upon the throne.

If the Lord be both able and willing to vouchsafe it, there is nothing imaginable can hinder it. Now the Lord, as offering himself to us on the throne of grace, appears willing; and faith has from hence sufficient ground to conclude he is so. I shall endeavour to discover this, both positively and comparatively. That this shews him positively willing, I have hinted something before; but now take it more fully and distinctly in these particulars.

1. He appears to be willing when he appears on the throne of grace. His manifesting himself there is a glorious appearance of his willingness. And will he appear to be what he is not? He is far from being like deceitful men; he will not delude us with vain shows, such as have no reality answering them. He would never seem willing, if he were not so indeed. All that the psalmist desired for the support of his faith was 'a token for good,' Ps. lxxxvi. 17. Here is a token for good; the throne of grace is a sign, a glorious signification, that he is willing to do us all the good, to give us all the help we stand in need of.

2. He bids us be confident when we come to the throne of grace; he would have us come boldly. Now he would not bid us do this if we had no ground for it; he would not encourage us unto a rash and groundless confidence. But we have no ground for it to come with boldness and confidence, if he be not willing to let us have what we come for. Would he bid us be confident of help from him, if he were not willing to let us have it? He will not so abuse poor creatures; he is infinitely further from it than the best of men. An honest, ingenuous man would never bid us be confident in him, come boldly to him, for that which he has no mind, no will to do, which he never means to do for us. And can we think the Lord would do it? He raises our confidence by offering himself on a throne of grace; and will he dash that which himself raises, and make that ashamed which himself encourageth? Will he bid us come boldly, and then send us away disap-

pointed? What would you think of a man like yourselves that should serve you so? Such unworthy thoughts you must have of him who sits on the throne, if this do not persuade you of his willingness. However men may serve us, those that trust in the Lord shall not be ashamed, never disappointed, Prov. x. 25. But they would be disappointed, and sent away with shame from the throne of grace, if they should not find the Lord willing to do that which he encourages them to trust him for.

3. His honour is engaged. It is the glory of his throne, that it is a throne of grace. It would not be a throne of grace, nor would he that sits on it be gracious, if he were not willing to do his people good, to help them when it is good, when needful. So that you have the throne of God, the glory of him who thus represents himself, engaged for his willingness. What greater engagement can you wish, or possibly have, than the throne of God? Can you have any security more considerable than heaven or earth? Can you have anything greater for your assurance herein than the throne of God, the glory of the Most High? This you have here in the text, and what need you more? What greater security can you have, since the Lord engages his own throne? If a man should engage his whole estate that he would be willing to help you, you would not doubt but he would be willing to do it. And will you doubt of the Lord's willingness when his throne is engaged for it?

4. He appears here as a God of mercy and grace, as I shewed you in the explication, and it is express in the text. And to be a God of grace and mercy, is to be a God willing to do good freely, willing to help in time of need. He is essentially merciful and gracious, and so essentially willing to do his people good. It is his nature, and here he displays it; it shines forth from the throne of grace. Now may faith say, Though I have deserved that the Lord should deny me, yet he cannot deny himself; though he has just reason to cast me off, yet he cannot lay aside his own nature and goodness; and that inclines him to be willing, freely willing.

5. He appears here in a willing posture. He is here upon the throne of grace, upon the mercy-seat: and why represented in such a posture, but to signify he is ready for acts of grace and mercy? We may now find grace, and obtain mercy. And what is mercy, but a willingness to pity and relieve? And what is grace, but a willingness to do it freely, a free willingness? That which is the *mercy-seat* in the Old Testament, is the *throne of grace* in the New Testament. And this throne is established for ever, he is willing, and freely willing for ever, to do his people good, to help and relieve in need. The golden sceptre will be always held forth, while the Lord is on this throne; and as the throne, so the sceptre is an everlasting sceptre. The Lord shews himself always willing that his people should have access to him; yet never willing that they should go out of his presence sad and dejected, as though they could not obtain mercy, &c. This throne is established in mercy, Isa. xvi. 5. That of Solomon may be applied to it, Prov. xx. 28, 'His throne is upholden by mercy.' The Lord would have no throne, no kingdom amongst his people, were it not upheld by mercy, were he not willing to pity and help. You may as well doubt whether the Lord will still have a mercy-seat, whether he will still have a throne or no; as doubt whether he be willing to help in time of need. You may as well say that now there is no mercy-seat, no throne of grace, *i. e.* that Christ is not in heaven, that you have no mediator there, that the Lamb is not in the midst of the throne; as that the Lord is unwilling to hear and help.

6. He here shews that he has given us Christ, and thereby assures us that he cannot be unwilling to give us anything. The Lord had not set forth himself to us on the throne of grace, but that he had set forth Christ

to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, Rom. iii. 25. We have now no *ἰλαστήριον*, no mercy-seat but Christ. That under the law was but a shadow of him. Christ was then hid in that shadow, but now set forth. Now not typified as to be given hereafter, but actually exhibited as given already. He has actually shed his blood for this purpose, that through his mediation the Lord might be propitious, merciful, willing to relieve us under all our guilt, and help in all our needs. It is through the Lamb in the midst of the throne, the Lamb slain, that the throne of God is to us a throne of grace. It is so through him who was slain, who was given for this end. Now he that was willing to give us Christ (as the throne of grace manifests he has already given him), assures us hereby, that he is freely willing to give all, Rom. viii. 32.

7. He appears here under obligations to be willing. The Lord on the throne of grace represents himself to us as a God under promise, a God in covenant, as I shewed in opening the point. Now what are the promises, but declarations what the Lord is willing to do for his people; gracious expressions of his willingness to do us all the good we need or can desire? Let me add, that the Hebrew doctors express a proselyte's or convert's entering into covenant with God, by being gathered under the wings of the divine presence. And the Lord's appearing on the mercy-seat, shadowed with the wings of the cherubims, they called peculiarly *שכינה*, the divine presence. To enter into covenant with God, is to be gathered under these wings. To which some conceive that expression of Christ has reference, Mat. xxiii. he would have 'gathered them under his wings,' *i.e.* he would have brought them into the new covenant. The Lord upon the mercy-seat, and so on the throne of grace, appears as a God in covenant. Now what are the contents of this covenant but sure mercies, Acts xiii. 34; mercies insured to believers through Christ; acts of grace and favour made sure by an everlasting covenant? The Lord hereby shews himself obliged to be everlastingly willing to help in time of need. He is as surely willing, as he is sure to be true and faithful, as he is sure to be like himself, as he is sure not to deal falsely in the covenant.

8. He appears here as having removed all impediments that might hinder him from being willing. For what can hinder, but either incensed justice, or the condemning law, or the provokings of sin? But the Lord, as offering himself on the throne of grace, shews that he has taken a course that none of these shall be any impediment to him.

Not incensed justice, for the Lord here shews himself upon the propitiatory. He is now propitious, as one reconciled, and that shews that wrath is appeased and justice satisfied.

Not the accusing law: for the mercy-seat is betwixt the Lord and the condemning law; the accusations of the law are all silenced through the mediation of Christ, the pleadings of the law will not be heard or admitted at this throne.

Not the provokings of sin: for here sin is covered. This is a throne for pardons and free forgivenesses.

So that nothing is left to hinder him from being willing. And if the Lord appears willing, bids us be confident of it, shews himself in a willing posture, and his promise, his honour, his throne, his Son, engage him, and there be nothing to hinder him, what remains, but that believers should be confident of his readiness, his willingness, to hear and help, to pity and relieve, and give them all their heart's desire? What remains, but to 'come boldly,' &c.

Thus it is manifest positively that the Lord is willing. Let me shew it comparatively also, but very briefly.

1. He shews himself more willing than he did of old under the law; yet then his people found him ready to help, relieve, supply. He shews it now more openly on the throne of grace; whereas in the mercy-seat it was but held forth obscurely, as in a shadow, a typical and mysterious representation: now there [is no veil interposed, now we may with open face behold the Lord's good-will towards men, shining in the face of Christ. This he shews continually on the throne of grace, to which all may have access every moment; whereas the people were admitted to the mercy-seat, only in the high priest, and that but once a year. The blood and incense, without which the mercy-seat was not to be approached, did but shadow forth the sufferings and intercession of Christ, and these are now not prefigured, but really exhibited. The throne of grace is now said to be the throne of God and of the Lamb; of the Lamb slain and already sacrificed, so he has made satisfaction; of the Lamb in the midst of the throne, there making intercession. So that, though he appeared willing before, yet now he manifests it in a way which gives much more assurance to faith; he shews it clearly, fully, effectually, continually.

2. He is more willing to help us, than we are to help one another, than those amongst us that are most so. The throne of grace shews us mercy and grace upon the throne; there this willingness appears in the highest exaltation and glory, and so sets forth the Lord to be as much more willing than we, to afford relief, as he is higher than we. As his other thoughts are not as ours, so his thoughts of grace and mercy, for the relief and supply of his people, and the ways wherein he is willing to help us, are far above ours, even as the heavens are high above the earth, Isa. lv. 9. Even as his highest throne is above his footstool, Heb. viii. 1. Who more willing to relieve a child in want or distress, than an affectionate father? yet that willingness comes short of his: Luke xi. 13, 'If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him,' so Mat. vii. 11. The gift of the Spirit is the sum of all good things; it comprises spiritual light, life, strength, treasures, comforts. And the Lord is much more willing to give all these, than any Father to supply his child.

3. He is more willing to send help, than we to have it. This is unquestionable in many cases, and those that are of most consequence to us, such as concern our souls. He that will do most for our relief, is most willing to help us; but hereby it appears that he has done more this way for us than we will do for ourselves. When we are loath to quit our own ease, to cross our own humours and inclinations, for the advantage and relief of our souls, he spared not his own Son for our sakes. It cost him more to relieve us in our lost condition, than ten thousand worlds are worth. At such a rate was he willing to appear for our help, when our state was otherwise helpless and desperate. This the throne of grace sets before us. There we may see Jesus, who by his blood has procured us access to it, and there sits on the right hand of the throne, making intercession for us. Which of us are willing to part with that for the interest of our own souls, which is as dear to us as the Son of God was to the eternal Father? His giving his Son for us is a clear demonstration he is more willing to help us than we ourselves.

Nay, further, we are not willing to have relief till he makes us so; and he that makes us so is more so himself. He encourages us, he invites us in the text, to come to the throne, that we may find grace to help. He uses means to make us willing. A plain evidence that he is more willing than we; more willing that we should have help, than we are to have it.

## OF CHRIST'S MAKING INTERCESSION.

*To make intercession.*—HEB. VII. 25.

THE offices of Christ, the great mediator betwixt God and man, are the foundation of our hopes, and the springs of our comfort and happiness, his priestly office particularly ; and of his priesthood there are two principal acts : his satisfaction, by dying for sinners, and his intercession at the right hand of God. Of the latter, I shall give you an account from the words read.

The apostle, observing that the believing Hebrews were in danger to fall from the profession of Christ, by being too passionately addicted unto the Levitical ordinances, to secure them, he, through this epistle, sets before them the glory of Christ, in his person and offices, and shews how infinitely he transcends all that they affected and admired in the Levitical administration.

In this chapter he proves the excellency of Christ's priesthood above the priesthood under the law, by many arguments. Only at present take notice of some from ver. 19. The law, and the priesthood under it, made nothing perfect, made no perfect satisfaction for sin, nor purchase of salvation ; but Christ, then hoped for, as better than those legal rites, being the end of and thing signified by them, being brought in, did, by virtue of his priesthood, make all perfect by perfect satisfaction and purchase. And by him we have nearer access to God than was held forth in the legal administration. None but the priests were then admitted into the holy place ; none but the high priest into the holy of holies, the place of God's special presence on the mercy-seat ; but now there is no veil betwixt us and the mercy-seat ; it was rent to make our way, and all believers may have always access unto the throne of grace, &c.

Ver. 20, 21. Christ's priesthood had a stronger confirmation. That under the law stood but by positive institution, the Lord leaving himself a liberty to change it when he pleased. But the priesthood of Christ is established by an oath, and rendered unchangeable for ever ; as unchangeable as God himself, who cannot repent, as inviolable as the oath of God.

Ver. 22. Christ is the surety of a better testament, of a covenant made up of better promises, Heb. viii. 6. The covenant of grace, in its administration under Christ, is more free, clear, full, extensive, and firm. Christ is surety of the covenant, *i. e.* he obliged himself to see the articles and contents of the covenant made good, removing what might hinder, and provid-

ing what might secure and promote the observance. In the same sense he is called, Heb. xii. 24, not a mediator of supplication only, as the woman of Tekoa, 2 Sam. xiv., but of satisfaction, as Paul, Philem. 18, 19. Such a mediator is a surety, binds himself to satisfy for another.

Ver. 23, 24. The priesthood was defective, and very imperfect. The priest, then, did need partners, one could not do all the work; and successors too, they could not live always. But Christ, our high priest, needs neither partner nor successor; he alone is sufficient for all the acts of his office; and he is so always, unchangeably; he lives ever. Hence he infers, ver. 25, *εις τὸ παντελές*.

1. Perfectly; to remove whatever is an impediment to their salvation, and vouchsafe whatever is requisite to make their happiness and salvation complete.

2. Eternally, ver. 9, 'Because he ever lives.' He is able, but is he willing? Yes, that is evident by his intercession. Therefore, those that turn from sin by repentance, and come unto God by faith in Christ, shall certainly be saved to the utmost.

*Obs.* Christ always makes intercession for his people.

For this intercession of Christ, there is all sorts of evidence in Scripture, by types, prophecies, and plain assertions.

That was typified under the law, by what the high priest is appointed to do on the day of expiation, Levit. xvi. 11-15. A bullock and a goat was appointed for sin-offerings; they were to be sacrificed, and their blood shed without, at the door of the tabernacle. Then Aaron was to take part of the blood, and carry it with incense into the most holy place within the veil, and there sprinkle it upon and before the mercy-seat. Now the slaying of these sacrifices, and offering them without, at a distance from the holy place, signified the death of Christ, wherein he offered himself to God a sacrifice on earth for the expiation of his people's sins; and the presenting of the blood of those sacrifices in the most holy place, signified the intercession of Christ in heaven; and so the apostle applies it, Heb. ix. 12, 23. He entered within the veil, *i. e.* into heaven; and there, by virtue of his own blood, appears, *i. e.* intercedes, for us.

It is foretold by the prophet, Isa. liii., where, having given an account of the sufferings and death of Christ (one main act of his priestly office, whereby he made satisfaction to justice), so plainly and punctually, that it may seem rather a relation of what was past, than a prophecy of what was to come; he concludes with the other part of that office, the intercession of Christ, ver. 12.

It is plainly asserted in the New Testament, Rom. viii. 34, Heb. ix. 24; how, and in what capacity he appears for us, the other apostle shews, 1 John ii. 1, 2. He appears as our advocate, to make our defence, to secure us in judgment, to plead for us; and his plea is grounded upon satisfaction, made by the sacrifice of himself for our expiation; *ἰλασμός ἐστιν ἡ θυσία ἱλαστική*, a propitiatory sacrifice. Having offered himself as such a sacrifice, sufficient to make atonement, he appears by its virtue to plead for, and obtain the effects of it; which are no less than perfect salvation, as the text comprises. For as he argues, Rom. v. 10, *πόλλω μάλλον*, much more shall we be saved, saved to the uttermost, by his life, *i. e.* by his living to make intercession.

It is a matter of great consequence, you see, though not much (that I can find) insisted on. Let me therefore endeavour to open it more fully and clearly, by giving you some account of the nature, efficacy, and continuance of this intercession.

1. For the nature of it. In general, it is Christ's appearance in heaven in behalf of his people; as having on earth satisfied for them, done and suffered all things which were requisite on his part to be there accomplished for their salvation, both for the removing of what might hinder it, and purchasing what might perfect it, and make it complete; or a presenting of himself, as having finished what was necessary on earth, for the saving of them to the utmost.

More particularly, it includes these severals;—

(1.) He appears in our nature, not only as God, but as man, 1 Tim. ii. 5. While he is mediator, he is man. Now his intercession is a principal act of his mediation. To intercede is to mediate. He did not cast off the human nature when he left the earth, but carried it into heaven, and there retains not only the soul, but the body of a man; the same body as to the substance, though freed from corruptible qualities, such as are inconsistent with his glorious condition in the heavens. The same body which suffered, which was buried, which rose again, the same ascended into heaven. The same body that did bleed and die, that suffered and was made a sacrifice, he presents in heaven. He appears with it, and thereby it is evident that he appears for us, as Heb. ix. 24. He appears as one concerned for us, as one [who] is bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh. As he assumed our nature, and took a human body for us, so he retains it in heaven, and appears there with it for us. The apostle does not say he entered into heaven, to appear there in glory and majesty, as if his appearance there had been for himself solely; but to appear in the presence of God for us. As he was born, and lived and died for us, so he ascended into heaven, and appears in our nature at the right hand of God for us. But how for us?

(2.) He appears as our advocate, to present us and our cause unto God. When Aaron was to enter the most holy place, to intercede for the people, he was to bear the names of the twelve tribes upon his breast and shoulders, Exod. xxviii. 12, 29. In that Aaron was to bear the names of the tribes, may be signified that he was not to enter into the place of intercession in his own name only, but in the names of all the people. So did Christ (typified by the high priest, and so often called) appear in heaven, the place of his intercession, not in his own name, but in the name and behalf of his people.

Aaron was to bear their names on his shoulder; to denote, as is conceived, that the high priest was to bear with their weaknesses and infirmities; and such an high priest is Christ represented, Heb. iv. 15.

Aaron was to bear the names of the tribes upon his breast, when he appeared for them in the holy place; to signify he was to have such care and love for them as though they were in his heart. According to what the apostle expresseth towards the Corinthians, 2 Cor. vii. 3, to be sure it is thus with Christ; he in appearing for his people as intercessor and advocate, does as it were bear them on his breast; presents them unto God as those that are in his heart, to die and to live for them. He died to make satisfaction, and lives to make intercession for them; he ever lives to appear as their advocate, 1 John ii. 1; he states their cause before God as it now stands, and represents it to him in the favourable and advantageous state and circumstances to which it is brought by his obedience and sufferings for them. And so stated it cannot miscarry, when they come to trial before God's tribunal; they need fear no charge that can be brought against them, no accusation of men or devils, they have such an advocate, as can answer, and nonplus, and silence all. Some resemblance of this you may see, Zech. iii. 1, 2; Joshua, a type of the church, is charged, accused by Satan;

Christ, called the Lord here, by his intercession with the Father, pleads that, instead of Joshua, his accuser may be rebuked and confounded, acquitting and justifying the accused. No charge will have better success, which is formed against those for whom Christ appears as advocate, Rom. viii. 34. No charge can be fixed on his chosen people, not only because Christ died and rose again, but because Christ appears at the right hand of God as their advocate, to plead, &c.

(3.) He presents his death as suffered in our stead, his blood as shed for us. The high priest (as was said) when he was to mediate for the people in the most holy place, was to bring the blood of the sacrifice and present it there; he was not to enter without it, there was no interceding but by virtue of it, Heb. ix. 7; so Christ by his own blood entered into heaven, ver. 12, thereby to make intercession for transgressors. Indeed, his intercession is but the continued virtue of his blood, and therefore is described by his presenting it, as the high priest did that of other sacrifices. Not that Christ in heaven presents his blood out of his veins, but his soul and body which was sacrificed; that body which was scourged, wounded, pierced through with nails, and made full of bloody furrows, remains in the presence and at the right hand of God, and will remain there for an eternal memorial of his sufferings. Not that the Lord needs any memorial, and wants any helps to continue things in remembrance, or less regards, or is less mindful of things long since past; for things past, how long since soever, are as full in his all-seeing eye as if they were present; and so are things future too, at what distance soever. Hence Christ is said to be the lamb sacrificed, &c., Rom. xiii. 8. That sacrifice of Christ was present to him, so as to procure all the advantages of it for believers under the Old Testament, many ages before it was actually offered; and so it is as present to him still, though it be many hundred years since it was offered.

But such expressions, when we say Christ presents his blood, they help our weaknesses; and signify to us that the death and sufferings of Christ have the same influence with God now, as if he were still suffering, as if he were but just now crucified. That the virtue of his blood is still as fresh and efficacious as if it were but just now shed; as if the wounds were still open, and the blood now streaming out in the presence and at the right hand of God. This blood, thus presented, is said to 'speak better things than the blood of Abel,' Heb. xii. 24, Gen. iv. 10; it cries for mercy as much as the blood of Abel cried for vengeance; it pleads powerfully, and has as much the virtue of interceding as if it had an articulate voice.

(4.) He presents his will and desire that his people may have all the purchase of his blood. The will of the divine nature as he is God, the desires of his human nature as he is man. Thus he is said to intercede for us, in that the Father understands that it is his will and desire, as he is God and man, that his people may be possessed of all the effects, and receive all the advantage of his obedience and sufferings for them; so that his intercession is in effect his praying for us in heaven. His intercession is by some called a prayer, and so it is rightly understood, as it imports his will and desire to the Father for us. His prayer on earth is expressed in this form, John xvii. 24; and his desires in heaven are called prayer, John xvi. 26, 'at that day,' after he had left the world and was ascended into heaven, 'I say not that I will pray,' I need not tell you that; this you may take for granted, you may be sure I will do it, some understand it. More plainly, John xiv. 16, when I am departed from earth, and am set at the right hand of God, I will be mindful of you, I will pray for you; so that in some sense Christ prays now that he is in heaven, and his interceding is praying for

us. To clear this, it differs in some circumstances, both from our prayers, and from his own prayers on earth.

[1.] He does not desire undeserved favours as we do ; so it differs from our prayers. The best of men that make any address to God, are unworthy of the mercies they pray for. But Christ wills nothing for us but what he merited ; he desires to obtain nothing on our behalf but what he has deserved for us. Rev. v. 9, 12, ' Worthy is the Lamb that was slain,' how unworthy soever they are for whom he was sacrificed ; he has redeemed us, laid down a price of more equal value with what he asks for us.

[2.] He does not present any petitions in the posture of a humble, dejected supplicant ; he does not fall on his knees, or lie prostrate to beg anything for us ; this is not agreeable to him as he is God, nor to his present glorious state as he is man. As God, he is equal with the Father, counts it no robbery ; as man, he sits at the right hand of God, Heb. i. 3, and viii. 1 ; he is exalted to all glory, power, and majesty, next to the Father : ' Far above,' &c. Eph. i. 20, 21.

[3.] Nor does he present any requests with cries and tears, or such expressions of passionate fervour ; and so his intercession differs from his own prayers on earth, Heb. v. 7. Then he did as a man of sorrows, acting suitably to his condition then in the flesh, which was a state of humiliation, but is not congruous to his present state, when he is crowned with divine glory, Heb. ii. 9.

[4.] Nor does he desire anything for us by virtue of what he undertook, but has not yet performed, as he did in that divine and admirable prayer, John xvii. For whatever was requisite to make way for the fulfilling of his desires in behalf of his people is already fully accomplished, John xix. 30. His intercession there was by virtue of the sacrifice he was to offer ; his intercession now is on account of the sacrifice already offered.

These are some accidental differences betwixt the intercession of Christ and other prayers, whether his own or ours. But then I conceive, with submission, that his intercession is a prayer.

[1.] Essentially. Though it differ from other prayers in some circumstances, yet it has the essence of a prayer, and is so truly and really. For prayer, when it is designed by what is essential to it, is a presenting of our desires unto God, Philem. 4 ; and if we add, in the name of Christ, that will make no difference here. Christ, as our intercessor, presents his desires for his people unto the Father in his own name. It is his earnest desire that his people may reap all the fruits of his purchase ; he desires it for his own sake, who died for this end, and made the purchase for this purpose, that they might inherit.

[2.] It is prayer virtually. The presenting of his blood has the virtue and force of a prayer, Heb. xii. 24. The blood of Christ, called the blood of sprinkling, in reference to the blood of the sacrifices, which were to be sprinkled on, and before the mercy-seat, and by virtue of which the high priest did intercede for the people ; it speaks, it cries ; there is something in it equivalent to the voice of an importunate supplicant. It speaks for excellent things, *χρηστόν*, for grace, reconciliation with God, and all the comfortable effects and consequents thereto ; it is a voice most powerful and prevalent, though it be not articulate. There needed no other plea, no other advocate for Abel against Cain, but the cry of his brother's blood ; the Lord heard it immediately, and answered it with a curse, Gen. iv. 10, 11. There needs no other plea for us with the Father than the cry of Christ's blood ; that prevails instantly, infallibly, for the blessings, Eph. i. 3 ; it has the virtue of a most effectual prayer.

[3.] It is transcendently a prayer. It is of greater force and prevalency with God than all the prayers of all creatures together, even of those which have most power with God. If all the glorious angels, and all the saints in heaven and on earth, should prostrate themselves before God, and come together to prefer one petition to him with all fervour and importunity, you would think that a powerful prayer indeed, of great virtue and prevalency. But the intercession of Christ, as it is a representation of the will and desires of Christ, is of more force and power to prevail, of more infinitely; for it is a presenting of the will of God for us, and of the desires of him who is God-man, and so more considerable than the united requests of men and angels all together. If we should have seen Christ on earth praying with strong cries and tears, we would not have questioned but he would have been heard. His intercession now is fully as prevalent with God as such a prayer of Christ would have been; nay, he presents his will and desires now with more advantage; for, being as our intercessor at the right hand of God, his power and interest is in the highest and most glorious exaltation. Thus much for the notion of Christ's intercession, what it imports, and wherein it consists.

2. For the efficacy of it, it may partly be understood by what is said. Let me add some particulars.

(1.) The intercession of Christ is grounded upon merit, and therefore must prevail in point of justice. Christ's obedience unto death was meritorious, and did deserve for his people that which, as intercessor on their behalf, he pleads for. There are three ingredients of strict and proper merit which concur in the obedience and sufferings of Christ. That which any will merit by, 1, must be his own; 2, and that which he owes not; 3, there must be a proportion betwixt it and that which he would deserve by it. Now, as to the first, the soul and body of Christ, which he offered for us, was his own, John x. 18; and the obedience he performed for us was done by his own strength, the divine nature empowering the human, both doing and suffering; whereas otherwise his sufferings would have been unsupportable to any mere man.

As to the second, that which he performed and suffered was what he owed not, not due from him. He was not obliged to it by his own voluntary undertaking and submission, being not only man, but God in one person.

As to the third, his obedience and sufferings were of equal worth with the recompence which he pleads for in behalf of his people. He thereby fully satisfied the demands both of law and justice; and though it was the life and pardon of a world of condemned persons that he pleads for, yet his obedience and blood is of more worth than all this; for these are of infinite value, being the obedience and blood of God himself, Acts xx.

So that Christ's obedience, active and passive, is meritorious, not only *ratione pacti*, by reason of the agreement betwixt the Father and him, he having performed all the conditions required in order to our redemption, but *ratione pretii*, by virtue of the intrinsic value of what he payed and performed.

Now, to use the apostle's expression, Rom. iv. 4, 'To him that thus worketh, the reward is reckoned not of grace, but of debt;' it is grace to us, but it is debt to Christ. And so the plea on our behalf in his intercession, being for a just debt, it cannot but be most effectual with a righteous God.

(2.) The efficacy of it appears in the acceptableness of all included in Christ's intercession unto God the Father, and his readiness to comply with the motions which it imports. Christ appears in our nature; now, that is the nature, the body which the Father prepared for him, Heb. x. 5, prepared

for Christ, that he might become a sacrifice ; such a sacrifice whereby justice was fully satisfied, mercy made wonderfully conspicuous, wisdom, power, goodness, truth, righteousness, and in a manner all divine perfections transcendently glorified, and thereby this nature eternally endeared unto God, and so exalted at his right hand as an everlasting monument thereof. Though it be man's nature, yet it is now (as the Lord says in effect) a part of my beloved Son, his nature too, in whom I am well pleased.

He appears as our advocate, and he pleads nothing but what is the will of God, Heb. x. 7-9. His will was that Christ should be a sacrifice ; and it is upon the perfect fulfilling of his Father's will that his plea proceeds ; that is the ground of it, therefore it must prevail. If it should not be effectual, the will of God would be ineffectual ; if it should meet with a repulse, the Lord would cross his own will. It is God that justifies, so as none shall condemn. How so ? It is Christ that makes intercession.

He presents his blood, his interceding is a commemoration of his sacrifice ; and this is the savour of a sweet smell to God, Eph. v. 2 ; he is infinitely pleased with it.

He presents his will and desires for saving of his people to the utmost ; and his will is his Father's will ; his desires always fulfilled, his requests ever heard and answered, Mat. xvii. 5. He would have him heard of all, he himself will certainly hear him, he is his beloved Son. Christ expresses his assurance of it, John xi. 42, xii. 48. He can ask nothing so great but the Father will give it, Ps. ii. 8. The Father says of Christ, ver. 7, 'Thou art my Son,' &c. It is spoken in reference to his resurrection from the dead (which was an evidence that he was not a mere man, but the eternal Son of God), and upon his resurrection followed his intercession ; in reference to which the Lord says to him, Ask of me, and I will give thee a spiritual kingdom over all my people through the whole world, a power to rule and save them. This is the greatest thing that Christ does ask, the sum of all he intercedes for. When Esther appeared before king Ahasuerus to intercede for her people condemned to destruction, he gives her this assurance, Esth. v. 3, hereby signifying that she could ask nothing so great but he would grant. Christ had this assurance of the Father before he became our advocate and intercessor actually, that there is nothing so great that he could ask but the Father would grant it. Such is the efficacy of his intercession.

(3.) By virtue of his intercession, all that he purchased by his obedience and sufferings is actually conferred. Pardon and salvation are sometimes ascribed to the death of Christ, sometimes to his life ; for he made the purchase by his obedience unto death. But we have the possession by virtue of his life in heaven, by his living there to make intercession for us. He merited salvation, and all that tends to save us to the utmost, by what he performed and suffered for us on earth. But all is actually conferred on us by virtue of his appearance for us at the right hand of God.

This we may understand by what he tells his disciples he would do in heaven, what he will intercede for, John xiv. 16, 17. The Lord was willing that his people should be saved to the utmost ; but then their salvation must be accomplished in a way that would glorify him, and on such terms as would be for his honour. Those terms are declared in the gospel ; those that will be saved must be both justified and sanctified : justified, since none can be saved unless the sentence of condemnation passed upon all sinners be reversed ; sanctified, because without holiness no man can see God. That they may be justified, they must have faith ; that they may be sanctified, they must have holiness. Both these Christ purchased by his blood, but he works them by his Spirit ; and that the Spirit may be given for this

purpose, he prays, he intercedes. For the word rendered Comforter is of large import, and denotes not only the act of comforting, but in a manner all the offices and operations of the Holy Ghost in reference to his people; and speaks him not only a Spirit of comfort, but of truth, and faith, and holiness. Thus Christ by his Spirit puts his people into a capacity of salvation, and all that salvation to the uttermost comprises. And this is done by virtue of his intercession. That which Christ purchased by his death is not actually bestowed but through his intercession. His people would not be capable thereof, but that the Spirit works them to it. The Spirit would not be sent for this purpose, but that Christ intercedes for it, John xvi. 7; not come, because his coming was to be the issue of Christ's intercession; therefore said to be sent in Christ's name: John xiv. 26, 'In my name,' *i. e.* for my sake, interceding to that purpose.

(4.) Christ's intercession was effectual before he was actually an intercessor. By virtue of this, all believers from the beginning of the world were pardoned and saved. The efficacy of his intercession is as extensive as the virtue of his death, upon which it is grounded. By virtue of his death, believers were freed from guilt in the Old Testament, before he actually suffered, Heb. ix. 15. His death was effectual to expiate the transgressions under the first testament, though it was then future; and so his future intercession was effectual to give them possession of the promised inheritance. Even as a debtor is discharged, when the surety gives sufficient security that the debt shall be paid, though he pay it not presently, 2 Tim. i. 9. Christ engaged himself, gave a sufficient security that he would offer himself a sacrifice in due time, and would present that sacrifice at God's right hand for all believers from the foundation of the world; and upon that account they were pardoned and saved, though they died many ages before he actually suffered or interceded in our nature, Rom. iii. 25. He was set forth as a propitiation, that which rendered God propitious, through his blood, for the forgiveness of transgressions before. The mercy-seat (which the word signifies) shewed that the Lord was reconciled, through the blood there sprinkled, which signified the blood of Christ presented in his intercession. By virtue of this transgressions were pardoned, and a way opened into heaven for those who believed in the Messias to come; though he came not, though he died not, though he interceded not, as now, till long after. In respect of the eternal purpose of God, and the undertaking of Christ, correspondent thereto, it was as sure to be, as though it had been already accomplished. And so it was as effectual before, as if it had been actually in being, 2 Tim. i. 9. That which is sure to be done, is said to be done already. He was 'the Lamb slain,' *i. e.* sacrificed, 'from the beginning of the world,' Rev. xiii. 8. The virtue of his sacrifice to be offered, and so of his sacrifice to be presented, was vigorous and efficacious in all ages, from the foundation of the world.

3. As to the continuance of this intercession, it is perpetual. The text is express for this, 'He ever lives,' &c. He intercedes while he lives, and he ever lives; he intercedes always: 1, without intermission; 2, without end. It is represented as the end why he lives, and the end of his life he pursues every moment. The high priest did but solemnly intercede for the people once in [a year]; but Christ appears for his people continually. There is not a moment wherein this act of his priesthood is intermitted. He is always at the right hand of God in our nature; he is always ready to justify our cause against all gainsayers, making a legal appearance for that purpose. He is always presenting his blood; his sacrifice is no moment out of the sight and presence of the divine majesty. He is always representing his will and

desires, that those who come to God by him may be saved to the utmost. His requests are not made known now and then, as ours are to him, but without ceasing; this he does every moment. And,

(2.) Thus he will be doing for ever. His oblation was but one act, his sacrifice was finished at once; but his intercession, the other act of his priesthood, is everlasting; it continues while he lives, who ever lives, Rev. i. 18, Rom. vi. 9, 10. He died once to expiate sin; and he did it perfectly, there was no need to repeat it, Heb. x. 14; but there was need to present this sacrifice to God, and to apply the virtue of it to us. And for this he lives unto God, with God, at his right hand, for ever.

Upon this account, the priesthood of Christ is preferred before the Levitical, Heb. vii. 15, 16. He was not made priest by a law that provides for mortality, and appoints priests in succession; but by the power which raised him to an endless life, and so made him priest for ever. So he is said to be a priest after the order of Melchisedek, of whose beginning and end we have no account; on purpose to signify that Christ's priesthood should have no end. And this the Lord, who cannot repent, confirmed by an oath, Heb. vii. 21, 28.

Now, it is upon the account of his intercession that the priesthood is everlasting; for his oblation is past, and he offered himself once for all, Heb. ix. 25. So that, if he do not intercede for ever, he will not be a priest for ever; unless he can be so, without any act of the priestly office.

*Obj.* But it may be said, the kingdom of Christ shall cease, and therefore his priesthood and intercession may cease; for one office of Christ is not of longer continuance than another. And that there shall be an end of his kingdom, the apostle seems to declare, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

*Ans.* The spiritual kingdom of Christ here on earth will cease at the end of the world, for there will be none left for the exercise of his government here. There will be no sinners to conquer, no subjects on earth to rule, no enemies to subdue. But his glorious kingdom in heaven shall not cease; he will have the same regal majesty, glory, and power, at the right hand of God, and may exercise his kingly power, though in a different manner, viz., in keeping those enemies under, whom he had before subdued; and in confirming and establishing his heavenly subjects in their glorious condition, Rev. xi. 15, Luke i. 32.

Accordingly, as to his intercession, there will be some difference therein, at the end of the world, from what there was before; but no total cessation of it. The state of his intercession will be somewhat different from what it is now, because the state of his people will not then be the same, nor will there be the same occasions or necessities. He will not intercede for those that shall believe hereafter, because all will then be gathered and brought to the obedience of faith; nor for pardon of sin, or power against it, because there will be no sin to be pardoned or mortified; nor for increase of holiness, because all his people will be then come to their full growth, to the fulness of the measure of the stature of Christ; nor for the acceptance of imperfect services, because then there will be no imperfection; nor for glory to come, because then it will be present.

Yet his intercession will not cease, there will be occasion and necessity for it in other respects. The virtue of it will be needful for the continuance in their state of perfection and happiness, that so hereby he may be the author of eternal salvation to them. For this he will still appear in our nature at the right hand of God, and appear as our advocate, and present his blood, that, by virtue thereof, they may have eternal redemption; for this he will still present his will and desires, and so will intercede for ever.

*Use 1.* This leads us to admire the loving-kindness of Christ to lost sinners, in that he lives ever to make intercession for them. His affection to his people, his condescension for them, appears herein every way admirable and astonishing. There are four severals held forth in the text, which may render this for ever wonderful in our eyes.

1. That this should be one end of his life. That he should live for us; live, to make intercession for us; live, that this should be an end and design of his life, to free us from misery, to promote our happiness and secure it; that the Son of God, infinitely happy and glorious without us, should make the concerns of men, inconceivably below him, the design of his life; and declare that he lives for this reason, and will live upon this account, to appear on their behalf. If any one, especially a person far above us, should assure us that he makes it one end of his life, and will design it while he lives, to mind our concerns, to promote all that may be for our advantage and happiness, and to appear for this on all occasions; what greater expression of love could be expected? If one far above you, and who had no dependence on you, should declare this, it would seem just cause of wonder. How much more admirable is it, that the Son of God should give us this assurance; that though we are but as worms and grasshoppers in his sight, yet it shall be one end of his life to do us good, and he will employ himself while he lives to promote our interest, and make us happy!

It was a wonderful favour to man that this lower world should be ordered for his good; that all creatures in heaven and earth should be for his use and advantage, Ps. viii. 3, 6, 7, 8. The consideration of this made David cry out with admiration, ver. 4. How much more wonderful is it, that the great and supreme Lord of heaven and earth should declare that he lives for man; that he lives for this end, to appear for our interest and concerns, that it should be any end of his life to intercede for us!

2. That he should live again for us; live more than once, more than one life for us. He had already lived one life for us, and had already lost one life for us; and when a new life was restored to him, he would live that life or us too. As though he had not thought it enough to live one life for us on earth, he lives another for us in heaven. He counts not two lives too much for us. Oh what manner of love was this! The whole world cannot shew anything like; amongst all the children of men, no instance of love can come near it.

For a man to live a whole life for his dearest friend, to make it the business of his life sincerely to promote his true interest, would be an instance of rare love. But to die afterwards to save his life is rarer yet, and would be more wonderful. But if any one could be found that would die for his friend, yet being once dead, there is an end of his love and the expressions of it.

Oh, but Christ after he had lived one life for us; a life of so many years, a life of sorrows and sufferings; and after he had died for us such a death as no man could endure, considering the unsupportable pains and sorrows of it; yet his love survives his death, and being raised to another life, he lives that for us also, he orders that to be a continued expression of his tender care and love for his people. After he had lived for us in this world, and died for us too; he still lives in heaven to intercede for us.

3. That he lives in our nature, and appears for us, not only as God, but as man, as one of us, as nearly allied to us; as our kinsman, Job xix. 25, *ὁ ἀγγιστεὺς μοῦ*, my nearest kinsman; our brother, so called on this account, Heb. ii. 11, 12. It was a wonderful condescension, that he would take our nature, and unite it with the nature of God in one person; for

what is man to him but a worm? It is more worthy of admiration than if the greatest monarch should take upon him the form, and live in the likeness of a worm. This was greater love and honour than he would shew the angels, Heb. ii. 16. He chose rather to be lower than the angels; for so in respect of our nature he is said to be, ver. 9. The great God of angels, upon the account of our nature, being made man, was made lower than the angels, though they be but his mere servitors.

How wonderful is it, that at his exaltation he did not cast off this rag, wherewith he was covered in his low condition; that he would retain that nature of ours, in which he had been so much humbled and debased, even to the form of a servant! Was it not enough that he lived in it, and died in it for us on earth; but will he still live in it for us in heaven; live again in our nature, have it seated at the right hand of God; and when he is in the height of his glory, then appear in our nature, as one most nearly concerned for us?

4. That he lives thus evermore, Rev. i. 18. And for what end he evermore lives, he expresses here by the apostle. This second life he lives for us is not like the first, a life of some certain years, but an endless life. He lives not for us a life of some hundreds, or some thousands, or some millions of years, but beyond all account of years, even for ever and ever. It is an everlasting life that he lives for us; it is one end and design of his life, while it lasts, to appear for us, and it lasts eternally. He ever lives in our nature; he is never weary, never ashamed of it, how mean and vile soever it be, as it is ours. He cast not off a human body, no, not when he had finished the work for which it was prepared, when he had offered himself a sacrifice; but presents the sacrifice, *i. e.*, the soul and body that was sacrificed, for ever before God. It is placed at God's right hand, for an everlasting memorial and representation of his bloody death and sacrifice. The blood is not sprinkled once on the mercy-seat, or seven times before it, as under the law; but that sprinkling which it signified is continued for ever; the blood of sprinkling, wherewith our high priest entered into the holy place, remains there eternally.

He appears as our advocate, not only in two or three trials, or in this and that special cause; but in all trials, in all causes wherein we may be concerned, to eternity. He ever appears. He is always ready to quit us, as to every charge; to clear us as to all accusations for ever, which law or justice, which men or devils, may form against us.

In his appearance and plea for us there lies an eternal challenge against all adversaries whatever. 'Who can lay anything to the charge?' &c., Rom. viii. 34.

He prefers not a petition for his people now and then only; he prays not for them in this or that season, as he did in the days of his flesh; but he ever intercedes. His intercession has the virtue of a continued, of an everlasting prayer. It is no less in effect, than if he were praying for them without ceasing, and that for ever. He continually, he eternally, presents his will and desires, that they may be saved to the uttermost. He is ever doing all this, he ever lives to do it; there is no end of his love, no end of these expressions of it. There should be no end of our praises, no end of our admiration, no end of our affectionate resentments of his endless love, in his everlasting intercession.

Use 2. This teaches us to live for Christ. This highly, strongly engages us to it. Shall he live for us again and again, and live eternally for us; and will not we live once, live a little while for him? The love of Christ in living ever for us should constrain us to live our whole life for him. But

how? Why, after his example and method he shews us. His living for us in the text succeeded his dying for us; he was made a sacrifice before he lived to intercede for us. There is something we must die to, before we can live for him. We must sacrifice our worldly, carnal, and selfish interest; carnal and earthly designs, and affections, and inclinations, and actings, must be crucified. We must carefully observe and take notice how far they are alive, by their motions and actings, within and without. We must be sensible how pernicious their liveliness is, how dangerous, both in reference to Christ and our souls, making account they are deadly enemies both to him and us.

And then proceed against them accordingly. Make it the design and business of our lives to get them put to death. Further than we are dead to these, we cannot live for Christ; these must first be made a sacrifice.

And then positively, to live for him is to make it the chief end and constant design of our lives, to please him and be serviceable to him; to conform in all to his will, and employ all for his honour and interest. To aim at him in all, even in our earthly business; to consecrate all we are and have unto him; to lay out our time, strength, parts, enjoyment for him, and not for ourselves; not for the pleasing, advancing or securing ourselves, but in such ways as he has declared to be honourable and well-pleasing to him: this is to live for Christ; this is it which his living ever for us obliges us to. And none can be assured that Christ ever lives for them, but those who sincerely endeavour thus to live for him.

This is it which the apostle calls importunately for, Rom. xii. 1, 2.

*Mercies.* All whose mercies do most eminently appear in the death and intercession of Christ, his giving him to die and live for us.

*Your bodies, i. e. yourselves.* Your whole persons, in the whole course of your lives.

*A living sacrifice.* We are not to die for sin, Christ only died for the expiation of it. All that is to die in this sacrifice is our carnal and worldly lusts; the rest must live to God.

*Holy.* So it will be, when we consecrate all entirely unto God.

*Acceptable.* This will be more pleasing to him than any legal sacrifices or burnt offerings.

*Reasonable service.* The spiritual service which the word calls for, and calls for upon the highest and strongest reason. How this may be done, he explains, ver. 2, 'Be not conformed to,' imitate not the men of the world who live for themselves; but let your life be conformed to the good, &c., will of God. That is the way to live for God, therein it consists. To be living sacrifices, is to live for God. This is reasonable service, upon account of Christ's living for us. And the apostle would have them argue themselves into it by this reason, because Christ died and lives for us, Rom. vi. 9-11. He died for sin to expiate it, and now lives with God to intercede for you. Therefore λογίζεσθε, count it reasonable, make account there is all reason you should die to sin and live for God. There is the strongest, the most cogent reason from Christ's living for you, that you should live for him.

1. Christ is infinitely above us. It is a wonderful condescension that he will live a moment for us; he humbled himself that he might do it. But it is our greatest honour and advancement to live for him, we cannot live in a more noble and honourable capacity. It is the honour of the glorious angels to live for him; and if we live not thus, we live like slaves. The greatest persons on earth, who live for themselves, are no better; slaves to the world, slaves to Satan, the worst tyrant in the world; slaves to sin, which is worse than the devil, ver. 16; a life, a service, that you may be ashamed

of, ver. 20, 21. It is a life of glory to live for Christ. The more perfectly we do it, the more gloriously we live. This is the difference betwixt earth and heaven : here we live for Christ imperfectly, there we shall live perfectly for him ; that is our shame and disgrace, this will be our complete glory.

2. He does this freely. We never in the least obliged him to it ; there was no engagement on him to live for us, but from his own free grace, and the good pleasure of his will. But there are infinite engagements on us to live for him. The mercies of God, which herein appear most conspicuously, engage us to it. The whole life of Christ eternally obliges us, for he lives eternally for us. His life in heaven, his death on earth, his life before that death, all were for us, all engage us to live for him. He calls not on us to live for him, till he has declared that he is living for us, and will do so for ever. He requires it not, till he have obliged us to the uttermost. It is a free favour in him, it is an absolute debt as to us. His love has so bound us, that heaven and earth may cry shame of us if we pay it not.

3. He had no need of us. He was infinitely happy and glorious without us, and might have been so eternally, if he had neither died nor lived for us. What advantage has he by us ? What could he expect from such impotent, inconsiderable creatures as we are, Job xxii. 23, and xxxv. 7, 8 ; Ps. xvi. 2. The Seventy *τῶν ἀγαθῶν μὴ οὐ χρείαν ἔχεις*. 'Thou hast no need of my good things,' but we have infinite need of, and advantage by him, and so are infinitely concerned to live for him. It is our true, our main interest to live for him, and not for ourselves ; indeed, we cannot live so advantageously for ourselves any way, as by living wholly for him, for thereby we shall gain all that comfort, treasure, and happiness which he died to purchase, and which he ever lives to intercede for.

*Use 3.* Here is great encouragement to faith and hope. Firm ground to believe and expect salvation to the uttermost, for those that come unto God by Christ, *i. e.* to those that repent and believe ; those that abandon sin in heart and life, *i. e.* in sincerity, resolution, and endeavour, and fly unto Christ for refuge, betaking themselves to him, to be ruled and saved by him. Such may have strong consolation from the intercession of Christ, Heb. vi. 18-20. Hope is an anchor fastening upon Christ within the veil, *i. e.* as interceding for us. That is it which is done within the veil ; that is the only act of his priesthood in heaven, and upon that account he is high priest for ever. That which the high priest under the law did within the veil, was interceding. Christ's intercession makes it sure and steadfast ; no waves or storms, from the justice of God, or the malice of Satan, or the weakness of such as cast anchor here, need make them lose anchor's hold, they may ride out all tempests, and be safe for ever, upon the account of Christ's living ever to make intercession.

Christ's intercession gives firm and assured hope of complete salvation ; by virtue of this, whatever is a hindrance to it will be removed, whatever is requisite to begin, carry on, and finish it, will be obtained.

This gives assurance, that all the riches of Christ's purchase shall be actually bestowed upon those that come, &c., for his intercession is the continued representation of his death and sacrifice, for this purpose, that the ends thereof may be accomplished, *i. e.* that believers may be possessed of all the fruits of his obedience and sufferings.

This assures us of all the blessed and comfortable operations and workings of the Spirit in us and for us ; for Christ intercedes, that the Spirit may be sent to supply his absence on earth, and to perform all those acts and offices for us, which are promised, and his titles import ; to be an advocate,

an intercessor in us, a comforter, an enlightening, convincing, persuading, sanctifying, and sealing Spirit.

This gives assurance, that all the great and precious promises, all the articles of the covenant of grace, shall be performed to a tittle. The sum of all we have, Heb. viii. 10-12, all will be performed, because, ver. 6. Christ is mediator, he undertook for the performance, became surety for it, and so appears, ver. 1.

Let me more particularly specify some of those great and comfortable advantages, which flow from the intercession of Christ; in expectation of which it affords great encouragement to our faith and hope.

1. Pardon of sin, Zech. xiii. 1. This fountain was opened in the death of Christ (it denotes the virtue of his blood shed for remission of sins); but it is kept open, and flows out continually, by virtue of his intercession. In reference to that, it is called the blood of sprinkling, the blood of the sacrifice being to be sprinkled upon, and before the mercy-seat by the high priest, when he was to intercede for the people, Heb. xii. 24. The virtue and effect whereof, is to sprinkle his people from an evil conscience, Heb. x. 22, *i. e.* to cleanse the conscience from guilt.

It is not enough to do this once, when we first believe and return to God. For sin being too often repeated, and guilt renewed, the sprinkling must be renewed, there must be fresh and new application of this blood. And we have advantage and encouragement for this from Christ's intercession. For though this blood was but once shed, at Christ's death, yet it is continually presented in his intercession, and so the virtue of it perpetually held forth for the cleansing of guilty souls, and daily sprinkling us from an evil conscience, 1 John ii. 1. The children of God should be careful, above all things, above all persons, that they fall not into sin. Their sins are more heinous than those of others, being the provocations of sons and daughters. But if they be overtaken, though falling into sin should be more dreadful and grievous to them than falling into any calamity, there is gracious provision made upon their repenting and returning. If any man sin, there is an advocate, who pleads for his children. He pleads nothing but what is righteous, and what justice will admit as satisfactory, and pleads satisfaction made for their sin, and that by the sacrifice of himself. So it follows, ver. 2. A propitiatory sacrifice, offered himself for the expiation of sin, made his soul a sin-offering, and so made atonement for us, that so we might find his Father a God of forgiveness.

2. Acceptance of our services; sanctifying of them, that they may be acceptable to a holy God. This is done by virtue of Christ's intercession, and upon the account thereof faith has ground to expect it. Under the law, the priest was to bear the iniquities of the holy things of the children of Israel, that they might be accepted, Exod. xxviii. 38, Num. xviii. 1. This they did by laying those sins upon the sacrifice which was to suffer for them, Lev. x. 17. And to signify the sacrifice was to bear the sin, the priest laid his hand on the head of it, Exod. xxix. 10. Herein the priests were a type of Christ; only he was both priest and sacrifice; he laid not the iniquities of our holy things upon another, but he himself bore our sins in his body, 1 Peter ii. 24. He bore them, so as to carry them away; and so removes what might render them unacceptable.

The high priest, when he was to intercede for the people, is appointed to carry much sweet incense into the most holy place, Lev. xvi. 12, 13. Christ's intercession, in reference to the holy services of his people, is represented by incense, Rev. viii. 3. Christ intercedes, by presenting the merits of his obedience and sufferings; and this is the incense which he offers with the

prayers and services of the saints. Herewith the mercy-seat is covered, and their services (for which they might otherwise die) offered herewith by the hand of their intercessor, become pleasing and acceptable to him who sits upon the throne; by virtue hereof they ascend as the savour of a sweet smell, Philip. iv. 18, 1 Peter ii. 5. Spiritual sacrifices, though accompanied with such failings and weakness as might render them distasteful to an holy God, become acceptable, delightful to him, by virtue of Christ's intercession.

3. Victory over our spiritual enemies, those that oppose Christ's interest, and our salvation. Sin, Satan, his wicked agents in the world, and death itself. The intercession of Christ gives us ground to expect and be confident that these shall all in due time be fully conquered and subdued, Heb. x. 12, 13. Christ our high priest having finished his oblation, his sacrifice on earth, the only act of his priesthood that remains is his intercession; this is here signified by his sitting at the right hand of God. The expression denotes that he is able to bring down these enemies, that he has all power for it, Ps. lxxx. 17, Luke xxii. 69; and that he is willing too. He expects it as that which he deserves. It is the merit of his humiliation and sufferings. This he presents at the right hand of God, and so intercedes for it. Upon this account the Father is engaged to see it done, Ps. cx. 2.

So that how many, how powerful, how prevalent soever the enemies of Christ's interest and our happiness are now in the world, yet faith may certainly conclude from the intercession of Christ, that they shall fall. He will in due time bring them all under his feet, they shall be made his footstool; he will put his feet upon their necks, as Joshua's captains did upon the necks of the kings of Canaan, Josh. x. 24. The intercession of Christ gives us the encouragement which is there given them, ver. 25.

Thus will the Lord do to sin particularly. That is the most dangerous, the most formidable enemy of all other. None of the rest, without this, could hurt you. It wars against your souls, but it wars against Christ too; the war is his, as well as yours; it is his enemy, not yours only. It is his interest, as well as yours, to have it subdued. It is one of those enemies that he appears against at the right hand of God. He is able and willing to have it quite vanquished; he expects till it be done; he intercedes for it as a conquest which cost him his blood. Upon this account the Father undertakes, this with the rest shall be brought under foot. Be but true to the interest of Christ and your souls in opposing it, and maintaining the conflict, and then, as sure as Christ intercedes at God's right hand, so sure will these lusts be subdued and made Christ's footstool; his intercession gives faith assurance of it, Josh. v. 13, 14. Joshua had not greater encouragement, that he should prosper in the war against the Canaanites, by Christ's appearing to him on earth, than we have to prevail against sin by his appearing for us in heaven.

4. For grace and spiritual blessing, for the increase of grace, for the means of grace, the continuance and efficacy. All this he appears for, and his intercession gives great encouragement to our faith to expect them by virtue of it.

For spiritual blessings, Eph. i. 3, *ἐν ἐπουρανίοις*, some render 'in heavenly things,' *i. e.* blessings which belong to heaven, which come from heaven, and are appointed to lead us to it. But it is better rendered, 'in heavenly places;' for so the word is used both in this chapter, viii. 20, and the next, ver. 6. And so we may read it, 'with spiritual blessings in Christ, who is in heavenly places,' as ver. 20 directs us. We have these blessings through Christ, as he is now in heaven at the right hand of God, interceding for us, *i. e.* presenting his will and desires that the blessings purchased by his blood

may be actually conferred on us. Hereby faith may conclude that Christ is both able and willing we should be blessed with spiritual blessings. He is willing, because he intercedes for us: he is able, because he intercedes in heavenly places, at the right hand of God.

For increase of grace, John x. 10. What Christ came for to earth, he intercedes for in heaven. For his intercession is in pursuit of the ends of his coming, that they may be effectually accomplished. Now he came, that his people might have spiritual life, and abundance of it; and so he appears in heaven, that they may have it more and more. Therefore in the sense of spiritual wants, weaknesses, and falling short of those degrees of grace you should attain; that strength, growth, liveliness, activeness, you should have arrived at; look up to Christ, as interceding at the right hand of God, and appearing for these ends, that your souls' wants may be supplied, that out of weakness you may be made strong, that of his fulness you may receive, &c. that the smoking flax may flame, and the bruised reed grow strong. He lives to intercede for this, John xiv. 19. If you had no hopes of this, but from the virtue of your own prayers, your hands might be weak. But the power of Christ's intercession is engaged for it; he lives for this end, that you may live, and have life in more abundance.

For the means of grace, Ps. lxxviii. 18. It is spoken in reference to Christ. These gifts he receives as fruits of his intercession. And he receives, that he may give them. So it is in the apostle, Eph. iv. 8, &c. Christ, being ascended to the right hand of God, appears there as a conqueror. And as conquerors were wont, in their triumphs, to bestow largesses, donatives, so he gives gifts. And these gifts are officers for the ministry of the word; and they are to continue, till the mystical body of Christ, all the members, be perfected.

So that, though Satan and his agents design and endeavour to destroy the ministry, and bereave us of the means of grace, yet while Christ has any people in the world to be converted and edified, the ministry shall be continued one way or other. It is as sure as that Christ ascended, and is at God's right hand; for there he intercedes for this purpose.

For the efficacy of the means, John xvii. 17, he prays that the word of truth may be effectual for the working and promoting of holiness. And what he prayed for on earth, he intercedes for in heaven. For his intercession in heaven is conformable to his prayer and intercession on earth. The differences that are between are for the encouragement of faith. He interceded on earth in a state of humiliation; he intercedes in heaven in a glorious condition: his power and interest, at the right hand of God, is in its highest exaltation. He interceded on earth, by virtue of the sacrifice not then offered. He intercedes in heaven, by virtue of his sacrifice already offered. He pleads for the purchase upon account of the price already paid. But as to the things interceded for, they are the same; he presents his will and desires in heaven for that which he prayed for on earth. And here we see he prayed for holiness, the growth and increase of it; for the means, and their efficacy.

Perseverance. The intercession of Christ is a sure ground of this, from whence faith may certainly conclude it. We need go no further for this than the text. He is able to save those who come to him, to the uttermost; and he is willing to save them, for he intercedes for it, and that is a presenting his will and desires for this purpose. Now they cannot be saved unless they persevere in the way to salvation. Therefore, being able and willing to save them, he is able and willing to make them persevere in the way to salvation. And what he is able and willing to have done, shall infallibly be effected.

The apostle from Christ's intercession concludes, that nothing shall sepa-

rate us from the love of God, Rom. viii. 34, 35. While Christ's intercession continues, the love of God to his people will continue; and while his love continues, it will secure them from what is inconsistent with his love. This is it which Christ intercedes for in heaven, for this is it which he prayed for on earth, John xvii. 11.

Joy and comfort. In the day of expiation, after the high priest had been interceding with blood and incense in the most holy place, the jubilee was to be proclaimed, the time of greatest joy to the people, Lev. xxv. 9. The issue and consequence of Christ's intercession is joy, matter of great joy. It is ground of everlasting consolation, 2 Thes. ii. 16. Christ, when he was on earth, promised he would intercede in heaven for the Spirit of consolation, John xiv. 16. He assures his disciples that he will pray the Father to give them his Spirit, as, for other acts and offices, which the word imports, so expressly to be a comforter, and that for ever. Not only for them, but for all his people to the end of the world. He is interceding for this for ever. We have further assurance for this, in that he prayed for it on earth, John xvii. 13.

Glory. Christ's interceding in heaven makes it as sure that they shall be glorified in heaven with him, as though they were already, Eph. ii. 6. He sits in heavenly places interceding; and, upon this account, those that come to him are as sure to be saved to the uttermost, as sure to sit in heavenly places with him, as though they were already with him. He sits there in our nature, as one with us; we are one with him who is in heavenly places; while we look upon him at the right hand of God, we may see ourselves in heavenly places. He sits there as our head; the body is so far in heaven, as the head is there. He is there as our forerunner, Heb. vi. 20. He is there to make way for us, John xiv. 2, 3. He prepares it by interceding, that is his great work for us in heaven. What he intercedes for there, we may understand by what he prayed for on earth, John xvii. 22, 24.

Relief in all weaknesses, infirmities, troubles, sufferings, whatever needs compassion or relief. Heb. iv. 14, 15, Christ our high priest is now passed into the heavens, and the only act of his priesthood in heaven is intercession for us. And he intercedes as one touched with the feeling of our infirmities. He sees all that we suffer by, in soul or body. He sees it all, so as to feel it, to be touched with the feeling of it. He is touched with the feeling of it, as one that has felt the like himself. He feels it effectually, so as to appear for our relief, so as to intercede for the procuring of what we want, securing us from what we fear, easing us of what is grievous, or obtaining for us that which is as good or better.

He accommodates his intercession to all our infirmities, according to the exigencies of them, so as to intercede for supply, ease, deliverance, relief, so far as it is needful, as soon as it is seasonable, whenever it will be good for us.

The intercession of Christ affords support to faith, and comfort to souls compassed about with infirmities, in the worst circumstances that can befall them, in all that may be grievous to them. All grievances whatever are comprised under infirmities, and this gives ground to expect relief, as to everything that is a grievance; especially taking in the ground of it in those words, 'but was in all things tempted,' or exercised like unto us.

Art thou poor? &c. Why, Christ is touched with the feelings of a poor condition, and intercedes as one touched with the feeling of it. It was once his own case. And so in other cases. *Vide* Serm. on Heb. iv. 15.

Answer of our prayers. The intercession of Christ gives great encouragement to come to the throne of grace, and ground to believe that we shall have admission and success, Heb. x. 19-22. The people under the law

were excluded from the holiest, the high priest alone was to enter it with the blood of the sacrifice ; but, by the blood of Jesus, presented in his intercession, all believers have boldness to approach the holiest, and make their addresses there. By him way is made for us, a new and living way, through him who ever lives, in opposition to the old veil, which was an inanimate thing. It is made for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh, which, when it was separated from his soul by death on the cross, it is said the veil of the temple was rent, Mat. xxvii. 51. That veil, which excluded priest and people from access to the most holy place, and the sight of the mercy-seat there. This was rent, to signify that now a way was made to the mercy-seat, and nothing left to hinder our access to it ; especially having an high priest, an advocate, an intercessor, there ready to appear for us. By virtue of this we may draw near, not only with faith but full assurance, that we shall obtain our requests, Heb. iv. 14-16. Since we have an high priest, whose office and work it is in heaven to make intercession for us, and who intercedes as touched with the feeling of what we want, or fear, or suffer ; upon this ground we may approach the mercy-seat, we may come to the throne of grace, and come boldly, without fears, or doubts, or jealousies ; without making any question, but that we shall obtain, &c. Faith is hereby assured, that we may obtain whatever will be a mercy to us, and that is all which is desirable. We may have it freely from grace, which gives to those that are most unworthy. We may find grace, which gives without money, without price, which expects no valuable consideration for it at our hands. We need but come to meet with it ; we need but ask to obtain it. We may have it in abundance from the throne of grace, from him who sits on the throne to shew himself gracious ; whose glory it is, to give like himself, the King of kings, to give royally, liberally, magnificently. We may have all this in time of need, whenever we need it, whenever it will be seasonable to have it. We shall not want what is best for us, nor when it is best. All this we have assurance of, because we have such an high priest interceding for us ; upon this account we may come boldly for it, and expect it.

There are many things in Christ's intercession which encourage us to come to the throne of grace, and to be much and often there ; and also give assurance that we shall not come in vain ; that we shall find the mercy we seek, and obtain the grace we desire, even all those great and glorious things already specified which Christ makes intercession for. When we pray for the same things for which Christ intercedes, and consider that while we are praying, Christ at the same time appears at the throne of grace on our behalf for the same things, how can we doubt but they will be granted ? Though we deserve to be denied, Christ our intercessor will meet with no repulse.

That our prayers may be prevalent, this is one condition requisite, that they be made in faith, James i. 6, Mark xi. 24, Mat. xxi. 22. Now, there is no stronger ground in the world for the establishing of faith in prayer than Christ's intercession.

His intercession gives assurance of the success of our prayers upon another account. It is by virtue thereof that we have the Spirit to help us to pray ; and that which proceeds from the assistance of the Spirit will be acceptable and prevail, Zech. xii. 10. It is by virtue of Christ's intercession that this promise is accomplished, John xiv. 16. The word *παρακλητος* signifies not only a comforter, but an advocate ; and the Spirit is promised, and declared to be an advocate for his people, both unto men and unto God, to plead for them or help them, to manage their plea, both with men, Mat. x. 20, and with God, Rom viii.

So that when Christ promises that he will pray the Father to give us an-

other advocate, he promises to intercede for us that we may have another intercessor in us ; and if we take notice how the Spirit acts as an intercessor, how he helps our infirmities, what he is ready to do for us in prayer, it will be a great encouragement to believe that our prayers, through his help, shall succeed.

I have shewed particularly what great things the intercession of Christ gives assurance of. Let me shew upon what ground we may have assurance hereof by his intercession.

1. Christ has power, all power, to effect what he intercedes for ; and this is a great support to faith, and that which we often doubt of, though we do not observe. Can God prepare a table, &c. ? can Christ do all those things for me which I hear he intercedes for ? Yes, assuredly he can ; for his intercession imports no less power than good will. He is at the right hand of God interceding, Rom. viii. 34. That is his work at the right hand, &c. Now, his sitting at the right hand of God is a metaphorical expression ; we must not take it literally ; for God is a spirit, not a body ; he has no right hand nor left. But thereby is signified the fulness of power which Christ our intercessor has in heaven, and so it is frequently used in Scripture. Ps. lxxvii. 10, in opposition to his own infirmity and weakness, he would consider the right hand, *i. e.* the power of God ; so Ps. cxviii. 14-16, he expresses the power of God by the right hand ; and Luke xxii. 69, Christ intercedes at the right hand of power, *i. e.* he has all power to accomplish what he intercedes for. He not only desires these great things for his people, but is able to effect them. He intercedes for the Spirit, John xiv. 16, and he sends the Spirit, John xvi. 7. He receives gifts as the effect of his intercession, Ps. lxxviii. 8. And he gives those gifts, Eph. iv. 8. He does not only ask and receive in behalf of his people, but has power to give. He intercedes that those who come unto God by him may be saved to the uttermost. And he is able to save, &c. He is able to remove all impediments, to conquer all difficulties, to bestow every degree of grace and spiritual strength, which is requisite that they may be saved to the uttermost, to make them conquerors, and more, &c.

2. He has right. He intercedes for nothing but what he has right to obtain, nothing but what is due to him. He sues but for his purchase, that for which he has paid the full value to a righteous God. He has bought his people, 1 Cor. vi. 20 ; he has purchased their persons, Acts xx. 28 ; and so has right to dispose of them as his own, according to the purpose of his grace ; he has purchased the kingdom of heaven for them, Eph. i. 14 he has purchased grace, and the means of grace, faith, holiness, perseverance, and all spiritual blessings ; glory, and holiness the way to it, and all good things on earth. This is the sum of what he intercedes for, and this is no more than what is due to him. His blood was the price of it : the price is paid and accepted, and he appears for the possession ; and his intercession will as certainly prevail for it, as it is certain that God is just and righteous, 2 Thes. i. 6-10.

To us, upon our account, belongs nothing but shame and confusion of face ; we have nothing to plead but free mercy. But that which Christ pleads for on our behalf is due to him, and therefore will assuredly be granted. His intercession, as I shewed before, is grounded upon merit.

3. He has interest, the greatest imaginable, as much interest as is possible. He intercedes, not with a stranger, or a friend, or a common relative, but with his Father, one who loves him as himself, John v. 20, and withholds nothing from him ; he has as much interest in him as in himself, and can prevail as much with him as with himself ; and can no more be denied

by him in what he desires than he can deny himself, for they are both one, John x. 30; they have not only one interest, and one design, but one essence and one will. What Christ wills, the Father wills, and therefore what he desires it is granted, it is done; that which he intercedes for is his Father's will. Christ will have us say to the Father, when we pray, 'Thy will be done,' for it is no other than his own will; and heaven and earth shall pass away, rather than one *iota* or tittle of it shall not be fulfilled.

4. He has affections and compassions for us, and so intercedes affectionately, compassionately, as one greatly concerned for us; and that assures us we shall not miss of the great advantages he intercedes for, Heb. iv. 15. The apostle shews what an high priest we have, how he executes the office of an high priest in heaven for us, *i. e.* how he there intercedes for us; for his intercession is the only part of his priestly office that he performs in heaven; and he does it as one touched, &c. Herein the comparison holds betwixt him and the Levitical high priest, expressed Heb. v. 2 and ii. 14. And as he is high priest and intercessor, both as God and man, so he has for us the affections, not only of God, but of a man; and accordingly intercedes for us, as one that has such love, care, pity, compassions for us, as are in the hearts of the children of men, the weaknesses excepted.

5. He is obliged; invested in an office, he is under the obligation of it: it is his office, as he is mediator, to intercede. His honour is engaged, and depends both upon the execution of his office, and the success of the performance. If he should either neglect it, or be unsuccessful in it, it would reflect ill upon him. It is impossible that either should fall out.

He took not the office upon him of his own accord, without a call, but the Father called him to it, engaged him in it, expects the discharge of it, Heb. v. 4, 5. The Father called him to be an high priest, and so to intercede; he would not have called him to it, but with a design to comply with him in it, and to be prevailed with by his intercession, Isa. xlii. 1. This is spoken of Christ, and applied to him, Mat. xii. 18. He is called his servant, in respect of the office of mediatorship, a principal act of which is his intercession. *Uphold*; the Hebrew doctor renders it, whom I lean upon, *i. e.* whom I trust to or rely on, for the performance of the office I have called him to. *My beloved*, one whom I have chosen, beloved and preferred before any other to this great office, and well pleased with him for his undertaking and discharging it.

Now, if intercession be an act of Christ's office, and his honour engaged upon his success therein; if the Father employs him in it, loves him for it, is well pleased with his performance, with his interceding: there can be no question but it will be admirably, eternally successful, John x. 17. He laid down his life to give satisfaction, he took it up again to make intercession. The Father loves him for both, and in both the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.

6. He has a personal, a particular respect for every of his servants in his interceding. It is as comfortable, will be as effectual, and gives as much assurance of success, as if now in heaven he did pray and intercede for every of us by name. If you knew that Christ now in heaven were praying for you by name, you would not doubt of being saved to the uttermost. Why, that which his intercession imports is no less in effect. The high priest under the law carried the names of the twelve tribes upon his breast when he went into the holiest. Christ does not carry the names of the tribes of his people upon his breast only, but every of them in particular is *in* his mind and heart while he is interceding. There is in heaven a special, a personal regard of all that come unto God by him, as if their names were there recorded,

Luke x. 20, Rev. xxi. 12. Christ remembers them as effectually, as if he presented them by name to his Father in his intercession, Rev. xiii. 8. Their names are written in the Lamb's book, that was slain, that was sacrificed, and he that was sacrificed is the same who intercedes. He knows who are his, 2 Tim. ii. 19, and how; he knows them by name, John x. 3; and as he knows, so he presents, so he intercedes for them. Those who come unto God by him, may have as much assurance of the comfort and advantage of his intercession, as if they heard him in heaven interceding for them by name.

For temporal deliverance. Christ, the great intercessor, is greatly concerned for his people in their outward distresses and calamities. Let me insist a little on this, as being seasonable. Our danger and distress is very great: we are threatened with ruin in all our concerns, and our posterity after us. Our main support in this sinking condition is, that Christ appears for us, and lives to do it. He is concerned for his people when they are in the depths, he has always been so, Gen. xlviii. 16. This angel is Christ, who redeemed him. The word is מֹשֶׁה, the Redeemer, as Christ is called, Job xix. 25, Isa. lix. 20. He redeemed Jacob not only from eternal miseries but delivered him out of all the troubles and calamities he had met with in the world.

But how does he deliver his people from outward calamities? Why, by his blood, by that presented, by his intercession, Zech. ix. 11. They were delivered out of Egypt, out of the wilderness, out of Babylon, by which the eternal redemption of believers is shadowed out, and confirmed by the blood of the covenant, by this blood presented in his intercession. Upon this account, when our condition seems helpless, as theirs in a pit of water; when we see not either how we can live in our present circumstances, or how we can get out of them; when we are encompassed with dangers and distresses on every side, as if we were in a strong prison, without means, and so without hopes, either to subsist in it, or get out of it: yet by virtue of this blood we may be 'prisoners of hope.' Upon the account of Christ's blood shed and presented, there is hope concerning this thing; even concerning temporal deliverance, when all things seem to look upon us with a hopeless aspect.

Deliverance out of all sorts of troubles seems ascribed to Christ as interceding, Isa. lxiii. 9. Who is this that saved and delivered his people in all their troubles and calamities? to whom so much love is ascribed, so much sympathy, so much compassion, so much tenderness and relief towards his people, in their distresses and dangers, all their days? Why, it is Christ, called 'the Angel of his presence,' Heb. ix. 24. All this was expressed to, all this was done for, his ancient people. Not some, but all the days of old, by the Angel of his presence, by Christ appearing in the presence of God for them; *i. e.* by Christ interceding for them. And all this may be expected, and will be done for his people now, by the Angel of his presence; in all days of distress and calamity, present or to come, even all their days, because he ever appears in the presence of God, he ever lives to make intercession.

Further, Christ is represented plainly, expressly, actually interceding for his people in reference to their outward distresses and calamities, Zech. i. 12. This angel is Christ, God and man in one person. He is called God, Jehovah, ver. 9, and he is called man, ver. 8, 10. It is Christ, the Son of God, who in the fulness of time became man, who expresses such an affectionate resentment of the sufferings and calamities of his people; who is tenderly sensible both of the weight and continuance of them, and impor-

tunes the Father to turn from his indignation, and shew them mercy in sending relief and deliverance. And his intercession was effectual, and prevails for a gracious return, ver. 13. And this particularly expressed and opened in the following verses. The return was gracious and full of consolations.

Hereby it appears that faith may expect great and comfortable advantages from the intercession of Christ, in reference to outward sufferings and calamities.

1. The turning away of God's anger and indignation. Upon Christ's interposal, the Lord's indignation was diverted from his people, and turned upon their oppressors and persecutors, ver. 14, 15. When the Lord's anger is turned away, the bitterness of any affliction is past. Though the Lord writ bitter things against his people before, yet upon Christ's appearing for them, he speaks good and comfortable words.

2. Faith may expect sympathy and compassions under sufferings, instead of wrath and indignation. Our great High Priest, who intercedes for us, is touched with the sense of our sufferings; and sufferings pass under the name of infirmities in the style of the apostle. He has as effectual a sense of them as if himself felt them. The Angel of his presence, he who appears in the presence of God for us, in all our afflictions he is afflicted. Whatever pressure lies upon us he bears us, and so is apprehensive of the weight of both.

3. Faith may expect that sufferings shall be proportioned to our strength. If our strength be small, sufferings will be, some way or other, made lighter; or if they be heavier, our strength will be proportionably increased. He who intercedes for us, as he is a merciful, so he is a faithful high priest, 1 Cor. x. 13. He will take care that they shall not be too heavy, nor lie too long. When Satan or his agents would sink them, Christ interposes with a *The Lord rebuke thee*, Zech. iii. 1, 2.

4. Faith may expect on this account that we shall be secured from the evil of sufferings; and when the evil is gone, there is nothing in them to be feared; for nothing is reasonably an object of fear, but something that is evil, John xvii. He prays not they may be taken out of the world, nor that they may be kept from troubles and sufferings, but from the evil of them. And what is there else to be desired? We cannot desire to be freed from the good of them, we need not desire to be freed from that which is neither good nor evil in them. All that we need, all that we can in reason desire to be freed from, is the evil; and this Christ prayed for, this he intercedes for.

5. Faith may expect deliverance in due time, when it is best, when most for his honour and interest, and most for our spiritual advantage and comfort. And that is as soon as we can in reason desire it; for before it be good in those respects, it is not desirable. Upon Christ's interceding for his people in their distress, the Lord prepares instruments from all quarters to cut off the horns which pushed, and gored, or dispersed his people. Their power and greatness could not secure them. Horns, in the prophetic style, signify kings or sovereign powers. Upon Christ's appearing for his people, they are cut off, their power is broken, so that the oppressed are no more in danger of their push.

6. Faith may expect, till deliverance come, that which is better than deliverance, *i. e.* an holy and fruitful improvement of suffering; and such an improvement of them is better than freedom from sufferings.

## BELIEVERS' COMMUNION WITH THE FATHER AND SON.

---

*And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.*  
—1 JOHN I. 3.

HERE is heaven in the text, as much happiness as men and angels do or can desire, happiness both formal and objective; and the sweet issue of both in the words following: 'These things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.' Joy, fulness of joy; joy, which is the smile of happiness and the flower of glory.

The object of this happiness, or the object which is our happiness, is God in Christ, the Father and the Son, the Father of Christ, and the Father of believers. 'I go to my Father and your Father;' his Father by eternal generation, ours by adoption; his, *quoad rem et modum subsistendi*; ours, *quoad effectum, et modum operandi*; which shews itself in indulgence, love, care, pity, providence. 'And his Son Jesus Christ,' that is the other object of our happiness; he who, ver. 1, is called 'the Word of life,' and, ver. 2, 'eternal life.' Now eternal life and happiness are reciprocal, and used as convertible terms in Scripture. Christ is the word of life in himself, eternal life to us: the word of life, *essentialiter*; eternal life, *causaliter*. And this is that happiness, that eternal life, which we have from him and by him. This fellowship in the text, which we call formal happiness, the word *κοινωνία*, is rendered by some *consortium*, converse; by others, *societas*, fellowship; by others, *communio*, so Beza. And this does best express the word, and therefore we will use it, and the rather because it includes both the former. And from the connection we might observe that fellowship, or communion with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ, is eternal life or happiness; for what is happiness but the enjoyment of the chiefest good? Now the Father and the Son are the chiefest good, and communion with them is the enjoyment of them; for then we enjoy the chief good, when we are united to it, when we have interest in it, and when we partake of it. But communion includes all these, as will appear in the explication.

And thence we might infer that eternal life is not confined to heaven. If we take eternal life for happiness, a man may have eternal life on earth. Heaven is not so much local as we imagine. Communion with God is heaven, and happiness, and eternal life. He that hath communion with

God is in heaven while he is on earth ; and if a man could be there without this, he would want heaven even in heaven. There is no essential difference betwixt happiness on earth and happiness in heaven ; they differ but gradually. If a man on earth could enjoy perfect communion with God, he would be perfectly happy. But I pass by this to that which is express in the text, and I shall insist upon this.

*Obs.* Believers have communion with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. We need not seek out more proofs. That which will be most profitable is an inquiry into the nature of this communion, wherein it consists. Take an account of this in three particulars. Communion includes, 1, real union ; 2, reciprocal community ; 3, familiar converse.

1. Union. This is the basis of communion. Believers are united to the Father and the Son, and the Father and the Son to them. They are united morally, conjugally, mystically. The bond of moral union is love, *gluten animarum*, by which spirits cleave to one another, nay, penetrate into one another and mix together so as they become one. Jonathan loved David as his own soul, as though one soul had informed and animated both bodies. Thus friends are united. Now believers are the friends of God. Abraham was called the friend of God, James ii. 23. 'Ye are my friends,' says Christ to his disciples, and in them to us, John xv. 14, 15.

There is also a conjugal union. By this men are *ἐν σῶμα*, as by the other they are *μία ψυχή*. And thus we are united to the Father and the Son. We are the spouse of Christ, and the Father has married us in an everlasting covenant. Christ, by assuming our nature, became *ἐν σῶμα*, with us, Eph. v. And by this conjugal conjunction we are *ἐν πνεῦμα* with him, 1 Cor. vi. 17. 'He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit.'

There is also a mystical union, which is set forth frequently, though not fully, by physical unions. We are united to Christ as the branches to the vine, John xv. 15 ; as the members to the head, Col. i. 18, Eph. v. 23 ; as the building to the foundation, 1 Cor. iii. ; and, which is nearer than all these, as the soul and body. Christ is wholly in every believer, and wholly in every part, as *anima is tota in toto corpore, et tota in qualibet parte* ; therefore, Gal. ii. 20, 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' As the soul liveth in the body, and the body is animated by the soul, so is the soul animated by Christ, and depends upon him as much for spiritual life, as the body depends upon the soul for natural life. He is the *actus primus*, the principle of our supernatural being and operations ; and, abstracting all imperfection from the word, Christ may be called the *forma informans* of a sanctified soul, as it is sanctified. But there is an expression beyond all this, John xvii. 21, 22, 'That they all may be one, as thou art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us' ; and ver. 22, 'that they may be one, even as we are one.'

2. Community. The Lord and believers have all this in common. And this seems to be the proper signification of *κοινωνία*. It may be rendered as well community as communion, if we may conclude from its original. *πάντα τῶν φίλων κοῖνα*, says the philosopher, and gives the reason in his Ethics, *ἐν κοινωνίᾳ γὰρ ἡ φιλία*, friendship consists in community, and so does fellowship. Now there is betwixt the Lord and believers a fourfold community. (1.) Of enjoyment ; (2.) Of affections ; (3.) Of interests ; (4.) Of privileges. There is a community,

(1.) Of enjoyments. The Lord is ours, and we are his. 'I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.' That is the covenant. The 'Lord is their portion,' Ps. xvi. 5, Lam. iii. 24. And they are the Lord's portion : Deut. xxxii. 9, 'The Lord's portion is his people.' We have interest in his

glorious essence and attributes. In his omnipotency, that is our safety. By it we are more secure than if all the hosts of heaven and earth did surround us. And if we could use faith when we seem most deserted in the world, we might see more with us than against us; we might behold, with Elisha's servant, 2 Kings vi. 17, the mountains full of horses and chariots of fire about us.

His wisdom is for us. That laid the plot of our happiness from eternity, and does carry it on successfully, maugre all the plots and stratagems of men and devils; and we, relying upon the conduct of omniscency, are further from miscarrying than if all the wisdom of angels and policy of men were engaged for us.

We have interest in mercy. Mercy is peculiarly the saints'; no creatures partake of mercy but they, and they have nothing but mercy. All the ways of God are mercy to them, Ps. xxv. 10. The greatest afflictions, yea, in some sense the greatest sins, the issue makes it *felix culpa*. The saints are vessels of mercy; it falls into them here, but they shall fall into it hereafter, and be filled therewith, as a vessel cast into the sea. We swim in streams of mercy from one condition to another, till at last we be swallowed up in the ocean of mercy.

In all-sufficiency. This is our riches, and we are richer in this interest than if we were actually possessed of the whole world. I am אלהים, says God to Abraham. And he is the same to all the faithful. 'To him that overcometh I will give to inherit all things,' Rev. xxi. 7. And he giveth us πάντα πλουσίως, 'all things richly to enjoy,' 1 Tim. vi. 17. Thus God, and with him all things, are ours; and so, reciprocally, we are his, and every part of us, our body, soul, and spirit. A saint is the temple of God, 1 Cor. iii. 16, and every part of him is dedicated and consecrated to God; he is ἀνάθημα, that is not ἀνάθεμα. Our body, that is the outer court; our souls, that is the holy place; our spirits, that is the holy of holies. God is most in this, and manifests himself most gloriously to it. 'This is my resting place, here will I dwell.' All the faculties of our souls and members of our bodies must be weapons and instruments of righteousness.

And as there is this community betwixt us and the Father, so also betwixt us and the Son. His nature is ours, and ours is his; he is bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh. His riches is ours, and our poverty his: 2 Cor. viii. 9, 'He became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich.' His righteousness is ours, and our sins are his; he made him sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. v. 21. His happiness is ours, and our curse is his, Gal. iii. He was made a curse for us, that he might free us from the curse of the law. His glory is ours, and our shame was his; he took upon him the form of a servant, that we might be made the sons of God. He was made the most contemptible and abject of men, for so Isa. liii. 3 is rendered *contemptissimus abjectissimusque virorum*, הרל אישים, *desitus virorum*, i. e. *in quo desinunt viri, ita ut ipse non habeatur pro viro*. He was brought so low, as he seemed not to be a man; and we are exalted so high, as we seem not to be men. He was the reproach of men and shame of the people, and we are the glory of Christ: John xvii. 22, 'And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them.'

(2.) Community of affections. The Lord and his saints have the same affections, running in the same channel, fixed on the same objects. There is mutual love. The saints love the Lord, and are beloved of him. 'I love those that love me,' says Christ, the Father's Wisdom, in Proverbs. And John xiv. 21, 'He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I

will love him,' &c. A saint loves whatever resembles Christ, whatever belongs to him: his image, his people, his ordinances. And the Lord loves whatever belongs to a saint as a saint; his love extends itself to his friends, his goods, his posterity; he shews mercy unto thousands of those that love him.

There is also a reciprocal delight. The Lord takes pleasure in his saints, and in their services; they are all his Hephzibahs, his rest, his joy, his peculiar treasure. And they delight in him and his administrations; they prefer him before their chief joy. The soul says, 'Lord, whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none on earth that I can love in comparison of thee.' And the Lord says to his saints, 'Whom have I on earth but thee? and there is none in the world that I love like thee.'

So mutual desires. The soul desires God's glory, and the Lord desires the soul's happiness. The soul desires to be with Christ, and cries, 'Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.' Make haste, my beloved, and be thou like to a roe or a young hart upon the mountain of spices. And Christ desires the soul should be with him, and calls, Cant. ii. 10, 'Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away.' John xvii. 24, 'I will that they also whom thou hast given me may be with me.'

So for hatred. The Lord hates sin and sinners, and so does a saint: Ps. cxxxix. 21, 'Do not I hate those that hate thee? and am I not grieved with those that rise up against thee?' Here is an exact compliance, they do *idem velle, et idem nolle*; love the same things, and hate the same things.

(3.) A community of interest. The Lord and saints have the same ends, the same designs, the same friends and enemies. So Jehoshaphat expresses his society with Ahab, 'I am as thou art, my people as thy people, my chariots as thy chariots.' The Lord aims at his own glory and our happiness, and we aim at his glory and our happiness. And though he may seem more to seek his glory than our happiness, and we may fear we seek our happiness more than his glory, yet indeed these two are inseparable and almost coincident. That which advances his glory promotes our happiness, and that which makes us most happy makes him most glorious. Wisdom and mercy have made a sweet connection betwixt his honour and our happiness, so that they cannot be disjoined. We need no more fear to come short of happiness than we need to fear that the Lord will come short of his glory, for these two are embarked together.

And as they seek the same ends, so they choose the same means. There is not only *μία βούλησις*, but *προαίρεσις*. A saint will use no means but what the Lord prescribes and approves; he will rather depend on the wisdom of God for the success of those means which seem most improbable, if the Lord has prescribed them, than consult with or rely upon carnal reason; rather hazard the loss of a kingdom than set up a golden calf, though Jero-boam, a stranger to God, did; rather die than deny the truth, to save his life; rather lose the world than tell an officious lie.

And as they have the same end and means, so in the prosecution of these they have the same friends and enemies. He is not a friend in the Lord's account that is an enemy to the saints; nor is he the saint's friend that is the Lord's enemy. Those that hate thee (says David), and rise up against thee, I hate them with a perfect hatred, I count them my enemies. And they have the same account of things as of persons; what is done against one is done against both, and what is done for one is done for both. The wicked they persecute the saints, and the Lord looks upon them as persecutors of him: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' And Saul need

not wonder at this, if he had considered that of the psalmist, 'He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of my eye.' And therefore the sufferings of the saints are called the sufferings of Christ. The saints they do good to their brethren, feed, clothe, and visit them, and the Lord takes it as done to himself: Mat. xxv. 34, 35, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father; I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: sick, and ye visited me: in prison, and ye came unto me.' But how could this be, think the saints, seeing Christ is above these kindnesses? He tells: ver. 40, 'The King shall say,' and he says it with an asseveration, 'Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'

(4.) Community of privileges. The Lord condescends to make the saints, so far as they are capable, partakers of his own privileges, even those which no creatures else partake of.

It is his privilege to be omnipotent, and the saints have something that resembles this. One would think Paul speaks as much, when he glories that he can do all things, Christ strengthening him. And every saint may presume as much.

It is the Lord's privilege to be omniscient, yet he vouchsafes some shadow of this to us, when he promiseth the Spirit shall lead us into all truth, and that the Spirit should teach us all things, 1 John ii. 20.

It is his privilege to be all-sufficient. And what does he promise less to us, when he assures us we shall want no good thing, we shall have all things richly to enjoy, we shall inherit all things? Who would desire more all-sufficiency than to have all things sufficient, all things that are good? 2 Cor. ix. 8.

And as we partake of the privileges of the Father, so also of the Son. He is *ἡμεῶν βασιλεὺς*, king, priest, and prophet, and so are we; he has 'loved us,' &c., 'and made us kings and priests,' enables us to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptably; and has prepared crowns, and sceptres, and kingdoms for us. We are prophets too, for we are all taught of God; we have the Spirit of wisdom and revelation, Eph. i. 17. The same Spirit, which was a Spirit of prophecy, is in us; and though it do not enable us, as formerly them, to foretell future contingencies, yet something future we know. Every saint, who has attained assurance, knows he shall be saved; and this is a contingency in respect of second causes.

Again, Christ is the Son of God, and so are we. What honour is this! 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us, that we should be called the sons of God,' 1 John iii. 1. Christ is the heir of all things, and we are heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ, Rom. viii. 17. Christ is the object of his Father's love, and so are we, Lev. xxvi. 11. Christ is the glory of God, the brightness of his glory, and we are the glory of God, Ps. xi. 10. It is rendered, 'His rest shall be glorious.' Now, the saints are they in whom God rests. *Ecclesia, in qua aquiescit Deus*, says one on the place. Therefore they are his glory. Christ is a conqueror, and so are we; conquer the world, John v. 5; and the god of this world, Satan, who also commands another world, prince of the power of the air; him we conquer, and all his legions of darkness. Yea, we conquer that which is more potent than both the world and the devils, and this is sin; it overthrow both the former, and we subdue this. Nay, in all this, *ὑπερνικῶμεν*, we are more than conquerors.

Christ is a judge, and so are we: 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3, 'Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?' Nay, the chiefest part of the world, the

angels: ver. 3, 'The saints shall judge the angels.' This is the second head, wherein this communion is expressed.

3. Familiar converse, which we may make out in four particulars: (1.) Visits; (2.) Walking with God, and he with us; (3.) Conference; (4.) Feasting.

(1.) Visits. The Lord visits us, and we visit him; he comes to us, stands at the door and knocks, and if we open he will enter, Rev. iii. 20; he will come in and manifest himself to us. This is the end of visiting, to see whom we visit; and this is it the Lord desires, Let me see thy face, and hear thy voice, Cant. ii. 14. There are sweet interviews betwixt God and the soul; he shews himself in part, withdraws the veil a little, that we may have some glimpses of his glorious excellencies. The day of glory dawns here, though the meridian be only in heaven; and though we see but darkly, as in a glass, yet we see more clearly than his ancient people. The object was far off from them, and the medium was darkened by the interposition of a cloud of ceremonies; but the Day-spring from on high hath visited us, and made them vanish. Abraham saw but his day, and that afar off; we see himself, he is set forth crucified before our eyes, Gal. iii. Moses's face was veiled, nor was he permitted to see anything of God but his back parts; but we, 2 Cor. iii. 16, with open face behold the glory of God, yea, the brightness of his glory shining in the face of Christ. These interviews, these visits are in the ordinances.

He visits us also in his providences. There is no condition so sad and forlorn, which can estrange him from us, hinder him from visiting us; nay, he takes those opportunities to be most kind and frequent in seeing us, when a visit will be most welcome; nor does he visit us merely to see us, but to do us good. In trouble of conscience, he visits us with his loving-kindness; in darkness and perplexities, with comforts makes his face to shine upon us. In troubles and dangers, he visits us with his salvation; in sickness and restraint he comes to us, and performs all the acts that love can put forth to a sick friend, he makes our beds in our sickness, Ps. xli. 3; his left hand is under our head, and his right hand sustains us. Nor need we fear to be troublesome to him with too frequent visits; he takes nothing more unkindly than when we withdraw and grow strange; he invites us: Cant. ii. 10, 'Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away.' 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary.' And when he cannot draw us up with his cords of love, he drives us with his rod; and that is one end why he exercises his people with sickness, losses, disappointments, wants, desertion of friends, and other afflictions, to draw them more to himself.

(2.) Walking with God. A saint walks with God, and God with him; so he promises, 'I will walk in the midst of you, 2 Cor. vi. 16; Lev. xxv. 12, 'I will never leave thee nor forsake thee.' Nor is this only in fair way: 'When thou goest through the fire, I will be with thee,' &c., Isa. xliii. 2. The familiarity of this walking, methinks, is held forth in this expression, Ps. lxxiii. 23, 'Thou holdest me by thy right hand.' What more familiarity than to walk hand in hand? Thus Enoch walked with God, Gen. v. 22; and Noah, Gen. vi. 9; the whole conversation of a saint is a walking with God. He sets God always before him, Ps. xvi. 8; walks, as seeing him who is invisible, Heb. xi. 27; makes God his meditation day and night, and says with David, 'I am continually with thee,' Ps. lxxiii. 23. He observes God in all his ways, looks upon the world as an engine acted by the Lord's influence, acknowledges no other *animam mundi*, he sees providence act and move the whole universe. He sees God in everything visible, *qualibet herba Deum*, tastes God's sweetness in every comfort, hears God's voice in every

one that speaks to him. David heard God speak, when his companions heard none but Shimei. Job's carnal acquaintance would blame the Chaldeans, Satan, and other second causes for his losses; but he looks higher, 'The Lord giveth,' &c. Others may refer sickness to the distemper of the humours, and blame the malice of men for their afflictions; but a saint says, with Eli, 'It is the Lord.' He rests not in the surface of things, but penetrates through them to the first mover; his sight is not terminated in second causes, he knows they are dead and without motion, till moved by the first; nor do any give a firmer, at least a more practical, assent to that metaphysical principle, *causa secunda non movet, nisi mota*.

And as he observes God in all, and ascribes all to God, so he depends upon God for all; the arm of the flesh supports not him except he see the strength of God in it. Ordinances are in his account empty cisterns, till the Spirit of God fill them; the staff of bread cannot strengthen him till the Lord strengthen it; the word is a dead letter unless the quickening Spirit enliven it. He esteems these because they are means of God's appointing, but he knows they are arbitrary means; God can give the end without them, but they can never attain the end without him.

As he walks with God in respect of thoughts and judgment, so also in respect of his affections. These are *animi pedes*, τῆς ψυχῆς πτηνῆματα.\* Desire draws us towards him, love joins us to him, delight continues us with him; by desire we move to God, by delight we rest in God. Desire acts thus: Oh when shall I come and appear before God? How long will the Lord be as a stranger, and as a wayfaring man? How long shall there be such a distance betwixt me and him whom my soul loves? Oh draw me, and I shall run after thee; nay, draw me, that I may run with thee, for nothing short of thyself can content me. Then, when desires are answered, love acts thus: it closes with Christ, and twines itself into a strict embrace with him; it is jealous of everything that might estrange, and counts it death to hear of parting. It says, with Ruth to Naomi, Ruth i. 16, 'Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: the Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me.'

Being thus united and resolved, delight acts thus: Oh then, and have I found him whom my soul loves? I have enough: 'Return to thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord has dealt bountifully with thee; whom have I in heaven but thee?' &c. There is more beauty in the light of his countenance than in all the glory of the world; there is more sweetness in thy presence than in all worldly pleasures; there is more riches in the enjoyment of thyself than in all the kingdoms of the earth. So in practice, as in judgment and affection, our conversation is a way, a pilgrimage. Now because our weakness is much, the difficulties and dangers many, the Lord promises his presence shall go along with us; he walks with us, Isa. xlix. 10, 11, nay, in us; before us, so he is our guide, Ps. xlviii. 14; behind us, so he is our guard, our rearward, Isa. lviii. 8; beside us, on our right hand, Ps. cxxi. 5, Ps. cx. 5; lest we should err, he leads us, Isa. lviii. 11, takes us by the hand, *cum apprehensione manus, i. e. apprehendendo manum meam*. When we grow weary, he bids us lean upon him: Cant. viii., 'Who is this that cometh out of the wilderness, leaning upon her beloved?' he holds us up, Ps. lxxi. 8. Faith is expressed frequently by this notion, leaning upon God, 𐤀𐤓, recumbency. When we faint, and can walk no longer, he bears us, his everlasting arm supports us, Isa. lxiii. 9, xlvi. 3, 4: a full place, Isa.

\* Qu. πτέρωματα?—Ed.

xl. 11, 'He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young.'

(3.) Friendly conference. The Lord talks with us, and we with him; friendly and familiar colloquies; he speaks to us by his word, by his providence, by his Spirit; the sweet whisperings of the Holy Ghost, that still voice comforts, directs, encourages. This answers all objections by which we would deprive ourselves of comfort; this tells us the non-consequence of all Satan's fallacies, and does nonplus that arch-sophister. When he presents hell and wrath, it says, 'I am thy salvation;' when he brings us into the valley and shadow of death, it saith, 'Be not afraid, I am with thee,' I will not leave thee. When we have lost our way, and know not how to return, then we hear a voice behind us, nay, in us, saying, 'This is the way, walk in it.' And when the word that he hath writ to us seems obscure, he instructs us *viva voce*. The Spirit, as Philip to the eunuch, not only joins himself to the chariot, but comes in; and this voice the saints know: 'My sheep know my voice,' John x. 5; others are strangers to it.

Nor does he only make known, tell us the secret of his word, but the secret of his providence: 'The secret of the Lord is with those that fear him,' Ps. xxv. 14; 'Shall I hide from Abraham the thing that I do?' Gen. xviii. 17, 'The Lord will do nothing, but will reveal his secret to his servants the prophets,' Amos iii. 7. Oh what familiarity is here! What more amongst the dearest friends than communication of secrets? These God communicates, yea, those which were locked up from eternity, even from the angels, the salvation of particular souls. So he speaks to us.

And we speak to him in prayer and meditation. We may speak at any time: the King's ear is never denied us; the chamber of presence is always open, and we may speak with boldness and confidence, though we be poor worms. The Lord delights in such dialogues, and is much displeased when we estrange ourselves: 'Let me see thy face,' &c. And therefore when he sees us so busy in the pursuit of other things, and so much taken up with outward comforts, as we neglect him, he many times deprives us of these comforts, that when we have less of them he may have more of our company. See a pregnant place, Hosea ii. 10, 'I will allure her into the wilderness;' she shall be in a wilderness in respect of friends, comforts, riches, honours; these shall desert her, or be taken from her. And what then? 'Then I will speak comfortably to her.' The noise of the world was before so loud in her ears as she would not hear me, no, not when I spake comfortably to her; she was so busy in parleying with the world, as she had no leisure to confer with me. But I will bring her into the wilderness, far from these incumbrances that have interrupt our communion, and then we shall enjoy one another; he will speak comfortably, and we may talk familiarly with him. He oftentimes breaks the cistern, that we may have recourse to the fountain; lets our corn, wine, and oil be plundered, that we may more delight in the light of his countenance; lets the swine devour our husks, that we may learn to prize the pleasures of our Father's house. He deals with us, as Absalom did with Joab, when he desires conference with him; he sets our corn on fire, for, says he, in their affliction they will seek me diligently, Hosea v. 15, 2, Lam. xiv. 30.

(4.) Kind entertainments. The Lord feasts the saints, and they feast him: Isa. xxv. 6, 'And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wine on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wine on the lees well refined.' Christ leads his spouse into his banqueting house, Cant. ii. He satisfies them with the fatness of his

house, Ps. xxxvi. 8, and makes them joyful in the house of prayer ; fills our souls as with marrow and fatness, Ps. lxiii. 5 ; feeds us with manna from heaven, with angels' food. All truths are *pabulum animæ* ; but divine truths, they are delicacies, sweeter than the honey and the honeycomb to a renewed soul. He gives us sweet intimations of his love, peace that passes all understanding, joy unspeakable, and full of glory. The full fruition of these joys are reserved for heaven, yet some drops fall from those rivers of pleasures that are at his right hand, to refresh us in our pilgrimage. He conveys to us in this wilderness some clusters of grapes and figs, though we must stay for a full vintage till we come to Canaan. We break our fast here, but stay for the marriage-feast till we be taken up to our glorious bridegroom. Some of our master's joy enters into us here, but there we shall enter into our master's joy, and shall bathe ourselves in that boundless and immense ocean of pleasure and sweetness to all eternity.

And as the Lord feasts us, so we him. 'Behold,' says Christ, Rev. iii., 'I stand at the door and knock ; if any man will open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me.' And what is that which the Lord counts a feast ? A broken heart, that is a sacrifice well pleasing ; a humble spirit, he dwells with such a spirit, Isa. lvii. 15. He does not sup and depart, but is at a constant diet with such a spirit. So also high thoughts of God ; these he delights in, they are as a feast to him. When they are so elevated as they make us tremble at his word, Isa. lvii. So also graces exercised, affections rightly fixed and elevated ; for when affection is down, and grace unexercised, the soul is asleep, and cannot entertain Christ, as the spouse, Cant. v. 12 ; will not admit him, will not open to him, though he tell her he has gathered his myrrh with his spices, and prepared the honeycomb with the honey, and brought wine and milk, brings his entertainment with him, will not put her to the charge and trouble of providing it. Yet, in the drowsy condition, she opens not, though he use such powerful rhetoric to get entertainment : 'Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled : for my head is filled with the dew, and my locks with the drops of the night.' What sweeter compellations, what stronger arguments, could be used ? Yet he prevails not ; the spouse was slumbering, the exercise of grace was suspended. A sleeping soul will not, cannot, feast with Christ. It is an awakened soul, whose graces and affections are exercised, that entertains Christ ; these he counts a feast.

*Use 1.* If believers have communion with the Father and the Son, then unbelievers hath communion with the devil and his angels. Your fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. There is happiness, here is your misery. I might enlarge it in analogy to the particulars formerly insisted on. As believers are united to Christ, are one with him, so wicked men with the devil. As all things are common between God and believers, so are all things common between the devil and unbelievers.

Briefly thus. Unbelievers are one with the devil. There is a physical union ; they are his members, he their head. There is a moral union betwixt them, such as is betwixt friends ; the bond of that union is love ; and though they defy him, and pretend much hatred, yet the argument of Christ proves unanswerably that they love him. 'He that keeps my commandments, he it is that loveth me,' John xiv. 21. And so answerably, he that keeps the devil's commandments, he it is that loves him ; but these keep his commandments, comply with his will, do what he suggests. The power of the devil is absolute over these, as the centurion's over his servants. He says to one, 'Go, and he goeth ; to another, Come, and he cometh ; to all his servants, Do this, and they do it.' Nay, which is more, there is an

essential union betwixt these; not because his essence, as he is a spirit, belongs to them, or their essence, as they are men, belongs to him; but because those qualities, which make him a devil, and are essential to him as he is so, are in wicked men; and those sinful qualities which make them wicked, and are essential to them as they are wicked, are in the devil. Pride, malice, averseness to God, hatred of his people, antipathy to his ways, ordinances, and administrations, these are the same in both, and do only differ in degrees. Further, the nearness of this union is evident, in that the devil is in them, keeps possession of them. He is the strong man that keeps the house. He is the prince of the power of the air, that not only rules *over*, but rules *in*, the children of disobedience. Wicked men may more properly be called demoniacs, than those whose bodies are possessed of the devil, of which we read in the Gospel; for he possesses wicked men's souls, and being a spirit, can join himself more intimately to a soul, and mix his being more nearly with it, than with a body.

And as they are united, so they have all things common. He is theirs, and they are his, Rom. vi. 16. The apostle's argument proves it. 'Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his ye are to whom ye obey?' He is their god, 'the god of this world;' their prince, he 'rules in the children of disobedience;' their father, 'You are of your father the devil,' John viii. 44; and they are his people, his slaves, his children: Acts xiii. 10, 'Thou child of the devil.' They have the same interests, the same designs; they both drive on this design, to dishonour God, and destroy souls; they have the same affections; they love, hate, delight in, and desire the same things; they love, and delight in, the works of darkness, hate God, his image, his people, his ways and ordinances. So for converse, they walk and confer together; for as the Lord does talk with his people, by his Spirit suggesting his will to their souls, so Satan talks with wicked men by his suggestions, making his will known to them.

And as they have all things alike in communion here, so they shall have the like condition hereafter; the like torments, and eternal woful fellowship in them. That is the doom which you must hear pronounced: 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' 'Consider this, O ye that forget God;' see and bewail the misery of your condition. Think you are in hell, while you are so near to, and so familiar and intimate with, the devil. Renounce this cursed fellowship with the prince of darkness, and with the unfaithful\* works of darkness, and never give rest to your souls till ye be in that happy condition on which you may be admitted to fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.

*Use 2.* An exhortation to get this fellowship, and continue it. This we shall urge by some motives, and shew the way to it, prescribing the means whereby it may be attained. The motives I shall reduce to two heads, the two ends for which we were sent into the world, and therefore the most powerful to move and excite desire and endeavours, God's glory, and our good. 1. It is most for God's glory. 2. It is best for us.

1. It is most for God's glory. God is most glorified in heaven. Now to have communion with God, is to be in heaven. This is the gate of paradise, and puts us into the suburbs of heaven. Besides, it is true, God's absolute glory is indivisible, admits of no addition or diminution; it is, as Chrysostom calls it, ἀναλλώσιμος καὶ ἀκίνητος δόξα, admits of no change, no alteration, for in this respect he was infinitely glorious from all eternity, and nothing can be added to infiniteness, *Infinito non datur majus*. But his relative

\* Qu. 'unfruitful'?—Ed.

glory, that may be augmented; he may be more glorious, though not in himself, yet in reference to us. And in this sense he is glorified, or (as we speak) made more glorious, both by himself and by his creatures: by himself, when he manifests his glorious excellencies to the world; by us, when we acknowledge and take notice of those excellencies. Both ways God is glorified by our communion with him. He manifests many glorious attributes hereby in admitting us to this fellowship: his truth in performing, whereby he is engaged to grant it; justice, in excluding others; power and wisdom, in fitting us poor pieces of clay for it; and that which is the darling of his attributes, to which he seems in the gospel to have designed a peculiar glory, his mercy, love, and free grace, so far condescending as to advance us, who are less than worms, worse than nothing, to such a glorious fellowship.

And as God glorifies himself, &c., so those that have fellowship with him hereby glorify him; for he is glorified when he is acknowledged to be glorious, and none can do it with such advantage as these, for it is grace by which God has most glory. Every grace exercised gives a testimony to all, or some of God's excellencies: love to his beauty and goodness, fear to his justice and holiness, faith to his truth, all-sufficiency, wisdom, power, and faithfulness, humility to his majesty, patience to his sovereignty. Now none exercise these graces but those who have this fellowship; and those who have most intimate communion have the most constant and vigorous exercise of them.

And as the Father, so the Son is hereby glorified. It is the honour of any person to attain his principal end, and this is it in which he most glories. The end not only crowns the actions, but the agent. Now the end of Christ's glorious undertakings on earth, the end of all his actions and sufferings, was to glorify himself and his Father, in bringing us to communion with both. He suffered so many things of God and man, that he might make reconciliation, Heb. ii. 17; that, being reconciled, we might meet and converse in a sweet and blessed fellowship here and hereafter.

And as the Father and Son are glorified hereby, so the Holy Ghost; the Scripture holds forth this as his peculiar glory. Hence that phrase in Paul's prayer, 'the communion of the Holy Ghost,' 2 Cor. xiii. 14. The Spirit is no less glorified by this communion (which seems to be ascribed to him as an attribute) than the Father by the manifestation of his love, or the Son by the dispensation of his grace. This then is the glory of God, and this renders it most desirable to all generous and self-denying spirits. The end is the *primum mobile*, the first principle of motion, and the motion is swifter and nobler, according to the value and excellency of the end. Heroic actions aim at glory, as that which is the noblest end. But no glory comparable to the glory of God, which seeing this communion so much advances our desires and endeavours after it, should be no less strong and indefatigable than they are noble and glorious. There is nothing more glorious than that which most glorifies God; and there is nothing so worthy of our desires and endeavours, as that which is glorious; and therefore we should desire and endeavour nothing more in the world than this fellowship, since hereby God is so eminently glorified, both in his attributes and relations. But if our spirits be so low, as we cannot rise to this highest and supreme end; though those, who are elevated by grace, neither can nor\* ought; if this last end seem too remote, to have any strong influence upon us by way of motive, though indeed nothing is nearer or dearer to those to whom grace hath endeared the glory of God, there are other motives near us, yea, within us,

\* Qu. 'either can or'?—Ed.

not only the glorious concernment of God, but our own may move us. It is not only most for God's glory, but best for us.

2. Most for our good. The sweetest pleasure, the highest honour, the greatest advantage, and the chiefest happiness.

(1.) The sweetest pleasures are in fellowship with the Father and the Son. Every step in communion with God is a paradise. And how can it be less, since they are led by that hand, at which are rivers of pleasures; lie in that bosom, which is infinitely sweeter than myrrh, aloes, and cassia; walk in the light of that countenance, from whose smile spring all the delights of heaven, are always in the view of that beauty which makes heaven glorious, and all that behold it happy? They sit under the shadow of the tree of life, and have the banner of Christ's love for their canopy; feast daily with the choicest delicacies of Christ's banqueting-house, and drink of that pure river of the water of life, which proceeds out of the throne of God and of the Lamb.

Pleasure is the result of those acts, which well tempered faculties exercise upon the best object. Now what faculty can be of a rarer temper, than that which is refined and elevated by grace, the most excellent accomplishment that ever omnipotency created; grace, I say, which informs the whole soul of him who has this privilege? And what more excellent, more glorious, more delightful object, than God in Christ, the Father and the Son? God in Christ is the ocean of all sweetness and pleasures, in comparison of whom all the pleasures that are, or ever were in the world, amount not to the proportion of a drop, and for quality, the very quintessence of them is but bitterness. This is that object, which is all made up of sweetness and ravishing delights. And he holds forth himself as delightful to every faculty of man that is capable of pleasure. Truth, that is the dainty upon which the mind feeds. Now he is the first truth, the sun, the fountain of it, from whom were darted all those beams of truth which are scattered to this lower world. 'He enlightens every man,' &c.

Goodness is that only which the will embraces with complacency. Now he is the chief good, *ἀντ' ἀγαθόν*, the idea and exemplar of all goodness, and the spring from whence dropped all creature goodness.

Beauty, that is the pleasure of the eye. Now God in Christ, as Clemens Alex. *ἀρχέτυπον τῶν καλῶν*, the archetypal exemplar of all beauty. The fairest and most glorious creatures are but rude, blurred, and imperfect transcripts. He is fairer than the morn, clearer than the sun. As Basil, *ὑπερλαμπεὶ τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου λαμπρότητα*, his brightness darkens the lustre of the sun. Nay, he is infinitely brighter than the most glorious seraphim, *τὸ ὄντως καλὸν κατάληψιν πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπίνην ὑπερβάνει καὶ δύναμιν*, it is this beauty that transports those happy souls that behold it, *εἰς θεῖαν τίνα ἕκστασιν*, as Basil, into a divine, an eternal ecstasy. To the taste he is hidden manna, angels' food, the bread of life. The touch is ravished with the kisses of those lips that drop sweet-smelling myrrh, Cant. v. 13, and with the embraces of his everlasting arms. The ear is delighted with the voice of joy and gladness: 'The voice of my beloved,' Cant. ii. 8. The sound of the voice can heal broken bones, Ps. li. 8, can breathe life into a dead soul, convey heaven into a spirit despairing at the gates of hell, and still it with joy unspeakable and glorious. To the smell he is spikenard, myrrh, aloes, cassia, Ps. xlv. 8. What a fragrant smell does Christ diffuse, when he lies in our bosom as a bundle of myrrh! as Cant. i. 13.

Oh what joy is in this fellowship, whenas there is nothing in the Father or Son, but is a spring of comfort, pure, satisfying, overflowing, ravishing comfort! It is true, while we are present in the body, we are absent from

the Lord. We are not yet admitted to the well-head, that is in heaven; but there are rivers flowing from hence, that make glad the city of God. There are streams of comfort conveyed to us in ordinances, promises, privileges, of which they only have the actual improvement who have such communion, they only with joy draw waters out of the wells of salvation, whereas to others they are a fountain sealed.

No wonder if the saints have such a high esteem of this communion, and of the ordinances wherein they enjoy it. See it in David: Ps. xlii. 1, 2, 'As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before him?' So Ps. lxxxiv. 1, 2, 'How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! my soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord. My heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God.' Ver. 4, 'Blessed are they that dwell in thy house,' &c. And why so? See ver. 7, 'Every one of them in Zion appeareth before God;' ver. 10, 'For a day in thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of God than dwell in the tents of wickedness.' Hence the Marquis of Vico, the pope tempting him with gold to leave the ordinances at Geneva for the enjoyment of his estate in Italy, replied, Let his money perish with him who prefers all the riches in the world before one day's communion with Jesus Christ. But it is in vain for me to endeavour to express what joys are in this fellowship, for it is beyond expression. It is joy unspeakable; nay, not only beyond expression, but above apprehension; the peace of God passes all understanding. Such peace, such joy is there in this fellowship.

(2.) The highest honour. It is accounted a great honour amongst men to be near unto and familiar with princes. 'Seest thou a man diligent in his business? he shall stand before princes,' Prov. xxii. 29. These shine in the orb of honour as the sun, when all about them, as planets of an inferior degree, borrow their light; and they shine with the clearest ray who are nearest to the fountain. What honour is it, then, to have such near and familiar converse with the King of kings and Lord of lords; to a companion of the prince of the kings of the earth? He alone is truly the fountain of honour, and whatever is not derived from him by advantage of vicinity to him is but a name, a shadow, οὐδὲ ἀξιώματα αὐτὰ εἶαι ἂν τις φαίη, ἀλλὰ ἰνόματα ἀξιομάτων μόνον, as Chrysostom. He is clothed with honour and majesty as with a garment; and there is no way to be honourable but by getting near to him, and creeping under the skirts of his garment. Those that are not near to God are far from honour, even as those are far from light who are antipodes of the sun. The light of these is darkness; the glory of those is their shame. Now, those who converse with God must needs be near him; they are so called, 'a people near unto God,' Ps. cxlviii. 14. They are *vicini*, neighbours; there is nothing but the partition of the body betwixt them, and there are many windows, many avenues in that by which God passes to them and they to God; whereas others are strangers, foreigners, aliens to the commonwealth of this Israel, Eph. ii. 12. There is a vast ocean parts them from that region where God is known and enjoyed. It is true of them which Abraham says of those in hell; we may say to them as he to Dives, 'Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass to you cannot, neither can they pass to us that would come from thence.' The king of this commonwealth forbids traffic and commerce with all but those few who have submitted to his sceptre, and these only are near him. They are not only *vicini*, but *propinqui*; not only

neighbours, but indwellers ; not only of the same commonwealth, but of the same family. They are members of the household of faith. The Lord is the master of the family, and Christ the heir. It is a great honour to be a servant in such a house ; so says Chrysostom, ἀντι μεγίστου ἀξιώματος ταῦτο τῶν ἰσθῆται, λέγων δοῦλους. Paul puts this amongst his titles of honour, accounts it one of his greatest dignities, to be servant of Jesus Christ. But we have greater honours than these ; we are not only servants, but friends : ' Henceforth I call you no more servants, but friends,' John xv. 14, 15 ; nay, not only friends, but favourites. What greater honour than to be a prince's favourite, to be in his presence, to have his ear, his smile, his heart ; to be deep in his affections, high in his thoughts ; to have liberty to make known all grievances, and the privilege to know all his secrets ? And all these are made ours by communion. Haman knew that his interest in the king's favour did entitle him to all the honour he could confer ; therefore he says, Esth. vi. 6, ' To whom Haman would the king delight to do honour more than to myself ?' Though Haman's hopes deceived him, yet does the Lord never disappoint his favourites. They have the royal apparel which the king useth to wear, the robe of his righteousness, and shall have the crown royal upon their heads ; and time will come when they shall be brought through the streets of the great city, the new Jerusalem, with glory and triumph ; and he shall command his angels to proclaim before them, ' Thus shall it be done to the men whom the king will honour.'

Nay, this is not all. They are not only *propinqui*, but *proximi*, by this communion ; joined to the Lord in the nearest ties of affinity and consanguinity. The nearest affinity are husband and wife. Now, they are married to the Lord, betrothed to Christ ; and *uxor coruscet radiis mariti*, the rays of honour which make the husband illustrious shine in the wife. The glory of Christ makes his spouse glorious ; so he says, John xvii. 22, ' The glory which thou gavest me, I have given them.' What glory in the world comparable to this ? It is as far above the highest honours in the world as he is higher than men who is higher than the heavens.

The nearest tie of consanguinity is that between parents and children. Now, these are the children of God, and do converse with God as with a father. They have fellowship with the Father, not only as he is so to Christ, but also as to them. Now, what kind of honour is this, that we should be called the sons of God ? Ἦσαν δὲ υἱοὺς ἔειπεν, ἅπαντα τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὸν θῆσαυρον ἀνεκάλυψε. The spouse is not only the Lamb's wife, and so a queen, a queen in gold of Ophir, Ps. xlv. 9, but also a king's daughter, ver. 13, the daughter of him who sits on the throne. And as though this were not honour enough, he gives us a better name than that of sons and daughters : Isa. lvi. 5, ' To him that lays hold on my covenant, I will give within my house a name, &c., even an everlasting name.' Here is immortal honour. Sweetly Chrysostom, κὰν οὐδὲν κὰν ἀγόνης κὰν πεινηρὰ τὲ καὶ ἄσημος κὰν ἐν τῷ κατὰ τὴν γῆν βίῳ ἀπερριμμένη, ὑπέρχη διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν κοινωνίαν ἐξευγενίζων βασιλῖδα οὐρανῶν ποιεῖ.

But we are not yet come to the highest of that honour to which this fellowship advances. There is not only approximation, but union. They are not only near to God, but one with him ; united to him closely, intimately, inseparably. And this by virtue of communion ; for this (as before) necessarily includes union. What honour is this, to be one with God ; to be one with the Father and the Son, even as the Father is one with the Son ? So Christ prays, John xvii. 22, ' that they may be one, as we are one ;' as truly, though not as perfectly. And the intimacy of this union is expressed by inclusion ; they are not only united to God, but (if we may use the phrase)

mixed with him; ver. 23, 'I in them, and thou in me.' Nay, a mutual inherency: 'He that dwelleth in love' (in love, which is the bond of this glorious fellowship) 'dwelleth in God, and God in him,' 1 John iv. 16.

(3.) The greatest advantage. We have hereby,

[1.] Plenty, and [2.] Safety.

[1.] Plenty. No good thing will be withheld from those that walk uprightly, Ps. lxxiv. 11; and who walk uprightly but those who walk with him? as appears, Gen. xvii. 1, 'Walk before me, and be thou perfect,' or upright, which is either an ἐξήγησις of the former, or has necessary connection with it. There is nothing good in heaven or earth which God will withhold, no, not heaven and earth itself, when they are good; nor that which hath more goodness in it than heaven and earth united, himself, his Son, his Spirit. 'The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands.' The Son loveth us, and giveth us all things; for all things are common in this communion; the Son, and whatever he hath, is ours, as before. He gives us πάντα πλουσίως, 1 Tim. vi. 17; 'all things richly to enjoy.' All things, not only good, but evil; not as they are evil, but good. The worst thing given to a saint becomes good. That which is evil in itself, and evil to others, is good to them; that which is good in itself and to others, is evil to the wicked. 'All things shall work together,' &c. 1 Cor. iii. 21, All is yours, the whole world; πάσης τῆς γῆς ἀρχόντες οἱ ἄγιοι, rulers of the whole world. See here the total of your wealth. The parcels are in the same chapter, ver. 22. You have your possessions in a map, divided into two hemispheres; each of them comprise a world; things present and things to come, heaven and earth, this world, and that which is hereafter. And in either of these, besides what is known and described, there is a *terra incognita*, vast continents which no eye ever surveyed, nor ear ever heard a relation of; nor could any heart, any thought, take the dimensions of it, so large it is. Yet all this is theirs who are Christ's, ver. 23.

[2.] Safety: Ps. xci. 1, 'He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High, shall lodge under the shadow of the Almighty.' Isa. xxxiii. 16, 'He shall dwell on high, his defence shall be the munition of rocks.' Who dwells in the secret of the Most High, but he that is continually with God, by secret and intimate communion? And he it is that abides under the shadow of the Almighty, his shadow, who is the rock of ages; therefore it may be well said, his defence is the munition of rocks. He that hath such a defence need not fear, as Ps. xli. 2, 3, 'Though the earth be removed, and the mountains carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof,' ver. 5, 'God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved.' No such safety as in nearness to God.

And as the Father undertakes their protection, so the Son. He looks upon them as parts of himself, and those parts that are nearest to his heart. They are his members, and he is sensible of their sufferings, as though the union betwixt them were not only mystical, but physical; in all their afflictions he is afflicted; nay, his body mystical, his people, who have communion with him as a head, are more dear to him than his natural body; for he exposed this to all miseries, to make that happy. Christ will suffer himself rather than they shall suffer. How safe are they!

(4.) The chiefest happiness; for what is happiness but the fruition of the chief good, the enjoyment of God in Christ? Now, what is it to enjoy the chief good (to enjoy God in Christ) but to be united to it, partake of it, converse with it? All these are included in communion.

There is no true blessedness but in this fellowship; and hell itself cannot

hinder those who have this fellowship from being blessed. There is more happiness in this communion, abstracted from heaven, than there is in heaven abstracted from this communion. Heaven is the place of happiness; but this fellowship is the cause, or rather the formality of happiness. This is it which makes heaven happy; and this would make hell to be heaven, if that unhappy place would admit of it: this is heaven upon earth now, and will be the heaven of heaven hereafter. He that has this fellowship is happy before he come to heaven; nay, heaven comes down to him, and is in him, before he be in it. After the descent of the new Jerusalem from heaven, John heard a voice, Rev. xxi. 3, saying, 'The tabernacle of God is with men,' &c. The tabernacle of God is heaven, Ps. xv. When God dwells with a soul, and continues to grant communion, heaven is with that soul. Where the king is, there is the court.

It is true, this communion, while in the body, is very imperfect, and much interrupted, and our happiness is answerable; but, whatever happiness we enjoy, we have it from and in this fellowship. In heaven it shall be perfect and constant, and this is it which makes heaven desirable; however, the happiness which we shall have in heaven, and this here, differ not essentially, but only in degrees. Communion here is the first dawns of heaven, the first gladsome appearances of glory; the day breaks here, and the day-star of bliss arises; the meridian, the noon-day of happiness is in heaven; but there is no happiness, here or in heaven, but springs from this communion.

This is the highest privilege, the greatest happiness, that the most glorious angel in heaven enjoys. What difference betwixt angels and devils, but this, that the one has fellowship with God, the other neither hath, nor can have it? What difference betwixt heaven and hell, but this, that heaven is made happy by this communion, hell miserable by wanting it? What difference betwixt saints militant and triumphant, but this, they are perfectly happy in a perfect communion; these happy imperfectly, enjoying but communion in part! But whatever happiness either angels or saints, in heaven or earth, enjoy, it consists only in this fellowship.

What a strong invincible motive should this be to desire communion with the Father and Son! What stronger motive than happiness! There is none but desire it. There is a strong inclination, a natural tendency, in all creatures, in their several spheres, to happiness. It is the voice of all mortals, 'Who will shew us any good?' Why, here is the way to the chief good, to the greatest happiness, if you will walk in it. Ask the glorious angels and saints why they are happy; they will tell you, because they have this fellowship. Ask the devils and damned spirits why they are miserable; they will say, because they have not, or ever shall enjoy this fellowship. Ask why there is nothing but darkness; they will answer, because they have no fellowship with the Father of lights. Why there is nothing but weeping, &c. *Ans.* Because no communion with the Father of consolation. Ask why there is nothing within them but the torturing worm that dies not; they will answer, because they have no fellowship with him who died for sinners. Ask why nothing without them but everlasting burnings; they will answer, because no communion with him whose blood should quench them. Ask the saints in this world why they are imperfectly happy, why their life is *γλυκύβραχυρον*, made up of bitters and sweets, happiness and misery; they will answer, because their communion is imperfect and interrupted. Ask inferior creatures why they are [not] so happy as men and angels; the answer is, because they are not capable of this fellowship. Ask who you will, all will conclude, all happiness is in communion, nothing but misery without it. If then you would be happy, if you would not be miserable, get it; and if

you would be perfectly happy, get nearer, closer communion with the Father and the Son.

Means.

1. Entertain frequent and delightful thoughts of God. Such will present us to God, and make him present with us. While they are in our minds, he is in our hearts; and there we enjoy him, and converse with him, in a way most suitable to spirits. Communion amongst men is maintained by conference; that with God principally by meditation. This is the character of the wicked, those who are at the greatest distance from God, 'God is not in all their thoughts;' he is not in all their thoughts, or to little purpose. But those who have fellowship with him, he must be in all their thoughts; all their thoughts must be of God. Even when their thoughts are employed about lower objects, they then think of him; because their thoughts of other things have always a tendency to him; he must be your meditation day and night, last and first thoughts; he must be betwixt your breasts as a bundle of myrrh, Cant. i. 13, that, when ye awake, ye may be satisfied with his image; and so, with David, ye may be continually with him, Ps. lxxiii., Ps. cxxxix.

It is true, while we are here, we must be employed in particular callings, and must do what we are called to with all diligence; but one who tastes the sweetness of this fellowship can never be so busied in the world, but he can steal a glance at Christ; and in the thickest crowd of worldly employments, can find a passage to let in some sweet thoughts of God; but, when disengaged from earthly affairs, oh then, as Basil sweetly, *πάς μὲν τόπος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τῆς ὕφραως Χριστοῦ περιληρωσάω*; let the whole soul be taken up with thoughts of Christ; let him fill every part of it; *μηδεὶς δὲ τῶ συνόλου τόπος ἐν αὐτῇ σχολάζεται*, no vacant place, no room to entertain vain, sinful thoughts.

He that is much in thoughts of God hath much of God; these both admit him into the soul, and there entertain him. Christ enters into our hearts, when thoughts of Christ enter; and the meditation of him, in effect, is his inhabitation in us. So Basil, *καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνοίκησις, τὸ δια τῆς μνήμης ἔχειν ἐνδουμένον ἐν αὐτῶ τὸν Θεόν*. These seat God in our hearts, as he sometimes seated himself between the cherubims; and these make our souls his temple, yea, the holy of holies, the holy place of the most holy God; so he, *οὕτω γινόμεθα ναὸς Θεοῦ, ὅταν μὴ φροντίσι γηναῖς τὸ σύνεχεις τῆς μνήμης διακόπτηται*. Our hearts, by a constant entertainment of such thoughts, either actually, or, when that cannot be, habitually, become the tabernacles of God; and he says of them, This is my resting-place, here will I dwell; and, according to his promise, I will walk in them, and dwell in them. God is but a sojourner with those who seldom think of him; he is a wayfaring man, that turns but in for a night; but he is an indweller, and makes a constant abode, with those who constantly entertain him with sweet thoughts. He dwells in them, and walks with them, *i. e.* he abides in them, and converses with them. He does not *παροικεῖν*, but *κατοικεῖν*. This for frequency.

They must be also delightful; such wherein both Christ may, and we must, take delight. Take heed of such thoughts as disparage or misrepresent God; they must be such as advance him, endear him to us; those must delight us. 'How precious are thy thoughts!' &c. Not merely speculative thoughts, for devils and reprobates may have such, but such as have a sweet and powerful influence upon heart and affections. Speculative let God into the head, but not into the heart; into the fancy, but not into the affections. They must be high, adoring, affecting thoughts. The Lord

enters with such thoughts, and with him enters divine light; which, as light here below, being accompanied with heat, kindles the heart into flames of love, zeal; burns up world-lusts and affections, quickens grace, refines the spirit, melts the whole soul, separates it from dross; makes it fit to be cast into the mould of God, and impressions of his glorious image. Be frequent in thoughts that beget such effects; for in these we both enjoy communion with God, and by them are fitted for further communion.

2. Live in dependence upon Christ, in the exercise of faith upon God in Christ. Trust him in all, for all, with all. Trust him with all your concerns, for soul and body, for this life and eternity, for yourselves and posterity. Have confidence in him. You can have no fellowship or intimacy with one in whom you have not confidence; so far as you have fears, doubts, suspicions, jealousy, distrust of him, so far you will be estranged from him; these will keep you off from him, as from one whom you cannot fully trust, and will disoblige him, and so keep him off from you. These, so far as they prevail, will occasion a mutual distance and estrangement, which will not stand with near and mutual fellowship. When you find anything too hard and difficult for you, sin, the world, temptation, any spiritual duty, any service, he calls you to leave it, commit it to him, Ps. xxxvii. 5. When you find anything too heavy for you, any want, affliction, suffering, when it proves too burdensome, cast it upon him: Ps. lv. 22, 'Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee.' He will shew the part of an intimate friend, and put his shoulder under, and not suffer thee to shrink, to be moved, much less to sink. When you are apt to be troubled, perplexed, solicitous about anything, cast that care upon him, 1 Peter v. 7, Philip. iv. 6. They that have lived most in communion with God have lived most in the exercise of faith; trusting him with all they have, in all they fear, for all they want. Walking in communion with God is a walking by faith, not by sense; not making sensible objects, persons or things, their support and confidence; but renouncing all confidence in the flesh, or in those things which a carnal heart has recourse to for support. Rely on, and stay yourselves upon God, Isa. l. 10, else you will walk in darkness, not see your way to communion with God, nor discern the comfort of it. There is perfect peace and repose in this communion, but how may one come by it? See Isa. xxv. 3. While you stay yourselves on God, and go leaning on him, you are near him; he is near you, you are in fellowship with him. This is the posture of intimate friends; thus they enjoy one another, herein their communion shews itself.

3. Renounce fellowship with others, all that is not consistent with, and subservient to this with God. Aristotle tells us, Eth. 10, πολλοῖς δ' εἶναι φίλον κατὰ τελείαν φίλιον οὐκ ἐνδέχεται. Perfect friendship can be betwixt no more than two. And good reason; for entire friendship requires intense affection, a high degree of love. And love, when it is divided, dispersed amongst many objects, is weakened. This is more evidently true here. The continuance of this blessed fellowship requires the whole strength of our souls, the highest strain of affection, Mat. xxii. 37. No love is sufficient, but that which is cordial, love with all the heart. God will have all, or none at all. He will have our love, or we must have none of his company. Now, how can God have all our hearts, if we let them be distracted, by admitting others into such endeared fellowship? Basil upon that place, With all thy heart, &c., says, τὸ δὲ ἐξ ὅλης μέρισμα ἐἰς ἑτέρα οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται, that is not the whole which is divided. God has not all that heart, which is parted betwixt him and others; ὅσον γὰρ ἂν τῆς ἀγάπης καταναλώσις εἰς κάτω, τοσοῦτον σοὶ λείψει ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕλου. God wants so much

of our affections as the creatures have, or when they are loved otherwise than for his sake. The stream of affection will run low to heaven, when it finds many channels on earth; nor will God ever mix with that stream that dirties itself in an earthly channel. As he will not be found of us except our whole hearts seek him, so he will not stay with us except all our affections wait on him; and how can this be, if we suffer other objects to steal them away?

More particularly,

(1.) No fellowship with sin. He shall not have fellowship with the Father of lights, who will have fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. Renounce all sin, the least, the sweetest, the dearest, the right hand, the right eye, else Christ will renounce you. We have fellowship with Christ as with a king. Now, what king will admit of a competitor, will suffer one to exercise equal authority with himself in his own dominions? Our hearts are Christ's throne, and when we obey sin, delight in it, we lift it up into his throne; and while we do this, Christ will be so far from conversing with us as friends or subjects, that he will denounce war against us as traitors and rebels. It is such as betwixt husband and wife. Now, what husband will admit of a co-rival? He is a jealous God. Our hearts are, as it were, the marriage bed; and when we delight in sin, it creeps into our hearts, and takes possession of the bed of love. If we suffer this, we may expect a divorce rather than a conjugal converse with Christ. It is as impossible that light and darkness should be received in the same subject, that heaven and hell should be in the same place, as that Christ and sin should be affectionately entertained in the same heart. Forsake sin, or Christ will forsake you, 1 John ii. 24.

(2.) No fellowship with the world. 'If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.' If the love of the Father be not in us, there is no love of the Father to us; and where no affection, there can be no fellowship, James iv. 4. 'The friendship of the world is enmity with God.' He that will be the world's friend will be God's enemy. No fellowship, in respect of things lawful or unlawful. You must not give too much of your hearts to lawful comforts, not too affectionately converse with lawful relations. 'He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me;' is not worthy of such fellowship. If we be ready and willing to forsake father and mother for Christ, we shall find incomparably more comfort in fellowship with God than in all these enjoyments. *Και πατὴρ ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ περιόντος ὑπερβάλλει φιλοστοργίαν καὶ μητρὸς κηδημονίαν*, Chrysost. If these have more of our affections than God, we shall lose both our relations in heaven and earth, and be deprived of fellowship with both. He that will not lay down his life for Christ, shall lose both his life and Christ too. *οὐκ ἐμπαθῆ δέει εἶναι τὴν ἀγάπην*.

(3.) No fellowship with the wicked: 2 Cor. vi. 14-18, 'Touch not the unclean thing,' or things (as the Syriac); it is an allusion to the legal ceremony. For as unclean things did defile the Israelites, who touched them, so are believers in danger to be defiled by conversing with the wicked; and as those so defiled were not received into the sanctuary, no more will the Lord receive those into friendship with himself, who defile themselves with familiarity, intimate, delightful, with the wicked. But be ye separate, keep at a distance from unclean persons, and then I will receive you. Not into heaven (that is not the meaning), but into my tabernacle, into the secret of the Most High, as appears, Lev. xxvi. 11, 12. I will admit you into my tabernacle, and there you shall converse with me as familiarly as sons and daughters with a father, ver. 8. Now that God's people are defiled by such

converse, appears, Heb. xii. 15, 16, 'Looking diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God, lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled,' &c. 2 Pet. ii. 13, 'Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings, while they feast with you.' Jude, ver. 12, 'These are spots in your feasts of charity,' &c.

4. Labour to be like to God. Assimilation is an effectual means to attain and preserve this fellowship. *Φιλία* is either *ὁμοίότης* or *καθ' ὁμοίωσιν*, as Aristotle. It is the mother of friendship; and communion is nothing but friendship in exercise. Likeness doth both engender and nourish it. There is in similitude a secret sympathy, which does strongly incline the subjects of it to unite, close, mix together, and that attained, does rest in it with much delight; whereas unlikeness is cause of disagreement, and this of estrangement. We must be like God, if we would converse with him; but how? It is true, if we speak properly, we cannot. No creature can be like God, there is an infinite distance betwixt us. He is infinite, we finite. Now betwixt finite and infinite there is no proportion, no similitude. This notwithstanding, God does put such a glory upon grace, as to style it his image, his likeness: Gen. i. 26, 'after his own likeness,' because his soul was adorned with holiness; which is, in Scripture phrase, the divine nature, the image of God, an impression of divinity. The way, then, to be like God, is to get this image repaired, which is now razed and defaced by sin. To get it conformed to its first idea and pattern; to raze out all the sculptures of hell, all the impressions that Satan hath stamped upon our souls, thereby making them deformed, unlike to God, the pattern of our primitive beauty, and incapable of this fellowship: we must be holy, as he is holy, 1 Peter i. 15, 16; merciful, as our heavenly Father is merciful, Luke vi. 35, 36; just, faithful, righteous, spiritual, even as he is so. 'Then shall the King delight in your beauty,' Ps. xlv.

Like the Son too. The same mind must be in us, Philip. ii. 5. We must express the virtues of him who hath called us out of darkness, &c. Learn of him to be meek, lowly, patient, self-denying, zealous, faithful, public spirited. Look unto Jesus as our pattern, endeavour unweariedly to reduce our whole man to a conformity and likeness with him. The more we resemble him, the more will he love and delight in, the more frequently visit us, the more affectionately embrace us; *ὅμοιον ὁμοίον ἐπιτεταί*. What communion hath light with darkness? The harmony of this communion may admit of disproportions, but not of contrarieties. You may as well reconcile light and darkness, as bring the holy God into fellowship with those who have nothing in them like him; *μόνοι φίλοι Θεῷ καὶ ἀλλήλοις ὡς ἅγιοι*, says Basil. There can be friendship and communion betwixt none but God, and those that are holy, like him; *οὐδὲ πίπτει τὸ τῆς φιλίας καλὸν εἰς μοχθηρῶν διάθεσιν*. A wicked disposition, an unsanctified heart, is incapable of friendly communion with men, much more with God.

5. Get nearer union with the Father and Son. This is the foundation of communion. Far from God, and far from communion. Distance hinders the acts of friendship; the interruption of these acts occasions forgetfulness, and this begets estrangement, and this destroys friendship; and where no friendship, no fellowship. On the contrary, the nearer union, the sweeter communion. That we may be more nearly united, we must exercise uniting graces, faith and love. Faith is the cause of mystical, love of moral union. The hand of faith clasps Christ to us, the bonds of love tie us to Christ. Exercise faith on the attributes, promises, providences of the Father; on the person, offices, undertakings of the Son. The more faith is acted, the

more it is strengthened; the more strengthened, the more it unites; the nearer united, the more sweetly may we converse with God: Heb. x. 22, 'Draw near to God in full assurance of faith.'

Love, that is *affectus unionis*. The formality of it is an inclination to union, accompanied with a sweet sympathy, which strongly inclines to join, unite, mix, with the object beloved. Love cannot endure absence or distance; it calls in and commands all other affections to assist in attainment of what it loves. Desire is the wing by which it flies towards its object, and hope supports it. It fixes hatred upon that which interposes, and when this cannot be removed, sorrow and anger attend it. When it is attained, joy and delight embrace it. No grace or affection tends so much to union as love, and therefore none so much to communion; οὐ πάντων Θεὸς ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ τῶν ἰσικειωθέντων αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης, Basil. Love is essential to friends, mutual love, ἀντιφιλήσεις, we cannot imagine this without friendship, nor any communion without both. When we love Christ, he loves us; and where there is mutual love, there will be reciprocal delight; and this will not suffer any distance or estrangement, the only obstacles of this fellowship.

Exercise love, then. Let it inflame itself by the contemplation of the glorious excellencies, eternal love, merciful administrations of the Father; meditation of the transcendent love, infinite loveliness of the Son. This is the way to increase love, and every degree of its increase brings us a degree nearer.

6. Comply with God's designs. That of the wise man\* is applicable, 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' No communion where no concord; no concord, where contrary designs: for contrary designs and ends require contrary means; and they who agree not either in end or means, agree not at all. If you would have fellowship, comply with his end, let his end be yours. Manifest this compliance by promoting his design with his own means. Now the last and the first design of God is his own glory; the end of all his purposes from eternity, and performances in time, is to glorify himself. This must be the aim of all our designs and actions, to make God glorious. Do nothing that tends not thereto; all things with an intent to advance it, and all so as they may most glorify him. The apostle's rule, 1 Cor. x. 31, ἐνὰ μάλιστα ὄρον ἡμῶν δοῦς, &c.; not only spiritual, but natural acts, must be directed in a straight line towards this end. And not only actions extraordinary and of great concernment, but ordinary and of smaller importance. No thought must be entertained, no employment undertaken, before we put this question to it, Will this glorify God? Can I think or do nothing that will more honour him? And if an answer cannot be returned, according to this rule, we should there stop, let it proceed no further, lest we run cross to God, and so break that concord which is the bond of communion.

And as we must comply with general, so with particular designs. God in every act of providence intends his glory, all his works praise him: but commonly he glorifies one excellency more than another, making one attribute more conspicuous than the rest, mercy, or justice, or power. Now when such a beam of glory shines in a dispensation, our soul should fix upon it, praise, adore, admire it; for when God thus honours himself, by darting forth such irradiations of glory, to the end we may glorify him, by acknowledging and taking notice thereof with suitable affections; if we neglect it, we run cross to God's design, and such crossness is inconsistent with communion.

And as we must comply with the end, so with the means which he has

\* Qu. 'Amos iii. 3'—ED.

made choice of to advance this end. Now the means whereby he promotes this end, in those who are admitted to this fellowship, is their holiness. Our holiness is his honour, our grace his glory; though not formally, yet by necessary consequence. God is most honoured by those who are most holy, gets most glory where he gives most grace. The way that is called holy leads directly both to God's glory and ours, brings us to the place where his honour dwells, and where we shall be happy in dwelling with him. Now we must shew our compliance with God in improving this means. Grow in grace, be perfecting holiness. Which that we may do, he calls upon us by the motions of his Spirit, ordinances, acts of providence: these all bespeak our holiness. The rod has a voice, he speaks by afflictions distinctly; he sometimes calls for the exercise of this grace, subduing of that lust. If we diligently observe, we may spy some passage, circumstance, which points at that grace, corruption, &c. Be watchful, obsequious, and then we have God engaged to vouchsafe communion, Rev. iii., John xiv. 23. But if we comply not with God in end and means, will not hear nor open, he will not deal with us as with the spouse, Cant. v. 2; he will withdraw and be gone.

## PUBLIC WORSHIP TO BE PREFERRED BEFORE PRIVATE.

---

*The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob.*—  
PSALM LXXXVII. 2.

THAT we may apprehend the meaning of these words, and so thereupon raise some edifying observation, we must inquire into the reason why the Lord is said to love the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob. This being manifest, the words will be clear.

Now the reason we may find assigned by the Lord himself, Deut. xiii. 5, 6, 11. The gates of Zion was the place which the Lord had chosen to cause his name to dwell there, *i. e.* as the following words explain, the place of his worship. For the temple was built upon, or near to, the hill of Zion. And this, you know, was in peculiar the settled place of his worship. It was the Lord's delight in affection to his worship, for which he is said to love the gates of Zion, more than all the dwellings of Jacob.

But it may be replied, the Lord had his worship, not only in the gates of Zion, in the temple, but also in the dwellings of Jacob. We cannot suppose that all the posterity of Jacob would neglect the worship of God in their families; no doubt the faithful among them resolved with Joshua, 'I and my house will serve the Lord.' Since, therefore, the worship of God was to be found in both, how can this worship be the reason why one should be preferred before the other? Sure upon no other account but this, the worship of God in the gates of Zion was public, his worship in the dwellings of Jacob was private. So that, in fine, the Lord may be said to love the gates of Zion before all the dwellings of Jacob, because he prefers public worship before private. He loved all the dwellings of Jacob, wherein he was worshipped privately; but the gates of Zion he loved more than all the dwellings of Jacob, for there he was publicly worshipped. Hence we have a clear ground for this

*Observation.* Public worship is to be preferred before private. So it is by the Lord, so it should be by his people. So it was under the law, so it must be under the gospel. Indeed, there is difference between the public worship under the law and gospel in respect of a circumstance, *viz.*, the place of public worship. Under the law, the place of public worship was holy, but we have no reason so to account any place of public worship under

the gospel; and this will be manifest, if both we inquire what were the grounds of that legal holiness in the tabernacle or temple, and withal observe that none of them can be applied to any place of worship under the gospel.

1. The temple and tabernacle was [set] apart, and separated for a holy use, by the special express command of God, Deut. xii. 13, 14. But there is no such command for setting apart this or that place under the gospel. The worship is necessary, but the place where is indifferent, undetermined; it is left to human prudence to choose what place may be most convenient. We find no obliging rule, but that in general, 'Let all things be done decently and in order.' Men's consecrations cannot make that holy which God's institution does not sanctify.

2. The temple was *pars cultus*, a part of the ceremonial worship under the law, but there is no such ceremonial worship under the gospel, much less is any place a part of gospel-worship; and therefore no such holiness in any place now as in the temple then.

3. The temple was *medium cultus*, a mean of grace, of worship, under the law. Thereby the Lord communicated to those people many mysteries of religion and godliness; thereby was Christ represented in his natures, offices, benefits. But there is no place under the gospel of such use and virtue now; no such representations of Christ, or communications of religious mysteries by any place of worship whatever; *ergo*, no such holiness.

4. The temple was a type of Christ, John ii. 19; but all the shadows and types of Christ did vanish when Christ himself appeared; and there is no room for them in any place under the gospel.

5. The temple did sanctify the offerings, the services of that people. The altar did sanctify the gift, Mat. xxiii. 19. The worship there tendered was more acceptable, more available, than elsewhere, as being the only place where the Lord would accept those ceremonial services, as also because there is no acceptance but in Christ, who was hereby typified. But these being ceased, to think now that our worship or service of God will be sanctified by the place where they are performed, or more available or acceptable in one place than another, merely for the place's sake, is a conceit without Scripture, and so superstitious; nay, against Scripture, and so profane. The prophet foretold this: Mal. i. 11, 'In every place incense shall be offered unto my name;' in every place, one as well as another, without distinction. The Lord Christ determines this in his discourse, John iv. 21. The hour is at hand when all such respects shall be taken away, and all places made alike, and you and your services as acceptable in every place of the world as at Jerusalem. Hence the apostle's advice, 1 Tim. ii. 8, 'I will that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands,' not in this or that place only. And the promise of Christ is answerable, Mat. xviii. 20. He says not, when two or three are gathered together in such a place, but only 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' Observable is that of Origen upon Matthew, Tract. xxxv., *Vir quidem Judaicus non dubitat de hujusmodi*, A Jew indeed doubts not but one place is more holy than another for prayer, but he that has left Jewish fables for Christ's doctrine doth say that the place doth not make one prayer better than another. So in Homil. V. on Levit., *Locum sanctum in terris non requiro positum, sed in corde*, I seek no holy place on earth, but in the heart. This we must take for the holy place rather (*quam si putemus structuram lapidum*) than a building of stones. So Augustine, *Quid supplicaturus Deo locum sanctum requiris*, &c., When thou hast a mind to pray, why dost thou inquire after a holy place? Superstition had not yet so blinded the world but these ancients could see reason to disclaim that holi-

ness of places which after-ages fancied. And well were it if such superstitious conceits were not rooted in some amongst us. Those who have a mind to see, may, by what has been delivered, discern how groundless that opinion is. But I must insist no longer on it.

Hence it appears that there is a circumstantial difference betwixt the public worship of God under the law and under the gospel. But this can be no ground to conclude that public worship is not to be preferred before private, as well under the gospel as under the law; for the difference is but in circumstance (the place of worship), and this circumstance but ceremonial (a ceremonial holiness); whereas all the moral reasons why public worship should be preferred before private, stand good as well under the gospel as under the law.

But before I proceed to confirm the observation, let me briefly explain what worship is public. Three things are requisite that worship may be public, ordinances, an assembly, and an officer.

1. There must be such ordinances as do require or will admit of public use; such are prayer, praises, the word read, expounded, or preached, and the administration of the sacraments. The word must be read, and prayer is necessary both in secret and private, but they both admit of public use, and the use of them in public is required and enjoined. These must be used both publicly and privately; the other cannot be used duly but in public.

2. There must be an assembly, a congregation joined in the use of these ordinances. The worship of one or two cannot be public worship. Of what numbers it must consist we need not determine; but since what is done in a family is but private, there should be a concurrence of more than constitute an ordinary family.

3. There must be an officer. The administrator of the ordinances must be one of public quality, one in office, one set apart by the Lord, and called to the employment by the church. If a private person in ordinary cases undertake to preach the word or administer the sacraments, if it be allowed as worship, which is not according to ordinary rule, yet there is no reason to expect the blessing, the advantage, the privilege of public worship.

This for explication; now for confirmation. Observe these arguments.

1. The Lord is more glorified by public worship than private. God is then glorified by us when we acknowledge that he is glorious. And he is most glorified when this acknowledgment is most public. This is obvious. A public acknowledgment of the worth and excellency of any one tends more to his honour than that which is private or secret. It was more for David's honour that the multitude did celebrate his victory, 1 Sam. xviii. 7, than if a particular person had acknowledged it only in private. Hence the psalmist, when he would have the glory of God most amply declared, contents not himself with a private acknowledgment, but summons all the earth to praise him, Ps. xcvi. 1-3. Then is the Lord most glorified, when his glory is most declared, and then it is most declared when it is declared by most, by a multitude. David shews the way whereby God may be most glorified, Ps. xxii. 22, 23, 25. Then he appears all glorious when publicly magnified, when he is praised in the great congregation. Then he is most glorified when a multitude speaks of and to his glory: Ps. xxix. 9, 'In his temple does every one speak of his glory.' The Lord complains as if he had no honour from his people, when his public worship is despised, neglected: Mal. i. 6, 'If I be a father, where is mine honour? If I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord God of hosts unto you, O priests that despise my name.' By *name of God* here is meant his worship and ordinances, as plainly appears

by what follows, ver. 7, 8, 11. And he here expostulates with them as tendering him no honour, because they despised his worship and ordinances. Then shall Christ be most glorified, when he shall be admired in all them that believe, in that great assembly at the last day, 2 Thess. i. 10. And it holds in proportion now; the more there are who join together in praising, admiring, and worshipping him, the more he is glorified: and therefore more in public than in private.

2. There is more of the Lord's presence in public worship than in private. He is present with his people in the use of public ordinances in a more especial manner, more effectually, constantly, intimately.

For the first, see Exod. xx. 24. After he had given instructions for his public worship, he adds, 'In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.' Where I am publicly worshipped, for the name of God is frequently put for the worship of God, I will come; and not empty-handed, I will bless thee: a comprehensive word, including all that is desirable, all that tends to the happiness of those that worship him. Here is the efficacy.

For the constancy of his presence, see Mat. xxviii.: 'I am with you always to the end of the world.' Where, after he had given order for the administration of public ordinances, he concludes with that sweet encouragement to the use of them, *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας*, I am with you always, every day, and that to the end of the world. Here is the constancy.

See the intimacy of his presence: Mat. xviii. 20, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' He says not, I am near them, or with them, or about them, but in the midst of them; as much intimacy as can be expressed. And so he is described, Rev. i. 13, to be in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, in the midst of the church; there he walks and there he dwells; not only with them, but in them. For so the apostle, 2 Cor. vi. 16, renders that of Lev. xxvi. 12, which promise he made, upon presupposal of his tabernacle, his public worship amongst them, ver. 11. Hence it is, that when the public worship of God is taken from a people, then God is departed, his presence is gone; as she, when the ark was taken from the Israelites, cried out, 'The glory is departed.' And why, but because the Lord, who is the glory of his people, is then departed? Public ordinances are the sign, the pledge of God's presence; and in the use of them, he does in a special manner manifest himself present.

But you will say, Is not the Lord present with his servants when they worship him in private? It is true; but so much of his presence is not vouchsafed, nor ordinarily enjoyed, in private as in public. If the experience of any find it otherwise, they have cause to fear the Lord is angry, they have given him some distaste, some offence; if they find him not most, where ordinarily he is most to be found, and this is in public ordinances, for the Lord is most there where he is most engaged to be, but he has engaged himself to be most there where most of his people are. The Lord has engaged to be with every particular saint, but when the particulars are joined in public worship, there are all the engagements united together. The Lord engages himself to let forth as it were, a stream of his comfortable, quickening presence to every particular person that fears him, but when many of these particulars join together to worship God, then these several streams are united and meet in one. So that the presence of God, which, enjoyed in private, is but a stream, in public becomes a river, a river that makes glad the city of God. The Lord has a dish for every particular soul that truly serves him; but when many particulars meet together, there is a variety, a

confluence, a multitude of dishes. The presence of the Lord in public worship makes it a spiritual feast, and so it is expressed, Isa. xxv. 6. There is, you see, more of God's presence in public worship, *ergo* public worship is to be preferred before private.

3. Here are the clearest manifestations of God. Here he manifests himself more than in private, *ergo* public worship is to be preferred before private. Why was Judah called a valley of vision, but because the Lord manifested himself to that people in public ordinances? Which he not vouchsafing to other nations, they are said to 'sit in darkness, and in the valley of the shadow of death.' Here are the visions of peace, of love, of life; and blessed are those eyes that effectually see them. Here are the clearest visions of the beauty, the glory, the power of God, that can be looked for, till we see him face to face. David saw as much of God in secret as could then be expected, but he expected more in public, and, therefore, as not satisfied with his private enjoyments, he breathes and longs after the public ordinances, for this reason, that he might have clearer discoveries of the Lord there: Ps. xxvii. 4, 'One thing have I desired, and that will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life.' Why did he affect this, as the one thing above all desirable? Why, but to behold the beauty of the Lord? &c. So, Ps. lxxiii. 1, 2, though David was in a wilderness, a dry and thirsty land, where was no water, yet he did not so much thirst after outward refreshments as after the public ordinances; and why? 'To see thy power and thy glory.'

If we observe how Christ is represented when he is said to be in the midst of the churches, we may thereby know what discoveries of Christ are made in the assemblies of his people, Rev. i. 13, &c.

*Clothed with a garment down to the foot.* That was the priests' habit. Here is the priestly office of Christ, the fountain of all the saints' comfort and enjoyments.

*Girt about the paps with a golden girdle.* This was the garb of a conqueror. So Christ is set forth as victorious over all his people's enemies.

*His head and hairs white like wool.* Here is his eternity; whiteness is the emblem of it. Therefore, when the Lord is expressed as eternal, he is called the Ancient of days.

*His eyes as a flame of fire.* Here is his omniscieny; nothing can be hid from his eye. The flame scatters darkness, and consumes or penetrates whatever to us might be an impediment of sight.

*His feet like to fine brass.* Here is his power; to crush all opposers of his glory and his people's happiness; they can no more withstand him, than earthen vessels can endure the force of brass.

*His voice as the sound of many waters.* Here his voice is most loud and powerful; so powerful, as it can make the deaf to hear, and raise the dead out of the grave of sin. His voice in private is a still voice, here it is as the sound of many waters.

*He had in his right hand seven stars.* Here is his providence, his tender care of his messengers, the ministers of the gospel, the administrators of public ordinances; he holds them in his hand, his right hand, and all the violence of the world, all the powers of darkness, cannot pluck them thence.

*Out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword.* His word publicly preached, sharper than a two-edged sword, as described, Heb. iv. 12, 13, pierces the heart, searches the soul, wounds the conscience. With this Christ goes on, conquering and to conquer, maugre all opposition.

*His countenance was as the sun that shineth in his strength.* Here the ace of Christ is unveiled, the fountain of light and life, the seat of beauty

and glory, such as outshines the sun in his full strength. So he appears, as he becomes the love, the delight, the admiration, the happiness, of every one whose eyes are opened to behold him.

Now, as he is here described in the midst of the churches, so does he in effect appear in the assemblies of his people. No such clear, such comfortable, such effectual representations of the power and wisdom, of the love and beauty, of the glory and majesty of Christ, as in the public ordinances: 'We all here, as with open face, behold the glory of the Lord.'

4. There is more spiritual advantage to be got in the use of public ordinances than in private, *ergo* they are to be preferred. Whatever spiritual benefit is to be found in private duties, that, and much more, may be expected from public ordinances when duly improved. There is more spiritual light and life, more strength and growth, more comfort and soul refreshment. When the spouse (the church) inquires of Christ where she might find comfort and soul nourishment, food and rest, he directs her to public ordinances: Cant. i. 7, 8, 'Go by the footsteps of the flock,' walk in the path of God's ancient people. And feed the kids beside the shepherds' tents. Shepherds are (in the phrase of the New Testament) pastors or teachers, those to whom the Lord has committed the administration of his public ordinances. To them is the church directed for food and rest, for spiritual comfort and nourishment; and it is commended to her as the known way of the whole flock, that flock whereof Christ is chief shepherd.

That is a pregnant place for this purpose, Eph. iv., where the apostle declares the end why the Lord Christ gave public officers, and consequently public ordinances. He gave them, ver. 12, 'for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' Here is edification, even to perfection: ver. 13, 'Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' Here is knowledge and unity, even in a conformity to Christ: ver. 14, 'That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.' There is strength and stability, maugre all the sleight and craftiness of seducers: ver. 15, 'But speaking the truth in love, may grow up unto him in all things, which is the head, even Christ.' There is growth and fruitfulness, and that in all things. These are the ends for which the Lord Jesus gave his church public officers and ordinances; and they will never fail of these ends if we fail not in the use of them. What more can be desired? Here doubts are best resolved, darkness scattered, and temptations most effectually vanquished. David had private helps as well as we, but how strangely did a temptation prevail against him, till he went into the sanctuary: Ps. lxxiii. 16, 17, 'When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me, until I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I their end.' Nothing was effectual to vanquish this temptation, till he went into the sanctuary. Thus you see there is more spiritual advantage in public worship than in private, and therefore it is to be preferred.

5. Public worship is more edifying than private, *ergo, &c.* In private you provide for your own good, but in public you do good both to yourselves and others. And that is a received rule, *Bonum, quo communius, eo melius*, that good is best which is most diffusive, most communicative. Example has the force of a motive; we may stir up others by our example: Zech. viii. 20, 21, 'There shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities: and the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts.' This was frequent with

David : Ps. xxxiv. 3, ' Oh magnify the Lord with me, let us exalt his name together ;' Ps. xcvi. 7, 8, ' Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people, give unto the Lord glory and strength. Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name.' Live coals, if ye separate them, and lay them asunder, will quickly die ; but while they are continued together, they serve to continue heat in one another. We may quicken one another, while we join together in worshipping God ; but deadness, coldness, or lukewarmness may seize upon the people of God, if they forsake the assembling of themselves together. It is more edifying ; therefore to be preferred.

6. Public ordinances are a better security against apostasy than private, and therefore to be preferred : an argument worthy our observation in these backsliding times. He that wants the public ordinances, whatever private means he enjoy, is in danger of apostasy. David was as much in the private duties of God's worship as any, while he was in banishment ; yet, because he was thereby deprived of the public ordinances, he looked upon himself as in great danger of idolatry. Which is plain from his speech, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, ' They have driven me out this day from abiding in the inheritance of the Lord, saying, Go serve other gods.' There was none about Saul so profane as to say expressly unto him, Go serve other gods. Why then does he thus charge them ? Why, but because by banishing him from the inheritance of the Lord, and the public ordinances, which were the best part of that inheritance, they exposed him to temptations which might draw him to idolatry, and deprive him of that which was his great security against it. They might as well have said plainly, Go and serve other gods, as drive him out from the public worship of the true God, which he accounted the sovereign preservative from idolatry.

But we have too many instances nearer home to confirm this. Is not the rejecting of public ordinances the great step to the woful apostasies amongst us ? Who is there falls off from the truth and holiness of the gospel into licentious opinions and practices, that has not first fallen off from the public ordinances ? Who is there in these times that has made shipwreck of faith and a good conscience, who has not first cast the public worship of God overboard ? The sad issue of forsaking the public assemblies (too visible in the apostasy of divers professors) should teach us this truth, that public ordinances are the great security against apostasy, a greater security than private duties, and therefore to be preferred.

For this end were they given, that we might not be tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine, Eph. iv. 14. No wonder if those that reject the means fall so wofully short of the end ; no wonder if they be tossed to and fro, till they have nothing left but wind and froth. This was the means which Christ prescribed to the church, that she might not turn aside to the flocks of those companions, hypocrites, or idolaters : Cant. i., ' Feed by the shepherds' tents.' No wonder if those who shun those tents become a prey to wolves and foxes, to seducers and the destroyer. Public ordinances are a more effectual means to preserve from apostasy, and therefore to be preferred before private.

7. Here the Lord works his greatest works ; greater works than ordinarily he works by private means, *ergo*. The most wonderful things that are now done on earth are wrought in the public ordinances, though the commonness and spiritualness of them makes them seem less wonderful. It is true, we call not conversion and regeneration miracles, but they come nearest to miracles of anything that is not so called. Here the Lord speaks life unto dry bones, and raises dead souls out of the grave and sepulchre of sin, wherein they have lain putrefying many years. Here the dead hear the voice

of the Son of God and his messengers, and those that hear do live. Here he gives sight to those that are born blind; it is the effect of the gospel preached to open the eyes of sinners, and to turn them from darkness to light. Here he cures diseased souls with a word, which are otherwise incurable by the utmost help of men and angels. He sends forth his word, and heals them; it is no more with him but speaking the word, and they are made whole. Here he dispossesses Satan, and casts unclean spirits out of the souls of sinners that have been long possessed by them. Here he overthrows principalities and powers, vanquishes the powers of darkness, and causes Satan to fall from heaven like lightning. Here he turns the whole course of nature in the souls of sinners, makes old things pass away, and all things become new. Wonders these are, and would be so accounted, were they not the common work of the public ministry. It is true indeed, the Lord has not confined himself to work these wonderful things only in public; yet the public ministry is the only ordinary means whereby he works them. And since his greatest works are wrought ordinarily by public ordinances, and not in private, therefore we should value and esteem the public ordinances before private duties.

8. Public worship is the nearest resemblance of heaven, therefore to be preferred. In heaven, so far as the Scripture describes it to us, there is nothing done in private, nothing in secret, all the worship of that glorious company is public. The innumerable company of angels, and the church of the first-born, make up one general assembly in the heavenly Jerusalem, Heb. xii. 22, 23. They make one glorious congregation, and so jointly together sing the praises of him that sits on the throne, and the praises of the Lamb, and continue employed in this public worship to eternity.

9. The examples of the most renowned servants of God, who have preferred public worship before private, is a sufficient argument. It was so in the judgment of those who were guided by an infallible Spirit, those who had most converse with God, and knew most of the mind of God; and those who had experience of both, and were in all respects the best, the most competent judges. If we appeal to them, this truth will quickly be put out of question. David, who has this testimony, that he was a man after God's own heart, shews by his practice and testimony that this was God's own mind. To what I have formerly produced to this purpose, let me add but one place, wherein he pregnantly and affectionately confirms this truth: Ps. lxxxiv. 1, 'How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts!' He speaks by way of interrogation, insinuating that they were amiable beyond his expression. You might better read this in his heart than in his language. Accordingly he adds, ver. 2, 'My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God.' Oh what expressions! Longing; nothing else could satisfy. Fainting; it was his life; he was ready to faint, to die, for want of it: ver. 10, 'I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.' David was at this time a king, either actually or at least anointed; yet he professes he had rather be a door-keeper where he might enjoy God in public, than a king where deprived of public worship. He would choose rather to sit at the threshold, as the original is, than to sit on a throne in the tents of wickedness, in those wicked, heathenish places where God was not publicly worshipped. Hezekiah and Josiah were the two kings of Judah of highest esteem with God, as he has made it known to the world by his testimony of them. Now what was their eminency but their zeal for God? And where did their zeal appear, but for the public worship of God? See it of Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxix. 2, 3, 'He did that which was right in the sight

of the Lord, according to all that David his father had done. He, in the first year of his reign, in the first month, opened the doors of the house of the Lord, and repaired them.' Of Josiah, chap. xxxiv. and xxxv. The apostles also, and primitive Christians bear record of this. How careful were they of taking all opportunities that the word might be preached, and the Lord worshipped in public! How many hazards did they run, how many dangers, how many deaths did they expose themselves to, by attempting to preach Christ in public! Their safety, their liberty, their lives, were not so dear to them as the public worship; whereas, if they would have been contented to have served the Lord in secret, it is probable they might have enjoyed themselves in peace and safety as well as others. The Lord Christ himself, how much soever above us, did not think himself above ordinances, though he knew them then expiring; nor did he withdraw from public worship, though then corrupted. Nay, he exhorts his disciples to hear them who publicly taught in Moses's chair, though they had himself, a far better teacher. You find him frequently in the synagogues, frequently in the temple, always at the passover; and his zeal for public worship was such, as they apply that of the psalmist to him, 'The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.'

10. Public worship is the most available for the procuring of the greatest mercies, and preventing and removing the greatest judgments. The greatest, *i. e.* those that are most extensive, of universal consequence to a whole nation or a whole church. It is most effectual for the obtaining public mercies, for diverting public calamities, therefore to be preferred before private worship. This is the means the Lord prescribes for this end; and he encourages his people to the use thereof with promises of success: Joel ii. 15, 16, 'Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly. Gather the elders, sanctify the people,' &c. There is the means prescribed: See the success, ver. 18, 19, *ad finem*. He assures them the issue hereof should be mercies of all sorts, temporal and spiritual, ordinary and extraordinary, and that to the whole nation. Jehoshaphat used this means, and found the success answerable: 2 Chron. xx. 3, 4, 'He set himself to seek the Lord, and proclaimed a fast throughout all Judah,' &c. This is the argument he uses, 'Thy name is in this house,' ver. 9. Immediately the Lord despatches a prophet with a gracious answer: ver. 15, 17, 'Thus saith the Lord, Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours, but God's. Stand still, and see the salvation of God.' The event was wonderful: ver. 23, 24, 'The children of Ammon and Moab stood up against the inhabitants of mount Seir, utterly to slay and destroy them. And when Judah came toward the watch-tower in the wilderness, they looked unto the multitude, and, behold, they were dead bodies.' Nineveh bears witness to this, who hereby prevented her utter destruction, threatened by the prophet within forty days. Nor want we instances in the New Testament. Hereby the church prevailed for the miraculous deliverance of Peter, Acts xii. 5. And wonderful were the effects hereof to the whole church: Acts iv. 31, 'When they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and spake the word of God with boldness.' So Rev. viii. 4. There you have mention of the prayers of all saints, in a description after the form of public prayers, offered in the temple at the time of incense. And an answer is immediately returned, such an one as brought with it the destruction of that domineering Roman state which then persecuted them. Now, that which is of most public and universal advantage is worthily to be preferred; but such is public worship, and therefore to be preferred before private.

11. The precious blood of Christ is most interested in public worship, and that must needs be most valuable which has most interest in that which is of infinite value. The blood of Christ has most influence upon public worship, more than on private; for the private duties of God's worship, private prayers, meditation, and such like, had been required of, and performed by, Adam and his posterity, if he had continued in the state of innocency; they had been due by the light of nature, if Christ had never died, if life and immortality had never been brought to light by the gospel. But the public preaching of the gospel, and the administration of the federal seals, have a necessary dependence upon the death of Christ. As they are the representations, so they are the purchase of that precious blood; as Christ is hereby set forth as crucified before our eyes, so are they the purchase of Christ crucified, so are they the gifts of Christ triumphant. Conquerors used on the day of triumph, *spargere missilia*, to scatter gifts amongst the people. Answerably the apostle represents to us Christ in his triumph, Eph. iv., distributing gifts becoming such a triumph, such a conqueror: ver. 8, 'When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.' And those gifts, he tells us, ver. 12, are public officers, and consequently public ordinances to be administered by those officers. How valuable are those ordinances, which are the purchase of that precious blood, which are the gifts Christ reserved for the glory of his triumph!

12. The promises of God are more to public worship than to private. Those exceeding great and precious promises, wherever they are engaged, will turn the balance; but public worship has most interest in them, and therefore more to be valued than private. If I should produce all those promises which are made to the several ordinances, the several parts of public worship, I should rehearse to you a great part of the promissory part of Scripture. I shall but briefly touch some generals. The Lord promises his presence, in the places before alleged: Exod. xx. 24, 'In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.' Protection and direction: Isa. iv. 5, 'Upon all the glory shall be a defence.' The Lord will be to the assemblies of his people as a pillar of cloud and fire. His presence shall be as much effectually to his people now as those pillars were then. 'Upon all their glory.' As formerly in the wilderness, the Lord, having filled the inside of the tabernacle with his glory, covered the outside of it with a thick cloud, Exod. xl. 34, so will he secure his people and their glorious enjoyments in public worship. His presence within shall be as the appearance of his glory, to refresh them; his presence without shall be as a thick cloud to secure them, ver. 6, a tent. His presence shall be that to the assemblies of his people which the outward tent or coverings were to the tabernacle, Exod. xxvi. 7.

Light, and life, and joy, and that in abundance, even to satisfaction, Ps. xxxvi. 8, 9. Satisfied abundantly, and drink spiritual delights as out of a river. Life and growth: Isa. lv. 2, 3, 'Hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness,' &c. Life and blessedness: Prov. viii. 34, 35, 'Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors. For whoso findeth me, findeth life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord.' Acceptance, Ezek. xx., xliv. 4. Spiritual communion and nourishment: Rev. iii. 20, 'Behold I stand at the door and knock,' &c. He speaks there to a church, and in public ordinances he knocks hardest. Grace and glory, yea, all things that are good. There is not a more full and comprehensive promise in the Scripture than that, Ps. lxxxiv. 11, 'No good thing will be withhold from them that walk uprightly.' But what is this to public wor-

ship? Why, the whole psalm speaks of public worship; and therefore, by the best rule of interpretation, we must take this as promised to sincere walking with God in public worship. Besides, the particle *for* tells us this is given as the reason why David had such a high esteem of public worship, why he preferred one day in God's house before a thousand; and therefore this promise must have reference to public worship, else there is no reason to use this as a reason. This promise is to public worship; and what is there in heaven or earth desirable that is not in this promise?

It is true, you may say, there are many great and precious promises to public worship, but are there not promises also to private duties?

