



J. H. 1826.

THE
FORLORN CASE OF POPERY!

OR,
The Romanist Undeceived :

BEING
A Rational, Historical, and Scriptural Refutation
OF THE SUPER-ADDED ARTICLES
OF THE
CHURCH OF ROME;
INCLUDING
THE LIFE AND ADVENTURES
OF
POPE JOAN, or JOHN the VIIIth.

Most seriously recommended to the perusal of Romanists.

BY THE LATE REV. JOHN CONNELL,
A Conformist to the Established Church,
CURATE OF ETTAGH.

“ Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls : but they said, we will not walk therein.”—*Jer. vi. 16.*

“ For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed ; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.”—*Acts xxviii. 27.*

DEDICATED
TO THE REV. THOMAS PERCIVAL MAGEE,
Sec. Sec. Sec.

DUBLIN :

*Printed for the benefit of the Widow and Orphan Children
of the Author.*

1826.

PART I.—*Price Five Shillings, British.*

PART II. will be published as soon as possible.

381.



TO THE
REV. THOMAS PERCIVAL MAGEE,
&c. &c. &c.

Rev. Sir,

It might be justly deemed presumption, were I to prefix to the writings of my father, a name so intimately connected with every Association, which all who feel an interest in the welfare of our Church, must hold dear, without assigning the motives which have actuated me, and the reasons which alone can justify me in taking that liberty; viewing the Work itself as the production of one who, though long yoked in the trammels of error, when freed, was eager to cast in his humble mite amid the treasures which, in modern times, have been contributed for the support of truth, to whom could it, (however small its literary pretensions,) be dedicated with such propriety, as to one so nearly allied to the "Author of the ATONEMENT?" to whom Christianity in general, and the Church of England in particular, stand so much indebted for his noble and uncompromising defence, on every occasion, against falsehood in all its varied forms, whether as the professed hostility of the Deist, the poisonous sophistry of the Unitarian, or the superstitious errors of the Romanist; considering the situation of the Author's family,

a Widow and Seven Orphans, whose name could I venture to prefix before that of a Clergyman, whose distinguished character it is practically to exhibit, that "pure Religion and undefiled before God," even the "Visiting the widow and the fatherless in their affliction?" In short, Rev. Sir, feeling that to you, further apology would be needless, and humbly hoping that something may be found herein worthy of your approbation, assured, that should this Work but gain the smallest meed of your Patronage, my most anxious expectations will be realized, and the public countenance secured, allow me to subscribe myself,

Rev. Sir,

Your very humble,

And much obliged Servant,

SARAH CONNELL.

Dublin, August 3, 1826.

THE
FORLORN CASE OF POPERY,

¶c. ¶c.

“ Victricem suprema Veritas facit.”

THE sudden, but premeditated change that I have made, through God's mercy, from a fabricated farce, supported by Papal tyranny,* and upheld by implicit obedience to its commands, to the pure, unadulterated and divine religion of the Gospel of Christ, has influenced some to censure me, and made others desirous to know the cause. While by the ignorant and prejudiced I am calumniated, nay, even condemned to perdition;† the candid and unbiassed are anxious to be acquainted with the true and just motive of my conversion. To inspire the one, if possible, with more charity, and candidly declare the sentiments of my heart to the other;—I now, openly avow, that prejudice, and a heretofore rooted aversion to the Protes-

* See a Sketch of Papal Tyranny and Additional, in a subsequent part of this work.

† It is a leading principle of the members of the Church of Rome, implicitly to believe, that Protestants are in a state of final perdition.—This is the basis of that tenet, that *no faith is to be kept with* (what they call) *Heretics*. This pious doctrine is studiously inculcated from their childhood. The result is obvious, and often, fatally experienced. “But who art thou that judgest another man's servant. To his own master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand?” Rom. xiv. 4.

tant Religion, and the English Establishment, debarred me from embracing the tenets of the United Church of England and Ireland, as established by Law. For the notions I entertained of the superadded Articles of the Church of Rome were so strong, and had so much the ascendant over me, that I easily swallowed sentiments, contrary one to the other, and equally ridiculous, without perceiving their astonishing contrariety; and had contracted such a familiarity with them, and regarded them as so many fundamentals, that they almost radicated in my heart; and such was my supineness, that if any doubts concerning them occurred, as being contrary to the dictates of reason, or common sense, far from clearing them up, I rather contributed to my prejudices, and endeavoured through subtleties and delusive means, to fortify them.

I was one of the thoughtless many, who have a firm belief in certain false opinions, and deemed them principles so unquestionable, that I scarce gave myself the trouble to examine them; nay, thought myself criminal, should I doubt of them for a moment. Such was the early prejudice I imbibed. This I am not, however, surprised at, whereas, many of an incomparably superior genius and reflection, in all ages, could not surmount the impressions made upon their tender and youthful minds. How few do we see now-a-days, bearing the flambeaux of truth in the midst of a multitude of errors? How many men of the first class have been plunged into, and swayed by the folly and horrors of Paganism? Are not Mahomedans and Jews as strongly prejudiced in favour of their tenets, as the most zealous Christian with regard to his principles? How many excellent men, votaries of the Church of Rome, are hood-winked and blinded through prejudiced and early education? should they wipe off the suffusion of credulity, and under the influence of

reason, search the Scriptures, and adopt the truth, our churches would scarce contain the vast number of proselytes.*

Biassed as I was, and endeavouring to sully and eclipse the light of reason, some vivid sparks notwithstanding, irradiated my soul. What am I? said I, in my first reflections. Am I not a rational being? What characterises me from a brute? Is it not reason? Welcome, then, thou bright luminary of man, dispel those clouds which have hitherto obscured you; Let prejudice, let education, let the false fear of offending parties and all worldly Popish interests, henceforth submit to you: be thou, in subordination to the revealed will of Christ, and the guidance of his Divine grace, my sole conductress for evermore.

Supported thus, by reason, and a serious reflection, I pried into the origin of the religion I was of, and, upon investigation, discovered that it was, in many points, repugnant to that which our Saviour Christ taught, and which was handed down by the Evangelists. Moreover, I found so many absurdities, unfair dealings, and manifest contradictions attending it, on every super-added article, that I could, to my real astonishment, scarce believe I had a jot of reason, and to have continued so long in its communion.

In the first place, I carefully examined and attentively considered what was meant by the Mass, and whether Christ instituted, or the Apostles celebrated any such thing; and, upon investigation, discovered,

* The word Proselyte, signifies a stranger, but now means any one who comes over to another opinion in religion. Among the Jews were two sorts,—one called Proselytes of Righteousness; the other Proselytes of the Gate. The first were thorough converts; the others lived among the Jews and were only obliged to observe the seven Precepts of Noah. The first forbade Idolatry. 2. To hallow the name of God. 3. To forbid murder. 4. To condemn adultery and incest. 5. Forbidding theft. 6. To do justice, and submit to it. 7. To forbid the eating things strangled and blood.

there was no foundation for it in Scripture : that it was unknown, much less practised in the primitive ages of the church : that Transubstantiation was not established until the year 1215, at the fourth Council of Lateran, under *Innocent* the third : and that in process of time, it was adopted by the Romish sacrificants through a mere lucrative motive.

To the innovation of the Mass, they patched *Oral Tradition, Purgatory, Indulgences, Works of Supererogation, Auricular Confession, the Invocation of Saints, Image Worship, &c. &c.* and to fence against all opposition, the Bishop of the Diocese of Rome, usurped the sole headship of the Church, and was gradually declared by his partisans, as infallible in his determinations, as Jesus Christ. Matters being thus established, or, rather compounded between the Roman Pontiff and his Associates, (which was easily effected in the leaden and rusty ages of the church) what private man dare remonstrate, or rise in lawful opposition ? There was no man of the smallest pretensions to reason, or the least penetration, who did not evidently see into the deep designs of those innovations ; but fear, and the too-delusive interests of this easily imposed on life, debarred most people from speaking their mind, or acting according to its dictates. How shocking must the thought of this be to any one who has a sense of our liberty in Christ, and in his holy Gospel. If any advocate, or abettor of the pure and primitive cause, spoke or proceeded contrary to those new introduced systems, his soul was, forthwith consigned to perdition, his body was exposed to the most cruel torments that avowed vengeance could suggest, his effects were confiscated, he was denied Christian burial ; in a word, he was exhibited as an example to future ages, to terrify others.*

* The cruel, tormenting, and lingering deaths of *John Huss*, and *Jerome of Prague*, both Protestants, who were burned at the Council of Constance,

Matters being thus adjusted, and their *common* lucrative interests requiring mutual assistance and connivance, these innovations after some time, were foisted upon an ignorant and credulous world, as nothing less than Apostolical traditions. If a son asked his father, or us *Rushworth*, in his dialogues would have it, rather, his mother, which of the Apostles was the *Virgin Mary's* confessor; (I am confident she often repeated the Lord's Prayer, and consequently, acknowledged herself a sinner,) What saints the Apostles prayed to, or what images they worshipped? whether Christ made holy water* to cleanse and purify his disciples? whether it was Christ's own head, or heels, or

in the days of pious cruelty; notwithstanding the Emperor *Sigismund* granted them both a safe conduct to and from the Council, are a sufficient instance, (not to name many more,) of what I advance. At the same time, the bones of *John Wickliffe*, formerly Rector of Lutterworth, were dug up and burned by order of this Council, for having written and preached against the Church of Rome.

Huss's chalice, which held the sacramental wine, was large and heavy enough to make a tolerable sized image of the *Virgin Mary*, and the patin, or plate, was converted into a half-moon, in the centre concave of which, the image is to be seen erect, in an outer niche of the church of Teynne, at Prague, to this day.

The above is founded upon this principle, that no Faith is to be kept with Heretics, by which you see what Protestants may expect from the establishment aimed at by the Catholic Board.

Lest they should deny the above charge, which they have effrontery enough to do, amongst such Protestants as are not acquainted with the fact, take the following extract out of the 19th Session of the forementioned Council:—

“Præsens sancta Synodus ex quovis salvo conductu, per Imperatorem, Reges, & alios sæculi Principes, hæreticis vel de hæresi dissimatis, putantes eodem sic a suis erroribus revocare, quocunque vinculo se astrinxerint, concessio, nullum fide Catholicæ vel jurisdictioni ecclesiastici præjudicium generari vel impedimentum præstari posse seu debere declarat, quo minus dicto salvo conductu non obstante, liceat judici competenti & ecclesiastico, de ejusmodi peronarum erroribus inquirere & alias contra eos debite procedere, eodemque punire, quantum justitia suadebit, si suos errores revocare pertinaciter recusaverint, etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii, aliàs non venturi, nec sic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipso eat, ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum.

* *Platina* ascribes the institution of Holy Water to Pope *Alexander*; But the infallible *Baronius*, is of opinion, that it was introduced by the Apostles, (the smallest vestige of which is not to be seen in their writings.) Let those reconcile them whose province it is to solder such disputes.

both, Christ and the Apostles received into their mouths, and thence into their stomachs, at the last Supper; and by what miracle they escaped bursting? whether the Apostles said, or sung low and high mass for the dead, and how those masses rated in the Apostolic and primitive ages of the Church? whether a person could do too many good works? whether the Apostles and *Virgin Mary* had a bead,* gifted with a plenary indulgence to pray upon at Mass? Which of the Apostles was Penitentiary to the rest, especially to *St. Peter*, after his denial, &c.? the deluded, and more than probably ignorant father† would command him to make no such enquiries, and oblige him to give a blind and inward assent to every article proposed by the Church of Rome, which she required, on pain of final perdition. This, it must be owned, was alarming to a tender mind, susceptible of the most incoherent impressions, and seconded by filial duty and affection, together with the superior influence of an ignorant, or bigotted Priest, gained the desired effect. Hence Romish Oral Tradition, by degrees, took its rise; hence, by similar collusion, it has gained esteem.



OF ORAL TRADITION.

As oral tradition is the main basis and sole support of the Church of Rome, let us, in the first place, examine what foundation it is built upon. If the foundation of any structure be weak, the superedifice will

* *St. Dominick*, Founder of an Order of men that bear his name, was the author and promoter of the Inquisition, and inventor of the Popish beads. Two pretty devices to lead men to Heaven!

† If we may believe authentic records, there were scarce ten gentlemen in Europe who had a Bible, in the beginning of the sixth century. So grossly ignorant are some, even in this enlightened age, as to be persuaded that *Luther* and *Calvin*, were the authors of it.

give way and soon tumble down ; this I dare venture to affirm can be most justly adapted to the oral traditional tenet of the Church of Rome. Let us, previous to the proof of this, see how *Moses* the ordained lawgiver of God proceeded. Did he not hand down in writing, the minutest articles of the old law ? Was there before the birth of Christ in the written law, even a shadow of oral tradition, * if you do not believe the Cabala, which is both ridiculed and rejected by the learned of all persuasions. Are we to neglect the Scriptures which Christ remitted to us, to follow the delusion of human oral traditions ? Are we not, who are children of the law of grace, particularised and distinguished through God's mercy from the unbelieving parts of the world ? How then can it be said, that Christ has adopted us preferably to thousands who are unacquainted with his holy law, if according to the tenets of the Church of Rome, we must be led by the halter of oral tradition ?

* The laws given by *Moses*, whether moral, ceremonial, or political, amount to the number 613. The Jews reckon up the negative laws to the number of 365, and the affirmative to 248. They apply the first number to the days of the year, and the second to the number of parts in a human body ; thereby not only intimating, but inculcating, that not a day of our life ought to pass without meditating upon the law of God, nor any member of our bodies enjoyed which is not consecrated and employed in his service, according to that saying of *Ecclesiastes*, " Fear God and keep his commandments, for that is the whole [duty] of man."

It is unquestionably true, that *Moses* was apprised, by immediate inspiration, of the creation of the world, and of what happened after 'till his time. And if he was not thus inspired, yet he could not err as he had such records and monuments and an uninterrupted account. For between *Adam* and *Moses* there did not intervene above four persons, as appears by the following table : —

Born in the year		Died	
<i>Adam</i> created	1	930	
<i>Lamech</i>	874	1651	
<i>Shem</i>	1558	2158	
Born in the year,		Died.	
<i>Isaac</i>		2108	2288
<i>Levi</i>		2255	2392
<i>Moses</i>		2433	

By this it appears, that *Adam* lived with *Lamech* 86 years ; *Lamech* lived with *Shem* 93 years ; *Shem* lived with *Isaac* 50 years ; *Isaac* lived with *Levi* 33 years ; *Levi* died but 41 years before the birth of *Moses*, who was his grandson ; consequently there must be an accurate account of what happened as they conversed so long together upon topics which they had fresh in their memories.

Should you be curious enough to enquire into the antiquity of such or such an oral tradition, a Romanist will plausibly tell you, it has been derived from the Apostles, but I will make it appear that this is not only a delusion but a manifest falsehood; whereas it must be undeniably granted, the Apostles were inspired, and consequently must have known the will and commands of Jesus Christ; being amply commissioned and fully authorised to promulgate his holy law. They then proceeded for or against his holy will; if for it, they transmitted to us in writing every point necessary for our salvation; if against it they did not proceed according to his divine commands and directions. If the Apostles deemed those oral traditions so pompously boasted of necessary to salvation, or even an appendix to it, can any one imagine that they being divinely inspired would not insert them in their writings as they have done the fundamental points of our religion.

So weak, feeble, and subject to variation are oral traditions, that the absurdity of them is self evident to any discerning and unprejudiced mind. Diseases, age, and their appendages, together with the manifold infirmities of human nature; the various ways and methods of relation, the spring from which it originates are incident to so many vicissitudes, so many different rehearsals, that no man philosophically tinctured can give credit to the traditionary result of them. Christ therefore, apprised of this, and also knowing what was necessary for the establishment and preservation of his church, consecrated by the Apostles, his divine will to writing.

A greater proof we cannot have of this than *St. Paul*, who 2 Tim. iii. 15. declares, "that the holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto Salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus." If every duty, as

the Apostle expressly says, requisite and conducing to our salvation be handed down in Scripture, innovations and oral traditions are introduced merely to deceive us.

St. John, xviii. 20. introduces Christ saying, "I spake openly to the world, I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple whither the Jews always resort, and in secret have I said nothing." This, upon the minutest reflection, undeniably shews how repugnant oral tradition is to the open and declared doctrine of Christ; here we plainly see, he spoke manifestly to the world at his public lectures, and when he privately conversed with the Apostles, he commanded them to illustrate what he said with light, and preach in a perspicuous manner what was whispered to them over the tops of houses, that all the world might without gloss or comment, be made acquainted with his laws. Here light is put in direct opposition with darkness, and whispering with a manifest and open promulgation. How then is it imaginable the Apostles thus commissioned by Christ, and inspircd by igniferous and unerring tongues, would bury in the lumber of oral tradition and darkness his soul-saving laws and life-giving mandates. Evinced of this truth, let the Scriptures alone be our only guide.

To convince you of the delusion of oral traditions, let us see how *Constantine* and the Prelates assembled at the first Council of *Nice* proceeded. The following are *Constantine's* words—"In all theological disputes the prescribed doctrine of the Holy Ghost is only to be attended to, the Evangelical and Apostolical books, together with the Oracles of the Prophets, evidently intimate to us the will of the Deity. Therefore, laying aside seditious contention it were but meet to have matters determined by the divine writings." Not one of the bishops dissented

from, or questioned the truth of this speech, which would have been perfidiously done had they imagined oral traditions to be of equal weight and importance with the divine writings of the Evangelists, Apostles, and Prophets in elucidating debated questions relative to faith.

Another ancient testimony out of *Irenæus*, who lived in the second century strengthens the above. He promises in his third book, to the Christian reader, “a most full resistance against all heretics and establishment in the *sole, true, and vivific faith which the Church received from the Apostles and distributed to her children.” He tells him in the beginning of the first chapter, “That we know not that the disposition of our salvation is by any others but those † by whom the gospel came to us which they then preached, but after by the will of God delivered to us in the Scriptures to be the foundation and pillar of our faith.” Thus, he adds, *Matthew* among the Hebrews set out the Scripture, or writing of the gospel in their language, generally knowing no other; thus *Mark*, the disciple and interpreter of *St. Peter* delivered to us, in writing, what was preached by *St. Peter*: thus *Luke*, a follower of *Paul* ‡ set down in a book the gospel which was preached by him: and afterwards *John*.

This was the same rule of faith in *St. Cyprian's* time, in the middle of the third century, Ep. 74. to *Pompeius*, where upon Pope *Stephen's* pressing tradition to him, he replies, § “Whence is tradition?”

* Plenissimum adversus omnes hereticus contradictionem, sola verâ ac vivificâ fide quam ab Apostolis Ecclesia percipit, et distribuit filiis suis.

† Per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos, quod quidem tunc præconcio naverunt, postea vero per dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt fundamentum et columnam fidei nostras futurum.