It is granted there are, but not so many, and the argument runs so. The promises are more to public worship than to private; besides, those which seem to be made to private duties are applicable to public worship, and that with advantage. If the interest of one saint in a promise be prevalent with God, how prevalent then are the united interests of many assembled together? So that all the promises which the people of God make use of to support their faith in private duties will afford us much support, nay more, in public. Then add to these the promises which are peculiar to public worship, and the sum will appear far greater, and this reason of great force to prove the truth propounded; that is most valuable which has the greatest share in those exceeding great and precious promises, but public worship has the greatest share in these, and therefore most valuable.

*Obj.* But notwithstanding all the arguments brought to prove public worship is to be preferred, I find something to the contrary in experience; and who can admit arguments against experience? I have sometimes in private more of God's presence, more assistance of his Spirit, more joy, more enlargement, more raised affections; whereas in public I often find much dullness of heart, much straitness and unaffectedness, therefore I cannot so freely yield that public worship is to be preferred.

*Ans.* I shall endeavour to satisfy this in many severals.

1. Experience is not a rule for your judgment, but the word of God; that is a fallible guide, this only infallible. If you press your judgment always to follow experience, Satan may quickly afford you such experience as will lead you out of the way. Be scrupulous of following experience when it goes alone, when it is not backed by the word, countenanced by Scripture. It has deceived many. Empirics are no more tolerable in divinity than in physic. As there reason and experience, so here Scripture and experience, should go together. Those that live by sense may admit this alone to be their guide, but the event has often proved it a blind one. Those that live by faith must admit no experiments against Scripture. Nay, those that are but true to reason will not admit a few experiments against many arguments. You find this sometimes true in private, but do you find it so ordinarily? If not, here is no ground to pass any judgment against what is delivered. It may be a purge or a vomit does sometimes tend more to your health than your meat and drink; will you therefore prefer physic before your ordinary food? It may be in some extremity of cold you find more refreshment from a fire than from the sun; will you therefore prefer the fire, and judge it more beneficial to the world than the sun? Experience must not rule your judgment here, nor must you be confident of such apprehensions as are only granted upon some few experiments.

2. It may be your enjoyments in private were upon some special occasion. Now some special cases make no general rule; nor are they sufficient promises to afford an universal conclusion. For instance, it may be you enjoyed so much of God in private, when you were necessarily and unavoid-

ably hindered from waiting upon the Lord in public ordinances. Now in this case, when the people of God bewail the want of public liberties as an affliction, and seek the Lord in special manner to supply that want in private, he is graciously pleased to make up what they are deprived of in public, by the vouchsafements of his quickening and comforting presence in private. So it was with David in his banishment, yet this did nothing abate his esteem of or desires after the public ordinances; far was he from preferring private duties before public, though he enjoyed exceeding much of God in private. Nor must we from such particular cases draw an universal conclusion; either affirmatively, that private is to be preferred; or negatively, that public is not to be preferred.

3. These enjoyments of God in private may be extraordinary dispensations. These the Lord does sometimes use, though seldom, though rarely. Now, such extraordinary cases are exceptions from the general rule, and such exceptions do limit the rule, but not overthrow it. They take off something from the extent, nothing from the truth of it. It holds good still, more of God is enjoyed in public than private; except in rare extraordinary cases, ordinarily it is so. And this is sufficient, if there were no other argument to establish the observation as a truth, public worship is to be preferred before private.

4. It may be thy enjoyments in private are the fruits of thy attendance upon God in public. It may be the assistance, the enlargement, the affections thou findest in private duties, are the returns of public worship. The benefits of public ordinances are not all, nor always, received while ye are therein employed; the returns of them may be continued many days after. The refreshment the Lord affords his people in public worship is like the provision he made for Elijah in the wilderness, 1 Kings xix. 18, 'He arose and did eat and drink, and went in the strength of that meat forty days.' When the Lord feasts his people in public, they may walk with the Lord in the strength thereof in private duties with more cheerfulness, with more enlargedness, more affection, many days after. Those that know what it is to enjoy communion with God in his ordinances, know this by experience. When the Lord meets you in public, find ye not your hearts far better disposed to, and in, private duties? Now, if the assistance you find in private be the fruits of your waiting upon God in public, this should rather raise your esteem of public worship than abate it. That which is objected tends to confirm this truth, so far should it be from hindering you to subscribe it.

5. There may be a deceit in thy experience. All those joys, affections, enlargements, which men find in duties, are not always from the special presence of God. There may be a great flash of spirit, and much cheerfulness and activeness from false principles; some flashes of fleeting affections, some transient and fading impressions, may fall upon the hearts of men, and yet not fall from above. The gifts of men may be sometimes carried very high, even to the admiration of others, whenas there is little or no spiritual life. Vigour of nature, strength of parts, enforcement of conscience, outward respects, delusive joys, delusive visions, ungrounded fancies, deceiving dreams, yea, superstitious conceits, may work much upon men in duties when there is little or nothing of God. When men seem to be carried out with a full gale of assistance, it is not always the Spirit of God that fills the sails. A man may move with much life, freedom, cheerfulness, in spiritual duties, when his motion is from other weights than those of the Spirit.

Nay, further, not only those potent workings which are ordinary, but extraordinary, such as ecstasies and raptures, wherein the soul is transported, so as to leave the body without its ordinary influence, so as it seems without

sense or motion; such inward operations on the soul as work strange effects upon the body, visible in its disordered motions and incomposed gestures. Such workings as these have been in all ages, and may be now, from the spirit of darkness transforming himself into an angel of light; and therefore, if such private experiences be produced to disparage the public worship, the public ministry, or any other public ordinance of God (however they pretend to the Spirit of God), they are to be rejected. The deceits of our own hearts, or the delusions of that envious spirit, who has always shewed his malice against God's public worship, should not be admitted, to render this Scripture truth questionable, that public worship is to be preferred before private. And, indeed, the experiences of ordinary personal assistance in private duties, if it be made use of to this end, is to be looked upon as suspicious; you may suspect it is not as it seems, if this be the issue of it. Those assistances which come from the Spirit of God have a better tendency than to disparage the public worship of God, which himself is so tender of. And this should be the more regarded, because it is apparent Satan has a design against God's public worship, and he drives it on in a subtler way than in darker times. He would thrust out one part of God's worship by another, that so at last he may deprive us of all. Mind it, then, and examine thy experiences, if there be a deceit in them, as many times there is. They are of no force against this truth, public worship is to be preferred before private.

6. It may be the Lord seems to withdraw from thee, and to deny thee, spiritual assistance in public worship for trial; to try thy love to him, and the ways which most honour him; to see whether thou wilt withdraw from him and his worship, when he seems to withhold himself from thee; to try whether thou wilt serve God for nothing, when thou seemest to find nothing answerable to thy attendance and endeavours. This is the hour of England's temptation in other things, and probably it is so in this as well as others. If it be so with thee, thy resolution should be that of the prophet, Isa. viii. 17, 'I will wait upon the Lord, that hideth his face from the house of Jacob.' If this be thy case, thy esteem of his public worship should hereby be rather raised than abated, since this is the way to comply with the Lord's design in this dispensation, the way to procure more comfortable returns, more powerful assistance than ever.

7. You may enjoy more of God in public, and not observe it. As there may be a mistake in thinking you enjoy much of God in private when you do not, so there may be a mistake in thinking you want the presence of God in public when indeed you have it. It is not the improvement of parts, enlargement of heart, flashes of joy, stirrings of affections, that argue most of God's presence; there may be much of these when there is little of God. It is a humble soul, one that is poor in spirit, that trembles at the word, that hungers and thirsts after Christ, that is sensible of spiritual wants and distempers, that is burdened with his corruptions, and laments after the Lord and freer enjoyments of him. He whose heart is soft and pliable, whose conscience is tender, it is he who thrives and prospers in the inward man. And if these be the effects of thy attendance upon God in public worship, thou dost there enjoy much of God's presence, whatever thou apprehend to the contrary. These are far more valuable than those affections and enlargements by which some judge of the Lord's presence in his ordinances; for these are the sound fruits of a tree of righteousness, whereas those are but the leaves or flourishes of it, which you may sometimes find in a barren tree. So far as the Lord upholds in thee a poor and hungering spirit, a humble and thirsting heart, so far he is graciously present with thee; for this is it to which he has promised a gracious presence in his ordinances, Isa. lxi. 1, 2.

The Lord speaks here as though he were not so much taken with the glory of the temple, no, not with the glory of heaven, as with a spirit of this temper. As sure as the Lord's throne is in heaven, this soul shall have his presence. The streams of spiritual refreshments from his presence shall water these valleys, whereas high-flown confidants, that come to the ordinances with high conceits and carnal boldness, shall be as the mountains, left dry and parched. See Mat. v. 3-6. You may enjoy the presence of God in public, and not observe it. Now, if thy experience be a mistake, no reason it should hinder thee from yielding to this truth, that public worship is to be preferred before private.

8. It is to be suspected that what you want of God's presence, in public worship, is through your own default. Not because more of God is not to be enjoyed, more spiritual advantage is not to be gained in public ordinances, but because, through some sinful miscarriage, you make yourselves incapable thereof. Let this be observed, and your ways impartially examined; and you will find cause to accuse yourselves, instead of objecting anything against the pre-eminence of public worship. There is so much self-love in us, as we are apt to charge anything, even the worship of God itself, rather than ourselves; yea, when ourselves ought only to be charged and accused. The Lord's hand is not straitened, &c. The worship of God is the same, the Lord as much to be enjoyed in it; no less comfort and advantage to be found in it than formerly (and formerly more has been enjoyed therein than in private); how comes it, then, that there is any occasion to object against it? Why, our iniquities have separated between us and our God.

Let our hearts and ways be searched, and all, or most of all those, who have any temptation to object against it, will find it thus, and may discern the reason in themselves.

Do ye not undervalue the public worship, and the enjoyment of God in it? Are ye not many times indifferent, whether ye enjoy it or no? Is it a sad affliction to your souls, when ye leave the ordinances, without enjoying God in them? Have ye bewailed it accordingly? If not, you have too low thoughts of spiritual enjoyments to have much of them. Do ye think God will cast such pearls before swine, such precious things before those who trample on them, who contemn them?

Do ye not entertain some prejudice against some public ordinances, or against the public minister? Even this is enough to render them less comfortable, less effectual. Why was the public ministry of Christ less effectual amongst his own countrymen? Why were they possessed with prejudices against him? Mat. xiii. 55.

Have ye not neglected the public worship? Have ye absented yourselves from the ordinances without any necessary occasion? Oh how common is this sin! and how justly chastised, when the Lord absents himself from them, who are so willingly absent from his public worship. When you withdraw from the public ordinances, you withdraw from God; and is not here reason enough for the Lord to withdraw from you?

Come ye not unprepared, with slight and careless hearts, without due apprehensions, either of the Lord or of yourselves? This is to affront his majesty, this lays his honour low, Mal. i. 6. No wonder if ye find not that power and quickening virtue in the ordinances; you may find the reason in yourselves; you hereby provoke the Lord to withdraw from them, and you in them.

Where are your desires after public ordinances, after the presence of God in them, after the spiritual advantages of them? Can ye say with him, 'One thing I have desired, and that will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord,' &c. Can ye say, 'As the hart panteth after the

water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God? My soul thirsteth for God, when shall I come and appear before God? Can you say, 'My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee, to see thy glory,' &c. Can ye say, 'My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God.' Oh, were there but such desires, there would be few such complaints, few such objections. Were there such desires, the Lord would quickly clothe his public ordinances with their wanted glory and power, cause to say, *Nunquam abs te, absque te*. But is it not reason they should not enjoy much, who desire so little?

Do ye not give way to deadness, slothfulness, carelessness in public worship? Do you stir up yourselves to lay hold on God? It is the diligent hand that makes rich. 'He becomes poor that dealeth with a slack hand,' Prov. x. 4. If the ordinances come not to you, as a ship laden with precious treasures, blame your negligence: Heb. xi. 6, 'He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.'

Do ye come in faith? Do your thoughts and hearts work upon a promise, when you are going to public ordinances? You know who said it, 'Except ye believe, ye shall not see the power of God.' If Christ could do no mighty works, because of their unbelief, what think ye the ordinances can do?

Do ye not come for by-ends, come for something else, something worse, than that which you complain you find not? Come ye not for custom, because it is the fashion, and shame not to come to it? Come ye not to avoid the censure, the offence, the displeasure of others? Come ye not to stop the mouth of conscience, to avoid its clamours? Come ye not for niceties, notions, novelties, as those who seek a fine weed rather than the ears of corn? Come for what you will, if ye come not to meet with God, to get life, to be filled with the Spirit, is it not reason why you should go without them?

Do ye not neglect the after improvement of public ordinances? Neglect ye not to draw out the efficacy of them in secret, by prayer, meditation, and the exercise of faith? Think ye the act done is sufficient, labouring for nothing but what ye find in the present exercise? Do ye think your work done when the minister has done? Oh no. If you would enjoy God in the word, then your work should begin. The ordinances are like grapes; it is not enough that they are given into your hands; if you would have the sweetness and nourishment of them, they must be pressed, that is your work in secret. The negligence, carelessness, slothfulness of men in not improving public ordinances in secret, causes him to withdraw himself, and his blessing in public.

These, and such evils, provoke the Lord to deny his presence, withhold the comforts and blessed advantages of public worship; so as others may enjoy more hereof in private than those that are herein guilty do find in public. You need but read your own hearts for an answer to this objection; it is not because the Lord is less to be found in public than in private, that you find less of him there, but because you make yourselves incapable of enjoying him, unfit to find him.

9. Suppose what is alleged were true, that you did find more joys, enlargement, assistance in private, that there was no mistake in these experiences, and that they were ordinary, which I am far from granting, yet, allowing all the advantage imaginable in this respect to private duties, this notwithstanding, public worship is to be preferred, for divers other unanswerable reasons formerly given. I will but now instance in two. Public worship is a more public good, it is more edifying, the advantage more common and extensive,

the benefit more universal, and therefore to be preferred before private, as much as an universal benefit is to be preferred before a particular, a public good before a private. He is a man unworthy to live in a commonwealth, who will prefer his private interests before the public good. It is a nobleness of spirit to be public-spirited; the light of nature discovers an excellency in it, religion and gospel principles much more require it, and the Lord himself does commend and encourage it with special rewards. Those that profess themselves to be servants of God should be ashamed to be outvied herein by heathen. Our first question should not be, Where may I receive most good? But where may I do most good? The saving of souls should be preferred before our comforts, and that advantage most valued which is most extensive and universal. Such is the advantage of public ordinances, and therefore they are as far to be preferred before private, as the public good before a man's private interest.

Then suppose you found more comfort, enlargement in private than in public worship, yet the glory of God is to be preferred before your advantages; and therefore that whereby his glory is most advanced, before that wherein your particular interest is most promoted. But God is most glorified in public worship; here is given the most ample testimony to his glorious excellencies, here is the most public acknowledgment of his glory. No otherwise can we glorify him than by acknowledging his glory, and the more public this acknowledgment is, the more is he glorified; but it is most public in public worship, and therefore this is as much to be preferred before private, as the glory of God before your private advantage.

*Use 1.* Reproof to those that undervalue public worship. Too many there are worthy of this reproof, especially two sorts:

1. Those that prefer worse things before public worship. If it be to be preferred before private duties, which are excellent and singularly advantageous in themselves, how heinously do they sin who prefer things that are base and sinful before public ordinances; those who prefer their ease, their worldly employments, their lusts or unlawful recreations, before them!

Do not they prefer their ease before the worship of God, who will not take the pains, who will excuse themselves by very slight and trivial occasions from coming to the place of public worship? The Lord has not made the way to his worship so tedious, so toilsome, as it was under the law; there is not the distance of many miles betwixt us and it, nor will it cost us divers days' journey to have the opportunities of public worship; we have it at our doors. And yet such slothfulness, such contempt there is of it, as we will scarce sometimes stir out of doors to enjoy these blessed liberties; a little rain, a little cold, anything of like moment, we take for a sufficient excuse to be absent. The people of God, in former times, counted it their happiness that they might come to the public ordinances, though through rain, and cold, and wearisome journeys, Ps. lxxxiv. But where is this zeal for God's worship now? Is there not much less, when the gospel engages us to much more? May not even the unbelieving Jews rise up in judgment against the slothfulness of this generation, and condemn it? No such thing would hinder them from coming to the gates of Zion at the appointed seasons, how far soever their habitations were distant from it, how unseasonable soever the season seemed; yet many amongst us make every sorry thing a lion in the way, prefer their sloth and ease before God's public worship.

Others prefer their worldly occasions before the public worship of God, willingly embrace any earthly business offered to stay from the ordinances. Esau was stigmatised as a profane person for preferring the pottage before his birthright; but they exceed Esau in profaneness who prefer the things

of the world before this singular prerogative, of worshipping God in public. What a special privilege is this! How few are they in the world enjoy it! Does the Lord vouchsafe this honour, to have it, and himself in it contemned? Of thirty parts, into which the world may be divided, twenty-five are pagans or Mahometans, wholly without the true worship of God; but five bear the name of Christian. And of those, when you have discounted the Greeks, papists, Abassines, amongst whom the worship of God is wofully corrupted, you may judge to how small a part of mankind the Lord has vouchsafed his public worship in its purity. It is a special, a peculiar favour, a singular prerogative. Oh what profaneness is it, to prefer outward things, such as are common to all, to the worst of all, before this peculiar blessing! Yet how common is this profaneness! The thinness of our assemblies does daily testify it. One part of the day is thought enough by some, too much by others, for God's public worship; whereas we think nothing too much for the world. Oh the Lord's infinite patience!

Others prefer their lust before it; had rather sit in an ale-house, or in the seat of scorners, than wait at the posts of wisdom. Many had rather spend that time which the Lord has allotted for their souls, in sports and recreations, than in the public worship; think one whole day in seven too much, will rob God of all, or part of it, to recreate themselves. Oh that such profaneness should be so common where the light of the gospel has so long shined! The Lord prefers the gates of Zion, but these prefer Meshech and the tents of Kedar. I beseech you, consider the heinousness of this sin. The Lord styles his worship his name frequently in Scripture, as though his worship were as dear to him as himself. What do ye then but contemn God himself, while ye despise his worship? He that speaks it of his officers has the same account of his ordinances: he that despiseth them despiseth me, &c. And what do ye think it is to despise Christ? How jealous has the Lord always shewed himself of his worship! Some of the most remarkable judgments we meet with in Scripture have been inflicted for some miscarriage about his worship. For this Nadab and Abihu consumed with fire from heaven, for this Eli's family utterly ruined, for this Uzziah smitten with leprosy and Uzzah with sudden death, Michal with barrenness, for an error in the outward part of worship. The Lord is a jealous God, jealous especially over his worship. If you despise that, you are in danger; his jealousy will burn like fire against you. Now, do ye not despise it, when you prefer your ease, worldly affairs, lusts, idleness, recreations before it? This is to profane the holy, the glorious name of God. And the Lord will not hold him guiltless; it is a *μείσις*; the Lord will certainly judge, surely condemn, him that does so.

2. They deserve reproof who prefer private before public worship, or equal with it. I shall but instance in two particulars, wherein this is evident.

(1.) When private duties are used in the time and place of public worship. Now, how ordinary is this amongst us! When you come too late to wait upon God, after the public worship is begun, I see it is common to fall to your private prayers, whatever public ordinance be in hand. Now, what is this but to prefer your private praying before the public worship, and so to despise the ordinance in hand? What is it but to thrust public worship out of its season, and put private in its room? It is held indeed a great point of devotion and reverence, that is the pretence for it; but this pretended reverence casts a real disrespect upon the public ordinance then used. For the mind is withdrawn from it in the sight of God, and the outward man in the sight of men; and so public worship is hereby disrespected, in the sight both of God and men.

The intention may be good indeed, but that cannot justify what is sinful, what is evil; for we must not do evil that good may come of it. And this is evil, it is sinful, since it is sinful to prefer a private duty before a public ordinance.

It is against the apostle's rule, which he prescribes for the regulating of public assemblies: 1 Cor. xiv. 40, 'Let all things be done decently and in order.' Now that is not done in order, which is not done in its place and season; but this is neither the place nor season for private prayers; it is the time of public worship, therefore private is now unseasonable. Nor is this the place of private prayer; that is thy closet, according to Christ's direction, Mat. vi. 6; and he makes it the badge of hypocrites, to use their private prayers in public places, ver. 5. A good thing, out of its place and season, may become evil, evil in the worst sense, that is, sinful. This is not the place, the time for your private prayers, therefore it is a disorder here to use them; and what is here disorderly, is, by the apostle's rule, sinful, and therefore I beseech you let it be avoided. Do not expect the Lord will accept your private devotion, when it casts disrespect upon his public worship, which he himself prefers, and will have us to prefer before private.

(2.) When men absent themselves from public worship, under pretence that they can serve the Lord at home as well in private. How many are apt to say, they see not but their time may be as well spent at home, in praying, reading some good book, or discoursing on some profitable subject, as in the use of ordinances in public assemblies! They see not but private prayer may be as good to them as public, or private reading and opening the Scripture as profitable as public preaching; they say of their private duties, as Naaman of the waters of Damascus, 2 Kings v. 12. May I not serve the Lord as acceptably, with as much advantage, in private exercises of religion? May I not wash in these and be clean? They see not the great blessings God has annexed to public worship more than to private. Oh, but if it be thus, if one be as good as the other, what means the Lord to prefer one before the other? To what purpose did the Lord choose the gates of Zion, to place his name there, if he might have been worshipped as well in the dwellings of Jacob? How do men of this conceit run counter to the Lord? He prefers the gates of Zion, not only before one or some, but before all the dwellings of Jacob; and they prefer one such dwelling before the gates of Zion. What is this but to disparage the wisdom of God, in preferring one before another when both are equal; in preferring that which is unworthy to be preferred? What presumption is this, to make yourselves wiser than God, and to undertake to correct him? He says the gates of Zion are to be loved, public worship before private; you say no, you see no reason but one should be loved as well as the other. Who art thou, O man, who thus disputest against God?

To conclude this use, let me shew you the sinfulness of preferring private worship before public, in the fore-mentioned or other respects, by applying what has been delivered. To prefer private before public, or by not preferring public before private, in your judgment, affection, or practice, you neglect the glory of God, which is here most advanced; you slight the presence of God, which is here most vouchsafed, that presence which is the greatest happiness the people of God can expect, in heaven or on earth. You undervalue the manifestation of God, those blessed visions of life and peace, which are most evidently, most comfortably, here represented; those manifestations which are the dawns of approaching glory, the first glimpses of the beatifical vision. You contemn those blessed soul advantages which

are here more plentifully gained ; you prefer a private supposed benefit before public edification ; you expose yourselves to the danger of backsliding, which is here more effectually prevented ; you condemn the Lord's greatest works upon the souls of sinners, which are here ordinarily effected ; you slight heaven, which is here in a more lively manner resembled ; you disparage the judgment of the most renowned servants of God, who in all ages have confirmed this truth by their testimony or practice ; you make yourselves less capable of procuring public mercies, or diverting public calamities, slighting the means most conducive to this end ; you undervalue the blood of Christ, whose influence is here most powerful ; you despise those great and precious promises of the gospel, which are more engaged for public worship than private. Oh, consider how heinous that sin is, which involves the soul in so much guilt, which is attended with so many provoking evils ; bewail this sin, so far as thou art guilty of it, and let the sinfulness thereof engage thee to be watchful against it.

*Use 2, of exhortation.* Be exhorted to give to the public worship of God the glory that is due to it ; let it have the pre-eminence which the Lord has given it ; prefer it before private, in your thoughts, in your affections, in your practice. Get higher thoughts of public ordinances, get affections answerable to those apprehensions ; manifest both by a frequent affectionate use of these ordinances, by your praises for the enjoyment, by your prayers for the continuance of them. A duty this is which the text requires, a duty which these times call for. When there is so much disrespect cast upon the worship of God, your endeavours should be more for the advancement of it. This is the way to shew yourselves faithful to God, stedfast and upright, in the midst of a declining generation. This duty always finds acceptance with God ; but now he will take it better, because there is a stream of temptation, of opposition against it. Oh let not your souls enter into their secret, who dishonour God, by despising his public worship ; who blaspheme God, by speaking contemptibly of his name, that name which he records amongst us, and thereby does graciously distinguish us from the neglected world. I might enforce this with many motives ; but what more forcible than this in the text ? 'The Lord loves the gates of Zion, more than all the dwellings of Jacob.' Those that thus do are herein like the Lord. This is the highest pitch of excellency that angels or men can aspire to, to be conformable to the Lord, to be like him, to have any resemblance of him. Why, this is the way ; when we thus love, prefer the public worship, the like mind is in us that is in the Lord (so far as likeness may be admitted, where there is an infinite distance), herein you will be followers of God as dear children. Whereas those who despise the public worship of God, despise God himself, comply with Satan in one of his most mischievous designs against God and his people, and hereby do what in them lies to lay his honour in the dust. It is not out of any respect of private duties that Satan endeavours to advance them above public worship ; his design is to withdraw professors from both, he knows they stand or fall together, and the event proves it. You will find those that withdraw from public worship will not long make conscience of private ; except the Lord break Satan's design, by a sudden reducing them. If you will not be carried away with the error of the wicked, and fall into the snare of the devil, keep up the honour of public worship. To that end observe these directions.

1. Get high thoughts of God. The Lord and his worship are so nearly related, as they are either esteemed or despised together. He that has high thoughts of God, will have suitable apprehensions of his worship, wherein his glory most appears, Ps. cii. 16. We see it in David. None

had higher apprehensions of God; see with what raised expressions he extols him, Ps. cxlvi. And none had a higher esteem of public worship, as appears in those affectionate expressions formerly alleged. If you have high thoughts of God, that will be of high esteem with you, wherein he most appears, wherein he is most enjoyed. 'In the temple will every one speak of his glory,' for in public worship he appears most glorious. If ye have low thoughts of God, no wonder if you undervalue his worship! If you have a high esteem of God, you will have an answerable esteem of his name, of his worship. So Ps. xlviii., they profess their high thoughts of Zion, the public ordinances, ver. 2, 3, and the reason you may see: ver. 9, 'We have thought of thy loving-kindness, O God, in the midst of thy temple!' If you apprehend God as great, and holy, and fearful, and glorious, it will help you to such thoughts of his worship as becomes his great, and holy, and fearful name. His worship is his name.

2. Get due apprehensions of those things, whereupon the pre-eminence of public worship is grounded. It follows, ver. 3, 'Glorious things,' &c., *i. e.* of the church and ordinances of God. It was the city of God in these respects, and in no other respect could so glorious things be spoken of it. Here is the sweetest enjoyment of God, the clearest discoveries of his glory, the powerful workings of the Spirit, the precious blood of Christ in its force and efficacy, the exceeding great and precious promises in their sweetest influences, spiritual life and strength, soul comforts and refreshments, the conversion of sinners, the edification of the body of Christ, the salvation of souls. These are the glorious things that are spoken of public worship; get a high esteem of these, and public worship will be highly valued. Look upon public ordinances in their glory, as they give the greatest glory to the God of heaven, as they are the greatest glory of his people on earth, and this will raise a spiritual mind to high apprehensions of them. Will you not honour that which is most honourable to God, that which is your greatest honour? Here the Lord, if anywhere in the world, receives the glory due unto his name, Ps. xxix. 1, 2. To worship God in public is the way to give him the glory due to his name; and is not this of highest value? It is your glory too. Public ordinances are the glory of the people that enjoy, that improve them. Where the Lord has placed his name, there his honour dwells. When the Lord has erected his public worship in a place, then glory dwells in that land; when this is removed, the glory is departed. That which is most your glory, challenges your highest esteem. Look upon this as your glory, and then you will account it highly valuable.

3. Delight in the worship of God. We soon disrespect that which we take no pleasure in; and, therefore, when the Lord is commanding the sanctifying of his Sabbath, he joins these: Isa. lviii. 13, 'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable,' &c. If it be not your delight, it will not be honourable. If you be of their temper who say, 'When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn; and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?' Amos viii. 5; if public ordinances, praying, preaching, be a burden to you: not only private duties, but the base things of the world, will take place of it in your minds and hearts. When we are weary of a thing, take no pleasure in it, we easily give way to any suggestion that may disparage it. Let the worship of God be your delight, the joy and solace of your souls. Be glad of all opportunities to worship God in public, in season, and out of season, like David: Ps. cxxii. 1, 'I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go unto the house of the Lord.' Let it be your meat and drink to be thus employed; go, as to a feast; sit

down under the shadow with great delight, while the fruits of ordinances, the shadow of heavenly enjoyments, are sweet.

4. Get spiritual hearts. All the glory of public worship is spiritual, and spiritual things are spiritually discerned, 1 Cor. ii. 14. A carnal man cannot discern that which renders the public ordinances so highly valuable. Custom, and other respects, may persuade him to use them, but he will never perceive the glory, the spiritual value of God's worship, till he have a spiritual eye. Christ himself was foolishness to the Greeks, because they saw no further than his outside, 1 Cor. i. 23. So was the preaching of Christ to carnal Jews and Gentiles; so it is, more or less, to all natural men, except some outward respect, some plausible ornament commend it. A spiritual eye can discern a glory in public worship, when the outside seems mean and contemptible. As the unbelieving Jews of Christ, so carnal men of his ordinances; there is no form nor comeliness therein to command any extraordinary respect; they see no beauty therein that they should desire them.

5. Look upon the public ordinances with the eye of faith. If you consult only with sense, you will be apt to say as the Assyrian, What are the waters of Jordan more than the rivers of Damascus? What is there in public reading the word, more than reading at home? What is there in public preaching, more than in another good discourse? Sense will discern no more in one than in the other; but the eye of faith looks through the prospect of a promise, and so makes greater, more glorious discoveries; passes through the mean outside, to the discovery of a special, an inward glory; sees a special blessing, a special assistance, a special presence, a special advantage, in public worship; no way so discoverable as by the eye of faith through a promise. Unbelievers want this perspective, and therefore see no further than the outside.

Faith can see the wisdom of God in that preaching, which the blind world counts foolishness, as they did the apostle's; can see a glory in those ordinances which, in the eyes of carnal men, are mean and contemptible. When the child Jesus lay in the manger, a poor, despicable condition, the wise men saw, through those poor swaddling clothes, such a glory as commanded their wonder and adoration, whereas many others, in the same inn, saw no such thing. And why so? The wise men looked upon the child Jesus through that intimation, that word from heaven, whereby he was made known to them. The outside of public worship, now under the gospel, is but like those poor swaddling clothes; but Christ is wrapped in them, there is a spiritual glory within, which a believer discerns, and accordingly values them, whereas an unbeliever sees no such thing. That worship, which, to sense and unbelief is mean and contemptible, is to faith, looking through a promise, the most glorious administration under heaven. The eye of faith must be opened, else the ordinances will not be valued. The Lord has given more encouragements to faith under the gospel, and therefore may expect more exercise of it, than under the law. And his dispensations are answerable. His children under the law were in their minority and nonage, Gal. iv. 1. The outside of his worship was then glorious, the administration of it in state and pomp, he allowed the children that which would please their senses; but now, under the gospel, they are come to riper age, he allows no such gay outside, prescribes no such pomp as sense is taken with; the glory is spiritual, and such as is only visible to faith. And yet the glory of the second temple is greater than the first, the public worship under the gospel is more glorious than under the law. Though there be no golden censer in the ark, overlaid with gold, no cherubims of glory shadowing the

mercy-seat, no such ornament to take the senses, yet there is a far more exceeding glory, 2 Cor. iii. 11, but it is such a glory as is only discerned by the eye of faith. This you must exercise if you would give to the public worship of God the glory that is due to it.

6. Labour to draw out the virtue and efficacy of public ordinances, to make the utmost improvements of them. When you find the refreshing comforts, the blessed advantages of public worship, you will not need many motives to give them their due honour: Ps. xlvi. 8, 'As we have heard, so have we seen,' &c. When they had not only heard, but seen, what God was to his people in his public worship, no wonder if they express their high esteem of it: ver. 1-3, 'Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of his holiness. Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is mount Zion,' &c.

Now, that you may reap such advantage by them as may raise your esteem of them,

1. Come not unprepared. No wonder if unfruitfulness under the ordinances be so common, when neglect of preparation is so ordinary: Eccles. v. 2, 'Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God.' Come not rashly, without due consideration with whom you have to do, and what you are a-doing. Come not with guilt and pollution upon your consciences, Ezek. xxiii. 21, 29. This is it from which we must be separate, if we would have God receive us, 2 Cor. vi. 17. Come not with minds and affections entangled in the world: 'Put off thy shoes,' &c. Come not with careless, indisposed spirits, with hearts unfixed, Ps. lvi. 7. Come not with that carnal, dull temper, which your hearts contract by meddling with the world. Plough up the fallow ground. If you sow among thorns, you will reap little to raise your esteem: Ps. xxvi. 6, 'I will wash mine hands in innocency, so will I compass thine altar, O Lord.' He alludes to the custom of the priests, enjoined under the law to wash their hands and feet, when they went about the service of the tabernacle. And this was exemplary to the people then, to us now, to teach us with what preparedness we should approach God.

2. Get acquainted with your spiritual condition. Come apprehensive of the state of your souls, whether it be the state of grace or nature, what your spiritual wants, what your inward distempers, what your temptations are; else you may hear much to little purpose, not discerning what is seasonable; else many a petition may pass unobserved, when you know not what most concerns you. Oh, if professors knew their soul's condition punctually, and were thoroughly affected with it, the word would come in season, it would be like apples of gold, the ordinances would be as rain upon the new-mown grass, they would distil a fruitful influence, and their souls would grow as the lily.

3. Come with hearts hungering after the enjoyment of Christ in his ordinances. This affection has the promise: Mat. v., 'He filleth the hungry with good things.' Sense of emptiness and indigency brings you under the aspect of this promise, under the sweet and gracious influences of it; whereas conceitedness of our own abundance, senselessness of our spiritual poverty, shuts up the treasury of heaven against us, 'The rich he sends empty away,' Ps. lxxi. 10. Our souls should stretch themselves wide open, in earnest longings after God; this is the way to be filled with the rich blessings of spiritual ordinances.


4. Use the ordinances with holy fear and reverence, Ps. ii. 11, and iii. 7. That confidence which the Lord approves in his children is not a carnal boldness, such as some mistake in the room of it. When we are admitted

to most intimacy and familiarity with Christ, when we are invited to kiss the Son; yet there is a holy fear required: 'Serve the Lord with fear,' &c. When we have cause to rejoice in the Lord's gracious condescension to us poor worms, yet then we must tremble in apprehension of that overpowering glory and excellency to which we approach, Heb. xii. 28. The house, which the Lord prefers before the temple, is a trembling heart, Isa. lxvi. And if he choose it for his habitation, he will richly furnish it; his presence will be to it light and life, joy and strength, grace and glory.

5. What you do in public worship, do it with all your might. Shake off that slothful, indifferent, lukewarm temper, which is so odious to God. Let your whole man tender this worship. Think it not enough to present your bodies before the Lord. Bodily worship profits as little as bodily exercise. The worship of the body is but the carcase of worship; it is soul worship that is the soul of worship. Those that draw near with their lips only shall find God far enough from them; not only lips, and mouth, and tongue, but mind, and heart, and affections; not only knee, and hand, and eye, but heart, and conscience, and memory, must be pressed to attend upon God in public worship. David says, not only 'my flesh longs for thee,' but 'my soul thirsts for thee.' Then will the Lord draw near, when our whole man waits on him; then will the Lord be found, when we seek him with our whole heart.

Let your whole man wait upon God; serve him so with all your might. Let his worship be your work, and be as diligent in it for your souls, as you are in other employments for your bodies. Spiritual slothfulness is the ruin of souls, it brings them to consumptions, it leaves them languishing under sad distempers. Those that will not stir up themselves to lay hold on God, will be bowed down under many infirmities. Soul-poverty will be the issue of spiritual sloth, Prov. xviii., 'a great waster.' So far from increasing the stock of grace, as he will greatly waste it, Prov. xx. 4. It holds in a spiritual sense. His soul shall be in a beggarly condition, as though it had nothing, even in harvest, in the midst of plenty, when others are reaping the sweet fruits of public ordinances, and laying up store against winter, against an evil day. In the midst of their plenty, the spiritual sluggard shall have nothing, Prov. xii. 17. It is the diligent man that shall be enriched with precious substance, even the precious advantages of public worship. The Lord is the rewarder of those that seek him diligently. Those that are diligent in preparing for it, diligent in attending on it, diligent in after improvement of the ordinances, this man's soul shall be rich, rich towards God. The Lord will bless him with such spiritual riches, in the use of public ordinances, as will raise his esteem of them.

END OF DISCOURSES.



THE PRACTICAL DIVINITY OF THE PAPISTS

DISCOVERED TO BE DESTRUCTIVE OF

CHRISTIANITY AND MEN'S SOULS.

[As this is a polemical treatise, it has been deemed necessary to use more than ordinary care in verifying the numerous quotations. Almost the whole have been so verified, and may be depended upon as absolutely accurate.—ED.]

## AN ADVERTISEMENT.

---

I HAVE always thought, since I considered and understood what popery was, that the knowing of it would be a sufficient dissuasive from it, to those that regard God and their souls. This persuasion, together with compassion for those that are seduced, and desire to secure those that are in danger, engaged me in this present undertaking; wherein I have discovered what the practical divinity of that church is, how pernicious, and inconsistent with the way to salvation declared in the Scripture. I have herein the concurrence of some (few in comparison) of that church, who are sensible of such doctrine prevailing amongst them, as they say is absolutely opposite to the rules and spirit of the gospel; <sup>1</sup> such as no man that hath never so little tenderness of his own salvation, but must conceive an horror at; <sup>2</sup> such as they call a poisonous morality, more corrupt than that of pagans themselves; <sup>3</sup> and which permits Christians to do, what pagans, Jews, Mahometans, and barbarians, would have had in execration; <sup>4</sup> such as is, in their style, the most palpable darkness that ever came out of the bottomless pit; <sup>5</sup> such as overthrows the essential points of Christian religion, and the maxims that are most important, and of greatest necessity, in order to the salvation of men. <sup>6</sup> Of this they have given the world notice in several discourses, <sup>7</sup> two of which I have seen (though unhappily not the latter, till I had gone through the greatest part of what I intended). As to the extent of this execrable divinity, they declare, that whole societies would have these extravagancies accounted Roman traditions; <sup>8</sup> that the church is overgrown with this poisonous morality; that it is ready to be overwhelmed with the deluge of these corruptions; that the church is filled with this most palpable darkness. <sup>9</sup> Elsewhere they seem to fix this charge upon the Jesuits principally, as if they would have it thought not to reach much further; but withal tell us, that the Jesuits are the most numerous and the most powerful body of men in the whole church, and have the disposal of the consciences of all the greatest. <sup>10</sup> So that I can represent them no worse

<sup>1</sup> Representation of Curés of Paris, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Page 4.

<sup>3</sup> Their Remonstrance, p. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Their Answer maintaining the Factum, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 12.

Provincial Letters, Jesuits' Morals.

Remonstrance of Curés of Paris.

Answer maintaining the Factum.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

than some of themselves do; and the worst that can be said falls, by their own acknowledgment, upon the most considerable part of their church. That they should so far accuse the whole, cannot be expected (whatever occasion there be for it), so long as they think fit to continue in its communion. But then, if we regard those who are so great a part of the church upon the account of their numbers, and more in respect of their authority and influence, the maxims so branded,<sup>1</sup> are Roman traditions,<sup>2</sup> the true doctrine of faith, the true morality of the church, not asserted by that society alone, but equally (if not more) by Catholic writers of all sorts; and those that quarrel thereat are factious spirits. Hereby, so far as the testimony of adversaries against themselves can clear a matter in question, there is evidence, both that the practical doctrine amongst them is pernicious and damnable, and also that it is common and generally followed.

I intend not here to impeach any maxim peculiar to the Jesuits, but that doctrine of the Romanists which is far more extensive, delivered by canonists and divines, secular and regular, of every sort, and in part by the canon law and their councils (who sometimes glance at this subject, though they make it not their business); that which in most particulars, and those of greatest moment, is ancients than the Society; and in many points such, as the censurers of the Jesuits' morality do not touch, but either approve themselves, or dare not condemn, lest they should involve the whole church in the condemnation. I cannot discern that the practical divinity of the Jesuits is more corrupt than that of other Romish writers, their contemporaries; and those that view the moral discourses of both, and compare them, will (if I much mistake not) discern no other. I never yet met with any author of that order so intolerably licentious, but might be matched, if not outvied, by others. There is no need to except Escobar or Bauny (though most branded), nor do their keen antagonists do it, when they speak of others whom they know to be no Jesuits, as the most extravagant that ever were.<sup>3</sup> There is no reason why the odium which a community incurs should be appropriated to a party; nor that the Society only should be noted as the sink, when the corruption is apparent everywhere. So far as the Jesuits are concerned herein, it hath been sufficiently exposed by others; upon which account I decline those of that order, not putting the reader to rely upon any evidence from their writing. Only because it is requisite to shew their concurrence in some points, which otherwise might not pass for the common doctrine, I make use of Bellarmine freely (whom none can count a corrupter of popery, however Christianity hath been treated by him), and of Suarez sometimes (whose judgment alone is counted equivalent to a thousand others, by some<sup>4</sup> that are none of the Society). I allege beside, though rarely, one or two more of those fathers, of like eminency and authority in that church; but none of them, save in such points wherein they have not been noted for extravagancies by others; or in such wherein those of other orders concur with, or go beyond them. The greatest advantage I make of them, is to represent the opinions of others, not their own; and most herein of Suarez, who usually gives an account of the common doctrine out of unexceptionable authors. Those whom I principally rely on to make good the charge, are the ancients and better sort of their divines and casuists (the strictest of them in points of morality that I could meet with), such as are so far from being disciples of Ignatius, that most of them are Dominicans (most opposite of all orders to the Jesuits, and said to be the least tainted with these corruptions), and the greatest part of them were writers before their

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*.

<sup>2</sup> *Defence of the Factum*.

<sup>3</sup> *Remonstrance of the Curés of Paris*.

<sup>4</sup> *Vid. Jo. Sanc. Disp. 44, n. 41.*

order was founded, or appeared to the world on this subject. To these I have added other casuists of this last age, not that there is need to produce any worse than the former, but to shew that time hath made little or no alteration amongst them for the better.

The Romanists, when they are ashamed of their doctrine, or think the world will cry shame of it, are wont to disown it. It is like they may do so here, and tell us that these points, not being determined by councils, are not the doctrine of their church, but the opinions of particular doctors. This serves them for a shift in other cases with some colour, but it will be absurd to offer at it here. For though this be not their doctrine of faith, which with some generals, most about the sacraments, (reflected on in the sequel as there is occasion) is the business of their councils; yet it is the practical doctrine of their church, if it have any, and if they think their catholics concerned to be Christians more than merely in opinion. And this, under several heads, I have collected out of such writings as are the proper place of it. Therefore, to say that this is not the doctrine of their church, because the particulars are not found decided by councils, is to tell us that they are not charged with it, unless we can find it, where they know it cannot be found, and where, with any reason, it cannot be looked for. It is no more reasonable than if one, who hath taken a purse, should plead, though it be found in his hand, that he is not to be charged with it, unless we can spy it in his mouth, when yet he never opens it. That councils should give particular directions for conscience and practice, in cases innumerable, was never attempted, nor ever can be expected. Their church leaves this to her divines and casuists; and that nothing may pass them but what is agreeable to her sense, no books are to be published, but with the approbation and authority of such as are counted competent judges hereof; so that the doctrine of their authorised writers, that especially wherein they commonly agree, is the practical doctrine of that church, or else she hath none such, and consequently no care of the lives and consciences of her members; and though this be not infallible, or *de fide*, as they count the decisions of councils, yet is it as certain, they say, as the nature of the subject requires, nor do they pretend to have any infallible doctrine for particular directions herein; which yet may justly seem very strange to any man that considers that gross faults in life and practice are more infallibly damnable than errors in faith and speculation. Now, upon this their common doctrine, the substance of the charge ensuing, and the principal articles thereof, are grounded. As for the opinions of particular doctors, wherein there is no such common concurrence, though they be not so certain as the other, yet they are (even the worst of them) safe in practice, any of their people may follow them without danger, and with a good conscience; for this (as will appear hereafter) is the common judgment of their schools and doctors, and so far the doctrine of their church. And if that church did no farther own these opinions, common or particular, then, under this character, this is enough for our purpose (when the question is of the danger of popery in reference to men's salvation), that she counts such rules of life safe, and publicly allows them as direction for practice, which tend to ruin religion and men's souls. If they were not counted safe, that church which pretends to so much care of souls, since all in her communion are exposed to the danger, would be concerned to give warning of it, and brand these maxims as pernicious; but this was never yet done, nor ever like to be. These opinions, all, or the greatest part of them, were taught and published in that church, before the Council of Trent; there was time enough, in eighteen years, to take cognisance of them and their pernicious consequence; yet, when they bestowed *anathemas* so liberally, where there

was occasion, and (for the most part) where there was none, they thought not fit to bestow one curse upon these doctrines, how execrable soever; yea, some part thereof of worst consequence had there an express confirmation. Their popes since, though they could see occasion to condemn such propositions as the five ascribed to Jansenius, and those of Baius, White, and many others, could not, by the help of a judgment counted infallible, discern anything in the worst of these doctrines worthy of, or fit for, their censure. The cardinals of the inquisition at Rome, and their setters in other countries, whose business it is to spy whatever (in books particularly) is against faith and good manners, see nothing of this nature in that which destroys both. No expurgatory index (what havoc soever has been made by those tools in their best authors) hath, so far as I have observed, touched the common opinions here exposed. It is true, some others have been expunged, and I find above forty opinions of the late casuists censured by Alexander the Seventh, and the cardinals of their sacred congregation;<sup>1</sup> but hereby more authority is added to those I insist on, being thought good enough to pass untouched; which must therefore be counted sound doctrine and safe for practice in the judgment of their virtual church, and the chief parts of their church representative.

There is no ground to expect that this doctrine, as to the principal and most pernicious parts of it, will ever be condemned by any popes or councils of such complexion and principles as that of Trent, where it was a maxim observed religiously, that no determination should pass, which either in matter or form would disoblige any considerable party among them, much less all. The Roman interest is supported by such politics, and must be secured, whatever become of souls or saving doctrine. There are indeed some dissenters amongst them (as there are elsewhere) who complain of their moral divinity, but they are such whose power and interest can reach little further than complaints; and these are so far from being the voice or sense of their church, that their writings which exhibit such complaints are condemned at Rome<sup>2</sup> by the supreme tribunal (as they call it) of the inquisition.

In short, by the known custom and settled order of the Roman church, the people, for regulating of their hearts and lives, are to be directed by their confessors, their confessors have their direction herein from their casuists and practical authors; both priests and people must believe this to be safe, because the church hath made this provision for them, approves the course, and obligeth them to take no other. And thus that doctrine, the deadly venom whereof I here discover, must be conveyed from their casuists to all sorts amongst them; nor must they fear any danger in it, unless they will question the wisdom and goodness of their church. There can be no question but that this doctrine is thus far owned by the church of Rome; whether it be delivered fallibly or infallibly, by councils or without, is not at all here considerable. It is enough that such is the conduct provided for Roman catholics, and that it is to be followed without apprehension of danger, and cannot be declined by those that will keep the ordinary road of that church, though it lead directly to destruction.

When no other shift will serve, to hinder those from being undeceived whom they would delude, it is usual with them to make loud outcries of false citations, and that their doctrine is misrepresented. I have been very careful to give no just occasion for this, being apprehensive that he who doth it wrongs not them more than he doth himself and his cause. The places cited I have viewed again and again, where there might be any doubt of misconstruction, and set down their own words where it might seem scarce

<sup>1</sup> Index Expurg. sub Alexand. VII. An. 1666.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

credible that Christians and divines (directing conscience) should speak at such a rate; and where that would have been too tedious, have given their sense faithfully, so far as I could discern it, and directed the reader where he may find and judge thereof himself. Yet if, notwithstanding all the care and diligence I could use, it hath been my unhappiness anywhere to mistake them, upon notice from any I shall do them right; and am capable to give them further satisfaction, knowing well that I am yet far from representing their doctrine fully so bad as it is. Large volumes might be filled with the corruptions of it; I have but pointed at some, and contented myself with few authors in many particulars, where plenty might have been produced. I designed briefness, and have waived much that was ready, lest I should be tedious, considering that some who are most concerned in such discourses will have nothing at all when they think too much is offered.

I have been less solicitous about the style; it doth not always satisfy myself, so that I can allow others to find fault with it; it may be thought sometimes less grave, elsewhere too sharp and vehement. I suffered it to be what the subject would have it; and the quality thereof now and then overruled me, somewhat against my own inclination. Only I make nothing ridiculous, but find it so, and should scarce do it right if I represented it otherwise than it is. Where I seem too sharp or severe upon any occasion, I found something in the nature of the subject that forced me to it. And it is not easy (if it be congruous or just) to speak of what is monstrously extravagant or pernicious, with such calmness as we treat indifferent things.

It will be enough for me if (through God's blessing) people will hereby be brought to understand that popery designs not to trouble them either with the reality of religion, or the happiness which Christ has entailed thereon. And that their practical doctrine is contrived accordingly, will, I doubt not, be hereby manifest to all such as have a mind to see, and are not wilfully resolved to lose the way to salvation, and their souls together, by shutting their eyes against so plain a discovery of so great a danger.

## INTRODUCTION.

---

THE danger of popery in points of faith hath been sufficiently discovered to the world by the divines of the Reformation, but their doctrine, which concerns life and practice, hath not been so much insisted on. And yet there is as much occasion for this ; for here the mischief is as great, an unchristian heart and life being at least as damning as erroneous belief ; and hereby the great apostasy and degeneracy of the papal church is as apparent, and herein they have proceeded with as much disregard of Christ and the souls of men. Their design in this seems to have been, not the promoting of Christ's interest (for that is manifestly prostituted), but the securing and greatening of a faction, which, under the profession of Christianity, might be false to all its realities. And their rule is the corrupt inclinations of depraved nature, to which they have throughly conformed their practical divinity, which easeth it of the duties for which it hath an aversion, how much soever enjoined, and clears its way to those sins to which it is disposed, as though there were no need to avoid them. This rule serves their design with great advantage ; but souls are more endangered hereby, and their principles become more pernicious, because they are so taking. Persuade a man that he may safely neglect the duties which he owes to God, his own soul, and others, and may gratify the lusts he is addicted to, and give him the maxims of religion, and the authority and conclusions of divines, and the teachers whom he trusts, for it, and he will like that religion, because he loves his sin, and is in danger to follow both, though he perish for it eternally. And indeed this is it which makes the condition of papists deplorable ; for though the principles of their belief, as it is popish, be mortally poisonous, yet there might be some antidote in the practicals of Christianity, retained and followed by those who are unavoidably ignorant of the danger of their more speculative errors, and so some hopes of such ; but their practical doctrine being no less corrupted, the remedy itself becomes poison, and their condition who freely let it down hopeless. Whether their errors in matters of faith be directly fundamental hath been with some of their opposers a question, but those who will view their practical doctrine may discern that it strikes through the heart of Christianity, casting off the vitals of it as superfluities, and cuts off those who will believe and follow it from the way of life ; not only by encouraging them with security to live and die in all sorts of wickedness, but also by obliging them to neglect, as needless, the greatest and most important concerns of Christians, without which God cannot be honoured by us, nor salvation attained. This will be apparent by observing what is determined in that church by those who have the conduct of their lives and consciences, concerning the worshipping of God, Christian knowledge, love to God, faith in Christ, repentance from dead works, and holiness of life ; as to the exercise of Christian virtues, the abandoning of sin, and the practice of good works ; of all which in particular the following discourse gives an account.

# THE PRACTICAL DIVINITY OF THE PAPISTS

DISCOVERED TO BE DESTRUCTIVE OF

## CHRISTIANITY AND MEN'S SOULS.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### *Real worship of God not necessary in the Church of Rome.*

There is nothing wherein the honour of God and the happiness of men is more concerned than divine worship. Religion provides for these great ends by obliging us to worship God; this it doth indispensably, and can do no less without abandoning itself; for this is essential to it,<sup>1</sup> and gives it being. And the truth and goodness of it depends as much thereon; for no religion is true and saving but that which obligeth to worship God really. Now worship is not real unless mind and heart concur in it; whatever it hath, without this it wants<sup>2</sup> its life and soul, and is no more worship really than a picture is a man. Hence Christ brands those who draw near to God with their lips, without their hearts, for hypocrites, Mat. xv. 7, 8, Mark vii. 6; such as pretend to be what they are not, and to do what really they do not; who are but worshippers in show and fiction; no more so indeed than the stage-player is the prince whose part he acts. The Romanists seem to acknowledge all this, and therefore ought not to deny but that it is as necessary that God should be really worshipped, as it is needful that he should have any honour in the world, or that there should be any true religion amongst men, or salvation for them. Yet notwithstanding, their practical doctrine makes it needless to worship God really. That this may be fully and distinctly manifested, let us observe, *first*, what they count requisite in *divine service* and in their *mass*. The former is their worship for every day (which goes under the name of *canonical hours* and the *divine office*), and is the proper service of their clergy and monastics; the latter is for holidays, and is common to the people with the religious, and the only public service they are ordinarily obliged to. Afterwards we may reflect upon what else

<sup>1</sup> Religio est virtus per quam homines Deo debitum cultum et reverentiam exhibent.—Tullius dicit, ii. Rhct. quod religio est virtus, quæ superiori cuidam naturæ (quam divinam vocant) cultum cæremonianque affert.—*Aquinas* ii. 2, q. lxxxii. art. i.

<sup>2</sup> Nam spiritus interior adorationis, qui est ipsa vita et anima adorationis exterioris, appellatur quoque ipsa veritas adorationis.—*Vasquez de Adorat.* l i. disp. i. cap. ii. p. 18.

passeth under the notion of worship in public, and also take some notice of their devotions, or religious employments in private.

For the first of these, their divine service, if there were anything of religion or religious worship counted needful amongst them, it would be required of their clergy, and those whom by way of eminency they call religious, in their divine office especially (if anywhere); but by their doctrine it is not needful for them to worship God really there, unless he can be said to be worshipped where both himself and all that concerns worshippers indeed may (as it may by their leave) be quite neglected, and no way actually minded. They seem, at least some of them, in their discourses of worship and prayer particularly, to require as necessary thereto both an act of the mind and of the will (*attention* and *intention* they call them); but proceed with them a little, and you will find the former of these quite lost in the latter; and the latter, as they order it, dwindling into nothing. It is the common determination of their schools and doctors, that actual attention of mind is not necessary when they recite their *canonical hours*, that is, they need not mind God in their service, nor the matter of it more than the object, nor the sense of what they say, nor the words they use; not any of these need be actually minded. A purpose or intention to do it is sufficient, though that purpose be not at all performed. This is the doctrine of their great Aquinas,<sup>1</sup> concerning prayer in general, whom the rest<sup>2</sup> commonly follow. Attention is not necessary all the while, but the virtue of the first intention, with which a man comes to prayer, renders the whole prayer meritorious, as it falls out in other meritorious acts. And this first intention also is enough to make the prayer prevalent. So he explains his main conclusion, viz. prayer ought to be at least attentive in respect of a previous intention.<sup>3</sup> So that they may be attentive enough, by virtue of this first intention, though they do not at all mind afterwards what they are doing, when they should be worshipping; which is just as if they should say, a man that goes to church with an intent to join in their service, but falls fast asleep when he comes there, serves God effectually, and is attentive enough by virtue of that former intention, though he sleep all the while. It seems it is sufficient in the church of Rome, and effectual, even to a degree meritorious, to worship God as one that is asleep may worship him, if he falls asleep after a good intention. However, hereby it is manifest that with them it is not needful to worship God at all, even in their most solemn service, but only to intend some such thing. If there be a purpose of worship, though God be never worshipped indeed, by their doctrine, it is enough for him. I suppose 'his holiness' would not think himself well served at this rate. The common women at Rome are to pay him a *julio* a head weekly, for the liberty he gives them to drive there their trade; now if, instead of payment, they should allege an intention of it, and declare this is all they are obliged to, and that they ought to be acquitted upon that account, though they never laid it down, he would think himself not paid hereby, but scorned; he loseth his sacred reverence, and is affronted into the bargain; yet at this rate will he

<sup>1</sup> Ad hunc effectum (viz. mereri) non ex necessitate requiritur quod attentio adsit orationi per totum: sed vis primæ intentionis, qua aliquis ad orandum accedit, reddit totam orationem meritoriam, sicut in aliis meritoriis actibus accidit.—ii. 2, q. lxxxiii. art. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Ut officium ipsa attentio comitetur actualiter, nec in officio, nec in aliis orationibus, vel bonis operibus, requiritur.—*Sylvester*, sum. v. hora n. xiii. edit. Lugdun. An. 1572. D. Thom. quem omnes sequuntur, affirmat (impetrationem) non pendere ex actuali attentione, sed virtualem ad illam sufficere, et videtur certa sententia.—*Suarez*, lib. iii. De Orat. Vocal. c. v. n. v.

<sup>3</sup> Attentam saltem in prima intentione, oportet esse orationem, si meritoria, si impetrativa sit futura, mentemque spiritualiter refectura.—*Ibid.*

have God served by Roman catholics. Well, but if God need not be worshipped but in purpose only, and the intention may serve without the act, yet sure it must be an actual intention, or at least a purpose to worship God. If it be not the worship of God that they need intend, divine worship is clearly abandoned, both in deed and in purpose; if it must not be actual, there need be actually no thought of worshipping God. But I cannot discern that they count either of these necessary. They declare plainly that an actual intention is needless; in this they generally agree, though they differ in the terms by which they use to express it. They call it an habitual, or a virtual, or an implicit intention, in opposition to that which is express or actual; so that actually either to worship God, or to have an intention of worshipping him, is more than needs. But since they will not have it actual, let it be what sort of intention they please otherwise, yet sure the thing intended should be the worshipping of God; so that they may be said to worship in purpose, though they think it needless to do it in deed. Whether they count this necessary, may be best discerned by their own expressions, which they use in some variety. Commonly, they say, a virtual intention may serve.<sup>1</sup> Now this is not an intention, indeed, to worship God; but supposeth a former act, by virtue of which one is said to have an intention when really he hath none. As they call that a virtual intention to worship when a man had a purpose to attend, though he do it not at all; answerably, a virtual intention to worship will be a purpose or thought to have such a purpose, though he never have it. Let those who can apprehend how they may be said to worship God so much as in purpose, by virtue of a purpose to worship him, which they have not, but only intend to have, without effect. But it may be there is no such intention needful with them, for custom may serve to this purpose (Soto). The precept for attending the performance of divine service canonically includes two things:<sup>2</sup> first, that at the beginning of prayer every one mind what he is going to do. But for this former it is enough that it be done by virtue of some former intention and custom, as if one, when the sign is given for prayers, go, as is the custom, to the choir; by this he satisfies the precept. Now this he may be accustomed to do, without any thought of God, or of worshipping him; yet by virtue of that custom, wherein God is quite neglected, he will have their virtual intention to worship him; all the intention that they require, that is, plainly none at all, unless by virtue of neglecting God he may be said to mind him.

Or an habitual intention may serve, they sometimes tell us. Sylvester<sup>3</sup> expresseth it thus, after Paludanus, he is bound in the beginning of the service to have an intent to perform it, so that the service may be from his reason, and not from his imagination only, *i. e.* he must go about it like a man, and not like a beast. But lest it should seem too hard for a man to go about their service, with an intention so much distinguishing him from a brute, he adds a favourable gloss.<sup>4</sup> This is to be understood, saith he,

<sup>1</sup> Ad horas canonicas recte pronunciandas requiritur propositum intendendi et attendendi, et sufficit virtuale.—*Martin. Navar.* Manual. Confess. cap. i. num. xiii. ut c. xxv. n. cv. edit. Antwerp. an. 1608; *Jac. de Graffys.* Decision. Aurear. l. ii. c. li. n. iv. edit. Antwerp. an. 1596; *Sylvest.* sum. v. hor. n. xiv.

<sup>2</sup> Preceptum attentionis in divino officio canonicè persolvendo, duo includit: videlicet, ut orandi initio quisque attendat quid agere aggreditur—quia vero ad prius membrum satis est, ut virtute alicujus præcedentis intentionis et consuetudinis fiat, ut si quis dum signum ad horas datur, ad chorum de more vadit,—per illud satisfacit præcepto.—*De Justitia et Jure*, lib. x. quæst. v. art. v. Edit. v. Lugdun. an. 1582.

<sup>3</sup> Quantum ad intentionem vel attentionem, quilibet ad officium obligatus tenetur in principio officii habere intentionem satisfaciendi, ita quod officium ab intellectu et non ab imaginativa proficiatur; secundum Petr. de Pal.

<sup>4</sup> Quod intellige actu, vel habitu seu virtute.—*Sum.* v. hor. n. xiv.

either in act, or habit, or virtue; so that if it be but an habitual intention, it may suffice.<sup>1</sup> Navarre explains it by this conditional (and others with him), if one be asked, why he takes his breviary, he would answer, that he doth it to say service.<sup>2</sup> Now hereby we are told, that rather an habitual than a virtual intention is expressed; and they acknowledge that such an intention is not sufficient<sup>3</sup> for a human act, much less therefore for an act of worship. Since then they think that such an intention will suffice, a purpose to worship God is not needful with them, unless they can make divine worship of that which is less than human; or will have the brutes to be catholic worshippers. They tell us also that this habitual intention is in those that are asleep.<sup>4</sup> So Scotus, the first founder of this distinction (and herein that which they call virtual agrees with it; indeed, Aquinas<sup>5</sup> saw no cause to distinguish them; and<sup>6</sup> others, who affect Scotus his subtlety, use the terms as if they were distinct, yet confound them in their instances). And thus, when all the worship which they think needful is shrunk up into an intention, yet that intention is no other than they may have in a dead sleep, when they dream of no such thing. So that their souls need be no more concerned in worshipping God, either when they are at service, or when they are addressing themselves to it, than if their church were in mount Celius with the seven sleepers. When they are coming to it (as we see here), they need have no more purpose to worship God than if they were asleep; and when they are at it (as we said before), they need no more attend to what they are a-doing than if they were not yet awake.

They say also an<sup>7</sup> implicit intention will suffice; which is, as they explain it, when a man hath not expressly any thought of praying or worshipping God, when he is to read service, but only intends<sup>8</sup> to accomplish the precept of the church, or to perform his task, or to do as he is wont to do. As when a man first takes orders or enters into a monastery, understanding that the church enjoins all in that capacity daily to recite their canonical hours, if he then have an intention to perform this task, to do as the church requires, or as others of that quality are wont to do, and accordingly say his *hours* as the fashion is, though he have not once a thought of God or worshipping him all his life after, either when he is going to service, or when he is reading it, yet that first intention may suffice, yea, it is of such sufficiency that any other act of mind or heart, either in worship, or in order to it, becomes

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* c. xxv. n. cvi. Juxta ea quæ post alios, presertim Majorem, scripsimus.—*Vide Jac Graff.* *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Navar. explicat virtuales intentionem per illam conditionalem, quia si interrogaretur quare accipit brevarium, responderet se id facere ad recitandum. Veruntamen hoc modo magis explicatur habitualis quam virtualis intentio.—*Suarez*, l. iii. de Orat. c. iii. n. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Actus autem humanus non potest esse ab intentione tantum habituali, ut omnes supponunt, et per se constat.—*Idem.* l. iv. de Horis, c. xxvi. n. iii. Actus inde procedens non est humanus, et deliberatus.—*Bellarmin.* de Sacramentis, l. i. c. xxvii. p. 92, edit. Lugd. an. 1599.

<sup>4</sup> Nec habet tantum intentionem habituales, quod talem habet dormiens.—*Scotus*, m. iv. dist. vi. quæst. vi. Qualis etiam in dormiente inesse potest.—*Bellarmin.* *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> iii. quæst. lxxiii. art. viii.

<sup>6</sup> Macor. Navar. Soto. Graff. g.

<sup>7</sup> Jo. Macor. Navar. in Suar. de Orat. l. iii. c. iii. n. vi.

<sup>8</sup> Certum imprimis est, satis superque esse, si in principio accedatur ad recitandum cum proposito implendi præceptum, etiamsi in discursu orationis in mentem non veniat, satis enim est quod non retractetur, quia manet virtus prioris attentionis. Præterea ut censeatur quis accedere ad recitandum cum proposito implendi præceptum, satis est quod ex consuetudine quadam velit illam actionem tanquam expletivam sui muneris et obligationis, vel quod in actu exercito (ut sic dicam) velit eam facere, ut solet, quia eo ipso vult illam ut impletivam præcepti. Ita sumitur ex Macor, Navar. et aliis.—*Idem.* l. iv. de Hor. c. xxvi. n. vi.

needless ; it is of such admirable efficacy, that by virtue of it they can worship God, when they mind no such thing as God, or worshipping him, no, nor ever intend it otherwise. Let us suppose that they thought it requisite to renew this implicit intention frequently, yet would it not necessarily amount to a purpose of worshipping God, for not only their task, and what they are wont to do, but the precept of the church, may be (as we shall hear them by and<sup>1</sup> by declare) accomplished by acts of wickedness, which sure cannot be acts of worship, nor a design to do them an intention to serve God ; yea, they may satisfy the church's injunction for divine service, though they have an express intention not to fulfil it all the while, as<sup>2</sup> Arragon and their divines of greatest reputation determine. So that if the church did enjoin them to worship God, yet no intention to worship him would be needful, because they can satisfy the church with a contrary intention. Finally, a sinful intention will serve their turn ; this passeth for their common doctrine.<sup>3</sup>

If a man intend principally his own praise or worldly advantage, and so design to serve himself, and not God, this cannot with any reason be counted an intention to worship God ; yet such a design will suffice for the worship they require, and it will be substantially good in their account, only a little tainted with a venial speck, which, though it may hinder it from being meritorious of eternal glory, yet he that never otherwise intends to pray or worship cannot be damned, and so will be saved notwithstanding. In short, the Lord requires the heart in worship ; without this, nothing else can please him, nothing in his account will be a real honour or worship of him, but only in appearance and fiction. The Romanists teach, that God need not have anything of their hearts in their service, not any one act or motion thereof, while they are at it, only some sort of intention before, while they are going about it ; but this no act of will or heart neither, but only a virtual, or habitual, or implicit something ; they have minced it so small, that an ordinary eye cannot discern in it so little, as a purpose to serve God ; yea, in fine, they have reduced it to that which is worse than nothing, and if the heart must be cumbered with any such thing as an intention about serving God, yet a sinful intention may serve, this satisfies their holy church and her precept fully ; she doth not, she cannot, require any more for God, what burdens soever in other cases she lays upon the consciences of men. But though the heart, and every act of it, be thus discharged from any concern in their service, yet it may be they will have the mind more engaged. One act thereof, and but one (mental attention), they seem to require ; and it is true some of them make show of calling for it, but as soon as ever it appears it is dismissed immediately as needless, for they conclude generally, that a purpose to attend will serve, though they attend not, and this purpose too by their handling (as we have seen) comes to nothing or worse. But suppose they did (though they do not) account an intention to worship God needful, and that actual, express, and well qualified, yet they confess<sup>4</sup> an intent to worship or wait on God is not to worship him really : no more than a man is sober when he is drunk, because he intended to be sober. But they leave us no ground for this supposition, yet ascribe as much to their intention, and more than the best imaginable will bear, after they have reduced it to

<sup>1</sup> Soto. Canus. Medina. Corduba. Navar. Covarruv. Bonacina. infra.

<sup>2</sup> In Suarez, *ibid.* n. viii. et tom. iii. disp. lxxxviii. sect. iii. There are near thirty doctors produced for this by John Martinez de Prado, a Dominican ; tom. ii. Theol. Moral. c. xxx. q. viii. sect. i. n. i.

<sup>3</sup> *Hæc est communis sententia—omnes fatentur.—Idem. Sua. l. iii. de Orat. c. iiii. n. v., vide infra.*

<sup>4</sup> *Licet velle attendere, non sit attendere in re, ut vere dixit Cajetanus.—Suar. de Orat. lib. iii. c. iv. n. 7.*

as bad as nothing. However, since all the worship they count necessary is included in this purpose, and all their pretensions depend on it, they are concerned to have it thought to be something, and they will seem cautious about it, as a thing material, so this *proviso* they lay down.<sup>1</sup> It must not be changed into a contrary purpose; if that should fall out, it will lose its wonderful virtue, and not make those worshippers who mind not what they are doing when they should be praying. But there is no danger of this, nor need they be solicitous about it, for (as they tell them) they change not their purpose, though they do nothing that they intended, or do what is quite contrary to it, viz., though if they purposed to attend, yet they attend not at all, but turn their minds to other things, if they act cross to the supposed intention; yet, so long as they assume not a contrary purpose, they must be thought to mind what they are about, though they mind it not one moment; and there need be as little care, as there is danger of changing their purpose, for<sup>2</sup> carelessness cannot do it. It cannot be changed, unless a man designedly, and on set purpose, will turn his mind from what he is about to other things. Since then a person who doth not mind God, or anything that concerns his worship, when he seems engaged in it, doth not worship God at all, as is evident in itself, and they confess it, in case he mind not this on set purpose; therefore, though he doth not worship God at all, yet he worships him as much as the Romanists require, unless he wills not to worship him on set purpose; yea, though he voluntarily mind nothing that concerns a worshipper, though he deliberately and willingly let his mind run upon other things, yet so long as he is so regardless of God, and what he is about, as not to take notice of this extravagancy, he fulfils the precepts of the church, and minds divine service as much as is required.<sup>3</sup> Thus Cajetan, Soto, and others; so that by their doctrine, if they do not worship God and voluntarily neglect it, yet they do as much as the church enjoins, so long as they take no notice that they do not worship him. And as they may voluntarily employ their minds about other things, when they should be worshipping, so may they on set purpose busy the outward man about other employments, when they are saying their service. They can perform their best devotions while (to give their own instances) they are<sup>4</sup> washing themselves, or putting on their clothes, or mending pens, or laying the cloth, or making beds, or anything else which requires no more attention. Nor dare they count this a venial fault, because the<sup>5</sup> Dominicans are enjoined by the rules of their order to say their service while they are doing something else. That which would spoil the devotion of others gives no impediment to theirs,

<sup>1</sup> Facillimum huic precepto obedire, nam nihil aliud exigit, nisi quod quis animo vacandi Deo horas inchoet, et in contrarium animus iste non mutetur, dum exsolvit divinum officium.—*Cajetan.* sum verb. horæ Canon. edit. Lugdun. An. 1544.

<sup>2</sup> Mutari autem in contrarium est impossibile, ex inadvertentia.—*Cajetan.* ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Si quis advertit se cogitare hæc vel illa, quæ debent esse extranea tunc a sua meditatione, sed non advertit quod ab officio Divino distrahitur; quamvis voluntarie ea meditetur; non tamen voluntarie animus ab officio divino distrahitur: ac per hoc animus vacandi Deo a principio officii habitus, non est mutatus in contrarium.—*Cajetan.* ibid. Etsi ultro et voluntarie alia cogitet (ut bene ait Cajetanus) quousque inspiciat se distrahi, semper reputatur inadvertenter divagari, atque adco excusatur ab omissione præcepti de attentione, impletque adco subinde orandi mandatam.—*Soto,* ibid. p. 341. Sic explicat Cajetan. Soto, presertim Medina; vide et Gabriel in Suar. iii. Thom. tom. iii. disp. lxxxviii. sect. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Hujusmodi sunt lavare manus, se induere, pennam temperare, aut id genus similia, qui quidem actus quandoque non sunt peccata neque venialia (verbi gratia) in ordine prædicatorum.—*Jac. de Graff.* ibid. l. ii. c. li. n. x. Talis est actio viestendi se, vel lavandi manus et ora, vel stertendi mensam, aut lectum.—*Fell.* Tract. xxiii. n. 260. vid. *Soto* ubi supra; vid. *Bonatin.* Divin. Offic. d. i. q. iii. p. 2. sect. ii. n. xii.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. infra.

and good reason, for how can that be disturbed that is not, or lessened when it is already nothing? This is to worship God after the Roman mode, when neither body nor mind is taken up with the service, but both deliberately employed about something else.

But that by their principles they need be no better worshippers, will yet be more manifest if we view their doctrine concerning attention more distinctly. Aquinas and Bonaventure (whom the rest follow) give an account of three sorts hereof, according to the severals which may be minded in prayer.

The first is attention to the words, so as not to err in pronouncing them.<sup>1</sup>

The second, to the sense of the words.

The third, to the person prayed to, and the things prayed for.

Bonaventure calls attention to the first superficial, and that to the second literal (we may as well call it human or rational), that to the third spiritual (divine or Christian attention others call it).<sup>2</sup>

Now (which is to be observed as that which unveils the whole mystery), they hold that any one of these is sufficient, not only the third or the second, but even the first, though it be the worst, and of least importance. So Angelus,<sup>3</sup> Sylvester,<sup>4</sup> Cajetan,<sup>5</sup> Bellarmine,<sup>6</sup> Tolet,<sup>7</sup> so Aquinas,<sup>8</sup> Soto, Navar, so all of them, it is (they tell us) the common doctrine universally received.<sup>9</sup> And this clears all, and leads us directly through their reserves and concealments, and the ambiguity of their expressions (apt to mislead an unwary eye, and abuse a charitable mind, loath to think them so bad as they speak themselves) into the open view of their irreligious (not to say atheistical) doctrine. This makes it very evident that with them it is not needful either to worship God or intend it. For since they agree that any one of the several sorts of attention is sufficient, the first, which concerns the bare words, is enough on their account, and the other are needless. It is not requisite that they should mind either the things to be prayed for, or the God they should pray to, or the sense of the words they pronounce; it will suffice that they mind the words, to them senseless, and therein the empty and insignificant figure and sound. Now, words without sense are in themselves neither good nor bad; no worship, sure, can be imagined in them; they are no better (but less tolerable) in the mouths of men than the sound of brutes. And the mere figure and sound of letters can make men no more worshippers than conjurers; yet such is all the worshipping and praying that they count necessary. But if they had a mind to supererogate, and their Catholics were to do more than their duty, *i. e.* act as becomes men in their service, taking the sense

<sup>1</sup> Sciendum tamen quod triplex est attentio, quæ orationi vocali potest adhiberi: una quidem qua attenditur ad verba, ne aliquis in eis erret: secunda qua attenditur ad sensum verborum: tertia qua attenditur ad finem orationis, sc. ad Deum, et ad rem pro qua oratur.—*Aquin.* xxii. q. lxxxiii. a. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Opusc. de process. Religionis, l. vii. c. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Quocumque istorum modorum adsit intentio, non est inefficax oratio ad satisfaciendum. Et ego dico nec ad impetrandum vel reficiendum.—*Sum. Angel.* v. oratio. n. xi.

<sup>4</sup> Quæcunque harum adsit, oratio non est censenda inattenta.—*Sylvest.* Sum. v. orat. n. vi.

<sup>5</sup> Una istarum attentionum sufficit.—*Cajetan.* Sum. *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Quælibet vero harum trium sufficit.—*Bellarm.* de bon. Operib, l. i. c. xviii. p. 1026. Edit. Lugd. An. 1599.

<sup>7</sup> Secunda attentio non est necessaria—Tertia etiam attentio non est necessaria.—*Tolet.* in struct. l. ii. cap. xiii. p. 449.

<sup>8</sup> Consequenter D. Thomas, Cajetan, Soto, et sæpe Navar. asserunt, quamcunque ex dictis attentionibus sufficere ad probitatem orationis et implendum præceptum.—*Suar.* de Orat. vocal. l. iii. c. iv. n. xviii.

<sup>9</sup> Communis est, quia omnes dicunt minimam attentionem sufficere.—*Idem, ibid.*

along with the words, yet the third sort of attention, which concerns God, is still unnecessary, there need be no application of the mind unto God in their prayers. Surely in any religion but that which will have men abandon both sense and reason in matters plain and obvious to either, God would not be thought to be worshipped when he is not at all minded. By their common doctrine now mentioned (wherein all sorts of their authors conspire), first their minds may in their divine service not only depart from God by natural or inadvertent vagaries, but they may dismiss them from God on set purpose; for they may voluntarily and upon deliberation decline in their service what is more than enough; and the attendance of the mind upon God in prayer is plainly with them more than enough, seeing they declare that their attending to the bare words alone is sufficient. If they mind but to pronounce the words entire, no more is needful; God may be left out of their minds during their whole service; and they may be as much without God in their worship as others are said to be without him in the world, deliberately and out of choice. They leave us not to rely for this upon consequences, how evident and undeniable soever; they stick not to declare<sup>1</sup> that they may without sin voluntarily abandon the better sorts of attention, viz. both that which is rational and that which is spiritual. This will be no fault at all, if done upon a reasonable account; for example, if any one decline these, that he may not tire his head therewith, or anything of like nature.<sup>2</sup> It seems reasonable with them not to trouble their heads with minding God, or what becomes men in their worship of him. The reason is, because they are not obliged to serve God as well as they can.<sup>3</sup> It is a received maxim amongst them, that they are not bound to do their best.<sup>4</sup> The third sort of attention is better than the second, and the second is better than the first<sup>5</sup> (that is worst of all); but when there are better and worse ways of serving God before them, they may choose the worst. The worst attendance of all, it seems, is good enough for God, even that wherein he is not at all regarded. This doctrine is so common, that I find but two who demur on it, and one of them (Cajetan) but drawn in by consequence. Only Navar, though he, as the rest, counts the first and worst sort of attention sufficient, yet thinks it may be a venial fault to retain it, so as voluntarily to exclude or hinder the better. Yet both<sup>6</sup> these hold that they may voluntarily want the better, and may without fault turn their minds from God to other things, so long as they observe it not, or if they do observe it, yet so long also as they do not reflect upon it as a vagary. And both maintain<sup>7</sup> that any one

<sup>1</sup> Ut adverterem sufficere attentionem ad verba, vel ad sensum verborum—ex quo fit ut recitans divinum officium, non teneatur meliorem attentionem querere, sed satisfacere, quamlibet ex dictis eligendo.—*Bonacin.* divin. off. disp. i. q. iii. p. 2, sect ii. n. 5 cum multis aliis.

<sup>2</sup> Infertur primo quancunque attentionem ex dictis sufficere, ut oratio sit honesta. Et siquidem voluntaria omissio melioris attentionis sit rationabilis, ut si quis nolit attendere ad perfectiorem, ne caput defatiget, vel quid simile, non impedit quominus honesta sit.—*Vid. Suarez,* de orat. l. iii. c. iv.

<sup>3</sup> In eo modo orandi nullum est peccatum per se loquendo, et ex vi naturalis legis, ob solum defectum voluntarium melioris attentionis—quia homo non tenetur orare meliori modo quam potest, &c.—*Idem ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Vid. Melch. Canum Prælec. de pœnitent. part. iii. p. 841. edit. Colon. Agripp. an. 1605.*

<sup>5</sup> *Angel. sum. v. Orat. n. xi.; Sylvest. sum. v. Orat. n. vi.; Navar. ibid. c. xxv. n. 105; Graff, ibid. l. ii. c. li. n. 9; Molanus Theol. Pract. Tract. iii. c. viii. n. xiv.*

<sup>6</sup> *Cajetan. supra Navar. c. xxv. n. 106.*

<sup>7</sup> Quod possit quis sine peccato orare dum se induit, aut aliam similem actionem exercet—quæ actio, licet admittat inferiorem attentionem, tamen sine dubio impedit perfectiorem, et maxime spirituales et elevatas. Non licere tales actiones exercere, est falsum, et contra usum omnium piorum; et Cajetan, et Navar, etiam fatentur.—*Suarez, ibid. n. xii.*

may pray whilst he is dressing himself, or is taken up with any other like employment. And such action, though it be consistent with the worst attention, yet undoubtedly (they say) it hinders the better, especially that which is spiritual and elevated. So that herein these authors are either reconciled to the common opinion, or fall out with themselves. And that such employments (though inconsistent with spiritual attention, *i. e.* with minding God) are lawful while they are at their service, is not only the sense of these two casuists, but to deny it is against the usage of all the pious (it seems the Roman piety is without regarding God even in his worship). All the Dominicans are particularly obliged to it (as we saw before), and have a visible demonstration for it from the ancient form of their dormitories.<sup>1</sup> Thus one way or other all agree that God may voluntarily be neglected in their worship without sin.

Secondly, As it is not necessary by their doctrine to worship God, so neither is there any necessity to intend it. When they have encouraged all, even their religious, not to pray at all, by assuring them they need not mind God at all, whilst they should be praying to him, yet they would persuade them notwithstanding that they may pray by virtue of a former intention. The vanity of this is shewed already (where we prove both that this is not enough, and that indeed they require not so much); but because it is the only pretence that such can be worshippers of God who think it needless to mind him, even in the most solemn addresses amongst them, it will not be amiss to see it again put quite away by their own doctrine. What must be designed in that previous intention, upon which, not only the efficacy, but the reality, of their prayers depends? Must they intend, when they are going about it, to mind the things they are to pray for, or the God they should worship, or the sense of the words they utter? No; as it is not necessary to mind any of these when they are at their worship, so neither is it needful to intend it beforehand: it will be sufficient if they do but intend to mind the senseless pronounciation of the words, and neither God nor anything else which becomes Christians, or men in acts of worship; nothing but what brutes or birds are capable of, the mere uttering of the words. This is very manifest by their common doctrine, now before us, concerning attention in prayer. Attendance to the words without the sense is sufficient, but they need not purpose beforehand to have any sort of attention more than that which is sufficient; for they will not imagine there is any need of a purpose to do that which is not needful to be done; and they declare expressly this is all which is requisite, that they come to their service with a purpose to have any sort of attention, that is sufficient;<sup>2</sup> telling us withal, that attendance to the bare words will suffice. So that in the issue the worship of God (his and our greatest concern in this world) is reduced to this: there is no need to mind God, and so not to worship him at all, either actually or virtually, since it is neither needful to do this, nor intend it. He is not worshipped in that remote and minute way which they call virtual (which is not the doing of it, but a purpose only to do it), but by virtue of a former intention; where this intention is not, it can have no

<sup>1</sup> *Dixerim forsan venialiter, quoniam non semper est peccatum, immo in ordine nostro præceptum nobis est, ut surgentes officium virginis dicamus: et ut antiqua indicat dormitorii dispositio: inter induendum se fratres illud inchoabant.*—*Soto*, *ibid.* l. x. q. v. art. v. *Graff.* *ibid.* l. ii. c. li. n. x.

<sup>2</sup> *Attentio necessaria consistit in habendo a principio horarum proposito actuali, vel virtuali ad eas attendendi, et postea actualiter, aut virtualiter attendendo aliqua attentione sufficienti, quæ est triplex, &c.*—*Navar.* *ibid.* c. xxv. n. clxv. *Vid. supra.* ad implendum præceptum orandi vocaliter supradicti authores asserunt, sufficere attentionem ad literam.—*S. Thom. Cajetan. Sotus. Gabriel. Vasquez. Opusc. Moral* p. 414. dub. v.

virtue ; but with them there need be no intention to mind God, and so by their doctrine it is not necessary to worship him one way or other.

Thirdly, Since with them it is not needful to mind anything in their service, for which they can be counted worshippers, nothing but the words, it will not be very material to take notice what attention they must give to these ; yet seeing the senseless recital of the words is all that they would have them mind in divine service, one would think that this should be attended to purpose, at least actually. No ; it is enough if their attention be but virtual, *i. e.* if they have a purpose to mind them, when they are going about their worship, and change it not while they are at it, though then they mind them not,<sup>1</sup> for as they generally hold that attention to the words is sufficient, so none question but a virtual attention thereto will serve.<sup>2</sup> It may seem strange that one should be said to attend when he attends not, but they will satisfy this with something that is as odd ; they would have them think their heedlessness is excused by being more heedless, and so the more careless they are in their worship the better. For if they mind not what they are doing, when saying divine service, yet if they do this without reflection, and take no notice that they mind it not at all, they therefore mind it well enough.<sup>3</sup> Such is the attention which the strictest of their authors require and judge sufficient ; even such as is as good as none, and about that which is nothing worth. Now, this doctrine hath such an atheistical aspect, that they (who profess themselves to be, and would have the world think that they are worshippers of God) seem concerned not to expose it commonly barefaced. And indeed they give it some disguise, when they declare so much for attention of mind in worship, as that which is of the substance of worship, so essential thereto, that without this it is no worship of God, no praying at all, but a mere clamorous noise, yea, a mocking of God, and taking his name in vain.<sup>4</sup> The Jesuits forbear not frequently to acknowledge this. Who would not think hereupon, that they count it most necessary for the mind to attend God in worship ? Oh ! but the vizer falls off, when we understand that attention of mind to nothing else but the bare words, stripped of their sense, and all respect to God, is enough with them, and that virtual only, and in purpose, though they never actually mind so little. They themselves assure us that the attending to the words only (if that were to be done indeed) is no attending God ; for they make these distinct things, and will have one of them suffice without the other ; and it is against the resentments of all religion, and common sense, too, that God should be said to be worshipped when he is not at all minded. And therefore, in fine, when they teach (as the best of them do, so that it passeth for their common doctrine) that superficial attention in their service is sufficient, they declare plainly enough, that in the church of Rome there is no need to worship God, no, not for their religious, in that which they call divine service.

But if we would have a plainer acknowledgment hereof than is needful, we may have it from those who declare that no attention of mind is needful in worship, and these are the greatest part of their authors, which I find

<sup>1</sup> Est autem attentio illa verborum—virtualis, cum incepit animo dicendi officium, et attendendi, et postea non mutat animum, quamdiu non attendat.—*Tolet. ibid. l. ii. c. xiii.*

<sup>2</sup> Actualis vel virtualis intentio sufficit ex omnium sententia ad implendum præceptum hoc.—*Suar. de hor. l. iv. c. xxvi. n. iii. D. Thom. quem omnes sequuntur, &c. Supra. Bonacin. tom. i. divin. offic. disp. i. q. iii. punct. ii. n. xv. Communis Doctorum sententia.*

<sup>3</sup> Cajetan, Soto, et alii. supra.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. Vasquez. de Adorat. l. ii. disp. viii. c. xii. n. cclxi. et c. xv. n. cccxcvi. Suarez, de orat. l. iii. c. iv. n. iv. et n. v. et l. iv. c. xiv. n. 12.

alleged in this question (taking none into the account neither, but those who are ancients than the foundation of the Society). They determine, without distinguishing that all attention is needless, actual, or virtual. If the words are pronounced entire, and no external action admitted to hinder that, it is no crime with them, if as nothing else, so neither the bare words be further minded, but the thoughts be quite dismissed from them. Sylvester, the master of the sacred apostolical palace, and their prime champion against Luther, in his book dedicated to Pope Leo the Tenth, determines expressly, that to pray with attention in their canonical hours is not required by God's law.<sup>1</sup> If he had said, the church had not required it, he had spoken within compass, and said no more than many others before and after him; but he says that too, for having told us that Hostiensis, Antoninus, Summa Rosellæ do all hold, that the church enjoins, not attentiveness, but only saying the service, he adds, that they say true as to this, that attention is not under the precept of the church.<sup>2</sup> Of the like persuasion are Durandus, Paludanus, Angelus de Clavasio, and others. For attention, as they say, is not a command of their church, but a counsel only, which may be neglected without sin.<sup>3</sup> Others, who make the best of it, deliver it thus. The church do not command internal acts, no more than judge of them, therefore requires not attention in worship; the precept is fully accomplished without it, by the external act alone; the want of attention is no fault, unless upon the account of the natural precept, and in reference to that it is no worse than venial.<sup>4</sup> They are herein opposed by some later casuists and Jesuits (however these come to be counted more licentious). But the differing parties fully agree in making it needless to worship God. For both hold, that they need not mind either God, or the matter, or the sense of the words in their service, either actually or virtually, and both conclude that the words without the sense (and all else for which they can be considerable) need not be minded actually. All the difference is about a virtual attention to the bare words, whether the want of that (which is no attention indeed) be a mortal crime. It is just as if when they had concluded it lawful to murder a man, they should fall into a hot debate whether it were a deadly crime to disorder his hair. But so it becomes those who make no scruple to destroy religion body and soul, to make a zealous stir about the slightest appurtenances of it. Some-

<sup>1</sup> Attente orare in horis canonicis, non est de jure divino, Sum v. horæ. n. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Sed isti licet verum dicunt, quantum ad hoc, quod attentio non est sub præcepto.—*Idem. Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Clericum qui distracto animo horas recitat, non peccare mortifere aiunt Durandus, Paludanus, Angelus, Sylvester, et alii quidam non improbabiler: quia attentio (in cap. dolentes de celebr. miss.) est in consilio; quia cum ecclesia internos animi actus non puniat, mentis attentionem non videtur præcipere.—*Victorel. add. Toll. l. iii. c. xiii. Glossa tenet quod sufficit dicere ore, licet non corde, et cum ea concurrunt multi Canonistæ.—Sum. Angel. v. Oratio. n. ix.*

<sup>4</sup> Evagatio quæ est advertentis et solum secundum actum interiorem, licet sit temeraria et gravis forte: non tamen est mortale, nisi propter contemptum; quoniam ecclesia non habet judicare de interioribus actibus mere. Propter quod minister ecclesiæ licet dicendo officium aliud cogitet, non videtur transgressor præcepti ex natura facti.—*Angel. sum. v. horæ. n. xxvii. Sic. et Sylv. sum. v. hor. n. xiii. Non tenetur autem quovis præcepto esse attentus, sed sine culpa mortali potest evagari, etiam a proposito.—Idem. ibid. n. xiv.*

Non est peccatum mortale sine attentione recitare, etiamsi ex pura negligentia, et cum advertentia fiat; ita Hostiensis, Jo. Andr. Anchoranus, Antoninus citans Umbertum et alios, Roscell, Summa Pisana, Angelic., Durandus, Paludanus, Sylvest., Turrecremata, Medina, in Suarez l. iv. de Horis Can. c. xxvi. n. i. et ii.

Qui officium divinum voluntarie distractus recitat præcepto satisfacit. Joh. Valerus alleges for this Aquinas, Paludanus, and twenty other doctors. *Vid. Acacium de Velasco tom. ii. res. mor. v. hora. res. liv.*

thing must be done with some shew of conscience, too, about its appendices, that the world may not think they retain nothing of it amongst them. And yet how palpable is the irreligion of these sophisters, who will have it a damnable crime to neglect their empty words, but no fault at all wholly to neglect the great God, even when, if ever, the whole soul should attend him. Here is evidence too much, that the church of Rome, so far as we can know her sense by her doctors, the most, and best of them, if she think it fit that God should be worshipped, yet thinks it not needful that he be minded, *i. e.* though it be convenient to pretend worship, yet it is not necessary to worship him indeed. Medina is so ingenuous as to tell us, that since the church requires not attention in their service, she doth not oblige them to pray, when she enjoins them to say their canonical hours.<sup>1</sup> So that all in the Church of Rome are discharged from any obligation to worship God at all, even in their most solemn service; they need not pray when they are at their church prayers. Not only he, but all of them, must acknowledge this, who will yield to that reason or authority which they count best. Their law saith, God is not prayed to with the mouth without the heart;<sup>2</sup> and it is a natural and evident principle (as themselves tell us) that vocal pronouncing of the words is not prayer, unless it is done with some attention;<sup>3</sup> whereas most of them say no attention is requisite in their service; and that virtual attention which the rest are for, themselves say, is no attention indeed, no more than the purpose is the act when not performed. But what then becomes of their pretences to worship or devotion? May they be wholly without this? Medina easily resolves this difficulty: though he who useth their service hath no devotion, yet the church in whose words he prays, and whose minister he is, brings her devotion.<sup>4</sup> So that the church brings devotion still, though none in the church, no, not the clergy, not the religious have any. The church prays effectually, in the words of those who say service, though these should blaspheme God in their hearts, while they utter the words of a prayer, and they pray in the person of the church by their common doctrine. So that though they be in mortal sin (suppose atheists or debauchees) their prayers prevail in regard of the church's holiness.<sup>5</sup> Happy persons they are, as ever any were in a dream, who can pray effectually when they pray not at all, and be devout with another's devotion, and why not saved too by the church's holiness? But, then, since this is applicable to all particular persons, what is that church, by which they may have such advantages? It must be something not made up of particular persons, something abstracted from subsistence, and refined above the grossness of any reality; and the structure, their devotion and worship must be answerable, and as much beholding to imagination for

<sup>1</sup> Præceptum ecclesiæ non obligat homines ad orandum, cum præcipit septem horas recitare.—*De Oratione*, q. xvi. *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Nec oratur Deus ore sine corde.—*C. Cantantes*, d. xcii.

<sup>3</sup> Naturale et evidens principium est quod vocalis prolatio, non est oratio, nisi cum aliqua attentione fiat.—*Suar. de Horis. Can.* l. iv. c. xxvi. n. xliii.

<sup>4</sup> Quod si minister non apponat devotionem, ecclesiæ apponit, cuius verbis orat et minister est.—*Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Si ille est in statu peccati mortalis, nihil meretur, vel satis facit, et tamen vere implet præceptum, et manus sum, solvendo pensum orationis suæ, vereque impetrat, seu impetrare potest, non tam attenta conditione personæ suæ, quam spectata ecclesiæ sanctitate in cuius nomine orat.—*Suar. ibid.* c. xviii. n. ix. *vide Bellarm. de Missa*, l. ii. c. xxvii. p. 837. Quatenus nomine ecclesiæ offertur prodest quia sanctitas ecclesiæ supplet recitantis defectum.—*Bonacin. de Offic. Divin.* disp. iv. punct. i. n. 3. Dignitas orationis commendata est ex dignitate ecclesiæ, cuius nomine offertur et recitatur, non ex dignitate improbi ministri ita.—*S. Thom. Navar. Nugnus. Soto. Medina. Covarravius, et alii apud Carolum Macignum. Bonacin. ibid.* punct. n. xii.

a being. Not to disturb their fancies further, it is enough that they acknowledge (what cannot be denied) that they are not obliged to worship God in their divine service; being there is no worship without attention, and no attention with them necessary, or only that which is in effect none.

But it is no wonder they make attention at their divine service not necessary, since, being in Latin, it is, to far the greatest part concerned in it, impossible. The first sort of it, which they call superficial attention, none are capable of effectually but those that are well acquainted with that language, so as not only to understand, but duly pronounce it, which few of their monastics are; indeed, it is not the talent of many of their priests. The lowest degree of attention, saith Soto, none can have, but he that knoweth the tongue.<sup>1</sup> The second, which they call literal attention, fewer can arrive at, it is only for expert divines. To attend to the sense is not for all Latinists, but only for those that are expert in divinity<sup>2</sup> (saith the same author), which is so far from being the attainment of monastics and common priests, that many of the chief of their clergy cannot pretend to it. It was necessary for them to conclude (since they will have their own way, whatever the Scripture saith against it), that it is no sin for the clergy not to understand what they say when they say service, though they confess they can have no relish of what they understand not.<sup>3</sup> As to the third, which they call spiritual attention, they cannot mind the things prayed for, who know not what they are, and apprehend nothing of the contents of their prayers. Nor can they mind the God that is to be prayed to, when they know not whether they pray to God or no; for they understand not to whom the prayer is directed, to God or to a creature, to an angel or a saint, to a man or a woman.

Now, seeing attention to what they do at their service is impossible to most and unnecessary to all, it may seem superfluous to shew that with them reverence and devotion is also unnecessary. (And what religious worship there can be without these, let those who have any tolerable notion of religion judge).

For reverence and devotion are included in attention, or necessarily depend on it, and unavoidably fall with it. No man will imagine that there can be any devotion or reverence toward God when he is not so much as minded, when he is not before their eyes, when the mind is voluntarily turned from him and wholly taken up with thoughts which are inconsistent with the observance of him. And this is the plain import of that non-attention which they allow in their service. When the mind departs, the heart follows it (since<sup>4</sup> it moves by its conduct and acts, not otherwise), and when these are gone,<sup>5</sup> the man is morally absent, and worships God no more, nor hath any more devotion or reverence for him (if these be so much as moral acts) than if he were not in the place where he is worshipped. And seeing (as<sup>6</sup> them-

<sup>1</sup> Prima puta attentio ad verborum prolationem, infimus est attentionis gradus: quem habere non potest, nisi qui linguam norit.—*De Just. et Jur.* l. x. q. v. art. v. p. 340.

<sup>2</sup> Secundus autem gradus puta ad sensum attendere, non omnibus Latinis congruit, nisi Theologiæ peritis.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Indignum enim est, ut altissima tractet mysteria, et eorum ignarus existat: nullum enim gustum inde potest percipere.—*Tolet. ibid.* l. i. c. xciii.

<sup>4</sup> Bellarm. de Baptism. l. i. c. xi. p. 244.

<sup>5</sup> Opus ergo advertere, ut dicatur moraliter præsens esse rei quæ fit.—*Tol. ibid.* l. vi. c. vi.

<sup>6</sup> Cum exterior cultus sit signum interioris cultus.—*Aquinas* ii. 2, q. xciv. art. ii. Ea quæ exterius aguntur sunt signa interioris reverentiæ.—*Angel. sum.* v. adora. n. iii. Sine quo (sc. submissionis affectu) nota exterior non esset adoratio et cultus.—*Vasquez de Adorat.* l. ii. disp. viii. c. xii. n. cccxi. Nec signum nisi ex affectu tali (interiori)

selves tell us) outward acts in worship are not considerable, but as signs of inward motions, all external shows of devotion or reverence, when there is none of these in the soul, will be but hypocritical significations, denoting that to be there which the Lord discerns is not there, and so tend to affront him, instead of approaching him with reverence, worship, or devotion. But there is no need of a proof where the thing is confessed; they tell us plainly that neither reverence nor devotion is necessary.

Reverence (saith De Graffius, in his time the grand penitentiary at Naples) consists in this, that the body be in a composed temper, otherwise it signifies an incomposed mind; they ought, therefore, reverently and humbly to pray, for such prayers penetrate the heavens. But this is only counsel and advice; it is not commanded, as he tells us immediately.<sup>1</sup> Such reverence, saith he, is not required by any precept; though the service be said irreverently, yet the command is satisfied.<sup>1</sup> Here is encouragement enough for irreverence, inward or outward. All the danger follows,<sup>2</sup> but possibly it may be a venial fault if the irreverence be great, according to Pope Innocent. And if great irreverence will in the pope's judgment prove but a small fault, they may venture on great as well as little freely, for neither pope nor penitentiary thinks any much concerned to avoid a venial sin. Sylvester tells us<sup>3</sup> that irreverence is not always mortal; but will it ever be so, or when? It is not so when, instead of worshipping God,<sup>4</sup> they take his name in vain, how severe soever the terms be in which the Lord hath forbidden this, and thereby signified the heinousness of it. Yea, that irreverence to God, which is injurious to his divine majesty and excellency, may not be big enough to be counted mortal;<sup>5</sup> unless it be so outrageous as to destroy the majesty of God, or some of his perfections, it may be venial. The little account they make of reverence is the more considerable, because, as themselves describe it,<sup>6</sup> it compriseth all love and observance of God.

For devotion, Aquinas tells us,<sup>7</sup> as to the fruit of spiritual devotion, he is deprived of it who doth not attend to the things he prays for, or doth not understand; so that devotion is lost (by the oracle of their schools) on a double account, both when prayer is not attended, as it needs not be with them, and when it is not understood, as it cannot be. He that is negligent both as to attention and devotion offends venially. Thus Cardinal Cajetan, after he had told us that devotion consists in every holy affection.<sup>8</sup> So that he who through negligence wants all holy affection (whatever is included in attention or devotion) incurs but a slight fault; and it may be not so much.

nasceretur, adorationis opus esset, sed commentitium, seu irrisionis potius nota judicaretur.—*Idem. ibid. c. xv. n. cccxvi.*

<sup>1</sup> Nou tamen talis reverentia est de præcepto, ita ut si minus reverenter officium dicatur, tamen præcepto satisfi.

<sup>2</sup> Verum possit esse peccatum veniale quando magna est irreverentia, juxta Innoc. in c. i. de Celebr. miss.—*Ibid. l. ii. c. lii. n. x.*

<sup>3</sup> Nec valet dici quod est ibi irreverentia, quia ipsa semper non est mortale.—*Sum. v. baptism. iii. n. vi.*

<sup>4</sup> Qui orat sine attentione, et qui laudes Deo canit, nihil de illo cogitans, in vanum nomen Dei assumit, at non propterea mortaliter peccat.—*Suar. de Juram. l. iii. c. xvi.*

<sup>5</sup> Irreverentia quæ fit Deo non implendo promissionem juratam, non destruit aliquod attributum Dei in se, etiam in affectu hominis, ergo non est unde illa irreverentia ex suo genere tanta sit, ut minui non possit usque ad venialem culpam ex levitate materiæ.—*Ibid. u. xvii.*

<sup>6</sup> Consistit reverentia: 1, in dilectionis affectu; 2, in obtemperacionis obedientia, &c.—*Angel. Sum. v. reverentia.*

<sup>7</sup> Quantum ad fructum spiritualis devotionis, privatur qui non attendit ad ea quæ orat, seu non intelligit.—*Comment. in 1 Cor. xiv. fol. c.*

<sup>8</sup> Qui vero negligenter se habet circa executionem attentionis et devotivis venialiter peccat.—*Sum. v. Hor. Can.*

There ought to be devotion (saith Cardinal Tolet), and he sets it out by love to God and desires of seeing him, but adds, if this be wanting without contempt, it is no great sin.<sup>1</sup> Whether he thought it a little one, he saith not; but if he had so hard thoughts of it, the Jesuit is more severe than those of other orders. Graffius, after he had described devotion, concludes,<sup>2</sup> He that wants devotion sins not, not so much as venially it seems. Lopez and Metina in him censures<sup>3</sup> that opinion as false and cruel which will have actual devotion requisite for receiving of the eucharist, though that devotion be no more than an actual consideration that they are there to receive Christ. Indeed, they generally count devotion needless there, where, if ever, it would be counted requisite. To<sup>4</sup> be destitute of it and attention too, at the eucharist, is either but a small fault or none at all. Sylvester saith inward devotion is not enjoined by the church,<sup>5</sup> but as to outward devotion, he will not exempt it from the command; and what that is, he lets us understand by the un-devoutness which is forbidden: when they make sport with one another for a great part of their worship, so as to scandalize others and disturb the priest.<sup>6</sup> It seems they may be as devout as their church would have them when they play the wags one with another at divine service, so that their sport be but thus qualified; if it be not so uncivil as to offend the people, or so boisterous as to disorder the priest, or so long as to take up a considerable part of their worship, their church, who requires no inward devotion at all, will not burden them much, we see, with that which is outward. So little devotion serves their mass, their divine service requires no more. Devotion there, saith he, is not commanded.<sup>7</sup> Others, amongst which the same author names Hostiensis, Antoninus, and Summa Rosellæ, hold that in the orders for divine service,<sup>8</sup> the bare saying of it is commanded, but all that consists in devotion is no more than counsel (which by their principles may be neglected without sin). The ground of their persuasion is considerable; to enjoin devotion (say they)<sup>9</sup> had been to lay a snare for men, and impose intolerable burdens on them; so that it seems the church had been wicked and unmerciful, if she had but obliged their clergy and religious to be devout in their worship. And by this reason, neither God nor man can make devotion a duty to any sort of Roman

<sup>1</sup> Debet esse devotio, ut animus noster inflammetur amore Dei, quem laudamus; et ardeat desiderio videndi quem fide cernentes preconii extollimus: quamvis si hæc desit absque contemptu, non sit peccatum mortale.—*Ibid.* l. ii. c. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Qui autem hac (sc. devotione) carct, non peccat.—*Ibid.* n. xi.

<sup>3</sup> Quarto animadverterit contra opinionem Cajet. asserentis ad dignam sumptionem hujus sacramenti requiri actualem devotionem, h. e. actualem considerationem qua considerat actu se suscipere Christum; ut ejus fructum percipiat, sine qua actuali devotione peccatum mortale esset Christi corpus sumpsisse: falsam esse et durissimam hanc opinionem.—*Lopez, Instruct.* par. i. c. xi. q. lxxx.

<sup>4</sup> Facillimum est homini, ita distrahi, ut nullam actualem attentionem, vel devotionem habeat; aut omnino sine culpa, aut certe ex levi culpa, quæ non satis est ad impediendum fructum sacramenti.—*Suar. in Thom.* iii. tom. iii. disp. lxiii. sect. iii. Vide *Durand. Paludan. Antonin. Soto. Ledesma. Catharinum, ibid.* sect. ii.

<sup>5</sup> Interior tamen devotio, quæ in attentione consistit, non cadit sub humano præcepto.—*Sum.* v. Miss. ii. n. vi.

<sup>6</sup> Quia aliqui pro notabili parte missæ nugantur cum socio, scandalizantes alios, et sacerdotem vexantes.—*Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* v. negligentia. Si ista negligentia esset circa omissionem horarum, esset mortalis: secus, si circa omissionem devotionis in dicendis horis, quia illa devotio non est sub præcepto.

<sup>8</sup> Alii dicunt quod sub præcepto ibi cadit horas dicere: cætera vero, quæ in devotione consistunt, suadendo dicuntur.—*Ibid.* Hora. v. n. xiii.

<sup>9</sup> Quem sensum primo videtur habuisse Host. Et sequitur eum tanquam benigniorem Archi. et Sum. Rosel. Quia ecclesia non injicit laqueum, nec homines alligare debet oneribus importabilibus.

catholics ; hereafter we must not wonder if they neither enjoin nor observe it. And though their reason may be singular, yet the opinion is the common doctrine, since all are discharged from devotion or reverence, who are not obliged to attention. Such, therefore, and no other, is the worship which the church of Rome makes needful for the clergy and religious. Such as it can be, without attention, without holy fear or affection ; it is not the thing they call it, it deserves not the name of worship, or the title of holy or religious ; it must be a profane and irreligious exercise, it can be no better without reverence, and without devotion ; it cannot but be without these, whilst it is without attention, which they oblige all to neglect, by declaring it needless. Durandus maintained that images<sup>1</sup> are not to be worshipped properly, but only abusively, that is, as they explain it, though worship be exhibited before, or about the image, yet the mind of the worshipper is far from it. This, his opinion, is now damned, as little less than heretical ; being, in their account, no less than a denial that any worship is to be given to an image. Yet this abusive worship is all that they make necessary for the God of heaven ; for requiring no attention of mind, no devotion of soul in their service, they allow both mind and heart to be far from him, while they do something before or about him which they call worship. So that what worship they count intolerably too little for a senseless image, not to say a detestable idol, they think enough in conscience for the true and living God. I have not observed that any idolaters in the world were ever so gross and stupid, as by their avowed doctrine thus to advance what they look upon as a mere image, and so to debase what they took to be the true God. However, hereby it appears, that they count no worship at all needful for God, since worship without the heart will, by their doctrine, serve the turn, which,<sup>2</sup> in reference to an image, is, with them, no worship at all. It is not true honour or worship, but fiction and mockery. This is their own character of such worship when images are concerned, and under it I leave their divine service.

*Sect. 2.* Let us in the next place view their mass. This is for the people,<sup>3</sup> and is the only public worship enjoined them in any of their days for worship. They call it<sup>4</sup> the chief part of their religion, and this summons us to expect that herein, if at all, they will shew themselves religious, and worship God indeed ; however, they think not themselves obliged to it in their divine office. But all expectation hereof is quite blasted when they tell us,<sup>5</sup> that less attention is required at the mass than at their canonical hours ; yet so they commonly determine, and their reason is,<sup>6</sup> because

<sup>1</sup> Quod est incidere in opinionem Durandi ab omnibus damnatum, dicentis, imaginem non proprie, sed abusive adorari, non enim alia ratione illam vocavit abusivam adorationem imaginis nisi quia licet fiat coram ipsa vel juxta ipsam, tamen animus adorantis, ut sic, longe est ab ipsa.—*Suar.* tom. iii. disp. lxxxii. sect. viii. p. 1075.

<sup>2</sup> Quamvis exterior actus rationem adorationis non habeat, nisi ut est ab interiori, seu ut manat a predicto affectu, nam si ab illo non oriatur; non est adoratio, sed irrisio potius, seu fictio quædam.—*Idem.* tom. i. disp. li. sect. i. p. 757.

<sup>3</sup> Sola missa communiter est in præcepto.—*Cajetan.* Sm. v. fest. Est communis sententia, *vide infra.*

<sup>4</sup> Bellarm. l. i. ; De Missa, c. i. p. 679.

<sup>5</sup> Attentionem vero quæ necessaria est sub præcepto ad audiendam Missam, dicimus non esse tantam quanta est in officio Divino.—*De Graff. ibid.* l. ii. cap. xxxiv. n. 8. Neque in audienda missa requiritur tanta attentio sicut in recitatione horarum.—*Lopez. ibid.* c. lii. p. 271. Ut Soto. et Navar. etiam annotant, minor attentio in missa necessaria est, quam in horis canonicis recitandis.

<sup>6</sup> Quia oratio est actio magis rationalis, quam illa moralis præsentia, quæ necessaria est ad implendum præceptum de audienda missa.—*Suar.* tom. iii. disp. lxxxviii. sect. iii. Ex quo fit majorem attentionem requiri ad horas quam ad missam.—*Ita Nugons,*

prayer is a more rational act than that moral presence required at mass. So that their hearing mass is a less rational act than that which is performed without understanding, and requires less attention of mind, than that to which none at all is actually needful. And we cannot yet apprehend how that can be divine worship, which is so far from being reasonable service, or how God can be thought to be worshipped, when the soul which is to worship him doth not take any notice of him. The servant of servants at Rome would not think himself honoured, if the holding out of his toe were not regarded by such as have access to him. But Roman catholics may, it seems, mind God less at their mass, than one that minds him not all, and yet worship him well enough after their mode.

Besides, all inward worship is clearly discharged, for when they teach that the mass is for the people, the only worship on the Lord's days, or any other day set apart for worship, they tell us expressly, no inward worship is the duty of those days, external worship alone is commanded.<sup>1</sup> So Aquinas, Cajetan,<sup>2</sup> so Navar, so de Graffis, so Lopez, Dominicus a Soto also, who asserts it with many reasons, amongst which this is one, because the church requires no other than this external worship, and if God had required more, the church had not been *fida divini juris interpres*, a faithful expounder of the divine law, which rather than they will yield they will admit anything, though it be that God should never have any true worship amongst them.

Particularly and expressly, they deny all acts of contrition for sin to be the duties of mass days. So Sylvester,<sup>3</sup> Summa Rosellæ,<sup>4</sup> Melchior Canus,<sup>5</sup> and all the other authors last mentioned.<sup>6</sup> Likewise, all acts of love to God,<sup>7</sup> Bellarmine, and in him Aquinas,<sup>8</sup> so Navar and Pope<sup>9</sup> Adrian, de Graffis,<sup>10</sup> and Soto,<sup>11</sup> who would maintain this with many arguments, one of the chief of them, he calls it *ingentissimum argumentum*, is,<sup>12</sup> that this would be to ensnare souls, and cast them into grievous straits, if so harsh a duty as an act of love to God, were enjoined so frequently. Another is,<sup>13</sup> that all the commands of God, as to the substance of them, may be fully accomplished without love to God, and therefore this.

It is good divinity with them that we are not bound to worship God out of love. The mass, saith Navar,<sup>14</sup> which we are commanded to hear on those days, and nothing else, may be heard well enough without any such act of

*S. Antoninus, Navar Sylvester, Graffius, Sotus, Angelus, Barthol. ab Angelo, Henricq. in (et cum) Bonacin. de Sacrament, disp. iv. q. ult. punct. xi. n. 20.*

<sup>1</sup> *Ex præcepto colendi Deum homo tenetur duntaxat cultum externum ei exhibere. —Petr. a S. Joseph de præcept. i. art. v. Aquinas xxii. q. cxxii. art. iv.; Cajetan. sum. v. fest. p. 305; Navar. cap. xiii. n. ii.; Lopez, c. lii. p. 266; De Graff. l. ii. c. xxxiii. n. viii. ibid.; Covarravius ver. resol. l. iv. c. xix. n. vi.*

<sup>2</sup> *Cum ergo ecclesia cultum hoc præcepto inclusum perinde suo statuto exprimeret —et hoc suo præcepto ad cultum nos tantum aritet, palam est jure divino non esse illic alium contentum; quoniam alias nisi illum explicaret, non fuisset fida juris Divini interpres. —Soto de Just. et Jur. l. ii. q. iv. art. iv.*

<sup>3</sup> *Sum. v. Domin. n. viii.*

<sup>5</sup> *Prælect. de Pœniten. pars. iv. p. 864.*

<sup>6</sup> *Cajetan. ibid.; Soto. ibid.; Navar. c. xiii. n. xvii.; Lopez, c. lii. p. 271; De Graff. ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *De Cult. Sanctorum, l. iii. c. x. p. 1609.*

<sup>8</sup> *Cap. xi. n. xix. &c. xxii. n. vii.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Esset enim hoc Christianorum animos irretire, et in artissimas angustias conjicere: nempe quod tam crebro ad rem tam arduam teneremur. —Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ejusmodi præcepta non obligant ad charitatis modum, sed possunt quantum ad substantiam operis, extra charitatem impleri. —Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *Nam missa quam in illis diebus præcipimur audire, recte audiri potest, sine tali amore actu concepto, unde rari vel nulli se hujus omissionis accusant. —Cap. xi. n. vii. ac Fest. Vide Suar. l. ii. c. xvi.*

love. So Bellarmine,<sup>1</sup> we are not bound on these days by any particular precept not to sin, or to have any act of contrition, or any act of love to God. What, not one act of love to God? No; he will prove it. One of his arguments is,<sup>2</sup> because the church hath determined the time and manner how divine law is to be observed in keeping this command, but the church nowhere requires inward acts; she thinks, it seems, that God may be served sufficiently with the mass, without any sense of sin or love to God. And thus all those other graces and affections that flow from repentance, or love, or necessarily depend thereon, as filial fear, spiritual desires, delight in God, &c., will be no duty on their mass days, their mass hath nothing to do with them. Confessions of sin there may be well enough without godly sorrow, and petitions without desires, and praises without complacence or ingenuous gratitude, because all is well enough without love to God, or grief for offending him; and that on all these days wherein they are obliged to hear mass.

If you would see anything of the worship of God in the mass, it is as if you look for the life and nature of a man in a picture; and such an one as will not so much as shew you his colour or figure, but very rudely.

The precept for observing mass days, as Sylvester tells us,<sup>3</sup> requires not the end, that is, waiting upon God, nor what is necessarily requisite thereto, but the hearing of mass. Not waiting on God, but hearing mass! These are distinct things, and disjoined in the sense of the Roman doctors, the one is commanded, the other is not; so that they may duly hear mass all their lives, and yet not wait on God one moment: the former they must do, the latter they are not obliged to regard, nor anything that necessarily belongs to it. Navar<sup>4</sup> asserts this, and would prove it by reason, and the authority of Aquinas, herein generally followed. In short, if there be any worship required in the mass, it is merely external; and that, disjoined from the inward service of the soul, is but a mere shew or visor of worship, as they themselves confess in their lightsomer intervals. Well, but is it worship in any sense? Is there anything religious required of the people herein? For this they tell us it is enough, if it be a human act, no more is enjoined,<sup>5</sup> the precept obligeth not, but to hear, so that it may be a human act,<sup>6</sup> saith Soto and others,<sup>7</sup> and if it suffice that it be a human act, it needs not be religious. Let it be deliberate, that is enough to make it a human act; and then, though there be no religious motion or intention in it, the precept is fulfilled. Sylvester confirms us herein: the precept, saith he, is given unto men, and therefore the work must not be the issue only of the imagination, which is common to us with beasts, it must proceed from deliberation, which requires some attention.<sup>8</sup> So that there is something more required of one

<sup>1</sup> Non tenemur in diebus festis ex præcepto peculiari, ad non peccandum sive ad annum contritionis, vel dilectionis Dei.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Ecclesia determinavit tempus et modum observandi jus divinum de observatione præceptum: at ecclesia nusquam præcipit actus illos interiores.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Non est simpliciter de fine, *i. e.* ipsa vacatioue circa Deum, vel necessario requisitis ad illam: sed de abstinentia a servilibus, et auditione missæ.—*Dominic. v. n. viii.*

<sup>4</sup> Quamvis finis hujus præcepti sit, ut homo Deo vacet, ipsoque fruatur, et in eo quiescat, ut docuit S. Thomas. Quando tamen finis præcepti est aliud a re præcepta, tunc non cadit sub præceptum, sicut idem. S. Thomas. Communitur receptus, c. xiii. n. ii. p. 198.

<sup>5</sup> Neque tale præceptum obligat ad alium actum interiorem, quam ad illum qui propter exteriorem est necessarius, scil. vere audire missam ea attentione, ut sit actus humanus.—*Soto. ibid. p. li.*

<sup>6</sup> Præceptum audiendi missam non obligat nisi taliter audire ut sit actus humanus.—*Idem. l. x. q. v. art. v. p. 341.*

<sup>7</sup> Sat est, quod sit actus humanus.—*Jac. de Graff lib. ii. c. xxxiv. n. viii. Satis est, sit actus humanus.—Lopez, c. lii. p. 271.*

<sup>8</sup> Præceptum datur hominibus, ideoque oportet ut non procedat opus ex sola imagina-

that goes to mass than of a beast ; but that is before he comes there ; if he advance but to it as a man, he may be excused even from human acts, when he is at it, he needs neither exercise his understanding nor his senses. He needs not understand it,<sup>1</sup> that it is far from being a duty, they have made it impossible ; it is no sin either for priests<sup>2</sup> or people not to know what they do, so reasonable is their service. The Latin makes it unintelligible enough, but if it were in a language less known, if in Mosarabic or Greek,<sup>3</sup> those who are present without any but their mother tongue fulfil the precept. As Victorel tells us,<sup>4</sup> after Soto and others, he need not see what is done,<sup>5</sup> he may do all that is requisite at the mass blindfold ; he needs not hear it, as Cajetan and others tell us,<sup>6</sup> and this is much, he is enjoined only to hear mass, and yet doth all that he is enjoined if he hear it not, if not one syllable of it reach his ears ; it seems, with them, to hear is not to hear. Just by the same figure that they say they worship God, when in truth they do not worship him at all.

He needs not be sensible of anything about it ; to hear mass, saith Tolet, is not to use any of his senses about what is done in the mass.<sup>7</sup> And if this be their worshipping God, a man may worship him as much as the church of Rome requires, not only without reverence and devotion, without heart and affection, but without the use of sense or reason. A brute may do more at mass than they require their catholics to do. No wonder that church enjoins no attention, devotion, or reverence, nor counts them needful (as we have already manifested), for can there be any pretence to require these, when both sense and understanding are superseded ; or can there be anything that deserves the name of worship without these ?

They themselves cancel and overthrow all their own pleas and pretences for their offering God anything of worship in the mass. For, they say, he doth not worship there who is not present ; and they cannot deny that in God's account he is absent whose mind is not present. And yet they justify voluntary departures of mind and heart, when they would be worshipping ; and those who would not seem to do this do it really, when they conclude it no fault to employ themselves about other things when they are at mass.<sup>8</sup> They allow them to say their hours (and so neglect the mass, out of a neglect of their divine office), or to recite what is enjoined them by way of penance (and so prefer a punishment before the chief part of their religion), or other voluntary performances (so they may do what they will rather than mind

tione, quæ communis nobis est cum bestiis, sed ex deliberatione quæ attentionem requirit, &c. v. hora. n. xiii. vid. Angelus v. hor. n. xxvii.

<sup>1</sup> Nemo teneatur ex præcepto audire, et minus intelligere verba sacerdotis, quia satis est vel ex longinquo missanti adesse.—*Navar. c. xxi. n. viii.*

<sup>2</sup> Clerici vel laici qui divinis intersunt, si non intelligunt quæ dicunt, non peccant.—*Jac. de Graff. l. ii. c. li. n. xii.*

<sup>3</sup> Si audiret missam Mosaravem, completeret.—*Lopez. c. xlii.*

<sup>4</sup> Qui Græcam missam audiret, satisfaceret præcepto, etiam si non intelligeret.—*Addit. ad. l. vi. c. vii. Tol. instr. Vid Bonacin de Sacram. d. iv. q. ult. punct. xi. n. xii. et ibi plures.*

<sup>5</sup> Non est videre ea quæ in missa aguntur.—*Tolet. l. vi. c. vi.*

<sup>6</sup> Utrum autem audiatur vel non, utrum sit missa propria vel non, sub præcepto non cadit.—*Cajet. Sum. v. Fest. p. cccvi. ; Navar. c. xxi. n. viii. supra. De Graff. l. ii. c. xxxiv. n. viii. Satis est præsentem esse missæ, ad impletionem præcepti, licet non audiat sacerdotem ; secundum Sotum. Lopez. ibid. Bonacin. ibid. n. xx. ibi S. Antonin. Nugnus, Navar. Sylvest. Henrique Graff. Sot. Angelus. Barthol. ab Angelo.*

<sup>7</sup> Secundum Antoninum, non est necesse sentire et distincte audire verba missæ, &c. *Sylvest. v. miss. ii. n. vi. Audire Sacrum—non est uti aliquo sensu erga ea quæ in missa aguntur, l. vi. c. vi.*

<sup>8</sup> Sponte inter sacrum audiendum, vana cogitantem, præcepto satisfacere—affirmant *Sylvest. Jo. Medino, Paludanus, Azor. in Victorel. addit. Tol. l. vi. c. vi.*

what they are about).<sup>1</sup> They know they cannot do two things at once, especially in divine worship, which should take up the soul. Though in their worshipping, where the soul is not concerned, they may attend a hundred acts at once; as much as they are obliged to mind the mass, that is, actually not at all. They admit them not only to read or write what they please, but also to sleep part of the time, so that they take not too long a nap.<sup>2</sup> It should not last above a third part, or half the mass (for that is *pars notabilis*<sup>3</sup>); if it be but less than that, it passeth for nothing.<sup>4</sup> Or if they be too brisk to sleep, they may entertain themselves with familiar chat.<sup>5</sup> Medina concludes that he who is at mass may spend the whole time in discourse about other things,—merchant affairs or making bargains,—and yet fulfil the precept.<sup>6</sup> They must, it seems, demean themselves at mass altogether as religiously as at the exchange, and no more is required. Suarez would have the discourse neither so long nor so serious, there should be some intermissions to attend. But what attention can he mean? He (with the rest) tells us that to the mass less attention is requisite than to their divine office; and to that office, he and they say, a virtual intention is sufficient, and this is the least of all that can be. So that to the mass less attention than the least of all will suffice; and this, to common apprehension, is none at all. Others of them (as we saw before) will have no attention of mind needful for their office; and so with them, none will serve the mass. Their catholics may have their choice here, and satisfy their devotion at mass either with the attention of this doctor and some other late authors, which is none at all; or (if this seem too much) with that of their ancienter doctors, which is less than none. And what must they attend to who need neither hear, nor see, nor understand what is said or done? It would puzzle one as subtle as himself to tell one how he can attend to that which is neither offered to his senses nor his intellect. And therefore the Jesuit, though he seems more strict, yet herein is less rational than Medina, and not so consistent with himself or their common doctrine. Also he would not have the discourse at mass so grave and serious as that of merchants: it should be more light, more idle than that about trade and business.<sup>7</sup> It seems the levity of the stage suits with the mass better than the seriousness

<sup>1</sup> Vera resolutio est—posse quem eodem tempore satisfacere præcepto de audienda missa, et de dicendis horis canonicis, aut aliis votis, juratis, vel in pœnitentiam injunctis, modo non adeo nni rei intendat, ut alteri necessariam attentionem adimat, quod fieri potest, cum nemo teneatur ex præcepto audire, et minus intelligere verba sacerdotis.—*Navar.* c. xxi. n. viii.

• <sup>2</sup> Vid. Adrian. de satisfact. q. vii.; Medina. tract. ii. de pœnit.; Cajetan. v. fest.; Soto. iv. dist. xiii. q. ii. art. i.; Lopez. c. lii. in Victorel. *ibid.*; besides the Jesuits, Tolet. Suarez. Sa. Azorius. Comitulus, &c.

So they may hear three masses at once, when said in one church at the same time, and thereby satisfy when their penance is three masses, as Bonacin. and in him Rodriguez, Graffius, Scortia, and others.—De sacrament. disp. iv. q. ult. p. xi. n. xiii.

<sup>3</sup> Peccat mortaliter—in aliqua ejus parte notabili colloquendo, pingendo, scribendo, dormiendo.—*Nav.* c. xxi. n. vi., parvitas in omni materia excusat a mortali, n. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Secundum Archidiaconum, præceptum non observat, qui partem notabilem amittit, partem medietatem aut tertiam partem; seens qui modicam.—*Sylv.* v. miss. ii. n. i.

<sup>5</sup> Modicam enim pro nihilo reputatnr.—*Cajet.* v. fest.

<sup>6</sup> Nonnulla modica misceantur colloquia.—*Lopez.* c. lii. p. 271.

<sup>7</sup> Medina docet, si quis missæ interest, semper tamen confabulatur, aut alia negotia, futura cum mercatoribus tractat, nihilominus implere præceptum.—*In Suar.* tom. iii. disp. xviii. sect. iii. Respondetur autem ex Cajetano, una cum Soto, quod sufficiat missæ esse præsentem, unde qui longe stat, eam non audiens, vel cum alio loquens, non propterea est præcepti transgressor.—*Corradus* in resp. quæst. 198.

<sup>8</sup> Qui voluntarie confabulatur—non satisfacere, nisi vel confabulatio esset discontinua, partim scil. loquendo, partim attendendo, ut communiter fieri solet; vel non de re seria, sed levi, &c.—*Idem, ibid.*

of the exchange. Answerably, if their discourse be not decent, nor the subject of it very modest, the mass will comport with it, and the church's precept will bear it without a breach.<sup>1</sup> And no wonder, since it hath been the custom of that church (as many of their writers inform us<sup>2</sup>) to sing not only profane, but filthy, songs at high mass; and that to the organ, that the people might not only be refreshed by their own private immodest discourse, but edified more effectually this way by the louder voice of the church. And how, we learn by a grave cardinal (though little herein more rigid than others), who tells us that the hearers were thereby excited to what was profane and filthy, as experience witnessed.<sup>3</sup> And still notwithstanding any pretence of reformation, tunes to the organ at divine service or mass, though lascivious and very profane, will pass for a small fault (in the judgment of those who seem most severe in the case) if either the matter be slight, or the intention good, or the actors inconsiderate.<sup>4</sup> Here is provision enough, that the scenes in their mass may not be dull and heavy. Yet further, they may laugh and be pleasant, and when the music (which sounds not always) doth it not, they may make themselves merry in the height of their worship. But this with some caution: their talk and laughter may break out into such noise, that possibly it may prove a sin of irreverence.<sup>5</sup> Here is some show of danger, but it will vanish presently; for if it should be a very loud extravagance, and the irreverence great, yet great irreverence may with them be but a small fault, and they have the authority of the pope to warrant this.<sup>6</sup> Nor must this seem strange to us, since they will not have all contempt of God criminal; that which is material may be venial, and it is not formal, unless besides the contempt of God there be also an intention to contemn him.<sup>7</sup> Such is the most solemn worship in the Roman church, and so is God worshipped amongst them; and that not by the unwarranted presumption of the profane multitude, but by the rules and conclusions of those who direct their worship and guide their consciences. Here we may see in the mass the religion of Roman Catholics; they call it the chiefest, the best part of their religion, that we may not look for anything better amongst them, nor anything religious, if it be not found here; yea, it is all (better or worse) that the people are obliged to in public (and in private their church doth not trouble them with any).<sup>8</sup> He that views it well, and believes he hath a soul, and that there is a God, must have little or no regard of either

<sup>1</sup> Soto in iv. dist. xiii. q. ii. art. iii., dicit quod licet indecentia sint colloquia inter audiendam missam, non tamen propterea fit transgressor præcepti.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Cornelius Agrippa, de vanit. scient. cap. xvii.; Cajetan. sum. v.; Organ. Soto. de just. and jur. l. x. q. v. art. ii. p. 336; Navar. cap. xiii. n. lxxxvii.; Lopez. eap. li. p. 263.

<sup>3</sup> In cujus signum, audientes ex illo sono excitantur ad illa profana scu turpia, ut experientia testatur: ita quod non est inficiationi locus.—*Cajetan, ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Canticus—ratione soni quia est lascivus aut valde sæcularis—potest esse venialis culpa, vel ratione materiæ minimæ, vel ex bona intentione vel inadvertentia, ut Cajetanus dixit, in Suar. de horis can. l. iv. cap. xiii. n. xvii., materia parva—si organista loco *Kyrie Eleison*, cantilenam profanam organo canat.—*Villalobus*, in Dian. v. blasphem. n. iv.

<sup>5</sup> Sed possent voces et risus in tantum prorumpere, quod esset peccatum irreverentiæ et scandali.—*Lopez*, c. lii. Soto in iv. dist. xiii. quæst. ii. art. i.

<sup>6</sup> Jac. de Graff. l. ii. c. lii. supra.

<sup>7</sup> Contemptus ille qui continetur in irreverentia Dei per se, et ut talis est, non semper est formalis sed materialis, qui non semper sufficit ad malitiam mortalem. Nos autem loquimur de contemptu formali, quo ipsa Dei irreverentia intenditur.—*Suar. de Juram*, l. iii. c. xii. n. iv. and vi; vid. *Cajetan. Sum. v. contempt*; vid. *Bonacin. de legibus*, disp. ii. q. iii. p. 5, n. x. l. xv.

<sup>8</sup> In qua (sc. missa) præcipua pars religionis nostræ.—*Bellar. de miss. lib. i. cap. p. 679.*

if he do not bless himself from it, as a thing which hath nothing of religion but the name, and that merely usurped. A religion which needs nothing, by the doctrine of its chief professors, that is either godly, or so good as human; no regard of God at all, so much as in one thought of him; nor any act of reason, yea, or of sense, either about anything religious or divine; yet allows a free exercise of both about that which is profane and irreligious; he that counts this religion indeed, must stifle the common notions of religion and Christianity; and he that, understanding it, makes choice thereof, had need first be very indifferent, whether he have any religion or none. Had the ancient fathers talked after this senseless, lewd, extravagant rate concerning the worship of God, how would Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian have triumphed over them! Nay, they might justly have challenged them to have instanced in any one that bore the name of a philosopher, that ever treated of the worship of God with so little reverence and discretion. Had such loose and wild doctrines been broached by the first teachers of Christianity, the heathens needed not have raised so fierce a persecution against it, they might with ease have hissed it out of the world.

But this is not the worst: they encourage that in the mass which they cannot but condemn as wicked, and maintain that the precept for hearing mass may be satisfied by such wickedness. Melchior Canus to this objection (that the command of God or the church cannot be fulfilled by sin) answers according to the opinion commonly maintained amongst them, that he is no transgressor of the precept who to the act enjoined, and good in its kind, adds something sinful.<sup>1</sup> He supposeth that the act commanded by the church is some way good; but withal, that the precept may be satisfied, though it be done wickedly, and that by their common doctrine. Whether the circumstances may be venially or mortally wicked he saith not, but leaves us to understand it of either. Dominicus à Soto tells us expressly, that though what is added to the act<sup>2</sup> enjoined be a mortal wickedness, yet the precept may thereby be satisfied substantially. With these divines of greatest reputation amongst them, concurs Navarre,<sup>3</sup> no less renowned (and none of them Jesuits); The opinion of Antoninus (which he is disproving) presupposeth, saith he, that by a sinful act, especially if it be a mortal sin, the command of the church cannot be fulfilled; but that this is false we have largely proved. He would have us know that he hath fully demonstrated that the precept for hearing mass may be entirely accomplished by deadly crimes. This is the judgment of the most eminent doctors amongst them, such as are not of the Society, and (if they will believe their famous bishop of the Canaries) the common doctrine in the Roman church, and by this the world may judge what a church it is, what her religion, what her worship, what her precepts for it are, when all that she requires for that worship, which is the principal part of her religion, may be satisfied by acts of wickedness, such as are mortal and damnable to the worshippers, and most (of all others) dishonourable to God, whom they pretend to worship. And let those that are seduced, or may be tempted by seducers, seriously consider whether they can wisely trust their souls to such a conduct, or be safe in such a com-

<sup>1</sup> Nos cum communi opinione in præsentia teneamus, non esse transgressorem præcepti, qui actui, bono ex genere suo, quem lex præcipiebat, apponit aliquam malam circumstantiam.—*Relect. de pœnit.* part iv. p. 936; vid. *Bonacinum de legibus*, disp. i. q. i. pñct. ix. n. i.; ibi. *S. Thomas, Soto, Navar, Medina*, et plures alii.

<sup>2</sup> Quamvis simul habeat propositum aliud mortale, satisfaciet præcepto quantum ad substantiam.—*Ibid.* l. x. q. v. a. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Non tamen est tenendum illud Antonini—quia præsupponit, malo, præsertim mortali, non posse adimpleri præceptum, quod esse falsum, late probavimus, c. xxi. n. vii.

munion, where there is no more tenderness for the salvation of souls than to be satisfied with such a worshipping of God as will confessedly damn them.

*Sect. 3.* Thus much for the manner of their public worship, all of it, whoever amongst them it concerns, whereby it appears that they count it not necessary that God should have any real worship from them. This will be further manifest by what they teach concerning the end of it.

They maintain that it is lawful for their clergy and monastics too (who profess perfection) to serve God for their own ends, viz. to get preferment, or compass a dignity, or gain some worldly advantage, and so to prostitute the honour and worship of God to such low, earthly, sordid designs, as religious persons would never appear to own, but that irreligion is grown too monstrously big for its vizard. He that riseth to their morning service for this end, that he may have his daily dividend, if it be not principally for this, he sins not. So their *glossa celeberrima*, the two popes Urban and Cœlestine, determine that it is lawful for their clergy to serve God in their churches for this design, and hope to get ecclesiastical dignity; in Navarre.<sup>1</sup> But then this great casuist (of so high esteem among them, that he was sent for from Spain to Rome, to give advice and direction to the old gentleman there, that cannot err) understands (after Aquinas and Jo. Major,<sup>2</sup> as he pretends) the principal end to be something else than others do. It is not that which so much moves the agent, as that without it he would not be drawn to act by any other end; and accordingly he will have the premised testimony to be understood.<sup>3</sup> So that one of their perfectionists, who riseth to morning prayer for this end, that he may have his dividend, and would not stir<sup>4</sup> out of his bed to attend the worship of God for God's sake, or any other end beseeeming a religious person, if the consideration of his daily allowance did not rouse him, yet he serves God so well herein as that he is sinless, and not so much as venially tainted. Likewise the clergy who address themselves to the worship of God, moved thereto more by hopes to gain preferment and dignity than any respect to God, yet they sin not; that is, they worship God well enough, though they respect themselves and their own ends more than him; or, which is all one, though they serve themselves rather than God, whom they are to worship. They are all concerned to maintain this; for he tells them, if such acts of virtue or worship were vicious,<sup>5</sup> all their acts in a manner would be stark naught, since there are extremely few amongst them that are purely done for God. They are a church in the meantime that worthily profess godliness, since nothing is done, or needs be done by them, even in the worship of God, for him, so much as for themselves;

<sup>1</sup> *Glossa illa celeberrima ait peccare quidem eum, qui surgit ad matutinas preces principaliter propter distributiones quotidianas, non autem illum, qui surgit principaliter ut Deo inserviat, et minus principaliter, et secundario, ut eas lueretur—Urbanus papa et Cœlestinus determinarunt licere clericis servire Deo in ecclesiis ob spem ascendendi ad dignitates illarum. Imo, Gelasius dixit eos ad hunc ascensum spe majoris commodi compellendos—Glossa recepta dicit expresse per illum textum, licere clerico servire in ecclesia ad quærendam aliquam dignitatem, modo principaliter ob id non serviat, &c., cap. xxiii. n. ci.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ut probavimus, non est bona definitio illa Bartoli, qua definit causam principalem esse causam qua cessante cessat effectus.—Id. ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ut aliquis finis sit principalis, non sufficit quod ille non fieret sine illo, sed oportet, quod plaris vel tanti æstimetur ac alius finis, propter quem ille fit.—Id. c. xvii. n. 209, &c. xx. n. xi. p. 459.*

<sup>4</sup> *Per supra dictos textus et glossas, quæ habent locum etiam in his, qui non serviant, ecclesiis vel prælatis, nisi sperarent beneficia, c. xxiii. n. ci.*

<sup>5</sup> *Surgens ad matutinas ob distributiones, alias non surrecturus.—Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Alioqui enim omnes fere actus nostri essent vitiosi; quia paucissimi fiunt pure propter solum Deum, et solam virtutem, &c.—Ibid. p. 590.*

and, indeed, Sylvester deals ingenuously when he tells us plainly, without the cover of any pitiful shift, that it is no sin to serve God principally for their own profit.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, and yet worse, they teach it is no sin to worship God for an end that is in itself a sin, if it be not principally intended. It is lawful by their doctrine to preach, to pray, say mass, &c., for praise of men (though Christ will have those that designed it, as Cajetan<sup>2</sup> notes, even when he is excusing this, to have no better reward), or for vain glory (though they reckon this amongst capital crimes<sup>3</sup>), only he must not make so wicked a thing his chief end, and then he is innocent enough, though sin against God be his design in worshipping him. It is no sin, yea, it is meritorious, to do these things, viz. to preach, and say mass, and to do other things of like nature principally for God, and secondarily for vain glory and praise of men, aptly directed as our end. Thus Navarre determines after their great saint and doctor, Aquinas.<sup>4</sup> Now he had taught us before, that these acts of worship are but done secondarily (and so unlawfully) for these criminal ends, when they so much sway a man as that he would not worship God unless he were excited by them; and that vain glory is not his principal end, even when he is so much influenced thereby as that he would not pray or preach, &c. If this were not his motive, this in the judgment of others, as he acknowledgeth, is to make sin his principal end, and to advance wickedness above God, even when he pretends to worship him.<sup>5</sup> But let us not interrupt this great doctor in his way, it is foul enough as himself makes it; for hereby a man may serve God, and that meritoriously (after the Roman mode), though he never would let him have an act of worship, if pride and vain glory did not set him a-work. He would never pray or preach, &c., if he were not more moved to it by sin, and out of regard to some wickedness, than out of respect to God.

Further yet, they hold it is but a venial fault to worship God principally for vain glory, and other designs of like quality.<sup>6</sup> Aquinas, as he is represented by Sylvester, determining that it is no mortal sin to serve God principally for vain glory, if that be one's chief end actually only, and not both habitually and actually. Sylvester declares it as his own persuasion, that it is both against Aquinas and the truth to hold it is a mortal sin, when

<sup>1</sup> *Licetum est etiam aliquid operari principaliter propter propriam utilitatem.—Sum. v. charitas. n. 5.* And that of Navar is plain enough: *Diximus quod falsum est, esse mortale facere ordinata ad cultum principaliter ob bona temporalia, cap. xxiii. n. 14, p. 555, &c., xiii. n. 14.* Solet circa hanc voluntatem inquiri, an debeat esse honesta; et specialiter, an voluntas confitendi propter humanum motivum, scilicet inanem gloriam, vel commodum temporale, sufficiat ad valorem sacramenti: nam in cæteris sacramentis certum est sufficere; in hoc—affirmant, *Soto. dist. xviii. q. 3. art. iii.; Navar, c. xxi. n. 40.* Negant enim illam voluntatem ex illo fine, esse peccatum mortale, sed veniale tantum: quod non repugnat valori sacramenti. Quæ sententia, per se loquendo, vera mihi videtur.—*Suarez, tom. iv. disp. xx. sec. iii. n. 4. p. 273.*

<sup>2</sup> *Sum. v. prædicat. p. 480.*

<sup>3</sup> *Aquinas. xxii. q. 132, art. i.; (in eo) Gregorius. xxxi; Moral. numerat inanem gloriam inter septem vitia capitalia.—Ibid. art. iv.*

<sup>4</sup> *Nullum autem peccatum immo meritum est facere illa (viz. concionare, missam celebrare, precari et id genus alia) principaliter propter Deum, et secundario propter vanam gloriam, vel laudem humanam, in finem aptum relatum per ibi dicta post S. Thomam. c. xxiii. n. 13.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ex quo infert quod mortale est prædicare aut missam celebrare, et hujusmodi, propter inanem gloriam, quod verum est solum ut dicit S. Thom. Si in ea ponatu ultimus finis, ita quod ipsa intenditur principaliter actu et habitu, secus si actu tantum, ut iste intendit.—Sum. v. vana gloria. n. 2.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ex quibus patet, quod Sum. Ang. contra. S. Thom. et veritatem dicit, quod est mortale, quando, ea quæ ordinata sunt ad Dei gloriam, facit ad gloriam suam, ut sacramenta et Scripturæ sacræ.—Ibid.*

those things which are ordained for the glory of God are used principally for a man's own glory. He instances in the sacraments, saying mass, the Scriptures, and preaching.

Cardinal Cajetan declares himself thus in one instance, which involves the rest :<sup>1</sup> It is but venial to preach for vain glory, or hopes of a gainful alms, signifying that he means such vain glory as Christ condemned in the pharisees, when he told them this was like to be 'their reward.'

Navarre<sup>2</sup> affirms, that to preach, or say mass, or pray, and such things as are instituted for the honour and worship of God and the salvation of souls, for vain glory principally, or more than principally, is but a venial fault; and that such as gainsay this (who are but two) have been confuted by others, and by himself after them. These are the chief of their doctors, whom the rest commonly follow (and none of them Jesuits), who unanimously assert this. Now it is not necessary with them for any man to avoid a venial sin, since by their doctrine a world of them can never damn a man; and therefore it is not necessary for any papist to worship God otherwise than principally for vain glory, or ends equally criminal, *i. e.* it is not needful for them to worship him at all; for no man can imagine that he is worshipped when he is in the highest degree dishonoured and affronted; and what greater affront can be put upon him than under a pretence of worship to debase the great God, and thrust him lower in our designs, not only than ourselves and earthly trifles, but lower than sin, the vilest thing on earth, yea, or in hell? and this is evidently done when vain-glory (a capital sin) hath the pre-eminence of God in addresses to him, and is regarded as principal; when the Lord of heaven and earth hath no regard at all, or only in a lower place. It is not worshipping of God, but a horrid impiety, for men to serve themselves instead of God, but more intolerably impious to worship sin; and that hath the worship and is honoured in the place of God which hath the highest advancement, and is principal in religious addresses; yet no better than this is all the worship which, by the Roman doctrine, is necessary from their catholics.

In short, whereas by their doctrine of non-attention, formerly examined, it is so evident that they discharge themselves from all real worship, as they have no colour to hide it, no shift to evade it, but a supposal of some previous attempt to serve God when they are addressing themselves to their service; this, their last reserve, they themselves ruin, by their doctrine concerning the end of worship; for they teach, besides what is premised, that a man who comes to mass or divine service, with a purpose not to worship God, but to serve his lusts, doth satisfy the precept. We are not obliged, saith Soto, to hear mass but only so that it may be a human act, which it may be, though there be a sinister intention in it;<sup>3</sup> yea, though the

<sup>1</sup> Veniale autem si vane propter gloriam aut spem quæstuarie elemosynæ prædicaretur; receperunt enim mercedem suam.—*Sum. v. prædicat. p. 480.*

<sup>2</sup> Peccat, qui res principaliter institutas ob honorem Dei et cultum ejus, et salutem animarum, principaliter, vel æque principaliter ob vanam gloriam facit; quale est concionari, missam celebrare, precari et id genus alia secundum Abulensem et Angelum, quod post alios efficaciter confutavimus, dicentes esse solum veniale, c. xxxiv. n. xiii. p. 554.

Dicendum est intentionem bonam simpliciter non esse de substantia orationis vocalis. Itaque si quis habet intentionem orandi, et ex illa proferet verba de se sufficientia ad orandum, et consentanea laudi, vel reverentiæ divinæ, licet hoc faciat ex intentione laudis humanæ, vel alicujus commodi temporalis in illud principaliter intendo, vere orat, quamvis non bene orat. Hæc est communis sententia.—*Talis oratio est sufficiens ad implendum præceptum ecclesiasticum recitandi horas, ut omnes fatentur.—Suar. de Orat. l. iii. cap. iii. n. v.*

<sup>3</sup> Præceptum audicadi missam non obligat, nisi taliter audire, ut sit actus humanus;

thing intended be a sin, and that highly criminal, for he adds :<sup>1</sup> If one attend prayer, though he do it for vain glory (that is a small matter to stick at), yea, though it be with a purpose mortally wicked, yet he fulfils the precept substantially. Such are the commands of the church of Rome for her most sacred worship. They may be fully satisfied by deadly wickedness; there needs no purity of heart or hand for her devotions; a design damnably evil will serve the turn. That of Antoninus, saith Navarre,<sup>2</sup> is not to be maintained, that he doth not satisfy the precept who comes to church principally to look on a handsome woman, or to talk with her, or for any other sinful thing. If a man, in going to mass, designs to satisfy his curiosity, or his lust, or anything else which is wicked, that church is so good-natured she will be satisfied with it, and think her precept for worship well observed, and you must believe (if you can) that she is a good Christian church that will have Christ worshipped at this rate. He adds reason for it.<sup>3</sup> A man may come to church for a wicked end, and yet hear mass well enough there.

Bonacina<sup>4</sup> instances in several sorts of wickedness, whereby the command for worship may be fulfilled. This is one amongst the rest: if a man go to church on purpose to gaze on or to lust after women lecherously, he satisfies the precept, and for the general rule vouches not only Sotus, Navarre, Medina, and others of greatest reputation in their church, but also their angelical Saint Thomas.

I need not censure these things. Let those that are impartial consider the premises, and see if this be not their sense, that the people in the papacy, by its order, do not, or are not obliged to give God any real worship in public, and by their leaders are taught and encouraged, instead of worship, to present him with gross wickedness. If the measures of religion may be best taken by its worship, what can any indifferent person judge of popery, where a service so palpably irreligious is the best and the most excellent worship they have? If this were duly considered, I think it alone might be sufficient to reduce those that are deluded, and to secure those against temptations who are not yet ensnared.

*Sect. 4.* There is another public exercise which Christ makes as necessary as any evangelical service whatever, and that is, preaching and hearing the word of God. But the Romanists are not of his mind in this.<sup>5</sup> The mass is commanded, but not preaching, saith Sylvester, and he one of the order of predicants. Accordingly hearing mass is commanded, but hearing sermons

qualis esse potest, etiamsi aliud simul adsit sinistrum propositum.—*De Just. et Jur.* l. x. q. v. art. v.

<sup>1</sup> Quod si quis attente oret, quamvis id faciat adjunctam habens vanam gloriam, imo quamvis simul habeat propositum aliud mortale, satisfaciet præcepto, quantum ad substantiam; ita ut non teneatur officium iterare.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Non tamen est tenendum illud S. Antonini, scilicet, eum qui ecclesiam adit principaliter ad videndum, aut alloquendum fœminam pulchram, aut ob aliud quodvis illicitum, non satisfacere huic præcepto, cap. xxi. n. vii.; with him concurs Medina. Addendum his est pravam intentionem adjunctam voluntati audiendi missam, non esse contrariam impletioni hujus præcepti. Itaque quamvis quis eat ad ecclesiam ex libidinosa intentione videndi fœminam, vel etiamsi officio missæ cum eadem intentione assistat, tamen si non excludat voluntatem implendi hoc præceptum, et sufficienter sit attentus, implet illud.—*Ita Medina in Suarez.* tom. iii. disp. lxxxviii. sect. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Potest quis malo fine ecclesiam adire, et bene in ea missam audire.—*Ibid.* p. 469.

<sup>4</sup> Qui ecclesiam adit causa videndi, vel etiam concupiscendi libidinose fœminas—satisfacit.—*De legib.* disp. i. q. i. p. 9, n. i.

<sup>5</sup> Cum missa sit sub præcepto, non prædicatio.—*Sum.* v. domin. n. viii. Audire missam est in præcepto; audire autem concionem non ita.—*Suar.* xiii. tom. iii. disp. lxxxviii. sect. i. vid. v. ii. defess.

is only matter of advice (saith another<sup>1</sup>), which may be neglected without imputation of sin, and if observed is an act of supererogation.

They conclude it no duty in such circumstances where it would be counted necessary, if ever; it is no duty on the Lord's day,<sup>2</sup> or any other time set apart for the public worship. Mass must be heard then, but no need to hear a sermon. If it were any man's duty in their account, it would be so in that case when one wants the knowledge which is necessary to salvation, and hath opportunity to get it by hearing; but even then they declare him not obliged. Sylvester propounds the case in these terms:<sup>3</sup> Doth he sin mortally who is ignorant of those common things which are necessary to salvation, and may hear sermons, but doth not? He answers, He so sins who omits it out of contempt, or with notorious scandal, but not always when it is out of negligence; because, according to Aquinas,<sup>4</sup> negligence is not mortal, unless something be omitted which is under precept, or with contempt; adding, such negligence may possibly be a mortal sin, but when it is so, it cannot be determined. It seems no man can tell when it will be a crime for a person damnably ignorant to neglect the means of instruction; but more briefly and positively he resolves it elsewhere, that he is not commanded to hear a sermon upon the Lord's-day; although he be ignorant of those things which are necessary to salvation, because he may otherwise satisfy the precept for learning.

*Sect. 5.* As to the sacraments, and the worship in them, the despatch may be quick. There are none considerable here but baptism and the eucharist, for their other five are not of divine appointment, nor the worship of God, but their own inventions; and therefore, how needful soever they count them, thereby they make no true worship necessary. But indeed none of them are in their own account necessary to salvation, save only penance, and that we shall meet with hereafter. What worship they shall have in the eucharist is sufficiently discovered by what they are satisfied with in the mass, where we have found them contented with none at all, or that which is worse than none. Neither do they account this sacrament simply necessary, for although it be required that they communicate once a year, yet that is but by human law or custom, as they teach. The sacrament of the eucharist, saith Canus, is not a sacrament of necessity.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Audire prædicationem in festis non est de præcepto simpliciter, patet per prædicta: ac etiam nullo jure cavetur, sed solum de missa.—*Sum. Rosell. Dominic. n. iv.*

<sup>2</sup> Jac. de Graff. l. ii. c. xxxiii. n. viii. xvi. Sotus et Covarruvias, Navar. c. xxi. n. i. Missa audienda diebus festis ex præcepto, non tamen concio, non tamen preces fundendæ; non exercendus alius actus cultus divini, ex præcepto (excipit diem paschatis, quo sumenda est eucharistia).—*Victorel. ibid. ad. l. iv. c. xxv. p. 693.*

Dico nullum esse præceptum, quod obliget in rigore, ac per se, ad audiendam concionem in die festo. Ita supponunt ut clarum doctores omnes, et constat ex communi usu, et sensu fidelium. Item quia nullibi extat hoc præceptum, præterea est optimum argumentum, quia si fideles tenerentur audire concionem sacram, pastores ecclesiæ tenerentur providere, ut omnibus diebus dominicis et festis fieret concio in ecclesia. Pastores autem ad hoc non tenentur, nec de facto ita fit.—*Suar. l. ii. de fest. c. xvi. n. vi.*

<sup>3</sup> Quæritur, utrum peccet mortaliter, qui ignorat communia necessaria ad salutem, et potest audire prædicationem, et non audit? Et dico quod sic, si hoc facit ex contemptu vel ex scandalo notabili: non autem semper si omittit ex negligentia, quia, secundum S. Thom. xxii. q. liv., negligentia non est mortale, nisi omittatur aliquid, quod sit sub præcepto, vel ratione contemptus, v. prædicat. n. vi., quando hoc sit, non potest sermone determinari.—*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Etiamsi talis habeat ignorantiam necessariorum ad salutem, quia alias poterit implere præceptum de addiscendo, v. dominic. n. viii.

<sup>5</sup> Sermo est de eucharistiæ sacramento, quod non est sacramentum necessitatis, pars. v. relict. de pœnit. p. 892. Many of them count it not necessary by virtue of any divine precept, and so not requisite. *jure divino.* Est prima opinio negans esse præceptum jure divino, quam tenuit Alexander Alensis, D. Thomas Carthusianus, Palacius,

For baptism, if they account any worship necessary, it must be either in respect of the administrator or the baptized; as to the former, none with them is needful. For by their doctrine it may be validly administered by any man or woman, or one that is both;<sup>1</sup> yea, or by a child, by those also that are strangers, or enemies to all Christian worship, by Jews, pagans, or infidels of any sort, by such as worship not the true God (as Sylvester tells us out of Aquinas, Paludanus, and their church's law); by such as believe that baptism is good for nought, and minister it in scorn; by such as believe that it is not a sacrament, that it hath no spiritual virtue, and intend not, while they baptize, to administer a sacrament, but only think to do as the church does, although they account that to be nothing at all; so Aquinas<sup>2</sup> and Pope Innocent saith it will be effectual, though the baptizer neither know nor believe what baptism is, but counts it a trifle; though he neither know what the church is, nor minds to do what the church doth, but means to do the contrary. No other worship is necessary upon the account of the ministers, but what might be expected from such as these. Nor any more upon the account of the persons baptized. For as to the adult (there being no presence in reference to infants), they think it sufficiently administered by force to those who would not endure it, but for fear of death<sup>3</sup> if they did not yield; to such as make all the resistance they can,<sup>4</sup> and offer foul injury to the sacrament, and defile the water; to those who receive it, not for the purpose for which it is intended, but for quite<sup>5</sup> other ends than ever it was designed for; yea, to those that are frantic, and never had the use of reason, or are<sup>6</sup> stark mad, and that in the height of their madness; to those also<sup>7</sup> that are fast asleep, if they had a mind to it when they were waking. Since they think it duly administered to such as these, they cannot count any worship necessary herein upon the account of the partakers, but what such as these now mentioned may offer.

*Sect. 6.* For fuller and more particular satisfaction, it is observable that they divide their sacraments into some for the dead and some for the living. Those for the dead are baptism and penance. As to these two, some count no disposition requisite<sup>8</sup> but only a willingness to receive them. Others, who

Bonaventura, Gabriel Sylvester, Ferrariensis, Cajetan. in Suarez, tom. iii. disp. lxi. sect. i. p. 879.

<sup>1</sup> Sum. v. baptism. iii. n. i. Seeundum omnes doctores, precipue S. Thom et Pet. de Pal, omnis homo dare potest baptismum—si sit clericus aut laicus, vir aut mulier, aut uterque simul, *i. e.* Hermaphroditus.

Etiamsi esset infidelis, *i. e.* Judæus aut paganus.

Dicit S. Tho. quod quamvis ille qui non credit baptismum esse sacramentum, aut habere aliquam spiritualem virtutem, non intendat dum baptizat conferre sacramentum, tamen intendit facere quandoque quod facit ecclesia; etiamsi illud reputet nihil esse.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. n. ii. Innocentius dicit, quod baptismus habebit effectum, etiamsi baptizans nec sciat nec eredit, quid sit baptismus, sed hoc reputet trufam, et etiamsi non sciat quid sit ecclesia, nec gerat in mente facere, quod facit ecclesia: immo si gereret contrarium, scilicet non facere quod facit ecclesia, sed tamen facit et formam servat, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ibid. iv. n. x. Si consentit quis per minas vel pœnas habendo voluntatem eactam. coactione conditionali, eligendo seilicet. potius baptizari quam mori vel aliud pati, et n. iii. Si oporteat eos ligari.

<sup>4</sup> Vel etiam si faciant injuriam sacramento, ut mingendo in aquam vel hujusmodi et, n. x. Si baptizetur infidelis non quia eredit sed ut sanetur, vel careat fœtore, aut vexatione diabolica—aut propter quæstum, ut faciunt erebro Judæi.

<sup>5</sup> Si vero usum rationis nunquam habuit, baptizatur in intentione parentum, &c.

<sup>6</sup> Si autem usum rationis habuit aliquando, sed non quando baptizatur, propter phrenesim vel amentiam vel dormitionem et hujusmodi, requiritur intentio quæ præferit, tempore usus rationis, n. iii.

<sup>7</sup> Dicit de dormientibus quod ratione perieuli baptizari possunt, si prius in iis apparuit voluntas baptismi: sicut de amentibus dictum est.

<sup>8</sup> Scotus, quem sequitur Sylvester, sum. v. confess. i. n. xxiv.

would seem to be more severe, count attrition sufficient, which is a slender dislike of sin, not as it is an offence to God, but out of some other consideration, human, natural, or servile. And the lowest degree of this possible, and that despatched in a moment; and this moment need not be while they are at these sacraments, but either before or after.<sup>1</sup> Their penitents<sup>2</sup> may make their confession with laughter instead of grief, yet have as much grief at their sacrament of penance as they require; this is past doubt with them. So that it is their common doctrine that no good act, or motion at all, no, not so little and low as that of attrition, much less any ingenuous reverence or devotion, any act of grace or holy affection, is needful while they are at the sacrament, either of baptism or their penance.

The sacraments of the living are their other five: confirmation, orders, matrimony, extreme unction, and the eucharist. These, they say, were instituted for the increase of grace; this is their proper effect; and that they may have their effect, there is not requisite in the partakers any actual dispositions at all, not the least inward act or motion that is good; no, not so little as that of attrition, which, in their account, is of all others<sup>3</sup> the least and lowest disposition. And well may they count it so, since the best sort of it, with them, is but the issue of servile fear, which, as such, is below the least degree of moral goodness; and so far from being supernaturally good, that it is morally evil, as we shall see hereafter. All that is needful is only that the partakers be in a state of grace (such as a priest may put a sinner into who is impenitent, and never truly contrite), though he shew it not by any act in the sacraments, where, if ever, it should appear. That the sacraments may confer an increase of grace, they only require an habitual disposition, *i. e.* that they be received in the state of grace;<sup>4</sup> this is the judgment of Aquinas and Scotus, whom the rest generally follow. So that, to partake worthily of these sacraments, no actual disposition, no act of reverence or devotion, not any inward motion (such as should be in true worshippers), is more required or expected than in the senseless statues which they idolise. Their souls need act or move no more as worshippers of God herein, than if they were neither Christians nor men; than if they were so far from having grace, as to have no souls. Yea, these sacraments may be valid, and duly celebrated as their church requires they should be, while the partakers are not only void of all good motion towards God, but while their souls are in motion against him, and all that is divine and sacred. Their minds and hearts may, during the celebration, be taken up with acts, not only of folly and vanity, but of pride, or lusts, or revenge, or infidelity, or atheism, or what is most contrary to the most holy God and his worship,

<sup>1</sup> Suar. tom. iv. disp. xx. sect. iv. n. xxix., Sylvester, *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *Judicandum non crit dolore carere ob risum, potuit enim domi de illis dolere, et postea ad sacramentum accedens, actualem pœnitentiam non adducere. At ad valorem et fructum percipiendum sacramenti confessionis non requiri actualem dolorem, sed virtutalem sufficere veram esse sententiam quis dubitet?—Jo. Sanctius, select. disp. xxxi. n. viii.*

<sup>3</sup> *Est minima et imperfectissima dispositio quæ in ordine supernaturali requiri potest.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ut sacramenta conferant augmentum gratiæ solum requirunt habitualement gratiæ dispositionem, id est, quod in statu gratiæ recipiantur. Hæc est sententia D. Thom. Scoti et aliorum in Suar. tom. iii. disp. vii. sect. iv.* All that is required to put them into this state, and free them from conscience of mortal sin (and so to give them all the disposition necessary for the eucharist, and so for the other sacraments) is their ritual confession: yet even this they may neglect lawfully, or without any great fault, as divers amongst them (and those Dominicans) determine. Cajetan. sum. v. communio. Fumus v. Paludanus, Sylvester in Ledesma de eucharist. c. xi. Jo. de la Cruz de eucharist. q. v. concl. ii.

and yet partake as well as the church requires.<sup>1</sup> For the precepts of their church, concerning the administering of the sacraments, and all other things by her enjoined, may be entirely satisfied by acts of wickedness; so notoriously holy is that church, by the report of their chief writers.

*Sect. 7.* If they count any of their sacraments more worthy of holier treatment than that now mentioned, it will be the eucharist; for this they count more worthy than the rest, and have it in such veneration, as not only to worship Christ in it, but to worship it even as Christ himself; and therefore here, if ever, they will judge it requisite to shew themselves worshippers indeed. Yet for all this, whatever worship of this sacrament they count needful, they conclude no true worship of Christ necessary; no, not so much as the least inward act of reverence, devotion, or honour; for this is their common doctrine,<sup>2</sup> that besides the disposition of habitual grace, there is no precept so rigorous as to require any actual disposition for the worthy receiving of this sacrament, so as that the omission of it can be a mortal sin. In this all their divines agree; so that any one may partake worthily of this sacrament, and be free of mortal guilt, without any actual reverence or devotion, any act of grace or holy affection, while he is communicating. This one maxim (wherein they all concur) quite stifles the spirit of Christianity, and bereaves it of its life and soul; it leaves nothing that can honour or please Christ, or be of any advantage to souls, needful in any Christian duty. For no good motion of mind or heart, being needful in the celebrating of this sacrament, which requires it more, they cannot imagine it necessary in any other duty of less consequence; and the want hereof being but a venial fault, there is no more necessity to have it, than there is to avoid a venial sin, which they make nothing of. In this very case, they hold that<sup>3</sup> a venial sin, even in the act of communicating, will not hinder the effect of the sacrament. Yea, it may not be so much as a venial fault, if the vagaries of the mind, which exclude attention and reverence due to such a religious act,<sup>4</sup> be natural. But will it not be more than so slight a fault, voluntarily to abandon every good motion in the celebrating of this sacrament? No;

<sup>1</sup> *Præceptum adimpleri potest per actum ex aliqua circumstantia malum; ita S. Thom. Medina, Navar, et alii in Bonac. supra.*

*Nam alia præcepta sacramentorum tum in aliis materiis, impleri possunt per actum peccaminosum.—Suar. ibid, disp. lxx. sect. iii, after Corduba, Soto, Covarruvius, whether it be less or more wicked is all one, disp. lxxxviii. sect. iii.*

<sup>2</sup> *Præter dispositionem gratiæ habitualis, nullam actualem requiri ex rigoroso præcepto ad dignam sumptionem hujus sacramenti, ita ut illius ommissio peccatum mortale sit. In quo conveniunt omnes theologî. Et a fortiori patet ex eo, quod supra diximus, ad effectum hujus sacramenti nullam actualem dispositionem requiri.—Ibid. disp. lxxi. sect. i.*

Those who seem to require some actual devotion, yet count it but a venial fault to want it, Alexander, Antonin, Sylvester, Paludan, Cajetan, in Vasquez in iii. tom. iii. disp. cevi. c. i. Not only attention and devotion are accounted needless for communicants, but sobriety, and the use of reason: for they teach, that not only young children, and such as are half fools; but also persons so frantic, as it will be necessary to have them bound, and those also who are possessed of the devil, and whom he has seized on for their enormous wickedness, may partake of this sacrament, and have it duly administered to them, and that even when they are blaspheming.—*Jo. Sanc. disp. xxxviii.* Imo licet arreptus quis sit a dæmone ob mores depravatos, et quia viveret in lenocinio,—non minus talibus ministrare tenebitur parochus eucharistiam, n. vii. Præterea ministrare tenebitur parochus licet videat obsessum, sive insanum, blasphemantem, n. viii.

<sup>3</sup> *Peccatum veniale actu concomitans sumptionem hujus sacramenti, non impedit gratiæ et charitatis augmentum; ita de Thom. Alensis, Gabriel. Adrian, Soto, Ledesma, Victoria, Corduba, Concil. Trident., sess. xiii.; vii. Suar. ibid. disp. lxxi. sect. iii.*

<sup>4</sup> *Excusabitur tamen homo, ab hujusmodi culpa veniali, si fortasse ex naturali tantum distractione hujusmodi attentivum omittat.—Ibid. disp. lxxvii. sect. i.*

to decline every good act of mind or heart, and that voluntarily, it can be no worse ;<sup>1</sup> if it be without contempt, it will be no mortal fault, and that also in the judgment of all their divines. But though there be not any good disposition in the soul towards Christ, in partaking of his supper, yet is it not necessary that vile and wicked dispositions should be excluded ? No ; there is no more need of this than the other. The mind and the heart may actually entertain such as are sinful, without any more danger than it rejects those that are good. It is but a slight fault<sup>2</sup> to communicate out of ostentation and vain glory, and so to nourish pride while he should be feeding upon Christ, and to design his own honour without any act of reverence for Christ ; he may let his thoughts run out upon vanity, or entertain his soul with vain delights, without the least motion of love, or delight, or desire for Christ, without the least act of faith in him ; and may be pleasing himself with sin, instead of grieving for it, when he hath the greatest advantage to look upon him whom he hath pierced. And all this he may do without any guilt that need be repented of or regarded. This is all the worship and honour that it is needful their souls should give to Christ, even in the sacrament of his body and blood ; who will have others cursed to hell, and burned beforehand, for not giving divine worship to a wafer. But this is not all ; their church will be satisfied with greater indignity offered to Christ than this ; for they teach, that those who communicate unworthily, to such a degree as they count sacrilege (and that so heinous, as they question whether it be not as tolerable to cast that which they count their God to be devoured by dogs, or throw it into the dirt to be trampled on ; and<sup>3</sup> many of them are positive that it is greater wickedness than murder or adultery, or that uncleanness against nature which is most abominable),<sup>4</sup> do fully satisfy the precept of the church for this communion. Thus Soto, Corduba, Covarruvius, and others, alleged by them. And this is all derived from their St Thomas, that maxim of his so generally received ;<sup>5</sup> the law commanding an act enjoins the substance of it, but not the manner. By which we must understand, that the church would have the thing done, but regards not how

<sup>1</sup> Talis culpa (scil. voluntaria earentia actualis dispositionis) non est mortalis, secluso contemptu ; ex omnium sententia.—*Ibid.* disp. lxiii. sect. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Dicendum videtur, si peccatum veniale sit aliquando circumstantia ipsius actus communicandi, peccatum esse veniale sic communicare, *v. g.* si quis communicat propter ostentationem seu vanam gloriam ; vel certe si actu sit in ipso peccato veniali, ut in vana aliqua cogitatione aut delectatione, et ea ratione accedat distractus, et sine debita attentione et devotione.—*Ibid.* disp. lxvi. sect. i. Ostentation and vain glory are here counted venial faults, because they are directly opposite to the act of communicating ; and so is outward irreverence, vain prating, and gestures, inconsistent with modesty, while they are at the sacrament, for the same reason. But other sins, not so opposite to the act, as studying a lie, or revenge, or detraction (or uncleanness, or any the like in venial degrees), while they are communicating (though the distraction there be voluntary, and all holy fervour be thereby hindered) are no faults at all in reference to the sacrament.—*Jo. Sanc.* disp. xxiii., alleging for it Scotus, Richardus de St. Vict. Maior, Adrian, Margarita Casuum, Soto, Marcella, Ledesma, Vivaldus, Coriolanus, and divers others, n. xx., xxi.

<sup>3</sup> An hoc peccatum sit gravius homicidio—aut adulterio, vel omnibus peccatis contra naturam : quidam enim theologi ita existimant, ut Gabriel. Petr. Soto, Ledesma, Dominic. Soto.—*Suar. ibid.* sect. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Dicendum est eum qui voluntarie suscipit sacramentum eucharistiæ, etiamsi indigne sumat, implere præceptum communicandi ; etiamsi alias peccet mortaliter per sacrilegium indignæ sumptionis. Ita tenet in specie Corduba, in genere Soto, Covarruvius, qui alios referunt.—*Ibid.* disp. lxx. sect. iii.

<sup>5</sup> Ratio autem sumitur ex principio generali quod tradit D. Thom. i., ii. q. ci. art. ix., quia lex præcipiens actum, præcipit substantiam ejus, non autem modum. *Ibid.* vid. Bonacin. and in him, besides the principal of the Society (Azorius, Valencia, Suarez, Sanchez), Aquinas, Sotus, Navar, Medina. Qui vero indigne, et sine devotione communicat tempore paschatis, satisfacit præcepto de leg. d. i. q. i. p. 9, n. ii. et iii.

they do it, whether as Christians or as atheists. She is indifferent as to devotion or sacrilege in her catholics, having something else in design than to be concerned in the honouring of God, and the happiness of men, which so much depends upon the manner of worshipping. It is too plain to be denied, that such a treatment of holy things (to use their own words) is not at all for the worship of God, or the salvation of souls, but opposite to both; yet their church's precept is entirely thereby fulfilled. So that, if God have no worship, and men no salvation, yet the church is satisfied. This and other outward acts must be visibly done, that the world may not think but they have something like religion amongst them; but though, instead of the worship due to the divine majesty, they perform the acts of it in such a manner, as no less dishonours and provokes him, than the crying sins of murder or sodomy, their church hath full contentment; it is all she requires.

Thus we have surveyed the church service amongst the Romanists in the several parts of it, and cannot discern any real worship therein to which they are obliged; but rather that all such worship of God in public is, by their rules and orders, rendered either impossible or unnecessary.

*Sect. 8.* Let us inquire, in the next place, whether they count it needful that God should have any worship from them in private; and this we may discover by what they determine concerning meditation, reading the Scripture, and private prayer. For meditation, the casuists speak little of it, nothing at all (that I have met with) of its necessity; it is like they reserve it for their contemplative persons, as a degree of perfection to which others need not aspire.<sup>1</sup> The perfectionists themselves may waive it, but when they will be so over good as to supererogate, and do better than God commands them, if they judge it necessary at any time, sure it would be on those days when such acts are most proper and requisite.<sup>2</sup> But they conclude it no duty upon the Lord's day, or any other devoted by them, as they pretend, to the observance of God. For they generally agree that no inward worship is then required, and meditation is discharged by name;<sup>3</sup> now if they need not think of God on his own day, or any other, wherein a particular observance of him is requisite, it is ground enough to conclude they do not count it needful to think of him at all. Who can imagine that they judge it necessary to think of God at any time, who count it needless to have God in their thoughts when they are at his worship?

*Sect. 9.* As for the reading the word of God in private, they are so far from esteeming this a duty, that they will scarce excuse it from a crime: all that can be obtained for it is only a toleration (as a thing that passeth under an ill character), and that but in some places, and there but for some persons, with more restriction and caution than the public stews are tolerated by their holy bishop in Rome. So much friends are they to the word of God, or so little do they judge it a friend to them. They are the best catholics in their account who do not desire to look into it, or to understand from God what he would have them to be; they think it advisable<sup>4</sup> that no mortal should be acquainted with more of the Scriptures than is in the mass, where they can understand nothing, and need hear nothing of it at all.

<sup>1</sup> Si patres, theologi—meditationem laudant et consulunt, non tamen docent esse omnibus præceptam.

<sup>2</sup> Ecclesiastici, clerici, religiosi non tenentur ex vi sui status et juris divini, ad hunc meditandi, recogitandi, aut mentaliter orandi usum.—*Vid. Suar. de Orat. ment.* l. ii. c. iv. n. vii.; *Navar. Enchirid. de Orat.* l. xx. n. lxi.

<sup>3</sup> Neque præcipitur cultus divinus internus qui in meditando et colendo Deo consistit.—*Navar. Manual.* c. xiii. n. ii. Non præcipitur cultus divinus interior, qui in meditatione interiori de Deo consistit.—*Lop z, c. xliii. p. 266.*

Consil. de Stabiliend. Rom. scde, p. 6.

*Sect.* 10. For private prayer, it is either vocal or mental.<sup>1</sup> That which they call vocal, they generally count not necessary by any law, either of God or nature, or the church; and so all praying with families is quite cashiered from the rank of Christian duties. There to call upon God's name together they are not concerned, though some think the heathen are. They count it not a duty to say so much as the<sup>2</sup> Lord's prayer (if they understand but otherwise what is to be prayed for). This is the common opinion in Suarez; nor do they think an<sup>3</sup> *Ave Mary* (though these are the prayers most in request with them) more needful. They are not obliged to say it when the public sign is given at night for that purpose; nor need they use any vocal prayer at all, no, not so much as on the solemn days for worship.<sup>4</sup>

But is mental prayer a duty when the other is not used? So it seems; but the question (as in all affirmative precepts) is, when?<sup>5</sup> Lessius thinks it should not be put off above a month or two; that would signify too much neglect of our salvation. It seems those that pray but once in two months do not much neglect it; but this Jesuit is too strait-laced. That opinion is probable enough, saith one of the greatest casuists of this age, which<sup>6</sup> assigns three times for prayer, once when we come to the perfect use of reason (suppose<sup>7</sup> when they think him capable of fasting, about twenty-one years of age); and again at the point of death, and in the interval, when we are obliged to love God (that is, once in five or once in seven years). But is not this Jesuit too severe also? It may be those of other orders will not oppress us so much, or wish us so unlike to atheists as to have us pray once in seven years. The Jesuits, though accounted most licentious, yet seldom exceed, and sometimes fall short herein of their other divines. Sylvester, a Dominican of<sup>8</sup> greatest reputation amongst the casuists, thus determines the question after Aquinas.<sup>8</sup> When one first comes to the use of reason, he should pray for God's assistance; (*videtur*) he is not peremptory that he must, and speaks but conditionally too; for he adds, If he be thus inspired, otherwise he is not determined to that time. When then?<sup>9</sup> Why, the pro-

<sup>1</sup> Vide Suarez de Oration. l. iii. cap. vi. n. iii. 5, 8, ut ibi Medina. Uldericus dicit, ad orationem vocalem ex divino præcepto non tenetur; sed ex statuto ecclesiæ, quæ ministris suis missas, et horas canonicas indixit, vel etiam ex injunctioe confessoris, et hoc sequitur sum. confes. et Pisa in Sylv. Orat. v. n. viii. ut Angelus sum. Orat. v. n. xx.

<sup>2</sup> Videtur tamen sufficere si quis sciat—quod debemus a Deo petere omnia bona corporis et animæ, et hujusmodi, licet nesciat *pater noster*. Idem v. scientia. vide sum. Angel v. scientia, et Suarez, *ibid.* n. viii.

<sup>3</sup> Idem multo magis dicendum est de salutatione Angelica vel *Salve Regina*.—*Idem ibid.* n. xi.

<sup>4</sup> Diebus autem festis neque est obligatio ad orationem vocalem, n. xiii.; nec in principio aliquarum actionum, n. xiv.; nec hora prandii, ne clericis quidem, n. xvi. Nec quando datur signum publicum, consuetudo recepta est ratione devotionis, non obligationis, *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Addit Lessius obligari nos, ut non multo tempore abstinamus ab oratione: ut verbi gratia, ad mensem unum vel alterum; alioquin esset signum magnæ negligentiae propriæ salutis in Fill. t. xxiii. l. ii. n. xlv.

<sup>6</sup> Videtur tamen satis probabilis ea sententia, quæ tria tempora assignat: primum est circa initium morale perfecti discursus, secundum articulus mortis: tertium aliquoties in vita: ut diximus de præcepto charitatis.—*Idem.* n. xliii. vide tr. xxii. c. ix. n. cexc. et tr. vi. c. viii. n. ccviii. In universum intra annum non videtur obligare, quolibet septennio est probabile.

<sup>7</sup> Communiter theologi tenent quod usque ad vigesimum; alii vigesimum primum, excusantur (a jejuniis).—Secundum alios ad xxv. annum, sum Angeli. v. jejuniis, n. xv.

<sup>8</sup> Quod tempus videtur determinatum, quantum ad instans quo quis incipit uti ratione, in quo tenetur se dirigere et ordinare in Deum: et, ut videtur, ejus auxilium precari, si hoc suæ menti inspiceretur.—*Sum.* v. orat. n. viii.

<sup>9</sup> Alias vero determinate non potest, sed divina providentia ad hoc movet, quando est necessarium.—*Ibid.*

vidence of God moves him to it when it is necessary. Thus he leaves it, and finds no other time, when a man is obliged to pray once for himself, but when he sees his soul in greatest danger,<sup>1</sup> which, it may be, he will never see. Their common doctrine is yet worse; thereby we are not bound to pray but in the article of necessity, and that is, when we are in such extremity as there is no other remedy for us:<sup>2</sup> if we judge that we can any way else obtain what we would have, we need not pray. The law of God or nature makes it not then our duty. They help us to understand this by two instances; the one to shew when it is requisite to pray for ourselves, the second when for others. When a man falls into most grievous temptations to impatience, or to lust, if there can be no other remedy against it but the grace of God, to be obtained by prayer, then it may be his duty.<sup>3</sup> But it seems if he can rid himself of it any other way, or but think he can, then, though the temptation be never so violent or dangerous, he needs not pray. The other is, when a man at a distance sees two ready to fight a duel, and makes account there is no remedy but the help of God for parting them, then he is to seek it (which is not the case of one in a thousand), yet if perhaps he can any otherwise more help them than by praying, he may let it alone.<sup>4</sup> So that private prayer needs not be their daily practice, nor used as a Christian exercise in ordinary, but in extremity only, and cases otherwise desperate, and as the last remedy, and when there is no other indeed, or in their apprehension;<sup>5</sup> it will not be a duty, but in such circumstances as do very rarely, if ever, concur.<sup>6</sup> They are not to use it as their common repast, but as physic; not for prevention neither, but when they are already surprised with extreme danger. And if such extremity occur not once in seven years, they need not pray for so many years; nay, perhaps it may not befall them, or they may not be apprehensive of it while they live, and then they need not pray at all. This is not my inference only; it is their own, and acknowledged to be the consequence of their common doctrine. Thereby there is no divine precept for prayer which can oblige any directly; only by accident it may happen sometimes to be a duty, but such an accident as few may meet with.<sup>7</sup> It is said expressly that from

<sup>1</sup> Quum homo videt seipsum in gravi tentatione, et periculo animæ suæ.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Idem dicendum est de illo qui preces ad Deum facere prætermisit eo tempore, in quo nullum aliud remedium suæ salutis aut proximi esse videbatur. Tunc enim lex divina naturalis ad id nos obligat, ut probavimus sequuti mentem Paludani et Sylvestri.

<sup>3</sup> Ubi posuimus exemplum de illo qui in gravissimam tentationem impatientiæ aut libidinis injectus, judicat nullum aliud remedium ad victoriam superesse, præterquam speciale auxilium Dei oratione impetrandum.

<sup>4</sup> Et de illo qui cminus intuens duos in duello consenturos manus, existimat nullum aliud esse remedium nisi speciale auxilium Dei oratione impetrandum ad dirimendum illud duellum injustum, in his enim casibus id a Deo petere tenetur.—*Avar.* cap. xiii. n. xviii.

Lex naturalis quæ obligat aliquem preces ad Deum fundere, et tempore, in quo nullum aliud remedium suæ salutis aut proximi esse videtur, secundum Sylvestrum; eadem obligat ad idem positum in tentatione impatientiæ, aut libidinis, cui videtur nullum aliud suppetere remedium nisi oratio, &c.—*Lopez*, c. lii. p. 272.

Est communis sententia, quod obligat solum pro articulo necessitatis. Duplex autem necessitas commuiter proponitur: prima est propria ipsius hominis, ut si aliqua tentatione vehementer pulsatur, quam sine auxilio divino vincere non potest.

<sup>5</sup> Alia est necessitas proximi, ut si quis videat aliquos ad duellum properare, nec possit eos aliter impedire.—*D. Tho. Paludan. Sylvest. Navar. Abulens.* vide *Suar.* l. i. de Orat. c. xxxvi.

<sup>6</sup> Nisi forte posset aliter melius, quam per orationem suffragari.—*Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> One of their greatest divines having acknowledged this to be their common doctrine, thus argues: Hoc esse obligare quasi per accidens propter necessitatem contingentem et extrinsecam—qui nunquam sentiret illam vehementem et urgentem tentationem, nec videt proximum in simili necessitate, nunquam teneretur orare.

thence it follows,<sup>1</sup> that many may pass their whole lives without ever praying to God, and this without any great fault. It should be said, without the least fault; for where there is no obligation, there is no duty at all; and then no sin, great or little, in the want of performance.

This is some of their church's sense; but they speak it more fully who tell us that mental prayer is to be reckoned amongst *counsels*<sup>2</sup> (which none are obliged to observe), and this by the common consent of Aquinas and their other doctors. And accordingly, that there is<sup>3</sup> no divine precept, or of natural law, of itself obliging to mental prayer, meditation (some peculiar engagements or occasions set apart, wherein mental prayer is not concerned); and this is counted so certain, that to teach the contrary is temerarious, because against the common use and sense of the whole church. So that they are not far from the sense of the church, who (without excepting public or private, mental or vocal), deny<sup>4</sup> that there is any divine precept in special for prayer. And these are not only their modern divines, but some of the ancients also, particularly Alexander Alensis<sup>5</sup> (the prime of all their school doctors), in strictness seems to deny that there is any proper command by divine law for prayer, taking it properly, but only in a most large sense, as any pious act or good desire may be called prayer. And those who would not seem to like this in general, yet allow it when they come to particulars, since they teach that the precept obligeth not at any such particular time or occasion, when it would oblige, if ever. There is no command, they tell us, which binds them to pray in private at any set time whatever.<sup>6</sup> They are not obliged to pray when they first come to the use of reason,<sup>7</sup> nor on common days afterwards; not the least prayer, not a *paternoster*, not once a-day, no, not at their meals;<sup>8</sup> even their clergy need not do it; nor on holidays neither,<sup>9</sup> no, not when they have quite neglected their service in public;<sup>10</sup> nor on their fasts, though Scripture still joins these, as all Christians who minded religion were wont to do of old. Their fasts are no more religious for prayer or any holy exercise than the abstinence of their cattle; nor to prepare themselves for sacred or solemn employments, for their sacraments of penance, or else for the eucharist (though this would but trouble them once a-year);<sup>11</sup> not at the beginning of any service or undertaking whatever. To pray at such times and occasions is mere matter of counsel,<sup>12</sup> which none can be blamed for neglecting; nor when a man hath vowed and solemnly promised to God, and sworn too, that he will pray, even then, if it be but a little prayer,<sup>13</sup> it

<sup>1</sup> Possent ergo multi totam vitam sine oratione transigere, absque gravi peccato.—*Suar.* l. i. de Orat. cap. xxx. n.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Jo. Sanc. disp. vii. n. x.

<sup>3</sup> Nullum invenitur præceptum divinum, seu naturalis juris obligans per se ad mentaliter orandum, meditandum, seu recogitandum. Quod ita censeo verum, ut contrarium sine temeritate doceri non possit, quia est contra communem usum, et sensum totius ecclesiæ.—*Suar.* de Orat. l. ii. c. iv. n. v.

<sup>4</sup> Quidam negant dari præceptum divinum speciale de oratione.—*Ibid.* t. c. xxviii. n. i.

<sup>5</sup> Alex. Alensis in rigore videtur negare proprium præceptum jure divino datum de oratione proprie sumpta, sed solum largissime, prout pia operatio vel bonum desiderium dicitur oratio.—*Ibid.* l. xxviii. n. ii.

<sup>6</sup> Idem *ibid.* t. i. c. xxx. n. iv.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* n. ix.

<sup>8</sup> N. v. and vii.

<sup>9</sup> L. iii. c. vi. n. xvi. n. xii.

<sup>10</sup> Antoninus, Adrian, infra Navar. cap. xxi. n. vii; Bonacina de Sacrament. d. iv. q. ult. p. ult. n. xvi.; ibi Barthol. ab Angelo, et alii communiter. Qui non potest aut non vult, missam eo die (festo) audire, non tenetur recitare alias orationes.

<sup>11</sup> Nulla obligatio orandi in principio aliquid actionum.—*Suar.* *ibid.* xiv.

<sup>12</sup> Hæc omnia esse consilia, n. xv. et xvi.

<sup>13</sup> A mortali excusantur—qui precationem angelicam, et alia similia parva pollicentur, etiamsi juramento, aut voto id ipsum confirmassent.—*Navar.* c. xviii. n. vii. Secundum alios.

will be but a small fault to omit it for all this. In short, which compriseth all, there<sup>1</sup> can be no certain time assigned (unless the hour of death) in which, by any precept of religion, we are bound to worship God, or seek his help by an act of prayer, as in like case is said of an act of contrition and love to God. So Bonacina; no time for prayer certain, none determined; but, as they conjecture, perhaps it may be a duty, when they apprehend themselves under grievous and dangerous temptations, and judge there is no remedy but prayer. This, or none at all, is the time for it by their common doctrine; and this is in effect to say, it is a duty at no time, for no person. For those under temptation may not apprehend it dangerous, or a remedy needful, as all will be ready to do who either regard not temptations, or are pleased with them, or what they lead to. And neither these nor any else can judge there is no other remedy but prayer, if they believe their doctrine, which offers them divers other remedies, and those more relied on than this. To mention none else, almost any of their sacramentals (of which they have multitudes) will serve their turn, even a little salt,<sup>2</sup> conjured after the mode of holy church, may do it. Thus we see these catholics secured from all divine obligations to pray while they live. But they have another way to do it; for, if any apprehend themselves in dangerous temptations, and also that there is no other remedy against it but prayer, they determine<sup>3</sup> that if such be ignorant that it is then a duty, or if they know it, but do not consider it, they are excused from sin, though they then neglect to pray. Now, the people may well be ignorant that they are in such case obliged, when their learned men scarce know it. And for those that do know it, the violence of the temptation (and the case supposeth it violent) may leave no place for consideration. However, no man considers this or other things unless he will, and so it will be no sin to neglect prayer at that time, when only they count it a duty, unless he list. Yea,<sup>4</sup> though the ignorance or inconsiderateness be culpable, and through his own default, yet the neglect of the duty which is thereby occasioned they can excuse from sin. Besides, if<sup>5</sup> they should both know and consider that prayer is then their duty, yet they teach that the omission of it is then no special sin, *i. e.* no other sin than that which they should seek to avoid by praying; whereby they plainly declare that there is in their account no special precept for prayer, no, not in that case wherein alone they would have it thought a duty; otherwise they would judge it a special sin then to neglect it.

*Sect. 11.* But though their catholics be thus sufficiently eased of all obligations to private prayer all their lives, by virtue of any divine command, it may be there is some precept in the church for it. Can she be content

<sup>1</sup> Non potest aliud certum tempus assignari in quo ex præcepto religionis teneamur Deum colere, et auxilium ab eo per actum orationis implorare, ut in simili dictum est de actu contritionis et charitatis.—*Bonacina*, tom. i. divini officii dispensationum. i. q. ii. p. 1, n. xii.

<sup>2</sup> Exorciso te creatura salis, &c. I conjure thee, creature salt—that thou mayest be hallowed—to drive away all the temptations of the devil.

<sup>3</sup> Quando tentationes ingruunt cum periculo succumbendi, tunc enim medium ad peccatorum vitium et auxilium impetraudum adhibendum est—quauquam a peccato multi excusantur, ignorantes, vel non advertentes ad hanc obligationem.—*Bonacina*, divini officii dispensationum. i. q. ii. p. 1, n. xii.; ibi. Medina, Navar, Malderus, Sylvester, et alii.

<sup>4</sup> Utrum excusetur a peccato, qui præceptum aliquod non implet ob inadvertentiam, vel ignorantiam, quæ ipsius culpa contigit?—Respondeo excusari a peccato.—*Idem de Peccatis*, dispensationum. ii. q. viii. p. 3, n. xxviii. ibi. Clavis Regia et alii.

<sup>5</sup> Scientes vero et advertentes graviter peccant, utpote negligentes medium ad vincendas tentationes—omisso tamen orationis tunc temporis non habet malitiam distinctam ab eo peccato quod cavere tenemur.—*Idem*, de divini officii dispensationum. d. i. q. ii. p. i. xii.; ibi. (besides the chief of all the Jesuits), Medina, Sylvester, Navar, Malderus.

that they should live so much without God, or any acknowledgment of their dependence on him, more like atheists than Christians? Yes, there is not anything for private addresses to God amongst all her precepts; she is too indulgent to trouble them with any such thing; she requires not of them the least prayer, or such as are accounted best, not so much as a *Paternoster*: there is no ecclesiastical precept for this, to make it so much as a venial fault, not to use it, says Medina,<sup>1</sup> not a *Salve Regina*, no, nor an *Ave Mary*. They have indeed a special respect to this last, and prefer it ten to one before any other (though they might use this every minute, without ever praying once to God all their life). And Pope John XXII. ordained, that thrice every evening the bell should sound, that every one might say an *Ave Mary* thrice; and since it is grown a custom (and a church custom usually stands for a law with them), that not only at evening, but at noon and morning, too, a bell should sound for the same purpose; so that this, if any, is under injunction. There is a fair show for it, but it is no more than a show, for they assure us this is a voluntary devotion, and hath nothing of obligation in it.<sup>2</sup> Those that never use this and such prayers, it is, they say, a shrewd sign they do not live well; but the omission thereof is no special sin with respect unto any precept either of God or the church.

And is not this a very pious concession that they are pleased to grant, that for a man never to say his prayers, is a general bad sign that he does not live as he ought, though they will by no means allow it to be any special sin. Oh the piety and tenderness of this mother and head of all churches!

If, for all this, any of them should conceive themselves obliged to pray sometimes; or if, without such opinion, they should find some season for private prayer, though God (as they dream), and the church (as they know), hath prescribed none; as when a confessor enjoins it for penance; or out of voluntary devotion, when they have a mind to supererogate, and do better than God requires, upon which accounts some of them may be found now and then very busy with their beads; yet in these cases there is by their principles no more need to worship God in their private than in their public prayers, where (as we have shewed) they account no actual observance of God at all necessary. As for the prayers enjoined them by way of penance, these are not necessary for them, but as their punishment; and then they pray not, for that is an act of the soul, but this is a suffering of the outward man. The church as (they say) it cannot judge of inward acts, so it cannot order them to be penal. And the malefactors here being their own executioners, as there is no need, so there is no fear that they will punish their souls, but leave them untouched, unconcerned, whatever their lips, or fingers, or beads may suffer, by that grievous penalty of praying. But it were well if God did not suffer more by such abuse of his name and worship, than those malefactors, who count it a suffering to do anything like his service. And it sounds not well that prayer must pass for a punishment. It is, as Damascene defines it, and they after him, the ascent of the mind unto God.<sup>3</sup> Now, is the approach of the soul to God a punishment? One would think the devils should think better of it; for the misery of hell

<sup>1</sup> Nullum esse de hac re præceptum etiam ecclesiasticum vel sub veniali.—*Medina de Orat.* q. x., in *Suar de Orat.* l. iii. c. vi. n. vii. Solum tradidit Christus formam, non vero dedit præceptum obligans ad exercitium, n. v.

<sup>2</sup> Consuetudo recepta est ratione devotionis, non obligationis—si hæc nunquam recitet, magnum indicium est, ipsum non recte vivere, etiamsi omissio illa speciale peccatum non sit.—*Idem. ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Oratio in genere sumpta est ascensus mentis ad Deum, et hoc essentialiter includit.—*Idem. ibid.* c. iv. n. iv.

is distance from God, without hopes of having access to him. But they can solve the difficulty well enough, for they mean not to do any such thing as praying in the case, but only to suffer some thing which they call so. Their care and pains is about their beads, not their souls; if they keep but count, and bring in the full tale which the confessor enjoins; though in as many crowns and rosaries as there are *Ave Mariæ* in each ten thousand times over, they have not one thought of God, nor the least motion of mind or heart towards him; yet they give full satisfaction, and undergo all they were adjudged to.

In their voluntary prayers there is less worship required than the other, if there can be less than none. For when they need not use such prayers unless they please, they may do it as they list;<sup>1</sup> it being no duty enjoined, the manner of the performance is arbitrary, and wholly at discretion. Hence those who think something (of some sort) of attention requisite in commanded prayers, count none at all necessary in these; no, not that which is superficial, not so little of that as they call virtual. So that, if herein they mind nothing at all, wherein worshippers at prayer are concerned, not so little as the bare words; yet they acquit themselves well enough, yea, if this neglect of all be wilful,<sup>2</sup> and the mind not only run of its own accord, but be sent away and employed about something else on set purpose, it will be at worst a slight fault.

*Sect. 12.* In this fashion they would have us suppose that God may be worshipped, when there is neither inward nor outward observance of him. Inward he hath none, when the mind is departed from him, and the heart with it. Outward he hath none, unless merely in show, when the mind directs it not to, and designs it not for him; which is never done, when he is not minded. In fine, by the doctrine of the Romanists (to say nothing of the idolatry or superstition of their service), it is unnecessary that God should have any real worship, either public or private; unless God can be said to be truly worshipped, without the love or fear of God, without acts of wisdom or affection, without reverence or devotion, without sincere or honest intentions; or with designs of wickedness; without knowing what they do, or heeding what they are about; without mind or heart, yea, or body either, unless in mere show; this is apparent by the premises. The people (as they think) worship God well enough at this rate; their leaders teach them no more is needful; their church, by confining their service to an unknown tongue, makes it necessary for their divines thus to teach, and unavoidable for the people to worship, no otherwise. Now, what a church is this, or of what religion, that makes the real worship of God, and of Jesus Christ, to be needless, and takes an effectual course that he shall have none? Let those who are of their communion, or tempted to it, consider it seriously, and in the fear of God. Is it the way to salvation to be without religion? Is there any religion, indeed, where it is made needless to worship God really, when worship is as essential to religion as a soul is to a man? They may, by joining with them, greaten a party, and promote the interest of a faction, which carries on other designs under religious pretences, without regard of God, as to his worship and honour, or to the souls of men, as to their happiness, and the true way to it; but if they follow the conduct of

<sup>1</sup> *Orationes voluntariæ—cum penitus omitti possent, consequitur quod evagatio mentis tollens attentionem non inducit peccatum mortale.—Graff. part. i. l. ii. c. li. n. xi.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ubi autem libere et citra obligationem oratur, sola est culpa venialis indecenter orare: quare distractio etiam meditata, nisi contemptio adsit, nunquam erit mortalis.—Soto de Just. l. x. q. v. art. v., in sin; Graff. p. I, l. ii. c. li. n. xi.; Gabriel. ibi. Angel. v. hor. n. xxvii.; Bonacin. de divin. offic. disp. i. q. iii. p. 2, sect. ii. n. vii., ibi. Maldarus et alii.*

the Roman doctrine, and worship God no otherwise than these would have them; they may be of the Roman profession, and yet of no religion. If a man have a mind to trouble himself with none of the realities of Christianity, and yet to pass for religious enough, in the opinion of so much of the world as is papal, and will hang his soul upon so common reputation, popery is contrived to allure and gratify him; and he may safely venture on it, if damnation be not dangerous, or if he can escape it by an opinion or show of worshipping God, and being religious without morality.

## CHAPTER II.

*Christian knowledge is not necessary for Romanists by their doctrine.*

*Sect. 1.* Knowledge is the foundation of almost all that is saving: of faith, holiness, obedience, worship. It is the groundwork, without which scarce a stone can be laid in the whole structure of salvation. No saving faith without it, Rom. x. 14. There can be no love to, or hope in, an unknown object. There can be no fear, no desire of what we know not. There can be no true worship of God, unless that of the Samaritans was such, 'who worshipped they knew not what.' There can be no obedience without knowing whom, what, why, and for what end we obey. In brief, without knowledge there is no eternal life, John xvii. 3; nothing but ruin and eternal destruction, Hosea iv. 6, 2 Thes. i.

Yet for all this, popery decries knowledge, as that which is unnecessary for the people, and extols the want of it, as that which is essential to their faith (Bellarmine saith, faith is better defined by ignorance);<sup>1</sup> as that which is the mother of their devotion; (so others declare it), as that which is the excellency of their obedience; none comparable to that which they call blind obedience, as Cardinal Cusanus tells us.<sup>2</sup>

It sufficeth the people to know that their church hath knowledge; and their sight is good enough, in that their teachers have eyes; so one of their authors: In matters of faith, the people ought not to see with their own eyes, but the eyes of their superiors.<sup>3</sup> They need not know what they pray for, nor what they are to believe, nor what they are to do.

1. They need not know what they are to pray for, or to whom, or whether they pray or not; all is muffled up in an unknown language, and they are to venture at they know not what, nor how, nor whither. No wonder if they direct the Lord's prayer to saints, male or female;<sup>4</sup> and say *Our Father* to the virgin mother, and, in like manner, direct *Ave Mariæ* to Christ, as if they took him to be a woman, or to be with child (and with himself too), to be the fruit of his own womb; or to be his own mother, which the words so applied signify. This ignorance is the dam of such devotion, such as is both horrid and blasphemous to the highest degree of horror; and yet their great clerks will countenance it. The wisdom of their church hath thought it fit, that they should not be so wise as to understand what they do, when they are serving God. The Council of Trent fulminates a curse against those

<sup>1</sup> Per hoc fides distinguitur contra scientiam, et melius per ignorantiam quam per notitiam definitur, l. i. de justif. c. vii. p. 706, sect. judicium.

<sup>2</sup> Consummata et perfectissima obedientia.—*Infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Laicos, ad dogmata fidei quod attinet, non propriis sed prælatorum suorum oculis, videre oportet.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. Navar. de Orat. c. x. n. xxxvi., et c. xviii. n. xxxii.; Spotsw. Hist. l. ii. p. 92; Molanus Theol. pract. tr. iii. c. ix. n. vi.

who hold that the mass ought to be celebrated in a known tongue; that is, they curse those who approve not that mode of service, which the apostle condemns as barbarous, 1 Cor. xiv., such as is not fit for God or man; they curse those who will not offer a blind sacrifice, or blindfolded.<sup>1</sup> As if one under the law ought not to have seen whether that which he offered were a hog or a sheep; whether he sacrificed a lamb, or cut off a dog's neck; whether he presented an oblation, or offered swine's blood. They think not only the people, but even the clergy unconcerned, to know what they say when they speak unto God. The clergy (saith Jacobus de Graffiiis), or the laity, when they are at divine service, if they understand not what they say, they sin not.<sup>2</sup> It is so far from being their duty to serve God as Christians, that they need not act as men in his service. If the words be but said, though with no more understanding than magpies are taught to sound them, it is as reasonable service as their church requires; what God requires of them is no matter.<sup>3</sup> They expect not that any should understand their service but expert divines, as Soto tells us.<sup>4</sup> Now it is a very small part of their clergy that pretends to be divines, and a small part of those few that are expert therein; it is an attainment which most of their bishops fall short of. Their common priests are sufficiently qualified with the art of reading, nor need they be masters of that neither; the mass-book is almost taught to read itself. For in the missals established by Pius the Fifth, and recognised by Clement the Eighth, every syllable is diversely marked, whether it is to be sounded long or short. What do we speak of clergy or priests? It is not necessary for their popes to be able to understand, or to read their common prayers; themselves spare not to divulge this. It is manifest, saith Alphonsus à Castro, that many popes are so illiterate, that they are utterly ignorant of the grammar.<sup>5</sup> It seems he may be universal pastor, and the teacher of the whole world, who hath not learned his grammar; and the infallible guide of all mortals, who understands not his own language, wherein the articles of faith, their laws, ceremonies, and church service is delivered. And is it not very much that two things so different as ignorance and infallibility, should have the good hap to meet together in the same person?

*Sect. 2.* Secondly, they need not know what they are to believe; they tell us they are obliged, under pain of damnation, to believe whatever the visible church of Christ proposeth, as revealed by almighty God. Now, their church proposeth for points of faith so revealed, not only what they have in Scripture, but what they have by tradition, or by the custom of the church in former ages, or by the consent of the fathers, or by the decrees of councils, or by the determination of popes, *ex cathedra*, whereby points of faith become infinitely numerous, beyond all account which the learned amongst them can give, either to satisfy themselves or others; yet all must be believed, and that under pain of damnation, whenas it is but a very small part of them that can be commonly known. The articles of the creed called the apostles',

<sup>1</sup> Omnis sermo qui non intelligitur barbarus judicatur.—*Jerom.* in 1 Cor. xiv.

In Navar de horis.—*Canon.* cap. xiii. n. iv. They are directed to address themselves to God or the virgin Mary thus: Grant, O Lord, or Lady, what I ask, though I know not what.

<sup>2</sup> Clerici aut laici qui divinis intersunt, si non intelligunt quæ dicunt, non peccant, l. ii. c. li. n. xii. p. 291.

<sup>3</sup> Quid hoc sit intelligere debemus uti humana ratione, non quasi avium voce cantemus. Nam et meruli, psittaci et corvi et picæ et hujusmodi volucres, sæpe ab hominibus docentur sonare quod nesciunt, scienter autem cantare non avi sed homini, divina voluntate concessum est.—*Augustin,* in Ps. xviii. exposit. secunda, p. 103, t. viii.

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, l. x. q. v. art. v.

<sup>5</sup> Cum constet plures papas adeo illiteratos esse ut grammaticam penitus ignorent, l. i. advers. Hæres. cap. iv. ed. Paris, 1534.

are not the hundredth part of those points that must be believed by all that will not be damned; and yet they generally conclude that it is not necessary for the people to know all of those few articles. How to believe the rest, and it may be five hundred times more, which they know nothing of, nor ever once came into their thoughts, they must make what shift they can.

However, they need not know all the articles of the small creed, as the chief of them teach. Not all, saith Aquinas,<sup>1</sup> but what is sufficient to direct to the last end; not all, saith Scotus,<sup>2</sup> but the gross things, as that Christ was born and suffered, and others belonging to redemption; not all, saith Sylvester,<sup>3</sup> and many with him, but those particularly for which the church hath public solemnities; not all, saith Bonaventure,<sup>4</sup> but those which we have notice of by the church solemnities, or acts of the priests, and these in him are four, that of the nativity, passion, resurrection, and remission of sins, to which he adds another, which the sign of the cross teacheth, and wherein Angelus follows him;<sup>5</sup> so that the half and more needs not to be known, for they reckon fourteen in all.

Others there are who require not this little, nor think it needful to know these articles more than implicitly, that is, without understanding them; so Gulielmus Parisiensis, and Altissiodorensis<sup>6</sup> in Bannez. Summa Rosellæ, after others,<sup>7</sup> holds it enough for the simple, and perhaps all discerning people, to believe that God is the rewarder of the good, and punisher of the evil. A compendious creed, truly, and that which will never trouble the conscience of a Turk or a heathen; the knowledge and faith of a barbarous infidel is enough, it seems, to make a papal Christian. Accordingly, others teach, that such as are educated amongst catholics, and are ignorant of the Trinity, are excused from the explicit knowledge thereof, especially if they want a teacher. So Bartholomew, Medina, and Immanuel say, who gives this reason for it: We cannot say that an infinite number of Christians, otherwise good people, do perish, that scarce know anything aright of the mystery of the Trinity and incarnation; yea, judge perversely of these points if you ask them.<sup>8</sup> And yet, without the knowledge of the incarnation of Christ, there is no knowledge of the creed or of the gospel. Sancta Clara is of the same mind too, and quotes others for it.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nec tamen necesse est cuilibet explicitè credere omnes articulos fidei, sed quantum sufficit ad dirigendum in ultimum finem, dist. xxv. q. ii. art. i., vid. Sylvest. v. fides.

<sup>2</sup> Maxime ad illa quæ sunt grossa ad capiendum, sicut quod Christus natus est et passus, et alia quæ pertinent ad redemptionem.—*Vid. Sta. Clara*, probl. xv. p. 94.

<sup>3</sup> Ut quæ solemnizantur in ecclesia quantum ad omnes catholicos, v. fides. n. vi.

<sup>4</sup> Quas cognoscere potest ex ipsis solemnitatibus, quas ecclesia celebrat, et actibus sacerdotum, iii. dist. xxv. n. xxvi.

<sup>5</sup> De unitate et Trinitate quam ex signatione noscere possunt, cum dicunt in nomine Patris et Filii, &c. item de nativitate, passione et resurrectione quæ festa prædicant: et remissione peccatorum quam ex actu presbyterorum noscere possunt.—*Sum. v. fides. n. vii.*

<sup>6</sup> If a man were demanded whether Christ were born of the Virgin, and whether there were one God and three persons, he might sufficiently answer, I know not; but I believe as the church holds.—*Bann. in xxii. q. ii. art. viii. sect. dubitatur.*

<sup>7</sup> Dicens quod simplicibus, et forte omnibus laicis discernentibus et adultis, sufficit credere Deum esse præmiatorem omnium bonorum, et malorum omnium punitorum. Alios autem articulos sufficit credere implicite, credendo scil. verum quicquid ecclesia catholica docet.—*Post. dic. l. i. in Sylv. v. fides n. vi.*

<sup>8</sup> Baptista Trivamala herein followed Peter Casuile, and says this is 'fidei mensura ad quam cuilibet tenetur, et quæ sufficit simplicibus et forte omnibus laicis.'—*Sum. Rosel. v. fides. n. i.*

<sup>9</sup> Quid enim dicemus ne perire infinitam Christianorum, alioquin bonorum, multitudinem, qui de mysterio etiam Trinitatis, et incarnationis, vix quidquam norunt recte, immo perverse sentiunt, si interrogas?—v. fides. n. 1. *Ita Ferr. Medina*, l. c. xiv. sect. ii.

<sup>9</sup> Deus, natura, gratia.—*Problem. xv.*

So that by this doctrine a man needs not know the persons in the God-head, nor the incarnation of Christ, upon which his birth, life, death, resurrection, and intercession depends, which are the sum of the gospel; yea, he may not only be ignorant of these truths, the knowledge of which, if of any, is necessary to salvation, but he may have false and perverse apprehensions of them, and yet be secure from perishing. According to Soto and Medina,<sup>1</sup> he that is ignorant of the incarnation and Trinity, because he was educated in the mountains, without a preacher to instruct him, will be saved if he die in grace, which they suppose he may have without knowledge, for an implicit faith, that is, without knowledge, will then serve his turn. *Secundum doctores nobiles*, as noble doctors conclude, saith Lopez, so that they may have eternal life without knowing the true God, or Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. Ignorance hereof will be invincible, that is, both inculpable in itself, and sufficient to justify the criminal issues of it, if they want a teacher, that is, not only if it be not possible, but if it be difficult or inconvenient to have one.<sup>2</sup>

The cardinals of the Inquisition at Rome<sup>3</sup> will have such confessors allowed, who hold that persons are capable of absolution, and so supposed to be in a state of salvation, how palpable soever their ignorance might be of the mysteries of faith; nay, though out of pure negligence they know nothing of the mystery of the blessed Trinity, or of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Medina teacheth, that if one when he is dying acknowledge that he hath been very negligent to learn Christian doctrine, and would not hear it, and thereby wants the knowledge of the mystery of the incarnation and Trinity, and the articles of faith, yet to deny him absolution would be impious: so Lopez reports him,<sup>4</sup> and himself says,<sup>5</sup> such an one is to be absolved. Here is encouragement, more than enough, to live and die in gross ignorance, and those who have a mind to continue without the knowledge of God under the name of men, or of Christ, under the profession of Christians, have a general warrant by their doctrine to do it.

For the former sort of their divines, who seem to require a knowledge of some articles, do indeed make no more knowledge necessary than those who require it not. For when they explain themselves, commonly such a knowing is sufficient, as is without understanding, a dark conceit, that such things there be, though they apprehend not at all what they are. Such mysterious subtilties their doctors are pleased with, as they have a sort of faith without knowledge, or any thought of what they believe; so a knowledge without understanding.

Scotus<sup>6</sup> thinks they have sufficient knowledge of the Trinity, three persons and one nature, who can neither apprehend what a person or a nature is.

<sup>1</sup> In 4 sentent., Sum. fol. lxxv. p. 2, quando quis laborat ignorantia invincibili fidei explicitæ incarnationis et Trinitatis, quia cum esset educatus in montibus, caruit prædicatore ipsum de ipsa instruente secundum veram sententiam, cum sola fide implicita, hoc est sine explicita, salvabitur, si moriatur in gratia, ad quam assequendam secundum Doctores nobiles sic ignorantia explicitam satis est cum cæteris requisitis fides implicita. —Lopez, c. vii. p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Sylv. ignorantia. n. 5 et v. impossib. Impossibile dicitur, 1, quod simpliciter fieri non potest; 2, quod fieri potest sed cum difficultate. Juridice dicitur, 1, quod non potest fieri iuste; 2, quod non potest fieri commode.

<sup>3</sup> Addit. to provincial Letters, p. 100, &c., c. ii. n. xvii.

<sup>4</sup> Instruct. c. vii. p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> P. 50, Talis est absolvendus.

<sup>6</sup> Qui non possit concipere quid est natura et quid persona, non est necesse quod habeat actum explicitum, de articulo pertinente ad essentiæ, et personarum Trinitatem distincte, sicut habent clerici literati, sed sufficit talibus credere, sicut ecclesia, credit.

—Vid. Sta. Cla. *ibid.*

Accordingly, Bonaventure saith,<sup>1</sup> the people may know the Trinity by crossing themselves, since they do it in the name of the Father, &c.; and by the festivals, they may know the rest which is necessary to be understood. And when it is argued, that there are few, but such as are expert in divinity, who know how to distinguish and number the articles of the creed; and therefore, if all were bound to know them distinctly and explicitly, *id est*, to know what they mean, few or none would be saved, which is an extreme cruel saying; he in his answer grants it all.<sup>2</sup>

Bellarmino<sup>3</sup> seems to make some knowledge of the articles of the creed necessary, but what it is he signifies elsewhere, when he tells us that experience witnesseth that the greatest part of the faithful, and in a manner all the country people, are so far from understanding the mystery of the Trinity, and the incarnation, and other such points necessary to salvation, that they scarce apprehend anything besides the mere sound of the words, and yet are deservedly counted believers.

So cardinal Tolet requires in those that are to be absolved, a kind of acquaintance with some prime articles of faith, but signifies it will be sufficient if, hearing them rehearsed,<sup>4</sup> they can tell us which is an article, and which not; and this they may do by the sound, though they understand nothing of the sense.<sup>5</sup> De Graffis is confident, that a confessor may make an ignorant person understand all that is necessary to salvation by making the sign of the cross. And Angelus, who would have three or four articles of the creed to be known, yet concludes, if one can answer this or that article decently,<sup>6</sup> *Quod sic*, it is so; it will be sufficient for him, though he know not the creed.

Sylvester pretends to make more knowledge requisite than Rosella, but yet he determines<sup>7</sup> that mere want of knowledge is no sin; that it is not a sin to be ignorant of what he ought to know, but upon the account of negligence; that negligence to know things necessary to salvation may be a mortal sin sometimes, but when, it is hard to tell, yea, impossible. So that here is encouragement enough to continue carelessly in ignorance of things necessary to salvation, and to neglect saving knowledge; for when this is a mortal sin, no man can tell, and a venial fault no man needs avoid. In short, they not only justify simple ignorance, how gross soever, but that which has a worse character, *ignorantia prava dispositionis*: and count it no crime, not

<sup>1</sup> Possunt nosse ex ipso actu consignationis, consignant enim in nomine Patris, &c. Cognoscere possent ex ipsis solemnitatibus.—*Ibid.* n. xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* n. xxvii.

<sup>3</sup> Et sane ita esse, experientia testatur, cum maxima pars fidelium, vel propter ætatem puerilem, vel propter sexum muliebrem, vel propter ingenii habitudinem, vel propter imperitiam literarum, et scientiarum, quales sunt pene omnes rustici, non solum non intelligunt mysteria Trinitatis, et incarnationis, et similia necessaria ad salutem, sed vix quidquam animo concipiunt, præter sonum verborum; et tamen inter fideles merito numerantur.—*De justif.* l. i. c. vii. p. 705.

<sup>4</sup> Sciat respondere esse mandatum vel articulum, quæ sunt; non autem esse, quæ non sunt.—*Instruct.* l. iii. c. xvii.

<sup>5</sup> *Decis.* p. 1, l. i. c. xxiv. n. iii. vid. infra.

<sup>6</sup> Idem possit dici de aliquo qui nescit *Credo parvum*, tamen si interrogaretur Deus est unus? responderet, quod sic—et sic de cæteris responderet, quod sic. Quod sufficeret sibi, licet nesciret præfatum *Credo*.—*Sum.* v. scientia.

<sup>7</sup> Privatio ipsa scientiæ secundum se non est peccatum v. ignorant. n. 8, est peccatum ratione negligentiae.—*Ibid.* Negligentia addiscendi necessaria ad salutem, quæ aliquando est mortale, licet hoc judicare sit difficile.—v. *Acedia.* n. iii. Non potest sermone determinari.—v. *Prædicat.* n. vii. supra.

Ipsamet ignorantia vincibilis non est formaliter peccatum nec commissionis, nec omissionis, &c.—*Bonacina*, de peccat. d. ii. q. viii. p. 3, n. xxxi. After Corduba and many others.

only to want the knowledge of the articles of faith, but, out of ignorance, to entertain opinions contrary thereto. He that believes an heresy, saith Navarre,<sup>1</sup> out of simplicity or ignorance, because he thinks the church holds it, and is ready to relinquish it when the truth shall be discovered regularly, he sins not mortally. And with Alphonsus à Castro, no kind of heresy is a sin, if it be out of ignorance and without pertinacy;<sup>2</sup> if their teachers instil such errors into the people, and they, through ignorance, receive impressions contrary to points of faith, and follow such guides blindfold, therein they sin not. Yea, I say more, saith Angelus,<sup>3</sup> Sometimes such an error may be meritorious; for example, one hears a famous preacher or a bishop preach some error, and he simply believes it, with a mind to be obedient to the faith, but ready to be reduced, for things are to be judged of by the intention. But sometimes it may be a venial fault,<sup>4</sup> as when an old woman believes the Trinity to be one woman; and because she thinks the church so holds, therefore believes it.

To recite the names of those who assert that the people, through ignorance, may safely follow their teachers in errors, would be tedious, they are so many. For shortness, let us take Sancta Clara's word, who tells us,<sup>5</sup> It is now the common opinion of their schools and doctors, that people erring with their teachers or pastors, are wholly excused from all fault; yea, many times by so erring materially, for this Christian obedience which they owe their pastors, they merit. So that ignorance of points, whose belief is with them necessary to salvation, is so far from being a sin, that it can render heresy sinless, yea, make the entertaining of damnable errors to be a meritorious belief.

We cannot expect that knowledge should be accounted necessary, where the worst sort of ignorance hath such excess of honour and privilege. It is no more necessary, nor more of it, according to their principles, *necessitate præcepti*, by virtue of any command, than we have shewed out of their best writers. But then the *necessitas medii*, needfulness as a means or way to life, that is none at all; for as the same author tells us, and brings us abundant evidence of it, it is the common doctrine of their more grave divines,<sup>6</sup> that men may now be saved; and the more common tenet of their schools,<sup>7</sup> that they may be justified without the explicit belief, and so without the knowledge of Christ himself. So that those who hold the knowledge of Christ unnecessary to salvation are many, and their most grave divines; those that count it unnecessary to justification, are the greatest number of their doctors: put these both together, and there will be few left amongst them, and these little considerable in comparison, for number or gravity, but such as judge the knowledge of Christ needless to bring men into a saving

<sup>1</sup> Idem *ibid.* n. ix. Si præ simplicitate aut ignorantia id credit, quia sibi videtur ecclesia ita tenere, et est paratus errorem deponere quandocunque veritatem fuerit edoctus—nec peccat mortaliter regulariter l. xi. n. xxii. p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. i. advers. Hæres. c. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Immo plus dico, quod aliquando talis error possit esse meritorius, ut puta, aliquis audit aliquem prædicatorem famosum, vel episcopum prædicasse aliquem errorem, et simpliciter credit animo obediendi fidei, paratus tamen corrigi. Nam ex intentione opera judicantur cum voluntate.—*De sent. excom. sum. Angel.* v. fides. n. vi.

<sup>4</sup> Aliquando cum peccato veniali, ut puta, vetula credit Trinitatem esse unam familiam: et quoniam credit ecclesiam sic tenere, sic credit.—*Id. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Et videtur hodie communis sententia scholarum et doctorum, quod laici errantes cum suis doctoribus aut pastoribus omnino ob omni culpa excusentur, immo multoties sic materialiter errando, ob actum obedientiæ, quam pastoribus suis debent, merentur Problem, xv. p. 99.

<sup>6</sup> Putem plane hanc esse sententiam doctoris, et communem.—*Ibid.* p. 90.

<sup>7</sup> Et hæc est communio in scholis.—*Ibid.* p. 89.

state; for this, it will not be needful to be Christians, unless any can be Christians without the actual belief or knowledge of Christ.

*Sect. 3.* Thirdly, They need not know what they ought to do; they may be, without sin, ignorant of what the Lord hath made their duty. Adrian, Corduba, Herrera, determine, and it is the more common and received opinion, that men may be inculpably ignorant of the law of nature and the ten commandments, as Sancta Clara informs us.<sup>1</sup> But, then, since they need not know the rule, what have they to follow? Why, the direction of their teachers; and these they must follow blindfold, right or wrong. It is one of the qualifications required in the obedience of others, but especially of the religious, which they would have us think to be best of all, that it be blind;<sup>2</sup> nor should fear of going wrong move them to open or use their own eyes, for if they do wander out of the way of God after such guides, yet they are right, and do their duty. Those who managed the conference<sup>3</sup> for the Romanists at Ratisbon, anno 1601, maintained that the people are so subjected to the government of their teachers, that if they err, the people may and ought to err with them. And they are not only excused from all faults, when they thus wander with their teachers, but their obedience to their pastors herein is many times meritorious. This is the judgment, not only of Valentia, Angles, Vasquez, but the common determination of their schools in Sancta Clara.<sup>3</sup> It seems a man may deserve eternal life by leaving the way to it, and may come to heaven meritoriously by wandering from it. What a strange thing is it, that they will not let their catholics be certain of salvation, since they cannot miss it, no, not by going out of the way that leads to it! When they follow their guide into the ditch, yet they are safe; but that is a small matter: by being willing to be led by such as see not, or mind not the way, they merit, and spring up to heaven marvellously, even when they are falling from a precipice, and tumbling headlong after their leaders.

The same author tells us<sup>4</sup> that some doctors ascribe so much to the instruction of pastors, who have care of the flock, that if they should teach that now and then God would have them to hate him, a simple parishioner is bound to believe them. All think not fit to give so broad instances; but whether all have not warrant to do it by their common tenet, let others judge.

However, if the people (content to trust, and not to see, what so much concerns them) suffer themselves to be deceived, they sin not, their ignorance will save them harmless.<sup>5</sup> And what would any impostor desire more than to have those whom he hath a mind to abuse to the uttermost, possessed with such a confidence, that however they be deluded, it will not hurt them? Now what an admirable expedient is ignorance for the children of this kingdom, when by virtue of it the leaders may carry the people whither they list without suspicion, the people may follow in the dark without danger! No wonder if ignorance be nourished in them by all means, when they are not concerned to know whether that which they are led to be good or evil,

<sup>1</sup> Communior tamen et recepta sententia post Adrianum, et est nostri Cordubæ et Herreræ et aliorum communiter, quod potest dari ignorantia invincibilis respectu legis naturæ et decalogi.—*Probl. xvi. initio.*

<sup>2</sup> Obedientiam cæcam, promptam, fortem, esse par est, de his conditionibus in obedientia religiosa præsertim requisitis bene.—*P. L. Victorel. ibid. ad l. viii. c. xiv. p. 11, 8.*

<sup>3</sup> Hungerus, Velserus, Hannemannus, Oretzerus, Tannerus.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. supra.

<sup>5</sup> Immo aliqui doctores tantum tribuunt instructioni pastorum, quibus incumbit cura ovium, quod si docerent hic et nunc, Deum velle odio haberi, quod teneatur parochianus rudis eis credere.—*Ibid. Probl. xv. p. 97.*

just or unjust, against God, or for him; whatever it be, they ought to obey at a venture. They need not so much as know whether their leaders have power to require what they enjoin.<sup>1</sup>

If they be in doubt whether that they are led to be against the law, yet on they must go, for they all agree here to drive them. *Secundum omnes*,<sup>2</sup> saith Sylvest, if he doubt of this, whether it be against the command of God, yet he is bound to obey, he may venture safely, It seems that is no danger which the apostle speaks of, 'He that doubteth is damned,' Rom. xiv. 23. They allege<sup>3</sup> an express text for this in their law, which will carry it against the apostle.

And as that evil which God forbids may be done by him that doubts lest God hath condemned it, so<sup>4</sup> that good which he hath enjoined (if salvation can be had without it) may be neglected when superiors will have it so; their canonical text saith it,<sup>5</sup> which must be regarded whatever becomes of that other, 'Whether it be better to obey God or men, judge you,' Acts iv. 19.

Yea, if they be past doubt, that what is required is against God, if they think, if they believe it to be against his command, yet if they believe it but upon weak grounds,<sup>6</sup> yea, or if upon probable grounds (if they be not more certain thereof than they ought to be of their salvation), they are to suppress their own judgment, and will be excused for the goodness of such obedience, *i. e.* for obeying men rather than God, and that against their own judgment.

Such art is used to persuade the people, that they need see nothing they are to do further than their leaders would have them; if they doubt or if they believe, if their eyes be opening or if they be opened, they must shut them close, and obey men blindly, without discerning what God forbids or requires. And it is not for nothing that they deprive them of their eyes, for thus they can make them grind. Such ignorance is the way to have them in more subjection, and that they account the most perfect obedience, which is next to brutish, without knowledge, and without judgment; that they need not have, and this they must not use. A judgment of discretion must by no means be left the people, that is a point they would maintain against us; but as to their own followers, they put it out of question beforehand, for by keeping them without knowledge, they leave them no judgment, but such as

<sup>1</sup> Non oportet quod sciat id ab eo juberi posse.—*Nav.* l. xxiii. n. xxxvii.

Affirmant in omni dubio parendum esse præposito. Bonavent. Paludan. Sylvest. Angelus, Sotus in Vasquez, in 1, 2 tom. i. disp. lxvi. l. ix.

<sup>2</sup> *Secundum omnes* si est de hoc dubius (illud esse contra legem Dei)—tenetur obedire.—*Sylvest.* v. consc. n. iii. Et generaliter ubi est dubius an debeat obedire necne, tenetur obedire.—*Idem.* v. relig. vi. n. vi. Quid si prælatus præcipiat aliquid quod conscientia subditi dicat esse contra legem Dei? Resp. secundum Bonaventuram quod tenetur eam deponere, nisi clarum sit illud fore contra legem Dei.—*Sum. Angel.* v. Conscient. n. ii. Quid debet facere inferior, quando dubius est, an quod ei præcipitur est peccatum? dico dehet obedire. Ita tenet Sylvest. et habetur hoc expresse.

<sup>3</sup> xxxiii. q. 1. *Can. quid culpatur* ubi statuitur, cum non est certum, superiorum factum esse malum, esse obediendum: in duhiis enim dehet inferior credere superiori.—*Tolet.* Instr. l. viii. c. xv.

<sup>4</sup> Immo aliquando etiam bonum, sine quo potest esse salus, propter obedientiam debet omitti.—*Sylv.* v. obedient. n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> 11. q. 3. quid ergo. *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Si vero opinatur, ita quod nescit, nec dubitat, sed credit, distinguendum est: quia si credit ex levibus, tenetur tale iudicium deponere, &c., et obedire: et similiter si credit probabiliter, et excusatur propter obedientiam bonum.—*Sylvest.* v. consc. n. 3.

Si non scit pro certo sed ex levi et temeraria credulitate, tunc ad consilium sui prælati, deponat. Si vero habeat credulitatem probabilem et discretam, quamvis non manifestam et evidentem: tunc propter obedientiam, faciat quod sibi præcipitur, quoniam tenetur in tali dubio, et propter bonum obedientiam excusatur.—*Sum. Angel.* v. consc. n. 2.

one may pass on colours in the dark. Ribera expresseth their sense significantly,<sup>1</sup> All who are to obey, especially religious persons, ought to have no head of their own, *i. e.* they are to obey as if they were without eyes or brains. So he explains this worthy expression, *non suo sed rectoris sui consilio duci.* Let me but add the pregnant words of Cardinal Cusanus, which comprise all that I charge them with in this particular,<sup>2</sup> No man (saith he) can be deceived by an ill pastor; if thou say, Lord, I have obeyed thee in him whom thou hast set over me, this will be sufficient for thy salvation; for thou by obedience paid to a teacher whom the church tolerates, cannot be deceived, although he command what is unlawful. Wherefore the opinion of the pastor binds thee upon thy salvation for the good of obedience, although it be unjust; for it belongs not to thee to take notice whether it be unlawful or not, neither hast thou leave not to obey if it seem unlawful to thee, for that obedience which is irrational is the most complete and most perfect obedience, to wit, when one obeys without the use of reason, as a beast obeys his owner. A speech fit only for the mouth of the beast and the false prophet.

The sum of their doctrine concerning ignorance is little less than this: they need not be men as to their obedience; they need not be Christians as to the knowledge of Christ; they need scarce be either as to their worship.

*Sect. 4.* The ground of all this is, that they judge the knowledge of the Scriptures unnecessary, in a manner, to all sorts; yea, count it necessary to keep as many as they can possibly from acquaintance therewith. They are highly concerned for this, even as much as those who have villainous designs, and would accomplish them without observance and control, are concerned to shun the light. They know full well the Scripture condemns popery; we may well say they know it, when themselves confess<sup>3</sup> that both their worship and their doctrine is contrary and repugnant to Scripture, and allege this as the reason why they would have as little of the Scripture, as can be, known to any. From their own mouths we have the reason why they would never have suffered the Bible to be exposed in a vulgar tongue, if it could have been avoided. The protestants' translations made that impossible, and the papists among them, who had a mind to look into the word of God, might have made use of these, if no other had been provided. To prevent which they were forced to translate it, and yet their own translations (which are so strange a disguise of Scripture) they dare not trust to the common view; they are in the index of forbidden books put out by Pius the Fourth, and an unpardonable sin they make it for any to read them, but such as can procure a licence for it from a bishop or inquisitor; that is, none but those who, they are confident, will not be moved by what they meet with there against popery. And yet (as if so great restraint were too much liberty for so dangerous a thing as the word of God), in the after edition of the index, by Clement the Eighth, he declares that no new faculty is granted to bishops or inquisitors to grant any licence for reading the Bible, since, by the mandate and usage of the church of Rome, and the universal inquisition, all power of granting such licences is

<sup>1</sup> Omnes qui parent, et præsertim religiosi homines, debent esse sine capite, *Comment in Amos*, p. 269.

<sup>2</sup> Nemo decipi potest etiam per malum præsentem: si dixeris, Domine, obedivi tibi in præposito, hoc tibi sufficit ad salutem: tu enim per obedientiam quam facis præposito quem ecclesia tolerat, decipi nequis, etiamsi præceperit injusta: quare sententia pastoris ligat te pro tua salute propter bonum obedientiæ, etiamsi injusta fuerit: nam ad te non attinet cognoscere quod sententia sit injusta, nec conceditur tibi ut non obedias, si tibi injusta videatur: obedientia irrationalis est consummata obedientia et perfectissima, scilicet quando obeditur, sicut jumentum obedit domino suo. *Epist. 2 ad Bohemos et Excitat.* l. ii. et vi.

<sup>3</sup> Consil. de stabilienda Rom. sede, p. 6.

taken away.<sup>1</sup> So far are they from thinking the knowledge of the Scriptures needful for the people, that they count it heresy to affirm the Scripture ought to be in a language which they know (how can it be less than heresy to think that needful to be known, though it be the revelation of God, which discovers popery to be an imposture?). It is a sin from which they shall never be absolved, if they read anything of the word of God in a language which they understand, without a licence from a bishop or inquisitor, by Pius his rule; and no bishop or inquisitor hath any power to grant any licence, by that of Pope Clement.

Knowledge of the Scripture is no more needful for monks than other people; it is equally necessary that they should be ignorant of the word of God; they are under the same restraint, and are no otherwise permitted to read or buy it.<sup>2</sup> Ignorance is proper for this kind of creature, they are for contemplation, not for knowledge.<sup>3</sup> It seems they may employ their heads in contemplation of they know not what. To be sure they need neither sacred nor any kind of literature. A monk may be illiterate (say they) they have that privilege by their canon law, there quoted by Sylvester and others,<sup>4</sup> and they generally make use of this indulgence; for their clergy, six parts of seven, need no more to be acquainted with the Scripture than the black art. The four first orders are sufficiently accomplished, if they are able to read<sup>5</sup> (according to the Council of Trent); the two next should understand Latin, *i. e.* the words, but not the matter, yet no necessity of either; it is not of necessity to their sacrament of order<sup>6</sup> that any below a bishop should have the use of reason when he enters into orders.

Yea, their priests need not have any knowledge of the Scriptures. It is no part of their qualification;<sup>7</sup> nor doth their office, by the Roman constitution, require it; all that belongs commonly to a priest is only to say service and to say mass;<sup>8</sup> there are infinite numbers made priests merely to read mass (as

<sup>1</sup> In indice recens edito jussu Clementis 8, circa prædictam quartam regulam—nullam per hanc impressionem et editionem de novo tribui facultatem episcopis vel inquisitoribus, aut regularium superioribus concedendi licentiam legendi biblia in vulgari lingua edita; cum hactenus mandato et usu S. R. E. et universalis inquisitionis, sublata eis fuerit facultas concedendi hujusmodi licentias in Azor. Instit. Mor. pars. i. l. viii. cap. xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Regulares vero, non nisi facultate a prælatis suis habita ea legere aut emere possint. Index lib. prohib. a Con. Trid. iv. regula. i. ita Pius iv. Sublata est regularium superioribus facultas concedendi licentiam.—*Ita Clemen. viii. id. ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Contemplatione magis indigent quam scientia.—*Sylv. v. Clericus. ii. n. 1. Graff. l. i. c. xv. n. 5.*

<sup>4</sup> Potest monachus esse illiteratus. ut. not. per gloss. xvi. q. i. ca. legi versic. instructio. Graff. *ibid.* facit quod legitur xvi. q. i. ubi dicit Joann. quod sufficit monacho si sit bonus, licet sit illiteratus.—*Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Nam in minoribus constitutis, sufficit scire legere, et commodo pronunciare; et juxta Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiii. c. xi. Saltem Latinam linguam intelligere diacono, et subdiacono sufficit intelligere quæ Latine legit, licet mysteria non ita calleat, Tolet. Inst. l. i. c. xciii.

<sup>6</sup> Ordines autem majores etiam presbyteratum posse conferri infantibus, est communis doctrina theologorum et canonistarum, S. Tho. Bonavent, Richard, &c.—*Idem. ibid. cap. lxi.*

S. Tho. tenet et probat quod in solo Episcopatu requiritur usus rationis in suscipiente de necessitate consecrationis Episcopalis.—*Sylv. v. ordo. iv. n. i. vid. Angel. v. ordo. iii. n. i.*

<sup>7</sup> Ad Presbyteratum sufficit scire canones communes penitentiales et cætera de quibus dist. xxxviii. quæ ipsis. *Sylv. v. Cleric. ii. n. i. Graff. l. i. c. xv. n. 5.* Angelus reduces their canons to twenty (none of which have any ground in Scripture).—*Sum. v. confes. vi. n. v.*

<sup>8</sup> Primum et secundum officium (viz. divinum officium et missam celebrare) commune est omnibus, reliqua vero, quæ ad praxim pertinent, non nisi iis, quibus ex munere particulari incumbunt.—*Tol. ibid. l. i. c. iii.*

Polydore Virgil tells us);<sup>1</sup> and this they may do completely, though they cannot so much as read without a fescue, such as the missal hath ready for every syllable.<sup>2</sup>

But if the priest have a special cure, and so be a preacher or confessor, yet may he be both good enough without any acquaintance with the Scripture; he may preach the gospel after the Roman mode, without knowing the word of God; for with them it belongs both to deacons and monks to preach; yet those need not understand anything of Scripture, and these must not read it in a language they understand, without a licence.<sup>3</sup>

The priests in Scotland were accounted sufficiently qualified, who, it is said, did think the New Testament to have been composed by Martin Luther.<sup>4</sup>

The priests even in Italy, if they had more notice of the author, yet scarce more acquaintance with the contents of the New Testament; they never read it, and were much more ignorant thereof than the silly women amongst the Taborites, as Æneas Sylvius, afterward Pope Pius II., writes.<sup>5</sup>

Knowledge of the Scriptures was not counted necessary for their preachers, either regular or secular.<sup>6</sup> The chief of their regulars were the Franciscans and Dominicans. In the rule of friar Francis, approved by several popes, the Minorites (one sort of preaching friars) are, amongst other vices, to avoid learning, if they were illiterate.

And those of the Dominicans (the order of friars prædicant) who were rude and illiterate, did preach notwithstanding.<sup>7</sup>

As for their other doctors or teachers, that which they are bound to know is, the rudiments of faith (such as our children, who can scarce read, will give an account of.<sup>8</sup>

The papacy had no doctors or divines more eminent than those of the Sorbonne; yet they seem little beholding to the Scripture for their divinity. Robert Stevens in the last age, conversing with those doctors, would be asking in what part of the New Testament such or such a thing is written, but had such answers returned. They had read it in Jerome, or the Decrees, but what the New Testament was they knew not.<sup>9</sup>

For a confessor he is sufficiently qualified, according to Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Albertus, as Sylvester collects, if he have but read and understand (not the Bible), but Antoninus his book entituled *Defecerunt*, unless he be a mere natural or presumptuous fool; and neither will doubt of anything (when he knows nothing), nor inquire of others.<sup>10</sup> So that he may be

<sup>1</sup> Sunt autem infiniti, qui tantum celebrandis missis, quas dicunt, operam dant, et ejus rei causa sacerdotes sunt, perinde quasi in ea omne consistat officium—*De invent.* rer. l. iv. c. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Sacerdos in quantum deputatus est ad officium divinum tenetur scire tantum de Grammatica, quod sciat verba congrue proferre, et accentuare, et quod intelligat saltem literaliter quæ legit.—*Graff.* pars. ii. t. i. c. xi. n. xix.

<sup>3</sup> Angel. sum. v. prædic. Sylvest. sum. v. Diaconus, n. iii. ex Paludano. Gratian. in Navar. c. xxvii. n. 259.

<sup>4</sup> Hist. of Ch. of Scot. l. ii. p. 75.

<sup>5</sup> Pudeat Italiæ sacerdotes, quos ne semel quidem legisse constat novam legem: apud Thaboritas vix mulierculam invenias, quæ de novo et veteri testamento respondere nescit. Comment de dict. et fact. Alfonsi regis lib. ii. Apophtheg. xvii.

<sup>6</sup> Et non curent nescientes literas, literas discere.

<sup>7</sup> Illi rudes et illiterati prædicabant.—*Urspergens* in Cent. xiii. Magd. cap. vi.

<sup>8</sup> Si vero sacerdos est doctor, tenetur scire saltem rudimenta fidei.—*Graff.* decis. pars. ii. l. i. c. xi. n. xix.

<sup>9</sup> Se illud apud Hieronymum aut in decretis legisse; quid vero novum Testamentum esset, ignorare.—*Rob. Steph. Resp. ad Censur. Theol. Paris in Præfat.*

<sup>10</sup> Secundum istos sufficientem credo, qui attente legit et intellexit *Defecerunt*: nisi

a complete confessor and guide of consciences, who knows nothing of Scripture, and little else, if he have but the wit to discern his own ignorance, and a will to learn of those that are wiser, when he can meet with them. Thus we see a Roman priest is furnished for all points of the office, common or special, without any acquaintance with the word of God.

As to bishops, they seem to agree, that some knowledge of the Scripture is requisite in them, and some venture to say a full and perfect knowledge of the Old and New Testament, signified by their mitres, the two horns whereof mystically demonstrate, that they understand the two Testaments both alike. And, indeed, since their prelates, secular and regular, have honour, power, and plenty by the papal contrivement, and hopes of more and greater than other professions can offer, their interest ties them so fast to it, that they may trust them (if any) with the sight of the word of God securely, and not fear that any discovery of popish corruptions, through such a medium, will make any impressions on them to their prejudice, or move them to believe, or act anything against that which is so much themselves; there is no such danger in admitting these to some acquaintance with Scripture, as others, who have no expectations from religion, but for their souls and eternity. Nevertheless, their rules which seem to make this knowledge necessary for bishops, are rather counsels than precepts, they are cautious, and will not press this too much (for conscience enlightened sometimes proves too hard for secular interest). And their prelates may be easily dispensed with, if they be ignorant of Scripture, or have little notice of it. It is one of Sylvester's and Angelus's questions, whether an ignorant bishop sin mortally, if in his ordination, being asked whether he understand the whole Bible, he should affirm he does?<sup>1</sup> This he so resolves after Richardus à Sancto Victore. If the bishop be so ignorant, that he knows not in general the commands of God, the articles of faith, what are virtues and vices, and which the sacraments, then he so sins, he lies perniciously: leaving us to judge that he doth not thus lie, when he solemnly affirms, that he hath as much knowledge of the Old and New Testament as the church of Rome requires in a bishop; if he do but know the creed, the ten commandments, which are virtues and vices, and which are sacraments, and have but some general perception of these. They will not have the bishops burdened with too much Scripture learning, since every child they confirm should have no less than this. This may pass for perfect knowledge of the Scripture, and of an episcopal pitch with those who count it no imperfection to be ignorant of that which, they say,<sup>2</sup> doth more hurt than good, for so they were wont to blaspheme the Scriptures, or the Holy Ghost, whose inspiration they are. The bishop of Dunkeld<sup>3</sup> thought he had enough of it, when he said, I thank God I have lived well these many years, and never knew either the Old or New Testament. I content me with my portuis and pontifical (History of Church

sit aut naturaliter stultus, aut præsumptuosus, ut non sciat dubitare, vel nolit interrogare.—*Sylv. Sum. v. Confessor. iii. n. ii. vid. Tol. ibid. l. iii. c. xv.*

That which a Confessor is to know is, which sins are mortal, which venial. Now this they cannot learn from Scripture, as themselves go near to acknowledge (Valent. tom. ii. disp. vi. q. xviii.), and so no need of Scripture for them. *Vide Angel. sum. v. confess. iv. n. iii.; Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> *Utrum peccet mortaliter Episcopus ignorans respondendo in ordinatione sua cum interrogatur utrum sciat novum et vetus Testamentum; quod scit. Resp. secundum Rich. quod sic. si est ita ignarus quod nesciat in generali, mandata Dei, articulos fidei, virtutes et vitia, etiam sacramenta, quoniam tunc mentitur pernitiose.—Angel. sum. v. episc. n. xxvi.; Sylv. ibid. n. v.*

<sup>2</sup> In indice lib. prohibet. Regul. iv. Pii. iv.

<sup>3</sup> Putant peccatum esse si scripturas legerint, et in lege Domini meditabundos, quasi

of Scotland, lib. ii. p. 66). Tho bishops in other countries thought themselves bound in conscience to be as ignorant of the Scriptures, when they counted it a sin to read them.

Yea, he that wants a sufficiency of this knowledge, though so very little or nothing be sufficient, may be dispensed with upon the account of some other quality. As for example, charity, they say, will make up want of knowledge in those who have not sufficient to make them capable of any place or dignity amongst them.<sup>1</sup> Yea, they may be dispensed with, though they have no better qualities than in Gerson's time, when he tells us, there were none anywhere that were good, or approveable for doctrine or practice, but all chosen were both carnal persons, and ignorant of spiritual things.<sup>2</sup>

So he in the fifteenth age; and about the same time Clemangis says there were scarce any advanced to the pontifical dignity, who had so much as superficially either read, or heard, or learned the Scriptures; or who had ever touched anything of the Bible, except the cover. 'Quotusquisque hodie est ad pontificale culmen evectus qui sacras vel perfunctorie literas legerit, audierit, didicerit; imo qui sacrum codicem nisi tegerimento tenus unquam atigerit.'—*De corrupt. Eccl. Statu.*

In the age after, wherein the Council of Trent was held, we have (in Papyrius Masson de Episc. Urbis) the character of the Roman prelates, by Pasquil begging the next cardinal's cap, as being more capable thereof than the bishops then created.

Si imbelles sum atque rude marmor,  
Complures quoque episcopos creari  
Ipsa me mage Saxeos videbis.

And the same age, in the Council of Trent, where (as they boast) was the flower of all the Roman prelates in Europe, very few of the bishops had knowledge in theology,<sup>3</sup> as father Paul tells us, yet these had only decisive

garrulos inutilesque contemnunt. Espencæus in 1 Tim. digress. l. ii. c. ii. p. 180, et in Tit. c. i. p. 486. Edit. Paris an. 1619.

<sup>1</sup> Magnitudo charitatis supplet imperfectum scientiæ.—*Sylvest. sum. v.; Cleric. ii. n. i.*

<sup>2</sup> Nullibi episcopos bonos et opere et doctrina præditos eligi; sed homines carnales et spiritualium ignaros. Gerson declar. defect. Eccles.

<sup>3</sup> The bishops, amongst whom very few had knowledge in theology. Hist. Counc. Trent, lib. ii. p. 179. It is not strange they had no skill therein, for the Italian prelates, who carried all in that council, being many more than two to one, neither studied nor read the Scriptures, lest the word of God should seduce them from popery; nor was divinity their study, but the civil and canon law, as one of them informed Espencæus. Memini Episcopum Italum nobilem, nec vero imperitum, mihi dicere, contraneos suos a studio theologico deterreri, et quodammodo abhorrere, ne sic fiant heretici, quasi vero hæreses ex scripturarum studio nascantur.—*Quam igitur artem vestrate (aio) profitentur? juris (ait) utriusque, sed in primis canonici.*—In Tit. cap. i. p. 486.

Dudithius, an eminent bishop in that convention, calls the prelates who prevailed there, indoctos et stolidos, sed tamen impudentia et audacia utiles.—*Epist. ad Max. ii.*

Yea, the whole Sorbonnedetermine that it is not requisite to inquire concerning those who sit in council, utrum sint docti et utrum habeant scientiam sacrarum literarum. In Juel. Epist. de conc. Trid. sect. 22.

Duarenus, who writ while that council was sitting, lets us understand how ignorant all their bishops then (few only excepted) were of the Scriptures, not only in Italy, but other countries. Hoc seculo episcopatus et sacerdotia indoctissimis hominibus, et a religione alienis, deferri solent; hodie episcopi nostri (paucis exceptis) sacrarum literarum scientia cæteris ex populo longe inferiores sunt.—*De sac. Eccles. minist. et Benef. lib. i. cap. xi. in sin.*

Some thought it strange, that five cardinals and forty-eight bishops should so easily define the most principal and important points of religion never decided before. Neither was there amongst these prelates any one remarkable for learning; some of

voices in that council, and all was concluded by plurality of their votes ; when far the major part understood not the matters concluded, so that the articles of the Roman faith were voted blindfold. And yet all must be damned who believe not these points of faith, when those who made them so were ignorant of them, and knew not what they did when they decreed them. Such is the Roman charity and knowledge ; so burning and shining are their best lights, they will have all burned here, and in hell, too, for not believing that which the council (for the greater part of it) understood not.

But sure, the knowledge of the pope must be transcendent, especially as to the Scripture ; his place and office requires it, being accounted the head of the whole church (which ought to have good eyes), and teacher of Christians (as much or more than Peter was), and judge in all controversies which concern religion, and interpreter of all difficulties in Scripture, and a more lively oracle of God than the Scripture itself in the things of God. Yes, say they, the pope ought to have far more knowledge than any other, being the president of the whole Christian commonwealth,<sup>1</sup> so de Graffis. But, then, he adds, as to him the presumption of the law is enough for all this, and that presumes that all is in the cabinet of the pope's breast (as it may well be presumed, that a skill beyond that of all physicians is in a bold mountebank), although indeed what is quite contrary may prove true.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly the pope may be all that they style him, without the knowledge of a novice in the Scripture, without any such acquaintance with it, as to pretend to the name of a divine (though acquaintance with it be expected from none but divines), and many that have the name have little or nothing of the thing. The popes think not themselves concerned at all to trouble their heads with divinity. If he be but a canonist (as Peter no doubt was), he is the apostle's undoubted successor, though he be no more a divine than his chair is, or can make him, and why may not the chair inspire him with knowledge as much as holiness ?<sup>3</sup> Pope Innocent the Tenth, in our days (since they have been more concerned for the reputation of the Vatican throne, than, as before, to let monsters of debauchery and ignorance ascend it), declared that he had never studied divinity, nor was it his profession.<sup>4</sup> Pope Clement the Eighth began to study it when he was very old, and then not to much purpose it seems ; for he could not at last decide the question that he had studied, how much soever their church was concerned in it.

None can understand their church prayers but expert divines, as Soto tells us ;<sup>5</sup> he means the matter of them indeed, but popes need not understand

them were lawyers, perhaps learned in that profession, but of little understanding in religion ; few divines, but of less than ordinary sufficiency.—*Hist. of Council of Trent*, l. ii p. 163.

<sup>1</sup> Papa debet habere longe majorem scientiam aliis, cum sit præpositus curiæ toti Christianæ reipublicæ. Pro eo tamen sufficit præsumptio juris, quoad papa præsumitur habere omnia in scrinio pectoris.—*Graff*. l. i. c. xv. n. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Licet de facto quandoque possit contingere contrarium ; cum memoria hominis sit labilis. id. ibid.

Quum hoc tempore nullus sit Romæ, qui sacras literas didicerit, qua fronte aliquis eorum docere audebit, quod non didicerit ?—*Arnulph. in Concil. Rhem.*

<sup>3</sup> The study of the laws, the canon law especially, is the nearest way (breve compendium) to the highest dignities in their church, even the popedom itself, scarce anything being left for divines but curacies. Theologis nihilo pene præter curata, quæ vocant sacerdotia, reliquo facto, as Espenæus informs us in *Tit. c. i. p. 486*. And the prelate or pope that hath studied the laws needs no divinity, because the law is learning enough ; immo jurium (aiunt isti) bonus interpres theologia non eget : cur ita ? quod in jure omnes disciplinæ includuntur.—*Idem. ibid. p. 487*.

<sup>4</sup> S. Amour, part. iii. cap. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Castrens. hæc. c. iv. edit. Paris, 1534.

the words neither ; for many of them do not who pass for lawful popes, and such can neither understand the subject nor the words of the Bible, for it is in Latin ; and, if Alphonsus deceives us not, many of them have not gone so far as their grammar ;<sup>1</sup> yea, very many of them have been so ignorant as they could not speak their own name in Latin. Yet such knowledge of Scripture is enough in the Roman account for the infallible interpreter of Scriptures, the supreme judge in all matters of faith, and the teacher of the universe. When we are ready to wonder at this, they stop us presently by telling us that God did make Balaam's ass speak.<sup>2</sup>

They seem to grant as much stupidity in a pope as can be imagined, but then the miracle of making an ass speak does partly answer that objection. Had the bishops of Rome anciently been such ignorant, dull creatures, as many of their later popes, and yet adored at that rate, the heathens might have had some colour for charging the Christians with worshipping an ass's head.

As for the people, they are so far from obliging them to get knowledge, that they either make it impossible for them to attain it, or encourage them never to look after it. They cannot attain it but either by reading or hearing. They must not read the Scriptures (as before), and they cannot, or need not, hear. If the priests be ignorant (as they are allowed to be),<sup>3</sup> they are not able to instruct them ; if they be able, they need not preach ; that is *sub consilio* ; or the people need not hear, no, nor inquire of them in private ; no, not those that are most ignorant. The further they are from all knowledge, the more excusable, if they take no care nor pains about it. Sancta Clara makes this query :<sup>4</sup> Are they not bound, at least to some diligence, to free themselves from this ignorance ? He answers, if it be one who hath no

<sup>1</sup> Adeoque plerique, literarum ignari sunt, ut vix sciant nomen suum Latine exprimere.—*Platina* in Jul. i. vid in Johann. xxiv.

<sup>2</sup> Bosius de sign. l. xvi. c. ix.

<sup>3</sup> The generals of the regulars and others declared to the faces of the bishops in the Council of Trent, that the bishops and curates had wholly abandoned the office of a pastor, so that for many hundred years the people remained without sermons in the church, and without the doctrine of divinity in the schools.—*Hist. of Council of Trent*, l. ii. p. 169.

And there also against the regulars and friars (the only preachers beside those who had abandoned the office) it was a general complaint, that though they were severely forbidden to preach and teach, yet they assumed the power. And so the flock remained without either shepherd or hireling, because those preachers knew neither the need nor the capacity of the people, and least of all the occasions to teach and edify them. Besides, the end of these preachers is not to edify, but to take alms, either for themselves or their cloisters, which, that they may obtain, they aim not to benefit the soul, but to delight the ear, and soothe men in their pleasures, that thereby they may draw more profit ; and the people, instead of learning the doctrine of Christ, learneth either novelty, or vanity at the least. That it is a clear case that they exhort the people to nothing but to give ;—*Ibid.*

How these things were reformed by that council, in the prelates, who would have the other severely forbidden to preach, appears by Espenœus. Quotusquisque prælatorum majorum minorumve populum suum docere videtur ? an illi ipsi decreti hujus auctores unquam docuerunt, quorum exemplo alii ad docendum aliaque munera sua facienda excitarentur ? Ludimusne in re adeo sacra ? an potius hac decretorum specie reformationem poscentibus illudimus ? Quid emendationis sperari potest a nobis, nostra tam recens edita non observantibus ?—In 1 Tim. l. ii. c. ii. p. 179.

<sup>4</sup> Petes annon teneantur saltem ad faciendam diligentiam, ut ignorantia talium expungatur ? Ad quod dico, primo, quod si aliquis fuerit, qui nullam de his notitiam habeat, unde moveretur ad quærendam de illis doctrinam, certum esse, nullam requiri industriam et sollicitudinem, saltem si nullatenus dubitavit : quia non tenetur ad id quod est impossibile, est autem impossibile, quod quis quærat aliquid, quod nunquam ipsi in mentem venit.—*Ut recte Angles Probl.* xv. p. 95, vid. Bonacin. do peccat. d. ii. q. viii. p. iii. n. iii., &c.

knowledge of these things which may move him to seek instruction, it is certain that no diligence or care is required of him, especially if he do not at all doubt, *i. e.* if he be confident that he knows well enough, and his ignorance makes him so senseless that he discerns it not. His reason is, because he is not obliged to that which is impossible, and it is not possible that one should seek that which never came into his mind (as Angles also determines with him); so that if knowledge never came into his mind, there is no need that it ever should come there, and he is not bound to take the least care or pains to make way for it.

### CHAPTER III.

*Their doctrine makes it needless to love God.*

LOVE of God, or, as they had rather call it, charity, is in their account, as they seem sometimes to express themselves, of greatest moment. Regeneration and spiritual life, they say, consists in it; without it no man is in the state of grace, or favour with God. This is the righteousness whereby they are justified, and their sins pardoned, *i. e.* abolished (for that is pardon with them), and their souls sanctified (for justification and sanctification is all one in their reckoning). This is it which is the life and spirit of all other graces and virtues, say they, without which the best of them are dead and unactive things, and deserve not the name of virtues.<sup>1</sup> And though they look not for heaven unless they deserve it by their own works, yet their works, they say, are of no worth without this;<sup>2</sup> yea, their indulgences will not avail anything without it.<sup>3</sup> So far, therefore, as love to God is unnecessary, so far regeneration and spiritual life, a saving state and réconciliation with God, justification, pardon, all graces and virtues, all their own good works or their church's indulgences, are unnecessary; no further need of what either God or themselves have made necessary to salvation.

One would think, if they had any desire of heaven or fear of hell, or dread of their own purgatory, if they had any design for the salvation of souls, or any regard of what is saving, they should be tender in this point above all, and not abate any moment of its necessity. But what they do herein, let us see. Indeed, they make both the habitual and the actual love of God unnecessary. First, for habitual love, they teach, the Lord hath not at all commanded us to have the habit or principle of this love; he nowhere requires that we should love him habitually. Certainly, saith Bellarmine,<sup>4</sup> the Lord hath not commanded that we should love him from an infused habit, for laws do not require habits. Add to him one of the most eminent amongst the Dominicans:<sup>5</sup> there is no affirmative precept for habitual love to God, saith Melchior Canus. I need allege no more; I find none of them questions it.

Now, in that they do not make this love necessary as a duty, they cannot

<sup>1</sup> *Nulla virtus nec ejus actus acceptatur sine charitate, quæ sola dividit inter filios regni et perditionis.—Sta. Clar. probl. xxxv. p. 244.*

<sup>2</sup> *Nam opera quantumcunque moraliter bona, si fiant extra charitatem, in statu peccati mortiferi, absque dubio pereunt, et mortua reputantur, quantum attinet ad gratiam et gloriam promerendam.—Nav. c. i. n. xxix.*

<sup>3</sup> *Bellarmin. de pœnitent. l. ii. c. xiv. p. 951.*

<sup>4</sup> *Certe non præcipit ut diligamus ex habitu infuso—leges enim de actibus dantur, non de habitibus.—De grat. et lib. arbitr. l. vi. c. vii. p. 664.*

<sup>5</sup> *De amicitia habituali Dei, nullum est præceptum affirmativum.—Pars. iv. relect. de pœnitent, p. 870.*

account it necessary as a means; for they<sup>1</sup> hold that all means necessary to salvation are commanded. So that the habitual love of God, by their doctrine, is no way necessary.

And this they teach not only of the habit of love, but of all other graces. The precepts of the law are not for habits, saith Soto.<sup>2</sup> We are not, as he adds, to pay what we owe from a habit of justice or liberality.<sup>3</sup> When we are enjoined to live soberly and righteously, we are not required to do so out of habit, but only to do it, saith Bellarmine; and these instances they bring to shew that we are not obliged to do anything out of a habit or principle of love to God.

*Sect. 2.* Secondly, For actual love, how can they account the acts of it needful, when they make the habits or principle from whence the acts must flow to be unnecessary? But let us view their doctrine about this more distinctly. The acts of love are either more foreign and remote, which they call *imperate*, or native and proper, which they call *elicit* acts.

For the former, all acts of religion and righteousness, that they may be truly Christians, such as the gospel requires in order to salvation; that they may have a real tincture of divine and supernatural goodness, and be advanced above the pitch at which heathen or graceless persons may arrive, they must proceed from love to God, and be ordered and directed by it. This they sometimes not only confess, but assert; and yet, notwithstanding, they teach<sup>4</sup> that it is not needful to perform any such acts, or to observe any commands of God out of love to him.<sup>5</sup> The commands of God, saith De Graffis, do not oblige us to perform them in love; he clears his meaning by an instance: for he sins not, nor is punished of God, who gives due honour to his parents, although he have not the habit of piety (and so though he do it not out of such a principle), much less, adds he, doth the church oblige any one to observe the command in love;<sup>6</sup> for if the end of the precept be love, saith Canus, we are not forthwith bound to observe all the commands out of love. The reason is premised; for in the opinion of Aquinas and the most grave authors, we are not bound to observe the end or

<sup>1</sup> Aquinas ii. 2, q. iii. art. ccxxiii. *Ea quæ sunt necessaria ad salutem cadere sub præcepto.*—Canus, *ibid.* p. 857. *Ea omnia quæ necessaria sunt necessitate medii, censentur necessaria necessitate præcepti, licet non quæcunque necessaria sunt necessitate præcepti, sint etiam necessaria necessitate medii.*—Bellarm. *de pœnit.* l. ii. c. viii. p. 935; Suarez. l. i. de Orat. c. xxix. n. ii., ex D. Thom. ii. 2, q. ii. art. v. et q. iii., art. ii. et iii. q. lxviii. a. i.

<sup>2</sup> Præceptiones legis non sunt de habitibus—non enim jubemur persolvere debita ex habitu justitiæ, aut liberalitatis; sed tantum persolvere ad justum.—*Nat. et Grat.* l. i. c. xxi. p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> Cum præcipit Deus ut juste sobrièque vivamus, non imperat ut ista faciamus ex habitu, sed tantum ut faciamus.—*De grat. et lib. arb.* l. vi. c. vii. p. 664.

<sup>4</sup> Utrum tenemur conformare voluntatem in modo volendi cum Deo? Resp. secundum Alexand. et Lombard in i. dist. xlviij., quod non absolute: quoniam si homo honorat patrem suum, non ex charitate, sed ex benevolentia, non peccat: sed tenetur conditionaliter scil. si vult mereri vitam æternam.—*Angel. sum.* v. voluntas n. vi.

<sup>5</sup> Præcepta Dei non obligant, ut perficiantur in charitate: non enim peccat, nec a Deo punitur, qui debitum honorem impendit parentibus, quamvis non habeat habitum pietatis, ergo multo minus ecclesia obligat quenquam, ut illud impleat in charitate.—*Decis. Aur. pars.* ii. l. iii. c. xvii. n. x. p. 176. Non tamen tenemur semper operari ex charitate, sed satis est operari ex aliqua honestate morali.—*Suarez.* l. i. de orat. c. xxx. n. iii.

<sup>6</sup> Non enim si finis præcepti charitas est, tenemur protinus omnia præcepta legis implere ex charitate.—Ex D. Thomæ, et graviorum autorum sententia, ad finem legislatoris minime tenemur, sed ad media, quæ lex finis gratiæ consequendi præscribit. *pars.* iv. relect. de pœnit. p. 871.

intention of the lawgiver, *i. e.* of Christ, but the means which the law prescribes in order to it. Soto discourseth this at large, and concludes : Love being considered as the universal condition and mode of acting all virtues, and performing all obedience, such a mode of acting out of love is not commanded, as when we are enjoined to honour parents, the precept binds us not to honour them out of love to God.<sup>1</sup> This he delivers as the doctrine of Aquinas, and finds but<sup>2</sup> one doctor amongst them of opinion that we are bound to do all out of love to God ; but<sup>3</sup> condemns this as false and very near the Lutheran error condemned by the council of Trent, because then all acts done without grace would be sins. So we must believe (if we will not venture to fall under the condemnation of their council) that it is no sin not to obey God out of love to him ; that all acts of virtue and obedience whatsoever may be performed without sin, though they be done without love to God ; that any man baptized may be saved, though he never act out of love to God, no, not so much as once while he lives ; though he perform not one act of a true Christian while he is on earth. He can never perish for want of love to God in any, or all the acts of his life ; for he will never be damned but for sin, and to act without love to God is no sin. Thus their chief doctors determine, and this they must all do, in conformity to the decrees of their infallible council, and be deluded infallibly in a matter of no less consequence than the way to heaven, believing that they may arrive there without acts of love, filial obedience, or ingenuous observance of God in anything that he hath commanded, without ever acting as (and so without being at all) true Christians.

*Sect. 3.* But though they do not transgress other commands, when they observe them without love, yet they may violate that special command which requires inward acts of love, if at that time when this obligeth they do not act out of love. Some of them seem to say this, and we shall see what they make of it in the next place.

The nature and proper issue of love is its internal act, when the heart being possessed with a principle of divine love to God in Christ, actually loves him above all. If this actual love (the inward act of it) be not necessary, as there will be no need of the habit (that being but in order to acts), so there will be no place for the imperate acts ; for those who would have us sometimes observe other commands out of love, yet never think this requisite, but when the precept obligeth us to actual love.<sup>4</sup>

Now, whether there be any command for this act of love, or whether it oblige, or when, they are not agreed, only in the issue they conspire to make the commandment of no effect.

Some of them determine that the command to love God with all our mind is not obliging ; which is all one as if they should say, There is no command

<sup>1</sup> Actus charitatis consideratur ut est universalis conditio, et modus omnium virtutum.—Modus talis charitatis non cadit sub præcepto ; quod est dicere in hoc præcepto, Honora patrem et matrem, non includitur ut sint parentes ex Dei charitate honorandi : sed quod exhibeatur eis exterior reverentia.—*De just. et iur.* l. ii. q. iii. art. x. p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Dionysius Cisterciensis.

<sup>3</sup> Hæc autem opinio non solum falsa, verum et errori quam proxima est Trid. Synodo Can. vii., adversus Lutheranos damnato, nempe cuncta opera, quæ extra Dei gratiam fiunt, esse peccata.—*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Neque hoc præceptum universum obligat ad suum ipsius modum, sed quando occurrit articulus interne diligendi.—*Soto, ibid.*

Tenemur secundum Bonaventur.—pro loco et tempore, quum viz. tenemur exire in actum charitatis.—*Angeli.* Sum. v. voluntas. n. vi. : et hoc si habemus charitatem ; si autem non habemus, non tenemur ad hoc, sed ad æquivalens : quoniam tenemur facere quod in nobis est, ut eam habeamus.—*Ibid.*

for it at all. Thus Stapleton, one of the greatest divines amongst them in his time, The precept of loving God with all our mind is doctrinal, and not binding.<sup>1</sup>

To the same effect others conclude there is no special precept of love to God. So John Sanctus,<sup>2</sup> There is no special command in the law of God for this, but general, says he. By which he would have us understand, that there is no precept in particular for loving God, none besides those commands that require other things; which, if they be done, we are discharged from any act of love, or inward affection to him. Aquinas is vouched for this, and much alleged out of him,<sup>3</sup> to shew he was of this persuasion. If there be any special precept for this affection to God, it is that which requires us to love him with all the heart, and soul, and strength; but this (as Cardinal Cajetan<sup>4</sup> declares) does not oblige to the love of charity. And Bannez<sup>5</sup> teaches, that for natural love there is no special command; and so amongst them they leave no such command for any sort of love to God at all. The command to love God with all our hearts, Maldonate<sup>6</sup> will have to be a general, no special precept.

Others of them confess there is a special command obliging us to love God actually; but they put such a construction upon it, that it signifies little or nothing more than if there were no such thing. They say it is requisite that we should love God one time or other; but what time this is needful, you will never learn of them; what period one fixeth, another unfixeth; and while they find no certain time for it, in the end they leave no place for it.

They all agree in this, that we are not bound to love God always actually; for, say they, the precept for it is affirmative, and such precepts bind not at all times.

But since we are not obliged to love God at all times, at what determined time is this required of us? Are we to love him after we are fallen into sin; is that the article of necessity? No; Canus<sup>7</sup> supposeth that this will be generally denied, that a man is obliged to love God soon after he hath sinned.

Are we to love him when he vouchsafes some special favour; when he discovers his infinite goodness and amiableness, and makes the most lovely representations of himself to us? One would think, then, if any time at all, we should be obliged to love him actually. No, saith the same bishop,<sup>8</sup> and he no Jesuit or late casuist, he sins not mortally (*i. e.* he transgresseth no command of God) who loves him not, how much soever he discovers his divine goodness, and most enamouring loveliness, unless it be when it is

<sup>1</sup> Hoc præceptum diligendi Deum ex tota mente, doctrinale est, non obligatorium.—*De Justific. l. vi. t. x.*

<sup>2</sup> Disp. i. n. xxi.

<sup>3</sup> II. ii. q. xlv. art. i. ad. iii., et art. iv. ad. ii., et art. vi. ad. ii., et 484, art. iii. ad. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Comment. in Deut. xvi., in Catherin. adv. Cajet. p. 268.

<sup>5</sup> Sanctus, *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Respondeo illud non speciale sed generale præceptum esse.—*In Luc. xvii. 10.*

<sup>7</sup> Dr Smith against Pet. Martyr so understands it. And Sancta Clara, quoting him, approves it as being agreeable to the sentiment of his great master.—*Scotus. probl. xii. p. 68.*

<sup>8</sup> Pars. iv. relect. de pœnit. p. 863.

<sup>9</sup> Nec peccat mortaliter, qui non diligit Deum, quantumcumque divina bonitas proponatur, omni dilectione dignissima, nisi necessitatis articulus intercedat. Idem de præcepto fidei et spei videre licet.—*Melch. Canus, ibid.*

Idem affirmat, unumquemque quoties insigne aliquod beneficium a Deo consequitur, teneri ad illud explendum, quod tamen nulla lege, neque ratione efficaci evinci posse videtur, et ita non est asserendum.—*Navar, c. xi. n. vii.*

necessary to love him. And when shall we ever meet with the time when it is necessary, if not in such circumstances as these? If it be not needful to love him, either when we disoblige him, or when he most obligeth us to acts of love; if neither when he is angry with us, nor when he is well pleased, when will, when can it ever be needful?

Let us see if any others amongst them can nick this article of time when this love will be necessary. Are we bound to put forth an act of love on holy days? So Scotus thought. The time, saith he, for observing this command is on holy days; then we are to recollect ourselves, and ascend in mind unto God. He would have had this love to be a holiday habit at least, if not fit for every day's wearing. But this is too much (say others), nor do they find any reason why this imagination should come in the subtle doctor's head; Canus saith,<sup>1</sup> without all doubt it is to be rejected, and so they do. Scotus herein is borne down by the full torrent of their doctors. I find none now that will have us obliged to love God so often.

But since they think it too much to love God every holiday, are we bound to love him upon his own day? No, not once a week neither;<sup>2</sup> for though the church oblige them to be present at his worship, to mind things above, to praise his infinite divinity, and to give thanks for his bounty towards them, yet in all this they are not bound to any act of love; and Soto gives this reason for it: The end of the commandment (which is love) is not commanded. The assertion is hardly so absurd as the reason given for it, that the end, which is the principal in moral actions, should not be commanded. This is to say, that the law does not require to be fulfilled; for love, which is 'the end of the commandment,' is by the apostle expressly said to be 'the fulfilling of the law.' But, notwithstanding all this, in this maxim (which is one of their chief engines, whereby they demolish Christianity in the practice of those who profess it; make void the commandments of God, depriving them of their life and spirit, and leave nothing of the whole body of religion but the mere superficies),<sup>3</sup> their divines, he tells us, unanimously agree with Aquinas. So that, it seems, the worship of God may be sufficiently discharged without any love to him. We may serve him well enough (as far as the command for his service will have us) without any affection. In all acts of worship, there needs not any act of love (by their doctrine) in any part, or any of the times of worship, either their own holidays, or the Lord's. They have no more respect to his than theirs, nor for him in either, but serve them and him all alike, and think they hallow them, and honour him enough, without any motion of love in their hearts, when (if ever it were needful in their account) it should be most in motion. Cer-

<sup>1</sup> Libere possum sine omni dubitatione negare.—*Ibid.* p. 871.

Dura videtur Scoti sententia, a quo recedit Adrianus, nempe, nos, omnibus festivis diebus teneri ad illud, quia nullus est textus, nec ulla ratio, quæ id necessario concludat, et ita non videtur asserendum.—*Nav.* c. xi. n. vii. Sententia negans necessitatem hujus actus in die festo, et vera et communis est: et sumitur ex D. Thom. ii. 2. q. cxxii. art. iv., quatenus ait per præceptum de observatione sabbati non fuisse mandatum cultum internum per orationem, vel devotionem internam, nam eadem est ratio de amore, ut Cajetan, Navar, Soto, et cæteri communiter.—*Suar.* l. ii. de fest. c. xvi. n. xiii.; Aquinas, ii. 2. q. cxxii. art. iv.; Bellarm. de cult. Storum. lib. iii. c. x. p. 1609; Graff. l. ii. c. xxxiii. n. viii.; Covarruvias, l. iv. varia. resol. c. xix. n. vi.; Soto, de just. et jure. l. ii. q. iv. art. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Quamvis finis ecclesiæ obligantis nos interesse sacris fuerit, ut superna animo meditantes, immortalī Deo, tum ob infinitam suam divinitatem, laudes dicamus, tum de sua in nos beneficentia habeamus gratias: tamen finis præcepti non cadit sub præcepto.—*Nat. et Gr.* l. i. c. xxii. p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> Theologi consentienter agnoscunt cum S. Thoma.—*Ibid.* c. xxii. p. 54

tainly those that think not this love due to God in his worship, think it not due to him at all.

But if it be more than needs to love God<sup>1</sup> once a week, are they obliged at least to love him once a year, if not at ordinary times, yet upon extraordinary or special occasions, such as more particularly seem to call for some act of love; when they are to partake of some sacrament, when they come to the eucharist, or to the sacrament of penance (as they are to do once yearly by their church orders)? No; it is not then necessary neither.<sup>2</sup> It is false, saith Navarre, that we are bound to fulfil this command when we receive any sacrament; for it is enough that we be not in mortal sin, or that we probably believe so, although no such actual love be conceived in the heart. We are not bound to that love (saith he) when we minister, or receive the sacraments; because we are not then bound to have contrition. Those that make such hard shifts to discharge themselves from the obligation of loving God, whenever occasion is offered, will scarce think it needful to love him upon no occasion; and what occasion can we think of upon which it will be counted requisite, if not on these already specified? If not after sin, if not upon the receipt of mercy, if not on any day of worship, if not in any part of worship; if these be not occasions for it, who can hope they will ever meet with any? If an act of love be not requisite once a week, or once a year, on such an account as would make it so, if any imaginable could do it, it will not be a duty in any week, or any year, in a whole life; those that discharge themselves of it in such circumstances, do plainly enough discharge it for ever.

But since they would make a show of finding some time for it (though their determinations all along are pregnant with a denial of any), let us proceed with them a little further. If an act of love be not due to God once a year, yet may it be a duty once in four or five years? Soto and Ledesma, in Filliutus, ventured to think it may be requisite once in five years; and he gives this reason for it: Because the time is not determined, but left to the judgment of the wise; but (saith he) thus wise divines have thought.<sup>3</sup>

Thus love to God, the greatest duty that we owe the divine Majesty, and that which is the sum of all the rest, is left to men's arbitrement; and if two or three reputed wise shall judge that God is to have no love at all, or but one act of love in a whole life, that must be the rule; God and man must be determined by it. Man will owe no more, and the Lord must have no more. Those of their divines have had the repute of wise, who thought it enough to love God once in a lifetime, as well as such who conceive it probable that he should have an act of love once in five years, or once in seven, for thither it may be adjourned by our author's leave.<sup>4</sup>

The Jansenists charge this opinion upon the late Jesuits, and would have all the odium cast upon them; but they go about to lead us into a mistake,

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Suarez. tom. iii. disp. lxiii. sect. iii. p. 801, in 3 Thomæ.

<sup>2</sup> Eadem ratione teneremur implere hoc mandatum quotiescunque aliquod sacramentum recipimus—quod falsum est: satis enim est, ut non simus in mortali peccato, aut probabiliter id credamus, quamvis hujusmodi adeo excelsum amorem actualem animo non concipiamus.—*Navar*, c. xi. n. ix.

Non tamen ad id tenemur quoties administramus aut accipimus sacramenta—quia non tenemur tunc habere contritionem.—*Ibid.* n. viii.

<sup>3</sup> Quia cum determinatum tempus non sit, relinquitur arbitrio sapientum. Sic autem sapientes theologi arbitrati sunt, ut Soto et Ledesma, &c. tr. xxii. l. ix. n. cxc. ; alii putant satisfieri præcepto, si semel in anno eliciatur actus amoris Dei; alii si tertio quoque anno, alii si non differatur ultra quinquennium.—*Petr. a S. Joseph*, sum. de i. præcept. art. iv.

<sup>4</sup> Tr. vi. n. ccviii.

if they would have us believe that these, and other horrid conceits concerning an actual love to God, are confined to that society; they are too common amongst those doctors who are of greatest repute, and judged free from extravagancies in their morality, and more tenacious of what they would have accounted the genuine doctrine of their church.

There were many in the time of the Council of Trent, when Jesuitism was but in its infancy, who held it enough to love God actually but once in a lifetime. One act of love,<sup>1</sup> once in a life, which some count enough, saith Soto; and these some, he tells us afterwards, were very many.

In the time of Francis de Victoria, who lived till the council of Trent had sat a year, this was the common doctrine, that a man is but obliged to love God once in his life. For upon the question, when the precept for love obligeth, he says, '*Nec videtur sufficiens solutio communis, quod tenetur semel in vita, Relect. part. iii. n. 11.* The common answer, that one is bound to it once in a life seems not sufficient;—he speaks modestly, as one loath to dissent from the common doctrine.—That council (who, if it had been concerned for God and men's souls, as it was for other things, would have appeared in all its thunder against such an error) mends this, as it did other matters, by establishing a doctrine which makes it needless to love God so much as once in a life; of which hereafter.

But when is that once? They leave us at liberty for the time, so it be but before we die. Suarez was not alone in this: as he wants not followers, so he had many that went before him in this conclusion, and those not Jesuits only; for it is grounded upon the notion which the Romish doctors have of affirmative precepts, when the time for their accomplishment is not expressed. They teach, that such divine commands, divers of them are fulfilled, and have sufficient observance, if they be but obeyed, *semel in vita*, once in a lifetime. Those that are very cautious express it with a *saltem*, once *at least* in a whole life, intimating that though more may be better, yet once is as much as is precisely needful; and this they extend to such things as, by the Lord's constitution, are means necessary to salvation.<sup>2</sup> There are precepts, saith Canus, without determination of time, which oblige us to observe them some times, at least once in our life, such as are the means necessary to salvation. But in what part of our life must it be, that the Lord must have this act of love from us, which is enough once in the whole? Why, since neither the Scripture nor the church, say they, hath determined the time, there is no reason for one time more than another; it is left to a man's own discretion,<sup>3</sup> to love God when he thinks fit, let him do it before he die, and he may take his own time; so some leave it.

But Vasquez would not leave it at such uncertainty, so he fixeth the period, and that is the period of a man's life; he determines, the time for

<sup>1</sup> *Semel in vita, quod quidam satis arbitrantur.—De Nat. et Grat. l. i. c. xxii. p. 58.*

<sup>2</sup> *Alia vero præcepta sunt sine determinatione temporis, quæ videlicet nos obligant, ut aliquando impleantur, saltem semel in vita, ut sunt media ad salutem necessaria, pars. iv. relect. de pœnit. p. 968.*

<sup>3</sup> *Sed quæras tandem, quodnam sit tempus illud quo divina charitas obligat ante mortem ad habendam Dei dilectionem: hoc est enim, quod oppositum sentientes maxime movet; et nos etiam plurimum torquet, quia non possumus tempus hoc in particulari certo et definite designare—Illud vero tempus, si non sit positiva lege præscriptum, prudenti arbitrio ipsius hominis, vel alterius, qui (ejus conscientia cognita) possit auxilium præstare, committendum est.*

*Neque aliquam regulam certiore, aut magis particularem assignare possum, tam in hoc præcepto, quam in aliis affirmativis, præsertim circa actus, quia ad Deum ordinantur, sola ac nuda ratione naturali perspectis.—Suarez, tom. iv. disp. xv. sect. vi. n. xx.*

loving God is when a man is at the point of death.<sup>1</sup> Nor is this the doctrine of a Jesuit only; for before his time, and before the Society was founded, it was the common opinion of the Romish doctors; so Dominicus Soto informs us,<sup>2</sup> very many hold that the time for the observing of this command is at the point of death, that is (as he explains it) when there is not any time left for deserving aught of God. Now every act of love being meritorious with them, either they contradict themselves, or by this opinion they are not bound to love God actually, till there be no time left for any acts of love. We are not by this doctrine obliged to love God, till we can live no longer, and are past acting at all.

But are we then bound to love him, is it then necessary? May not a man be saved, who hath continued without love to God all his life, if he love him not actually, neither, when he is a-dying? For this, observe what Aquinas tells us,<sup>3</sup> that we do not break this command, but fulfil it, so as to be free from all mortal guilt, if we do nothing against the love of God, that is, if we run not into mortal sin, and so hate him; as a soldier satisfies his captain's command, who, though he get not the victory, yet doth nothing against military discipline; or as Bonaventure explains it,<sup>4</sup> *per exclusionem affectus contrarii*, by the exclusion of the contrary affection, as if it were sufficient that he do not hate him.

Marsilius<sup>5</sup> (of great renown for learning amongst their divines), will have that which the command for love enjoins, to be the keeping of grace and friendship with God, and the recovering of it when lost. So that it doth not oblige to actual love, but only to the avoiding of habitual enmity and hatred of God.

But what if we hate God, and persist therein; is it not absolutely necessary that he should beware of that? It seems not; for saith one of their doctors, there is no precept that a sinner should not persevere in enmity against God; there is no negative command which forbids him to persist in such hatred. It may be you do not read this (no more than I could) without some horror and trembling; and I confess, when I found Reginaldus quoted for this, I was ready to think it was but the extravagancy of some

<sup>1</sup> Merito ergo diximus esse præceptum dilectionis, et solum extrema necessitate obligare, sicut præceptum contritionis, sed non quemcunque, sed tantum existentem in mortali, non supplementem suam justificationem per sacramentum.—In 3 Th. tom. iii. q. xc. art. i. dub. iv. n. xl. So that the command to love God does not oblige any but at the point of death, nor any then who are justified, nor any other in the state of sin, unless they cannot have the sacrament.

<sup>2</sup> Plerique aiunt, tempus hujus præcepti, illud maxime esse, quod est articulus mortis.—*Ibid.* Quando jam nullum superest tempus bene merendi de Deo.—*Ibid.*

Besides these many in Soto, others determine with Vasquez, that love to God is never a duty but at the point of death. So Jo. Sanctius; Hæc videtur verior sententia, disp. i. n. xxi., et Antonin. Dian. alii velint solum obligare in articulo mortis.—*Verb. Charitas.* And before them, others in Bonacina, alii dicunt obligare solum tempore mortis, i. præcept. d. iii. q. iv. p. 2, n. i. And we must take it to be the opinion of all, who hold that this precept obliges not, but when we are bound to an act of contrition; and they commonly maintain that none are obliged to this before the approach of death, nor any that are in the state of grace then; no, nor any that are in mortal sin, if they will use those other expedients which their general council or other doctors have devised, to discharge them from the obligation of a duty, to which not only the gospel but the law of nature binds all rational creatures eternally.

<sup>3</sup> Qui in vita hoc præceptum non implet (viz. perfecte). Nihil contra divinum dilectionem agens, non peccat mortaliter, xxii. q. xlv. art. vi. ad ii.

<sup>4</sup> In iii. dist. xxvii. n. lviii.

<sup>5</sup> Marsilius vir profecto inter theologos egregie doctus, l. ii. q. xviii., tenet, lege hac dilectionis obligari homines, servare gratiam et amicitiam Dei, et perditam recuperare.—*Soto de Nat. et Grat.* l. i. c. xxii. p. 57.

singularly bold Jesuit; but upon further inquiry, I find it asserted by such whose writings have the greatest approbation of the Romish church. Melchior Canus, a Dominican, a bishop, cried up as a most elegant, judicious, and cautious writer too, and inferior to none of that order, their angelical doctor only excepted, clearly delivers this doctrine,<sup>1</sup> we are not bound by any negative precept that we should not be enemies of God, in respect of guilt. He adds, for as there is no affirmative precept requiring habitual friendship with God, so for habitual enmity against God in respect of guilt, there is no negative precept that forbids it. So that to persist in enmity and hatred against God, by their approved doctrine, is no sin, it is against no command.

We need not allege the words of any other, since this is the plain and necessary consequent of their common doctrine; and we must take it to be the judgment of all, who hold that it is no sin to delay contrition (*i. e.* repentance and turning to God) in which both their ancients school doctors and modern divines agree. For while it is no duty to turn to God, habitual enmity and hatred of him will be no sin. Now, contrition (and so conversion to God) they say may be deferred till death. Indeed, by their doctrine it will never be a duty; for even at death, the last attrition, with their sacrament of confession, is all that is needful.

*Sect. 4.* However, they make it unnecessary to love God either living or dying. For though they pretend that there is a time, some or other, when the precept for it is obliging, and make a show as if then unavoidably, he that will be saved must have an act of love for God in his heart; yet whenever that time comes, in life or death, to which their several fancies have determined it, they discover to them many ways whereby the precept may be satisfied, without any act of love that it requires; and those which have a mind to be deceived with hopes of heaven, without ever loving God while they live, may have their choice which way they will be deluded, for they present them with variety. First, a natural love will serve the turn, such as a graceless man may have. For Aquinas determines after others, that he that hath no love to God may observe the precept of loving him actually, by disposing himself to receive this grace;<sup>2</sup> and whereas some think that this great precept of loving God, since Adam's sin, cannot be fulfilled but in the state of grace, Navar asserts the contrary, both upon reason and authority, because a man by his natural power, remaining also in mortal sin, may and doth conceive God to be amiable above all, and the last end of all, and consequently can love him as such; as also, because there may be a love for God above all, without grace, as Cajetan proves; moreover, because St Thomas affirms that one may, without grace, fulfil the command of loving God, as to the substance of the act, though not as to the meriting of blessedness.

Elsewhere he affirms<sup>3</sup> that all the ten commandments, and all other precepts, may be fulfilled by him who is in mortal sin as to the substance of the act, so as to avoid all sin that would be incurred if they were not fulfilled;

<sup>1</sup> At ne simus inimici Dei secundum reatum, nullo negativo præcepto sumus stricti. Sicut enim de amicitia habituali nullum præceptum affirmativum est, sic de inimicitia, quæ secundum reatum est, quasi habitualis, nullum est negativum.—*Pars. iv. relect. de pœnit. p. 870.*

<sup>2</sup> Non est impossibile hoc præceptum observare, quod est de actu charitatis: quia homo potest se disponere ad charitatem habendam, et quando habuerit eam, potest ea uti, l. ii. q. c. art. x. corp.

<sup>3</sup> Contra quod tamen facit, quod homo sola virtute naturali, etiam existens in peccato mortali, potest concipere, imo concipit, partim Deum esse super omnia diligibilem, et finem omnium ultimum, et consequenter eum ut talem diligere potest. Deinde quod datur dilectio Dei super omnia, sine gratia, ut probat Cajetanus. Præ-

and this, according to the judgment of Aquinas,<sup>1</sup> commonly followed, and the sense of the Council of Trent.<sup>2</sup> They assign, we see, two ways whereby the divine precept may be fulfilled. One as to the substance of the act, so as sin is avoided, and the other as to the end of the lawgiver, so as to deserve heaven. And they teach that any precept may be accomplished the former way by such as are destitute of grace. Now to observe the command of loving God, so far as not to sin against it, is all that is required, if Bellarmine's arguing be good. If I sin not, saith he, when I love God, without<sup>3</sup> degree of love (in the judgment of St Thomas), certainly I am not bound in strictness to love him more; therefore, if I add another degree, I love him more than I am bound to do.<sup>4</sup> So that an unsanctified man, loving God in such a degree as not to sin against the precept of love, hath all the affection for God that it requires; and none will be obliged to any love but such as is natural, and may be found in a graceless heart.

Secondly, An inferior degree of love will satisfy the command, such as is far short of what it enjoins. He is no transgressor (saith the oracle of their schools) who attains not the intermediate degrees towards perfection, if he reach but the very lowest of all.<sup>5</sup> To keep the divine precepts (saith Bellarmine), any degree of love whatsoever is sufficient.<sup>6</sup> Any act of love (saith Bannes), how remiss soever, is sufficient to fulfil all the commands of God; neither is there any certain intensionness requisite that one in this life may accomplish the precept of love to God.<sup>7</sup> The Lord requires that we love him with all our hearts, *i. e.* with all the affection our hearts can contain; they say that any, the smallest degree, will suffice. He enjoins us to love him with all our might, *i. e.* as much as we can. They say it is enough to love him as little as we can; we need not love him as much as we might if we would; no more is commanded but as little as possible. The lowest degree of all will serve; and if we advance but another step, we supererogate, and God is beholden to us for more than is due.

Their gross mistake about the perfection of obedience in this life entangles them in a necessity to maintain this and other impious absurdities. For if every just person perfectly observes the law, the least degree must be sufficient for such an observance; and when this command, declared with such circumstance, of loving God with all our hearts, mind, and strength, doth

terea, quod ipsemet S. Thomas affirmat posse quem sine gratia implere præceptum diligendi Deum quoad substantiam actus, licet non quoad meritum beatitudinis, cap. xi. n. vii; v. Soto de just. et jur. l. ii. q. iii. art. x. p. 44, col. ii.

<sup>1</sup> Universa ista x. præcepta et alia omnia, possunt impleri ab illo, qui est in peccato mortali, quoad substantiam actus et præcepti, et effectum evitandi novum peccatum, quod incurreret si non adimpleret illud, juxta definitionem Aquinatis communiter recepti quod Conc. Tridentinum sensit, &c.—*Ibid.* n. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> Deum ab homine posse diligi super omnia, viribus propriis, sine auxilio gratiæ (dicunt), Scotus, Cajetan, Nominales, Petr. Alliaco, Ocham, Almain, Major, Durandus, apud Vasq. in i. ii. disp. cxciv. cap. i.

<sup>3</sup> Qu. 'with one'?—Ed.

<sup>4</sup> Si non pecco, ex sententia S. Thomæ, si amem Deum, nisi uno gradu amoris, certe non teneor in rigore amplius amare:—ergo si addam alterum gradum amoris, amo plus quam teneor.—*De Monach.* l. ii. c. xiii. p. 1162.

<sup>5</sup> Non est transgressor præcepti, qui non attingit ad medios perfectionis gradus, dummodo attingat ad infimum, 2. ii. q. clxxxiv. art. iii. ad secundum.

<sup>6</sup> Sufficit autem quilibet charitatis gradus ut quis servet verbum, *i. e.* præcepta domini.—*De Purgat.* l. ii. c. iii. p. 1381.

<sup>7</sup> Quælibet actum charitatis quantumlibet remissum, sufficere ad implendum omnia præcepta: neque ullam determinatam intensionem requiri, ut aliquis in hac vita adimplat præceptum dilectionis Dei, in 2. ii. q. xlv. art. v.

Dilectionis mandatum in quolibet gradu intensionis impleatur. For this Jo. San. alleges Aquinas, and near twenty more of their divines, besides Jesuits, disp. i. n. xxi.

especially puzzle them, they are concerned either to deny its obligation, as some of them do, or to interpret it so as to make it signify that which is next to nothing, as others. All of them are obliged to deface it one way or other, that it may not appear to confound them.

But to go on. If we are not bound to love God save in the lowest degree, yet that degree sure should exceed our affection to all other things. No, not so neither; for they tell us commonly we are not obliged to love God more intensely than other things. So Cardinal Tolet.<sup>1</sup> Yea, saith he, sometimes we more fervently love things sensible and the creatures. Navarre,<sup>2</sup> after Aquinas, and their divines, ancient and modern, concur herein.

It is true, they say, God should be loved appreciatively (as to valuation, and in esteem) above all; but then by *all* they understand, not simply all things, but the worst things of all. In those, the worst of evils, he is to have the pre-eminence; but the creatures are not such evils, and they may be preferred before God in most cases. By their doctrine we may prefer the judgment of others, or our own, before the advice of God in all matters of mere counsel, and to this they have reduced the greatest part of Christian duties; and we may follow our own wills, or the will of others, rather than God's continually, and make this the constant practice of our lives in all those innumerable evils which they count venial. And so in the most instances by far we may love and esteem ourselves and others more than God, and yet love him enough, and not transgress the precept. We need not love him more than all creatures; we may love any creature more than him, even in way of valuation; only he is to have this honour, and this will be enough, to love him more than deadly crimes, such as declare open hostility against God. This is all the import of that great precept which concerns us in this life, as it is expressed after Aquinas by Soto and others.<sup>3</sup>

Yea, to admit mortal sin, and so to love the creature more than God, in that respect in which alone they say he is more to be loved, is not against this precept. So Navar informs us.<sup>4</sup> Indirectly, saith he, to love the creature more than God is not against this command (of love), because whoever sins mortally, indirectly loves something more than God; yet such a delinquent doth not therefore sin against the precept, because directly he doth nothing against it, nor acts what in itself, and in its own nature, separates from God, but by accident, according to Aquinas and Scotus. So that

<sup>1</sup> Quantum ad intensionem vero non tenemur sub præcepto illum plus diligere: imo aliquando ferventius amamus res sensibiles et creaturas.—*Instr.* l. iv. c. ix. p. 614.

<sup>2</sup> Cap. xi. n. vi., et cap. i. n. iv. p. 57; Gabriel, Major, Jo. Medina, Domin. Soto, Navar, Sylvester, Paludanus, in Vasquez, in i., ii. tom. i. disp. cxxxiv. cap. iii. n. xiii.

<sup>3</sup> Nihil divinæ amicitiae contrarium admittat, juxta evangelicam vocem, *ex toto corde*, &c., contrarium inquam: quoniam venialia non obstant dilectioni Dei super omnia.—*De Nat. et Grat.* l. i. c. xxii. p. 56.

*Ex toto corde*, idem sit quod nihil charitatis adversum mentis assensu concipere.—*Idem de Just. et Jur.* l. vii. q. v. art. i. p. 244.

Ut transgressionis delictum quis evitet, satis est ut nihil contrarium charitati ejusque præceptis committat.—*Idem*, *ibid.* p. 242.

Non tamen peccamus, dummodo nihil divinæ dilectioni contrarium agamus.—*Sylvest.* v. charitas. n. iii. Vid. Bonaventur, iii. dist. xxvii. n. lviii.; Graff. l. i. c. iii. n. ix.; Sta. Clar. probl. xii. p. 67.

<sup>4</sup> Admonemus item indirecte diligere creaturam amplius quam Deum non esse contra hoc præceptum, quoniam quicumque peccat mortaliter, indirecte plus diligit aliud quam Deum—attamen hujusmodi delinquens, non ideo peccat contra istud præceptum, quoniam directe non facit contra ipsum, neque aliquid operatur, quod secundum se et suam naturam separet a Deo, sed secundum accidens.—*Juxta S. Thom. et Scotum*, cap. xi. n. xix.

to love the creature more than God, and to shew it in a way which themselves say is most repugnant to the love of God, is no transgression of this command. To say he doth nothing against it directly is no salvo, when that he doth is all which they count (if they count anything) inconsistent with the love commanded. He tells us further,<sup>1</sup> and Lopez after him, that absolutely to love God, but so much, or not so much as other things, without making any comparison, is not evil. So that if God have some affection from us, though we love him less than other things, it is no sin, no transgression of the precept; and if this be not transgressed in the instant when it calls for performance, it is fulfilled.

Thirdly, It will suffice, if nothing be done against love, as we heard before out of Aquinas. So that when the precept of love obligeth, if we then do nothing contrary to that love, we may be excused from the act itself, or from acting anything out of love. For that which they count contrary to it may be avoided out of fear, or other considerations foreign to love; and so the command may be satisfied at the instant, when (if ever) it requires actual love, without any act either of love or from it.

Fourthly, External acts may satisfy. The precept of love, saith Soto,<sup>2</sup> doth not oblige precisely to inward affection, but certainly to some outward act; so elsewhere he explains this loving God above all, by doing his commandments.<sup>3</sup> To the same purpose Maldonate and others.<sup>4</sup> Now if the precept of love may be fulfilled by external acts, or by endeavours to observe the other commands of God, then it requires not the exercise of the inward act of love to him, and so there will be no command for that at all, nor will it be a duty; and all these other commands may be satisfied without any act of love to God in the heart, and we shall love him enough, though we never conceive any actual love for him in our souls.

Fifthly, It will satisfy the precept if a man believe that he loves God above all, though indeed he do not. So Lopez.<sup>5</sup> It is enough to avoid the sin of neglecting this precept, for one to believe probably that he fulfils it at the time when its obligation occurs. Navarre had concluded this before him.<sup>6</sup> He that believes God, probably believing that he is in the state of grace, and that his love is a love of God above all, although in truth it is no such thing, nor he in such a state; nevertheless, the precept is fulfilled by him, so far, that he is not then guilty of sin for omitting the observance of it. He adds this reason for it: Because, without special revelation, no

<sup>1</sup> Licet diligere Deum comparative minus quam illum, vel æque ac illum, sit malum: diligere tamen eum absolute, æque vel minus, absque ulla comparatione, non est malum, c. xi. n. x., et n. xviii., et cap. i. viii. Ut facile colligat quis ex dicto Couc. Trident.

<sup>2</sup> Lopez, cap. x. p. 217.

<sup>3</sup> Præceptum dilectionis non præcise ad internum affectum obligat, sed certe ad externum opus.—*De just. et jur.* l. ii. q. iii. art. x. p. 44. Col. ii. Cum vero dicitur, Diliges, non tam exigitur delectio affectus, quam charitas operis.—*Molanus. Theol. pract.* Tract. iii. c. xvi. n. v.

<sup>4</sup> Diligere Deum super omnia, est omnia in ipsum referre, puta, omnia præcepta ejus facere.—*De nat. et grat.* l. i. c. xxii. p. 57.

<sup>5</sup> In Luc. xvii. 10, p. 435.

<sup>6</sup> Vide S. Clara. Probl. xii. p. 68.

So Bannes concludes that the precept for love is fulfilled by receiving the eucharist once a year. Absque scrupulo credi potest, quod qui digne sumit eucharistiam semel in anno, adimplet simul speciale præceptum charitatis, in xxii. q. xliv. art. Yet (as we saw before) it is their common doctrine, that the eucharist may be worthily received without any act of love, or other grace, or any actual disposition that is gracious.

<sup>6</sup> Satis est ad evitandum peccatum omissionis hujus præcepti, probabiliter quis credat, se illud implere tempore, quo occurrit ejus obligatio, cap. xl. p. 217.

man can know when he is in the state of grace, as the Council of Trent determines; and so unless we maintain this, we cannot know when we fulfil the precept.<sup>1</sup> Thus, though his determination seem strange and desperate, yet the ground he proceeds on is a principle of their faith, and obligeth all to be of his persuasion who submit to that council. He declares himself further to this purpose: He sins mortally who loves not God at that time when he is bound to do it, under the pain of mortal sin, that is, when there is danger of death, or necessity of receiving or administering a sacrament, unless he probably believe that he hath grace or charity;<sup>2</sup> for then he would have us believe it is not sin, as his limitation shews. Here we have the times specified wherein the precept of loving God obligeth, and these are but two, and the latter of them himself expungeth, concluding it false that we are bound to love God at a sacrament.<sup>3</sup> So that a man is never bound to love God but when he apprehends death approaching; no, nor at the point of death neither, if then he probably believe that he hath grace and charity, though he have it not; for such a presumption will excuse him from sin if he love not God (as all his life before, so) even when he is dying. Thus is the case resolved according to their common principles, by the most learned and the most pious of their casuists, as Bellarmine honours him, though he was none of the Society.<sup>4</sup>

Sixthly, Attrition, with the sacrament of penance, will excuse any from loving God actually, living or dying, and will secure him from perishing eternally, though he never entertain an act of love for God in life or death. The doctrine of their church obligeth them all to believe this, and if any of their doctors seem to say otherwise, they contradict either that or themselves. For their church requires nothing precisely to put a man into the state of grace and salvation, living or dying, (how long soever he hath persisted in enmity against God, how highly soever he hath expressed his hatred of him), but only a due partaking of the sacrament of penance; and he is sufficiently qualified for such a participation if he be but attrite, that is, as they explain it, if he have but some remorse for sin out of servile fear, not out of love to God (for that fear as servile is contrary to the love of God<sup>5</sup>), so that for this (which they count sufficient to secure his eternal state), even at last gasp, he needs not any act of love to God. And this is not only the opinion of particular doctors, but (as I shall shew hereafter) the doctrine of the council of Trent,<sup>6</sup> and so not only probable with them, but certain.

If a man at the point of death, who never had an act of love for God in all his life, do then ask his confessor whether such an act be needful for him before he die; if the priest tell him it is not necessary, he may safely give up the ghost, and die as he lived, without any actual affection for God; for

<sup>1</sup> Addo, eum qui diligit Deum, probabiliter credens se esse in statu gratiæ, subindeque suum amorem esse amorem Dei super omne aliud, quamvis in rei veritate non sit hujusmodi, neque sit in eodem statu; nihilominus tamen adimplere hoc præceptum, quoad effectum evitandi novum peccatum quod admitteretur ob omissionem implementi ejus, quoniam sine speciali revelatione scire non potest quis, quando est in statu gratiæ; ut definit Conc. Trident. Et ita nisi hoc teneamus, nequiremus scire quando hoc præceptum impleverimus. Cap. xi. n. x.

<sup>2</sup> Peccat mortaliter, qui eo tempore Deum amare negligit, quo sub peccati mortalis reatu tenetur, veluti quando mortis periculum, vel necessitas recipiendi vel administrandi aliquod sacramentum se obtulit, nisi probabiliter crederet se gratiam vel charitatem habere.—*Idem.* ibid. n. xx.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. n. viii. et ix. supra.

<sup>4</sup> Martinus, Aspilcaeta, Navarrus, vir doctissimus, et Piissimus. De script. Eccles. p. 313.

<sup>5</sup> In quantum servilis est contrariatur charitati. So Aquinas. ii. 2, q. xix. art. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Sess. xiv. c. iv.

though he be deluded by his confessor, yet consulting him he has done his endeavour, and so his<sup>1</sup> ignorance, they say, is invincible, and will excuse him. And the priest must tell him that it is more than needs, if he believe the council of Trent, since there it is declared that the sacrament, with attrition (though this include something repugnant to such love), is enough to justify, and pass any into a state of grace, and consequently is sufficient for salvation. And thus they argue,<sup>2</sup> grace is a sufficient cause of glory; hence whatever it is, without which grace may obtained, that is not necessary to salvation; by which account no act of love (nor of any other grace) will be needful for them, that they may be saved.

Thus, in fine, here is a religion which pretends to be Christian, but excuseth and disengageth all that profess it from the love of Christ; a doctrine which bereaves religion of that which themselves count its life, and quite stifles all the spirits of Christianity, chops off all Christian virtues, all gracious acts and qualities in this one neck, and leaves nothing but a ghastly carcase. For obliging them to neglect love as needless, it makes the rest impossible; without it, there can be no saving faith, no godly sorrow, no filial fear, no delight in God, no desire to enjoy him, no genuine gratitude. When the life of a true Christian should be made up of these, they leave it not possible for him to have one act of true Christian virtue, for without love, they say themselves, there cannot be any one true virtue. Here is a way to heaven for those that never loved God in life or death, a path that pretends to heaven, but lies quite cross to the way of Christ, and leads directly to outer darkness; a doctrine that encourageth them to live in hatred of God all their days, and in the end sends them out of the world under the dreadful sentence of of the apostle, 1 Cor. xvi. 22, 'If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be Anathema, maranatha.' To conclude this head, it is a doctrine which is damning, not only meritoriously, but effectually, and will certainly ruin eternally all that believe and practise it, and hath in it the mortal poison and malignity of a hundred such speculative opinions as pass for heresies.

And beside the danger and horrible impiety of this doctrine, it is ridiculous to the very highest degree; for can anything be more senseless, than to ask how often a man ought to love his best friend and benefactor? whether once in his life be not enough in all conscience? nay, whether it be not very fair not to hate him? And, indeed, they state the business all along in such a manner, and manage it with such nicety and caution, not as if they were afraid lest men should love God too little, but as if all the danger lay on the other hand; and their great care were that nobody should love him too much, or love him at all. I do not believe that things so palpably impious and ridiculous were ever so solemnly debated by men of any religion whatsoever.

#### CHAPTER IV.

*There is no necessity of saving or justifying faith by the Romish doctrine.*

*Sect. 1.* That no man can be justified or saved without faith is so evident in Scripture, that none but an infidel can question it. The Romanists do not express any doubt of it, and yet they make no other faith necessary than that which is neither justifying nor saving. They have two sorts of faith,

<sup>1</sup> Sum. Rosel. v. ignorant. n. i. Bonacin. de peccat. disp. iii. q. viii. punct. iii. n. 16. Sta. Clara. Problem. xv. p. 87. Doctores communiter.

<sup>2</sup> Dicendum quod gratia est sufficiens causa gloriæ, unde omne illud sine quo obtineri potest gratia, non est de necessitate salutis.—*Aquinas* in iv. dist. ix. art. i.

one for the unlearned and ignorant, which they call *implicit*; the other for the learned and more knowing, which they say should be *explicit*.

The former, as they describe it, is an assent to some general, including many particulars, with a mind to believe nothing contrary thereunto. The general is this, that whatever the Roman church (which cannot err) believes, is true; the particulars included are they know not what, for they are supposed ignorant. Now this, we say, is no Christian faith, and make it apparent that it is no such thing. For, first, it is no belief of any one particular or article of the Christian faith. It is only a belief of a general, which is no truth at all, much less Christian (that the church of Rome cannot err, or believe anything but what is true), when the ignorant person neither knows what this church is, nor what she believes, nor why he should give her such credit. So that the *act* is a blind conceit, unworthy of a man, or a Christian; and the *object* a general error.

And then as to the particulars which are necessary for Christians to believe, this implicit faith doth not actually believe any of them at all; if it did, it would not be what it is, implicit. It apprehends them not, and therefore cannot believe them; for, as themselves acknowledge,<sup>1</sup> that cannot be believed which is not known. To render this clear to us, they thus explain it. When<sup>2</sup> a man is asked whether Christ were born of the Virgin Mary, and whether there be one God and three persons, and he answers that he knows not, but believes touching these things as the church holds, this is to believe implicitly; so that a man may have this faith completely, and yet not believe an article of the creed; and if this be Christian faith, a man may have it who believes nothing of Christ. They are believers, at this rate, who have a mind to hold what the church doth concerning Christ or the creed, though they never know what that is. They know not what the church holds, unless the church's knowing be their knowledge; and so believe nothing, unless the church's believing be their faith; and so have no faith to save them, unless it be saving faith to believe by an attorney.

Secondly, As this faith may be without the knowledge and belief of any of the particular articles which are necessary to be believed by Christians, so (which is yet more strange) it may be with the belief of what is opposite and repugnant to the Christian faith. This they acknowledge, and clear it to us by instances. A man may be disposed to believe what the church holds, and yet may believe that God the Father and God the Son are not equal, but one greater and elder than the other, or that the persons in the Trinity are locally distant. Such is the virtue of implicit faith, saith Alstentaig,<sup>3</sup> that, if he who hath it believes these errors, or any like them, he would be no heretic; he would not sin, provided he doth not maintain his error pertinaciously, and that he believes because he thinks the Church believes it. Or such a catholic may believe<sup>4</sup> that the three persons in the Godhead are one woman; it would be but a small fault with Angelus to believe this,

<sup>1</sup> Neque enim credi potest quod non cognoscitur.—*Fill.* tr. xxii. n. xxxix.

<sup>2</sup> Bannes. xxii. q. ii. art. viii. sect. *dubitatur secundo*. Sum. Rosel. verb. fides. n. i.

<sup>3</sup> In tantum valet fides implicita, quod si quis habens eam falso opinaretur, ratione naturali motus, Patrem majorem, vel priorem Filio: vel tres personas localiter distare, aut simile quid, non sit hæreticus, non peccet: dummodo hunc errorem pertinaciter non defendat, et hoc ipsum credat, quia credat ecclesiam sic credere. Verb. Credere.—*Sum. Rosel.* v. fides. n. ii. After Pope Innocent and Hostiensis.

<sup>4</sup> Ut puta vetula credit Trinitatem esse unam fæminam, et quoniam credit ecclesiam sic tenere, sic credit: et tamen non est hæretica: quia conditionaliter credit, si ecclesia sic tenet et credit.—*Verb. fides.* n. vi.

thinking the church believes the same. Or he may believe that Christ is not true God and man, and yet not be condemned for it, if the pope believed it too.<sup>1</sup> If trusting a priest (who tells him the church holds it) he believes anything against the articles of faith, he is excused, saith Sancta Clara, after Scotus and Gabriel and others.<sup>2</sup> Though he expressly disbelieve any article of faith, yet he may be said to believe it implicitly.<sup>3</sup> So that he may believe that the creed or the gospel is not to be believed, he may count it a fable (as Pope Leo called it) and yet be a Christian as to his belief, if this be the Christian faith. He may be expressly an heretic or a monstrous misbeliever, and yet implicitly be a faithful Roman catholic.

Thirdly, Such a faith as this Jews and Turks and Pagans have, even the worst of these, who do but acknowledge a God of truth; for they believe what this God reveals is true, and this generally involves all the particulars of the Christian belief, so that if the belief of such a general, without other faith as to the particulars, may be sufficient for papists, such infidels may pass for as true believers, as Roman catholics. Yea, the faith of such catholics will be so much worse than that of these infidels, as it is better to believe God's veracity and revelation than to believe the infallibility of the Roman church, or the truth of all therein believed.

Indeed, such a faith was not counted sufficient for Christians, till Christians were thought to be something like asses. Aquinas inquires whether all be alike obliged to have an explicit faith. He answers negatively, and the ground of his conclusion is Job i. 14, 'The oxen were ploughing, and the asses were feeding beside them;' from whence he argues gravely<sup>4</sup> that the people, who are signified by asses, are to lie down in the faith of their superiors, who are signified by the oxen, as Gregory expounds it. But what if the oxen go astray; what must become of the asses then? Why, they may follow them without hurt, believing that they are right when they are in a wrong way (for they must not have their names for nothing). So he resolves this difficulty. Human knowledge is not the rule of faith, but divine truth,<sup>5</sup> from which, if some of the superiors (the oxen) make defection, that hurts not the faith of the simple (the asses), who believe them to have the right faith. After these two saints, their best pope and their angelical doctor, that we may see we owe not this rare notion (where their whole church is so subtly divided into oxen and asses) to any lower than the most eminent amongst them, Cardinal Bellarmine,<sup>6</sup> their great champion, makes use of the same exposition of that text to maintain the sufficiency of such a faith.

Stapleton would have us believe that they admit not of this implicit faith, save in points of less moment; but herein he misrepresents them, and would delude us; for it is the common doctrine of the Romanists, that an implicit faith in Christ (such as pagans may have, and for which none

<sup>1</sup> Siquis non crederet Christum esse verum Deum et hominem, et idem sentiret papa, eum non iri damnatum. Cardin. St Angeli. ad legatos Bohem. an. 1447.

<sup>2</sup> Rusticus et imperitus qui suo parcho fidem habens, credit aliquid contra articulos fidei, excusatur a peccato.—*Probl.* xv. p. 98.

<sup>3</sup> Licet alicui articulo fidei discredat explicite, credit tamen implicite eidem in generali fide, &c., *ibid.*—*Corduba.*

<sup>4</sup> Quia videlicet minores qui significantur per asinos, debent in credendis adherere majoribus, qui per boves significantur, ut Gregorius exponit in ii. moral.—*Aquinas.* ii. 2. q. ii. art. vi.

<sup>5</sup> Humana cognitio non sit regula fidei, sed veritas divina; a qua sic aliqui majorum deficiunt, non præjudicat fidei simplicium, qui eos rectam fidem habere credunt.—*Aquinas.* *ibid.* ad tertium.

<sup>6</sup> De justific. l. i. c. vii. p. 706.

should have the name of Christians) is sufficient under the gospel to pass any into a justifying or saving state.<sup>1</sup>

This is it which our divines commonly teach, saith Vega,<sup>2</sup> when they say the faith of one mediator, either explicit or implicit, is enough for justification. And Sancta Clara,<sup>3</sup> with others, tell us this is the more common tenet in their schools; and whereas they make some difference between justification and salvation in this point, Bannes helps to remove it. It is neither heresy, saith he, nor error, nor rashness, nor scandal, to assert that a man may also in the same manner be saved, because justification, being the last disposition to glory, it is very probable that he which is justified by an implicit faith, may also, by the same faith, without alteration, be saved.<sup>4</sup>

It is true, they say there is a precept for a more express faith, though no more than this implicit belief in Christ be needful, *necessitate mediæ*. But they have so many ways to exempt infidels (even under the profession of Christians) from its obligation, that few in comparison will be culpable for not observing it. By their doctors they are excused, if they<sup>5</sup> be dull or gross-witted. If they be ignorant or impotent,<sup>6</sup> or if their priest or their parents mislead them,<sup>7</sup> or if the object of faith be not duly proposed,<sup>8</sup> if by slight reasons or by impious persons (then it would be imprudence to believe); or if they do not doubt of their faith,<sup>9</sup> or if their teachers be fallacious or erroneous, or if the proposal<sup>10</sup> be not enforced with reasons, with holiness of life, with the confutation of the contrary, and with some wonders; in short, if they have not had sufficient instruction (in this all agree). And this alone will excuse a great part of their church, who, for want of such instruction, are acknowledged by themselves to be infidels. Thus Navarre delivers it. In the whole Christian commonwealth<sup>11</sup> (he means the Roman church), there is so great neglect as to this, that ye may find many everywhere who believe no more of these things (*i. e.* of Christ and the most necessary articles of the Christian faith) in particular and explicitly, than some heathen philosophers who have only the natural knowledge of the one true God.

<sup>1</sup> For this are alleged. Altisiodorensis, Gulielmus Parisiensis, Richardus de Media Villa, Scotus, Bradwardin, Gabriel, Baptista Tronamala, Vega, Medina, Corduba, Faber, Petigianis, Herrera, &c. Victoria, Soto, Canus, Bannes, Alvarez. in Sta Clara. Probl. xv. et in Bannes in xxii. q. ii. art. viii.

<sup>2</sup> Vega pro Conc. Trident. l. vi. c. xv. p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> Probl. xv. p. 89, Et hæc est communior in Scholis, ut declarat et sequitur Herrera, &c. So Bartholom. de Ledesma sum. de sacram. penit. cum ad primam justificationem fides explicita Christi non requiratur, ut supponimos, tanquam magis probabile, et commune in scholis, &c.

<sup>4</sup> In xxii. q. ii. art. viii. dub. ult.

Dicendum quod gratia est sufficientis causa gloriæ, unde omne illud sine quo obtineri potest gratia, non est de necessitate salutis.—*Aquinas*. in iv. dist. ix. art. i. vide; *Soto*, in iv. dist. v. q. unica. art. ii. dub. ult.

<sup>5</sup> Fill. tr. xxii. n. xl. et n. lv.

<sup>6</sup> Dico secundo obligationem prædictam esse sub peccato mortali, nisi ignorantia aut impotentia excuset. Communis doctorum.

<sup>7</sup> Probabilis est (ignorantia) quando quis habit fundamentum probabile; ut dum rusticus credit aliquid, ductus testimonio sui parochi aut parentum—sic doctores Communiter.—*Sancta. Clar. ibid.* p. 87.

<sup>8</sup> Quando articuli fidei non modo debito proponuntur; aut rationibus frivolis, vel ab hominibus impiis: tunc enim credere esset actus imprudentiæ, secundum D. Thom. xxii. q. i. art. iv. ad secundum.—*Idem. ibid.* vid plures in Jo. Sanc. d. xix. n. et. iv.

<sup>9</sup> *Id. ibid.* p. 95.

<sup>10</sup> Aragon, in xxii. q. xi. art. ii. dub. ult. *ibid.* p. 101.

<sup>11</sup> In universa Christiana republica. circa hæc tanta est scordia, ut multos passim invenias nihil magis in particulari et explicite de hisce rebus credere quam ethnicum quandam philosophum, sola unius veri Dei naturali cognitione præditum. Cap. xi. n. xxii. p. 142.

But if the precept could reach any through all these securities (which we cannot easily imagine), yet there is one way to clear them all of it, so that they may live and die infidels, without danger from any command requiring faith in Christ; for he that hath not that express faith which is commanded in the gospel, but only what is requisite *necessitate mediæ*, is living or dying, if he be sorry for his negligence, and purpose to amend (which may be in their sense without true repentance), capable of absolution without any instruction from his confessor.<sup>1</sup> And by virtue of that he may live in a justified state, or if he die, he passeth out of the world as a very good Christian, though he believe in Christ no more than a heathen.

*Sect. 2.* Pass we to their other sort of faith, which they call *explicit*. It is, as they define it, an actual assent to the particulars which the church propounds as revealed by God. This, with them, is justifying faith, requisite in the learned and more intelligent amongst them. As to the object of it, if we view it well, it looks untowardly for a thing by which a sinner is to be justified. For it is prodigiously extended, and takes in things uncertain, false, impossible, impertinent, and ridiculous, as points that must certainly be believed unto justification; for their church propounds as things revealed by God (and so objects of justifying faith) not only what is delivered in Scripture, but unwritten traditions concerning matters of faith and manners, and these, if they will be justified, they must believe, though they know not what they are, nor where to find them, but in the church's unerring fancy. She propounds also the unanimous consent of the fathers in several points; and though this never was, or is impossible to be known, yet it must be believed by those that mean to be justified. She propounds the decrees of councils to be believed as divine truths, when it is acknowledged that the design in councils for many hundred years was not to discover truth, but to promote the Roman greatness.<sup>2</sup> She propounds also the determinations of popes: these must be believed as infallible, when ordinarily they were neither persons of common truth or honesty; and we must be justified by believing the dictates of atheists or heretics,<sup>3</sup> of conjurors<sup>4</sup> or incarnate devils,<sup>5</sup> of vicious beasts and wicked monsters;<sup>6</sup> for those who cry up his holiness have adorned him also now and then with these other sacred titles.

I know not whether these things are more ridiculous or more horrid; however, letting them pass as they are, let us take their faith at best, and make it better than they will have it. Suppose it rested in the Scriptures, and had nothing for its object but revelation, such as is truly divine, yet even so, they give such report of it as will scarce suffer us to think that they can expect to be justified by it. Considered in itself, they count it not worthy the name of a virtue.<sup>7</sup> They call it a dead, idle thing;<sup>8</sup> and though they

<sup>1</sup> Imo in rigore, non tenetur confessarius, etiamsi sanus sit pœnitens, cum instruere ante absolutionem; dummodo enim doceat de preterita negligentia, et proponat emendationem in futurum, capax est absolutionis, sola fide explicita circa mysteria necessario credenda ex medio.—*Fill.* tr. xxviii. n. lviii. vide *Jo. Sane.* d. ix. n. xviii.

<sup>2</sup> Omnia concilia post Chalcedonense potissimum instituta fuerunt, non ut erueretur veritas, sed ut roboraretur, defenderetur, atque augetur semper ecclesiæ Romanæ potestas, et ecclesiasticorum libertas.—*Æneas Sylvius.* l. ii. de gest. conc. Basil.

<sup>3</sup> Canus. loc. Theol. l. vi. p. 248, 344.

<sup>4</sup> Sylvest. ii. Platin. Chron. Martini Poloni. Hildeband. Binno Cardin.

<sup>5</sup> Fœx vitiorum et Diabolus incarnatus; Constan. concil. Sess. xi. art. v.; Benedict. ix. vid. Baron. an. 1034, n. iii.

<sup>6</sup> Sunt qui scribunt hunc sceleratissimum hominem, seu monstrum potius.—*Platina.* vita. John xiii.

<sup>7</sup> Dominic. a Soto. de natur. et grat. lib. xxi. c. vii. d. lxxix. et lxxxii.

<sup>8</sup> Concil. Trident. Sess. vi. c. vii.

would have it to be an infused habit, and the gift of God (because the Scripture so calls that which is justifying faith indeed), yet they say<sup>1</sup> a mere human quality, acquired without any supernatural assistance, may perform its proper act and office by actual assent to the whole Christian doctrine. They confess it is commonly found in the worst of men (*in perditissimis hominibus*), such as are neither acted nor possessed by the Spirit of God; such as live and die in mortal wickedness,<sup>2</sup> and are damned for it; yea, some of them confess that it is in the devils. This faith, saith Cardinal Contarenus,<sup>3</sup> is not it by which we believe that there is a God, or by which we believe that the things are true which God speaks; for this also is in the devils and the most wicked men. Yet at other times this is with them, the Christian, the catholic faith, as if it were enough to make them true<sup>4</sup> Christians and catholics; but sure they will not seek for their Christianity and catholicness in a room lower than purgatory. However, instead of a faith which the Scripture calls for as saving and justifying, they commend to Christians a faith which hath no connection at all, necessary or probable, with salvation or justification. All they have to say is, that it must necessarily be joined with love; but when they have said this, they undo it, and all by making love itself unnecessary, as we saw before.

*Sect. 3.* In fine, they seem little concerned for faith, who hath it or hath it not, or how little it be, or how seldom acted. It is not<sup>5</sup> necessary that the pope himself should have this faith (though the devils want it not), yea, or any other virtue, for all his 'holiness:' the body may do well enough, though the head of it be an infidel. They are obliged to maintain this, because their popes often have been no better. And the body may shift pretty well without it too. This may be the true catholic church made up of the whole company of believers, when not one amongst them all hath faith; for time was, say they,<sup>6</sup> when none at all had faith, but only one woman, and it may be so again.

As for the exercise of it, Hurtado thinks an act of faith may be requisite once in a year;<sup>7</sup> but the Jesuit may seem to deal unmercifully with them, putting them to believe some of their creed once in twelve months. Those of other orders would not have them so much oppressed, once in twelve years will be enough; Bonacina<sup>8</sup> saith four or five moments in a whole life may suffice for this, and specifies them; but because this may seem too hard, he signifieth withal how they may be eased in a manner of them all. For once (though that be at the point of death) an<sup>9</sup> implicit act may serve; at another time or two, the precept for faith doth not of itself oblige to the act, only<sup>10</sup> it is requisite by accident; and so the neglect of it, then, will be no special sin, nor need be confessed; at another time (or more if there

<sup>1</sup> Scotus in iii. dist. xxiii. ait. fide humana (quam ipse appellat acquisitam), hominem posse assentire toti prædicationi Christianæ. Imo ita inquit, credimus auctoritati ecclesiæ (quam ipse putat humanam et institutione parentum).—Cui sententia adhuc explicatius subscribit Durandus q. i. in ii. sent. d. xxviii. dicens fidem infusam non esse necessariam, nisi ut facilius credamus.—*Soto. ibid.* l. ii. c. viii. p. 81.

<sup>2</sup> Bellarm. de baptism. l. i. c. xiv.

<sup>3</sup> Fides hæc non est ea tantum qua credimus Deum esse, et qua credimus vera esse quæ dicit Deus, hæc et enim est etiam in dæmonibus et perditissimis hominibus.—*Confut. artic. Lutheri.* art. i.

<sup>4</sup> Concil. Trident. Sess. vi. c. xxviii.

<sup>5</sup> Non enim fides interior Romani pontificis ecclesiæ est necessaria.—*Canus;* loc. Theol. lib. vi. c. ult. p. 344.

<sup>6</sup> Abbas in Sylvest. sum. v. concil. n. iii.

<sup>7</sup> Existimant aliqui preceptum eliciendæ fidei obligare singulis annis—verum hoc communiter negatur.—*Petr. a S. Joseph.* sum de i. præcept. art. i. p. 6.

<sup>8</sup> Tom. ii in . præcept. disp. iii. q. ii. punct. ii. <sup>9</sup> N. xii. <sup>10</sup> N. ix. and xi.

were occasion), ignorance, or want of consideration, may<sup>1</sup> excuse them (for these two, though they ruin the greatest part of the world eternally, yet are the greatest security of Roman catholics; and not only exempt them from that which is most the duty of Christians, but will not suffer them to sin, at least mortally, do what they can). So that, after all, one act of their faith once in a lifetime will be enough. I think it sufficient (saith he after many others) for those that are rude, to give an explicit assent once to the articles necessary to salvation, while they are propounded by their confessor, or some other.<sup>2</sup> But how must the confessor propound these articles to them, so as they may pass this one act of faith upon them once for all? Why, the best way,<sup>3</sup> he tells us, is by a mode of forming the sign of the cross, as it is described for this purpose by Graffius, Bellarmine, and other great divines. I had the curiosity to see how a confessor can make the most ignorant persons true believers by the sign of the cross, and so effectually, as they never need more believe than once while they live, and found it lying thus:<sup>4</sup> Let the confessor teach him to form the sign of the cross with three fingers, to signify the mystery of the most sacred Trinity. But first, it must be drawn from the top of the head, or front, to the navel, to shew that the Son of God descended from the highest heavens into the bowels of his mother; then draw the cross line from the left arm to the right, so the cause of the incarnation is expressed; he came from heaven to earth, that we, who were to be placed amongst the goats at his left, might be removed to his right hand amongst the sheep. This is the admirable expedient. The grave Benedictine reflecting on it was put into a transport; for he adds, Behold what great mysteries of faith mother church has taught us by one mode of forming a cross, so that a rude person needs know nothing besides this, even this alone may be sufficient for his salvation!<sup>5</sup> Here is a compendious way indeed to salvation, and all the knowledge and faith needful for it. He that can be satisfied with it (and give himself up to absurd and ridiculous delusions, against all the evidence of God's word), may in few minutes, with once making the sign of the cross, get all the faith requisite for a Roman catholic; and when by such admirable conduct of the cross he hath but once believed, he need never more trouble himself with faith while he lives.<sup>6</sup> The precept for faith (saith another) obligeth not, but perhaps once in a life; and it is delivered as the judgment of Aragon Torres, and other their chief divines, that of itself it binds not, but when one comes to the use of reason, or if it be not then performed, afterwards; but after one act of faith once put forth, the obligation to exercise more acts do rarely, or may be never, occur. Such is their faith, and thus you must conceive, if you can, how they live by it.

<sup>1</sup> N. viii.

<sup>2</sup> Existimo tamen sufficere, ut isti rudes semel assensum explicite præbuerint articulis ad salutem necessariis, dum sibi proponerentur a confessario, vel ab alio.—*Ibid.* p. xiv. ibi. Malderus et alii. Peter a S. Joseph reduces all the moments and occasions where an act of faith may be thought requisite to six heads, and then declares upon each severally, either that the precept doth not of itself oblige, or that they may be excused from sin in neglecting it at any of them.—Sum in i. precept. art. i. pp. 3-6.

<sup>3</sup> Bonacin. *ibid.* n. xvi.

<sup>4</sup> Graff. decis. part. i. l. i. c. xxiv. n. iii.

<sup>5</sup> Ecce quanta nobis fidei nostræ mysteria unica tormandæ crucis ratione mater ecclesia docuit, ut si nihil præterea sciret rudis homo, vel hoc solum ad salutem illi sufficere queat.—*Ibid.*

Præceptum fidei non obligat per se, nisi semel forte in vita. Vid. Jo. Sanc. disp. xli. n. xxxii. Advertant præceptum fidei non obligare per se, nisi tempore usus rationis advenientis, vel postea si tunc non est impletum taliter, quod post semel elicitum actum fidei raro vel fortasse nunquam occurrat, dicta obligatio exercendi actus fidei, sic expresse Suarez, Aragon, &c.—*Ibid.*

They can make a life of faith of one act alone in a whole life. No wonder they presume that they can so perfectly fulfil the whole law, yea, and pay God much more than his due, when they make the greatest commands (the sum of the law and gospel) to amount to little or nothing, and instead of a hundred, set down, not fifty, but a fraction, or a cypher; when, in the case before us, they take no more notice of the faith which the gospel calls for, yea, make bold in a manner wholly to neglect that of their own making.

## CHAPTER V.

*There is no necessity of true repentance for Romanists by their doctrine.*

*Sect. 1.* If anything be absolutely and indispensably necessary to salvation, it is repentance. Christ himself declares it, Luke xiii. 3. The doctrine of repentance from dead works is a fundamental, and so made expressly by the apostle, Heb. vi. 1; so that without the belief and practice of it, no sinner can possibly be saved, nor have any hopes of it, but such as are delusions. Thus necessary hath the Lord made it, and yet by the Roman doctrine, it is more than needs for any sort of sins.

As to original sin (the corruption of our natures), those of them who hold there is any such thing within us, yet declare that if it be any sin at all, it is the least of all sins. Andradius, employed by the council of Trent to write, tells us that their divines so determine. Bellarmine saith,<sup>1</sup> that amongst all sins it is the least voluntary, and on that account is less than any venial sin; and it must be little indeed, that is less than any venial, for that, as another cardinal<sup>2</sup> tells us, passeth for nothing. And that which hath so little, or nothing of sin in it, needs no repentance. So Soto<sup>3</sup> concludes, a man that hath no guilt but that of original sin, hath no need of any repentance. Thus they represent original sin as it is in them before baptism, but after they are baptized, they all agree that it is no sin at all. The council of Trent hath determined it (and so it is now with them an article of faith)<sup>4</sup> that in baptism, not only the guilt of original sin is remitted, but whatever of it hath anything of the true and proper nature of sin, is totally taken away; and they curse<sup>5</sup> those who hold that it is only pardoned or impaired, and not all the sin of it quite abolished by baptism. They say they are become innocent, pure, harmless, spotless,<sup>6</sup> without the least speck of original sin, and so without any need of repentance upon that account.<sup>7</sup> They are so far from being actually obliged to repent of any natural corruption, that they cannot be obliged to it, God himself cannot bind any one to repent of it. So that if there be in our natures any defectiveness as to the image of

<sup>1</sup> After Aquinas, iii. q. i. art. iv. de amiss. grat. l. i. c. x. p. 226. Inter omnia peccata minimum habet de voluntario, et ideo minus grave est, in ratione voluntarii, quam quodlibet veniale.

<sup>2</sup> Modicum pro nihilo habetur, Cajetan. Sum. v. fest. (et sæpius alibi) secundum quoque commune est, modicum pro nihilo reputari, p. 310.

<sup>3</sup> Haud tamen huic homini, ulla est penitentia necessaria.—*De Nat. et Grat.* l. ii. c. xii. p. 92.

Contritio cum sit dolor, voluntatis duritiam ex peccato contractam comminuens, non proprie est de peccato originali, Aquin. supplem. q. ii. art. ii.; Sylvest. v. contritio. n. iv.; Graff. l. i. c. iv. n. ii.

<sup>4</sup> In Baptismate, non modo remitti reatum originalis peccati, sed totum id auferri, quod veram ac propriam rationem peccati habet, Sess. v. c. iv.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. ca. iv.

<sup>6</sup> Innocentes, puri, immaculati.

<sup>7</sup> Tantum abest obligari quempiam ad originalis culpæ penitentiam, ut neque possit. Soto *ibid.*

God, any averseness to God and that which is good, any propenseness to evil, we are not to take notice of it, or grieve for it as a sin; for however the apostle frequently calls it so, it is none; no more to be repented of than an innocent, harmless thing. Thus original sin is quite discharged from any concern in our repentance.

*Sect. 2.* There are other evils which make up the far greatest part of actual sins, which by their doctrine are but venial. Of this quality are not only those which they count small in their own nature, and those which are small in respect of the matter of them, but likewise all (how heinous soever as to the nature of them, how great soever as to the matter of them) that are acted without perfect deliberation, and are not completely voluntary. And by favour of their describing this third sort of minute evils, the most enormous wickedness that can be acted against God or man, may come under the notion of venial faults (of which hereafter). Blasphemy, perjury, adultery, murder, &c., when without perfect deliberation, will be no worse.

However, these with them are light faults, and lightly cancelled (as they tell us) by the bishop's blessing, by holy water, by knocking the breast, by saying a *paternoster*, by extreme unction (so our Rhemists, Aquinas adds<sup>1</sup>), by the eucharist, by any of the seven sacraments,<sup>2</sup> by any sacramental unction, by prayer in a holy place; yea, or by but entering into a consecrated church.

So that by these and other such means, *et si aliqua alia sunt hujusmodi* (saith Aquinas), pardon of venial sins may be obtained; yea, any one of them will quite<sup>3</sup> abolish the fault, if not the whole penalty, particularly holy water, which (as Canus teacheth<sup>4</sup>) takes away the punishment of sin, and also the faults that are venial. No wonder if they determine that the sacrament of penance is not needful for these, not so much as their ritual repentance, and that there is no necessity they should be so much as confessed, nor any remorse or grief required for them,<sup>5</sup> nor that they should be relinquished so much as in their resolution only.<sup>6</sup> Contrition is so far from being requisite for venial sins, that with them attrition is not needful, for that is a displicence arising from shame or fear; but these sins are (in their account) neither shameful<sup>7</sup> (it is no crime, they say, to glory in them) nor dangerous; no man can be condemned for them.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In Mat. x. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Tertia, q. lxxxvii. art. iii. Taceri citra culpam, multisque aliis remediis expiari possunt, Conc. Trident. Sess. iv. can. v.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Aquinas ibid. tertium.

<sup>4</sup> Peccatorum pœnas solvit, culpas etiam veniales, De Sacrament, pars. i. p. 752, vid. p. 751.

<sup>5</sup> Concil. Trident. Sess. iv. Can. v.

Ad venialia in confessione explicanda teneri, qui solis venialibus urgetur—negat communis opinio cum D. Thoma. Scoto. Durando. Major. Victorell. ad Tol. l. vi. c. xi.

Utrum peccata venialia necessario sint confitenda? Resp. secundum Scotum, quod non; etiamsi nullum habet mortale: quoniam per peccatum veniale etiam in proposito, homo non potest damnari nec periclitari, et pœnitentia est secunda tabula pro periclitantibus, igitur non obligatur ad eam nisi habens mortale. Immo dicit Petrus de Palude in iii. quod nec etiam papa possit ad hoc obligare.—Angel. sum. v. Confess. n. xxv.

Cum dolor de venialibus non sit necessarius, ne confessio quidem venialium necessaria est. Canus. pars. vi. relect. de pœnitent. p. 955. Secundum S. Thom. in iv. dist. xvii. homo tenetur habere istum dolorem (contritionis) de peccato actuali, non de originali—et de mortali non de veniali, quia cum ejus complacentia mori potest, ac salvari, Sylvest. v. contrit. n. iv. vid. Navar. c. i. n. xxiv.

<sup>6</sup> Non est necessarium habere propositum nunquam peccandi venialiter, Navar. c. i. n. x.

<sup>7</sup> Conc. Trid. Sess. xiv. 4.

<sup>8</sup> Vid. Suarez, tom. iv. disp. xx. sect. vi. n. iii.

Thus their doctrine giveth them all abundant encouragement to live and die impenitently in these sins, in all of them; for all of them in the world, if found in one man together, amount not to so much as one mortal sin.<sup>1</sup> All the penitence for these that is required by the precisest of them, is no more than one act of charity contains, *i. e.* such a virtual dislike as a man may have of that which he was never actually displeased at, no, nor so much as thought of.<sup>2</sup>

It may seem strange (the operation of the spirit of delusion not considered) how such a conceit could ever possess the fancies of rational persons, and of some acquaintance with the Scriptures; that their sacramentals (holy water, and the like trifles) should have the virtue to procure pardon of sins, even without repentance. Aquinas would have us satisfied with this, that they do not remit sins of themselves, but are said to do it, because they may excite that fervour by which they are remitted;<sup>3</sup> but this fervour is not repentance, and whatever it be, it ought to be excited, that it may remit sin, since this admirable virtue is ascribed to it on that account. No, say his followers, we must understand him so, that it is not always requisite it should be excited, but that these sacramentals are instituted for this end. Wherefore to receive them as accommodated by the church to this effect is an act of repentance, and procures remission of venial sins; although there be no way any excitement of devotion, nor any remembering of these sins, nor any dislike of them; for if this were required, truly they would not be sacramentals, since this dislike alone would be sufficient; so de Graffis after Soto.<sup>4</sup> Here is pardon of sin by an excitement of fervour, though it be not excited; that must be the *implicit* repentance, sufficient for the pardon of venial sins; and the *explicit* very like it, an act of repentance (such as is receiving of holy water), without any remembering the sins to be repented of, or any dislike of them. They had need believe that these sins are no transgressions of the law, since they expect to be secured from its penalty by that which is no repentance.

*Sect. 3.* Hereby it is too manifest that they make repentance needless, both in reference to original sin, and likewise to all those which they count venial. If they will have it needful for any sin at all, it must be for those they call mortal; but then these are but few in comparison. They have reduced them to seven, and none pass for deadly but such as quite extinguish spiritual life, and kill the soul immediately.<sup>5</sup>

Well, but is repentance necessary for these? As to this, divers of great eminency amongst them conclude that there is no divine precept for repentance.<sup>6</sup> God hath not commanded any to repent. Now if he command it

<sup>1</sup> Etiamsi omnia venialia peccata simul colligerentur in unum, nunquam efficerent id, quod facit unum lethale peccatum.—*Bellarmin.* de amiss. grat. l. i. c. xiii. p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> Aquinas iii. q. lxxxvii. art. i. c.

<sup>3</sup> Ideo ista dicuntur specialiter dimittere, non quia remittunt per se, sed quia sunt excitativa fervoris per quem fit remissio.—*D. Th.* in iv. art. ad ii. dum.

<sup>4</sup> Sed advertet quod responsio D. Thom. quod ideo ista dimitunt venialia, quia excitant fervorem, intelligenda est, non quod semper requiratur illa excitatio, sed quod de se hæc sacramentalia ad hoc sint instituta. Quare illa suscipere, tanquam ad illum effectum ab ecclesia accommodata censetur actus penitentiae, et acquirit remissionem venialium, etiamsi nullatenus excitetur ad devotionem, nec memoriam habeat venialium, vel displicentiam, nam si illa requireretur, profecto sacramentalia non essent, cum sola displicentia sufficeret. Sotus dist. xv. q. ii. art. i. modo tunc non habeat complacentiam, Graff. t. i. c. xvi. n. ix. p. 13. Victoria, Canus, Major, Cajetan. Ledesmi et alii in Suarez. tom. iv. disp. xii. sect. ii.

<sup>5</sup> The particular sins contained under these seven capitals (as their offspring), the people need not trouble themselves about them; for common confessors are not obliged to know whether they are mortal or no.—*Angel.* sum. v. Confess. iv. n. iii.

<sup>6</sup> Sunt enim theologi et fuerunt, quorum opinione de actu penitentiae speciali præ-

not, it is not necessary; and if it be not a necessary duty, it is no mean necessary to salvation. For, as themselves tells us, though all that is commanded be not necessary to salvation, yet all that is necessary to salvation is commanded.<sup>1</sup> That there is no special precept which requires repentance, was the opinion of their famous Franciscus de Victoria (in his time the great master of divinity in Spain), and of other divines, both before and after him, as Melchior Canus (sometimes his scholar) tells us. And when that of Christ, Luke xiii., 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish,' is objected, they answer the meaning is, They shall perish for preceding sins, not for impenitence. By their doctrine there is no danger that any should perish for that, though persisted in unto death; and they had some reason to allege Aquinas (the angel of their schools) as of their judgment herein; for he saith plainly, that impenitency continued in till death is no special sin, but a circumstance of sin.<sup>2</sup> By this doctrine it is no sin, no transgression of any divine precept to be impenitent, or to persevere therein to the end.

Those who will be concluded by the council of Trent must believe that there is no divine precept which requires contrition or true repentance precisely, but only disjunctively, either that or what is there declared to be sufficient without it. And they must take it for certain that it is not a medium necessary to salvation, since that council has determined that something else will suffice for pardon without it, and so they declare it expressly.<sup>3</sup>

*Sect. 4.* But let us take notice of those who seem more severe. Many there be who think that repentance is under a divine command, yet these in the issue make it no more necessary than the other, who find no precept for it. For they determine that we are not obliged to repent presently, that it may be deferred till the approach or danger of death; and, in fine, that it is needless, even when a man is dying.

For the first, they teach that a sinner is not bound to repent presently, it is lawful to defer it. So their doctors of all sorts, so all the faithful (say they), so the whole church. That a man is not bound to repent presently is a conclusion, saith Soto, established by the practice and the usage of the church.<sup>4</sup> Canus tells us it is his own, and the common opinion, that a man is not obliged to repent forthwith; and this, he saith, is confirmed by best reason, viz. the consent of all the faithful, both priests and people; and adds, that to make the precept so rigid as to require present repentance, hath no probable reason, no, nor any authority.<sup>5</sup>

ceptum nullum est; hanc vero sententiam in primis suadent testimonio D. Thomæ, &c. —*Canus*, pars. iv. relect. de pœnit. p. 856.

<sup>1</sup> Aquinas et Bellarmin. supra. Media necessaria ad salutem sunt nobis divino jure precepta quod tradit, D. Tho. ii. q. ii. art. v. &c., et est quasi axioma communiter receptum.—*Suar.* l. i. De Orat. c. xxix. n. ii.

In hac controversia Præceptor meus olim. F. Franciscus Victoria, vir nostra ætate literis ingenio, religioneque clarissimus.—*Ibid.* Fuere Catholici quidam, ut refert Jo. Medina et Vega. et quidem ex schola, D. Tho. ex quibus fuit Victoria, qui dicebant pœnitentiam non esse in præcepto ullo, idque ex D. Thom. videbantur probare, et meo judicio satis efficaciter.—*Vasq.* in 3 hom. tom. iii. q. lxxxvi. art. ii. dub. ii. n. i.

<sup>2</sup> Permanere in peccato usque ad mortem, non est speciale peccatum, sed quædam peccati circumstantia, xxii. q. xiv. art. ii. Corp. et tamen si esset de pœnitentia speciale præceptum, omissio illius specialis culpa sine dubio esset, as they argue in Canus.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Contritio proprie accepta, in lege nova, non est necessaria simpliciter necessitate mediæ ad justificationem et salutem, Bonacin. de Sacram. disp. v. q. v. p. 2, n. i.—*Ibid.* Petigianus, et alii.

<sup>4</sup> Non illico ut homo se reum sentit culpæ, pœnitentiæ lege pœnitere constringitur. Hæc profecto conclusio more et usu ecclesiæ satis videtur constabilita.—*Soto* in iv. dist. xvii. q. ii. art. vi.