‡ Unde est ista traditio? utrumne de dominicâ et evangelicâ auctoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis ventens? Ea faciendâ esse quæ scripta sunt.

§ Si aut in evangelio præcipitur aut in Apostolorum epistolis aut actibus continetur—observetur divina hæc et sancta traditio.

Doth it descend from the authority of the Lord and the gospel? Doth it come from the commands and pistles of the Apostles? For God," says he, "testifies and proposes to *Joshua*, the son of *Nun*, that * those things are to be done which are written," saying, "the book of this law shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shall meditate in it day and night, and observe to do those things that are written in it." [God, it seems, then thought people were to be guided by his written law.] † "If then he commanded in the gospel, as contained in the epistles, or acts of the Apostles, let this divine and holy tradition be observed. But ‡ if in all former times it be no where commanded nor written, what obstinacy, what presumption is it to prefer a human tradition to God's disposing? He further adds, that § custom without truth, is but antiquity of error. He concludes, that it is the duty of priests who keep God's law, that if in any particular the truth totter, or be ready to fall, they revert to the beginning in Christ and the gospel, and from thence let the reason of our action arise whence the beginning of our Christianity arose. ||

St. Basil, in the Fourth Century, says, "Let Tradition put thee to the blush, the Lord hath thus taught, the Apostles preached, the Fathers observed, the Martyrs confirmed, be thou content to speak as thou hast been taught, and bring me not those captious sophisms." § A little after, he says, "every word or

* Si retro nusquam omnino præceptum est, neque conscriptum, quæ est ista obstinatio, humanam traditionem divinæ dispositioni anteponeat?

† Consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est.

‡ Si in aliquo nutaverit aut vacillaverit veritas, ad originem dominicam et evangelicam et apostolicam traditionem revertamur. Inde surgal actus nostri ratio, unde et ordo & origo surrexit.

§ Tom. 1. Hom 27. contra Sab. p. 608. Tom. 2. p. 307.

thing ought to be confirmed, or ratified by the testimony of inspired Scripture.

St. Austin, in the beginning of the Fifth Century, requires the *Donatists* to shew from the Canonical Books of the Holy Scriptures, whether they be right or not, in their pretensions, as when Christ rose from the dead, and shewed himself to his Disciples, lest they might think there was any deceit in it; “magis nos testimoniis leges & prophetarum & psalmodum, confirmandos esse iudicavit:” he thought fit to confirm them by testimonies of the law, and prophets and psalms, shewing that those things were fulfilled in him, which had been so long before foretold. This is an eminent testimony from Christ’s own judgment, that Scripture and not oral tradition was the surest and fittest way of concluding controversies relative to Faith. In like manner against the letters of *Petilian*† “Whether I, or you, be schismatics, non ego nec tu sed Christus interrogetur ut indicet Ecclesiam suam. Let Christ be asked, and neither I nor you, that he may shew, or point out his Church.” In his 166th epistle, he says, “In Scripturis discimus ecclesiam, &c. The Scriptures which teach us Christ, are the means to teach us the church also: and again, in Psalm lxxix. “Lest any should tell thee, that is Christ, which is not Christ;” “aut ecclesia est, quæ non est ecclesia, as that is the church, which is not the church; audi vocem pastoris, hear the voice of the shepherd, i. e. of Christ in the Scripture. “Puritas doctrinæ expendenda est, non secundum traditionem præsentis aut hujus, vel illius particularis ecclesæ, hujus vel illius interpretis, sed secundum traditionem ab initio, a temporibus Apostolorum concordia Patrum sententia, ad nos usque

† L. 4, c. 85.

deductam. The purity of doctrine is to be weighed, not according to the tradition of the present church, or of this, or that particular church, of this, or that interpreter, but according to tradition deduced from the beginning from the times of the Apostles, even to us, by a concordant opinion of the Fathers."

About the middle of the Fifth Century, *Salvian*, Bishop of Marseilles, speaking of the Goths, who received the faith, but yet corrupted by the *Arians*, gives this account of them, that "though they have the Scriptures, yet for want of literature, they know nothing, but what they hear from their teachers, and what they hear, they follow." And again, "they that are ignorant of all literature, * do know the sacred mystery of God's law, by teaching rather than reading, (a true picture of oral tradition,) do rather retain what they are taught, than the Law of God, and therefore the tradition of their masters, and inveterate teaching, is as it were law to them, who know that which they are taught; they are therefore, heretics, but know it not; heretics in our, but not in their own account; for they are so confident that they are Catholics, that they defame us for heretics.

Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur.

Change but the name, the Papist here is traced.

Here we have the concurrent testimonies of the writers of the five first centuries of the church, in support of Scripture being our only guide. Is not the imposition and innovation self-evident, when we see, as has been proved, that the system of oral tradition

* Nihil omnino sciunt, nisi quod a doctoribus suis audiunt, quod audiunt hoc sequuntur l. 5, p. 153, of the Oxford edition. Necesse est eos, qui totius literaturæ ac scientiæ ignari sacramentum, divini legis doctrinam magis quam lectione cognoscunt, doctrinam potius retinere quam legem. Itaque eis traditio magistrorum suorum & doctrinæ inveterata quasi lex est, qui hoc sciunt quod docentur, hæretici ergo sunt, sed non scientes; demique apud nos sunt hæretici apud se non sunt. Nam in tantum se Catholicos esse judicant, ut nos ipsos titulo hæretici appellationis infament. Ibid.

was not known in those days? Hence, I deduce that the votaries of oral traditions, which are of human, not of Divine or apostolical institution, may be addressed in the same manner, which Christ did the Pharisees. "Thus have you made the commandments of God of none effect by your traditions." Matt. xv. 6.

The oral traditions of the Jews in Christ's time, were styled by them, the Law by the mouth, in opposition to the Law in writing. They were, and are as profuse in the commendation of this Law of the mouth, as any Romanist can be of his oral tradition. *Maimonides* gives us the following account of them. "The foundations on which ye are founded, the roots, the customs, the decrees and constitutions which your great ones have constituted, from the day which the Lord commanded, and so on through all generations, like the Tower of David erected on your hill, in which are hanged a thousand helmets, with all warlike instruments of the choice ones, all the shields of the mighty." For the pretended divine original and unquestionable conveyance of them from God and *Moses*, he gives this account,—First, "that all the precepts of the Law that were sent down by God to *Moses*, were sent down to him, together with their interpretation, God delivering by word of mouth, first, the text, then the interpretation and explication of it, and [what] the authentic text comprehended. Secondly, that *Moses*, having received both, coming to his tent, he sent for *Aaron* and declared to him the text; and taught him the interpretation; then *Aaron*, standing at his right hand, called unto him *Eleasar* and *Ithamar*, *Aaron's* sons, and did the like to them; then the seventy in like manner, *Aaron's* sons standing by; and then the promiscuous assembly of Israel, in the presence and audience of all the former. Thirdly, that *Moses* departing, *Aaron* who had now heard these things four

times, repeated it out of his memory to all, and after him his sons in like manner, and so to the seventy also, and by this means, every one heard both text and interpretation four times, and so were enabled to instruct one another; the text being written in rolls or volumes, and the interpretation or tradition fixed in their memories. Fourthly, that *Moses* before he died, made proclamation, that if any had forgotten any tradition which he had received from him, he should come and ask, and he would declare it to him; and then writing thirteen copies of the law, one for every tribe, and one for the *Levites*, he died. Fifthly, that *Joshua* being furnished with these oral traditionary explications, judged the people according to them. Sixthly, that *Joshua*, before his death left all those traditions to the elders of the people, and the elders to the prophets; and thus continued without any dissension to the time of the men of the great Synagogue, *Haggai*, *Zachary*, *Malachy*, *Daniel*, *Exra*, *Nehemiah*, *Zorobabel*, &c. and so from hand to hand from *Exra* to *Simeon*, from *Simeon* to *Antigonus*, from *Antigonus* to *Joses*, from *Joses* to *Joshua* son of *Pharak*, from *Joshua* to *Judas*, from *Judas* to *Semajah*, from *Semajah* to *Hillel*, from *Hillel* to *Simeon*, from *Simeon* to *Gamaliel*, from *Gamaliel* to *Simeon* the just, called *Rabbeni Hakkadosh*, the Phoenix of his age, and he collected all the oral traditions of *Moses* thus delivered down to him." In this account, if the Jews' own testimony may be taken, what can be more exact and circumstantial than the conveyance of these oral traditions from *Moses* and God himself? Could the Pope pretend this, for all the articles of his Romish oral traditions, what trophies would he erect? And yet after all this, we cannot disbelieve our Saviour, who assures us, that the doctrine of God was depraved, evacuated, and destroyed by their traditions.

pretended to be thus lineally deduced from *Moses* and God himself. These oral traditions were not the result of their literal collections, but pretended to be delivered from father to son, orally from *Moses*, as the unwritten interpretation of the written text of the law; they were as universally received by the most learned Jews, in our Saviour's time, as the Pope believes and supports his oral traditions at present;— Instance that of their washing up to the wrist before meat, Mark vii. 2. of which says the Evangelist, "the Pharisees, and all the Jews, if they do not so wash, do not eat, holding the tradition of the elders," and he adds, "there be many other things which they have (traditionally) received to hold." The like follows, v. 9, &c. of saying *Corban*,* to father and

* The Hebrew word *Corban*, and the Greek *Gazophylachion*, signify both an offering and the vessel or chest that contained it. *Josephus* mentions in the plural *Gazophylachia*, which induced me to make a further enquiry, and discovered there were many of those chests. Two of those chests were for the half shekel that every Israelite was to pay for the redemption of his soul or life, Exod. xxx. 13. one chest for the payment of the last year, if not discharged: and the other for the half shekel due for the present year. The collectors exacted a profit *Kollubos*, which exaction caused our Saviour to overthrow *Trapesas Kollubistoon*, the tables of those *Collubists*, John ii. 15, at the first Passover after his Baptism, and Matt. xxi. 12, at the last.

Besides those two Treasure Chests that were used but for a certain time every year. there were eleven more that stood in the porticos all the year long, guarded by some Priests and Levites.

1. One for them who were to offer two turtle doves, or two young pigeons; the one for a burnt offering, and the other for a sin-offering.
2. A second was for them that were to offer a burnt offering of birds.
3. A third for whosoever offered money to buy wood for the Altar.
4. A fourth for whosoever would offer money to buy frankincense.
5. A fifth for whosoever would offer gold for the mercy-seat.
6. For the residue of a sin-offering, that is, if a man had set apart a sum of money for a sin-offering, and it purchased a sin-offering, and there was more than it cost. that which was to spare was put into this chest.
7. A seventh for the residue of a trespass-offering.
8. An eighth for a surplus of an offering of birds; of men and women who had issues; and of women after childbirth.
9. A ninth for the surplus of a Nazarite's offering.
10. A tenth for the surplus of a leper's trespass offering.
11. The eleventh for whosoever would willingly offer a sacrifice of the herd, the money wherewith to buy it, he cast into this chest.

There were besides the Chamber or Treasury of the holy shekel *Poll Money*, two other chambers, in one of which was laid up what was offered towards the repair and service of the temple, and another in which were

mother, where our Saviour expressly sets down the text first, the commandment of the Law, "Honour thy father," and then, the Jewish doctrine, derived (as they pretended) by tradition from their elders, that if any one should say Corban to his father or mother, it was no more lawful for him to relieve them, than to convert to his own private use any thing that was consecrated to God; according to a rule derived from tradition, that vows have force upon matters of precept, as much as upon matters of will or choice. In these examples, it is evident, that those doctrines were generally and publicly avowed and constantly adhered to by the Jews, as derived to them from God by *Moses*, by an uninterrupted tradition, which was so far from being derived either from God or *Moses*, that one of them destroyed the law, which undoubtedly was derived from heaven; and the other was a mere impertinent addition, and exactly of a piece with what we charge Romanists with. And there is no argument that can be urged for the authenticity of the tradition for the Romish Additional, which will not be equally of force to a Jew, in Christ's time, for either of these traditions.

offerings for charitable uses. *Maimonides* gives the following account of them, "There were two Treasure Chambers in the Temple; one, the Chamber of the Silent; and the other the Chamber of the Vessels. Into the Chamber of the Silent, religious men did silently or secretly put in their offerings, and poor children of honest parents were brought up by them secretly. The Chamber of the Vessels was where those that offered any vessels cast them in there, and once in thirty days, the Treasurers opened the Chamber, and brought out what they found fit for the supply of the Temple, and what was not fit they sold, and converted the price of it to proper use."

It was a leading principle amongst the Jews, when they fell away from the written law, that if any of them made a vow to cast money or value, into those Corbans or Treasuries; they were released from the obligation of succouring their parents, though reduced to extreme want and misery. This was the blind and infatuated result of oral tradition in opposition to the Fifth Commandment.

What an imperfect account should we not have of the works of any of the Heathen writers, were they handed down to posterity by oral tradition? How barbarously would they have been mangled, how basely traditioned, if a faithful manuscript or impression did not preserve them? Seriously consider the result of this. If books, whose perpetuity did not, ultimately concern either soul or body, were carefully handed down and transmitted to future ages in writing, how much more should the law of the living God, upon the observance of which our eternal welfare depends, be handed down in writing to posterity?

Let us, to put an end to the point in question, take an impartial view of that seeming unanswerable proof, by which Romanists would endeavour to enforce their oral traditions. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle," 2 Thess. ii. 15.

Notwithstanding the sound and appearance of this text in favour of oral tradition, yet it seems to me most unfortunately introduced for the purpose. For, it totally destroys all that heap and lumber of oral tradition which Romanists, under the severe judgment of everlasting misery, impose upon the belief of their over-credulous subjects.

The Apostle, throughout his Epistles, quotes the Gospel in no less than fifty-seven passages, as the basis upon which he founds, and the fountain out of which he extracts the doctrines which he so earnestly recommends. In the preceding verse to this Romish palladium, he mentions it, as having others joined with him in the ministry of it, "*our gospel*," and would enforce his epistle the more, because he exhorts them to nothing now, but what was intimated to them before in the gospel; "Remember ye not," he says, ver. 5, "that when I was with you, I told you

these things?" What things can these be, but a repetition by letter of what he now actually writes to them? As if he should have said possibly, O Thessalonians, what I traditioned or delivered to you by word of mouth might have escaped your recollection; but as soon as you receive this my letter, you will forthwith recollect and immediately apprehend, seeing their conformity one with the other, that I impose no new creed on your belief; what I now write and recommend to you, I told you before: you will find these my sentiments declared in the gospel which I remit to you for your greater certainty. That this, or something similar to it, is what the Apostle meant evidently appears, if we only consider, that neither he or the other apostolic writers advanced a single proposition of any moment,* but what is plainly deducible from the sermons, parables, and discourses which we find recorded in the Old Testament, or the gospels, in which we have a most perfect revelation of the will of God, characterised in so obvious a manner, that it strikes out the method of salvation to the most vulgar understanding. The Apostle, in express terms, supports this assertion, where he says, "That he had kept back nothing that was profitable for them, but had testified both to the Jews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ: and that he had not shunned to declare unto them all the counsel of God." Now, this whole counsel of God, if we believe Irenæus, and the unanimous voices of the most celebrated christian writers,

* St. Paul in the i. 12, to Titus, cites a saying out of Epimenides's treatise of oracles and their answers, to guard Titus against the Cretians, whom he otherwise knew to be "noted liars, evil beasts, and lazy lubbers." Epimenides lived about 596 years before the Christian æra. He is said to have slept several years, without intermission in a cave; to have made holy water that cured the Athenians of the plague; that he could die and recover whenever he pleased; that he had an intimate intercourse with Gods, &c.

was nothing else but the compilation which *St. Luke*, who was converted by him, made of our Saviour's life and doctrines which the Apostle had taught: and if so, the whole of God's counsel must necessarily be contained in that gospel; whereas *St. Luke*, in his prefatory discourse, tells *Theophilus*, "That for as much as many had set forth a declaration of those things that were surely believed among Christians, it seemed good unto him also, having had a perfect understanding of all things from the first, to write them down in order, that he might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been instructed." If *St. Luke* was equal to his promise, (and who dare assert he was not?) it undeniably follows, that his gospel contains a full declaration of the doctrines of Christianity; because he solemnly engaged himself to give an entire and accurate account of them; and if he has indited the sum total of all Christian obligations, it cannot be denied, but we have a full revelation of the will of God in his gospel; and if so, all Romish oral traditionary tenets, as is self-evident, must inevitably fall to the ground, and the whole of the Romish superstructure perish.

It must be granted that the Apostolic tradition prevailed and had the sanction of the Holy Ghost, until the New Testament was written, and copies of it transmitted to the several Christian churches; but when this was done there could be no further use or necessity of it, unless we suppose that either Christ did not sufficiently reveal his gospel to the Apostles, or that he had some other oral gospel to reveal which he only communicated to the Church of Rome, which would be an assertion utterly subversive of the evangelical dispensation.

The foregoing text, which manifestly ruins the Romish cause, obliges us to be only guided by the traditions handed down by the Evangelists and Apostles themselves, which being first orally given, were afterwards, for greater certainty, committed to writing; and to eliminate the oral traditions foisted in by the Church of Rome after many hundreds of years the Apostle indited his second epistle to the *Thessalonians*.

Prejudice and prepossession apart, is not oral tradition, a reed that bends with every fickle wind? Is it not subservient to the most absurd, ridiculous, and incoherent ends? What a medley of contradictions and inconsistencies, if oral tradition is to be attended to evidently appears, as I will in the sequel demonstrate by proof? Does it not undermine the fabric of our divine institution? Alas! what precipitate gulphs of blindness and prejudice are persons (who should rather believe the word of God than the tales of men) tumbled into, when they wilfully abandon the known paths of rectitude and blindly follow those of error and delusion?



OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

HAVING thus refuted the futility of oral tradition, give me leave to enquire what doctrine the Apostles preached to the world, and whether it be that very doctrine which is contained in that book, which, for its excellence, is called the Bible. If those doctrines be contained in the Bible, upon the observance of which our salvation depends, why is it prohibited as if it contained some damnable principles

improper to be conveyed to the chaste ears of a Romanist? Are they of worse tendency than some of the Popes decretals,* which are part of the Romanist's Rule of Faith, and which are a law to their Confessors, as they must abide by them in their decisions? Examine the Scriptures, and you will soon become acquainted with the reason. Should you be conversant with them, the Romish Priests are well apprised, that none of their superadded articles [all money making ones] imposed upon the belief of the credulous, can be adduced from that source; and, consequently must be ultimately, not alone dangerous to, but subversive of their principles. Notwithstanding the express command of Christ to search the Scriptures; notwithstanding those holy writings are addressed to Christians in general; notwithstanding *St. Luke* wrote nothing but what Christians were instructed in, and all that Jesus began to do and teach; notwithstanding the *Bereans* are commended for searching the Scriptures; notwithstanding the praises which *St. Paul* bestows upon *Timothy* for having known them from his childhood; notwithstanding the ancient churches ordered translations of the Bible into all

* Si ergo clericus amplectitur mulierem, interpretabitur quod causa benedicendi eam hoc faciat. Causa. xi. 9, 3. cap. Absit. in Glossa.