<sup>5</sup> Ut mea fert et communis opinio, non protinus tenetur homo pœnitentiam agere.

Now this doctrine concerning repentance, in this first step of it, where it appears more modest and innocent than in its further advance, is yet very horrid and desperate. For it is all one as if they had said, that they may, notwithstanding any command of God, continue (for some time at least) in their hatred of God, and state of enmity against him, since that is confessedly the temper and state of the impenitent. Besides, it emboldens sinners, and giveth them confidence to leave their souls at a desperate venture, presuming they may repent time enough hereafter, when they can have no assurance of any time at all for the future. And it is the more dangerous, because their doctrine takes away all apprehension of danger, leaving them no fear, either of penalty or sin, in putting off repentance; no danger of suffering by present neglects or delays, for they are told that they may repent when they please. The Lord, saith one part of their divines, is every moment ready to help them to repentance;<sup>1</sup> or, say the rest, he will help them to it (if they please) in the article of necessity, whenever the precept makes it their duty.<sup>2</sup> And what should hinder them, upon such encouragement, to defer it, even to the point of death? They need not fear that they shall perish, nor need they fear they shall sin by thus putting it off. Some of their doctors make it no sin at all, others as good as none. Bellarmine determines that it is not a sin, but only a circumstance of sin, when the command doth not oblige; and that it doth not presently, but only at a certain season.<sup>3</sup> Medina affirms that, without all doubt, it is lawful.<sup>4</sup> Soto saith it is but a venial sin.<sup>5</sup> Canus takes a course to reconcile them, he concludes it is no sin at all not to repent presently, and that is but a venial sin to will (or resolve) not to repent.<sup>6</sup> Now if it be no sin at all, there is no danger at all; if it be but a

Atque hæc assertio non alia ratione potiore ostendi possit, quam quod fidelium omnium consensus facile admittit, &c., nec aut pœnitentes in confessione hujus criminis se accusant, aut sacerdotes id curant—Cum nulla idonea ratio sit, nullave autoritas qua præceptum adeo durum asseratur, &c.—*Melch. Canus.* pars. iv. relect. de pœnit. pp. 862, 863.

Licet toto temper, quo quis agnoscat se lethali peccato mortuum, de bono consilio debeat curare, ut a tam gravi morbo resurgat, periculumque mortis subitæ atque æternæ effugiat, juxta illud, Ne tardes converti ad Dominum, et ne differas die in diem.—*Ecc̄l. v.* Non tamen ad id tenetur præcepto, ad novum peccatum mortiferum obligante; nisi ea temporis parte, qua memoriæ occurrit quoad usum—secundum communem opinionem. Imo neque tunc, ob ea per quæ id affirmavit Adrianus, et ob ea, quæ nos addimus.—*Navar.* cap. i. n. 27 et n. 29.

Alensis, Bonaventura, Durandus, Aquinas, Adrianus, Angelus, Medina Viguerius, &c., vid. in Suarez. iv. iv. disp. xv. sect. v. n. ii. Præceptum non obligat ad agendam pœnitentiam statim, etiamsi opportunitas occurrat, seu licet facile fieri possit.—Vid. Vasq. in iii. Th. ibid. dub. v. n. ix. Est verissima opinio præceptum contritionis non obligare statim. Alexand. S. Thom. Angelus. Jo. Medina, Sotus, Durandus. Canus, Navar. Paludan. Adrian. Viguerius, merito ergo omnes in hoc conveniunt.

<sup>1</sup> Vega in Conc. Trid. lib. xiii. cap. xi. Molina. concord. grat. et lib. arb. q. xiv. art. xiii. disp. x. Valent. tom. ii. disp. viii. q. iii. Semper quoad se habet opportunitatem, quia semper est in suo arbitrio positum conteri. Filliuc. tr. vi. c. viii. n. 202. Cum quilibet possit ope divina (quæ nunquam [deest] facienti quod in se est) suorum peccatorum pœnitere, et eorum veniam consequi.—*Nav.* cap. xxiv. n. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Cum non potest sine conversione vitare peccatum. Bellarm. de grat. l. ii. c. v. et c. viii. Becan. de auxil. grat. cap. vi. Alvarez. de auxil. grat. l. xi. disp. cxii. n. v. concl. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Neque enim præceptum de pœnitentia agenda quovis tempore obligat, cum sit affirmativum, sed solum certis temporibus, ut cum versamur in periculo mortis, cum ad confessionem est accedendum (but for this, he says, irritation will suffice, l. ii. c. xviii. p. 974), cum Deus peculiari inspiratione ad pœnitentiam nos invitat. At extra ejusmodi tempora impenitentia non tam peccatum novum, quam peccati patrati circumstantia est.—*De Pœnit.* l. ii. c. ix. p. 958.

<sup>4</sup> Non est dubium, quin id licitum sit.—*De Pœnit.* tr. i. q. vi. p. 18.

<sup>5</sup> In. iv. dist. xvii. q. ii. art. vi. Relect. de Pœnit. pars. iv. p. 866.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. p. 863, supra.

venial sin, there is very little or none to be regarded, no necessity upon any account to repent of it; and he saith the people never confess this in order to repentance, the priests never require it nor regard it; by the consent of all, we are not obliged to it.

Now, that which a man is not bound to repent of, he may still continue in, and so he may still continue resolved to put off repentance; yes, so he may safely, say they, till the article of necessity.

*Sect. 5.* But when is that? Let us next inquire after it, and in the pursuit thereof we shall discover the second point I charge them with, That a man, by their doctrine, needs not repent all his days, till he be in danger of death.

This is their common doctrine: since the command to repent is affirmative,<sup>1</sup> it doth not oblige, but in time of necessity, even as other affirmative precepts do. All the question will be, When is this time of necessity; when it will be necessary to repent without longer delay? Now their doctors are agreed in no other article of time, except it be the point of death, or when a man's life is apparently in danger. There is no other time in a man's whole life, wherein it is likely that repentance should be requisite, but they deny it to be then necessary, and offer arguments to prove that it is not needful in any other, however probable seasons. Let me shew this in some instances.

Is it necessary to repent at solemn times of worship, when we address ourselves in a more particular manner to a holy God? No, say they,<sup>2</sup> generally; and Canus<sup>3</sup> giveth this reason for it: Though acts of religion be then required, yet repentance is not an act of religion, but of revenge.

Is it needful on days of fasting? It may seem so, because the main and proper end of fasts is the exercises of repentance and humiliation. No, say they, it is not needful then; for if this were the intention of God, or the church, in enjoining fasts, yet the intention of the lawgiver doth not bind us. No exercise of repentance is with them requisite on their fasts, but what they may perform in a dream;<sup>4</sup> for if they sleep the whole fasting day, yet they fulfil the precept for fasting.<sup>5</sup> To their fasts they require nothing but abstinence from some sort of meat, not any religious act at all; and if with them the precept for the mass, or prayer, could not be fully accomplished without some penitent sense of sin, as it may, yet neither the mass nor prayer, public or private, is requisite to their fasts. Yea, in extraordinary times for prayer, upon occasion of some great calamity befallen them for their sins, they think not contrition for sin needful. The people know not there is then any necessity thereof; their confessors and preachers are never wont to mind them of this as a thing necessary;<sup>6</sup> and therefore Lopez saith, he

<sup>1</sup> Quantum autem ad vitandum novum peccatum transgressionis præcepti de contritione, tempus est determinatum ad articulum necessitatis: sicut in aliis affirmativis præceptis contingit.—*Cajetan*, Sum. v. contrit. p. 104. Canus, *ibid.* p. 863.

<sup>2</sup> Aquinas, ii. 2, q. cxxii. art. iv.

*Cajetan*, *ibid.* p. 185; Soto de just. et jur. l. ii. q. iv. art. iv. supra Bellarm. de cult. Storum. l. iii. c. x. supra. Sylvest. sum. v. Domin. n. viii. Graff. lib. i. cap. v. n. xxiv. Navar. cap. xiii. n. xvii. Sum. Rosellæ, v. feriæ n. ii.—*Lopez*, cap. xii. p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> In diebus festis non obligari homines ad agendam pœnitentiam aut divino præcepto aut humano, præceptum enim de colendo Deo, quo festis diebus astringimur, opera religionis præscribit: at pœnitentia religionis opus non est, sed vindicationis, Canus, *ibid.* p. 864. Ita *Cajetan*, Soto, Navar, Armilla, Rosell. et. alii communiter, Suar. l. ii. de fest. c. xvi. n. xiv.

<sup>4</sup> Ex. D. Thomæ et graviorum autorum sententia ad finem legislatoris minime tenemur.—*Canus*, *ibid.* p. 871.

<sup>5</sup> Si aliquis dormiret per totum diem qua observari præcipitur jejuniū, præceptum jejunii impleret.—*Jo. Sanc.* disp. li. n. ii.

<sup>6</sup> Vid. Bonacin. de Sacram. d. v. q. v. p. 2, n. vi.

Quia non constat privatis hominibus tempore urgentis necessitatis oraturis pro populi

would not condemn any private person that neglects it in these circumstances, and so concludes he after others. As for their common fasts, these (no more than their festivals) require not abstinence from acts of wickedness, much less repentance for them.

Is it necessary, when sins are brought to our remembrance, and when our minds dictate to us, that they are to be hated and repented of? It seems then needful, if ever, seeing a practical judgment obligeth even in things lawful, though they be not otherwise necessary.<sup>1</sup> No, not then; a man is not bound to repent when his sins are offered to his mind, either speculatively or practically.<sup>2</sup> One would think, if a sinner needs not repent, when he is mindful of his sins, it could never be needful, since he can never repent but when he is mindful of them.

Is it necessary, when a sinner comes to their sacraments, particularly to that of penance?<sup>3</sup> This must be the time for it (as we may well conceive), if there be any time for it at all, in the Romish church. Then a sinner is to survey his life, to find out his sins, and as a penitent to make particular confession of them, and is to have pardon of his sin, as one that only repents; being absolved by a judicial sentence, as valid as if Christ himself did pass it immediately.<sup>4</sup> If repentance be not needful, when a sinner is to have pardon, then the Lord never required it, nor can it ever be made necessary by man.

This notwithstanding, repentance, they say, is not necessary, no, not for the sacrament of penance. Attrition will serve for that, which is but a slender<sup>5</sup> dislike of sin, because it is hurtful to a man's self, without respect to God, as it is offensive to him.<sup>6</sup> This, though short of true repentance, is sufficient to qualify a man for the sacrament of penance, by the doctrine of

necessitate, quod contritio de suis peccatis sit remedium solitum ab ipsis adhiberi, et quia ignorant id remedii esse necessarium, neque de hoc tanquam de re necessaria solent admoneri a confessoribus vel prædicatoribus: ideo peccatorem privatum tempore calamitatis magnæ, qua premitur respublica, orantem Deum pro reipublicæ liberatione sine prævia contritione, ad peccatum mortale non ideo damnarem, &c., Lopez, cap. xvi. p. 97.

<sup>1</sup> Ex hoc autem quod peccata memoriæ occurrunt, sicut non tenetur ad tunc confitendum, ita nec ad tunc conterendum.—*Cajetan*, sum. v. contrit. p. 105. Non autem quandocunque occurrit memoriæ peccatum tenetur conteri—nec etiam si practice occurrit memoriæ peccata extra tempus præcepti, quia tunc secundum Sotum, neque displicere, sed neutro modo se habere, non est contemptus. Lopez, cap. xii. p. 85.—Vid. *Navar.* (after *Adrian*) cap. i. n. xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Non tenetur homo pœnitentiam agere, quoties peccata memoriæ occurrerint, sive speculative sive practice occurrerint.—*Canus*, ibid. p. 863.

<sup>3</sup> Non tamen ad id tenemur quoties ministramus, vel accipimus sacramenta—quia non tenemur tunc habere contritionem. *Navar.* cap. xi. n. viii. Vid. Lopez, cap. x. p. 70.

Their common doctrine, as we saw before, requires nothing but attrition for baptism and penance, no actual disposition at all for their other five sacraments.

Baptizans autem in necessitate non tenetur ad hoc (viz. contritionem). *Sylvest.* v. Baptism. iii. n. vi. neque Baptizandus vid. *Soto* de Nat. et grat. l. ii. c. xv. p. 101.

Si attritus suscipit Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ et Eucharistiæ, satisfacit præcepto ecclesiæ.—*Cajetan*, sum. v. contrit. p. 104, Sacramentum Baptismi et penitentiæ, licite sumi possunt ab his qui habent conscientiam peccati mortalis, modo habeant attritionem qua tollitur obex et complacentia in peccatum commissum.—*Canus*, ibid. pars. vi. p. 932.

<sup>4</sup> Neque aliter est accipienda vox sacerdotis peccata condonantis quam vox Christi, qui ait paralytico, *Mat.* vii. Confide fili, remittuntur tibi peccata.—*Catechism*, *Trident.* de Pœnit.

<sup>5</sup> Aquinas asserit attritionem esse displicentiam imperfectam.—*Can.* ibid. p. 935.

<sup>6</sup> Attritio est dolor peccatorum, non qua ratione sunt offensa Dei, sed quatenus nobis nocua. Nimirum quia sunt causa pœnæ aut in hoc, aut in futuro sæculo.—*Soto* de Nat. et Grat. l. ii. c. xiv. p. 99.

their church.<sup>1</sup> For they hold the sacrament is not only duly administered, but effectual for all its ends and purposes, when there is no obstacle in the receiver;<sup>2</sup> the obstacle in this case is complacency in mortal sins,<sup>3</sup> the complacency is gone, when sin is disliked or displeasing out of any respect,<sup>4</sup> and so the obstacle is removed by the dislike of sin, which is in attrition.

Thus comes attrition to be sufficient, and true repentance not needful, no, not for the sacrament of repentance.<sup>5</sup>

This is not only concluded by the generality of their doctors, but by the council of Trent. And by these particulars we may discern, that repentance with them is not necessary, at any season of a man's life, and when it would be counted so, if they did judge it needful at all, before the approach of death.

*Sect. 6.* But, indeed, there needs no induction of particulars to prove this, for they declare plainly, that by the command of God, it is not necessary to repent till one be at the point of death. This is said to be the judgment of Aquinas, Soto, Navarre, Durandus, Medina, Cajetan, and others, in Suarez. The ground of it is, because the reasons brought to prove that it doth not oblige presently, prove it as much of any other certain time in our life, except that only when a man is dying.<sup>6</sup>

It is to the same effect that others say, the precept does but oblige in danger of death or perpetual madness. So Bonacina, and in him (besides Jesuits) Medina, Sotus, Angles, Zerola Pitigianus, Sayrus, Molfesius, and others, *De Sacram. ibid.* n. 5. So that, while a man is like to live, and be sober, he need not repent; but if he be in danger to die, or run mad, he should be so wise as to repent first; but how he shall know when he is like to run mad, or that his madness will be perpetual, is a hard question; and till he can resolve it, they will go near to excuse him. And if he can have a confessor, though he be at the point of death and distraction too, he need not trouble himself with repenting, that proviso they still add (*saltem quando non adest copia confessarii, cui fiat confessio cum attritione*); this, indeed, is it, that their confessors serve for to save sinners the labour of going to heaven, by turning them out of the only way to it.

However, by this it appears, that any papist hath warranty, by their doctrine, to live impenitently, till he be in danger to live no longer. He need not grieve for offending God till he be dying, nor resolve upon that account

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Trident. sess. xiv. cap. iv.; vid. Cajetan, Navar, Canum, Lopez, supra Bellarm. de pœnit. l. ii. c. ult. p. 974. Sacramenta novæ legis conferunt gratiam attritionis.—*Canus de Sacramentis*, pars. v. p. 797.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. Trident. sess. vii. c. vi. Sacramentum gratiam confert omni adulto offerenti se, non ponendo obicem.—*Cajetan*, sum. v. absolut. p. 12; *Canus*, pars. iii. Relect. de pœnit. p. 844; *Angel*, sum. v. confess. vii. Secundum Scotum et S. Thom. si præcedens dolor non sufficisset ad contritionem, &c.

<sup>3</sup> *Idem*. *ibid.* p. 932, supra.

<sup>4</sup> Complacentia vero satis tollitur per quemcunque dolorem.—*Soto de Nat. et Grat.* l. ii. c. xv. p. 101.

<sup>5</sup> That which we, with the Scripture, call true repentance, they call contrition; as for attrition, it is so far from being true repentance, that with the council of Trent they all acknowledge it is not of itself sufficient for pardon. Attritio—quamvis siue penitentia sacramento per se ad justificationem peccatorem perducere nequeat.—*Concil. Trid.* sess. xiv. c. iv.

<sup>6</sup> In qua re est multorum opinio hoc præceptum (penitentia) per se et natura sua, tantum obligare pro articulo mortis, ita sentit D. Thomas et Durandus—et eodem modo sumitur hæc opinio ex Cajetano, Medina, Soto, Navar, &c. Et fundamentum—quia supposito, quod præceptum non statim obliget ante articulum mortis; nulla est major ratio designandi unum tempus, quam aliud: imo neque est ratio designandi aliquod, quia in nullo est vera necessitas: præceptum autem affirmativum tantum obligat pro articulo necessitatis.—*Suarez*, tom. iv. disp. xv. sect. vi. n. ii.

to forsake any sin, till there be reason to think that he can live no longer to commit it.

What a temptation is here for all wicked persons to turn papists, if they could but prevail with themselves to believe in this particular as the church believes, against all that God hath declared concerning repentance! And since men easily believe what they desire should be true, though against the word of truth, how strange would it be if the world did not 'wonder after the beast'?

*Sect. 7.* But though they excuse a sinner from repenting all his life before, yet when he comes to die, do they not then make it needful? They make some show of it, indeed, but it is a mere delusive show; and they are therein as false to their own pretensions, as they are to the souls of sinners. For at the approach of death (as at any period before, wherein some of them seem to make repentance necessary, yet), even then they abuse them with conceits, that something else will serve without it. The expedients which they have provided thus to delude perishing souls all their lives, and even when they are passing into eternity, are many and various; that those who do not like to be ruined one way may be taken with another; and so, that repenting, which alone can secure them, may be declined by all.

First, Repentance without any sensible sorrow for sin, will serve the turn. This is the way of Scotus, and Vega, and others. A will not to have sinned, though it be without any grief for sin, or without any actual consideration that he hath sinned, is sufficient for pardon.<sup>1</sup> Such an act of the will is the essence of that contrition which procures forgiveness, as not only Scotus, but Paludanus, Cajetan, Soto, Victoria, and Navarre in Lopez.<sup>2</sup>

Sorrow is not essential to repentance, but an effect; and such a one as is contingent and separable, and doth not necessarily follow it.<sup>3</sup> Correspondent to this is their doctrine, who teach, that a virtual repentance is sufficient,<sup>4</sup> any act whatever, which may be counted penitence virtually, though it be no such thing actually, or formally, is enough by their common doctrine; any love to God above all is such a virtual repentance,<sup>5</sup> though without any remembrance of sin;<sup>6</sup> this is not only the opinion of Medina, but that which is commonly received. Any kind of love will serve for this, though it be but natural, and such as may be had without the grace of God, as Navarre expresseth it.<sup>7</sup> And the limitation which he would seem to add, that such a virtual repentance is but sufficient when there is no time for a formal repenting, is excluded by their common doctrine; for he, and others with him, generally teach, that there is no space of time requisite for this, but it may be sufficiently despatched in a moment.<sup>8</sup>

And some of their chief divines hold that, a sinner being pardoned upon

<sup>1</sup> In Navar, cap. i. n. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Ex mente Navarri, Soti, Paludani, Scoti est, quod contritio quoad suam essentiam est iste actus, Nollem peccasse.—Lopez, cap. x. p. lxxviii. et cap. vi. p. xxxviii; vid. D. Thom. Paludan, Soto, Navar, Ledesma, Cajetan, Concil. Trident, and others in Jo. Sanc. disp. i. n. viii.

<sup>3</sup> Per supradicta constat (contritionem) non esse dolorem essentialiter; sed causam ex qua, et aliis ad id necessariis, nascitur dolor, si aliunde non impediatur.—Nav. ibid, n. xiv.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficit actus qui licet non sit pœnitentia talis formaliter, est tamen virtualiter secundum Scotum communiter receptum.—Ibid. n. v.

<sup>5</sup> N. xxx.

<sup>6</sup> Imo quilibet amor Dei, quo plus quam omnia alia diligitur, videtur virtualis peccatorum pœnitentia, secundum communem quam sequitur. Jo. Medina, ibid. n. v.

<sup>7</sup> Cap. xi. n. vii. p. 133, supra.

<sup>8</sup> Cap. i. n. xxxviii. Pœnitudo momentanea—ad remissionem peccati juxta communem sufficiat.

this virtual penitence, if he remember his sins afterwards, is not bound to repent of then. So Corduba, Sotus, Vega, Bonacin. *ibid.* d. v. q. v. p. 2, n. i.

Thus we have repentance sufficient to salvation in the Roman church without any sorrow, without any sense or remembrance of sin. And how can they count any more sorrow for sin necessary, who hold that no prudent person doth confess his sins to a priest, but he detests them formally or virtually,<sup>1</sup> and so some way sufficiently; when it is known to be their common practice to confess sins, without any sorrow or detestation thereof? Yea, even in the hour of death, asking God forgiveness, without any remembrance of sin or actual repentance, is enough for pardon. So Joseph the Minorite teacheth, favouring their conceit (as Lopez observes) who think it repentance enough, to beat their breasts, and say, 'Lord, have mercy.'<sup>2</sup> Nor doth such pernicious presumption find encouragement only in the Minorites' divinity. Pope Clement the Eighth contributes more to it when, in his indulgences sent to Poland, he promiseth pardon to any one whoever that is dying, if he have but the name *Jesus* once in his thoughts, though he cannot express it.

As there can be no true repentance without sorrow for sin, so neither without resolution to forsake it; and yet they teach, repentance may be as well without this as the other. A virtual resolution may serve, *i. e.* such a purpose to abandon sin, as he may have who never thought of leaving it.<sup>3</sup> Navarre tells us that the sufficiency of such a purpose is learnedly and magnificently asserted by Vega.<sup>4</sup> He himself explains it and defends it, without any limitation, but that, the vanity whereof appears before;<sup>5</sup> and tells us the council of Trent requires not a formal purpose, but thinks that sufficient which is only virtual.<sup>6</sup> And their divines whom they call Nominals, deny that any purpose to forsake sin is necessary to repentance, as Soto informs us.<sup>7</sup> So that by the doctrine of all sorts of divines

<sup>1</sup> Nullus est adeo imprudens qui tempore confessionis peccata sua non detestatur formaliter vel virtualiter.—*Major et Victoria in Lopez*, c. xvii. p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> Sufficere ad contritionem, tusionem pectoris, aut prolationem *Miserere mei*—cap. xiii. p. 90. Instante mortis, præ angustia tollente recordationem peccatorum, si quis toto corde petat veniam, sine actuali penitentia, per orationem justificabitur.

<sup>3</sup> Non est necessarium ad remissionem peccatorum formale propositum vitandi peccatum.—*Vega. Concil. Trident.* l. xiii. cap. xxi.

<sup>4</sup> Cap. i. n. vi. Sicut actus, qui est penitentia virtualis, sufficit, ita eadem ratione sufficere videtur, quod eam comitetur id, quod est propositum virtuale confitendi, satisfaciendi, et amplius non peccandi, n. xi.

<sup>5</sup> N. xii.; vid. Suarez. tom. iv. disp. xx. sect. iv.

<sup>6</sup> Graves doctores existimant sufficere virtuale propositum, ita Major, Almain, Vega, Medina, Petrus, Soto, Navar, Adrian.—*Idem. ibid.* disp. iv. p. 3, n. ii.

<sup>7</sup> Ex nominalibus quidam addubitant, nam in ratione contritionis necessarium sit propositum cavendi a vitiis in futurum. Atque id negant Soto de natur. et gr. l. ii. c. xiv. p. 99; vid. Canum, Cordubam qui refert Durandum, Paludanum, Capreolum et Antoninum, pro tali sententia in Suarez, tom. iv. disp. xx. sect. ii. n. vi. Non esse necessariam detestationem efficacem cum absoluto dolore et proposito non peccandi, sed displicentiam quamcumque, cum velleitate non peccandi, sufficere ad valorem sacramenti, tenet Cajetan, Victoria, Canus, Ledesma, Sicut Paludanus, Sylvester.—*Ibid.* sect. iv. Aquinas, Capreolus, Thom. Hurtado.—*Tom.* ii. tr. ult. n. 501.

Neque oportet, ut confessor sibi persuadeat, et judicet etiam probabiliter, ita esse futurum ut penitens a peccando absteineat, sed satis est, ut existimet tunc habere tale propositum, quamvis post breve tempus illud sit mutaturus. Ita docent omnes auctores.—*Idem.* disp. xxxii. sect. ii. n. ii. p. 426.

Scotus in iv. dist. xiv. q. ult. art. iii., and Sylvester after him, sum. v. confessio, n. xxiv., hold that neither sorrow for sin, nor resolution against it (no, not so little as they ascribe to attrition) is needful; but that a willingness to partake of their sacrament is sufficient for justification by it.

amongst them, a repenting, which wants the essentials of true repentance, will suffice in life or death.

Secondly, A repentance or sorrow for sin which is merely natural is counted sufficient. The apostle to true repentance requires godly sorrow, 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10, but they, many of them, think it not requisite that it should be godly, no, not in respect of its original. That will serve which is not from God, but from nature. Scotus, a leader of one mighty squadron of their school doctors, determines, that such a sorrow may be had by the power of nature as will in congruity merit pardon of sin.<sup>1</sup> And Adrian, Durandus, with all the Nominals in a manner, take that to be his judgment, and are of the same persuasion themselves. The Franciscans maintained it in the council of Trent.<sup>2</sup> Aquinas, whom the rest of their school divines generally follow, was of that opinion too.<sup>3</sup> And the chief of the Dominicans, his modern followers (even those of them who are loath their angelical doctor should appear to be so much a Pelagian), do hold, that such a sorrow as is merely from nature (without either habitual grace or special assistance) is enough to justify him who through ignorance thinks it enough. So Canus and Soto in Lopez,<sup>4</sup> from whence Lopez infers, that in their account such remorse for sin, as requires special assistance, is not necessary to the justification of a sinner; but that may suffice which is had from the power of nature, though the ground of it be but outward disgrace.<sup>5</sup> Thus if we will believe the Roman doctors, Thomists or Scotists (the Jesuits, who serve themselves of both as they see occasion, I need not mention, since of their concurrence herein there is no question), a sinner may be saved by such a sort of repentance as is not the gift of God, but the pure issue of corrupt nature.

Thirdly, A slight and inconsiderable sorrow (such as falls short of what the Scripture calls for) will suffice instead of true repentance. One act of grief, they tell us, is enough for the sins of a whole life, one only, there needs not two. So Soto,<sup>6</sup> Bellarmine,<sup>7</sup> &c. One act will serve for all sins in general and together; remembered or not remembered, in which sense

<sup>1</sup> *Expresse ipse (Scotus) in iv. dist. xiv. q. ii. ait., quod ex puris naturalibus, cum communi influenza, potest esse attritio, quæ sit meritum de congruo ad deletionem peccati mortalis—adeo pro constanti ubique habet, quod naturaliter possumus disponi de congruo ad justificationem: quam solam dispositionem ipse docet. Atqui Adrianus, Durandus, et ferme Nominales, et ita illum sentire indubie putant, et sentiunt ipsi.—Soto, ibid. l. ii. c. iv. p. 68.*

<sup>2</sup> That a man by natural power only may feel a sorrow for sin, which is a disposition, and merit of congruity to abolish it.—*Hist. of Coun. of Trent. l. ii. p. 198.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid. et Soto, ibid. l. i. c. ii. Aquinas opinionem communem insequutus affirmasset, tum quod homo ex naturalibus posset se disponere ad gratiam, tum quod dispositio illa esset meritum de congruo, p. 66.*

<sup>4</sup> *Quæstio oritur, an cum attritione orat solum ex viribus naturæ simul cum sacramento in re, possit pœnitens justificari. Et quidem quæstio est, quæ nobis Thomistis facit negotium, propterea quod Scotus et Canus clarissimi Thomistæ, videntur hic affirmativam tenere, cap. viii. p. 53.*

<sup>5</sup> *P. 55.*

<sup>6</sup> *S. Thom. Nugnus, Navar, Victoria, Sotus, Pitigianus, Zerola, Cajet., Palatius, Canus, in Bonacina.—Ibid d. v. q. v. p. 5, n. i*

*Satis est si pœnitens peccatis omnibus memoratis, unam detestationem applicet.—In Lopez, c. vi. p. 39.*

<sup>7</sup> *Neque illud exigitur ut tot sint actus contritionis, quot sint peccata—est concedendum hominem unica actione peccata omnia, quæ memoriæ forte occurrunt, detestari, atque ob ea commissa dolere: alioquin enim falsum esset, quod paulo ante demonstravimus, in momento posse hominem converti, et justificari.—De Pœnit, l. ii. c. xi. p. 944.*

they say general repentance will suffice.<sup>1</sup> Their sense de Graffis thus reports: A particular repentance is not required, but one general will serve, extending itself, at least virtually, to all mortal sins, both which he remembers, and remembers not; with a will to abstain from all; this is enough for remission of sins.<sup>2</sup>

Further, this one act of grief needs be but very little and slender; the very least remorse, in the lowest degree that can be, will serve.

When they require no sensible sorrow at all to repentance, but only a dislike of the will, or a will not to have sinned, the least and weakest motion of the will that way (against past sins) will suffice.

To the perfection of repentance, a certain slender inward grief is requisite, saith Maldonate;<sup>3</sup> one act of contrition, though it be remiss, is enough, saith Tolet. These two are Jesuits, but speak more modestly than others of their doctors. Let us hear Canus: We need not grieve for sin as much as we can; such an endeavour is not required in any other precept for love, faith, hope, or righteousness.<sup>4</sup> Yea, they would be foolish precepts, if they enjoined a certain degree. But if we need not grieve so much as we can, how then? Why, as little as can be; or if that will not satisfy, as little as we will. *Quantumcunque sit remissa*, saith Navarre.<sup>5</sup> Penitence, be it never so little, it is sufficient for the washing away of all crimes, according to the common sense of the doctors, *quantumvis remissa*, be it as little as you will, says Lopez after Aquinas.<sup>6</sup> No certain degree, none that can be assigned, above the least of all, is requisite in Bellarmine, Victoria, &c.<sup>7</sup> But should there not be a degree, more than the least, for the more grievous sins? No, no more for them than the less. In honesty we may grieve more for the greater, to comply with the advice of God, but there is no necessity for it; it is only matter of counsel, and so left to our pleasure.<sup>8</sup> But must we not grieve for sin, as those who conceive it to be hateful above all, and most to be avoided? No, not that neither.<sup>9</sup> Lopez tells us, that neither council nor Scripture have declared it necessary to grieve for sin, as that which is

<sup>1</sup> Cajetan, sum. v. contrit. p. 103, 104; Soto, dist. xvii. q. ii. art. iii.; Tol. l. iii. c. xv. p. 516.

<sup>2</sup> Non requiri singularem sed quod sufficiat una generalis, quæ saltem virtualiter se extendat ad omnia peccata mortalia, &c., l. i. c. v. n. v.

Satis est ut concipiat generalem ejusmodi pœnitentiam quæ virtute se extendat ad omnia mortifica. Navar. c. i. n. xxii., quod tenendum est cum Jo. Majore et Cardinale S. Sixti, alii communiter—*In Bonacin.* ibid. punct. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Ad perfectionem pœnitentiæ requiritur tenuis quidam dolor internus, sum. q. xvi. art. i. Contritio una licet remissa, l. iii. c. v.

<sup>4</sup> Præceptum de actu fidei et de actu spei homo implet, etiamsi non agat ex toto conatu; ergo et præceptum de charitate et contritione: non ergo contritio totum animi conatum exigit—quod autem nullum ejusmodi esset præceptum, patet, esset enim stultum præceptum, quod semper invincibiliter ignoratur.—*Relect. de Pœnit.* pars. iii. p. 841.

<sup>5</sup> Quantumcunque sit remissa—satis est ad crimina diluenda, cap. i. n. xxxi. Secundum mentem communem doctorum.

<sup>6</sup> Secundum, S. Thom. quæcunque contritio vera, quantumvis remissa, etiam in instanti concepta, satis est ad remittenda omnia mortalia, cap. xv. p. 91.

De Pœnit. l. ii. c. xi. p. 943; Contrit. n. cvi.

<sup>7</sup> Dicendum est ad rationem contritionis nullam definitam intensionem requiri, sed sufficere substantiam actus, in quocunque gradu fiat.—*Suarez*, tom. iv. disp. iv. sect. iv. Ita expresse, Gabriel, Soto, Medina, Vega, Nevarrus.—*Ibid.* n. ix.

Vid. plures in Bonacin, ibid. punct. vii. n. iii.

<sup>8</sup> Licet de graviori peccato gravior requiratur pœnitentia sive pœnitudo, hoc tamen intelligendum est de consilio et honestate, non autem de necessitate.—*Navar.* c. i. n. xxxi.

<sup>9</sup> Detestari peccatum supra omne malum pœnæ, non necessarium.—*Cajetan*, *Navar.*, Vega, in *Suarez*, ibid. disp. iii. sect. ix. n. viii.

most hateful, and (which is more than all) that the council of Trent requires it not.<sup>1</sup> Navarre had said as much before him, only the former thinks it may be requisite that the penitent do not expressly or positively form in his mind a resolution not to grieve for sin above all that is hateful.<sup>2</sup> Thus is repentance reduced in a manner to nothing. In respect of appreciation, it is too much to grieve for sin, as that which is most odious; in respect of intensesness, it is enough to grieve less for it than other grievances; the least degree of all is sufficient, and that which is next to nothing may serve.

Moreover, this one act, so extremely little, may be despatched in a moment.<sup>3</sup> The least degree of it is enough, but the least continuance is too much; all the repentance that is a sinner's duty may be perfectly finished in the twinkling of an eye; an indivisible instant can serve all the exigencies of it, and it may be as soon over as a man can say *Peccavi*. It is such an act as vanishes so soon as ever it appears, and is come and gone before there is time to observe it; they allow not the least space, the least particle of time to be necessary for it. And it is so in faith, hope, love, and other virtues; no man ever required any space of time for this; so Bellarmine,<sup>4</sup> Canus de Graffiiis;<sup>5</sup> so Navarre,<sup>6</sup> so all in a manner; for he tells us it is the common sense of their divines.<sup>7</sup> The least penitence that may be, in the shortest time that can be, yea, in that which is less than any particle of time, even in an instant, is enough to blot out all crimes. And Scotus, for saying that penitence despatched in a moment is not sufficient for pardon, had like to have suffered shrewdly, every one almost being ready to fall foul upon him; but his followers have compounded for him, and brought him off with a distinction, which makes him say as the rest do, whether he thought so or no.<sup>8</sup> And now it passeth currently, that all the sorrow which any need have for all his sins may be over in less than a minute, and may be begun, perfected, and ended in less time than you can pronounce the least syllable of *miserere*, and this they restrain not to extraordinary cases, but conclude it as common to all. Finally,

This one little act, so suddenly despatched, need never return: do it but once, and no need to do it again. The act, though next to nothing in degree, though nothing at all as to continuance, is not necessarily to be repeated, or the defect of it to be supplied by another act, though there be time and occasion for it; all exercise of repentance for sin, supposed to be thus pardoned, upon any occasion, is altogether unnecessary. Having passed one act of grief, so extremely slender and so suddenly over, he needs never trouble himself with it further. There is no command<sup>9</sup> that can oblige us to

<sup>1</sup> Nullum concilium, nec sancti, nec scriptura sacra, id supra omne odibile, dolorem necessarium esse expressere, c. xv. p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> Cap. i. n. xxv.

<sup>3</sup> Sufficit, si fiat in instanti.—*Bonacin*, ibid. punct. viii. ibi. Nugnus, Molfesius, et alii.

<sup>4</sup> Non requiritur certus gradus intensionis, neque mora ulla temporis ad veram contritionem—quis unquam in præceptis fidei, spei, dilectionis, aliarumque virtutum istas mensuras excogitavit, &c.—*De Pœnit.* l. ii. c. xi. p. 943.

<sup>5</sup> Canus. pars. iii.; *Relect. de Pœnit.* p. 842.

<sup>6</sup> Graff. l. i. c. v. n. vii.

<sup>7</sup> Secundum mentem communem doctorum, quam explicat, Jo. Major, pœnitudo circumamicta debitis circumstantiis et supradictis, quantumcunque remissa, et brevissimo tempore, etiam in instanti concepta, satis est ad crimina diluenda, cap. i. n. xxxi. et n. xxii. et n. xxxviii.

<sup>8</sup> Vid. Lopez, cap. xv. p. 94, alii Scotistæ videntur Scotum salvare ejus sensum et mentem interpretando—nam culpam posse remitti per contritionem etiam remissam, et habitam in instanti, non dubitavit, &c.

<sup>9</sup> Non est præceptum quod nos obligat ad eam habendam bis speciatim de eodem.

have it twice for the same sin. Such is the repentance which, in the church of Rome, is counted sufficient for salvation even in ordinary cases; how agreeable it is to that which the Scripture makes necessary, let others judge; to me it seems calculated for the humours of those who would be saved with a conceit of repenting, without troubling themselves with the thing; yet this is not the worst. For,

Fourthly, When they have commended to sinners a sort of repentance which is not sufficient to save them, they take it for granted that it is insufficient, and yet maintain that it is enough, if the sinner do but think so, yea, or do not think the contrary. He that thinks he is contrite, saith Soto, when he is not,<sup>1</sup> though his inward remorse be not sufficient, yet because he means honestly, he shall receive justifying grace by the sacrament. Navarre tells us that Soto herein followed Aquinas commonly received, and he,<sup>2</sup> after Franciscus Victoria, judgeth it to be the plain sense of the council of Trent;<sup>3</sup> Corduba, Canus, and de Graffius,<sup>4</sup> with others, concur herein. As for the followers of Scotus, amongst them it is taught, that whosoever thinks he is contrite, hath really obtained pardon; and therefore none, who make account they bring contrition to the sacrament, do by it receive the first grace, because they are possessed of it already, by thinking so well of themselves,<sup>5</sup> as Soto reports them. Add but Cardinal Tolet (that we may see how all orders conspire herein<sup>6</sup>), those who come with remorse (which they think to be contrition) receive the first grace. He thus explains it: Sometimes a man hath some grief for sin which is not sufficient for pardon; but the sacrament being added, he is pardoned.

Thus, all sorts agree in this conceit, which I know not whether it be more ridiculous or pernicious, that a man's thinking he hath true repentance, when he hath it not, is enough (at least with the sacrament of absolution) to save him. Let any man but delude himself, or be deluded by others, with a false conceit that he truly repents, when he doth not; and any priest can let him, in his impentence, into heaven; if the best of the Roman guides may be believed, or those impostors regarded, who hereby make it plain (if they did it no other way), that they are given up to strong delusions.

Fifthly, If a man want that penitent sorrow which is sufficient, yet if he signify that he would have it, or that he is sorry that he hath it not, it is as effectual as if he had it. The penitent is to be asked (saith Paludanus) whether he repent; and if he do not grieve sufficiently, whether this do not

—*Navar*, c. i. n. xxviii.; vid. *Sylvest* sum. v. contrit. n. iv. He is not obliged afterwards when he remembers his sins, Aquinas, Navar, Sayrus, Angles, Pitigianus, Mofesius, &c.—*Bonacin*, *ibid.* punct. ii. n. ix.

<sup>1</sup> Tum enim licet attritio interna non sufficit, tamen quia ille bona fide accedit, recipiet gratiam per sacramentum.—*De Nat. et Grat.* l. ii. c. xv. p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> Cap. i. n. xlii. et n. xxxv.

Quando non habet signa sufficientia doloris, potest et debet interrogare pœnitentem, an ex animo detestetur peccatum, cui affirmanti credere tenetur. Et hoc idem dicendum est de proposito in futurum—Ita docent omnes authores.—*Suar.* tom. iv. disp. xxxii. sect. ii. n. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Victoria, Soto, Ledesma, Vega, Corduba; in Suarez, l. iv. disp. xx. sect. i. n. vii.

<sup>4</sup> Quando saltem concipitur ob amorem Dei—cum credulitate quod habeat sufficientem dolorem, licet revera illum non habeat, l. i. c. ii. n. viii. et n. vi.

<sup>5</sup> Neque vero ignoro nominalium quorundam opinionem docentium, quod quicumque existimat se esse contritum, revera obtinuisse jam veniam, atque adeo quod nullus cogitans contritionem se adferre ad sacramentum, per ipsum recipit primam gratiam: quin vero jam recipit per suam bonam illam cogitantiam.—*Ibid.* p. 102.

<sup>6</sup> Aliquando homo dolet de peccato, dolore qui per se non sufficeret delere peccatum, et tamen accedente sacramento deletur.—*Just.* l. ii. c. xvi. p. 460.

displease him, and whether he would not grieve sufficiently;<sup>1</sup> and this (saith he) is sufficient, which Sylvester would have well observed, because one so disposed may be absolved (*i. e.* though he want that repentance which is sufficient, yet he hath enough to put him into a saving state); and this, he tells us, is not only the sense of Peter Paludanus, but of Aquinas and Bonaventure, and all their divines. Navarre saith as much, approving it as the opinion of all their doctors.<sup>2</sup> And yet this willingness, which they will have to supply the want of sufficient repentance, is but a conditional velleity, such as, Lopez observes,<sup>3</sup> may stand with an absolute unwillingness to repent sufficiently; such a will as a whore may have to leave the stewes when she hath an absolute purpose to stay there; and yet he himself<sup>4</sup> will have such a velleity with attrition (which is far from true repentance) to be sufficient in the want of it. And this leads us further;—

Sixthly, Attrition, though known by the sinner to be short of true repentance, is sufficient without it, to pass him into a saving state, if the sacrament be added. Betwixt *contrition* (which with them is true or complete repentance) and this *attrition*, the distance is great; they give an account of it in many particulars.<sup>5</sup> *That* is a grief for offending God, *this* for temporal or eternal punishment, as the greatest evil; *that* proceeds from filial, *this* from slavish fear; *that* cannot be had without supernatural assistance, *this* may be had by the power of nature, say many of them; *that* is an act formed by grace and love, *this* an act unformed, destitute of grace and love; *that* can pass one into the state of grace, with a desire only of the sacrament, *this* cannot, without an actual partaking of it; so, in fine, *that* is complete repentance, *this* but a defective remorse,<sup>6</sup> such as was in Antiochus and Judas. Attrition, we see by their own account, is very far from true repentance, yet being held sufficient for a saving state without it, if the sacrament be added, by virtue hereof, repentance is most evidently rendered needless. And such attrition they think sufficient for this purpose, as either ariseth from the turpitude of sin, as it is disagreeable to reason, or from fear of hell, or apprehensions of temporal punishments and damage, as loss of health, credit, estate, &c. The council of Trent admits of any of these. For attrition, by their declaration,<sup>7</sup> is either<sup>8</sup> that which proceeds from consideration of the

<sup>1</sup> Secundum Pet. de Pal. a pœnitente requirendum est, si pœnitet: et si non sufficienter dolet, an hoc sibi displicet, et vellet sufficienter dolere. Et hoc, inquit, sufficit, quod valde nota, quia sic dispositus est contritus vel saltem attritus, ut possit absolvi—et est mens S. Thom. S. Bonavent et omnium Theologorum.—*Sum. v. contrit. n. ii.*

<sup>2</sup> Cap. i. n. xviii. et cap. x. n. iv.

<sup>3</sup> Secundum doctores et ipsum Navarrum pœnitentia de præteritis habetur per istum conditionalem actum, Nolle peccasse, sed cum istis conditionalibus nolleitatibus aut velleitatibus, stare potest propositum absolutum de sibi contrario. Ut cum nolleitate qua ingruente procella mercator nolleit projicere merces suas in mare secundum, Aristot. stat absolutum propositum eas projiciendi. Et cum velleitate quam meretrix in lupanari tenet inde exeundi, stare potest absoluta voluntas ibi manendi. Cap. xv. p. 91.

<sup>4</sup> Non sufficit cum sacramento pœnitentiæ ad salutem, nisi saltem attritio adsit, ibid.—*Vide Suarez.*

<sup>5</sup> Vide Soto in iv. sent. dist. xvii. p. ii. art. iii.; Graff. l. i. c. ii. n. iii.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ibid. C. Judas. C. Sceleratior; de pœn. dist. iii.

<sup>7</sup> Quinimo minime malum est pœnitere solum metu pœnæ, infamiæ vel alterius mali: modo voluntatem peccandi excludat, luculenter declarat, Concil. Trident. Sess. xiv. c. iv.; Navar. cap. i. n. viii.; Vega lib. xiii. in Trident. c. xiv. Concedit detestationem ob metum aliarum pœnarum, esse attritionem, et contineri sub primo membro: nam Concilium utrumque conjunxit, scil. ex metu gehennæ et pœnarum, in Suar. tom. iv. disp. v. sect. ii. n. xv. vide Bonacin. ibid. punct. iii. n. iii.; Zerola. Chamberota, Pitigianus, et alii. ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Illam vero contritionem imperfectam, quæ attritio dicitur: quoniam vel ex turpi-

turpitude of sin, or fear of hell, or other punishment. And such attrition is, with the sacrament, sufficient for pardon, as is determined by that council in these words: Hereby he makes his way to righteousness; and although without the sacrament, it [attrition] cannot by itself bring a sinner to justification, yet it disposeth him to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of penance.<sup>1</sup> So that, by their doctrine, attrition so disposeth a sinner for justification, that their sacrament being added, it actually justifies, *i. e.* puts a sinner into a state of grace and salvation. From this sentence of the council, as Bellarmine tells us,<sup>2</sup> the truth of what their divines hold is conspicuous, viz. that attrition, arising out of fear, is a disposition to justification, and the sacrament being added, doth truly justify. How generally they hold (with some difference of notion) the sufficiency of attrition with their sacrament, we may see in such as give an account of their opinions distinctly (not taking any of the Society into the reckoning): it will be enough but to name some of them, since their suffrages, after the determination of a council, are less needful. Some are for attrition improved,<sup>3</sup> as Henricus, Cajetan, Ferrarionensis, Petrus, Soto; some for attrition mistaken for contrition,<sup>4</sup> as Victoria, Soto, Ledesma, Vega, Corduba; some for attrition known to be so,<sup>5</sup> as Aquinas, Scotus, Paludanus, Capreolus, Durandus, Adrian, Antoninus, Sylvester, Canus; and some<sup>6</sup> for the opinion of attrition without the reality. But this is enough to shew that, by the doctrine of their church, attrition with the sacrament is sufficient to put a sinner into a saving state at any time, living or dying. Thus is true repentance reduced to attrition, and this made enough to qualify an impenitent sinner for pardon, so as he cannot fail of it; and yet attrition, of what kind soever, can scarce pass for a good quality. That sort of it which is rational (a dislike of sin, because it [is] disagreeable to reason), is not so good in their account as that which is servile; because, as such,<sup>7</sup> it is but a mere natural act, and hath no respect to God, and so hath nothing in it which looks like godly sorrow. As for that which is servile (a dislike of sin only, or principally, for fear of punishment temporal or eternal), this is so far from being spiritually good, that it is morally evil; so bad it is, by the authority and reason of their own divines. Thus Gregory, Almain, and Adrian conclude,<sup>8</sup> that it is evil to act out of fear of punishment, as the next end or motive. It is no better by the reasoning of others, who would have us think better of it; a sinner thereby prefers himself before God; and that sure is a sin (in any, unless they will except 'his holiness') not any repenting of sin; for he that dislikes sin for punishment principally, or as the greatest evil, regards more (as themselves argue) that which is evil

tudinis peccati consideratione, vel ex gehennæ et pœnarum metu communiter concipitur, Sess. xiv. cap. iv.

<sup>1</sup> Quo pœnitens adjutus viam sibi ad justitiam parat, et quamvis sine pœnitentiæ sacramento per se ad justificationem peccatorem perducere nequeat: tamen eum ad Dei gratiam in sacramento pœnitentiæ impetrandam disponit.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Et de eo loquuntur theologi, cum dicunt, attritionem ex timore conceptam, dispositionem esse ad justificationem, et sacramento accedente, revera justificare, ut perspicuum est ex concilio Tridentino, Sess. xiv. c. iv. de pœnit. l. ii. c. xviii. p. 972.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Suarez. tom. iv. disp. xx. sect. i. n. v.

<sup>4</sup> N. vii.

<sup>5</sup> N. ix.

<sup>6</sup> Soto, Canus, Vega, n.

<sup>7</sup> Detestatio peccati quia est contra rationem non est sufficiens, quia non respicit Deum ipsum, nec peccatum, ut est offensa ejus—tunc quia ex vi illius motivi non est supernaturalis.—*Idem. ibid.* disp. iv. sect. ii. n. xi. Primum itaque genus imperfectæ displicentiæ est, cum quis ddet de peccato propter humana naturaliaque motiva, ut quia turpe est et contra rationem.—*Canus, Relcct. de pœnit. pars. iii. p. 836.*

<sup>8</sup> Nonnulli catholici—operari ex timore tanquam ex fine proximo, judicant esse malum, ut Gregorius, Almain, Adrian, Suar. *ibid.* disp. v. sect. ii. n. iii. p. 65. Vide Angel. Sum. v. Timor.

to himself, than that which is evil to God, and so placeth the ultimate end in himself, not in God.<sup>1</sup>

*Sect. 8.* Having thus reduced repentance to a thing no better than we see attrition is, as though it were yet too good and too much, they bring attrition down to nothing. It is but as they describe it, a dislike of sin, not as that is offensive to God, but out of other respects, wherein self-love is most concerned, and slavish fear is most operative.<sup>2</sup> The least dislike of this nature will serve, and in the lowest degree that can be:<sup>3</sup> nor need this continue any longer than the least moment.

And it will be sufficient, say some, though it be but merely natural,<sup>4</sup> excited by some natural or human motive, without the grace of God, or his divine assistance; so Canus and Soto. Or it will serve if there be but a dislike that this dislike of sin is wanting;<sup>5</sup> so Paludanus, Navarre, and others. Or it will be enough if there be a willingness to have it in those who have it not,<sup>6</sup> according to the doctrine of their holy men, Aquinas and Richardus especially; or a man's thinking, probably, that he hath it when he hath it not,<sup>7</sup> will serve the turn, so Canus and Vega; or if he neither have it in reality nor in conceit, it will suffice, if he be but willing to partake of the sacrament;<sup>8</sup> for so, they tell us, he is virtually willing to be attrite, and this qualifies him for pardon, though he neither actually hath attrition, nor desires it; so Scotus, and Sylvester after him. Thus after attrition hath swallowed up true repentance, yet it still becomes more lank by their handling, and, in fine, shrinks quite away. But whether it be little or nothing, it will serve to justify them, yea, and that too without their ritual penance; other sacraments or rites, with this, will do it. They advance the sufficiency of attrition, for all the purposes of true repentance, even without their penance. This, with the eucharist, will serve; not (say they) that there is need of true contrition, a conceit that he hath it, with this and the eucharist,<sup>9</sup> will pro-

<sup>1</sup> Si pœna timeatur tanquam maximum, supremum, pessimumque malum, tunc est pravus timor, nam per illum prefert homo malum suum, malo Dei: unde in se, non in Deo, constituit finem ultimum.—*Idem.* disp. i. de spe. sect. iv. n. vi.; *Valent.* tom. iii. disp. ii. q. ii. punct. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Aquinas ii. 2. q. xix. art. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Nulla intentio vel duratio est de ratione contritionis (Gabriel, Soto, Medina, Vega, Navar.) et idem est de attritione propter easdem rationes.—*Suar.* ibid. disp. v. sect. i. n. vi.

<sup>4</sup> Ad effectum hujus sacramenti sufficere attritionem naturalem, *i. e.* solis viribus naturæ elicitam: sive illa sit concepta ex motivo æterno et honesto, ut est fugere pœnas inferni, vel turpitudinem peccati, sive ex motivo temporali et indifferente, ut est vitare infamiam, vel aliud temporale detrimentum.—*Soto et Canus,* ibid. disp. xx. sect. ii. n. vii.

<sup>5</sup> Satis est, ut quidam dicunt, quod pœnitens displicentiam habeat, quod de peccato non dolet.—*Ibid.* sect. i. n. ii.

<sup>6</sup> Sufficit, si quis vellet habere displicentiam, et Dei gratiam cavendi in posterum: quia talis est attritio virtualiter, secundum doctrinam sanctorum, maxime, S. Thom. et Rich.—*Sylvest. Sum.* v. Confess. i. n. xxiv.

<sup>7</sup> Aliqui sentiunt ad hunc effectum non esse necessariam veram attritionem, in re existentem, sed inculpabiliter et probabiliter putatam sufficere, quod sensit Canus et Vega. l. xiii. c. xxxiv.—*Suar.* ibid. sect. ii. n. ii. et alii in Bonacin, ibid. q. v. p. iii. n. vi.

<sup>8</sup> Imo dicitur fortius secundum Scotum, quod sufficit, quem velle talem displicentiam non solum formaliter, sed etiam virtualiter, eam volendo in sua causa, *i. e.* in sacramento penitentiæ justificante, quia in iv. dist. xiv. q. ult. in art. ii. tenet, quod ad consequendam gratiam per hoc sacramentum, non requiritur attritio: sed sufficit voluntas suscipiendi hoc sacramentum, &c.—*Sylvest.* ibid.

Imo aliqui Doctores asserunt hoc valere (*viz.* attritionem putatam) etiamsi ommissa sit vera attritio ob negligentiam in præparatione facienda.—*Bonacin.* ubi supra de pœnit. d. v. q. v. sect. i. p. 3. n. vi.

<sup>9</sup> Aquinas xiii. q. lxxix. art. i. ii. in Tol. l. vi. c. xvi. Halensis in Victorell, ibid.

cure him pardon. This, with extreme unction, will serve, as Sylvester<sup>1</sup> tells us; yea, this may be enough without any sacrament at all, as if a man in mortal sin, and so (with them) not in the state of grace, be killed, because he is a Christian, while he is asleep. If he was attrite, and willing to suffer before, by virtue hereof his sins are pardoned; so Cajetan, Sotus, and Lopez<sup>2</sup> after them.

In short, the mass may serve their turn; for divers of them hold that this being offered for such as are attrite, by virtue thereof (*ex opere operato*) immediately, and without more ado, they have pardon of mortal sins and habitual grace; so Catharinus (in Canus, loc. Theol. l. xii. c. xiii. p. 693) and others.

Here is competent provision made that sinners may perish securely, and never look after true repentance, living or dying. There is but one thing which may seem to give some check to this great encouragement. These administrations, whereby they will have the impenitent saved, depend upon a priest; and the sinner may be in such circumstances (though this be very rare) wherein a priest cannot be had; and then, if he should chance to die without contrition, he will perish. But this need not disturb any in their course of impenitence; for in case of necessity, where a priest cannot be had, another may serve in his stead; though he be a laic, confession may be made to him, and God will supply the want of a priest; so Aquinas (in iv. dist. xvii. q. iii. art. iii.); or he may have the eucharist administered to him without a priest; and it is their common doctrine that the eucharist justifies one that is in mortal sin if he be attrite, and thinks but himself contrite; yea, he may administer it to himself with the same effect in case of necessity. Divers of all sorts amongst them are of this opinion. The authority of Aquinas is alleged for it (iii. q. lxxxii. art. iii.), and Cajetan in Mat. xxvi. The example of the Queen of Scots (commonly produced), who, having the sacrament by her, administered it to herself, is highly approved by all.

Thus far Satan has prevailed with them to promote the damnation of sinners, by hardening them in impenitence, even when the interest of their priests seems a little concerned. But what if a catholic sinner, relying upon such impostors, still neglect true repentance, and death to surprise him so suddenly as to render these other devices unpracticable; is not his case then desperate? No; he may have as good hopes of salvation as other catholics have, a probable ground for his hope (and none must have any certainty). Such a ground is the judgment of their angelical doctor, who declares that if one sick desires penance, and before the priest comes he dies, or is speechless, the priest may look on him as if he had confessed, and may absolve him, being dead (*Opusc. lxxiii. de offic. Sacerd.*). Accordingly Clemens VIII. absolved one whom he saw falling from St Peter's church in Rome (*Molfes. t. i. tr. 7. c. v. n. xlvi.*); so that any may be absolved, *i. e.* pardoned and sanctified (for the sense of the priest's *absolve* is, I give thee grace which pardons thy sins, *Impendo tibi gratiam remissionem peccatorum; ut communiter doctores*; in *Jo. Sanc. disp. xxvii. n. xviii.*) even after they are dead, if they did but desire confession before. Now, those amongst themselves who do not desire confession while they live, are such only as will not have salvation if they might upon the most trivial terms, and so none need fear damnation, how impenitent

Soto d. xii. q. i. art. iv. dicit hanc esse D. Thomæ sententiam, et omnium. Suarez says, omnes theologi ita docent, tom. iii. disp. lxxiii. sect. ii.

<sup>1</sup> Sum. v. Sacram. n. iv. Navar. juxta opinionem, S. Thom. communiter receptam c. xxiii. n. xiii. this may (as they say of all their sacraments) ex attrito facere contritum, infundendo gratiam primam, ut communiter tenent omnes, in *Jo. Sanc. d. xxvii. n. viii.*

<sup>2</sup> Cap. xii. p. 83. Et hoc videtur sentire D. Thom.

soever otherwise they live and die, but such as are worse than any devil now in hell. And who can accuse them as too rigid, if they make true repentance unavoidably necessary for such as these, since this doctrine makes it needful for none besides ?

All these ways any man may be saved without true repentance, if he will believe the Roman doctors (though, if we believe Christ, he shall certainly perish that repents not, whatever course he takes besides). Any of these are probable, and may be by their principles (having grave doctors, more than enough, to authorize them) safely followed ; but that of the council's prescribing is infallible, and will not fail to secure those who practise it, if anything in their church may have credit, nor can fail to ruin those who follow it if the word of God may be trusted. Thus, while they would increase their party by having it thought that in their way scarce any Roman catholic will be damned, they take the course (in this as in other particulars) that none who will follow them can be saved, unless salvation be for the impenitent.

*Sect. 9.* By this it is also manifest that the charge brought against them in the three last articles for making saving faith, love to God, and true repentance, needless in life or death, is not founded only upon the opinion of their private doctors, or the greatest part of them, but hath that which they count the surest ground of all, the determination of a general council confirmed by the pope. For if attrition be sufficient, as that council declares, then true repentance is not necessary. If grief for sin, out of slavish fear or shame only, without any love to God, be enough, then love to God is needless ; and if love be not needful, then faith, which works by love, and is the only saving faith, is needless, till there be no time for it to work.

But is it credible that they who sometimes seem to lay so great stress upon these graces, as necessary to salvation, should contradict not only the Scriptures, but themselves, and make them needless, not only all a man's life before, but even when he is dying ? Sure, they must have some device to supply, in pretence at least, the want of these, if not before, yet at the point of death, and will substitute something in their stead of supposed equivalence to them. Indeed, they are fruitful in inventions tending to ruin souls and subvert the doctrine of salvation ; and one particularly they have in this case, and that is, what we before mentioned, their sacrament of penance. When a man is near death, if he be attrite and confess his mortal sins to a priest, and be absolved, by virtue thereof he hath remission of sins, and together therewith infusion of grace, particularly of faith, hope, and charity. Thus they come to have grace in a moment who lived graceless all their days before, and had died so if such a rite had not been provided for their relief. By virtue of this sacrament, love is planted in their heart, and their faith in God ; and sorrow for sin is formed by love, and becomes saving, so that if they die presently in that state, their salvation is secured. But what if they live, must not these habits be afterwards exercised ? must not there be some act of contrition in those who never had any before ? No ; by their doctrine there is no necessity for it, though there be no true actual repentance without it. The question is in one of their greatest divines, Whether in the law of grace, after justification obtained by the sacrament of penance with attrition alone, there remain any obligation to have contrition ?<sup>1</sup> And it is resolved that there is no such obligation, and that this is the judgment of all

<sup>1</sup> An etiam in lege gratiæ, post obtentam justificationem per sacramentum penitentiae cum sola attritione, maneat hæc obligatio habendi contritionem ? Dicendum est, per se loquendo, non manere in lege nova obligationem hanc post prædictam justificationem. Ita sentiunt omnes, qui putant sacramentum penitentiae justificare cum sola attritione cognita.—*Suarez*, tom. iv. disp. xv. sect. iv. n. xii. et xiii.

those who hold that the sacrament of penance doth justify with attrition alone, known to be so; and these are the most for number, and the most considerable for authority in their church and schools, Aquinas and Scotus both, whom the rest most commonly follow, concurring in it, besides their great council.<sup>1</sup>

*Sect. 10.* This, then, is the doctrine of their church, introduced there instead of that of the gospel. The habits must serve to save them without their acts, and the sacrament of penance will help those that are attrite to those habits. Here is all the hopes they have for sinners whom they have encouraged to continue all their days without repentance, saving faith, or love to God, even to the very article of death. If this sacrament do not perform all this for them, they will not deny but they are certainly damned. But what ground have they for this, upon which their everlasting estate depends? None at all but their own opinion, and the opinion of such men as themselves, without any support from the word of God. If their own word will secure them for eternity, they are safe enough; otherwise, trusting to this, they are lost for ever; the whole weight of their salvation hangs upon a spider's web, spun out of their own conceits. For this sacrament of penance, upon which all depends, is a mere invention of their own; there is no divine institution for it, it was never authorised by God, he never promised anything to it, or any part of it upon their terms, much less any such thing as they expect.

And who but they who are under the power of strong delusions would trust to anything for salvation without a word from him who is the absolute disposer of grace, and the sovereign Lord of life and death? Some of themselves acknowledge that their sacrament of penance<sup>2</sup> was never instituted by Christ. And many<sup>3</sup> of them hold that the material parts of it have no

<sup>1</sup> Aquinas, Scotus, Paludanus, Capreolus, Durandus, Adrian, Antoninus, Sylvester, Canus, *ibid.* disp. xx. sect. i. n. ix. Corduba, Vega, Sotus in Vasquez. (Corduba docet, quod qui justificatus est Sacramento penitentiae, cum contritione tantum existimata, non tenetur eorundem peccatorum contritionem veram habere; et eam aperte colligere licet ex Soto. Et ita Vega) in *iii.* Thom. q. 86. a. ii. d. ii. n. xi.

<sup>2</sup> Glossa quam nonnulli Canonistae secuti sunt. Erasmus, B. Rhenanus, Bonaventura, Alexander Alensis, Hugo Victor, Jansenius, in Suarez, tom. iv. disp. xvii. sect. i. n. ix.

<sup>3</sup> The essentials of this pretended sacrament are with them its matter and form. The matter of it consists in contrition, confession, and satisfaction; each of these are acknowledged by their own authors to be unnecessary any way, or at least by Christ's institution. Contrition, and therewith true repentance, is dismissed as unnecessary to this rite, not only by their other doctors, but by the council of Trent, and another thing assumed instead of it, as we saw before. Satisfaction is as unnecessary in their account. There is no need either that the priest should enjoin it (D. Thomas, Petrus Paludanus, Petrus Soto, Victoria, Ledesma, Cajetan, Navar, *ibid.* disp. xxxviii. sect. iii. n. ii. et iv.) or that the confitent should submit to it. Scotus, Gabriel, Medina, Sylvester, Amilla, Navar, Hostiensis, Panormitan, Cajetan. *ibid.* dist. xxxviii. sect. vii. n. i. Thus all material in it is reduced to confession, and so the rite has almost lost its name, being now commonly styled the sacrament of confession. Yet confession is acknowledged not to be of divine institution by all their canonists. *Sunt inter catholicos qui putant nullum esse divinum praeceptum de confessione, ut omnes decretorum interpretes, et inter scholasticos, Scotus, Maldonat.* Sum. q. xviii. art. iv, and their best divines deny the necessity of it as to this rite. *Hunc modum Secretae confessionis non esse de necessitate hujus sacramenti. Ita docent frequentius scholastici.* Alensis, D. Thomas, Major, Richardus de Sancto Victore, Paludanus, Soto, Adrian, Richardus, Medina, Pet. Soto, Vega, Castro, Cajetan (*Christum non instituisse auricularem confessionem*), Canus. *Et nunc censo hanc doctrinam certam ex concilio Tridentino, viz. neque in institutione posuit Christus Dominus modum secretae confessionis.* Suar. *ibid.* disp. xxi. sect. ii. n. ix. p. 290.

Yea, the form of it (their mode of absolution) is denied by their divines, who hold that the priests cannot forgive sins properly as to the fault and eternal punishment.

such institution. Now, to trust to any device of man for spiritual effects of so high a nature is impious folly; but to lay their salvation on it is prodigious madness. They may with as much reason expect the infusion of grace from the sprinkling of holy water, or the cleansing of a soul at death from the guilt and stain of sin by a priest's spittle; the Lord hath given them no more ground to expect any more from the one than from the other.

But I need not insist upon anything which they may have the confidence to deny. It will be plain enough by what they cannot but acknowledge, that neither pardon nor grace can be expected from their sacrament of penance as ordered by them. For they assert that pardon and grace are always inseparably conferred together, so that he hath no infused grace that hath not pardon.<sup>1</sup> And it cannot be denied but that pardon can never be had without true repentance; in Scripture nothing is more evident; he therefore that comes to the sacrament of penance with attrition only, and so without true repentance, he gets thereby nothing at all; neither pardon, which cannot be had without repentance, nor infused grace, which is never had without pardon; neither love, nor faith working by love, nor godly sorrow, nothing that is saving, unless he can have it without God, or against what he hath expressly declared. So that if he comes to their sacrament in a damnable condition, he certainly dies so, for any relief that rite will afford him. And therefore their doctrine, which encourageth sinners to live all their life without saving faith, or love, or repentance, in confidence that this rite will help them to these graces when they are dying, is a damning imposture; and their sacrament of penance, a most pernicious trap to draw sinners (as they set and bait it) out of the way of salvation whilst they live, and to plunge them into hell when they die, without any apprehension of their danger till there be no way to escape it.

*Sect. 11.* Hereby they manifestly declare themselves to be enemies to Christianity and the souls of men. For what more effectual course could they take to destroy these, and root out that, than by concluding it certain (as certain as they would have a decree of the council of Trent accounted), that though sinners neglect the great duties and acts of Christians, and live in any wickedness opposite to the rule of Christ, yet the church hath a device to save them, and by it they may be sure to escape hell without true repentance! What is this but to declare that the most damnable neglects and practices shall never damn them? Though they never repent thereof, the church hath a trick to secure them notwithstanding. What is this but to proclaim that the laws of God and the rules of the gospel are unnecessary impositions, without the observance whereof salvation may be had? The knowledge of Christ, explicit faith in him, actual love of him (which comprise all the rest), as they teach, are not necessary as means, salvation may be had without them. And as for a necessity hereof by virtue of any precept, that is not considerable, but in reference to the danger of not observing the precept; and there is no danger in this, though the neglect hereof were

*Qui negant potestatem clavium extendi ad remissionem culpæ mortalis.* So Magister sentent, Hugo, et Richardus de Sancto Victore, Alensis et Bonaventura, Gabriel, Major, Supplementum Gabr. Medina, Adrian, Petr. Soto, Altisiodorensis, Abulensis. — *Ibid.* disp. xx. sect. i. n. iii.

<sup>1</sup> Unde in ipsa justificatione cum remissione peccatorum hæc omnia simul infusa accepit homo per Jesum Christum cui inseritur, fidem, spem, charitatem. Concil. Trident. Sess. vi. c. vii. Gratia non præcedit sed simul infunditur cum remissione peccatorum. Bellarm. de pœnitent. l. c. p. 954.

Sperare a Deo remissionem peccatorum sine pœnitentia—modus pœsumptionis conjunctus cum hæresi. Pet. S. Joseph. Dei 1 præcept. art iv. Aquinas, Arragon, Bannes, Malderus, et alii in et cum Bonacin. in 1 præcept. q. iii. p. 1, n. 4.

in their account a mortal sin, no more than in venials (or no sins at all), if it will not damn those who never truly repent of it. So that plainly by excusing sinners from repentance, they make all sins safe and all duties needless; and give men assurance that they may live and die impenitently, in the neglect of all, even the most important duties, and in the practice of any, the worst, wickedness, and yet be saved. There never was any heresy broached in the world more monstrous and pernicious than this which the council of Trent hath brought forth; it hath all the damnable wickedness, both as to judgment and practice, that ever was or can be on earth, in the bowels of it. It promotes the birth, the growth, the continuance thereof; for it promiseth safety to impenitency therein, yea, salvation too, by a knack of a very easy use and new invention. It hath in it the venom of all damning opinions, practices, and neglects; for that which makes them all deadly is impenitency; nor would they without this be finally and unavoidably destructive. But this would have impenitency itself swallowed.

## CHAPTER VI.

*Their doctrine leaves no necessity of holiness of life, and the exercise of Christian virtues.*

*Sect. 1.* Holiness of life is needless by the popish doctrine; though the Lord hath made this every way necessary, both as a duty which he indispensably requires, and as a means without which he ordinarily will save no man. It is declared necessary both ways at once, Heb. xii. 14. The papists indeed boast much of it, and seem sometimes to lay great stress on it, as if they would have it to be a character of the true church; concluding theirs is the only true church, because there is no holiness to be found in the world but amongst them only. Thus they pretend it to be of greatest consequence; but this is but to serve another turn, the design is not for holiness of life, for their doctors count that more than needs. And really they are extreme good husbands here, and make a little holiness go a great way; for it is enough to denominate the universal church holy, if there be but one holy person in it. So Costerus: How many soever of its members be dead and impious, so long as there is any one man that retains holiness, the church must be called holy.<sup>1</sup> And then to make this one man holy, one act of virtue is enough, and that a very slender one too; for, saith Bannes, any one act of charity, how weak soever it be, is enough to fulfil all the commandments of God.<sup>2</sup> Now, he is doubtless a holy man who fulfils all those commandments. Further, this one act he need but do once, and that not all his life; he may defer it till he die, if he have no mind to trouble himself with it in any part of his life before, as we have already shewed. Yea, and he may be excused from it when he is a-dying too, as well as whilst he lives, if he can but get a priest to absolve him; and the priest must absolve him, if the dying man give but any sign which may be interpreted a desire of it.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tametsi ejus plurima membra sint emortua et impia, non amittit tamen sancti nomen, quamdiu vel unus pietatem ex animo colens, retinet sanctitatem. Enchirid. liii. c. viii. Possibile est, quod tota fides remaneret in uno solo: et verum esset dicere, quod fides non deficit in ecclesia.—*Abbas in Sylvest. v. Concil. n. iii.*

<sup>2</sup> Quilibet actus charitatis, quantumlibet remissus, sufficit ad implendum omnia præcepta. In ii. 2, x. q. xlv. a. v.

<sup>3</sup> Vide above forty doctors for this in Jo. Sanc. disp. xlv. n. xxxiv. Sacramenta baptismi et absolutionis posse conferri, etiam iis qui in periculo vitæ sunt, licet ipi vi morbi oppressi non habeant usum rationis aut sensuum: modo constet eos antea

And their sacrament he must have, and be absolved absolutely, when speechless and senseless, if any can but witness that he desired confession, Antonin. iii. part. tit. 10, cap. ii.; Sylvest. v. confess. iii. n. 16; Paludan. dist. xxi. q. 2. a. 2. concl. 2. Yea, if he did not desire it, nor ever give any sign of repentance, he may be conditionally absolved, Rituale Pauli. 5. And though he have lived wickedly without restraint all his days, if at last gasp he be attrite, and have but (though it never appear) the virtue of Judas (only hoping better, *i. e.* presuming more, than he did), by virtue of such absolution he will be as certainly saved as other good catholics; though the other unfortunate wretch, for want of a priest (as virtuous as himself), to absolve and give him hope, was unhappily damned.

See here a most compendious way to be holy! Who can imagine any other but that such principles as these make holiness of life extremely needful? But, more particularly, we may discover how necessary they judge it, by what they determine concerning the necessity of exercising Christian virtues, and the forsaking of sin. There is no need of either of these by their doctrine.

*Sect. 2.* It is not necessary to live in the exercise of such virtues (though one would think that religion could not be Christian which obligeth not the professors of it to Christian virtues, and excuseth them from the most proper character of true Christianity), yet those who have the confidence to account themselves the only true Christians do this. For they teach that the acts of these virtues are required by affirmative precepts, and such commandments oblige not at all times; no, nor always when there is occasion and opportunity for the exercise of them, but only in the article of necessity; and when this is, it is not certain, there is no determination of it, it must be left to discreet men to judge; and being left to men, either they find no time for it at all, or none that will signify it needful to live in the exercise of such virtues. To exert an act of virtue once a year, or once in many years, or once in a whole life, or at the hour of death, is far enough from the daily exercise of Christian virtues, or an intimation that it is needful in their account who so determine. But indeed their church is more indulgent, and assures them all (that have no more regard for their souls than to believe it), that at the hour of death one act of slavish fear (though themselves count not that so much as a moral virtue<sup>1</sup>), with confession, will excuse the neglect of every Christian virtue all their lives, and make their way at last into heaven, though they never had one act of virtue, any one character of a Christian, all their days. A pleasant doctrine indeed, and greedily to be swallowed by those that have an antipathy to a holy life, if the gospel and the doctrine of Christ concerning hell and heaven and the way to it could be counted but fables.

*Sect. 3.* They reckon but three theological or divine virtues; all the other they call moral, of which the divine are the foundation, and so all the rest must stand or fall with them.<sup>2</sup> Now, two of these three they make needless desiderasse ejusmodi sacramenta—*Bellarm. de effect. Sacrament. l. ii. c. viii. p. 121.* *Actus charitatis semper requiritur ad justificationem, seclusis tamen sacramentis: sacramenta autem in non ponente obicem, eundem habent effectum, quem haberet charitas et contritio sine sacramento. Canus, Relect de pœnit. pars. iii. p. 844.* Thus, though an act of charity or repentance be requisite always where the sacraments cannot be had, yet the sacraments in him that gives no obstruction (as he does not who has neither the use of sense or reason) have the same effect that love to God or repentance would have, without the sacrament, *i. e.* the sacrament will justify and save them who have no act of love to God, or true repentance.

<sup>1</sup> Aquinas, ii. 2, q. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Virtutes theologice quæ sunt circa ultimum finem—sunt causæ omnium aliarum virtutum.—*Aquinas, ii. 2, q. clxi. art. iv. ad primum.*

(as is before declared), and without these two, hope, which is the third, is so far from being needful, that it is not possible to have it, as themselves acknowledge.<sup>1</sup> A lively hope with them is needless till they be dying, and then it can but be like the giving up of the ghost.<sup>2</sup> For to all that follow their doctrine, and look after no more than that makes necessary, their hopes at last can be no better, no other, than the expectation of such a pardon of sin, as a priest can give to an impenitent person, one to whom the Lord did never give hopes of pardon. And this is a hope than which despair itself is more hopeful; for this leaves no sense of danger (which despair retains), and so leaves no desire nor endeavour to avoid it, even when they are sinking into bottomless misery. Hope is no more needful with them than a house is to him who thinks himself concerned to dig up the foundation of it, and counts it enough that he hath a castle in the air. And when they have left nothing that can be a real ground of hope, they found it upon that which is worse than nothing, their own merits; that which is inconsistent with the free grace of God and the merits of Christ, without which sinners are hopeless.<sup>3</sup> It is a conjecture, founded upon a delusion, upon merit, which no man can have, and themselves say none of them know they have, and so upon they know not what. Oh wretched hopes, that have not so much for their foundation as the sand, that have nothing to bear them up but a proud and groundless fancy, that we might count ridiculous, if it were not too horrid to be the matter of sport. Can they blame those who doubt whether they will be saved, when they themselves have no better hopes of their own salvation?

How much they are concerned for hope they declare, when they tell us that the precept for hope does but of itself oblige, when the soul is tortured with the more grievous assaults of despair.<sup>4</sup> It seems, unless they be violently tempted to despair, they need not hope. This rarely falls out as to any, and is scarce the case of one in a thousand, so that there is not one of a thousand in popery who need have any hope in God, or of mercy from him. No, not any at all, as others teach; for the command for hope is satisfied both by grief for sin, and also by a purpose against it (Dian. after others, v. Spes.) So that either of these, or both at least, will supersede all acts of hope for ever, and make them needless. And indeed he that considers what sorrow and purposes they count sufficient, may believe them when they teach that these leave them without hope.

*Sect. 4.* The next in excellency to the divine graces, by their account,<sup>5</sup> is humility, and for this their doctrine makes excellent provision, as a virtue most necessary, by quite sweeping away the true ground of it. It leaves them without sense of any sinfulness, weaknesses, or unworthiness, to make or keep them humble. Being baptized, by virtue thereof all the sinfulness of their natures is not only pardoned or weakened, but quite washed away

<sup>1</sup> Fides et spes—sine charitate, proprie loquendo, virtutes non sunt, nam ad rationem virtutis pertinet, ut non solum secundum ipsam aliquod bonum operemur, sed etiam bene.—*Aquinas*, i. 2, q. lxxv. art. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Tempus quo obligant præcepta fidei et spei esse idem, quod tempus charitatis.—*Fill.* tr. xxii. n. ccxciii.

<sup>3</sup> Actus spei est expectare futuram beatitudinem a Deo, qui quidem actus perfectus est, si fiat ex meritis quæ quis habet, quod non potest esse sine charitate.—*Aquin.* i. ii. q. lxxv. art. iv. c. Propria certitudo spei est ex meritis. Certitudo quæ non est præsumptio, ex meritis est, et meritis se comitatur.—*Alex. Alensis.* q. lxxv. in iii.

<sup>4</sup> Quando graviores desperationis impetus animum vexant. Victorel. ad Tol. l. iv. c. vii., and Bonacin. (with others) in i. præcep. d. iii. q. iii. p. 2, n. ii.

<sup>5</sup> Post virtutes theologicas—humilitas est virtutum excellentissima, et potissima.—*Aquinas*, ii. 2, clxi. art. v.

and utterly abolished. So that they are pure, immaculate, innocent, even as our first parents were in the state of innocency; not anything left in the least that can be truly counted sin.<sup>1</sup> So that it would be very absurd and irrational for them to be humble under the sense of any remaining sinfulness, since they believe really there is none. But if they sin mortally afterwards (for venial sins they make no account of, and think that the Lord herein is such an one as themselves), they may be presently restored again by their sacrament of absolution to a perfect righteousness, without the least mixture or allay of what is faulty; a perfection short of heaven, because not so firm and fixed, but not wanting a hair of what is due, having not only all the parts, but every degree of what is required for their present state.<sup>2</sup> And by the power hereof they can fully and perfectly fulfil the whole law in every precept, without any culpable defect; they can fulfil it very easily, *facili et parvo negotio*.<sup>3</sup> Yea, they can do much more than the law requires, or the Lord hath made their duty;<sup>4</sup> so far are they bereaved of all sense of any weakness that might humble them. And their righteousness is not only spotless, but meritorious; there is such a transcendent worth and sufficiency in it, as they improve it, that they need not, at least after they are justified, ask anything of God but what they fully deserve at his hands. All that God doth for them is but the paying of his debts; his bounty is prevented, his grace is quite excluded; it is not in his power to bestow any free gift; all is due to the meritorious excellency of their performances beforehand. They can merit the first grace<sup>5</sup> in congruity,<sup>6</sup> the second grace by way of condignity; and heaven and glory is as due to them as a penny for a pennyworth, or hell is due to proud, presumptuous sinners. God would be unjust, and not pay what he oweth them on their own just account, if he should not let them have all the glory of heaven and eternity. They can merit the pardon of mortal sins before they have grace;<sup>7</sup> pardon of venial sins before or after; they can merit the continuance of grace while they have it, and the restoring of it when they have lost it.<sup>8</sup> They can merit not only for themselves, but for others; and deserve for them not only pardon, but grace;<sup>9</sup> such grace as will enable them to set up and merit heaven for themselves. They can merit not only habitual grace for them,<sup>10</sup> but the divine assistance, whereby the Lord works it. They can merit for them not only while alive, but when they are dead, and by their merits bring them out of those torments which are equivalent to the pains of hell, but only for the continuance, which their deserts hinder from being everlasting.

Here is a doctrine as proper to nourish humility as poison is to make a

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Trident. Sess. c. supra.

<sup>2</sup> Soto de Natur. et Grat. l. iii. c. iv. p. 134; Bellarm. de purgat. l. ii. c. iii. p. 1281, de justificat. l. ii. cap. x. p. 794.

<sup>3</sup> Idem. cap. i.

<sup>4</sup> Possumus facere plus quam debemus, si consideremus legem nobis a Deo impositam, et proinde possumus facere plus quam debemus.—Idem de Monach. l. ii. c. xiii.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. Soto ibid. l. ii. c. iii. p. 65 et 66; Bellarm. l. ii. de pœnit. c. xii. p. 945; Sancta Clara. Deus. Nat. Gr. Probl. xxi. p. 125.

<sup>6</sup> Conc. Trident. Sess. vi. ca. xxxii. and ca. xvi.

<sup>7</sup> Potest homo nondum reconciliatus per opera penitentiæ impetrare et mereri de congruo gratiam justificationis.—Bellarm. de just. l. v.

<sup>8</sup> Reparationem post lapsum et perseverantiam usque in finem, non cadere sub merito de condigno, sed solum de congruo.—Idem, ibid. cap. xxii. tit.

<sup>9</sup> Sicut certum est non posse unum alteri ex condigno gratiam mereri, ita non dubium est, posse id ex congruo fieri.—Idem, ibid. cap. xxi.

<sup>10</sup> De congruo potest unus alteri mereri primam gratiam, non solum sanctificantem, sed etiam primum auxilium supernaturale, et alia dona. S. Thom. i. 2, q. cxiv. art. vii.; vid. Fill. tr. xxi. n. ccccxviii.

man fat and healthful; however, this, as that, is apt to swell them big, and mount them upon the heights of boasting and glorying. It is far below persons of such dignity to receive eternal life at God's hands as a poor man receiveth an alms:<sup>1</sup> *absit*, far be it from them; it moves their indignation to think of it, that they should expect eternal glory for God's sake. They will not so disparage themselves as to have it in such a beggarly way; they will have it for their own sake, as that which they fully deserve, or else be without it. They will have it in a way more glorious, becoming persons of such transcendent worth, as conquerors and triumphers,<sup>2</sup> as a laurel which they have sweat for, and is due to their merit. The Lord must treat them as persons of such high quality, and in a way that suits their honour. Now it is much more honourable, saith Bellarmine, to have a thing by his own merit than another's gift (though God be the giver).<sup>3</sup> And the Lord (adds he), to honour them, would have them get heaven by their own deserts. Oh humble doctrine, and that which is as like the gospel as the apostle St Paul was to the king of pride. Can they think humility needful, who, plucking away the true grounds of it, instead thereof instil those principles, than which hell can scarce hatch any prouder?

*Sect. 5.* As for those virtues which concern men, they are all comprised in love, that love which affects others as capable of eternal happiness, and so desires it for them. Thus they describe Christian love (as for human or natural, we are not here concerned in it), and tell us it is this the Scripture speaks of, John xv. and Col. iii., and cannot deny but it is called for in the New Testament most frequently, and with greatest importunity; and yet their doctrine makes it needless. We are not bound, saith Sylvester,<sup>4</sup> to be moved with love towards any men whatsoever, but only in preparation of mind, if necessity occur. This seems to dissolve the obligation of this great command, and turn it into a mere counsel; for in these very terms they describe a counsel to us,<sup>5</sup> and thereby distinguish it from an obliging precept. But are we bound to love our brother when there is necessity? No, not when he is in such necessity as is extreme, and consequently never; for though it be requisite that we help him in that condition, yet we sin not if we do not help him out of Christian love; it is enough to avoid sin if we relieve him out of natural affection. Thus Navarre.<sup>6</sup> And this holds not only in the external necessities of others, but also in those that are spiritual; only he saith that it very rarely falls out that one can relieve spiritual necessities without this Christian love; but he tells us also,<sup>7</sup> that a Christian is rarely in such necessity. So that though it cannot be done without Christian love but very seldom, that will not make such love a duty at any time, because the external act needs not be done but seldom. Yea, if the external act also, whereby we should relieve the soul of our brother, be neglected, it is with

<sup>1</sup> *Absit ut justī vitam æternam expectent, sicut pauper elemosinam.*

<sup>2</sup> *Tanquam palmam suis sudoribus debitam.*

<sup>3</sup> *Magis honorificum est habere aliquid ex merito, quam ex donatione.*

<sup>4</sup> *Motu dilectionis—nec tenemur moveri ad quoslibet homines, nisi secundum præparationem animi, si necessitas occurreret.—Sylvest. v. charitas. n. iii.; Sum Rosel. v. charitas. n. v., both of them in the words of Aquinas.*

<sup>5</sup> *Præceptum differt etiam a consilio—quia consilium non est de necessitate ad salutem, nisi secundum præparationem animi, si oporteret (S. Tho.) i. 2. q. cviii.—Idem. ibid. v. præceptum. n. i. Gratian et Aquinas in Navar. cap. xx. n. xxi.*

<sup>6</sup> *Putamus non peccaturum eum, qui hunc amorem charitativum non conciperet erga eum, qui eam pateretur extremam necessitatem vitæ corporeæ, si modo alio, amore naturali, inferiore divino, ei opitularetur.—Navar. cap. xiv. n. ix.; Lopez. cap. liii. p. 274.*

<sup>7</sup> *Cap. xxiv. n. ix. Raro tamen ejusmodi necessitatem patitur Christianus, quum per contritionem absque alia ope salvari possit.*

them no great matter. For as Cajetan determines<sup>1</sup> that weakness of mind, which withholds us from those things which are profitable to our neighbour, especially for the salvation of souls, though it be grievous, it is but a venial fault. In short, whatever be the circumstances of our brother, yet we may be excused from loving him indeed, if we do but think we do it. For Navarre<sup>2</sup> and others tell us that he who honestly thinks himself to be in the state of grace when he is not, may satisfy this command for Christian love by some other kind of affection, so that it is enough to think that we have this love when we have it not; and this is confirmed by a reason *a fortiori*,<sup>3</sup> because it is so in our obligation to love God. Thus one dangerous error is grounded upon another, and by such arts we are discharged from all Christian affection to God or men. But we need not stay longer here. All necessity of this love they quite take away, by making it needless to love God, the connection between these being indissoluble by their own account.<sup>4</sup>

If any will not rely upon consequences, Cajetan tells them,<sup>5</sup> that the command to love our neighbour as ourself, obliges not to a love of charity, *i. e.* that special love which was always thought, till the Roman doctors taught otherwise, to be the great duty required of all Christians by the gospel. By the doctrine of Aquinas,<sup>6</sup> the precept requires no special act of love to our brethren, no formal<sup>7</sup> or internal act at all, nor any exterior that will signify more than the want of hatred. This is the common doctrine amongst his devoutest followers, the Dominicans.<sup>8</sup> Others express it thus:<sup>9</sup> There is no affirmative precept for love to our neighbour, no time for it; it is enough that we do nothing against him. Thus, so great a part of the whole sum of the law and the prophets, and all the rules of the gospel, leading us to brotherly love and the special expressions of it, are snapped off short; and we reach all that they oblige us to do, by doing nothing. We love them well enough, though we neither will nor do them good, if only we do them no mischief; or do no more for them than may be done without inward affection, or any Christian charity.

*Sect. 6.* It would be tedious to pursue this in all particular virtues. The generals which they acknowledge will serve for the rest. They confess<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pusillanimitas quando retrahit ex aliis utilibus proximo, et præcipue salutis animarum; licet veniale sit, grave tamen est.—Sum. v. pusillan. p. 485.

<sup>2</sup> Lopez, cap. liii. p. 275. Satisfacit præcepto de diligendo proximum, qui extra statum gratiæ, putans se verisimiliter in eo statu gratiæ esse.

<sup>3</sup> Videtur nobis non peccare neve illum, qui bona fide credens se esse in statu gratiæ, cum tamen non sit, adimplet præceptum de diligendo Deum ex charitate, quando ad id est obligatus; ita a fortiori satisfacere videtur præcepto de diligendo proximo ex charitate, qui extra statum gratiæ, illud implet, putans verisimiliter se in eo esse.—*Navar. ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Amor supernaturalis et divinus seu charitativus, vel charitas infusa, qua proximum amamus, est ejusdem generis et naturæ, cujus est amor Dei charitativus, seu charitas; secundum S. Thom. Nam licet objectum materiale amoris charitativi proximi sit idem proximus, objectum tamen formale, sive ratio vel causa amoris, est ipsa divina et infinita bonitas, quæ nihil aliud est quam ipse Deus—ut idem S. Thom. explicatus ibi a Cajetano.—*Idem, ibid.* n. vi. Charitas est dilectio qua diligitur Deus propter se, et proximum propter Deum, vel in Deo.—*Pet. Lombard*, dist. xxvii. Dilectio proximi nihil aliud est quam quidam Dei amor.—*Soto de Just.* l. vii. q. v. a. i. p. 242; vid. *Suar.* tom. iii. disp. lxxxii. sect. viii. p. 1078.

<sup>5</sup> Catherin. annot. adv. Cajet, p. 268.

<sup>6</sup> II. ii. q. xv. a. viii.; Quodl. iv. art. xxiv. ad. i.

<sup>7</sup> *Suar.* de Charitate, disp. v. sect. iv. n. iv.; Jo. Sanc. disp. i. n. xxi.

<sup>8</sup> Vid. Acacium de Velasco in Guinen. p. 139.

<sup>9</sup> Vid. Vasquez in 3 tom. iii. q. xc. art. i. dub. xl., dilectionis proximi ex charitate, cujus præcepti affirmative ego nullum tempus video. Satis est nihil contra ipsum facere.—*Vid. Jo. Sanc.* disp. i. n. xxi.

<sup>10</sup> Cognitio apprehensiva præexigit quidem ad fidem.—*Bellam.*

that knowledge must go before faith, and that faith<sup>1</sup> is the foundation of charity, and that charity, or love to God, which hath its rise and being from faith,<sup>2</sup> is the form and root of all virtues. They all agree in it, nor is it only evident by their own confession, but also by the nature of the things themselves, that other virtues depend upon knowledge, faith, and love, for their being or exercise. For example, without love to God proceeding from faith, there can be no delight in God, nor desires to enjoy him. Delight and desire are but love in several postures; desire is love in its motion, and delight is love in its rest. There can be no delight<sup>3</sup> in enjoying that which we love not, nor can the enjoyment of it be desirable; so, also, there can be no filial fear without love, for love is essential to it, and thereby it is distinguished from that which is slavish. Ingenuous fear springs from love,<sup>4</sup> and is nourished by it, and increaseth or declines with it; it cannot be, nor act, but when and where love is, and is acted. So that together with love, the fear of God and the acts of it are cashiered; even all due reverence of him, and care not to offend him.

It is their common doctrine,<sup>1</sup> that there is no special command, either for servile or filial fear of God; so that the want of it need neither be confessed nor repented of.<sup>5</sup>

So likewise there can be no hatred of sin, or sorrow for it, as it is an offence or dishonour to God,<sup>6</sup> nor any true virtue at all without love, nor love without faith, nor faith without knowledge. Now, these radical graces being rendered needless by their doctrine, as I have declared before, they hereby stub up all the rest by the roots, so that neither sprig nor bud thereof can be expected. To tell us, after this, that they count any exercise of Christian virtue needful, is as if a man should take the spring out of his watch, and then persuade us seriously that he counts it very necessary it should still go, and the wheels be always in regular motion.

*Sect. 7.* But let us stay here a little longer, and observe how their principles, concerning love particularly, disengage all from any exercise of virtue, and every act that is truly Christian. They take notice in virtue of a goodness that is merely moral, such as may be found in heathens; and of a goodness that is divine and supernatural, such as ought to be in Christians. This latter, they tell us, is derived from their end, when in the exercise of them they are referred to God as our supernatural end, and acted for his sake,<sup>7</sup> with an intent to please him. They declare, further,<sup>8</sup> that they cannot be thus referred to God without affection for him, nor done with a design to please him, unless they be done out of love to him; and so must be at least

<sup>1</sup> Fides est fundamentum spei et charitatis.—*Idem*. Fides generat spem et spes charitatem.—*Aquinas*. i. 2, q. lxxv. art. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Charitas est forma et radix omnium virtutum.—*Aquinas*, *ibid.* q. lxxii. art. iv.

<sup>3</sup> Spirituale gaudium quod de Deo habetur ex charitatis dilectione oritur.—*Aquin.* ii. 2, q. xxviii. art. i.

<sup>4</sup> Timor castus sive amicalis quo timemus ne sponsus tardet, ne discedat, ne offendamus, ne eo careamus, timor iste de amore venit.—*Mag. sentent.* iii. dist. xxxiv. Timor ex amore generatur.—*Bonavent.* iii. dist. xxxiv. n. lxxxiii. Quanto aliquis plus habet de spiritu amoris, tanto plus habet de spiritu timoris.—*Idem, ibid.* n. lxxxvii.; *vid. Aquin.* ii. 2, q. xix.

<sup>5</sup> Licet nonnulli existiment dari speciale præceptum horum timorum, ita ut eorum defectu speciale peccatum committatur; oppositum tamen docetur communiter, longoque est probabilius.—*Pet. S. Joseph*, de i. præcepto, p. 55.

<sup>6</sup> Nulla virtus est vera virtus sine charitate.—*Aquinas*.

<sup>7</sup> *Vid. Navar*, cap. xiv. n. vii.

<sup>8</sup> Convenit inter omnes, ut opus referri debeat in Deum, ut finem supernaturalem, si futurum sit meritorium vitæ æternæ, at opera virtutum cæterarum non referuntur in Deum, ut finem supernaturalem, nisi a charitate imperentur et dirigantur, &c.—*Bellarmin.* de *Justific.* l. v. cap. xv. p. 958.

imperate acts of love, that they may be Christian acts, and anything better than nature in the heathen might reach. And yet they conclude, as appears before by variety of testimonies, that we are not obliged to observe any command, or act any other virtue out of love to God. They find no time at all,<sup>1</sup> when we are obliged to this, unless it be when we are bound to have an inward act of love to God; but when this is, they never agree, except in this, that it may be never. For those who seem to say that it should be sometimes, though but seldom, or but once for all, in other words signify it need not be at all, since they assign something else which may serve instead of it, whenever it may be thought requisite. Thus, according to their rule in indefinite precepts, their wise men have determined, if their school doctors, or casuists, or their council of Trent, will pass for wise. Now, being thus discharged from doing anything out of love, they are thereby exempted from all Christian acts, and any other Christianity, as to the exercise of virtue, than honest heathenism. It is true, they hold they cannot be saved without meritorious acts, and cannot well think them meritorious if they be no better than merely heathenish: they should, one would think, have some Christian character upon them, and this of love particularly,<sup>2</sup> that they may merit salvation; and if they disengage their catholics from this, they make it not needful for them to be saved. But I cannot help that, seeing they will have it so.

If they think there is no necessity their catholics should be Christians, as they do when they make no act truly Christian needful for them, they conclude it is not necessary for them to be saved, unless they believe that such as are no Christians can be heirs of salvation. Their church, pope, or council, or whoever it is, must provide them some other heaven, since that which is prepared for Christians they need not; no one step of the way to it being needful for them. All the necessity laid upon them by the popish profession is not for salvation, but for something else; they must be Roman catholics, but they need not be true Christians; they must be the pope's subjects, but they need not be Christ's disciples; and this, and the rest, because they need not learn of him one Christian act while they live.

*Sect. 8.* Moreover, all exercise of virtues, opposite to acts in their account but venially evil, is with them unnecessary. And this goeth near, not only to discharge all acts of virtue which are required of Christians, but such also as were found even in pagans. This is grounded upon their doctrine concerning venial sins; these with them are not necessarily to be avoided, being either not prohibited by any command, as most of them hold, or by no command necessary to be observed, as some of them had rather express it, and therefore no need that the virtuous acts opposite to them should be practised. Upon this account no exercise of virtue will be necessary but what is consistent with the vicious acts contrary thereunto, in any degrees of wickedness which they think venial; no acts of temperance, sincerity, righteousness, truth, or faithfulness, chastity, liberality, &c., will be needful, but what is consistent with all the intemperance, hypocrisy, unrighteousness, perfidiousness, &c., which by their doctrine is venial. So he may be temperate who still loads his stomach till he vomits, and is daily half drunk; he may be sincere enough, though he always design to seem better than he is, or good when he is not; he may be a man of truth and Roman faithfulness, though his constant practice be telling lies, or breaking promises, or swearing falsely, so all be but in venial measures; he may be just enough,

<sup>1</sup> Non obligat pro semper, sed certis opportunisque temporibus; extra quæ ideo tempora, non est cur obligemur, cætera ex charitate præstare.—*Soto de Just. l. ii. q. iii. art. x.*

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Bellarm. supra.

though in all his dealings he be continually wronging others in lesser matters. He may be chaste enough, though he be unclean in thought, word, and deed, venially; and he may be liberal enough, though he constantly practise all the covetousness which is opposite to every degree of liberality, so it be no worse. He may be religious enough, though his soul never actually worship God, and devout enough without any inward devotion, and reverent enough though greatly irreverent, even in the worship of God, and though at other times he be still profaning the name of God with vain oaths and divers sorts of blasphemies; holy enough also, though he never have one act of inward holiness, no, not on those days which either God or themselves have made holy; and, in short, he may be godly enough, though he never love nor fear God till he die! Some of these particulars are plain by the premises; the rest will appear so when we present their account of venial sins. So that, though a man were so far from expressing any Christian virtue, that he should be instead thereof continually acting the contrary sins in all degrees not mortal, yet he would not be condemned; for by their doctrine,<sup>1</sup> all the venial sins in the world that a person can be guilty of, though every hour, every minute of a whole life, how long soever, should bring forth one or other of them, cannot possibly damn him. And since whosoever shall not be condemned will be saved, which themselves also maintain, consequently he that, after baptism, acts not one virtue divine or moral, whose whole life hath nothing of a Christian in it, but less and worse than a pagan, will yet be saved. Thus may they be deluded who trust their souls in this infallible church; they may be true catholics, though they be not Christians, so much as to one religious act, and may pass currently to heaven though they never move one foot in the way. Such a thing we must take Christianity to be, and with so ghastly and frightful a face will it look upon the world. If popery have not thus far abandoned it, and obtruded upon us a changeling, instead of what Christ left us, there will be no lineament of virtue in the visage of it, not one of necessity; nor needs there be more in the lives of those who would be counted the only true professors and faithful embracers of it.

*Sect. 9.* They have other ways to make the exercises of Christian virtues unnecessary. They do it especially by turning the commands of God into counsels. Of those things that are required in Scripture, some, they say, the Lord only adviseth and commends, others he commands and enjoins: those which he adviseth, they call evangelical counsels, the other are divine precepts. Now, the precepts, they say, are necessary to be observed, sometimes at least; the counsels are not needful to be observed at all, any man may be saved without complying with them, they are matters of supererogation, more than we need to do. So that all those virtues which they make but matter of counsel, are unnecessary, the acts and exercise of them more than needs. And those which they make so expressly, are not small nor inconsiderable in themselves, and in consequence little less than all. Many of those admirable rules which Christ giveth us in his sermon on the mount, wherein the singular and divine excellency of that religion to which he calls the world is so very conspicuous, they will not have to be laws obliging all Christians, but dissolve the obligation of them by declaring them mere counsels, though they were ratified by our great Lawgiver with those univer-

<sup>1</sup> Etiam si omnia peccata venialia, simul colligerentur in unum, nunquam efficerent id, quod facit unum lethale.—*Bellarmin. de Amiss. Grat.* l. i. c. xiii. p. 91. Non est meæ mentis hic asserere, quod veniale possit fieri mortale per multiplicationem actuum venialium, etiam si in infinitum multiplicarentur.—*Lopez, cap. ii. p. 12.*

sal sanctions : Mat. vii. 21, 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he which doth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' And ver. 26, 'Every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man who built his house upon the sand.' Maldonate giveth that as the account why he is said, chap. v. 2, then to 'open his mouth,' because he<sup>1</sup> never before propounded that sublime doctrine of evangelical perfection. Of this nature, in their account,<sup>2</sup> is trusting in God, such as frees us from sollicitousness about the things of this life, chap. vi. 31, 34 ; sincerity of intention in doing good, such as is enjoined, ver. 1 ; patient digesting of injury, such as is commanded, ver. 39 ; relieving others freely, such as is required, ver. 42 ; innocent communication, such as is specified, ver. 37 ; avoiding occasions of sin, such as are meant, vers. 20, 30 ; exemplary walking, intended<sup>3</sup> ver. 14 ; poverty of spirit, ver. 3 ; spiritual mourning, ver. 4 ; Christian meekness, ver. 5. The three last, saith Soto,<sup>4</sup> are *trinum consiliorum votum*. We must take them to be peculiar concerns of votaries. Righteousness, likewise,<sup>5</sup> as to earnest desires after it, ver. 6 ; mercifulness,<sup>6</sup> ver. 7 ; purity of heart,<sup>7</sup> ver. 8, as it is the height of charity ; peacefulness<sup>8</sup> also, ver. 9 ; love to enemies, ver. 44, more pressed by Christ than the rest, vers. 45-48 ; and before popery, taken to be the proper character of Christians, but with them it is no duty,<sup>9</sup> nor anything of like nature : as that, Prov. xxv. 'If thy enemy hunger, feed him,' &c. Yea,<sup>10</sup> acts of mercy are no more our duty, for these are another instance of the same author immediately adding, *et reliqua præcepta misericordiæ* ; not only that, Prov. iii. 4, 'Honour the Lord with thy substance,' but all the rest in Scripture of like nature. So likewise, not only magnificence and magnanimity,<sup>11</sup> but humility also,<sup>12</sup> with sincerity of conversation, and Christian simplicity or plain dealing. If these be not enough, all good works are in danger to become no duties. Dominicus à Soto tells us,<sup>13</sup> there are three kinds of good works to which all Christian offices are reduced : one respects a man's self, the quelling of his own

<sup>1</sup> Quod nunquam ante, sublimem illam de evangelica perfectione doctrinam proposuisset.—*Comment. in Mat. p. 99.*

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Joh. de Combis. in compend, theol. l. v. cap. lxx. ; Ludolph. de vita Christi, par. ii. cap. xii. ; Angel, Sum. v. et v. præcept. n. xvii. ; Sylvest. Sum. v. præceptum, n. ii. ; Soto de Just. l. ii. q. ix. art. iii. ; Navar. c. xxiv. n. v. ; Soto de Nat. et Grat. l. iii. c. ii. p. 126 ; Jo. Sanc. disp. vii. n. x.

<sup>3</sup> Unde statim Christus in solenni illa legis promulgatione, ante necessaria præcepta proposuit perfectorum consilia ; Beati pauperes spiritu—beati qui lugent, et his similia. Et ideo subdit, Vos estis lux mundi : quasi quibus competit non solum justitiam vulgariter colere, sed egregie usum etiam rerum licitum abjicere.—*Idem, ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Quod si trinum hoc consiliorum votum, quod uno hoc loco stabilitur, &c.—*Idem, de Just. et Jur. l. vii. q. v. art. i. p. 243.*

<sup>5</sup> Idem, *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Quæ ad cumulatiorem virtutum perfectionem ornatumque attingunt, sub forma consilii admonet, qualia sunt illa quæ pertinent ad inimicorum dilectionem, Prov. xxv. Si esurierit inimicus tuus, ciba illum.

<sup>10</sup> Et reliqua præcepta misericordiæ, ut cap. iii. ; idem, *ibid.* l. ii. q. iii. art. ii. p. 37.

<sup>11</sup> De magnificentia et de magnanimitate, non fuerunt danda præcepta, sed magis consilia.—*Aquinas, ii. 2, q. cxl. art. ii. ad primum.*

<sup>12</sup> Dico virtutes evangelicas dici illas, quæ colliguntur ex consiliis evangelicis traditis a Christo Domino—ducunt hominem ad perfectionem supra communem bonitatem—potissimum sex : 1, Paupertas spiritus ; 2, Castitas virginum ; 3, Obedientia, præsertim religiosa ; 4, Humilitas, qua ita animi nostri comprimitur elatio, ut ad altiora non se erigat ; 5, Pænitentia, qua pro commissis culpis Deo satisfacimus ; 6, Simplicitas, quæ posita est in quadam facilitate et sinceritate morum, juxta rationis præscriptum.—*Full. tr. xxi. n. cxciv. cxcv.*

<sup>13</sup> Vanam gloriam a tribus operum generibus expulit, ad quæ cuncta officia redcuntur—ex his enim tribus, eo quod opera sunt supererogationis, solent homines mundi auram ambire. *Ibid.* l. ii. q. ix. art. ii. p. 66.

pleasures, signified by fasting; the other respects the love of our neighbours, of which kind is alms-deeds; the third respects God and divine worship, denoted by prayer; and all these three with him are works of supererogation. When they come to an account in particulars, they vary not: as to what concerns ourselves,<sup>1</sup> to abstain from our lawful pleasures, even when they may be an impediment to holiness, is but advice, we need not follow it. Also, to avoid worldly cares, to be content with food and raiment, not to be eager after superfluities, not to be too solicitous for the body, not to affect dignities, are but matter of counsel by their common doctrine, in *Jo. Sanc. disp. 7. n. 10.*

As for the concerns of God,<sup>2</sup> no inward worship in public is under command, nor any outward, but the mass; and for the hearing of that, no divine precept. No more are we obliged to worship in private;<sup>3</sup> meditation is reckoned among counsels of perfection.<sup>4</sup> Vocal prayer is not enjoined by God, and so all public prayer in Christian families and assemblies are under no divine injunction. Mental prayer may be a duty,<sup>5</sup> when it is our duty to love God; but when that will be is not<sup>6</sup> well known. So mental prayer will be a duty, nobody well knows when. But this is a Jesuit, who minces the matter too precisely. In the judgment of Aquinas,<sup>7</sup> and the generality of their doctors, mental prayer is under counsel only. And it is the more considerable, because they tell us that in mental prayer all the internal acts of religion are comprehended; so that hereby the very soul of religion is dismissed, as a thing of no necessity among Roman catholics. And since in all worship, public or private, they will have spiritual attention and devotion to be but matter of counsel (without which all that they call worship is but a cipher, or a blot rather), they leave no worship of God at all necessary. Cardinal Tolet gravely distinguisheth<sup>8</sup> of a sanctifying the Lord's day and all other holy days, for which presence at mass and abstain-

<sup>1</sup> *Licitis voluptatibus abstinere ad consilium continentiae attinet.—Idem, ibid. art. iii. p. 67. Consilia vero ea rescindunt, quæ etsi licita sint, nec charitati prorsus inimica, tamen nonnulla sunt ad culmen progredientibus obstacula, l. vii. q. v. art. i. p. 242.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ex præcepto colendi Deum homo tenetur duntaxat cultum externum ei exhibere.—S. Joseph. Sum. de i. præcept. art. v.*

Attentio ad Deum non est necessaria. This is commonly asserted, even when it is acknowledged that all inward worship is included in it. Sub hac autem attentione ad Deum includitur omnis interior reverentia et cultus. omnis oratio et petitio, ut eleganter describit. Gregorius x. in c. Decret. de immunitat. Eccl. in vi.; Suarez, tom. iii. disp. lxxxviii. sect. iii. p. 1146. Solus exterior cultus cadit sub hoc præcepto—sola missa communiter est in præcepto. Utrum autem audiatur (missa) vel non—sub præcepto non cadit.—*Cajetan, Sum. v. fest.*

<sup>3</sup> *Meditatio Scripturarum—perfectionis instrumentum.—Soto, ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Uldericus. Sum. confess. et Pisan. et alii in Sylvest.—v. Orat. n. viii. supra.*

<sup>5</sup> *Supra.*

<sup>6</sup> *De præcepto diligendi Deum et aliorum, nempe fidei et spei—non satis certo constat quando obligent, et quando violentur.—Fill. tr. xxii. n. cxcvii.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ut orent mentaliter—solum sub consilio—ut tenet D. Thom. ii. 2. q. xxxii. et communiter, doctores, Jo. Sanc. ibid. Oratio mentalis, in qua omnes actus interni religionis comprehenduntur.—Suar. de Orat. l. ii. c. vii. n. x.*

<sup>8</sup> *Adverte, festum posse sanctificari, et posse bene sanctificari. Ad sanctificandum duo sunt necessaria—id est, sacrum audire—et abstinere ab opere servile et prohibito, l. iv. c. xxiv. p. 685. ad bene autem sanctificandum, ultra hoc, aliud est necessarium, puta, ut qui est in mortali, tunc conteratur, et ad Dominum converti studeat: qui vero est in gratia, divinæ vacet contemplationi, et bonis operibus, uterque autem a novo peccato absteineat. Adverte tamen, quod homo tenetur sub mortali ad sanctificandum festum, sed non tenetur sub mortali ad bene sanctificandum.*

Ita solum obligor ad illa duo in festo præstanda, non ad finem, quamvis consilium sit optimum, omnia ista exequi in die festo, vid. Soto, Navar. Cajetan. qui nobiscum sentiunt—*Ibid. p. 687.*

ing from servile work is sufficient, and of a sanctifying them well, to which it is necessary that he who is in mortal sin should be contrite, and turn to God; and he that is in grace should give himself to divine contemplation and good works, and both of them should abstain from new sin; yet observe, saith he, that a man is bound under mortal sin to sanctify the day, but not to sanctify it well; and after concludes: So I am only obliged to these two things, viz., presence at mass, and avoiding servile works; but not to the end, to wit, sanctifying it well, although it be very good counsel to perform all the other upon this day. Thus with him it is no necessary duty to which any are obliged on Lord's days, or any other days for worship, to repent of sin and turn to God, to meditate on divine things, and do good works, and abstain from any wickedness. All these, it seems, are only matters of counsel; and herein, he saith, Soto, Navarre, and Cajetan concur with him. And if they be only counsels on all these days, the world will scarce find a day when they will be duties. However, with them, to *do* a thing is commanded, to *do it well* is not necessary. On all the days which either God or themselves would have kept holy, it is mere counsel either to do that which is good or to think of it, either to be sorry for past wickedness, or not to commit more. And since it is no more on the holiest, it may seem not so much as a counsel on profane and common days. The means of honouring God being thus by them made unnecessary, no wonder if they discharge us from the due use of them.<sup>1</sup> Pious sedulity (diligence for heaven and our souls) is but matter of counsel; we need not trouble ourselves with it. No more scarce with anything else, for<sup>2</sup> the shunning of idleness is but counsel, yea, and such as doth not oblige the monks themselves, though they will have none else obliged by counsels. In reference to them, Soto says, the avoiding of idleness is not commanded.

Acts which concern others are either those of righteousness or charity; for the former, how favourable they are we saw before; they<sup>3</sup> discharge us from such desires thereof as Christ encourageth to the uttermost, Mat. v. 6; the latter they make corporal or spiritual. That mercy or charity which affords outward relief, even their religious<sup>4</sup> are not obliged to; nor need others exercise it by giving anything,<sup>5</sup> no, not to those that are in greatest necessity, how much soever themselves have, how extremely soever others want. Spiritual relief, in affording of which the exercise of mercy consists, they give an account of in many particulars, viz. advising those that want counsel, teaching the ignorant, comforting the dejected, correcting offenders, remitting offences, bearing those that are burdensome, and praying for others. Now, all these (and as many more belonging to the other branch)<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pia sedulitas inter consilia recenset Hunnæus in Catechism. ad finem Sum. Aquin.

<sup>2</sup> Evitatio otii non est in præcepto.—Soto, ibid. l. vii. q. v. art. ii. p. 243. ad fin.

<sup>3</sup> Quæcunque vultis ut faciant vobis, &c., Scil. necessario, aliter consilium est, Angel. Sum.—v. *Præceptum*, n. xvii.

<sup>4</sup> Eleemosynas erogare non est in religiosis virtus.—Soto, ibid.

<sup>5</sup> In quibus vero duobus non est de præcepto subvenire donando; sed satis est subvenire commodando vel mutuando.—Navar. cap. xxiv. n. v. Non semper est necesse donare, sed tunc solum, cum egenti neque per mutuum, neque per venditionem, neque alia ratione succurri potest—quamvis hæc doctrina vera sit, et non solum a S. Thoma. in ii. 2, q. xxxii. art. vi. sed etiam ab aliis Theologis communiter tradi soleat.—Bellarm. *de bon. Operib.* l. iii. c. viii.

Consule, castiga, remitte, solare, fer, ora.

<sup>6</sup> Misericordia seu eleemosyna sive sit spiritualis, quæ melior est corporali, sive sit corporalis, est de consilio; vel saltem non de præcepto obligante ad mortale, exceptis duobus casibus.—*Idem*, ibid. Subvenire necessitatibus proximorum corporalibus, sicut propriis necessitatibus, pertinet ad consilium.—Vid *Aquin.* Quodl. iv. art. xxiv. ad. i. Misericors cor proximi necessitatibus communibus præstare, infelicesque eventus eorum condolare—consilium.—In *Jo Sanc.* disp. i. n. i.

are no necessary duties, or, which is all one in effect, under no precept obliging to mortal guilt, except in two cases only, saith Navarre, and those two concern only corporal relief; so that all the other duties, which we owe to the souls of the men, are left arbitrary, as mere matters of advice without exception.<sup>1</sup> That of the apostle, 1 Peter ii. 13, for subjection to governors, is with them a counsel; no more is that rule of Christ for church discipline and government, Mat. xviii. 15–17, ‘If thy brother shall trespass against thee,’ &c.

Mortification can scarce with them be so much as a counsel, for their doctrine will have nothing in us to be mortified; that which is to be so treated is sin in us, but they maintain that in a just man there is no sin after baptism. Carnal concupiscence itself is sinless; it is natural to us, and so innocent.<sup>2</sup> That which is in us by nature, they say, is neither worthy of praise or dispraise; hence they conclude, he is blind who will say concupiscence is a sin. They grant it induceth us to sin, but it is no more sin upon that account than hearing, seeing, or other of our senses; than gold, or honour, or beauty, or anything else that may draw us to evil; and so, plainly, we are no more bound to mortify it (if sin only is to be mortified) than we are obliged to ruin our senses, to destroy gold, or to spoil the beauty of a handsome woman. And the same must be said of other vicious habits contracted by a continued practice of sin; for though they call these vices, yet vices with them are no sins, no more than virtues are duties.<sup>3</sup> The law of God is not concerned in any habits; as it commands not those that are good, so it forbids not those that are vicious, and no reason to mortify that which is not condemned by the law. However, they retain the word, but little else we meet with in them about this great concern of a Christian, and a very odd object they find for it, instead of that which the Scripture assigns. It is the natural body that is to be afflicted and macerated, not the ‘body of sin;’ and so they are not concerned to get the work of the devil destroyed; it is the work of God that must be mortified. They may be excused if they make not this so much as a counsel. But they say the maceration of the body is in order to the bridling of concupiscence. It seems, as innocent as it is, it may need a curb, yet they take care to leave it loose enough, for those severities which should hamper it, they say, are not commanded. Afflicting of the body is under no precept,<sup>4</sup> saith Soto and Sylvester. Having told us out of Aquinas that a vow is properly of a work of supererogation, acceptable to God, he adds, the maceration of the body, as such, for the bridling of concupiscence, falls under vows.<sup>5</sup> And so, how unruly soever the flesh is, they may choose whether they will use the bridle or no; yea, if the priest should be so rigid as to enjoin severities of this tendency, the sinner needs not submit to them.

Nor will they have us more engaged against the world than against the

<sup>1</sup> Glossa in loc.

<sup>2</sup> Concupiscentia carnis naturalis nobis est—Igitur cum ea quæ nobis insunt a natura, nec laude digna sint nec vituperio, quis vel cæcus, dixerit concupiscentiam illam esse peccatum? nisi forsan materialiter ante baptismum. Ut superius explicatum est. Revera qua ratione id dixeris, sequenter compulsus confiteberis, et visum, et auditum, et reliquos sensus qui nobis post peccatum Adæ instrumenta sunt delinquendi, delicta et ipsos esse. Quin vero et aurum et honores, et muliebrem formam, et quicquid nos pellicit, pellitve ad malum.—Soto, de nat. et grat. l. i. c. xii. p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> De habitu constat non esse peccatum: How they would prove it, see in Suar. l. iii. de Juram. c. vi. n. i. Non sufficit habitualis affectus seu dispositio ad peccandum, sed requiritur actualis affectus seu dispositio, ut peccatum reipsa contrahatur.—Bonacina, de peccat. disp. ii. q. iii. p. v. n. iii. alii. communiter.

<sup>4</sup> Afflictio corporis non est in præcepto, de just. et. jur. l. vii. q. v. art. ii. Mortificationis operibus sedulo esse addictos, consilium, in Jo. Sanc. disp. i. n. i.

<sup>5</sup> Sum. v. Votum. i. n. iv.

flesh. All the evils of the world are by the apostle reduced to three heads, 1 John ii. 16; but the oracle of their schools tells us that to relinquish these three wholly,<sup>1</sup> as far as we can, belongs to evangelical counsels. Soto herein follows him, and tells us<sup>2</sup> that Christ left this unto every one under counsel. So to be crucified to the world, and to get the world crucified to us, Gal. vi., is matter of advice with him; nor are we obliged thereto in reference to those things,<sup>3</sup> or lusts, which very much endanger our souls.

Self-denial also hath the same measures from them. Bellarmine, by those words of Christ to the young man, Mat. xix. 21, 'Follow me,' understands self-denial, explaining it by Mat. xvi., 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself.' It is nothing else, saith he, but to renounce one's own judgment and affections, and to accommodate himself to the judgment and will of others. This the young man should have done, but it was not his duty; it was only a counsel of perfection, as he and all of them conclude, to subject himself thus to the will and judgment of Christ. He distinguisheth indeed, and will have submission to the will and judgment of Christ in things necessary to salvation, to be a common duty enjoined, Mat. xvi. and Luke ix.; but such a subjection of our wills and judgments to Christ, in things not of themselves necessary to salvation, to be only a counsel,<sup>4</sup> it is advice for those alone that would be perfect. This is bad enough, for thus it will not be a duty to subject ourselves to Christ in most things, or to deny ourselves in anything which is not in their sense a deadly evil. But Soto, than whom there was no divine more considerable in the council of Trent, advanceth farther, and concludes that self-denial, not only which is required, Mat. xix., Luke xviii., but that also commanded, Luke ix., Mat. xvi. (which the cardinal understood to be a subjecting of our wills and judgments to Christ in things necessary to salvation), is but a counsel; and tells us<sup>5</sup> for a man to deny himself is by vow to give up his liberty to another's will; and so Christ nowhere enjoins other self-denial than what their perfectionists voluntarily oblige themselves unto by vow, and the main duty of Christians is confined to cloisters, that self-resignation wherewith Christ should be honoured being transferred to an abbot.

There is one thing more remains which Christ requires of those who will be his disciples, that is, Christians (and but one where he gives us the sum of all), and that is suffering for him. It would be strange if, when they have eased themselves of the rest, they should leave their catholics obliged to this. The device of evangelical counsels had not been so useful a tool, though it freed them from the rest of Christ's yoke, if it would not have served to cast off the heaviest part of it; but hereby they can cast off sufferings greater or

<sup>1</sup> Hæc autem tria totaliter derelinquere secunndum quod possibile est, pertinet ad consilia evangelica.—*Aquinas*, l. ii. q. cviii. art. iv. Corp.

<sup>2</sup> Temporalium tria sunt genera, scil. concupiscentia carnis, concupiscentia oculorum, et superbia vitæ—animos vero ab illis prorsus evellere, non est cunctis, immo neque multis in hoc sæculo possibile. Quare sub consilio Christus id cuique reliquit, ut qui capere possit, caperet.—*Ibid.* l. ii. q. ix. art. iii. p. 67, vid. Jo. Sanc. disp. vii. n. x.

Huc enim (viz. ad votum religionis) attinet Paulinum illud verbum ad Gal. vi. Mihi absit gloriari nisi in cruce Domini, &c., per quem mihi mundus crucifixus est, et ego mundo.—*Ibid.* l. vii. q. v. art. i. p. 242.

<sup>3</sup> Non possunt non multa alendæ charitati creare pericula.—*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Solis iis consulitur qui volunt esse perfecti, de qua agitur, Matth. xix. Luc. xviii. —*De Monach.* l. ii. c. ix. p. 1151.

<sup>5</sup> Luc. ix.—Idem est se hominem ipsum abnegare, quod propriam libertatem alterius arbitrio voti nexu subdere.—*Ibid.* p. 248. Abnegare seipsum, est propriam voluntatem, per quam homo est homo, abnegare: quod revera, nisi obligatorio voto alteri eam sic tradas, ut in tua non supersit facultate eandem rursus tibi usurpare, fieri non potest.—*Ibid.* art. iv. p. 247.

less. Martyrdom they reserve for those who receive the truth in love ; for themselves it is only a counsel,<sup>1</sup> when it serves for nothing more than the glory of God and the advancing of the faith ; and this according to the judgment of Aquinas. If it be no more than an opportunity of manifesting the divine glory and edifying the church, it is a work of supererogation, and of no necessity, saith another. Parting with other things for Christ is no more a duty ;<sup>2</sup> to ' forsake brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for Christ's sake,' Mat. xix. 29, is not a duty of any Christian, but only such as profess perfection. Such forsaking all for Christ, to follow him, is more than needs ; it was so in the apostles.<sup>3</sup> In short, taking up the cross is more than is commanded, when it is joined by Christ with self-denial, and following him, as the best character of his disciples, Luke ix. They take it to be but matter of counsel, and so quit themselves of the full character of Christians at once.<sup>4</sup>

If there be any virtue left, requisite for the practice of a Christian, which this engine hath not yet demolished and brought to discretion, by working it otherwise, it will make clear work. The least degree of virtue, they say, is all that is necessary ;<sup>5</sup> none can be assigned above the lowest (in faith, hope, love, repentance, or other virtues) which is enjoined. Now that which is lowest of all is next to nothing, and that which is no more can act no further ; so that all exercise of virtue which their doctrine makes needful, is either nothing or next to it. All growth in grace with them is needless,<sup>6</sup> for the first degree they attain is not only a sufficiency, but all the perfection that is necessary ;<sup>7</sup> what is more may be profitable, but not simply needful. The first and least degree of virtue in every kind satisfies the precept, and that being satisfied, requires no more. So all other degrees will be but under counsel ; it will be no duty to look after more than the least, nor will the grossest negligence as to endeavours for more be any sin.

And since increase of virtue is by the exercise of it, where the increase is not necessary the exercise is needless. Further, no act of virtue in any degree is requisite, but only in the article of necessity ; for then only affirmative precepts oblige ; at all other times they bind no more than mere counsels, nor then neither, unless it can be known when this article occurs. And how shall it be known ? The Scriptures have not declared it, they say, nor counsels neither. Why, they have a rule in the case.<sup>8</sup> Things not deter-

<sup>1</sup> Est autem solum in consilio, quando ex eo nihil amplius quam Dei gloria, vel fidei exaltatio consequitur ; secundum mentem ejusdem doctoris.—*Navar.* c. xii. n. xl. ; *Lopez.* c. xli. p. 224. Si adest solum opportunitas manifestandi Divinam gloriam et ædificandi ecclesiam, martyrimum est supererogationis, et non necessitatis. Angel. sum. v. charit. n. v. Sylvest. sum. v. Martyr. Secundum Bonavent. et S. Thom. Sum. Rosel. v. charitas. n. x.

<sup>2</sup> Mat. xix. Omnis qui reliquerit Domum vel fratres, &c. Vide quam cunctis rebus eum denudet, qui optaverit esse perfectus.—*Soto, ibid.* art. ii. p. 244. Religio—nihil aliud significat, quam quod Christus evangelicum adolescentulum docuit : Si vis perfectus esse, vade et vende, &c. Et sequere me.

<sup>3</sup> Et quod subinde Petrus subjunxit : ecce nos reliquimus omnia, et secuti sumus te.—*Ibid.* art. iii.

<sup>4</sup> De voto obedientiæ intelligit. Luc. ix. Si quis vult post me venire, abneget semetipsum, et tollat crucem suam quotidie, et sequatur me.—*Ibid.* art. i. p. 243, vide art. iv. p. 247.

<sup>5</sup> Bellarm. de pœnit. l. ii. c. xi. supra.

<sup>6</sup> Nisi forte in religioso, qui tenetur habere propositum proficiendi : quia nullibi est præceptum, ut istam curam habeamus, sed consulitur tantum.—*Sylvest.* v. peccat. n. iv. &c.

<sup>7</sup> Perfectio una necessaria ad esse, altera necessaria ad bene esse, quæ consistit in consiliis.—*Bellarmin.* de Monach. l. ii. c. xii. p. 1158.

<sup>8</sup> Quæ indefinita relinquuntur a lege, arbitrio boni viri sunt definienda.—*Navar.*

mined are left to the arbitrement of an honest man ; and so it is left to every man's will who can suppose himself honest. If he never find time for any act of virtue, he will not be obliged to any ; or if he will be so cautious to consult their divines in the case, some of them declare that such a virtuous act is rarely needful, nor can they certainly tell when ; others conclude there is no necessity of it at all. Now he may follow which please him best, even those, if he list, which discharge him from all obligations to the acts in question ; and this he may do safely, not only by their doctrine of probability, but by the determination of their oracle. The council of Trent will secure him, though he never perform one act of virtue all his life, nor repent thereof at his death, by a fine device, which is neither repentance, nor a virtue ; of which before.

Besides, all acts which have more than moral goodness seem by their doctrine to be under counsel, and all acts supernatural and truly Christian more than needs. They are not truly Christian unless they be done out of respect to God, with an intent to please and honour him, as the apostle requires, 1 Cor. x. 30. But this rule, as Soto tells us,<sup>1</sup> taken in that sense which is nearest to the letter, that all be actually referred to God, is but a counsel. But may not a virtual intent to glorify God be necessary, though an actual respect thereto be but advice ? No, not that neither ; for without such a virtual reference, the acts we speak of may be morally good (as they say they were in those that knew not God), and so no sin. Now in any degree above this (viz. wherein they are more than not sins, or anything better than merely inculpable),<sup>2</sup> they are works of supererogation, if their great cardinal be not mistaken.

There is yet another maxim pregnant for this purpose. The mode of virtue falls not under the precept ;<sup>3</sup> that is, we are not enjoined to act in a virtuous manner, or as becomes virtuous persons, viz. out of a virtuous habit or principle. Aquinas, who delivers and maintains this maxim, explains it by this instance : He is neither punished by God nor men as a transgressor of the precept, who pays his parents due honour, though not out of a habit of piety.<sup>4</sup> Such honour, though it be no act of that virtue (piety they call it) from whence proceeds what we owe to parents, doth satisfy the precept, so that the person is free both from sin and the punishment. Accordingly Soto : We are not commanded to pay what we owe out of the habit of righteousness or liberality, but only to pay it to the full.<sup>5</sup> By this one instance he would have us judge of all other precepts concerning virtues. The habits, *i. e.* the virtues, need not be exercised. Let the thing be done, and it is all the command of God requires, though it be not done out of a virtuous principle, nor be any act or exercise of it. So Bellarmine : When God commands that we live righteously and soberly, he commands not that we do this from a habit, but only that we do it.<sup>6</sup> The external acts which pious, sober, and righteous persons do are requisite ; but the exercise of any virtues therein, whether they concern God, others, or ourselves, is not com-

<sup>1</sup> Potest tamen accipi in sensu, ut sit consilium : et hic videtur propinquior literæ, scilicet sive comeditis sive bibitis, &c., omnia actu referatis in Deum.—*De nat. et grat.* l. i. c. xxiii. p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> Si addam alterum gradum (viz. præter eum quo non pecco) eo modo facio actum supererogationis et consilii.—*De Monach.* l. ii. c. xiii. p. 1162.

<sup>3</sup> Modus virtutis non cadit sub præcepto neque legis divinæ neque legis humanæ.

<sup>4</sup> Neque enim ab homine neque a Deo punitur tanquam præcepti transgressor, qui debitum parentibus honorem impendit, quamvis non habeat habitum pietatis, i. ii. q. c. art. ix. c.

<sup>5</sup> *De nat. et grat.* lib. i. c. xxii. p. 57, supra.

<sup>6</sup> *De grat. et liber. arbitr.* l. vi. c. vii. p. 664, supra.

manded.<sup>1</sup> The habit is that which they count the virtue. Since, therefore, they say that nothing need be done out of habit, they thereby declare that no exercise of virtue is enjoined; nothing that we do need be the act or issue of a virtuous principle; this will be but matter of counsel, and not under any obliging command. Indeed, they make the exercise of virtue universally needless, since they declare it not requisite in all those cases where, if in any at all, it would be needful; they find no necessity for it, either in worship or common conversation; all may be done very well, without any act of grace or virtue. They may pray effectually; they may celebrate or hear mass meritoriously (and these are the sum of all their ordinary worship); they may partake worthily of all their sacraments; they may obtain all the effects of sacraments or sacramentals (these are evident by the premises); they may satisfy all the commands of God, and precepts of their church, so as to free both from sin and punishment, in the judgment of Aquinas and his followers; yea, they may merit too, not only other things, but grace and glory. This is the point more stuck at than the rest, but the<sup>2</sup> gravest of their authors maintain that it is sufficient for merit that a man be in the state of grace, though he do not act it; and this state consists but in that imaginary grace to which a priest can help an impenitent sinner. It will be hard to divine for what ends the exercise of virtue can be by them counted needful, since without it all the ends specified may be accomplished, the chief not excepted. However, here is enough to enter the exercise of virtue amongst mere counsels.

If we should take into this account all these rules in Scripture, the transgression of which is by their doctrine but venial, as Scotus, Gabriel, and others would have us (*Scotus et Gabriel, asserunt peccata mortalia esse contra præcepta; venialia vero contra consilia*, Vasq. in i. 2, tom. i. disp. 143, c. iv. n. 7), the number of counsels would swell infinitely, and all conscience of the exercise of virtue would be in a manner stifled under that notion; but of venials hereafter. They have, without this, yet another expedient ready to do them universal and effectual service this way; for by their principles any one may turn what divine precept soever pinches him into a counsel, and make no more conscience of it, if he have but some doctor's opinion for it; *Ad præceptum non teneris, si te non teneri probabilis Doctorum est sententia*, Medina, Soto, in Victorell. ad Sa. v. dubium, n. 2. Yea, though he have but the opinion of some one doctor, that is enough to secure him, as Angelus, Sylvester, Navarre, Sairus, Victorel (*ibid.* and in Jo. Sanct d. xlv. n. lxi.), and above twenty of their authors conclude (*vid. infra*). So far is it from being the singular conceit of some Jesuits; yea, though that doctor therein be opposed by all others.—*Idem, ibid.* after Lorca, Villalobos, and many more.

Not to be tedious; where Christ intimates, Mat. v. 19, that some of the commands are greater, and some less, the great commands some of their writers will have to be evangelical counsels, because they are better, more meritorious, and tend to greater perfection;<sup>3</sup> others will have the less commands to be such counsels, because they are not necessary to be observed. Now betwixt these two, both the great commands and the less will be dissolved into counsels, and what then becomes of the exercise of Christian virtues? If this be but matter of counsel, there is no necessity that any should trouble themselves about it. For this is the difference, saith Aquinas,

<sup>1</sup> Per virtutem intelligimus habitum bonum.—*Nav.* c. xxiii. n. i.

<sup>2</sup> Non desunt gravissimi authores, qui sentiant, omne opus bonum hominis justî, et habitu charitatis præditi, vitæ æternæ meritum esse.—*Bellarmin. de Justis.* l. v. c. xv. p. 957.

Ad meritum imperium charitatis non est necessarium proprie et in rigore, sufficit enim, ut ab habente charitatem proficiatur.—*Vid. Suar.* tom. iv. disp. xxxvii. sect. iii. n. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Soto.—*Ibid.* l. iii. c. ii.

betwixt a precept and a counsel: <sup>1</sup> a precept imports necessity; counsels are left to the free choice of him to whom they are given, so that he may mind or not mind them, as he lists. If he observe them not, there is no fear of penalty, either eternal or temporal. <sup>2</sup> There is no punishment, saith Bellarmine, if a counsel be not observed. <sup>3</sup> They all maintain this. Not one of their divines will yield that God may punish any one for acting against his counsel, though of the highest importance. And no wonder, for by their doctrine he no way sins mortally or venially that doth not observe it. Though it may seem strange that it should be no sin to neglect counsels given us from heaven, and not to follow the advice of the all-wise God, yet it is past all doubt by their principles. A neglect of counsel is no sin at all. <sup>4</sup> It is not only no sin to neglect these counsels at other times, but also when God calls us to comply therewith by divine inspirations and motions of his Spirit; to disobey these calls, and resist these inspirations, is no fault at all. Cardinal Tolet is rejected as too rigid for counting it so bad as a venial fault, not to yield to these divine inspirations (Jo. Sanc. disp. vii. n. iv.). So that if the great God calls to us, either by his Spirit or by his word, or both together as our counsellors, we need not regard it; we may resist both, and yet be innocent. Herein others concur. Aquinas himself counts it no sin to neglect counsels, even against conscience dictating that it is good to follow them (2 sentent. dist. xxxix. q. iii. art. iii. ad. vi.). They may refuse the observance of them with some contempt; a presumptive contempt (*i. e.* a continued neglect thereof) passeth without control as innocent. A negative contempt hereof is justified as either a small fault or none at all. <sup>5</sup> And some of them exclude not a positive contempt of these counsels of perfection, but allow a contemptuous neglect of them as sinless. So Angelus, after their law and gloss, and their Saint Antoninus. <sup>6</sup> They may glory in their neglect of these divine counsels, and make their boast thereof. This will be but a slight fault at most; for they may glory in anything but mortal crimes, and this is not so much as venial. It will be no worse if they not only neglect, <sup>7</sup> but abandon them with some abhorrence too. They may bind themselves by oath not to observe them; it will be but a small fault at worst to swear, and call God to witness that they will not follow his counsels. So they commonly determine; <sup>8</sup> and if they be true to their oath, it will be no

<sup>1</sup> Præceptum importat necessitatem, consilium autem in optione ponitur ejus, cui datur, i. 2, q. cviii. art. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Consilium si non servetur, nullam habet pœnam.—*De Monach.* lib. ii. c. vii.

<sup>3</sup> Operari vero contra consilium, licet altissimum, peccatum non est: nullus enim Theologorum concedit fractionem consilii puniendum fore a Deo.—*Jo. Sanc.* disp. vii. n. v.

<sup>4</sup> Intermittere consilium, nullum peccatum est.—*Vega. de Justific.* l. xiv. c. xii. Nec ullæ (leges) divinæ consultoriæ etiam ad veniale obligant; *Navar.* c. xxiii. n. xlix. &c., xxi. n. xliii. Inobedientia aut est contra consilium, et tunc si sit consilium perfectionis, non est peccatum, Sylvest. v. inobedient. n. ii. Ut enim optime ait Suarez, operari contra consilium, nulla nec minima Christi offensio est.—*Jo. Sanc. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Contemptus negativus est peccatum mortale, si Dei lex quam violat, est præceptiva: aut veniale, vel nullum, si est consultoria tantum.—*Sylvester*, v. contempt. n. iii.

<sup>6</sup> Si vero non contemnit auctoris potestatem, sed observantiam consilii seu exhortationis: et sic solum peccat venialiter, si consilium est reverentiæ—si vero est consilium perfectionis, nec etiam venialiter peccat; et tunc est perfectionis quum licite potest dimittere, Sic Archi. vi. dis. et sic intellige Gloss. et jura quæ alligat.—*Sum.* v. contempt. n. i. omittere rem levem ex contemptu formali non est mortale.—*Vide plures in Dian.* p. 3, tr. 6, ref. 72.

<sup>7</sup> Et ex hoc patet, quid dicendum de eo qui attediatus abominatur divina et spiritualia: quoniam nisi sint necessaria ad salutem, et ea demittat, vel deliberate dispoat dimittere, non peccat mortaliter.—*Angel. Sum.* v. accidia. n. i.

<sup>8</sup> Non est peccatum mortale per se loquendo jurare aliquid contrarium consilii, Glossa, Tabien, Cajetan, Navar, c. xii. n. xvi. Antoninus, Soto, et alii in Suarez, de Juram, l. iii. c. xviii. n. vi.—*Graff.* l. ii. c. xv. n. vi. et c. xviii. n. xi.

fault at all.<sup>1</sup> So that if we be loath to believe that they abandon holiness in the exercise of Christian virtues, as a thing superfluous, and more than needs under this notion of counsels, to put us out of doubt they are ready to swear it, and their doctors assure them they may do it safely.

*Sect.* 10. But if all this were otherwise, and any exercise of virtue were needful by their doctrine, yet would there be no necessity of it, but only during the pope's pleasure. For by their principles, if the pope should determine that any virtue were a vice, all Romanists are bound in conscience to conform to his judgment, and virtue must be avoided as if it were a vice indeed. Bellarmine, their chief champion (who is wont with so much confidence to deny, or with so great artifice to hide or disguise anything in popery, which may render his party either odious or ridiculous), delivers himself plainly to this purpose. If the pope, saith he, should mistake in commending vices, and forbidding virtues, the church would be bound to believe those vices to be good, and those virtues to be evil, unless she would sin against conscience.<sup>2</sup> The cardinal would have us think, that he proceeds herein upon an improbable supposition, and that the pope cannot thus mistake, as to commend vices, or forbid virtues; but the world knows, that this is so far from being impossible, that he hath already actually done it, and this in such instances as may well persuade us, that it is not only possible, but likely, that there is not any virtue, but (if occasion serve, and his interest requires it), he may forbid it, and declare it a sin, yea, and bind the church in conscience to avoid it, as if it were a vice.

He may do it with as much demonstration of reason, holiness, and infallibility, in any case, as he hath already done it in too many.<sup>3</sup> Since, then, that church hath so far subjected all the conscience and reason they have unto him, as they cannot without sin but believe him, if he should determine that light is darkness, and good is evil, he may take away all conscience of virtue, and the exercise of it, whenever he pleaseth; there will be no need of any act of virtue for any papist, if he list but out of his chair to say so; they cannot, without sinning against conscience, practise any, if he do but the same thing in the rest as he hath done in a great many already.

This is enough to shew how needless they count the exercise of Christian virtues, and so how unnecessary they make all holiness of life; but it will be yet more evident, if their doctrine allow them to live in a course of sin, and make it not necessary to forsake wickedness, and abandon such evil ways as are condemned by the holy God. For continuance in sin is as inconsistent with holiness of life, as it is with hopes of salvation; and this is as clear in Scripture as if it were described with a sunbeam, 1 John iii. 8, Acts iii. 26, 2 Tim. ii. 19, Gal. v. 16, and 19, 20, 21, 1 Cor. vi. 11, 9, &c. Notwithstanding, by their doctrine it is not necessary to forsake sin; this will be manifest, if we take notice, that there are many sins that they count virtues, and so not to be avoided; and many which they call sins, but think it not necessary for the salvation of any man to abandon them; and many sins also, which they have made to be no sins at all.

<sup>1</sup> Hujusmodi juramenta sine peccato observare possint.—*Navar, ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.—*De Rom. Pontif.* lib. iv. cap. v. p. 721, sect. secunda.

<sup>3</sup> He may bind the catholic church in conscience to believe a lie, and to call good evil, and evil good. This is to speak home: and now let Bellarmine say a worse thing of antichrist if he can, and shew us what the gates of hell can be imagined to design or attempt more destructive to the Christian church and religion, than what he supposes the pope to have full power and authority from Christ to do.

## CHAPTER VII.

*Many heinous crimes are virtues, or necessary duties, by the Roman doctrine.*

There are many horrid sins which they have transformed into virtues, or count high strains of piety and devotion; and thereby are so far from being concerned to forsake them, as they are obliged to live in the practice of them. I might instance in blasphemy, idolatry, perjury, robbery, murder, &c.

Their blasphemies, in ascribing the peculiar excellencies of the divine majesty and the prerogatives of our Lord Jesus Christ to the blessed virgin, and other creatures, and to their popes (though divers of them, as themselves acknowledge, were monsters and incarnate devils), have been sufficiently discovered by others, and therefore, designing brevity, I here waive them.

For the same reason, I will not insist upon their idolatry in invocating saints, adoring the host, and worshipping images; only as to this last, let me observe what is less taken notice of, that their own doctrine, before opened, quite shuts out the best, and only considerable, plea they make use of, to excuse themselves from this crime. It is their common doctrine, that the same worship is to be given to the image and the exemplar, *id est*, the worship of God to the images of the Trinity, the worship of Christ to a crucifix, or a cross, or the image of the cross. They also define idolatry to be, a giving the worship of God to any thing else besides God. Who would imagine but they had hereby fastened the charge of idolatry upon themselves unavoidably? Yet they make account to escape by pleading that the worship they give to images is transient, not terminative, *id est*, it stays not in the image, but passes from it to the exemplar, the mind of the worshipper directing it to God. There is no need to ask what ground they have to imagine, that their giving the worship of God to an image transitively, is not idolatry; it is enough that they acknowledge it to be idolatry, if it be not transient, since whatever they pretend when they are pinched, yet they count it not requisite that their worship should pass from the image unto God, but think it safe to let it stop where it first fell, and terminate in the image. For they confess it passeth not to God without an act of the mind directing it to him. This is not, nor can be, when in the worship God is not minded; and they generally agree (as was shewed before) that they need not mind God in their worship. So the result of their own doctrine is, that they need be no better than idolaters. I know not what they will say here, unless, as Cajetan, that a virtual termination will suffice, *id est*, when they have an intention to terminate their worship on God, without doing it actually, and indeed. But if no more be necessary, the worship need not pass to God really, but may rest in the image, and actually terminate there; and so they will be real and actual idolaters, whatever their intention be. Yea, as to that, by their doctrine it is not needful to intend to worship God, as we saw before. Answerably in their prayers to saints, before their relics, or before an image (which is their usual practice); since, by their common doctrine, the person prayed to, whether God or a creature, need not be minded, the address may be actual to the image, and to that only; the mind not transferring the prayer, so much as by one thought, towards the saint, it will terminate in the image, if anywhere, and be as senseless idolatry as the most stupid amongst the heathen were guilty of. Thus, what they say,

many of them do ; by their common doctrine all may do, viz., apply themselves to a senseless image, as though it heard their prayers, and searched their hearts, and were no less than God.<sup>1</sup>

*Sect. 2.* There is another branch of this crime which I shall stay a little on, viz., their worshipping of relics. Herein they are so liberal as to give religious worship to such things which they do but fancy to be relics ; yea, such as it is absurd and ridiculous to imagine they are relics. For who can imagine (at least when he is waking) how they could catch or keep St Peter's shadow, or bottle up Joseph's cough, his toilsome breathing, when he was at his carpenter's work ? Yet both these, with others of like quality, are among the relics which they count worthy of such worship. The shadow of St Peter, says one, is not the greatest among relics, and therefore, if that be adored, why are not the rest to be honoured and worshipped ?<sup>2</sup> Bellarmine asks, What relic can be imagined to be meaner than the shadow of Peter ?<sup>3</sup> Possibly he might be resolved, near Blois, in France, where Joseph's cough is honoured and worshipped as a relic. Baronius ascribes much to the shadow of Peter, for he makes it the ground, not only of their worship of images, but also of the honour and power of the popes.<sup>4</sup> Who can doubt hereafter, but that the weightiest things in popery have a substantial foundation ? They worship their relics, not only when they are whole and sound, but when they are corrupted and reduced to dust, or nothing else of them left but the vermin bred in them. Not only the ashes, but the vermin too, may be worshipped, though some stick at the latter. Henricus, one of their school doctors, concludes, that the relics in the form of dust and ashes may and ought to be adored, but not under the form of vermin, and gives some reason for it ; but their great Vasquez rejects this scruple, and the ground of it, as vain and frivolous, and concludes they may be worshipped as well when they are vermin as when they are ashes. A man, saith he, may with right intention, and sincere faith, apprehend a saint, and worship him in worms.<sup>5</sup> If the question had been of the little worms in the ulcer of St Harry of Denmark,<sup>6</sup> for which he had such saint-like love, as when they crept out of his knee, to put them in again, that they might be nourished where they were bred ; or of the lice of St Francis,<sup>7</sup> for which he had such a holy tenderness (it is recorded as an argument of his holiness), that when they were shaked off, he gathered them up, and put them in his bosom. I suppose Henricus himself could scarce have denied but those sacred creepers (having so near relation to, and being sanctified by such extraordinary contact of so great saints) might have been adored.

It cannot be denied but they are liable to gross mistakes about the object of their worship here ; and some of them acknowledge, that the people herein are deluded with great and detestable impostures.<sup>8</sup> What if the tooth which they worship for St Christopher's (as big as a man's fist),<sup>9</sup> should prove the tooth of a beast ? or the hair, which they worship as part of St Peter's beard, should be the excrement of some malefactor ? or the shift which they

<sup>1</sup> Sunt bene multi rudiores qui imagines colunt non ut signa, sed perinde quasi ipsæ sensum habeant, magisque eis fidunt quam Christo.—*Polyd. Virgil de invent. rer. l. v. c. xiii.*

<sup>2</sup> Umbra vero non est maxima inter alias reliquias, &c.—*Vasquez de adorat. l. iiii. disp. iiii. c. ii. n. viii.*

<sup>3</sup> Quæ reliquiæ viliores umbra (Petri) cogitari possint ? de imagin. cap. iiii. p. 1494.

<sup>4</sup> An. xxxiv. in Spondan. n. lxxvii.

<sup>5</sup> Recta intentione et sincera fide, possit quis in vermibus sanctum apprehendere, et venerari.—*Ibid.* cap. ult. n. cxiii. cxiv.

<sup>6</sup> Engl. Martyrol. Jan. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Canus. Loc. Th. lib. xi. c. vi.

<sup>8</sup> Ingentes et detestandæ imposturæ patefierent.—*Cassand. Consult. c. de reliquiis.*

<sup>9</sup> L. vives in August. de civit. Dei, l. xv. c. ix ; Dens molaris pugno major.

worship as the virgin Mary's, should be the covering of some harlot? or the dust or the vermin which they worship as the remains of some saints, should have been in their original no more holy than a brute or a damned sinner? As great mistakes as these about their relics, the world has discovered, and themselves have been convinced of. Valla, a person of great learning and eminency amongst them, says plainly, There are ten thousand such things (counterfeit relics) in Rome itself.<sup>1</sup> And if the seat of infallibility be so well stored with cheats, what shall we think of other places? They say, indeed, they have the attestation of visions, revelations, miracles to ensure them; but these they have, and produce as well for those that are confessed to be counterfeits, as for them which they take to be true. So that they are proved beyond all question to be all alike: the true ones, as very counterfeit as any, and the counterfeit as true as the best. Now, may they with safety venture to worship them for all this? Yes, their devotion is maintained to be not only safe, but meritorious, however they be deluded about the object of it. They may worship at all adventure, what they take to be a relic, though indeed it be no such thing; and yet be so far from idolatry or any sin, that they deserve highly at God's hand by so doing. If any man think, says one, that to be a relic of a saint, which indeed is not so, he is not frustrate of the merit of his devotion.<sup>2</sup> Yea, a man may merit by a mistaken belief, though he should worship the devil, says another.<sup>3</sup> So that they have not only a fair excuse, but great encouragement, to venture, though they may happen to worship the devil himself, and not only some limb of him, instead of Christ, or his saints, or their remains. When the Lord declares, Deut. xxxii., 'that his wrath should burn to the bottom of hell,' for that the Israelites 'worshipped devils instead of God,' they might, if Baronius had been their advocate, have come off well enough with his plea, *fides purgat facinus*. The Israelites believed as firmly as the Roman catholics (only they were mistaken), that they did not worship devils, but that which was a proper object of worship; therefore, they were so far from the bottom of hell, or any danger of it, that hereby they might merit heaven and glory.

Let me add, that the miscarriages in their mass furnishes them with many sacred relics, and their orders about the disasters there create for them divers objects of worship, and help them to many right worshipful things of the vilest vermin, and that which is more loathsome. If the body or blood of Christ (so they will have it to be) fall to the ground, it must be licked up; the ground is to be scraped, and the scrapings, reduced to ashes, are to have place among the relics. If the blood be spilt upon the altar-cloths, those cloths are to be washed, and the sacred wash is to be enshrined. If a fly or a spider fall into the blood, it is to be taken out and burnt, and the ashes put into the holyshrine. But if the blood of Christ be poisoned, it is to be kept in a clean vessel among the relics; and so poison becomes a very worshipful thing. If a mouse, or a spider, or a worm, eat the body of Christ (I must desire pardon for mentioning such horrid things), these vermin, in their ashes, are to have the same preferment, and be put into shrines for relics. If a priest or other person do vomit up the host, even that (if no man's stomach will serve him devoutly to lick it up), being turned into ashes, is to be honoured among the relics. All these and more particulars are ordained and provided for in the cautions of the mass; and thereby we

<sup>1</sup> Decem millia talium rerum Romæ sunt.—*De Constant. donat.*

<sup>2</sup> Si quis putans aliquam esse particulam sancti, quæ non est, merito suæ devotionis non caret.—*Vasq. ibid. cap. ult. n. cxiv.*

<sup>3</sup> Holcot infra.

see what order is taken by holy church, that dirty water, the scrapings of the ground, venomous or loathsome vermin, yea, the vomit of a weak or gluttonous stomach, casting up that which they call Jesus Christ, may be enshrined among the relics which they adore. They tender worship to all, under the altar promiscuously; yea, their very prayers are so directed thereto, that you cannot discern whether it be more to the relics or the persons they relate to; for example, when they say, Oh you that are seated under the altar, intercede ye to God for us.<sup>1</sup> For they may as well believe that these relics can intercede, as that Christ, or the glorified saints, are seated under their altar.

*Sect. 3.* Some of them would have us believe that they give not divine honour to relics, but a sort of religious worship, which they call *δουλεία*; but the Scripture (and secular authors too,<sup>2</sup> as is acknowledged) make no difference between the terms of their distinction, but appropriate both to God. And the people make no difference in their practice, as is confessed, but worship saints (and so their relics), even as they worship God. And their teachers and learned writers encourage them to give that to relics, which is divine worship indeed, viz. to put their trust in them, to swear by them, to bring them oblations, to burn incense, and pray to them. So they are taught to give them the thing which is confessed to be divine worship, only they will not give it the name (for though they be real idolaters, yet it is not convenient to be called so). Nor is this all: there are a world of relics, to which they will have thing and name given, even *λατρεία*, expressly; for it is their common doctrine, that the relics of Christ are to have the same worship with Christ himself.<sup>3</sup> And under the notion of these relics, they take in (as of the saints also) not only the parts of his body, but all that belonged to him, yea, that touched him, or was touched by him. Accordingly Aquinas (whose doctrine is highly approved, not only by all the Jesuits, but in a manner by all their universities<sup>4</sup>) teaches that not only the cross is to have divine worship, because it touched Christ, but all things else that belonged to Christ, by virtue of this contact;<sup>5</sup> and Damascene (whom he quotes) will have all things near to Christ, *τὰ ἀνακείμενα*, worshipped on that account.<sup>6</sup> It is true they distinguish here; some things touched him innocently, others injuriously. Waldensis seemed loath to grant these latter should be worshipped, lest he should be brought to adore the lips that betrayed him, or the hands that buffeted him; but he is run down by the stream, both of their doctrine and practice, for the things which they worship especially, and will have worshipped as Christ himself, are the instruments of his sufferings. The knife wherewith he was circumcised, the pillar at which he was scourged, the cord wherewith he was bound, the twenty-eight steps of white marble, up which he was led, in his passion, to Pilate's house; the purple robe, and the white one too, which he wore in derision; the keys and stones of the sepulchre, the sponge, the reed, the vinegar, the crown of thorns, the lance, the nails, and (which may serve for

<sup>1</sup> Pontific. Roman. Sect. de consecr. eccles.

<sup>2</sup> Secundum profanos autores idem significant.—*Bellarmin.* de sanct. l. i. c. xiv. p. 1463.

<sup>3</sup> De fide esse adorandum (signum crucis) adoratione latria, sicut adorantur spinæ, lanciæ, clavi, præsepe et aliæ reliquiæ quæ Christum tetigerunt—ita S. Thom., et alii communiter.—*Bonacin.* tom. ii. disp. iii. q. i. punct. iii. n. vi.

<sup>4</sup> Possevin. Biblioth. Select. l. i. c. x.

<sup>5</sup> Crux Christi—propter membrorum Christi contactum, latria adoranda est—Dicendum quod, quantum ad rationem contactus membrorum Christi, adoramus non solum crucem sed etiam omnia quæ sunt Christi, par. iii. q. xxv. art. iv.

<sup>6</sup> πάντα τὰ θεῶ ἀνακείμενα προσκυνοῦμεν.—*Orthod.* fid. l. iv. c. xii.

all) the cross, which is, never the less for the loss of so many pieces, as are ten thousand times more than the whole. All these (and who can tell how many more ?), though they ministered to his pain, or reproach in his passion, have divine worship. But the things which they will have worshipped for the innocent contact might suffice, being numerous beyond account. To waive the rest, Damascene (whom Aquinas follows) of this sort reckons not only his clothes, and tabernacles, the cave, the manger, and sepulchre, but also Golgotha, and Sion, and the like,<sup>1</sup> wherein may be included Galilee, Samaria, Judea, and Egypt, the earth where he trod in every place being (if not deified, yet) sanctified by such contact. There is a divine virtue therein, says Baronius,<sup>2</sup> and they were wont to bring earth from those parts for the working of miracles. And amongst the relics at Venice they had a stone translated from Chio thither, whereon, it is said, he sat at Tyre.<sup>3</sup> The water also of the River Jordan, at least after it comes to the place where he was baptized, and there that was taken up, they say, which is enshrined at Cassino.<sup>4</sup> And why not the air too, when it comes to any place, wherever it touched him ? And so every element might furnish them with objects of divine worship ; and they might have no need to content themselves with such petty idols as the heathen had, but have them in such extent and largeness as is proportionable to the vast improvement of this kind of devotion in the church of Rome.

Moreover, by virtue of this contact, not only things, but persons, are capable of divine worship, and such as touched Christ may be thus worshipped. The blessed virgin in the first place. Cajetan declares that, in secret, where it can be done without scandal and danger, she may have divine worship on that account ; and tells us this is the sense of Aquinas.<sup>5</sup> Later writers determine that she may be so worshipped as Christ himself, either upon the account of contact or consanguinity. Upon the same ground Simeon may have divine honour, for he once embraced Christ ; and Joseph, his foster father, for he had him oftener in his arms, which their church has taken notice of in a prayer on his holiday. The apostles, and seventy disciples did probably sometimes touch him, and so, by the same reason, may have the same worship with their Lord ;<sup>6</sup> and no wonder, seeing they tell us the lips of Judas, for but touching him with a treacherous kiss, may be thus worshipped ;<sup>7</sup> the woman also with the bloody issue, and those many of the multitude that pressed him, Luke viii. 45. Mary Magdalene especially, she has double honour, seeing they worship more bodies than one for hers. But this is common, and they had need of a prodigious faith to believe (if any of them believe) that the things they worship are not counterfeit ; since the most of them may be convicted of imposture, even by their own practice and approved writings. They must either believe themselves deluded, or believe that one person had more bodies, and one body more heads than one, yea, more than two or three. Many of their most eminent saints are thus turned into monsters, but I instance only in those who may challenge divine worship upon the common ground of contact. John, who touched Christ when he baptized him, had three or four heads, if he had as many as they

<sup>1</sup> Golgotha, Zion, et similia.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Spondan. An. xxxiv. n. xli.

<sup>3</sup> Platin vit. Cælestin. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Cent. xi. p. 305, Chronic. Cassinen. 161.

<sup>5</sup> Cajetanus, Cessante (scandalo et periculo) fatetur, posse B. Virginem adorari adoratione latriæ, ratione solius contactus. Alii vero recentiores Theologi, non solum ratione contactus existimant, adorari posse adoratione latriæ, sed etiam ratione maternitatis, propter sanguinis conjunctionem.—*Vasq.* *ibid.* l. i. disp. viii. c. i. n. cxcv, cxvi.

<sup>6</sup> Sicut B. Joseph unigenitum tuum—suis manibus reverenter tractare meruit et portare.

<sup>7</sup> Idem. *ibid.* l. iii. disp. ii. c. vi. n. lxxvi. vid. infra.

worship; for they worship his head in so many several places, and when they have it whole in some shrines, yet they will have several pieces of it in others.<sup>1</sup> So that Herod had not beheaded him when one head was quite cut off; and when the damsel had it in a charger, it might be still on his shoulders. Longinus also, who, they say, pierced Christ's side, and had his eyes cured with a touch of his blood, must have four bodies, for in so many very distant places they worship it; and yet this their saint had never one body, nor being in the world.<sup>2</sup> As for St Christopher (who must needs touch Christ too, if, as they say, he carried him over an arm of the sea on his shoulders), there was no need to make him so many bodies, since they have made him one as big as many, and worship for him an effigies more like a mountain than a man.<sup>3</sup> I need not mention those many thousand besides, who had an occasion to touch Christ for the space of three and thirty years, while he was on earth; the meanest of these might have divine worship, by that doctrine which makes contact a sufficient ground for it. Nor must this seem strange, since the very ass he rode on, when it could be done without scandal, might upon this account be religiously adored.<sup>4</sup> Yet all these are not all that may have the honour of Christ, if we follow their doctrine whither it leads us. Hereby not only these persons, but their relics too, are capable of divine worship; for they commonly teach that the relics may have the same worship with the persons whose remains they are.<sup>5</sup> Those are in the right, says one of their most absolute divines; Doctor Stapleton, who confer the like honour on the relics, as on the saints, since from both they hope to receive the like advantage.<sup>6</sup> Thus they have huge shoals of objects fit for divine worship: those multitudes of relics which pass for the blessed virgin's, and all accounted to be the apostles', and the other persons fore-mentioned. They say they have the blessed virgin's hair in several places, which is no such wonder, since a monk could shew some of the hairs, which fell from a seraphim, when he came to imprint the five wounds in Friar Francis his body!<sup>7</sup> Her milk too kept from souring, by a continued miracle, sixteen hundred years, and so much of it as if, with their St Catherine, she had had nothing but milk in her veins.<sup>8</sup> Nor is this so wonderful, seeing an image of hers could let forth of its breast such a liquor in great plenty.<sup>9</sup> Her nails, too, or rather the parings of them (worthy enough of divine worship), for the nails themselves she could not spare at her assumption. That one story has prevented a hundred other fables. If they had not believed the assumption of her body, it is like we had heard of as many bodies of hers, in several places, as Geryon had, twice or thrice over, and more heads than they were wont to shew of St Barbara. Her wedding ring,<sup>10</sup> too (though

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Fulk on Math. xiv. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Bolland. act. Sanct. ad Jan. xiii. p. 912. Jacobus de voragine, cap. xev.

<sup>3</sup> Erasmus Colloq. Nanfrag. et peregrin. Monti justo par.

<sup>4</sup> Vasq. ubi supra. Those that stick at this believe there is in the ass a sufficient ground for divine worship, only they say it is not decent. Respondeo cum Suarez contactum Christi esse causam sufficientem adorationis, aliquando tamen non expedire, vel non decere, ut omnia quæ Christum tetigerunt adorentur. Propterea asina, quæ Christum detulit non esset adoranda, quia non decet — *Bonacín. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Eadem adoratio tribni potest reliquiis, quæ tribuitur personæ ejus sunt reliquiæ. — *Idem, ibid. punct. iv. n. iv.*

<sup>6</sup> Promptuar. part. i. p. 292.

<sup>7</sup> Vid. Vergerium annot. in catalog. hæret. p. 17.

<sup>8</sup> Quid dicturus si videat hodie passim ad quæstum ostentari lac Mariæ, quod honore propemodum æquat corpori Christi consecrato? — *Erasm. Annot. in Math. xxiii.*

<sup>9</sup> M. Paris. in anno. 1099.

<sup>10</sup> Vid. Rivet. Apol. pro Virg. M. l. ii. c. ix. p. 281.

they used none in her country), and her attire *cap-a-pie*, from her veil even to her petticoat<sup>1</sup> and shift too. Whether she wore any or no is not material ; the 'archbishop of Chartres<sup>2</sup> wore it, and was thereby inspired with such courage in a battle against Rollo, that the dagger wherewith St Michael combated the dragon (if he had borrowed it of his neighbours in Normandy) could not have performed braver exploits, nor made greater slaughter, than his grace did ; though some will ascribe less to his prowess, because being harnessed with such a shift of mail he might think himself invulnerable. Her slipper also, and shoe ; yea, the figure also of the sole of her shoe is to be adored.<sup>3</sup> Yet this is at a pretty distance from Christ (though its prime virtue be from contact), and derives from him, like the feathers of the hen which were of the brood of the cock that crowed when Peter denied him. They have Simeon's arm (mentioned in the Gospel) at Aken,<sup>4</sup> which hinders not but they may have it at Hartsburg and other places too. They have not only Joseph's hem, but his breeches ;<sup>5</sup> and I hope kept less nastily than Thomas Becket kept his, which yet were worshipful, vermin and all, and that not *per accidens* (it may be), since it is one commendation of his saintship<sup>6</sup> that his breeches ran quick. They have some remains of all the apostles, though nobody could tell them where divers of their bodies were interred, but things of this nature they still have by revelation. And how can such as these want revelations, who, in pilgrimage to holy relics, declared that a goose carried before them was the Holy Ghost.<sup>7</sup> They have Peter's keys, his sword, his staff, his coat, his garment besides, and his girdle ; part of his body is at Constantinople, half of it at Rome in one place, and yet the whole in another.<sup>8</sup> They have martyred him over again (or some other bodies for his), and torn him into more pieces than their St Hippolytus was torn with horses. They have his head (or some of it) in seven several places in Rome ; only they want his brains, which were reserved in another place, and worshipped (or a pumice-stone instead thereof). And there may be some mystery in that ; for they speak of some time, under Peter's successors, when their church should have *caput sine cerebro*.<sup>9</sup> Setting that aside, we may be sure they have missed nothing that belonged to St Peter, since they could catch his shadow, and hold it as fast as they do his keys. And why might not this be done as well as the monk could bring with him from Palestine the sound of the bells that hung in Solomon's temple.<sup>10</sup> I have not yet in their sacred lists discerned the lips of Judas, but they have his lantern, which shewed him the way to apprehend his Master, and thereby perhaps in time they may discover the other. They want nothing for this but some of the oil of the candle of the sepulchre, which can light itself, and this the monks at Casino can help them to.<sup>11</sup> If they have not the ass upon which Christ rode to Jerusalem, they missed it narrowly when they caught the palm<sup>12</sup> he then had in his hand (whether he had any or no) ; and a worshipful relic of the ass some shew ; it is said<sup>13</sup> his tail is enshrined in Liguria. And who can think but that may be as proper an object of adoration as the hay wherewith Friar Francis his ass was saddled. And every hair in that tail may make a complete relic, as worshipful as the

<sup>1</sup> Erasmus, *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Vid. Rivet, *ibid.* p. 295.

<sup>5</sup> Erasmus, Annot. in Math. xxiii.

<sup>7</sup> Aventinus, lib. v.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 515.

<sup>11</sup> Chronic. Cassinon. lib. iii. cap. xxxviii. in Cent. Magd. xi. p. 305.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* lib. iv. cap. xxiv.

<sup>13</sup> Vid. D. Hall ; No peace, sect. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> Gaguinus. l. v. de gestis Franc.

<sup>4</sup> Ranulphus. l. v. c. xxvi.

<sup>6</sup> Engl. Festival in S. Thom. Episc. Cant.

<sup>8</sup> Vid. Reinold. de. Idolatr. p. 59.

<sup>10</sup> Vid. Vergerium ubi supra.

whole ; for by their divinity,<sup>1</sup> the virtue of the whole is in every part. If it were but well distributed, this one might serve to furnish a hundred shrines, and entertain the devotion of as many votaries and pilgrims as come to worship at Loretto.

But I need not insist on such relics as are to have divine worship by consequence ; those which they say expressly should be so worshipped are enough, and as many as they please to imagine. For though they have no good ground to believe that they have any one true relic of Christ, or the least part of one, yet imagination is enough with them, both to give them being, and to multiply them *in infinitum*, and to warrant their worship of each of them as of Christ himself ; even such imaginations as interfere and confute one another, and are each of them confuted by such miracles as are the ground of the whole imposture. The foreskin of Christ is more religiously worshipped among them than Christ himself ; as Erasmus observed.<sup>2</sup> It is kept and exposed in at least four several countries,<sup>3</sup> and miracles brought to confirm the truth of its being there ; and yet while it is seen and adored in so many places on earth, some of their chief writers say it is nowhere on earth, but in heaven ; and must be so, otherwise the glorified body of Christ would be imperfect, and not entire. His shirt, and besides that (though he had no other shirt) his coat, which the soldiers disposed of at his death, was not found till the year 593 ;<sup>4</sup> yet they had it elsewhere, and greatly worshipped it long before in a city of Galatia, says Gregory of Tours.<sup>5</sup> It is much that they should have it before it was found, and something strange too, that as it was without seam so it should be without rent, though afterwards they found it in several places at once, many hundred miles distant. They have it in Germany, and they have it in France, and they may have it in all parts of the world at once, as certainly as they have it there ; but whether they have it or no, that which they take to be it must have the same worship and honour with Christ. And we must not think it strange that it should be in so many places, since they say it grew on his back,<sup>6</sup> and so not unlikely might multiply itself since. About the blood of Christ there is no less imposture, and as great idolatry. They pretend to have much of it in parcels ; that which Nicodemus saved in his glove, that which Longinus brought in a vessel to Mantua, that which Joseph of Arimathea brought into England in two silver vessels, that which is kept at Venice with the earth it fell on, that which is shewed at the holy chapel in Paris, that which is adored at Rome on Easter day, that which may be seen in every country where popery hath left people no eyes. Yet the angel of their schools<sup>7</sup> (whose doctrine they say was approved by a miracle, and which they must not question if they believe their portess) is positive that all the blood of Christ that was shed before was in his body at his resurrection, and so ascended with him into heaven ; and that the blood which is shewed in churches for relics did not flow from Christ's side, but miraculously from a certain wounded image of Christ. So that the blood which

<sup>1</sup> Eandem virtutem in exigua parte reliquiarum, quæ in toto sit corpore, experimento probatum.—*Baronius*. an. lv.

<sup>2</sup> Alibi Christi præputium, cum sit res incerta, religiosius adorant, quam totum Christum. Annot. in Math. xxiii.

<sup>3</sup> Vid. Rivet. *ibid.* l. i. c. xvii. p. 132, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Baronius. an. 593.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. Spondan. an. 593, n. xi.

<sup>6</sup> Ludolphus de vita Jesu. part ii. cap. lxxiii. p. 221.

<sup>7</sup> Sanguis autem ille, qui in quibusdam ecclesiis pro reliquiis conservatur, non fluxit de latere Christi, sed miraculose dicitur effluxisse de quadam imagine Christi percussa. iii. q. liv. art. ii. ad iii. An autem extet aliqua portio sanguinis—dissentio est inter Doctores ; aliqui enim negant.—*Bonacin.* ubi supra punct. iii. n. vi.

they worship as God is no better than that which an image can bleed; and this will scarce prove so good in England as the blood of Hales, which (how much soever worshipped) was discovered to be but the blood of a drake.