Quod sacerdotes fiant mariti, multo esse gravius peccatum, quam si plurimas domi meretrices alant, &c. Sleidan. Coment. lib. 4.

Is qui non habet uxorum & pro uxore concubinam habet, a communione non repellatur. Decret. distinct. xxxiv. cap. 4.

Meretrix est quæ admiserit plures, quam viginti tria hominum millia, Ibid. cap. xvi vidua est.

Sane postulasti per sedem Apostolicam edoceri, si presbyteri, plures concubinas habentes, Bigami censeantur, ad quod duximus respondendum, quod cum irregularitatem Bigamiæ non incurrerint, cum eis tanquam simplici fornicatione notatis quoad executionem sacerdotalis officii poteris dispensare. Decret. Greg. l. i. Tit. 20 cap. 6.

Thou desirest to be instructed by the Apostolic See, whether priests keeping many concubines [keeping one, it seems is but a peccadillo] are to be reckoned among the bigamists; to which we thought meet to reply; that whereas those have not incurred the irregularity of bigamy, thou mayest dispense with them as to the exercise of the priestly office, as with those who are noted only with the crime of simple fornication.

languages; (and that they had them in all languages appears from the account we have of the traditors, betrayers, who to avoid torture, gave up those sacred books, whereby the cause of Christ and his church was betrayed, which could not have been if they had no Bibles to deliver to the Heathen Magistrates;) notwithstanding I say, the sacred Scriptures are the power of God unto salvation to all believers; that they are the grand charter of Christianity, the criterion of divine truth; yet after all, Romanists are forbidden to read them. If we believe that Christ is the only begotten Son of God, we must necessarily believe nothing was withheld in his divine doctrines, necessary to our salvation; as his mission upon earth was to save our souls which were forfeited by Adam's fatal transgression. Those divine doctrines, those heavenly truths are only to be found in the Scriptures: let them be searched from the beginning to the end; let them be fairly sifted, I challenge the most quibbling sophister of the Church of Rome to prove his super-added articles from them. And I flatter myself the mal-founded assertions of that church will, in the sequel be unanswerably refuted to the satisfaction of any man open to conviction. Romanists are precluded from reading the Scriptures, lest they should understand the cheat. Let them open their understandings; let the deep fog of error in which they are involved evaporate; let them discuss the circumstances which debar them from reading the last will and dying testament of Christ; in which all the world has an equal property, being indiscriminately bequeathed to every one obnoxious to the curse inseparably annexed to *Adam's* transgression; let them act like rational beings, endued with the power of discussion, and then they will evidently discover, that filthy sor-

did lucre was the prime, the promovent, the only cause of its prohibition.

Should the schemes of Popery be investigated, they vastly preponderate the designing acts of the ancient priests of Apollo. I am persuaded the Romish laity will never forget, how they were gulled out of many many thousands, (a great part of which, their Priests, if fame may be relied on, monopolized to themselves) to have you dubbed Judges, Statesmen, Generals, Admirals, Senators, in short, to fill all the places of trust in the British Empire; which they well knew, and zealously expected would be finally subversive of the existing government. But the Lord of Hosts has defeated their expectations. Chimerical as the suggestion was, it was yet pursued, whilst a teapenny, whilst a five-penny, whilst a penny could be extorted from the poor of the country. In all the stages of life, nay after death, Romish Priests must be supplied with money. When they want a fresh supply, whether it suits a poor man's convenience or not, they repair to his house, hear confessions,* say mass, compose the soul of a being which was once a man or woman, but has ceased to be such, to temporary rest; piously attend at the solemnization of a marriage, the ceremony being more or less sacred, in proportion to the sum of money then received; in short, dine and get merry at his expense, and walk off with his money, humming a lillibolero, or his favourite odet

* These intrusions and forced invitations, they most improperly call Stations. A Station, in the sense adopted by the Church of Rome, is a chapel or oratory, where people by visiting them, may gain indulgences, as many of the visitants ignorantly believe. How far this coincides with a merry meeting in a distressed farmer's house, where after mass and confession, the priests and communicants, generally tally another score, by their excess and intemperance for the next confession bout, the dupes, upon reflection, may be judges.

† *Mihi est propositum in Tabernâ mori,
Vinum sit oppositum morientis ori,*

and laughing in his sleeve at the poor man's ignorance and credulity.

Let Romanists divest themselves of their inherent prejudices, and place both sides of the question before them with an honest heart: Let them scan the arguments pro and con; let them seriously consider how whole nations, convinced of the erroneous and superstitious practices of their Church, embraced the doctrine of Christianity set forth in the Bible; and renounced the superadded articles which were foisted among the fundamentals of our common faith. Let

Ut dicant, cum venerint, angelorum chori;
Bacchus sit propitius huic potatori.

Poculis accenditur animi lucerna,
Cor, imbutum Nectare, volat ad superna;
Mihî sapit dulcius vinum in taberna,
Quam quod aqua miscuit pressulis pincerna.

Solum cuique proprium dat naturæ usus,
Ego nunquam potui scribere jejunos,
Me jejunum vincere possit puer unus,
Sicim & jejunium odi tanquam funus.

Unicuique proprium dat natura bonum,
Ego, versus faciens, vinum bibo bonum;
Et quod habent melius dolia cauponum;
Tale vinum generat copiam verborum.

Tales versus facio, quales vinum bibo,
Nihil possum scribere, nisi sumpto cibo,
Nihil valet penitus quod jejunos scribo,
Nasonem, post calices, carmine proibo.

Mihî nunquam spiritus prophetiæ datur,
Nisi tunc, cum fuerit, venter bene satur,
Cum in arce cerebri Bacchus dominetur,
In me Phœbus irrui; ac miranda fatur.

Fertur in convivio vinus; vina, vinum,
Masculinum displicet, sed placet femininum;
In neutro genere vinum est divinum,
Loqui fecit Clericos optiniam Latinum.†

† This sort of versification was invented by *Leonine*, a native of Paris, who lived in the 13th Century; and from him is called *Leonine verse*.—The *Dies Irae*, the most solemn part of the ceremony called the *Mass* for the dead, is *Leonine*: consequently, it must be granted, it, and all the *Proses* of the same metre, were patched to that ceremony after, and not before the 12th century. This shews the *Mass* stole by degrees, into the Church.

them weigh those points with impartiality, and remove the error which darkens their understandings, the bright sunshine of reason, assisted by divine grace, will transform them from unthinking passive automatans, to reasonable creatures.

Let them be seriously convinced that the Evangelists and Apostles preached and wrote the whole doctrine of Christ, as the salvation of our souls was the errand of their commission; and that they, with thousands of martyrs sealed this *very* doctrine, and *no other* with their blood; it must then naturally occur to them, that no doctrine in the world is more valuable, more interesting more desirable than that contained in the Bible. If the fallen angels were granted such free, such unmerited pardon, with what raptures would they embrace the glad tidings, the ecstastic terms of reconciliation? Some men, alas, are lost to their own interest, rejecting the divine medium of salvation, to follow the delusions of human inventions. With what transports have some Romanists read the successes of that execrable usurper *Buonaparte*, the *Mila* of Europe, the scourge of kings and of nations, and the murderer of priests and bishops? The battles of Marengo, Jena, Austerlitz, &c. were reported and re-echoed from house to house of many of those of their communion, his encomiums resounded through this nation. As the parable says of the unjust steward, they were right, so far as policy constitutes that point; all their pretensions being founded upon his final success; but, now, the God of glory and of Hosts be praised, he is fallen, fallen, fallen, together with all his machinations and their ill-founded expectations, never, never, never to rise again.

If the achievements of a robber of the living and the dead, witness the leaden coffins he melted down, a murderer, a hero in iniquity, a destroyer of the

human race, the Corsican Jack-a-napes, le petit garçon de corse, the villain who committed incest, to the carnal knowledge of both his uterine sisters; the butcher and poisoner of thousands at Jaffa,* whose memory will be detested by the sober part of mankind until time shall be no more; how infinitely much more should the Bible, the oracle of peace and concord; the very word of God; the standard of divine truth; the light that shone in darkness; the glad tidings of the depraved race of Adam; the accomplishment of all that was predicted of the Messias, rouse our souls to a deep, to a constant investigation of the glorious promises: the happy issue of afflictions; the never ending felicities amply guaranteed by a God who will

* *Buonaparte* having carried the city of Jaffa, in Egypt, by assault, put the garrison to the sword. But the greater part flying into the mosque, and imploring mercy from their pursuers, were granted their lives by the Italian Legion. *Buonaparte* expressed his resentment at the compassion manifested by his troops; and determined to relieve himself from the maintenance and care of three thousand eight hundred prisoners, ordered them to be marched to a rising ground near Jaffa, where a division of French infantry was formed against them. When the Turks entered the fatal spot, and the preparations were completed, the signal gun fired, volleys of musquetry and grape instantly played amongst them; and *Buonaparte*, who had been viewing the scene through a telescope, when he saw the smoke ascending, could not restrain his joy. When the Turks had all fallen, the sabre and bayonet put a period to the sufferings of the wounded!

After this execrable and more than diabolical massacre, *Buonaparte*, finding that his hospitals at Jaffa were crowded with sick, sent for a physician, and entered into a long conversation with him respecting the sick, concluding, at last, with the remark, that the destruction of the sick in the hospitals, was the only measure that could be adopted to prevent a contagion. The physician, alarmed at the proposal, bold in the confidence of virtue, and the cause of humanity, remonstrated manfully, and represented the cruelty, as well as the atrocity of such a complicated murder; but finding that *Buonaparte* persevered and threatened, he indignantly left the tent, with this memorable observation,—“Neither my principles, nor the character of my profession will allow me to become a human butcher.” *Buonaparte* was not to be diverted from his object by any considerations. He persevered and found an apothecary, who dreading the weight of power, consented to become his agent, and to poison the sick.—Opium was administered at night, in gratifying food; the wretched unsuspecting victims banqueted, and in a few hours 380 soldiers, who before suffered so much for their country, thus miserably perished by the order of its idol!

“ Ille venena Colchica,
 “ Et quicquid usquam conspicitur nefas
 “ Tractavit.”

fulfil his promises, and mercifully see them accomplished.

In the New Testament, we find the history of Christ's nativity, his crucifixion, his resurrection, his ascension, his effusion of the Holy Spirit upon his Apostles, and his divine doctrines confirmed by miracles. In it, we can find the means of salvation, and the reformation of sinners. In it, we find the history of the B. V. Mary, the pattern of piety, devotion, meekness, humility, submission, maternal affection, &c. graphically delineated by St. Luke. In it, there is no sin, no vice which has not an antidote: no virtue but what is stimulated to perfection. Never-fading crowns of glory await the followers of the gospel doctrine; never ending disgrace and remorse are the portion of all who despise it. Read them, then, if you consult your everlasting happiness: Let them be your food by day, and ruminate on them by night.

The following papers are founded upon Scripture proof, and designed for use and information; let them, therefore, have a fair and impartial hearing; let them not be condemned before they are read: let them be proved by the standard of both Scripture and reason. In order to this, it is previously necessary you should shake off that lethargic fit, which, hitherto, stupified your understandings, in which you had nothing but illusive dreams and bare appearances. Arise from the dead, and Christ will give thee light; be no longer beguiled by false doctrine, by any doctrine which is not founded on Scripture, even though an angel from heaven should preach it. I fear, the thought is too alarming, to think, in what abhorrence future generations will hold you, for neglecting to sow the seeds of the saving principles of holiness, so emphatically set forth in the Bible.

I am unwilling to rake up the many massacres, murders, cruelties, treasons, plots, conspiracies, &c. which have, heretofore, affected different parts of the world; nay, some of them might be charged to the last and present era; I barely mention them, merely to exculpate them, and to shew, if your reason be not very much clouded, they proceeded from false consequences and false conclusions drawn from the best of principles. For what deduction can be more opposite to the spirit of Christianity than to conclude, the greatest crimes may be committed under the mask of religion, in order to exalt the see of Rome, and establish its supremacy over the Christian world? I venture to affirm, that fostered ignorance, the want of self-knowledge, a rooted and malign aversion to the true religion of God, the exclusive system of salvation so forcibly preached, so deeply impressed on the minds of the Romanists, together with the all-gripping avarice of their priests, the star by which they are chiefly guided, were the original causes of those, for ever lamentable outrages against God and man. Does the Bible sanction those horrid deeds? No, they were not heard of until *Hildebrand*, that brand of hell, let loose the cataracts of hell to deluge a world, wretched enough without them.

It is universally granted, that supreme magistrates are of divine appointment, as without a ruling power nothing would ensue but anarchy and confusion; if so, with what face, what colour, out of what text of Scripture can Popes pretend a power to dethrone kings and rulers, and free their subjects from allegiance, which constitutes an hereditary, primary article of the political Popish creed. To be brief, the Pope is an universal alchemist, he transmutes hypocrisy and villainy, fraud and deceit, into honour, grandeur, and immense riches,

which he either nepotises, or deposits within the strong enclosures of the Vatican, for which, when once within his clutches, no man, so dreadful are his thunders, dare bring him to account, though he should lavish them upon a fair *Lucretia*, as is known was more than once the case. To screen their nefarious deeds, they preclude those of their communion from reading the Bible, being well assured none of their antichristian tenets can be palliated by any one text in it. Scrutinize, therefore, the sacred records of God, most humbly thanking him for the divine bequest; in them you will find no doctrines but the doctrines of Christianity established; the peace of your souls placed upon a solid basis, and the encroachments of Papal usurpation gradually vanished into smook.

All the malfounded and unscriptural knowledge and artifices of Romish Priests are founded upon the credulity of the deluded people, fated to be amenable to their directions, and upon the prejudices and prepossessions which they studiously implant, and the passive obedience which they exact, without allowing them the power, under the penalty of damnation, of exerting their rational faculties; otherwise, how could they be so far besotted as to believe that their priests can forgive sins, which is the sole, the unalienable prerogative of God, and for which the second person of the most adorable Trinity became incarnate? If their credulity was not unlimited, how could their Priests impose so far upon their belief as to persuade them, that by repeating five words of Latin [the enim, one of the words is spurious] their Cabala will not admit any other language, they can metamorphose a loaf of bread [according to Romish principles, there is no limitation of size or quantity] as big as the Hill of Howth, and a vessel of wine twenty thousand times

larger than the tuns of *Heidelberg* and *Konigstein** into an Almighty God, and body and soul, and spirit of man, all in perfect union together. This they have imposed upon their over-credulous subjects, notwithstanding the very identical bread which they pretend to change is, after the words are expressed, to be seen as bread, to be touched as bread, to be tasted as bread, to be ponderous as bread, to be smelt as bread, to be nutritive as bread, to pass into the draff as digested bread, to be poisonable as bread, to be as visible and tangible and divisible as any other bread, or any other object within the sphere of their cognizance. This is alchymy which is not discoverable in the powers of God, as it comprises a contradiction; because two self-existing beings could not exist together, much less myriads of millions of Romish Christs daily all over the world. I must confess, they in other respects, are perfect alchymists; they transmute their jugglings into ready money, by pinching the vitals of the poor. It would be absurd to deny them the power of procreation. *Cum cerere & baccho exhilaratur venus*, this is too evident to be questioned. But to have the power of recreating Christ, who sits on the exalted throne of Heaven is more chimerical than to pretend to leap from earth to Heaven. Let us suppose, for supposition sake, a Priest belching out the fumes of hesternal intoxication, or, perhaps, after enjoying the favours of an adulterous bed, (this may possibly happen) who, but a man devoid of all reason, can believe that such a Priest is a proper subject for creating (blasphemous is the thought, blasphemous the undertaking) a self-existing God; who, from being the supreme ruler of heaven and earth is made a creature by the creating power of a Romish sacrificant;

* The tun of Heidelberg contains 26250 gallons.. and that of Konigstein 3709 hogshcads, or 233667 gallons.

who, in a few minutes after, eats that God which he had but just created. If they weigh this tenet with a heart open to conviction, can they, any longer be induced to believe, not alone such absurdities, but downright impious contradictions in opposition to ocular demonstration, and the concurrent testimony of their senses. Must they not then be persuaded, they are imposed upon by a race of men born to consume the hard earned labours of the poor; the vultures of the rich, whose trade is to amass money; to riot in luxury at other men's expense; and to oppress, neglect, and despise the poor and indigent. Let the juggles and artifices of the Heathen Priests and Bramins be investigated, and we will find they are far surpassed by the modern sacrificants of the Church of Rome; give them but money enough, and nothing on their part can be effected without money, all the inmates of Purgatory shall obtain a general delivery, and become qualified by a trental to take a trip to Heaven. But how sottishly do they betray themselves; the day after, nay every day until the day of judgment, they, without either remorse or shame, would take money upon the same terms which, to any man of common sense, must appear a juggle of such magnitude, that no juggler ever pretended to so great a cheat; and such is their effrontery, that their subjects are inviolably bound to assent to it, it being one of the articles of their belief. Their cheats, their inconsistencies, their impositions are so glaring, so self-evident, that they are now laid open to the world, and recognized by none but the ignorant or prejudiced; or prepossessed, who tamely suffer themselves to be led in trammels.

But to return, if the Scriptures are the word of God, whence can we learn the will of God so well as from his own mouth? they are the great instrument,

and should not every man be acquainted with that which alone can perfectly instruct him what he must believe, and what he must do that he may be saved? This is the testimony which the Scripture gives of itself, that it is "able to make men wise unto salvation;" and is it not very fit that every man should have this wisdom, and the free use of that Book from which this wisdom is to be learned?

Keeping men in ignorance of their religion, and taking away from them the use of the Holy Scriptures, our Saviour calls "taking away the key of knowledge, and shutting the kingdom of heaven against men."—That is, doing what they can to render it impossible for men to be saved. This is to stop knowledge at the very fountain head, and not only to lead men into error, but to take away from them all possibility of rectifying their mistakes. And can there be a greater sacrilege, than to rob men of the Word of God, the best means in the world of acquainting them with the will of God, and their duty, and the way to eternal happiness? To keep the people in ignorance of that which is necessary to save them, is to judge them unworthy of eternal life, and to declare it does not belong to them, and maliciously to contrive the ruin and the eternal destruction of their souls.

To lock up the Scriptures and the service of God from the people in an unknown language, is in effect to forbid men to know God and to serve him; to render them incapable of knowing what is the good and acceptable will of God; of joining in his worship, or performing any part of it, or receiving any benefit or edification from it. And what is, if this be not, to shut the kingdom of heaven against men? This is to take the surest and most effectual way in the world to destroy those for whom Christ died, and directly

to counteract the great design of God, our Saviour, "who would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth."

Can any man think that God should send this great light of his word into the world, for the priests, "to hide it under a bushel," and not rather that it should be set up to the greatest advantage for enlightening the world? *St. Paul* tells us, Rom. xv. 4. That, "whatsoever things were written, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." And, 2 Tim. iii. 16. "That all Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." And if the Scriptures were written for these ends, can any man have the face to pretend that they do not concern the people as well as their teachers? Nay, *St. Paul* expressly tells the Church of Rome, that they were written for their learning; however it happens that they are not now permitted to make use of them. If the Scriptures are so useful and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness, why may they not be used by the people for those ends for which they were given? 'Tis true they are fit for the most knowing and learned, and sufficient to make "the man of God perfect, and thoroughly furnished to every good work." But this does not exclude their being profitable also to the people, who may reasonably be presumed to stand much more in need of all means and helps than their teachers? And, though there are many difficulties and obscurities in the Scriptures, enough to exercise the skill and wit of the learned; yet they are not therefore, either useless or dangerous to the people. The ancient fathers of the Church were of another mind. *St. Chrysostom* tells us, that "whatever things are necessary, are manifest

in the Scriptures." And *St. Austin*, that "all things are plain in the Scripture, which concern faith and a good life; and that those things which are necessary to the salvation of men, are not so hard to be understood; but that as to those things which the Scripture plainly contains, it speaks without disguise like a familiar friend to the heart of the learned and unlearned." And upon these and such like considerations, the fathers charged and exhorted the people to be conversant in the Holy Scriptures, to read them daily, and diligently, and attentively. And I challenge our adversaries to shew, where any of the ancient fathers discouraged the people from reading the Scriptures, much less forbidding them to do so. So that they who do it now have no cloak for their sin: and they who pretend so confidently to antiquity in other cases, are by the evidence of truth forced to acknowledge, that it is against them in this. Though they may have ten thousand schoolmen on their side, yet they have not one father, not the least pretence from Scripture, or rag of antiquity to cover their nakedness in this point.

God severely threatens the priests of the Jewish Church, for not instructing the people in the knowledge of God, *Hos. iv. 6.* "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge; because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, thou shalt be no more a priest to me; seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children."—God, you see, lays the ruin of so many souls at their doors, and will require their blood at their hands. So many as perish for want of knowledge, and eternally miscarry, by being deprived of the necessary means of salvation; their destruction shall be charged upon those "who have taken away the key of knowledge, and shut the kingdom of heaven against men."

And it is just that God should punish people, not only as the occasion, but as the authors of their ruin. For who can judge otherwise, but that they who deprive men of the necessary means to any end, do purposely design to hinder them from attaining that end? And whatever may be pretended in this case to deprive men of the Holy Scriptures, and to keep them ignorant of the service of God, and yet while they do so, to make a shew of an earnest desire of their salvation, is just such a mockery; as if a school-master should tell his scholar, how much he has his interest at heart, and that he will instruct him in such a manner that he cannot possibly fail of making a fortune and acquiring an estate; and teaches him in the mean time, and whilst he is under his tuition, nothing but gibberish, or some unintelligible jargon, and with the strictest care conceals from him the best means of learning, whereby alone he thought to thrive and make a figure in the world. The Church of Rome proceeds upon the same principles; she has taken away the key of knowledge, not only depriving the people of the right understanding of the Scriptures, but of the very use of them, as if they were so afraid they should understand them, that they dare not suffer them so much as to be acquainted with them.

This tyranny that Church has exercised over those of her communion for several hundreds of years. It grew upon them, indeed, by degrees; for the governors of that Church still kept up the Scriptures, and the service of God in the Latin Tongue; which was, at last, as unintelligible as Hebrew to the common people. And about the ninth and tenth centuries, when by the general consent of all Romish historians, gross darkness and ignorance covered this part of the world, the Pope and the Priests took away the key of knowledge, and put it under the door for several ages,

until the first Reformers discovered it, rubbed off the rust of it, and restored it to its original lustre.

What thing in the world was ever more astonishing than this uncharitable and cruel usage of the people in the Church of Rome? And can any one tell, which to wonder at most, the insolence of their superiors in imposing upon men this senseless way of serving God, or the patience, shall I call it, or rather stupidity of the people in enduring to be so intolerably abused?—Why should reasonable creatures be treated at this rude and barbarous rate? As if they were unworthy to be acquainted with the will of God; and as if that which every man ought to do, were not fit for every man to know; as if the common people had only bodies to be present at the service of God, but no souls, or as if they were all distracted, and out of their wits, and it were a dangerous thing to let in the light upon them.

But to speak more distinctly, there are two things they are charged with, and which they are not able to deny: their performing the public service of God in an unknown tongue, and depriving the people of the use of the Scriptures.

As for their performing the service of God in a tongue unknown to the people, I will begin with *St. Paul*, who, in the 14th chapter of the 1st Cor. shews the unreasonableness of this thing, and how contrary it is to the edification of Christians. His discourse is so plain and so well known, that it is unnecessary to insist upon it. *Erasmus* in his annotations upon this chapter, breaks out (as well he might) into admiration at the practice of the Church of Rome in his time. “*Hac in re mirum quam mutata sit ecclesiæ consuetudo.*” It is wonderful, says he, how the custom of the Church is altered in this matter. *St. Paul* “had rather speak five words with understanding and

so as to teach others, than ten thousand in an unknown tongue." Why "does that Church doubt to follow so great an authority, or rather how does she so dissent from it?"

As for the practice of the ancient Church, let *Origin* bear witness. "The Grecians," says he, "in their prayers, use the Greek, and the Romans the Latin tongue; and so every one according to his language prayeth unto God and praiseth him as he is able."

And not only in *Origin's* time, but for more than the first six hundred years, the service of God was always performed in a known tongue. And this the learned men of their own tongue do not deny. Cardinal *Cajetan*, as *Cassander* tells us, said it was much better this custom was restored, and being re-proved for saying so, he said he learned it from *St. Paul*. And *Bellarmino* himself confesses, that the Armenians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, Russians, and others used their own language in their Liturgies in his time.

But it is otherwise now in the Church of Rome, and has been so for several ages: and it seems they lay great stress upon it, not only as a thing of great use, but necessity. For *Gregory VII. Hildebrand* of infernal memory, forbids *Ladislaus*, Prince of Bohemia, to permit to the people the celebration of divine offices in the Slavonian tongue; and commands him to oppose them with all his forces. It seems he thought it a cause worthy the fighting for, and that it was much better the people should have their threats cut, than suffered to understand their prayers.

Let us reason this matter a little calmly. Is it necessary for men to understand any thing they do in religion? And is not prayer one of the most solemn parts of religion? And why then should not men understand their prayers as well as any thing else they do

in religion? Is it good that people should understand their private prayers? That we thank them they allow, and why not public as well? Is there less of religion in public prayers? Is God less honoured by them? Or, are we not as capable of being edified, and of having our hearts and affections moved and excited by them? Where then, lies the difference? The more one considers this, the more he will be at a loss what tolerable reason any man can give, why people should not understand their public devotions as well as their private? If men cannot heartily and devoutly pray alone, without understanding what they ask of God, no more, I contend, can they heartily and devoutly join in the public prayers which are made by the Priests, without understanding what they are. If it be enough for the Priest to understand them, why should not the Priest only be present at them; unless the people do not meet to worship God, but only to wait upon the priest. But by saying the Priest understands them, it seems it is better some body should understand them than not; and why is not that which is good for the Priest good for the people?

Now, the true state of the controversy is, whether it be fit that the people should be edified in the service of God; and whether it be fit the Church should order things contrary to edification? For it is plain that the service of God in an unknown tongue is useless and unprofitable to the people; nay, it is evidently no public service of God when the Priest only understands it. For how can they be said to be public prayers if the people do not join in them? And how can they join in that they do not understand? And to what purpose are lessons of Scripture read, if people learn nothing by them? And how should they learn when they do not understand? This is, as if one should pretend to teach a man Greek out of an Ara-

tic or Persian book of which he understands not one syllable.

As to their depriving the people of the use of the Holy Scriptures, our blessed Saviour exhorts the Jews "to search the Scriptures;" and *St. Paul* charges the Christians, that "The word of God should dwell richly in them;" and the ancient Fathers of the Church do most earnestly recommend to the people the reading and study of the Scriptures; how comes the case now to be so altered? Sure the word of God is not changed; that certainly abides and continues the same for ever.

I cannot see what objections can be made against the people's reading the Scriptures which would not have held as well against the writing and publishing of them, at first, in a language understood by the people, as the Old Testament was by the Jews, and the Epistles of the Apostles by the Churches to whom they were written, and the Gospels both by Jews and Greeks. Were there no difficulties and obscurities then in the Scriptures capable of being wrested by the ignorant and unlearned? Were not people then liable to error, and was there no danger of heresy in those times? And yet these are their great objections against putting the Scriptures into the hands of the people. Which is just like their arguing against giving the cup to the laity from the inconveniency of their beards, lest some of the consecrated wine should be spilled upon them; as if errors and beards were inconveniencies lately sprung up in the world, and which mankind was not liable to in the first ages of Christianity.

But if there were the same dangers and inconveniencies in all ages, this reason makes against the publishing of the Scriptures to the people at first, as much as against permitting them the use of them now. And, certainly, if you pry into the matter all these objec-

tions are against the Scripture itself; and that which the Church of Rome would find fault with, if it durst, is that there should be no such book in the world;* and that it should be in any body's hands,

* So conscious are the Romish Prelates of the gross absurdity and the manifest folly of their own doctrine, and the plain contradictions that it bears in many of its articles to Scripture, and the clearest reason; that they dare not permit the meanest subjects of their church to look into the Scriptures, or make any enquiry or search into the articles of their faith, or trust a child of twelve years old without an oath to bind him firm to their superstitions.

It has been decreed by many of their councils, (see Binius's Collection of Councils, tom. xi. part I. p. 430, 693, 722, 724, and 725.) that all males at fourteen and females at twelve years of age, shall abjure all heresy; extolling itself against the Holy Catholic Roman Church, and orthodox faith; and shall swear also, that they will hold the faith which the Roman Church teacheth and holds. This is determined by a council met at *Toulouse* in France, A. D. 1229. can. 12. By a council held at *Beziers*, A. D. 1246, can. 31. By a council held at *Alby*, can. 11, 12. Moreover, this oath, by the decrees of the council of *Toulouse* and *Alby* is to be renewed upon them every two years. And all that do come in and confess their heresy must take the same oath, saith the council of *Beziers*, can. 5.

All consuls, governors of castles, authorities and barons must be compelled by ecclesiastical censure to abjure heretics, with the favourers and abettors of them, saith the provincial council of *Narbon*, can. 15.

No layman, upon penalty of excommunication, must dispute publicly or privately touching the Catholic Faith, saith *Nicholas III.* Bullar, Rom. tom. i, p. 182.

No Layman must have any books of the Old or New Testament, except the Psalter, the Breviary, and the hours of the blessed Virgin, (three New Testament Books of the Roman edition) any of which they must, by no means, have in the vulgar tongue, council of *Toulouse*, can. 14, council tom. xi. p. 430.

And so great is their aversion to the Bible, when translated into intelligible language, that on the 20th of April, 1544, the English Bible, at the instigation of the Romish Bishops, was publicly burnt in *London* by order of Queen *Mary*. And on the 25th of January, 1791, a Bible was found hanging at the gallows, in the island of *St. Vincent*.

Must not such unworthy arts and treatment give just reason to all considering persons to suspect the truth of that religion which is supported by oaths, abjurations, and the vilest calumnies; stopping men's mouths, and not permitting them to ask that reason of their faith which all men are obliged, by their Christianity, to be "in readiness to give to all that ask it," 1 Pet. iii. 15., and by withholding of those Scriptures of the Old Testament, "which are able to make them wise unto salvation," 2 Tim. iii. 15, which, by the law of *Moses* were to be continually read unto, continually talked of by the people, Deut. vi. 7, to which they, by the Prophets, were advised to go, and by which they might pass judgment on those who spake unto them of religious matters, Isaiah vii. 20, which our Lord doth enjoin them both to hear and "search," John v. 39; as also his Apostles did, commending them who "from their youth had known," and who, upon occasion, "search the Scriptures, 2 Tim. iii. 15," and also those of the New Testament which were purposely written in the plainest language of the world, Acts xvii. 11; that all might know them, and in great simplicity of speech, 2 Cor. xii; that they might understand them; and which were carefully left to be a rule of faith and manners to

learned or unlearned; for if it be dangerous to any, none are so capable of doing mischief with it as men of wit and learning. So that at the bottom, if they would speak out, the quarrel is against the Scriptures themselves. This is too evident by the counsel given to Pope *Julius III.* by the Bishops met at *Bononia* to consult about the establishment of the Roman See; where, among other things, they gave this as their last advice, and as the greatest and weightiest of all, "That by all means, as little of the gospel as might be, especially in the vulgar tongue, should be read to the people; and that little which was in the Mass ought to be sufficient: neither should it be permitted to any mortal to read more. For so long, say they, as men were contented with that little, all things went well with them; but quite otherwise since more was commonly read." They moreover, at the same time, and in the same breath, gave this remarkable testimony and commendation of the Scripture. "This, in short, is that book which above all others, hath raised those tempests and whirlwinds which we were almost carried away with: and, in truth, if any one diligently considers it, and compares it with what is done in our Church, he will find them very contrary to each

all succeeding generations; which the primitive fathers vehemently recommended to the perusal of all Christians; and which the Heathen persecutors as fiercely as the modern Romans did strive to wrest out of their hands.

If, notwithstanding all the care that is taken by the Romanists to keep the laity, both ignorant and blind, some by the strength of natural reason and religion, and others by conversing with men of better principles, or reading that so pestilent, and therefore carefully forbidden book, the Word of God, come to the knowledge of his truth, and be convinced of the superstitions and follies of the Romish doctrines, and so become, according to their notions Heretics; all imaginable care is used, that they may not escape their hellish cruelty, nor find a corner in villages or woods, above or under ground, which may preserve them from their fury. See the Bull of Martin V. published with the consent and approbation of the General Council of Constance. *Martinus Episcopus, Archiepiscopus, Episcopus, ac Inquisitoribus Hæreticæ pravitatis ubilibet constitutis, Bin. tom. vii. p. 1119. Bullary Rom. tom. i. p. 178. Const. Innocentii Quarti cap. 3, 4. Clem. IV. Const. xiii. leg. 3. and Binus.*

other, and our doctrine not only to be very different from it, but repugnant to it." If this be the case, they do like the rest of the children of this world prudently enough in their generation; can we blame them for being against the Scriptures, when the Scriptures are acknowledged to be so clearly against them? But surely no body that considers these things would be of that church, which is brought by the undeniable evidence of the things themselves to this shameful confession, that several of their doctrines and practices are very contrary to the word of God.

What can be pretended in justification of so contumelious an affront to mankind, so great a tyranny and cruelty to the souls of men? Has God forbidden the people to look into the Scriptures? No, quite contrary. Was it the practice of the ancient Church to lay this restraint upon men, or to celebrate the service of God in an unknown tongue? Our adversaries themselves have not the face to pretend this.

As to the service of God in an unknown tongue, the Romanists say, the people exercise a general devotion, and come with an intention to serve God, and that is accepted, though they do not particularly understand the prayers that are made, and the lessons that are read.

But is this all that is intended in the service of God? Does not *St. Paul* expressly require more, that the understanding of the people should be edified by the particular service that is performed? And if what is done be not particularly understood, he tells us the people are not edified, neither can they say Amen to the prayers and thanksgivings that are put up to God; and that any man that should come in and find people serving God in this unprofitable and unreasonable manner, would conclude they were all mad.

And if there be any general devotion in the people, 'tis because, in general they understand what they are about, and why may they not as well understand the particular service that is performed; that so they might exercise a particular devotion? So that they are devout no farther that they understand; and consequently as to what they do not understand, had every whit as good be absent.

They say the prayers are to God and he understands them, and that is enough. But what harm could ensue, if all they that pray understood them also? Or, indeed, how can men pray to God without understanding what they ask of him? Is not prayer a part of the Christian worship? and is not that a reasonable service? And is any service reasonable that is not directed by our understandings, and accompanied with our hearts and affections?

But what have they to say for the lessons and exhortations of Scripture, which are likewise in foreign countries, every day read to the people in an unknown tongue? Are these directed to God, or to the people only? And are they not designed by God for their instruction, and read, either to that purpose or to none? And is it possible to instruct men by what they do not understand? this is a new and wonderful method of instruction, to conceal from the people the very things which they should learn. Is it not all one as to all purposes of edification, as if the Scriptures were not read, or any thing else instead of them, as they generally, every day do their legends? For all things are alike to them, that understand none, as all things are of a colour in the dark. Ignorance knows no difference of things; it is only knowledge that can distinguish.

They say that some do, at least in some measure,

understand the particular prayers; if they do, they are not to be thanked for that. It is by accident, if they are more knowing than the rest, and more than their church either desires or intends. For if they desired it, they might order their service so, as every man might understand it.

They say that it is convenient that God should be served and worshipped in the same language all the world over. Whence had they this divine revelation? Convenient for whom? For God? Or for the people? It must be for either of the two. Not for God surely. For he understands all other languages as well as Latin, and for any thing we know to the contrary, likes them as well. And, certainly, it cannot be convenient for the people, because they generally understand no language but their own; and it is very inconvenient they should not understand what they do in the service of God. But, perhaps, they mean that it is convenient for the Roman Church to have it so; because this would look like an argument, that they are the Catholic, or Universal Church; when the language, which was originally their's shall be the universal language in which all nations shall serve God; and by this means also, they may bring all nations to be of their religion, and yet make them never the wiser; and this is a very great convenience, because knowledge is a troublesome thing, and ignorance very quiet and peaceable, rendering men fit to be governed and unfit to dispute.

As to their depriving the people of the Scriptures, they say that their Church can give leave to men to read the Scriptures. But this is not without great trouble and difficulty; there must be a license for it under the hand of the Bishop, or one of the officers of the Inquisition, wherever one is held by the advice and recommendation of the Priest, or Confessor, concerning

the fitness of the person who desires this privilege; and we may be sure, they will think none fit, but those of whom they have the greatest confidence and security: and whoever presumes to do it otherwise, is to be denied absolution; which is, as much as in them lies, to damn men for presuming to read the Word of God, without their leave.

Whatever liberties they in this respect, may grant in Ireland, yet this privilege is very rarely granted where they are in full possession of their power, and have the people perfectly under their yoke.