They have the reed, the sponge, the crown of thorns, in so many places as gives them reason enough to believe they have them in none, and yet they worship these in all. We must imagine (to have such things go down smoothly) that they grow more than any thorn hedge does, not only in length but in number. And something towards this, Gregory of Tours<sup>1</sup> writes of those thorns: they are green still, and though the leaves wither sometimes, yet they revive again, and flourish. But the old bishop had not the good hap to see this, he had it only by rumour; and such rumours their annalist is wont to make much of; for it is not amiss to abuse others into a belief of that which they cannot believe themselves. The lance which pierced Christ's side was got into the West before it had left the East (its proper place). Otto the Great presented Athelstane, king of England, with it and other rarities, in the tenth age.<sup>2</sup> Yet the dominical spear (the same, we may suppose, though some question it) was the same age in the possession of Rudolphus, Duke of Burgundy,<sup>3</sup> of which Harry emperor of Germany was so covetous, that he threatened the Duke to destroy his country with fire and sword if he would not give it him; and, in fine, gave him a good part of his country for it. Much worship it had, and brave feats it played then, and I know not how long before, for Charles the Great, they say, had it too;<sup>4</sup> yet for all this it was still in Asia (if anywhere), and not found there till two hundred years after, for the Latins having taken Antioch,<sup>5</sup> were blessed with the revelation of it in St Peter's church (for holy relics was the adventure which those knights errant sought, and they were concerned in point of honour either to find or make some). But this was confirmed by miracle, else it had not been worth a rush. Peter, the finder of it, to prove the truth thereof,<sup>6</sup> walked through a mighty fire with the lance in his hand. It is like this champion had something of the metal of that hermit's<sup>7</sup> marvellous pot, in which, though it was of wood, he boiled his meat constantly, how hot soever the fire was, without burning; but that of the pot it seems was better tempered, for that endured many years, do the fire what it could, but the man could not long survive that hot brunt, dying shortly after. The nails where-with Christ was fastened to the cross were three or four at most.<sup>8</sup> Baronius dare not say they were four, though he does not always speak with the least in this matter of miracles. These, as the rumour was, being sent by Helena to Constantine, lost quite the form of nails, being used for the making of a bridle and a helmet for the emperor. In this, Theodoret,<sup>9</sup> Sozomen,<sup>10</sup> and Socrates<sup>11</sup> agree, but they tell us not how the nails which pierced Christ were known from those which fastened the two thieves to the other crosses. If they had foreseen that such things should have been worshipped equally with Christ himself, they would have thought this necessary, or rather to

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Spondan. an. xxxiv. n. xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Ranulphus, lib. vi. cap. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Luitprandus, l. iv. c. xii. Otho Frisingensis, l. ix. c. viii. in Cent. Magd. x. p. 336.

Vide et Spondan. an. 929, n. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Spondan. ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Baron. an. 1099. Bellarm. de imagin. l. ii. c. xxvii. out of Guliel. Tyrius, Paulus, Æmilius, Dodechinus, &c.

<sup>6</sup> M. Paris, in an. 1099.

<sup>7</sup> Gregor. Turonens. de glor. confess. c. xcviii.

<sup>8</sup> Sententiam de tribus tantummodo clavis Christi recentior probavit usus. Spondan. an. xxxiv. n. xxxv.

<sup>9</sup> Lib. i. c. xviii.

<sup>10</sup> L. ii. c. i.

<sup>11</sup> L. i. c. xiii. χαλινῶς τε καὶ περινεζάλαιαν πύσσας.

have said nothing at all without better ground, lest the nails of the thieves might have divine worship for those of Christ's. Gregory of Tours, who will have a fourth nail,<sup>1</sup> says one was thrown into the Adriatic Sea, where it seems it spawned, and from thence came the multitude of nails which were shewed and adored for the true one. (This is as satisfactory as the shuffling account which their great annalist gives thereof.) If Constantine had lived in times of popery, his horse had been in danger of divine worship for his bridle's sake, and his helmet could scarce have defended itself from being made an idol; but seeing his religion was of another strain than that now in request with Romanists, it is well if he escape reproach for converting that, the counterfeit of which they think worthy of the worship of God, to a profane use. However, they would not long endure such abuse, for upon a time one of them (whether reassuming its old form or no, I know not) skipped out of the bridle (or helmet, as you please, into Constantine's sword hilt, and that from thence, sword and all, into these western parts; and that we may not question this, it was given by Otho the Great to our Athelstane.<sup>2</sup> But this was nothing to the spear which Count Sampson gave to Rudolph of Burgundy, and which Harry the emperor (or king, as Baronius calls him) forced from Rudolphus; for there were I know not how many of these nails artificially fastened to the spear, say some;<sup>3</sup> others will have it wholly made of them,<sup>4</sup> and then these nails had need be twenty times more than ever touched the cross, or else they must be such as were fit only for the use of their giant Christopher, whose saintship they make full twelve ells high.<sup>5</sup> For all this they had still many of these nails at their shrines and altars. To waive the rest, the bishop of Metes, officiating at Tryers<sup>6</sup> for Poppo, who was turned pilgrim, slyly filehes away from the altar one of those sacred nails, conveying another very like it into the place; and he had carried it clearly, but that, as ill luck was, the holy nail fell a bleeding (and it is like the nail had more tenderness than the consciences of those who coined such stories). However, this holy bishop, who had so dear a love for relics, must not suffer under the bad character of a thief, much less as sacrilegious, for stealing of relics was then the practice of the best (and no wonder if theft got reputation, when cheats were in so much request). Besides, there was something more than ordinary in the case, for such thieves, with the receivers, cheated themselves most of all, and those that were robbed made account (as they had reason) that they lost nothing, but worshipped what was gone, as still in their possession. So they at St Dennis believe that they have still the body, as well as the name of St Dennis the Areopagite, though Pope Leo the Ninth declared by an authentic bull, that it was stolen from thence, and carried to Ratisbon in Germany.<sup>7</sup> And no wonder if the French will not be baffled out of their faith by the pope; for is it likely that he who carried his head in his arms (after it was smitten off)<sup>8</sup> for two or three miles together, and would not die till he came to the place where his body should rest, would not keep it from being carried from that place, signalised with such a miracle? And the remains of St Bennet's body were stolen from Cassino in Naples, and carried, as they say, to Fleury in France, and the monks there offer proof of it by miracles;<sup>9</sup> and yet those at Cassino believe they have it, and accordingly

<sup>1</sup> De glor. Martyr. cap. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Ranulphus, l. vi. c. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Otho Frisinges. l. ix. c. viii.

<sup>4</sup> Sigebert et alii in Spondan, an. 929, n. ii. Lancea ex Christi clavis confecta.

<sup>5</sup> Baptista Mantuan. fast. lib. vii.

<sup>6</sup> Catalog. Trevirens. in Cent. Magd. xxi. p. 308.

<sup>7</sup> Baronius, an. 1052.

<sup>8</sup> Breviar. Sarum. et breviarium Roman. nov. Lesson. vi.

<sup>9</sup> Sigebert, an. 753. Vincentius, lib. xxiii. c. clv.

worship it still, confirming themselves and others in that confidence of miracles too.<sup>1</sup> Whereby the world may judge of their miracles, for since God works none upon such occasions, to be sure, not for the confirming of contradictions, these must be the fictions of cheating knaves, or the feats and illusions of Satan. And some of themselves<sup>2</sup> confess that multitudes of them are no better as to their original. Indeed, they make such use of their miracles, that it is enough to blast the credit of a thing to have a miracle alleged by them for it, since it is their common practice to confirm one lie with another, and the confirmation is more intolerable than the first fiction, because they will have the divine power interposed, thereby to delude the world.

Not to digress further, they tell us of the oil, or liquor which drops from the knots of the true cross.<sup>3</sup> No wonder if this be thought worthy of no less worship than the rest, since they ascribe to it a divine power. Besides many marvellous feats, it can cast out devils; for it must be of no less virtue than the oil of the sepulchre of St Martin, which, duly administered to a man possessed, gave him such a purge that he squirted out a foul fiend behind, and voided the devil for a stool.<sup>4</sup> In short, that the cross itself should have divine worship is their common doctrine.<sup>5</sup> This at first was no more than one man might well bear, but by the good housewifery of that church (who scruples no cheats in this sacred traffic) it is retailed out for worship in so many pieces, that together would sink a ship of a good burden;<sup>6</sup> so that there are many, many cart loads of Roman gods, which are really no better than common chips. In all this there is not any one bit, which they can upon good ground believe to be part of the true cross. They cannot be more confident of any than that piece which, with Pilate's inscription on it, they say is reserved and worshipped at Rome; but that is detected to be a counterfeit by Baronius his own words;<sup>7</sup> for he says, that on the true cross the Latin inscription was first (and so the Greek next, and the Hebrew last), and confirms it by no less authority than that of a pope, Nicholas I.; whereas in that piece at Rome, the Hebrew is first, and the Latin last. By this we may judge of the stories concerning the invention of the cross by Helena. This now mentioned was a considerable piece of the discovery; nor would the cardinal himself have us believe, that what is said to be sent to Constanti-nople, or reserved at Jerusalem, were more real parts of the true cross than that at Rome. However, true or false, here is enough, one would think, to glut the most ravenous devotion of any Egyptian. But when they will have this worship given to the images of the cross,<sup>8</sup> in any matter whatsoever, or immaterial either, they give warranty to turn all things in the world into idols, any sticks or straws, yea, a man's own fingers laid across may be worshipped by him; or let him but move one finger across in water, or

Vide Spondan. an. 1088, n. i.

<sup>2</sup> Aliquando maximam deceptionem fieri in ecclesia per miracula ficta a sacerdotibus, Nic. Lyran. in cap. xiv. Daniel, Cassander, consult. c. de reliquiis infra. Vincentius, l. xxvi. cap. xxi. dicit fuisse quosdam qui quæstus gratia per magiam hæc miracula fieri aperte contestati sunt.

<sup>3</sup> Spondan, an. 598, n. iv. et an. 633, n. i.

<sup>4</sup> Gregor. Turon. de glor. Confess. cap. ix. Dæmonem per fluxum ventris egressit.

<sup>5</sup> Aquinas iii. q. xxv. art. iv. Asserimus cum sententia commniori et in Scholis magis trita, crucem colendam esse latræ, hoc est cultu divino, &c.—Gretser. l. i. c. xlix. E. de fide. Bonacin. supra.

<sup>6</sup> Fragmentula ligni crucis tam multa, ut si in acervum redigantur, vix vel navis oncraria vehat. Erasm Annot. in Math. c. xxiii.

<sup>7</sup> Baron. an. xvi. n. viii.

<sup>8</sup> Vide Gretser ubi supra.

Utraque crux adoratur adoratione latræ.—Bonacin. *ibid.*

oil, or the air, anywhere, and instantly he has of his own creating what he may worship as God.

For those relics to which they give divine worship under another name, they are yet more numerous. So that, upon the whole, if the Philistines had worshipped not only the god of flies,<sup>1</sup> but the flies themselves too, they would scarce have outvied these in numbers. The idolatrous Israelites, who worshipped the host of heaven, had a fair company of idols; but the Egyptians might have more, who could sow gods in their gardens, and make them spring up on their backsides; but both put together would come short of the Romanists herein, both for number and quality, though they of Egypt became the scorn of the world for the vileness of what they religiously worshipped. How they came by so many, when for three hundred years after Christ we hear of none, we have an account from their own authors. Out of covetousness, says their learned and ingenious Cassander, false relics were daily forged, feigned miracles were published, superstition thereby nourished, and sometimes, by the illusion of the devil, new relics were revived.<sup>2</sup> So that, in brief, to use the language of their own author, the devil helped their church to some of them, and covetous knaves to others. This stuff might be had cheap, and sold very dear; this encouraged many to take up the trade, and monks are noted as prime merchants for this traffic. They were such who, in Austin's time,<sup>3</sup> being employed, as he says, by Satan (whose factors they were, and for whom the trade was driven), sold the members of martyrs, or what they pretended to be so. He was of the same profession<sup>4</sup> who declared he came out of Spain into France with relics, which, being looked into, proved to be roots of trees, the teeth of moles, the bones of mice, and the claws and fat of bears. And they were monks who, as the same author tells us, were found at Rome, near Paul's church, digging up bodies, and confessed their design was to make relics of them. As for him whom Glaber speaks of,<sup>5</sup> who furnished France with innumerable relics, it may seem strange that he should be counted a cheat when he was thus trading in another country, since his stuff had the very same mark which makes their other relics current as good ware, unquestionably good, and than which their best have no better; for he wrought wonders (or the devil for him), and by one carcase, which he feigned to be a martyr's,<sup>6</sup> he freed many that were sick from variety of diseases; but I suppose he was not free of the company, and they like not interlopers. The court of Rome can furnish altars with holy relics out of common graves, and none must count them cheats for it. And if this huckster had but procured a commission from thence, he might have substantiated the bones in any churchyard, yea, those of a sheep or a hog either, into the bones of martyrs or apostles, as well as others. By this we may judge what their relics are, the best of them mere cheats; and consequently, how criminal it will be to give them worship, the highest of all;<sup>7</sup> and yet they are so far from abandoning this, that it is in a manner the sum of their religion.

<sup>1</sup> זבוב בעל rendered by LXX. Βααλ μύιας.

<sup>2</sup> Avaritiæ causa ad simplicem populum illicendum falsæ reliquiæ supponebantur, et ficta prædicabantur miracula—nonnunquam autem astu et illusionē Dæmonis hominum superstitione abutentis, per insomnia et visa novæ reliquiæ revelabantur, et ejusdem operatione miracula edi videbantur.—*Consult. c. de reliquiis.*

<sup>3</sup> Augustin. de opere Monach. c. xxviii. Tam multos hypocritas sub habitu monachorum usquequaque dispersit Satan—alii membra martyrum, si tamen martyrum, venditant.

<sup>4</sup> Gregor. Turon. hist. Franc. l. ix. c. vi.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. Spondan. an. 1027, n. iii.

<sup>6</sup> Multos infirmos variis morbis liberassc.—*Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> In bonis quoque viris, pio zelo præditis, summa quasi religionis in hujusmodi reliquiis &c. *Cassander, consult. c. de reliquiis.*

And so it is expressed by some of their own communion. The whole of religion is almost brought to this, to wit, their religious treatment of relics, through the covetousness of priests, and the hypocrisy of monks, fed by the foolishness of the people.<sup>1</sup> Thus their great Erasmus, in his Annotations, approved by Pope Leo X. his brief.<sup>2</sup>

*Sect. 4.* Let us see, in the next place, if perjury may not prove as blameless and as necessary. Breach of oaths is no less with them than a virtue, or a necessary duty in many cases (of which a further account hereafter). Let me now instance but in one. Suppose a prince that has protestant subjects should, for their satisfaction, give them the security of his most solemn oath, that they should not suffer for their conscience either in life, estate, or liberty; that religion does oblige the prince to break all such oaths, or to count himself no ways obliged by them, because they are against the laws of the church, against that particularly of the general council of Lateran under Pope Innocent III., which forbids all favour to be shewed to heretics, under the severest penalties, and decrees that favourers of heretics are under excommunication. So that in this case it must be the prince's duty to be perjured, and to break his oath made in favour of his heretical subjects, and that by the sacred decree of the church. He must forswear himself, if he will not be excommunicated, and consequently deposed, and thereby exposed to the violence of every hand; yea, he puts himself into the state of damnation, and sins mortally, if he be true to his oath. So Pope Martin V. declared in writing to Alexander, Duke of Lithuania:<sup>3</sup> Know, says he, that thou sinnest mortally if thou keep thy oath with heretics. Hereby it appears that no papists, princes or subjects, can possibly give any security which may be trusted, that protestants shall enjoy anything which is in their power to deprive them of; for the greatest securities that can be given in this case are engagements of faith and truth, God being invocated for confirmation in solemn oaths. But by the principles of their religion they are so far loosed from all such bonds that they are not at all to be trusted by any but credulous fools, unless it can be supposed that they will act as other men than papists, and contemn all the authority of that church, which leaves no hope of salvation but in obedience to it; for another general council, that of Constance, has determined that no faith is to be kept with heretics. In the nineteenth session of that assembly, it was decreed that no safe conduct given by emperor, king, or secular prince to heretics, or any defamed<sup>4</sup> for heretics, though with a design to reduce them, by what engagements soever they have obliged themselves, shall hinder those heretics from being prosecuted, unless they recant,<sup>5</sup> though they come to the place of judgment relying upon such security, and would not have come otherwise. And it is declared further, that one thus bound by promise was not hereby in the least obliged. And what they decreed and declared they immediately practised; for the emperor Sigismund, having given safe conduct to John Huss, and so engaged the public faith and his own honour that he should come and go safe to and from the council; and Pope John XXII., then present in the council, having given his promise and engaged his faith (if he had any) for his safety, yet the honour and faith of the emperor was borne down by the principles of

<sup>1</sup> Huc fere summa religionis vocatur avaritia sacerdotum, et monachorum quorundam hypocrisi, quos alit populi stultitia. in Mat. xxiii.

<sup>2</sup> Hist. of Council of Trent, p. 473.

<sup>3</sup> Scito te mortaliter peccare, si servabis fidem datam hæreticis.—*Apud Cochlaeum.* . v. hist. Hussitarum.

<sup>4</sup> Quocunque vinculo se astrinxerint coucesso.

<sup>5</sup> Etiam si salvo conductu confisi, ad locum venerint iudicii, alias non venturi, nec sic promittentem—ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum.—*In Crab.* tom. ii. p. 1111.

their church, and the pope (as soon as the poor man was drawn into danger past escaping) made nothing of his promise, pretending, when he was urged with it, that he was overruled; and so, notwithstanding all the security an emperor and a pope had given him, he was first miserably imprisoned, and after cruelly burnt to ashes. Hereby the world, protestants especially, have this plain and useful admonition, that they must trust to nothing among papists (those that will be true to that church), but what will keep them out of their power. The principles of their religion (for such are determinations of general councils) bind them to observe no faith, or truth, or common honesty with those whom they count heretics, no, not when life is concerned. Their religion obliges them to violate the most sacred oaths and the most solemn engagements of faith and truth, rather than an heretic shall be safe in any of his concerns where they can reach him. It is a virtue, a duty in that religion to snap asunder all securities (by which the world and human society hath hitherto been preserved) to ruin a heretic; no fear of perjury or any other perfidiousness must be a hindrance in the case. Nor is perjury so necessary or innocent only when it is mischievous to us, but when it does mischief to themselves, and the world also. The practice of their popes for many ages may satisfy us herein, and to those who are acquainted with history, which gives an account thereof, it is no improbable observation that the bloody wars and massacres that have been for many hundred years in those places which the papal influence could reach, cannot be imputed to anything more, for the most part, than the perjuries of the popes themselves, and of those whom they involved in that guilt by discharging them from the obligation of their oaths.

*Sect. 5.* And this brings me to some other crimes forementioned, robberies and murders, which the wonderful power of papal holiness hath transformed into Christian and virtuous acts. By the doctrine of their church, to deprive those whom they count heretics of their estate and lives is a virtue, and a meritorious act. There is too good evidence for this. A decree of Pope Innocent III., recorded in the tomes of their councils, by their own writers, as an authentic act of the general council of Lateran under that pope, and inserted by Gregory IX. into the decretals, which is the law of their church, and part of that which passes with them for divine law. There is, there can be, no act of their church more authoritative and obliging than such a decree as this. There, first of all,<sup>1</sup> heretics are excommunicated and condemned; and then it is decreed that the estates of those condemned are confiscated. But that is not all; the secular princes or lords are to be compelled (if they will not do it otherwise), and bound with a solemn oath, to endeavour to the utmost of their power utterly to destroy them all. They are to labour in good earnest with all their might to root them all out.<sup>2</sup> And, further, if any temporal lord proceed not to such ruining execution within a year,<sup>3</sup> the pope is to absolve those that are under him from their allegiance; the land is to be seized on by catholics, who, having exterminated the heretics, are to possess it without control. Here it is plain that, by the highest authority the Roman church pretends to (that which is no less with them than divine), the papists

<sup>1</sup> Cap. iii. Concil. Later. sub Innocent. iii. in Crab. tom. ii. p. 947, 948. Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnem hæresim—condemnantes universos hæreticos quibuscunque nominibus censeantur—ita quod bona damnatorum, si laici fuerint, confiscentur.

<sup>2</sup> Quod de terris suæ jurisdictionis subjectis, universos hæreticos ab ecclesia denotatos, bona fide pro viribus exterminare studeant.

<sup>3</sup> Ut tunc ipse vasallos ab ejus fidelitate denunciaret absolutos, et terram exponat catholicis occupandam, qui eam, exterminatis hæreticis, sine ulla contradictione possideant.

are bound to destroy all whom they count heretics, and to take possession of their estates. And this barbarous decree (which has so much force with them,<sup>1</sup> as the word of God with any) was put in execution in the days of that very pope; for he employed armies against the Albigenes (the predecessors of the protestants in France), who destroyed above two hundred thousand in the space of some months.<sup>2</sup> It was executed in the age before this in France,<sup>3</sup> where so many thousands were treacherously and cruelly murdered, that the channels run down with blood into the river; and this magnified as a glorious action, honoured with a triumph at Rome, and the unparalleled butchers rewarded with his holiness's blessing. We have known it executed in our days upon some hundred thousands of the protestants in Ireland, where that bloody tragedy was acted by the pope's excitement and concurrence, just according to the tenor of that decree, the Irish papists endeavouring, with all their might, utterly to destroy all the protestants, that their estates and the whole land might be in the possession of Roman Catholics. And in all countries about us, wherever they have been powerful enough, or but thought themselves so, they have effected or attempted it. Such outrages were and are to be committed by warrant of the Romish doctrine. They are bound to act thus by all the authority of that church, which not only enjoins this by her decrees, but gives all encouragement thereto; such robberies and butcheries are virtuous, yea, meritorious acts. Those that will engage therein to the utmost (as their church requires) are assured by the pope, of these indulgences and privileges, which were granted to the adventurers for the recovery of the holy land, and these are expressed, in an appendix to that council, to be full pardon of all their sins here, and a greater measure of glory hereafter.<sup>4</sup> At no less rate do they value the blood, and utter destruction of such as we (whom they count heretics); with such, and no less hopes, do they engage all papists, to endeavour, as far as possible, our utter extermination. It is true, there are good-natured persons amongst them, as there are amongst other sorts of men, and such as have a great aversion to such barbarous cruelty, but their religion tempts them to it, not only with hopes of heretics' estates, but of the greatest rewards that can be propounded; yea, and forces them to it, even beyond their inclination, with threatenings of the most dreadful import, expressed in that decree, which signifies also, that they must act at this rate of inhumanity if they will be counted Christians,<sup>5</sup> and must not expect to pass for faithful Romanists, unless they will act as monsters. But if it be their duty, as they are Roman catholics, and they bound in conscience, as far as their religion, and all the power of it, can bind them, to destroy the protestants amongst whom they live, and seize upon what they have, why do they not fall to work, and make an end of us, that all may be their own? How is it that they live quietly and peaceably in this, and some other places? To satisfy us here, they use plain dealing (though we must not always expect it), and tell us in express terms they do it not, merely because they have not power to do it. Though the church have made it their duty to destroy protestants, yet when they are not strong enough to do it, and where the attempting of it, because they are a weaker party, would endanger them, there they are excused, they may wait the happy hour till they have suffi-

<sup>1</sup> Conciliorum decreta sunt Spiritus Sancti oracula.—*Staplet. Relict. contr.* vi. p. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Jo. Paul, Perin. de Albigen.

<sup>3</sup> Thuanus, Hist. l. liii.

<sup>4</sup> Qui ad hæreticorum exterminium se accinxerint, illa gaudeant indulgentia, illoque privilegio sint muniti, quod accedentibus in terræ sanctæ subsidium conceditur, p. 948, ibid p. 967.

<sup>5</sup> Etiam sicut reputari cupiunt et haberi fideles, p. 948.

cient power, to shew their obedience to the church in executing her exterminating decrees, without apparent hazard of their own interest. So Bannes, a Dominican, determines that catholics in England and Saxony are excused from rising up against their protestant princes with their subjects, because they commonly are not powerful enough, and the attempt in such circumstances would expose them to great danger.<sup>1</sup> Bellarmine speaks it as plainly; if it were possible to root out the heretics, without doubt they are to be destroyed root and branch; but if it cannot be done, because they are stronger than we, and there be danger if they should oppose us, that we should be worsted, then we are to be quiet.<sup>2</sup> So that the reason why protestants in such places are not presently ruined, is because the papists are not there strong enough; we and others have the privilege to live, because they are not yet able to kill us, and to seize on what we have. When they have once power enough (or but think they have it), let us look to ourselves; for if papists have any conscience, that anything in their religion can touch, they must then destroy us utterly, and leave us neither liberty, estate, nor being, unless they will resist conscience, and rebel against the authority of that church which they count most sacred and sovereign; or, which is all one in their catholic sense, they must either exterminate us, or be damned themselves. And to deal thus with us would be so far from being a sin, that by their most infallible doctrine (the decrees of popes and councils) it would be an act highly meritorious, though in the common sense of mankind it be robbery and murder. They may become the best catholics, by abandoning justice, mercy, and humanity itself, and procure pardon of all other sins, by the most detestable injustice and cruelty, and obtain higher degrees of glory by such crimes, as (to use their own expression) deserves all the fires of heaven, and earth, and hell. If Satan could inspire all other sects with this catholic doctrine, it would be an expedient to satiate his enmity to mankind; this would turn the world into a shambles, and no sort of men should escape unbutchered, but such who could find no party able to force them to the slaughterhouse, yet this is the way to heaven, and transcendent glory, for those who will follow the Roman conduct, and believe what passes for most infallible amongst them!

*Sect. 6.* There is another crime which passes for an eminent virtue with them, and is so esteemed and practised, that is, sorcery and conjuring. In the books of devotion published for the use of their exorcists, there are such horrid practices in and upon the devil as fully answers the titles of the books, one of which is called *Horrible Conjuraton*, and another *Devilish Exorcisms*. He that has not seen them can scarce believe that such things should be practised by any that bear the name of Christians; nor can they be heard without conceiving a horror at them. But they have been mentioned by others, I will only insist on that which may seem more innocent, but has indeed too much of sorcery and enchantment, and that is their sacramentals, with things of like nature and supposed virtue. Of this quality is their consecrated water, salt, oil, bread, waxen tapers, branches of trees, roses, bells, medals, and *Agnus Deis*. To such things as these they ascribe marvellous and supernatural effects, a virtue to save and sanctify souls, to blot out sins, to expel devils, to cure diseases, to secure women in travail, to preserve from

<sup>1</sup> Sequitur primo excusandos esse Anglicanos et Saxonicos fideles, qui non se eximunt a potestate superiorum, nec bellum contra eos gerunt; quoniam communiter non habent facultatem ad hæc belligerenda contra principes, et imminet illis gravia pericula. In ii. 2 Thom. q. xii. art. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Hæretici—siquidem potest fieri, sunt proculdubio extirpandi, si autem non possunt quia sunt fortiores nobis, et periculum est, ne si eos bello aggrediamur, plures ex nobis cadant quam ex illis; tunc quiescendum est.—*De Laicis*. lib. iii. cap. xxii. p. 1319.

burning and drowning. Pope Alexander, in the decrees which they ascribe to him, asserts that water, mixed with salt and consecrated, does sanctify the people,<sup>1</sup> purify the unclean, break the snares of the devil, and bring health to body and soul. The form of exorcising salt, which we have in their authorised books, tells us it is exorcised, that it may be to all that take it both health to body and soul.<sup>2</sup> The exorcised water is to chase away all the power of the devil and root him out.<sup>3</sup> The virtues of an *Agnus Dei* are described by Urban V. in verse, wherewith he sent some of them to the Greek emperor. If you will believe a pope, who may be infallible in rhyme as well as in prose,<sup>4</sup> it drives away lightning, and all malignancy, delivers pregnant women, destroys the force of fire, secures from drowning, and, which is more, destroys sin, even as the blood of Christ does. Bellarmine says<sup>5</sup> they are of power for the blotting out of venial sins, for the chasing away devils, for the curing of diseases; others<sup>6</sup> ascribe to them a power to excite gracious motions, even *ex opere operato*. Now, it is acknowledged, that the natural power of these things cannot reach such effects, and that there is no virtue in or of themselves to produce them, no more than there is in such things by which magicians and conjurers work their strange feats; nor has the Lord instituted them, or anywhere promised to empower them, for such purposes, no more than he has promised to make the charm of any sorcerer effectual for marvellous operations. Bellarmine confesseth<sup>7</sup> that such things have their force not by any promise of God expressed. And Suarez<sup>8</sup> says the effect thereof is not founded in any special promise of God, because, as he had said, it does not appear there is any such promise. And they confess there is a tacit invocation of the devil in using things for effects, to which they have no power, natural or divine. There is such an invocation of the devil, says Cajetan,<sup>9</sup> when one uses any thing or word as having power for such an effect, for which it appears not to have any virtue, either natural or divine, for then he tacitly consents to the aid of the devil. And so Sylvester<sup>10</sup> after Aquinas; If the things made use of for such effects appear to have no power to produce them, it follows that they are not used for this purpose as causes, but as signs or sacramentals, and consequently they belong to some compact with the devil; and this, even the Jesuits will acknowledge. Thus cardinal Tolet,<sup>11</sup> It is to be generally observed that there is a tacit invocation of the devil when a man attempts to do anything by that which neither of itself nor by divine power produces such effects. And Filliucius, declaring the several ways whereby a magical operation may be discerned, most of which are applicable to their sacramentals, gives this as the reason of them all:<sup>12</sup> because when the effect cannot be expected from the power of such causes, since they have it not, neither from God, who has not instituted them, it follows that it must be expected from the devil, who is therein tacitly invocated. They take it for evident, that the efficacy of such

<sup>1</sup> De consecr. D. iii. cap. aqua.

<sup>2</sup> In salutem credentium, ut sit omnibus sumentibus sanitas animæ et corporis.

<sup>3</sup> Ad effugandam omnem potestatem inimici.

<sup>4</sup> — Omne malignum

Peccatum frangit ut Christi sanguis, &c. Angel. i. lib. Cærem. c. nlt.

<sup>5</sup> De cultu sanct. l. iii. c. vii. p. 1594.

<sup>6</sup> Tribuitur Thomæ, Cajetan, Soto in Suar. tom. iii. disp. xv. sect. iv.

<sup>7</sup> Vim habent ejusmodi res non ex pacto Dei expresso.—*Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Non est fundatus in speciali aliqua Dei promissione, quia ut dixi, de tali promissione non constat.—*Ibid.* p. 187.

Sum. verb. divinatio.

<sup>10</sup> Sum. v. superstitione. n. x.

<sup>11</sup> Instruct. sacerd. liv. c. xiv. p. 634.

<sup>12</sup> Tract. xxiv. cap. vii. n. clxx. p. 82.

things is not from God if he did not institute them; not from God, says Filliucius, since he was not the instituter.<sup>1</sup> So Sylvester<sup>2</sup> will have the magical signs referred to diabolical compact, because, having no such power of themselves, they are not of divine institution, plainly signifying that if their sacramentals were not instituted of God, they could be no better than what he refers to the devil. Now, what evidence is there that their sacramentals are of divine institution, and appointed by God for such purposes? They say so, and that is all, and so may the magicians say, if they please, and prove it as well too; for from the word of God, the only proof in this case, neither of them have a syllable. The author and original of this strange power may hereby be discerned, and the means they use to derive it helps the discovery. They have it, they say, by virtue of their exorcisms, but if they can consecrate or exorcise a thing into a power which is above itself, and yet comes not from God, their consecrations hereby will prove no better than conjuring. And, indeed, he that reads but their consecrations may have cause to think they are no other; for instance, their form of consecrating salt in these words: I conjure thee, creature of salt, by the living God, the true God, the holy God, that thou mayest be made a conjured salt, for the salvation of believers.<sup>3</sup> And the like conjuring they use for the making of holy water and other things. There is a charm in Alexander Trallianus, a magical doctor, which is exactly like these, in what the form of an enchantment requires, to convey a virtue into an herb for the cure of a disease: I exorcise, or conjure thee, by the great Jah and Sabaoth, the God that founded the earth, &c.; take the spirit of thy mother-earth and its virtue, and dry up the flux of feet and hands.<sup>4</sup> He that will count this a charm, will have no reason to deny but the papists' form of consecration is an enchantment; and indeed the common notion of enchantment is applicable hereto. They define it to be the conveying of a marvellous power into a thing by virtue of the words of an enchanter. Now, it is a marvellous power which they will have conveyed by their consecration, since it is a power above the natural capacity of the things, and such as enables them for spiritual and supernatural effects; and they think it conveyed by virtue of the words of the consecrator, as in the other case by the words of the magician, for as soon as the words are pronounced, they believe the things so consecrated are endowed with the power. They will say, indeed, that they expect the power from God, and use his name accordingly in their consecrations; and so might enchanters and magicians say, with the like reason, for they were wont to use the name of God in their charms and incantations, as Origen assures us. Many, says he,<sup>5</sup> of the Egyptians, when they are conjuring devils, insert in their incantations 'the God of Abraham;' and he says, not only the Jewish exorcists did invoke the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,<sup>6</sup> but almost all others who meddled with conjuration and magic. Oh, but this virtue comes from the church's prayers, says Bellarmine! By these prayers, I suppose he means their forms of consecration; yet in them there is no praying, but rather plain conjuring, for the words are

<sup>1</sup> Nec a Deo, qui eorum institutor non. est.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Si qua sunt supervacua, cum non sunt divinitus instituta, sicut sunt sacramentalia, et consequenter pertinent ad pacta quedam significationum cum dæmonibus.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Exorcizo te creatura salis per Deum verum, &c.

<sup>4</sup> ἔρκιζω σε ὄνομα μέγα Ἰαῶθ' Σαβαώθ, &c.

Vid. annot. in Orig. p. 17.

<sup>5</sup> πολλοὶ τῶν ἰσχυόντων δαίμονας χρεῶνται ἐν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν τῶ, Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ.—*Contr. Celsum.* lib. i. p. 17.

<sup>6</sup> ἀλλὰ γὰρ σχεδὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς τα τῶν ἰσχυῶν καὶ μαγικῶν πραγματευομένους. lib. iv. p. 184.

all of them directed to the things consecrated, and not at all to God, as is evident to any that reads them. And if they should use some prayers besides the forms of consecration, a magician may do so too besides his charm, and yet be no less an enchanter. Origen tells us that some invocation of God and use of his name is often found in conjuring books.<sup>1</sup> And what would it mend the matter for either of them to pray to God to bless an enchantment, or make his conjuring effectual? If the Ephesian magicians should have invocated God at the recital of their *γράμματα*;<sup>2</sup> or the conjurers among Jews or Gentiles, in the use of their suffumigations and other magical tricks;<sup>3</sup> or the Simonians for their *agogima*;<sup>4</sup> or Eleazer in the application of his ring and root;<sup>5</sup> the practice had been no better on this account, it would be still, at least, a tacit invocation of the devil, from whom alone such virtue must be expected, as is neither in the nature of the thing nor from God's appointment; yea, it would have been worse to make so bold with God as to invoke him for the service of the devil. But, indeed, popish prayers themselves, as they use them, are as like charms as they can look. In their prayers there are barbarous, *i. e.* unintelligible words (like those of the magician in 2. Pausanias), which the people, or priests many times, understand no more than the hard words in the charms of conjurers were understood:<sup>6</sup> such as *Jah, Zebaoth, Elohim, Sadai*, or those which Cato says were used in a charm,<sup>7</sup> for curing members out of joint; or the name Abraham, which though the conjurers in other countries used, yet they knew not what it meant, says Origen.<sup>8</sup> They are tied to the same syllables, as conjurers are in their charms, and that they may not vary, must, as the Persian magician,<sup>9</sup> read all out of a book, yea, though they have it by heart. It is not requisite by their doctrine, as we saw before, to mind the God of heaven in their prayers more than the prince of darkness. The mere mnttering of the words they count effectual, as in charms and enchantments, yet they have no promise from God, that the bare recital of their forms, without any inward devotion or attention, shall prevail, more than a magician has, that such a pronouncing of the words he uses in conjuring will be prevalent; or more, that the words of a prayer which one carries in his pocket,<sup>10</sup> another charm in use among the papists, will be effectual. So that Salmeron had more reason than he expressed, to say that their prayers were like the words of a charmer. They had need first excuse their prayers from this crime, before this will serve to excuse their sacramentals.

*Sect. 7.* There is another crime, no less heinous than the former, and yet in their account it is a necessary duty and a most excellent service, and that is, the destroying of Christ, which by their doctrine and laws of their church they are to do daily in the mass. To clear this, take notice of these severals: they teach that Christ is really in the mass, not only as he is God (and so everywhere), but as he is man, soul and body, flesh and blood, and there

<sup>1</sup> Ευρίσκεται γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μαγικοῖς συγγράμμασι πολλαχού ἡ τοιαύτη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπίκλησις, καὶ παράληψις τοῦ Θεοῦ ὀνόματος.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Clemens Alexandr. Strom. l. i. c. xviii.

<sup>3</sup> Θυμιάμασι καὶ καταδύσμοις χρῶνται.—*Just. Martyr. dial. ad Tryph.* p. 91. Edit Steph.

<sup>4</sup> Exorcismis et incantationibus utuntur. Amatoria quoque et Agogima apud eos studioso exercentur.—*Irenæus.* l. i. xx. p. lxxvi.

<sup>5</sup> δακτύλιος, ἔχων ὑπὸ τῆ σφραγίδι ῥίζας.—*Joseph. Antiq.* l. viii. c. ii. p. 257.

<sup>6</sup> βάρβαρα καὶ οὐδαμῶς συνετὰ.—*Lib. i. Eliacor.*

<sup>7</sup> Cato de re rustica luxata membra hac cantione sana fieri tradit; Danata daries dardaries astararies, &c.—*Polyd. Virgil. de Prodigis,* lib. i.

<sup>8</sup> οὐκ ἐπιστάμενοι δὲ τίς ἐστίν ὁ Ἀβραάμ.—*Ibid.* lib. i. p. 17.

<sup>9</sup> ἱσαῖοι ἐπιλεγόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ βιβλίου. Pausan. *ibid.* Vid. Soto de *Justir.* lib. x. q. v art. iii.

<sup>10</sup> Vid. Horæ B. Virg. Paris edit. an. 1526, p. 63.

not only mystically in signs and representations, or spiritually in virtue and efficacy, but as to the very substance of his body, some say corporeally, others after the manner of a spirit; but all say the true substance of his flesh and blood is as really on the altar as his body was on the cross when nailed to it; yea, that it is there visibly, and may be (though it be not ordinarily) seen. 2. They hold that Christ is truly and properly sacrificed in the mass, and his body and blood there offered, as much as any bullock or lamb was sacrificed under the law. The council of Trent declares that the sacrifice in the mass, and that offered on the cross, is the very same for substance, and differs only in the manner of offering;<sup>1</sup> and denounces a curse against any that shall say that this is not a true and proper sacrifice, or that Christ in these words, *Do THIS*, did not command the disciples, and priests after them, to sacrifice the body and blood of Christ.<sup>2</sup> 3. They maintain that in every true and proper sacrifice, that which is sacrificed is really destroyed. So Bellarmine: To a true sacrifice it is required that what is offered to God in sacrifice should be plainly destroyed.<sup>3</sup> And if it be a live thing that is offered, that it may be a true and real sacrifice, it must of necessity be slain and deprived of life. A true and real sacrifice, says he, requires the true and real killing of it, since in the killing of it the essence of the sacrifice consists. Hence it clearly follows, and it is their own inference, that Christ being truly and properly sacrificed in the mass, he is there really consumed, killed, or destroyed; he is as really consumed in the mass as incense when it was burnt for an oblation. The body of Christ, says the cardinal, for the honour of God, is laid upon the table that it may be consumed.<sup>4</sup> He is as really destroyed as the whole burnt offering was destroyed when it was totally burnt. The consumption of the sacrament, says the same author, as it is done by a sacrificing priest, is an essential part of the sacrifice; for it is a real destruction of the sacrifice, and is counted correspondent to the burning of the holocaust.<sup>5</sup> He is as really killed in the mass, by their doctrine, as a bullock that was slain for a sacrifice. If in the mass, says he, there be not a true and real killing and slaying of Christ, it is not a true and real sacrifice; adding this reason, because the essence of a sacrifice consists in the killing of it.<sup>6</sup> So also Doctor Allen says, Christ is killed there indeed, and sacrificed to God.<sup>7</sup> And Vega, Christ is as truly slain and offered in the sacrament of the eucharist, as he is truly in the sacrament;<sup>8</sup> and they think him to be as truly there as they believe him to be in heaven. Aquinas<sup>9</sup> favours this opinion, and Gabriel insinuates it; Soto, Ledesma, Canus, and the modern Thomists do plainly deliver it, besides Bellarmine and other Jesuits. Canus says they believe that to the perfect sacrificing of an animal

<sup>1</sup> Sess. vi. cap. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Can. i. et ii.

<sup>3</sup> *Et omnia omnino, quæ in Scriptura dicuntur sacrificia, necessario destruenda erant; si vivientia per occisionem, &c.—De Miss. lib. i. c. ii. p. 685. Ad verum sacrificium requiritur, ut id quod offertur Deo in sacrificium, plane destruat. —Ibid. p. 688. vid. lib. i. cap. xxvii. p. 760.*

<sup>4</sup> Christi corpus ad Dei honorem super mensam ponitur ut consumatur.

<sup>5</sup> Consumptio quæ fit a sacerdote sacrificante—proprie combustioni holocausti respondere censetur.—*Ibid. p. 759.*

<sup>6</sup> Vel in missa fit vera, et realis Christi mactatio et occisio vel non. Si non fit, non est verum et reale sacrificium: sacrificium enim verum et reale, veram et realem occisionem exigit, quando in occisione ponitur essentia sacrificii.—*Ibid. p. 760, sect. denique.*

<sup>7</sup> De Euchar. Sacrific. c. xc. xi. xii.

<sup>8</sup> De miss. Thes. xxii. xxiii.

<sup>9</sup> In Suarez. tom. iii. in iii. Thom. disp. lxxv. sect. v. Ratio præcipua hujus sententiæ est quia de essentia sacrificii est, et præsertim holocausti, ut tota victima consumatur—nam hoc sacrificium est holocaustum, in quo victima debet perfecte consumi, &c.

it ought to be destroyed and slain, if it be truly sacrificed.<sup>1</sup> He says also, that the body of Christ, in the mass, is a living and breathing body, even the very same that is in heaven, and that it is truly sacrificed. What, then, can follow from hence, but that the living and breathing body of Christ in the mass is truly killed? This is not denied, only they say it is an unbloody death. And this indeed is their doctrine, Christ is put to death in the mass as he was upon the cross. It is the same death for the substance that he dies by the priest, as he died by the Jews and Romans, only with some difference in the manner of it: it was a bloody death on the cross, it is an unbloody death in the mass, but he is put to death in both. And why should they say it is an unbloody death that he suffers by the priest, since they profess that his blood is there shed and poured forth, the very same blood that was shed on the cross?<sup>2</sup> This may seem strange, and they cross themselves here sometimes; but nothing must seem strange in the mass, for it is such a heap of absurdities and contradictions as ever entered into the fancy of any men waking and in their wits; nor could have entered into theirs, if the spirit of delusion and the dream of infallibility had not distracted them. However, this they do, and must hold, whatever come of it, that Christ is killed or destroyed in the mass. They are as much concerned to do it as all their religion comes to; for if Christ be not really destroyed in their mass, they have no true and proper sacrifice; and they tell us (to prove us altogether irreligious), where there is no proper sacrifice there can be no religion.<sup>3</sup> Hereby it is very manifest that the office of their sacrificing priest is daily to offer deadly violence to Christ; that Christ in their mass is every day slain or consumed, and that the highest devotion of the Romish church is the destruction of Christ. It is true, Christ is above their reach; whatever they fancy, they cannot offer him this violence, or destroy him as they do his members; but they really design to destroy him when they would make a sacrifice of him. And they verily believe they do it, and they do all which they count requisite in order to it; and therefore they are destroyers of Christ by their own rule: to will to do it is the same wickedness with the doing of it.<sup>4</sup> The horridness of this will be more apparent if we take notice wherefore they will thus use Christ. Their church does it for the honour of the saints and of his mother. In that part of the mass which is called the offertory, they say, We offer thee this oblation in honour of the blessed Mary, for ever a virgin, and of all the apostles, and of all the saints, that it may be for their honour.<sup>5</sup> So that they sacrifice the Son to honour the mother, and destroy the Lord in honour of his servants. If one under the law had but offered a pigeon, or the meanest sacrifice, in honour of Abraham or Moses, it would have been counted a crime worthy of the worst of deaths, for this had been an advancing them into the place of God; and yet to sacrifice the Son of God, that is, to destroy him in honour of a saint of the pope's making, is a meritorious act. Further, the priest will not venture on such a fact for nothing; he has no reason to destroy Christ, more than Judas had to betray him, without some valuable consideration. He is to sacrifice Christ for the living and the dead: for those that are dead, if they have bequeathed anything to the church for this purpose, or if their friends hire him to do it; for the living, those that are frugal, may be secretly men-

<sup>1</sup> Loc. Theol. lib. xii. p. 675, 676.

<sup>2</sup> The blood is shed in the mass, but it is shed unbloody.—*Hart in Rainold Confer.* p. 618.

<sup>3</sup> Nulla unquam fuit religio, sine externo sacrificio.

<sup>4</sup> Voluntas faciendi, et ipsum factum, sunt ejusdem malitiæ.

<sup>5</sup> Ut illis proficiat ad honorem.

tioned in the *momento* of a common mass for a piece of money, but if any will go to the price of a particular mass, the priest is ready to sacrifice and destroy Christ on purpose for them in particular.<sup>1</sup> In fine, they do not offer this to Christ for spiritual respects only, but for temporal and worldly advantages, and such often as are of no great moment.<sup>2</sup> Christ is to be destroyed for the health and safety of any body that is catholic; yea, for the curing of a diseased horse, or the recovery of a sick pig, or the preserving of their fruit from frost or a blast. They think it not amiss for such matters as these to make a sacrifice of Christ, and to destroy him; it is done amongst them many thousand times daily. And though the apostle seems to make it a horrid crime for one to 'crucify again the Son of God,' yet for them to do that daily which, for the substance of the thing, is as destructive to Christ as the first crucifying was, is the principal part and office, and the most eminent and meritorious act of their religion.

These and such like are the prime virtues of the Romanists, most needful to be observed and practised; and if things of such a quality be so far from being relinquished, where shall we find anything which God hath made a sin that can be thought worthy to be forsaken? But I have stayed long enough here; let me proceed to the next head propounded, to satisfy us that they count it needless to forsake sin.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### *Crimes exceeding great and many are but slight and venial faults by the Popish Doctrine.*

SECT. 1. There are innumerable evils which they call sins, yet they count it not necessary in point of salvation for any to forsake them; but give all encouragement to live and die therein, as sins for which they can never be condemned. Such are those which they count venial. Let me shew you what sins they are which they reckon to be of such a quality; and thereby it will be discerned how far their doctrine gives warrant to sins of all sorts, and to continue in the violation of all the commands of God. And this I shall do out of their own authors, such as are unexceptionable, declining the Jesuits; and thereby it will be more manifest how little reason there is to excuse the practical doctrine received in their church, by charging their impious and licentious principles upon the Society.

To hate God,<sup>3</sup> if it be out of inadvertency, and not with deliberation, is no mortal sin: and this they say of actual hatred; for habitual enmity against God is, with them, no sin at all. Acts of infidelity, when they are led thereto by fear,<sup>4</sup> or worshipping an idol (such as not only we, but themselves, count idols), are no worse than venial.<sup>5</sup> Unbelief, and perplexing distrustfulness of God about the things of this life, is as innocent. To present the body only before God, in all religious exercises, in prayer, the sacraments, yea, the eucharist itself, without any actual disposition suitable to the nature of the duties, without any good motion in mind or heart; without any inward attention, reverence, or devotion; without any act of faith, fear, love, desire, or any other grace or holy affection, though the want of these be voluntary, is but a venial fault. It is no worse, not only to make

<sup>1</sup> Pro incolumitate, says the Missal. Pro bonis temporalibus, says Innocent. III.

<sup>2</sup> Pro qualibet necessitate, says Lindanus.

<sup>3</sup> Navar. Manual. cap. xi. n. xviii.

<sup>4</sup> Angl. Sum. verb. fides, n. ix.

<sup>5</sup> Idem. verb. sollicitud.

base and earthly things the end why we worship God, but to make that which is a sin our design in any part of his service, yea, to propose it as the chief and principal end why we worship him; though this be no less than to prefer sin, and the pleasure of the devil, before God and his honour.<sup>1</sup> To make use of a witch to dissolve some witchcraft, is scarce so much as a venial sin. And so to use the devil's assistance instead of God's, and employ others disposed thereto to act as witches, and to practise with the prince of darkness by a deputy in diabolical arts, is not unlawful. To deal with the devil for to get some knowledge by him, or obtain other things of him by such converse, is but a venial fault. For example, if an exorcist require the devil to satisfy him in some curious questions (such as tend nothing to the expelling of him); if he believe him not, but does it out of lightness and curiosity, he offends but venially.<sup>2</sup> To use adjurations to God, or man, or angels, or devils, or irrational creatures lightly, without reverence to the name of God, or any necessity, is but a slight fault.<sup>3</sup>

*Sect. 2.* By virtue of their doctrine concerning venial sins, they have formed rules to encourage men in the practice and constant use of all sorts of profane and wicked oaths. They<sup>4</sup> acknowledge that the oath is sinful, unless it be made in truth, and judgment, and righteousness; when that which is sworn is not true, or not just and righteous, or not with reverence and discretion; yet they teach it is but a venial fault to swear without<sup>5</sup> reverence or discretion, or without righteousness also, if that be not much. So that, though swearing be an act, as they tell us, of God's worship, wherein divine honour is given to him whom we swear by, yet this may be done without reverence and discretion (as the rest of their worship is), and God may be solemnly called to witness that the man intends to sin against him, if it be not much; and this without any great fault.<sup>6</sup> A habit of swearing thus, or worse, is no sin, for habits of what wickedness soever are not forbidden. To use this habit frequently, so as to swear customarily, almost at every word (*tertio quoque verbo*), unless he regard not at all whether he swear true or false, yea, though he regard not that as much as he ought, is no more a fault.<sup>7</sup> So to swear<sup>8</sup> out of lightness and vanity, upon any the slightest occa-

<sup>1</sup> Si est aliquis dispositus actualiter facere aliquod maleficium ut aliud destruat, possum illo uti ad bonum meum.—*Petr. Aureolus*, in iv. dist. xxxiv. q. ii.; *Angelus*, Sum. v. superstit. n. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Si autem exorcizator imperet dæmoni, ut dicat curiosa, et nihil ad expulsionem facientia, non quia illi credat, sed quadam levitate et curiositate ductus; est peccatum grave, licet illud non videatur mortale.—*Silvest.* sum. v. adjurat. n. iii.; *Graff.* l. ii. c. vii. n. iv.; *Sotus*, de Just. et Jur. l. viii. q. iii. art. ii.; *Cajetan.* et *Navar.* in *Suar.* l. iv. de adjurat. cap. ii. n. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Si (adjurato) fiat ad Deum, vel homines, vel angelos, vel dæmones, aut irrita, nabilia leviter, i. e. sine reverentia divini nominis, aut necessitate—modo septimo videtur veniale, sicut et juratio levis.—*Silvest.* ibid. n. v.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. *Bonaventur.* iii. dist. xix. art. ii.; *Angelus*, sum. v. jurament. iii. n. viii.

<sup>5</sup> Veniale est regulariter dum deest judicium, vel reverentia.—*Lopez*, cap. xlii. p. 225. Veniale vero cum non deest nisi judicium, sive reverentia, vel justitia levis.—*Navar.* cap. xii. n. iii. Juramentum assertorium cui deest tantum justitia, quatenus contra religionem est, regulariter est veniale.—Est assertio communis et facilis.—*Suar. de Juram.* l. iii. c. xii. n. vii.

<sup>6</sup> Malus jurandi habitus non est mortale peccatum, quia non est actus.—*Victorel.* ad *Tol.* l. iv. c. xxii. p. 681. Præcepta non dantur de habitibus.—*Aquinas*, xxii. q. xxxi. art. iv.; vid. *Suar.* de *Juram.* l. iii. c. vi. n. i.

<sup>7</sup> Utrum jurans sine judicio discretionis peccat mortaliter, sicut faciunt illi qui in quolibet verbo jurant?—Si jurat verum, sic non erit mortale peccatum.—*Angel.* Sum. v. juram. iii. n. x. *Lopez*, et in eo *Jo. de la Pinna* et *Metina*, cap. xlii. p. 226, 227; *Cajetan.* Sum. v. præcept. p. 475.

<sup>8</sup> Qui in re levissima, atque inani jurant, sive etiam frequenter, et absque necessaria causa, sicut ementes et vendentes æpe facere novimus, peccant quidem, sed venialiter

sion, without any advantage or the least necessity, is as innocent a practice, according to all their doctors. And the common practice of their catholics is correspondent to these conscientious rules. You can scarce find any one, (says Soto<sup>1</sup>) who will either begin or end the least discourse without an oath; for they use oaths for ornaments of speech at every word. But should they not at least endeavour to leave this custom of swearing? No, never to endeavour; it is but a small fault. Although (says one of their most approved casuists) he sins venially who swears true without any necessity, and so the custom of swearing be evil and pernicious, yet he sins not mortally who labours not to break off that custom, because it is but an occasion of falling into venial faults. Hereby they have encouragement, not only to accustom themselves to this impious practice, wherein so much profaneness, irreverence, and contempt of God is expressed, but also never to give it over, yea, never to endeavour it. And the reason whereby they warrant this, reaches all the wickedness which by those conscientious divines is counted venial; they may commit it customarily, continually, and need never go about to do better; all will be but a fault so small as is next to nothing. They need not regard in what terms their oaths are dressed. They may swear [by the] body or blood of God, by Cajetan's leave;<sup>2</sup> yea, though they swear by such parts of Christ's body, or such members of the saints, or the virgin mother, as are not to be named (*per inhonesta membra*<sup>3</sup>), it is but venial, if without contempt and scandal, which will make an act, in itself lawful, to be criminal. And though they seem to give caution that what is sworn be not false, since this cannot be excused by any artifice from being damnable, yet they try what may be done to make this go down as easily as the rest. If the thing sworn be false, and he knows it, yet swears it by his faith, or troth, or this fire, such perjury is venial, *non peccant mortaliter cum perjurant* (Angel. after Aureolus v. perjurium). To swear that which is false in jest is a harmless venial, by the gloss upon their law.<sup>4</sup> Commonly to swear that which is false, without considering whether it be false or no, or whether he swear or not, is as harmless.<sup>5</sup> This is the judgment of Aquinas and their common doctrine: so that if a man heed not what he does, he may do what he will, and, as it were, wink a damnable crime into a slight fault. By this expedient he may swear false as commonly as true without any considerable hurt. This is enough, one would think, to render their worse sort of swear-

tantum, si veritas non defuerit—*Graff.* l. ii. cap. xv. n. v.; Sotus, *ibid.* l. viii. q. i. art. iii.; Sylvest. *ibid.* v. juram. ii. n. viii., secundum omnes doctores.

Juramentum assertorium cui inest veritas sufficienter cogitata et cognita, solúmque illi deest necessitas vel utilitas, nunquam est in individuo peccatum mortale, dummodo absit contemptus. Assertio est communis omnium theologorum et summistarum.—*Suar.* l. iii. de juram. c. xii. n. iii.

<sup>1</sup> De Justit. et Jur. *ibid.* p. 270.

Non tamen peccat mortaliter, qui non conatur ejusmodi consuetudinem evitare, eo quod ipsa non est occasio nisi labendi in venialia.—*Pet. a S. Joseph*, de ii. præcept. art. i. p. 85, approved by the doctors of Paris.

<sup>2</sup> Dicere ad sanguinem Dei, vel ad corpus Dei, sive invocando sive resonando in rixa aut turbatione,—peccatum est grave, non tamen mortale, quia non contra, sed præter Deum est.—*Sum.* v. blasphem. p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Qui per Christi inhonesta membra jurat, si contemptus desit et scandalum, venialiter tantummodo peccare credendus est.—*Graff.* l. ii. c. xiv. n. x; Sylvest. *Sum.* *ibid.* n. x.

<sup>4</sup> Gofredus asserit perjurium jocosum esse peccatum veniale: et Angelus v. Perjur. non esse amplius quàm veniale jurare falsum jocandi gratiã.—*Solemnis*, gloss. cap. veniens de jure jur. et gloss. in c. unum. nunc.

<sup>5</sup> Communiter jurare falsum, non considerando an illud sit falsum, vel an juret, non est amplius quàm veniale; secundùm S. Thom. et communem opinionem.—*Navar.* c. xii. n. vi.; Lopez, c. xlii. p. 226; *Graff.* lib. ii. c. xvi. n. vii.

Scotus, iii. dist. xxxix. art. i. dicit communiter concedi, quòd unicum perjurium leve, non est peccatum mortale.—*In Suar.* l. iii. de juram. cap. iv. n. i.

ing, perjury itself, practicable in ordinary, with ease and safety. Yet, as an overplus, they add, he that swears what is false through gross or careless ignorance, thinking it to be true, though if he use due diligence, he sins not at all; yet if he used some diligence, but not enough, he offends no more than venially, if Aquinas or the common doctrine may be credited; for this is it, saith Navarre.<sup>1</sup> And that, which way soever a man turn himself, he may have liberty to be perjured, they teach that he that swears the truth, believing it to be false, and takes notice that he swears, but minds not what he swears, sins not mortally; or if he neither regard the one nor the other, but does both without consideration, it is only a little fault,<sup>2</sup> unless this inconsiderateness was wilful and out of contempt, for then perhaps it may be worse upon the account of contempt; probable error will excuse perjury from mortal guilt, as if one appeals, thinking there is reasonable cause for it, though he has sworn before not to appeal. So Panormitan. and Angel. Sum. v. Perjur.

He that hears a thing from a person of credit, may swear it is true, only not in court, unless he express his reason (Bonacin. tom. ii. disp. iv. q. i. punct. iii. n. vii). But as if it were not sufficient for a man to swear false himself, they conclude he may without harm draw others to do it also; for, 1, they say he may induce others to swear, when he is not satisfied whether they will swear true or false; that is the opinion of Aquinas and their common doctrine.<sup>3</sup> Further, he that knows another will swear false, may yet put him upon it, if he be a public person; that is also the opinion of Aquinas, and commonly embraced by their doctors;<sup>4</sup> yea, moreover, any one whosoever may put him to swear whom he fears, or knows will forswear himself, if he be disposed to swear.<sup>5</sup> Let us see in the next place, whether they may not be as perfidious in promissory oaths, as they may be false in others, and upon as easy terms: in all cases, good, or bad, or indifferent. He that swears he will not go to or pass by such or such a place, though he do it for no end that is honest or profitable,<sup>6</sup> sins not mortally if he go contrary to his oath. He that swears he will do a thing lawful, and does it not, sins but venially if it was a small matter;<sup>7</sup> this is the common opinion which

<sup>1</sup> Qui per ignorantiam quam crassam vel supinam vocat, jurat falsum, credens se jurare verum, quamvis si debitam adhibet diligentiam, nihil peccat, si tamen aliquam adhibet, sed non quantum debet, non amplius quam venialiter delinquit, secundum eosdem, c. xii. n. vii. (Aquinas, Soto et alii in Suar. ibid. c. v. n. iii.)

<sup>2</sup> Qui jurat veritatem credens esse falsum quod jurat; si quod jurat advertit, non advertendo se jurare illud, vel contrà advertit se jurare, non advertendo quid jurat, non peccat mortaliter. Si autem neque hoc neque illud advertit, immo utrumque sine deliberatione et consideratione facit, peccat quidem, sed tantum veniale leve.—*Idem, ibid. n. vii.*

<sup>3</sup> In Suarez. Jurament. l. i. c. xiv. n. ix.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid. n. x. et xi.*; Richard de St. Victor. in Angel. sum. v. juram. iii. n. xi.

<sup>5</sup> Non credo tamen mortaliter peccare cum qui dat juramentum, etiam ut persona privata, illi, quem scit falsum; quum ille est jam dispositus jurare.—*Angel. ibid. Graff. ibid. c. xvi. n. x.*; Turrecremata in cap. quamvis. xxii. q. i. p. 161.

<sup>6</sup> Non peccaret mortaliter contra faciendum, quia juramentum esset vanum, juxta Cajetanum et mentem St. Antonini.—*Nav. c. xii. n. xii.*; *Graff. l. ii. c. xv. n. vii. et c. xviii. n. iii.*

<sup>7</sup> Ubi minimum est quod promittitur, tunc non observare, non erit saltem mortale peccatum.—*Idem* quando id quod jurat est indifferens, ut notat D. Ant. de Butrio. *idem, ibid. S. Antonius, Sylvest. Sotus, Corduba, alii in Suar. ibid. c. xvi. n. iv.*, et in Navar. *ibid. n. x.* Tenendum videtur cum communi, peccare quidem venialiter, qui juramentum de re parva et levi non implet, non autem mortaliter, quod ipsum de voto rei levis dicemus. Cum parva res est pars minima materiæ juramenti, non implere potest esse veniale—ut qui promisit non ludere, et parum temporis in parva quantitate ludit.—*Cajetan, Covarruv, Corduba, Philiarcho in Suar. l. iii. c. xvi.*

Quando est tota materia, est veniale. Antonin. Silv. Angel. de Butrio, Graff. Soto, Navar. Joh. Andr. Hostiensis, Panormit. Aureolus.—*Ibid.*

Navarre attempts to prove with several reasons. As if a woman swears she will give her children apples to quiet them, and gives them none; or swears to chastise them, and does it not (which are Cajetan's instances, though he vary from the rest in the general conclusion); or if a man swear he will say an *Ave-Mary*, and says it not;<sup>1</sup> or swears to say a *Pater-Noster*, or to give a small matter, and gives it not;<sup>2</sup> or not to take place of his friend, and yet does it; or to game no more, and plays a little: in such cases any breach of promises, confirmed by oaths, is but a small fault; and consequently it will be no worse in all matters, not only small but great, for the obligation of an oath rises not from the quantity of the matter sworn, but from the concern and interest of God in an oath, he being invocated therein as witness. Now this is always the same, whether the matter be less or more; and so if they be not obliged to keep oaths in less matters, neither are they bound in greater. But by their rules of conscience they are set at liberty to break all. He that swears to give a whore one hundred crowns for the act of fornication, is only bound to give her that part of it which persons of his condition are wont to give such women, because a prodigal engagement confirmed by oath obliges only to that proportion in which there is no profuseness (Bannes et alii in *Diana*, v. promiss.). If a man swear to be true to a whore, and she to be faithful to him, so as to entertain no other, the oath doth not oblige either of them to such honesty (Idem, v. juram. n. x). Whether the matter be small or great, when one is drawn by fear, or brought by law to swear, if he break his oath that is promissory, he sins but venially (Pet. Aureolus, Joh. Andreas, et multi alii; et placet Angel. sum. v. Perjur. n. vii.). He that swears he will not observe some evangelical counsel<sup>3</sup> (that which is not only lawful, but excellently good, and better in their account than what the law of God requires), offends but venially; so their authors generally.<sup>4</sup> And yet to these counsels they have reduced a great part, almost all, which God has made our duty, as we shewed before; so that a man may call God to witness, that he is resolved not to do what he has made his duty. As for one to bind himself by oath that he will not lend to his neighbour, nor be surety for any, nor give alms to any in great necessity, nor do any of those important things, which they count works of supererogation, is but a small venial.<sup>5</sup> Such oaths, they say, do give obstruction to the Spirit of God, yet they may be kept without sin. He that swears he will return to prison and does not, is no more guilty, if he was not duly imprisoned.<sup>6</sup> He that swears he will commit any sin if it be but a venial, offends but venially; this is the common doctrine, well declared by Cajetan and Navarre, as he tells us.<sup>7</sup> As if a man should swear that he would never use to speak without an

<sup>1</sup> Idem. *ibid.* c. xviii. n. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Graff. *ibid.* n. xiv. et n. xvii.

<sup>3</sup> Qui jurat se non facturum aliquid ad quod non tenetur, est tamen secundum se melius facere quam non facere; si forsan erit aliquid ad consilia evangelica pertinens; neque S. Thom. neque S. Antoninus dicunt hoc esse mortale. Cajetanus, Jo. Tabienna, et glossa communiter recepta, tenent non esse lethale.—*Nav. ibid.* c. xii. n. xvi.

<sup>4</sup> Cajetan. sum. v. perjurium, p. 464, perjurium secundum quid incurritur. Graff. *ibid.* c. xv. n. vi. qui jurat eleemosynam non dare, vel aliud supererogationis opus non facere, venialiter tantummodo peccat: et c. xviii. n. xi. *Nav. ibid.* vid. plures in Suar. *ibid.* cap. xviii.

<sup>5</sup> Docuit S. Thom. hujusmodi juramentis Spiritui sancto apponi obstaculum.—*Idem, Navar. ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Qui juravit redire ad carceres, si carcer est injuriosus, non tenetur redire—est verum quando vult evadere illud quod indebite sustinet, et sic ut evadat jurat, non intendens se obligare. Angel. sum. v. juram. v. n. xxxvii.; *Nav. ibid.* c. xii. n. xviii.; Graff. *ibid.* c. xviii. n. xxv. secundum glossam communiter approbatam.—*Sylv.* sum. v. juram. iv. n. xxvi.

<sup>7</sup> Cum jurat quis, se facturum aliquid quod solum est illicitum venialiter; non

oath, or never avoid any of those horrid acts which they mince into venials. To call God to witness that he purposes thus to dishonour him, is, it seems, no great contempt of him, or else a great contempt of God with them is but a trifle. This is to threaten God to his face, and call upon him to take notice of it, that they will do these evils against him. Soto and others say, it is such a threatening of God when they swear to commit mortal sin, and no difference can possibly be here discerned, but that the one is a threatening God with a greater evil, the other with a less; however, this is their common doctrine, *Assertio posita communis est*. They give as much liberty for fraudulent oaths, whereby God and man are abused; to swear with equivocation or mental restriction, so as those to whom oath is made are deluded, is with them, in many cases, not so bad as a venial evil, of which in due place. To take an oath outwardly,<sup>1</sup> without an intent to swear, is but a small fault, though it seem a mocking of the divine Majesty, and is cross to the end of an oath, if it be unduly required. So they determine also in case one swear without an intention to oblige himself. Angelus inquires, whether he sins who takes an oath with a mind not to be obliged; he tells us<sup>2</sup> Panormitan affirms, that if he be a perfectionist (*id est*, a votary) who so swears, he sins venially, otherwise not; but himself says, Whether he be perfect or imperfect, he sins not so much as venially, and proves it by their law. He takes an oath, which in its own nature obligeth, without an intention to be obliged; he calls God to witness when he is deluding men; he abuses the name and authority of God for a cheat; and yet offends but venially, whoever he be, says one; and sins not at all, says another, but then he explains it: Understand this when in swearing, he had a mind to use an oath for reverence to God, but not for obliging himself.<sup>3</sup> So that must be for reverence to God which mocks him, and he must be invocated in a way that is most obliging, without any intent to be obliged. And further, to prevent falseness (where there is nothing but fraud), he must swear with a mental reservation. For example, I promise thee an hundred (pound), with this inward reserve not expressed: If I be bound to pay it; for such concealments, says he, are lawful, and quotes their church law for it, as allowing that, which all other laws of God or honest men condemn.<sup>4</sup> It is plain by the premises that their doctrine encourages the Roman catholics to venture upon all sorts of oaths, in many cases, whether they be rash, or injurious, or fraudulent, or false, as slight and trivial faults. No more do they make of perjury, though it be frequent and customary. If more evidence be

enim erit tunc amplius; quam veniale secundum communem sententiam a Cajetano optime et a nobis explicatum. Navar. *ibid.* n. iii. Cajetan, sensible that this is capable of great aggravations, mentions some, but concludes: Though it seem, and be a grievous sin, yet it is but a venial. Unde grave videtur et est hoc peccatum, non tamen mortale.—*Sum. v. perjur. p. 464.*

<sup>1</sup> Sotus in Suar. *ibid.* c. xvii. n. vi. quando juramentum injuste exigitur, vel quoties voluntarie, et sine obligatione, et sine alio nocumento vel injuria tertii, non esse mortale, Soto tenet, et multi sequuntur.

Juramentum simulatum, etiamsi promissorium sit, intrinsece non continet perjuri-um, non grave peccatum; si absque injustitia et ex honesta causa fiat. Conclusio est communis. Angelus, Navar. Lud. Lopez. in Suar. *ibid.* n. xii.

<sup>2</sup> Dicit Panormitan. quod, si est homo perfectus, peccavit venialiter; sed ego dico, quod nec perfectus nec imperfectus peccaverit etiam venialiter.—*Sum. v. jurament. v. n. ix.*

<sup>3</sup> Intellige hoc quum jurando habet animum solum inducendi juramentum ad reverentiam Dei, non ad obligationem suam.—*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Et in mente habuit aliquam circumstantiam debitam qua verum jurabat; puta, Promitto quod dabo tibi centum, cum ista subauditione, scil. Si sum tibi obligatus ex debito: licet hoc non exprimat ut hujusmodi, quoniam sibi utitur simulatione licita quod licet. ut in c. utilem xxii. q. ii. *ibid.*

desired, take notice only of the determination of Dominicus Soto (a grave and learned doctor, and one who was a principal divine in the council of Trent). He having premised something concerning the heinousness of perjury, that the Lord forbids it, with a particular emphasis more than other sins; that it is a greater crime than murder, and is most grievously punished both by God and man;<sup>1</sup> *his tamen non obstantibus*, all this notwithstanding, he lays down two conclusions, in which he maintains perjuries of all sorts, *id est*, both in promissory and assertory oaths, to be no worse than venial:<sup>2</sup>

1. Every assertory oath, though it be vain and unlawful, and in a sort perjury, is not a mortal sin, but oftentimes venial. 2. There are many promissory perjuries (*promissoria perjuria*) which are no greater faults than venial, and reduces these perjuries to four general heads (under which many thousands of particular cases may be obtained), and all must pass for venial. Then, for customariness of such perjuries, how commonly, how often soever a man is guilty thereof, that makes them not mortal; he speaks of some mentioned by Scotus, who thought that a light perjury was no worse than venial, but if it were customary, it would be mortal; but he confutes this opinion by a principle generally received,<sup>3</sup> that a multiplication of the same acts, do not change the nature thereof, that is, ten thousand venial acts do not make one mortal sin; and concludes,<sup>4</sup> if the perjury be but venial (as it may be by his determinations now mentioned in many thousand instances), how habitual and customary soever it be, it is not thereby mortal; so that if a man, how talkative soever, should never speak while he lives but with an oath, or such perjury as he here excuses, yet all the perjuries of a whole life would not be a mortal sin.

*Sect. 3.* They determine in their schools,<sup>5</sup> that of all sins those are the greatest and most heinous, that are against the theological virtues and religion. Of those against religion (which are counted sacrilege), there are three degrees; and in the highest of all (containing crimes against the deity and being of God), as the most grievous, they place perjury, blasphemy, and the sins against the Holy Ghost (and those in the same rank with these), yet for practice how little they make of perjury we have seen. Blasphemy meets with the same measures; they teach it may be but a venial fault in any of those cases wherein they describe it: whether by denying God's infinite perfections, his wisdom, goodness, justice, providence, &c.; or by charging what is reproachful to him, as injustice, partiality, impotency, cruelty, ignorance, &c.; or by ascribing his incommunicable excellencies to others, as calling a friend our God; or attributing the divine perfections to the devil; or else, by way of detestation, decrying, renouncing, cursing God, with imprecations against his blessedness or being; or else by way of derision, &c. Now it will be but a venial fault to blaspheme the divine Majesty in such a manner, (1) when it

<sup>1</sup> De just. et jur. l. viii. q. ii. art. iii. p. 269.

<sup>2</sup> Non omne juramentum assertorium, licet sit vanum atque illicitum, et subinde quodammodo perjurium, est peccatum mortale: sed crebro veniale. Plura sunt promissoria perjuria quæ non sunt gravius culpæ quam venialis.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Cum frequentatio actuum non sit distincta ab ipsis actibus, non est per se peccatum ultra numerum multiplicatarum actionum: consuetudo speciem juramenti nec mutat nec aggravat.—*Ibid.* p. 270, col. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Si perjurium fuerit leve ut veniale—quantumcunque fiat ex habitu et consuetudine non efficitur mortale.—*Ibid.*

Juramentum prolatum sine advertentia formali—non est in se novum et proprium et speciale mortale peccatum, propter solam pejerandi consuetudinem, etiam non retractatum. D. Thom. Bonavent. Durand. Major, Scotus, Sylvest.—*Navar. in Suar.* l. iiii. de jurament. c. vii. n. iii.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Suarez, tom. iii. disp. lxxvi. sect. ii.

is out of lightness of mind;<sup>1</sup> or (2) when it is sudden from passion; so Sylvester<sup>2</sup> after Aquinas. And Navarre<sup>3</sup> after Angelus adds, that it is not material though the passion be without just cause, or in gaming, or from drunkenness, or any unlawful employment, such passion and excess will be so far from being great sins, that they will lessen the greatest. Or (3) when it is from wicked custom, with contempt of one's own salvation;<sup>4</sup> when one is so habituated in the practice of reproaching God, that blasphemies break from him without observance or consideration. So Cajetan and Sotus, and Navarre after Sylvester. Thus, by their rules, the more a man sins in the most horrid instances, the less will his sin be. To blaspheme God customarily, may be a slight fault, when to do it rarely will be a most deadly crime. Here is a course described, to make such blaspheming of God, as a soul that has any sense of his majesty, can neither think nor speak of without horror, to be familiar and practicable without danger. Let him, then, blaspheme God at first out of levity or passion, he may do it thus customarily with safety; and the oftener he does it, the more he secures himself; for when he hath so perfected this habit of wickedness by custom, that blasphemies will issue from him without his notice or observance, he may, when he is not heated by passion, reproach God at every word while he lives, and breathe out his soul with blasphemies when he dies, and yet be saved, for all this will amount to no more than such faults as never endanger the soul of a Roman catholic. There needs no more to make mortal sins venial but to get the perfect habit of them; that is, if a man be but wicked enough, there is no great danger.

*Sect. 4.* For the sanctifying the Lord's day, or any other which they count holy, all that is necessary is the worship of the mass only, with abstaining from servile works; this is enough on any festival for the avoiding of mortal sin.<sup>5</sup> It is their common doctrine, and there is not anything wherein they more generally agree. So it is to be observed, that the total sum of all the holiness which is necessary for these catholics, even at those times when it should appear, if ever, and all which they are obliged to exercise, consists in their being at mass, and avoiding servile work. What holy attendance at the mass they count necessary, we saw before; they may spend the time in sleeping, or talking, or laughing, or scoffing: only with some little intermissions, that

<sup>1</sup> Blasphemia, si ex levitate animi, esset tantum veniale. If a man blaspheme God, so to be in jest, that makes it so small a matter that it may pass for venial.—*Vid. Bonacin.* tom. ii. p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> Cum quis subito ex passione in verba contumeliosa prorumperet quorum significationem non considerat, et tunc est veniale.—*Sum. v. Blasphem. n. iv.; Aquinas, xxii. q. xiii. a. ii.; Lopez c. xv. p. 262.*

<sup>3</sup> Neque quidquam ad rem facit, an subitanea illa ira ex injusta causa originem habeat, vel ex ludo, ebrietate, vel aliqua occupatione circa rem illicitam; secundum Angelum. *Cap. xii. n. lxxxiv.*

<sup>4</sup> Si blasphemiam procedat ex quadam consuetudine depravata, cum contemptu salutis animæ: si inconsideratio sola fuit causa prolationis blasphemie, taliter quod si adverteret non proferret, non erit mortale tunc secundum Cajetanum; ita est, et in hoc consentit Sotus, Lopez, *ibid.* Neque satis est ad peccandum mortaliter quod talis inconsideratio, ex depravata quadam consuetudine, cum propria salutis contemptu, vel ex culpa lata procedat, juxta Sylvestrum, dummodo illa inconsideratio prolationis talis blasphemie causam dederit.—*Navar. ibid.; Cajetan. sm. v. blasphem; Graff. l. ii. c. xix.* Tbis caution rejected as impertinent.—*Suar. l. iii. de Juram, n. vii. c. vii.*

<sup>5</sup> Licet cum abstinentia a servilibus, solius missæ cultus sufficiat in festo ad evitandum mortale peccatum.—*Cajetan. sum. v. fest. p. 316.* Regula generalis est, hoc præceptum colendi Deum in die festo, quatenus affirmativum est, non obligare ad excercendum intra illum diem alium actum divini cultus, sive internum sive externum, præter missam. Assertio est communis. Ratio unica est, quia ecclesia nihil aliud præcipit.—*Suar. l. ii. de festis, c. xvi. n. i.*

they may stand at the gospel, and kneel at the consecration, and bow at the elevation; but therein no inward act being necessary, all the holiness requisite lies in their legs, which should be ordered as the priest gives the signal;<sup>1</sup> yet even this they are not obliged to, who neither hear nor see what is done; and it is not needful, at the mass, for any of the people so much as to use their senses. When the mass (which may begin at break of day, or before) is despatched in such a holy manner, with such attendance as would scarce be counted civil, at least sufficient, at a stage-play, they may spend the rest of the day according to this beginning.<sup>2</sup> Those (says Cajetan) who, after mass, vainly consume the rest of those days in sports, in jesting, in idle vagaries, in hunting, in seeing shows or plays, and anything of this nature,<sup>3</sup> by such acts, because they are not servile works (upon which account, they say, that no other acts of wickedness are a profaning of these days, or a breach of that precept), they incur no mortal sin. But then he (who is more precise herein than the generality of their divines) brings an after reckoning. Yet, says he, hereby, because they neglect that divine worship for which these days were instituted, they sin greatly.<sup>4</sup> How can that be, since he said immediately before, that they sin not mortally? Why, there is a latitude in their venial faults, some are great and some less; and so with him, to neglect all worship but the mass is a great sin of the little size. He gives the reason, because hereby they give not to God the things that are God's, and as much as in them lies make the festivals of Christians ridiculous, according to that Lam. i. 7. So that, by him, those who, after morning service, spend this day in such pastimes, they rob God of his due, and they render Christians, in their pretences to the sanctifying of the Lord's day or others, ridiculous to the world; and yet this is but a venial sin; or at worst, but a great little fault, not so great as any man need fear; no, not he who is most afraid of damnation. Navarre adds another reason why it should be a sin, though but a venial, to consume these days but in recreations; because in such employments many mortal sins occur, according to Antoninus, who says, The blindness of Christians is to be lamented with the tears of all men, who more grievously offend God, on the days appointed for his worship, than the whole week besides.<sup>5</sup> Notwithstanding this is their way of sanctifying the Lord's day, and all other times for devotion of their own; with profane and irreligious divertisements, such as render their pretences to religion ridiculous (as the cardinal notes), accompanied with such debaucheries, as make their holy days the profanest of all others. It is but a venial fault at most (for many count it not so much), to consume

<sup>1</sup> Vide Bellarm. de miss. l. c. p. 837.

<sup>2</sup> Secundum Paludanum semper licet missam facere, ita ut finis missæ incidat in initium auroræ.—*Vid. infra.*

<sup>3</sup> Qui festos dies post missam vane consumunt ludendo, joeando, otioseque vagando, aut venando, spectaculis intendendo, et hujusmodi, licet ex ipsis operibus, utpote non servilibus, mortale non incurrant, Sum. v. fest. de actibus corporalibus musicæ—ut agitationibus eorum, quæ in saltationibus, choreis et tripudiis fiunt. *Vid. Angel. Sylvest. Rosall. Abulens. Suarez, l. ii. de fest. c. xxvii. n. iv. Aliqui addunt, si totus dies festus, etiam audita missa, in his actibus consumatur, graviter peccare, quia festa Christiana ridiculo exponuntur—non intelligunt autem esse mortale, sed veniale, sed disserte declarant—non refert quod intentio est vana, vel turpis, vel principalis.—*Ibid.**

<sup>4</sup> Ex omissione tamen divini cultus ad quem festa instituta sunt graviter peccant: quia non reddunt quæ sunt Dei Deo; et quia quantum in se est, ridiculo exponunt Christiana festa: juxta illud, Viderunt eam hostes, et deriserunt sabbata ejus.—*Ibid. Armill. v. fest. n. xxiii.*

<sup>5</sup> Quia in hujusmodi occupationibus, multa occurrunt peccata mortalia, secundum S. Antoninum; ubi ait omnium lachrymis defendam esse Christianorum exercitatem, qui gravius Deum offendunt diebus festis ejusdem divino cultui dedicatis, quam tota hebdomada ad vitam parandam instituta. Cap. xiii. n. xv.

the whole day herein without any other religious act, or exercise of any sort whatever. They need hear no sermons, nor attend their vespers, nor use any prayers, public or private, nor read the Scriptures, nor sing the praises of God, nor meditate on him; nor have any one act of love, or contrition, nor any other act of inward worship at all, nor of outward either, but only part of the mass.<sup>1</sup> This will serve for all, so highly divine and religious a service it is; though they declare themselves not obliged therein, either to mind God or divine things. Yea, though they hear mass (when nothing else is needful for the sanctifying of the day) out of contempt for the day; yet the precept is satisfied. But if they be not at mass on those days (though presence at mass may make all other holy duties unnecessary in other cases, yet) should they not make up that defect with some other prayers or religious exercise, lest God should have no service at all, nor show of it, in public or private, on those days which alone are set apart for that purpose? No; if they neglect mass, either upon reasonable or damnable occasions (to wit, if they spend the time when they should be at it, in any other wickedness), yet are they not obliged to prayer, or any other act of worship, on those days afterwards.<sup>2</sup> This is the doctrine, not only of their famous Navarre, but of Pope Adrian, and their St Antoninus, with others. Yea, after all other holy exercises are cashiered as needless on any of their holy times, the mass itself may be dismissed too for company. And because all their religion necessary for the people consists in this, at all times, when anything religious is by their doctrine needful for them, it will not be amiss to observe how easily they may be excused from this. Thereby we may discern of what moment it is in their account to have nothing at all of religion amongst them. Cardinal Cajetan will satisfy us herein: he determines that it is no mortal sin to neglect the mass on a reasonable occasion, though it be but such an occasion as is not urgent.<sup>3</sup> Yea, he says, it is but a venial fault to omit it, upon no sufficient reason, and universally it is no great fault to neglect it, if a man thinks really he may be excused from hearing it, or if, besides his intention, out of some negligence it be omitted.<sup>4</sup> Yea, they may be excused by custom; for so, he says, maids are excused from hearing mass till they be married (and their mothers, too, who are obliged to stay at home with them), because so is the custom.<sup>5</sup> If so were the custom, it seems, all the rest might be excused. So many ways, at least, may these catholics be

<sup>1</sup> Vid. supra cap. i. et Suarez. l. ii. de fest. c. xvi. et Victorell. infra.

Qui audit missam in contemptum diei festi—satisfacit præcepto.—*Bonacin.* tom. ii. disp. i. q. i. punct. ix. n. i.

<sup>2</sup> Qui absque excusatione, ut peccatum mortaliter, omisit sacrum, non tenetur eodem die aliis actibus colere et orare Deum; ergo multo minus tenebitur qui excusatur: est ergo optimum consilium, nullum tamen est latum ea de re præceptum, et latius docent, Navar. cum Antonino, Adriano, et aliis.—*Suarez.* tom. disp. lxxxviii. sect. vi. p. ult.

<sup>3</sup> Quia sola missa communiter est in præcepto, ideo sine rationabili causa, omittere missam in festo, peccatum mortale reputatur. Et hic esto prudens, admittendo pro rationabili causa omne motivum rationi humanæ consentaneum, etiamsi non fuerit urgens.—*Ibid.* p. 304, Angelus v. Feria, n. xlii; Citans Richardum, quodl. i. q. xix. Negat omissionem missæ in die festo esse peccatum mortale, nisi ex contemptu formali vel virtuali fiat, quod etiam affirmavit Sum. Rosellæ. v. miss. et Turrecremata, Suar. *ibid.* sect. i. initio. Sequitur posse pontificem in hoc præcepto (de missa audienda) dispensare, cum ecclesiasticum sit. Only to dispense with one, that he should not all his life hear mass, when no reasonable occasion hinders him, is not expedient.—*Idem*, *ibid.* in fine, vid. *Bonacin.* infra.

<sup>4</sup> Quamvis si minus sufficiens sit ratio, peccetur venialiter. Et universaliter sic est, quando quis bona fide putat se excusari ab auditione missæ, et ideo omittit illam.—*Cajetan.* *ibid.* Et simile est, si præter intentionem ex aliqua negligentia missa omittitur.—*Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Hinc enim excusantur puellæ, non cunctes ad missam, quia sic est consuetum.—*Ibid.* p. 305.

excused from all their religion; by custom, or necessity, or opinion, or (which alone may suffice) by an insufficient reason; it will be but a venial fault at most, together with all religious exercises, to omit the mass too; and that at those times when alone (if ever) they are obliged to them. Such being their doctrine, we need not wonder if religion be starved to death among them; the life of it cannot be sustained (no more than God can be honoured by mankind) without some acts of worship and religious exercises in ordinary practice. Their teachers assure them that they are not ordinarily obliged to any of these on common days; and to none of them all, but the mass, on their days of worship; nor to any religious attendance on God or their souls, in that; nor to any attendance on it at all, but what they may decline, without mortal sin. If the life of religion be preserved amongst any, without its necessary supports and proper nourishment, it must be by a miracle; but they seem so far from regarding the life or the power of it (on which the honour of God and the salvation of souls depends), that they are not concerned for the carcase of it, in exterior acts; no, not that of the mass (when they have reduced all to that), further than the fear of a venial sin will oblige, ten millions of which cannot, as they teach, damn a man. As for servile works, abstaining from which they make the negative part of this precept, the avoiding of these is but that we may with more leisure attend on divine worship; it cannot be expected they will much insist on the means, when they have so overturned the end. In short, they determine that they who do any servile or forbidden works on the Lord's day, if they do it not with a design to profane it, offend but venially.<sup>1</sup> Thus, if they never all their life perform one religious act which God has commanded, on his own day or others, they scarce sin venially; or, if they neglect that, which themselves have made the religious duty of these days, they may do it without greater fault or danger. And for the negative part, if they consume these days in servile works (without an intention needlessly perverse), or, which is worse, in profane diversions; yea, or in acting the most enormous wickedness (as we shall see in its place); yet by their doctrine they do nothing against this precept, or nothing which any of them need regard. Thus their doctrine of venial sins is improved to possess them with a conceit, that they may make what breaches they will upon the commandments of God, without doing anything at all (or anything dangerously) against them, and so to render all sorts of ungodliness practicable with safety. We have seen it in instances against precepts of the first table; let us see if those who make so bold with God, in the duties which more immediately concern himself, will be more tender as to those which respect man.

*Sect. 5.* The duties which children owe their parents (to instance, for brevity, only in those which the Lord hath made the exemplar of the other, and by which we may pass a judgment on the rest), they reduce to these three: reverence, love, and obedience. In reference to the first, they conclude that those who have no more respect for their parents, than to count it a disgrace and a shame to be their children, if it be for the inconveniences of a sinister opinion, or such like cause, sin not mortally; and the fault may be less still, if the parents consent to it expressly, or tacitly, to avoid some inconvenience.<sup>2</sup> It seems the command calls for no such reve-

<sup>1</sup> *Sive id quod committitur, sit opus servile, sive ab ecclesia prohibitum, si vero nec intentio fuit violandi festum—non incurritur peccatum mortale.—Cajetan. ibid. p. 310.*

<sup>2</sup> *Filius qui—sibi dedecori et contumeliæ futurum esse existimaret se pro filio illorum haberi—si absque contemptu id facit, ad vitandum aliquod incommodum sinisteræ opinionis, vel ob aliam hujusmodi causam, non peccaret mortaliter, maxime si parentes tacite vel expresse in eo consentirent.—Navar, c. xiv. n. xii.; Graff. l. ii. c. li. n. xii.; Lopez, c. liv. p. 279.*

rence from children; but they may be ashamed of their parents if they be poor and low in the world. Children may curse their parents, if they do it but with their lips, and this whether they be alive or dead, the offence is but venial.<sup>1</sup> And, indeed, they allow parents to give their children occasion enough to curse them, when they will not have them obliged, under mortal sin, to teach them any more than the sign of the cross, the small creed, and *paternoster*;<sup>2</sup> nor teach them these in a language they understand.<sup>3</sup> However, parents may come even with their children, and if they love and reverence their father and mother, so much as to curse them, their parents may curse them again, upon as easy terms, only they should not desire mischief to them in their hearts, though their words express that desire.<sup>4</sup> When parents curse their children, having no inward desire of their mischief, it is never a mortal sin, says Soto<sup>5</sup> (and it may seem strange, considering the account of it immediately added): Although it be indeed a wicked custom, and not at all for correction; besides, that the heat of cursing often raises anger into hatred, and so alters the mind, that they often desire that all the mischief imprecated may befall them; besides, the appellation of the devil can scarce be excused from a mortal evil, for it is a kind of blasphemy and scandal to wish eternal death to any. Yet all this, it seems, may be excused from deadly sin, though not very easily.

For love, they may rejoice at the death of their father, because of some outward advantage they gain thereby;<sup>6</sup> they may accuse their parents of heresy, though the effect of that will be a cruel death to those who gave them life.<sup>7</sup> As to obedience; in things that pertain not to paternal government, it is no mortal sin to disobey them.<sup>8</sup> In any things whatsoever it is but a venial fault to disobey them, out of negligence or sensualness;<sup>9</sup> and so there is room enough for a continued disobedience while they live. In matters of great importance, where, if ever, disobedience would be mortal, they exempt it from such guilt. They may enter into a monastery before they are at age, though their parents charge them not to do it;<sup>10</sup> they may dispose of themselves in marriage without their parents' consent, because, according to Aquinas, in the choice of their condition they are not subject to their parents, and their parents' concurrence herein is for decency, not out of necessity.<sup>11</sup> Not only in

<sup>1</sup> Filius qui ex animo maledicit, sive vivis, sive jam sæculo defunctis, si tamen ore tenus tantum maledicit, non amplius quam venialiter offendit.—*Navar, ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Sylvest. Sum. v. scientia; Graff. l. ii. c. lviii. n. xiv. Ea quæ parentes tenentur facere sub peccato mortali, ut filii addiscant, est signum crucis, et Credo parvum, et Paternoster.

<sup>3</sup> Navar, cap. xi. n. xxii.

<sup>4</sup> Idem. cap. xxiii. n. cxvii.

<sup>5</sup> Cum parentes filiis maledicunt, nullum intus habentes mali desiderium, nunquam est peccatum mortale: quamvis consuetudo profecto pessima est.—*De Just. et Jur.* l. v. q. xii. art. i.; Graff. l. ii. c. lviii. n. xx.

<sup>6</sup> Navar, c. xv. n. x.

<sup>7</sup> Si filius scit patrem esse hæreticum, et non solum sibi ipsi, sed et aliis prava sua doctrina nocere potest, debet eum accusare. Alexand. Alensis. secundum eum Graff. l. ii. cap. lv. n. viii., quamvis tenetur filius ad denunciandam hæresim patris, et ad testificandum de illa.—*Nav.* c. xxv. n. l.

<sup>8</sup> Idem. *ibid.* c. xiv. n. xii.

<sup>9</sup> Circa rem familiarem—in necessariis ad salutem, sicut sunt spectantia ad bonos mores—est veniale non obedire ex negligentia vel sensualitate.—*Sylvest.* Sum. v. filius n. xxv.

<sup>10</sup> Quæritur, ntrum intrare possint pueri vel puelle in anno pnbertatis? Et dico quod sic, etiam parentibus prohibentibus.—*Sylv.* v. relig. i. n. xii.

<sup>11</sup> Utrum filius potest nubere sine licentia patris? Resp. quod sic, tam masculus quam fœmina: quamvis non expediat.—*Angel.* sum. v. filius n. xxiv.

In electione statûs filius vel filia, non subijcitur parentibus, secundum S. Thom. xxii. q. civ. art. v. In Tabienna. v. filius n. xiv.; vid. Aquin. iii. q. xlv. art. v. addit.

things of great consequence as to this life, but in matters necessary to their salvation, it is but a venial fault if they disobey them; so it be not out of contempt, that is, out of obstinacy and pertinaciousness. Thus Sylvester and others.<sup>1</sup> De Graffis is more particular herein: a son should not be disobedient to his father in things which belong to the family, and his salvation, as in avoiding pernicious company, and unlawful games, and whores; he should not disobey him herein out of contempt, by which (says he) I understand obstinacy and pertinaciousness, so that not to be obedient (herein) out of inconsiderateness, or negligence, or sensuality, would be venial.<sup>2</sup> They encourage a maid not only to dispose of herself in marriage without consent of parents, but also to give up herself to uncleanness. If she willingly be deflowered, they conclude it is no injury to her nor to her future husband, nor to her parents. Their reason is, because she has the disposing of her own body, and so may use it freely, for the satisfying of lust, though not lawfully;<sup>3</sup> yet lawfully too so far that they will have this lewdness to be no wrong at all to the parties most concerned, herself or others. If she be unchaste herein, yet not unrighteous, she owes not so much obedience to her parents as to keep herself honest; nor have they authority to oblige her not to be a whore, no more than not to be a nun. By this we may take an estimate of the honour which other superiors must expect, by their rules of morality. I must not descend to other particulars, fearing tediousness.

*Sect. 6.* They hold that he breaks not the sixth (in their account the fifth) commandment, who desires, or procures, or does any mischief to another's soul.<sup>4</sup> It seems it is no murder to kill the soul. It is a rule with them, that sins in heart, word, and deed are of the same kind.<sup>5</sup> So they yield to Christ in this, that anger and hatred may be a kind of murder; yet they think fit to exempt these, for the most part, from mortal guilt. When there has been such hatred and enmity betwixt two, as neither of them will be induced to speak to the other, yet both are to be absolved (says de Graffis) when there is such indignation that will admit of no affability or converse.<sup>6</sup> It is a fault, says Cajetan, for the inordinancy of the passion, yet commonly venial.<sup>7</sup> They would reconcile us to anger when both the measure and the effects of it seem intolerable, when it is so extravagant as that it both burns excessively within, and flames out no less in external significations of its excess, yet such an excess is a small fault.<sup>8</sup> It will be as harmless, though it be revengeful too,

Aquinas. Puella sicut potest monasterium ingredi absque parentum consensu, cum sit persona libera, sic et nubere, vid. Gratian. Petr. Lombard. et alios in Espencæo de Clandest. matrim, c. ix. et x.

<sup>1</sup> Sum. v. filius n. xxv.

<sup>2</sup> Inobedientiæ crimen filius incurrit in iis quæ pertinent ad res familiares, et ad salutem animæ, ut fugere noxia sodalium contubernia, ludos prohibitos, et meretrices, modo non obediatur ex contemptu. Per contemptum hic intelligo, obstinationem et pertinaciam animi; unde non obedire ex inadvertentia, aut negligentia, vel sensualitate, esset veniale.—*Sylv.* v. fil. q. xxii.; *Nav.* c. xiv. n. xii.; *Graff.* l. ii. c. lv. n. xv.

<sup>3</sup> Pet. a S. Joseph, de vi. præcepto art. i. (et alii). Cum illa habeat dominium in suum corpus, non parentes, vel futurus sponsus; ideoque illa possit libere, licet non licite, eo uti ad explendam libidinem.

<sup>4</sup> Non autem (infringit illud) qui vult, procurat aut operatur detrimentum animæ ut ipsummet concilium sensit.—*Nav.* c. xv. n. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Aquinas, i. 2, q. lxxii. art. vii.

<sup>6</sup> Graff. l. ii. cap. lxxi. n. vi.

<sup>7</sup> Peccatum est propter inordinatam passionem: et communiter veniale.—*Sum.* v. indignatio.

<sup>8</sup> Quando est inordinata quantum ad modum irascendi, non habet ex suo genere, rationem peccati mortalis.—*Sylvest.* v. ira. n. iv. Potest à recta ratione ita discordare quantum ad modum irascendi puta, quia nimis ardentem intus quis irascitur, aut secundum exteriores motus nimis excandescit. Et sic si excessivus modus sit nudus, peccatum est veniale.—*Cajetan*, Sum. v. ira.

if it seek not a great revenge; yea, a man as innocently seeks and takes the greatest revenge, if he do it inconsiderately.<sup>1</sup> This they deny not when they tell us withal that the passion may be but venial when it makes a person inconsiderate; so that a man may destroy all that he is angry at if his passion be but quick, and great enough. To desire that he whom we count our enemy were killed, or to rejoice that he is murdered, if it be for some good that ensues upon it, is no crime.<sup>2</sup> No more it seems than it is for the cannibals to delight to have others killed; it is for the good they reap thereby, they have the advantage to feed on them. They will scarce be able to persuade one that it is unlawful to act what he may lawfully desire; yet they count it no sin to desire the death not only of those that are mischievous, and do or may do them hurt, but of such as are innocent; nor only of strangers, or of such they count enemies, but even of their nearest relations. A woman may desire the death of her daughters because they are unhand-some or poor, so that she cannot marry them according to her mind; and the reason (which must clear this from guilt) is, because this is not a hatred of enmity to their persons, but only a hatred of abomination as to their unhand-someness and poverty. Thus she may hate her own children to any degree of abhorrence, so far as to will them the grandest evil in this world, death itself, because they are not rich; or because they are not comely; she may kill them, so far as her mind and heart can do it, upon this account, and sacrifice them inwardly to her covetousness, or ambition, or curiosity, and this very innocently. An affecting to kill one's enemy without consent is but a venial fault with Cajetan.<sup>3</sup> If he actually kill him, so it be done indeliberately, he does no great harm. The rule received by them without exception will warrant it, surprise and inconsiderateness excuses from mortal sin.<sup>4</sup> Thus, if a man kills any he meets with, without any deliberation at all, through natural hastiness, drink, or passion, it is no mortal sin; yea, it may be done as easily, with some deliberation, if that be not full and perfect; and there are so many things which they tell us of to hinder it from being full, that killing of others may be a common practice, with little or no fault. But when it is more voluntary, there are more cases, wherein they make murder no sin at all, than so much as a venial fault, of which in its proper place.

*Sect. 7.* Proceed we to the next command. Some of their doctors have determined that fornication is not intrinsically evil, nor forbidden because it is evil, but only evil because it is forbidden. So Martinus à Magistris, and after him Durandus, held that fornication is not condemned by the law of nature as a sin deserving eternal death, but is only prohibited by a positive law,<sup>5</sup> Deut. xxiii., Eph. v., and so it will be no worse, nor deserve any more than a venial fault, since a positive law neither adds to the penalty nor makes it a greater evil, but only declares the native evil of it more expressly. Not only fornication, but also adultery, even in the clergy, has passed amongst them as a lesser sin, and is so expressed in the pontifical law. For

<sup>1</sup> Posset est veniale, propter imperfectionem actus, quia scilicet prævenit deliberationem; vel est de aliquo modico, ex S. Thom.—*Sylv.* v. ira n. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Licet mihi optare, ad bonum, mortem alicujus. Idem v. maledicit; Mortem alicui optare possumus, licet nobis constet viam perditionis ingressum ire. Soto, de Just. et Jur. l. v. q. xii. art. i.; Navar, c. xxi. n. xxv.; Lopez, cap. lxiv. p. 321, 322. (Bonacin. t. ii. de leg. disp. iii. q. iv. p. ult. n. vii.)

<sup>3</sup> Affectus ad occidendum inimicum absque consensu rationis, Sum. v. Votum.

<sup>4</sup> Inferre notabile damnum in proximi personam—subreptio et inconsideratio ejus quod aggrediebatur ipsum excusare possit à mortali.—*Navar.* c. xv. n. viii.

<sup>5</sup> Affirmat Martinus—quod fornicatio non est sua natura mala, et ideo prohibita, imo vero ob id tantum est mala, quia prohibita, nempe lege veteri—et eisdem applaudit Durandus, iv. dist. xxxiii. q. 2.—*Soto de Just. et Jur.* l. v. q. iii. art. iii.

some crimes clergymen were to be deposed, for others the bishop might dispense with them, to wit, when they were lesser faults. Amongst these lesser, Pope Alexander III. reckons adulteries; but for adulteries, says he, and other lesser crimes, the bishop, after they have done penance, may dispense with the clergy.<sup>1</sup> They teach that for a whore, though she be a married woman, or a nun, to seek or receive a reward for prostituting herself, is but a venial fault, if any, only they differ how she should have it. Some say as a gift or gratuity,<sup>2</sup> but others as a hire, legally due in justice;<sup>3</sup> by which it is evident that either they must think such uncleanness not to be intrinsically evil, or else that it is as warrantable to seek and receive rewards for other such acts of wickedness (as for slandering, robbing, assassinating men, or firing houses, &c.). The use of matrimony before the marriage be solemnised, if it be without contempt, is no mortal sin, says Cajetan,<sup>4</sup> because neither the violation of rules nor of custom, through the weakness of passion, can be mortal. Others concur with him herein. Nor do Antoninus and John Tabienna much mend the matter, who will have the first act to be a sin, but none of the rest after. He or she who first contracts marriage with one privately, and after with another publicly, sins not mortally, if they lie with the former without scandal, but is bound to live with the latter, the church commanding it, if there be no danger of coming together.<sup>5</sup> As though they could cohabit together as man and wife without such danger! This is in effect to determine they may lie with both, and they that have a mind to it may have warranty from the master of sentences<sup>6</sup> for the latter, and from the master of the sacred palaces,<sup>7</sup> and others, for the former. A woman whose chastity is attempted with some force,<sup>8</sup> though she cry not out, though she call not for help when it may be had, though she make no resistance at all with any part of her, though she do not so much as any way move to hinder it, yea, though she take natural pleasure in the act, yet if her will do not deliberately consent (though they say in any court she could not in such circumstances but be presumed to consent), she sins not mortally; thus Soto with others. They confess that a woman can scarce ever do this and be honest, and yet give this encouragement to all to do it.<sup>9</sup> Here is a way to have all women corrupted that are but attempted with eagerness, if the rules of those who have the guidance of their practice and consciences be but complied

<sup>1</sup> Decretal l. ii. tit. i. c. iv. de adulteriis vero et aliis criminibus, quæ sunt minora, potest episcopus post peractum pœnitentiam cum clericis dispensare. Alexander III. Salenitano Archiepiscopo respondens de adulteriis ut aliis criminibus minoribus, episcopo cum clericis pœnitentibus dispensandi jus fecit.—*Espenœus*, de digam. l. ii. c. vii. p. 714.

<sup>2</sup> Medina, Navar. c. xvii. n. xxxix.

<sup>3</sup> Cajetan Soto de Just. l. iv. q. vii. a. i. Graff. l. ii. c. cxxiii. n.ii.

<sup>4</sup> Si tamen desit contemptus, non est peccatum mortale consummare matrimonium ante benedictionem: quia nec statuti nec consuetudinis violatio ex infirmitate passionum, infert peccatum mortale.—*Cajet. Sum. v. Matrimon. Angelus, v. debitum. Sylvest. (after Aquinas and others) v. debet, sect. xi.*

Navar. cap. xvi. n. xxxviii. pro Cajetano videtur textus Conc. Trident.

<sup>5</sup> Non tamen peccaret qui absque scandalo eam (rem) haberet (cum priori), tenetur autem posteriori convivere, ecclesia id jubente, si absque periculo habendi rem cum ea vel eo, id facere potest.—*Idem, ibid. n. xxxix.*

<sup>6</sup> In iv. dist. n. xxviii.

<sup>7</sup> Sum. v. debitum. n. xiv.

<sup>8</sup> Neque clamore se defendere—suis propriis membris se defendere sed immota manens nihil agat—etiamsi de actu ipso delectationem aliquam percipiat, modo neque in ipsum actum, neque delectationem voluntate deliberata consentiret. Nam talis delectatio non esset voluntaria sed naturalis—quamvis quoad forum exterius presumere consentiret. Soto, de Just. et Jur. lib. v. q. i. art. v. p. 141; Navar. cap. xvi. n. i.: Graff. l. ii. c. lxxvii. n. x.; Vega in Jo. Sanc. disp. x. n. xvii.

<sup>9</sup> Credo paucas honestas reperitum iri, quæ aliquo modo non resistant, saltem sine clamore, &c.—*Ibid.*

with. Impetuous lust may make the essay upon any without fear of so much as a check or any resistance, and those who are engaged by the laws of nature, God, and man, to make opposition, may innocently give place to it without struggling; yea, they may be chaste enough though they yield to such lust with pleasure, so it be no more than sensual, and these delights be not jumbled together in practice, which in the doctrine of their teachers is sufficiently distinguished and parted for them. They bid fair also to make that uncleanness to which persons are drawn by the power of courtship and insinuation pass as innocent; for they say that is no sin which is involuntary, and that is not voluntary to which we are necessitated; and Cajetan<sup>1</sup> tells us (in a case much akin to this) that our passions, excited by exterior persuasion, do, as it were, offer us violence; after he had informed us that what whores extort by flatteries more than their hire is an involuntary gift, the mind being this way necessitated; and sure flatteries in reference to the act, as well as the reward, may as much necessitate, and make the one as involuntary as the other; further, if man or woman need neither force nor importunity, but be ready to commit uncleanness without more ado, one may without sin invite them to it. Self-pollution is no mortal sin in any that desire it may befall them in their sleep for the ease of nature;<sup>2</sup> nor is it a sin to be pleased with it when it is past for a good end,<sup>3</sup> and so Aquinas, Paludanus, and the common doctrine; nor to be pleased with it as future, if the pleasure do not cause it, nor to be pleased with it when it befalls them awake,<sup>4</sup> if the pleasure be but sensual, and not rational. Under the favour of this distinction they may act uncleanness, either natural or against nature, and that with delight too; for though the lower faculties take pleasure therein, yet if the superior either check it, or run not into a full compliance therewith, they are safe. They encourage them to venture upon, and continue in, such occasions of uncleanness, as those who think it needful to avoid the acts cannot but judge necessary to be abandoned. They that eat hot meats, such as provoke and cause uncleanness, or otherwise eat excessively, if they do it not with such an intention, but to satisfy their gluttony, or for other cause, yea, though they doubt uncleanness will be the issue of it, offend but venially.<sup>5</sup> Carnal touches,<sup>6</sup> used for sensual pleasure, without designing the act of uncleanness or the delight of it (though it be confessed that of all other occasions this leads most directly and most

<sup>1</sup> *Passiones nostræ ab extrinseco suatore illatæ quasi vim faciunt—meretricum blandæ valde extortiones supra debitam mercedem—omnis similis actio causans involuntariam dationem rei suæ quia non minus necessitatur ex hujusmodi humanus animus, &c.—Sum. v. restitut. p. 509.*

Ex sententia Cajetani (et Navarri) sequitur licitum esse invitare ad fornicationem, eum qui paratus est alios fornicari; in Vasq. opusc. moral. dub. iii. p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Antoninus, Sylvester, Cajetan. in Navar. in Lopez. c. lxxiv. p. 252, tenent quod ita licet cupere et ita complacere.—Vid. Navar. cap. xvi. n. vii.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. S. Thomas, Paludanus ut communes asserunt non esse peccatum complacere sibi de præterita pollutione ob sanctum finem. Vid. Sylvest. v. pollutio; Post-placentia non faciat præteritam pollutionem esse peccatum.

<sup>4</sup> Non est autem peccatum saltem mortale, pollutio illa, quæ incipit evenire alicui, dum dormit, et finitur postquam est experrectus, si voluntas superior, sive rationalis deliberata, in illam non consentiat, quamvis sensualitas ea delectetur, &c.—Navar, ibid. n. viii. et Cardin. Turrecremata.

<sup>5</sup> Non esse peccatum mortale, comedere nimis, aut calida edulia, ob quod pollutio evenit, dummodo non comedat ea eo fine, sed solum ut suæ gulæ satisficiat.—Navar. c. xvi. n. viii. Si non intenditur, sed quid tale fiat propter gulositatem aut aliam causam, cum dubio tamen securaturæ pollutionis, esset veniale. Sylv. v. Pollut. Lopez. cap. lxxiv. p. 354.

<sup>6</sup> Martinus de Magistris, Gabriel, Javellns, Navar, Soto, Nider, Antoninus, et alii in Sanch, l. ix. de matr. disp. xlvi. n. vi. et Bonacin. tom. i. p. 318.

dangerously to the consummation of the act), yet are they but venial faults with many of their writers. To go to the place or company where is danger of sinning mortally, by reason of the sights, persuasions, opportunities, or anything of this nature, though it be done without any cogent necessity, is not a mortal sin with them; and the reason is, because it rests in the man's free will not to sin mortally, though such occasions of sinning be offered.<sup>1</sup> Filthy discourse, when it is out of lightness and curiosity, without any other ill design, or when it is merely for the pleasure taken in the obscene talk, without any further intention, is no worse than a venial fault.<sup>2</sup> The filthiness which the apostle forbids, Eph. v. 4, Bellarmine,<sup>3</sup> understanding thereby filthy words, will have it be but a venial; and the same he determines not only of filthy talking, but scurrility; and Cardinal Cajetan<sup>4</sup> before him, says, in its own nature it is not a mortal sin, though he describes it to be shameful mirth; and Alensis<sup>5</sup> refers it to lascivious affection; and in Angelus<sup>6</sup>, it is a provoking others to laughter either by idle or obscene words. A woman sins not mortally, who, being moved with the affection of a little vain-glory, without any other deadly intention, does paint or adorn herself, although she believe that some who see her in such a dress will be inflamed with mortal lust, when it is certain also, that without any disparagement or inconvenience, she might abstain from such a garb; yea, though she so trick up herself, that some may be induced to love her honestly but carnally, or with a dishonest affection either, only not beyond the bounds of venial uncleanness.<sup>7</sup> This being their doctrine, no wonder if Christian purity be abandoned in their practice. Navarre<sup>8</sup> tells us there is such a deluge of unbridled luxury amongst them who are so near a kin, that he dares not express it; and amongst the married and unmarried, amongst virgins consecrated and unconsecrated, that divine and immense goodness may send upon them a horrible deluge of all calamities, not only corporal, but spiritual. And because it is not lawful for one to take the profession of a nun if she have committed uncleanness before, he says that there are few grown up that without caution can be lawfully consecrated for virgins.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ire ad locum sive ad societatem, ubi est periculum peccandi mortaliter, propter aspectum, persuasiones, commoditates, aut aliquid hujusmodi, non est ex suo genere peccatum mortale, licet sine urgente necessitate fiat, ad peccatum incautelæ spectet. Hæc est Cajetani, et probatur, quia in suæ libertatis arbitrio restat non peccare mortaliter, etiam præsentibus talibus occasionibus.—*Lopez*. cap. xx. p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> Antoninus de Graff. Cajetan. et alii in Sanch. *ibid.* n. xxxix. Cajetan. Navar. Graff. *Rebellus* (in) Bonacin. tom. i. p. 318, n. xviii.

<sup>3</sup> De Amiss. Grat. l. i. cap. ix. p. 78. Docere volebat tria posteriora (turpia verba, stultiloquia et scurrilitatem) debere quidem esse aliena ab ore sanctificato fidelium, non tamen ex genere suo talia esse, quæ excludant ab hæreditate Christi et Dei.

<sup>4</sup> Scurrilitas qua homo ad risum provocat inverecunde—non est mortalis ex suo genere.—*Sum. v. Scurril.*

<sup>5</sup> Scendum Haleusem refertur ad lasciviam affectionis.—*Angelus. Sum. v. Scurril.*

<sup>6</sup> Non peccat mortaliter ab hoc solum mulier, quæ vanæ gloriæ et venialis desiderio tacta, absque alio fine mortali se fucat et ornat, licet credat aliquos, qui ipsam sic fucata et ornatam videbunt, in ejus concupiscentiam mortalem exarsuros. Attamen certum est, eam absque incommodo verecundiæ, et dedecore suo, posse ab hujusmodi ornatu temperare.—*Navar.* cap. xiv. n. xxvii.

<sup>7</sup> Non autem (peccat mortaliter) si facit illud, ut ametur honeste, licet carnaliter—imo neque si id facit quo ametur inhoneste, sed non mortaliter, ad luxuriam videlicet tantum venialem.—*Idem* c. xvi. n. xiv.

<sup>8</sup> Cap. xvi. n. iii.—Diluvium tam effrenatæ luxuriæ, etiam inter cognatos adeo propinquos et affines, ut non audeamus exprimere, et inter conjugatas et vi. gines tam sacratas quam non sacratas, &c.

<sup>9</sup> Ob quod forsitan paucæ grandiorum sine cautela licite consecrari possunt — *Ibid.*

Sect. 8. For theft, they teach that to steal anything of small value is but a venial fault; for this is the rule they universally proceed by, the smallness of a thing in all causes excuses from mortal sin;<sup>1</sup> and thus far all are encouraged to steal, not only strangers, but children from their fathers, and wives from their husbands, and servants from their masters.<sup>2</sup>

1. A servant may be excused from mortal guilt if he steal from his master by little and little, though in time it come to a considerable sum, provided he convert it to his own use. He should not, it seems, steal for others too, unless he do it out of charity.<sup>3</sup>

2. A son may steal more from his father than strangers or servants may do; he must be regulated herein by his father's estate. This love and indulgence to him, the greater that it is, the more he may steal from him. They excuse him if he steal from his father the sum of three crowns; they say not that it may not be a greater, but only that it should not be a far greater sum.<sup>4</sup>

3. Accordingly, he may spend what he gets from his father in gaming, or in recreations, not only such as are honest, but also luxurious, without any more guilt.<sup>5</sup>

4. If his father allow him not what others of his condition do, he may filch from him privily what a prudent confessor thinks fit. Thus men's estates will be at the confessor's discretion, and as much may be stolen from them as their priests please.<sup>6</sup>

5. Or if he do business for his father, his expenses deducted, he may keep to himself as much as a stranger would have for such service.<sup>7</sup>

Now, that we may know when theft will be a mortal crime, it must be known of what value the thing stolen must be to make it so; and this not being determined by any law natural, divine, or human, they agree, that this must be determined by the judgment of a good man;<sup>8</sup> and who better than the Casuists, since they ought, and are presumed to be, both knowing and conscientious? Let but them conclude (and they have done worse in many cases) that things of great worth are not of value sufficient to make the stealing thereof to be a mortal sin, and then theft, neither little nor great, will be criminal. Thus this command of God (as the rest are) will be made of none effect by this distinction. An engine which (as they work it) serves to destroy both law and gospel, and to sink Christianity, in morals, many degrees below heathenism. Let us see what progress they have made herein, and whether they have not done it in effect already. They teach that to steal anything, though in itself small, yet of great value in the account of the owner, and of much consequence to him; so that the damage he suffers by it, and the trouble it gives him, is really great, yet if the thief did not, or could not know it, it is but venial.<sup>9</sup> Yet

<sup>1</sup> Aquinas i. ii. q. lxxxviii. art. v. et vi. et xxii. q. iii. art. v. et q. lix. art. iv. v. Antoninus. ii. per tit. iv. c. v. sect. vii. et viii. Adrian. quodlib. viii. in Navar. c. xvii. n. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Cajetan Sum. v. furtum. Adrian in iv. de restit. Navar. c. xvii. n. cxxxviii. Sylvest. Sum. v. furtum. n. xvi. Graff. l. ii. cap. xcii. n. xxv.

<sup>3</sup> Bonacin. de restit. disp. ii. q. x. punct. ult. n. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Pet. Navar. et Bonacin. ibid. punct. i. n. v. longe majorem summam.

<sup>5</sup> Lopez. Navar. et alii in Bonacin. ibid. n. vi. in ludos—recreationem etiam luxuriosam.

<sup>6</sup> Sairus Sueonius et alii cum Bonacin. ibid. Possit filius clam accipere juxta prudentis confessorii arbitrium.

<sup>7</sup> Angelus. Navar. Bartolus. Baldus et alii in Bonacin. ibid. n. viii.

<sup>8</sup> Quæ tamen parvitas excusat a peccato mortali, communis est opinio, standum esse arbitrio boni viri.—Graff. ibid. n. xx.; vid. Navar. cap. xvii. n. ii.

<sup>9</sup> Navar. ibid.; Graff. ibid. n. xvi.

the reason why they count the stealing of a small thing, to be but a little fault; is because the owner is presumed not unwilling<sup>1</sup> the stealer should have it, it being no considerable loss, or trouble to him; but this cannot be presumed in the now mentioned cases. And if theft, whether of small or great consequence, whether with or without that which makes little theft to be venial, be still no worse than venial, then will no theft be mortal. They also teach, that those who are in need, though it be not extreme, but such only as would be counted great, may steal from others for their relief;<sup>2</sup> nor are they bound to make restitution, when they have got a good estate.<sup>3</sup> Thus theft will be made as common as moderate indigence; and the practice being continued, as long as there is need, it may amount in a while to a considerable sum; yea, when the necessitous are grown rich, those whose estates are impaired by such thefts shall have no reparation. Thus a wide door is opened for common thievery in considerable quantities, without any restraint, either from respect to sin or to satisfaction. Further, when so many persons in no necessity take each of them a little fruit from a vineyard or an orchard, or a little corn from a field, that there is nothing at all left for the owner, yet if they did not conspire together to do this, it is a small fault.<sup>4</sup> And thus any men of estates (since it holds in other cases, no less than those specified) may be utterly impoverished; and yet those that ruin them be guilty of nothing that they need regard. Moreover, when any one without any need continues so long in the stealing matters of less worth from one person or many, that in time they rise to a great value, and the thief thrives into a good estate thereby, without designing it, this altogether is no more than a venial fault; nor will it be worse, though he never make restitution, if there was any considerable interval betwixt the acts of theft, say some;<sup>5</sup> no, nor if there were no such intervals, say others.<sup>6</sup> The consequence of which is, as Lopez observes, that any innkeeper or tradesman may grow rich, and raise a fair estate, without mortal sin, by defrauding all that buy of them, a little, in false measures, and so fleecing a whole town.<sup>7</sup> And why might not they as well conclude, that he who beats another, so it be but with little blows, though he beat him to death, offends but venially? These of old were thought alike.<sup>8</sup> They conclude also, that such a quantity may be stolen as is sufficient to make it a mortal sin, without sinning mortally, if it be for a good end. These are some of the instances they give: 1, A man may steal to give alms.<sup>9</sup> We need not wonder at this, since they think

<sup>1</sup> Si minimi erit pretti, nemo mortalem esse culpam affirmabit; ex D. Thom. et ratio est quia præsumitur non esse omnino contra voluntatem ejus qui hoc patitur.—*Graff.* l. i. c. xiv. n. v.; *Nav.* *ibid.* n. v.

<sup>2</sup> Tradunt Medina. Angelus. Pet. Navar. Malderus et Plures alii in Dian. p. 2, l. iii. mis. res. xxix.

Quamvis non sit in necessitate extrema, excusari tamen potest a toto, furtive subripiendo.—*Sylvest.* sum. v. furtum. n. x.; *Navar.* *ibid.*, vid. *Angelum.* One in extreme necessity may kill the owner if he would hinder him from stealing; Si a domino impediatur, potest se tueri et occidere impediendum.—*Bonacin. de restit.* disp. i. q. viii. punct. iii. n. iv.

<sup>3</sup> Communis est opinio, quam refert Sylvest. quod non teneatur ad restitutionem si ad pinguiorem fortunam pervenerit is—qui in magna necessitate surripit.—*Graff.* l. ii. c. xciii. n. xi.

<sup>4</sup> Corduba. Navar. Lopez, pars. ii. eap. xciii. p. 414.

<sup>5</sup> Navar. c. xvii. n. cxxxix; *Graff.* l. ii. c. xcii. n. xviii.

<sup>6</sup> Angestus in Lopez, *ibid.* p. 416.

<sup>7</sup> Tabernarius seu quilibet negotiator posset ditescere sine mortali, et statum decentem fundare, et singulos emptores in modico mensuras curtaudo defraudare, totam civitatem sic depilando.—*Ibid.* p. 14.

<sup>8</sup> Nihil refert, an paulatim, an simul aliquem interimas, vel spolies.—*Jerom. ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Communis sententia ampliatur, ut non tantum pro se, sed etiam pro alio existente in extrema necessitate, quis occulte subtrahere possit.—*Graff.* c. xciii. n. xii.; *Navar.*

not much to rob Christ of his honour in all their good works, and so commit the worst kind of robbery (the highest sacrilege) in their best acts, arrogating that to them which is Christ's peculiar satisfaction and merit. And then, that the charitable thief, if he become rich, is not bound to restore what is stolen, is the common opinion.<sup>1</sup> Also, one may steal money from another, rather than he shall venture it in gaming;<sup>2</sup> for it is good divinity with them (whatsoever it was with the apostle) that one evil may be done to hinder another, and that not only in other sins (as friar Joseph would limit it), but such as are intrinsecally evil;<sup>3</sup> for example, if one be about to commit adultery, it will be a lawful, a holy act, to beseech and persuade him to commit fornication. Or nearer the matter in hand, if one be ready to steal an hundred pounds, I may advise him to steal fifty, and so persuade to a mortal sin with some moderation. They think it not only lawful to persuade a thief to a smaller robbery, but also to accompany and assist him therein. Further, a woman, if her husband be profuse, may against his command take away his goods, and conceal them to provide for the future.<sup>4</sup> If a man be distracted, or if he be absent, his wife may spend more of his estate than he would do if he were sober or present (Bonacin. *ibid.*). Finally, they all agree, that to steal anything, of what value soever, inconsiderately, that is, without full and perfect deliberation, is but a venial trespass. And how he can be obliged to restore it, by their principles, I understand not; since they hold that no man is bound to make restitution but for a mortal offence.<sup>5</sup> If in a matter that is weighty, the fault be venial, for want of full consideration, it will not be so much as a small fault, not to make restitution, how much soever be stolen inconsiderately.<sup>6</sup> By these and such like rules, they have opened a way to make thievery, small or great, practicable, without any sin or danger, but what is small and inconsiderable in their account. Scholars, and those who count good books their treasure, are by their doctrine exposed more particularly, for they teach, that to take away heretical books from such as have not licence to read them, is no theft (*Bonacin. de restit. disp. ii. q. viii. punct. i. n. i.*); so that it will be no fault at all to rob one of the best part of his library, how valuable soever.

They open as wide a gap, and give as much encouragement to cheating, and like unconscionable practices. They teach there is no necessity to be regulated in bargaining, by the just value of things; but they may sell for as much as they can extort, and buy answerably; and this they take for a general rule, a thing is worth so much as it can be sold for.<sup>7</sup> Hence Syl-

c. xvii. n. cxviii. If a man be in mortal sin, his wife may take of his goods privily, and give them away in alms for his conversion.—*Bonacin. de restit. disp. ii. q. x. punct. ii. n. ix.*

<sup>1</sup> In Navar. *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Antoninus quem sequitur Nav. *ibid.* n. v. p. 282.

<sup>3</sup> Licet inducere ad minus malum, paratum jam ad majus malum; ut si quis proponit interficere, aut adulterari quis, licet ei persuadere percutere aut fornicari, contra fratrem Josephum, qui limitat hanc sententiam ad peccata quæ non sunt intrinseca mala; sed censeo sententiam hanc generaliter esse tenendam, prout eam tenet Navarrus, et Cajetanus, Lopez, pars. i. cap. lviii. p. 297; Adrianus, Cajetan. Sotus, quos sequitur Navar. cap. xiv. n. xl.

Luxurioso sancte consulitur ut non adulteretur, sed fornicetur. Cajetan. *sum. v. Tyrannis. Medina, Sotus, Adrian existimant*—non tantum licere suadere minus furtum laironi, sed etiam ipsum comitari, imo etiam adjuvare. in Vasq. *opusc. Moral. p. 24, dub. ii*—*Bonacin. de rest. disp. i. q. ii. punct. vii. n. ix.*

<sup>4</sup> Sylvest. v. furtum. n. xv.; Navar. cap. xvii. n. cliv.; Graff. l. ii. c. xcii. n. xxvi.

<sup>5</sup> Adrian. iv. de restit. sam. ad viii.; Sylvest. v. culpa. q. iv. in Fill. tr. xxxii. n. xxxii.

<sup>6</sup> Sylvest. et alii *ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Justum prærium reputatur quod absque fraude extorqueri potest.—*Ità, Bannes, Medina, Arragon, Villalobos, Bonacina, et alii in Dian. i. p. tr. viii. res. lv.*

vester concludes it lawful for any one to sell as dear, and buy as cheap as he can;<sup>1</sup> which, unlimited, gives liberty to all to prey upon one another, without equity or conscience. So one may buy a thing of great value,<sup>2</sup> though he knows it, and the owner understands it not, for a small matter; nor needs he declare it, when he apprehends that it is much more worth, since that may be inquired of others.<sup>3</sup> They conclude, that false measures and weights may be used, though the buyer be hereby deceived and damnified, and the custom itself to be a corruption; yet they are excused who use them, if they do it for their own security, or for moderate gain, as if in case they should give full measure, the price would be greater, and consequently they would have few or no customers.<sup>4</sup> So, by their rules, they may further deceive those that deal with them, by selling one thing for another, or adulterating what they sell; and so cheat them not only in the measure, but in the quality, yea, or the substance of the commodity. Instances hereof we have in Soto. Corn or wine, when it is more worth than the set rate, the merchant may sell it by false measure, thereby to get his price.<sup>5</sup> If a man have very good wine, but people, if they did not take it for Rhenish, would not give so good a price for it, he may sell it at the rate they would give for Rhenish, though it be not.<sup>6</sup> So he may mix his wine with water, and sell it for pure, taking but a just price;<sup>7</sup> as, for example, in case wine were so dear, that scarce any would buy it at the price it is worth, he may mix it with water, and sell it at the rate they will give.<sup>8</sup> So cloth or silks may be sold for that of such a country which is most esteemed, though it be of another.<sup>9</sup> These conclusions, he says, are collected out of Aquinas; and to complete these cheats, he tells us,<sup>10</sup> that if perhaps the seller should lie too, in these cases (for example, if he should affirm that to be Rhenish wine which is not, or that to be pure which is adulterated, or that to be full measure which is short of it, &c.) it would not be a mortal sin. And Sylvester determines, that a man with perjuries and lies, denying the badness of his commodities, or making them better than they are, the lies, if they do not much damnify the buyer, are but venial.<sup>11</sup> They allow persons also to deceive those who entrust them to dispose of their estates or goods; as, if one be employed to sell what is another's at a certain price, if he sell it for more, he may keep the overplus to himself; yea, say some,<sup>12</sup> though he had a reward for his pains in selling, yet he may retain to himself the overplus of what is sold.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Res tantum valet quantum vendi potest—et secundum hoc licet cuilibet carius vendere, aut vilius emere quantum potest.—*Sum. v. Emptio. n. x.*

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Cajetan.—*Sum. v. Emptio. p. 138.*

<sup>3</sup> Emptor non tenetur ei explicite affirmare quantum valet: quum habeat alios, unde possit inquirere et scire.—*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Tabernarii dantes vini mensuram diminutam secundum Arc. non excusantur: quia decipiunt et damnificant emptores, non obstante contraria consuetudine, quæ est corruptela: nisi hoc faciunt ad suam indemnitate, vel lucrum moderatum: puta, quia si darent plenas, oporteret pretium augere, ut consequenter nullos aut paucos invenirent emptores.—*Sylv. Sum. ibid. n. xx.; Vid. Soto, de just. et jur. lib. vi. q. iii. art. ii.*

<sup>5</sup> Soto, *ibid. p. 198.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Eadem ratione, et aqua possit vinum diluere.—*Idem, ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Idem, ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Forsan venditoris mendacium in talibus casibus, si alioqui prædicto modo servetur justitia, non est pernitiosum.—*Idem, ibid. p. 199, quem sequitur in his omnibus, Tol. instr. l. viii. c. xlix.*

<sup>11</sup> *Sum. ibid. n. xxii.*

<sup>12</sup> Si accipit certo pretio vendendum, retinere potest id quo pluris illud vendiderit, nisi excesserit pretium rigorosum.—*Navar. c. xxiii. n. xvii.*

<sup>13</sup> Angel. *Sum. in Sylv. ibid. n. xxv.*

Further, Panormitan<sup>1</sup> takes notice, that their canon law allows of deceit, if it be not extended beyond half the worth of the thing bargained for (that is, if a man be not cozened of above fifty per cent. in a bargain). But then, to salve the reputation of the law (which he, like a true canonist, says was formed by the instinct of the Holy Ghost), he will have it understood of deceit in the thing, not of fraud in the persons, and others after him; but Sylvester, who sees no ground for that, uses another shift: he says it may be understood, either of deceit in the thing or fraud in the persons, which their law tolerates, but approves not.<sup>2</sup> Cajetan grants so great deceit is lawful by human constitution; but says, it is condemned by the law of God.<sup>3</sup> And so we leave this shameful deceit, lawful by the pope's decrees, but damnable by God's word.

Sect. 9. Let us see, in the next place, what truth may be expected in popery, or those that profess it; and whether their rules tend not to leave neither truth in the world, nor amongst themselves, by giving liberty to all falseness and lying in words and deeds. A lie, as they define it, is an asserting of what is false, with an intent to speak falsely, and to deceive others.<sup>4</sup> Now they teach that to deliver what is false,<sup>5</sup> if not on purpose, though it be without any care whether it be true or false; if it be a fault, is such as needs not be regarded, unless where it is in testimony or upon oath (and there they will excuse it too, by and by), because this is but a material lie, and not in its formal perfection. But then a perfect lie, with a design to speak what is false, and to deceive the hearers, is as innocent, if it be for pleasure or in sport,—*ridentem dicere falsum quis vetat?*—to make a sport of violating truth, or in offering it such injury to please himself or others; any one may do it out of habit, and make a practice of it, and tell lies when he list, out of mere pleasure to be telling lies;<sup>6</sup> yea, or out of malice,<sup>7</sup> (though that be the highest aggravation of sin). An officious lie is with them as harmless, they have warrant enough for the most complete and perfect lies, when they are of any advantage to some, and no hurt to others,<sup>8</sup> how much soever truth be injured, or others deceived thereby. So that their true catholics need leave no place for truth, either in their heart or words, when the excluding of it from both will, without hurt, serve either their pleasure or profit. However, herein they use true and plain dealing, in letting the world know that, in these cases, they are never to be trusted, either in matters of conversation or religion. This being their principle,<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dicit etiam Panormitan quod jura Canonica permittentia deceptionem usque ad dimidium, intelligi debent quando venit deceptio re ipsa, in Sylv. *ibid.* n. ix.

<sup>2</sup> Ego dico quod loquitur in foro contentioso, sive deceptio sit ex re, sive ex dolo: non quia illum approbat, sed quia tolerat.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Jure humano dicitur licitum decipere citra dimidium justii pretii: sed lex domini immaculata est, &c.—*Sum. v. emptore.*

<sup>4</sup> Aquinas, ii. 2, q. cx. art. i.

<sup>5</sup> Si dicatur falsum sed desit voluntas dicendi falsum—non est mendacium proprie aut perfecte, et si diligentia esset adhibita, non esset peccatum, et si non sit adhibita, est veniale, ii. 2, q. ii. c. homines in Sylv.—*Sum. v. mendacium.* n. i.

<sup>6</sup> Quod sit sola mentiendi libidine quod procedit ex habitu: nam mendax ex eo quod talis est secundum habitum ipso mendacio gaudet, iv. *Ethic.*—reducitur ad jocosum, cum sit delectabile mentienti. Idem *ibid.* nec mendacium erat mortale ut in jocosum et officioso, *ibid.* n. iii.

<sup>7</sup> Contingit tamen propter imperfectionem actus esse veniale peccatum ex malitia: ut si quis vana mendacia eligit dicere ex intentione hujus mali, quod est vane mentiri, et non propter aliud.—*Cajetan. Sum. v. malitia.*

<sup>8</sup> Officiosum (mendacium) quod sine alicujus injuria dicitur, ut alicui prosit, et hoc etiam est veniale.—*Cajet. ibid. v. Mendac.*

<sup>9</sup> Lex de non mentiendo jocosae aut officiosae sine damno alterius—(ejus) transgressio est solum venialis, secundum omnes Catholicos.—*Navar. c. xxiii. n. v.*

received by all catholics, and universally acknowledged, we need not wonder that it hath been their common practice in several ages, and that they make no conscience of it still, to counterfeit false miracles, to forge false stories, to shew false relics, to divulge false visions and revelations, to obtrude on the world supposititious writings, to corrupt the monuments of former times, and expunge out of them all the truth that makes against them, to make even the dead speak lies, or disguise the truth. For all this falseness is officious; it serves the interest of the church; it is to commend her doctrine, and to maintain her authority over men's consciences, and it does the world no hurt; for it is (they say) the duty of all men, and would be their advantage, to entertain her doctrine, and subject themselves to her authority. Now if the rest of mankind, Jews, Turks, heathens, had retained no more conscience nor reverence for truth than these catholics; if upon their supposition (that their way was the best) they had proceeded by their rules and methods to broach any lies for them, or falsify any records against them, who sees not that this had been a direct course to have left no truth at all in the world, nor means to come to the knowledge of it? Yet this practice with the Romanists (so great friends are they to truth) is but a venial fault. Did I say they count it so bad? I do them wrong; it is a great piece of piety to make lies for their religion, as some of themselves do acknowledge it has been accounted.<sup>1</sup> To proceed, there are five or six several sorts of lies (that they may have room enough still to avoid truth) which they may make their practice without danger.<sup>2</sup> It is the pernicious lie only that need be avoided, that which wrongs others, and is against justice; and thus no violation of truth, no injury to it, how great soever (so tender they are of it) will be a crime, unless, withal, it be against justice; and a lie (be it as gross as can be) will not of itself,<sup>3</sup> and in its own nature, be more than venial, but only by accident, when it so falls out that it does mischief. And it may be as innocent to tell lies as truth, and as criminal to speak truth as lies. There will be no difference as to mortal guilt in their own nature, and by accident they may do hurt alike. However, considering that truth and their religion are so much at odds, the world is obliged to them for being so indifferent as to truth and lies, and that these have no more the preference. But then, though none but pernicious lies need be shunned, yet not all of this sort neither; they give liberty to tell mischievous lies, as many and as oft as you please, so the mischief they do be not great, though it prejudice others in spirituals or temporals; or though ye do the greatest mischief that can be done,<sup>4</sup> yet, if you did not intend it to be great, or if you should not or did not observe and consider that it would be so, in such cases even pernicious lies will be harmless venials. They may, by their rules, lie to the prejudice of others in soul, body, or estate, and that deliberately, and with design to do it, provided the damage be not great; but *when* it will be great, their casuists cannot well determine. This is not confined to a point; there is a fair latitude, and liberty enough given for less or more, it is much left

<sup>1</sup> Fnerunt qui magnæ pietatis loco ducerent mendaciola pro religione confingere. Ludovicus Vives, et Espenæus.—*Com. in Tim.* l. i. c. xi. p. 156.

<sup>2</sup> Sylvest. *ibid.* n. v.

<sup>3</sup> Mendacium si aliam non habet maculam quam falsitatis, non est genere suo mortale; patet, quia neque est contra religionem (Romanam) neque contra justitiam.—*Soto. ibid.* l. v. q. vii. art. iv. p. 168.

<sup>4</sup> Mortalis autem est omnis, et sola illa, quæ fit animo notabiliter nocendi in bonis spiritualibus aut temporariis, quamvis non noceat, et illa quæ fit nocendo notabiliter, aut dando causam ita nocendi sine tali animo, advertendo tamen, aut advertere debendo per illam notabiliter nocere, aut causam notabiliter nocenti dando, alias non, quamvis injuria gravissima sit juxta mentem. S. Thom. declaratam utroque per Cajetan.—*Navar.* c. xviii. n. i.

to discretion; and if he do much mischief instead of little, the liar cannot be charged with mortal guilt; for who can condemn any for transgressing bounds that are not set? And how can they think that any injury done by lying can be great, who count it better than innocent (as we saw before) to abuse the world with lies in point of religion? Sure if the injury be not great there, any will be small. And in other matters, they have fair leave to do great hurt by lying; so they do it but by degrees, and be not so hasty as to do it all at once. Take but an instance of it in commerce.<sup>1</sup> To use lies, says de Graffius, in bargaining, to get a good price, or the using of them to deceive others in a little, is but a venial fault, though it were a daily practice. Hostiensis thought that this lying to cheat others, if it were their continual practice, might prove mortal; but he is confuted by the common judgment of their doctors, who hold that a venial, how much soever multiplied or continued, can never become mortal. We see they may lie, and deceive those that deal with them, if they wrong them but a little at once; this they may do daily and continually, and so in time, that little will be much, yet the sin will be no more; the pernicious lie, which does great injury, will be as innocent as any.

Others teach that lying is venial in trading: for example, if one affirm falsely that his wine is so many years old, or of such a country, which, if the buyer know to be a lie, he would not buy it at all, or would not give so much for it, this seems no mortal sin, provided, all circumstances considered, it be as good, and as much worth, or not much less (*Bonacin. de contract. disp. iii., q. i., punct. ii., sect. ii., n. vii.*); or if the sellers affirm with a lie, that the thing cost so much, or was sold to others at such a rate, that they may draw the buyer to a rigorous price; by thus lying, for the most part, they sin but venially, and regularly they are not bound to restitution; because such lies are customary, and men commonly know that these are the tricks of sellers, to which those who deal with them give no credit; and for the same reason the same must be said of buyers, who affirm (falsely) that they bought the thing cheaper, or had it offered them for less, that they may get it at the lowest rate (*Idem ibid., disp. iii., q. i., punct. iv., n. xxxi.*) after others; yea, if they not only lie, but swear false too with some equivocation, they may be probably excused from mortal sin, if no great damage be done thereby to another. But though they have no more regard of truth in common conversation, or in commerce, yet it may be expected that they will be more tender of it in judgment and courts of judicature, since they cannot but acknowledge that the perverting of truth in judgment is destructive of human society, and tends to throw the world into confusion. Notwithstanding, they maintain lying there also, and that in many cases; I shall but mention some of them. 1. To lie in court, if the end of it be but delight,<sup>2</sup> is harmless; also, witnesses may lie there seriously, if they do it not as witnesses, and in matters judicial;<sup>3</sup> and the judge too,<sup>4</sup> if he lie not as a judge. Further, they may bear false witness in favour of another;<sup>5</sup> a false testimony for

<sup>1</sup> Mendaciis uti co fine in venditione, ut pervenire possit ad justum pretium, vel ipsis uti tantum ad decipiendum in modico, peccatum veniale est, quamvis illis assidue utatur: licet Hostiensis dicat esse mortale, si assidue fiat, quod falsum est, quia veniale de se, quantumcumque multiplicetur et continuetur, nunquam fit mortale, ut doctores notant, &c.—*Gaff. l. ii. c. cxviii. n. x.*

Excusari tamen à mortali eum qui utitur amphibologia in contractu cum juramento, &c.—*Idem. tom. ii. disp. iv. q. i. punct. xii. n. vii. ubi Sayrus et alii.*

<sup>2</sup> Durandus et Sylvester.—*Ibid. n. v.*

<sup>3</sup> Navar. secundum Cajetanum, cap. xviii. n. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Mortalia sunt iudicis ut sic mendacia, reliqua sunt per accidens et ideo venialia.—*Cajetan. Sum. v. Mendac.*

<sup>5</sup> Testimonium falsum in favorem proximi, non est mortale: neque adeo quando

my neighbour is not mortal with them ; and the reason is, because the precept forbids false witness *against* another, not *for* him. And upon the same account, Soto says, a false testimony may be excused, when it is to hinder one from doing injury. Likewise, when the matter in judicial process, is not of great consequence, a lie is venial, whether it be for or against another. So Navarre,<sup>1</sup> and in him Ledesma (whom he calls the glory of the Dominican order), with Soto (of the same order and no less renown), maintain that no lie is mortal in any court exterior (that of the judge) or interior (that of the confessor), which is but venial out of court ; so that if the lie be not signally injurious, it is not mortal, however or wherever it be delivered, though by a witness in a trial before a judge in the face of the country. Moreover, it is as innocent in all those cases, wherein the liar is not obliged to speak truth, which are not few. A lie, says Sylvester,<sup>2</sup> in judicial matters, is pernicious and mortal, because it subverts the truth of judgment, which tends to the ruin of the universe. But then he adds, this is to be limited to things in which the liar is bound to speak the truth, and not extended to any other. Now they hold, there are very many cases in which they are not obliged to speak the truth, no, not in courts ; and in all these, by their common doctrine (not that of the Jesuits only), either they may lie plainly, or (which is all one as to the justice of the practice, and as to the subverting of judgment) secretly, by equivocation or mental reservation. Antonius Corduba determines, that a person otherwise virtuous, being unduly interrogated, whether such a thing was done, which confessed might endanger him, he and the witnesses too, if they cannot otherwise evade (by saying, I know not, or I remember not),<sup>3</sup> may say, though it be false, that it was not done, with this reserve, *to discover it unto thee*, and says, such interrogatories may be answered or evaded, by any, with equivocal words in usual form ;<sup>4</sup> so that he is not bound to tell the truth, though he be sworn to declare it. Navarre holds that not only virtuous, but any person whatever, may so answer in like case, denying that to be done which was done, secretly meaning, *in such a month* ; and this he asserts after Gabriel, Paludanus, Adrian, Vincentius Justinianus, and Lopez<sup>5</sup> after him. Sylvester<sup>6</sup> concludes, when the process is not judicial, or the accused not subject to the judge, in this case mentioned, or any

dicitur, ut idem impediatur injuriam facere: quoniam neque hoc est contra ipsum Præceptum, Ex. xx. sub illa forma constituitur ; Non loquaris contra proximum tuum falsum testimonium.—Soto, *ibid.* l. v. q. vii, art. iv.

Victoriæ visum est non esse damnandum de mortali falsitate—qui ut suum tueatur innocentiam, utitur testibus se ultro offerentibus ad testificandum, falsum jurando.—Vide Lopez, *pars.* ii. c. xliv. p. 264.

<sup>1</sup> Concludendo nullum mendacium esse mortale, eo solo, quod, in judicio exteriori, vel interiori dicatur, quod extra illud dictum tale non esset.—Navar. cap. xviii. n. iii. Censeo in judicio mendacium circa rem ad id pertinentem levissimam tamen contingens, non esse mortale crimen quod—ostendunt. Domin. a Soto, Covarruvius, Navar. Graff. l. i. c. xiv. n. vi. et l. ii. c. cxliiii. n. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Mendacium de his quæ ad judicium pertinent est perniciosum et mortale : quia subvertit veritatem judicii, quod tendit in perniciem universitatis, quod limitatur quantum ad ea, in quibus qui mentitur, tenetur dicere veritatem, non aliter.—*Ibid.* n. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Liceret sibi et testibus injustè interrogatis sic respondere, (quando tunc respondere *Nescio, Non recordor* non prodesset), Non furatus sum, intelligendo, ad jure revelandum tibi.—alias tenemur per verba, et modos assuctos, licèt æquivocos, injuste interroganti respondere.—Lopez. cap. li. p. 264.

<sup>4</sup> Angel. Sum. v. Confess. n. i.

<sup>5</sup> Intelligendo intra se quod isto vel illo mense non fucrit res furatus—Navarri opinio testimonii Gabriel Adriani, Paludens et Vincent. Justiniani, rata habetur.—*Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Quum juridice non procedet, vel quia accusatus non est ei subjectus simpliciter vel in hoc casu, aut quacunquæ alia causa, tunc licèt mendacium sic illicitum, non est tamen mortale. Inimò non erit etiam veniale, si respondendo cautissime, et ut aiunt Sophisticæ, dicat aliquid falsum, apud sensum judicis, et apud suum verum ; quia eo casu

other cause whatsoever, though a lie be not lawful, yet it is not mortal; yea, it will not be so much as venial, if answering cautiously, and, as they say, sophistically, he speak that which is false in the judge's sense,<sup>1</sup> and true in his own, since not being under him, he is not obliged to speak truth in his sense; and alleges Henricus de Gandavo, with his reason for it. Soto allows him to use equivocation. Cajetan permits him to deny his complices though he had them. If the judge demand of a priest upon oath, whether he knew such a thing by confession?<sup>2</sup> Aquinas, and all the doctors conclude that he may swear he knows it not, though it hath been confessed to him, because he knows it not *as a man*; and according to Vervecellus, if he cannot otherwise decline the judge, he may answer he knows nothing, with this inward reserve, *as a man*; and in this Richard. de Sancto Victore, Bonaventure, Scotus, and Panormitan agree; yet Angelus thinks, when he swears he knows it not, it had better be with this reserve, *to discover it*, because it cannot be denied, but that he knows it *as a man*;<sup>3</sup> but this, says Sylvester, is said against the judgment of all his doctors, and against the canon law, understood according to their common doctrine, because the priest is there said to know it *as God*. This needs no aggravation; a priest rather than speak the truth (though the discovery of it may be necessary to secure a prince or a nation from ruin),<sup>4</sup> may with mental reservation delude authority and blaspheme God, and lie and swear falsely in open court; and be justified in all, by the authority of the chief saints and doctors that church has had, and such as she gloried in, before Ignatius had any disciples.

But, though truth suffer so much by them in civil things, it may be she may find sanctuary in their divine offices, and be secured there from such shameful violations; no, even there she is prostituted before their altars, in their pulpits, and at their penitential tribunals; their liturgies have been stuffed with fables, and lies made both the ground and part of their public devotion; their own writers<sup>5</sup> take notice of plain lies recited in their daily prayers.<sup>6</sup> And what store of them there were in the whole, we may guess by a part. Peter Abbot of Cluny<sup>7</sup> declares, that in a church-hymn in praise of Saint Bennet, though reading it cursorily, and not marking all, yet he found cum non sit ejus subditus, non tenetur dicere veritatem ad ejus intentionem. Rationem dictorum assignat.—*Hen. de Gan. Sylv. Sum. v. accusatio. n. x.*

<sup>1</sup> Licet ei uti æquivocatione, Soto de just. l. v. q. vi. art. ii. Adrian dicit, talem reum posse dicere Non feci, et Cajetan. Opusc. xvi. q. v. Dicit posse respondere se non habuisse complices, quamvis habuerit, in Tol. Instr. l. v. c. lviii.

Non tenetur respondere etiamsi jurasset dicere veritatem, secundum Henr. de Gand.—sed dicetne mendacium? Resp. quod non, sed utetur aliis verbis duplicibus et simulatis.—*Angel. Sum. v. Confess. n. i.*

<sup>2</sup> Quid si judex instat, vel exigit juramentum à sacerdote an per confessionem sciat aliquid de tali facto? Et dico quod secundum S. Tho. et omnes doctores, sacerdos si ab eo quæretur, de aliquo absente, an aliquid sciat quod audivit in confessione, jurare potest, se nescire illud: quia non scit illud in quantum homo—secundum Vervec. si alio modo iniquum judicem declinare non potest: respondere potest se nihil scire, quia subintelligitur ut homo—et consentit Rich. Bonav. Scot. et Pan. Sylvest. v. confessio iii. n. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Quod ejus dictum est contra omnem doctrinam suorum doctorum et contra C. Si sacerdos, intellectum juxta communem doctrinam: quia ibi dicitur sacerdos hoc scire ut Deus.

<sup>4</sup> Certum est obligationem hujus precepti tantam esse, ut in nullo casu, et propter nullum finem, etiam pro tuenda tota republica ab ingenti malo temporali aut spirituali, violare illud liceat. Ita docent theologi omnes contra unum Altsiod; tenet D. Tho. S. Bonav. Richard, Scotus, Durand. Palud. Major. Capreol. Gabriel, Alensis. Adrian. Medina. Vigner. Sylv. et alii summistæ, omnes Pet. Soto, Domin. Soto, Navar. Covarruv. Simanca. Cajetan. Ledesma. in *Suar.* tom. xxxiv. disp. xxxiii. sect. i. n. ii.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. Espenc. com. in 2 Tom. c. iv. digr. xxi.

<sup>6</sup> Nuper Raphael. Volateranus, ausus est scribere dolendum, aperta in horis Canonicis legi mendacia.—*Ibid.* p. 424.

<sup>7</sup> Nosti quantum me pigeant falsa in Ecclesia Dei cantica, quantum nugæ canoræ

twenty-four lies at least. Some reformation hereof was thought requisite, for shame of the world; but though the old sore smelt noisomely even to the sense of those amongst themselves who had any; yet it must be touched tenderly, and not all the corruption let out, lest nothing at all of the old service should be left. Melchior Canus (a bishop from whom better things might be expected than most in the Council of Trent, where he sat) acknowledged, some years after, that there are things read in their church-service that are uncertain, counterfeit, frivolous, and false too; but yet he thought it not advisable to have this thoroughly purged. Those that attempt it, in his account, want prudence; they cure a sore nail, but mischief the head; they bring in grave stories instead of what were false, but they change the church-service so far from what it was, that scarce any show of the old religion seems left in the daily prayers, whereby he lets us understand what their old religion or religious service is, since so little or nothing of it would be left, if no lies or forgeries were left therein. Another learned bishop of their church, who survived the Trent Council, and all the orders there made for reformation, not only complains still of false and foolish things there, but of something worse too, in these words: If the Bishop of Lyons,<sup>1</sup> says he, who declared that he had corrected superfluous, and ridiculous, and blasphemous things, in their missals and antiphonaries, were now alive, and did behold them, oh, with what terms would he set them out? for our prayers are defiled with most filthy corruptions; but the rest will admit of no reformation through the fault of the bishops. He signifies that there was something worse in their service-books than that idle, false, ridiculous, and blasphemous stuff which that ancient bishop, Agobardus, corrected in the old missals and antiphonaries; declaring expressly that their prayers now were polluted with most filthy corruptions, and that without hope of amendment. Nor is truth more secure amongst them in the pulpit, though that (where it bears any sway at all) is its throne. A preacher may lie, by Cajetan's leave,<sup>2</sup> if he does it not as a preacher, or in things which belong to him as such. In other matters, it seems, he may take his liberty, and lying when he is preaching, will be but venial, unless it be scandalous. He may lie in the pulpit if he can do it wittily, he may mix his sermons with false stories,<sup>3</sup> (if they be facetious) to please his auditory, that is commonly a venial.<sup>4</sup> He

mihi odibiles, inter quas, nam plurimæ sunt—mendacia ad minus xxiv. canticum id, citato percurrens animo, reperi.—*Ibid.* p. 423.

In res sacras hanc quoque mentiendi licentiam irrepisse, seu potius aperte invectam esse.—*Ludovic. Vives*, l. ii. de corruptis artibus, *Espencæ*, in 1 Tim. digr. l. i. c. xi. p. 156.

Quæ in Ecclesia legi solent—quanquam nonnulla ex his incerta sunt, apocrypha, levia, falsa.—*Loc. Theol.* l. xi. c. v. p. 911.

In his prudentia desideratur. Quidam namque dum reduviam curant, capiti incommodant, videlicet historias graves pro apocryphis reddunt quidem, sed divinam Ecclesiæ officium usque eo præter solitum immutant, ut vix ulla antiquæ religionis forma in quotidianis precibus relicta esse videatur.—*Ibid.* p. 910.

<sup>1</sup> Episcopus ille Lugdunensis quia dixit se in missalibus et antiphonariis superflua, levia, falsa, ridicula, blasphemæ phantastica multa correxisse; si nunc viveret et ea conspiceret, Deu immortalem! quo ea nomine depingeret? sunt (enim) preces (nostræ) turpissimis mendis conspurcatæ: com. in Tim. i. l. i. p. 157.—*Espencæ*, in the words of Lindanus.

<sup>2</sup> Sum. v. mendacium, p. 437, Omne mendacium predicatoris contra veritatem spectantem ad predicatoris officium (est mortale)—quoniam hæc tantum sunt predicatoris ut sic—mendacia reliqua sunt per accidens, et ideo venialia: nisi ratione scandali aliud occurrat censendum.

<sup>3</sup> Queritur utrum sit peccatum mortale predicatori mentiri in ambone? et dico quod non, in eis quæ non spectant ad doctrinam, puta, sidicat aliqua jocosa.—*Sylv.* v. Mendac. n. iv.; *Graff.* l. ii. cap. cxliiii. n. v.; *S. Thom.* in opusc. iv. precept. viii.

<sup>4</sup> Immiscere predicationi facetas fabellas delectandi gratia quod B. Ambrosius reprehendit, quia non debent, in tam gravi actione de rebus tam arduis qualia sunt

may tell a tale in his sermon,<sup>1</sup> or anything ridiculous, if he do it with some wit, this is commonly no worse than venial; no, nor so bad, if it be done succinctly, to make the people merry, so the mirth be honest. He may lie too, as a serious divine, and instil false doctrine into the people, without any fault but what is venial, if it be done without contempt or scandal, so Summa Angelica, and Rosella, with others, conclude.<sup>2</sup> They limit it, indeed, to matters under counsel, but this does not much straiten them, for practical divinity being the most proper subject for sermons, and virtues, with Christian duties (and the opposite sins), being, by their common doctrine, in a manner all reduced to counsels, some way or other (as we have shewed before); they have liberty enough left them to do nothing else but lie instead of preaching. But in any matters of divinity whatsoever, speculative or practical, enjoined or but advised, they may lie at as easy a rate, if it be but done out of a fluent faculty, or without danger and design of doing signal mischief.<sup>3</sup> Their practice publicly allowed, has outdone their rules; for these, though licentious enough, must have now and then some show of modesty and caution. Sylvester takes notice of those who held it was no mortal sin to lie in the pulpit,<sup>4</sup> and acted accordingly, and thought themselves concerned, only to avoid such monstrous lies as the people would smell out. But this cautiousness was not always thought needful; he that reads the legends, which served the people heretofore for sermons, will find there multitudes of such stories, so absurdly, ridiculously, horridly false, as may fully convince him that the spirit which acted them was seven times worse than that which inspired Ahab's prophets; and where they are now disused, it is not with any acknowledgment that such notorious lies were not fit to be preached, but for shame of that part of the world which they could no longer delude and abuse. And, even after their reformation, they could not quite leave their old habit; their priests since, have this testimony from one of their own doctors: The law, says he, is perished from priests; for history they recite fables; for serious things, jests; for truth, lies; for the power of God, feigned miracles, not to say the prodigies of devils.<sup>5</sup> That such doctrine should have some confirmation is no more than needs; they provided such as was answerable to it, such are their false miracles, which their (now mentioned) Espencæus calls, devilish prodigies. And false relics, or miracles, they allow to be shewed or published;<sup>6</sup> it is not a mortal sin with them, divina verba, immisceri jocosa et ridicula. Communiter tamen est hoc veniale.—*Cajetan. sum. v. predicat. p. 481.*

<sup>1</sup> Qui concioni fabulam et facetias, aut aliquid ridiculum miscet, peccat quidem juxta S. Antoninum et Cajetanum, sed communiter non plusquam venialiter, juxta eundem, imo non semper venialiter, ut cum ad hilaritatem honestam breviter dicuntur, ut tradit Augustin. *Triumphus.*—*Navar. c. xxv. n. cxlii.*

<sup>2</sup> In pertinentibus ad doctrinam tenent. Sum. Angel. et Rosell. quod non sit mortale, nisi ratione scandali vel contemptus doctrine annexi: vel nisi in his quæ sunt de necessitate faciendi, intellige etiam omittenda, secus si ex consilio.—*Sylvest. v. Mendac. n. iv.*

<sup>3</sup> Peccat qui mentitur in materia fidei, sacræ scripturæ vel morum—quod limitat Cajetanus, non procedere quando id fit per solum multiloquium, vel alias sine animo et periculo nocendi notabiliter.—*Navar. c. xviii. n. iv.*

<sup>4</sup> Credunt non esse mortale mentiri in ambone, nisi ut illi dicunt, predicant maximas falsitates, quæ deinde à sæcularibus deprehenduntur.—*Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Verum lex perit à sacerdotibus; recitant pro historia fabulas, pro seriis joca, pro veritate mendacium,—pro virtute Dei fictitia miracula, ne dicam portenta Dæmoniorum.—*Espencæus, Scrm. i. De officio pastorum.*

After he hath premised something of the preaching and writing of false miracles, he adds: At facilius Augeæ stabulum, quam talibus fabellis multorum tum libros, tum conciones repurges, in 2 Tim. c. iv. digr. xxi. p. 424.

<sup>6</sup> Peccat qui utitur falsis reliquiis aut veris, causa turpis quæstus. *Navar. cap. xvii. n. clxix.*; *Graff. l. ii. c. cxxxiv. n. xxx.* Idem dic de illo, qui utitur falsis reliquiis, si causa turpis quæstus fiat, id est, eo fine aliquod accipiendi pro ostensionem earum.

unless it be done for filthy lucre, and it is not filthy lucre, if it be done principally for a good end, and less principally for gain.<sup>1</sup>

And now I cannot devise where there can be any expectation that they will be restrained from lying, unless in their sacrament of penance, that is, in their account, the holiest rite, wherein the partakers have liberty of speech. Here they confess sin, and profess to do it with a sincere abhorrence of it, as before God, in order to pardon, which they then expect. One would think, in this act, at least, they should count themselves obliged to be far from such a crime as offering violence to truth; but hereby it appears that truth can in no wise be fastened to any part of their religion, they let us know that there is nothing so holy amongst them where they will not find a place for lying and deceit, and that wherever they have liberty of speech they must have leave to lie. It is the common doctrine that they may lie in confession,<sup>2</sup> which yet they say is directed principally to God, and they look upon the confessor's chair as the divine tribunal. The confitent may deny that ever he committed those venial sins which he is guilty of,<sup>3</sup> or affirm he is guilty when he is not,<sup>4</sup> or he may deny either venial or mortal sin to his confessor, if he be not sufficient.<sup>5</sup> Or he may deny that ever he acted those mortal sins which he has committed, if he has confessed them to another.<sup>6</sup> And thus he may without mortal sin delude and cheat his confessor, even when he is upon his knees before him, and looks upon him as God and not as man (for so they are taught to do, as we said before). To this purpose, when their purpose is too shameful to be made known to a sober priest, a person may have two confessors;<sup>7</sup> one a lewd fellow like himself, to whom he may, without shame, confess the worst debauches; and the other more civil, to whom he may confess his lesser sins, denying, if he be asked, that he is guilty of any greater. And as they may abuse their confessors with plain lies, so likewise with equivocations. Joh. Sanchez (no Jesuit) offers us several instances (Select. Disp. ix.) He that is not able to make restitution, may affirm he has done it, if he think his confessor be ignorant, and would not absolve him without it. He that is accustomed to some wickedness, and thinks the confessor would not absolve him if he con-

<sup>1</sup> Navar. *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Angelus, v. Confess. Sylvest. v. Confess. i. n. ix. Nav. c. xxi. n. xxxvii. Graff. l. i. c. xiv. n. vi. Covarruvius. Pet. Soto in Victorcl. p. 530. Bannes, Salonijs, &c. in Fill. tr. iv. n. xliv. alij in Suar. tom. iv. disp. xxii. sect. x.

Cirea eas circumstantias, quæ nullo modo pertinent ad materiam confessionis—non est peccatum mortale miscere aliquod mendacium, sive affirmando sive negando; sed est veniale gravius quam esset simile mendacium extra illum actum. In hoc conveniunt omnes doctores citandi (viz. Richardus Paludan. Bonavent. Cajetan. Ledesma, Armilla, Angelus, Sylvest. Soto, Navar. Pet. Soto).—*Idem. ibid.* iii. et vi.

<sup>3</sup> Navar. *ibid.* n. xxxvii. Soto in opusc. de secret. memb. ii. vii. Sylvest. *ibid.* Est certum mentiri in materia non necessaria negando factum, non esse peccatum mortale, in quo etiam omnes conveniunt quos statim referemus (viz. jam laudati).—*Suar. ibid.* n. iv.

<sup>4</sup> Mendacium affirmativum de peccato veniali—non esse peccatum mortale per se loquendo, hoc est secluso scandalo et contemptu, tenet Angelus, Sylvester, Soto, Petrus, Soto, Navar.—*Idem. ibid.* n. vii.

<sup>5</sup> Sylvest. *ibid.* vel affirmando.—*Idem in Suar. ibid.* n. x.

<sup>6</sup> Non peccare mortaliter, ut diximus, confitentem negantem se admisisse peccatum mortale, alias legitime confessum.—*Navar. ibid.* n. xxxviii.

<sup>7</sup> Unde sequitur non peccare mortaliter eos, qui ne suam existimationem honestam amittant, confessario cuidem familiari suo confitentur omnia peccata sua, etiam obscena, et postea alteri probato et gravi solum leviora, quod de se non est malum, et si finis venialis fuerit, peccatum veniale crit, et si mortalis, mortale, et si bonus, qualis frequenter est, sanctus et probus, immo interdum necessarius. *Idem ibid.* n. xl.; vid. Sylvest. *ibid.* n. viii.; Bonacina (et in eo Victoria cum alijs), tom. i. disp. v. q. vi. sect. ii. punct. ii.

fessed it, may with equivocation deny it is his custom; to this sense, I have no such custom, not absolutely, but which I will confess at present, n. vii.; yea he may deny it, though he believe the priest would absolve him, n. viii. Also he that is in the next occasion to sin, which he cannot avoid without great inconvenience or scandal, may, using equivocation, deny it, n. ix. Or if the penitent be known to the confessor, who well understands that he has a sister with whom he commits uncleanness, not removed out of his house, and so will not believe but he is in such occasion to sin, he may feign himself to be another, changing his voice, habit, name, country, and the like, without plain lying, yet using equivocation (n. x. after Navarre); yea, though he be a religious person he may do thus, and deny his order with equivocation (*Ibid*). And as the penitents may thus delude their confessors, so they may have their satisfaction on them, and delude them likewise; pretending to absolve them when they neither do it nor intend it (*Idem*. disp. xxxv. n. i., n. vii. and viii.; *Antonin. Dian. resol.* v. equiv). Let the world judge where we may be assured of truth and honesty in Romanists, that walk by these rules (which the holiest of their doctors give them), since they think not themselves obliged thereto in any of the cases specified. If by their doctrine they may without danger be false to private persons, to magistrates, to their priests, to their God, where can they have credit? If they may practise lying and deceit in common conversation, in commerce, in doctrine, in worship, in courts of justice, and before that which they count God's tribunal, where may they be trusted?

*Sect.* 10. They give as much liberty to violate faith as truth, and no less encouragement to perfidiousness and breach of promises; either where faith is engaged mutually, as in compacts and agreements, or singly, as in solicitations. They distinguish perfidiousness as they do lying, and accordingly make the like decisions for both. There is a pleasant perfidiousness, another which they call officious, and a third pernicious. To be perfidious merely for delight is venial; to deal perfidiously, if it be for the advantage of any, and no great hurt to others, is as harmless; and they have ways enow to make that which is pernicious pass for innocent. Cajetan gives this reason why the two former sorts of perfidiousness are but venial: because from a simple promise no duty ariseth but that natural duty of not telling a lie; for in each is a moral duty, without which moral honesty cannot be preserved; and both are reduced to the same virtue, to wit, that of veracity; and both respect others, being for the society, and advantage, and conversation of mankind.<sup>1</sup> One would think those who regard natural duty, moral honesty, or veracity, and human society, should for this reason rather judge both to be great crimes, than either of them petty faults. But let us take notice of their rules for conscience in this matter. To make a promise without an intent to be obliged, is but venial,<sup>2</sup> if no great hurt be done or intended to others. He promiseth, but while he is doing it intends not to perform, though he make others believe so, nor to be obliged to it by that which should engage any one who has faith and honesty; and yet offends but venially. If all men should take the liberty which this rule gives Roman catholics,<sup>3</sup> human society would disband; all confidence on

<sup>1</sup> *Perfidia quidem jocosa et officiosa venialis; quoniam ex simplici promissione non nascitur majus debitum, quam sit naturale debitum non mentiendi: nam utrumque debitum est debitum morale, sine quo morum honestas salvari nequit; et ad eandem virtutem reduci creditur, scil. ad virtutem veracitatis: et utrumque ad alterum est, pro convictu, utilitate et conversatione humana.—Sum. v. perfidia. p. 460.*

<sup>2</sup> *Navar. c. xviii. n. vi.: Sylvester, v. pact. iv.; Angelus, Sum. v. pactum.*

<sup>3</sup> *Nisi fide stet republica, opibus non stabit.—Liv. iii. doc. l. i. Fides hæc non solum ad justitiam attinet, verum est ipsissimum justitiæ fundamentum.—Cicer. i. de off.*

promises and assurances vanisheth, thereby I can never be sure of another, nor he of me. That which Navarre, after many others, determines elsewhere, does it more fully. He that promiseth anything outwardly without any intention to promise, if he be asked whether he promised, he may deny it, understanding that he made not any promise that was obliging, and he may swear it too.<sup>1</sup> He may promise, and yet not intend to promise, and so cheat; he may deny that he promised, and so lie; and swear that he did it not when he did it, and so be perjured innocently, because he promised as a perfidious knave. Sylvester inquires, whether one by a promise alone or a compact be obliged in conscience? He answers he is bound, under pain of mortal sin, if it be of important matters;<sup>2</sup> signifying that in other matters it is no mortal sin to break promises or agreements. And Navarre expresses their common opinion when he tells us, that the violation of a promise in a small matter is not mortal, though it be venial.<sup>3</sup> But why should perfidiousness be a crime in great things and not in lesser; since it is no less perfidiousness in one than the other, and faith and truth is equally violated in both? The reason they give is, because in great matters there is injustice; great wrong is done, and so by accident perfidiousness becomes criminal;<sup>4</sup> from whence it follows, that perfidiousness, how great soever, without the addition of injustice, is no crime; a man may be as treacherous and faithless as he will, if he be not withal unjust too, there is no danger. And so the world must believe that they would oblige men to be just, though not to truth or faithfulness; as if those who may by their rules without scruple be false and faithless, will make any conscience, or find any more reason, to be just and righteous. However they teach that they who promise but small things, and perform not, are excused from mortal sin, though they confirm the promise with an oath or a vow.<sup>5</sup> Whether the thing promised be little or great, if it be an internal promise, though an oath be added not to revoke it, yet it obliges not, but may be revoked without mortal sin. (*Panormitan. Jason. Rebellus et alii cum Bonacin de contract. disp. iii., q. xii., punct. ii., n. i. and iii.*) Yea, if it be made in the form of a vow, yet when it is of a thing indifferent or less good; as if a man inwardly promise to marry such a woman, and promise it to God, too, it does not oblige him (*Idem. ibid., n. ii.*). And how can it be expected they should be faithful as to any engagement to man, who think they are not bound to observe truth or faith with God, how much soever concerned, either as a witness (in oaths) or as a party (in vows)? Well, but when the matter is of great importance may they not then break promises, bargains, or compact, may not perfidiousness, which themselves account pernicious, pass commonly for an innocent venial? Yes, they have ways enough ready to make this current at so easy a rate. The worst perfidiousness in the world may be excused from mortal

Periret convictus humanus et fides, si sibi persuaderent hominus, in promissis frangere fidem, et verba dare non esse genere suo plusquam veniale.—*Lopez. p. ii. c. xxx.*

<sup>1</sup> Qui promisit exterius aliquid absque intentione promittendi, si interrogatur, an promiserit, negare potest, intelligendo, se non promississe promissione obligante, et sic etiam jurare. Vid. Navar. in c. *humane aures* xxii. q. v. q. i. et ii. pro hac doctrina adducit S. Thom. Scotum, Paludan. Ricard. de Sancto Victore. Major. Adrian. et alios.

<sup>2</sup> Quæritur utrum ex sola promissione sive ex pacto, quis obligetur in conscientia: et dico quod sic, sub peccato mortali, in rebus scilicet alicujus importantiæ.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Nec violatio promissæ rei exiguæ erit mortalis, quamvis venialis sit. c. xviii. n. vii. Soto, Canus, Victoria, Sylvester, in *Lopez. pars ii. c. xxx.*

<sup>4</sup> Quando non per se est perfidus, non incurret mortale, nisi per accidens, hoc est, propter notabile nocumentum seu scandalum.—*Cajetan. v. perfidia.*

<sup>5</sup> A mortali excusantur qui—parva pollicentur (et non implent) etiamsi juramento, aut voto id ipsum confirmassent, secundum eos quos sequimur (viz. Antonin. Sylvest. Soto).—*Navar. c. xviii. n. vii. c. xii. n. x.*

guilt, according to Cajetan, through ignorance of the fact, or through forgetfulness (if one forget to be honest, he may be innocently a knave); or out of confidence in him to whom he is engaged (the good nature of one party concerned may be a warrant to the other to break faith with him); or for any cause which he thinks reasonable.<sup>1</sup> He need have said no more than this, any one may violate all truth and faith, not only when there is some reasonable cause, but when there is any that seems but so to him, when anything will seem so to him who is disposed to play the knave. This is enough to license a world of perfidiousness; but this is not all. Sylvester after others tells us a man is not obliged to perform promise or compact, if he had not a mind to oblige himself thereby, yea, or if he had a mind to dissemble (to feign that he is engaged when he did not mean it); for, says he, though he offend, yet he is not obliged, unless there was a cause from some command which of itself would oblige him; as for example, if he had promised clothes to his father, and he is now starving for cold.<sup>2</sup> In such a case (would ye think it?) one may be bound to keep his promise, to wit, when he would have been a monster if he had not done the thing though he had never promised it! He tells us elsewhere, that a promise does oblige when it is made to a city, or an university, the clergy, the church, or the poor of a certain place, in case it be for some cause, to wit, for the honour of God, or the like; but if there be no cause it does not bind, though it be made to those fore-mentioned; and it does not bind, when it is made to any other besides those, though there be cause for it.<sup>3</sup> Others<sup>4</sup> maintain that a promise or compact does not oblige in conscience to performance, if the cause why it is made be not expressed; so Panormitan, Angelus, and Rosella, with others. So that if a man forbear but to mention the cause (which is most commonly done, and may be always); though he bind himself with ten thousand promises or covenants, he may with a safe conscience break them all, by their rules. They hold that the firmest promise does but bind under venial guilt. (*Cajetan, Armilla, Rebellus, Garzias, in Bonacin. ibid.*, n. xii.) Or if it did of itself oblige further, yet he that intends to bind himself no otherwise, may break any promise without any more than venial guilt, whether the matter be small or great which is promised (*Ibid.*, n. xii.). Lopez, that a promise may bind under mortal guilt, concludes it requisite that he who makes it should have a mind to be so bound by it; and so in promising (as he says), unless there be an oath to confirm the promise, or a writing, as is usual, they are not thought to oblige themselves to mortal

<sup>1</sup> Excusatur à mortali—ex parte formæ, hoc est quia non per se, seu ex intentione peccatum illud fit—sed ex oblivione, aut ignorantia facti, aut ex fiducia quam accipit de eo cui promisit, aut ex causa quæ sibi videtur rationabilis.—*Sum. v. perfidia.*

<sup>2</sup> Est theologorum doctrina (quod obligatur) si habuit animum se obligandi; secus si habuit animum essendi liber usque ad redditionem: vel si habuit animam fingendi: quia licet peccet non obligatur tamen, nisi subesset causa de se ex præcepto obligans: puta, si promissa est patri vestis, et frigoribus alget.—*Ibid. n. iv.* Alias si non habuit animum obligandi, non tenetur sub pœna mortalis peccati ad pactum nudum servandam: nisi subesset causa quæ ad hoc obligaret de necessitate præcepti, puta, promisi patri meo vestem, qui moritur ex frigore, quoniam tenetur quauvis non habuerit animum obligandi se.—*Angel. Sum. v. pactum. n. iv.*

<sup>3</sup> Utrum autem quis obligatur ex pollicitatione? et dico quod sic, quando pollicetur civitati, universitati, clero, ecclesiæ, vel pauperibus alicujus loci, et ex causa: puta, ad honorem Dei et hujusmodi: secus si fiat prædictis sine causa: vel aliis à prædictis etiam cum causa: quia non obligatur, nisi prætextu promissionis aliquid cæperit.—*Ibid. v. pollicitatio.* Ità et eisdem verbis.—*Angelus. Sum. v. pollicitatio.*

<sup>4</sup> In Sylvest. *ibid. v. pactum. n. iv.*, Promissio sive pactum obligat in conscientia—hoc autem *Sum. Ang. et Rosell. et est limitatio Coll. quem sequitur Panor. quando exprimitur causa promittendi.*

sin; and by this, says he, a multitude of scruples is removed.<sup>1</sup> And he says true, for hereby a man may without any scruple break any promises that are not under his hand or oath.<sup>2</sup> But what if he had no mind so to oblige himself by his oath or writing? Why, then, by his own rule, he is no more bound by his written or sworn promise than by any other. To this purpose he concludes again, that he who promises in word, without mind or intention to oblige himself, is not bound in conscience to perform it;<sup>3</sup> and this is their common doctrine. So that if a man intend not to be honest, he need not be so, whatever he promise. These rules observed are more than sufficient to excuse men from all faith and honesty in contracts and promises of all sorts; to fill the world with cheats and perfidiousness; to take away all confidence and security from men in dealing one with another; to ruin human society; and to render Roman catholics less conscientious, and more faithless and intolerable to mankind, than sober heathens; nor are they more like the rules of Christianity than those which bid defiance to it.

*Sect. 11.* Hitherto, thus much of deceit and lies, in word and promises, &c. Hypocrisy is a lie indeed; both are equally sinful. Aquinas,<sup>4</sup> after some of the ancients, asserts that it is all alike to lie in deeds as in words: as that is a composing of words, so this of acts, to signify and make one believe what is false: both are used as instruments of deceit, and it is all one which way you cozen another, so he be but cheated, as it is all one whether you kill a man with a sword or an axe, as they express it; and both by their doctrine are made venial. Sylvester inquires whether to make a false show of sanctity be a sin?<sup>5</sup> He answers that if it be for the honour of God, and the profit of others, it is no sin; but if it be to palliate his own wickedness, and that he may be accounted good, then it is a sin, because it is a false ostentation of sanctity. But so is the other too, which yet with him is no sin; either both must be acquitted, or neither. So Cajetan<sup>6</sup> will have it to be evil, though the end be good; because we must not do evil, that good may ensue. But they agree, and it is their common doctrine, that bare hypocrisy, when one feigns he is good and is not, or better than he is, is no mortal evil, though it hath the force of a lie,<sup>7</sup> and be designed to deceive

<sup>1</sup> Ut sit vera requiritur primo quod adsit animus in promittente, dum promittit, obligandi se ad mortale. Et sic inter promittendum, nisi adhibuerit juramentum promissionis confirmatorium, vel scripturam ut pro more hominum contingit, fit ut non se ceaseant obligare ad culpam mortalem. Hinc tollitur scrupulorum multitudo.—*Pars. ii. cap. xxx. p. 175.*

<sup>2</sup> Promissio obligat nisi non habuisti animum te obligandi, sed solum proposuisti facere.—*Navar. Garzias in Sa. v. promiss.* Vix autem quis promittentium obligari intendit, nisi juret aut faciat instrumentum.—*Idem, ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Qui dum aliquid promittit verbo tenus, animo et intentione se obligandi caret, non fit reus in conscientia obligationis promissi.—*Idem, ibid. p. 176.*

Secundum communiter theologos, nemo ex quacunque promissione obligatur, nisi qui habuit animum obligandi se.—*Angel. Sum. v. pactum. n. iv.*

<sup>4</sup> Paria esse factis aut verbis mentiri, vid. *Navar. cap. xviii. n. viii.*

Non solum in verbo, sed etiam in facto, mendacium consistit, cum in utroque sit eadem intentio fallendi, uterque æqualiter peccat, quia verbum et factum assumuntur ut instrumentum fallendi: nec refert quantum ad peccatum, verbo, nutu, vel facto mentiri; sicut nec quantum ad homicidium, uti gladio vel securi.—*Sylvest. Sum. v. mendacium, n. v.*

<sup>5</sup> Sum. v. simulatio n. iv. Ut pallietur iniquitas, et ipse bonus putetur, quod est peccatum—ad honorem Dei, et proximorum ædificationem—et hoc non est peccatum.

<sup>6</sup> Si finis ille sit bonus (puta, ad ædificationem aliorum) nihilominus peccatum est, quia non sunt facienda mala ut bona eveniant.—*Sum. v. hypocrisis. p. 340.*

<sup>7</sup> Solummodo intendit simulare se bonum seu meliorem quam sit, et hoc hypocrisis si nuda sit, licet non sit peccatum mortale, est tamen peccatum, quia mendacii vim habet.—*Cajetan, ibid. Sylvest, ibid. Navar. c. xviii. n. viii.*

others,<sup>1</sup> otherwise it would not be so bad as a venial.<sup>2</sup> Although he delight in thus playing the hypocrite, it will not be worse; this is but vanity, not wickedness, unless it be for an end mortally wicked, such as will make an act, otherwise indifferent, to be criminal. But if he made this false and deceiving show for an evil end,<sup>3</sup> to wit, for vain glory, so long as it is not made his last end (to wit, his God), such vain glorious hypocrisy will be no worse; for though the sin, says Cajetan, be here doubled, yet the double sin is but a single venial. And if he do those works which are naturally ordained for the service of God with an intention not to serve him,<sup>4</sup> but for glory from men, it is but such hypocrisy, and that with some extenuation; it is not so bad explicitly, seeing the intention to deceive is but implicit. They have a reverence for hypocrisy as a holy art: they honour it and their church with the same title, both being holy alike (so much alike, some will think, that it is hard to know the one from the other). They extol their great saints from their holy hypocrisy. It is amongst the commendations of Saint Dominic himself. Vincentius, Bishop of Beauvois, in his praises, spends one chapter upon this subject, *de sancta ejus hypocrisi*, shewing that it was not only the practice of their saint, but that he commended the holy thing to his brethren, the friars predicant. Hypocrisy being such a holy quality in their account, and a special ornament of their greatest saints, no wonder if they be so far from branding it as a crime, that they declare it meritorious. A religious person that feigns himself to have more holiness than he hath, that others may be edified, sins not, but rather merits (so Rosella v. Hypoer. n. i.) Thus they give us warning not to trust any shows of sanctity or mortification amongst them, since they are so far from counting it a sin, that they conclude it meritorious even for their religious to deceive others, with hypocritical ostentation of what holiness they have not. Indeed the Romanists are concerned to speak favourably of hypocrisy, and treat it with kindness; for since they require no more truth and sincerity in their dealings with men, and make no more than exterior shows of piety (if so much) needful in the worship of God, and yet would be accounted the best or only true Christians on earth; if they should condemn hypocrisy as a mortal sin, that religion and righteousness, which their church counts sufficient, would be branded by themselves as damnably criminal.

*Sect. 12.* Disgracing and defaming others to their face by contumelies, or behind their backs by detraction; reproaching them with charges true or false, to the impairing or ruining of their esteem or credit (though some of them say this is worse than theft or robbery, and others make it worse than adultery; and in the canon law such are called murders; yet) is allowed under the notion of a venial in so many cases, that he who is addicted thereto may satisfy his humour fully in the practice of it without scruple. It is a maxim with them that the quality of sins in words is regulated by the

<sup>1</sup> *Facere opera quibus bonus appareat, cum non sit, sine intentione ostendendi se bonum, non est etiam veniale, juxta mentem omnium.—Idem, ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *Alias erit veniale, puta, cum in ipsa fictione delectetur,—magis vanus videtur quam malus.—Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Si autem finis ille sit vana gloria, non tamen ita quod in ea ponatur ultimus finis, peccatum est veniale quidem sed duplicatum.—Cajetan, ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Qui opera ad Dei servitium naturaliter ordinata (ut sunt jejuniun, oratio, elemosyna) facit ex intentione non serviendi Deo, sed ob gloriam humanam, hypocrisis peccatum incurrit formaliter, implicite tamen.—Cajetan, ibid. p. 341.*

Nonnunquam etiam fratres suos admonuisse, ut aliquam ostenderent virtutis apparentiam in abstinentiis, vigiliis, verborum ac gestorum disciplina, quum apud sæculares essent; et sic eos sancta quadam hypocrisi, ad fidei reverentiam, et virtutis amorem propensius invitarent.—*Specul. histor. l. xix. c. cv.*

intention.<sup>1</sup> It is this that gives this sin, and others besides, their formality (which Cajetan often inculcates); and without that they are no sins, or but venial. Hence he tells us that the contempt of our neighbour is a mortal sin, speaking formally, that is, with an intention of contemning him; for no man formally contemns another, but he that despises him, that he may despise him; so no man is a detractor formally, but he that backbites, that he may backbite; and no man is formally contumelious but he that speaks reproachfully that he may reproach.<sup>2</sup> So that if he intend not thus to sin, let him say what he will against his neighbour, he is not guilty of the sin formally and in deed. Accordingly he tells us that materially (*i. e.* without intention of dishonouring another) contumelious words may be spoken, either without any sin, or any but what is venial.<sup>3</sup> It is true, some of them say words may be a crime, if they grievously defame a person, though they be uttered without a design to do it; but then withal they allow of such reproaches as venial, which are of no better consequence, but tend to disgrace him effectually. To reproach him with natural defects of mind, or body, or birth, is regularly but venial. All agree in this, says Sairus: To charge him with ignorance, to say he has little wit and small judgment, to call him a fool, or an hermaphrodite, or a bastard, though the charge be false. To report one to be infected with the French disease is but venial, because that is no great disgrace. (Pet. Navar. Sairus, et alii communiter in Bonacin. *ibid.* n. ix.)<sup>4</sup> Also to charge him falsely with any wickedness which they count venial.<sup>5</sup> Thus they may calumniate any man, and without crime charge him falsely as a blasphemmer, a thief, a liar, a perjured person, a cheat, &c., since they count these in many degrees venial; and if they be consistent with the honour and reputation of Roman catholics, yet others, either Christian or heathen, will think their credit blasted with such imputations. Likewise to revile one in such terms as may signify either great or lesser crimes, to accuse him as one greatly proud, covetous, wrathful, or anything whatsoever which may denote either the natural inclination and first motions or the outward acts, this is not mortal, because the hearers are to put the better construction on it.<sup>6</sup> And here is liberty enough to calumniate in such terms as may ruin any person's reputation, upon a presumption that all who hear the slander will be always so wise and good as any rarely are. Or if a man be noted for wickedness already, you may charge him with crimes that are not known, and yet offend but venially, be-

<sup>1</sup> Aquinas, et Alexander Alensis, in Sylv. Sum. v. contumel. n. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Hinc patet quod contemptus proximi est peccatum mortale formaliter loquendo, hoc est ex intentione contemnendi. Nullus enim formaliter contemnit proximum, nisi qui spernit proximum ut spernat proximum: sicut nullus detrahit formaliter, nisi qui detrahit ut detrahat, &c.—Cajetan, Sum. v. contemptus.

<sup>3</sup> Materialiter (hoc est non ex intentione dehonorendi) possunt verba contumeliosa etiam absque ullo peccato dici.—*Ibid.* v. contumelia, *Soto de Just.* l. v. q. x. art. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Lib. xi. c. vi. n. iv.

<sup>5</sup> Detegere falso defectus naturales, puta quod est luscus, claudus, mancus, gibbosus, ignarus, et alia hujusmodi, quæ non pertinent ad bonam famam morum, non est suo genere, nec regulariter mortale.—Navar, cap. xviii. n. xxiii. Vid. Bonacin. de restit. disp. ii. q. iv. punct. ii.

<sup>6</sup> Imponere vel detegere veniale, non est de se mortale.—*Idem*, Navar, *ibid.* n. xxiv. Sylvest. Sum. v. detractio n. ii., non esse mortale in his quæ sunt modicæ importantiæ, ut venialia quæ communitur non infamant secundum Antoninum, et Angelum, Sum. v. detract. n. ii.; Pet. Navar, Arragon. in Bonacin. *ibid.* n. vi. et alii communiter.

<sup>6</sup> Qui ex loquacitate profert ea, quæ et pro mortali et pro veniali possunt accipi, ut dicendo talis est magnus, superbus, avarus, iracundus, vel hujusmodi, quæ sumi possunt et pro naturali inclinatione et motu primo, non peccat mortaliter; quia audientes debent in meliorem partem interpretari.—*Sylvest.* secundum Antoninum, *ibid.*; Angelus, *ibid.*; Graff. l. ii. cap. cxxxvii. n. xxvi; Pet. Navar, Sairus, Arragon, et alii communiter in Bonacin. *ibid.*

cause you cannot hurt his reputation, which is hurt already;<sup>1</sup> as if, when a man has dangerously wounded himself, you might give him more wounds and despatch him, when life and fame are of like account; or you may charge those falsely for committing a crime when they did it not, if it hath been their practice before;<sup>2</sup> or you may charge them with any crimes that are secret, if they be less than those that are known;<sup>3</sup> as if one had been guilty of murder, you may accuse him of theft, and if he hath stolen, you may accuse him of fornication, and if he be a heretic you may charge him with anything, since with them nothing is worse than what they count heresy. Or you may accuse others of any wickedness, which such sort of persons seem to make nothing of, as some young men of fornication, and others of adulteries.<sup>4</sup> Further, any terms tending to defame others may be used in passion, such as hinders full deliberation, for these will excuse blasphemy against God, much more the worst reproaches of men; or you may do it in jest, with moderate facetiousness, when the reproach is set off neatly;<sup>5</sup> then it is a virtue with those who learn their divinity of Aristotle rather than the apostle, and think if a man hath wit he needs herein have no conscience. Or you may do it out of levity or pleasure in tattling, unless the words be so exasperating as to occasion some other deadly evil;<sup>6</sup> or it may be done by way of recital, suggesting what tends to blast them as reported by others;<sup>7</sup> or when the defamer is not believed, or gives no just cause of belief;<sup>8</sup> or for correction, for they may defame others to amend them and reform them by making them worse than they are.<sup>9</sup> Or through some want of cautiousness, as amongst women and persons of inferior rank, who vent what reproachful language comes next, how injurious soever;<sup>10</sup> or when their reputation does hurt, and may seduce others, to defame them is absolutely lawful, *eos defamare esse licitum, absolute respondet Adrianus in Soto, ibid. q. x. art. ii.* Or (to add no more) if one accuse others whom they think he ought not, though he impute nothing to them but what is true, they may charge him with false crimes; this will be no worse than a venial fault (*Bannes, xxii. q. lxx. art. iii. p. ii.*) Thus, as in other cases, so

<sup>1</sup> Si ille cui dicit habebat eum pro scelerato: quia jam infamatus erat apud eum de aliis, et si non de isto.—*Angelus, ibid.* Idem est in mortalibus notoriis, secundum Archiepiscopum, quia non læditur fama jam læsa.—*Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Mentitus est meretricem tali nocte admisisse lenonem, eo casu non restituere famam, non est peccatum mortale.—*Graff. ibid. n. xxii. secundum Cajetanum.* Excusatur à peccato mortali, qui aliquem infamavit cum secundum suam existimationem illa non esset infamia.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Idem esset in criminibus mortalibus etiam occultis, si sunt minora notoriis, sicut non est infamia notorio homicidæ et furi, quod sit fornicatus.—*Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Si sunt personæ quarum famam simplex fornicatio in nullo lædit, ut juvenes sæculares—quod simile est de adulterio apud multos.—*Graff. ibid.* (juxta Cajetanum) n. xxviii.

<sup>5</sup> Respondetur quod convitiari, secundum Arist. iv. Ethic. c. viii., eatenus est virtutis Eutrapeliæ, quatenus intra limites moderatæ facetiæ continetur: quando scilicet urbanitatis venustas in convitio adest.—*Soto de Just. l. v. q. ix. art. ii. p. 172.*

<sup>6</sup> Si autem ex animi levitate loquendive libidine ore labatur in summa, si propter aliquam causam non necessariam fiat: peccatum est plurimum veniale.—*Idem, ibid. q. x. art. ii.; Cajetan, Sum. v. contumel.*

<sup>7</sup> Idem esse (veniale) secundum Scotum, quum ex loquacitate dicuntur infamatoria recitative.—*Sylvest. ibid. Cajetan. in xxii. q. lxxiii. art. ii.*

<sup>8</sup> Quoties non dedit justam causam credendi, vel non fuit ei adhibita fides.—*Graff. ibid. n. xxiii.*

<sup>9</sup> Nec qui per fraternam correctionem aliquem infamavit, et ad majorem emendam, &c.—*Idem, ibid. n. xxiv.; Soto, ibid. q. ix. art. ii.*

<sup>10</sup> Ubi vero nonnullus est cautelæ defectus, plurimum, consuevit esse veniale, ut sæpe inter mulierculas contingit, et homines infimæ classis, qui invicem se convitiis conspergunt, ut in buccam veniunt.—*Soto, ibid. Graff. ibid. n. ix.*

when anything is said or writ to the disparagement of their church or themselves, how justly and truly soever; if they fix upon the authors the most odious imputations that can be invented (such as Bolsee and Cochleus would have fastened upon Luther and Calvin), and divulge them with a design to delude the world into a belief thereof, though their own consciences tell them there is not a syllable of truth therein, yet they incur no fault thereby that a good catholic need fear or make conscience of. This is not only the opinion of the Jesuits, but the common doctrine of Aquinas his disciples, as Ledesma, a Dominican, assures us; and so we may spare those more than twenty doctors, which, Caramuel says, assert it. Hereby they give warning to mankind, that they are no more to be trusted in their charges against their opposers, to vindicate the reputation of themselves or their church, than such persons will be trusted in a court which openly sentenced them to the pillory for false testimony; yea, in this maxim they have as good as set themselves upon a pillory, and done that justice to the world as to fix this inscription upon their own foreheads, We are they who declare it no crime to calumniate most odiously and falsely whoever speak ill (how truly soever) of us and our church. These are some of their methods for destroying the honour and reputation of others, without any fault which they regard; they deliver them in great variety, so that every one so disposed may serve himself of such as suit his humour. And as a man may defame others, so he may do the same good office for himself,<sup>1</sup> not only by blazoning his secret wickedness, but by charging himself falsely with crimes he never acted; thus to impair or utterly ruin his own credit, is but regularly a venial fault, according to Adrian and Sotus and others; for prodigality is but a venial, and this is but to be prodigal of one's credit.

*Sect. 13.* Flattery also (that falseness of every sort, even the vilest, may not miss of their favour and encouragement) is reconciled to common practise under the notion of a venial. To praise one for the virtue which he has not, or the good that he does not, is little or no fault.<sup>2</sup> To extol the good he does above measure and desert, is as innocent; yea, when a man is to be praised for a good work, though you know he will thereby be transported with deadly pride, such as will destroy his soul, yet you should not desist, but may and ought to lay aside the sense of his future ruin, because (says Cardinal Cajetan) there are twelve hours in the day, and a man may in an instant be illuminated and changed by divine mercy.<sup>3</sup> To applaud one for his sins, if they be not mortal, is as harmless, when it is out of a design to please the sinner without ruining him, or to gain some advantage by such flattery;<sup>4</sup> so that when it is both wicked and sordid at once, yet will

<sup>1</sup> Detegere propria peccata vera et secreta, et imponere sibi falsa, suo genere et regulariter non est nisi veniale; quamvis per illud notabiliter fama lædatur, aut omnino amittatur, ut Magister Sotus explicuit, et multo ante Adrianus sensit. Navar. cap. xviii. n. xxvii. et xxiv. et xxviii. Prodigalitas regulariter non est peccatum mortale, ut S. Thom. et detectio proprii peccati non est injustitia, sed prodigalitas famæ.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Est adulatio prima, quando quis adulatur, vel attribuit alicui bonum virtutis, quod ille non habet. Secunda quando nimium vel ultra debitum extollit bonum, quod habet, et utrumque istorum est veniale.—*Graff. decis. pars. ii. l. iii. c. iii. n. v.*

<sup>3</sup> Quum aliquis debet ex officio aliquem de bono aliquo opere laudare, etiamsi si sciat laudatum in superbiam mortalem se elaturum, non tenetur propterea desistere à debito officio; potest tamen et debet deponere hujusmodi scientiam de futura ruina illius, quia duodecim horæ sunt diei, et potest in instanti homo illuminari, et mutari à divina miserecordia.—*Cajet. Sum. v. adulatio.*

<sup>4</sup> Est autem peccatum veniale quando vel laudatur aliquis de malis venialibus, vel de bonis, sola complacendi intentione absque ruina, vel etiam ob aliquam utilitatem consequendam, vel non impediendam, ut de se patet.—*Cajetan, ibid. Graff. p. 1, l. ii. cap. cxxxviii. n. i., clxi.; Aquinas ii. 2, q. cxv. art. ii.; Sylv. v. adulat. n. iv.*

they scarce count it a fault. There is no more hurt in giving flatterers reward and encouragement. Sylvester inquires if this be a mortal sin?<sup>1</sup> and in him Aquinas answers No, unless a man affect, as Herod, to be extolled as a god, or design and desire to be magnified for mortal crimes. But it is a virtue to give consent to false flattery, as when a woman who is secretly an adulteress is praised for faithfulness to her husband, that scandal may be avoided and others deluded by a good opinion of her.<sup>2</sup> And so we may understand how the praises of the church of Rome for her faithfulness to Christ come to be a virtue. Or if one be not in so complacent a humour as to flatter others, he may curse them at as easy a rate, for it is but a venial fault to curse in words<sup>3</sup> (if not from the heart) any thing, any person, one's own father not excepted; to imprecate any mischief or misery to them; to wish God's curse on them, or an ill end might befall them, or the devil might have them.<sup>4</sup> And when he is at it he may curse the devil too. It is no sin at all if it be for his fault, and gives the devil but his due.<sup>5</sup> Cursing may be one's usual practice as innocently.<sup>6</sup> It is scarce so bad as a venial, when cursing is used for honest recreation.<sup>7</sup> And he may curse the irrational creatures or the elements, and if he do it with his mouth only, or with both mouth and heart, without respect either to God or man, in these cases it is only a venial fault.<sup>8</sup>

*Sect. 14.* I have been long in viewing their account of venial sins; the pernicious use made of it to corrupt the whole body of practical Christianity, and to give liberty to the acting of all sorts of wickedness, with this modification, will excuse me. They venture hard to leave in a manner no mortal sin, and so none needful to be avoided. This will be further manifest by what they determine concerning those few sins which they style mortal or capital; they are reduced, in their ordinary reckoning, to seven. Some of these they conclude to be in their own nature, or regularly venial; in others of them they state the mortalness so high, that those who will be satisfied with wickedness which is not rare and prodigious, may live in the sins, and not reach the mortalness, and so wickedness which is deadly, in their speculative account, may be practised without mortal danger.

<sup>1</sup> *Utrum dare adulatoribus sit peccatum mortale? et dicit S. Thom. ii. 2, q. clxviii. quod non: nisi nimius appetitus vanæ gloriæ—sicut delectabatur Herodes, quum ei Dei et non hominis laudes dabatur: vel nisi intendat quis et cupiat laudationem de peccatis—Et hoc est quod dicit Alexand. de Alis, quod tale peccatum est ista datio, quale adulatio propter quam dat, id est si venialis veniale, &c.—Sum. v. adulatio. n. vi.*

<sup>2</sup> *Imo virtus est consentire laudi, sive se false laudanti, de virtute tamen suo statui necessaria, exemplum de uxore occulte adultera, quæ de fidelitate laudatur, non eo intaitu ut laudetur, sed ut per bonam opinionem, quam alii habent, scandalum evitetur.—Graf. l. ii. cap. cxxxviii. n. ii.; Navar. cap. xxiii. n. xiii.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ore tantum maledicere non est mortale, ut communiter maledicunt parentes filiis, et coloni, et muliones bobus, et mulis.—Idem, ibid. n. cxvii.*

<sup>4</sup> *Vid. Soto de Just. l. v. q. xii. art. ii.; Navar. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Peccat qui maledicit diabolo ratione suæ naturæ, quia illa bona est, et a Deo facta; secus si ratione suæ culpæ, et tradit S. Thom. modo nec plus nec aliter quam meretur.—Idem, ibid. Cajetan. sum. v. maledictio.*

<sup>6</sup> *Quum malo usu hujusmodi profert et est veniale peccatum.—Cajetan. ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Contingit tamen inquit (S. Tho.) quod aliquando sit veniale—vel propter affectum proferentis, dum ex levi motu vel ludo—talia verba profert, quia peccata verborum ex affectu pensantur.—Sylvest. v. maledict. n. iii. Sit veniale—quod ex levi motu seu lusu.—Soto, ibid. Aliquando etiam culpa veniali carere possit, ut si fiat joco et ludo, vel causa recreationis honestæ.*

<sup>8</sup> *Si pœnitens dicat se maledixisse creaturam irrationalem vel elementa, interrogare debet confessarius maledixeritne ore tantum, vel ore et animo, nulla ratione Dei vel proximi habita, quia in his casibus est tantum veniale peccatum.—Graf. l. ii. c. lxxii. n. iii.; Navar. ibid. n. cxvii.*

Covetousness is one of these capital crimes, which in general they heavily aggravate, and inveigh against, as most pernicious; yet when they come to direct conscience, and give particular rules for practice, it is shrunk into a harmless venial. Covetousness, says Cajetan, simply and absolutely, is not a mortal sin in its own nature, because it is not *against*, but *besides* charity.<sup>1</sup> To deliver themselves more distinctly, they consider this sin, either as it is opposed to liberality or to justice; as it is opposite to the former virtue, they generally determine it is but a venial fault; so the same cardinal, As it is contrary to liberality, and signifies an inordinate desire of money, so commonly it is a venial sin.<sup>2</sup> Thus Navarre,<sup>3</sup> and Sotus,<sup>4</sup> and all after Aquinas.<sup>5</sup> So that by their doctrine, if a rich man should be so sordidly, so monstrously tenacious, as not to perform one act of liberality to himself or others, in all his life, yet would not this be a mortal sin, since the vice, which is opposite to all liberality, and wholly exclusive of it, is but a venial fault. Only when it is opposed to injustice,<sup>6</sup> it may be a mortal sin, that is, when a man gets riches by unjust practices and methods, or detains what he has unrighteously. Thus covetousness, however it comes into the account of mortal sins, yet it will stand there as a cipher, and signify no such thing, unless injustice be added to it. Let a man have the most extravagant passion for riches, let him be as greedy as hell or the grave, and penurious as the worst of misers can be, yet if he be not withal a thief, or a cheat, and attempt not to get or keep an estate by fraud or violence, there is no guilt upon him that he need regard. In their sense only thieves and robbers, extortioners or cheats, are covetous, when covetousness is a crime.<sup>7</sup> They speak of covetousness as little worse than an indifferent thing. Injustice added to an act, otherwise lawful, will make it criminal, and this vice will be no crime upon easier terms. But is covetousness a mortal sin, indeed, with them, when it is accompanied with injustice? They would seem to say so sometimes, but then they unsay it again in their other decisions. They allow men to gain unrighteously, and to keep what they have so gained. They declare them not obliged to restitution of what they have got by sinful practices, yea, and such as are most abominable. I have shewed before what unjust and fraudulent methods of gaming<sup>8</sup> they encourage under the favour of venial faults; let me here instance in gaming only. This with them is venial,<sup>9</sup> though it be not only of an inordinate, but of an excessive desire of gaining, if there be no other mortal ingredient; yea, though not only the subservient, but the principal end be lucre, and so that which is only for recreation be turned into a trade. And this is not only the opinion of some particular doctors, but seems to be the persuasion of them all; for, says Navarre, we see in all parts of the world, all sorts of people play for great sums of money, and the greatest part of them principally for gain; and yet the con-

<sup>1</sup> Simpliciter et absolute non est peccatum mortale ex suo genere, quia non est contra, sed præter charitatem.—*Sum v. Avaritia.*

<sup>2</sup> Ut contrariatur liberalitati, et sic significat inordinatum appetitum pecuniæ: et sic communiter est peccatum veniale.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Cap. xxiii. n. lxx.

<sup>4</sup> De Just. l. iv. q. v. art. ii. p. 112.

<sup>5</sup> 22 q. cxviii. art. iv.

<sup>6</sup> Qu. 'justice'?—*Ed.*

<sup>7</sup> Ut opponitur justitiæ, et sic significat injustam voluntatem accipiendi seu retinendi alienum, et est manifeste mortale peccatum, et juxta hunc sensum, usurarios, fures, latrones, negotiatores fraudulentos, &c., avaros dicimus.—*Cajetan. ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Qu. 'gaining'?—*Ed.*

<sup>9</sup> Multi ludo, qui recreationis causa licitus et sanctus est, abutuntur, ut negotiatione ad lucrum—ludunt principaliter propter lucrum. Et hoc semper est peccatum: quoniam est dare operam turpi lucro, si tamen nulla alia deformitas immisceatur, non est peccatum mortale.—*Cajetan. sum. v.; Ludere. p. 410; Navar. cap. xx. n. iii.; Lopez. pars. ii. c. xxxi. p. 183.*

fessors absolve them, though they signify no intention to give over the practice, which they could not do, if there were any mortal sin in it.<sup>1</sup> And such gaming is allowed, even that which they call diabolical,<sup>2</sup> in any place, though in their account sacred;<sup>3</sup> at any time, for whole days, even the holiest, that little time excepted which will suffice the people to hear the chief parts of the mass; or in any person, even their cloistered pretenders to perfection, so they omit not divine service. Their mode of devotion needs be no hindrance, for with them it is lawful to make a game of their prayers. Lopez inquires (*an licitum sit ludere preces sacras*) if it be lawful to play at prayers. He says it is the practice of devout persons, and that Navarre seems to approve it, part ii. c. xxxii.; so does Bonacina after Navarre, Rebellus, and others, *De restit. disp. ii. q. iii., punct. i. n. viii.*, and not only at *Ave Marys*, but other prayers also, and that it will be no irreverence against God to play with their prayers, if they do it reverently, *Ibid.* To say nothing that their clergy and monks may be spectators of games, and shows that are mortally wicked, if they continue not a long time at it, and yet offend but venially.<sup>4</sup> They teach further, that it is not needful to restore what is wickedly gained.<sup>5</sup> Sylvester, after others, says, that filthy lucre (that is, dishonest or shameful gain) is not necessarily to be restored, it is but matter of counsel.<sup>6</sup> But he that hath lost much at unlawful games may take another course for his satisfaction; for pope Adrian and others allow him to steal it from him that has won it, *Vid. Lopez, ibid.* Or to save himself the trouble of stealing, he may refuse to pay what he loses; or if he have bound himself by oath to pay it, not only the pope, but any bishop may release him from the obligation of his oath, and that without the citation of the party. So Navarre, Corduba, Sotus, Penna., et alii in Bonacina, *ibid.*, punct. iii. n. ii. Yea, they will not have those obliged to make restitution who have received anything for acting enormous wickedness, for example, a judge for passing an unjust sentence, or a witness for false testimony and perjury, or a man for satisfying the lust of a lewd woman, or any sort of woman for prostituting themselves, or an assassin for murdering, or a rogue for firing houses or towns, all are comprised in this conclusion, that which is unjustly received, freely of the giver, where there is wickedness on both parts (as in giving, so in receiving), is not, by virtue of any command, to be restored to any.<sup>7</sup> Only (for the encouragement of covetous-

<sup>1</sup> In omnibus mundi partibus cujusque ordinis laicos videmus magnam pecuniarum summam, et maximam eorum partem principaliter propter lucrum ludere, et a confessariis, sine proposito nunquam ita ludendi, absolvi, quod facere requirent, si in eo mortaliter peccarent.—*Navar. ibid.* n. xi.

<sup>2</sup> Quæritur utrum et quomodo ludus diabolicus alearis sit peccatum? et dico quod hic ludus non est peccatum, vel est veniale quum luditur aliquid modicum, &c.—*Sylvest. sum. v. ludus.* n. iv.

<sup>3</sup> *Navar. ibid.* n. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Peccat clericus vel monachus qui ludum mortaliter malam spectat, si multo tempore spectat, secus si parvo.—*Navar. ibid.* n. xiv.

<sup>5</sup> Nullus tenetur cum famæ periculo rem alterius restituere. Est communis sententia.—*Cajetan. v. restit. Navar. c. xix. n. xc. (Tol. l. v. c. xxvii.)*. This will go near to excuse most, if not all: dicitur non posse—qui commode non potest.—*Cap. xvii. n. lvi.*

<sup>6</sup> Non tamen necessario tale turpe lucrum est restituendum; secundum Rodofred, sed de consilio solum.—*Sum v. Emptio*, n. x.; *Vid. Lopez. ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Acceptum voluntarie ab alio, ita ut ab utraque parte admittitur turpitudine, nulli est de precepto restituendum, S. Antoninus Monaldus, Angelus, Sylvester, (in) *Navar. c. xvii. n. xxxvi. et n. xxx.* Sensit Thom. et Cajetan, quod quicquid turpiter accipit contra legis prohibitionem—ut in Simonia—lucro meretricis (et idem diceret de datis et acceptis ob alia quæcunque crimina), quod non sit restituendum, nec pauperibus *Vid. Vasq. opusc. moral. p. 134, dub. ix. n. lxxxiv.*

ness, and injustice together) where money is given for the perpetrating of such crimes, if they be not acted, it is to be restored; but if the wickedness be done, the villanous actor may conscientiously detain it. As the judge that receives a bribe for a false sentence, if he pass a just one, he is obliged to restore, but not if he make an unjust award.<sup>1</sup> And a witness, if he receive money for a true testimony, is bound to restore it, but not for a false deposition.<sup>2</sup> He that is promised a reward for murdering a man, may not receive or keep it before he kill him, but after the murder is done, he may take it (and need not restore it) upon the account of his labour and hazard in killing him, and because therein he has done a fact profitable and delightful to him that hired him, *Idem ibid.* n. v.; *Pet. Navar. et alii*. So an astrologer, who takes money for telling things which he cannot know but by the help of the devil, is not bound to restore it, after diligence and pains to get the devil's assistance therein, because that diligence and pains (with the devil) is valuable, though it prove ineffectual. But he that pretends but to this skill, and makes no use of the devil, is bound to restore, *Pet. Navar. et alii cum Bonacin. ibid.* n. x. And that the poor may be cut off every way by covetousness, whether it be with injustice or without it, though they say what is received for the perpetrating of wicked acts, may be restored to the poor; yet it is a rule with them that restitution to the poor, in this, and other cases, is only a counsel, not a command,<sup>3</sup> so that he who is hired to do villany may restore what he received to the poor, if he will, but if he will not, he needs not; he may conscientiously enjoy the fruits of his villany, and the poor have nothing. In short, not only disquietment of mind through the tumult of worldly distracting cares, and the restless agitation of a covetous humour,<sup>4</sup> but also hardness of heart against the poor, and unmercifulness to them in their distress (the natural effect of extreme covetousness) is as innocent as its cause, no worse than venial, unless when one is obliged under pain of mortal guilt to afford relief.<sup>5</sup> And when is that? Only in extreme necessity,<sup>6</sup> when the starving man may sell his own child to get bread;<sup>7</sup> or when it will be lawful to steal from him who would otherwise part with nothing;<sup>8</sup> or when he may be compelled by law to part with something;<sup>9</sup> then his heart must relent so far as to let go what he cannot keep; but it is like he may never meet with such a case while he lives, and then the miser is excused; no moment of his life need be embittered with one act of charity; he may enjoy the felicity of a petrified heart all his days, and not suffer by one dint in it. Or if he should unhappily meet with one in such extremity, yet may he escape without giving a farthing; it will be enough to exchange or to lend; yea, he may be excused from either giving or lending,<sup>10</sup> if it be but likely that any other may do it.<sup>11</sup> In fine, this

<sup>1</sup> Quando malum ob quod datum fuit, non consequitur, ut si datum est judici quo inique judicaret, et recte judicavit, &c., datori, et non pauperibus restituendum est; ut doctissimus Medina, efficaciter probat.—*Navar. ibid.* n. xxx. p. 295, et c. xxv. n. xlv.

<sup>2</sup> Peccat qui mercedem accipit, ut verum testetur, cum obligatione restituendi ei qui dedit; et qui accipit, ut falsum testetur, sine tamen necessitate restituendi. Vid. *Bonacin. de restit.* disp. i. q. iii. punct. ii. n. vi. et punct. iii. n. viii.

<sup>3</sup> Est regula Vercelli, recepta à S. Antonino, Angel. Sylvest. et ab aliis complurimis, quod restitutio, quæ non est facienda alicui certæ personæ, sed pauperibus, non debetur ex præcepto, sed solum ex consilio.—*Navar. ibid.* c. xvii. n. xxx.

<sup>4</sup> Cajetan. sum. v. inquietudo.

<sup>5</sup> Per duritiam cordis, et inquietudinem mentis peccant qui non subveniunt pauperi, quoties tenentur de præcepto obligante ad mortale—alias enim hæc venialia tantum sunt.—*Navar. c. xxiii. n. lxxvi.*

<sup>6</sup> *Idem.* cap. xxiv. n. v.

<sup>8</sup> Vid. supra.

<sup>10</sup> *Idem ibid.* n. xcv.

<sup>7</sup> *Idem.* c. xxiii. n. xcv.

<sup>9</sup> Glossa communiter recepta.—*Ibid.* n. lxxiv.

<sup>11</sup> *Idem.* c. xxiv. n. v.

unmercifulness, which admits no compassion for the distress of others, is scarce ever mortal, unless it become so (accidentally) by some other mortal acts, and so there is no need to confess it as a sin.<sup>1</sup> How well does this indulgence to such monstrous covetousness as quite swallows up at once Christian charity, mercy, and liberality, become those who cry up themselves as the sole assertors of the necessity of good works?

But that they may not be partial, they shew themselves as favourable to the crime in the other extreme: pure prodigality is no mortal sin, because it is a less fault than covetousness, contrary to liberality, which is manifestly of itself no mortal sin; and the reason of both is, neither of them is against charity to God or others, but only besides it; so Cajetan and others.<sup>2</sup> So Navarre: prodigality (including both that of a man's credit and his estate) is regularly no mortal sin;<sup>3</sup> and this after Aquinas.<sup>4</sup>

*Sect. 15.* Pride is another capital crime; they style it the queen of mortal sins;<sup>5</sup> but then they will have it advanced so high before it be mortal, that the proudest person amongst Christians can seldom reach it. And so all pride which is not of an extraordinary size, and such as is rarely found, must pass for venial. In Aquinas it is an aversion to God, in that he will not be subject to him and his will; not upon other accounts (to wit, desire of pleasure or profit, &c.), but out of contempt;<sup>6</sup> so Cajetan also, and others after him.<sup>7</sup> Navarre says they make it an actual contempt of being subject to God; and adds, thanks be to God, this is but found in few Christians, though all are truly proud.<sup>8</sup> So that mortal pride, by that account which the oracle of their school and his followers give of it, is rarely to be found in the Christian world. It is questionable whether Scotus did count that pride mortal which Aquinas judged to be so; he says, few learned men know in what degree it is deadly, and others are not bound to know it.<sup>9</sup> However, Cajetan ventures to tell us what pride is venial, and his account is worth our view. It is thus at large: He that shews himself so irreligious and ungrateful, as if he had not received all from God, is proud (says he) in the first kind; for of a like effect the apostle says, What hast thou which thou hast not received? why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received? whereby glorying, as the effect, the inward pride is manifested, as though he had not received it. Likewise when one is so affected as to be secure concerning the good he hath, or querulous for the good which is lost, or wonders that he is

<sup>1</sup> Quia hæc fere nunquam sunt mortalia nisi conjungantur aliis actibus mortalibus, non sunt necessario confitenda, quia satis est confiteri illa mortalia, quæ per predictam duritiam et inquietudinem admittuntur.—*Idem*, c. xxiii. n. lxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Prodigalitas non est mortale peccatum si pura est: quia minus peccatum est, quam avaritia liberalitati contraria; quam si pura est, constat non esse mortalem. Et utriusque ratio est quia neutra, agit contra charitatem Dei aut proximi, sed præter illam.—*Cajetan*. Sum. v. Prodigal.

<sup>3</sup> Cap. xviii. n. xxviii.

<sup>4</sup> xxii. q. cxx art. ii. et iii.

<sup>5</sup> Ipsa vitiorum regina, superbia.—*Gregor. moral.* xxxi.; Aquinas, ii. 2, q. clxii art. viii.

<sup>6</sup> Ex parte aversionis superbia habet maximam gravitatem, quia in aliis peccatis homo à Deo avertitur vel propter ignorantiam vel propter infirmitatem, sive propter desiderium cujuscunque alterius boni. Sed superbia habet aversionem à Deo ex hoc ipso quod non vult Deo et ejus regulæ subjici—cujus natus est Dei contemptus.—*Aquin.* xxii. q. cxlii. n. vi.

<sup>7</sup> Sum. v. superbia, vid. Sylvest. v. superbia.

<sup>8</sup> Requiritur uterque Thomas communiter recepti ad ejus essentiam actualem contemptum subjiciendi se Deo et legi ejus—cum id (Gratia Deo) pauci Christiani faciant et vere omnes aliquo modo superbiamus, c. xxiii n. v. certe paucissimi Christiani, &c. n. vi.

<sup>9</sup> Quilibet tenetur vitare omne peccatum mortale, tamen non tenetur scire in quo gradu superbia est peccatum mortale, quia nec multi experti sciunt.—*Scotus*, in *St. Clar. Probl.* xv. p. xciv.

not heard of God, this is the second kind of pride, because such a one makes account that such things are due to him. But he that prefers himself before others, and is prone to spy in his mind or fancy the defects of others, or to excuse his own naughtiness and to aggravate that of others, has a third sort of pride, when he will have himself to be great as if he alone were great. Further, he who caring little for the heavenly country, for the members of Christ, for the expiation of his sins, passing his days as one dreaming or scarce awake, has a fourth kind of pride; for he presumes he is a heavenly citizen, a friend of God, a son, a member, when such negligence and carelessness are no evidence of his favours, the love of God, where it is, producing (those) great things. And likewise in reference to his neighbour's crudeness of mind, and incompassionateness to others, counting injuries intolerable, impatience, not enduring to be slighted, indignation, and the like, do shew that the man thinks better of himself than he is, &c.<sup>1</sup> So great a litter of this monster he exposes to our view, telling us its issue is much more numerous; and then strokes all gently over, calling them venials. These, says he, and many others, are a sort of imperfect pride, and are commonly venial sins for the imperfectness of them, since they occur in the manner of passions, without injury to God or others.<sup>2</sup> Yet (that we may be the more amazed to see all this pass for a little fault) such sins, he adds, hinder spiritual life exceedingly, being of the stock of pride, when it is written that God resists the proud. As for that pride which they count mortal, and grown to its full height, Aquinas out of Gregory,<sup>3</sup> and others after both,<sup>4</sup> give an account of it in some particulars. The prime are these: When one thinks that good he has is from himself; when he thinks that what he has from God is for his merits; and when he boasts that he hath what he has not.<sup>5</sup> If their great Azpilcueta could see none of this most deadly crime amongst Christians, having the merit of congruity and condignity before him, either his sight failed him, or his church was not visible. Others, with his eyes, can see not only mortal pride, but (as deadly a sin) infidelity, where this is part of a creed.<sup>6</sup> To make up one article of two deadly sins, must be a sure mark of the only church. Seriously, finding so many of their authors on this head, charging the opinion of merit, with mortal pride; and therein following not only the greatest of their doctors, but the most infallible of their bishops, I have wondered why they did not either make that none of their faith or this no such sin. What *salvo* they will find against deadly sin, when it is in their faith, I know not; but if part of their belief had proved arrogance (though that sounds like the worst of pride), they might have come off well enough, for arrogance is a venial sin, except in some rare cases. It is, says Cajetan,<sup>7</sup> frequently venial, when without

<sup>1</sup> Sum. v. superbia.

<sup>2</sup> Sunt autem hæc et multa alia, quæ imperfectæ sunt superbiæ, communiter venialia peccata propter imperfectionem actus, dum per modum passionum occurrunt absque injuria Dei et proximorum. Impediunt autem hujusmodi peccata valde vitam spiritualem: utpote ex genere superbiæ existentia: quum scriptum sit, Superbis Deus resistit.—*Ibid.* p. 548.

<sup>3</sup> xxii. q. cxlii. art. iv.

<sup>4</sup> Angelus, v. superb.: Sylvest. v. superb.; Navar. c. xxiii. n. vii. alii communiter,

<sup>5</sup> Secundum hoc sumuntur duæ primæ superbiæ species, scilicet cum quis à semetipso habere æstimat quod à Deo habet, vel cum propriis meritis sibi datum desuper credit.—Sic est tertia species superbiæ, cum scilicet aliquis jactat se habere quod non habet.—*Aquinas, ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Credere id (viz. predicta) in genere est actus—infidelitatis.—*Navar. ibid. n. viii.* In universali dicere—bonum aliquod habere à se et non à Deo, vel suis meritis, hoc pertinet ad infidelitatem, et est mortale peccatum infidelitatis.—*Angel. Sum v. superbia.*

<sup>7</sup> Est autem frequenter venialis arrogantia dum absque prejudicio proximi æstimat

prejudice of others a man values himself as having more knowledge, or goodness, or authority than he hath; and again, It is a sin, but it is not mortal, unless when it usurps against God; as the king of Tyre, when he said, I am God (now none are observed to do this except the pope, who has the law in his own hand), or against others by tyranny (which is so odious as all disclaim it; and affecting it is no worse than affecting to kill men without consent, which with him is not deadly<sup>1</sup>), or unless it be made one's ultimate end (which none will own). Accordingly, Angelus determines that arrogancy is commonly a venial fault, unless upon the account of something else that is mortal, as when it arises from mortal pride; but that (as he and others define it we heard before) is scarce to be found amongst Christians.<sup>2</sup>

*Sect. 16.* Ambition was wont to be counted a deadly crime; the world and the church too has reason to judge it so, since the most of their miseries and ruins may be imputed to it; but the church of Rome and her champions are concerned not to think so ill of it, *stilo curia*, in the sense of the court it may pass for venial. Angelus inquires whether ambition be a mortal sin?<sup>3</sup> He answers negatively, it is not so simply, but may be so in respect of its end, and so may anything in itself lawful be, if its end be criminal; or it may be so, if the thing affected be a crime, but that is accidental, and still ambitiousness, the inordinacy of the affection is excused, and may transgress all bounds if the honour and power affected be lawful. Thus Cajetan, he will yield it more than venial,<sup>4</sup> when one will be honoured for a crime, or would be counted a god; accordingly, it is resolved by Sylvester,<sup>5</sup> with Navarre, regularly an inordinate appetite or greediness of honour exceeds not the bounds of a venial fault.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, if pride and ambition had been branded as damnable, two *cardinal* virtues had been concerned, and, which is more, the Vatican throne, both in its foundation and supports.

*Sect. 17.* Vain glory is another capital crime in their account, and pregnant with many others. They define it to be an inordinate affecting of human glory, and yet determine, that an inordinate affecting of praise, or favour, or honour, or reverence, or glory, is but regularly a venial sin;<sup>7</sup> only it may happen to be mortal in some case, as when one would inordinately have glory from others for a deadly end, or for a mortal sin, or that which he makes his last end; in all other cases this capital evil is but a slight fault. According to their common doctrine, Cajetan will have it to be mortal then only when one glories in mortal sin<sup>8</sup> (but to glory in venials they count it a small fault), or sets his ultimate end in vain glory. Angelus<sup>9</sup> collects out of

quis se plus scientiæ, aut bonitatis aut autoritatis habere, quam habet. Sum. v. arrogantia. Peccatum est quia contra rectam rationem est. Sed mortale non est nisi vel id quod sibi usurpat, sit contra divinam reverentiam: ut Rex Tyri, Ego Deus Sum. aut contra proximum: ut tyrannis, vel finis ultimus in hujusmodi elatione ponatur.—*Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* v. vovendi condit.

<sup>2</sup> Utrum sit mortale peccatum? Resp. quod sic, quum ex tali superbia vel contentione fit quæ sit mortalis—alias communiter peccatum veniale erit.—*Sum.* v. arrogantia.

<sup>3</sup> Utrum ambitio sit peccatum mortale? Resp. quod non simpliciter sed pro ratione finis—vel secundo ratione rei quæ appetitur.—*Sum.* v. ambitio.

<sup>4</sup> Non est autem mortale peccatum, nisi vel ex parte rei in qua appetitur honor: puta, si quis vult honorari ob crimen aliquod; vel ex parte finis—quia vult haberi ut Deus.—*Cajetan.* v. ambit.

<sup>5</sup> *Sum.* v. Superbia. n. vii.

<sup>6</sup> Quamvis regulariter, appetitus inordinatus honoris, non excedat metas culpæ venialis, cap. xxiii. n. xv.

<sup>7</sup> Appetitus eorum etiam inordinatus regulariter est venialis, &c.—*Idem ibid.* n. ix.

<sup>8</sup> Solum peccat mortaliter, qui gloriatur de aliquo quod est peccatum mortale: secundo qui ponit suum finem ultimum in gloria humana.—*Sum.* v. glor. van.

<sup>9</sup> Colligo ex Alex. in ii. 2, et Thom. ii. 2, q. cxxxii. et Henr. de Gandavo in quod

Alexander and Aquinas, that vain glory of itself imports not anything contrary to the love of God or man. Aquinas himself says, that if love of human glory, though vain, be not perfectly repugnant to charity, it is not mortal.<sup>1</sup> And Sylvester delivers this as the sense of their oracle, that the desire of vain glory in its own nature is not mortal.<sup>2</sup> Angelus concludes, that this may be a man's end in all things but the Scripture and the sacraments;<sup>3</sup> but this limitation is too strict in the judgment of their doctors which are of greatest repute: for they determine, that he who does those things which are principally instituted for the honour and worship of God, and the salvation of souls, for vain glory as his chief end; as for example, he that in preaching, or praying, or celebrating, makes vain glory his principal end, and aims at nothing higher, sins but venially.<sup>4</sup> Angelus had made it worse, but others had confuted him effectually, and Navarre after them. Aquinas, the angel of their schools, was, it seems, of this persuasion, that vain glory may be actually our principal end in worshipping God, without any mortal sin: for Sylvester tells us, that Angelus did contradict, not only the truth, but St Thomas, in saying it is a mortal evil, when those things which were ordained for the glory of God, are done principally for a man's own glory, as the sacraments and the Scripture.<sup>5</sup> And they are highly concerned to maintain this, for, says he, if this were a mortal sin, the whole clergy in a manner were in an ill condition;<sup>6</sup> he means they were in a state of damnation: so that it was high time for the Roman doctors to form a divinity of new maxims, since those of Scripture and antiquity left them in a damnable condition. One would think, that to count it but a *peccadillo*, to make vain glory the cause or motive without which a man would not preach, or pray, or perform any worship, should be a prodigious thing for any that calls himself a Christian; but he that will allow it, under no greater censure than that of a petty fault, to be the principal end of worship, and the great concern of salvation, advances it higher.<sup>7</sup> He that takes a church living or spiritual benefice, principally for honour or temporal profit, offends but venially, unless he be unworthy because of his ignorance or other defect.<sup>8</sup> So that in their church, for any or all of them, from the pope to the meanest officer, to make honour and profit their chief end in taking the charge of souls,

l. i. q. xxiv. Quod vana gloria de se non dicit aliquid quod sit contra charitatem Dei aut proximi.—*Sum. v. van. glor. n. i.*

<sup>1</sup> Inanis gloria non est mortale peccatum, nisi charitati perfecte adversatur.—*Aquinas, ii. 2, q. cxxxii. art. iii.*

<sup>2</sup> Intendit ergo S. Tho. quod appetitus vanæ gloriæ ex suo genere non sit mortale.—*Sum. v. van. gl. n. ii.*

<sup>3</sup> Si aliquid aliud quod non pertinet ad divinam scripturam vel sacramenta propter gloriam faceret, peccaret venialiter.—*Sum. ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Navar. cap. xxiii. n. xiii. supra. Quamvis eximius vir ille Angelus teneat, concionari, missam celebrare et alia principaliter divino cultui dedicata facere propter honorem aut inanem gloriam, esse mortale, contrarium tamen tenendum est, ut latissime demonstravimus. Idem c. xxi. n. xl. vide Soto, in Suarez. supra.

<sup>5</sup> Contra S. Tho. et veritatem dicit quod est mortale quando ea quæ ordinata sunt ad gloriam Dei quis principaliter facit ad gloriam suam, ut sacramenta et Scripturæ sacræ.—*Sum. v. van. glor. n. iv.*

<sup>6</sup> Alias si is qui gloriatur de sacris vestibus, aut cantu divinatorum, vel conditione theologica, actualiter nullum alium finem intendens, peccaret mortaliter, totus pæno clerus esset in malo statu.

<sup>7</sup> Vid. Navar. c. xx. n. xi. et c. xxi. n. xl. et c. xxxiii. n. ci.

<sup>8</sup> Peccat qui accipit beneficium ecclesiasticum spirituale principaliter propter honorem aut utilitatem temporariam; secundum S. Antonin. Quod limo procedere in eo qui est eo indignus ob ignorantiam, vel alium defectum. Nam supra diximus, quod falsum est esse mortale facere ordinata ad cultum divinum principaliter ob bona temporalia.—*Idem, c. cxiii. n. xv.*

or other place or employment, which concern the worship of God, or the the salvation of the people, is so slight a thing as needs never trouble them; ten thousand faults of this nature, ten thousand times over, would never hazard their souls. These two last conclusions will help us to discern of what complexion popery is, upon what it is founded, for what ends they may think it safe to maintain it, and persist in it, without or against any conscientious or spiritual consideration: and why they may make religion all along serve a worldly interest and truckle under it. There is no danger in all this; it is a harmless venial by their doctrine, to thrust the great God and his glory into an inferior place, below their honour and profit, even in those things which they say were principally instituted for his sovereign honour; this is a fault with them next to nothing. If they should, in the worship of God, aim at him in the first place, and at their own glory and profit in the next, there might be some danger lest they should too much oblige him: for thus to join God and their carnal interest together, as their end in any religious concern, is a meritorious act, according to Aquinas.<sup>1</sup> Further,<sup>2</sup> vainglorious boasting, though it be with irreverence to God, and injury and scandal to others, if that be not much, is only venial, according to Aquinas and Alensis. And a man may vaingloriously praise himself for something that is good, though it be false, or something that is evil, if it be not deadly,<sup>3</sup> and yet offend but venially, when he does no great mischief to others.

*Sect. 18.* Aversion to, or grief at, spiritual and divine things, is another capital crime in their reckoning, which is called *acedia*. The object is God, as to man's friendship and communion with him, and the spiritual acts and duties requisite thereto; the act they express by sloth, and loathness to meddle with these things, coldness, tepidness about them, not caring for them, nauseating and accounting them a grievance. This some of them do not deny to be a mortal sin, but they will have it mortal only upon such strange terms, that any one may have a great aversion for God, and the things of God, without danger of deadly guilt; for they define it by an aggrievedness at what is spiritual and divine, *quatenus est divinum*, as it is divine, and not otherwise;<sup>4</sup> not because it is laborious or troublesome to the flesh, or any impediment to its pleasures, which are Aquinas's words;<sup>5</sup> but under that formality, in that it is divine, as his followers understand it.<sup>6</sup> So that the greatest disaffection to spiritual things, if it be because they are unsuitable to corrupt nature, not agreeable to the flesh, its ease and pleasure (which is the common and ordinary cause of it), if it be not on an account that rarely falls out, as they acknowledge, and which a man can scarce ever deliberately be subject to;<sup>7</sup> it brings him not under this

<sup>1</sup> Nullum autem peccatum, immo meritum est, facere illa principaliter propter Deum, vel quia honesta sunt et sancta, et secundario propter gloriam, vel laudem humanam in finem aptum relatum.—*Idem.* *ibid.* post Sanctum Thomam.

<sup>2</sup> Peccat qui per jactantiam se aut suos laudat cum irreverentia notabili Dei, aut cum injuria vel scandalo proximi notabili: alias enim solum est veniale juxta S. Tho. receptum. Alexand. Alens.—*Idem.* *ibid.* n. xvi.

<sup>3</sup> *Idem.* *ibid.* n. xiii. Cajetan. sum. v. jactantia, Angel. sum. v. van. glor. n. i.

<sup>4</sup> Definiri potest, esse vitium inclinans ad tristandum de bono spirituali divino, quatenus est divinum; secundum mentem utriusque Thomæ ii. 2, q. xxxv. art. ii. Navar. cap. xxiii. n. cxxiv. Tristitia de bono spirituali in quantum est divinum.—*Sylvest.* sum. v. *Acedia.* n. i.

<sup>5</sup> Non prout est laboriosum vel molestum corpori aut delectationis ejus impeditivum. xxii. q. xxxv. art. ii.

<sup>6</sup> Navar. *ibid.* *Sylvest.* *ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Peccatum est valde grave, genereque suo mortale, cum deliberato, et advertente animo admittitur, quod raro videtur contingere.—*Navar.* *ibid.*

guilt. So Cajetan tells us, If a man, not as to his affection, but in effect, be grieved at this, viz., that he is to be a citizen with the saints, and one of God's family, because he little cares for the happiness of this divine friendship, neglecting to attain it, because he gives up himself to other delights, he is not guilty of this sin.<sup>1</sup> Angelus, that he may discover when this disaffection to spiritual and divine things is mortal, and when venial, tells us, that when it consists in the omission of things not necessary to salvation, it is venial;<sup>2</sup> that is, it is little or no fault, if all the duties of real worship, all the acts of grace and Christian virtues, are omitted; for we cannot yet discern that they account any of these necessary to salvation, and by the premises it appears they do not. It is venial, says Sylvester, when a man counts the doing of it grievous, but yet omits not what he is bound to.<sup>3</sup> Angelus expresseth it more significantly: By this it appears, says he, what is to be said of him who counts grievous, and abominates divine and spiritual things, since unless they be necessary to salvation, and he declines them, or is deliberately disposed to decline them, he sins not mortally.<sup>4</sup> So that spiritual and divine things (all that they account not necessary; that is, all in a manner which is requisite for a Christian) may be abhorred, without any mortal guilt; and herein the two sums agree well enough, though they seem to be at some odds. It is false, says Sylvester (not limiting it to things necessary) that abominating of spiritual things is always a mortal sin.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly he determines, that rancour against those who would induce us to spiritual things (that is, would draw us to God, or the things of God), is a venial fault.<sup>6</sup> It is no mortal sin (say others) to conceive an indignation and loathing of those who persuade to what is spiritual (so as not to endure to hear or see them), whether preachers or others. We see by this (as by other instances) that sins so stated, as they are scarce ever practicable, they can be content to have them counted mortal; but common provocations, and such of which there is most danger, must pass for venials; yea, there are some amongst them who will have this capital crime, though it have such a deadly aspect, both in itself and in its effects, to be no mortal sin.—*Laisius Turrian. ibid. sect. iii. n. ii.*

*Sect. 19.* Anger stands in their general account as another capital crime. I have touched it before; but here let us see how criminal they make it, when in particulars they bring up their reckoning. It is considered in respect of the mode or degree, and the tendency or effects of it. As to the degree of it, how high soever it rise, to what excess soever it transport one,

<sup>1</sup> Si vero de hoc (ut sit civis sanctorum et domesticus Dei, &c.) non tristatur secundum affectum, sed secundum effectum, quia parum de hujusmodi amicitie bono curat; negligens adipisci illam, quia vacat delectabilibus humanis, peccatum Acedie non incurrit.—*Cajet. sum. v. Acedia.*

<sup>2</sup> Aut (consistit) in omissione eorum que non sunt necessaria; et sic est veniale peccatum.—*Sum. v. Acedia. n. i.*

Si omittit ea quæ sunt de necessitate salutis, peccat mortaliter: si vero alias debita, peccat venialiter.—*Cajetan. sum. v. Inconst.*

<sup>3</sup> Est autem veniale, quando homo quidem in operando attædiatur, sed tamen ea ad quæ tenetur, non omittit.—*Ibid. n. ii.*

<sup>4</sup> Et ex hoc patet quid dicendum de eo qui attædiatus abominatur divina et spiritualia: quia nisi sint necessaria ad salutem, et ea dimittat, vel deliberate disponat dimittere, non peccat mortaliter.—*Sum. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Falsum est, quod dicta abominatio (spiritualium) semper sit peccatum mortale.—*Sum. v. malitia.*

<sup>6</sup> Rancor i.e. displicentia hominum inducentium ad spiritualia et est veniale.—*v. Acedia, n. iv.*

Neque mortaliter peccat, qui fastidiam, indignationem, et quandam aversionem concepit in eos, qui spiritualia consulunt, ut in concionatores, aut alios.—*Bonacin. i. præcept. d. iii. q. iv. p. ult. sect. i. n. vi.*

inwardly or outwardly, it is not in its own nature mortal, unless it be so vehement as to bear down both love to God and man,<sup>1</sup> and leave the passionate person neither, which yet it will not do, though it sally out furiously into curses or blasphemies against God or man, if this be but merely verbal, as we saw before.<sup>2</sup> The tendency of it, that which it leads to, is revenge; and as to that, it will be venial if the revenge be but little, or it may be great when it can be taken legally; or it may be great and illegal too, if the passion be but quick and great enough. The more excessive it is, the more mischief it may do, and be innocent, if the passion prevent deliberation when it comes, and hinder it while it stays; both it, and the effects of it, how horrid soever, will be venial.<sup>3</sup> So that, if one be angry enough, he may blaspheme God, renounce Christ, perjure himself, kill or burn whom or what he will, with little or no fault. Thus, by their doctrine, this capital crime seems more like a virtue than a vice, since the greater is the better; or at least the less it has to do with reason, the more excusable and venial. Other extravagant passions meet with as favourable measures. Indignation, which makes a man disdain others, as unworthy of his conversation or affable treatment, it is commonly venial.<sup>4</sup> Audaciousness, in itself, is no worse; nor excessive wrath and immoderate fear, because they are not contrary to charity, but exorbitant from the right measures of reason.<sup>5</sup> So intemperance or foolhardiness is venial, when it proceeds from tolerable foolishness; but the folly may be so great, that the fault will be none.<sup>6</sup> Also incontinent desires, or lusts; love likewise, whether of the flesh or the world.<sup>7</sup> Of the former, thus Angelus: Immoderate self-love, when one excessively seeks the delight of the body and ease of the flesh, it proceeds from luxury, yet it is commonly venial, when it causes not other mortal acts or neglects.<sup>8</sup> As for love of the world, to love it for necessity, is no sin, and to love to stay a long time in the world, for the pleasures of it, is but a venial fault.<sup>9</sup>

Envy is another capital crime, and in general they inveigh against it, as a devilish wickedness;<sup>10</sup> yet when they come to give particular rules for con-

<sup>1</sup> Attenditur ordo rationis in ira—ut scilicet motus iræ non immoderate ferveat interius vel exterius, qui ordo si prætermittatur non erit sine peccato—sed non erit mortale ex genere suo: sed possit esse mortale peccatum, puta si ex vehementia iræ excidat à dilectione Dei vel proximi. Angel. Sum. v. ira. n. i.; Sylvest. ibid. n. iv. Cajetan. Sum. v. ira.

<sup>2</sup> Navar. c. xxiii. n. cxvii. et alii supra.

<sup>3</sup> Passiones nisi ad deliberatum consensum vindictæ inducant, veniales sunt.—Cajetan. v. rixa. Possit esse veniale propter imperfectionem actus, quia prævenit deliberationem. Sylv. v. ira, n. iv. Angelus, ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Indignatio (qua ex ira afficitur homo proximo tanquam indigno sua affabilitate, conversatione et hujusmodi), peccatum est propter inordinatam passionem; et communiter veniale.—Cajetan. sum. v. Indignatio.; Sylv. v. Indignatio.; Angel. sum. v. diligere. n. ii.

<sup>5</sup> Audacia si pura est, communiter est peccatum veniale: sicut immoderata iracundia, et immoderatus timor; quia non contrariantur charitati, sed a recta exorbitant rationis regula.—Cajetan. v. audacia.

<sup>6</sup> Veniale autem peccatum hoc est, quando ex stultitia excusabili procedit—tantaque possit esse stoliditas, quod nullum esset peccatum.

<sup>7</sup> Idem, ibid. v. Incontinentia.

<sup>8</sup> Amor sui est, quum quis nimis diligit seipsum, quærendo delectationes corporis nimis, et quietem carnis, et procedit ex luxuria, quod est peccatum mortale solum, si propter eum non implet præcepta aut facit contra: aliter communiter est veniale.—Sum. v. Amor sui.

<sup>9</sup> Diligitur ad necessitatem, et sic non est peccatum—est etiam diligere mundum, i. e. longo tempore velle stare in mundo propter delicias, et sic est veniale peccatum.—Idem, ibid. v. diligere. n. iii.

<sup>10</sup> Soto de Just. et Jur. l. iv. ar. p. 176.

science and practice, they leave room enough for the entertainment of it in the hearts and lives of their catholics. The general notion of it is an excessive grief at the good of others, but all are acquitted from mortal quiet<sup>1</sup> who grieve at others' good, because it may be prejudicial to themselves, or because they want it. So far a man may envy all in the world who have more worth, honour, or power, or prosperity than himself. This may be good or evil, but evil in no other degree, than the desire of temporals,<sup>2</sup> which, when it is excessive, is of itself, by their doctrine, but venial. Or they may grieve at others' good, because they think those who have it unworthy of it.<sup>3</sup> Grief or indignation at the outward happiness of others, upon this account solely, is of itself a venial fault with Aquinas and Cajetan. But why evil at all? The reason is because, since that which is grieved at is neither an evil of sin or punishment, it seems in a manner to reprove God, and to grieve, as though there were injustice in the dispenser of these things. All the envy in the world may find shelter and security in these decisions, as a harmless venial. If this last-mentioned be not envy, what is? why, a grief at the good of others, as it lessens and obscures our proper worth or excellency. But he that thinks others more unworthy, and himself far better, will think it a lessening and obscuring his own worth to have it so overlooked, and that which they distinguish and mince in speculation, will go down together in practice. However, two limitations they add, which will commonly excuse envy: it must be betwixt equals,<sup>4</sup> and so grief at the prosperity of inferiors, or superiors at least, will be acquitted; also, if it be for little things,<sup>5</sup> it is venial. Now all temporals are little things to him who has the eternal in his prospect; so way is made to acquit all envy for outward prosperity, which yet they make the only object of envy.<sup>6</sup> And if envy, upon a small ground, may be excused as a little fault, envy upon a great occasion will be excusable, as less; except when they derive the sinfulness of an act from its exorbitancy as to reason; that will be less sinful which is more unreasonable. They might as well have concluded directly, and without circumlocution, as Lorca the Dominican doth, that envy is no more a mortal sin than vain-glory or covetousness, which they count venial, unless heightened with some such circumstance as will make an act otherwise good to be a deadly evil.<sup>7</sup>

*Sect.* 20. Intemperance, which they call *Gula*, comprising both gluttony and drunkenness, may well pass for a cardinal crime, yet both together, by an after reckoning, make but a poor venial.<sup>8</sup> They define it an inordinate appetite of eating and drinking, viz., to excess, not for necessity, but for pleasure. This, when it is excessive every way, in the charge, the time, the quality, the pleasure, the quantity, is not in its own nature a mortal sin,

<sup>1</sup> Qu. "guilt?"—Ed.

<sup>2</sup> Si vero sit circa temporalia, potest esse cum peccato vel sine, eo modo, quo et appetitus temporalium.—*Sylv.* sum. v. Invidia. Ut si mediocris homo tristetur quia non est rex, quia non est papa: et hoc veniale est ex se.—*Vid. Cajetan.* v. Invid.

<sup>3</sup> Idem, *ibid.* n. ii. Quia indignus est tali bono, hujusmodi indignatio, ut dicit S. Thom. et Cajetan, mala est et ex se veniale; nam cum id, de quo dolet, nec sit malum culpæ, nec pænæ, videtur quodammodo arguere Deum, et dolere, quasi injustitia sit ex parte datoris. In Tol. l. viii. c. lxv.

<sup>4</sup> Invidia qua homo tristatur de prosperitate alterius similis seu æqualis.—*Cajetan.* sum. v. Invid.

<sup>5</sup> Nec etiam (est mortale) si bonum de quo dolet, sit quid minimum.—*Sylv. ibid.* n. ii.; *Cajetan. ibid.*

Posunt magna videri non aspicientibus æterna.—*Idem, ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Cajetan. ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Vid. Bonacin. i. præcept. d. iii. q. iv. p. ult. sect. ii. n. iii.*

<sup>8</sup> In general with them, all sins against temperance and modesty are regularly venial.—*Vid. Nav.*

according to the doctrine of Aquinas, though it be a capital vice, and the cause of many other.<sup>1</sup> But then it may be deadly by accident, if it be grievously hurtful to the body; <sup>2</sup> so it becomes those to determine, who are more tender of the concerns of the body than of the soul. Yet that we may understand how the pleasure of sensuality may be preferred before either soul or body, they tell us, that if the damage done to the body by intemperance be not grievous, or if it prove so great, yet if the glutton do not observe it, or if the great prejudice done to his health be not so frequent that he is bound to observe it, it will be venial still.<sup>3</sup> But Cajetan troubles us not with this respect to health, but concludes it may be venial (and of a large size sometimes), not only when it brings upon us other inconveniences, but other sins, and particularly when it is prejudicial to health.<sup>4</sup> He has but one case wherein it will be more than venial; then only is it mortal, says he, when this pleasure in eating is a man's chief end, and his belly his god;<sup>5</sup> that is, when for the pleasure of it, he not only transgresses all rules of temperance, but has no regard of any command of God, or the church, as if a man will steal to play the glutton, &c. It seems this sensual lust will never be criminal, unless one be so much at its devotion, as to contemn God,<sup>6</sup> and make nothing of any other wickedness to gratify it. And though there be no danger here, but when one makes his belly his god, yet there is no great danger of that, since a man may be a perfect epicure, like the rich glutton in the Gospel, and yet escape. When one, says Angelus, for delight of his appetite, resolves to give up his whole life to such (gluttonous) pleasures as Dives, &c., this is near to mortal sin.<sup>7</sup> It seems, then, it is not deadly, but only near it; though it brought the epicure not only near hell, but into the torment of its flames. Yea, further, if intemperance proceed to beastliness, and pollute not only the soul but the body loathsomely, if the glutton load himself with more than he can bear, and so burden nature, that it is forced to ease itself in nasty ways, this will be no more a fault. Intemperance, says Navarre, is regularly venial, though without any profit, and out of design, one stuff himself so full with meat and drink, even to vomiting.<sup>8</sup> If he eat so much till he vomit, on purpose that he may be at it again the sooner, and so may be still gormandising, it is no worse. Uncleaness, says Angelus, which is the issue of intemperance, when one pro-

<sup>1</sup> Dico secundum S. Thom. (2, ii. q. cxlviii. art. i.) et secundum mentem ejus in multis locis, quod (Gula) non est mortale ex suo genere, licet sit vitium capitale, id est, ex quo vitia multa nascuntur.—*Sylv.* v. Gula. n. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Quando quis scienter comedit vel bibit, in grave corporis nocumentum, secundum S. Thom. *Idem. ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Si hoc (grave nocumentum) fiat inadvertenter, non est mortale, nisi adeo frequenter fiat, quod tenetur advertere, sicut de ebrietate dictum est. Similiter nec si nocumentum sit modicum.—*Idem. ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Frequenter autem est veniale, et quandoque valde grave, ut cum delectatio cibi allicit ad comedendum usque ad vomitum, aut alia inconvenientia, et similiter cum inducit ad alia peccata: puta ad nimium sumptum, vel ad nocendum propriæ sanitati, et ad quæcunque alia peccata.—*Cajetan.* v. Gula.

<sup>5</sup> Tunc solum est mortale, quando delectationem cibi habet quis pro ultimo fine, juxta illud: Quorum Deus venter est: hoc autem cognoscitur ex hoc, quod homo ob delectationem in comedendo, non curat transgredi præceptum Dei aut ecclesiæ ut si propter hoc furetur, &c.—*Idem. ibid. vid. Sylv. ibid. Angelus.* v. Gula. n. ii. Paratus facere quæcunque ut eam consequatur.

<sup>6</sup> *Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Quum propter talem delectationem appetitus, ducit totam vitam hujusmodi delectationibus deputare, sicut Dives, qui epulabatur quotidie. Et hoc est multum vicinum mortali.—*Sum. ibid.* n. ii.

<sup>8</sup> Gula regulariter est venialis, etiamsi absque utilitate usque ad vomitum, etiam intentum sese quis cibo et potu ingurgitet, ut sentit Cajetan. cap. xxiii. n. cxix.

vokes himself to vomit, that he may eat the oftener, or when he eats so much that he must of necessity vomit, is commonly a venial fault.<sup>1</sup> Cajetan more fully: Uncleanliness is used for the sin of voiding excrements excessively, as of meat by vomiting, and the like, proceeding from intemperance; it is frequently a venial sin, since it is neither against the love of God nor man; yet it is filthy, since it brings with it even bodily nastiness.<sup>2</sup> So that intemperance, even when it bewrays itself, and vents its filth by all the passages that oppressed nature can find in the glutton's body, is but a small fault. To be half drunk is no mortal sin. So Lopez,<sup>3</sup> after Aquinas;<sup>4</sup> herein they all agree, says a learned cardinal;<sup>5</sup> take their sense in the words of Cajetan.<sup>6</sup> Drunkenness not complete (when one by drinking wine is made too merry, or is disturbed in his fancy, so that the house seems to whirl round, or the like effect of intoxication befalls him, but he does not quite lose the use of reason), without doubt is a great sin (but not big enough to be feared), unless it be done for medicine; because it is excessive drinking in quantity or quality, when fallen into it knowingly or negligently; but it is worse when it is out of design (when one drinks too much, with an intention thus to disorder himself), because then it is almost mortal (there is no danger in all this, since he adds) but yet it is not mortal, since it reaches not the complete notion of drunkenness, and is without signal damage to reason. So that if a man be not dead drunk, and utterly deprived of the use of reason, he falls short of that perfection which is requisite to make this a deadly evil. In fine, however the Scripture, ancient Christians, and all that are sober, brand drunkenness as a most deadly vice, yet the Roman doctors have discovered two admirable virtues in it; one is that the full dose (perfect drunkenness), will make the highest impieties, the greatest outrages and villanies, to be no sins at all. So Angelus,<sup>7</sup> who proves it by the canon law. So likewise Rosella, after others. Those of their writers which seem most cautious,<sup>8</sup> except culpable drunkenness, as to this only, when such out-

<sup>1</sup> Immunditia est filia gulæ, quum quis provocat se ad vomitum, ut sæpius comedere possit: vel tantum comedit quod necesse habet evomere, communiter est veniale peccatum.—*Sum. v. Immunditia.*

<sup>2</sup> Usurpatur pro peccato inordinatæ emissionis superfluum, ut cibi per vomitum, et similibus ex gula procedentium, et sic ponitur filia gulæ; frequenter est peccatum veniale, utpote nec contra Dei nec proximi dilectionem: turpe tamen, utpote etiam corporalem immunditiam inferens.—*Sum. v. Immunditia.*

<sup>3</sup> Quando aliquis bene potatus, ita bene confortatus est capite quod rationis incompos non est factus, et tamen sibi videtur quod domus moveatur, hæc semiplena ebrietas, sicut non est mortalis, licet sit grave peccatum, quia secundum mentem.

<sup>4</sup> D. Tho. et. Cajet. *ibid.* Ratio non obumbratur, cap. ii. n. xi. xxii. q. cl. art. i. and v.

<sup>5</sup> Quando ebrietas non est perfecta, sed imperfecta, quæ turbat aliquo modo rationem, sed non omnino, tunc est grave veniale. In his omnes conveniunt.—*Tol. Instr. l. viii. c. lxi.*

<sup>6</sup> Ebrietas non plena (quando aliquis potu vini redditur nimis lætus, aut turbatur in phantasia, dum videtur ei quod domus gyretur, aut hujusmodi aliquid incurrit: non tamen perdit usum rationis) peccatum proculdubio grave est, nisi causa medicinæ fiat: quia immoderatus est potus secundum quantitatem vel qualitatem, et hoc si advertenter aut negligenter accidit. Pejus tamen, si ex intentione: est enim tunc prope mortale: non tamen est mortale, quia nec attingit ad completam ebrietatis rationem; nec notabile damnus rationis eligitur.—*Sum. v. Ebrietas.*

<sup>7</sup> Quoad culpam excusat a toto quod fecit in ebrietate, ex quo est sine usu totali rationis.—*Sum. v. Ebrietas. n. iii.*

<sup>8</sup> In Sylvest. v. Ebriat. n. v. Tol. l. v. c. x. Rosella, v. Ebriat. n. ii.

Actus vel omissiones contra præcepta contingentes tempore somni, vel ebrietatis, etiam si fuerint voluntarii in causa, non denominari tunc peccata, sed tantum effectus peccati præcedentis; ut late defendit Vasquez, referens pro ea sententia, Paludan. Major, Gabriel, et Adrian. Sura. de Juram. l. iii. e. vii. n. vii.

rages are the usual effects of it.<sup>1</sup> So that unless both drunkenness, and the criminal issues of it, be customary, this will not be sin, or imputable to the drunkard. Hereby they furnish the Christian world with a new argument to prove Mahomet a false prophet, seeing he was so greatly mistaken in making his law so severe against wine, which, in its greatest abuse, is of such sovereign efficacy as to drown so much mortal sin, and to make all crimes whatever lose their deadly quality. But that impostor's head was not so intoxicated but he might discern that such who are guilty in the cause, are chargeable in the effects; nor was he so much a prophet as to foresee, that in after times, anything under the disguise of divinity should stumble at this. The other virtue of this sin is, that the moiety of it (half drunkenness) will make any the most horrid crimes to be but small faults. Weakness of judgment, says one, such as they who are half asleep, or half drunk, though it be enough to make a sin venial, yet not mortal.<sup>2</sup> When those, says another, that are half asleep, or half drunk, perpetrate any wicked thing whatever, since they are plainly under weakness of judgment, they are quitted of mortal guilt.<sup>3</sup> So that if any one will but make himself half drunk every morning early (and it will be no worse than a venial to do it purposely), he may, whatever wickedness he acts, be free from mortal sin all his life; and thus, he that lives all his days like a devil, may escape hell notwithstanding, and be saved by being daily half drunk.

There are multitudes of particular sins which they comprise under these seven capitals, and call them their daughters, after Gregory and Aquinas; but they need not be taken notice of as mortal by common confessors, much less by their confitents, for such confessors need not know whether they are mortal or no,<sup>4</sup> as Angelus tells us after Henricus; and so must absolve sinners, though they never resolve, or think of leaving their sins.

*Sect. 21.* By the premises we may see what, and how many, sins may pass for venial in the church of Rome, and they have presumed to make them so without evidence from Scripture, as even a Jesuit will acknowledge.<sup>5</sup> The maxims they proceed on therein (though eternal life or death depend on it) are purely their own conceits; no wonder if they leave them at great uncertainty. Many sins are believed to be venials which are mortal, says Bonaventure, and it is most difficult to discern them.<sup>6</sup> So that they have no sufficient direction from any rule, no, not their own; but they are encouraged to venture upon all this wickedness in the dark and blind-fold. The instances I have given may serve for a test; there is a world more, nor have I picked out all the worst; more time and diligence may

<sup>1</sup> An actus mali, quos ebrius facit in ebrietate existens, sint peccata, si fornicetur, si occidat, &c. ad hoc respondent, S. Tho. ii. ii. q. cl. art. iv. Cajetan. Sylvest. et responsio in his consistit—quando culpabilis fuit ebrietas—quando non erat solitus talia mala facere, nec timebantur, tunc non sunt nova peccata, in Tol. l. viii. c. lxi.

<sup>2</sup> Parvitas iudicii, qualem habent semi-dormientes et semi-ebrii vel adeo turbati, licet sufficiat ad veniale, non tamen ad mortale.—*Navar. prælud. ix. n. xii.*

<sup>3</sup> Quando semi-dormientes, vel semi-ebrii quidvis patnaverint, cum parvitate iudicii aperte laborent, et lethali culpa redduntur immunes. *Graff. l. i. cap. xiv. n. iv.; Bonacin. de Matrim. q. iv. punct. vii. n. vi. ubi.; Navar. Cajetan. et alii. Communiter.*

<sup>4</sup> Alia sunt peccata, quæ sunt filiæ peccatorum capitalium, et de talibus non-ordinarius non tenetur scire, utrum sint mortalia vel non. Sed curatus ordinarius, ut episcopus, archiepiscopus et cæteri alii superiores tenentur scire.—*Sum. v. confessio. iv. n. iii.*

<sup>5</sup> Ex Scripturis divinis quamvis de multis peccatis constat, quod sunt mortalia, tamen vix de ullis expresse satis videtur constare, quod sint tantum venialia.—*Greg. de Valent. tom. ii. disp. vi. q. xviii.*

<sup>6</sup> Multa enim creduntur esse venialia, quæ mortalia sunt, et difficillimum est in talibus discernere, ii. dist. xxiv. n. liii.

discover more as bad or worse. But by these we may discern, that whatever the Lord hath forbidden in his law, they have ways to reduce it to the rank of venials; for the whole matter of the divine law is, in itself, either of less or greater weight: if it be small, or they please to count it so, they conclude presently, upon that account, it is not mortal. Whatever appears not to be a grand enormity, whether it be against God, others, or ourselves, must be venial, according to that of Richard de Sancto Victore. Mortal sin cannot be committed by any, but by a grand corrupting of himself, or contempt of God, or grievous mischief of others; all the rest are venial.<sup>1</sup> Whatever is not, in their apprehension, grand and grievous, is next to nothing. Yea, one member of the three is, in a manner, wholly shrivelled away into venials. A man can scarce do anything against himself which will be big enough to make a mortal sin of.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, it may seem no more than requisite to make it no crime for a man to damn himself, when they animate him to venture on so many damnable things, as if they were nothing. Thus they serve whatever the great God hath forbidden, which they have the confidence to count small; but if they cannot choose but think it great, they have other expedients to level it (according to the exigence of men's lusts), and diminish it into a venial. To make it more, they require so very much, that a sinner may make shift enough to be without some of it, and so escape the mortalness (as they will have him dream) though he practise the wickedness. That any sin may be mortal, there must be *judicium integrum*, an entire judgment,<sup>3</sup> not distracted, not weakened, not disturbed, as they prove out of their canon law. Also, there must be perfect deliberation;<sup>4</sup> it is venial (how grievous soever otherwise) where there is not perfect deliberation. If, by any means, deliberation not only in itself, but in its perfection, be either prevented, and the thing be done before the mind take due cognizance of it, or hindered while it is under debate, it cannot be mortal. And that deliberation may be perfect, there must be a sufficient presenting of the evil in its object and its circumstances.<sup>5</sup> If the mind only consider the advantage or pleasure, and not the sinfulness and danger, it is but a semi-deliberation, and not full enough to make a sin mortal. Besides, it will require time to perfect it,<sup>6</sup> and here they may favour the sinner as much as they please, by determining what time is sufficient for human frailty; but if he be in haste, and do not stay this time, because he is so forward to sin, he will but sin venially. Finally, there must be full consent

<sup>1</sup> Mortale non potest a quoquam committi sine grandi corruptione sui, aut contemptu Dei, aut gravi læsione proximi; et reliqua omnia esse venialia.—Vid. *St. Clar. Probl. xiv. p. 83.*

<sup>2</sup> Quando sunt contra bonum proprium tantum, sunt magna ex parte venialia.

<sup>3</sup> Ad constituendum peccatum mortale judicium integrum requiritur, Navar. cap. xvi. n. viii. Ad constituendum peccatum mortale integrum judicium requiri debet, cap. i. de delict. puer. Graff. l. i. c. xiv. n. iv. Requiritur plena advertentia, et non sufficit semiplena, qualis in semiebriis, cum dormientibus, et eis qui alio distrahuntur; ut Cajetan, Navar. et alii communiter cum Bonacin de Matr. q. iv. punct. vii. n. vi. p. 313.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. *St. Clar. Probl. xiv. p. 79*, et *Tol. l. iv. c. xii.*, Cajetan. *Sum. v. delect. mores. p. 112.*

<sup>5</sup> Veniale ex imperfectione operis, licet in re gravi, ubi deest perfecta deliberatio, vel presentatio sufficiens malitiæ in objecto, &c.—*St. Clar. ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Per sufficientem deliberationem intelligit (Bonaventura) tempus sufficiens ad deliberandum postquam ratio advertit.—*Sylvest. v. Consens. n. i.* Intelligitur si advertentia sit satis deliberata. Nam si est motus surreptitius, adeo ut sit subita deliberatio, non autem plena, poterit esse veniale (perjurium): scilicet si tempus non suppetebat ad plene deliberandum.—*Soto de Just. lib. viii. q. ii. art. p. 271.* Sufficiens advertentia et deliberatio non habetur sine discursu: discursus autem in tempore fit.—*Suar. de Vol. l. i. c. ix.*

of will. If the inferior and sensual part take never so much complacency in a wicked thing, yet so long as the superior takes no notice of it, there is no harm; it is certainly no more than a venial.<sup>1</sup> Or if the superior part takes cognizance of it, and be some way inclined to the wickedness, yet that may not make it criminal, for every inclination is not sufficient for this purpose, but full consent of will, such as is perfectly deliberate; neither is a tacit and constructive consent sufficient.<sup>2</sup> A neglect to repel or suppress the delight in sin, with some reluctancy of reason, is with Bonaventure constructive consent, which, in the opinion of many doctors, is no mortal sin.<sup>3</sup> Now if there be not a concurrence of all these, the horridest crime that can be perpetrated will be a venial. If a man should blaspheme God, or curse Christ, or renounce the faith, or murder his own father, or ravish his own child or mother, or fire cities and countries, yet if he did it not with such perfection of judgment, deliberation, and consent as is expressed, it would be a petty fault. And he may be easily furnished with many things, which will any of them so weaken this as not to hurt him. Ignorance, drowsiness, disorder by drink, inconsiderateness, negligence, forgetfulness, precipitancy, natural or accidental, levity, passion, custom or habit, and the like, will serve to excuse any wickedness from mortal guilt. Let me but add one more (which serves to make clear work): the opinion of their doctors, one or more, will make any crime not to be mortal to him that follows it. Any person upon this ground may venture upon the most deadly sin as if it were venial. It will be no more dangerous, for he is to be absolved, by their doctrine, though he declares that he will not forsake such a sin. The confessor ought to absolve him, though in his own opinion, and the judgment of other divines also, it be a mortal crime.<sup>4</sup> This is their common doctrine, delivered by multitudes of their writers;<sup>5</sup> so that hereby a fair way is opened to leave no mortal sin in the world, at least in the consciences of all that will regard their doctors. In the mean time, the far greatest part of sins the world is guilty of are, by this and their other maxims, become peccadilloes, and they bid fair for all. The principles, by virtue of which they have done so much already, a little improved (though extended no further than they will reach), would go near to leave no deadly sin at all. To be sure, he that will regulate himself by their maxims, may act any wickedness in the world

<sup>1</sup> Contingit igitur delectari ad apprehensionem delectabilis, ante adversionem delectationis, et hoc est sensualitatis, et absque dubio est veniale peccatum.—*Bonaventura*, ii. dist. xxiv. n. lxxiv.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Bonavent. *ibid.* n. lxiv.

<sup>3</sup> Negligentia repellendi complacentiam, cum displicentia rationis de ea, secundum Bonaventur. est consensus interpretativus: quod non est mortale peccatum secundum multos magistros.—*Sylv.* v. Consensus. n. i. Necessaria est positiva complacentia—et non sufficit consensus interpretativus. Cajetan. et alii in Bonacin. *ibid.* n. viii.; vid. Jo. Sanc. disp. xxi. n. iii. et *ibi.*; Adrian. Cajetan. Armilla. Navar. D. Thom. D. Bonavent. et xxx. alii.

<sup>4</sup> Si pœnitens nollit agnoscere tale quod peccatum, nihilominus absolvat eam, &c., quia ex quo ille credit opinionem quam sequitur esse veram, innixus autoritate probabili, non videtur peccare mortaliter: et sic debet absolvi.—*Sylvest.* secundum Gofredum. v. Confess. iii. n. xi. Si diversitas esset inter doctores, et pœnitens ex aliqua rationabili causa vult adhærere uni opinioni, non est sibi denegenda absolutio: sed suæ conscientiæ relinquenda. Caveat igitur confessor, ne sit præceptus in dando sententiam de mortali, ubi sunt variae opiniones doctorum.—*Angel.* Sum. v. Confess. iv. n. iii. et xiii.

<sup>5</sup> Gofredus, Antoninus, Rosella, Armilla, Angelus, Sylvest. Conradus, Ledesma, Soto, Medina, Navar. in cap. xxiii. n. xxxi. et in Suarez. tom. iv. disp. xxxii. sect. v. et Victorel, l. iii. c. xx.

Near fifty of their authors are produced for this by Jo. Sancius, disp. xxxiii. n. liv. pp. 223, 224.—Vid. *Bonacin*, et in eo alios, tom. i. disp. v. q. vii. punct. iv. n. xxvi.

without fear of deadly guilt. And hereby it appears plainly how very need-  
less holiness of life is in that church (which pretends to a monopoly of all  
the holiness on earth), since by their doctrine they may not only neglect  
acts of piety, righteousness, and common honesty, but may live securely in  
practices opposite to, and inconsistent therewith. They may continue in  
customary blaspheming of God, in common swearing and perjuries, in per-  
fidiousness to God and men; in a neglect of all that is acceptable in divine  
worship; in a total profanation of all time which is indeed, or in their ac-  
count, holy; in impiety and disobedience to parents or superiors; in  
divers degrees of uncleanness and murder; in variety of cheats and stealing;  
in unfaithfulness as to breach of promise and compacts; in all falseness and  
lying, everywhere, and upon all occasions; in slandering or detraction, in  
covetousness or prodigality, which they will; in unmercifulness and out-  
rageous passions; in pride and ambition; in vain glory and hypocrisy; in  
flattery or cunning; in gluttony and drunkenness, &c.; in sins against God  
and man, against godliness, righteousness, mercy, charity,—in any of these,  
a little modified in all of them, and many more than I can reckon. They  
may persist in them impenitently to the death, and yet (if impostors may be  
trusted rather than the word of God) not fall short of salvation; their doc-  
trine gives them encouragement to live in them without conscience, and die  
in them without repentance. It takes off the motives which might work  
upon either fear or love (the main principles of such motions in us) to for-  
sake them. They are taught by their best authors that these sins may  
stand well with their love to God; that they do not so much as impair the  
habit of charity;<sup>1</sup> that they do not hinder the increase of grace, or the  
effects of their sacraments;<sup>2</sup> that they do not stain the soul;<sup>3</sup> that they  
hazard not God's favour thereby; that they displease not God, that  
they are not against his will;<sup>4</sup> that they are consistent with a perfect  
fulfilling of the law;<sup>5</sup> that they have not perfectly the nature of sin;<sup>6</sup>  
that they are not against the law, but only beside it;<sup>7</sup> or if they be against  
it in any respect, as some of them think,<sup>8</sup> yet against no precept, the ob-  
servance of which is necessary for salvation, or not against the end of the  
law,<sup>9</sup> which is charity; that they are but as specks or motes,<sup>10</sup> we may look  
on them as nothing,<sup>11</sup> that without the interposal of mercy they are such in  
their own nature,<sup>12</sup> as ought to be passed by, they deserve pardon.<sup>13</sup> They do

<sup>1</sup> Ex consensu omnium neque tollunt neque minuunt habitum charitatis.—*Bellarmin.*  
*de Amis.* grat. l. i. c. xiii. p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> Actuale peccatum veniale non esse obicem in eucharistia (docet) D. Thomas,  
unde à fortiore idem diceret de cæteris sacramentis quæ minus digna sunt; de Bap-  
tismo affirmat Scotus,—*frequentiores Theologi.*—*Suar.* tom. iii. disp. vii. p. 132.

<sup>3</sup> Aquinas proprie loquendo peccatum veniale non causat maculam in anima, i. 2,  
q. lxxxix. art. i.

<sup>4</sup> Bonavent. ii. dist. xlii.; Soto de nat. et gr. l. i. c. iv. p. 132.

<sup>5</sup> Neque obstant quominus iusti, perfecti etiam dicantur.—*Soto, ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Non habet perfectam rationem peccati.—*Aquinas* i. 2, q. lxxxviii. art. i. ad primum.

<sup>7</sup> Non est contra legem sed præter legem.—*Idem, ibid.* Lombard ii. Sentent.  
dist. xxxv. Bonaventur. ii. dist. xliii. Scotus a quo vocatur consilium, quod in-  
fringitur per peccatum veniale, in St. Clar. *ibid.* p. 79. *Bellarmin.* de Justific. l. i. iv.  
c. xiv.

<sup>8</sup> Durandus, Major, Vega. Rada. Herrera. <sup>9</sup> Estius. Becanus.

<sup>10</sup> Isti ergo vitiorum atque lapsuum quotidiani nævuli, licet Christiani hominis vitam  
quasi pulvisculo aspergant, haudquaquam tamen defædant turpiter.—*Lindanus.*

<sup>11</sup> Modicum pro nihilo censetur.—*Cajetan.*

<sup>12</sup> *Bellarmin.* De Amis. grat. l. i. c. xiv. p. 95.

<sup>13</sup> Veniale ex se venia dignum, *Aquinas* i. 2, q. lxxxviii. art. i. Veniale dicitur quod  
est venia dignum, *Bellarmin.* *ibid.* p. 81.—*Cajetan.*

*Estius*, ii. sent. dist. xlii. sect. vi.

not (as they teach) deserve eternal punishment, and the Lord (as they blaspheme) would be unjust,<sup>1</sup> if he should condemn any for them. So that not only as long as God is merciful, but while he is just, the practice of these sins is safe. Neither love to God, nor fear of his displeasure, nor dread of hell, nor desire of heaven, nor a design for perfection, need move them to abandon any one of these sins. They need not fear, how much soever they multiply or abound in them; if they should commit millions of them in a day, and continue the practice all the days of a long life, this would not damn them; for all the venial sins in the world, if they meet in one man, would not amount to so much as one damning sin.<sup>2</sup> They may commit them not only out of ignorance or infirmity, but with a high hand out of contempt.<sup>3</sup> They may praise themselves or others for them,<sup>4</sup> they may boast of and glory in them,<sup>5</sup> they may perpetrate them out of malice.<sup>6</sup> They may be so far from resolving to leave them, as it will be but a small fault, to bind themselves by oath to commit them,<sup>7</sup> and call God to witness, that they will thus sin against him. They may die with resolution to continue therein,<sup>8</sup> if they might live; yea, they may breathe out their souls with delight and complacency in these sins, and yet be saved.<sup>9</sup> To conclude, mark how they may act and multiply, and persist in them, and then view the nature and quality and number of them, or guess thereat by the severals premised; and then suppose a man living after the rules of these conscientious doctors and casuists, and taking but part of that liberty which the Roman divinity allows, such a man would pass for a good catholic with them, and be holy enough, according to the holiness left among them, and made necessary by them; yet, even by the rules of heathen morality, he would appear little better than a monster. So faithfully do they retain, and so much do they regard the rules of Christ in forming the maxims of their new divinity, that sober heathenism would be ashamed thereof; and so like is practical popery to true Christianity, in that wherein the reality and triumphant splendour of it consists, innocency and purity! If an atheist had a mind to render the Christian name odious, and to represent Christianity with a black and detestable visage to the sober part of the world; if he had a design to make men believe that Christ was a minister of unright-

<sup>1</sup> Negamus—posse Deum juste punire peccatum quodlibet, etiam veniale, pœna omnium gravissima, quæ est mors æterna.—*Bellarmin. ibid.* p. 92, et de Purgat. l. i. c. vii. p. 1359.

<sup>2</sup> Etiam si omnia peccata venialia simul colligerentur in unum, nunquam efficerent id, quod facit unum lethale.—*Bellarmin. ibid.* p. 91.

<sup>3</sup> Non quasi ipse contemptus et vilipensio venialium sit mortale—quia nullibi est præceptum ut istam curam habeamus, sed consulitur tantum, Sylvest. v. peccat. n. iv. Peccare venialiter ex contemptu infra limites venialis, non est peccatum mortale.—Cajetan. Sum. v. contemptus, Lopez. cap. i. p. 3, Metina, *ibid.*, Graff. l. i. c. xiv. n. viii. *ibid.*, Aquinas ii. 2, q. cvii. art. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Navar. cap. xxii. n. xiii. et xvi.

<sup>5</sup> Secus etiam si gloriaretur de re peccati venialis solum, quoniam sic non esset mortalis vana gloria, Angel. Sum. v. van. gl. n. i., Cajetan. Sum. v. glor. vana. Est mortale cum—landant alios et jactant de peccatis mortalibus quæ fecerunt, secus esset de veniali, quoniam non est contra Deum.—*Angel. v. Jactantia*, n. i.

<sup>6</sup> Contingit tamen propter imperfectionem actus, esse veniale peccatum ex malitia: ut si quis vana mendacia eligit dicere ex intentione hujus mali, quod est vane mentiri, et non propter aliud.—*Cajetan. Sum. v. malitia*.

<sup>7</sup> Juramentum de peccato veniali peccatum est, si tamen fiat cum proposito implendi illud, non est mortale, Cajetan, Soto, Antoninus, Sylvest. Tabien. Navar. in Suar. de Juram. l. iii. c. xix. n. iii.

<sup>8</sup> Potest quis dum moritur, habere voluntatem permanendi in peccato veniali.—*Bellarmin. de Purgat.* l. i. c. vii. p. 1359.

<sup>9</sup> Potest quis mori in complacentia peccati.—*Idem. ibid.* cap. x. p. 1370.

Cum venialis complacentia potest mori ac salvari.—*Sylvest. Sum. v. Contritio.* n. iii.

eousness, and the gospel a licentious doctrine, tending to debauch mankind, he would need no more, but persuade them that the maxims of the Roman divines were conformed to the rules of the gospel; but then, if he should attempt to prove this conformity, he might as easily demonstrate that darkness is light, or the Alcoran the Christian gospel.

## CHAPTER IX.

*Many enormous crimes are no sins at all in the Roman account.*

*Sect. 1.* I proceed to those sins which they will have to be no sins, but need not stay long here, having given a large account of those which they make venial; since betwixt these, and no sins, there is little difference in their doctrine, and none in their practice. I need not stay to shew how it is no sin with them to vilify the Scriptures (the written word of God), or to rob him of the sole glory of his mediation, and to give much thereof to others, in all its parts and specialities, merit, satisfaction, intercession; or to put their trust in others besides God, for things which he alone can give, and for which he only is to be relied on, and this not only in saints and angels, but their images, and their imaginary relics. And how it is no sin in their account to abide in ignorance, unbelief, impenitency, or to live without the love and fear of God, and the exercising of other graces; by what is already premised this is sufficiently manifested.

To resist the inspirations of God,<sup>1</sup> drawing us to the observance of his commands, or withdrawing us from wickedness, is no special sin, *i. e.* we contract no other kind of guilt thereby, than if we had sinned without any such inspirations to withhold us from it. Thus it will be no fault at all to quench the motions of God's Spirit, inducing us to turn to him, to love him, to repent, &c., or dissuading us from blasphemy, perjury, adultery, murder, or any other crime.<sup>2</sup> And yet if a man be ready to commit any wickedness, it will be no sin for another to invite him to do it. Thus far men may promote all sin in others, and resist the Spirit of God, moving against it. As for evil spirits, they conclude it no sin, for good men, by special instinct or revelation, to make use of the ministry of devils;<sup>3</sup> they tell us that to apply themselves to devils to know,<sup>4</sup> or obtain any thing of them, is to have some familiarity and society with those damned spirits (unless it be the better to expel them out of the possessed), yet they teach it is no sin to inquire of the devil in a possessed person, what his name is, and wherefore he vexes that person, and what devils are his associates, and the like. But he must not believe the devil, though he tell him (for this would be as bad as necromancy);<sup>5</sup> yet if he believe him not, none can tell how the devils answer-

<sup>1</sup> Si tamen contingat speciales inspirationes dari a Deo, quando se offert occasio frangendi aliquod præceptum, et homo resistens inspirationibus præceptum transgrediatur; nullo modo speciale peccatum committit, quia resistit inspirationi.—*Jo. Sanc. select. disp. vii. n. xi. p. 36.*

<sup>2</sup> Ex sententia Cajetani et Navar. in Vasquez, Opusc. moral. dub. iii. p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Sylvest. Sum. v. adjurat. n. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Si quis eos adjuret—ad aliquid ab iis sciendum, aut ad aliquod obsequium per eos consequendum, est illicitum 1. quia hoc pertinet ad quandam societatem, vel familiaritatem cum ipsis.—*Sylvest. Sum. v. adjura. n. ii.* Licite adjuramus in omnibus ut de corpore expellatur, utputa, quod suum nomen fateatur—similiter ut dicat causam vexandi hominem—licet non credamus, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Quod si ei crederet, ut necromantici, credo esse mortale, quia pertinet ad amicitiam.—*Ibid. n. iii.*

ing him in those inquiries can contribute any thing to his expulsion. They declare also, that it is lawful to use adjurations to the devils who possess no person, not to assist those that do, or to apply themselves to the great devils, to cast out the less.<sup>1</sup>

*Sect. 2.* So far we see (and further) they may deal with the devil; how they may deal with God we saw before. Though the whole body of popery be corrupt, yet there is nothing more leprous than their worship. They think it not needful that it should be conformed to the divine rule in any thing, either as to the end, or manner, or matter, or object, yet it is transcendently good in their own eyes, no sin in it, even when there is nothing else. For what sordid and wicked ends they think it fit to worship God, we have discovered already, and also in what an irreligious manner. To this latter, let me add, what I meet with in Angelus, when he is inquiring, whether attention or devotion be necessary in their divine service (a strange question it might seem among any called Christians, if their divine service were the worship of God), he tells us their gloss maintains that it is sufficient to say it (their service) with the mouth, though not with the heart, and that many other canonists agree therein.<sup>2</sup> Thus it seems they understand the pope's law for divine worship; so as to approve that in plain terms which Christ expressly, and the prophets before him, condemns; so as to declare to the world, that the church of Rome makes no other worship necessary, than what Christ hath openly branded as vain, false, and hypocritical, Isa. xxix. 14, and Mat. xv. 7-9.

The sense of their divines agrees so well with the canonists, and as little with Christ (though it be expressed in other terms), that the contradiction to him is not so open though it be as full. Angelus himself,<sup>3</sup> and Sylvester after him, with others, determine that wandering in one that observes it, when it is but as to the inward act, though it be temerarious and grievous, is not mortal unless it be out of contempt,<sup>4</sup> the plain English of which is this: the departing of the mind and heart from God in worship, willingly and wittingly, how great soever it be, is a small fault, if any, unless to this neglect of God a greater contempt be added, whereas the contempt of God herein is very great. His reason is that which others give, because the church is not to judge of mere inward acts;<sup>5</sup> and therefore, if a minister of the church, when he is at service, mind something else, he seems to be no transgressor of the precept by that act.<sup>6</sup>

He tells us out of Aquinas (what we saw the rest of them do before) that they need not continue actually attentive in worship, but only virtually,

<sup>1</sup> Hac etiam ratione non solum licet adjurare dæmones non obsidentes, ne adjuvent obsidentes: sed etiam superiores, ut expellant inferiores.—*Id. ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Quoad attentionem vel devotionem, Quæritur utrum peccent mortaliter non dicentes officium devote et studiose? Resp. Glossa tenet, quod sufficit dicere ore, licet non corde, et cum ea concurrunt multi Canonistæ in c. dolentes.—*Angel. Sum. v. horæ. n. xxvii.*

Similiter non peccat mortaliter qui verba quidem dicit, sed ad illa non attendit: quoniam cum præceptum de dicendo horas sit de jure positivo, non refertur nisi ad ea, quæ sub judicio humano cadere possunt: et ista sunt quæ exercentur per actus exteriores, non autem interiores. Et hoc idem videtur voluisse Scotus in iv.—*Hostiensis etiam. —Idem. Pet. de Palud. Sum. Rosel. v. Horæ.*

<sup>3</sup> Verb. Horæ. n. xxvii. supra.

<sup>4</sup> Evagatio autem advertentis secundum actum interiorem solum, licet sit temeraria et gravis forte, non tamen est mortale, nisi propter contemptum.—*Sylv. v. hora. n. xiii; Rosella. v. horæ; secundum Petr. Paludan.*

<sup>5</sup> Quia ecclesia non habet judicare de actibus interioribus mere.—*Uterque. ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Propter quod minister ecclesiæ, licet dicendo officium aliud cogitet; non videtur transgressor præcepti ex natura facti.—*Angelus, ibid. Rosella, ibid.*

*id est*, if they intend to perform service when they are going about it, that will make them pass for attentive enough all the while, though their minds be carried away after other things when they are at it, and never heed the worship in hand.<sup>1</sup> This is the common sense of their authors, as if they should gravely tell us that a man who goes into company with some intent (actual or virtual) to be sober, but presently falls to his cups, is overcome and continues drunk divers hours, yet he may be said to be sober all the while he is drunk, by virtue of his first intention. And so we should wrong the Romanists if we did not think they would have as much of true worship and religion in their service as that man has of sobriety all the time he is dead drunk.

*Sect. 3.* But there is not any more horrid abuse of divine worship than that which they are guilty of in reference to its object; for besides what they determine concerning divine worship to be given to other things besides God, it is no sin with them to worship the utensils of their worship, the vessels, books, tables, linen, and priestly vestments, being once dedicated to divine service, and made holy by the charm of a consecration. Antonius Corduba says they are to be worshipped for themselves,<sup>2</sup> and in the judgment of Clychtovius they are to have a worship distinct from his worship, to whose honour they are dedicated.<sup>3</sup> Vasquez will have them worshipped relatively (as images, to whom he gives divine adoration) with respect to him in whose service they are used.<sup>4</sup>

It is no sin to worship the word *Jesus*, whether it be pronounced or written, and some will have honour given to the word for itself; so Corduba and others.<sup>5</sup> Some will have the word worshipped together with him that it signifies, as the image and the exemplar are both worshipped together, so that they will have the word *Jesus* to be worshipped as the image of *Jesus*.<sup>6</sup>

It is no sin to worship the accidents of bread and wine in the eucharist, where the object worshipped is not only Christ there, nor is it the substance of bread and wine (for they say there is no substance left), but that which they worship is the colour, figure, or taste of the elements. The colour, when there is nothing that is coloured; the tartness, when there is nothing that is tart; the roundness, when there is nothing that is round. To these wonderful (not to say monstrous) accidents, some will have a single worship due,<sup>7</sup> but that, the very same worship that is due to Christ, and besides that divine adoration, which is common to them with Christ, will have also a proper worship given without reference to Christ; but all of them agree

<sup>1</sup> Tunc videtur manere secundum virtutem, quum accedit ad orationem cum intentione aliquid impetrandi, vel Deo debitum obsequium reddendi: etiamsi in prosecutione mens ad alia rapiatur.—*Idem, ibid.*

Adverte tamen quod intentio debita et actualis, si adsit in principio vocalis orationis, licet postea mens evagetur (nisi talis evagatio interrumpat primam intentionem per contrariam intentionem) sic est meritoria et impetrativa oratio vocalis sine attentione, per virtutem primæ intentionis.—*Idem, v. oratio, n. x.*; Rosella, v. hora; Scotus, *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Vasquez de adoratione l. ii. disp. viii. c. x. n. cccxlii. Posse secundum se, cultum deferri rebus sacris, sic docet Antonius de Corduba, et alii recentiores.

<sup>3</sup> Vasis et aliis rebus sacris inanimis concedit cultum aliquem, distinctum a cultu illius, in cujus honorem dicatæ sunt.—*Idem, ibid. c. ii. n. cccxl.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid. c. x. n. cccxliv.*

<sup>5</sup> Ipsi etiam voci secundum se, censet honorem aliquem tribui.—*Ibid. n. cccxlii.*

<sup>6</sup> Simul—cum Christo quem significat vox illa.—*Ibid. n. cccxliii.* Idem quod de imagine, de voce quoque *Jesus* et aliis rebus inanimis, manifeste sequitur, et quamvis diceremus, quia imagines exemplaribus substituntur, ideo cum ipsis adorari; quis audeat asserere, vocem *Jesus* aut scriptam aut prolatam, in locum significati non subrogari? &c.—*Ibid. n. cccxliv.*

<sup>7</sup> Alii vero recentiores—eodem modo de speciebus sacramentalibus atque de imaginibus docent: nempe eas adorari posse eodem motu, et adoratione patriæ cum Christo

that they are to be adored with divine worship, and some say that this adoration is terminated on them, as the worship of the exemplar upon the image.<sup>1</sup> They will not only have the manger wherein Christ lay, and the thorns wherewith he was crowned, and the spear that wounded him, to be worshipped, but the picture of these when they are but painted;<sup>2</sup> they are to have the same worship which the true cross has, that is, divine adoration; and so are natural thorns or a common manger or spear to be worshipped, when they are made use of to adorn the cross or to set off the passion of Christ, as they are wont theatrically to represent it.

It is no sin to worship anything that Christ touched, or that touched him, how injuriously soever. Therefore, they teach that the ass upon which Christ rode is to be worshipped. Hereby it appears, says Vasquez, how rightly the ass upon which Christ did ride may be worshipped,<sup>3</sup> and that the very lips of Judas (that traitor and devil as Christ calls him) for kissing Christ, when he betrayed him, for that very act wherein he shewed himself a traitor and devil, are to be worshipped.<sup>4</sup> If they had but that traitor's lips they would reverently and devoutly kiss, that is, adore them; and it is strange if they have them not among their sacred relics, since they say they have the foreskin of Christ cut off at his circumcision,<sup>5</sup> and his very countenance impressed by him upon a white cloth,<sup>6</sup> for one would think these as hard to come by; however, in diverse places they worship something at a venture which they count so.

It is no sin to worship the imaginary blood which flows from a crucifix or image of Christ, when it is wounded, for they, being given up to believe the most ridiculous lies, do believe that such blood hath issued from a mere picture or image,<sup>7</sup> they keep it as a most sacred relic,<sup>8</sup> and it is to be worshipped with the same worship they give to Christ himself.<sup>9</sup>

sub ipsis contento: posse etiam secundum se, propria adoratione coli, quæ non referatur in Christum ibi contentum sicut in terminum proximum adorationis: sed tanquam in motivum remotum, sicut de imaginibus, et de nomine *Jesu*, docuerunt.—*Idem, ibid.* c. ii. n. cccx.

<sup>1</sup> Eandem adorationem qua Christum ibi colimus, ad eas terminari, dicendum est (ut docet Claudus Cello. vi.) Sed per accidens, sicut adoratio exemplaris in iuaginem quoque terminatur. Id expresse tradit Algelus. l. ii., de *Euch.* c. iii.—*Idem, ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Si autem pingeretur sacrum præsepium, vel lancea, vel spinea corona, vel aliquid simile, non minus quam ipsa crux in veneratione esse debere. Id vero quod de pictura vel sculptura dicimus, de iisdem rebus naturalibus dicendum esset, si in ornamentum crucis, et monumentum passionis, vel alterius mysterii, publice poneretur, &c.—*Idem, ibid.* l. iii. c. vi. disp. ii. n. lxxiii.

<sup>3</sup> Inde etiam constat, quo pacto recte possit asinus, cui Christus insedit, adorari.—*Ibid.* n. lxxvi.

<sup>4</sup> Nil tamen obest, quominus aliquis sincera fide, et recta intentione, affectum et animum solum in Christum intendens, labia Judæ, et alia quæ injuste Christum tetigerunt, reverenter osculetur.—*Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Ex dictis inferitur Christi præputium et sanguinem relictum in terris, sive sit sub forma sanguinis, sive sub alia, non secundum se, hyperdulia, sed ex affectu latræ circa Christum eodem motu adorationis cum ipso, sicut alias ejus reliquias, adorandum esse, ut notavit Corduba et Sylvest.—*Idem, ibid.* disp. iv. n. cxxv.

<sup>6</sup> Antiqua etiam traditione constat vultum sanctum Domini, tempore passionis suæ in linteo expressum fuisse. Qualis Romæ—et in Hispania ostenditur—Taurus vero magna cum veneratione servatur, et nec minori religione colitur sindon, qua Christus in sepulchro fuit involutus: cui impressam reliquit sui corporis figuram.—*Idem, ibid.* l. ii. disp. iii. c. i. n. xxix.

<sup>7</sup> Vid. Aquinas iii. q. liv. art. ii.

<sup>8</sup> One at Berytus, in Syria, pierced by a Jew, related in a book ascribed to Athanasius falsely (as Bellarmine confesses, de script. Eccles. p. 78), of which our author, l. ii. disp. iii. c. i. n. xxix.

<sup>9</sup> Idem dicendum de sanguine, qui ex aliqua imagine Christi fluxit, nisi quod ille non ratione contactus, sed representationis tantum adorandus est.—*Idem, ibid.* l. iii. disp. iv. c. ii. n. cxxv.

It is no sin to give divine worship to any man, not only the saints in heaven or holy persons on earth, but any men whatever in the world (the wickedest not excepted), may, together with God, have divine worship, as the image has with the exemplar, since every man is the living image of God.<sup>1</sup> This is not only the doctrine of Vasquez, but of Alensis, of Waldensis, and of Cardinal Cajetan, only in the practice of this there must be caution; for Albertus Magnus and Aquinas say there is danger lest a man being of more excellency than an image, divine worship should be given him, not for God's sake but his own dignity, but where this danger is not, they would not deny but any man may be so worshipped, even with divine worship; so that if Paul and Barnabas, with the Lycaonians,<sup>2</sup> Acts xiv., had but proceeded with the caution of these doctors, and taken care that those people should so worship them only for God's sake, they might lawfully have admitted the worship offered them, though they (not learned in this kind of doctrine) chose rather to be stoned than so honoured.

It is lawful to worship not only rational creatures, but anything else in the whole world, whether living or lifeless.<sup>3</sup> Any beast or creeping thing may be worshipped as the image of God, which they hold is to be honoured with divine worship; so that not only the planets, stars, the queen, and the host of heaven may be thus adored (for which the Lord condemns Israel and Judah as idolaters), but the vilest creature that lives on earth, a fly, or a frog, or a serpent, or a toad may be thus worshipped; yea, meaner creatures than any that have life, any inanimate thing whatsoever, though it be but a wisp of straw. That is our author's own instance: whereas, says he, the Wickliffites object that Christians who worship images may as well worship a wisp of straw (*modulum straminis*).<sup>4</sup> The same Leontius (upon whose authority he grounds all) would as freely grant this of a bit of straw, as he does it of everything else in the world, so far is it from being counted absurd; yea, they may worship not only vile, but sordid things; and not only God, but angels and saints in them, *quævis alia res mundi*; anything whatever in the world, whether lifeless, unreasonable, or rational, may rightly have divine worship with God.<sup>5</sup> And this is not only the judgment of their famous Vasquez, but of Cardinal Cajetan, and in consequence, of them all; for those great wits well discerned that the adoration of other things, approved and practised by the Romanists, could never be defended, without extending their principles to such a latitude. Thus it is manifest that whatsoever the apostate Israelites adored, or the Egyptians worshipped, or the Laplanders do worship, or the grossest and the most ridiculous idola-

<sup>1</sup> De homine, qui est viva Dei similitudo et imago, nec aliqua institutione in cultum Dei dedicata, docent Alexander, Waldensis et Cajetan, eum posse esse adorationis materiam, sicut de imagine picta dixerunt: hoc est, in illo et per illum ita Deum adorari posse, ut ipse etiam homo, eodem motu, et signo submissionis colatur, sicut imago cum exemplari: atque, idem de angelo dicere debent.—*Ibid.* disp. i. c. i. n. iv., et cap. iii. n. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> Ubi periculum non esset, non negarent adorari posse sicut imaginem pictam.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Quævis etiam alia res mundi sive inanima, et irrationalis, sive rationalis, ex natura rei et secluso periculo, rite cum Deo, sicut imago ipsius adorari potest. Hanc opinionem tradit Cajetan 2, ii. q. ciii. art. iii. ad dub. iv. Id docuit Leontius.—*Ibid.* c. ii. n. v.

<sup>4</sup> Frustra igitur Wickliffistæ objiciebant Christianis imagines colentibus, ipsos quoque modulum straminis adorare posse—idem enim Leontius, de modulo straminis, quod de quacunque re mundi, libenter fateretur; tantum abest, ut absurdum judicari debeat.—*Ibid.* n. x.

<sup>5</sup> In brutis animantibus et rebus sordidis, Deo exhibere notam submissionis, primo aspectu indecens apparet: id tamen non obest, quominus suapte natura in equalibet re mundi Deum ipsum adorare liceat: imo et sanctos homines seu angelos, si eos cum rebus illis cogitatione nostra possimus conjungere.—*Ibid.* n. xi.

ters in the world, ever made an idol, all that, with much more and worse, may lawfully be worshipped by popish principles; there never was any idolatry so absurd or horrid in the world but may have patronage or excuse by this doctrine.

And now heaven and earth being furnished with their idols, one would think they need go no further, but be satisfied, without seeking hell for any, yet there is an inquiry which reaches that too. It is a question amongst them, if the devil should appear in a beam of light, or the form of a crucifix, whether that apparition may be worshipped? <sup>1</sup> Antisidorensis, Alexander, Aquinas, Marsilius, Adrian, and others, will not allow it should be worshipped, unless conditionally, and with a condition expressed; but Vasques is for adoration hereof absolutely, no condition expressed; <sup>2</sup> and he has those who are otherwise minded at a great advantage, because they conclude for worship absolutely in a parallel case; for they will have a consecrated host to be worshipped without condition, though the devil were in it, or lurked under it; and if they think he would be worshipped in the former without the interposal of a condition, he will be worshipped in the latter, where they will have no condition to exclude it. I conclude this with what Holcott determines: a man may merit by a mistaken belief, although it so fall out that he worship the devil. <sup>3</sup>

These decisions were necessary to justify their devout persons who have met with such adventures. A great part of popery is grounded upon visions and apparitions. These were much affected and admired by their reputed holy men, and women too, who were admired and adored for them. Satan, in the darkness (wherein this mystery did best thrive), had the advantage to put store of cheats upon them. Many monks and hermits (says à Lapide) were deceived by him. Particularly, among the rest, Valens the monk was thus deluded, the devil frequently appearing to him as an angel. In fine, Satan in an apparition feigned himself to be Christ, and the monk went, and for Christ worshipped the devil (*Idem* in 2 Cor. xi. 15). They are concerned to plead for that worship, which had the same original with much of their religion.

*Sect. 4.* For oaths or perjury, I will only instance in those which are fraudulent. First, they determine that he who takes an oath, and intends not to swear, the oath binds not, it is no sin to go against it. <sup>4</sup>

Secondly, when a man intends to swear, but intends not to be obliged by

<sup>1</sup> An sit peccatum adorare radium luminis, vel speciem crucifixi, sub qua Dæmon delitescit.—*Ibid.* disp. i. c. v. n. xxx.; vid. *Bonacin.* tom. ii. disp. iii. q. i. punct. iv. n. v.

<sup>2</sup> Quare nec conditionem expresse addere oportet, ut recte et legitime adoratio fiat; et multo minus ea exprimenda est, quando Eucharistiam adoramus; ut optime tradunt Alexand. S. Thom. Bonaventura: qui cum dicant, necessariam esse expressam conditionem, quando adoratur Christus in specie crucifixi, ubi Dæmon delitescit; affirmant tamen, eam non esse necessariam, ut adoretur in hostia consecrata. *Idem* sensit Gabriel. Quinimo, ut Cajetan, Hosselanus et Claudius Sainctes, docent, male faceret qui adderet conditionem, ut securus adoraret.—*Ibid.* n. xxxiv.

<sup>3</sup> Hominem posse mereri per fidem erroneam, etsi contingat ut adoret diabolium.—*Refert. Humphred de vita Jucl.* p. 120.

<sup>4</sup> Quid ergo si quis exterius juret proferendo verba, et tangendo evangelia, intus tamen non habeat jurandi animum? Respondetur in illo casu, non esse verum sed fictum juramentum. Sed nunquid in conscientia qui sic jurat, tenebitur adimplere? Respondetur unimne quidem, &c.—*Soto de Just. et Jur.* l. viii. q. i. art. vii. p. 262; *Graf. decis. aur.* l. ii. c. xvii. n. v. Ut obligationem inducat necessarium est, ut ab intentione jurandi procedat, hoc certum est apud omnes.—*D. Thom., Cajetan, Soto, Covarruvias, Panormitan, Glossa in Suar.* l. ii. de Jurament. c. vii. n. ii. Necessarium est ut intentio jurandi sit sufficienter libera. Communis est.—*Idem, ibid.* n. iii.

swearing, there he is not obliged, but may lawfully break it, as the ancients casuists and school-doctors generally determine.<sup>1</sup>

There is real evidence for the practice of this from the conclave; for, as their excellent historian tells us, in the vacancies of the see, the cardinals use to compose certain capitulations to reform the papal government, which all swear to perform if they be assumed to the popedom, though it appear by all precedent examples that every one sweareth with a mind not to keep them in case he shall be pope; for so soon as he is elected, he saith, he could not bind himself, and that he is at liberty by gaining the papacy.<sup>2</sup> This was remarkably exemplified in Paul IV., who, resolving to break one of the capitulations he was sworn to a little before, and some of the cardinals being ready to put him in mind of his oath, he declared in consistory, that it is an article of faith that the pope cannot be bound, and much less can bind himself, that to say otherwise was a manifest heresy,<sup>3</sup> and threatened the inquisition to any that hold it. It seems it is damnable error, deserving something like a hell upon earth, to believe that his holiness intends to be honest whatever he swear. It is true, every one has not the privilege of a pope to have it counted heresy for any to believe that he can be bound to keep any oaths, or ever to intend it; but all have this liberty by their doctrine, that they may take oaths without any intention to keep them, and are not bound to keep them if they do not intend it.

Thirdly, to elude an oath, and deceive those who give it, or are concerned in it, by equivocation, or other artifice of words, yea, or by mental reservation, is no sin, and that in many cases.<sup>4</sup> As when a man has no mind to swear, and thinks he is not bound to do it; when he is drawn to it by force, or induced by fear, or brought to it by importunity; or when the judge is incompetent (as they count all that are heretics or excommunicate, and that have not lawful jurisdiction), or if the judges are competent, yet when they proceed not juridically.<sup>5</sup> In these and other cases, either for avoiding harm or inconvenience,<sup>6</sup> or when it may be for their advantage in any respect, they think it lawful to use these methods of deceit in swearing. Indeed, the

<sup>1</sup> Tenet S. Bonaventura quod universaliter non obligat juramentum, si jurans animum se obligandi non habuit. Sylvest. jurament. iv. n. xix. vid. plures ibid. n. vii. et n. xvii. Nec qui sic jurat, peccat.—Angelus v. juram. v. n. ix. et Sylvest. v. juram. iv. n. vii. Qui jurat cum intentione non se obligandi, non obligatur ex vi juramenti. Ita—D. Thom. Bonaventur. Scotus. Gabriel. Richard. Sylvest. Angelus Medina. Gutierrez. Navar. Gloss. Felinus. Abbas. Jo. Andr. in Suar. l. ii. de juram. c. vii. n. ix. Hos et alios vid. in Bonacina. tom. ii. disp. iv. q. i. punct. vii. n. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Hist. of Counc. of Tr. l. i. p. 71.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. l. v. p. 396.

<sup>4</sup> Si judex juramentum exigens talis (competens) non fuerit, vel esto quod sit competens, interrogat tamen contra juris ordinem, vel est alius homo privatus, qui per metum aut importunitatem juramentum extorquet, tunc jurare poterit quod secundum suam mentem est verum, falsum autem, secundum mentem alterius, cui exhibit juramentum. Sicuti fecisse B. Franciscum ferunt, qui rogatus qua perrexisset quidam homicida, respondit, non transisse illac, intelligens, per illas manicas.—Cum Adriano; Qui sic inique interrogatur, potest optime respondere, quod nescit, intelligendo, non eo modo se scire, quo illud dicere teneatur.—Navar. cap. xii. n. viii.

<sup>5</sup> Vid Navar. c. xviii. n. lvii.

<sup>6</sup> Qui alio sensu jurat quam alter intelligat, non peccat, modo justam habeat causam ita jurandi—justa autem causa utendi his verbis (amphibologicis) est necessitas aut utilitas corporis, aut honoris, aut rerum familiarium—Ex quo sequitur, non esse illicitum uti verbis amphibologicis, addendo restrictionem aliquam in mente retentam, quoties aliquid incommodi, vel injuriæ nobis impendet loquendo ad mentem interrogantis, adest enim justa causa ita loquendi.—Bonacin. tom. ii. dis. iv. quest. i. punct. xii. n. ii. iii. iv.

Ejusmodi autem æquivocationibus uti, addito etiam juramento absque causa, non est peccatum mortale, modo ne id fiat in fraudem tertii, aut in judicio, dum judex juridice interrogat.—Ibid. vid. Dion. v. æquivoc.

reason they give to justify the practice in these cases, will make it as lawful in any other; for they say what is so sworn is true in their own sense, though not in the sense of the hearers, and so they will have it in strictness to be neither lie nor perjury, nor any mortal sin, even when there is no honest nor reasonable occasion for swearing or promising in this fraudulent manner.

And that you may perceive the Jesuits are not the prime masters of these arts, I shall instance in other authors who were either before them, or not addicted to the Society.

For equivocations, or other sleight of words in swearing, they are justified by multitudes of their writers,<sup>1</sup> viz., Sairus after Aquinas, and their Gloss, Paludanus, Gabriel, Johannes Major, Adrian, Hen. Gandavensis, Angelus, Sylvester, Soto, &c. The instances which Soto gives may serve for a test; as for example, when one instead of saying *I swear*, uses a word which signifies another thing, but so pronounces it as the difference is not discerned;<sup>2</sup> or if the word God in the language wherein the oath is taken may signify some other thing, he that swears may mean something else by it, when he that gives the oath understands the God of heaven;<sup>3</sup> or if the oath be formed in this order, *I swear to you to pay so much money*, he that swears may mean not to pay him but some other, when he to whom the oath is made, understands it intended for himself.<sup>4</sup> Such an oath, says Soto, is true, just, prudent, because then simulation is profitable,<sup>5</sup> having said before that it is lawful, with such fraud to deceive one who forces him to swear, since he who puts him to swear hath no right to do it;<sup>6</sup> and these fore-mentioned are the very same instances which Sanchez uses<sup>7</sup>, by which we see the Jesuit was not the inventor hereof, but learned them of a Dominican.

Of mental reservations, justified by their chief authors, who were no Jesuits, instances might be given in abundance;<sup>8</sup> for example, if a man will have his wife swear that she is not an adulteress, though she be guilty, she may deny it with an oath, and swear what is false in his sense, if it be true

Videtur esse communis sententia juramentum simulatum, id est, cum justa et prudenti amphibologia factum, non obligare. D. Tho. Cajetan. Soto. Abbas. Tabiena. Covarruvias. Navar. in Suar. l. ii. de juram. cap. viii. n. ii. Juramentum autem dolum cum injustitia obligare—sed tantum secundum proprium sensum.—Scotus, Bonavent. Richard. Gabriel. Sylvest. Angelus. Antoninus.—*Ibid.* n. v.

<sup>1</sup> Licet jurare cum æquivocatione. D. Tho. Scotus. Paludanus, Richard. Major. Adrian. Navar. Covarruvias. Sylvest. Gloss. *Ibid.* l. iii. cap. ix.

<sup>2</sup> Si injurius ille nequam sic rogaret, juras mihi tantam numerare pecuniam? et alter responderet, sic uro (absque *J.*) non esset peccatum mortale, sed simplex mendacium: quia forte tunc nihil ureret.—*Soto, ibid.* p. 263.

<sup>3</sup> Item si Dei nomen, lingua illa qua fit juratio, diversum quoque aliud habuisset significatum, liceret, illud intelligendo, dicere, Testis mihi est Deus, quamvis alter Deum cœli intelligeret.—*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Aut si altero interrogante, juras mihi numerare pecuniam? alter responderet, Tibi juro numerare, non esset sensus, numerare tibi, hoc est solvere aut tradere, sed tibi juro apud me pecuniam recensere, quandoquidem *numerare* utrumque significat.

<sup>5</sup> Quare tale juramentum esset verum, justum et prudens, quoniam tunc simulatio (quoniam absque falsitate fieret) utilis esset.

<sup>6</sup> Quando vero vi illata petitur, licitum est ea fraude petentem deludere.—*Ibid.* Similis est æquivocatio quam in verbo *est* ponit Glossa in cap. neque ii. 2, q. ii. et quam in nomine *sororis* notavit Glossa in c. ult. ii. 2, q. ii.

<sup>7</sup> Opp. Mar. l. iii. c. ii. n. 37.

<sup>8</sup> Navar. Sylvest. Angelus. Lud. Lopez. Tabien, Armilla, &c. And among those who seem to dislike it. Soto fatetur licitum esse alicui jurare, se nescire quod revelare non potest, aut non tenetur; subintelligendo, nescio ut tibi dicam—quando judex non potest legitime interrogare de occultis, recte illi responderi, Non feci, subintelligendo publice, &c. Et ita etiam concessit aperte Cajetan. et Adrian. in Suar.—*Ibid.* cap. x. n. art. iii.

in her own, by the addition of some secret reserve.<sup>1</sup> If a man swear to give another a hundred crowns with this inward reserve, *If he owe it him*, he sins not, though he swears false in the senso of him who is to have the money.<sup>2</sup> A woman who, because of some secret impediment, will not live with her husband, and is excommunicated for it, she at the point of death, that she may be absolved, being put to swear, that if she recover, she will live with him, may swear it absolutely in show, with this conditional reserve, *If she may do it without sin*; yet if she do it not, she is not forsworn; so Sylvester and Navarre, according to the determination of Aquinas and Jo. Major.<sup>3</sup> He that in the time of pestilence comes to a town where the officers, before they admit him, will have him swear that he came from no infected place, though it be not true he may swear it, if he think himself have got no infection.<sup>4</sup> If you have not a mind, or are not bound to give or lend anything in your possession which another desires, you may lawfully swear that you have it not, with this inward reserve, that you have it not, *to give or lend*.<sup>5</sup> If a man threaten to kill a confessor, if he will not tell him, whether his wife hath confessed her adultery to him, though she have confessed it to him, yet the priest may absolutely say and swear that she has not, with this reserve, *So that he should be bound to tell it*.<sup>6</sup> He that is examined upon oath concerning crimes that he knows, and swears to declare all he knows, may, concerning some that are not known to others, though they be to him,

<sup>1</sup> Sylvest. sum. v. jurament. iii. n. ii. Navar. cap. xii. n. xviii. Quia id injuste agit, potest illa jurare, quod secundum suam intentionem verum est, falsum autem juxta mariti mentem. Et Angelus v. juram. iv. n. i. Nam cum talis inique a tali confessionem exigat, poterit jurare secundum suam intentionem, quod verum est: licet secundum intellectum audientis sit falsum, secundum Rodo. quem sequitur Astensis.

<sup>2</sup> Si in aliquo sensu intendebat facere, quod jurabat, licet non in sensu ejus, cui jurabat: ut quia juravit dare centum, subaudiendo in animo suo, si debuero: tunc non peccat: quia non tenetur jurare secundum intentionem ejus, cum non sit suus judex: sed utitur simulatione licita quæ licet: ut in c. utilem ii. 2, q. ii. Sylvest. ibid. iv. n. vii. Navar. c. xii. n. xiv. Neque peccaret jurando, neque etiam non implendo amplius quam ipse intellexit; quoniam non tenetur aliquis jurare secundum intentionem illius qui perperam ipsum ad jurandum cogit.

<sup>3</sup> Aquinas et Jo. Major. in Navar. c. xii. n. ix. Sylvest. ibid. iii. n. ii. Angelus. Sum. v. juram. iv. n. i. Quum quis ex juramento exigit ab aliquo quod ipse non potest sine peccato implere; potest habere intentionem, cum jurat illud facere, scil. Quantum poterit sine peccato. Sic et Sylvester. Sic secundum Rich. de St Victore obstetrices non peccabant, licet non respondissent ad intentionem Pharaonis, quia non fuit ei data auctoritas ad aliquid agendum contra Deum. Secundum Innocent. in c. Veniens de curia, in juramento determinato super aliquo singulari, sic interpretatur in foro anime, secundum intentionem jurantis.—*Angel. ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Sylvest. v. juram. iii. n. ii.; Navar. c. xii. n. xix; Bonacin. ubi supra.

<sup>5</sup> An qui jurat se non habere rem aliquam ab alio petitam, ut ab ea danda vel accommodanda se excuset, peccet? Responderi enim debet, peccare si mens ejus verbis consonat: sed non, si non tenetur ad dandam vel accommodandam, neque respondendum juxta mentem petentis, et ea mente juret, quod non habet illam, ad eam illi dandam aut accommodandam.—Navar. c. xii. n. xviii.; Bonacin. ibid.; idem c. viii. n. xix.; Lopez. cap. xxxvii. p. 211.

<sup>6</sup> And this they maintain not only in this case, but as to all sins confessed. Quod si judex instat vel exigit juramentum a sacerdote, an per confessionem sciat aliquid de tali facto? Dico quod secundum S. Thom. et omnes doctores, sacerdos si ab eo quærat de aliquo absente, an aliquid sciat, quod audivit in confessione: jurare potest se nescire illud: quia non scit illud in quantum homo, &c. Sylvest. v. confess. iii. n. vi. Sic Angelus. v. confess. viii. n. iv. secundum Scotum et Richardum, &c. Graff. l. i c. xxxiii. n. ii. For the seal of confession must not be violated; no, not to secure the soul of the penitent, or the life of a king, or a whole commonwealth from temporal or spiritual destruction. Vid. ibid. n. iv. et viginti auctores contra unum Altisiodorensem in Suarez. tom. iv. disp. xxxiii. sect. i.

swear without perjury that he knows them not, with this secret reserve, he knows not to discover them.<sup>1</sup>

If one promise to another, or contract with a woman outwardly, without an intention of promising, and is demanded of a judge upon oath whether he promised or contracted, he may plainly deny it, because he may have this sense, I promised not with a promise obliging me; and he has just cause so to answer, because since he cannot otherwise prove his want of intention, he will be condemned to pay what he owes not, or to cohabit with her whom he truly contracted not.<sup>2</sup> A witness, either when he is not interrogated juridically, or when he has good occasion not to bear witness in judgment, as if he fear great damage to himself thereby, may answer, that he knows not, or saw it not, or the like, with a mental reservation;<sup>3</sup> he that out of necessity, or for any profit, offers himself to swear of his own accord, may therein use such fallacy.<sup>4</sup> He that hath good occasion to hide his goods, lest they should be seized by his creditors, being for his livelihood, and to keep him from beggary, may swear that he has not hid any, understanding *not any that he could not hide, or any that he is bound to discover*. The same may the witnesses swear for him (*viz.*, that he hid none), knowing that he hid them lawfully;<sup>5</sup> such fallacious oaths may be used also in contracts and bargaining. Those who cannot otherwise get a just price of the buyer, may swear in a sense that he perceives not, that the commodity cost them so much.<sup>6</sup>

Here are a few instances, but they have rules (some of them are premised) which license it in cases innumerable, so that it may be a common practice, and they may use it upon any occasion which they think reasonable.

These things considered, with others authorised among them, I cannot devise what course can be taken to bind those who follow their doctrine, or to get from them the least security by an oath. They have declared that if you put an oath upon them which they think ought not to be imposed, they may lawfully deceive you if they can, and put a cheat upon you even in a solemn oath. Contrive then what oath you will for your security, they will take it so far as you can judge, as much as any man in the world takes an oath; yet if they did not intend to swear (which none can tell but themselves) by taking this oath, they have not sworn, they are not obliged. Or if they had a mind to swear as well as to make you think so, yet if they did not intend to oblige themselves thereby, their conscience by their principles is free, the oath does not touch them; or if they have a mind to be obliged by that oath, yet need they not bind themselves to that it was designed for, but to quite another thing, for they may swear in a sense vastly distant from what you intend or imagine; and thus they are taught to do, and it is practicable, either by the sly and undiscerned change of one letter in a word, as they may pronounce it, which will turn the sense as far from yours, as burning is from swearing, which is plain in a former instance. Or else by the ambiguity of some word in the oath, affording another sense than you are aware of, they may fix upon that and leave yours to yourself, and so

<sup>1</sup> *Quamvis juret se dicturum, quod scit, vere respondere potest se illa nescire absque perjuriæ metu, intelligendo intra se, illud se non ita scire ut detegere teneatur.*—*Navar.* c. xviii. n. xvi. cap. xvii. n. cxvii.

<sup>2</sup> So *Navar.* in cap. *hnmænæ aures. ii. 2, q. v. q. i. et ii.* alleging for this doctrine. *Aquinas. Scotus. Paludanus. Richard. Major. Adrian.* and others.—*Vid. Suar. l. iii. de Juram. cap. ix. n. v.*

<sup>3</sup> *Bonacin. tom. ii. disp. iv. q. i. punct. xii. Clavis Regia. Navar. et alii.*—*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Idem ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Idem ibid. et alii.*

<sup>6</sup> *Idem ibid. Sayrus. Rebellus et alii.*

bind themselves to nothing you are concerned for, when you think you have them fast bound to all; or if such care be taken that in the oath there be no ambiguous terms which may give them the advantage to delude you by a sense foreign to your intendment; yet, do what you can, they may put such a sense upon it by a mental restriction; for thereby adding something reserved in their mind, to what is expressed in the oath, the sense is quite changed, and the thing they swear is nothing at all of what you would have sworn.

Yea, or if they swear that they will observe the contents of your oath, according to the plain and natural meaning of the words, without any equivocating or mental restriction; yet at the same time they may mean, without any mental restriction that they will tell you of, and so delude you with a mental reservation when they are swearing against it. Nor is this an imaginary supposition of a thing that they never practised; for thus their priests and others have taken the oath of allegiance, and by this art eluded it;<sup>1</sup> and so they are instructed, and may do still, and defeat any oath that can be devised. Yea, by their doctrine they may do it lawfully, and without sin; for in all this juggling they teach that they do not swear false, but by the artifice specified, it is true in their own sense, though not in theirs who give the oath. Indeed this is a cheat (where God is called to witness), nor do they deny it. But they say such deceit is lawful, as in many other cases, so always when the judge is incompetent. And that is our case in England; we have none from the throne to the lowest bench that, in their account, have any jurisdiction;<sup>2</sup> we have none that have power to put an oath on them; they may choose whether they will swear or no, or whether they will cheat them all in swearing. No oath which can be given them can oblige them, but in their own sense, how distant soever from the true sense of the oath or of the imposer of it. This our Roman Catholics were assured of long since, by instructions sent them from Rome in Queen Elizabeth's time.<sup>3</sup> So that they need make no conscience (if they will follow the best guides of their consciences) to practise all their contrivance upon us in oaths (much more in promises, contracts, &c.), even such as the light of nature has ever condemned in the world, as not only impious in point of religion, but destructive to human society, and those which tend to subvert the main grounds and foundations of it. We can never oblige them by oath at any time but when they please, nor any further than they list. We can never tell when they swear, though they take oaths, nor when they are obliged, though they swear. We cannot possibly know when we may be sure of them; when we think them fast, by all the rules that men of conscience and common honesty proceed by, yet they can juggle themselves loose by the Roman rules at pleasure, and make sport with God and man, even in oaths where God himself is a witness, and the greatest of men concerned as parties.

*Sect. 5.* There needs no other demonstration of the irreligion of the

<sup>1</sup> Quando quis inique interrogat, excludendo omnem æquivocationem, posse interrogatum uti æquivocatione, apponendo aliquam particulam in mente, &c. Idem dic de teste. Bonacina. tom. ii. disp. iv. q. i. punct. xii. et ibi plures. Quoties gravis causa occurrit, ob quam licet uti verbis ambiguis, vel mentali restrictione, ejusmodi usum esse licitum, et si interrogans urgeat, ut sine amphibologia, aut restrictione loquaris. Pet. a S. Joseph de ii. precept. art. i.

<sup>2</sup> Judex hæreticus aut schismaticus amittit omnem jurisdictionem. Vide Conc. Lateran. sub Innocent. III. in Crab. supra.

<sup>3</sup> Juramentum exactum a judice non competente (quales nunc omnes sunt in Anglia) in jurisdictione ecclesiastica, non obligat nisi secundum intentionem jurantis. In Abb. de mendac. o. p. 49.

Roman church, and its utter regardlessness of God and the souls of men, than their doctrine concerning the observance of the Lord's day, and all other which they pretend to be set apart for holy employment. If any man would understand what religion is left among them, he may see it there in short, and needs look no further, since there he may be satisfied that they have no design for the honour of God or the salvation of souls. For when they have discharged the people from all duties of religion at any other determinate times,<sup>1</sup> and reserved all which they make necessary for them to holy days; yet even on these days, by their doctrine, nothing is made their duty to which any regard of God or of their souls is needful. All that they are obliged to is only to be present at mass,<sup>2</sup> no other act or duty of religion or worship is necessary; no internal act at all,<sup>3</sup> nor any external,<sup>4</sup> either public or private, but only the mass. And that may be so external, that neither God nor any divine thing need to be minded in it. For this I have produced evidence enough already, let me only add this; they are wont to speak of a three-fold attending at mass (as before was shewed at their divine service). One, to what is said and done by the priest, as sacred; a second, to the meaning of what is said or done; and the third, to God and divine things. Now the first of these, they say, is enough, though it be the worst of all;<sup>5</sup> therefore the second (to regard the meaning

<sup>1</sup> Vide supra, cap. i.

<sup>2</sup> Sola missa communiter est in præcepto.—*Cajetan. sum. v. fest. p. 304.* Missa audienda diebus festis ex præcepto, non tamen concio, non preces fundendæ; non exercendus alius actus cultus divini ex præcepto (excipe diem paschatis, quo sumenda est Eucharistia) Victorel. addit ad Tol. l. iv. c. xxv.

<sup>3</sup> Aquinas. ii. 2, q. cxxii. art. iv.—*Cajetan. Sum. v. fest. p. 305; Soto. de justit. et jur. l. ii. q. iv. art. iv; Navar. c. xiii. n. ii. &c.*

No act of love, Bellarm. de cult. Sanct. l. ii. c. x.; Nav. c. xi. n. vii.; Soto, ibid. Or contrition; Soto, ibid.; Sylv. Sum. v. Dominic. n. viii.; Canus. relect. de pœnit. pars. iv. p. 364. Or sincerity; no need to have that devotion in the heart which they outwardly make show of. No necessity of a good end in their worshipping. For that they commonly maintain after Aquinas, that the end of the command for worship is not under command.—*Vid. supra.*

<sup>4</sup> Not hearing sermons. Sylv. sum. v. Dominic. n. viii. Victorel. supra. Nor other prayers, private, Sylv. ibid.; Navar. c. xxi. n. vi.; vide Suar. de fest. l. ii. c. xvi. n. iv. or public. Vesperas cæteraque divina officia, diebus festis, non audire, non est peccatum mortale, neque veniale; nisi ratione voti aut juramenti.—*Graff. l. ii. c. xxxiv. n. xii.* Nemo jure communi regulariter tenetur audire de præcepto alia divina officia, etiam vespervas.—*Navar. c. xxi. n. i.* They are not obliged to any prayers but those in the mass, which indeed are not theirs; nor need they concur in them otherwise than by a virtual wish that the priest may be heard; Satis est vel ex longuino missanti adesse, et surgendo, genua flectendo, vel alias actualiter vel virtualiter exoptare, ut sacerdos, qui pro omnibus loquitur, orat et sacrificat, a Deo exaudiatur.—*Idem, ibid. n. viii.*

This all the praying of the people (when they have reduced all their religions acts to this) in popery. All that the church makes necessary, or leaves possible to them in public, which yet is no praying, otherwise than one while he is at Paris, may be said to be praying at Rome, because he virtually wishes success to a priest saying mass there; or than one in their purgatory may be said to be praying at the same time in heaven, because he would have the supposed intercession of the saints there to be successful.

<sup>5</sup> Hæc satis est, licet omnium imperfectissima, Fill. tr. v. n. 214. Suarez, having premised that he believes there is no dissention or difficulty amongst them concerning attention at the time of mass, reckons after Aquinas the three sorts of attention, and adds of the first: Hæc attentio est infima omnium, tamen sufficiens: quia illa satis est, ut illa missæ auditio seu præsentia sit humana, moralis, et ex objecto religiosa, tom. iii. disp. lxxxviii. sect. iii. This being sufficient, the second and third are more than needs; and yet in the third (this excluded as needless) he acknowledges all inward reverence and worship is included. Sub hac autem attentione ad Deum omnis interior reverentia et cultus, omnis oratio et petitio includitur, ut eleganter describit Gregorius x. in c. decet.—*Ibid.*

of what is said or done); and the third (to mind God or divine things) is more than needs. So that plainly all that is required of a papist, by their doctrine, in order to the honour of God and the salvation of his soul, on any of those days when these ought to be most minded, is only being present at mass, without understanding what is said or done, and without minding God or anything divine. Such is their worship of God and care of souls in the church of Rome; this is the sum of their religion, when it appears set forth to greatest advantage, in its solemn exercises; he that understands it, and can be in love with it, must be under the power of some other consideration than that of God and his soul.

Having seen how these days are sanctified, or profaned rather, by their worship, we might view what observance they have in reference to servile works. And here they have little but what may be done without sin; and indeed, as they order the matter, it may seem less sin to follow the works of their callings than to forbear them, since their abstinence from them is not that they may better attend the worship of God (for they think it not needful to worship him, unless he can be said to be worshipped when he is not heeded), but that they may be idle, or worse employed than in their daily business. However, whether it be to indulge their ease, or serve their lusts, or to make show of some rest (though far enough from a holy rest), they will have some works forborne; but herein they will be regulated by custom, not the divine law.<sup>1</sup> Paludanus and others will have them excused who use manual labours on these days, if they omit not the mass.<sup>2</sup> And Sylvester says, this is reasonable, because custom, the interpreter of laws, will have it so. This may so far regulate them, that every province and city must observe those days, and those alone, in that manner, and so far only as custom requires.<sup>3</sup> Yea, it must so far prevail, that if it were the custom to observe these days no longer than till noon, or only till mass were ended (which may be dispatched in half an hour, and that before sunrise), the rest may be spent in servile works.<sup>4</sup> They account it worse to spend these days in servile labour than profane divertisements; for this, with them, is only a venial fault, or none,<sup>5</sup> but that may be a mortal sin; yet they declare there is no sin in the worst but what custom makes (they are like to make conscience of it, when their own wills and practices are their rule). This, as many other, by their doctrine, which makes void the commands of God at pleasure, is but a sin at discretion; they may make it none when they please, and render all days alike, as easily as they can bring up a custom, such a one to which nature is forward.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dicendum consuetudine fieri posse, ut aliquæ personæ licite possint in Die festo aliqua opera servilia, vel aliter in festo prohibita, exercere.—*Antoninus, Sylvester, Cætan, Soto, Tabiena, Armilla, Navar, in Suar. l. ii. de fest. c. xxxiii. n. xii.*

<sup>2</sup> Per (Dominicum) intelligitur generaliter omnis Dies festus de præcepto, secundum Pet. de Palude, quod sentire videtur etiam Jo. Andr. et doctores dicentes aliquos in Diebus festis excusari, nisi missam etiam. Et est rationabile; quia consuetudo legum interpres, ita habet.—*Sum. v. missa. ii. n. i.*

<sup>3</sup> Unaquæque provincia, aut civitas, observare tenetur illa, eo modo, et tantum, quæ, quomodo, et quantum consuetudo ipsius præcepti observari.—*Navar. c. xiii. n. v.* Si usus haberet, ut solum serventur usque ad meridiem, vel usque ad solemnia missarum peracta, postea possent opera servilia fieri.—*Idem, ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Gabriel cum Scoto dicunt, licitum esse inchoare missam, una hora et quarta parte alterius ante ortum solis.—Non erit peccatum hora et dimidia ante ortum solis sacrificare: imo addit Paludanus, et clarius Victoria, posse licite inchoari missam dimidia hora ante crepusculum, ita ut finis missæ sit sub initium crepusculi, plus minusve. Et hoc est in praxi servandum.—*Suarez, tom. iii. disp. lxxx. sect. iv.* So mass may be ended not only before sun-rise, but about break of day, above an hour before the sun is up.

<sup>5</sup> Bonacin. tom. ii. disp. v. p. 277, n. xxv. p. 274, n. iii.

<sup>6</sup> Observatio Diei Dominicæ non est de jure Divino, sed Canonico, ut aiunt communi

But no wonder they think not these sacred days violated by working, since they teach they are not profaned by any acts of wickedness. Their divines generally agree herein.<sup>1</sup> Contrition for sins, and the avoiding of other sins, is not enjoined, says Cajetan.<sup>2</sup> The day is not profaned by fornication, says Soto;<sup>3</sup> nor by lying, murder, or blaspheming, says Bellarmine;<sup>4</sup> nor by any wickedness whatsoever is holy time profaned, but only by those opposite thereto, viz. not hearing mass, and bodily labours. So that the days may be sanctified well enough, according to the holiness of that church, if after an irreligious presence at mass for half an hour (the precept for which may be satisfied without minding God or abstaining from wickedness while they are at it), the rest thereof be spent in beastly drunkenness or gluttony, in perjuries, blasphemies, or cursing God or man, in murders, whoring, sodomy, or bestiality, or the most enormous debauches. And though they are not bound, as they teach, to be at the pains of one good act of mind or heart in serving God at the only time set apart for his service, Scotus is almost worried by the herd of their divines for seeming to think that a good act of mind towards God was enjoined on these days;<sup>5</sup> yet they may spend their bodies, and toil themselves more in the service of their lusts, without profaning them, than in servile works. The reason why they hold that no excess of wickedness does profane these days, is because wicked acts are not servile works.<sup>6</sup> It seems slavery to Satan, and the service of the vilest lusts, is not servile; whatsoever Christ or the apostle thought thereof, John viii. 34, Rom. vi. 16, that is consistent enough with the liberty and honour of such Christians as they are. However, hereby it is manifest that their religious observation of all holy times (and so all the religiousness which that church requires of her catholics) is consistent with the lowdest acts of ungodliness and debauchery.

In fine, God can have no honour from men, nor they salvation from him, without religion; this cannot be kept up in the world without the solemn exercises of it; these cannot (or will not) be performed without time for that end; therefore hath the Lord appointed time to be set apart for these purposes; the church of Rome hath reduced all religious exercises, at the times appointed by God or themselves, to the people's hearing of mass, and there will not have the precept oblige them to any real religiousness, not so much

ter doctores—et consequenter posse consuetudine, vel humana potestate abrogari.—*Bonacin.* tom. ii. disp. v. n. iv. p. 272, Sairus et alii ibi.

<sup>1</sup> Cajetan, Soto, Sylvester, Victoria, Navar, Covarruvius et alii, quos refert et sequitur Suarez, de fest. l. c. xviii. n. iii., iuter quos etiam recenset S. Thom. vid. *Belarmine.* de cultu sanct. l. iii. c. x.; *Graff.* l. ii. c. xxxiii. n. viii.

<sup>2</sup> Non continetur sub hoc præcepto contritio peccatorum, nec vitatio aliorum peccatorum.—*Sum.* v. fest. p. 305.

<sup>3</sup> Non quod per fornicationem videtur festum.—*De Just. et Jur.* l. ii. q. iv. art. iv.

<sup>4</sup> Non enim violatur tempus sacrum per quæcunque peccata, sed solum per ea, quæ opponuntur ipsi tempori sacro, qualia sunt non audire sacrum, et operari corporaliter.—*Ibid.* l. iii. c. x. p. 1610.

Secunda opinio asserit—peccatum etiam mortale in Die festo commissum, non habere ex illa temporis circumstantia specialem malitiam, quæ in confessione necessario aperienda sit: illam docent Cajetan, Corduba, Soto, Victoria, Almayn, Sylvester, Armilla, Tabiena, Angl., Navar, Covarruvius, Gutier; pro hac etiam sententia potest referri. D. Thomas in iv. dist. xxxii. art. v. q. i.; *Suarez*, l. ii. de festis. cap. xviii. n. iii.; vid. *Bonacin.* tom. ii. disp. v. p. 274.

<sup>5</sup> Scotus sentire videtur hoc nos præcepto juberi, diebus festis bonum habere mentis actum circa Deum—*Soto de Just. et Jur.* l. ii. q. iv. art. iv. p. 51.

<sup>6</sup> Nec valet dicere inter ista servilia computari peccatum: quia hoc falsum est.—*Sylv.* *Sum.* v. Dominic. n. viii. Nisi esset opus servile in festis prohibitum, quale non est peccatum juxta S. Thomam. in iii. sent. dist. xxxvii. art. v. q. ii.; Navar. c. vi. n. x. Probat a Cajetano et cæteris—quia opus peccati ut sic non est servile.—*Suar. ibid.* n. vi.

as to a thought of God or any thing divine, yea, or the forbearance of wicked thoughts and acts while they are at mass. Thus far is religion (upon which the interest of God and man so much depends) sunk among them. And it must of necessity sink (all but the shadow or froth) in any part of the world where these principles prevail. But though they declare them not obliged to serve God any better at this, or at any other time, yet they maintain for them as much liberty to serve the devil and their lusts on these holy times as any other. Let all concerned judge of the Roman religion and holiness hereby; if there were nothing else by which the measures thereof could be taken, this would suffice.

*Sect. 6.* In the next place, in reference to heretics, to go no further (for that is far enough, since in their charity the far greatest part of Christians are no better), all relatives are discharged of their respective duties enjoined them by the laws of God or man. Their decretals (the law of their church, which presumes to over-rule all other law, natural, divine, or civil) deprives heretics immediately of all due fidelity, right, duty, observance, which any whosoever do owe them.<sup>1</sup> They lose all which they have by civil right.<sup>2</sup> Subjects owe no allegiance or duty at all to princes or magistrates.<sup>3</sup> Children owe no duty to their parents;<sup>4</sup> they have (by their law) no power over them, and this from the first day of their heresy. Wives owe not conjugal duty to their husbands;<sup>5</sup> and if they knew they were not papists when contracted, they lose their dowry.<sup>6</sup> Servants are freed from all fidelity to, and observance of, their masters.<sup>7</sup> Yea, debtors are freed from paying what they owe to heretics, though bound thereunto either by penalty or oath.<sup>8</sup> They hereby oblige their followers to make nothing of such duties, without the observance of which mankind would become worse than brutes.

But this may seem a smaller matter to them; they go higher, and allow any one to kill a heretic, as though murder were no sin; they may be killed with impunity, says De Graffis,<sup>9</sup> and proves it out of their church laws. Pope Urban II. declared that they are not guilty of murder who kill any that are excommunicate.<sup>10</sup> Now all heretics are excommunicate by the Council of

<sup>1</sup> *Ipsa jure privatos esse hæreticos omni debito fidelitatis, domini, obligationis, et obsequii, quo illis quicunque tenebantur astricti.—Decretal. Gregor. ix. l. v. c. ult. de hæret.*

<sup>2</sup> *Amittunt omnia quæ juris civilis sunt. Graff. l. ii. c. xi. n. xii. Privantur jure domini naturalis, æconomici et civilis. vid. Ovandus in iv. dist. xiii. p. 347.*

<sup>3</sup> *Eorum vassalli absoluti sunt a debito fidelitatis et totius obsequii—et idem de vassallis dominorum, qui contra hæreticos sunt negligentes. Sylvest. v. hæreses i. n. xiv. Angelus v. hæret. n. xv.*

<sup>4</sup> *Perdunt patriam potestatem, quia non habent filios in potestate.—Graff. ibid. Filii hæreticorum ipso facto quo sententiam est contra eorum parentes de hæresi, efficiuntur sui juris, et effecti intelliguntur a die commissi criminis.—Angel. ibid. n. x.; Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Viro debitum reddere non tenetur. Simanca. Instit. Cathol. c. xlv. n. xxvii.*

<sup>6</sup> *Uxores scienter cum hæreticis contrahentes perdunt ipso facto dotem.—Sylvest. ibid.; Angelus. ibid. n. xi.*

<sup>7</sup> *Et quicunque alii aliqua obligatione adstricti: ut famuli, liberti, et hujusmodi. ipso facto liberantur. Ut dicitur et notatur in c. fi. eo. ti. Angelus. ibid. n. xv. Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Omnes hæreticos obligatos ex juramento, fidelitate obsequii, pactione vel promissione, liberari, ita habetur c. ultimo de Hæret. Propterea si aliquis promisisset hæreticis solvere sub pæna vel juramento certo die, non tenetur, ut notat Glossa ibid. Ego teneo quod eo ipso quod est manifestum in hæresin incidisse tales absoluti sunt, quantumcumque sententia non feratur contra eos. Angel. ibid. n. xv.; Sylvest. ibid. n. xiv.; Armilla. v. hæres. n. xi.; Ovandus in iv. dist. xii. propos. xxx. p. 348.*

<sup>9</sup> *Possunt etiam impune occidi. Facit. Gloss. sing. in Capital. fælic, &c.—Graff. l. ii. c. xi. n. xii.*

<sup>10</sup> *Non enim eos homicidas arbitramur, quos adversus excommunicatos, zelo matris*

Lateran, under Innocent III. ; and the sentence which lies dormant there is roused once a year ; the pope in person denouncing it in a solemn manner, and very gravely, with a peacock-tail on either side his head. We in England particularly are under excommunication to this day, and Cardinal Barbariu thought fit, not long since, to give special notice of it in a letter to some of the Irish. They forget not how obnoxious we are ; and we may remember how much we are obliged by them, that any of us are suffered to live, when they may kill us without murder.

*Sect. 7.* But we may the better bear with them in this, because they seem not very tender of killing one another. A man is not to be punished who kills his wife, taken in adultery, and the adulterer together with her. He may kill his own daughter in like case, or his sister, yea, or his own mother, if his father give order for it ;<sup>1</sup> and he may do it as safely though these his female relatives be quick with child. For the child in the womb (say they) being the same morally with the mother, he that may kill the mother may kill the child too. Thus a private person may be judge in his own cause, and proceed to mortal execution without trial, and sacrifice the guilty and innocent both at once, to his own or another's passion, and destroy together the body and soul of his nearest relations, and all this with impunity. They deliver it for certain, that a mother in danger may lawfully use a medicine which tends directly to her cure, though it be probable that it will make her miscarry. And because she may take such a course to secure her life or recover her health, they conclude it lawful to do this to preserve her state or reputation.<sup>2</sup> So that, if a maid or married woman have prostituted herself to another's lust, she may procure abortion, when otherwise the crime might be discovered, and her life or credit in hazard.<sup>3</sup> Thus neither families, nor parishes, nor monasteries need be pestered with natural children, how many soever be got ; the shame of their birth, and the pain too, may be prevented, and the trouble and expense of their education avoided, by a receipt approved by the Roman doctors, if it be but taken in time. As for the censures of their church in this case, or worse, there is no fear, for even a nun got with child may procure abortion, and not be excommunicate<sup>4</sup> (so much more favourable is new Rome to her vestals than the old was, though their crimes be doubled) ; any who are so disposed, have encouragement enough to venture upon both. For as to the murder, they are secured from the laws of God by this doctrine, which makes it no sin ; from the laws of the church by her natural indulgence ; and may be from those of the state, by their own private conduct. And as to the whoredom, they may be quitted upon as easy terms as they would wish. For the priest, if he get the child, is empowered to absolve the mother, and he need not be so strict as to enjoin for penance the avoiding of the sin ; yet for all this, they seem so tender (which

*catholicæ ecclesiæ ardentes, aliquos eorum trucidasse contigerit.—Refert ex Ivo et laudat Baronius. an. 1059, n. xi.*

*Omnis hæreticus, sive occultus sive manifestus, est ipso jure excommunicatus.—Rosel. v. hæret. n. xiv. Quoting their law for it.*

<sup>1</sup> Pet. a S. Joseph. de v. præcepto, art. vi. pp. 258, 259.

<sup>2</sup> Videtur etiam satis certum, &c. Idem ibid. art. ii. p. 218, vid. Corduba. Pet. Navar. Arragon. Lopez in Fill. tr. xxix. n. civ.

<sup>3</sup> Liceret etiam procurare abortum nondum animatum cum ad famam et statum conservandum opus erit. Basil. de Leon, de matrim. l. x. c. xiii. n. ii. Liceret etiam fæminæ nuptæ, aut virgini fornicanti idem efficere. quando nullo alio quæsito medio sibi consulere possint, ne crimine detecto, famæ vitæque jacturam facerent.—*Pet. Navar. l. ii. ; de Restit. c. iii. diff. ii. n. cxxx.*

<sup>4</sup> Secundum Sylvestrum, monialis sollicitans abortum non est excommunicata, quia non injuriam sibi sed proli facit. Lopez. cap. lxiv. p. 322, vide Nalcum in Bonacin. de restit. d. ii. q. ult. p. 7, n. vi.

may amuse us) of unborn infants in other cases, that they will have it lawful to cut up the mother quick, and sho obliged to suffer, yea procure it, that the child in her womb may not perish unbaptized.<sup>1</sup> Thus their doctrine will have them more regard the reputation of a whore than the life of an honest woman; yea the child may perish without regard of its wanting baptism, when the credit of a strumpet is concerned; but a chaste woman must be killed in the other case, that the infant in her womb may have it. Yet one would think the issue of whoredom in as much danger for want of baptism as the fruit of lawful matrimony.

They teach further, that a man may kill another, either to secure his own person, or his goods, or his reputation. In defence of his person, they hold it lawful to slay any one; a servant may kill his master assaulting him unjustly, or a monk his abbot, or a subject his prince, or a child his own father.<sup>2</sup> This is their common doctrine, and thereby there is warrant for it, not only to secure one's life, but to avoid a wound or a blow.<sup>3</sup> Any one may do this at any time, even a priest while he is celebrating, may kill one that invades him,<sup>4</sup> and when he has shed his blood, may go on with his other sacrifice, which will be unbloody notwithstanding. If he that assails him be frantic, or in drink, yea, or asleep,<sup>5</sup> and has no sense that he offers any wrong, he may innocently kill him for all that, whoever he be, if he cannot otherwise avoid the injury; yea, though the aggressor have had the highest provocations, by intolerable reproaches, or the loss of his estate, or the defiling of his bed;<sup>6</sup> yet in this case, he that has given the occasion, and done the wrong, may kill the sufferer; the thief may lawfully slay him whom he has robbed, and the adulterer may kill the husband after he has abused the wife, or deflowered his sister, or buggared his child. He may not only kill the aggressor, but an innocent person also, to escape himself.<sup>7</sup> As if he cannot be secured from Peter, without killing Paul, he may be the death of them both; or state it thus (and they cannot stick at it), if he cannot escape his father without killing his mother, he may slay both father and mother at once. Thus they may deprive any of life, not only when they are actually assaulted, but before any blow is given. When a man perceives one coming towards him with his weapon ready, and fears he is not able to deal with him, he may shoot him dead at a distance.<sup>8</sup> Nor need he be hindered by the consideration that killing him in such circumstances (since he is in mortal sin), will be the destruction both of body and soul together. Soto objects this to himself, but abates nothing of his conclusion notwithstanding. Yea, he answers, that to hold it not lawful to kill in this case (with the destruction of the slain man's soul too), is both to pervert the law of nature, and to render

<sup>1</sup> Aliqui affirmant non tantum id licere, sed etiam matrem teneri talem sectionem procurare, et ferre, ne illius infans sine baptismo intereat.—*Pet. a S. Joseph. ibid.* p. 220.

<sup>2</sup> Bonacin *ibid.* punct. viii. n. iv. ubi Sylvester, Julius Clarus, et alii communiter.