They tell us they instruct the people otherwise. But was there ever a book that contained such divine instructions as the Bible? When seldom they speak to the people, their oratory consists of curses and abusive language, or some stimulations to incite them to pay off their arrears, or prepare for the next payment.— I heard one of them pray “that as many legions of devils as the sheep had hairs on its body, may snatch the soul of the thief who stole it.” This and such like are Christian instructions. Moreover, when they preach, and that is very seldom, their Sermons are commonly made up of feigned stories and miracles of saints, and exhortations to the worship of them, and of their images and relics. And for the truth of this I appeal to the innumerable volumes of their sermons in print, which, I must suppose, are none of their worst. I am convinced that in many chapels in Ireland, the people scarce in a year, hear a profitable sermon to exhort them to true piety. Indeed they allow their people, catechisms and manuals of devotion, but their errors are slyly interspersed in them, and they have the conscience and confidence to steal away the second Commandment out of them all. If those helps to instruction are agreeable to the Scriptures, why are they so afraid the people should read the Scriptures? if they are not, why do they deceive and delude them?

They say the People are apt to wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction, and that the promiscuous and indiscriminate use of them has been the great occasion of heresies. It cannot be denied to be the condition of the very best things in the world, that they are liable to be abused; health and light, and liberty, meats and drink, as well as knowledge, are often used to bad purpose. But must all these, therefore, be taken away? This very inconvenience of people's wresting the Scriptures, and making them speak what they did not intend, *St. Peter* takes notice of, in his days, and prophetically foresaw what the Romanists would do in their times; but he does not therefore forbid men the reading of them, as his successors have done since. Suppose the reading of the Scriptures have been the occasion of heresies, were there ever more than in the first ages of Christianity? And yet neither the Apostles, nor their immediate successors ever prescribed this remedy. But are they in earnest? Must not men know the truth for fear of falling into error? Because some men may possibly miss their way at noontide, must others never travel but in the night, when they are sure to lose it?

But it is not true that heresies have sprung from this cause? They have generally been broached by the learned, from whom the Scriptures neither were, nor could be concealed, and never by the common people. And for this, I appeal to the history and experience of all ages. I am well assured the ancient fathers were of another mind. *St. Chrysostom* says, "If men would be conversant in the Scriptures, and attend to them, they would not only not fall into errors themselves, but rescue those that are deceived; and that the Scriptures would instruct men both in right opinions and a good life." And *St. Jerome* more expressly to the

purpose, that "infinite evils arise from the ignorance of the Scriptures, and that from that cause the most part of heresies have come."

But, if the Scriptures are so dangerous as Romanists represent them, is not this to lay the blame of all the ancient heresies upon the ill-management of our Saviour, and his Apostles, and the holy fathers of the Church for so many ages, and their imprudent dispensing of the Scriptures to the people for their guidance and direction? This indeed is charging the point in question home, and yet the consequence is unavoidable. For the Church of Rome cannot justify her present practices, without accusing all these.

But the thing which they chiefly rely upon is this, that though these things were otherwise in the Apostle's days, and in the ancient Church, yet the Church has power to alter what she deems convenient according to the exigence and circumstance of time.

To shew the weakness of this pretence, it must be granted, that the governors of the Church have in no age more power than the Apostles had in their's.— Now, *St. Paul* tells us, 2 Cor. x. 8, That the Authority, which the Apostles received from the Lord, was only "for edification, but not for destruction;" and the same *St. Paul* makes it the business of a whole chapter to shew that the performing the public service of God, and particularly, praying in an unknown tongue, are contrary to edification; from which premises the conclusion is plain, that the Apostles themselves had no authority to appoint the service of God to be performed in an unknown tongue; and surely, it is arrogance for the Church, in any age, to pretend greater authority than the Apostles had; and therefore, no church can unchurch at any time, the unchangeable Church of Christ.

This is the sum of what our adversaries say in their justification in these points. And there is no doubt, as lawyers do in Court, that men of wit and assurance will always make a shift to say something for any thing, and some way or other give a superficial tint and daubing to the blackest and most absurd things in the world. But I leave it to the judgment of any man of candor, whether any thing be more unreasonable, than to tell men in effect, that it is fit they should understand as little of religion as is possible; that God has published a very dangerous book; with which it is not safe for the people to be familiarly acquainted; that our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles, and the ancient Christian Church, for more than six hundred years, were not wise managers of religion, nor prudent dispensators of the Scriptures, but like fond and foolish fathers, put a knife and a sword into the hands of their children, with which they might easily have foreseen what mischief they would do to themselves and others. And who would not choose to be of such a church, which is provided with such excellent and effectual means of ignorance, such wise and infallible methods for the prevention of knowledge in the people, and such variety of close shutters to keep out the light of divine knowledge?

This is so very plain and evident, that the most ordinary capacity may judge of this usage and dealing with the souls of men; which is so very gross, that every man cannot avoid being sensible of it: because it touches every man in the common rights of human nature, which belong to them as much as the light of heaven, and the air we breath in.

It requires no subtlety of wit, no skill in antiquity, to understand these controversies between Romanists and Protestants. For there are no fathers to be pretended on both sides in these questions; they yield

we have antiquity on ours; and we refer it to the common sense of mankind, which Church, that of Rome, or ours, has all the right and reason in the world on her side, in these disputes? And, who they are that tyrannize over Christians, the governors of their Church, or ours? Who use the people like sons and freemen; and who like slaves? Who feed the flock of Christ committed to them, and who take the children's bread from them? Who they are that when their children ask for bread, for bread give them a stone, and for an egg a serpent? I mean the legends of their saints, instead of the Holy Scriptures, "which are able to make men wise unto salvation;" and who are they that lie most justly under the suspicion of errors and corruptions, they who bring their doctrine and practises into the open light, and are willing to have them tried by the true touchstone—the Word of God; or they who shun the light and decline all manner of examination? And who are most likely to carry on a worldly design, they who drive a trade of such mighty gain and advantage, under pretence of religion; and make such markets of the ignorance and sins of the people: or Protestants of the established Church, whom malice itself cannot charge with serving any worldly design by any allowed doctrine or practice of their religion? For they make no money of the mistakes or sins of the people, nor do they fill their heads with vain fears of new places of torment, to make them willing to empty their purses, in a vainer hope of being delivered out of them. They do not, like them, pretend a mighty bank and treasure of merits in the Church, which they sell to the people for ready money, giving them Bills of Exchange from the Pope to Purgatory, when they, who grant them, have no reason to believe they will avail them, or be accepted in the other world.

For their parts, they have no fear that their people should understand religion too well : they could wish with *Moses*, “ that all the Lord’s people were prophets :” they should be heartily glad the people would read the Scriptures more diligently, being sufficiently assured, that it is their own fault if they learn any thing but what is good from them : They have no doctrines or practises contrary to Scripture ; and consequently, no occasion to keep it close from the eyes of the people, or to hide any of the commandments of God from them : they leave these mean arts to those who stand in need of them.

In a word, there is nothing which God has said to men, which Protestants desire should be concealed from them ; they are willing the people should examine what they teach, and bring all their doctrines “ to the law and to the testimony ;” that if they be not according to this rule, they may not believe them. It is only things false and adulterate which shun the light and fear the touchstone. They have that security of the truth of their religion ; and of the agreeableness of it to the Word of God, that honest confidence of the goodness of their cause, that they do not forbid the people to read the best (or worst) books their adversaries can write against it.

Now, let any impartial man judge whether this be not a better argument of a good cause, to leave men at liberty to try the grounds of their religion, than the courses which are taken in the Church of Rome, to frighten men with an Inquisition ; and as much as is possible, to keep the common people in ignorance, not only of what their late adversaries, the Protestants, but their chief and ancient adversary, the Scriptures, have to say against them.

OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

ONE, amongst the many impositions which the Church of Rome has imposed upon a credulous world, is the belief, that Christ solemnized the first Mass; from whom it was transmitted to the Apostles, and from them to future ages. If you read Matthew xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22. Luke xxii. 19. and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, in which the institution of the Last Supper is handed down to us, you cannot discover any thing that bears the least relation to the Mass, but the plain and simple narrative of the institution: that Christ gave thanks to his eternal Father, took and brake bread, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, "This is my body, this do in remembrance of me;" and likewise, gave them wine, saying, "This Cup is the new Testament in my blood, which is shed for you, &c." This is all that can be collected from the forecited passages. Where, then, in Scripture, is the Mass to be found, either name or thing? That Christ did not institute any words or ceremonies, but what we read in Scripture, is undeniable, and consequently, it must be an assertion totally ungrounded, that Christ either said or sung high or low Mass, or Mass for the dead (the Lord's Supper being instituted for the living and not for the dead) as we have no vestiges of either in Scripture. What the Romish sacrificants now are taught to say, in what they call the Mass, cannot be discovered in any book extant, in our Saviour's or the Apostles' days, nor for many centuries after, except the 43rd Psalm. This is beyond any doubt: this is irrefragably true; consequently, what Romanists mean by the Mass must be finally reduced to the words of the institution: and the Church of Rome must ultimately admit, that the whole ceremony of the Mass, with all its pa-

geantry, more resembling a theatrical performance, than an humble and solemn address to God; is of human and not of divine invention; and, therefore, that Christ, much less his Apostles, never said or heard a word of it: and that the Church of England follows the exact form of the Divine institution. Let Rome will all her sophistry; contradict this, if she can; therefore, as there is no foundation for the Romish Mass in Scripture, I will examine, whether a Sacrificant of the Church of Rome, by virtue of any delegated power from Christ, can transubstantiate a piece of bread and a cup of wine into the real and identical body and blood, and soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. In this consists the essence of the rite or ceremony called the Mass; and upon this, the main difference, with respect to the Eucharist, rests between Romanists and Protestants.

Before I proceed to the main subject under inquiry, it is previously necessary we should be acquainted with the rites used by the Israelites at their passover.

To omit the manner of killing and roasting the Paschal Lamb, the first remarkable circumstance that occurs, is that on the evening of the Passover, a man may not eat from near the Minchah, or a little before the evening sacrifice, or until it was dark; and this is founded upon that of Exodus xii. "They shall eat the flesh in that night; and accordingly these words of the Evangelists, relative to our Saviour's Passover, are to be understood, "when the evening was come, he sat down with the twelve." They sat upon beds or couches with a table in the centre. At their ordinary meals they sat as we do, with their bodies erect; but when they enlarged the freedom of feasting, they sat upon beds, leaning upon the table, on their left elbow, and this or the other posture they used indifferently; but on the Passover night they were obliged to use

this leaning posture, in memory of their freedom, because servants eat standing; therefore, now they eat sitting and leaning, to shew they were delivered from bondage to freedom. A man was bound to behave himself at the Passover, as if he himself had been delivered out of Egyptian thralldom. Therefore, on that night a man was bound to eat and to drink at his utmost ease, and to sit in a posture of freedom.

Upon this principle of freedom they used this manner of discumbency, frequently at other times, but indispensably this night; and quite different from their attitude at the first Passover in Egypt, when they ate it "with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, their staves in their hands, and in haste," *Exod.* xii. 11. But after their return to the land of promise, the freedom they enjoyed disposed them to use this lolling posture, and to represent it the better, they had their legs and feet as much behind them as they could, to shew they were quite at their ease, and under subjection to no man, see *Luke* vii. 38. According to this manner of sitting and leaning are we to understand that passage of the Evangelist about the beloved disciples "leaning in the bosom of Jesus," *John* xiii. 25, "and on the breast of Jesus," *John* xiii. 28. and xxi. 20. From those different expressions some have thought that *John*, contrary to all reason and decency, reposed himself, or lolled upon the breast of Jesus. But the manner of their sitting together was only this, Jesus leaning on the table on his left elbow, and so turning his face and breast away from the table on one side, *John* sat in the same posture next before him with his back towards Jesus's breast, or bosom, not so near as that *John's* back and Jesus's breast joined together and touched one another; but at such a distance, that there was space enough for Jesus to use his right hand at the table, and all the rest

had the like liberty when they sat in this manner. In such a manner and distance did the beloved disciple lean before our Saviour, and yet is said, very properly, to lean in his bosom, because he leaned before his breast, so that whenever Christ put up his arm, he was, in a manner within his embrace. But when *Peter* beckoned to *John* to enquire who it was that should be the traitor, then anepesen epi to stethos, he leaned back so far, that his back or shoulders rested upon Jesus's breast, and he lay in a sitting posture to whisper with him.

The Jewish rituals and directories inform us, the first thing towards this Passover supper was, that every one drank off a cup of wine. "The order of performing the things commanded for the fifteenth night, says *Maymony*, was thus they first mingled a cup for every one of them, and one gave thanks, and they drank it off.

Among the several viands which accompanied the Paschal Lamb at its eating, there were two which they held to be most eminent and most honorable; and those were "bread and wine;" and amongst other expressions of respect and honor which they shewed to these, this was not a small one, that however they disposed of their posture of sitting at all the rest of the meal, they were obliged to lean (the emblem of their liberty) when they eat their unleavened bread and drank their wine. "When is it necessary," says *Maymony*, "that they use the leaning posture? Even at the time that they are eating an olive quantity of unleavened bread, and drinking their four cups of wine." And as for the time of eating and drinking any thing else at the Passover, if they sat leaning, it was the more commendable, but if they did not, it was not so very material. The unleavened bread requires the leaning posture, but

the bitter herbs require it not; of the wine it is said that it requires the leaning posture, and it is said it does not require it; for they say, "that the two first cups require this leaning composure; but the two last require it not."

They were enjoined to eat unleavened bread at this time by a special and express command, Exod. xii. 18., but as for the use of wine they took it up upon this general principle, because a man must cheer up his wife and children to make them rejoice at the festival. And what do they cheer them up with? With wine. And they were so punctual and exact in this matter, that the poorest man in Israel was bound to drink off four cups of wine this night, though he lived of the alm's basket. And if he had no other means to procure so much wine, or if the almoners gave him not enough to buy four cups, he must sell or pawn his coat, or hire himself for a time for four cups of wine. The Jewish doctors are divided, why four cups of wine, rather than any other number, and the result is to the following purpose. "Whence is the ground of four cups?" *Rabbi Johanan* says, "in parallel to the four words that are used about Israel's redemption, bringing out, delivering, redeeming, and taking." *Rabbi Levi* says, "in parallel to the four cups of *Pharaoh* in these texts, *Pharaoh's* cup was in my hand, and I squeezed them into *Pharaoh's* cup. And I gave the cup into *Pharaoh's* hand, and thou shalt give *Pharaoh's* cup into his hand." *R. Levi* says, "in parallel to the four monarchies," Dan. vii. other Rabbins say, "in parallel to the four cups of vengeance which the holy blessed God will make the nations of the world drink off." For which there are those four texts, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel to me, take the wine cup of this fury at mine hand," Jer. xxv. 16. "Babel is a golden cup in the

hand of the Lord." Jer. li. 7. "For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup," Psal. lxxv. 8. "And this is the portion of their cup," Psal. xi. 6. And answerably the Lord will make Israel drink four cups of consolation in these four texts; "The Lord is the portion of my cup," Psal. xvi. 5. "My cup runneth over," Psal. xxlii. 5. "I will take the cup of salvation," Psal. cxvi. 13, which was two.

They were curious about the measure and about the mixture of these four cups of wine which they were to drink. The proportion of wine in every cup should not be less than the fourth part of a quarter of a hin, which is half a pint and half a naggin of our measure, besides what water was mingled with it; for if they did not drink it mixed they missed of the right performance of that service. "These four cups," says *Maymony*, "must needs be mingled;" and the Rubric, for this night's service, whenever it speaks of any of these cups of wine brought to the officiator, uses this expression, "they mingled it for him;" and it is a current maxim with them, "that whoever drank these four cups of pure wine, did his duty about drinking wine, but had not done his duty about setting forth their freedom." This mingling of their wine was not so much in reference to sobriety, as it was to make the wine the more pleasant, according to the quality of the wine and the taste of the drinker, which represented their freedom, and which they affected to express at this time. When they were seated, the first cup was brought to them, and one of the company, whom they called "the rehearser of the office of the Passover," gave thanks over the wine, and then they drank it off. The tenor of his thanksgiving was to this purpose; over the wine he said, "Blessed be thou, O Lord, who hast created the fruit of the

vine ;” and concerning the day he used these words, “ Blessed be thou for this good day, and for this holy convocation which thou hast given us for joy and rejoicing ; blessed be thou, O Lord, who hast sanctified Israel and the times.” After washing their hands the table was furnished with what provision they held requisite for that supper, which consisted of several sorts ; besides the Passover lamb, and unleavened bread, and bitter herbs for which they had an express command ; they had, at least, two or three dishes more which they had taken up upon tradition. Let us take a particular view of all those dishes.

There were two or three cakes of unleavened bread, (the number is under some dispute) and they held the eating of this bread so indispensably commanded, that infants and sick persons were brought to it ; and if they were not able to eat it dry, they had it soft and macerated in some liquid, that they might eat of it, at least to the quantity of an olive. As for people in full health, they were to eat very little the preceding day that they might be hunger-bitten, and eat the unleavened bread with a keen appetite at night ; and many of them would fast all day for that purpose. Especially they might not eat unleavened bread all that day, because there should be a distinct appetite for it at the passover ; and he that ate any unleavened bread that day, before that time, was beaten with the rebel’s stripes. *

* This was a most desperate beating, or mauling by the people, without and sentence of the judges passed upon the offender. If a man was deprehended faulty in such, or such an offence, the people fell upon him pell mell with fists, staves, and stones, and mauled him unmercifully, and very often to death. *Rabbi Nathan* describes it thus, “ The beating, according to the law is, of those that transgress against negative precepts, and it is by measure and for admonition, and with a three-corded whip ; but he that transgresses against affirmative precepts, they beat him until his life depart, and not with a threefold whip. And likewise, whoever transgresses against the words of the wise men, they beat him without number, or measure, and they call it the rebel’s beating,

They used five kinds of herbs, *lettuce, endive, succory, beet, horehound*, or some such herbs as these, some of them salad herbs, and some bitter; and these either green or dried, but neither boiled nor pickled. And the general and proper reason that is given for using this rite of eating bitter herbs, is that they might remember the bitter affliction they underwent in *Egypt*. The body of the Paschal Lamb was also set upon the table, with his legs and inwards, as heart, liver, &c. held by some to have been roasted within him, but by others to have been fastened upon his body, and so roasted on the outside of him. Now, besides these three dishes of bread, flesh, and salad so positively appointed by the law, they used to eat some other meat before they began to eat of the Paschal. And the reason of this was, because they would eat of that to satiety. For it was held a positive command that a man should eat the flesh of the Passover with satiety; therefore, if he had offered his fourteenth day's peace-offerings then he ate of them first, and afterwards ate of the flesh of the Passover, that he might satiate himself with it; yet if he ate no more than what amounted to the size of an olive, he discharged the obligation of his duty. They also had a dish of thick sauce which they called *charoseth*, made of sweet and bitter things, ground and pounded, and mingled together, as dates, figs, raisins, vinegar, &c. And this was a memorial to them of the clay in which their fathers laboured in the land of *Egypt*, in which there is a mixture of every thing.