<sup>3</sup> Si non possum effugere quin me percussas, nisi te interficiam, licite te interficio.—*Angel. Sum. v. defens. n. iv.*; *ibi Bartolus, Florianus, Navar. cap. xv. n. iv.*; *Lopez, part i. c. lxii.*; *Pet. a S. Joseph. ibid. p. 221*; *Bonacin. ibid. n. iii. et alii communiter.*

<sup>4</sup> *Angel. Sum. v. homicid. iii. n. ii.*; *Sylvest. v. homicid. i. n. xiii.*; *Graff. l. ii. c. lxiv. n. viii.*

<sup>5</sup> *Bonacin. ibid. n. v. ibi. Bartolus, Gomez. et alii.*

<sup>6</sup> *Pet. a S. Joseph. ibid. p. 222 et 230.*; *Bonacin. ibid. n. iii.*; *ubi Pet. Navar. Sotus, Julius Clarus, Rodriguez.*

<sup>7</sup> *Petrus a S. Joseph. de v. præcept. art. ii. p. 223*; *Pet. Navar. de restit. l. i. c. iii. n. cxlvii.*; *Bonacin. ibid. punct. vii. n. i. ubi Julius Clarus, Corduba, Cajetan. et alii.*

<sup>8</sup> *Graff. l. ii. c. lxiv. n. iv.*; *Soto de Just. et jure. l. v. q. i. art. viii. p. 143.*

the sweet and easy yoke of Christ intolerable.<sup>1</sup> They give further instances wherein they will have it no sin to kill a person that has not yet touched them; it is sufficient, in their account, if they know that he is prepared for it, yea, or does but design it. In case one be shut up in a house or a city, so that he cannot get out, and knows there is one in the town that designs upon his life, and waits but an opportunity to execute it, he may prevent the designer, and fall upon him unawares, and kill him.<sup>2</sup> They declare it lawful for a man to kill his wife taken in adultery; but then they allow the adulteress to be beforehand with her husband, and kill him first if she can: she may despatch him with the poison prepared for her, or stab him with the weapon he has ready, and so secure her adultery by murder, and yet be innocent.<sup>3</sup>

They maintain it is lawful to kill others to secure their goods; so it is no sin with them to take away the life of him that would take away part of their goods by night or day;<sup>4</sup> yea, if he that steals makes no resistance or defence, but flies, he may be pursued and slain, to recover what he has taken. And although the goods may be recovered otherwise, and in a legal way, yet if it be not certain that he may get them with the greatest ease, but doubtful that it may give him some trouble, he may use his liberty, and send him to hell to save himself a little trouble.<sup>5</sup> But of what value must the goods be (that we may discern at what rate they set the life and soul of a man)? It must not (says Soto) be a vile thing; it should not be so little worth as two or three ducats.<sup>6</sup> So that it seems, if what is stolen be of the value of about twenty shillings, a man may be killed for it, and his body and soul destroyed together; and since a crown or a shilling may be more to some than twenty to others, those who follow him might well infer from hence, that a man's life might be taken away for a crown or less; yea for an apple, since to some persons, that may be of more value than the sums mentioned. Accordingly, they conclude expressly, that he who takes a thing, the owner or keeper of it seeing, and offering to hinder him, may be lawfully slain for it, though it be but of the value of one crown or less either,<sup>7</sup> because thereby he offers an affront. That is another ground of their lawful murder. A man, they avow, may kill others for his honour or reputation;<sup>8</sup> for though it be so slight a thing, that it will be scarce a fault in a man to throw it away himself (as we heard before), yet they will have him maintain it at the expense of the blood and life of others, and his own too. For example, if he sees one approach to assault him, though he might avoid the danger by retiring, yet he may kill him rather than so avoid it;<sup>9</sup> because it would be a disparagement to him to fly, and so rather than suffer the least, in the repute of the injudicious rabble, he may be the death of any person, and be a man of blood, that he may be the master of such honour, as a truly generous spirit must despise. They advance further yet: if one should offer to give a person a

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Graff. l. ii. c. lxiv. n. v.

<sup>3</sup> Navar. c. xv. n. iii.; Lopez. c. lxii. p. 311; Bonacin. de restit. d. ii. q. ult. p. 9, n. ii.; ubi. Julius Clarus, Bannes, Rodriguez, Corduba et alii.

<sup>4</sup> Soto. *ibid.*; Graff. *ibid.* n. xvii.; Lopez. cap. lxii.; Navar. c. xv. n. ii.; ibi Cajetan. Antoninus, Sylvester.

<sup>5</sup> Non licet furem occidere—si spes esset certissima quod facillimo negotio recuperari posset—ubi autem res esset dubia, posset liberum esse domino jure uti suo.—Soto. *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. p. 144.

<sup>7</sup> Etiamsi res sit valoris unius aurei aut minoris—videtur posse occidi.—Bonacin. de restit. d. ii. q. ult. p. 10, n. i.

<sup>8</sup> Comuniter omnes docent. Vid. Victorel. add. Tol. l. v. c. vi. Famam suam—negligere et prodigere potest sine peccato. Pet. S. Joseph, de. viii. præcept. art. ii.; vid. Navar. c. xviii. n. xxvii.

<sup>9</sup> Soto, *ibid.*

blow with a cudgel, or a light switch;<sup>1</sup> he that is offered such an affront may lawfully kill him for it, especially in Spain, where this is counted a great injury, says Soto. And elsewhere, a box on the ear may be resented as such an injury. Accordingly, others determine that he who gives it may lawfully be slain for it, yea, or he that does but offer it.<sup>2</sup> If he be any person of any moment that is thus attempted, he need not stay till he feel it, but may prevent it by killing him that offers it, if there be no other honourable way to avoid it. He need not fly to avoid it, if that would be a disgrace, for he is not obliged to suffer such an inconvenience, though by retiring he might save both his own life and the aggressor's, says Bonacina after others. In this manner, when one smites them on the cheek, do they turn the other; and thus do they comply exactly with Christ's advice, by stabbing him to the heart, who smites their cheek, or does but offer at it!

The same they determine of ill language; that is with them a sufficient ground to kill men. In the judgment of all, says Navarre, it is lawful to kill him that gives reproachful words, when there is no other way to avoid the injury,<sup>3</sup> and the words being once past, there is no preventing them. Thus, killing men may be as common as provoking language, when such language, by their doctrine, may be as common as any they speak. They teach that it is but a venial fault, ten thousand of which he may commit every day or every hour without endangering his soul, to give one the lie, to call him a fool, a bastard, &c.<sup>4</sup> And then they declare it lawful to slay men for such words, as if it were their design to have it thought tolerable for men to do nothing else but kill one another; and shedding man's blood were no more to be avoided than such faults as they encourage the continual practice of. They proceed further yet, and conclude it lawful to kill one, not only for contumelious words, but for mere signs of such import, when an ill word is not spoken, suppose such motion of the tongue, or lips, or nose, or fingers, as are accounted an affront.<sup>5</sup> This is after the Roman mode to imitate Christ, and comply with the apostles' rule in laying down their lives for their brethren, when they take away their lives for a foul word or an untoward gesture. But what if one who gives such a blow, or such language, or the like affront, should run for it when he has done, is it lawful to pursue him to force satisfaction from him, though it be by the loss of his life? Yes, say they, the person affronted may pursue him, and strike him till he have reparation of his honour, though it be by killing him.<sup>6</sup>

They speak favourably of duels. Cajetan says, princes may permit them lawfully among their subjects, as the stews are permitted upon reasonable considerations;<sup>7</sup> so that it seems they may farm out this liberty, as the

<sup>1</sup> Si quis quempiam aggrederetur, ut eum fuste levissime percuteret, posset id alter etiam hostem interimendo repellere. Ibid. Victoria. Navar. et Sylvester in Fill. tr. xxix, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Ad vitandum vulnus vel alapam—potest occidere. Navar. c. xv. n. iv.; Lopez. p. i. c. lxii. p. 316.; Bonacin. ibid. n. vi et alii.

<sup>3</sup> Ex omnium sententia licet contumeliosum occidere, cum aliud non manet remedium eam injuriam arcendi. de restit. l. c. ii. iii. n. cclxxvi. vid. Bonacin. et apud eum plures infra.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. Navar. c. xviii. n. xxiii. xxiv.

<sup>5</sup> Posse occidi qui afficit contumeliis atrocibus sive per verba sive per signa. Bonacin de restit. disp. ii. q. ult. p. 10, n. vii. ibi. Gomez. Rodriguez, Lopez, Pet. Navar. Julius Clarus et alii.

<sup>6</sup> Possit eum persequi, et percutere tantum, quantum ad sui honoris defensionem opus esset—etiam occidendo. M. Navar. c. xv. n. iv.; Pet. Navarra. ibid. n. cclxxx.; Rodriguez, Lopez. et alii in Bonacin. ibid. n. viii. plurimi apud Henriquez. Sum. l. xiv. c. x.

<sup>7</sup> Sum v. duellum.

pope does the other. Bannes determines that an innocent person may either accept or offer combat, not only to secure his life or estate, but his reputation, when he cannot otherwise do it. Such a person, when one goes about to accuse him falsely before a judge, and he is like thereby to be defamed, may challenge him and kill him lawfully.<sup>1</sup> This he reports as Cajetan's opinion, and counts it more than probable. But there is no need of duels in the case; they discover a way to despatch men more effectually with less notice and less hazard to the murderers, allowing them to kill any privily to secure their repute. The same Dominican, in the case mentioned, concludes, that if the accuser, being admonished, will not desist, the aggrieved person, in defence of his concerns, may kill him.<sup>2</sup> Not only judicial accusations, but more private aspersions, are counted a sufficient ground to kill men. He who, by whispers and detraction, endeavours to wrong and bespot another, if the infamy and disgrace cannot otherwise be avoided, it will be lawful to slay him.<sup>3</sup> So Pet. Navarre, who gives reasons why he thinks it more advisable to kill a defamer privily than in a duel; nor need he stay till he be actually aspersed, but when one threatens, or signifies he will do it, he may lawfully prevent it by killing him. Forty-nine doctors are produced in favour of this. Prado, an eminent Dominican, says it is the common doctrine of Aquinas his followers.<sup>4</sup>

These are some of the maxims which serve so much to furnish those who design upon men's lives with lawful occasion to murder, and tend so plainly to fill all places with blood and slaughters, without leaving any man security of his life, that even some Jesuits, though they deny not that they may be probable in speculation, yet seem shy to allow their common practice. But this is rejected by others, and so the Jesuits' cautiousness and moderation counted unreasonable, seeing that in matters of morality,<sup>5</sup> what is speculatively probable, *i. e.* safe and lawful, in point of conscience, must, as such, be admitted in practice.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, though there be no charge more odious upon the Society than their doctrine of murder, yet, so far as I can discern, they are outdone here by others, both in numbers and extravagancy. However, the maxims, to diminish the horror of which the Jesuits seem solicitous, are now the common doctrine in that church; the divinity of her schools and doctors generally being advanced to such a pitch as to bid defiance to common humanity. And if the civil laws did give as much liberty to murder as their rules for conscience do, desolation would soon be brought upon the face of the earth.

*Sect. 8.* For uncleanness, they are very favourable to it, they seem to condemn the consummation of the act, but scarce anything else, and not that neither in every kind. They give up the outworks which should secure them from this sin; they admit its approaches, they encourage sinners to venture upon the occasions, even such as have very often ensnared them in this wickedness. Any confitent, they teach, ought to be absolved, though he do not purpose to avoid any occasions which lead to it, unless they be such as he does or ought to believe, he can seldom or never use without per-

<sup>1</sup> In. ii. 2, q. lxiv. art. vii dub. iv. concl. ii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Qui murmuratione et detractioe injuriam maculamque inferre conatur, licebit, si aliter infamiam et dedecus fugere non potest, occidere. De restit. l. ii. c. iii. n. cccclxxvi. Calumniatore occulte occidere licet. Duvallius Doctor Sorbonicus de Charit. q. xvii. a. i. Sayrus. Cas. Consc. c. xvii. n. xxii. xxiii.

<sup>4</sup> Theol. Moral. tom. ii. c. x. q. iv. n. xiv.

<sup>5</sup> *Opinio speculative probabilis, est practice probabilis.* Serra, Leander, Spinola, Jo. Henriquez, Narbona, Aversa, Machado, in Diana, part x. tr. xi. Resol. xlvii.

<sup>6</sup> Vid. Jo. Sanc. disp. xliv. n. lxiii. et disp. liv. n. xi.

pretrating the deadly act.<sup>1</sup> So that, though he very frequently fall thereby into uncleanness, yet unless he believe they will, *quasi semper*, in a manner always overthrow him, he may make bold with them.<sup>2</sup> To go into place or company, where the sight of any, their persuasions or opportunities, expose him to the danger of sinning, though he do it without necessity, is of itself no great fault, says Cajetan;<sup>3</sup> and if he find, that he can for some time withstand the temptation, and do not in a manner presently fall, *statim aut quasi statim*, though he find himself weak, yet he may venture on them without any necessary occasion, as the cardinal leaves us to conclude from what he there adds. A confessor does well who absolves those who will not express any purpose to avoid converse with such women, by which he hath very often sinned every way, both by desire, words, shameful touches, yea, and the very act of uncleanness; because this is such an occasion as is not deadly in itself, nor does make them, *fere semper*, commit deadly sin.<sup>4</sup> Those women or servants who have committed lewdness with their masters or others in the house, yea, though they be their kinsmen, may be absolved, though they still live together, if they cannot leave them without great inconvenience or damage;<sup>5</sup> provided if they be truly sorry for what is past,<sup>6</sup> and intend to sin no more, and think they shall not; yea, though after this they fall many times into the same wickedness,<sup>7</sup> of fornication, adultery, or incest, and do not avoid the occasion, yet still they may be absolved. And this liberty is not restrained to houses where they live together,<sup>8</sup> he extends it to other houses also. He that hath secretly committed filthiness diverse ways, with a friend or a kinswoman in another house, may be absolved, though he do not intend to forsake that house.<sup>9</sup> Or if the occasions he meets with in private houses do not satisfy him, he may venture into the common stews, but then it ought to be with a good intent. A man may go to a common whore, with confidence that he may convert her, though there be

<sup>1</sup> Quæ credit, vel credere debet, confessarius vel pœnitens, nunquam vel raro usurum ea, sine peccato mortali.—*Navar.* c. iii. n. xiv.

<sup>2</sup> Non vitare hujusmodi occasionem est peccatum mortale, at talis est occasio, qua credit se fere semper ad sic peccandum impulsus iri.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Eundo ad locum sive societatem ubi est periculum peccandi mortaliter propter aspectum, persuasiones, opportunitates aut aliquid hujusmodi. Et hoc quidem si sine vegente necessitate sit, ad incautelâ peccatum spectat—Si experientia icste didicit se non subsistere in hujusmodi, sed statim aut quasi statim cadere, nulla necessitate vincatur, ut illuc eat, aut ibi moretur.—*Sum.* v. peric. peccandi.

<sup>4</sup> Recte faciunt confessarii absolvendo multos adolescentes, qui versantur inter mulieres, emendo, vendendo, laborando et conversando absque cohabitatione in eadem domo: licet non proponant perpetuo abstinere ab occasione peccandi, quam id illis præbet, quamvis sæpius peccent voluntate, verbo, aut tactibus impudicis, et etiam copula, quia occasio quæ ex hoc præbetur ad peccandum, non est ex se peccatum mortiferum, neque hujusmodi, ut fere semper faciat mortaliter peccare eos qui ea utuntur.—*Navar. ibid.* n. xvii.

<sup>5</sup> Possunt absolvi, sine separatione, cognatæ, ancillæ, ac famulæ, quæ rem habuerunt cum suis consanguineis dominis vel his in quorum domo degunt, concurrentibus quatuor predictis: quorum quartum scilicet causa notabilis, est quod non possunt sine magno incommodo, et detrimento separari, n. xxi. i.

<sup>6</sup> 1. Vera pœnitudo præteritorum. 2. Verum propositum non peccandi. 3. Credulitas quod Deo juvante non peccabit. n. xv.

<sup>7</sup> An possint absolvi prædictæ iterum absque separatione si reciderint? Videtur nobis posse, concurrentibus prædictis quatuor. Et idem dicendum arbitror de tertia et quarta vice, quia non solum semel aut bis, vel septies, sed etiam septuagies sexties est parcendum.—*Ibid.* n. xxi.

<sup>8</sup> Those that keep concubines may be rightly absolved upon the same terms, without parting from them, n. xix.

<sup>9</sup> Idem dicendum est de illo, qui occulte rem, aut impudicos tactus habet cum aliqua consanguinea, aut alia sibi amica in alia domo agente; scilicet eum absolvi posse, sine proposito nunquam ingrediendi eam, n. xxii.

danger, and it is probable that he will commit filthiness with her.<sup>1</sup> And so any, their religious brothers or fathers not excepted, may seek the conversation of common whores, though they see imminent danger that they shall make no better use of the strumpets than those who come to them with the worst design.

They are as indulgent to unclean thoughts, as to lewd and ensnaring company. To entertain filthy thoughts,<sup>2</sup> to delight in those thoughts, and to consent to that delight,<sup>3</sup> is either no sin, or but venial; says Sylvester and others. They distinguish betwixt the unclean act and the thought of it. Cajetan, though he would not have the act to be the object of delight, yet he allows any to take pleasure, not only in the thought, but in the special manner of the act.<sup>4</sup> If a man do not observe what he is delighting in, while he is pleasing himself with such thoughts; yea, if he do not fully consider it, though he entertain himself with this mental pleasure a whole day together, it will not be sinful delight.<sup>5</sup> Lust, with a perfect inadvertency,<sup>6</sup> will not be mortal; when the delight of it so invades the mind, says Lopez,<sup>7</sup> nor needs he resist such delight, or repel these thoughts,<sup>8</sup> if he believe they will not engage him further, or if he thinks that by resistance they will grow upon him; or if it would hinder him from some necessary, or profitable, or honest employment, such as the study or reading of filthy things, which provoke such delight, is in their account.<sup>9</sup> They are no more rigorous as to obscene words, filthy songs, lascivious writings and discourses. They sin not, says Navarre, whether they be men or women, who see, or read, or hear, or speak any filthy things, men to women, or women to men, such as provoke to uncleanness, if it be upon an honest occasion;<sup>10</sup> now, it must needs be an

<sup>1</sup> Si quis certus esset de convertenda muliere prostituta, si accederit ad persuadendum illi viam salutis, potest, inquit, accedere, etiamsi ex tali accessu, imminet sibi probabile periculum peccandi cum illa.—*Soto*, in Lopez. cap. liii. p. 275. Prudentis charitatis fervor nonnunquam hominem animat, ut ad convertendas perditas mulieres, cum aliquo suo periculo earum colloquium adeat.—*Soto de Just.* l. v. q. i. art. vi. Vide plurimos sequentes D. Thomam dicentem, quod exponens se periculo peccandi, causa urgente, non peccat, Navar. Cordub. Cajetan. Armill. Castro. &c. in Jo. Sanc. disp. x. n. viii.

<sup>2</sup> Si quis de modis et inventionibus fornicandi speculetur, sola quadam novitate, et curiositate intelligendi hos modos adductus, non erit mortale.—*Lopez.* c. lxxiv. p. 355.

<sup>3</sup> Non tamen est peccatum mortale consentire in delectationem cogitationis, quæ est de peccato mortali, sed est veniale quando cogitatio est inutilis: vel nullum, puta cum quis utiliter cogitat. Sum. v. delect. n. ii.; Lopez. *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Si delectatio sit de miris et similibus modis, non est delectatio morosa: quam modi isti sint admirabiles, et naturaliter delectabiles cogitanti animæ.—*Sum.* v. delect. moros.

Sicut nec est (mortale) delectari in modo operandi scelus aliquod: licet non in ipso scelesto opere, ut in modis occupandi regnum—sicut etiam in speculatione variorum moderatorum coituum, dum absit periculum consentiendi.—*Lopez.* c. lxxv.

<sup>5</sup> Si circa id non adverteret, quamvis diem integrum delectatio perduraret, non peccaret mortaliter. Neque satis est advertere nisi integre advertat secundum Cajetanum. Navar. c. ii. n. xii.; Cajetan. Sum. v. delectat. p. 112; Graff. l. ii. c. lxxvii. n. ii.

Si vero advertere incipit, et prævalente impetu concitata passionis non plene advertit: sed antequam plene advertit delectatio facit suum cursum, peccatum non mortale sed veniale intervenit.—*Cajetan. ibid.* Non sit signum sufficiens ad probandum consensum tacitum, sola perseverantia delectationis post advertentiam.—*Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Qu. 'imperfect advertency?'—*Ed.*

<sup>7</sup> Ad mortale requiritur advertentia plena, quia non satis est imperfecta, quæ ex prævalente impetu passionis solet causari, libido cum tali inadvertentia imperfecta non erit mortalis, quando sic ejus complacentia impetit mentem.—*Cap.* lxxxv. p. 359.

<sup>8</sup> Navar. cap. xi. n. xii.; Lopez. ex mente Cajetaui et Metinæ. *ibid.*; Graff. l. ii. c. lxxvii. n. iii., iv., v.; Cajetan. *ibid.* p. 113.

<sup>9</sup> Non esset culpa—si delectationem illam omisisset expellere, ne suam occupationem honestam et necessariam, aut utilem derelinqueret, quale est studium et lectio rerum impudicarum, ad hujusmodi delectationes provocantium.—*Navar. ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Qui ad prædicandum, &c., aut alloquendum fœminas ex causa honesta cum sint ipsi

honest occasion when this is done, while they are at church for divine service; and there they have used it. Church music is now so licentious, says one, that filthy ditties are sung to the organ, and keep time even with the canon of the mass,<sup>1</sup> the most sacred part of that which they count most sacred; and Cajetan informs us, that in their church this is the practice everywhere, to sing to the organ amorous and filthy songs;<sup>2</sup> and that such cleanly stuff is in the person of the church offered to God,<sup>3</sup> instead of responsals and divine praises, and that experience witnesses that the hearers are thereby excited to profane and filthy things.<sup>4</sup> He allows not this indeed, but in some, and with limitation, laying the blame of the rest upon the pastors of their church, who seek not, as he says, the things of Christ;<sup>5</sup> and would have us believe the church approves it not, when yet he allows it to be the common practice everywhere.<sup>6</sup> It seems, she does but tolerate filthiness in the church, as she does in the stews, that she may be holy uniformly everywhere. However, if any one should, out of simplicity, think it lawful to mix profane and filthy songs with divine worship for recreation sake, because he sees that this custom hath commonly prevailed, Navarre would excuse him from mortal sin, as Lopez tells us.<sup>7</sup>

And so will Lopez excuse him too, provided the songs mixed with divine service be not too grossly filthy, and excessively lascivious.<sup>8</sup>

And so he may well excuse those who sing obscene or lascivious songs in the church, but not in divine service, as he seems to do those who sing to one another filthy rhymes on the evening of the nativity, when they are asking benedictions.<sup>9</sup> (It seems that is the usual way to get their church blessings; but the custom of that church needs no timorous advocate; this can plead for itself, and is wont to stand as good as any law whatever, that of God not excepted.)<sup>10</sup>

Their sacrament of penance also is an honest occasion; and there in confessions, as one of their bishops informs us, the priests inquire after such obscene and shameful things (instilling thereby into their ears unheard of filthiness and lasciviousness) as cannot without the blushing of the confitents of either sex, and without provoking the wanton appetite of the confessor, be well expressed in any words.<sup>11</sup>

virī, vel contra viros, cum sint ipsæ fœminæ, vident, legunt, audiunt, aut dicunt aliqua turpia, aut talia, quæ illam provocant. Ii enim quamvis possint, non sunt tamen obligati ad omitendum id quod faciunt, quo pollutionis eventum impediunt.—*Idem*, c. xvi. n. vii.

<sup>1</sup> Hodie vero tanta est musicæ liceutia ut etiam una cum missæ ipsius canone obscenæ cantiuiculæ, etiam in organis pares vices habeant.—*Corn. Agripp. de Vanit. Scient.* c. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> Turpes et amatorias cantilenas.

<sup>3</sup> Loco antiphonarum et divinæ laudis offeruntur, ex ipsius ecclesiæ persona, prophana hæc a falsariis ministris.—*Sum.* v. Organ. p. 453.

<sup>4</sup> Audientes ex illo sono excitantur ad illa prophana seu turpia, ut experientia testatur, ita quod non est locus inficiationi.—*Ibid.* 454.

<sup>5</sup> Quia ecclesiastici pastores non quæsierunt quæ Jesu Christi sunt.

<sup>6</sup> Ubique sic vident fieri.

<sup>7</sup> Si aliquis rustica simplicitate putaret licere divino cultui recreandi animi gratia, miscere cantilenas profanas et turpes, quia videt communiter in his usum invaluisse; excusaretur a mortali; ita Navarrus, cujus sententiam esse veram judico, si loquatur de simplicibus rusticis, &c.—*Cap.* li. p. 263.

<sup>8</sup> Dummodo tales cantus non sint adeo patenter turpes, et nimis lascivi.—*Pars.* ii. cap. xxxi. p. 183.

<sup>9</sup> Addit vero Navarrus, non esse lethale crimen, sic extra divinum officium cantare in ecclesia cantilenam turpem et lascivam, videtur que excusare contra Sotum rithmos turpes sibi occinentes in nocte nativitatís Domini, tempore quo petunt benedictiones, licet non aperte eos excuset.—*Ibid.* p. 264.

<sup>10</sup> The custom of the church is of equal authority, and to be received with the same pious affection with the Scripture.—*Counc. Basil. resp. Synod.* tom. iv. Surg.

<sup>11</sup> Quibusdam interrogationum formulis, circa scrupulo as peccatorum differentias, ob-

Further, they allow persons to entertain themselves with pleasure conditionally, upon supposal that they were married together, if the act be not respected as present.<sup>1</sup> They grant liberty to make use of such things as provoke lust. He may be absolved who, by eating of hot meats, hath fallen into grievous temptations of the flesh, and has been drawn to consent to pollution or fornication, though he hath no purpose to avoid such provoking meats, this being done with the provisoes before mentioned.<sup>2</sup> They are no more severe against immodest touches or shameful sights. To suffer touches from one who is thought to do it out of honest love or custom, is no great fault;<sup>3</sup> but if it proceed from lust, in order to the act of uncleanness or impure delights, she sins if she avoids them not; and this holds if she can avoid them without scandal (say they) which signifies they account it no sin to yield to this impure treatment, since none are obliged to give way to sin for the avoiding of scandal. He that by ensnaring sights, viewing another's nakedness, &c., hath been often drawn to sin, may be absolved, though he do not propose to avoid such temptations, with the forementioned cautions.<sup>4</sup>

Men and women viewing one another's nakedness (*pubenda vel partes vicinas*) may be excused, if it be but for curiosity, and a short time, without danger of great commotion.<sup>5</sup>

The beholding of filthy sights, for natural or sensual pleasure, when there is no danger of passing into unclean thoughts (*id est*, passing through the mire when there is no danger of being dirtied), is no crime.<sup>6</sup> Those who, upon pretence of spiritual mortification, make women strip themselves naked, to discipline them, sin mortally, if lust were the principal cause of it, says Sylvester,<sup>7</sup> leaving us to think, that if lust be but a less principal motive to do it, it is but a small fault or none. In fine, they account it no crime to offer no hearty opposition unto temptation. He (says De Graffis) who coldly resists temptation, so that it returns upon him, and invades his soul a second and a third time, because he resists so coldly, sins not mortally, if there be no danger of consenting;<sup>8</sup> as if there could be no danger to consent when there is little or no mind to resist.

scæna et impudica quædam exquirunt, quæ sine utriusque sexus interrogati (cujus auribus inaudita turpitudines et lasciviæ instillantur) rubore, et interrogantis inhonesti appetitus titillatione, vix ullis verbis, aut ne vix quidem, enuntiare possint.—*Pontius. Tyardæus. Episc. Cabilon.* p. 35.

<sup>1</sup> Cajetan. Sum. v. delect. p. 116; Metina et Victoria in Lopez. c. lxxv. pp. 356, 357.

<sup>2</sup> Absolvi potest ille, qui ob esum rerum calidaram incidit in adeo graves carnis tentationes, ut eum aliquando impulerint ad consentiendum pollutioni vel fornicationi, sine proposito nunquam in posterum sic edendi. Concurrentibus quatuor prædictis.—*Navar. c. iii. n. xxv.*

<sup>3</sup> Non peccat mortaliter, quæ patitur tactus vel oscula ab eo, quem credit moveri honesto amore, secus vero si ab eo quem credit moveri libidinoso amore ad actum venereum, vel delectationem morosam. Quod procedit, quando potest vitare sine scandalo eorum, qui de libidine non suspicantur. Graff. l. ii. c. lxxiv. n. xi.; Lopez. cap. lxxv. p. 360. Neque pati tactus impudicos licitum est feminae, quando sine scandalo potest eos vitare.

<sup>4</sup> Idem dicendum est (*i. e.* absolvi potest) de persona, qui—quia videt lavantes fæminas in flumine, aut viros natantes, aut ex aspectu pedum, crurum, pectorum, &c., aut aliorum ejus generis, sæpe peccavit. *Navar. ibid. n. xxvii.*

<sup>5</sup> Bonacin. tom. i. pp. 3, 8.

<sup>6</sup> Cajetan. Navar. Medina. in Fill. tr. xxx. n. ccxv. Videre fæminas aut viros—ad solam delectationem carnalem, quæ ex visione insurgit, solum est veniale, ut notat Cajetan. Idemque dicendum de auditu et locutione rerum venerearum, si delectatio non transit ad res ipsas in Tol. l. v. c. xiv.

<sup>7</sup> Quid de his qui sub specie spiritualis mortificationis faciunt mulieres coram se nudare ut disciplinas inferant? Et dico quod non est dubium, eos peccare mortaliter, si libido sit principaliter in causa.—*Sum. v. delect. n. vii.*

<sup>8</sup> Non peccat mortaliter is qui tam tepide resistit tentationi, ut secundo et tertio

They teach that a man, suspecting his wife is an adulteress, may with a good intent offer her the occasion to commit adultery without sin. Also that a servant is excused (when declining it would be a great inconvenience) if he accompany his master when he goes a-whoring; because here is a just occasion, and the action is of itself honest.<sup>1</sup> And a maid too, if sho go along with a whore to the house of her lover, to act filthiness with him, or opens the door for him on such occasion. And so is a servant likewise to be excused, when he is sent to bring a whore to his master's lodging, or carries presents, or an epistle, or a message, or writes letters, when the contents are to have a whore come to him, at such a time; or any such (with them) indifferent thing, unless there be an express desire of the filthy act.<sup>2</sup>

Such encouragement they give to use the preparatives, and play with the incentives, and dally with the temptations to lust and actual uncleanness. For the act itself, how little they make of self-pollution we have seen before, they conclude that single pollution (though a sin against nature) is of itself no sin at all,<sup>3</sup> and so they may desire it beforehand,<sup>4</sup> or delight in it when it is past,<sup>5</sup> for an honest end, and use the incentives, if it be but for gluttony. Moreover, whoredom itself has excessive favour and encouragement from this holy church. This is too plain by their authors, and their practice, to be denied; and too heinous to be excused by any but those who have a mind to have mortal sins to pass for small, or no faults. It seems it is no sin to build stews for the entertainment of common whores, and the best accommodation of them for their trade of uncleanness. Pope Sixtus did it, as Cornelius Agrippa tells us,<sup>6</sup> and they were so multiplied long since, that as one of their doctors observes, under Christ's vicars, and Peter's successors, *urbs est jam tota lupanar*, now the whole city is one whore-house.<sup>7</sup> It is no sin to farm out whoredom, and to take so much a-head of the strumpets weekly for their practice.<sup>8</sup> The pope's holiness hath done it long at Rome, and does it to this day; and the whores daily commit lewdness, not only for themselves, but for the pope, their benefactor's, advantage, who is to share in their gain: they drive this trade for him. And the number of his farmers was so great long since, that they brought him in yearly an *intrado* of above twenty thousand ducats, a great sum then, and probably very much improved since. Such an abominable tribute, nature, even corrupted, blushes at; but that *Holiness* at Rome thinks it no shame to maintain his honour and state, as Christ's vicar, by the hire of whores. Evagrius extolling Anastasius the emperor for abolishing such a detestable practice,

regrediatur ad pulsandam mentem, eo quod solum tepide resistit, secluso periculo consentiendi.—Sylv. v. delect.; Graff. l. ii. c. lxxvii. n. ix.

<sup>1</sup> Jo. Sanc. diss. xxxv. n. xii.

<sup>2</sup> Bonacin. tom. i. p. 323, ibi. M. Navar. P. Navar. Zerola.

<sup>3</sup> Non est in se peccatum, secundum omnes.—Navar. c. xvi. n. vii.

<sup>4</sup> Cajetanus. Sylvester. et alii ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Aquinas. Paludanus et communis. ibid. Si autem placeat, ut est exoneratio naturæ, non creditur peccatum—appetere pollutionem in somnis sine omni delectatione propter alleviationem naturæ, non est peccatum: sed dare operam, utendo calidis, vel alio modo, esset mortali peccatum, si propter hoc facit. Secus si faceret propter gulositatem, dubitando nihilominus de ea, quia sic esset veniale peccatum.—Angel. Sum. v. pollut. n. ii.

<sup>6</sup> Recentioribus temporibus Sixtus Pontifex maximus nobile admodum lupanar Romæ extruxit.—De vault. scient. cap. lxiv.

<sup>7</sup> Nunc vero sub Christi vicariis et Petri successoribus, ut alius quidam cecinit—urbs est jam tota lupanar.—*Espencœus de Continent.* l. iii. c. iv.

<sup>8</sup> Romana scorta in singulas hebdomadas *julium* Pontifici pendant.—*Agrippa, ibid.*

brands it as a wretched tribute, abominable to God, and shameful to the most barbarous people; as that which was a reproach to nature itself and the civil government; as that which did, as it were, by a law authorise this wickedness.<sup>1</sup> Nor do the popish writers deny that it is as bad as he represents it; and yet, since the pope hath made it a custom, they have the confidence to justify it. Hear one of their prime penitentiaries: The gain, says he, or tribute for whoredom, is by the common law a deadly crime; and Nicephorus says it is a filthy gain, detestable, absurd, hateful, and which the most savage barbarians may be ashamed of.<sup>2</sup> What then? Is he or the great bishop ashamed of it? You may know how by what he adds immediately. Yet, says he, because of the custom, which passes for a law, the pope consenting to it in the lands of the church, *non est peccatum*, it is no sin, it ought to be paid.<sup>3</sup> So that the pope's will and interest, passing into custom, can make that to be no sin, which nature, law, history, and their own consciences condemn as a most horrid crime, and that well becomes his holiness, which the worst barbarians would detest. No wonder, then, if they conclude it lawful for any to let their houses to harlots, though they know they take them for the practice of whoredom; the trade is so good, they can pay higher rents than others. No wonder their casuists and divines determine so many things in favour of whores; what they receive for their detestable practice is not to be accounted a reward only, but a lawful debt;<sup>4</sup> thus their divines conclude, while their conscience extorts this from them, *dolendum tamen est, debitum esse ob scelus putatum*. And so they may demand it, and recover it, and have patrons and officers for their assistance; that whoredom may be practised by rules of justice, and they may force the payment, though there was no price agreed on,<sup>5</sup> nor is the whore bound to make restitution, though she take more than her due,<sup>6</sup> nor is it necessary she should give any of it to the poor.<sup>7</sup> And they are as punctual in resolving prostitutes and their customers about the price of this staple commodity, as about the lawfulest negotiations in the world.<sup>8</sup> Who may sell themselves to serve the lusts of others, at what rate, what liberty they have to take a price, answerable to the just value, how the value may be computed, and how they may improve it, &c. Though filthiness in a woman be a fault, yet it is no fault filthily to set it to sale.<sup>9</sup> A man may satisfy the

<sup>1</sup> Τίλος ἰλεεινόν τι καὶ Στοιμισὲς, καὶ βάρβαρων ἀντῶν ἀνάξιον, &c., l. i. ii. cap. xxxix. p. 567. Hist. Eccles.

<sup>2</sup> *Lucrum vel tributum ex meretricum opera quærere, inspecto jure communi, peccatum mortale est, et a Nicephoro. l. xvi. c. xl. Hist. Eccl. dicitur vectigal impurum, detestabile, absurdum Deoque invisum, feris quibusque barbaris indignum et execrandum piaculum.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ratione tamen consuetudinis, quæ pro lege habetur, et consentiente rege in terris suis, et Papa in terris ecclesiæ, non est peccatum, ideo est solvendum.—Graff. l. ii. c. cxxiii. n. v.*

<sup>4</sup> *Meretricem promissam, ob turpem usum corporis, mercedem, tanquam debitum posse petere, negat Navar. Aiunt probabilius Lopez. Soto. Cajetan. Covarruvias—nam pretium illud debitum est jure nature: dolendum tamen est, debitum esse ob scelus putatum. Victorel. in Tol. l. v. c. xix. vid Soto. de Just. et Jur. l. iv. q. vii. art. i. p. 128.*

<sup>5</sup> *Qui illis statum pretium non solveret, cogeretur in foro judiciali.—Idem. ibid. Graff. ibid. n. iii. n. viii. Potest illud meretrix petere in judicio. Illis solis lege decreta sunt pretia.—Soto. ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Graff. ibid. n. ii.; Navar. c. xvii. n. xxxiv.*

<sup>7</sup> *Graff. ibid. n. ii.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ratio Cajetani, viz. quod usus meretricis est materia vendibilis et non rei sacræ quam Sotus et recentiores magni facere videntur.—In Navar. c. xvii. n. xxxv.*

<sup>9</sup> *Licet turpiter faciat quod sit meretrix, non tamen turpiter accipit. Aquinas. in Nav. ibid., Soto. ibid., Graff. ibid.*

lust of a female at a price;<sup>1</sup> and he is so far from being obliged to restitution, that it is more than equal it should be paid him; he parts with more for it<sup>2</sup> (there is not only justice, but equity, and conscience for him in the case); and there is invincible proof for it, since Alexander himself took hire upon this account, and the Amazons were wont of old to hire men to do this work.

Any whores whatever may retain the price of their filthiness;<sup>3</sup> only a whore is bound in conscience to restore what is given her by their religious persons.<sup>4</sup> This, it seems, is the peculiar privilege of their votaries, that harlots must serve their turn *gratis*; and they have so much encouragement more than others to practise whoredom, since in conscience it must cost them nothing. But if a secular person give a religious man money, or anything else for the religious man's whore, that is not to be restored. It would be too hard to part with his whore for nothing.<sup>5</sup> Yet one encumbrance there is, but very gently laid on them: if the religious man have goods in his power to dispose of, he may (it is not said he must) satisfy a wench when he has deflowered her, &c.; for this is a pious use.<sup>6</sup>

A woman that commits lewdness secretly may take the price of fornication more justly than a common harlot (though she does it justly enough), because in her it is more valuable; the price may rise, being an honest whore.<sup>7</sup> If a married woman fall into adultery once and again, she may take her price without charge of restitution (it is more lawful gain than to have any such burden annexed), and the adulterer is bound upon his soul to lay it down; for though adultery be illegal, yet to buy and sell it is no sin, if the price be not excessive, and much above the just value of the thing, the quality of the persons considered.<sup>8</sup> And it must not be forgotten that the adulteress is not to be accountable to her husband for what she gains by this traffic, or a maid to her parents when she prostitutes herself for hire in her father's house, but may convert it to their own use, as that which they earn by hand labour, unless they grow very wealthy by the trade.<sup>9</sup> And if these women do but take moderate sums for this filthy traffic of those who are not at their own disposing, they are not bound to restitution; because it is presumed that those who have the charge of those minors do allow such expenses.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Imo utraque ratione posset etiam masculus a fœmina pretium recipere: quin vero æquius, quia plus præbet: sicuti Alexander in jure naturæ potuit a duce illa Amazone quæ illum gratia recipiendæ prolis invisit, quod et prece et pretio, ut fertur, impetravit. Nam illi fœminarum generi in more erat, pretio accersere viros qui ad illas ingrederentur.—Soto. *ibid.* Graff. *ibid.* n. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Qui a fœmina propter opus libidinosum accipit pretium non tenetur illud restituere, quin vero æquius est ut illud accipiat, cum plus præbeat, sicut Alexander, &c. Item si causa salutis quispiam emissionem illa egeret, posset amplexum illum pretio coemere.—Soto. *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Adrian. Sylvest. Covarruv. Soto. Medina. Corduba. Navar. Antoninus in Vasquez. Opusc. Moral. p. 124, dub. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Idem. *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Paludan. Palac. *ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Porro autem crediderim has multo justius posse recipere pretium: quippe quæ ob majorem honestatem pluris sunt æstimandæ. Idem. *ibid.* Graff. *ibid.* n. vi.

<sup>8</sup> Quod si de aliis scisciteris quæ sunt puellæ aut maritatæ quæ semel aut bis collabuntur—et illis quoque liceret pretium recipere: tenebiturque in foro conscientiæ, qui illis promisit solvere, nisi excessus justæ æstimationis pro ratione personarum immodicus esset. Et ratio est eadem S. Thomæ. Nam licet flagitia illa sint lege vetita, datio tamen non est prohibita. Et ideo juri naturali standum est: quo utique jure concessio illa corporum æstimabilis est pecunia.—Soto. *ibid.* Potest nupta quæ semel aut bis collapsa est pretium recipere absque nexu restitutionis, et adulter tenetur judicio animæ illi solvere, &c. Graff. *ibid.* n. viii. et Covarruvias *ibi.*

<sup>9</sup> Soto. *ibid.* Idem esse judicium atque de aliis, quæ operis manuum suarum acquisierint, &c. et Graff. *ibid.* n. ix.

<sup>10</sup> Si res est modica pro qualitate personæ, etiamsi a filio-familias recipiat, retinere

This was necessary to be added, that harlots might not be discouraged from admitting boys under age among their customers. Lastly, a nun playing the whore may both do it for hire, and with a good conscience keep it when she hath done.<sup>1</sup> It had been hard measure for their votaries if some provision had not been made for them, that their trade might be gainful, when their own authors tell us it is so common. There was no reason to be partial, and make much difference betwixt them and other prostitutes, when their Clemangis could see no difference betwixt their nunneries and the common stews.<sup>2</sup> But to proceed with the latter, while they are giving rules for conscience, they tell us the law countenances fornication so very much, that it compels public whores to commit lewdness with any one whomsoever giving her her hire.<sup>3</sup> And so indulgent is the church to whoredom, that harlots who live there many years (even as long as they can get custom), do incur no ecclesiastical censure.<sup>4</sup> So that at Rome, made so purely Christian by its popes, whoredom is as lawful as when it was most heathenish, and is objected as the shame of it by St Augustine, that there the use of whoredom was a lawful practice.<sup>5</sup> Hereby the people under popery are so well edified that they cannot easily know whether fornication committed with common prostitutes be a sin, as one of their doctors tells us;<sup>6</sup> for many of the common people (says he) who know not how to distinguish betwixt sin permitted or not forbidden as to the punishment, and not as to the sinfulness; because that simple fornication is not punished, and whores have the privilege of impunity, they make account it is no sin to deal with them (at the pope's rate); and this is very common in cities otherwise well instructed in the faith and religion (of Rome) as those who hear confession well know.<sup>7</sup> It seems confessors have something to do to persuade the people that that is a sin which the pope publicly allows; and they might have more to do if the people did not suspect that the pope is a man like themselves, and for all his infallibility may, in matter of whoredom, err as they usually do.

But if any man be not disposed to take this liberty, so freely offered, of haunting the common stews, he is encouraged by the law of their church to have a concubine at home, and that without any great hazard. It will not cost him so much as the loss of the communion, for the canon law provides,

potest. Nam præsumitur pater scire, ratasque subinde habere ejusmodi expensas. Soto. *ibid.* Graff. *ibid.* n. x.

<sup>1</sup> Quinimo, ut inquit Covarruvias, Nec monialis pecuniam recipiens ob mercedem sui coitus tenetur illam restituere in foro animæ.—*Idem. ibid.* n. x.

<sup>2</sup> Nihil distinguit inter sui temporis virginum monasteria, et meretricum lupanaria.—*Espencæus de Contin.* l. ii. c. xii.

<sup>3</sup> Et in tantum lex tolerat hujusmodi fornicationes, ut etiam cogat publicas meretrices ad fornicandum cum quocunque, juxta tamen mercedem.—*Graff.* l. ii. c. lxxiv. n. iv.

<sup>4</sup> Though one continue a whore for twenty years, yet doth she not incur the censures of the church.—*Vid. Vivaldus Candelabr. aur. tit. de Confess.* n. lx.

<sup>5</sup> Tu tu sancte pater Augustine. Quid vere terrenæ civitati velut exprobas, quod scortorum usum licitum fecerit, ut quem nulla ejus lex vindicet, cum eadem turpitudine in nostra, hoc est Dei civitate, neque minus permittatur, neque magis puniatur.—*Espencæus de Contin.* l. iii. c. iv. Ratio vero quam prædictus Segobiensis (*Soto*), secutus aliquot alios sentit, viz. quod lex permittit, et facit justam operam meretricis, non tamen alias prædictorum operas, &c.—*Navar.* c. xvii. n. xxxv.

<sup>6</sup> *Fill. tr.* xxx. c. ii. n. li. p. 203.

<sup>7</sup> It is not the common people only that have this good opinion of it. Nec hodie Anistippe quidam desunt, qui simplex hoc stuprum pro crimine non habeant.—*Espencæus de Contin.* lib. iii. cap. iv. Utinam non essent in orbe atque nomine Christiano, qui libellis publice editis, quasi quibusdam fornicandi Isagogis, mulieres, et quidem omnes, nihil aliud in vita communi esse putarent, quam rem explendæ libidini natam.—*Idem. ibid.*

that he who has not a wife, but instead of a wife a concubine, shall not be kept from the communion, so that he be satisfied with one woman, either a wife or a concubine.<sup>1</sup> Now, since they tell us sometimes that none who are in mortal sin may partake of the communion, it should seem that with them to live in fornication is either no sin, or none that is mortal.

Their doctrine is as indulgent to those who will not put away their concubines as such persons need desire. Absolution is not to be denied him who, having lent his concubine whom he keeps in his house one hundred crowns, has no hope to recover it if he put her away. Or, on the contrary, if the woman be not like to recover the like sum owing her, if she leave the house of the whoremaster; for, as was said before, none are bound to avoid the next occasion of sin, to their great loss. Nor is he bound to put away his concubine if she be very useful for the gaining of temporal goods by way of traffic.<sup>2</sup> It is enough that he intends not to sin hereafter. Yea, if the concubine be very serviceable for the delight of the whoremaster, so that his life would scarce be pleasant without her, and other cates would be very distasteful to him, and another woman, so much for his purpose, would hardly be found, the whoremaster will not be obliged to put her away.<sup>3</sup> Neither is absolution to be denied if he might lose his reputation by quitting his whore; yea, or if the concubine would be disgraced thereby. It is enough if he firmly promise not to sin more with her, since it is in his power not to sin, although there be present danger of it while she stays in his house.<sup>4</sup>

But what if he sin with her still, after such promises to the contrary? That will not hinder if he repent still; and he may truly repent (in their way), and be absolved, when there is no appearance of amendment. So he determines in a like case after others.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, Bonacina determines a confessor may absolve one who keeps a whore, and will not put her away, if he cannot do it without much disgrace, or scandal, or other great inconvenience.<sup>6</sup> And him also who sins but seldom with his whore, three or four times in a year (or thereabouts), and hopes he may not relapse further.<sup>7</sup> And so may a youth be absolved who keeps a whore in his father's house, with whom he sins customarily, though he put her not away, so that he have a firm purpose to desist.<sup>8</sup> But what if after such a purpose he relapse still? He may be absolved still (as we heard before), even innumerably innumerable times, because so oft we are to forgive our brother.<sup>9</sup>

Or if a concubine at home will not satisfy an unclean person, but he commit fornication with others, yet if he make but himself drunk before, that fornication will be no sin, or but an inconsiderable fault, if he be but half drunk.

Nor will adultery be a sin in that or many other cases. Christ teaches that 'he who puts away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery,' Mat. v. 32; yet they teach that where the marriage is both firm and consummated by conjugal enjoyment, yet the parties may

<sup>1</sup> Decret. dist. xxxiv. c. iv. Is qui non habet uxorem, et pro uxore concubinam habet, a communione non repellatur. Rabanus. l. penit. c. x. alleges a Spanish Canon for this. And Gratian. dist. xxxiv. and Espencæus de contin. l. ii. c. vii. Jacobus Curio. l. ii. Chron. says of Gregory vii., Quasi cælibatum perpetuum concubinitus temperamento mitigaret, sacerdotem unius concubinæ societate contentum ab officio non repellendum statuens.—*Vid. ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Jo. Sancius, disp. x. n. xx.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> N. xxi.

<sup>5</sup> Absolvendum fore toties quoties vere penituerit, non solum quando aliqua emendatio notatur; ut tenent. Suar. Graff. Navar. Coriolan. Lopez.—quod possit absolvi penitens, etiamsi nullus appareat profectus, tenet Vivaldus.—*Ibid.* n. xvi.

<sup>6</sup> De Matrim. disp. iv. punct. xiv. n. xi.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* n. xii. juxta Graffium et alios.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* n. xiii. ita Graffius. Lopez. et. alii.

<sup>9</sup> Jo. Sanc. *ibid.* n. xvi.

be separated as to cohabitation, and as much divorced as they can be for adultery (by their doctrine), either for outward danger, or when one tempts the other to mortal sin, or for that which they call heresy, or if either of them will enter into a monastery.<sup>1</sup> And if there had not been carnal knowledge after the marriage, though it be firm and valid, yet if either of them will make the monastic profession, the other is at liberty to marry another, and live together as man and wife, the parties whom they first married still living. So that if a wife will turn nun, she may put away her husband (doing it *eo ignorante vel invito*<sup>2</sup>), and he may marry another wife.

The Council of Trent confirms this to purpose, when it curses those who hold that lawful matrimony, not consummated, is not dissolved by a solemn religious vow.<sup>3</sup> It is acknowledged by Boniface VIII.,<sup>4</sup> and Gregory XIII.,<sup>5</sup> that this of matrimony is a bond made firm and indissoluble by God himself, and the other, of a vow, but a church constitution; yet (as was observed long since) the Trent prelates will not only have a human bond to dissolve a divine, but will have those accursed who will not believe that an institution of man, born many hundred years since the apostles, should prevail against a divine institution, made at the creation of the world.<sup>6</sup> Thus in behalf of their pretended chastity, they have opened a broad way for real adultery; and who could expect more reasonable decrees in such a case?

This for their laity; then for their clergy and monastics, their doctrine is, that adultery is not so much a sin as marriage,<sup>7</sup> no, nor incest, or sodomy, or bestiality, so that they may better venture upon any of these abominations than upon that state which the Lord hath authorised and honoured. And he is more capable of orders amongst them who hath kept two whores, than one who hath been twice married, or but once married a widow.<sup>8</sup> An incestuous person, says Erasmus, is admitted to be a bishop, a murderer, a robber, a sodomite, a sacrilegious wretch; a parricide, is admitted, and who not?<sup>9</sup> *Solus digamus*, one that has been twice married, is only excluded from this honour, though he alone be blameless. The apostle commends marriage to prevent the heats of lust, which he calls burning; but burning lust is with them innocent. To burn, says Valentia, does not signify to burn with the flames of lust, for this in itself is not evil.<sup>10</sup> The apostle determines it better to marry than to burn; but Bellarmine says, it is worse to marry, however our adversaries gainsay (where he puts the apostle with us amongst his adversaries), especially for her who is under solemn vow; and a little after he tells us, she that marries after a simple vow,<sup>11</sup> in a manner sins more than she that commits fornication; his reason is, because the one

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Sylvest. Sum. v. divort. n. x. et n. ii. Quantum ad vinculum, matrimonium ratum solvi potest per mortem civilem, *i.e.* professionem tacitam vel expressam religionis approbatæ: ita quod remanens in sæculo potest libere cum alia contrahere. —*Ibid.* (vid. Maldonat. Summ. quæst. xiv. art. xiii.)

<sup>2</sup> Idem. *ibid.* n. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Sess. viii. Can. vi.

<sup>4</sup> 6 Decret. l. iii. tit. xv.

<sup>5</sup> In bulla Ascendente Domino.

<sup>6</sup> Vid. Histor. of Counc. of Trent. l. viii. p. 790.

<sup>7</sup> Marriage of them who have vowed chastity, is the worst sort of incontinency.—*Rhem. Annot.* in Cor. vii. ix.

<sup>8</sup> Aquinas, Comment. in Tit. i.

<sup>9</sup> Annot in 1 Tim. iii. admittitur incestus, admittitur homicida, admittitur pirata, admittitur sodomita, sacrilegus, parricida; denique quis non? solus digamus excluditur, qui solus nihil admisit.

<sup>10</sup> Uri non idem significat quod flamma libidinis uri; hoc enim per se malum non est, imo materia potius victoriae. l. de Cœlibat. Cap. vi.

<sup>11</sup> Non utrumque est malum, et nubere et uri; imo pejus est nubere, quicquid reclamant adversarii, presertim ei, quæ habet votum solenne.—*De Monach.* l. ii. c. xxxvi. p. 1213.

makes herself incapable of keeping her vow, which she does not, who plays the whore.<sup>1</sup> Where we see what their vow of chastity is (the argument wherein they triumph to prove the holiness of their church), it is a chastity which consists well enough with whoredom, and is only violated by marriage. Accordingly, the clergy have liberty to haunt the public stews. It is in reference to those who are unmarried (to wit, the clergy) that the stews are held to be so very necessary; <sup>2</sup> that no consideration could move the pope or his council to think any thing more fit to be done against the common whores, but only some diminution of their pride and luxury, as one of their doctors intimates. And as if that would not serve, they have been heretofore allowed to keep whores at home, paying a yearly rent for that liberty; <sup>3</sup> yea, those priests that would not keep whores (that they might not want temptation to it), were forced to pay the rent, because they might have had the liberty if they pleased. For a monk or friar to lay aside his habit is a crime, by which he incurs excommunication; and yet if he lay aside his habit that he may commit fornication the more expeditely, without the incumbrance which his monkish weeds would give him in the act, they declare him upon that account freed from censure. Excommunication is not incurred, says Navarre, for every leaving of his habits which is temerarious or deadly, because he incurs it not by laying it aside that he may the more readily indulge himself in fornication.<sup>4</sup> Sylvester had made such a decision before him, so understanding Paludanus, that he is under excommunication who puts off his habit to disguise himself in reference to others, that he may not be known, but not he that lays it by with a respect to himself, viz., for the pleasure of fornication.<sup>5</sup> So that the censured dismissing of habit is, as he distinguishes, that which is fraudulent, so as to put on another, but not that which is for an hour's pleasure while he is quite stripped.<sup>6</sup> Panormitan concludes that an oath is never to be given to him of whom there is vehement suspicion that he will not observe it, and he that gives it in that case sins mortally.<sup>7</sup> Hence Pope Alexander would not have priests bound by

<sup>1</sup> Quæ autem nubit post votum simplex, illa verum matrimonium contrahit, tamen aliquo modo magis peccat, quam quæ fornicatur, quia reddit se impotentem ad servandum votum, quod non facit quæ fornicatur.—*Ibid.* p. 1214.

<sup>2</sup> Mirum certe tales tantosque viros consuluisse, minuendum modo seortorum fastum et luxum, non etiam ea semel ejicienda, an vero propter tam multos ibi cælibes necessario retinenda? O rem horrendam!—*Espenceus de contin.* l. iiii. c. iv. p. 734.

<sup>3</sup> Turpissimum est quod (Officiales) permittant (Clericos) cum concubinis, meretricibus, et pellicibus habitare, liberosque procreare sinunt, accepto ab iis certo quotannis censu: atque adeo alibi a continentibus. Nam habeat (inquiet) si velit. Et quoties enim quisque talis, cum tales tam multi sint, hodie aliter punitur? Idem. in Tit. c. i. p. 479; Corn. Agrippa de Vanit. Scient. c. lxiv.

<sup>4</sup> Non incurritur etiam ob quamlibet dimissionem temerariam mortiferam, quia non incurritur ob dimissionem ut expeditius fornicationi indulgeat.—*Navar.* c. xvii. n. cxxxii.

<sup>5</sup> Si quis habitum dimittat ut fornicetur secundum Pet. de Pal. sine dubio est excommunicatus, quod ego verum erederem quando habitum dimittit relative ad alios, puta ne cognoscatur: secus relative ad se, puta propter voluptatem. Sum v. Excom. ix. n. liii. Non afficit excommunicatione qui se vestibus spoliat—ut liberius et voluptuosius peccet. Bonacina Tom. iii. de Excom. disp. ii. q. viii. punct vi. n. iii. Sayrus et alii quos magno numero refert Sanctarell. *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Unde dico illam dimissionem debere intelligi, quando habitus dimittitur dolose cum assumptione alterius ad utendum eo, secus ubi dimitteretur ad horam voluptuose, nullo alio sumpto.—*Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> In c. Clericus. de coha. Cler. et mulier. Concludit quod nunquam est deferendum juramentum illi, contra quem est vehemens suspicio de transgressione, et deferens peccat mortaliter et Alex. facit optime (textus dicti, c. Cleric.), ubi non vult clericos cogi jurare dimittere concubinas, Angel. Sum. v. juram. ii. n. xi. Navar. e. xii. n. xx. Ne in fornicationem reversus perjuri quoque reatum incurreret.—*Espenc. de Cont.* l. ii. c. vii.

oath to forsake their concubines, because it seems there was strong presumption they would venture on perjury rather than leave their whoredom. Hence Erasmus had so much cause to complain, that among so vast multitudes who were unmarried, and under the vow of chastity, so exceeding few did live chastely, so innumerable many did wallow in uncleanness.<sup>1</sup> And Cassander, another moderate papist, says that a man could not find scarce one in a hundred of them that abstained from women.<sup>2</sup>

Before these, the gloss on the Canon Maximianus, dist. lxxxi., tells us, it is the common opinion that no priest should be deposed for simple fornication, because there are but few priests free from it.<sup>3</sup> If all fornicators had been deprived, their church would have been made desolate, and left in a manner priestless. This was a great reason then, and is, it seems, of the same force still; for at this day, a priest is not to be deprived for simple incontinency. The congregation of cardinals (much concerned for the propagation of the holy church) declared it to be law, that the penalty of deprivation proceeds not for simple incontinency, as Garzias observes; only they must not keep whores in the capacity of concubines.<sup>4</sup> It may be that came too near marriage to have so much favour as vagrant whoredom. Yet if a priest keep a whore at board and bed, and use her constantly as if she were his wife, he is not therefore irregular; indeed, if he marry her, or an honest woman, all the world cannot excuse him; for though such whoredom never disables a priest, yet chaste marriage utterly spoils him; yea, if he keep in that capacity more whores than one (I know not how many more, for they are not limited to numbers), yet still he is not irregular (as innocent bigamy would make any one though he were an apostle), but the bishop may dispense with him. So Pope Innocent III. determined, and it is now as good law as their church has any; and the more remarkable, because the doctor's gloss on it would have it noted as admirable, that whoredom has with them more privilege than chastity.<sup>5</sup> Where we may suppose the gloss speaks the sense of such as are strangers to Rome; for that uncleanness should be preferred before chastity is in that church nothing wonderful nor strange at all, but ordinary and obvious. That pope (whom they magnify as the singular glory of their law) decrees that the bishop may dispense with priests who keep many concubines to exercise their office, as he doth also with those who are noted for simple fornication.<sup>6</sup> And how the bishops were wont to dispense with them is known, their own writings declaring it the custom, as before, to let out those women to them at a yearly rent; and that they were so hard — lords, that if a priest had no mind to the bishop's tenement,

<sup>1</sup> Cum ubique tam ingens sit sacerdotum turba, quorum quotusquisque castam agit vitam? de conscrib. Epist.

Si quis perpendat horum temporum statum, quotam hominum portionem monachorum greges occupent, quotam sacerdotum et clericorum collegia: deinde perpendat quam pauci in tanto numero viri servent castimoniam, tum in quæ libidinum genera quam innumeri divergant, quanto cum probro complures palam incesti sint et impudici, &c.—*Annot.* in 1 Tim. iii.

<sup>2</sup> In concilio Neocæsar. magis punitur sacerdos qui fornicatur quam qui publice contrahit—jam eo res redit ut vix centesimum invenias, qui ab omni commercio fæminarum absteineat.—*Consult.* art. xxiii.

<sup>3</sup> Communiter dicitur quod pro simplici fornicatione quis deponi non debet, cum pauci sine illo vitio inveniantur. Dist. lxxxi.

<sup>4</sup> Quæ tamen pæna privationis beneficii non procedit in simplici incontinentia, absque qualitate concubinatus, ut constat ex declarat. adducta a Garcia.—*Jo. Sanc.* disp. l. n. x.

<sup>5</sup> Si presbyteri plures concubinas habentes—poteris cum eis tanquam simplici fornicatione notatis, quod ad executionem sacerdotalis officii, dispensare—*Extra. de Bigam.* tit. xxii. c. quia circa.

<sup>6</sup> Notandum mirabile quod plus hic habet luxuria quam castitas.

and did not take it, yet he must pay for it no less than the forwardest farmer.

Sodomy abounds most in Italy (for it was requisite that Rome should be, as it is in the prophetic style, Sodom, and not incongruous that the vilest wickedness should thrive best under his holiness' wing); yet, as if they would have it as common everywhere, and more there than it is, their decisions are exceeding favourable to it, and treat it very indulgently. Married persons may practise sodomy together, the beginnings of it, all of it, bating the last complement of the act, without mortal guilt.<sup>1</sup> Unmarried persons, their clergy, may act it without restraint to the uttermost, and be neither suspended nor irregular. There is no danger of it if they do it but two or three times now and then, yea, they are safe unless they make a custom of it.<sup>2</sup> The strictest decree that we find any pope ever made against sodomy is that of Pius V., which was yet formed in such terms, on purpose that it should not reach any ecclesiastics, but such only as made a trade of it by continual practice. This Navarre had from the mouth of Gregory XIII.<sup>3</sup>

And if they do make a trade of it, yet still they are secure if it be not notorious and public; and it will not be counted notorious, though it may be proved, though it be commonly reported, though it be confessed; nor public, unless it be manifest to all.<sup>4</sup> Thus, if any ecclesiastic will practise sodomy, provided he do it not continually, or if he will make a daily trade of it, yet so he do not keep an open warehouse, the pope has taken special care (even in the severest order that his zeal against this wickedness could ever be brought to make) that the sodomite shall have his liberty without any fear of losing office or benefice in holy church.

Further, they declare that mental heresy is a greater crime than sodomy.<sup>5</sup> As, suppose a man should believe that the public worship of God ought to be in a known tongue (such a heresy as they cannot acquit the apostle Paul of), the secret belief of this, though never manifested by expression or practice, is in their account worse than sodomy. What conscience are they like to make of this while such is their judgment? Moreover, some of them say that the stealing of thirty rials (about fifteen shillings) is a greater sin than sodomy.<sup>6</sup> Yet theft is wont to be counted one of the least crimes, and this is none of the greatest theft. Of what value the thing stolen must be to make theft a mortal sin, is, they say, to be determined by the judgment of a prudent man. Those who have the reputation of great prudence amongst them, declare that to steal one hundred crowns, in some case, is no mortal crime.<sup>7</sup> If they should any of them determine that the stealing of twenty-nine rials, or thereabouts, is but venial, there will but be about sixpence difference betwixt sodomy and a venial fault. It is true they do not commonly deliver this conceit in the terms expressed, but it is clearly inferred from the doctrine of Aquinas, and Scotus too, generally embraced; for he concludes that justice is a more excellent virtue than chastity;<sup>8</sup> and that the sin is more heinous which is opposite to the nobler virtue;<sup>9</sup> upon

<sup>1</sup> Zerola, Graffius. et alii apud Dianam. ii. p. tr. iii. res. xxxvii.—*Angelus*, v. debitum. n. xxv. vide Navar. c. xxvii. n. ccl.

<sup>2</sup> Bonacina de Matrim. q. iv. punct. xi. n. ii. ibi. Navar. Quaranta. Riccius. Mattha. Duardus Garzias, et alii.

<sup>3</sup> Cap. xxvii. n. cclxix. vid. Bonacin. ibid. n. iii. ibi. Navar. Rodriguez Lazarius.

<sup>4</sup> Navar. ibid. n. cclxviii. Publicum definitur esse, quod patet omnibus.—*Bartol. ibid.* n. cclv.

<sup>5</sup> Navar. Manual. c. xxvii. n. cclxix.

<sup>6</sup> Vid. Vasq. i. 2, q. lxxi. art. ult. Montesinum i. 2, tom. i. q. lxxiii. art. iii. d. v.

<sup>7</sup> Aragon et alii in Pet. Navar.—Vide *Bonacin. de Restit.* d. ii. q. iii. p. 2, n. vii.

<sup>8</sup> *Justitia major virtus quam castitas.* i. 2, q. lxxvi. art. iv.

<sup>9</sup> *Quod majori virtuti opponitur, gravius peccatum,* q. lxxiii. art. iv.

which ground not only sodomy, but copulation with a brute or a devil will be a less sin than petty theft. In short, if their divines (whether followers of Thomas or Scotus, betwixt whom they are all in a manner parted) will be true to these principles, since they cannot deny but there is injustice in stealing one rial, they must hold that sodomy is no more a sin, nor more conscience to be made of it, than of stealing sixpence, when their doctrine of theft has left no conscience of that. Thus far they have advanced to secure sodomy against the laws of God and by those of the church; as for any secular laws, they may laugh at them, for sodomy has ecclesiastical immunity. By the special care of Pope Gregory, sodomites were not mentioned amongst those who are excluded from that privilege.<sup>1</sup> The civil law (I suppose before the unmarried clergy were law-givers) ordains that sodomites should be burned, but the church has provided that no fire may touch them if they can escape that from heaven. Besides other sacred places, the palaces of cardinals and bishops, all monasteries, yea, the house of every parish priest and ecclesiastic, are all sanctuaries for sodomites. They could not well proceed further in favour of this crime, since the eyes of the world was open about them. It is not now so seasonable for the pope's legate (as he did before) to praise sodomy in print as a pious act. These rules and examples considered, who can think that they count uncleanness of any sort a sin much to be avoided? Or who can wonder if Rome became hereby, in a literal sense, 'the mother of harlots and abominations'? or yet think strange that they should be most taken with papal holiness who are most addicted to whoredom and uncleanness?

*Sect. 9.* Further, it is no sin for the Romanists to take from those whom they count heretics (from protestants particularly) all that they have. This will not be theft or robbery, but an act justified by the laws of their church, which oblige them to do it; for this is one of those many punishments which that law will have inflicted on us; the goods of heretics are by sentence of law immediately confiscated.<sup>2</sup> There is no question of this amongst them, only as to the execution there is some doubt, whether heretics are bound in conscience, as soon as they are such, to give up their possession themselves, and deliver all they have to Roman Catholics; or whether they may not, without mortal guilt, keep possession, till the papists see it fit to put them out, and seize on all they have. The famous Panormitan concludes that the heretics are bound, under the pain of deadly sin, to do this execution upon themselves, not expecting any other sentence or executioner.<sup>3</sup> And there is a pretty army of doctors (*longa doctorum phalanx*) do maintain this with him, but Soto and some others determine that they need not be so hasty to give up all they have of their own accord, but may stay for a declaratory sentence, and seizure upon it; but then a general sentence will serve,<sup>4</sup> without particular process or examination who are personally guilty, and a sentence by some ecclesiastical person may suffice.<sup>5</sup>

But all of them agree in this, that heretics lose all title and property in whatever they possess, and that for them and their heirs; and this before

<sup>1</sup> Bonacin. in i. præcept. d. q. vii. p. 5, n. xiv. Colligitur reos Sodomitici criminis immunitatis privilegio non privari, quia in bulla Gregorii non exprimuntur.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. Later. sub Innoc. III. bona ipsorum ipso facto applicantur fisco.—*Angel.* Sum. v. hæret. n. v. Sunt ipso jure, vel ipso facto confiscata.—*Sylvest.* v. hæret. c. i. n. xii.

<sup>3</sup> Cujus regula est, quod ille cujus bona sunt ipso facto confiscata, non potest illa cum bona conscientia retinere, quia statim sunt acquisita fisco.—In Soto de Just. et jure l. iii. q. vi. art. vi. p. 21.

<sup>4</sup> *Sylvest.* ibid. n. xii.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ibid. et *Angel.* ibid. n. v.

any declaratory sentence,<sup>1</sup> even from the first day of their pretended heretical pravity, as the Directory for the Inquisitors determines.<sup>2</sup>

To lose all title to their estates may seem a small matter, considering that they lose all power and jurisdiction, all right to honour and fame (they and theirs being infamous), to liberty also, and life itself; but because loss of property is great in consequence, let us stay a little on it. All that these pretended heretics have, being confiscated, they are liable to a seizure presently, and though their convenience will not serve them to seize on all, a long time after, yet in the interim the poor heretics are responsible for all the mesne profits<sup>3</sup> (it may be in our case for a hundred, or two hundred, years past); and all this while they have no power to alienate or dispose of their goods or estates by gift, sale, will, or otherwise; yea, not of any of it by way of charity, for they are not their own to dispose of. Hence all wills, sales, contracts, for this purpose (it may be for some ages together) are null and void.<sup>4</sup> And if the heretic will venture to alienate anything he has, he that buys it does it at his peril; for though it pass from hand many years, yet it may be taken away from the purchaser, with whom it is found,<sup>5</sup> without restoring the price that was paid for it,<sup>6</sup> and he that sells it is a cheat, and sins mortally, if he gives not the purchaser notice of the hazard, and tell him, that when he sells his estate, or goods, he has no right to sell them.<sup>7</sup> If the pretended heretic die, and leave what he has to his children, it is no better than if he left them another man's goods which he had no title to.<sup>8</sup> Yea, though the children be catholics, they lose their portion.<sup>9</sup> But who are

<sup>1</sup> Idem *ibid.* v. pœna. n. iii.—*Graff.* l. ii. c. xi. n. x. fine.

<sup>2</sup> Ut etiam tenet director. l. iii. tit. ix. qui etiam dicit, quod dicta bona damnatorum propter hæresim, vel hujusmodi, ad fiscum pertinent a die commissi criminis.—*Sylvest. ibid.* n. xiii.

Condemnatio illa retro agitur usque ad articulum quo hæreticus omni ignorantia nudatus, hæresim studio asseruit. Assertio est Jo. Aud. Sed nulla opus est authorum citatione: nam lex est expressa. Et universalis usus et practica St. Senatus Inquisitionis sic habet, nempe secundum normam directori. l. iii. tit. ix. Soto, *ibid.* p. 23; vid. *Sylv. ibid.* n. xiv.; *Graff.* l. ii. c. xxi, n. xvii.

<sup>3</sup> Talis clausula, *ipso jure vel facto*, operatur restitutionem fructuum medii temporis—nam a die commissi criminis, non facit fructus suos, sed statim debentur fisco. Fel. in cap.; Rodolphus de rescript.; *Graff. ibid.* n. xxi.

<sup>4</sup> Donatio vel alienatio facta per hæreticum ante damnationem non tenet—sicut facta damnatione bona alienare non possunt, sic nec ante illam a die commissi criminis.—*Sylv. ibid.* n. xiv.

Habetque eousque vim talis sententia, ut omnes contractus, nempe donationes, venditiones, atque alii, etiam causa dotis, quos hæreticus ab illo articulo fecerit, habeantur pro infectis.—Soto, *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Navar. c. xvii. n. cvi.

<sup>6</sup> Si hæreticus alienavit, fiscus vel inquisitores non tenentur restituere pretium emptori, quia effectus damnationis retro trahitur.—*Sylvest. ibid.* Fiscus nullo emptoribus restituito pretio sibi adjudicat dicta bona.—Soto, *ibid.* Res quælibet per delinquentem alienata a fisco vindicari possit a die commissi criminis, pretio ipsi emptori minime soluto.—*Graff. ibid.* n. xvii. Non solum revocabit rem, pretio non restituito emptori, qui emit ab hæretico: verum etiam nec ei qui emit, quantumcumque per plures manus transierit, quia non habuit jus vendendi; hæc Jo. Manald. Archidiaconus, et Jo. Andrus, et idem Directorium in *Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Navar. c. xxiii. n. lxxxix.—*Sylv. ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Nihil habebunt de bonis parentum filii, nec etiam agnati.—*Angel. ibid.* Si aliquis sit declaratus hæreticus, statim potest fieri executio in bonis ejus, exclusis filiis, etiam de legitima.—*Graff. ibid.* n. x.

<sup>9</sup> Si habuerint catholicos filios, nihilominus confiscantur, secundum Gloss. in *Sylv. ibid.*; *Angelus, ibid.*

Quinimo veniunt privandi ipsi filii Catholici etiam legitima; ita notatur per Genzelinum—quem sequitur Zabarella; et ratio est, quia legitima est quota bonorum, quæ pater habebat tempore mortis, sed pater eo in tempore nihil habet, quando bona sunt confiscata.—*Graff. ibid.* n. ix.

those that may take from protestants (or others whom they count heretics), what they possess? Why, any that will; authority is given to all whoever to rob, spoil, or bereave us. So Sylvester, and others, quoting the Rabbies of the pontifical law for it. It is their determination, that in point of law and conscience, all that will have authority to spoil us of what we have.<sup>1</sup> What he adds is matter of caution for more plausible proceedings in the spoil and robbery. It seems safe that this be not done but by special edict of the prince, or of the church; this is convenient, lest otherwise one might seem to do it rather out of covetousness or revenge, than out of justice and obedience.

By this we may understand in what condition protestants are by the laws of the Romish church, and how papists are obliged to look upon us, and demean themselves towards us. No protestant, from the prince to the meanest subject, has any title to lands, houses, money, or anything else which they possess, or can justly call it their own.<sup>2</sup> All rules of righteousness, which concern property, are void; papists owe them no observance. In reference to us, we are not capable of injury upon this account; whatever they do against us, in respect of our estates, they wrong us not, they sin not, for we have no title. If they take from us anything, or all we have, they steal not aught from us, they rob us not, because they take nothing from us that is our own. If they burn our houses over our heads, and fire towns and cities (as they have done, and their famous Simanca says they may do),<sup>3</sup> they do us no injury, they sin not on this account, because the houses and goods consumed are none of ours. If they deprive a protestant prince of his throne and dominions, they sin not; he is by their law and doctrine but a usurper, and had no just title to his crown.<sup>4</sup> If they draw any of his subjects into war against him, at home or abroad, they do him no wrong, for they are not his subjects, no more than the popish clergy, who are sworn to another sovereign.<sup>5</sup> Or if he entrust them with the commands of forts or

<sup>1</sup> Si aliter fieri non potest, manu armata sunt eis omnia bona auferenda, ut 23. q. iii. c. i. Sicut tamen dicit Raynuc. et Gofredus; licet ecclesia videatur dare generalem auctoritatem omnibus exspoliandi eos: tamen satis videtur tutum, quod non fiat nisi specialiter edicto, vel principis vel ecclesiæ: ne aliter videatur quis potius ex cupiditate vel ultione, quam ex iustitia et obedientia pugnare.—*Sylvest. ibid.* n. xiii. Infidelitas hæreticorum est pessima. Utrum infideles qui non recognoscunt dominium ecclesiæ licite possint suis rebus spoliari? Resp. Hostiensis, quod sic per illud Mat. ult.; Data est mihi omnis potestas, &c., quam quidem transtulit in vicarium suum.—*Angel. Sum.* v. infidel. n. iii. et n. vii.

<sup>2</sup> A constitution of Pope Paul IV., subscribed by all the cardinals, declares that all prelates and princes, even kings and emperors fallen into heresy, should be, and should be understood to be, deprived of all their benefices, states, kingdoms, and empires, without farther declaration, and incapable to be restored to them, even by the apostolic see; and their goods, states, kingdoms, and empires shall be understood to be common, and to belong to those catholics who can get them.—*Hist. of Council of Tr.* lib. v. p. 409.

<sup>3</sup> Institut. Cathol. Tit. xlv. sect. xiii.

<sup>4</sup> Tenens regnum contra formam juris et mentem papæ dicitur tyrannus.—*Mascon.* de imper. Reg. pars. i. c. ii.

Propter hæresin rex non solum regno privatur, sed et filii ejus a successione regni pelluntur.—*Simanc. ibid.* tit. ix. cclix. Post latam sententiam declarativam de crimine hæresis, injuste princeps possidet regnum, et principatum, et exercet jurisdictionem in subditos: tenenturque subditi eximere se ab ejus obedientia, et bellum gerere contra illum, si vires illis suppetant.—*Bannes* in xxii. q. x. p. 614. Yea, Bannes says, it is the more common opinion with Aquinas and his followers, that before the sentence declaratory, subjects may lawfully, if they have strength, exempt themselves from the power of the prince, p. 590.

<sup>5</sup> Vassalli hæreticorum ipso facto liberantur. *Angel. Sum.* v. hæret.; *Sylvest. ibid.* n. xiv. Principibus apostantibus a fide non est obediendum. *Aquinas*, ii. 2, q. x; *Concil. Lateran.* cap. iii.

garrisons, they may betray them to the Romanists, and not wrong him, because they were not his.<sup>1</sup> If they take all places of trust, or profit, from nobles or commons, they do them no wrong, because they had no right to them, nor had the children after them any, for some generations.<sup>2</sup> If they pay no debts to protestants, though they were not only under the obligation of a promise, but of solemn oath, they may justify it, they owe them nothing.<sup>3</sup> If trust be reposed in them, or anything be deposited in their hands, or they borrow anything of us, they may detain it; they need not restore it, for they have nothing of ours.<sup>4</sup> In a word, there can be no parliaments, or convention of the three estates of a nation, because there are none in that capacity. As there are no persons of honour for peers, all being infamous, so can there be no freeholders to choose, or to be chosen, for commons, since there are no proprietors.<sup>5</sup> And as no laws can be made, can be valid, there being none who have any power to make them, so there can be no aids or subsidies granted, or required, since they cannot be given or required of those who have nothing of their own to give.

Thus, by the popish principles, the foundations of the civil constitution in England, and other countries in like circumstances, are quite blown up, as if they had been at the mercy of a Faux. And those who will follow their conduct, must hold that we have no government, no king, no subjects, no parliaments, no laws, no liberties, no property, and, indeed, none of the rest, because not this last. And all that will be true to the doctrine and laws of popery must believe this, and may lawfully deal with us accordingly; they sin not if they do, there is no conscience in the case to hinder them, or secure us; nay, they are bound to do it, if that which they account most sacred can oblige them, and that as soon as they can. That which restrains them is not the fear of God, but of the penalties of our laws, which yet are of no more force by their determination, than the agreement of a company of robbers, or the constitutions of mere usurpers, which will stand in their way no longer than till they can master the power which bears them up, against that which the Roman decrees and edicts have made equity and justice, in despite of the laws of God and nations.

*Sect. 10.* Moreover, they may bear false witness, either privately or in open court, for their advantage; and if it do not much wrong another, it is but a small fault, so that if it do no wrong at all, it will be less than a small fault.<sup>6</sup> On this account they may bear false witness against a protestant, or any other, whom they count heretics, even when estate or life is concerned; for by their laws and doctrine his life is forfeited, and his goods confiscated, and so though by false testimony he lose both, yet he has no wrong, because he had no right to either. They may use fraud and deceit in bargains, to

<sup>1</sup> *Absoluti sunt subditi a debito fidelitatis, etiam custodes arcium. Simanca, ibid. tit. xlv. sect. lxxiii.; Concil. Lateran. ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *Angelus. Sum. v. hæret. n. viii.; Sylvest. ibid. n. xiv.; Concil. Lateran. infra.*

<sup>3</sup> *Si quis promississet eis solvere certo die sub juramento, vel pœna, non tenetur; ut ibi notat gloss. Sylv. ibid.; Angel. ibid. n. xv.; Armilla, v. hæret. n. xi.; Ovandus. infra.*

<sup>4</sup> *Simanca. ibid. tit. xlv. sect. xxvii.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ipso jure sunt infames, ut neque ad publica officia sen consilia seu ad eligendos ad hujusmodi aliquos, neque ad testimonium admittuntur. Sunt intestabiles etiam, nec ad successiones admittuntur.—Angel. Sum. n. xx. ibid.* For this there is a decree of one of their general Councils (that of Lateran under Innocent III.), involving not only heretics themselves, but expressly all the receivers, defenders, and favourers of such. *Ex tunc ipso jure sit factus infamis, nec ad publica officia seu consilia, nec ad eligendos aliquos ad hujusmodi, nec ad testimonium admittitur, sit etiam intestabilis, &c. Cap. iii. in Crab. Tom. ii. p. 948.*

<sup>6</sup> *Soto e just. et jur. l. v. q. vii. art. iv. supra.*

get what a protestant sells, for little or nothing, yea, or to cheat him of all he has, for the deceit is not considerable in point of conscience, but for the wrong it does; and here is no wrong in the case, for he cheats the heretic of nothing that was his own, and so does him no injury. They may use perfidiousness in breaking compacts, agreements, or promises; for perfidiousness, when it is officious,<sup>1</sup> and does but a little injury to those concerned, is one of the least sorts of faults, by their doctrine; therefore, when it does no injury at all, it is less than the least; but by breaking promises, or any such bond of faithfulness which concerns the estate of a heretic, they do him no injury, because he has no estate of his own, by their account. So that if a papist should make a thousand promises, and confirm each of them with an oath to a heretic, that he will pay what he owes him, or restore to him what is his own, he sins not, though he never pay, nor restore a farthing of it, because nothing is due to a heretic, nor is there any thing he can call his own. And this is not my inference only, but they themselves declare it to be the consequence of their principles, and what they deliver in express terms, amounts to as much as this charge comes to.<sup>2</sup>

*Sect. 11.* Thus they leave little that can be sin in papists, one towards another, but less towards protestants. It is no sin not to keep peace or faith, not to observe either truth or honesty, towards heretics. It is no deceit to equivocate with them in private dealing, or public transactions; it is no dishonesty to cheat them of what they have; it is no perjury to break oaths with them; it is no theft to rob or spoil them; it is no inhumanity to burn their houses over their heads; it is no murder to kill them; in a word, it is no sin for all relations to deny them what God hath made their respective duties.

*Sect. 12.* Finally, natural corruption, after baptism, has nothing in it that can be charged with sin, no, not in wicked men, who afterwards by mortal sin are quite destitute of grace. So that by their doctrine, a fixed averness and contrariety to God and holiness, an habitual enmity against him, a propenseness to all ungodliness and unrighteousness, is no sin;<sup>3</sup> an inward temper and disposition, though it be most impious, atheistical, rebellious, filthy, treacherous, and bloody, has no sin in it; an inclination to deny God, to speak all evil of him, to depose him, to advance lusts and the devil before him; an inclination to adulteries and beastly uncleanness, to murder and barbarous cruelty, to the most prodigious wickedness against God or man, is no sin. Yea, though it be not transient, but constant and habitual, though it be strong and impetuous, though this corruption be reigning, not subdued or mortified; though it be active and fruitful in all the powers of the soul, though it hurry the lower faculties into rebellious commotions, and follow the superior with frequent and strong impulses, and exert its power and malignancy both in thoughts and affections, yet if the inward motions have not consent, there is no more sin in their acts than in their principles.

In all these evils papists may live and die, and in many more, which I pur-

<sup>1</sup> Cajetan. Sum. v. perfidia.

<sup>2</sup> Si aliquis promississet eis hæreticis solvere sub pæna vel juramento certo die, non tenetur; ut Gloss. Et hoc intellige, si est manifestum ipsum in hæreticam incidisse perfidiam, et dicit, Phil. idem etiam si est occultus; dummodo probari possit. Panormitan. *ibid.* vult, quod a die commissi criminis sunt liberi. Angel. Sum. v. hæret. n. xv.; Armilla. v. hæret. n. xi.; Sylvest. v. hæret. n. xiv. He that fails, being bound by oath or otherwise, to make payment, sins not, because the creditor's heresy hath discharged him.—So *Ovandus*, in iv. dist. xiii. prop. xxx.

<sup>3</sup> Qui ita est habitualiter dispositus, ut adveniente occasione, committeret peccatum mortale, non peccat mortaliter—non sufficit habitualis effectus ad peccandum—ut peccatum reipsa contrahatur.—*Bonacin.* de peccat. d. ii. q. iii. p. 5. n. iii. *ibi.* alii communiter.

posely waive, lest I be too tedious, and many more too, than I have taken notice of, even in plain violations of every part of the divine law, the rule of righteousness and holiness; and yet wipe their mouths, and say they have no sin at all, but are as holy as their church requires them, and as sure of salvation as their doctrine and the power of delusion can make them. Though any protestant, who allows himself but in a very small part of these enormities, we will give them leave (or they may take it from Scripture) to count him an ungodly and unrighteous wretch, who can have no good conscience towards God or man, nor any hopes of heaven (continuing so) but such as will delude him.

*Sect. 13.* But if they have not legitimated wickedness enough already, they have expedients at hand to do it, for much more; they are furnished with devices to justify all the sin in the world, or at least in their church, when they please to use them. Let us instance in two or three.

That power which they challenge for the pope herein, is notorious. We heard Bellarmine tell us before, that if the pope should command vice, the church must practice vice, or else sin against her conscience. And he says expressly elsewhere, that in a good sense, Christ gave to Peter a power to make that which is sin to be no sin, and that which is no sin to be sin; and what he gave to Peter, they will have us believe he gave to popes.<sup>1</sup> So that it seems, Christ hath given Peter, and consequently his successors the popes, power to authorise any sin and wickedness; only we are to understand this in a good sense, which let any man do if he can. They declare, that he can dispense not only with positive but divine laws, and so make the transgressions thereof to be no sin. To omit the many testimonies for this, produced by others (and which some of themselves count extravagant), let us hear Sylvester, who seems modest in comparison: The pope has power in all things purely positive, and in some pertaining to divine law, because he has all laws in his own breast, as to interpretation and dispensation.<sup>2</sup> Where, what in his assertion seems restrained, in the reason of it (fetched from the canon law), is unlimited, he has all laws in his own breast; it seems to import that they are all in his power and at his pleasure, so as he may either interpret them, or dispense with them, as he thinks fit. Some of them, in reference to natural and divine laws, make show of denying this in general; but then they grant in particular instances, what is sufficient to make good the general charge. There is no command of the first or second table, wherein they do not hold the pope may dispense, unless it be the first, and to question his power of dispensing there, is no great disparagement to him, since they deny it to God himself. There is no doubt amongst them, but he can dispense with oaths,<sup>3</sup> and make it no sin to break them, though they acknowledge the obligation of an oath to be by divine law.<sup>4</sup> And no wonder it has been so ordinary a practice, since they hold that this condition is still presupposed in the oaths, *if it shall please the pope.*<sup>5</sup> And though they conclude vows to be more obliging than oaths, yet they teach, the pope may

<sup>1</sup> In bono sensu Christus dedit Petro potestatem faciendi de peccato non peccatum; et de non peccato peccatum.—In *Barkla.* c. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Sicut habet papa (potestatem) in omnibus pure positivis, et in quibusdam pertinentibus ad jus divinum, quomodo dicitur omnia jura habere in scrinio pectoris sui (de const. licet. l. vi.) quantum scilicet ad interpretationem et dispensationem.—*Sum.* v. dispens. n. vii.

<sup>3</sup> In votis autem et juramentis dispensavit, ac poterat quidem, quod erat in ædificationem.—*Canus.* pars. vi. relect. de pœnit. p. 371.

<sup>4</sup> Reddere vota, juramenta servare, juris est divini et naturalis.—*Idem* ibid. p. 370.

<sup>5</sup> Subintelligitur—si placuerit papæ, ut in D. C. Venientes. de jurejur. immo in omni juramento excipitur auctoritas superioris.—*Sylv.* v. juram. iii. n. i.

dispense with the accomplishment of solemn promises made to God, and so can make both sacrilege and perfidiousness to God lawful enough.<sup>1</sup> The pope can dispense not only with rash oaths or vows, but those that are best, and their obligation most unquestionable. If any (says Rosella, after others) do vow or swear anything that may lawfully be observed, the pope should not alter it when there is no cause; yet if he do release such (though without cause) the release holds good, because he is above positive law, and also can dispense against the divine law, so that he dispense not against the gospel and articles of faith, *Sum. v. juram. i. ii. 4.* But if he do that too, he may stand to it, for many teach that the pope is not forbidden to dispense against the gospel, but only not to destroy the gospel (*v. papa. n. 3*), and we must conceive (if we can) that he may take away the obligation of the rules of the gospel without destroying it.

However, as to oaths and vows, he can totally (they say) dissolve the obligation, *quemadmodum potest ipse Deus*, even as God himself can, because it is likely that God, as he had cause, gave his own power to his vicar, otherwise he had not been a good father of his household, if he had left his flock without a shepherd, who could, as occasion serves, provide for them in all (even to license perjury and perfidiousness to God himself), as Pope Innocent argues; but whether with more reason or blasphemy, let others judge. Whereupon, Hostiensis saith, that seeing God and his vicar have the same consistory, the pope can do in a manner all that God can do, the key not erring, for Christ says generally to Peter, 'Whatever thou shalt bind;' and saying *whatever*, he excepts nothing, *Ibid. n. i.*

There is not any thing in the world which they count more inviolable than their vow of religion, yet he may dispense with this, and the reason is considerable; because religion derived its being from the authority of the Roman bishop, he therefore who gave it may take it away. So Pope Innocent and their canonists generally, *ibid. n. iv.* Hostiensis and others, seem to speak extravagantly when they say, the pope can do as much in a manner as God himself. But this may pass for a modest speech, if they will have him to do more, and more he can do if he can make contradictions to be consistent. One instance of it we have in the question, whether the pope can dispense with a monk to have secular property. Rich. de S. Victore says, it is essential to a monk to want it, and so a contradiction to be a monk, and have it; yet others say the pope can do it, and render those consistent enough, and so make one to be a monk while he is none, *Idem. ibid.*

So for sanctifying of the Lord's day, there can be no doubt of the papal power herein, since they count the command for it positive,<sup>2</sup> for that he can dispense in all positives,<sup>3</sup> is with them unquestionable. Nothing is necessarily required by the precept for sanctifying of this day, but the hearing of mass, and abstaining from servile works. The pope, if he please, may turn these into working days, for he can abrogate them. And since the people, by their divinity, are not obliged to any other public worship but the mass, and that only on these days, he may discharge them from all conscience of public worship, and disengage them from tendering any unto God, for he can dis-

<sup>1</sup> Canus. *supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Dicimus omnia Christianorum festa, etiam dies dominicos. solo humano jure—id quod etiam sentit, Turcrementa, Archidiaconus, S. Thomas, Waldensis, Navar. c. xiii. n. i.

<sup>3</sup> Quæ sunt de jure positivo, potest summus Pontifex, etiam sine causa, tollere et abrogare, et quamvis male faciat, factum tamen validum sit.—*Canus. ibid. p. 972.* Sylvest. juxta mentem S. Thom. v. papa. n. xv. vid. Angel. *Sum. v. papa. n. iii.* Universaliter potest dispensare—contra statum universalem Ecclesie.

pense with the mass.<sup>1</sup> They make it, indeed, sometimes a character of antichrist, to put down the mass; but it is not fit the pope should want power to be antichrist at pleasure; and why should they be angry with us for thinking him so already, since with them herein he may lawfully be antichrist when he list. And he may do as much for the clergy and monastics; all the solemn worship necessary and proper for them, is that of their canonical hours, but the pope can order that they shall not be obliged to say their service.<sup>2</sup> So Sylvester, after others, concludes; he adds, indeed, that though the pope can discharge them from this service, yet he cannot disoblige them from making some recompence to their benefactors for not praying for them; but for this (he says) they need not trouble themselves; for the least prayer that can be will suffice for that.<sup>3</sup> So an *Ave Mary* may serve (that serves generally on all occasions) a prayer (if it may be so accounted) of one petition to the virgin, and not a word to God, not a syllable for their benefactors, they may be as well without it. And so others leave them, determining without any reserve, that the pope may dispense with their divine service, and may do so validly without any cause, too.<sup>4</sup> So that the pope, when he list, may leave no public worship of God in the whole Roman world; and when he does this, it will be no sin wholly to neglect it. He can dispense against the universal state of the church; so the law of their church will have it. Only, says Panormitan, he should not deface it;<sup>5</sup> but there is no danger of that, though he should destroy it (as he has done indeed; they ascribe no power to him in this, but what he has given the world proof of effectually), for he cannot deface it, unless he change the universal state of it without reason; and this he can never want, so long as his will is good reason, as they say it is.

He can as easily discharge them from all righteousness towards men; he can make it lawful for a son to calumniate his father; or covet all he has, or to wrest it from him by force, yea, to attempt his life, and when he hath reduced him to want and misery, to leave him perishing for want of relief. This office he did for the emperors heretofore, and is commended for it.<sup>6</sup> He can take away any man's right, and dissolve all bonds, contracts, obligations, whereby one man is bound to another;<sup>7</sup> and so can make it lawful to act against all faith, truth, justice, and common honesty.<sup>8</sup> Further, those whom

<sup>1</sup> Sequitur posse pontificem in hoc præcepto (de missa audienda) dispensare, cum ecclesiasticum sit. He adds only, Dispensare cum aliquo ut nunquam in tota vita missam audiat, etiamsi possit, neque ulla rationabili causa impediatur, non potest esse expediens.—*Suarez*. tom. iii. disp. lxxxviii. sect. ii. p. 1140. Hinc patet summum Pontificem posse dispensare in præcepto audiendi missam. Tom. i. disp. iv. q. ult. punct. xi. n. vi.; Bonacina. Aiunt communiter Doctores posse consuetudine vel humana potestate abrogari.—*Idem* in iii. præcept. q. v. n. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Quarta causa (a recitando divinum officium exensans) est dispensatio papæ; juxta Cardinalem Turrecrematam, neque aliud sentit Cardinalis Florentinus.—*Navar.* c. xxv. n. cii.

Utrum papa facere possit quod prædicti non teneantur ad horas? Laud. et Jo. de Lig. senserunt quod papa hoc potest, &c.—*Sum.* v. hor. n. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Sed circa istam suppletionem non oportet esse multum scrupulosum, quia congruit ex naturali lege potius quam ecclesiæ præcepto; ut reompensetur benefactoribus: quod etiam per minimam orationem fieri potest.—*Ibid.* n. v.

<sup>4</sup> Bonacin. Divin. Offic. disp. i. q. vi. p. iii. n. i.

<sup>5</sup> Sum. Roscl. v. papa.

<sup>6</sup> So the Emperor Henry IV. was used by his own son, excited by the pope; and Baronius will have it, past denial, an eminent work of piety.—*Annal.* tom. xii. an. 2156. n. xiv.

<sup>7</sup> In omnibus et per omnia potest facere et dicere quicquid placet, auferendo etiam jus suum cui vult.—*Specul. Guliel. Durand.* l. i. par. i. de legit. sect. vi. n. li.

<sup>8</sup> Utrum possit aliquem absolvere ab obligatione, qua tenetur alteri homini? et dico

God hath joined together in lawful matrimony, the pope (they say) hath power to separate, and sometimes, so as to marry others, and so live in adultery without sin, as he did with the son of the Conde D'Olivares.

If there have been no carnal knowledge, they make no bones at all of the pope's dissolving marriages, how firmly soever contracted, or solemnly celebrated. No, nor if they have had that full consummation with reluctance. But there is one rarer feat that the pope can do, he has power to dispense with persons to marry and continue so, not during life, but for such time as they desire, a year or two, or till they can have a child, and then be unmarried again, and freed from all bonds of that state, without any divorce or occasion for it. Jo. Andreas (a principal rabbi of their church Talmud) says, He had disputed this question, whether the pope might not dispense with a king's only son, being a monk, to marry for a while, till he could get a boy, and after return to his monastery and unmarried condition? He answers, That the pope, whose power is disputed, may resolve it himself, yet he may be advised to forbear, but many maintain, that if he should dispense, the dispensation would stand good (according to whom, the pope is not forbidden to dispense against the gospel, when he sees cause, but only not to destroy it, as before), and this holds especially, if the party would be content to be married for a while, rather than for ever. So Andreas, and the same, it seems, is defended by Jo. Antonius, bishop of Alexandria (in Millain), by Baldus, by Fulgosius, and Baptista Toruamala. Our author will not grant that the pope cannot dispense with a religious person to be married a little, but makes it a question whether he can let him marry during life.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, he can not only legitimate adultery, but incest; for they teach that he can dispense with marriages in those degrees which God's law forbids, even such as are acknowledged to be against the dictate of nature.<sup>2</sup> They except no degree of consanguinity, but only the first in the direct line, viz. marriage betwixt parent and child; they say he can license it in the first degree in the collateral line, viz. betwixt brother and sister.

Some indeed stick at this, because they observe not that the pope has dispensed in this case. But the credit of their St Antoninus will not be questioned, who tells us that Pope Martin the Fifth dispensed with one who had married his own sister.<sup>3</sup> Yea, he takes upon him to dispense with sodomy.<sup>4</sup> Sixtus the Fourth gave license to the whole family of Cardinal St Lucy, that they should use sodomy in the three hotter months, June, July, and August.<sup>5</sup> And Alexander the Sixth gave the cardinal De Valentia leave to buggar the Marquis De Zaneta, his own natural son.<sup>6</sup>

The most modest opinion at first blush (which yet ends little better than the worst) that I have observed amongst them, concerning the pope's power in reference to the laws of God, is that of Richard De Sancto Victore, as Angels reports it, that the pope can dispense with the divine precepts when the reason of them ceaseth; otherwise, says he, God (if he had not so em-

secundum Innocentium quod hoc potest, de plenitudine potestatis.—*Sylvest.* v. papa. n. xiii.

<sup>1</sup> Sum. Rosell. v. papa. n. iii. et iv.

<sup>2</sup> So Aquinas (in Dian. v. matrim. n. lvi.) Bonaventur, Scotus, Durand. Alensis, Richard. Augustinus Triumph. Cajetan, Roffensis (in Victorell. ad Tol. l. vii. c. ix.)

<sup>3</sup> Fe re omnes gradus Mosaica lege prohibiti, sunt etiam prohibiti naturali.—*Sylv.* v. papa. n. xvii.

<sup>4</sup> Reperitur tamen Martinus V. ut Archiepiscopus (viz. Antoninus), referit, dispensasse cum eo, qui cum sua germana contraxerat, et consummaverat, habito consilio cum peritis theologis et Canonistis. Idem. *ibid.* et Angelus. v. papa. n. i.

<sup>5</sup> Vid Myster. iniquitatis, 1310.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 1328.

powered him) would not seem to be a good master of his household<sup>1</sup> (not wise, say some; not diligent, say others; for this is a common argument for the papal prerogative). We must take heed how we question the pope's power herein, for if we do, they may question the government of God. And herein he is followed by Sylvester,<sup>2</sup> a Dominican, and Angelus,<sup>3</sup> a Franciscan (though in other things they often clash) who tell us that besides divines, all the canonists agree in it, if well understood.<sup>4</sup> And this the former extends to particular cases, whether in the natural or divine law,<sup>5</sup> and the latter concludes it, not only as to the precepts of the second table, but as to all the commands, both in the Old and New Testament.<sup>6</sup> All the question is, How one may know when the reason of God's law ceaseth in any case?<sup>7</sup> To which he answers, That this we sometimes may learn by the examples of God himself, who many times dispensed with his own law. So that in such cases, it seems, the pope may do as much as God himself. But this may not prove enough to serve the pope's turn. So he adds, when we have not an example of that, or the like dispensation in Scripture, the declaration of it (that is, when the reason of the law fails) in any other case belongs to the pope alone.<sup>8</sup> Accordingly Sylvester, He may, when there is any doubt, authoritatively explain whether or no in any certain case the reason of the divine or natural precept takes place.<sup>9</sup> The pope, if he were God (as they too often call him) needs not herein desire more power than this; he may declare that the reason of the divine law ceases when he pleases, and so he may dispense with it when he list. Thus the pope might discern the reason of the law for marriage to cease, when Olivares had declared Julian Naleasor his heir, and so gave him leave to marry another wife, when he had one already, lawfully married (yet his holiness might be hastier herein than some doctors would have him, who though they hold the pope can dispense with one to have two, or more wives at once, yet think it not so very fit to be done, while catholics are so plentiful).<sup>10</sup> And he would have seen something more in Harry VIII.'s case, than he let the world know, if the emperor Charles V. had not stood in his light. And so in that against perjury, Clement VII. saw the reason of it cease, when he saw it his interest that Francis I. should break his oath. And Sixtus IV. could well see that the reason of that law against sodomy ceased in the hotter months, and so dispensed with it then, though not in cooler seasons.

But what if the pope should mistake in his declaration about the law, and the reason of it, and so err in dispensing with it? This must not easily be supposed. I firmly believe, says Angelus, that if any one seeking a dispensation, in any case against the law of God, not interposing the importunity of gifts and solicitations, do put himself simply into the pope's hands,

<sup>1</sup> Si occurreret casus particularis in quo deficeret ratio legis—tunc papa posset dispensare; aliter, ut dicit Ricar. non videretur Deus fuisse bonus pater-familias. V. papa. n. i.

<sup>2</sup> V. papa n. xvi.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Et in prædicta opinione concurrunt omnes Canonistæ, si bene intelligantur.—*Idem. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Potest ea interpretari in dubio authoritative, scil. utrum in aliquo determinato casu, habeat locum ratio divini, aut naturalis statuti, vel non.—*Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Et quod dico de præceptis secundæ tabulæ, idem dic de omnibus præceptis veteris et novi Testamenti.—*Angelus. ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Sed quis poterit scire quando ratio legis deficit in aliquo casu? Resp. quod istud aliquando habemus exemplo Dei, qui multoties dispensavit in sua lege.

<sup>8</sup> Sed quum talis dispensationis vel similis non habemus exemplum in scriptura, tunc ad solum papam pertinet ipsius declaratio.—*Idem. ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Supra.

<sup>10</sup> Vid. Sum. Rosell. v. papa. n. v.

with a declaration of his case, that God will not suffer his vicar to err in dispensing.<sup>1</sup> Yet if the worst should come to the worst, and the pope should err herein, that will make no alteration in the case before us; for though it may be a fault to dispense, yet the crime he dispenses with may be no sin to him who has his holiness's leave to commit it. I judge, says Navarre, that though the dispenser may be in fault, yet he that is dispensed with is excused, if, relying honestly upon the authority of his superior, he thinks it was granted upon just cause, till he be convinced that it was not justly granted.<sup>2</sup> For all this, Bellarmine has the confidence to affirm that no catholic ever held that the pope could dispense any way with the divine commands, and yet what is it less that himself ascribes to the pope, when he says by his indulgences we are disobliged from the command of bringing forth fruits worthy of repentance?<sup>3</sup> These fruits are, by their own account, all good works; and so in time the pope can make it to be no sin to live without the worship of God, righteousness towards men, and good works, which respect either.

*Sect. 14.* But they need not make use of the pope's authority for this purpose; there are other expedients nearer hand will serve to make any sin lawful. One is *probable ignorance*, and that, when upon a *probable ground*, error is conceived to be truth, and that which is sin indeed is taken to be no sin. When upon such a ground one ventures upon a crime, it will not be criminal. Now, they give an account of several things, each of which will serve them herein for a probable ground.

First, a *probable reason*, when there are arguments *pro* and *con*, all probable in his judgment that views them, if he follows that which seems to him most probable, he sins not, though it lead him into sin.<sup>4</sup> They lay great weight upon authority, and think it safe to follow the herd in a common opinion; yet one good reason, they say, is to be preferred before the common judgment of their writers, and one may venture against the stream, being backed with it.<sup>5</sup> Nor is there need to be very scrupulous about the probability of a reason; it is enough if it seems but probable to him that weighs it, yea, though it seem but so, out of affection to him that offers it.<sup>6</sup> And that may as well pass for more probable, which is more favourable to the inclination of the inquirer, and he may be his own judge in the case, and act against the scruples of his conscience when he has probable reason. But when there are more reasons against it, and but one probable for it, must not the more sway us, since that is safer, and that which is safer is to be chosen, according to the common rule? No, we are not obliged, for that rule even in matters of faith and practice is only a counsel,<sup>7</sup> not a pre-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* n. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Arbitror autem, quod licet dispensator peccet, tamen dispensatus, si bona fide nixus autoritate superioris, putat eam justa de causa esse datam, excusatur donec satis noverit eam non fuisse sic datam.—*Ibid.* *præ*lud. ix. n. xiii. xiv.

<sup>3</sup> Indulgentiæ—faciunt tamen, ut pro iis panis, quæ nobis per indulgentiam condonantur, non teneamur præcepto illo de faciendis dignis penitentia fructibus.—*De penit.* l. iv. c. xiii. p. 1068.

<sup>4</sup> Quando homo occurrentibus rationibus in utramque partem suo judicio probabilibus, eligit eos quæ sibi videntur probabiliores, quæ tamen revera sunt contra veritatem, cui ipse alias bene effectus est: tunc iste (licet contra veritatem erret, et sic laboret ignorantia contraria) nulla culpa errat: sic doctores Communiter.—*Sancta Clara.* Deus. nat. gr. problem. xv. p. 87.

<sup>5</sup> Navar. cap. iii. n. viii.

<sup>6</sup> Ignorantia excusat—etiam cum quis, in affectione ad suum doctorem, judicat probabiliter, ut sibi videtur, esse verum, quod est falsum.—*Sylvest.* sum. v. opinio. n. i.

<sup>7</sup> Navar. c. xxvii. n. 281.

cept; we are only enjoined to do what is *safe*, not to what is *safer*, and a practice upon a probable reason is safe enough.<sup>1</sup>

*Sect. 15.* Secondly, *custom* is another probable ground which (with them) will secure a person from sin in doing what is unlawful. It is ordinary with their casuists to conclude a practice innocent when there is custom for it, though otherwise they condemn it as a sin. So Navarre determines that if it were a custom to observe the Lord's-day only till noon, or till mass were ended in the morning, it would be no sin to spend the rest of it in servile works.<sup>2</sup> And that of Cajetan is observable: he takes notice that it is a practice in the church of Rome to sing to the organ profane and filthy songs when they are at church for worship. This the cardinal reflects upon severely, condemns it as a mortal sin, and a crime of sacrilegious superstition; yet in the conclusion, thinks something of it excusable upon the account of custom and probable ignorance.<sup>3</sup> Those who in dancing use habit, gesture, or songs which are notoriously lascivious, as immodest women who wantonly lay open their breasts, and men who expose without due covering their shameful parts; they sin mortally.<sup>4</sup> So De Graffiiis had concluded (as any person that is not past shame would do); but then he presently corrects himself: Yet of this, says he, we can pass no certain judgment, but must stand to the custom of the country.<sup>5</sup> Though so much wantonness seem a mortal sin, yet if it be the custom he cannot certainly judge it any. In like manner Sylvester determines of a habit that will not suffice to hide their shame; if it be a custom, though not laudable, and without ill intention, no general rule can be formed against it.<sup>6</sup> In positive precepts, where things are evil because prohibited, custom will excuse.<sup>7</sup> And so fornication, which, in the judgment of Durandus and some others, is of this nature, needs nothing but custom to excuse it from being a sin.<sup>8</sup> So much they ascribe to custom that they will have the Scripture not to direct and regulate it, but to follow it and be conformed to it even in its changes, so that the sense and obligation of the divine rule shall be changed, as the Romanists change fashions. This Cardinal Cusanus affirms. The Scripture (says he) is fitted to the time, and variably understood, so that at one time it is expounded according to the current fashion of the church, and when that fashion is changed, the sense of Scripture is also changed; and again, no wonder if the practice of the church do take the Scripture, one time one way and another time another, for the sense of it keeps pace with the practice.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hoc potest facere (viz. crebro contra scrupulos) tuta conscientia ex consilio proprio, quando habet probabilem rationem.—*Sylvest. v. scrupul. n. iii. Regul. v.*

<sup>2</sup> Cap. xiii. n. v.

<sup>3</sup> Excusandos tamen illos crediderim, qui simplici corde credentes licere non turpia, sed vana, quasi pro recreatione pulsare, pro eo quod ubique sic vident fieri, erraverunt —tales enim ex ignorantia probabili erraverant.—*Sum. v. Organ.*

<sup>4</sup> Qui habitu, gestu, cantu, notabiliter lascivo, in ludo chorearum utitur, sicut feminae inverecundæ pectora lascive nudant, viri partes inverecundas indecenter cooperatas ostendunt, peccant mortaliter.

<sup>5</sup> Verum de hoc pro certo judicare non possumus, sed standum est consuetudini patriæ l. ii. cap. cxx. n. xvi.

<sup>6</sup> Sum v. Ornat. n. vii.

<sup>7</sup> In his quæ ideo sunt mala quia prohibita, ut communiter positiva præcepta, excusat consuetudo præscripta, quia tollit legem, et est legum interpres: Imo hac ratione dico, quod excusat etiamsi non sit præscripta, modo sit rationabilis et scienter tolerata, &c.—*Idem. ibid. v. scrupul. n. iv. reg. v.*

<sup>8</sup> Supra.

<sup>9</sup> Scripturasque esse ad tempus adaptatas, et varie intellectas, ita ut uno tempore secundum currentem universalem ritum exponerentur, mutato ritu iterum sententia mutaretur.—*Epist. ii. ad Bohem. de usu Com.*

Nec mirum si praxis ecclesiæ uno tempore interpretatur scripturam uno modo, et alio tempore alio modo: intellectus enim currit eum praxi.—*Idem. epist. vii.*

This was urged in the Council of Trent, and judged to be the meaning of the Lateran Council, when it decreed that the Scripture should be expounded according to the doctors of the church, or as custom has approved.<sup>1</sup> Thus it must come to pass, that what the word of God, in its true meaning, did once condemn as a sin, if it become the Roman practice, the divine precept will change its sense, and the act will be no sin. It was a sin once by the word of God to deprive the people of the cup in the eucharist, but since it was the custom of Rome, the Scripture has changed its meaning, and it is now no sin. To worship images was a crime condemned in Scripture, as that which God most abhorred, but being once the practice of the Romanists, the Scripture renounced the former sense, and it is now far from being criminal. It has not only made a change in the word of God, but in the nature of the thing, and the same thing which was idolatry is now no such matter. Of the law against idolatry (says Sylvester), nothing must be said, because now by the grace of Christ it is not in use.<sup>2</sup> It is not in use, because it is their custom; it is not the same thing that it was to all the world besides, because they use it. And what custom has done in these instances, it may as well do in any other; when all sin is once the practice of that church (as the worst is already), there will be no sin in it.

*Sect. 16.* Thirdly, Another probable ground is a *considerable authority*, or the opinion of one whom we may trust; hence this is their doctrine, that he who does what is sinful, following the judgment of an able doctor, is excused from sin. This principle is without ground appropriated to the Jesuits, with the pernicious consequences of it; it was current in the church of Rome before the fathers of that society were infants. Panormitan thus determines: He that follows the opinion of any doctor, not curiously examined, which afterward appears false, is excused from sin, so long as it appears not to be false.<sup>3</sup> In Sylvester, this is confirmed, and he directs to several proofs out of their law for it;<sup>4</sup> removes what, by mistake, is alleged out of Aquinas against it; and shews that both their great saint and their great abbot agree with others, that this is safe in points which concern either faith or manners, when they are not evident (not clearly and manifestly determined). To him, one doctor may be sufficient.<sup>5</sup> In morals, we must be satisfied with probabilities; and, according to the rule amongst them, a man may probably follow one doctor.<sup>6</sup> And by a multitude of authors we are not to judge what is better or more equal; the opinion of one, and he worse than the rest, may be preferred before many in some particular. So he,<sup>7</sup> and Angelus<sup>8</sup> before him, after others. They conclude, in reference to Joachim, who was not accounted a heretic (though

<sup>1</sup> History of Council of Trent. l. ii. 159.

<sup>2</sup> Queritur quid juris de idololatria? Et dico supersedendum esse hic: quia jam per gratiam Christi, non est in usu.—v. *Superstitio*, n. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Panormitan. in C. Capillan. de feri. dicit quod sequens opinionem alicujus doctoris non subtiliter investigatam, quæ postmodum apparet falsa, excusatur a peccato quamdiu non apparuerit falsa. Sylv. opinio. n. i. et Angel. Sum. v. opin. n. ii. Ubi Glossa cum textu. Innocentius, Gofredus, et alii.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. secundum Antoninum.

<sup>5</sup> Opinio probabilis erit, si illam affirmant boni nominis doctores, imo et si unus doct. Angelus. Sylvester. Navar. &c., Jo. Sancius. disp. xlv. n. lxi. Bonacin. tom. ii. disp. ii. q. iv. punct. ix. n. i. et alii ibid. For this 24 doctors are produced by Vericelli. Q. moral. tom. i. tr. ii. q. v.

<sup>6</sup> Probabiliter quis sequitur opinionem sui doctores: sed neque ex multitudine authorum quid melius et æquius est, judicatum; cum possit unius, et forte deterioris sententia multos in aliqua parte superare.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. n. ii.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. n. i.

his opinions were against the faith), because not condemned by the church, that he is much more to be excused who follows the opinion of a doctor not rejected by the church; <sup>1</sup> and if he thought it not true, would not adhere to it. Certainly (says Angelus) in him there can be no contempt, and so no sin of disobedience. <sup>2</sup> It is true, that which is maintained by more and better authors seems more probable; but they will not have us always bound to follow that which is more probable; for though this be more secure, yet the rule, that what is safest to be followed, holds not (they tell us) but in points that are properly dubious; and where there is opinion, we are not properly in doubt. <sup>3</sup> Thus Navarre also explains it, <sup>4</sup> having told us that it is not always necessary to choose what is safer, because it is enough for the fulfilling of the precept to choose that which is safe, even in those things which concern faith and manners; <sup>5</sup> for in other things, it is not so much as under counsel to follow the safest. Accordingly, Medina (in Lopez) says: The opinion of expert divines may be held without sin, although the contrary be more clear and more safe. <sup>6</sup> In short, that an opinion which is less probable may be followed, is asserted (we are told) both by the greater part and the graver sort of their divines; above forty of their grave doctors are alleged for it, and amongst them, Martin Navarre, Medina, Peter Navarre, Arragon, Bannes, Du Vallius, with others, besides Jesuits. <sup>7</sup> At present, take only the words of Navarre, who speaks fully: In the court of conscience (says he) it is enough, for the avoiding of sin, to take his opinion for true, whom we probably think to be a man of sufficient knowledge and conscience; and quotes their Gloss and Panormitan for it. <sup>8</sup> To whom let me add Sancta Clara, who not only tells us (as we have heard before) that at this day it seems to be the common opinion of their schools and doctors, that the people erring with their teacher or pastor are wholly excused from all

<sup>1</sup> Multo magis excusatur sequens opinionem doctoris non reprobata, cum voluntate non adhaerendi, si vera non apparet.—*Uterque, ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Certe in isto non potest esse contemptus, et sic nec peccatum inobedientiae.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Nec obstat, quod in dubiis tutior pars est eligenda—ut videtur se exponere periculo, qui in diversitate opinionum non eligit tutiorem: quoniam hoc verum esset quum proprie dubium est, sed quum est opinio secus est, quia nec tunc sumus in dubio: nec consequenter exponit se quis periculo. Angelus. *ibid.* n. ii. et Sylvest. n. i.

<sup>4</sup> Rectus intellectus illius vulgati *Tutior pars est eligenda in dubio*, nempe in eo quod est proprie dubium, quale non est, cum sufficienti auctoritate aut ratione altera pars creditur, neque cum ex multis opinionibus una pro vera eligitur, cap. xxvii. n. 284.

<sup>5</sup> Non semper esse necessarium, partem tutiorem eligere, quia satis est quoad præcepti implementam tutam eligere, ut late probavimus, etiam in his quæ ad fidem et mores pertinent: in aliis enim, nec de consilio quis tenetur eligere tutiorem, n. cclxxxii. Vid. Antoninum. Angel. Sylvest. Navar. Gutier in Jo. Sanc. disp. xlii. n. xii.

<sup>6</sup> Dicit opinionem posse teneri sine peccato, quæ est peritorum virorum, licet contrarium sit planius et securius, cap. lii. p. 271.

<sup>7</sup> Licetum esse sectari opinionem minus probabilem, relicta probabiliori, docent Mercado, Medina, Sairus (naming twenty besides, and adding, et alii plures).—*Jo. Sanc. disp. xlii. n. xii.*

Possumus absque peccato sequi opinionem probabilem, relicta probabiliori, et tutiorem. Bonacin. tom. ii. disp. ii. q. iv. punct. fx. n. iv.; Clavis Regia, et alii communiter. *ibid.* n. v. For this Barnabas Gallego, a Dominican, produces near fifty of their doctors. many of them of the same order, and says it is sententia communior inter Thomistas. tract. de conscient. dubi. de consc. probabili. So that if we may trust those whom we see no reason to think partial to the Society, this is not a singular conceit of the Jesuits, but the opinion of their other divines generally, and the more common doctrine of Aquinas his disciples, otherwise most opposite to the Society.

<sup>8</sup> In foro tamen conscientiae ad effectum non peccandi sufficit eligere pro vera opinionem, quem merito censemus esse virum idonea et scientia et conscientia præditum. cap. xxvii. n. cclxxxviii.

fault,<sup>1</sup> but also, when any has a probable ground for what he does; as when a countryman believes anything to be lawful, induced thereto by the testimony of the parish priest, or of his parents, although he mistake, yet his mistake is void of sin; according to the rule in law, just and probable ignorance ought to be excused.<sup>2</sup> So that, to make a sin to be no sin, not only the judgment of a grave doctor so determining, but of a parish priest (who are known to be sufficiently ignorant), yea, of parents also (more ignorant than they) will suffice; and herein (says he) the doctors generally concur. In fine, if it be the common opinion that invincible (as divines) or probable ignorance (as the canonists call it) is excused from all sin, and that it is an instance hereof when one is misled by a sufficient author, then this is the common doctrine of the Romanists, and not the extravagancy of some particular sect or order amongst them.<sup>3</sup>

If, then, this principle be so destructive to religion, the souls of men, and human societies, as some of the French Romanists brand it in reference to the Jesuits, the charge falls upon the common doctrine of the Roman church; for there it is generally taught and received, and was so before Ignatius had founded his order. And this prevents their ordinary exception against our alleging particular authors against them; they cannot with reason or modesty make use of this shift longer; for a single doctor is so far authorized by the common doctrine of their chief writers (and so of their church), that any, or all in their church, have warrant to rely on him; and so, in producing a particular author, in esteem with them, we do, in effect, allege their common doctrine. And indeed, by the premises, the opinion of a grave doctor is the doctrine of their church so far, that any of their church are allowed to follow it, both as to belief and practice. Their church (if we know her sense by the declaration of the generality of her approved authors) does allow all Romanists to follow the opinions I have charged them with, though they be plainly destructive of worship, faith, and holiness, both of heart and life. For I have charged them with nothing without a considerable author; and what is so grounded is with them probable, and what is probable is safe, and allowed both as to faith and manners. Or if there be any particular in the charge in which there is not a common concurrence, or which is contradicted, though by a multitude of their writers, yet since there is at least one grave doctor for it, it is in their account safe; and any Romanist has liberty, by the doctrine now insisted on, to follow it (if he please), rather than that which, upon the account of more assertors, may be thought safer.

But as to the purpose for which I now take notice of it, this principle serves to rid their church of all sin, that is, of all conscience to avoid any; for if that be safe which is probable, and that will be probable, which is countenanced by the opinion of particular doctors, then all the sins which they, or any of them, have already concluded to be no sins (and these are an infinite

<sup>1</sup> Deus. nat. gr. probl. xv. p. xcix. supra.

<sup>2</sup> Probabilis est quando quis habet fundamentum probabile; ut dum rusticus credit aliquid esse licitum, ductus testimonio sui parochi vel parentum:—tunc iste (licet contra veritatem erret) nulla culpa errat: sic doctores communiter, secundum illud: Ignorantia justa et probabilis excusare debet.—*Ibid.* p. 78.

<sup>3</sup> Durandus; cum excuset probabilis ignorantia, puta, si habet aliquem doctorem authenticum et famosum, cujus opinioni nititur in *Sylvest.* v. confess. n. ii. Vervec. dubitans et consulens viros doctos falso consulentes, laborat ignorantia invincibili.—*Ibid.* v. Ignor. n. v. Justa ignorantia—qualis est, cum quis petit consilium a viris habitis pro prædicitis scientia et conscientia in id sufficienti, qui falso ei consulunt, et hæc omnino excuset. Navar. c. xxiii. n. xvi.; Graff. l. ii. c. cxxxi. n. xxi. et l. iv. c. ix. n. viii.; Sancta Clara. *ibid.* p. 96; Herrera et Fabr. *ibi*; Bonacina. de peccat. d. ii. q. viii. p. ii. n. ix. et xvi.

number) may be safely committed; and all that any of them hereafter may determine to be no crimes, may be practised with as little conscience, and as much security. So that a train is laid hereby to blow up the whole rule of Christianity, and all innocency and holiness, which consists in conformity thereto. It has done horrible execution already, and what has hitherto escaped is at the mercy of it, being wholly under the mine, and may be despatched whenever the casuists (their engineers), who are daily at work about it, shall think fit.

*Sect. 17.* Let me but add some of the rules they lay down for the direction and relief of scrupulous consciences. They must persuade themselves that they sin not, though they break the law in a strict sense, if they observe it according to some complaisant interpretation. A benign sense is rather to be put upon any precept, than that which is strict; for the precepts of God and the church are not against that pleasantness which a scrupulous interpretation takes away:<sup>1</sup> and that a person may the better be pleased, he may make the interpretation himself, and so make it as benign as he desires, and as favourable as his inclination and interest would have it; for though, in other courts, the interpretation belongs to him who makes the law, yet, according to their St Antoninus, in the court of conscience, it belongs to every one to do it for his own practice.<sup>2</sup> Or if he will be so over cautious, as not to rest in his own sense, but inquire the opinion of others (and he may easily meet with those amongst them, who will either make that which he has a mind to, no sin; or will mince it for him so small, that it may go down without hurt), yet he may choose that opinion which is most for his purpose (that which is most complaisant, and so will best serve his turn);<sup>3</sup> and if he thinks it probable, though he fear the contrary, and it be false indeed, yet he may act according to it, and sin without fault.<sup>4</sup> Nor is he concerned whether the doctor's opinion be true or no; for though it be false, he may notwithstanding thereupon cast off all scruple, and break the law without sin.<sup>5</sup> Thus if either himself, or any other will give him liberty to sin, when the law gives it not, yet he may take it, and his sin will be no sin.

Secondly, he must persuade himself he sins not when he breaks the law, not only if it be impossible, but if it be very difficult to keep it.<sup>6</sup> Now it may be very difficult to avoid sin, when his employment leads, or when his complexion inclines him to it, or when he has got a habit of sinning, or otherwise when he is under temptation; and if it will be no sin to break the law in these and the like cases, he may make wickedness his daily practice with-

<sup>1</sup> *Sexta (medicina) usus æquitatis circa leges; de qua S. Thom. persuadendo sibi non peccare—qui (legem) in sensu benigniori servet, quamvis in duriore violet.—Navar. c. xxvii. n. cclxxxiii. Cæteris paribus inter sententiam benignam et duram circa præcepta potius benigna interpretatio facienda est, secundum Jo. de Amb. Vervec. et Archi. et ratio est, quia præcepta Dei et ecclesiæ non sunt ad tollendam dulcedinem, quam aufert interpretatio scrupulosa.—Sylvest. v. Scrupul. n. iv.*

<sup>2</sup> *Interpretando discrete præcepta non solum humana, sed et divina, maxime affirmativa: quæ interpretato licet in foro contentioso ad eum spectet ad quem est editio legis: tamen secundum Archi. in foro conscientiæ, pertinet ad quemlibet pro facto suo.—Idem, ibid. n. iii.*

<sup>3</sup> *Septimum est eligere opinionem magis facientem ad propositum proprium — Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Si credat probabiliter sic esse faciendum, etiamsi sit cum formidine alterius partis, non peccat illud agendo, etiamsi falsa esset ejus opinio. Sylvest. Antoninus. in Fill. tr. xi. n. clxxxii.; Sylv. ibid. n. iii. ad. ob. ii.*

<sup>5</sup> *Excusatur, etiamsi sequatur consilium falsum, quia fecit quod potuit.—Sylv. ibid. n. v.*

<sup>6</sup> *Non peccare—qui eam non servat, ubi et quando est impossibile aut valde difficile.—Navar. ibid. Nec Deus nec ecclesia intendit obligare ad vix possibile alicui, secundum Jo. de Amb. Illud esse impossibile dicitur quod vix est possibile: utputa nimiam habens difficultatem. Vide supra. v. potent; Sylv. ibid.*

out danger of sinning. But they seem to take *difficult* or *impossible* in a great latitude, as though it might be no more than *incommodious*; and so Sylvester explains it in the place to which he here refers us.<sup>1</sup> Now it may be judged *incommodious* to observe the commands of God, when they suit not his fancy, or humour, or inclination, or interest, that of his ease or advantage; and if then, it will be no sin not to obey the divine commands, a man may go near to be excused from sinning all his life, though he do little or nothing else but sin. The obligation of the whole law, and gospel too, will be superseded by our conveniences; he may omit what is enjoined, or practise what is forbidden, and it will be no sin, if he judge the observance of the rule too difficult or *incommodious*.

Thirdly, He must make account that he sins not by breaking the law, when he may be thought a fool for keeping it, or when the observance of it may be ridiculous.<sup>2</sup> Now, when sin is general, and the common usage of the times and places where he is, it may be as ridiculous to avoid it, as to be out of the fashion, or to appear in an antique garb. And those who reap pleasure and advantage by sin, will be ready to account them fools who abstain from it; as Nic. de Clemangis says they did in his time. A blessed time when there could be no sin, because piety and virtue were grown ridiculous!<sup>3</sup> He must not think he sins who observes the law according to the common usage of good catholics,<sup>4</sup> and makes that his example and rule, and what conscience he is like to make of sin by this rule, we may understand by the character which the count of Mirandula gave of the good catholics (the chief of them) to Pope Leo. Amongst the most (says he) of the most eminent in our religion, to whose example the silly multitude should be conformed, there is either no worship of God, or certainly very little; no regard at all of good life, no shame, no modesty; righteousness is declined into hatred or favour, and godliness even sunk into superstition.<sup>5</sup>

And if there be danger, it will be accounted folly indeed to expose himself; and whether it be accounted so or not, the apprehension of danger may excuse a man from sin in any case, so Sylvester after others.<sup>6</sup>

There is no need to insist upon their other rules, as that the scrupulous ought to exercise himself in choosing what is less safe (more dangerous) amongst probable opinions, and not to regard (though he cannot answer) the arguments against it; it is enough that he believe what another says. Or this, The confessor may tell him that he should count no sin mortal, but

<sup>1</sup> Aliquid dicitur alicui possibile, quia potest illud commode— eodem modo dicitur impotentia, scil. quia non est aliquid possibile de jure, vel commode, vel honeste.— *Idem v. potentia.*

<sup>2</sup> Neque cum non servat, ut pro stulto non habeatur.—*Navar. ibid.* Nec Deus nec ecclesia intendit obligare ad hoc, ut quis appareat fatuus, et ridiculo sit. *Sylv. ibid. secundum; Jo. de Amb. Gloss. Innocent. Antoninum. v. Scrupul. n. iv.*

<sup>3</sup> De corrupt stat. eccles. Cap. xxv.

<sup>4</sup> *Navar. ibid.; Sylvest. ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Franciscus Picus Mirandula de reformand. moribus. Apud plerosque religionis nostræ primores, ad quorum exemplum componi atque formari plebs ignara debuisset, aut nullus aut certe exiguus Dei cultus, nulla bene vivendi ratio, atque institutio, nullus pudor, nulla modestia: Justitia vel in odium vel in gratiam dechnavit: pietas in superstitionem pene procubuit.

Quamobrem dico et exclamo (neque enim metuo homines, Deo fretus), neminem meæ ætate fuisse fidelem dispensatorem, imo papa ipse pacatis populis bella infert, opus alienas sitit, et suas exsorbet, nulla sanctitas, nulla religio, nullus Dei timor, et quod horresco referens, omnium scelerum, impii homines a papa sumunt excusationem.— *Valla de donat. Contant.*

<sup>6</sup> In quolibet casu pretermittens facere quod lex imponit. Excusari potest a peccato, si hoc facit per virtutem *Epikeiæ*, sine contemptu, ratione alicujus periculi considerati.—*Joh. de Amb. Antoninus. in Sylvest. ibid.*

what is manifest to be such, and so manifest sometimes, that he cannot swear it is not;<sup>1</sup> or any else, though they have store of like nature; the former are sufficient to leave no conscience of sin amongst them in ordinary practice, and to encourage sinners commonly to venture upon any violation of the divine rule, with warrant from their doctrine, that it will be no sin to them. Thus they take a course to ease men's consciences, by leaving them none. And what clearer way can there be to remove scruples, than to persuade them (who would retain some conscience, if they would suffer them) that there is little or no sin to be scrupled at.

*Sect. 18.* This is abundantly sufficient to make it apparent that the popish doctrine is destructive to holiness of life, since they have warranty thereby, not only to neglect the proper acts and exercises of holiness, but to give up themselves to practices of all sorts, which are directly opposite thereto. It is true, they do not acknowledge those practices to be sins or dangerous; but they may with as good reason justify such acts, which they cannot but condemn for crimes, as they go about to excuse these from being criminal. A son of Belial, that has lived in the neglect of holiness, and in the practice of ungodliness and unrighteousness all his time, will scarce pass at the day of judgment for one that is holy or innocent, because he has had the confidence to think so, or has found out some shift to support his presumption; or because others like himself were of the same mind; nor is he like to escape because he had wit enough to cozen his conscience, or boldness to stifle it, or wariness to keep out the light which would have informed it, or self-love to believe those who flattered him, in what his corrupt inclination led him to, or facileness to follow those blindfold who had no mind to see. Those devices which they have found out to justify innumerable transgressions of the divine law (and may serve as well to justify them all), have no countenance from Scripture, nor from antiquity, faithfully following it. This is not only acknowledged, but charged home by some of the French Romanists, upon a supposition, that these pernicious artifices are peculiarly the Jesuits'; but since it is apparent that the divines and casuists of all orders, and those of universal repute, are no more excusable, the charge is justly fixed upon their church and practical doctrine in general. Nor is their acknowledgment needful, it is plain in the writings of those who have the conduct of their consciences, that they consult not with Scripture in these determinations, no more than with ancient writers; you shall find them very rarely meddle with either. An allegation out of their canon law is an authentic authority that passes for the text. A schoolman or casuist of note, that went before them, is a sufficient conduct; if there be a concurrence of five or six, it is then the common opinion, and they are as secure in it as if they marched with a caravan; but if they have a mind to be singular, and have but something like a reason for it, they supererogate, though the reason be such, that the next who examines it puffs it away as a trifle. Such are the foundations of their practical divinity. The masters of it (the casuists) are followed by the priests and confessors, and the priests are followed by the people; and so the blind follow the blind, and those that see not, those that will not see.

But it may be, there was less need to be so long and particular, in shewing how unnecessary it is with them to forsake sin. It is manifest enough by their doctrine of repentance, before insisted on, that there is no necessity they should break off their sins till they be obliged to be contrite; and their doctors cannot agree upon any time for this (though some of them specify the point of death, though then indeed they do not account it indispensably necessary): the people may think themselves excused if they do

<sup>1</sup> Bonacin de peccat. disp. ii. q. iv. punct. viii. n. iii. ubi Sayrus. et alii et n. iv.

not resolve to leave their sins till their teachers agree that they must do so, and so live in them, till they can live no longer. If any particular doctor fix a more early period, and bring some reason for it, though they may if they please, yet they are not obliged to believe him, for no reason is brought by any of them for a more timely turning from sin, but is confuted and rejected by some or other among them as slight and insufficient. And it is no sin not to believe him who proposes to them upon frivolous reasons; yea, it would be an act of imprudence to do it, as Sancta Clara<sup>1</sup> assures us, out of Aquinas and Victoria; so they may hereupon go on in their sins till the approach of death; and he, whom they worship as a saint, and reverence as the angel of their schools, may encourage them herein, since he declares that continuance in sin unto death is not a special sin, but only a circumstance of sin.<sup>2</sup> Nor need they be afraid of this circumstance, as though it would make their case worse; for by their doctrine, to sin (and so to continue in sin) upon confidence that they shall have pardon by confession, is so far from aggravating sin that it extenuates it. So Cajetan and Navarre after him.<sup>3</sup> And that nothing may discourage them from continuing in wickedness, the council of Trent declare (without excepting the sinner's perseverance in sin unto death) that if he be attrite, the sacrament of confession will secure him, though attrition is confessed not to import so much as any pious or ingenious purpose to forsake sin.

## CHAPTER X.

### *The Roman doctrine makes good works to be unnecessary.*

*Sect. 1.* But their good works possibly may satisfy for their other defects and extravagancies, and in these they glory above all, and have the confidence to condemn us, upon a pretence (though utterly false and groundless) that we deny the necessity of good works. Is it imaginable that after this they themselves should hold them to be unnecessary, and so run into the heresy which they charge upon others? I will not desire any to believe this unless I let him see it; but their writings make it visible to any who have a mind to see. They reduce all good works to fasting, prayer, and acts of mercy, or alms-deeds. For their fasting I shall only say this, it is no fast, it is no good work, nor is it in their account necessary. To the making of a fast there must (as they tell us) be the concurrence of these severals. First, there must be no more than once eating. Gregory lies (though both a pope and a saint with them) if this be not true, says Cajetan.<sup>4</sup> Secondly, this eating must not be a dinner. Bellarmine makes this good by scripture, a troop of fathers, and the perpetual custom of the faithful; concluding that it was never heard in the ancient church, that they did eat either till night, or be-

<sup>1</sup> Quando articuli fidei nou modo debito proponuntur, ut rationibus frivolis—tunc enim credere esset actus imprudentiæ, secundum D. Tho. ii. 2, q. i. art. iv. Deus. Nat. Gr. Probl. xv. p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> Permanentiam in peccato usque ad mortem, nou esse speciale peccatum, sed quandam peccati circumstantiam.—*Aquinas.* ii. 2, q. xiv. a. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Peccans ob fiduciam, quod postea per confessionem veniam obtinebit, non tenetur de necessitate id confiteri: quia non est circumstantia adeo peccatum aggravans; imo potius minuit, ut inquit Cajetanus in ii. 2, q. xxi. art. ii.; Nav. cap. vi. n. iii. p. 98.

<sup>4</sup> Unica demum comestio, nisi ad jejuniu[m] necessaria sit, mentitur Gregorius.—*Sum. v. jejuniu[m].* p. 344. Unica comestio est de essentia jejunii.—*Navar. cap. xxi. n. xiv.* Sane si in jejuniu[m] bis cibum capere fas esset, equæ hic abstinentiæ forma, vel species quidem foret? Parvi enim refert, quo vescaris cibo, si modo te ad summum satiaveris.—*Polyd. Vergil. de invent. rer. lib. vi. cap. xvi. p. ccelxxii.*

fore three at afternoon.<sup>1</sup> Thirdly, what they take must be less nourishing and delicious than their ordinary fare. And so the church forbids that which in its nature, and for the most part, is more nourishing and more pleasing, the end of fasting requires it, which is (says he out of St Austin) to tame and subject the concupiscence of the body.<sup>2</sup> All these are necessary to the being of a fast, as they affirm, and yet not one of these is observed in their fasting. For first they eat a dinner, a full meal, at noon, or an hour or two sooner if they please, at the same time, and in as great quantity, as they do any other day; yea, if they eat to great excess at a fasting dinner, yet they keep the fast. As to the quantity (says another of their cardinals, who can best tell what belongs to fasting) of a dinner at a fast, there is no certain measure; but though one be very excessive, and transgress the law of sobriety, yet he fasts well enough; and adds, it is lawful to eat more than ordinary at dinner upon a fast day.<sup>3</sup> Others, not of the Society, may hit the sense of the church herein more unquestionably, when they teach, that one who, observing the quality of the meat, stuffs his belly so full as to be so far from any sense of the hardship of fasting, or from repressing the sins of the flesh, that he rather excites and cherishes lust thereby, yet fulfils the precept for fasting. So Covarruvius, Abulensis, Medina, Cajetan, and others, in Bonacina, and he after them,<sup>4</sup> where, by the help of a distinction or two, intemperance both in quality and quantity, is made perfectly consistent with the fast and temperance of holy church. So that they fast, though they dine, and that lustily, whatever the Scripture, or the fathers, or all the faithful (in Bellarmine) say of the inconsistency of a dinner with a fast. But this is too little for a Roman fast (though many that never dream they fast eat constantly less); they may eat a breakfast too, and yet keep a fast after they have broke it. They may drink ale or wine, and eat bread after it, that the strong drink may not hurt them; or if bread will not serve them (though these together may make a breakfast for a festival) they may eat other things also after their morning's draught, if it be not beyond measure; and these both at their first and second breakfast.<sup>5</sup> Oh! but thus they eat twice, that the cardinal was aware of, where is then their fast, when it is, as they affirm, essential thereto not to eat twice? Why, says he, a pious construction must be put upon it, it is that the drink may not hurt them; and so taken it seems either they eat not twice, when they eat once and again, or they fast by a pious interpretation, when in the sense of the universal church, and the world too, they fast not.<sup>6</sup> Thus, that they may be sure to afflict the

<sup>1</sup> Unicum igitur refectioem, eamque cœnam esse debere, nec prandium, cum jejuniò datur opera, facile probari potest, extant enim exempla scripturarum, testimonia patrum, et perpetua consuetudo fidelium.—*De Jejun.* l. ii. c. ii. p. 1034. Apud veteres inauditum est prorsus, ut ante horam nonam, quæ est tertia post meridiem, jejunium quodcumque solvatur. Quemadmodum etiam nulla est apud veteres mentio binæ refectioem, cum de jejunio agitur.—*Ibid.* p. 1035, vid. Victorcl. ad Tol. l. vi. c. ii. p. 972.

<sup>2</sup> Certum genus cibi prohibuit jejunaturis, illud videlicet quod ex genere suo, et ut plurimum magis nutrit et magis delectat.—*Idem. ibid.* cap. v. Nam finis jejunii est corporis concupiscentias edomare, et in servitatem redigere.—*Ibid.* p. 1043.

<sup>3</sup> In continua autem quantitate prandii, non est certa mensura ratione jejunii: sed quamvis aliquis multum excedat, non ob id solvit jejunium, peccat tamen contra sobrietatem—licet tamen tempore jejunii, aliquid plus accipere in prandio.—*Instruct.* . vi. c. ii. p. 990. Qui intemperanter comedit, dum prandet die jejunii—satisfit præcepto.—*Bonacin.* tom. ii. disp. i. q. i. punct. ix. n. i.

<sup>4</sup> De præcepto eceles. ult. di. p. q. i. punct. ii. n. vi.

<sup>5</sup> Licitus est mane potus etiam vini sine fraude; etiam licitum aliquid sumere pro stramento, potus ne obsit. Sylv. v. jejun. n. ix. et hoc expresse tenet.—*S. Thomæ.*

Nec sumere in serotino jentaculo parum panis, frangit jejunium: quia ad hoc videtur serotinum jentaculum reductum ut non referat quid quisque sumat, si modum non excedat. Cajetan. Sum. jejun. it holds as well of a breakfast early as later.

<sup>6</sup> Sumere vero jentaculum serotinum ad sustentationem naturæ, est proculdubio

flesh with a severe abstinence, they may eat a supper too. And no wonder, for if they can excuse the second eating, it will be, as they conclude, no fault to eat a third, or a fourth, or a fifth time, or as often as they please; but three meals may serve them for a fast, and so one supper may suffice.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, they call it by *canula*, and will have it pass under a little name, though the quantity allowed be great, even full as big as custom will make it, for that is their rule for fasting suppers, not to eat by any certain measure, but so much as others are wont to do; if it be excessive great, that which custom introduces will justify it.<sup>2</sup> And those that tell us custom is their rule acquaint us also, that it is the custom in divers countries to sup with notorious excess.<sup>3</sup> And so they may eat at supper not only for hunger, but out of sensuality, as Panormitan, and others after him.<sup>4</sup> And thus sensuality and the severity of a popish fast, are perfectly reconciled.

Such a supper these fathers may eat in the morning, if they please. This will be but a small fault, though they do it when there is no occasion for it;<sup>5</sup> and they may the better fast after, upon a full stomach, till noon at least; but they need not stay so long, for they may drink every hour, or oftener if they will, and whenever they drink they may eat something too, that the drink may not hurt them; and thus they may break their fast every hour of the day, or more, and yet keep it the whole day well enough.

For the quality of their fasting-meat (to say nothing that some flesh is allowed) they may use the most delicious that they can compass, the most curious sweetmeats, the choicest wines, the rarest fish, and that dressed after the most delicate mode, and this at dinner, the meal most repugnant of all to fasting. Oh, how gladly would thousands of our people be condemned to such a maceration of the flesh, for more days in a year than the Romanists are thus pitifully mortified, and never trouble pope or prelate for a dispensation! Nay, they would purchase a license to fast, if any would accommodate them with expedients to do it at such a rate. Besides their meats, they may drink freely, not only at meals, but before or after, though they need it not, and be not thirsty;<sup>6</sup> the drinking of wine out of sensuality breaks not the fast, says Sylvester.<sup>7</sup> And thus they may drink before the meat they fast on be digested, for though that be intemperance in other cases, as Navarre tells us, it breaks not the fast.<sup>8</sup> Sylvester thinks it possible that intemper-

iterum comedere.—*Ibid.* Pie interpretandum est: ut scilicet fiat ne potus noceat.—*Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> Sola autem secunda comestio peccatum est: non autem tertia neque quarta, vel ulterior: quia illa sola jejunium frangit, secundum Durandum, quam sequuntur recte Angelus, et Sylvester. Navar. c. xxi. n. xiv.; vid. Cajetan. Sum. v. jejunium, p. 392.

<sup>2</sup> Quanta tamen debet esse, consideranda est consuetudo communis patriæ—non enim est peccatum mortale talem consuetudinem servare, licet quantitas sit aliquantulum grandis. Unde Armilla probat collationes, quæ fiunt Romæ secundum consuetudinem tenelli ob consuetudinem, et quia Pontifex tolerat, cum sciat: nec ego auderem damnare, quamvis isti sunt abusus hominum parum timeratorum.—*Toll. ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Navar. c. xxi. n. xiv. Collatio notabiliter immoderata frequenter, præsertim in Lusitania.

<sup>4</sup> Immo etsi ex sensualitate, secundum mentem Panormitani, quia sufficit non exire terminos consuetudinis—*Sylv. ibid.* n. x.

<sup>5</sup> Bonacin. de præcept. Eccles. q. i. p. 3. n. vi. ibi Angles. Naldus, et alii, vide p. I. n. viii.

<sup>6</sup> Utrum pluries bibere vinum vel aquam frangit jejunium Resp. Innocentius et Ricar. quod non, sive ante pastum sive post.—*Angel. sum. v. jejum. n. iv.* They may drink it, and that often, for hunger as well as thirst.—*Navar. cap. xxi. n. xiii.*

<sup>7</sup> Potus etiam vini et electuaria, &c. De quibus intelligitur, quod ex sensualitate sumpta, non frangunt jejunium.—*Ibid. Sylvest.*

<sup>8</sup> Esto, quod venialiter peccaret, qui cæpta et nondum finita digestionem biberet, non quidem quod jejunium frangat, sed quia actum inordinatum agit.—*Navar. ibid.*

ance in drinking may be a sin; however, it is lawful for those that fast to drink often, on the same day, for drinking breaks not the fast, either before or after dinner; so he after others.<sup>1</sup> A man may wonder what can break this fast, since neither drinking nor eating so often, and so much, even to excess, and the gratifying of sensuality, in so high a degree can do it. It is wine that they may drink so often when they fast, and yet they acknowledge that wine is more contrary to the nature and end of a fast than flesh. Though wine, says De Graffis, be more nutritive, and the drinking of wine do more provoke to concupiscence than the eating of flesh, according to that: Prov. x. Wine is a luxurious thing, and Eph. v. Be not drunk with wine in which is luxury; yet, says he, he that on a fast day often drinks wine or water, either sooner or later, does not break the fast.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, as they may eat like gluttons, so (by the doctrine of their chief authors) they may drink till they be drunk, and yet not break their fast, for no drinking (how excessive soever) can break it. The church-fast (they tell us) consists not in abstinence from drink; consequently, he that drinks wine, or other liquor, before or after dinner, breaks not the precept for fasting, though he sin against temperance, and drink excessively. So Bonacina, after Aquinas, Abulensis, Navarre, and others, telling us it is their common doctrine).<sup>3</sup>

I suppose this fast can never be broke; it will be a fast for ever, do what they can, if all they are allowed to do against it cannot make it to be no fast; for so far as I can perceive, they may break their bellies, and yet not break their fast. If one in the ancient church had spoke of his fasting after three such meals, and so much drinking, yea, or but eating a dinner, he would have been thought out of his wits; yet they must not be accounted ridiculous, who tell us gravely that this is fasting, and that they break not a fast unless they dine twice on a fasting day;<sup>4</sup> and indeed some of their writers seem ashamed of this good work, as they do it in their church.<sup>5</sup> But suppose this were a fast (when indeed it is no such thing), and observed by them, ἐν ξηροφαγία (as Epiphanius explains it), and so that they tasted nothing till three o'clock, or till evening as of old, yet by the Roman order it could be no good work.<sup>6</sup> That it may be such, there must be something religious

<sup>1</sup> Licitum est jejunantibus pluries intra diem unam potare, licet immoderantia circa hoc posset esse peccatum. Sylv. *ibid.* n. ix. secundum S. Thom.; idem dicit Albertus. Paludan. Richardus. Quod potus non solvit jejunium sive post, sive ante prandium.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Etsi vinum sit nutritivum, et ad concupiscentiam magis provocet potus vini quam esus carniū illud Prov. xx. Luxuriosa res est vinum; et ad Eph. v. Nolite inebriari vino, in quo est luxuria, tamen qui die jejunii sæpius biberent vinum, aut aquam, et mane et vespere, jejunium non frangunt, quamvis hoc facerent ad sustentandum se, et famem sedandam. ita D. Th. ii. 2, q. cxlvii. art. vi. ad. ii. qui inquit, quod bene possunt peccare et meritum jejunii perdere sicut si immoderate cibum sumerent; sed non ut jejunium frangatur; et ratio est quia jejunium est abstinencia a cibo tantum.—*Graff.* l. ii. c. xxxvi. n. xxi. p. 215.

<sup>3</sup> Non violat præceptum jejunii—quamvis peccet contra temperantiam, bibendo immoderanter.—*Tom.* ii. p. 337. n. vii. et alii communiter.

<sup>4</sup> Innocent. et Richard. (dicunt) quod prandere pluries in die jejunii est contra consuetudinem probatam ecclesiæ.—*Angel. Sum. ibid.* n. iii. Semel esse in die prandendum seu manducandum: qui vero pluries, solvit jejunium.—*Tol.* l. vi. c. ii. p. 989.

<sup>5</sup> Jejunia nostra, quæ in vini copia natant, et piscium varietate carnis delicias superant—veteribus omnibus non modo fuisse incognita, sed et intolerabilia adcoque abhominanda, constat.—*Lindan. Panopl.* l. iii. c. xi. Inanem tantum veri jejunii retinet umbram.—*Cassand. defens. lib de Offic. viri.* p. 119.

<sup>6</sup> ἐν ξηροφαγία διατελοῦσι πάντες οἱ λαοί, φημι δε ἔστω καὶ ἀλλὶ καὶ ὕδατι τότε χρῶμενοι πρὸς ἰσπίσαν.—*Compend. Doctrin. Cathol.*

If they sleep the whole day, yet they accomplish the precept.—*Jo. Sanc. disp. li.* n. ii.

(for mere abstinence has no more goodness in it than eating); it cannot be religious unless it be subservient to some religious design or employment; but they disjoin it from all things of that nature; we hear not a word from them, of their taking notice of their sins, or confessing them, or afflicting their souls for them; they need not so much as pray when they fast, either in public or private; yea, they are not obliged to hear mass, though that be the employment of every day for worship, so that their fasts are no days for worship, or any religious exercise.<sup>1</sup> They are discharged also from religious ends; two are commonly assigned, the taming of the flesh, and the elevating of the mind to God; but though the flesh be more unruly, and the mind move not in the least towards God on a fasting-day; though they never mind these ends in their abstinence, yet they entirely fulfil the precepts of their church for fasting, as they commonly conclude, upon this ground, because the end of the precept is not commanded.<sup>2</sup> So that this practice which they call fasting, is a mere bodily exercise amongst them, and thus it is represented by Cajetan, applying that of the apostle to it,<sup>3</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 8, 'Bodily exercise profiteth but little,' &c. Where he denies it the character of a good work. And since it is neither a true fast nor a good work, if they made it never so necessary, it would be no proof, that by their doctrine there is any necessity either of real fasting or any good work. But, indeed, they declare their pretended fasts needless; for their best writers conclude it to be but a venial fault not to observe them; so that there is no more necessity with them to fast after their mode, than there is to avoid a venial sin, which is none at all.<sup>4</sup> They have so many ways to excuse men from fasting, as leave no necessity of it. This one may serve any that have no mind to fast. If a man have tired himself with any employment (lawful or damnable) not only with honest labour, but with too much gaming, yea, or with excessive whoring, he is thereby exempted from the obligation to fast, though he so wearied himself on purpose that he might be excused. But one thing herein is more intolerable, that this ridiculous piece of mockery which they call fasting, has the glory given it which is peculiar to Christ alone, and is thought sufficient both to satisfy the justice of God, and to merit, by way of condignity, not only grace but eternal glory; an opinion of such malignancy as is enough to poison the best work in the world into deadly guilt. To hold that a person, because he eats not two dinners, or abstains for a day

<sup>1</sup> Dixi festo: quia nemo ullo alio die hoc præcepto (de audienda missa) tenetur, etiam clericus vel monachus, imo neque episcopus—Nullo inquam, alio die etiam jejunii et quadragesimæ, &c.—Navar. cap. xxi. n. ii.; Rosel. v. miss. n. xiii.; Sylvest. v. miss. ii. n. i.

<sup>2</sup> Lex quæ præcipit aliquid, non obligat ad finem, sed ad media tendentia ad finem.—*D. Tho.* i. ii. q. e. art. ix. et x. Unde lex non obligat ad carnis petulantiam compescendam, sed ad media quibus comprimi possit, sicut est jejunium.—*Graff.* l. ii. c. xxxvi. n. xx. Licet ecclesia nos quadragesimali observatione extenuare in carne intendat, ut liberior mens spiritualibus accomodetur, tamen finis ille non est in præcepto, sed tantum ciborum abstinence.—*Soto*, de nat. et gr. l. i. c. xxii. p. 57. Finis præcepti jejunii est elevatio mentis: si tamen quis jejunat et non elevatur mente, non est transgressor præcepti.—*Cajetan.* Sum. v. matrim. p. 430. Nec, si lex jubet quadragesimæ jejunium ut mens elevetur in Deum, astringimur proinde ex hujus præcepti vigore mentem in Deum elevare.—*Canus.* Relect. de pœnit. pars. iv. p. 871; vide *Tol.* instr. l. iv. c. xii. p. 623.

<sup>3</sup> Sum. v. jejunium. p. 348. Opera utriusque misericordiæ meliora sunt quam jejunii: juxta illud apostoli, Corporalis exercitatio ad modicum utilis est: pietas autem ad omnia valet.

<sup>4</sup> Quantum est ex jure scripto nullum cognosco intervenire mortale peccatum in fractone jejunii ecclesiæ, si contemptus desit. *Cajetan.* ibid. p. 362; vid. *Aquin.* Antoninum. Archidiaconum. Angelum. et alios in Sylvest. v. Jejun. n. xxi. Communis opinio.

from flesh, though he stuff himself with other delicacies, even to excess, should be worthy of the glorious prerogative of Christ, is a conceit to be entertained with scorn and laughter, if the horror of it did not call for another passion. Yet such are points of faith in that church; and this surely is enough to cloy any man with their fasting.<sup>1</sup>

*Sect. 2.* Come we to the next of their good works, that is, prayer. This unquestionably is a good work, but then sure it must be good praying; but they are so far from judging it necessary to pray well, that they conclude it sufficient to employ themselves about this work in such a manner as cannot, upon a just account, be called praying at all. The only public prayers necessary for the people, by the Roman orders, are those of the mass, but how they pray therein, I cannot apprehend. They use not the words, they need not hear them, they cannot understand them. Now, can it be imagined that he prays, who neither expresses nor conceives any petitions? They do it not themselves, they join not with the priest, for no man can possibly concur with the words or the sense of him whom he neither hears nor understands. They cannot concur with the priest as men, with rational acts, much less as Christians. The church of Rome has made it not only needless, but impossible, for the people to pray in their public service; they must think something sufficient for them, which is not praying. Let us see what account their authors give of this. Sylvester, proving that it is not needful to pray on the Lord's day, or any of their days for public worship, tells us what will serve the people instead thereof. It suffices that they stand by the priest praying in the mass, and that is all that is requisite, by virtue of this precept.<sup>2</sup> So that the church requires no more than the presence and posture of the body. And they that can make a prayer of this, may make an image in the church to pray; and if this would be a miracle, it would be as wonderful that the other should be praying; but thus it becomes those who will worship images, as if they were God, to worship God, as if themselves were images. Oh, but they must concur with the priest so far, as either actually or virtually to wish that his prayers may be heard.<sup>3</sup> And if this be praying, a man may pray in the church while he is in his bed at home, for actually he may do this if he be awake, and virtually, though he be asleep. There is no prayer, but what is either vocal or mental; what the people do in the mass, is neither; they say nothing, nor do they understand anything, nor need they mind anything, of what is said; and it is much, if a man's mind can be employed about that which he not only understands not, but minds not at all. The mind must necessarily attend actually in mental prayer,<sup>4</sup> but actual attention is not necessary to what they call praying. So it is neither vocal nor mental, not any at all, unless they can devise a mode of prayer without either voice or mind. They know not what to mind, nor whom, person or thing; they understand not whether the

<sup>1</sup> So Jo. Sancius after others; *Liberos a jejuniis existimo, qui culpa sua ita defatigati redduntur—quod jejunare non valeant; ut qui defatigatus esset ludo pilæ, aut nimis esset deditus fæminarum commitioni—docent Medina. Diana. Ledesma, Montesin, &c. disp. liv. n. xx. Nonnulli doctores extendunt ad eos qui defatigantur in ludis, aut in quærenda meretrice, &c.—Bonacin. tom. ii. disp. ii. q. viii. punct. i. n. xvi.*

<sup>2</sup> Unde sufficit astare oranti sacerdoti in missa, quantum est ex vi hujus præcepti.—*Sum. v. Dominic. n. viii.*

<sup>3</sup> Cum nemo teneatur ex præcepto audire, et minus intelligere verba sacerdotis, quia satis est, vel ex longinquo missanti adesse, et surgendo, genua flectendo, vel alias actualiter vel virtualiter exoptare, ut sacerdos, qui pro omnibus orat et sacrificat, a Deo exaudiatur.—*Navar. cap. xxi. n. viii.*

<sup>4</sup> Cum ipsa eadem attentio sit ipsissima oratio.—*Soto de Just. et Juv. l. x. q. v. art. v. p. 340.*

priest be in confession, or at prayer, or in his lauds; no, nor whether he be praying or reading, unless the dumb signification of a posture tell them; nor that way neither, for they need not see, no more than hear, the priest. They know not whether he be addressing himself to God, or to a creature, whether to another divine person than the Father (for they have prayers in the mass to Christ and the Holy Ghost, though an ancient council forbids it); they know not whether he be praying to an angel or to a saint, to a man or to a woman, to an image or to a crucifix, for they have addresses to all. They can in no wise be thought to pray, who do not, who cannot so much as say *Amen* to a prayer; and this they cannot say, who understand not what is prayed for, as Aquinas himself assures us from the words of the apostle.<sup>1</sup>

But the priest who celebrates seems to pray, though the people at mass do not. He seems so, but the church of Rome obliges not him to pray, unless he can be said to pray who only reads the words of a form, without minding anything else which they must necessarily be concerned in who pray indeed. Of the several sorts of attention requisite in prayer, none, with them, is necessary but that which respects the pronouncing of the words right. If the priest mind but this only, so as to read the words right, it is sufficient, he does all the church requires, and fully satisfies the precept of saying mass; this is their common doctrine. So that unless he can be said to pray who neither minds the God he should pray to, nor the things to be prayed for, no, nor the sense of the words he uses, their church requires not the priests to pray, even when they are saying their mass-prayers. Nor is it more needful, on the same account, in the canonical hours, as we have seen before. So that praying indeed is not necessary for priest or people in all the public service of the Romish church; much less is it needful in their private devotions, which are not enjoined;<sup>2</sup> for there they declare it lawful to be more neglectful of all the necessary concerns of prayer than in public. Now that they who mind nothing but the bare saying the words of a prayer do not pray indeed, they themselves will acknowledge in their lucid intervals. Cajetan tells us that if one be corporally present at mass, but lets his mind considerably wander after other things, he satisfies not the precept, because he is but so there as if he voluntarily slept at it; for to be far from the mass by voluntary sleeping and by voluntary wandering are both alike.<sup>3</sup> Hence it is clear that priest or people whose minds voluntarily wander at mass, do no more pray there than if they were voluntarily asleep; and consequently, if they wander carelessly, without observing it, they pray no more than if they were carelessly asleep. Yet many of them think the church forbids not voluntary wanderings. He himself thinks she forbids not careless wanderings; therefore all of them must believe that she thinks it sufficient to pray as they may do who are fast asleep, one way or other. And yet none that are awake can well count sleeping to be praying. Bellarmine reckoning the several sorts of prayer, one (says he) is mental,

<sup>1</sup> *Quomodo enim dicet Amen cum quid orat nescit? Quia non potest intelligere quid boni dicas.—Comment. in 1 Cor. xiv. Manifesta sunt verba apostoli, cum qui ob imperitiam quod dicitur non intelligit, fieri non posse, ut ad alterius gratiarum actionem Amen respondeat.—Cassand. Defens. lib. offic. pii viri.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ubi autem libere et citra obligationem oratur; sola est culpa venialis indecenter orare: quare distractio, etiam meditata, nisi contemptio adsit, nunquam erit mortalis. Soto de Just. et Jur. l. x. q. v. art. v. p. 341; fine. vid. Angel. Sum. v. horæ. n. xxvii.; Gabriel de Can. Miss. Lect. xxii.; Græff. l. ii. cap. li. n. xi.*

<sup>3</sup> *Si quis corporaliter præsens sit missæ, sed mentem advertenter a missa divertat ad alia, non satisfacit præcepto missæ: quoniam ita ibi est, ac si voluntarie ibi dormiret; paria namque sunt, longe a missa fieri per voluntarium somnum, et per voluntariam diversionem mentis ad alia.—Sum. v. fest. p. 305.*

another is both mental and vocal.<sup>1</sup> But when he would add that which is vocal only, he will not have that accounted prayer. A third member of the division ought not to be added, to wit, that which is vocal only; and gives good reason, for that, says he, is of no use to please God, but rather to provoke him to anger, according to that Isa. xxix., 'This people honour me with their lips,' &c. Yet such is the praying in the Roman church, and no other needful in their divine service, as the cardinal himself declares sufficiently in the same book. And if no other praying be needful, no prayer that is a good work is necessary by their doctrine.

*Sect. 3.* Proceed we to the last sort of their good works, to wit, acts of mercy or charity, comprised in alms-deeds for the relief of the indigent; and we can scarce discover that these will ever be necessary by their doctrine. Cardinal Cajetan (one represented as more favourable to these acts of charity than divers others) tells us that to omit them is no mortal sin (and therefore to do them will not be necessary by any command), but only in two cases; first, when one hath superfluities, both of nature and state, that is, more than either nature or the quality of the person requires; secondly, when the poor are in extreme necessity (not in common want only, but such as is extraordinary).<sup>2</sup> And these two are so described to us that themselves confess they very seldom fall out, and we may think hardly ever, so that rarely or never will this good work be necessary. For the former, that a person may be judged to have anything superfluous (without which he is not bound to relieve others), it must be considered what is requisite for the honourable expenses of himself, his children and family, and what for the munificence of his state and magnificence too, what for common events and casualties, to provide against them, and other things of this nature.<sup>3</sup> Upon which he concludes, it will rarely fall out that a man living splendidly, according to his quality, will have anything superfluous. And so very rarely (if he had said *never* the premises would have borne it) will it be the duty of such as have enough to live gloriously to spare anything for the poor. Less pride and vain-glory, or prodigality, than they allow them to have without any mortal guilt, will leave nothing superfluous, and so quite excuse them from these good works. Navarre is of the same mind, and tells us there are few rich men who have anything superfluous, since neither kings nor great princes can be thought to have superfluities;<sup>4</sup> having said a little before, that it cannot easily be judged that any secular person hath more than is needful for his

<sup>1</sup> *Alia est oratio tantum mentalis, alia mentalis simul et vocalis; neque debet addi tertium membrum (id est) vocalis tantum. Ea siquidem non est utilis ad placandum Deum, sed magis ad provocandum ad iram, juxta illud, Populus hic labiis me honorat, cor autem eorum longe est a me, Isai. xxix.—De bonis oper. l. i. cap. ii. p. 974.*

<sup>2</sup> *Eleemosynam non facere est peccatum mortale in duobus solummodo casibus; primus est, si quis habet de superfluo naturæ et personæ—secundus est quum apparet pauper in extrema necessitate constitutus; juxta illud, pasce fame morientem.—Sum. v. Eleemos. p. 134.*

<sup>3</sup> *Superfluum in tali latitudine consistens, judicandum est consideratis sumptibus honorabilibus etiam filiorum, familiæ, status munificentia, magnificencia, communibus eventibus, hæredibus, et aliis ejusmodi: ita ne raro videatur contingere, ut homo secundum statum gloriose vivens, superfluum habeat.—Idem, ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Sequitur item Rosellam sine justa ratione dixisse, paucos divitum confessarios salutatum iri, si eleemosyna in prædictis duobus casibus de præcepto foret; non enim tot sunt, quot putat, hujusmodi divites, quibus sit superfluum status, cum nec reges et magni principes superflua habere censeantur.—Cap. xxix. n. vi. Facile judicandum non esse, aliquem sæcularem plura, quam quæ suo statui necessaria sunt, habere. Cum etiam ille qui ad aliquod dominium emendum, et mutandum suum statum in alium majorem, ad quem idoneus est, pecunias congerit, non habet plus quam suum statum deceat.—Ibid.*

condition, for he may heap up moneys to purchase more, or to advance his condition higher, and so still have no more than is requisite for his state, and nothing at all will be due for charitable acts. He expresses it more fully elsewhere, and concludes, For all this he cannot be said to have any such superfluities that he should be obliged by any command to give to the poor.<sup>1</sup> So that unless a man have so much as he neither has at present, nor may have for the future, occasion to use—that is, unless he has so much as no man will or can believe he hath,—an act of charity will not be his duty. If he do but desire to have more than he now has, or do but design to rise any higher than he now is, though but in such a degree as is found in all, and may innocently be in any; at least, if he have but anything of covetousness or ambition, though far less than they determine he may have without any deadly guilt (and so without any considerable danger), he is discharged from all obligation to this good work.

The other case will make charity no more necessary; it is when the poor are in extreme necessity, and this is only when it is apparent they will die for want of necessaries if we relieve them not.<sup>2</sup> Now such a case rarely happens, and a man may never meet with one in such extremity all his life; but if he do, yet he may be excused for want of evidence that his necessity is so great; he need not take the party's word for it, no, not though in public places there seem to be also clear signs of it; he need not take the word of any other, no, not the judgment of his parish priest or confessor (though upon their opinion he may safely venture upon acts of wickedness), unless they can assure him thereof as eye-witnesses, or if he be morally certain of the extremity;<sup>3</sup> yet if there be a probability that any other will relieve the person ready to starve, he may leave him to the mercy of others, without doing anything himself towards his relief (for that is another limitation which they add in the case).<sup>4</sup> For example, if he thought it likely that a protestant would relieve the perishing party, a papist (by their doctrine of good works) might reserve his money and charity for another world, nor would it be necessary to exercise one act thereof while he lives. Or amongst themselves, while each one expects that another may do it, the poor may perish, and all that might relieve them are excused. Besides, in this case, they conclude it lawful for the person in extremity to steal, either secretly or openly, from those that have enough;<sup>5</sup> so that acts of charity will not be necessary among them but when theft is lawful, and no man need relieve the indigent with anything he hath, till they

<sup>1</sup> Cap. xxiii. n. lxxiv. Nec ob id dicitur habere tale superfluum, quod de præcepto pauperibus teneatur erogare.

<sup>2</sup> In sententiam Cajetan. et Navar. inclinant Sotus et Sarmientus. Vasques. Opusc. Moral. de Eleemosyn. dub. iii. n. xx. Asserunt non esse præcepti obligationem ullam, extra tempus extremæ necessitatis proximi, quantumvis divitiæ superfluant non tantum naturæ, sed statui, etiam congruæ sustentationi, Gabriel, Alexander, Major, Gerson—reputant probabilem Antoninus, Contadus, Durandus.

Durandus asserit se non audere dicere esse aliquid tempus præcepti extra extremam necessitatem, ne tot divites condemnet.—*Idem, ibid.* n. xi. et Jo. Medina. in Sa. v. Eleemosyn.

<sup>3</sup> Bonacin. i. præcept. d. iii. q. iv. p. 6, n. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Extreme egere dicitur, non solum qui jam animam agit vel spirat: sed etiam cum indicia probabilia apparent eo deventurum, nisi ei subveniatur, et non se offert nec expectatur probabiliter alius, qui ei subveniat, juxta S. Thom. et declarat Cajetan.—*Idem, cap. xxiv. n. v.*

<sup>5</sup> Soto de Just. et Jur. l. iv. q. vii. art. i. Licet alienum arripere sine peccato in extrema necessitate.—Sotus, Cajetan. Navar. Adrian. Armilla. Covarruvius. Et in urgenti.—Sylvest. Angelus. in Vasq. *ibid.* dub. vii. n. xxviii. in gravi licitum esse. Sylvest. Medina. Angel. Navar. Pet. Navarra, Malderus et plures alii apud Dian. p. 2, tr. iii. Res. xxix.; Bannes in 2, ii. q. lxxvi. art. vii.

may justly take it from him. But if it were possible in these cases whereto they confine it, to find any place for the necessity of this duty, yet one thing more, added by their prime doctors, dashes all, for they teach that it is not required to relieve the necessitous by giving them anything, but it is sufficient to let, or sell, or lend to them.<sup>1</sup> Navarre concludes it lawful to buy persons in extreme necessity, and lawful for them to consent to it.<sup>2</sup> His reasons, among others, are because a father in time of extreme hunger may sell his son; also, because no man is bound to relieve one, though in extreme necessity, *gratis*, if he can do it sufficiently by loan, exchange, &c. So that if a man were in such extremity for want of food, that he might sell his son to get it for the saving of his life, yet no Christian, in that case, were bound to give him relief freely; by their doctrine it would suffice to let him have money or meat by the sale of his child. We cannot expect they will ever find it a duty to give to the indigent if not in such circumstances; and it is a plain case, where there is no obligation to give, there is no necessity to give alms.

But if they did make it necessary to give alms, yet it is not needful by their doctrine to do it so as it will be a good work (or so to fast, or pray, or do any other act which have any goodness in them, or pretend to it; so good works will, by their principles, be still unnecessary. For that any work may be good, it must be from a right principle and for a good end; but both these they make needless. As to the former, there is no necessity, as they teach, to act out of love to God;<sup>3</sup> for though this be the intention of God, and the design of the law in all good acts, as they acknowledge from that 1 Tim. v., Rom. xiii., yet they have a maxim generally received, The intention of the command is not commanded.<sup>4</sup> Herein they follow Aquinas, and hence they conclude that such a mode of acting out of love to God is not required in any command of the divine law;<sup>5</sup> but the whole, and every part of it, may be fulfilled, and sin avoided, if that which is required be done, though not out of love to God at all.<sup>6</sup> And particularly Soto takes much pains to argue us out of the love of God in all our actings, and to prove that it is not necessary. And all generally conclude that it is not needful in any acts of piety, mercy, or charity required on their days of worship; since there they determine that there is no need of any act of love, as was shewed before.