“ because he rebelled against the words of the law, and against the words of the scribes. The reason of this beating, says another Jew, is because he transgressed against a prohibition of theirs, in a thing which hath its foundation in the law, and he is, therefore, a son of rebellion.” The frequent taking up of stones by the people to have stoned our Saviour, and that incursion upon him, *Matt. xxvi. lxvii.* and upon *Stephen*, *Acts vii. 57, 58.* for blasphemy, as they pretended; and upon *Paul*, *Acts xxj. 31.* for defiling the temple, as they supposed, were of this nature.

The table, thus furnished, the officiator takes some of the salad, and after he had blessed God for creating the fruit of the ground, he dips it in something, but whether in the thick sauce *charoseth*, or in the wine, or in the vinegar, is disputed, and he eats the quantity of an olive (the size of a plumb) at least of them, and so do all the rest of the company likewise. Now this dipping and eating of herbs was not comprised under the notion of eating bitter herbs, which the law enjoined, but it was some other of the herbs, as *lettuce*, *endive*, or the like; and it was for this end merely, that the children might begin to wonder at this strange beginning of a meal, and might be incited to enquire about the matter. And to urge them to this the more, the company had no sooner eaten a bit of the salad, but immediately all the dishes were removed from before the officiator, and a second cup of wine was filled and laid before him. And here the children began to enquire about the matter, and if he had no children the wife enquired; and if there was no wife, the company enquired one of another. And if no one enquired, yet he unasked began thus:—"How different is this night from all other nights! For on all other nights we eat leavened or unleavened bread indifferently, but on this night unleavened bread only. On all other nights we eat any sort of herbs, but on this night bitter herbs. On all other nights we eat flesh either roasted or stewed, or boiled, but on this night we eat flesh only roasted. On all other nights we wash but once, but on this night we wash twice. On all other nights we eat either sitting or leaning, indifferently; on this night we all sit leaning." And according to the capacity of the child he would address him, if he was very young and of slender understanding, he would tell him, "Children, we were all servants like this

maid or man servant in waiting, and as on "this night, the Lord redeemed us, and brought us into liberty." But to children of capacity, and to the rest of the company, he would tell the wonders done in Egypt; the manner of their deliverance; and God's various goodnesses towards them. He began with their disgrace, and ended with their glory, and expounded from that text, a *Syrian* ready to perish was my father, to the end; that is, he began his discourse with the idolatry of *Terah*, and their fathers beyond the flood, and he led on the story to their bondage in Egypt, and the wonders wrought for their deliverance; and the Lord's giving them his Law, and making them his people: and, particularly, he took up that text, Deut. xxvi. 5, 6, &c, and enlarged upon it, and the more, the more commendably.

Then the dishes that were taken away are set before the officiator, and he says, "This is the Passover which we eat, because the Lord passed over the houses of our Fathers in Egypt;" and holding up the bitter herbs in his hand, he says, "These are the bitter herbs that we eat in remembrance that the Egyptians made the lives of our Fathers bitter in Egypt." And holding up the unleavened bread, he says, "This is the unleavened bread which we eat, because the dough of our fathers had not time to be leavened, before the Lord revealed himself, and redeemed them suddenly. Therefore we are bound to give thanks, to praise, to laud, to glorify, to extol, to honor, and magnify him who has done all these wonders for our fathers and for us: who brought us from bondage to freedom, from sorrow to rejoicing, from mourning to a good day, from darkness to great light, from affliction to redemption; therefore must we say Hallelujah, "Praise ye the Lord, praise ye servants of the Lord, praise the name of the Lord, &c." And he said the 113th

and 114th Psalms, and concluded with this prayer, "Blessed be thou, O Lord, our God, King everlasting, who hath redeemed us, and redeemed our fathers out of Egypt, and brought us to this night to eat unleavened bread and bitter herbs. And then he and all the company drank off the second cup of wine.

And now he washes his hands a second time, using the same ejaculation, or short prayer that he had done at the first washing; and, then, taking the two cakes of unleavened bread, he breaks one of them in two, and lays the broken one upon the whole, and gives thanks to God, who bringeth bread out of the earth. Not *eulogisas eklase* first giving thanks, and then breaking, as was the method of our Saviour, Matt. xxvi. 26. Mark xiv. 22. Luke xxii. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24, for that action of Christ was farther in the supper, than we are yet come, but *klasas eulogese*, he first brake and then gave thanks. For according to the Jewish rites, he might not give thanks either over both, or either of the cakes whilst they were whole, but over it when it was broken, because it was the bread of poverty and affliction; and the poor have not whole cakes to give thanks over; but are glad to do it over bits and scraps. Hence the phrase and practice of breaking of bread seems to have its original.

Half the broken cake we are speaking of, was given to one in the company to reserve for the *Aphicomem*, or the last bit, and he laid it under his napkin. After this, the officiator took a bit, and wrapt it together with the bitter herbs, and dipped them into the thick sauce, and gave thanks, and said, "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King everlasting, who hath sanctified us by his commandments, and commanded us concerning the eating of unleavened bread." And after this prayer, he and the company eat the unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Immediately after, but first he gave

thanks, "blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King everlasting, who hath sanctified us by his command, and commanded us concerning the eating of the passover," they ate of the fourteenth days *Hagigah*, or those peace offerings which they had offered on that day; and of these they made the most of the meal. And then giving thanks again, "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King everlasting, who hath sanctified us by his command, and commanded us concerning the eating of the Passover," they ate of the flesh of the Lamb, every one, at least, the quantity or size of an olive, which when they had done, he washes his hands again, and says grace over the third cup, and they drink it off. And here we have the first action of Christ at his last Passover. Matthew and Mark record his words as they were eating, "One of you shall betray me, &c. even one of the twelve that dippeth with me in the dish, &c." Matt. xxvi. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and Mark xiv. 18, 19, 20, 21. This was most probably, at the time, when they dipped the unleavened bread, and bitter herbs in the thick sauce *Charoseth*. And Luke has those words, "with desire I have desired to eat this passover with you, &c." Luke xxii. 15, 16. But the first action which is particularly specified is, that he took the cup and gave thanks, and said, "take this and divide it among yourselves," Luke xxii. 17. This was the third cup in the supper, for there is but one more mentioned in the ceremony.

The reason why the third cup bore the name of the Cup of Blessing, above all the rest, is partly because the blessing, or grace after meat, was said over it, as it terminated the meal; and chiefly to distinguish it from the first cup, for over that and this, there was a particular blessing or thanksgiving pronounced. It has been disputed whether there was a thanksgiving or blessing used over the four cups alike, and the debate

ends to this purpose. He gave thanks, especially over the first cup, and over the cup of blessing; or, over the first cup and over the third. The Jews have this parable What is written: "And the child grew and was weaned; the Holy Blessed God will make a feast for the righteous, in the day that his mercy shall be shewed to the seed of Isaac. After they had eaten and drank, they gave Abraham our Father the cup of blessing to bless; he said I cannot bless it, because Ismael came from me: he gave it to Isaac to bless; he said I cannot, because Esau came from me: He said to Jacob, take it and bless it, he said I cannot, because I married two sisters, which the law forbids: He said to Moses, take it and bless it; he said I cannot, because I was not counted worthy to go into the land of Israel neither alive nor dead: He said to Joshua, take it and bless it, he said I cannot, because I have no son; He said to David, take it and bless it; he said to them, I will bless it, and it is fit for me to bless it, as it is said, "I will take the Cup of Salvation, I will call upon the Lord."

The Apostle uses these words, "the cup of blessing," concerning the Sacramental Cup in the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. x. 16, in which he not only alludes to their custom and manner of expression, but also gives us to understand, in the following chapter, that the Judaizing Christians in the Church of Corinth did imitate this Paschal custom at the receiving the sacrament, and that they had a supper and such plenty of wine before it; that they generally got drunk; 1 Cor. xi. 21, 22. And that to conclude the meal, they had the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, as they, at the Passover, had the unleavened bread and the cup of blessing. And as the Apostle alludes to their expression and custom, so does our Saviour also speak suitably to their practice, when taking this third cup, or the "cup of

blessing, he bids them "divide it among themselves." For the four cups, that were used at the Passover supper, were enjoined to men, women, and children; all alike.

And now we are come to the fourth cup, which was called the cup of the *Hallel*; for he finished the *Hallel* at it, and at it he said the blessing of the song. He began the *Hallel* over the second cup, for he concluded the *Haggadah*, or shewing forth of their deliverance, (as 1 Cor. xi. 26.) with the rehearsal of the 113th and 114th Psalms. And now he begins with the 115th, and proceeds to the 116th, 117th, and 118th; for these six Psalms were the *Hallel*. Now, the blessing of the song, was the following prayer or blessing (blessed, Matt. xxvi. 26.) which they either said or sung after the *Hallel* was ended,—“O Lord our God, let all thy works praise thee, and thy saints, and the righteous ones that do thy will, and thy people the House of Israel, all of them with shouting. Let them praise, and bless, and magnify, and glorify, and sing out the name of thy glory, with honor and renown, for remembrance of thy kingdom; for it is good to praise thee, and it is lovely to sing unto thy name. For ever and ever thou art God. Blessed be thou, O Lord, the King, who art to be lauded with praises. Amen.”

And he concluded thus, “Let the souls of all living bless thy name, O Lord our God, and the spirit of all flesh glorify and exalt thy memorial for ever, O, our King. For, for ever thou art God, and besides thee, we have no King, Redeemer, or Saviour. Amen.” And here the supper was quite ended, and they neither ate nor drank any more that night, Matt. xxvi: 29.

Now, to sum up the whole Rubric of this Sacramental Supper, they sat down in a leaning posture, began with a cup of wine, over which they hallowed the day; washed their hands; the table is furnished;

they first ate some sallad, have a second cup of wine filled, over which is the rehearsal of the *Haggadah*; and of Psal. cxiii. 114, and then the wine is drank off. They wash their hands again, unleavened bread is broken, thanks given, and some of it eaten with bitter herbs dipt in the thick sauce; then they ate the flesh of the peace-offerings, and after that the flesh of the lamb, after which they wash; have a third cup of wine filled, or, the "cup of blessing," over which they say grace after meat, and then give thanks for the wine, and so drink it off. And lastly, they have a fourth cup of wine filled, over which they terminate the *Hallel*, and a prayer or two after it, and so they have done.

Thus was the rite of this great solemn supper, with which if the reader compares the action of our Saviour at his last Passover, he will easily perceive, that the mention of the first thing he did, is coincident with the third cup, or, the "cup of blessing," which he bids them to "divide among themselves;" and then he takes some of the unleavened bread and gives thanks, and breaks it, and gives it to be eaten for his body sacramentally, in that sense that the flesh of the Paschal Lamb, which they had lately eaten, had been his body hitherto; for Christ was the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world. And that which was commonly called the cup of the *Hallel*, he takes and ordains for the cup of the New Testament in his blood, and after it they sung a hymn, or, the *Hallel* out; and then he withdrew and went to Mount Olivet, where he was soon after apprehended.

Thus have I traced the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to its primitive institution, and made it appear that (as baptism succeeded circumcision,) bread and wine were substituted, in the law of grace, in place of the Paschal Lamb, because Christ the true Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world, fulfilled and

completed all typical sacrifices which prefigured his death, and by his one oblation of himself realized all the expiations of the old law, by which he abrogated all sacrifices but his own, which he incessantly presents to his eternal Father, as fresh and powerful, and unimpaired, as when he suffered on Calvary. This is graciously represented to us by the bread and wine we receive in the Sacrament, they being, by his divine institution, and the graces annexed to them, ordained pledges of his love for us, and a memorial of his death until his coming again.

Search the Scriptures and the archives of antiquity; search the records of after ages, and you cannot find that the Lord's Supper (now perverted by the Romanists,) was celebrated in any form analogous to the present *Romish Mass*, until *Scholasticus*, of Vienne, in France,* patched up that ceremony, which was often corrected and amended, and at last licked up into the present form, by Pope *Pius IV.* and imposed upon the unthinking multitude, as of divine institution.

Before we proceed to the point in question, if oral traditions were true, undoubtedly, according to its votaries, we should have a just and invariable etymon of the Mass. How different, however, and incoherent are its derivations? Some will have it to be derived from *He Missa est*, which the deacons, in communion with the Church of Rome, pronounce at the conclusion of that ceremony. Some from some Greek word or other, which they had the misfortune never to have discovered as yet. Some from prayers and collects used at divine service. But others more refined, displeased with these grovelling derivations, have traced the Scriptures backward and forward, until they fortunately scented, Deut. xvi. 10; the Hebrew word

* His true name was *Fredigarius*.

Missach, which, they say, implies a voluntary oblation, or a free-will offering. Hence, exulting, they discovered in the Old Testament an adumbration, not alone of what is signified by the Mass, but even its very name.* O what a happy discovery! O what a pleasant delusion! Remark, however, the contrariety of opinion.

* *Baronius*, an accomplished blunderer, who knew neither Greek nor Hebrew, and who stumbled at nothing, that might, in any light, favour the Church of Rome, (what will not the prospect of a red hat do,) is the inventor of this opinion. But he should have remembered, that the Greek Fathers, through whose channel the other churches have received the Hebrew words, *Hosanna, Alleluia, Sabbath, Satan, Amen*, and never used the word *Missach*, but always adopted the word *junuzis* for the mysterious parts of divine service, or the celebration of the Eucharist. Moreover, *Nedovak* is true Hebrew for a free-will offering; and *Missach* signifies a babbling speech. *Baronius* should rather have told the truth, (but when they fly to artifice and falsehood, how can the truth be in them,) and informed us, that there was anciently a dismissal after divine service, of the catechumens, penitents, possessed; &c. who could not communicate at the Lord's Table, and who were commanded to depart after the sermon was ended, the Deacon crying aloud, *Osi katechoumenoi proelthete*, "Those who are catechumens go out, which gave rise to the words *Norunt Fideles*. In the church of Rome, the form was, *He, missa est*, "Depart, ye are dismissed." *Missa* being the same as *missio*, as *remissa* is often used for *remissio*; hence it was that the church service from the beginning, until the hearers were dismissed, was called by the Western Churches, *Missa catechumenorum*. "the dismissal of the catechumens;" and that which was performed afterwards at the celebration of the Eucharist, was called *Missa Fidelium*, the "dismissal of the faithful," because none but they were present at it. In this sense, and no other, the word is used by *Tertulian*. In process of time, as the discipline of the catechumens wore out, so the title which belonged to the first part of the service, was appropriated to the Lord's Supper, and made use of by the Church of Rome, to denote their Mass, the canon of which was framed by *Scholasticus*, of Vienne, in France; and the more plausibly to impose this delusion upon the people, they, with their wonted assurance, muster the places of the ancient fathers, (but not earlier than the third century,) where the word *Missa* is to be found, and apply it to their Mass; though it would puzzle them to produce any one place where the word is used; in the same sense they use it now, out of any genuine and approved writer of the Church, until after the fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215.

Moreover, the Romish Mass is of quite a different tenor from the primitive form of divine worship, which consisted in audibly reading appropriate parts of the old and New Testaments, Homilies, and Prayers addressed to God alone, whilst the candidates for baptism, &c. attended; and afterwards, in the celebration of the Eucharistical elements which were given in both kinds, to all the faithful, (as they were then called) nay, even to children. To the reverse of this, the short portions of Scripture which are read in the Romish Mass, in an unknown language, are mumbled so low that they cannot be distinctly heard, much less understood; instead of addressing their Latin prayers to God, as if God did not understand the other European languages, they are, generally directed to some favourite he, or she saint. It seems, by their invocations they know the genders of saints

Not to insist any longer upon the inconsistencies of the etymons of their Mass, Let us take an impartial survey of Christ's procedure at his last supper. Was it not the only design and chief intent of Christ's mission and preaching, to enforce and inculcate the belief of the mystery of his incarnation, and the life-giving result of it? Did not all his doctrines and miracles, his resurrection and ascension tend to this sole end? Was it not to this purpose, that he expressed that of John vi. 51; "The bread which I will give you, is my flesh, (his sufferings on the cross,) which I will give for the life of the world." Who does not see, that the whole force and energy of this text is, to enforce a spiritual manducation, or, a firm belief in the Incarnation, and Death, and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ? This is what *St. Austin* understands, in his comment upon it, when he says, "Why do you prepare your teeth and belly, believe, (in the mystery of the Incarnation) and you have eaten."

This is the language of the New Testament, and thus, or in words to the same effect, we find Christ accosting his disciples. Can ye, for whose redemption I became incarnate, after the many and repeated miracles I have wrought, to your knowledge, doubt of my incarnation? Can ye imagine, after so close and spiritual an attachment, that I am an imposture, after the many attestations I have given you of the real

in heaven, and instead of distributing the sacrament to the faithful, according to primitive custom, the sacrificant alone eats his created God.— To this the Romanists reply, that the Church, upon just occasions, can frame ceremonies; this is granted, when they are, according to the Apostle, designed for edification and instruction; and do not clash with the word of God. But what instruction can people have from the Mass, when they cannot hear it; or, how can they be edified when they do not understand it? Moreover, to appoint a ceremony for Transubstantiation, which has not a shadow of reality, and which cannot be proved from Scripture, is too notorious an imposition upon the credulity of the people intrusted to their care.

union of my divinity and humanity for the ransom and spiritual preservation of mankind? Have I not testified my mission with miracles? Have I not fulfilled the prophecies? Are you not fully convinced and persuaded of this? After all those testimonies of my incarnation, will you be so obdurate as to deny, or even question the result? That you may be further convinced of the truth of what I advance, I will as you shall see, be immediately betrayed, and forthwith put into the hands of a merciless crew, whose blind, lame, and halt I have both corporally and spiritually cured; and on the morrow, I am to suffer a most cruel and tormenting death, to redeem the guilt of protoparental iniquity. Now, my beloved disciples, who are to be promulgators and dispensators of my evangelic laws; partake of this my last terrestrial banquet. To fulfil the law, I have eaten of the Paschal Lamb, in commemoration of the deliverance of your forefathers out of Egyptian bondage; let this, however, be the last instance of it amongst you, for henceforth, it shall be totally abrogated for evermore. I am now about instituting in its stead, an everlasting memorial for those who will be of my household. Come then, take and eat this bread, and drink ye all of this wine, which I ordain as pledges of my body and blood; and as often as ye do it, do it in commemoration of me; do it, I say, in commemoration and honor of him, whose divinity and humanity hypostatically united, you worshipped and adored. By doing this, you will acknowledge, that I died and suffered for your sins, which is the soul and life of your belief.

To recapitulate the matter, at the conclusion of the passover, our Lord took some of the bread which remained after the Paschal supper, and "gave thanks, and brake it," and said, "This is my body

which will be given for you :” and likewise some of the wine, and poured it forth and said, “ This cup is the New Testament in my blood.” And to this he added, “ This do in remembrance of me,” as a memorial of me ; that is, as oft as you eat this bread and drink this cup, think of me who shed his blood and died for you. Dost forget me when I am gone to my father, from whose right hand I am not to depart, till I summon the children of *Eve* to the tribunal of the last and immutable judgment : keep up the remembrance of your absent friend, and lifegiving benefactor, and Redeemer, by this token of love and respect. And as the Paschal Lamb was, heretofore, a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egyptian bondage ; in like manner, let this my last supper, whenever ye commemorate it, be a memorial to you, that ye are through my sufferings, delivered from the bondage and tyranny of sin, and entitled through my merits alone, to everlasting happiness and glory.

Let any man of reason, and of an ingenious and honest mind, reflect and consider, whether this sense of the words be not most agreeable and consonant to the subject then treated of. Does it not make the transaction uniform and all of a piece ? That this is what our Saviour meant, plainly appears from the conduct of his disciples ; who, notwithstanding their scrupulosity, made no doubt or question of it, but took it in the obvious and natural sense.

What a happy system of religion was this ? Should we have had (I am sorry to have reason to mention it,) so many tumults, so many national animosities, so many lives lost, if it was universally transmitted to us in its native plainness, and suffered to remain unvaried and incorrupted ? Should the firebrand of uncharitableness be so inhumanly, so barbarously

hurled amidst a Christian world, which should rather be irradiated by the bright beams of charity, and united by the electrical fire of philanthropy? But this would never have answered the deep laid schemes of Popery: its leading members, lucratively inspired, plainly saw, that if they did not pro aris & focis, by all possible means, reverse the original system, and assert the legality of this new coined principle,* the

* The doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, was first started by *John Damascene*, a converted Sarrasin; upon occasion of the dispute about the worship of images, in opposition to which, the Council of Constantinople, about the year 750 argued thus: That our Lord having left us no other image of himself but the Sacrament, in which the substance of bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord. In answer to this argument, the second Council of Nice, in the year 787, declared, at the instigation of *Damascene*, that the sacrament after consecration, is not the image and antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is properly his body and blood. Thus the corporeal presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament, was first introduced to support the stupid worship of images.

Paschasius Rabbertus, abbot of Corbey, was the first broacher of it, in the church of Rome, in the year 818. This is acknowledged by *Bellarmino* and *Sirmondus*, who, in effect, confess that this *Paschasius* was the first who wrote to purpose upon this argument. *Bellarmino*, in his treatise of ecclesiastical writers, says this author, (*Paschasius*) was the first who had seriously and copiously written concerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. The church must be very remiss in not discovering this truth for the space of 818 years! *Sirmondus* says, he (*Paschasius*) so first explained the genuine sense of the Catholic Church, that he opened the way to the rest, who afterwards, in great numbers, wrote upon the same argument. By this you see, the way was not opened before *Paschasius's* time. But though *Sirmondus* is pleased to say, that he only first explained the sense of the Catholic Church in this point, yet it is very plain, that this was the first time that this doctrine was broached in the church of Rome; *Rabanus Maurus*, Archbishop of Mentz, about the year 847, resiting the very words of *Paschasius*, in which he had delivered this doctrine, has this remarkable passage, concerning the novelty of it. "Some," says he, in his epistle to *Heribaldus*, "of late, not having a right opinion concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have said, that this is the Body and Blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered upon the cross, and rose from the dead. Which error, says he, we have opposed with all our might." From this it is plain, by the testimony of one of the greatest and most learned Bishops of that age, and of eminent reputation for piety, that what is now the very doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning the Sacrament, was then esteemed an error broached by some particular persons, but was far from being the generally received doctrine of that age. Can any one think it possible, that so eminent a person in the church, could have condemned this doctrine as an error and a novelty, had it been the general doctrine of the Christian Church, not only in that, but in all former ages: and no censure passed upon him for that which is now the great burning article in the Church of Rome, and the denial of it esteemed by them one of the greatest and most pernicious heresies?

Notwithstanding Christ gave his disciples clearly to understand, that the bread and wine which he gave them at his last supper, was to perpetuate to the remembrance of posterity, the redemption of mankind wrought by his bitter and dolorous passion on the cross; yet (how shocking is the thought) the administrators and dispensators of his holy law, led and infatuated by avarice;* their inherent characteristic gradually found out the method of enforcing the system of the mass. They foresaw it would be a treasure without end, and a bank of daily supply. Avarice, you may see was not wanting, which when jumbled with the mass, hatched the chicken of idolatry which was carefully fostered, and its spurious brood of superstition of such lucrative importance, was greedily swallowed by the gaping Priests and Monks.—Adieu then to the simplicity of the Lord's Supper, avarice reigns in despite of original truth. The gates of

every particle of those numbers, according to the Romish supposition, must necessarily contain a whole and entire Christ, and then you will have nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine quintillions; nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine quadrillions; nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine trillions; nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine billions; nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine millions; nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine whole and entire Christs; and what is yet wonderful, you may compress them all into a smaller compass than the bowl of a child's thimble! A Romanist must grant that all those fabricated Christs cease to be under the species, as they call them, when the bread is corrupted; where then do they go to? Not to heaven I am certain, for there is but one Christ, who sits at the right hand of God his eternal Father, and whose humanity remains there until he comes to judge the quick and the dead; neither can they be on earth, as so many particles, and consequently Romish Christs as could be extracted in their hypothesis from one consecrated wafer could not be stowed on the earth's superficies; and I am persuaded a Romanist will never discover where else all their imaginary Christs, since the year 1215, when this doctrine was first established are gone to.

* Cardinal *Hugo de S. Cher*, who immortalized his name by writing the first Biblical Concordance, and who died at *Orvieto*, March the 19th, 1263, speaking of the Clergy of his time says, "That the devil had two daughters, Avarice and Luxury; that he had married the former to the Jews, and the latter to the Heathens, but that the Clergy had now forced them both away, and made them their own."

heaven were occluded against every person who could bequeath a shilling for whom mass was not said or chaunted, to relieve his distressed soul languishing, as they persuaded the deluded and credulous vulgar, in the blazing and insufferable fires of purgatory. There was no malady of either man or beast (as if the merits of Christ's passion were, in their supposition, to be applied to a murrained cow, or a glandered horse,) but was immediately alleviated and assuaged, if you was silly enough to believe them by the almighty power and infinite value of the mass.* And if, through the course of infirmity or nature, they happened to die, they received and current apology was; that they did not correspond with the graces prayed for, and obtainable in the pretended sacrifice: but if, through the means of a vigorous constitution, or active care, they survived their malady, it was forthwith re-echoed, that it was a manifest miracle from the hands of the Almighty, through the channel of a holy Romish sacrificant. How composedly could the sacrificant, who in the eyes of the vulgar wrought the pretended miracle then rest? What holocausts, what sacrifices was he to offer? Hence, and from similar pretensions, the number of their masses in most of their vestries is so great, that they are constrained to compound with some indigent priests, who, for want of a miraculous image, or favourite saint, have not discovered the mystery of miracles to discharge the superabundant cargo. †

Let us, in the next place, examine whether *St. Paul* acted more conformably to the tenets of our Established Church, or those of the Church of Rome.—What we learn in the eleventh chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, in which he mentions the Eucha-

* See Dr. Andrew Meagher's Popish Mass, p. 218.

† In direct opposition to the Apostolic usage, whatever is collected in Romish Chapels is appropriated for the use of the Priests.

ristical Supper, is that the christians of the early ages of the church brought their love feasts or agapes, as signals of mutual love and reconciliation, to their respective places of meeting; thereby to demonstrate how far the relief and support of their poor brethren concerned them.* Is not this practised in Protestant Churches, where with pecuniary alms, it were much to be wished they were extended with a more liberal hand, the wants of the distressed are relieved? Did they not then receive, as Protestants do now, bread and wine in commemoration of the Lord's Supper, and the mystery therein contained? *St. Paul* pre-advises

* *Innocent XI.* in the year 1680, being informed that the Carmelites of *Naples* had celebrated a mass in music, to acquit themselves of all the masses they were obliged to say, sent a commission to examine the registers and books of the Sacristan; and upon examination, there were found no less than forty-four thousand masses which were not discharged. *Innocent* being acquainted with the circumstance, let them know, that as they received the money they ought to discharge the masses; and because they had not priests enough in the convent to celebrate them, they must take in some other priests to their assistance. The thing being divulged, many strange priests presented themselves to celebrate some of them, and for fifteen days they admitted them; within which time they dispatched four thousand masses at different altars. After this the strange priests were dismissed, and told, that "all the masses were celebrated." But it was a thing absolutely impossible to say so many masses in so short a time; but they alledged, they had celebrated several masses at their privileged altars.—This was a stratagem against which the Pope had nothing to alledge.

A mass said at this sort of altar on such a day of the week, which is commonly *Monday*, infallibly, if you believe the Pope, delivers a soul out of purgatory, and a man who should dare question this would be looked upon as a Heretic, and committed to the Inquisition, as if he had denied one of the fundamentals of Christianity. According to this principle they argue thus, "The Pope, say they, grants a privilege to one of our altars, and declares that when they shall procure a mass to be said there for any soul in Purgatory, though the most obnoxious that is there, it shall, in the same moment, be delivered thence. Now the Pope is infallible in all he declares, especially about the concerns in the other world; wherefore, to draw a conclusion, we have money sent us to celebrate so many hundred, or thousand masses for such a man or woman; what is to be done in this case? "*frustra fit per plura, quod fieri potest per pauciora,*"—It is a folly to go about, when there lies a short cut before us; "we will therefore cause one mass to be said at our privileged altar, which will infallibly deliver the party concerned out of Purgatory, and will trouble ourselves no farther about saying the rest; for as much as they being only in order to procure the same end, would be altogether superfluous and unprofitable; so that by this fair way we have, without much trouble, gained a round sum of money without the least rique of our peace of conscience."

them, that if they unworthily eat of that bread and drink of the cup of the Lord, they should be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. This is the sum of what the Apostle mentions with respect to the last Supper: is not this, under the divine and apostolic sanction, what Protestants assert and maintain?

If Transubstantiation was known in the infant era of the Church, the Apostle would, undoubtedly, have mentioned it in this singular address to the Corinthians. If he was persuaded that the bread which was administered was the real transubstantiated body of the Lord, he might, with the greatest ease have said, whoever eats of this bread truly, really, and substantially changed into the body of the Lord, &c. But it manifestly appears he knew no such thing; for he simply called it four different times, without any adjunctive term, *bread*; by which he undeniably shews there was no change made in the Eucharistical elements. Thus far as to the Lord's Supper in reference to Christ and the Apostle. Let us now see what the writers of the primitive ages of Christianity have recorded concerning it.

During the first seven centuries, at least, after Christ, no Christian writer, whose works are extant, ever mentioned Transubstantiation, or even an equivalent to it in terms, or signification: to the contrary, in their treatises upon the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, they said many things that were totally inconsistent with, and entirely subversive of it. I will select some few testimonies out of many which I might advance, upon this subject. *Justin Martyr*, who lived about the middle of the second century, in express terms, maintains in his second apology to the successors of *Antonius Pius*, that "our flesh and blood are nourished by the change of that aliment, which we partake of in the Eucharist." But this is impossible, if there be a total

change made of each and every the most minute particle of the bread into the real body of Christ, because it is then supposed, the material elements subsist no longer, but become immaterial or spiritualized: and if so, it is as great a contradiction, as any in nature, to assert, as *Justin* does, that a material and living body might be nourished by immaterial and spiritual food.

Irenæus, who suffered martyrdom in the reign of *Severus*, A. D. 202, speaking of this Sacrament, says, that the "bread which is from the earth receiving the divine invocation, is now no longer common bread; but the Eucharist, (or Sacrament) consisting of two things, the one earthy, the other heavenly." He says; it is no longer common bread, but after invocation or consecration, it becomes the Sacrament, that is, bread sanctified, consisting of two things, an earthy and a heavenly; the earthy thing is bread, and the heavenly is the divine blessing, which by the invocation, or consecration is added to it. And in his fifth book, cap. 21, he has this passage, "When therefore the cup which is mixed (that is of wine and water) and the bread that is broken, receives the word of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh is increased and consists." But if that which we receive in the Sacrament nourishes our bodies, it must be bread and wine; and not the natural blood and body of Christ. It must be then, consequently granted that *Irenæus* was a stranger to transubstantiation. *Tertullian*, a cotemporary with *Irenæus*, to prove the reality of Christ's body against *Marcion*, who heretically maintained it was but an imaginary substance, says in his 4th book against him, that "our Saviour made his own body of the bread which he distributed amongst his disciples; saying, This is my body, viz. the image or representation

of it, but it could not have been the image or representation of it, if he had not a real body. The main strength of his argument depends upon this, that the Sacrament is an image or representation of the body of Christ, which must have really existed previous to any image of it, otherwise the sacramental bread would be an image of an imaginary substance which would be the greatest absurdity. If the Sacrament, according to *Tertullian*, be but an image or representation of the body of Christ, Transubstantiation must necessarily be allowed to be unknown 208 years after Christ. *St. Austin*, who flourished in the 4th and 5th centuries, says, in his book against *Adimantius*, the Manichean, that "our Lord doubted not to say, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body." If, therefore, according to *Austin*, we have the sign, and not the reality of Christ's corporeal presence in the sacramental elements; who but an idiot can believe transubstantiation to have been the received doctrine in his days. *Facundus* who lived in the 5th and 6th centuries, expresses himself in Protestant terms against the doctrine of transubstantiation, in a letter written to excuse *Theodorus* who called Christ the adopted Son of God. Christ, says he, "deigned to receive the sacrament of adoption, both at his circumcision and baptism; and the sacrament of adoption, may be called adoption, as the Sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the consecrated bread and cup, is by us called his body and blood: not that the bread is properly his body, and the cup his blood, but because they contain the mysteries of his body and blood." This passage is so very clear, that it requires no illustration, and evidently shews that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not broached in the days of *Facundus*. *Theodoret* who died A. D. 427, speaking of the Eucharist, dial. 1, tom. 4. says, "after sanctification, the mystical sym-

bols do not depart from their own nature, but remain in their former substance, and figure, and form, and may be seen and touched just as before. Had *Theodoret* lived in our days, in what stronger terms could he express himself against Transubstantiation? Whereas Romanists rely more upon the infallible doctrine of one Pope, than that of an hundred of either ancient or modern writers,* I shall introduce *Gelasius*, who filled the see of Rome, at the close of the 5th century, confirming *ex cathedra*, what has been said above, he, to prove the reality of the two natures in Christ, notwithstanding the union, against the Eutychians, who said, that the human nature in Christ was absorbed by, and transformed into the Divinity; so that Christ could not be said to have two natures after the union, thus argues against them; "The Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which we receive, are surely a divine thing, and by them we partake of the divine nature; but yet the substance or nature of bread and wine do not cease to be in them. Indeed, the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the mysterious action; we are therefore to believe the same thing in our Lord Christ, as we profess, celebrate, and take in his image, viz. that as by the perfecting virtue of the Holy Ghost, the elements pass into a divine substance, while their nature still remains in its own propriety; so in that principal mystery (the union between the divine and human natures) whose efficacy and power these represent, there remains one true and perfect Christ, and both natures of which he consists remain in their properties unchangeable." Here we plainly see, that the whole strength of the Pope's argument rests upon

* *Cornelius Mus*, Bishop of Bitonto, in the Kingdom of Naples, says, I would give more credit to one Pope than to a thousand *Austina*, thousand *Jeromes*, and a thousand *Gregories*.

this, that the bread and wine in the Eucharist retain the nature and substance of bread and wine, notwithstanding their sacramental union with the body and blood of Christ. This he takes no pains to prove, but supposes it as a truth not questioned either by the Eutichians or the Catholics, and from thence argues the human nature in Christ to retain in the same manner, its own substance, although united with the Divinity. Should we suppose the bread and wine in the Eucharist to be changed into the body and blood of Christ, or be mad enough to think with *Baronius* and *Bellarmino* that *Gelasius* meant no more, than that the substance of the bread and wine remained in appearance, or that it only appeared to remain; this argument had been of no manner of force against the Eutichians, but might have been by them thus unanswerably retorted against the Catholics. As in the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remained indeed, in appearance, but was really and truly changed into the body and blood of Christ; in like manner, in the mystery of the incarnation, the human nature of Christ remained, indeed, in appearance, but was really and truly absorbed by, and changed into the Divinity. From this passage we can plainly infer and undeniably shew, that the Church of Rome was utterly unacquainted in those days, with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, at least, that *Gelasius*, her then infallible guide, was.*

Thus far, we have the concurring testimonies of Christ, of St. Paul, and of the most eminent primitive Christian writers, for six centuries after Christ, in vin-

* It is not, that Protestants found their belief upon the particular opinion of any one man, that the testimonies of those fathers are introduced, but merely to point out what the current doctrine of those days was. For the Church of England is not concerned with the private doctrine of any man, or sect: her belief rests on the Bible; and her usage she derives from the primitive Church: she disclaims the name of Lutheran or Calvinist, and professes no name, no father on earth to impute her faith to.

dication of the Protestant cause, as to this point.— Now, let us see, what the Scriptures say, for or against it. To me it seems as unaccountable a thought as ever entered a rational man's head, to assert, that Christ transubstantiated the bread which he held in his hands, by uttering the words, "This is my body;" because, if he designed a real conversion of the bread into his identical body, he must (not to speak of its impossibility, and the manifold contradictions attending it,) have spoken in direct opposition to the received custom of all ages in point of communicating thought. It is a most unexceptionable and undeniable truth, that a proposition of the like nature with this, "This is my body," can no where be discovered, to signify the undoubted presence and actual existence of any being, *after* and not *before* the expression. On the contrary, whether we examine sacred, or profane records, we find no one to have ever uttered such a proposition, but to signify the pre-existence of the thing which he spoke of; because things must exist prior to any conception of them. As it is impossible to define any being without having a knowledge of its properties; thus, in like manner, it is impossible to conceive any being, if it has not an existence previous to our conception of it; therefore, as every being must exist before it can be conceived to be such, that being which Christ handed to his disciples, expressed by the word This was his body, before he could have conceived it to have been his body, and he conceived that it was his body, before he said, "This is my body," therefore, it was not in virtue, or consequence of the words "This is my body," that the bread became the body of Christ, but rather by some unknown supernatural power, by which he divinely annexed the sacramental union of his body to it, and rendered the Apostles and all true believers, as often as they commemorated

the action which he then celebrated, partakers of the gracious result of his divine incarnation. Now, as this is undeniably true, it necessarily follows, that Christ, by expressing the words, "This is my body, &c." made no change in the Eucharistical elements; but as we are convinced that by our participation of them, the soul, through God's gracious dispensation, is divinely nurtured, we must, if we do not mean to extinguish the light of reason, be naturally led to think them signs verily representing the body of Christ to our belief: and thus, Transubstantiation can, by no means, be founded upon this text, "This is my body."*