It is no wonder therefore (as to the second) if they conclude it needless to act for God in what we do, and make him alone our chief end. In the theory indeed they determine that an act is not good unless there be a concurrence of all conditions requisite thereto, and that the end is the principal

<sup>1</sup> Adrian. iv. de restit.; Navar. cap. xvii. n. lxi. et cap. xxiv. n. vi. In quibus tamen duobus non est de præcepto subvenire donando, sed satis est subvenire commodando vel mutuando.—Vid. *Bellarmin.* de bon. operibus, l. iii. c. viii. Hæc doctrina vera et non solum a S. Thom., sed etiam ab aliis Theologis communiter tradi solet.—Vid. *plures in Vasq. ibid.* dub. vi. n. l.

<sup>2</sup> Licet eos emere et illis emptioni suæ consentire, c. xxii. n. lxxv. Quia pater tempore famis extremæ filium vendere potest—tum quia nemo tenetur ad gratis subveniendum, egentibus etiam extreme, modo commodando, vel mutuando satis ei succurrat.—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Alexander Alensis, Petr. Lombard, Aquinas, Angelus, Sylvester, Canus, Soto, Jac. de Graffius, &c. supra.

<sup>4</sup> Ex D. Thom. et graviorum autorum sententia, ad finem legislatoris minime teneatur, sed ad media, &c.—*Canus, Relect. de pœnit.* part. iv.; *Soto de Nat. et Gr.* supra.

<sup>5</sup> Modus talis charitatis non cadit sub præcepto, &c.—*Soto de Just. et Jur.* lib. ii. q. iii. art. x.

<sup>6</sup> Hinc ergo patet adimplem præceptum per actum ex aliqua circumstantia malum satisfacere præcepto, etiamsi non adimpleat modum, aut etiam finem a legislatore intentum.—*Bonacin.* tom. ii. disp. i. q. i. punct. ix.

(as much in morals as the form is in naturals). So that without a good end that act must be naught, and no good end where God is not chief;<sup>1</sup> yet for practice they discharge them from any necessity to make God their principal end. They conclude it lawful for a man to act principally for his own advantage;<sup>2</sup> yea, they count it but a venial fault to do the best act principally for a sinful end.<sup>3</sup> Now, to avoid a venial sin, they hold it not necessary by any command of God, and therefore it will not be needful to do anything but principally for an end so far sinful; and, consequently, unless the work can be good, whose principal end is sin, no good work at all will be necessary. But it is a more wicked end, which they openly avow, when they design by what they do to merit grace and glory, and make satisfaction to divine justice. This is to make Christ a leg, while they attempt his crown; to offer him a rush, with an intent thereby to invest themselves in his prerogative. They should shew us how it is possible such acts can be good, before they pretend to account good works necessary.

*Sect. 4.* But though they find no necessity of good works by virtue of any divine precept ordinarily, yet they seem to make some when they will have the priest to enjoin them for penance (and it is like in this as in other cases, they leave so little or nothing needful that God has commanded, to render their own devices more necessary). But good works, being enjoined as penance, become punishments, and it signifies the church of Rome is no good friend to good works when she counts or makes them punishments; for punishment is properly evil to us, and not to be done, but suffered, and thus she will have good works neither to be good nor to be done. To be sure thus they cannot be done so as to be good, or as becomes Christians to do them; for he that must think it a suffering to do them, does them with the spirit of a slave, not of a Christian. But let us suppose they may be good works, and well done too by way of penance, yet they are not necessary at all in their church upon this account, and so no way. For, first, the priest needs not enjoin good works as penance;<sup>4</sup> he may enjoin nothing at all if he pleases;<sup>5</sup> or some slight thing, that which is good for nothing, or that which is worse;<sup>6</sup> or what the confitent must have done if he had not sinned;<sup>7</sup> or he may dismiss him with this general, All the good thou doest, or evil thou sufferest, let it serve for satisfaction;<sup>8</sup> or he may commend something by way of counsel, without obliging him by any injunction;<sup>9</sup> or he may require him only to avoid the sin he confesses for a while<sup>10</sup> (and when he shrives the woman that he has sinned with, it is like he may not prove very rigorous this way<sup>11</sup>). Or, secondly, if he should enjoin this, or any good work, the confitent need not accept of, or submit to it, as many of their chief doctors determine.<sup>12</sup> Or, thirdly, if he do accept it, yet he needs not perform it for all that; he may be released by himself; to omit it will be but a small fault (such as he needs not regard, be the good work little or

<sup>1</sup> Omne opus cuius finis est malus, ipsius quoque malum est.—*Navar.* cap. xii. n. xxx

<sup>2</sup> *Sylvest. Sum. v. Caritas. n. v.;* *Navar. supra.*

<sup>3</sup> *Cajetan. Sylvest. Navar. supra.* The precept may be fully accomplished where the manner and end is naught.—*Bonacin. ibid. et apud eum, Aquinas, Sotus, Navar, Medina, et alii.*

<sup>4</sup> *Vid. Sylv. v. Confess. iv. n. ii.;* *Suarez, iii. tom. iv. disp. xxxviii. sect. vi. n. iv.*

<sup>5</sup> *Cajetan. Navar. ibid. sect. iii. n. iv.*

<sup>6</sup> *D. Thomas, Soto, et alii communiter;* *ibid. sect. iv. n. iv.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid. sect. vi. n. v.*

<sup>8</sup> *S. Thom. Paludanus, Petr. Soto, Navar. ibid. sect. vi. n. vi.*

<sup>9</sup> *D. Thom. Paludanus, Petr. Soto, Victoria, Ledesma, ibid. sect. iii. n. ii.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid. sect. vi. n. ii.* <sup>11</sup> *Vid. Angel. sum. v. confess. v. n. viii.*

<sup>12</sup> *Scotus, Gabriel, Hostiensis, Pauormitan, Medina, Sylvester, Armilla, Navar, in Suar. ibid. sect. vii. n. i.*

great), if he not out of contempt.<sup>1</sup> Or another may undertake it, and satisfy by suffering it for him;<sup>2</sup> or a priest may release him, either he that enjoined it or another.<sup>3</sup> However, indulgences will do it effectually, these serve to sweep away all good works (all necessity of them) on this account for ever. This is their special use, to relieve the pope's subjects from the sad penalty of good works; for though they have dealt hardly with good works, to make them a punishment, yet they will not deal so hardly with catholics as to have it necessary that they should be thus punished. And therefore to ease them of this grievous suffering of doing good, the church in great tenderness has provided indulgences, which they may have at easy rates; and thereby an acquittance, discharging them from the good works they were to *suffer!* And if the priest should be so rigorous as to enjoin a sinner to be doing good all his life, or so impertinent as to require it for an hundred years, he may meet with indulgences will quit him of it, every moment of his life; and if he will, many thousand years over and above. And if this cannot be had unless he pay for it, yet for his encouragement they teach that it is better to lay out his money for an indulgence than in deeds of charity.<sup>4</sup> So that there is no such goodness or necessity in the best work a priest can enjoin, but it may be better, and more necessary, to give the pope money; and this done, through his indulgence, there may be no need to do any more.

### THE CONCLUSION.

By the premises, it is manifest that popery, by its practical principles, is destructive to Christianity and the souls of men. As to Christianity, whether we consider it in general as religion, or in its specialities as the best religion, it is both ways by the popish doctrine ruined. This plucks up the fundamentals of it, and dissolves the whole structure, and buries and confounds both the necessary materials, and the peculiar excellences thereof, in its rubbish. There can be no religion in reality without real worship, this being essential to it; yet their doctrine declares it needless, either for clergy or people to be real worshippers of God, being so far from engaging them to be reverent or devout, or sincere, or affectionate towards God in religious addresses, that it will not have them obliged so much as actually to mind God when they pretend to worship him. There needs not so much as one act of true and real worship, to make them as religious, and as much Christians, as is necessary by their divinity; so that Christianity, as they form it, is a religion regardless of God, even when, if ever, he should be most observed and honoured, and thereby sunk lower than heathenism, and the notions of natural religion retained by infidels. Further, it discharges those acts and duties of Christianity which are necessary and essential to it; and allows and encourages all that it forbids, and condemns even what is most repugnant to, and inconsistent with it. It makes all Christian acts and duties needless, and all wickedness opposite thereto, safe and practicable, without

<sup>1</sup> Omittere satisfactionem est peccatum; sed non mortale, si desit contemptus: quia non omititur aliquid necessarium ad salutem.—*Cajetan. Sum. v. satisfact. p. 520.*

<sup>2</sup> Communis sententia theologorum est, posse pœnitentem implere per alium satisfactionem sibi impositam. Ita D. Thom. Paludanus, Sylvester, Alensis in Suar. *ibid. sect. ix. n. i.*

<sup>3</sup> Opinio communis est quam tenet Sylvest. Angelus, Navar, Rosella, Victoria, Ledesma, Medina. *ibid. sect. x. n. iv.*

<sup>4</sup> An sit melius dare argentum in Eleemosynam, quam dare in subsidium ad consequendam indulgentiam?—loquendo ex genere ceuseo esse melius, subsidium facere ad consequendam indulgentiam.—*Idem, ibid. disp. xlix. sect. v. n. vii. p. 633.*

fear of condemnation ; and there needs no more to ruin the religion of Christ. A great part of those duties are by this doctrine mere matter of counsel, and thereby they are made no duties, all obligation to perform them being, in that notion, quite dissolved. The remnant (all conscience of which is not swallowed up in counsels) which they cannot but acknowledge to be duties, yet they will have them to be so but sometimes, and that very rarely, and when that is they cannot tell ; it is not certainly known when, and the observance thereof must be correspondent : nobody knows certainly when. Or if they guess at the time, and point some out as probable, yet when the time comes, the acts (though the life of Christianity consists therein, and the salvation of the persons depends thereon) need not to be done, something else will serve instead thereof, some natural act, or faint wish, or false conceit, something or other, though neither truly Christian nor virtuous (with the sacrament at least), will excuse them from all other Christian acts. It is not the accessories of religion only that they make thus bold with ; but thus they handle the very vitals of Christianity, and make them unnecessary for Christians. The very acts of faith, and hope, and love, yea, repentance itself, and all the rest with these, are thus made needless, and they may be true Christians (at their rate), and saved (in their conceit) without ever exerting, in a whole life, so little as one act of grace or Christian virtue. The world never saw Christianity, into what hands soever it fell, more clearly stripped, not only of its lustre and ornament, but of its life and being. If this suffice not to make an end of all religion truly Christian, they not only dismiss, as more than needs, what the doctrine of the gospel makes most necessary, but advance and encourage what is most opposite to it, not only ignorance, unbelief, disaffection to Christ, impenitency, but therewith all disobedience unto the gospel. Instead of the holy rules thereof, they have formed a doctrine of licentious maxims, which give security to the practice of any wickedness, and take away (when they had left no other restraint) the fears of hell from those who live and die in damning sins. Whatever it is that Christ forbids, it is with them either no sin, or not dangerous, or the worst of all, by virtue of some devices of their own, not damning ; so that they may venture upon any wickedness freely, and persist therein securely till death ; and yet, by some evasions which they tell them of, escape the wrath to come (whatever Christ say to the contrary) without either the fruits or acts of repentance. There are many sins, and amongst them horrid and enormous crimes, condemned by the law of God and natural light, and such as the practice of them is reproachful to the Christian name, which yet, with them, pass for no sins ; and they are furnished with expedients to make any other so too, when they see occasion, and in these they will discern no shadow of danger. There is a world of wickedness, which by their doctrine is venial, abundance more than enough, utterly to deface Christianity, and to make any who takes but part of the liberty given by their divines, to look more like an atheist, or a brute, a person of no religion, conscience or honesty, than a true Christian. They can gratify any vicious disposition, which way soever it leads, with impiety and debauches enough to fill up a whole life ; and yet, if he will be satisfied with anything but the highest degree of wickedness, promise him security.

If he could swallow ten millions of their venials every minute at a gulp, they would not (by their divinity) endanger him, though one that will follow the rules of Christ must choose death rather than venture upon some one of them. There is with them no danger in thus sinning, though the Christian doctrine never discovered anything else in sin ; or, if their catholics will be outrageously wicked, and cannot be satisfied with less than the practice of

the most mortal crimes, they will not disoblige them (the party must be kept up though their souls sink), they shall have their liberty upon easy terms; deadly sins shall be as free for them, and in a manner as safe as their harmless venials. That which makes venial faults seem less dangerous than mortal, is because they will not damn a man, though he never repent of them; but even herein they have made venial and mortal alike safe; for, by their doctrine he may live in all sorts of deadly wickedness, and die therein without any act of true repentance, and yet escape damnation. They commend to them several evasions to secure impenitent sinners, how damnable soever their neglects or practices have been to the last. But that of the Trent Council must not be doubted of; attrition (which they confess alone to be no sufficient, no saving repentance), with the sacrament of confession, will pass any sinner into a saving state. This one device of their own will serve instead of all that Christ hath prescribed; if this be observed, though they live and die in the neglect of all Christian virtues, and in the practice of all wickedness which Christ condemns, they need not fear; this alone will secure them. The least natural or slavish remorse, and a priest, is all the Christianity that a papist need trouble himself for: if he can but make sure of these at last gasp, he is safe, though all his life he be more like a devil incarnate than a Christian. By this alone Christianity is utterly subverted, all the laws of Christ in effect repealed, and their observance rendered needless, the whole gospel made a cipher, and a way to salvation opened by bold impostors, not only without, but against the gospel, and quite cross to the way, the truth, and the life.

*Sect. 2.* No more is needful to manifest that the practical part of popery (however it hath passed for more harmless than the other more insisted on) is destructive to the souls of men. It leads them out of the way of salvation, if real Christianity be the way. It obliges them to neglect as needless not only the lesser, but the principal, parts of that way, without which heaven is altogether inaccessible. They that have discovered another hell, may as well fancy another heaven; but the way to that heaven which Christ hath prepared for his people, lies through the knowledge of Christ, love to him, faith in him, that repentance from dead works, and exercise of Christian virtues, that mortification of sin, holiness of life, and real worshipping of God, which, by this doctrine, is abandoned as unnecessary. It tempts them into the way of destruction, encourages them in such practice of wickedness as Christ hath declared to be the broad way. It promises safety therein, and hides the danger from their eyes, it covers the pits (whose descent is into that which is bottomless) with spiders' webs, and persuades them it is firm ground. It leaves them no sense, nor notice of many sins; no conscience of far the most; no fear of any, no not of the worst, such as themselves call deadly crimes. It gives as much security to such wickedness as a heart that has sold itself to it need wish. For what need he desire more than assurance, that after a whole life spent therein, there is a very easy way for him to be saved, so easy that he need not trouble himself so much as truly to repent? Such grace as any priest can help a sinner to (an impenitent sinner) at last gasp, will bring him to heaven, though he never once thought of the way to it all his life.

Such being the rules which Roman Catholics have for the conduct of their hearts and lives, and the worst sort of them being as much approved by their church, as any practical doctrine current amongst them, let it be considered what regard that church hath of religion or salvation, which leaves them to such doctrine as is so inconsistent with both, and what regard they have of their souls, who, after notice hereof, will trust them to such a conduct. It

gratifies the lusts and corrupt inclinations of the seduced, and serves the interest of the contrivers, drawing the world into the bosom of the pope's church, and entangling it there by all the charms of such a religion as dissolute persons would make for themselves ; but if the God of infinite goodness and truth have given us any certain notice of the ways of eternal life and death, those that believe and practise it will certainly destroy their own souls.

## CONTENTS

### OF THE PRECEDING TREATISE.

#### CHAPTER I.

By the doctrine of the Romanists it is not needful to worship God really in public or private. True religion will have God to be worshipped really. Real worship requires the concurrence of mind and heart. In their divine service they require no act of the will, but an intention beforehand to attend their service is enough, though they be not attentive when they are at it. An intention to worship God there is scarce needful. Their intention may be effectual, though they act contrary to it. They may employ both soul and body about other things when they are at their prayers. The act of the mind which they seem to require is attention, but this need not be either spiritual or rational ; so that they need not mind God in their prayers, nor the things to be prayed for, nor the sense of the words they use, but only the pronouncing of them, nor need they actually mind that. The church's holiness supplies their defects, and makes those pass as such that pray devoutly who pray not at all. All due attention in worship is not only unnecessary, but impossible in their way. As attention, so inward reverence and devotion likewise, is not necessary in their service. Hereby their worship is no better than a profane irreligious exercise. They seem satisfied with less worship for God than for their images.

Sect. 1, to p. 24.

In the mass, by their doctrine, God may be less minded than in their canonical hours, where they tell us he need not be minded at all. No inward worship requisite in the mass. It is enough if their attendance there be but an human act ; nay, the use either of sense or reason is not there required. They may busy themselves in other employments while they are at mass. They may sleep a while, or laugh, if they be not too loud. Or talk of their worldly affairs all the while, say some ; others would not have their discourse so serious ; yea, it may be immodest, without transgressing the precept. And lascivious or very profane tunes to the organ at mass may be a small fault. The precept for mass (the chief part of their religion) may be fulfilled by mortal wickedness.

Sect. 2, to p. 31.

Of their ends in worship. They may lawfully worship God for their own ends. Sin may be their end in worshipping, and that without sin, if not principally intended. It is but a small fault to worship God principally

- for vain glory. He that comes to mass or prayer with a design to satisfy his lust, or other mortal wickedness, satisfies the command of the church. . . . Sect. 3, to p. 34.
- How unnecessary preaching is counted in their church, and hearing the word, in such circumstances where it would be accounted needful, if ever. . . . Sect. 4, to p. 35.
- In their sacraments no good motions or actual dispositions (such as are necessary in real worshippers) are required by that church in any that administer or partake thereof. This shewed as to baptism and penance, the sacraments for the dead; also in the other five for the living. In all, the precepts of the church may be fully accomplished by impious and wicked acts. . . . Sects. 5 and 6, to p. 38.
- Even as to the eucharist (for which they profess they have the highest veneration) they may partake worthily who are without any the least good act of mind or heart. And to shut out good motions from their souls, on set purpose, when they are communicating, is but a venial fault, such as will not hinder the effects of the sacrament. Those vagaries which are inconsistent with attention and reverence, if they be not taken notice of, will be no fault at all; if they be deliberate, will be but slight ones. Not only reverence and devotion are accounted needless at this sacrament, but sobriety and the use of reason. To communicate out of ostentation and vainglory is but a peccadillo. And all holy fervour being excluded by voluntary distraction, to employ their souls vainly or wickedly during the celebration is no fault at all, in reference to the sacrament. Those that communicate unworthily to such a degree as is counted most horridly impious, do fully satisfy the precept of their church for the communion. . . . Sect. 7, to p. 40.
- Their doctrine doth not more oblige them to worship God in private. Meditation not necessary, no, not on the holiest seasons or occasions. Reading the word of God scarce tolerated in the people, and that not so freely as the stews. . . . Sects. 8 and 9, to p. 40.
- Private prayer rarely a duty with some, never a duty with others. Not at all by their common doctrine, but by accident, in the article of necessity, which many never meet with; so that many may never pray while they live, and yet be innocent. Some say there is no divine precept for prayer; others, who acknowledge a precept, will not have it oblige them at such times and occasions when, if ever, it would oblige. Even in their article of necessity, when it comes, they have ways to excuse them easily from the obligation, and to make it no special sin to neglect this duty all their life. . . . Sect. 10, to p. 44.
- Their church obliges not any to private prayers, not to the least or those of most account among them. Whenever they use private prayer upon any account, as required by precept, or enjoined for penance (for prayer passes commonly with them as a punishment), or voluntary as a work of supererogation, there is no need by their principles to worship God therein. Seeing they are to worship him no more anywhere, the world may judge what religion they have, since that worship is as essential to religion as a soul to a man. . . . Sects. 11 and 12, to p. 47.

## CHAPTER II.

Christian knowledge is not necessary for Romanists by their doctrine. They

- need not know what they are to pray for. Many of their priests, yea, of their popes, understand not their common prayers. Sect. 1, to p. 48.
- They need not know what they are to believe. The knowledge of all the articles of the small creed, nor of the Trinity, and incarnation of Christ, scarce necessary for all Christians. Ignorance and error in points of faith may not only be innocent but meritorious. Sect. 2, to p. 53.
- They need not know what they are to do. They may merit heaven by following their leaders out of the way. That is the most complete and perfect obedience which is next to brutish, without knowledge and judgment, when they obey their leaders as a beast doth his owner. Sect. 3, to p. 55.
- The knowledge of the Scriptures (to which their doctrine and worship is confessed to be repugnant) unnecessary in a manner for all sorts; not only for the people and monastics, but their confessors and preachers. Their bishops afraid to look into the Bible lest it should make them heretics. Therefore very few of their bishops in the council of Trent (who decreed so many new articles of faith) had knowledge in theology. Their popes commonly no divines, many of them understood not Latin, though not only their church-service and laws, but their authentic edition of the Scripture be confined to that language. The people, the further they are from knowledge, the more excusable, if they take no care nor pains to get it. . . . . Sect. 4, to p. 62.

### CHAPTER III.

- Their doctrine makes it needless to love God. There is no command for habitual love to God. The acts of this love are as unnecessary. The imperate acts thereof not enjoined; neither God nor the church requires any to observe the commands of God out of love to him. Sects. 1 and 2, to p. 64.
- How needless the elicit acts of this love are. Some hold there is no command for this actual love (any inward act of it) that binds them, or no special command. Others, who acknowledge a precept, will not have it to bind them upon any occasion when, if ever, it would oblige. Not when they have sinned against him. Not when he expresses his love. Not when he discovers his infinite excellencies to them. Not when they are to worship him. Not at any sacrament, no, not the eucharist. It is too much to love God once a week, or once a year, or once in four or five years. One act of love once in a life may be enough; yea, and more than needs too, for when that time comes (if ever it come) when they will have any obliged to an act of love, yet they then assign something else which will serve instead of it, and so render it needless still. A love which is the issue of nature unsanctified may suffice. Or to love God less than other things, only more than mortal crimes, may be enough. Or to do nothing against this love, though there be no acts of it or from it, may be sufficient. Or external acts may satisfy. Or if a man believes that he loves God above all, though indeed he does not, it may serve the turn. Or attrition (which includes something repugnant to this love) with their sacrament of confession, may excuse him from loving God at the point of death, though he never once loved him in his life before. How extremely pernicious and ridiculous this their doctrine is. . . . . Sect. 3 and 4, to p. 75.

## CHAPTER IV.

- By their doctrine no faith is necessary, but that which is neither justifying nor saving. That which they will have necessary for the ignorant is what they call implicit. A faith which they may have without actually believing any one article of the Christian faith. And is consistent with the belief of what is quite opposite to the Christian belief. And is but such a faith as Jews, Turks, and Pagans have. This was not thought sufficient for Christians till they were thought something like asses, and so expressed by some of their great saints and doctors. How many ways they have to exempt the people from the obligation of all precepts for any other than this brutish faith. . . . Sect. 1, to p. 79.
- The faith requisite in the more intelligent to justify them they call explicit. This, as described by them in its object, includes things uncertain, impertinent, false, impossible, and ridiculous, as points that must be certainly believed unto justification. This of itself (as themselves say) deserves not the name of a virtue, is an idle, dead thing, may be found in the worst of men, and in the devils too. Yet it is with them the Christian, the Catholic faith. . . . Sect. 2, to p. 80.
- They see no great necessity of faith. The pope (the head of their church) needs it not. And the body may make a shift without it, if any one among all the members have it but. And one act of it in a whole life may serve. The ruder sort may be helped to this act (which will serve once for all) by making the sign of the cross, as their grave divines direct them. . . . Sect. 3, to p. 82.

## CHAPTER V.

- No necessity of true repentance for any sort of sins, by their doctrine. Of original sin, or the corruption of our natures, no man can be obliged to repent. . . . Sect. 1, to p. 83.
- It is as needless for those many (and divers of them horrid sins), which they count venial. What pretty expedients they have to expiate these without repentance. . . . Sect. 2, to p. 84.
- For mortal sins some teach there is no divine command to repent. And so to live and die impenitently will be no transgression. No need of it any way, either as a duty enjoined, or as a medium. Sect. 3, to p. 85.
- Others who confess there is a command for it, will not have it oblige any sinner presently. No sin nor danger to defer repentance. Nor will they have it needful at such times and occasions which, if any, would be the necessary seasons for it. Not at solemn times of worship. Not on days of fasting. Not when visited with great calamities. Not when sins are brought to their remembrance. Not when they address themselves to their sacraments, no, not that of penance. Sects. 4 & 5, to p. 89.
- No need to repent till one be at the point of death. Nor is it so needful then, or any time before, but something else may serve without it. A repentance without any sensible sorrow for, or actual resolution against, sin, is sufficient. Or a penance merely natural may suffice. Or a slight remorse in the lowest degree possible, one act of it, despatched in an instant, and never repeated, will be enough. Or if a man conceive that he truly repents, though really he does not, this may serve the turn. Or if he know that he does not repent sufficiently, yet if he signify that

he would grieve more, and is sorry that he does not, this will be effectual. Or attrition with the sacrament will unquestionably justify him. Attrition with them is far distant from true repentance. Several sorts of it. Any of them seem sufficient by the Council of Trent. The general concurrence of their divines for the sufficiency of attrition, yet the best sort of it confessed to be morally evil. . . Sects. 6 & 7, to p. 98.

When they have excluded true repentance by attrition, they reduce attrition to nothing; yet will have it still sufficient. The least servile dislike of sin, in the lowest degree, though it be gone in a moment, though it be merely natural, is enough. Or if there be but a dislike that this dislike is wanting, Or a willingness to have it in those who have it not. Or a man's thinking probably that he hath it when he hath it not. Or a willingness without it to receive the sacrament will serve the turn. Yea, even without their sacrament of penance, attrition with the eucharist, or extreme unction, or the mass, or without any sacrament at all, may procure pardon. What ways attrition may secure them when they cannot have a priest, or the rites proper to priests, while they live, or after they are dead without them. Sect. 8, to p. 148.

This doctrine, which makes saving faith, love to God, and true repentance needless, is established by the council of Trent. Their sacrament of penance hath no ground in the word of God. And being taught to depend on it for pardon, and to neglect the things of most necessary importance to salvation, it proves a most damning imposture. Their doctrine thus making repentance needless, plainly destroys Christianity, debauches the lives, and ruins the souls of sinners. And is one of the most pernicious heresies that ever was broached.

Sects. 9, 10, & 11, to p. 103.

## CHAPTER VI.

Their doctrine leaves no necessity of holiness of life. It is enough to denominate their universal church holy, if there be but one holy man in it. One act of charity, the least of all, may make one a holy man. Other maxims of this tendency. How they destroy the necessity of holy life, by making it needless to exercise virtue and avoid sin.

Sect. 1, to p. 104.

How they make the exercise of Christian virtues unnecessary in general, more particularly hope (one of the three divine virtues) fares no better than faith and love. They leave themselves no good ground of hope. Their hope a conjecture, founded upon a delusion. The precept for hope obliges not but in the more grievous assaults of despair. So that not one of a thousand in popery need have any hope in God. No, not any, since the command for it may be satisfied by other acts.

Sects. 2 & 3, to p. 105.

Their doctrine leaves no room for, no ground of, humility, no sense of sinfulness, weakness, unworthiness. It is pregnant with pride and arrogance. . . . . Sect. 4, to p. 107.

Brotherly love unnecessary by their doctrine. No need of love to any, unless in necessity. Nor then, though the necessity be extreme, if we help them, though not out of Christian love. This extended not only to external, but spiritual necessities. If the acts whereby we should relieve their souls be neglected, it may pass for a small fault. Those who have no Christian love, if they believe they have it, may be ex-

cused from sin. No precept requires any special act of love to our brethren. No affirmative command for such love. It is enough that we do nothing against them. . . . Sect. 5, to p. 108.

In destroying the necessity of those radical graces instanced in before, they root out the rest. Particularly those that depend upon love to God, viz., delight in God, desires to enjoy him, hatred of sin, sorrow for it as an offence to God, and filial fear. By their common doctrine, there is no special command for any fear of God. So that the want of all fear of God, filial or servile, is no special sin. Since they need not act out of love, they exempt themselves from all acts truly Christian, and any other Christianity than honest heathenism. All exercise of virtues opposite to acts accounted but venially evil, is with them needless. The monstrous consequences of this. . . . Sects. 6, 7, & 8, to p. 111.

A special expedient, whereby they make the exercise of Christian virtues unnecessary, is their turning the commands of God into counsels, such as need not be observed. Such they count many of those excellent rules in Christ's sermon on the mount. These and many others specified. More instances in virtues which concern ourselves, God, and others, in acts of temperance and contentment, in acts of religion, and in acts of righteousness and mercy. Also mortification, crucifying the world, self-denial, taking up the cross, and all growth in grace, is but matter of counsel. So is every degree of grace above the lowest of all. Yea, all commands for good acts are no more than counsels, but only in the article of necessity. And all acts that have more than moral goodness. And all actings in a virtuous manner, and from a good principle. Exercise of virtue not necessary either in worship or common conversation. Not in those cases where, if in any at all, it would be needful. A way they have for any man to turn whatever precept pinches him into a counsel. There is no danger, nor any sin at all, in rejecting the counsel of God. No, not when conscience dictates that it is good to follow them. No, nor when God further calls thereto by inspirations or motions of his Spirit. They may be neglected out of contempt. And with some abhorrence of them. They may boast and glory in such neglects. They may bind themselves by oaths not to observe God's counsels. . . . Sect. 9, to p. 121.

No exercise of virtue necessary but only during the pope's pleasure, for if he should forbid virtue (as he hath done already in divers instances) the church would be bound to believe those virtues to be evils, and so to avoid them. Further, their doctrine encourages the continual practice of such wickedness, as is inconsistent with all holiness of life, reduced to three heads. . . . Sect. 10, to p. 122.

## CHAPTER VII.

Many heinous crimes are virtues, or necessary duties with them. Their blasphemies waived, because insisted on by others. Also a great part of their idolatry. Their plea in excuse of this crime, from the distinction of terminative and transient worship, removed by their own doctrine formerly opened. . . . Sect. 1, to p. 123.

Their idolatry as to relics. These are to be religiously worshipped, though many of them be ridiculous and loathsome, though many thousands be confessed to be counterfeit, and great and detestable impostures be therein acknowledged. To worship false relics, or the devil upon a

- mistaken belief, is meritorious. What worshipful things miscarriages in the mass furnish them with. . . . Sect. 2, to p. 125.
- They give divine worship to relics, though they give it not the name. They give both name and thing expressly to vast multitudes. All which they count relics of Christ are to have Christ's honour. Among these they reckon all things that were near him, or touched him on earth, even the earth, water, stones, &c. Not only the things, but persons that touched him, thereby become his relics, and are to have his worship. The Virgin Mary expressly, and thousands more may have it; by the same reason, they will not absolutely except the ass on which he rode. Yea, all the relics of such persons may have it. For they commonly teach that the relics may have the same worship with the person whose they are. The best of their relics impostures, that which passes for the foreskin of Christ, his shirt, coat, blood, the crown of thorns, lance, nails, cross, and its liquor. Their relics numerous beyond account. How they came to be so, their own authors tell us. The devil furnished their church with some of them, and crafty knaves with others. Yet their whole religion in a manner consists in worshipping such things as these, as some of themselves tell us. . . . Sect. 3, to p. 134.
- Perjury necessary by their doctrine. If a prince swear solemnly not to prosecute his supposed heretical subjects, unless he break his oath, he is in danger to be damned. No faith to be kept with heretics. Their doctrine ruins all securities that popish princes or subjects can give to protestants. These can with prudence trust to nothing but what will keep them out of the papal reach. . . . Sect. 4, to p. 135.
- Robbery and murder as necessary a duty. To deprive heretics of estate or life, a meritorious act. All papists, princes, or others, are bound in conscience by that which is most obliging in their religion, utterly to root out all they account heretics, and to seize on all they have. A decree of a general council for it, which encourages the execution with promises of the greatest rewards, and enforces it with threatenings of most dreadful import. They must not be counted catholics unless they do it. It hath been effected or attempted in all countries where the papists had power to do it, or but thought that they had it. The reason why they do it not in England and some other places is, as themselves declare, because they have not yet power enough. . . . Sect. 5, to p. 137.
- Sorcery and conjuration part of their religion. This manifested in their sacramentals, where by their own rules there is a tacit invocation of the devil. Their excuses here insufficient. Even their mode of praying too like conjuring. . . . Sect. 6, to p. 140.
- The chief act of their religion is to destroy Christ, by sacrificing him daily in the mass, which they maintain they do truly and really. . . . Sect. 7, to p. 143.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Their doctrine tends to destroy holiness of life, by encouraging the continual practice of all sort of wickedness under the notion of venials. What hatred of God. What acts of infidelity and idolatry. What distrustful cares. What irreligiousness in all religious exercises. What use of witches. Or dealing with the devil. What irreverence towards God in adjuation. . . . Sect. 1, to p. 144.

What impious swearing almost at every word. In horrid terms. Without offering to break off this ungodly custom. Binding themselves by oaths, and threatening God that they will sin against him. And never comply with his will in things which he commends to them as most excellent. What fraudulent oaths. What perjuries of all sorts, both as to assertory and promissory oaths, not worse for being most frequent and customary. . . . . Sect. 2, to p. 149.

What blasphemies. Out of levity, passion, or inconsiderateness. Or from wicked custom and contempt of a man's own salvation. The more habitual and customary blaspheming is the better. Sect. 3, to p. 150.

What profaning of holy time. Where it is manifest, that little or nothing at all of religion need be made conscience of amongst them; even at the only time set apart for the acts and exercises of it. Sect. 4, to p. 153.

What irreverence in children to parents. They may be ashamed of them. And curse them; as parents may curse them again. What unaffectionateness. They may desire the death of their parents for some outward advantage. Or by accusations procure their death. What disobedience in all things, out of negligence or sensuality. And in matters of greatest importance as to this life. Or in matters which concern their salvation. Parents have no right to oblige their daughters not to be whores. . . . . Sect. 5, to p. 155.

What murder of soul or body. As to acts inward and outward. What hatred. What outrageous anger. What revenge. Desires of the death, not only of enemies, but nearest relations, because they are poor, or not handsome, may be innocent. Actual killing them without deliberation is no fault, when not fully deliberate (when ordinarily many things may hinder it from being so) is but little worse. . . . .

Sect. 6, to p. 156.

What uncleanness. Fornication in its own nature not evil with some. Adultery one of the lesser sins. To seek or receive hire for whoredom scarce a fault, even in a nun. The conjugal act before marriage venial. And also to lie with one contracted privately, after a public contract with another. A woman whose chastity is attempted with some force need not cry out, nor make any resistance, but may take natural pleasure in the act. How excused when drawn to it by courtship. Those who are disposed to fornication may innocently be invited to it. Self-pollution may be desired or delighted in as past or future for a good end. To venture upon the occasions. To use hot provoking means, carnal touches. To expose themselves to place, company, sights, persuasions, opportunities that are ensnaring. To use filthy discourse, or a tempting garb, all venial. . . . . Sect. 7, to p. 159.

What stealing in all sorts, children, servants, wives. Mortal theft is so stated that they may make it venial when they please. They may steal little or much. Of these many instances. What cheating in false measures. Or the quality or substance of what they sell. They may promote the cheat with lies or worse. And defraud those who entrust them. Their church laws allow cozening, so it be but as to half of the worth of the commodity. . . . . Sect. 8, to p. 164.

What lying. They may lie merrily, and do it customarily, out of mere pleasure in telling lies, yea out of malice. They may lie whenever it will be for their advantage, if it do no great mischief, or they do but think so. To tell lies for their religion is piety. No sort of lies mortal but by accident, when they do great mischief, as speaking the truth may do. Nor in many cases when they do such mischief. They may

- use lies in commerce, and confirm them with oaths, both together may be but venial. Also in courts of judicature. How both judge and witnesses may lie there. They may bear false witness in favour of one another. They may delude the court by equivocation or mental reserves. Even a priest may swear he knows nothing of what he has heard in confession, with this reserve, he knows it not as man, but as God. They have lies in their divine office. Abundance of such stuff, or worse, is confessed to be there. Nor would they have all purged out, lest none of their old service should be left. They may tell lies in the pulpit. But some of them would have such rank ones avoided as the hearers may smell out. They may do it even in confession, and delude the priest with lies in much variety. And he may delude them likewise, pretending that he absolves them, when he neither doth it nor intends it. Since they have such liberty to lie everywhere, when can they be trusted? . . . . . Sect. 9, to p. 172.
- What perfidiousness venial. How they may be perfidious for delight, or advantage. They may make promises outwardly, without intention to be obliged. Yea, they may deny, with oaths too, that they promised. Internal promises, though made in the form of a vow, or with an oath added, oblige them not. How easily they may excuse the worst perfidiousness. The firmest promises bind not but under venial guilt, unless they be in writing or with an oath. Nor then, if they intended not thereby to be obliged. . . . . Sect. 10, to p. 175.
- What hypocrisy. To make false shows of sanctity for a good end is no sin. Bare hypocrisy venial, though one delight to play the hypocrite. Yea, when it is for a bad end, though the fault be doubled it is venial still. They reverence hypocrisy as a holy art. It is amongst the commendations of their great saints, and recommended by them to their religious. If they feign more holiness than they have, to edify others, it is rather meritorious than faulty. Their church much concerned for the honour of hypocrisy. . . . . Sect. 11, to p. 176.
- What calumny. How many ways they have to ruin the reputation of others without mortal guilt. Amongst others, if one speak ill of them or their church, though truly, they may charge him with false crimes. A small fault for one to defame himself. . . . . Sect. 12, to p. 179.
- What flatteries venial. To praise one for the virtues he never had, or the good he never did. Yea to applaud him for his sins, to gain something by such flatteries. Cursing may be their usual practice. It is scarce any fault when used for honest recreation. . . . . Sect. 13, to p. 180.
- What capital sins are with them venial. All covetousness, unless injustice be added. Yea, and with injustice too. They allow them to gain unrighteously. They may gain out of excessive desire of lucre, and make it their principal end, and turn it into a trade. They need not restore what they win by unlawful, or what they call diabolical games. But the loser may steal it from him that wins. Or refuse to pay, though he have sworn to do it, his oath may be easily dispensed with. They may take hire for acting the most abominable wickedness, or unjust judgment, or false depositions, or murder, or consulting with the devil. But then they must be sure to do the fact. No restitution to the poor a duty. Hard-heartedness and unmercifulness to the poor venial. Pure prodigality a less fault than covetousness, though this be next to none. . . . . Sect. 14, to p. 184.
- All pride venial, but such as is scarce to be found in the Christian world. The numerous issue of this queen of mortal sins, as they style it, to

which they are so favourable. To ascribe what they receive from God to their own merits, is confessed to be mortal pride, yet they make it part of their creed. Arrogance, commonly a venial fault.

Sect. 15, to p. 186.

Ambition venial, unless one would be honoured for a crime, or counted a god.

Sect. 16, to p. 186.

Vain-glory regularly a venial, it imports nothing contrary to the love of God or man. It may be their principal end in all things ordained for the honour of God, otherwise their whole clergy, they say, would be in a dangerous condition. They may take livings and spiritual promotions principally for honour or temporal profit. So we have an account why they may make religion all along subservient to a worldly interest.

Sect. 17, to p. 188.

Loathing of spiritual and divine things venial, unless it be on such an account as rarely happens. All in a manner that is requisite for a true Christian may be abhorred without mortal guilt. Rancour and indignation against any who would draw them to spiritual and divine things, a venial.

Sect. 18, to p. 189.

Anger, though extravagant and revengeful, may be venial. The more excessive it is, the more mischief it may do and be innocent. Disdain of others. Audaciousness, immoderate fear, or wrath. Fool-hardiness. Incontinent desires and lust. Love of the flesh or the world, venial. Envy scarce any worse.

Sect. 19, to p. 191.

Intemperance, comprising gluttony and drunkenness, in its own nature a venial. When they play the epicures like Dives, and resolve to give up their whole life to gluttonous pleasures, it is but near to a mortal sin. When it proceeds to beastliness, and the glutton so burdens nature that it is forced to ease itself by vomiting, or other nasty, loathsome ways, it is still venial. When he eats till he vomit, on purpose that he may be ready to eat again, it is no worse. Drinking till the house in the drunkard's fancy run round, is venial. Nor will it be worse till reason be totally drowned. The rare virtues of drunkenness; complete drunkenness will make any wickedness then acted to be no sin at all. And half drunkenness will make it to be but a venial.

Sect. 20, to p. 194.

The multitude of particular crimes which issue from these seven capitals need not be taken notice of as mortal. They have no warrant from Scripture to count any sin venial. Yet they venture to reduce to this account what the law of God forbids, not only when it is of less but greatest importance. To make a sin mortal requires so very much, that the sinner may easily miss some of it, and so venture upon it without fear that it is deadly. This declared particularly. They shew them a way to pass any mortal crime as venial. How they represent venials as so very harmless, that all have encouragement enough to practise them continually all their life, and even when they are dying. Though some few of them may make any look like monsters in the judgment of a sober pagan.

Sect. 21, to p. 199.

#### CHAPTER IX.

They conclude many crimes, inconsistent with holiness of life, to be no sins at all, and so warrant all to live in the practice of them. Some particulars of this nature before insisted on, here only pointed at. It is

- no sin to quench the motions of God's Spirit, drawing them to the observance of his will any way. Yet may they invite others to wickedness when they are ready for it. They may lawfully deal with the devil divers ways. . . . . Sect. 1, to p. 200.
- It is sufficient to pray with the mouth, without the heart. Sect. 2, to p. 201.
- How it is no sin to worship the untensils of worship. Or the word *Jesus* pronounced or written. Or the accidents of bread and wine in the eucharist. Or the picture of the manger, thorns, or spear which touched Christ. Or the ass he rode on, or the lips of Judas for kissing Christ, though to betray him. Or the imaginary blood of a crucifix. Or to worship any person whatever as the image of God, or any other creature in the world, toad, serpent, or a wisp of straw. Or the apparition of the devil himself in a beam of light, or the form of a crucifix. . . . . Sect. 3, to p. 204.
- Perjury no sin. When one takes an oath and intends not to swear. Or swears and intends not to be obliged. Or swears in another sense than he knows is intended in the oath. So they may use equivocation or mental restrictions in swearing. And think this lawful either to gain some advantage, or to avoid any damage. Many instances of such artifice of words or inward reserves which they may use to elude oaths. They may swear with such ambiguities or reserves, when they are swearing not to use them. No oath can be contrived which they may not thus elude. . . . . Sect 4, to p. 209.
- The irreligion of the Roman church palpable in the observance required of the Lord's day, and others set apart for holy employments. When the people are discharged from religious duties at other times, nothing is enjoined them on these days but presence at mass. At mass they need neither mind God nor divine things. It would be no sin to employ themselves in servile works on these days if it were but the custom. Nor to give them no observance at all after mass. This may be despatched before sunrise. These days are not profaned by any acts of wickedness. So that all the religiousness which that church requires of their catholics, when they make the best show of it, is consistent with the lewdest acts of ungodliness and debauchery. . . . . Sect. 5, to p. 213.
- In reference to those whom they count heretics, all relatives are discharged from their respective duties, subjects, wives, children, servants, yea, debtors too. It is no murder to kill a heretic, or those that are excommunicated. . . . . Sect. 6, to p. 214.
- Upon what occasion they may kill one another. A man may with impunity kill his wife taken in adultery, or his daughter, or sister, or his own mother, and this though they be big with child. A woman married or unmarried, being unlawfully got with child, may procure abortion, not only to secure her life, but her state and credit. It is lawful to cut up an honest mother quick, and she bound to procure it, that the child in her womb do not want baptism. They may without sin kill any one assaulting them unjustly, not only to secure their life, but to avoid a wound or a blow (a priest may do it while he is celebrating) though the aggressor be frantic, or in drink, or asleep; or though he have had intolerable provocation and be the sufferer. They may kill an innocent to escape themselves. They may kill one before he actually assaults them, though his soul be like to perish with his life, if they know he is prepared for it, or does but design it. So the adulteress may prevent her husband, and kill him first, with the poison or weapon

prepared for her. They may kill one to secure their goods, or recover them, when they may be recovered in a legal way. Yea, though they be of small value, worth but three or four ducats, yea, but one crown or less. They may kill men for their reputation. If he sees one approach to assault him, he may kill him rather than retire. A blow with a cudgel or a light switch, yea, or a box on the ear, is a just ground to kill him that gives it, yea, or does but offer at it. They may kill men for ill language, though they allow it to be as common as any they speak. Yea, for an affront by mere signs, though he that gives such an affront runs for it. They speak favourably of duels. But allow them to kill men more privily, and by surprise, when they impeach their reputation publicly or privately, yea, or do but threaten to do it. Jesuits scarce so extravagant here as some of other orders. If the civil laws did but give so much liberty to murder, as their rules for conscience, no man near them could have security for his life. Sect. 7, to p. 218.

How indulgent their doctrine is to uncleanness. They oblige them not to avoid such occasions of this sin by which they very frequently fall, unless they fall thereby in a manner always. Divers instances. What liberty they give to unclean thoughts. Obscene words. Lascivious writings. Filthy songs. Such ditties sung to the organ at mass. Offered to God in the person of the church for divine praises. This was the custom everywhere in Cajetan's time, and since. As intolerable obscenity in their penitential confessions. What licence they give to use such things as provoke lust. Also to immodest touches and shameful sights. No need to be resolute in resisting temptations. How servants may minister to the lust of their superiors. Actual whoredom hath excessive encouragement. The pope builds stews for prostitutes. They pay him a weekly tribute for liberty and accommodation to drive their trade. This condemned as most abominable to God and man, even by barbarians; but the pope consenting to it, it is no sin, not indecency for his holiness to be maintained by the hire of whores. Many things concluded by their divines in favour of them. How punctual in deciding at what rates all sorts of women may set themselves to sale. They oblige them not to restitution, but when their religious make use of them, who are to have it gratis. Public prostitutes compelled by law to commit lewdness with any that will hire them. Hence the people (instructed in their religion) know not that such fornication is a sin. He that keeps a concubine at home is not to be denied the communion. Nor will they oblige him to put her away, if that would impair his estate, or delight, or his reputation, yea, or her's either. It is enough if he promise not to sin with her, though he keep not promise. Adultery no sin in divers cases. For the clergy, adultery, nor unnatural uncleanness, not so much a sin as marriage. Burning lust, innocent. Better to burn than to marry, whatever the apostle with their adversaries say. The admired chastity of their votaries consists well enough with whoredom, and is only violated by marriage. Their priests have been allowed to keep whores at home, paying a yearly rent for it. And those were to pay it who took not the liberty, because they might. Votaries incur excommunication for laying aside their habit, but not if they lay it aside to commit fornication more readily. Priests in no wise to be obliged by oath to forsake their concubines. Extremely few chaste, by their own confession, of those innumerable many that profess it. A priest not to be deposed for fornication, because there are very few not guilty. Priests who keep

many concubines not irregular. How they favour sodomy. Married persons may practise much of it together. Their clergy may act it to the uttermost, and be neither suspended, nor irregular, unless they make a trade of it, and do that so publicly and notoriously, as they can scarce do (by their description hereof), if they had a mind to it. Mere mental heresy a greater crime than sodomy with them. Yea, petty thievery a more heinous sin, with some of them expressly, and in consequence with most. Sodomy hath ecclesiastical immunity. All sorts of religious places amongst them are sanctuaries for sodomites, all sorts of uncleanness having such free and favourable entertainment in their church, no wonder if it be the sink of the Christian world.

Sect. 8, to p. 232.

It is no sin to take from protestants, or any counted heretics, all they have. All their estates are confiscated immediately, before any declarative sentence, from the first day of their pretended heresy. Though the papists make not seizure presently, yet those heretics are in the interim responsible for the mean profits. And they cannot any way alienate or dispose of their estates. All wills, sales, contracts for this purpose, are null and void. All may be taken from the purchaser, without restoring the price he paid. Children, though Roman catholics, lose their portions. Liberty given to all to spoil and bereave them. All rules of righteousness which concern propriety are void here, papists owe them no observance. It is no sin to burn their houses. To deprive a protestant prince of his throne. To draw his subjects into war against him. To betray garrisons to the Romanists. To pay us no debts. To detain what is deposited with them in trust. There can be no lawful parliament among protestants. No king. No peers. No freeholders. No laws that are valid can be enacted. No aids or subsidies can be granted. The fundamentals of the government in England, and other such like countries, quite blown up by their principles.

Sect. 9, to p. 235.

It is no sin with them to bear false witness against protestants, when their life or estate is concerned. Or to use fraud and deceit in bargains, to cheat them of all they have. Or perfidiousness in promises, compacts, &c. They leave little that can be sin in papists towards themselves; less towards protestants, . . .

Sects. 10 and 11, to p. 236.

An aversation and contrariety to God and holiness, a propenseness and inclination to all ungodliness and unrighteousness in the horridest instances, when it is habitual, reigning, impetuous, active, is no sin at all in the temper and habit; no, nor in the acts and motions, without consent.

Sect. 12, to p. 237.

What expedients they have to justify all sin in the world, or make it no sin. The pope's power herein. If he command vice, their church is bound to practise it. He can make sin to be no sin. He may dispense in all positive laws, and in the divine law (and against the gospel) at least where God can dispense, particularly with oaths and vows, such as are best, and most inviolable. With the observance of the Lord's day, so as to turn it into a working day. With all public worship amongst them, both mass and divine service. And against the universal state of the church. He can discharge them from righteousness towards men. Take from any man his right. Dissolve marriages. Legitimate adultery. License persons to be married for a while, and not during life. Authorise incest (dispensing with marriage betwixt any but parents and children) and sodomy. He can dispense with any divine

law when the reason thereof ceaseth, and can declare it to cease when he pleaseth. If he should err in dispensing, yet he that makes use of his licence to sin, sins not. He can free any from the obligation to fruits meet for repentance. Thus can he discharge all from acts of religion, righteousness, and good works. . . Sect. 13, to p. 242.

He is excused from sin, who ventures on it upon some probable reason, though it seem but probable to him, out of affection to the person that offers it, and there be more reason against it. . . Sect. 14, to p. 243.

Custom will excuse from sin, and make it no sin. Divers instances. The sense of Scripture must be conformed to the custom of their church, and vary from what it was, as they change fashions. . . Sect. 15, to p. 244.

He sins not who does what is sinful, following the judgment of a grave doctor. One such doctor may suffice (as multitudes of their divines conclude). And will secure him in following his opinion, though both less safe and less probable. This granted to be the common doctrine of their church. So it is unreasonable to except against our alleging the opinion of particular doctors against them, since their common doctrine allows any to follow the opinion of particular doctors, as to belief or practice. Hereby a way is opened to leave no conscience of sin amongst them. . . Sect. 16, to p. 247.

Their directions for the scrupulous of like tendency. He sins not who breaks the law in a strict sense, if he observe it in some benign sense. He may make the interpretation himself, and so such as will please him, or choose that of others which is best for his purpose, though he fear it is not probable, and it be false indeed. Or when the observance of the law is very difficult or incommodious. And ordinarily he is like to judge it so. Or when the observance of it is ridiculous, as the observing of the divine rule has been (by their acknowledgment) long since in their church. Or when there is apprehension of danger in complying with it. Or when he observes it but according to the common usage of good catholics, when amongst the most eminent of their catholics it is confessed, there is little or no worship of God, no regard of good life, righteousness, or godliness. Their devices for justifying of much wickedness (to the excluding all holiness of life), were founded. . . Sects. 17, 18, to p. 250.

## CHAPTER X.

Good works not necessary by the Roman doctrine. This shewed in fasting, prayer, alms-deeds, to which they reduce all good works. They do not, they need not, fast on their fasting days. Their church requires the observance of none of those things, which they say are necessary to the being of a fast. They may eat a dinner, a full meal at noon, may be excessive therein, so as to transgress the laws of sobriety, and to excite and cherish lust, instead of repressing the flesh, and yet fulfil the precept. They may break their fast in the morning (and yet keep it), with ale, wine, bread, or other things. They may eat a supper, too, and that excessive great, as big as custom will have it, when they tell us, it is their custom to sup with notorious excess. They may sup out of sensuality. And may take their supper in the morning. And drink and eat every hour. The quality of their fasting meat most delicious. They may drink at any time, and wine, too (though that is confessed to be more contrary to a fast than flesh). They may drink it till they

be drunk, and yet not break their fast. Nothing religious in their fast. Neither religious ends nor employments. And so it can be no good work, nor necessary in their account. Those that have tired themselves with gaming or whoring are excused. Yet this piece of mockery passes with them as satisfactory and meritorious. Sect. 1, to p. 255.

Their praying no good work. The people pray not in the mass. They neither express nor conceive any petitions. Nor concur with the priest, but by presence and posture of the body, as an image may do, or by virtually wishing the priest's prayers may succeed, which they may do when they are asleep. Nor do their priests pray better in their public service, unless the bare pronouncing of the words (which is all they count necessary) be praying. How far they acknowledge this.

Sect. 2, to p. 257.

Acts of mercy or charity not necessary with them, but in two cases, which seldom or rather never occur, at least together. One is, when they have superfluities both in respect of nature and state; but, they say, it cannot easily be judged that any secular person (no, nor kings and princes), have such superfluities. The other is when the necessity is extreme; except it be such, if any had superfluities, they would not be obliged to part with any thing. When it is extreme, they allow the poor to steal. So charity is not needful but when stealing is lawful. Or then he may be excused so many ways, that he need never find himself obliged to relieve any gratis. Good works not necessary with them, because to act from a good principle, and for a good end, is needless. Their design to satisfy justice, and merit grace and glory by what they do, makes their pretended good works deadly evils. No necessity of good works upon the account of their being enjoined for penance. So they are not done as good, but suffered as evils. Besides, the priest need not enjoin such. Or the sinner need not submit thereto, or need not perform it. But may be released many ways. Especially by indulgencies. It is counted better to give money for these, than in ways of charity. . . . . Sects. 3 and 4, to p. 261.

The conclusion; where from the premises in brief is inferred, that the practical doctrine of the Romanists tends to ruin Christianity, and the souls of all that follow it. . . . . To p. 264.

## GENERAL INDEX.

*In this and the following Index, the treatise on the Practical Divinity of the Papists is referred to by the letter P., while the number iii. refers only to the former part of the third volume.*

**Abraham**, his prayer for Sodom, i. 215 ; in what sense he is said to have offered up Isaac, 452.

**Absolution**, priestly, may be given on a mere presumption of penitence, P. 90.

**Acquaintance** with God, a preparation for bearing the cross, i. 492.

**Acts**, according to the Romanists, alone prescribed by the law, not habits or principles, P. 118.

**Adam**, in innocence, what he might expect from justice, i. 20 ; whether we must repent of his sin, 39.

**Adultery, &c.**, for a Romanist priest, not so great a sin as marriage, P. 228.

**Affections**, for mortifying sin, ii. 227 ; anger, *ib.* ; fear, 228 ; shame, 229 ; grief and sorrow, 230 ; hatred, 231 ; revenge, *ib.*

**Afflictions**, through the righteousness of Christ, made blessings, i. 319 ; are occasions of thankfulness, 388 ; are so many stones thrown at the door of the sinner's heart, ii. 53 ; how God secures from the evil of, 167 ; and does us good by, *ib.* ; how we are to be thankful for, 173 ; the end of, to purge God's people from their sins, 186 ; of God's people, imposed not by a judge, but a father, 188 ; God's end in afflicting us should be complied with, 189 ; otherwise they will be increased, 191 ; advantage of duly improving, 198 ; improvement of, incomparably better than deliverance from, 202 ; why they befall the people of God, 238 ; to be endured with patience, cheerfulness, thankfulness, 239 ; the way to attain comfort under, 416 ; to be used for the promotion of fruitfulness, 458 ; necessary for the people of God, 466 ; how ordered and ruled by God, 478.

**AGAINST ANXIOUS CAREFULNESS**, ii. 137.

**Agnus Dei**, its virtues described in verse by Urban V., P. 138.

**Ahab**, his repentance, ii. 254.

**Abigenses**, 200,000 destroyed in some months, P. 136.

**ALL, THE LORD RULES OVER**, ii. 454.

**All-sufficiency** of God, belief of, a remedy against anxious carefulness, ii. 160.

**Anger**, distinction between, and hatred, i. 148 ; against sin, holy, ii. 228.

**Antichrist**, his character, ii. 327.

**ANXIOUS CAREFULNESS, AGAINST**, ii. 137.

**Arminians**, their inconsistency, i. 321.

**Assertions** of Scripture, may be applied as promises, i. 188.

**Assurance**, how it is produced, and the effects of it, i. 91 ; what they who want, can expect in prayer, 229 ; how near hypocrites may come to it, ii. 264 ; means whereby it may be attained, 415 ; is never but when there is fruitfulness, 416.

**Atonement**, what it is, iii. 58 ; the same with propitiation, *ib.*

**Attention**, actual, not required of the Romanists in prayer, P. 10 ; three degrees of, 15 ; the lowest alone necessary ; impossible to most, unnecessary to all, 21.

**Attributes** of God, objects of faith, i. 177 ; some are suited to every case and condition, 169 ; nothing in any of them to discourage faith, 180 ; consideration of, fitted to produce fear of God, ii. 233.

**Attrition** is a slender dislike of sin, not as it is an offence against God, but out of some other consideration, P. 37 ; with penance, will excuse any from actually loving God, 74 ; not even needful for venial sins, 83 ; difference from contrition, 96.

**Augustine**, saved from assassination by mistaking his road, ii. 516.

**Baptism**, by the Romanist doctrine, valid, by whomsoever administered, P. 36 ; may be administered by force to the unwilling, *ib.*

**Barrenness** and unfruitfulness of England lamented, ii. 392 ; the cause of God's controversy with the land, 394 ; great danger of, 401.

**Basil**, his steadfastness against Arianism, i. 505.

**BELIEVERS' COMMUNION WITH THE FATHER AND THE SON**, iii. 165.

**Believers**, true, fear and hate sin, i. 106 ; have a right to all things promised, 194 ; have communion with the Father and the Son, iii. 166.

**Bellarmino**, his objections to the imputation of Christ's righteousness answered, i. 304.

**Belly**, how men make it their god, ii. 309.

**Bible**, reading of, Romanists not only do not deem a duty, but almost regard as a crime, P. 40 ; reason of their discouraging, 56.

**Blessings**, spiritual, promised conditionally, i. 217 ; bestowed not *for*, but *according to*, prayer, 225.

**Blood** of Christ, with the benefits purchased by it, offered to sinners, ii. 42 ; its preciousness, 43.

**BOLDLY, COMING UNTO THE THRONE OF GRACE**, iii. 110.

**CALAMITIES AND AFFLICTIONS, GOD'S END IN SENDING, ON HIS PEOPLE**, ii. 185.

**Calamities** and afflictions, not to be mortified and reformed by, most dangerous, ii. 191 ; exceeding sinful, 196.

**Callings**, to be followed in the Lord's service, i. 396.

**Canonical hours**, and the divine office, the proper service of the clergy and monastics, P. 9.

- Care and industry, essential to soul-worship, ii. 304.
- CAREFULNESS, AGAINST ANXIOUS, ii. 137.
- Carefulness*, anxious, about the things of this life, ii. 138; getting and providing them, *ib.*; keeping, ordering, or securing them, *ib.*; deliverance when losses have surprised us, 139; not all kinds and degrees of, forbidden, *ib.*; but excess of care, 140; distinctions between care and carefulness, 141; excessive, either draws into sin, or is a temptation to it, 143; is useless, *ib.*; needless, 144; heathenish, 146; hurtful, 148; very sinful, 150; foolish, 153; incongruous, 155; the ends men have in it, 158; means to secure against, 160.
- Ceremonies*, and the preaching of the word, cannot stand together, i. 508.
- CHILDREN OF GOD SHOULD NOT BE PARTAKERS WITH OTHERS IN THEIR SINS, ii. 334.
- Children*, undue anxiety about, i. 426; of light, what it is to be, ii. 370; what it is to walk as such, *ib.*
- Christ* died not for impenitent sinners, i. 28; his sufferings to be considered, to enforce repentance, 55; the object of justifying faith, 77; his terms not hard, 117; easy, not as opposed to difficult, but as opposed to harsh, rigid, unequal, 119; his offices and intercession, encouragements to faith, 182, 204; his blood, how it is a prayer, 207; his excellency, 257; nothing in him but what is excellent, *ib.*; all the excellencies that are in the creatures are in him, and in a more excellent manner, *ib.*; innumerable more than are in all creatures are in him alone, 258; what it is to love, 266; what it is to be found in, 273; implies spiritual intimacy in respect of union, *ib.*; judicial account in respect of representation, *ib.*; real efficacy in respect of participation, 274; how to be found in, 276; his sufferings imputed to us, and how, 285; his death a punishment, a ransom, a sacrifice, *ib.*; arguments against the imputation of his righteousness answered, 289; his active obedience imputed, 290; what is meant by the imputation of his righteousness, 293; his obedience and sufferings not to be disjoined, 296; his righteousness the foundation of the covenant of grace, 308; his righteousness the cause of a believer's interest in the promises, 312; signs of having come to, 340; they who have come to, are sorry that they came not sooner, *ib.*; are acquainted with his being, *ib.*; have a high esteem of him, 341; are in a new condition, *ib.*; walk with him, *ib.*; are at a distance from sin and the world, 342; have renounced their own righteousness, *ib.*; those who have not come to, are under the power of Satan, 343; under the guilt of sin, *ib.*; under the wrath of God, *ib.*; under the curse, 344; the justice of God engaged to destroy them, *ib.*; their outward enjoyments uncomfortable, unsanctified, accursed, 345; advantages of coming to, *ib.*; danger of not coming to, 353; is denied when either faith or obedience is denied, 460; what makes way for his reign, 480; the glory of his majesty inexpressible, ii. 35; his all-sufficiency, *ib.*; independence, *ib.*; sovereignty, *ib.*; his presence twofold: general, as he is governor of the world; and special, as he is a Saviour, 87; special, in respect of manifestations, communications, operations, *ib.*; his supping with his people implies provision, 94; plenty, 95; variety, *ib.*; delicacies, *ib.*; familiarity, 96; complacency, 97; the way to know whether we are in him, 98; the way to get into him, 99; to be without, is to be without union to, 102; without his influence, 103; the way to, lies through the sense of misery, 517; the ardency of his love, iii. 4; how it appears that he loves us, *ib.*; his love moved him to union with us, 6; his excellency, 21; loves men more than the best of men love one another, 26; more than man loves himself, 27; more than he loves the angels, 28; more than heaven and earth, 29; as himself, and in some respects more, 30; as
- the Father loves him, 36; his sacrifice of expiation, 51; how touched with our infirmities, 83; comfort of this, 108.
- Christiani sunt cruciani* (Luther), i. 448.
- Christians*, must repent of their daily sins, i. 30; who are? 447; how all things are theirs, iii. 9; their imperfections, 19.
- Christianity*, a harder thing than many suppose, i. 470.
- Churches*, may be guilty of the sins of particular members, iii. 349; many ruined for unfruitfulness, 408.
- Circumcision* of heart, in the Old Testament, is renewing and quickening by the Spirit of regeneration in the New, ii. 433.
- Circumstantials*, not to be given up for persecution, i. 503.
- Citomachus*, his modesty, ii. 283.
- COMING BOLDLY UNTO THRONE OF GRACE, iii. 110.
- Commandments* of God, virtually promises, i. 188; Romanists turn into counsels, and so destroy obligation of, P. 111; some greater, some less, 119; some Romanists represent the former, others the latter, to be counsels, *ib.*
- Common assistance*, how afforded to natural men, ii. 132.
- COMMUNION, BELIEVERS' WITH THE FATHER AND THE SON, iii. 165.
- Communion* with God, includes union, iii. 166; community, *ib.*; converse, 170; believers have with God, unbelievers with the devil, 173; motives to get and to continue with God, 174; is for God's glory, *ib.*; for our good, 176; engaged in the ordinances, 177; affords the sweetest pleasure, 176; the highest honour, 177; the greatest advantage, 179; the chiefest happiness, *ib.*; means of attaining, 181.
- Compassion* of Christ, a ground of comfort, iii. 107.
- Concupiscence*, carnal, held by the Romanists to be sinless, P. 115.
- Concurrence* with the sins of others is a partaking of them, ii. 335; may be by contriving, *ib.*; consenting, 336; inclination, *ib.*; rejoicing, *ib.*; sentence and vote, *ib.*; assisting, 337; sharing the profits or pleasures, *ib.*
- Condescension*, Christ's, like himself, wonderful, ii. 34.
- Conditions*, attached to gospel-promises, are not conditions of merit, ii. 65; of dependence 66; of inducement, *ib.*; of uncertainty, *ib.*; of obligations, *ib.*; are no more than necessary antecedents or duties to which the Lord will enable his people before the fulfilment of his promise, *ib.*
- Conference* with God, how managed, iii. 172.
- Confessional*, impurity of, P. 57.
- Confessor*, qualifications necessary for, P. 57.
- Conscience*, tenderness of, a preparation for hearing the cross, i. 490; its office to discover sin, ii. 215; must be under God's virtue, 475.
- Consecration*, magical virtues ascribed to, P. 139.
- Constance*, council of, decreed against keeping faith with heretics, P. 134.
- Contingent*, or casual things, ordered by God, ii. 458.
- Contrition*, distinguished from attrition, P. 96.
- Conversion*, a turning of the heart towards a new centre, ii. 19; why sinners are so much affected when first converted, 44; a man cannot convert himself, 168; a universal change, 355; the same thing with regeneration, vocation, renovation, *ib.*; how we may know whether converted or not, 365; condition of the converted safe and comfortable, 368.
- Converse* of the believer with God includes visits, iii. 170; walking with God, *ib.*; friendly conference, 172; kind entertainment, *ib.*
- CONVICTION OF HYPOCRITES, ii. 241.
- Conviction*, wrought by God, gives a new sense of sin and danger, i. 72.
- Corruption* of nature, the ground of a sinner's humiliation, i. 3; is a sin, 4; wherein it consists, 5; is the foundation of our misery, *ib.*; consists in a privation of all that is good, antipathy to God, and propensity to all evil, *ib.*; extends to all faculties of the soul, 10; its mon-

- strousness and strength, 11 ; how it propagates itself, 15 ; mortification of, a preparation for bearing the cross, 489 ; is all sin in one, ii. 203.
- Countenancing* the sins of others makes us partakers of them, ii. 344 ; may be by defending, *ib.* ; by justifying, 345 ; by extenuating, *ib.* ; commending, 346 ; conniving at, *ib.* ; by company, 347 ; by rejoicing, *ib.*
- Covenant*, assurance of interest in, an encouragement to prayer, i. 202 ; of grace, its foundation the righteousness of Christ, 308 ; why called a testament, 309.
- Creation*, new, first step in, is of light, ii. 26 ; requires an infinite power, 28.
- CREATURE, THE NEW, ii. 3.
- CROSS, TAKING UP THE, i. 447.
- Cross, he who will not bear, not a Christian, i. 447 ; includes loss and damage, *ib.* ; shame and reproach, 450 ; pain and torture, *ib.* ; death itself, *ib.* ; what it is to bear, 451 ; to be borne patiently, 453 ; cheerfully, 454 ; fruitfully, 455 ; is ordinarily the lot of Christians, *ib.* ; reasons why it is so, 456 ; embitters the world to them, 459 ; cannot ordinarily be avoided without sinning against Christ, 460 ; they who sin ordinarily to avoid, are not Christians, *ib.* ; they do not bear who lay it upon others, 472 ; who will not forsake their sins for Christ, 473 ; who will bear but some part of it, *ib.* ; who do not think the gospel worth knowing, 474 ; who neglect the worship of God, 475 ; exhortations to bear it, 479 ; to be prepared for, *ib.* ; how this is to be done, 480 ; the pleas against bearing answered, 502 ; of Christ, how to be gloried in, ii. 4 ; sign of, how, according to the Romanists, it teaches all needful doctrine, P. 81.
- CURSE, SINNERS UNDER THE, ii. 517.
- Curse of God, what it is to be under, ii. 106 ; can only be removed by Christ, 107 ; the penalty of God's violated law, 517 ; sin brings under it, 518 ; they who are delivered from, ought to praise and adore their Redeemer, 525.
- Damned*, their misery for not hearing and obeying the word, i. 435.
- DARKNESS, UNCONVERTED SINNERS ARE, ii. 355.
- Darkness, to be in, is to be in sin, the work of darkness, ii. 356 ; under Satan, the prince of darkness, 357 ; under the wrath of God, the fruit of darkness, *ib.* ; near to hell, the place of darkness, *ib.* ; fearful, 359 ; those are in who walk in the ways of darkness, 360 ; who want spiritual discerning, 361 ; who act not for God, *ib.*
- Day of grace, when it may be said to be past, i. 142 ; not past with a sensible sinner, 143.
- Death, the end of a wearisome pilgrimage to the Christian, i. 246 ; of Christ, real, iii. 64 ; violent, *ib.* ; cruel, *ib.* : shameful, *ib.* ; cursed, 65 ; the same, as to the main, that was due to us, *ib.* ; was for us, in our stead, 66 ; the punishment of our sin, *ib.* ; the price of our redemption, 70 ; a sacrifice of expiation, 71.
- Debt of the elect, paid by Christ, i. 274.
- Decrees, God's, unreasonable to pry into, i. 128.
- Delight, an act of soul-worship, ii. 304.
- Desire after Christ, proceeds from a sinner's sense of his misery, i. 87 ; virtually faith, ii. 128 ; an act of soul-worship, 303.
- Despair, only two cases of, recorded in the history of 4000 years (Cain and Judas), ii. 135.
- Diogenes, his contempt of the world, ii. 280.
- Dispensations of God must be submitted to, ii. 489.
- Dissension, a cause of misimprovement of afflictions, ii. 214.
- Distractions by worldly cares, a hindrance to profiting by the word preached, i. 437.
- Divisions and contentions, the cause of sufferings, i. 465 ; who are the instruments of, 509.
- Dogs, why false teachers are called, i. 247.
- Dominicans, required to recite their prayers while dressing, P. 17.
- Dominion of God, absolute, ii. 381 ; justifies election, *ib.*
- Door, at which Christ knocks, is the heart of man, ii. 51 ; who they are who do not open, 80 ; who that open deceitfully, 82 ; motives to open, 84 ; misery of them who will not open, 91.
- Duelling, spoken favourably of by Romanist writers, P. 217.
- Duties, to be specially attended to which are too much neglected by professors, ii. 377 ; for the neglect of which we are reproached, 378 ; which the providence of God more particularly calls us to, 319 ; that have a special tendency to en-dear the ways of God to others, 381 ; to which we have naturally most averseness, 381 ; which we are under temptation to neglect, *ib.*
- DYING IN FAITH, i. 238.
- DYING, CHRIST'S, FOR SINNERS, iii. 63.
- Dying in faith, what meant by, i. 238 ; they who die so, die honourably and comfortably, 239.
- EARTHLY-MINDEDNESS, THE LORD'S OWNERSHIP OF ALL THINGS, AN INDUCEMENT FROM, i. 365.
- Earthly blessings, how they are promised, i. 408.
- Election, doubts about, an impediment to faith, i. 127 ; cannot be known before faith, *ib.*
- END, GOD'S, IN SENDING CALAMITIES AND AFFLICTIONS ON HIS PEOPLE, ii. 185.
- Enemies, God can secure against the power and violence of, ii. 502.
- England, God's judgments upon, ii. 189 ; wickedness of, 302.
- Enjoyments, outward, of unconverted, uncomfortable, unsanctified, accursed, i. 345 ; afford advantage for fruitfulness, ii. 442.
- Ennity of men against God, iii. 18.
- Epaminondas the Theban, his frugality, ii. 279.
- Equivocations, not peculiar to the Jesuits, P. 246.
- Erasmus, his account of the religion of Romanists, P. 134.
- Erroneous teachers and seducers described, ii. 3.
- Errors and mistakes of brethren to be treated with forbearance, iii. 104.
- Essenes, spent their whole time in prayer and meditation, ii. 290.
- Esteem, an act of soul-worship, ii. 301.
- Eternity, living in the view of, a remedy against anxious carefulness, ii. 170.
- Eucharist, in partaking of, Romanists require no actual reverence or devotion, P. 38.
- EVERYTHING, PRAY FOR, ii. 102.
- Evil, a small one, may be great in its consequences, i. 504 ; how ordered and over-ruled by God, ii. 459.
- Evidences for heaven, to be cleared up, i. 241.
- Example of sin, in one, may occasion many, ii. 338 ; of Christ, in forbearance, iii. 104.
- EXCELLENT KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST, i. 247.
- Experience, an encouragement to faith in prayer, i. 215.
- Expiation by legal sacrifices, how it differs from that by the death of Christ, iii. 75.
- FAITH, i. 63.
- FAITH, LIVING BY, i. 174.
- FAITH IN PRAYER, i. 197.
- FAITH, DYING IN, i. 238.
- FAITH, the principal condition of life, i. 63 ; salvation depends on, *ib.* ; what it is, 64 ; comprises knowledge, *ib.* ; assent, 65 ; recumbence, *ib.* ; implies coming to Christ, *ib.* ; fleeing to him as to a stronghold, 66 ; leaning upon him, 67 ; adhering to him, 68 ; rolling or casting ourselves upon him, 69 ; applying him, *ib.* ; receiving him, 70 ; embracing him, 71 ; includes in its sense of misery, 72 ; rejecting of other dependences, 73 ; submission, *ib.* ; resolution to persist in dependence, 74 ; support, 75 ; consent to accept Christ on his own terms, *ib.* ; justifying or saving, its object is Christ, *ib.* ; assents to the whole of Scripture, but does not justify as so assenting, 76 ; is not an assent to a proposition affirmed, but affiance in a Saviour offered, 77 ; its principal and proper object the person of Christ, *ib.* ; and that not barely considered, but as clothed with righteousness, *ib.* ; at first relies on Christ, not as having pardoned, but as

- willing to pardon, 78; wrought by God, ordinarily by several steps, *ib.*; discovery of sin, *ib.*; application of the desert of sin, 79; compunction, 80; inquiry, 81; renunciation of all unsafe ways, 82; revelation of Christ, 83; hope, 84; self-abhorrence, 86; valuing of Christ, *ib.*; strong desires after Christ, 87; persuasion, 89; resolution to comply with the Lord's invitation, 90; encouragements to, 96; impediments of, 101; historical distinguished from saving, *ib.*; former may be had by hypocrites, reprobrates, the actually damned, the devils, 102; impediments to, 101; a conceit that we have faith already, *ib.*; a conceit that faith is a business of no great difficulty, 115; a conceit that the terms of Christ are hard, 117; resting in our own righteousness, 123; difficulties about election, 127; feeling of unworthiness, 129; want of preparation, 133; fear that it is too late, 138; fear that we have sinned the unpardonable sin, 146; want of fulfilment of the conditions of the promise, 155; its object not a proposition or a promise, but Christ, 154; means of attaining, 156; prayer, 157; hearing the word, 170; living by, what it is, 174; a sense and acknowledgment that we cannot live without God, 175; a reliance upon God for continuance of what we have, and supply of what we have not, *ib.*; is not an act, but a life of acts, *ib.*; objects of, 176; divine attributes, *ib.*; offices of Christ, *ib.*; mutual relations between God and his people, 177; promises, *ib.*; providences, *ib.*; directions how to live by, *ib.*; asking in, what it implies, 197; discouragements of faith in prayer removed, 218; faith of dependence may constitute a prayer of faith, though assurance be absent, 229; objects on which it is acted, 230; the name of God, *ib.*; the free offers of Christ, 231; the general promises, *ib.*; its acts, *ib.*; renouncing of all supports and refuges but Christ, *ib.*; submission, *ib.*; acceptance, 232; appropriation, *ib.*; resolution, 233; expectation, *ib.*; encouragements to, in reference to the success of prayer, *ib.*; its difference from presumptuous confidence, 234; the elders died in, 230; direction for dying in, 240; and repentance of the best is imperfect, 312; its power to support under the cross, 498; in what sense the gift of God, ii. 108; in its lowest degree, is a consent to take Christ as God offers him, 122; of formalists may be so like that which is saving and justifying, that both themselves and others may mistake it, 259; wherein it is defective, 266; discouragements to, removed by the sight of God on a throne of grace, iii. 131; though weak, has encouragement to come to the throne of grace, 134; implicit, alone required of Romanists, P. 50; saving, or justifying, not necessary by their doctrine, 75; implicit, sufficient, 76; explicit is impossible, and if it were possible, is not of the nature of justifying, 79.
- Fasting**, Romanist, is no fasting, is no good work, and is not necessary, P. 250; a ridiculous piece of mockery, 254.
- FATHER AND SON, BELIEVERS' COMMUNION WITH**, iii. 165.
- Fear** of the cross, makes it worse than it is, i. 486; makes a Christian less fit to bear the cross than a weaker one whose fears are less, 487; exposeth to what is far worse than any cross we can meet with, *ib.*; how to be removed, 488; of sin, a means of preserving us from it, ii. 228; of God, may be great even in natural men, 277; an act of soul worship, 303; of man, how unreasonable, 470.
- FEELING OF OUR INFIRMITIES, CHRIST TOUCHED WITH**, iii. 81.
- Fig-tree**, kind of, in Palestine, bore fruit all through the year, ii. 392.
- Formalists**, are not in a state of salvation, ii. 295; are exposed to the curse of God, 523.
- Free-will**, doctrine of, the foundation of all popery (Luther), ii. 128; exempts man from God's power, 129; refutation of, *ib.*
- Friends**, ought to be helpful to one another in discovering sin, ii. 216.
- FRUIT, CHRIST SEEKING, AND FINDING NONE**, ii. 385.
- Fruits**, good, what they are, ii. 386; must be real, 387; such as import a change of soul, 388; distinguishing, *ib.*; seasonable, *ib.*; sound, 389; must be in fulness, *ib.*; proportionable to the means, 390; increasing, *ib.*; in variety, 391; lasting, *ib.*; means to be used for producing, 394, 431; which respect God more particularly are acts of admiration, 445; of subjection, 446; of complacency, *ib.*; which respect ourselves are temperance, chastity, humility, modesty, contentedness, 447; which respect others must be both in heart and life, 448; some should be cultivated with peculiar care, 449; those to which we are naturally averse, *ib.*; which are too much out of fashion, 450; which we are specially engaged to bring forth, 452; whose goodness and advantage is most extensive, *ib.*; which we are most tempted to neglect, *ib.*
- Fruitfulness**, advantages of, ii. 412; impediments of, 419; unmortifiedness, *ib.*; worldliness, 420; privateness of spirit, 422; carnal indulgence, *ib.*; mistaking that for good fruit which is not, *ib.*; looking more at comfort than duty, 429; being too much taken up with little things, 430; directions for, 431.
- Gain**, unlawful, a hindrance to faith, i. 121.
- Glory**, steps by which fallen man is raised to, i. 256.
- GOD, CHILDREN OF, SHOULD NOT BE PARTAKERS WITH OTHERS IN THEIR SINS, ii. 334.**
- GOD'S END IN SENDING CALAMITIES AND AFFLICTIONS ON HIS PEOPLE, ii. 185.**
- God**, his mercy should lead to repentance, i. 57; the owner of all things, 366; of the world in general, *ib.*; of lands, 367; the fruits of the land, 368; money and clothes, *ib.*; our children, *ib.*; ourselves, 369; bodies, *ib.*; souls, *ib.*; his greatness considered, 379; his right to pass by some, when he chooses others, 380; the freeness of his love, 383; consideration of his attributes a means to hear the cross, 492; his dispensations, are judgments to all who are out of Christ, ii. 107; his giving over a people, the worst of judgments, 192; misconceit of his mercy, an occasion of man's false hope, 243; his rule over all, 454; objects of his government, 455; heaven and earth, *ib.*; all the parts thereof, 456; things great and small, *ib.*; all things and all motions, *ib.*; actions and events, 457; substance and circumstances of things and actions, *ib.*; end and means, *ib.*; things orderly and confused, 458; things necessary and contingent or casual, *ib.*; good and evil, 459; things natural and voluntary, *ib.*; properties of his government, 460; it is supreme, *ib.*; absolute, 461; irresistible, 462; perfect, *ib.*; over all things at once, *ib.*; easy, 463; continual, *ib.*; his right and ability to rule all, 463; danger of not submitting to, 469; his government in all things must be observed, 492; his government a great support under fears and dangers, 495; is in covenant with his people, through the mediation of Christ, iii. 117; is a God hearing prayer, 118; the manner of his presence with his people, 119.
- Gospel**, contempt of, disobedience to, unfruitfulness under, the cause of God's judgments, i. 16; a great mercy, or a great judgment, 430; preached, is the word of God, not of men, 432; is that by which we must be judged, 434.
- GRACE, THRONE OF, COMING BOLDLY UNTO**, iii. 110.
- Grace**, in this life, has perfection of parts, but not of degrees, i. 38; its implanting and continuance in the soul is from the righteousness of Christ, 307; is advanced by the cross, 458; low degrees of, not to be rested in, 495, ii. 297; restraining, may be when renewing is not, ii. 8; doctrine of a sufficiency vouchsafed to all men, contrary to Scripture and experience, 79; must first be planted in the heart, and continually fortified and increased, 434; throne of, to come to, at once our privilege and duty, iii. 110; equivalent to mercy-seat, 112; intimates what God is to us, 115; as a God in Christ, *ib.*; as a God reconciled, 116; as a God

- of forgiveness, *ib.*; as a God in covenant, 117; as a God that will have communion with his people, 119; to be approached with holiness of heart and life, 124; with fear and reverence, 125; with sincerity, *ib.*; with subjection, 126; with love and affectionateness, *ib.*; in faith, 127.
- Graces*, special, for mortification of sin, ii. 232; love to God, *ib.*; faith, *ib.*; fear, *ib.*; and affections, hypocrites may go far in, 252.
- GRACIOUS INVITATION, CHRIST'S, TO SINNERS*, ii. 34.
- Gratitude*, an act of soul-worship, ii. 314.
- Grief* and sorrow for sin, passionate, is the fruit and not the forerunner of faith, i. 138.
- Habits*, held by the Romanists not to be commanded or forbidden by the law of God, P. 115.
- Hating* of relatives, &c., for Christ's sake, how to be understood, i. 447.
- Hatred* of sin is an act of repentance, i. 26; whether it may consist with any love of it, 38; an important affection for mortifying sin, ii. 231; of God, according to the Romanists, no sin, P. 69.
- HEARING THE WORD*, i. 248.
- Hearing* the word, a means of attaining faith, i. 170; must be with diligence, 171; without prejudice, *ib.*; most heed to be given to what is most suitable, 172; should be accompanied with prayer, 174; we must take heed how we hear, 428; an act of eternal consequence, 431; a sin to neglect opportunities of, 434; is a duty enjoined by Christ, 436; impediments to it, *ib.*; ignorance, *ib.*; contempt, 437; distractions, *ib.*; prejudice, 438; obduration, 439; bad ends and principles, *ib.*; directions for profitable, 440.
- Heart*, tenderness of, what it is, i. 136; of the sinner shut against Christ, ii. 45; what kind of Christ delights to dwell in, 97; humble, broken, sincere, *ib.*; not required in Romish worship, P. 13.
- Heathen*, though they have gone far in outward reformation, come short of true repentance, i. 45; may have moral virtues, but are not new creatures, ii. 9; never refused to admit Christ knocking, 61; how far they may be careful to avoid sin, 282.
- HEAVEN, SOUL-IDOLATRY EXCLUDES MEN OUT OF*, ii. 299.
- Heaven*, endeared to us by the cross, i. 459; neglected, when men are too careful about the world, ii. 152; many think themselves sure of, who shall never come there, 242; how far professors may go, and yet come short of, 245; the greatest part of those who enjoy the gospel have no right to, 293; children of light should walk in the view of, 383.
- Heresy*, no kind of reputed a sin by the Romanists, if it be out of ignorance, and without pertinacity, P. 52; is even meritorious if it be adopted from the teaching of a famous preacher or hishop, *ib.*
- Hereticks*, no faith to be kept with (Council of Constance), P. 134; a virtue to deprive of their estates and lives, 135; have no claim upon any for relative duties, 213; any one may kill, *ib.*; what they have sold may be taken from the buyer without compensation, 233.
- High-priest*, Christ discharges all the offices of, by sacrifice and intercession, lii. 82.
- Hindering* the sins of others, when we can, a duty, ii. 348.
- Holiness*, necessity of, not lessened by the imputation of Christ's obedience, i. 297, 304; of life, needless, by the popish doctrine, P. 103.
- Idly Ghost*, how he intercedes for us, and assists us in prayer, i. 207; his peculiar glory placed in communion with believers, iii. 175.
- Hope*, how it is supported, i. 84; an act of soul-worship, ii. 303; has great encouragement from the intercession of Christ, iii. 155.
- Hopes* of heaven, false, grounds of, ii. 242; ignorance and inadvertency, *ib.*; negligence and slothfulness, *ib.*; self-love, 243; misapprehensions of God, *ib.*; vain and insufficient pleas, 244.
- Humility*, how it may be promoted, i. 437; ground for, swept away by the Romish system, P. 105.
- Humiliation* for sin, a preparation for Christ, ii. 127.
- HYPOCRITES, THE CONVICTION OF*, ii. 241.
- Hypocrites*, whether they can do good works, i. 112; three sorts of, ii. 241; their pleas, 244; many go far in the ways of Christ, and yet come short of heaven, 245; in revelations, dreams, visions, *ib.*; the gift of prophecy, *ib.*; miracles, 246; tongues, *ib.*; knowledge, *ib.*; graces and affections, 252; some kind of repentance, 254; of faith, 258; of love to God, 269; to Christ, 270; to the people of God, *ib.*; of joy and delight in spiritual objects, 273; of zeal for God and his concerns, 275; of fear of God, 277; of contempt of the world, 278; in the avoidance of sin, 281; in acts of piety and godliness, 287; in acts of charity, 291; in sufferings, 291.
- IDOLATRY, SOUL, EXCLUDES MEN OUT OF HEAVEN*, ii. 299.
- Idolatry*, definition of, ii. 300; two sorts of, *ib.*; soul, all natural men are guilty of, 305; whether the regenerate may be guilty of, 306; danger of, 307; secrecy of, 308; different forms of *ib.*; making a god of the understanding, *ib.*; the will, *ib.*; the fancy, the senses, 309; the belly, *ib.*; pleasures, *ib.*; credit, *ib.*; riches, 310; relations, 311; friends and allies, *ib.*; enemies, *ib.*; the creatures, *ib.*; satan, 312; lusts, *ib.*; acts of worship rendered to these idols, 313; continuance, will shut out from heaven, 326; in some sense worse than open idolatry, 327; how to be avoided, 331; of the Romanists, P. 122.
- Ignatius*, his discipleship, i. 450.
- Ignorance*, sins of, propositions and distinctions respecting, i. 31; of Christ a pernicious evil, 259; in this land inexcusable, 261; a great impediment to hearing and profiting by the word, 436; inconsistent with being a new creature, ii. 25; a cause of men's mistaking their condition, 242; wilful, severely dealt with in the judgment, 293; held in high repute by Romanists, P. 47; sum of their doctrine regarding, 55; probable, will make any sin lawful, according to their doctrine, 242.
- Imitation* of the sins of others, a partaking of them, ii. 334.
- Impenitent* sinners, apt to think themselves not so great sinners as others, i. 23; characteristics of, 42; he is impenitent who does not leave sin at all, *ib.*; who does not leave all sin, 43; who leaves sin only outwardly, *ib.*; who leaves sin only because he cannot commit it, *ib.*; who leaves it only out of sinister respects, 44; who leaves one sin for another, *ib.*; who leaves sin hut for a time, *ib.*; who leaves sin, but does not endeavour to subdue it, *ib.*; who so turns from sin as he doth not turn to God, 45; who never had a full, clear, discovery of sin, 46; who has not some sense of the corruption of his nature, *ib.*; who is loath that his sin should be discovered, 47; who will not endure a reproof, *ib.*; their misery, 48.
- Impotence* of men to do anything without Christ, ii. 104; a total privation of power, *ib.*; to satisfy justice, *ib.*; to pacify the hatred and wrath of God, 105; to avoid the curse of the law of God, 106; to escape judgments, 107; to deliver from hell, *ib.*; to procure or act any grace, 108; to subdue any lust, 110; to improve any ordinance, 111; to remove any spiritual distemper, 112; to do anything as they ought, 113; consistent with endeavour, 131.
- Imputation* of Christ's sufferings, equivalent to the acceptance of them for us, i. 285; of his righteousness taught in hundreds of places of Scripture, 289; of his active obedience, 290; views of the Arminians and Papists, 295; of sin to Christ, not unrighteous, iii. 52.
- Indifferent* things, not to be used to the offence of others, li. 335.
- INFIRMITIES, OUR, CHRIST TOUCHED WITH THE FEELING OF*, iii. 81.

- Infirmities*, with the feeling of which Christ is touched, are whatever our weak and frail condition makes us subject to suffer by, iii. 82; he knows them all, 83; knows them experimentally, *ib.*; is affected with them, 84; pities, has compassion on them, *ib.*; and that with the motions and acts of love, *ib.*; with an inclination to succour and relieve, *ib.*; is affected with them as a man, 85; as one very much and nearly concerned in us, 86; affected with them really and to purpose, 87; with all of them, 88; with those which are the effects of sin, *ib.*; his sympathy proportionable, 91; constant and perpetual, 92.
- Iniquity*, purging of, better than outward deliverance, ii. 201.
- INSUFFICIENCY, MAN'S, TO DO ANYTHING OF HIMSELF**, ii. 101.
- Intention*, an act of soul worship, ii. 301; virtual, all that is required of the Romish clergy in their offices, P. 11; habitual, held to be sufficient, 12; implicit, held to suffice, *ib.*; is held to exist, though there be none, provided only there be not an absolutely contrary intention, 14.
- INTERCESSION, CHRIST'S MAKING**, iii. 143.
- Intercession* of Christ, a great encouragement in prayer, i. 204; consists in appearing for us, *ib.*; presenting our persons to God, *ib.*; offering our prayers, 205; sanctifying our prayers, *ib.*; answering all accusations that can be framed against our prayers, *ib.*; mingling his own prayers with ours, 206; praying for us, *ib.*; is perpetual, iii. 144; is his appearance in heaven on behalf of his people, 145; as their advocate, *ib.*; presenting his death as suffered in their stead, 146; his will and desire that his people may have all the purchase of his blood, *ib.*; is prayer, 147; though with some differences both from ours and from his own while on earth, *ib.*; is grounded on merit, 148; is acceptable to God, *ib.*; by virtue of it all believers from the beginning of the world pardoned and saved, 150; its perpetuity, *ib.*; some difference at the end of the world, but not a cessation, 151; should lead us to admire his loving-kindness, 152; is the one end of his life, *ib.*; a great encouragement to faith and hope, 155; advantages which flow from, 156; accommodated to all our infirmities, 159; sure to prevail, 161.
- INVITATION, CHRIST'S GRACIOUS, TO SINNERS**, ii. 34.
- Irreverence* in prayer, encouraged by the Romish doctrine, P. 22.
- Israel*, ten tribes, ruined for sins of which they were ignorant and unconvinced, ii. 205.
- Jehu*, his zeal for reformation, ii. 276; did more than some of the good kings of Judah, 282.
- Jesuits*, their practical divinity not more corrupt than that of other Romanists, P. 4.
- Jezreel*, the "scattered of the Lord," and the "seed of the Lord," ii. 457.
- Joy* in spiritual things, hypocrites may have some, ii. 273; wherein it is defective, 275.
- Judas*, had power to work miracles, ii. 247; the lips of, might, according to the Romanists, be objects of worship, as having kissed Christ, P. 126.
- Judgment*, the principal part of God's government, and must be accordingly prepared for, ii. 494.
- Judgments*, God's, upon others, what use we should make of, i. 16; upon England, ii. 189; spiritual, inflicted on his own children for not improving temporal calamities, 193; non-improvement of, a heinous sin, 196; in what respect we should be thankful under, 239.
- Julian*, the apostate, his cunning methods to ensnare the Christians, i. 476.
- Justice* of God obliges him to punish sin, i. 283; is fully satisfied by Christ's suffering in our stead, 284; men cannot satisfy, without Christ, ii. 104.
- JUSTIFICATION BY THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST**, i. 273.
- Justification*, actual, is not before faith, i. 294; Romanists confound with sanctification, P. 62.
- Killing*, allowed by the Romanists in many cases where it is clearly murder, P. 214.
- Kings*, in what respect Christians are, iii. 37.
- Knocking*, Christ's, at the door, what it implies, ii. 39; checks of conscience, 52; acts of providence, 53; ministry of the word, 54; motions of his Spirit, 55.
- KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST, THE EXCELLENT**, i. 247.
- Knowledge* of Christ, characters of that which is excellent, i. 251; it is extensive, appropriating, effectual, *ib.*; fiducial, 253; useful, *ib.*; desired by the most excellent creatures on earth and in heaven, *ib.*; is a knowledge of the glorious excellencies of God, 255; making those excellent that have it, *ib.*; evil of despising, 258; of not communicating to others, *ib.*; means of attaining, 261; of increasing, 262; how we may know whether we have attained it, 269; of divine things, unchristian men may have, ii. 246; theirs is not truly experimental, 250; nor efficacious, 251; hypocrites may go far in, 246; wherein theirs comes short of that which is saving, 250; the foundation of almost all that is saving, P. 47; decried by the Romanists, *ib.*
- Law*, a non-conformity to the whole, is a transgression of the whole, i. 4; man, in his own person, cannot perfectly obey, ii. 106; we must obey every part of, to manifest our subjection to God, 487; the least part of, more valuable than heaven and earth, 529; a sinner cannot be justified by observance of, 534; commands the act, but not the manner (Aquinas), P. 39.
- Leaving* all for Christ, the condition of being his disciple, i. 447.
- Liberality*, a greater blessing than riches, i. 365.
- Life* everlasting, the reward of faith, i. 97; the present possession of the believer, 98; what it is which they have who come to Christ, 357; another kind of temporal, *ib.*; spiritual, 359; eternal, 361; marks of spiritual, 363; breath, motion, sense, *ib.*; eternal, not confined to heaven, iii. 165.
- Light*, denotes spiritual knowledge, ii. 362; purity and holiness, *ib.*; the favour of God, and joy and comfort, *ib.*; glory and happiness, *ib.*; is delightful, 365; is accompanied with heat, 366; is progressive, *ib.*; consolation to those who are in, 368; to be children of, denotes descent, 371; propriety, *ib.*; distinction, *ib.*; residence, *ib.*; constitution, *ib.*; obligation, *ib.*; to walk in, is to walk at a distance from darkness, 372; to walk boldly, 373; exemplarily, *ib.*; cheerfully, 375; directions for walking in, *ib.*; not according to opinion, *ib.*; follow the light of the word fully, 377; walk above the world and earthly things, 382; walk in the sight of heaven, 383; motives to walk in, 384; otherwise we walk unprofitably, as disobedient children, *ib.*; cross God's design, *ib.*; undermine our hopes, *ib.*
- LIVING BY FAITH**, i. 174.
- LIVING AS STRANGERS**, i. 243.
- Living* as strangers in the world, necessary in order to dying in faith, i. 243.
- LORN, THE, RULES OVER ALL**, ii. 454.
- Lord's day*, and other holy days, Romanists hold not to be profaned by any acts of wickedness, P. 212.
- Lord's prayer*, addressed by Romanists to saints, male or female, P. 47.
- Losing* all things to gain Christ, what is meant by, i. 268.
- LOVE OF CHRIST**, iii. 3.
- Love* of God, its freeness, i. 383; to Christ, a mean to bear up under the cross, 481; attained and maintained by thoughts of his love to us, 483; of God, how manifested to sinners, ii. 41; of Christ, ardent, transcendent, everlasting, *ib.*; to Christ, a sign we are in him, 122; to the brethren, want of, often disguised as zeal for truth, 207; to God, a means to make us hate sin, 232; to God and Christ, what kind of may be in hypocrites, 269; it is not ingenuous, nor superlative, 272; an act of soul-worship, 302; of God, long clouded from the world, appears in the sending

- of Christ, *ib.* ; of Christ, appears by his expressions, *ib.* ; his thoughts, *ib.* ; by what he has done for us, 5 ; by what he has given us, 8 ; by his sufferings by us, 11 ; with us, 12 ; for us, *ib.* ; is free, unchangeable, incomprehensible, 14 ; magnified by the consideration of who are the loved, 15 ; and who is the lover, 21 ; and of the manner of the love, 26 ; is greater than that of the best men for one another, *ib.* ; comprises, and eminently contains, the love of all relations, *ib.* ; is perfect, 27 ; is more than man's love of himself, *ib.* ; is more than his love of angels, 28 ; is more than his love of all heaven and earth, 29 ; is as his love of himself, in some respects more, 30 ; is as the Father's love of him, 36 ; is distinguishing, 37 ; personal, 38 ; how men are rendered capable of, 41 ; its greatness, 77 ; its freeness, *ib.* ; should excite love in return, 78 ; a great love and most extensive, 94 ; free, 95 ; lasting, *ib.* ; peerless, *ib.* ; cordial, 96 ; all-sufficient, 97 ; to God, not required by Romanists, P. 62 ; neither habitual, *ib.* ; nor actual, 63 ; those who say in words that it is necessary, neutralise it, 65.
- Lusts**, they who will not part with, cannot be Christians, i. 473 ; reigning, are idols, ii. 3.0 ; how men make their gods, 312.
- Luther**, his stumbling before his conversion, i. 302.
- MAN BY NATURE UNWILLING TO COME TO CHRIST**, i. 331.
- MAN'S INEFFICIENCY TO DO ANYTHING OF HIMSELF**, ii. 101.
- Man**, the most debased of all earthly creatures, i. 14 ; by nature far from Christ, 332 ; in respect of knowledge, *ib.* ; of union, *ib.* ; of participation, 333 ; of converse, *ib.* ; without Christ, can do nothing, ii. 102, 113 ; alone of earthly creatures, properly capable of government, 460 ; nothing in him to attract Christ's love, iii. 16.
- Marcellinus**, hishop of Rome, condemned as an apostate, i. 477.
- Marius**, hishop of Arethusa, an example of consistency, ii. 526.
- Martyrdom**, in general held by the Romanists to be a work of supererogation, P. 117.
- Martyrs** suffered far less than Christ, iii. 65.
- Mary**, Queen, her persecution permitted as a chastisement for not carrying out the Reformation begun by Edward VI., i. 464.
- Mass**, sacrifice of, its horrid wickedness, iii. 61 ; the only public service the Romish laity are ordinarily obliged to, P. 9, 24 ; only presence at it required, 27 ; no attention of mind needful for, 28 ; doctrine of, involves the daily slaughter of Christ, 140 ; blasphemy in the service of the offertory, 142.
- Means**, of grace, have no efficacy of themselves, ii. 112 ; God stands in no need of, to accomplish the end he aims at, 458.
- Meditation**, how far hypocrites may use, ii. 290 ; not inculcated by Romanists, P. 40.
- Mercies**, providential, are amongst Christ's knockings at the door of men's hearts, ii. 63.
- Mercy** of God, though infinite, does not lead him to pardon the impenitent, i. 57 ; the object of faith, 76 ; the more to be praised and admired, because its object is so contemptible, ii. 454 ; respects misery in the object, as grace respects unworthiness, iii. 111.
- Mercy-seat**, what it signified respecting God, iii. 112 ; a God of a glorious majesty, *ib.* ; of almighty power, 113 ; of holiness, *ib.* ; of wisdom, *ib.* ; of omniscience, 114 ; a God in Christ, 115 ; a God reconciled, 116 ; a God of forgiveness, *ib.* ; a God in covenant, 117 ; a God that will have communion with his people, 118 ; a God that hears prayer, *ib.* ; a God present with his people, 119 ; a God that will shew grace and mercy to his people, 121.
- Mindfulness**, an act of soul-worship, ii. 301.
- Ministers** are sent by Christ, i. 433 ; inequality amongst, the first step to the papal encroachments, 505 ; how may he guilty of their people's sins, ii. 351.
- Ministry**, one main end of, to convince of misery, ii. 118.
- Miracle**, what it is, ii. 112 ; hypocrites may do, 246.
- Misery** of man without Christ, its elements, i. 3 ; not only unable to free ourselves from, but insensible of, 7 ; of man by nature, ii. 47 ; is in possession of Satan, *ib.* ; under the curse of the law, 48 ; under the wrath of God, 49 ; under the sentence of condemnation, *ib.* ; near the confines of hell, *ib.* ; of man without Christ, 118.
- Mitre** of the Romish hishops, what it is said to signify, P. 58.
- Monks**, not ordinarily allowed to read the Bible, P. 56.
- Morality**, hypocrites may go far in, ii. 286.
- Mortal sins**, reduced by the Romanists to seven, P. 84 ; true repentance not necessary for, *ib.* ; standard of, placed so high, that it is scarcely possible to commit, 181 ; reduced to seven, *ib.* ; covetousness, 181 ; pride, 184 ; vain-glory, 186 ; avarice, or aversion to divine things, 188 ; anger, 189 ; envy, 190 ; gula, comprehending gluttony and drunkenness, 191.
- Mortification**, a kind of martyrdom, i. 489.
- Natural** men far from Christ, i. 332, ii. 58 ; and therefore miserable, i. 333, ii. 47 ; consent not to accept Christ on the terms on which he is offered, *ib.* ; are under the power of Satan, *ib.* ; impotency, what it is, 104 ; men, what preparatory acts they may do, in order to receive benefit by Christ, 131 ; make idols of themselves, 308 ; things are ordered and ruled by God, 459.
- Negligence**, the cause of many men's ruin, ii. 242.
- NEW CREATURE, THE** ii. 3.
- New creature**, he who is not, no privilege or religious duty will avail him, ii. 6 ; wants faith, *ib.* ; is not in Christ, *ib.* ; can do no good, *ib.* ; man is made when the Lord creates new and gracious qualities in his whole soul, 7 ; not a common work hut a creation, 8 ; not any innovating humour, *ib.* ; not merely a restraint of the old man, *ib.* ; not moral virtues, or good nature, 9 ; not outward conformity to the law of God, *ib.* ; not a partial change of the inward man, *ib.* ; is a making of the soul new in all its faculties, 10 ; in the understanding, judgment, and assent, 11 ; valuations, 12 ; designs, 13 ; inventions, 14 ; reasonings, 15 ; thoughts, 17 ; consultations, 18 ; in the will, 19 ; its inclinations, *ib.* ; intentions, 20 ; fruitions, 21 ; elections, 23 ; consents, 24 ; applications, 25 ; resolves, *ib.* ; means and ordinances for becoming, 29 ; special duties of those who are, 32.
- Oaths**, Romanist methods of evading the obligation of, P. 204 ; none can bind them, 209.
- Obedience**, threefold, negative, positive, and passive, ii. 281 ; how far hypocrites may go in, *ib.* ; blind, accounted best by Romanists, P. 53.
- Occasioning** the sins of others, makes us partakers of them, ii. 338 ; may be by evil example, *ib.* ; by the offensive use of things indifferent, *ib.* ; by scandalous sins, either in judgment or practice, 339 ; by provoking, *ib.* ; ensnaring, *ib.* ; leading into temptations, 340 ; shewing opportunities to sin, *ib.* ; affording matter of sin, *ib.* ; not removing occasions of sin, *ib.* ; authorising, 341.
- Offence**, of two kinds, given and taken, i. 468 ; fear of giving, an occasion of suffering, *ib.*
- Offer**, Christ's, of himself is to men, not angels, ii. 36 ; to sinners, *ib.* ; to enemies, 37 ; is of his love, 41 ; himself, 42 ; his blood, *ib.* ; his comforts, 43 ; his glory and kingdom, *ib.*
- Offertory** of the mass, a blasphemous service, P. 142.
- Offices**, of Christ, objects of faith, i. 182 ; civil and ecclesiastical, those who put insufficient men into, are accessory to their miscarriages, ii. 341.
- Omission**, sins of, are heinous, and expose to the curse of God, ii. 520.
- Omnipotence**, in what sense it may be said to belong to a Christian, iii. 5.
- Opening** to Christ, urged by several motives, ii. 84 ; what it is not, 80, 99.

- Opinion*, evil of walking according to, ii. 375.
- Ordinances* are sanctified and made effectual by the righteousness of Christ, i. 315; how we must use in order to the making us new creatures, ii. 29; a special means towards fruitfulness, 435; not an end, but a means, 437.
- ORIGINAL SIN**, i. 3.
- Original Sin*, the ground of a sinner's humiliation, i. 3; to be repented of, 39.
- OWNERSHIP, THE LORD'S, OF ALL THINGS, AN INCURMENT FROM EARTHLY-MINDEDNESS**, i. 365.
- Ownership*, of God extends to all things, i. 366; founded upon his creating and upholding them, 370; particulars of, 372; in what sense we may be said to have of the things which we reckon ours, 376; of God, a motive to thankfulness, 387; to self-dedication, 391; to patience, 407; to humility, 409; to self-denial, 412; to contentment, 414; an encouragement to all, 422.
- Papists*, rest in the work done, without respect to the manner of doing it, i. 443; how church government is depraved among, ii. 213; their strictest fast a feast, compared with the best fare of the Essenes, 284.
- Paraclete*, is both a pleader and a comforter, a comforting pleader and a pleading comforter, i. 209.
- Pardon* of sin, bestowed when we repent, not because we repent, i. 20.
- Parents*, who neglect the instruction of their children, compared to the ostrich, i. 259; how they may be guilty of their children's sin, ii. 351.
- PARTAKERS WITH OTHERS IN THEIR SINS, CHILDREN OF GOD SHOULD NOT BE**, ii. 334.
- Pasquil* on the ignorance of bishops, P. 59.
- Patience*, the exercise of, and advantages by, i. 407; a great support under the cross, and how to be attained, 501; under afflictions a duty, ii. 239.
- Paul*, before his conversion, probably ascribed the miracles of Christ to the working of Satan, i. 152; yet was not guilty of the unpardonable sin, 153; his different carriage in things indifferent, doubtful, and necessary, 248; his grounds of confidence in the flesh, 249.
- Penance*, admitted by the Romanists not to be a sacrifice of Christ's institution, P. 101.
- People* of God, more peculiarly under his government, ii. 460.
- Perjury*, according to the Romanists, a virtue in many cases, P. 134.
- Persecution* is through the malice of Satan, i. 456; the enmity of the world, 457; permitted by God, to distinguish true disciples from hypocrites and pretenders, *ib.*; to exhibit his disciples' faithfulness and affection to him, *ib.*; for the advancement of grace, 458; to take us off from the world, 459; to tame the flesh, *ib.*; to endear heaven to us, *ib.*; must be prepared for, before it comes, 479; endured by Christ, 501.
- Persecutors*, are no Christians, i. 472.
- Pharisees* wore broad hats to shade their eyes from the sight of temptation, ii. 282.
- Phocion*, forty-five times governor of Athens, his frugality, ii. 279.
- Piety* and godliness, hypocrites may go far in the acts of, ii. 287.
- Pleasures*, sinful, must be parted with, i. 120.
- Poor*, relief of, not a duty by the Romish system, except in cases which can never occur, P. 257.
- Popes*, not required to be divines, 60; might determine virtue to be vicious, and vice to be virtuous, and the church would be bound to hold it so (Bellarmine), 121; can make sin to be no sin, 237; can dissolve the obligation of oaths and vows, 238.
- Power* of God to help his people, easily, iii. 138; instantly, *ib.*; irresistibly, *ib.*; advantageously, 139.
- Powers* of heaven, the greatest of them subject to God's government, ii. 461; of hell, how God rules over them, *ib.*
- Praise*, or blessing of God, consists in acknowledging that to be God's which is his, i. 365.
- PRAY FOR EVERYTHING**, ii. 172.
- PRAYER, FAITH IN**, i. 197.
- Prayer*, a means of attaining faith, i. 157; of an unbeliever, not so sinful as his not praying, 158; a necessary duty, 159; what it is, 160; ii. 172; encouragements to unbelievers to pray for faith, i. 161; pleas which a sensible sinner may use, 165; what it is to pray in faith, 197; may be heard, yet the thing prayed for not granted, or the thing may be granted, and yet not in answer to the prayer, 201; encouragements to faith in, 202; directions to prevent doubting in, *ib.*; is God's ordinance, 211; has many transcendent privileges ascribed to it in Scripture, *ib.*; nature and dignity of, an argument to confirm faith, *ib.*; is the Lord's delight, 212; hearing of, is glorious to God, 214; others' success in, an encouragement to faith, *ib.*; never wholly denied, *ib.*; usually more than answered, *ib.*; may be in faith, though we be not confident that the very thing asked shall be granted, 216; various ways in which it may be answered, 218; may be heard, though not answered presently, 219; the discouragement removed from weakness in, 222; the sinfulness of, considered, 224; how we may know when we pray in faith, 226; a duty incumbent on the unregenerate, ii. 31; two principal parts of, petition and thanksgiving, 172; should be much and often, 176; careful, 177; earnest, 178; spiritual, *ib.*; in faith, 181; what is meant by praying in the Spirit, 179; motives to excite to, 181; most honourable to God, *ib.*; most advantageous to us, 182; available in everything, *ib.*; to be improved for the discovery of sin, 221; hypocrites may be much and affectionate in, 287; encouragement to hope for gracious answers to, from the consideration of Christ's intercession, iii. 160; family, cashiered by the Romanists from the rank of Christian duties, P. 41; mental, acknowledged a duty, but held to be enough if performed once in a lifetime, 42; prescribed as a punishment, 45.
- Prayers*, of God's ancient people, are virtually promises to us, i. 188.
- Prayerfulness*, honourable to God, ii. 151; advantageous to us, 182.
- Praying* and believing, the life, breath of a quickened soul, i. 327; discouragement in, answered by the righteousness of Christ, *ib.*
- Preachers*, were golden when chalices were wooden, and wooden when chalices were golden, i. 508.
- Preaching*, or hearing, not required by Romanists, P. 35.
- Preparatory* acts for receiving Christ, ii. 131; knowledge of men's sinfulness and misery by nature, *ib.*; and of our own in particular, *ib.*; desire of deliverance, *ib.*; belief that Christ alone can deliver; diligent use of outward means, *ib.*; outward reformation, *ib.*; these acts may be done by one out of Christ, 132; though not certainty, yet probability that these will bring to Christ, 134; these not the cause of conversion, nor even necessary antecedents, 136; yet never in vain, *ib.*
- Presence*, God's, with his people, iii. 119; is intimate, special, gracious, glorious, all-sufficient, continuing, *ib.*
- Presumption*, an impediment to faith, i. 103; distinguished from faith, *ib.*; different in their rise, *ib.*; in their object, *ib.*; in their grounds, 105; in their effects, 106; in their properties, 109.
- Pride*, a most absurd and ridiculous evil, i. 403; a perverse and desperate malady, 410; a transcendent weakness, *ib.*
- Priesthood* of Christ, superior to the legal, iii. 143.
- Priests*, Romish, need not have any knowledge of the Scriptures, P. 56.
- PRIVATE WORSHIP, PUBLIC TO BE PREFERRED BEFORE**, iii. 187.
- Privileges*, performances, enjoyments, useless without Christ, i. 275.
- '*Probable grounds*,' make any sin lawful, according to the Romish doctrine, P. 242.
- Prodigal*, an emblem of a sinner, both in his fall and his recovery by faith, i. 66; his unworthiness did not hinder his acceptance, 129.

*Profane persons*, who arc, ii. 294; those who commit gross acts of wickedness, *ib.*; those who neglect and slight the worship of God in public or private, *ib.*

*Profession* to be held fast, iii. 98; firmly, *ib.*; affectionately, 99; openly, *ib.*; entirely, *ib.*; difficulties of holding, *ib.*

*Professors*, the sad condition of many, ii. 72.

*Promises of God*, objects of faith, i. 76, 187; as the dishes wherein Christ, the bread of life, is set before faith, 76; some conditional, others absolute, 154; ii. 65; how to be improved, i. 189; give encouragement to faith in prayer, 213; their multitude, universality, obligation, *ib.*; must be treasured up, 241; all made upon account of Christ's righteousness, 311; are all articles of the covenant of grace, iii. 133; though made on special occasions, may be applied on others, 134; will be performed when seasonable, 135.

*Property*, to be laid out and employed for God, i. 397; how it is not so employed, *ib.*; equity and advantage of so employing, 399; danger of neglecting so to employ, 400.

*Propriety*, how we may be said to have in the things we enjoy, i. 376.

*Prosperity*, not good for evil men, ii. 465.

*Providence of God*, affords many encouragements to faith in prayer, i. 210.

*Providences*, God's, should be observed, i. 16.

**PUBLIC WORSHIP TO BE PREFERRED BEFORE PRIVATE**, iii. 187.

*Punishments*, God can turn what we most value into, if we sin, ii. 469.

*Quakers*, a deluded generation, have an appearance of some contempt for the world, ii. 279.

*Real worship of God* not necessary in the Church of Rome, P. 9.

*Reason*, is rectified in the new creature, ii. 15; corruption of in the natural man, 16.

*Regeneration*, by some thought needless, i. 336; whether the regenerate may be guilty of soul-idolatry, ii. 306.

*Rejoicing in the Lord*, a ground of freedom from anxious cares, ii. 137.

*Relation* betwixt God and his people, the food of faith, i. 177.

*Relations* of what God has done for his people, are virtually promises of what he will do for them, i. 188.

*Relics*, Romish worship of, P. 123; absurdities to which it leads, 125; enormous number of pretended, 127.

*Religions*, may be measured by the worship they prescribe, P. 34; by this test Romanism condemned, *ib.*

*Religious duties*, to be performed by the unconverted, ii. 115.

**REPENTANCE**, i. 16.

*Repentance*, an evangelical duty, i. 17; taught by Christ, *ib.*; excluded by the covenant of works, *ib.*; required in the gospel, *ib.*; preached by the apostles, *ib.*; was the end of Christ's coming, 18; purchased by his death, *ib.*; has evangelical promises, *ib.*; is urged upon evangelical grounds, *ib.*; is the condition of evangelical mercy, *ib.*; is confirmed by the seal of the covenant of grace, *ib.*; is a fundamental of Christianity, 19; is the way to life, *ib.*; directions for the practice of, *ib.*; cannot make amends for sin, 20; not only above the power of nature, but contrary to it, 21; is accepted through Christ, *ib.*; without it men must perish, 24; wherein it consists, 25; in sorrow for sin, *ib.*; hatred of sin, 26; forsaking sin, 27; must be even for sins unknown, 30; for sins before, and sins after, conversion, and for natural corruption, 32; is an imputed grace, and is to be in constant operation, 33; considerations to enforce, 49; without it all enjoyments are cursed, 55; all sin is unpardoned, 56; all ordinances ineffectual, *ib.*; God is an enemy, *ib.*; justice

is unsatisfied, *ib.*; wrath is unavoidable, *ib.*; death is terrible, *ib.*; hell is certain, *ib.*; hopes of heaven arc delusive, *ib.*; danger of delaying, 57; how it is unpleasing, 61; is the gift of God, ii. 109; danger of deferring, *ib.*; of hypocrites, its defectiveness, 256; not necessary by the Romanist doctrine, P. 82; not for original sin, *ib.*; nor for venial sins, 83; for mortal sins may be put off till death, 87; and then it may be without sorrow for sin, 90; or with a slight sorrow, 92.

*Reservation*, mental, not peculiar to the Jesuits, P. 206.

*Resignation* of ourselves to God, wherein it consists, i. 391; motives to induce us to, ii. 476.

*Resolution*, is an act of soul-worship, ii. 301.

*Revelations* and visions, not peculiar to the godly, ii. 245.

*Revenge* must be exercised against sin, ii. 231.

**RIGHTeousNESS OF CHRIST, JUSTIFICATION BY THE**, i. 273.

*Righteousness*, men's resting in their own, a hindrance to true faith, i. 123; personal, cannot be the ground of justification, 271; of Christ, more excellent than that of man in innocence, 272; attainable by faith, *ib.*; is eternal, *ib.*; which is of the law, what it is, 277; why it cannot justify, 278; confidence in, the ruin of many, 280; different forms of, 281; who they are that have confidence in their own, 300; of Christ, called of faith, 301; of God, 302; how we come to have, 303; its imputation does not supersede the necessity of repentance and obedience, 304; of what use and advantage to us, 305; through it is the pardon of sin, *ib.*; acceptance of our persons, 306; grace, and the continuance of it, 307; the will and the power to obey, 308; interest in the covenant of grace, *ib.*; and in the promises, 311; deliverance from the condemning power of the law, 313; the enjoyment and efficacy of ordinances, 315; improvement of temporal enjoyments, 316; blessing in afflictions and death, 319; turns the law into a gospel to the believer, 315; who they are who deny, 321; those who deny the satisfaction of Christ (the Socinians), *ib.*; who deny the sufficiency of it (Romanists), *ib.*; who deny the imputation of it (Arminians), *ib.*; who deny it in effect, while they profess it in words, 322; the necessity of, *ib.*; how to get an interest in, 323; how to be improved, 326; what kind is insufficient to salvation, ii. 295; a negative righteousness, *ib.*; a moral righteousness, 296; a religious righteousness, *ib.*; how Christ's is imputed to us, iii. 52.

*Rome*, church of, real worship of God not necessary in, P. 9; Christian knowledge not necessary in, 47; love of God needless in, 62; saving or justifying faith not required, 75; no necessity of true repentance, 82; holiness of life, and the exercise of Christian virtues, no necessity for, 103; many heinous crimes accounted virtues or necessary duties, 122; exceeding great and many crimes are but venial faults, 143; many enormous crimes accounted no sins at all, 199; good works made unnecessary, 250.

*Romanism*, its practical divinity as bad as its doctrinal, P. 8.

*Romanists*, some have acknowledged the prevalence of pernicious doctrines among them, P. 3; are wont to disown their own doctrine, 5; required to believe all that the church teaches, yet have no means of knowing what it does teach, P. 48.

**RULES OVER ALL, THE LORD**, ii. 454.

*Rule*, includes authority, power, and actual governing, ii. 455; God's is over all, *ib.*; both heaven and earth, *ib.*; all the parts thereof, 456; and all great things and small, *ib.*; all beings and all motions, *ib.*; both actions and events, 457; both the substance and the circumstances of things and actions, *ib.*; both ends and means, *ib.*; not only things orderly, but those which seem most confused, 458; both things necessary and things contingent or casual, *ib.*; both good and evil, 459; both things natural and things voluntary,

- ib* ; is supreme, *ib*. ; absolute, 461 ; irresistible, 462 ; perfect, *ib*. ; is over all at once, *ib*. ; is easy, 463 ; is continual, *ib*. ; an encouragement to his people, 495.
- Rules*, God not confined to, ii. 201.
- Sabbath*, how to be sanctified, according to Romanists, P. 114.
- Sabbath-breaking*, disguised as gospel liberty, ii. 207.
- Sacraments*, not held by Romanists to be necessary, except for once, P. 35 ; some for the dead and others for the living, 36.
- SACRIFICE, CHRIST'S**, iii. 47.
- Sacrifices*, under the law, were either eucharistical or propitiatory, iii. 48, 71 ; Christ's was of expiation, 49 ; all that was essential to such a sacrifice, found in this, 51 ; the sin of the offender, whether a particular person or the people, laid upon the victim, *ib*. ; the penalty due to the transgressor under the law inflicted on the sacrifice, 53 ; the victim suffered instead of the sinner, 54 ; made satisfaction to God for the sin, 55 ; put away civil guilt from the offerer, 59 ; freed from civil guilt, 75 ; from ceremonial guilt, *ib*. ; but not from spiritual guilt, except typically, 76.
- Saints* in Scripture repented of original sin (instances, David and Paul), i. 41 ; invocation of, began with simple commemoration, 505 ; there is sin in their best services, ii. 114.
- Samaritan*, the good, a figure of Christ, iii. 32.
- Satan*, his two paths, profaneness and self-confidence, i. 280 ; how men make him their god, ii. 312.
- Satisfaction*, made by Christ for us, cannot be without the imputation of his sufferings and death to us, i. 287 ; how made by sacrifice, iii. 56.
- Saul*, king, most impartial in justice, though otherwise a hypocrite, ii. 287.
- Secrecy* of sin, cannot conceal it from God, ii. 471.
- Secundus*, his steadfastness in the persecution under Diocletian, i. 476.
- SEEKING FRUIT, CHRIST, AND FINDING NONE**, ii. 385.
- Self-denial*, promoted by considering God as the owner of all, i. 412 ; as to our own judgments, *ib*. ; our wills, 413 ; our ends, *ib*. ; our interests, *ib*. ; our business and employments, *ib*. ; our possessions, 414 ; to be constantly practised, 484 ; consists in denying our own worth and excellence, *ib* ; our own judgment and wisdom, *ib* ; our own reasonings, *ib*. ; our own wills, *ib*. ; our own inclinations, 485 ; our own interest, *ib*. ; how explained by Bellarmine, P. 116.
- Self-examination*, obstacles to, ii. 211 ; self-love, *ib*. ; subtlety, *ib*. ; pride, 212 ; interest, *ib*. ; the judgment or example of those whom we reverence, 213 ; dissensions, 114 ; prejudice against those who tell us of our sins, *ib*. ; the exceeding vileness of others, 215.
- Self-love*, an obstacle to self-examination, ii. 211 ; makes men mistake the condition of their souls, 243.
- Self-righteousness*, an impediment to faith, i. 123 ; is imperfect, *ib*. ; is no righteousness, 124 ; is unrighteousness 125 ; those who are rest in, are enemies to all righteousness, 126 ; marks of, 300.
- Service*, only acceptable in Christ, i. 21 ; of men cannot be accepted while they are out of Christ, 275 ; the power and the will to render any to God, is from the righteousness of Christ, 308.
- SIN, ORIGINAL** i. 3.
- SINS, CHILDREN OF GOD SHOULD NOT BE PARTAKERS WITH OTHERS IN**, ii. 384
- Sin*, a propensity to all, is more or less in every man, i. 6 ; original not an excuse for, but an aggravation of, actual, 7 ; is more sinful than any actual, or, in some sense, than all actual transgressions put together, 8 ; its injury infinite, and cannot be satisfied for by a finite creature, 21 ; sorrow for must be hearty, 25 ; and godly, 26 ; hatred of is well grounded, 26 ; must be universal, *ib*. ; irreconcilable, *ib*. ; resolution to forsake must be effectual and strong, *ib*. ; impartial, 28 ; all pardoned on the first act of faith and repentance, 30 ; sorrow for, should be more than for outward afflictions, 34 ; effects of, some concern us only, some both God and us, 37 ; original, is either imputed or inherent, 39 ; each of them to be repented of, according to its nature, 40 ; no creature ever got, or can get, advantage by, 49 ; the least is infinitely evil, and deserves infinite punishment, 50 ; cannot be expiated without infinite satisfaction, 51 ; is the cause of all misery, *ib*. ; is the soul's greatest misery, 52, 351 ; is God's greatest adversary, 53 ; against the Holy Ghost, what it is not, and what it is, 147 ; the Lord concerned not to let sin go unpunished, 282 ; its great evil, 335 ; is the worst we can possibly do against the greatest benefactor, *ib* ; is an abusing of the good things of God against himself, 386 ; danger of, since we cannot make satisfaction for the injury we do, 387 ; is the cause of suffering, 463 ; discovery of the heinousness of, ii. 69 ; how we may be guilty of other men's, 206 ; its disguises, 207 ; some are mothers, giving life, strength, and motion to many others, 208 ; what classes are specially to be opposed, 209 ; mother sins, 208 ; those we are most subject to, 209 ; the sins of the times, *ib*. ; those which are less disgraceful amongst professors, *ib*. ; those for which the Lord judges and afflicts, 210 ; opposition to, must be universal, 223 ; how to be mortified, 224 ; of others, partaken of by practising the like evil, 334 ; by concurrence, though it be but partial, 335 ; by occasioning, 338 ; by causing, 342 ; by countenancing, 344 ; by not hindering, 348 ; against knowledge, its heinousness, 4, 0 ; its criminality, as against the supreme Ruler, 468 ; its danger, 469 ; its unreasonableness, *ib*. ; the least, deserves everlasting wrath, 518 ; none absolutely little, 519 ; not omissions of duty, 520 ; nor secret sins, *ib*. ; nor idle words, *ib*. ; nor vain thoughts, 521 ; nor motions to sin without consent, *ib*. ; small, have in them something of atheism, 526 ; of idolatry, 527 ; of murder, *ib*. the least is a violation of the whole law, 528 ; is the object of infinite hatred, 530 ; in the least against God, there is more provocation than in the greatest injuries against men, 531 ; the least requires infinite satisfaction, *ib*. ; the least is now punished in hell, 532 ; the least is worse than the greatest suffering, 533 ; is treason, adultery, murder, iii. 12 ; of saints more heinous than of reprobates, *ib*. ; original, declared by Council of Trent to be not only pardoned, but abolished by baptism, P. 82.
- Sincerity*, not to be inferred from extraordinary acts or gifts, ii. 297 ; nor from every inward act, though holy and spiritual, 298.
- Sinfulness* of outward acts, derived from inward and unlawful motives, ii. 206.
- SINNERS, CHRIST'S GRACIOUS INVITATION TO**, ii. 34.
- SINNERS, UNCONVERTED, ARE DARKNESS**, ii. 355.
- SINNERS UNDER THE CURSE**, ii. 517.
- SINNERS, CHRIST'S DYING FOR**, iii. 63.
- Sinners*, impenitent, under-estimate their sinfulness, i. 23 ; unwilling to come to Christ, 334 ; reasons of their unwillingness, 335 ; think they have come already, *ib*. ; do not fully apprehend their need of him, *ib*. ; too busy to come to him, 336 ; will not part with sin, 337 ; are possessed with prejudice against him, 338 ; their hearts shut against Christ, ii. 44 ; by prejudice, 46 ; distrust, *ib*. ; disaffection, 47.
- Socinians*, their impiety, in denying the satisfaction of Christ, i. 238 ; in effect deny Christ's righteousness, 321 ; their evasions, iii. 48, 50, 54.
- Sodomy*, its abundance in Italy, P. 231.
- Sorcery* and conjuring, passes for an eminent virtue with Romanists, P. 137.
- Sorrow*, godly, has more joy in it than is in the choicest worldly pleasures, i. 19 ; for sin, must be greater than for outward afflictions, 34 ; but may not always appear so, *ib*. ; godly, respects sin mainly as it is against God, 38.
- SOUL-IDLATRY EXCLUDES MEN OUT OF HEAVEN**, ii. 299.

- Soul*, is corrupt as soon as united to the body, i. 5 ; sanctified, its beauty, iii. 5.
- Spirit*, his office as a Spirit of supplication, to pray in us, i. 207 ; stirs us up to pray, 208 ; teaches us what to pray for, *ib.* ; helps us to expressions, *ib.* ; stirs up suitable affections, 209 ; acts graces in us, confidence and reverence, *ib.* ; helps us against distempers, 210 ; is a comforting advocate, a pleading comforter, 209 ; his assistance in prayer, *ib.* 179.
- Standing*, Christ's, at the door, imports condescension, ii. 57 ; his approach, 58 ; his desire, his readiness to enter, *ib.* ; his patience, *ib.* ; his readiness to depart if he be not admitted, *ib.*
- Stedfastness*, a property of one who is in Christ, ii. 124.
- STRANGERS, LIVING AS, i. 243.
- Strangers* and pilgrims, Christians are in respect of their station, the place of their abode, i. 243 ; their design, *ib.* ; their motive, 244 ; their enjoyments, *ib.* ; their usage, *ib.* ; their continuance, 245 ; their relations, *ib.* ; directions for living as, 245.
- Strength*, spiritual, its importance towards bearing the cross, i. 494 ; means of attaining, 497.
- Subjection* to God, should be universal, ii. 473 ; necessity of, 476 ; equity of, 477 ; advantages of, *ib.* ; excellency of, 480 ; a means to redress the disorders of the world, 481 ; danger of refusing, 482 ; duties flowing from, 485.
- Submission* to God, a remedy against anxious carefulness, ii. 168.
- Sufferings* may be for God, though they be inflicted by those who profess to be the people of God, i. 461 ; and though they be brought on us by our own sins, 463 ; positively, what are for Christ, 465 ; of Christ, were real, penal, vicarious, iii. 57 ; a threefold evil in, legal, moral, natural, 101.
- Superiors*, how they are to be obeyed, ii. 468.
- Swearing* by saints, the rood, the mass, &c., is idolatry, ii. 311.
- Sympathy* with one another, a duty founded upon Christ's with us, iii. 102.
- TAKING UP THE CROSS, i. 447.
- Talents*, an account must be given how they are improved, i. 434.
- Teachers*, false, description of, ii. 3.
- Temper*, sinful, worse than many sinful acts, ii. 203 ; good natural, wherein it is an advantage, 441.
- Temporal* enjoyments made comfortable by the righteousness of Christ, i. 317 ; good things to be prayed for, ii. 175.
- Tenderness*, threefold, i. 136 ; of expression in tears and weeping may be where that of heart is not, *ib.*
- Terms* upon which men give themselves up to sin and Satan, compared with those offered by Christ, i. 121.
- Terrors*, legal, no part of faith or conversion, i. 133 ; no causes of faith, *ib.* ; no condition of any promise, 134 ; not necessary antecedents of faith, *ib.* ; differ in measure and continuance, *ib.* ; preparedness for Christ not to be judged by their strength, 135.
- Thankfulness*, to be for everything, ii. 173 ; for afflictions, *ib.* ; for public judgments, because they are mingled with mercy, 174 ; under temptations, *ib.* ; when we fall into sin, that we are not left to go on in it, *ib.*
- Thief*, penitent, his repentance at death no ground to defer repentance till death, i. 59 ; a solitary example in the history of 4000 years, *ib.*
- Thoughts* renewed when a man becomes a new creature, ii. 17 ; must be under government, 474.
- Threatenings* are, by just consequence, promises, i. 188.
- THRONE OF GRACE, COMING BOLDLY UNTO, iii. 110.
- Thrones*, God hath two, of judgment and of grace, iii. 111 ; imports glorious majesty, 112 ; dominion and sovereignty, *ib.* ; almighty power, 113 ; holiness, *ib.* ; wisdom, *ib.* ; of grace, what it declares the Lord to be to us, 115 ; after what manner we are to come to, 124 ; God's offering himself to us, as sitting on the throne of grace, shews he is able and willing to help us, 137.
- Thurificati*, and libellatici, who ? i. 466.
- Ticket-holders* (*Libellatici*), were reckoned amongst the lapsed, i. 475.
- Titles* of God, virtually promises, i. 187.
- Translations* of the Bible allowed by the Romanists, only when they cannot help it, P. 55.
- Transubstantiation* involves, according to the principles of the Romanists themselves, the constant destruction of Christ, iii. 62.
- Trent*, council of, its timidity, P. 6 ; pronounced a curse against any who shall hold that the mass should be celebrated in a known tongue, 48.
- Trinity*, the carnal man's, ii. 300 ; doctrine of, thought to be sufficiently learned by the people in making the sign of the cross (*Bonaventure*), P. 51.
- Troubles* and sufferings of God's people, designed to purify them, ii. 156 ; three classes of, 187 ; can do no hurt if God forbid them, will do good if he command them, 511.
- Trust*, an act of soul worship, ii. 302.
- Unbelief, the root of all sin, ii. 208.
- Unbelievers*, their misery, i. 91, 200 ; negatively, 91 ; positively, 94 ; who they are, 96 ; whether they sin in praying, 158 ; their encouragement to pray, 161 ; cannot pray in faith, 198 ; outward mercies cursed to, 346.
- Unblameable*, children of light must be in their walk, ii. 373.
- Uncleaness*, very leniently treated by Romanists, P. 218.
- UNCONVERTED SINNERS ARE DARKNESS, ii. 355.
- Unconverted*, their misery, ii. 356 ; how we may know whether we are, 360.
- Unfaithfulness*, horribly wretched, ii. 240.
- Unfruitfulness*, evils of, ii. 396 ; is a reproach to the gospel, 397 ; causes of, 419 ; unmortifiedness, *ib.* ; worldliness, 420 ; privateness of spirit, 422 ; slothfulness, *ib.* ; mistakes, *ib.* ; looking more at comfort than duty, 429 ; being taken up with little things, 430.
- Union* with Christ, obtained by coming to him, i. 347 ; signs of, ii. 120 ; separation from sin, *ib.* ; likeness, *ib.* ; propinquity, 121 ; adherence, *ib.* ; participation, *ib.* ; sympathy, 122 ; growth, 123 ; pruning, *ib.* ; fruitfulness, 124 ; stedfastness, *ib.* ; dependence, 125 ; uniformity, *ib.* ; means of, 127.
- Unpardonable sin*, described in three passages of Scripture, i. 147 ; definition of, *ib.* ; what it is not, 151.
- UNWILLINGNESS, MAN'S NATURAL, TO COME TO CHRIST, i. 331.
- Unworthiness*, sense of, an impediment to faith, i. 129 ; none excluded by Christ on account of, *ib.* ; qualifies for Christ, 131 ; unbelief is the greatest, 133 ; a discouragement in prayer, 219 ; how to be obviated, *ib.*
- Urim* and Thummim, how the mind of God was made known by, iii. 137.
- Venial sins*, according to the Romanists, need not be avoided, P. 33 ; pardon can be procured for in very easy ways, 53 ; not necessary to forsake in order to salvation, 143 ; include hatred of God, profane and wicked oaths, 144 ; blasphemy in many cases, 149 ; Sabbath-breaking, 150 ; dishonouring of parents, 153 ; hatred and enmity, 155 ; fornication, 156 ; theft in many cases, 160 ; falsehood, 164 ; perjury, 172 ; hypocrisy, 175 ; contumely and detraction, 176 ; flattery, 179.
- Vice* may be, by the mere light of nature, mistaken for virtue, ii. 299.
- Vico*, Marquis of, his preference of Christ to riches, ii. 22.
- Vineyard*, to be planted in the Lord's, is to have a standing under the means of grace, ii. 386.
- Virtues*, of heathens, how to be accounted of, ii. 256 ; not required to be practised by the Romanists, P. 104.

**Visitation**, time of, is limited, i. 139; sometimes longer, sometimes shorter, *ib.*; to a particular man, is not always as long as his life, 140; probable signs that it has expired, 141; probable signs that it has not expired, 143.

**Voice of Christ**, heard principally in the gospel, ii. 67; of command, *ib.*; threatening, *ib.*; promising, 68; persuading, *ib.*; entreating, *ib.*; reproving, 69; hearing, implies attendance, 70; belief, *ib.*; application, 71; consideration, *ib.*; conviction, *ib.*; persuasion, *ib.*

**Walking with God**, what it is, iii. 170.

**Wants**, God's sufficiency to supply his people's, ii. 498; his willingness, 501; Christians can have none, iii. 129.

**Washed**, what is implied in Christians being, iii. 37.

**Wave-offering**, its signification, iii. 3.

**Wealth**, how men make it their god, ii. 310.

**Whoredom**, a source of revenue to the pope, P. 223.

**Wicked men**, in what respect their prayers are sinful, ii. 31, 111; why they often enjoy temporal prosperity, 62; prosperity of, not incompatible with God's government, 465; their blessings are cursed, while the curses of believers are blessed, iii. 3.

**Will of a man** is renewed when he becomes a new creature, ii. 19; in its inclinations, *ib.*; its intentions, 20; its fruitions, 21; its elections, 23; its consents, 24; its applications, 25; its purposes, determinations, resolves, *ib.*; of the natural man is impotent, 125; we must subject ours to God's, 169; and to his rule and government, 474.

**WORD HEARING THE**, i. 428.

**Word of God**, is the general object of faith, i. 76; hearing of, is a means to obtain faith, 170; importance of hearing aright, 429; difficulties of hearing aright, *ib.*; evil and danger of neglecting, 434; is not effectual, but when particularly applied, 441; must be mixed with faith to make it effectual, 445; must be received in the love of it, 446; hearing of, unprofitable, when it is heard carelessly, ii. 73; not as the voice of Christ, *ib.*; without application, *ib.*; without consideration, *ib.*; without conviction, 74; without obedience, *ib.*; its power to discover sin, 218; its commands, *ib.*; its threatenings, 219; its relations, 220; hypocrites may be

diligent and attentive in hearing, 289; must be followed fully, 377.

**Works**, good, three classes of, represented by fasting, alms-deeds, and prayer, P. 112, 250; all these made by the Romanists works of supererogation, 113.

**World**, a strange country to the people of God, i. 244; what is meant by living as strangers in, *ib.*; means to wean us from, 414; danger of having much of, 417; embittered to the Christian by the cross, 459; crucified to the Christian, ii. 4; how far hypocrites may condemn, 287.

**Worldly cares** compared to thorns, ii. 141; enjoyments of little continuance, 158.

**Worldliness**, disguised as diligence in a lawful calling, ii. 207; makes men unfruitful under the word, 420.

**WORSHIP, PUBLIC, TO BE PREFERRED BEFORE PRIVATE**, iii. 187.

**Worship**, false, disguised as order, decency, reverence, and submission to authority, ii. 207; due only to God, 300; thirteen acts of soul, 301; public, three things necessary to, iii. 189; God more glorified by public than private, *ib.*; more of his presence in, 190; clearest manifestations of God in, 191; more spiritual advantage, 192; more edifying, *ib.*; better security against apostasy, 193; the Lord works his greatest works by, *ib.*; the nearest resemblance of heaven, 194; most available for procuring the greatest mercies, and removing the greatest judgments, 195; the blood of Christ most interested in, 196; promises of God more to public than to private, *ib.*; objections answered, 197; reproof of those who undervalue, 202; honour of it to be kept up, 205; how to be used, 208; of God, essential to religion, P. 9, not real, unless mind and heart concur in it, *ib.*; reduced by the Romanists to nothing, 17; attention to the bare words, without thinking either of their meaning or of the God to whom they are addressed, held to be sufficient, 15; lawful for the clergy and monks to celebrate for worldly ends, 31; or for a sinful end, provided that be not the principal, 32; private, not required by Romanists, 40.

**Wrath of God**, is the inheritance of men, i. 6; heavier on impenitent sinners under the gospel than on others, ii. 61; consists in displeasure, 105; anger, *ib.*; wrath, or sublimated anger, 106; hatred, *ib.*; enmity, *ib.*; abhorrence, *ib.*

## SCRIPTURE TEXTS.

Gen. ii. 17, . . . . .	I. 359	Gen. xxv. 22, . . . . .	I. 232	Exod. xxxiii. 19, . . . . .	II. 36
iii. 4, . . . . .	II. 343	xxv. 30, 32, . . . . .	I. 88	xxxiv. 7, . . . . .	I. 50
iii. 15, . . . . .	I. 456	xxv. 32, 34, . . . . .	II. 153	xxxvii. 9, . . . . .	I. 264
iii. 24, . . . . .	I. 14	xxvi. 12, . . . . .	II. 419	Levit. i. 4, . . . . .	I. 286
iv. 13, . . . . .	II. 472	xxvii. 34, 38, . . . . .	I. 344	v. 2, 3, . . . . .	III. 75
vi. 3, . . . . .	I. 140	xxx. 1, . . . . .	I. 87	v. 6, . . . . .	III. 62
vi. 3, . . . . .	I. 141	xxx. 27, . . . . .	II. 269	xiv. 41, 42, . . . . .	I. 9
vi. 3, . . . . .	I. 145	xxxiv. 10, . . . . .	I. 27	xvi. 11, . . . . .	III. 53
viii. 21, . . . . .	III. 48	xxxix. 4, 6, . . . . .	I. 415	xvi. 12-14, . . . . .	III. 134
x. 28, . . . . .	I. 73	xl. 5-7, . . . . .	II. 166	xvi. 29, . . . . .	I. 25
xv. 11, . . . . .	II. 18	xl. 5, 7, . . . . .	II. 516	Xix. 17, . . . . .	II. 216
xvii. 7, . . . . .	I. 427	Exod. x. 26, . . . . .	I. 43	xix. 17, . . . . .	II. 351
xviii. 19, . . . . .	I. 258	xii. 35, 36, . . . . .	I. 368	xix. 23-25, . . . . .	I. 400
xviii. 32, . . . . .	II. 200	xiv. 13, . . . . .	II. 513	xxiii. 29, . . . . .	I. 25
xx. 6, . . . . .	II. 459	xiv. 31, . . . . .	II. 260	xxv. 3, . . . . .	II. 438
xx. 6, . . . . .	I. 162	xx. 24, . . . . .	III. 190	xxv. 23, . . . . .	I. 307
xxi. 17, . . . . .	I. 162	xxi. 32, . . . . .	II. 69	xxvi. 21, . . . . .	II. 504
xxii. 5, . . . . .	I. 441	xxv. 20, . . . . .	III. 114	xxvii. 28, . . . . .	I. 405
xxiii. 15, . . . . .	I. 22	xxv. 22, . . . . .	III. 118	xxxv. 16, . . . . .	III. 48
xxiv. 8, 11, 12, . . . . .	I. 89	xxxii. 19, . . . . .	II. 227	Num. xiv. 20, 39, 44, . . . . .	II. 284

Num. xxi. 15, . . .	i. 681	1 Kings viii. 33, . . .	i. 176	Job xxxix.-xli. . . .	i. 12
xxii. 17, 18, . . .	ii. 470	x. 8, . . .	ii. 480	xxxix. 22, . . .	ii. 27
xxiii. 21, . . .	i. 37	xi. 7, 8, . . .	ii. 306	Ps. ii. 1-5, . . .	ii. 462
xxiv. 1, . . .	ii. 245	xi. 9, . . .	ii. 61	ii. 68, . . .	i. 182
xxxiii. 55, . . .	i. 240	xii. 26-28, . . .	ii. 208	ii. 9, 10, . . .	ii. 461
Deut. iv. 4, . . .	ii. 262	xv. 3, . . .	ii. 268	ii. 10, 11, . . .	ii. 467
v. 24, 25, . . .	ii. 232	xix. 10, . . .	ii. 506	iv. 7, 8, . . .	ii. 12
vi. 6-9, . . .	ii. 487	xix. 18, . . .	iii. 198	v. 5, . . .	i. 29
vii. 7, 8, . . .	ii. 385	xx. 11, . . .	ii. 457	v. 5, . . .	iii. 42
viii. 3, . . .	i. 188	xxi. 4, . . .	ii. 148	viii. 12, 13, . . .	i. 95
viii. 15, 16, . . .	ii. 166	xxi. 16, . . .	ii. 336	viii. 3, 6, 7, 8, . . .	iii. 152
xiii. 5, 6, 11, . . .	iii. 187	xxi. 27, . . .	ii. 254	viii. 4, . . .	iii. 16
xiii. 11, . . .	ii. 349	xxi. 29, . . .	ii. 31	viii. 5, 6, . . .	i. 14
xvii. 2, . . .	i. 467	xxi. 29, . . .	ii. 107	ix. 6 . . .	ii. 505
xviii. 15, . . .	i. 177	2 Kings v. 12, . . .	iii. 204	ix. 10, . . .	i. 277
xxi. 1-9, . . .	iii. 56	v. 13, . . .	ii. 183	ix. 18, . . .	i. 233
xxviii. 16-17, . . .	i. 95	vi. 15, . . .	i. 79	x. 17, . . .	i. 208
xxviii. 18, . . .	i. 357	vi. 20, . . .	i. 64	xi. 10, . . .	iii. 169
xxix. 18, . . .	ii. 394	vi. 32, . . .	ii. 63	xii. 3, 4, . . .	i. 369
xxix. 19, . . .	i. 144	vii. 3, 4, . . .	i. 75	xiv. 1, 2, . . .	i. 160
xxix. 19, 20, . . .	i. 24	viii. 11, 12, . . .	i. 24	xiv. 1, . . .	ii. 527
xxix. 20, . . .	i. 57	viii. 12, 13, . . .	i. 10	xiv. 6, . . .	i. 66
xxix. 29, . . .	i. 128	x. 16, . . .	ii. 275	xvi. 5, . . .	i. 178
xxix. 29, . . .	ii. 131	x. 26, 27, 30, . . .	ii. 255	xvi. 5, . . .	iii. 5
xxx. 6, . . .	i. 384	xiv. 25-27, . . .	ii. 201	xvi. 7, . . .	i. 10
xxx. 19, . . .	i. 59	xvi. 10, . . .	ii. 334	xix. 1, . . .	ii. 458
xxx. 19, . . .	i. 350	xvii. 19, . . .	ii. 205	xix. 12, . . .	i. 31
xxxii. 17, . . .	ii. 326	xviii. 20, . . .	i. 182	xix. 12, . . .	i. 153
xxxii. 19, . . .	ii. 215	xviii. 21, . . .	i. 83	xix. 12, . . .	iii. 105
xxxii. 32, . . .	i. 8	xix. 15, . . .	iii. 130	xx. 2, . . .	iii. 113
xxxii. 33, . . .	i. 118	xx. 17, 18, . . .	ii. 490	xx. 2, . . .	iii. 129
Josh. v. 13, 14, . . .	iii. 157	1 Chron. xxix. 11, . . .	i. 364	xxii. 14-17, . . .	iii. 64
vii. 19, . . .	i. 19	xxix. 11, 12, . . .	ii. 455	xxv. 10, . . .	ii. 107
x. 12, 13, . . .	ii. 182	2 Chron. iii. 17, . . .	i. 203	xxvii. 4, . . .	ii. 303
xiv. 12, . . .	i. 162	iv. 23, . . .	ii. 503	xxvii. 13, . . .	i. 493
Judges i. 6, 7, . . .	ii. 218	xiii. 5, . . .	i. 310	xxviii. 2, . . .	iii. 118
xii. 6, . . .	i. 508	xiii. 8, 9, . . .	ii. 217	xxviii. 13, . . .	i. 33
xvi. . . .	i. 12	xviii. 30, . . .	ii. 209	xxix. 1, 2, . . .	iii. 206
xvi. 21, . . .	i. 122	xx. 9, . . .	i. 188	xxix. 1, . . .	iii. 116
Ruth i. 16, 17, . . .	i. 233	xx. 12, . . .	i. 180	xxxii. 7, . . .	ii. 495
i. 16, 17, . . .	i. 295	xx. 12, . . .	ii. 183	xxxii. 10, . . .	i. 62
i. 16, . . .	iii. 171	xx. 17, . . .	ii. 512	xxxiii. 9, . . .	i. 193
1 Sam. iv. 21, . . .	i. 443	xx. 20, . . .	ii. 142	xxxiv. 10, . . .	iii. 8
vii. 2, 6, . . .	ii. 255	xx. 22, . . .	ii. 516	xxxv. 13, . . .	i. 220
x. 10, 19, 23, . . .	ii. 245	xxvi. 5, . . .	ii. 253	xxxvi. 7, . . .	i. 66
xiv. . . .	ii. 267	xxviii. 22, . . .	ii. 196	xxxvi. 8, . . .	i. 122
xiv. 6, . . .	i. 229	xxviii. 23, . . .	ii. 266	xxxvii. 4, . . .	ii. 44
xv. 3-24, . . .	ii. 212	xxxii. 8, . . .	ii. 263	xxxvii. 7, . . .	i. 73
xv. 13, . . .	i. 28	xxxiii. 10, 11, . . .	ii. 53	xxxvii. 15, . . .	i. 317
xv. 23, . . .	i. 28	Esther iv. 16, . . .	i. 74	xxxvii. 34, . . .	i. 115
xv. 23, . . .	i. 53	v. 3, . . .	iii. 9	xxxviii. 4, . . .	i. 46
xv. 23, . . .	ii. 309	vi. 6, . . .	iii. 178	xxxviii. 4, . . .	i. 79
xv. 23, . . .	iii. 43	Job i. 21, . . .	i. 408	xxxviii. 4, . . .	i. 106
xv. 29, . . .	i. 497	ii. 10, . . .	i. 409	xxxix. 5, . . .	i. 501
xvi. 7, . . .	i. 222	iii. 1, . . .	ii. 476	xl. 8, . . .	i. 186
xvii. 32, . . .	i. 20	v. 19, . . .	ii. 165	xl. 8, . . .	iii. 27
xviii. 8-10, . . .	ii. 169	ix. 3, . . .	i. 54	xl. 12, . . .	i. 54
xxiii. 21, . . .	i. 47	ix. 4, . . .	ii. 485	xlii. 1, 2, . . .	ii. 20
xxv. 32, . . .	i. 47	xi. 20, . . .	ii. 110	xlii. 1, 2, . . .	iii. 177
xxix. 4, 5, . . .	ii. 514	xiii. 23, . . .	ii. 221	xlii. 11, . . .	ii. 168
2 Sam. vi. 22, . . .	i. 445	xiv. 4, . . .	i. 15	xliv. 4, . . .	iii. 132
vi. 22, . . .	i. 474	xv. 4, . . .	i. 160	xliv. 17, 19, . . .	i. 506
vi. 22, . . .	ii. 453	xvi. 8, . . .	i. 29	xlv. 7, . . .	iii. 42
ix. 3, . . .	ii. 96	xvi. 14, . . .	ii. 189	xlv. 7, . . .	iii. 78
xii. 9, . . .	i. 153	xviii. 5, 6, . . .	ii. 369	xlv. 15, . . .	i. 22
xv. 25, . . .	ii. 176	xviii. 7, . . .	iii. 28	xlvi. 5, . . .	iii. 120
xviii. 51, . . .	i. 47	xxi. 14, . . .	ii. 301	xlix. 12, . . .	i. 14
xxi. 1, 2, . . .	i. 506	xxii. 30, . . .	ii. 200	xlix. 12, . . .	ii. 170
1 Kings ii. 23, . . .	i. 67	xxxiii. 17, . . .	ii. 197	1. 9-12, . . .	ii. 35
ii. 23, . . .	i. 298	xxiv. 32, . . .	i. 47	1. 16, 17, . . .	i. 56
ii. 30, . . .	i. 74	xxv. 4, . . .	i. 15	1. 18, . . .	ii. 337
iii. 10-12, . . .	i. 163	xxxvii. 23, 24, . . .	ii. 235	1. 21, . . .	i. 235
viii. 24-26, . . .	i. 199	xxxviii. 8-11, . . .	i. 12	1. 23, . . .	ii. 182

Mat. ix. 13, . . .	I. 18	Mat. xxv. 34, . . .	II. 419	Luke xviii. 11, . . .	II. 281
x. 20, . . .	I. 210	xxv. 34, 35, . . .	III. 169	xviii. 11, . . .	II. 423
x. 30, . . .	II. 492	xxv. 41, . . .	I. 49	xviii. 12, . . .	II. 5-3
x. 34, . . .	I. 471	xxv. 45, 46, . . .	II. 295	xix. 10, . . .	I. 170
x. 37, . . .	I. 448	xxvi. 37-41, . . .	III. 100	xix. 17, . . .	I. 510
x. 42, . . .	II. 488	xxvi. 75, . . .	I. 25	xix. 27, . . .	II. 485
xi. 28, . . .	I. 122	xxvii. 3, . . .	II. 25	xix. 41, 42, . . .	I. 169, 186
xi. 29, . . .	I. 484	xxvii. 3, 4, . . .	I. 25	xix. 41, 42, . . .	II. 40
xii. 20, . . .	I. 155	xxviii. 48, . . .	I. 55	xix. 41, 42, . . .	II. 59
xii. 28, . . .	I. 150	xxviii. 18, . . .	III. 25	xix. 42, . . .	I. 139
xii. 31, 32, . . .	I. 148	Mark i. 14, 15, . . .	I. 18	xx. 27, . . .	III. 32
xii. 33, . . .	I. 110	i. 16, . . .	I. 17	xxi. 3, . . .	I. 223
xii. 35, . . .	II. 6	iv. 25, . . .	II. 217	xxi. 26, . . .	III. 130
xii. 41, . . .	II. 116	vi. 11, . . .	I. 16	xxi. 34, . . .	II. 150
xii. 42, . . .	II. 70	vi. 12, . . .	I. 18	xxii. 32, . . .	I. 100
xii. 43-45, . . .	I. 27	vi. 20, . . .	II. 425	xxiii. 34, . . .	I. 149
xiii. 6, 7, . . .	I. 139	vi. 28, . . .	II. 284	xxiv. 21, . . .	I. 152
xiii. 12, . . .	II. 411	ix. 24, . . .	I. 114	xxiv. 47, . . .	I. 17
xiii. 19, . . .	I. 436	x. 29, 30, . . .	II. 25	xxiv. 47, . . .	I. 18
xiii. 20-22, . . .	II. 420	x. 29, . . .	I. 461	John i. 11, 12, . . .	I. 107
xiii. 22, . . .	II. 392	xii. 34, . . .	II. 134	i. 11, . . .	I. 116
xiii. 31, 32, . . .	II. 529	xv. 15, . . .	II. 348	i. 11, . . .	II. 481
xiii. 35, . . .	I. 270	xvi. 16, . . .	I. 63	i. 12, . . .	I. 232
xiii. 55, . . .	III. 200	xvi. 17, . . .	I. 430	i. 12, . . .	I. 325
xiv. 24, . . .	I. 140	Luke i. 11, 19, 20, . . .	I. 116	i. 18*, . . .	I. 97
xiv. 29-31, . . .	I. 71	vi. 43, 45, . . .	II. 6	i. 49, 50, . . .	I. 177
xv. 18, 19, . . .	II. 203	vi. 44, . . .	I. 53	ii. 19, . . .	III. 188
xv. 18, 19, . . .	II. 373	vii. 4, 6, 7, . . .	I. 131	ii. 32, . . .	II. 66
xv. 19, . . .	I. 9	viii. 18, . . .	I. 428	iii. 2, . . .	I. 149
xv. 26, 27, . . .	I. 169	viii. 14, . . .	II. 421	iii. 3, . . .	II. 7
xvi. 16, . . .	I. 102	viii. 15, . . .	I. 102	iii. 3, . . .	II. 9
xvi. 16, . . .	I. 153	viii. 17, . . .	I. 434	iii. 6, . . .	I. 15
xvi. 24, . . .	II. 47	x. 20, . . .	III. 37	iii. 8, . . .	II. 29
xvi. 25, . . .	II. 155	x. 30, 33, . . .	III. 86	iii. 8, . . .	III. 21
xvii. 10, . . .	I. 324	x. 41, . . .	II. 140	iii. 14, 15, . . .	I. 77
xvii. 15, . . .	I. 165	xi. 21, . . .	I. 143	iii. 18, . . .	I. 63
xviii. 6, . . .	II. 489	xii. 5, . . .	II. 471	iii. 18, 36 . . .	I. 338
xviii. 20, . . .	III. 188	xii. 10, . . .	I. 149	iii. 18, . . .	I. 359
xviii. 28, . . .	I. 212	xii. 19, . . .	II. 22	iii. 19, . . .	I. 116
xix. 17, . . .	I. 17	xii. 24, . . .	II. 146	iii. 20, . . .	I. 78
xix. 27, . . .	I. 270	xii. 15, . . .	II. 156	iii. 36, . . .	II. 85
xix. 23, 24, . . .	II. 155	xii. 17, 20, . . .	II. 138	iv. 10, . . .	I. 77
xix. 27, . . .	II. 278	xii. 19, . . .	I. 120	iv. 14, . . .	I. 248
xix. 29, . . .	I. 426	xii. 29, . . .	II. 142	iv. 28, . . .	III. 327
xx. 10, 15, . . .	I. 380	xii. 42, . . .	I. 378	iv. 34, . . .	III. 34
xx. 11, 13, 15, . . .	I. 408	xii. 47, . . .	II. 407	v. 4, . . .	I. 443
xx. 12, . . .	I. 282	xii. 48, . . .	I. 417	v. 14, . . .	I. 16
xx. 28, . . .	I. 285	xii. 50, . . .	I. 186	v. 14, . . .	I. 198
xxi. 14, . . .	I. 152	XIII 5, . . .	II. 385	v. 36, . . .	I. 150
xxi. 33, 34, . . .	I. 378	xiii. 44, . . .	II. 242	v. 40, . . .	I. 116
xxi. 37, 38, . . .	I. 149	xiii. 27, . . .	I. 29	v. 40, . . .	I. 331
xxi. 38, . . .	I. 26	xiv. 21, . . .	I. 131	v. 44, . . .	I. 116
xxii. 32, . . .	I. 432	xiv. 26, . . .	I. 39, 161	vi. 9, . . .	I. 427
xxiii. 5, . . .	II. 290	xiv. 26, 27, . . .	I. 268	vi. 31, 35, . . .	II. 96
xxiii. 25-27, . . .	I. 111	xiv. 27, . . .	I. 447	vi. 32, 34, . . .	I. 77
xxiii. 27, . . .	I. 116	xv. 7, . . .	I. 19	vi. 37, . . .	I. 29
xxiii. 29, . . .	I. 116	xv. 7, . . .	I. 61	vi. 37, . . .	I. 231
xxiii. 34, 35, . . .	II. 335	xv. 7-10, . . .	I. 353	vi. 37, . . .	I. 348
xxiii. 37, . . .	I. 139	xv. 13, . . .	I. 66	vi. 37, . . .	I. 352
xxiii. 37, . . .	I. 142	xv. 17, . . .	I. 121	vi. 44, . . .	I. 7
xxiii. 37, . . .	I. 355	xv. 17, . . .	I. 345	vi. 60, . . .	I. 444
xxiii. 37, . . .	I. 462	xv. 18, 19 . . .	I. 168	vii. 12, . . .	I. 147
xxiii. 37, . . .	II. 59	xvi. 5-7, . . .	I. 418	vii. 17, . . .	I. 265
xxiv. 23, . . .	I. 510	xvi. 11, . . .	I. 146	viii. 36, . . .	I. 346
xxiv. 27, . . .	III. 138	xvi. 16, . . .	I. 82	viii. 41, 44, . . .	I. 413
xxiv. 41, . . .	I. 356	xvi. 23, . . .	I. 120	viii. 56, . . .	I. 255
xxv. 11, 12, . . .	I. 103	xvi. 31, . . .	I. 433	ix. 4, . . .	II. 361
xxv. 20-22 . . .	II. 408	xvii. 3, . . .	I. 18	ix. 41, . . .	I. 56
xxv. 30, . . .	I. 49	xvii. 10, . . .	I. 300	x. 5, . . .	III. 172
xxv. 30, . . .	I. 386	xviii. 9, . . .	I. 123	x. 10, . . .	I. 360
xxv. 30, . . .	II. 396	xviii. 11, . . .	I. 45	x. 17, 18, . . .	III. 69
xxv. 30, . . .	II. 520	xviii. 11, 12, . . .	I. 109	x. 18, . . .	III. 148
xxv. 34-36, . . .	II. 417	xviii. 11, 14, . . .	I. 281		

John	x. 29,	I. 374	Acts	x. 33,	I. 444	Rom.	v. 8,	III. 14
	x. 31,	III. 18		xi. 18,	I. 19		v. 10, 11,	III. 58
	xi. 33,	III. 86		xi. 18,	I. 25		v. 10, 11,	III. 74
	xi. 42,	I. 206		xi. 18,	I. 29		v. 14,	I. 8
	xi. 47,	I. 149		xii. 1, 23,	II. 504		v. 18,	I. 363
	xi. 47,	I. 152		xiii. 1,	I. 43		v. 19, 20,	I. 39
	xii. 37, 38,	I. 117		xiii. 24,	I. 19		v. 30,	I. 198
	xii. 43,	II. 310		xiii. 38,	III. 75		vi. 9-11,	III. 154
	xiv. 2, 3,	I. 349		xiii. 46,	I. 141		vi. 11,	I. 19
	xiv. 16,	I. 100		xiv. 16,	II. 405		vi. 14,	I. 306
	xiv. 16, 17,	III. 149		xv. 9,	I. 96		vi. 16,	I. 393
	xiv. 20,	III. 7		xv. 9,	I. 110		vi. 16,	III. 174
	xiv. 21, 23,	II. 319		xv. 39,	I. 438		vi. 16,	II. 482
	xiv. 21,	III. 167		xvi. 14,	I. 52		vi. 1-5,	III. 20
	xiv. 21, 23,	III. 45		xvi. 20,	I. 462		vii. 4,	III. 387
	xiv. 23,	III. 186		xvi. 27, 28,	I. 171		vii. 7,	I. 78
	xv. 5,	II. 101		xvi. 29,	I. 81		vii. 8,	I. 14
	xv. 7,	I. 202		xvii. 28,	II. 456		vii. 9,	II. 54
	xv. 9,	III. 36		xvii. 30,	I. 17		vii. 18, 20,	I. 4
	xv. 13,	III. 26		xvii. 30,	I. 58		vii. 18,	I. 6
	xv. 15,	III. 5		xvii. 31,	II. 467		vii. 18, 19, 20,	I. 38
	xv. 19,	I. 457		xix. 25,	II. 213		vii. 21,	I. 9
	xv. 20,	III. 161		xx. 20, 21,	I. 18		vii. 24,	I. 14
	xv. 22,	I. 261		xx. 21,	I. 144		viii. 1,	I. 30
	xvi. 2,	II. 423		xx. 22, 23,	I. 479		viii. 3,	I. 328
	xvi. 8,	II. 222		xx. 24,	I. 451		viii. 3,	III. 93
	xvi. 20,	I. 61		xx. 25,	I. 365		viii. 3,	III. 156
	xvi. 23,	III. 8		xx. 28,	II. 532		viii. 4,	I. 304
	xvi. 26,	III. 146		xxiv. 25,	I. 81		viii. 7,	I. 6
	xvi. 27,	I. 205		xxiv. 25,	II. 8		viii. 7,	I. 10
	xvi. 32,	III. 108		xxvi. 5,	II. 281		viii. 7,	II. 46
	xvi. 33,	I. 122		xxvi. 10,	II. 337		viii. 13,	I. 56
	xvii. 9, 20,	I. 92		xxvii. 11,	I. 161		viii. 16, 17,	I. 99
	xvii. 9,	III. 22		xxvi. 18,	I. 46		viii. 18,	I. 425
	xvii. 19,	I. 147		xxvi. 18,	I. 64		viii. 18,	I. 500
	xvii. 20,	I. 100		xxvi. 18,	I. 71		viii. 22,	I. 69
	xvii. 20,	I. 231		xxvi. 18,	I. 78		viii. 22,	II. 494
	xvii. 21, 22,	III. 166		xxvi. 18,	I. 85		viii. 23,	I. 459
	xvii. 22,	II. 43		xxvi. 18,	II. 84		viii. 28,	II. 187
	xvii. 22,	III. 11		xxvi. 20,	I. 18		viii. 28,	II. 479
	xvii. 24,	III. 7		xxvi. 20,	I. 45		viii. 32,	I. 77
	xix. 12,	I. 462		xxvi. 22,	I. 88		viii. 32,	III. 141
	xx. 17,	III. 10		xxvi. 26, 27,	II. 259		viii. 33, 34,	I. 176
	xx. 27-29,	I. 103		xxvi. 28,	II. 8		viii. 33, 34,	I. 181
	xxi. 17,	I. 176		xxvi. 28, 29,	I. 471		viii. 34,	I. 349
Acts	i. 6, 7,	I. 129, 338	xxvii. 20,	II. 358		viii. 34,	III. 144	
	ii. 16,	II. 245	Rom.	i. 17,	I. 114	viii. 34,	III. 146	
	ii. 28,	I. 17		i. 18,	II. 401	viii. 37,	I. 321	
	ii. 37,	I. 19		i. 19, 20,	III. 4	viii. 37,	I. 361	
	ii. 37,	I. 80		i. 25,	II. 300	viii. 37,	I. 454	
	ii. 37,	I. 82		i. 31,	I. 37	ix. 4,	I. 48	
	ii. 38,	I. 18		ii. 7,	II. 428	ix. 18-20,	I. 371	
	iii. 14-17,	II. 205		ii. 14, 15,	II. 215	ix. 30,	I. 71	
	iii. 17-19,	I. 150		ii. 17,	II. 270	x. 2,	II. 21	
	iii. 19,	I. 17		ii. 22,	II. 157	x. 4,	I. 22	
	iv. 12,	I. 83		iii. 2,	I. 48	x. 11,	II. 439	
	iv. 34,	II. 147		iii. 24,	I. 176	x. 14, 17,	I. 240	
	v. 3,	II. 48		iii. 25,	I. 76	xi. 17,	II. 122	
	v. 29,	II. 21		iii. 31,	II. 522	xi. 20,	II. 102	
	v. 29,	II. 468		iii. 31,	II. 530	xi. 32,	I. 85	
	v. 31,	I. 18		iv. 4,	I. 23	xi. 35,	I. 372	
	v. 31,	I. 29		iv. 4,	III. 148	xii. 2,	I. 245	
	v. 31,	I. 58		iv. 6,	I. 305	xii. 2,	I. 442	
	v. 31,	I. 176		iv. 20,	I. 90	xii. 2,	II. 376	
	v. 31,	II. 109		iv. 20,	I. 239	xiii. 4, 6,	II. 472	
	viii. 51,	I. 143		iv. 21,	I. 176	xiii. 12,	II. 373	
	viii. 13,	I. 102		iv. 25,	III. 68	xiii. 14,	I. 276	
	viii. 22,	I. 18		v. 1,	I. 480	xiv. 1,	I. 248	
	ix. 4, 5, I. 157,	III. 97		v. 1-3,	I. 91	xiv. 15, 20,	I. 469	
	ix. 5, 6,	I. 146, 171		v. 3-5,	II. 440	1 Cor. i. 26-28,	I. 131	
	ix. 7,	II. 70		v. 6,	I. 52	i. 26-28,	III. 25	
	ix. 11,	I. 157		v. 6,	II. 104	i. 26-28,	III. 5	
	ix. 22,	I. 162		v. 8,	III. 63	ii. 12,	I. 9	

2 Pet.	i. 2-4, .	I. 311	1 John	iii. 4, .	I. 41	Rev.	iii. 19, .	I. 354
	i. 4, .	I. 107		iii. 9, .	I. 34		iii. 19, .	III. 45
	i. 4, .	II. 41		iii. 9, .	II. 81		III. 20, .	II. 34
	i. 5, 6, .	II. 379		iii. 12, .	I. 470		iv. 4, .	I. 464
	i. 5-8, .	II. 435		iii. 14, .	I. 33		v. 12, .	I. 328
	i. 10, .	I. 128		iii. 18, .	III. 80		v. 19, .	III. 71
	i. 19, .	I. 195		iii. 22, .	II. 251		vii. 15, 16, .	III. 129
	ii. 4, .	I. 140		iii. 23, .	I. 90		vii. 17, .	III. 131
	ii. 15, .	II. 256		iv. 11, .	III. 102		viii. 3, 4, .	I. 206
	ii. 17, .	II. 357		iv. 16, .	III. 4		ix. 11, .	II. 408
	ii. 20, .	II. 249		iv. 18, .	I. 482		x. 9, .	I. 62
	ii. 20, 22, .	II. 8		iv. 18, .	I. 487		x. 9, .	I. 120
	iii. 9, .	I. 19		v. 10, .	I. 90		xi. 19, .	I. 77
1 JOHN	I. 3, .	III. 165		v. 11, 12, .	I. 85		xii. 1, .	I. 465
	i. 6, .	I. 276		v. 13-15, .	I. 202		xii. 6, .	II. 507
	j. 9, .	I. 17		v. 14, 15, .	III. 119		xiv. 13, .	I. 122
	i. 9, .	I. 18		v. 21, .	II. 325		xvi. 9, 11, .	I. 320
	ii. 1, .	III. 145	Jude.	20, .	II. 180		xvii. 5, .	II. 327
	ii. 8-11, .	II. 382	Rev.	i. 8, .	I. 49		xix. 6, .	II. 464
	ii. 15, .	II. 152		ii. 2, 3, .	I. 467		xxi. 8, .	I. 94
	ii. 16, .	II. 5		ii. 4, 5, .	I. 482		xxi. 8, .	II. 303
	ii. 16, .	II. 208		ii. 14, .	I. 478		xxi. 27, .	II. 321
	ii. 24, .	II. 50		ii. 24, .	I. 346		xxii. 2, .	I. 8
	iii. 1, .	III. 169		iii. 1, 2, .	I. 495		xxii. 3, .	III. 115
	iii. 2, .	I. 244		iii. 7, .	I. 49		xxii. 11, .	I. 139
	iii. 2, .	I. 256		iii. 15, 16, .	II. 203		xxii. 14, .	I. 361
	iii. 4, .	I. 4		iii. 15-18, .	I. 131			



Physiologie Zoologie Seminar-Speer Libran



1 1012 01101 6682