* The Romanists are so puzzled with this argument, that their divines are divided in their opinions; not being able to reconcile to the Scriptures, nor to the definition of the Council of Trent, in the 13th Session, by what form Christ consecrated the Eucharist, in the last Supper. The variety and confusion of their opinions may be ranked under the seven following heads:—1. Of those who affirm that Jesus Christ consecrated without pronouncing any words. This is the opinion of Pope *Innocent 3*, and *Innocent 4*, *Francis Mairon*, *Gabriel Biel*, *Godfrey of Poitiers*, *William Durantus*, Bishop of Mende, and before them, of *Rupertus*, *St. Anselm*, and *Odo Cameracensis*. 2. Of those who believe, that Jesus Christ, pronounced words when he blessed the Eucharist; but that we do not know, what they were: this was *Albertus Magnus's* notion. 3. Of those that say, that Jesus Christ consecrated by those words, This is my body, but then that he repeated them twice; first secretly, when he blessed the bread: and then publicly, when he gave the Eucharist, this has been the notion of *Stephanus Augustodunensis*. 4. Of those who think, that by these words Jesus Christ did consecrate: that he pronounced them but once when he blessed the Eucharist; though the Evangelists not observing the order of things, do not relate them until after the blessing. 5. Of *Thomas Aquinas*, who says, that Jesus Christ continued the pronounciation all the while he blessed, and brake and distributed the Eucharist. 6. Of *Soto* and *Cajetan*, who say that Jesus Christ did not consecrate the Eucharist when he blessed or gave thanks, but when he pronounced these words, "This is my body." 7. Of those that hold, that when Jesus Christ blessed the bread, he pronounced these words, "This is my body," and consecrated at the same time. Those confused and discordant opinions, or notions, subversive one of another (for if one should be true, the other must be false) have not, neither can they have one substantive argument to enforce a belief of Transubstantiation. *Vasquez*, in 3 par. D. Th. Distr. 18. c. 1. says upon this subject, "Audito nomine transubstantiationis, tanta inter recentiores aliquos scholasticos exorta fuit controversia, ut quo magis ab ea extricare conati fuerint, eo majoribus difficultatibus seipso implicaverint. As soon as the name of Transubstantiation was heard of (which was not established till the 4th Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, under *Innocent 3*.) there arose so great a controversy among some later schoolmen, that the more they endeavoured to extricate, the more they involved themselves in

Some very eminent Romish divines, apprised of this, ingeniously own, that Transubstantiation was not grounded upon Scripture. Thus *Gabriel Riel*, who in his 36th lecture upon the canon of the mass, says, "That Christ, as true God, could, without expressing a word, consecrate the substance of bread and wine; that is, change it into his body and blood, as by a *flat* he created heaven and earth; or he might pronounce some words secretly with which he could consecrate; or he might consecrate with those words, 'This is my body,' by which we (he says) consecrate; or he might consecrate before the distribution; or distribute before the consecration. But which of these methods he has adopted can by no means be deduced from Scripture." Thus *Gabriel*, I am not indeed surprised, that they thus fluctuate in opinion, whereas there can be no certainty of what is destitute of all manner of truth. If it be not evident from Scripture, as *Gabriel* says, how and with what words Christ changed the substance of bread and wine into his body and blood; I know not what to impute this their fiction to, but the spirit of deception and falsehood.

John, bishop of Rochester, in express terms, declares N. 8, 10, "Secluding the interpretation of the fathers, and the usage handed down by them, it cannot be proved from the bare words of the gospel, that a priest of those days can consecrate the *true* flesh and blood of Christ. Should it be even granted, that Christ, at his last supper, changed bread and wine into his body and blood, it does not hence follow, that likewise every priest can change bread into his body, and wine into his blood. For we are assured

difficulties, concluding that there is nothing to be invented, which in that way can explain the difficulty. By this you see, that what is now an article of faith with a Romanist, was not such before the council of Lateran, much less was it derived from the Apostles.

that Christ has transacted many things, which no one in our days, however holy or wise, can effect. There is not a word in *Matthew* whereby it may be proved we have the real presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in our mass." Now, as it cannot be proved from the sacred Scriptures, that Christ has changed the substance of the bread and wine into his body and blood, who does not evidently see, that the Romish consecration and Transubstantiation are nothing else but the fiction of the tyrannising spirits of error and seduction. The bishop of Rochester founds his belief upon the traditions of the Fathers. But one would think he should have rather placed it upon the usage of the Apostles. In this, indeed, he acted ingenuously, being persuaded the Apostles knew nothing of the matter. But why did he not expressly mention the names of those fathers whom he quotes for his traditional purpose? The reason is obvious, he could not without betraying his cause, and therefore very wisely declined it. But suppose some of the ancients to have been of that opinion, (which I challenge any Romanist to prove) what credit can be given them; whereas neither they nor their successors could prove out of the Scriptures, or the institutions of Christ, the doctrine of Transubstantiation?

Baronius ad. A. C. 53. *Malchior Canus*, p. 413, of the *Bassano* edition, and *Tournelly de Sacram. Euch.* freely acknowledge, that Transubstantiation is an unwritten tradition. This, to expatiate no further upon the subject, evidently shews, at least, according to their testimonies, that Transubstantiation which is the chief pillar of the Romish church cannot be found to have been instituted or commanded by Jesus Christ. But yet, after all, they would prove their doctrine from that of *Mark* eulogesas eklase, viz. "when he blessed, he brake it," which they lay a

mighty weight upon. For they imagine, that to bless is the same as by some mysterious and hidden power and virtue to consecrate and change the substance of bread into Christ's body. But this, to any man of discernment is a most frivolous subterfuge; because a blessing, especially in this place, does not imply a consecration, but the giving of thanks; wherefore *Matthew, Luke, and Paul* make use of the word *Eucharistias*, which signifies "when he had given thanks;" hence it indubitably follows, that the two words being spoken upon the same subject, signify a thanksgiving, and not a consecratory blessing. Consequently our adversaries must have resource to some other argument, if any they can find, to found their erroneous doctrine of Transubstantiation upon. To clear up all scriptural difficulties relative to the point in question, let us consider those of *John vi. 54, 55*, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." That we might not be mistaken in the genuine sense of this text, it is necessary to know what that *Life* is, which Christ, through his sufferings has purchased for us; and what that *Death* consists of in which we were involved through the guilt of protoparental iniquity. Both these particulars, *St. Paul*, *Eph. ii. 5*, explains, saying, "When we were dead in sin and trespasses, God hath quickened us together with Christ, by grace ye are saved." Hereby we see, that the *Death* wherein we were involved, consisted in the curse of the law which imported the privation of felicity, and the suffering of temporal and eternal punishment for our sins; from which we were graciously redeemed by the quickening life which Christ has purchased for us. By this *Life* we were delivered from the curse of the law, and all its appendant obligations against us, as *St. Paul*,

Colos. ii. 13, 14, testifies, " God hath quickened you together with Christ, having forgiven you all trespasses, blotting out the obligation which was against us."— This obligation we all subscribed to by the hand of *Adam*, in whom we were radically grafted, by which we rendered ourselves obnoxious, according to the just decrees of the Almighty to eternal *Death* and endless misery ; but God, through Christ, of his infinite mercy, has cancelled this obligation, by the quickening grace of sanctification, wherewith we are regenerated into a new life. This appears from *John* iii. 3, where he says, " Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. And *St. Paul*, *Heb.* xii. 14, " Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Now, as the *Life* which Christ has purchased for us, consists in the pardon of our sins, and in our regeneration and sanctification, and that Christ calls himself *Meat* in reference to this purchased *Life* ; we must consider the means whereby Christ has purchased those things for us ; and whereas it is certain, that his *Death* is the means by which he has purchased the pardon of our sins, and the regeneration of our *Lives*, we must conclude, that Christ is the food and nourishment of our souls, in regard to the merit of his *Death*. And that Christ by his *Death* has purchased *Life* for us, appears from these passages of Scripture, *Rom.* v. 8, 9, " We are justified by the blood of Christ, and reconciled to God by his death." *Colos.* i. 14, " We have redemption by his blood, even the remission of sins." v. 22, " He hath reconciled us in the body of his flesh, by his death, that he may present us holy, without spot and blameless in his sight," *Heb.* x. 10, " We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all." Therefore, as Christ by his *Death*, has purchased *Life* for us ; and that his *Flesh* and *Blood* are our *Meat* and *Drink*, because they pur-

chased eternal *Life* for us on the cross, viz. the remission of our sins: it follows, that the action whereby Christ is applied to us for righteousness and sanctification, is the same, by which we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood. But this action is nothing else but faith, as we are informed by the Scripture, *Rom.* v. 1, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God," *Acts* xv. 9, "God purifieth our hearts by faith; and *John* vi. 40, "He that believeth hath eternal life." Hence it is evident, that that action whereby we obtain *Remission of Sins* is the same, whereby we have that *Life* which Christ has purchased for us by his *Death*. Therefore, the "spiritual eating and drinking by faith," is the action through which we have that *Life* which Christ has purchased for us by his *Death*; and not the corporeal, or material eating and drinking by the mouth of the body, as Romanists, actuated, I know not by what delusion, pretend. And consequently, as a certain *eating* and *drinking* is mentioned in *John* vi. through which we have that *Life*, which Christ has purchased for us by his *Death*; it is evident, beyond dispute, that a spiritual eating and drinking is there spoken of, and not a corporeal, or material one. Hence it appears to a demonstration, that when Christ said, "My flesh is *Meat* indeed," &c. the figure falls upon the word *Meat*, which is taken not for a corporeal but a spiritual *Meat*. And the reason is, because corporeal food is that which is appropriated for the nourishment of the body; as spiritual food is that which is appointed for the nourishment of the soul. And though corporeal food may be taken by the mouth of the body, yet the sumption alone does not render it a corporeal food, except it be taken for the nourishment of the body; otherwise poison, or a lump of lead, or iron would be corporeal food, which no man will venture to affirm. But the flesh of Christ,

which is pretended to be eaten in the Eucharist by the mouth of the body, is not appointed for the nourishment of the body, because that food which is appointed for the nourishment of the body, is partly changed into the substance of the body; but the body of Christ is not either totally, or partially changed, or converted into the substance of our body; therefore the flesh of Christ is not a corporeal food; but his flesh broken, and his blood shed on the cross, is a spiritual food which nourishes the souls of those who, by a true and lively faith, do embrace this flesh broken and this blood shed; that is, who do entirely depend and solely rely on the merit of his death and passion for obtaining mercy from God. Now, whereas the *Life* which Jesus Christ gives us by his *Death* is *spiritual*, and the nourishment *spiritual*, and the eating his body and drinking his blood *spiritual*, it manifestly follows, that his *Flesh* must be spiritual *Meat*, and his *blood* must be spiritual *drink*. And everlasting praise to the father of mercies, this flesh of Christ is incomparably better, and more truly meat indeed, with regard to its gracious and ineffable effects, than any corporeal food whatsoever can be; because it superiorly and more perfectly nourishes the souls of believers, than corporeal food does their bodies. This, being corruptible food which gives temporal life only; but that, spiritual and incorruptible food which gives life everlasting.

Thus far the Protestant Cause has successfully maintained its ground. Now, let us briefly see what reason can produce in vindication of it. Can you imagine that Christ Jesus could be capable of inspiring us with thoughts dissonant to reason? Certainly you must, if you believe that a Romish sacrificant has thousands, nay, myriads of little *Jesuses* in his box.

This you must admit, and greater absurdities, if possible, should you believe Transubstantiation. For, there is not the most minute, the least cogitable particle of the bread, which you behold in the Sacrificant's hand, but what, according to the Romish system, is transubstantiated, or totally changed into the real and identical body of Christ, and if you choose, you may have an hundred thousand of them for six pence. An extraordinary bargain, indeed! O! ye, hitherto deluded, can ye brook this? Can ye, with your eyes open, bear with such a manifest, such a flagrant imposition? Are ye so much bereaved of your senses, as to suffer yourselves to be cheated of both your money and reason, with such a gross delusion? Is it possible that any rational being can imagine, that Christ, who sits as Mediator, at the right hand of the Eternal Father, can be dragged down from heaven by the word of command, * to veil his body under the imaginary species or appearances of bread, and his blood under them of a few drops of wine.

Let us consider these modifications, appearances, or accidents. What are they accidents of? It cannot be said, they are the accidents of the bread; whereas, in the supposition, it is transubstantiated into the body of the Lord: neither can they, by any means, be said to be accidents of the body of Christ, because it is a spiritualized body, and consequently must exist after a spiritual manner, which, spiritual manner of existing positively excludes an accident. Then if they be neither accidents of the bread, nor of the body of Christ, they must necessarily, subsist of themselves, without any inhesive subject, and thence it will follow, that an accident may become a substance, and that contrary to the nature and essence of things. This is

* It is not improbable, but the Jugglers have borrowed their *Hocus* *Pocus*, from the *hoc est corpus* of the Romish Mass.

as great an absurdity, philosophically speaking, as to pretend to think without a soul: or to conceive matter without extension. A Romanist will tell you that a real presence of Christ's body lies under the accidents, until they are corrupted, and that then it ceases to be such, upon the return of the pristine matter.— But in the first place, I ask, how can an accident, which is the reverse of matter, be subject to material decay or corruption? Secondly, I should be desirous to know where the matter took its abode, whilst its accident veiled the real presence. And thirdly, I would request to be informed, by what extraordinary power or miraculous operation, the body of Christ ceases to be in the accidents when the bread becomes gradually corrupted.

Should you consecrate a six-penny loaf, or a box of wafers, who will be so absurd as to say that you could not satiate yourself with that bread, though consecrated? Should you drink six or eight quarts of strong consecrated wine, what would be the result? O, you, who have a jot of reason, reflect upon, and seriously consider the self-evident absurdity that follows from the undeniable supposition. Did ever any one hear or know, that a modification or accident filled a man's belly; or stupified his senses? The blood of Christ in the Romish system is going down your throat, and in the mean time, depriving you of your sense and reason. Who can hear this without horror and indignation? Behold, what glaring contradictions have they not precipitately, and blindly tumbled into!

You will, perhaps, say, that Transubstantiation should be considered in the nature of a miracle; that it transcends our reason and senses, and consequently, should not be measured by the ordinary course of nature and maxims of philosophy. To this I answer,

that "a miracle is the work of God, exceeding the power of nature, or second causes, evident to the senses, and productive of conviction." Only seriously consider, what has been said before upon this head, and you will forthwith, see, that it is utterly subversive of conviction and reason. As to the second point I say, that if we cannot depend upon our senses, we cannot be certain, but we live in an imaginary world. But Christ has cleared this up, when he summoned the senses of his disciples, to prove the reality of his resurrection; "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have." Luke xxiv. 39. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet, and said unto *Thomas*, "reach hither thy finger, and behold my hand; reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing," John xx. 27. Several instances of the like nature could be advanced out of the Old and New Testaments, to prove that man is only to be guided by the light of reason and the evidence of his senses. Thence, it is highly reasonable to conclude, that Transubstantiation, as repugnant to both sense and reason, is by no means miraculous.

It is an undeniable fact, that there was no elevation of the Host or Chalice, until the thirteenth century.* It is also universally known that the Grecian Priests, even those in communion with the Church of Rome, could never be influenced or persuaded to elevate the Host or Chalice; no, nor to kneel (by which they exclude adoration) during the celebration of the Eucharist. This I have been an eye-witness of at *St. Athanasius's* Church at Rome. From these two circum-

* Let Romanists following the usage of the primitive Christians for the space of 1300 years and upwards, after Christ, desist from elevating their Host and Chalice, and exposing them to adoration; and, then, we shall have no material difference with them, as to the Eucharist.

stances, which I challenge any Romanist of candor to deny, it is evident, there has been no adoration paid to the Eucharistical elements, seven or eight centuries ago : and that the Grecian Priests act upon Protestant and primitive principles to this very day.

A Romanist, upon the merit of Transubstantiation, will tell you, that the Mass is of an infinite value.* If it be, whence comes it to pass, that a deceased soul is not immediately alleviated by one single Mass, without a daily repetition of them ? Is the merit and efficacy of Christ's sacrifice (which they pretend to have in the Mass) insufficient to redeem a soul destined to misery, if it be but once duly applied to it, especially, as it is in the Sacrificant's power (thus they pretend) to apply it to whom he will ? Why does a rich man's soul require more Masses to free it from Purgatorial torments, than a poor man's soul, which must content itself with one, nay, with none, if his distressed wife and children cannot immediately pay for it ? This, on one hand, seems to be a downright breach of charity ; and on the other hand, a most notorious fraud. If a poor man's soul might be relieved from its imaginary torments, by a Mass of an infinite value ; is it not the height of uncharitableness to defer its release even for a week, as it might be effected upon such easy terms ? And, if one Mass be of such an infinite value, is it not an open cheat to repeat them until doomsday, if the money be yearly told down ? If the Apostles knew any thing of these Masses, they could not, without mutilating the errand they were sent upon, but have handed down a matter of such momentous consequence to posterity. We read in Scripture of the

* The stated price of an ordinary Mass in Italy, is, according to our coin 6d. ; in Germany 15d. ; in France and Brabant 3d. or 4d. and in Ireland, a British Shilling. But, of late, I am assured, our Irish Priests have turned out for a price : but now there is an appearance of a reduction.

breaking of Bread; of the *Lord's Supper*; and of the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*, but we cannot find the least vestiges of an expiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, in any one instance of it. How could the faithful of the infant era of the Church attain to salvation without them? How is the system of *Indulgences* reconcileable with their *Masses*? If a soul is forthwith transported to the mansions of bliss, by virtue of the Pope's merchandize (which must be purchased) what has a Sacrificant to do with it, with his *Masses*? If *Masses* are yet requisite, the Pope is an impostor, and his *Indulgences* mere impositions.— If there be no occasion for *Masses*, as the Pope vouches, the Sacrificant is a cheat, and his *Masses*, consequently, are to no purpose. In this, there is a visible contrast between the Pope and his Clergy. The Pope, by his practice, runs down the goods of his Sacrificants; and they, in tacit opposition, cry down the merit of his *Indulgences*. A parchment given *sub Annulo Piscatoris*, together with a Priestly absolution, completes the purchaser's bliss, according to the Pope's doctrine; the Sacrificant impeaches the purchaser of heresy, if he has not bequeathed some legacies for *Masses*. Thus, they mutually accuse each other of seduction and imposture.

This is so very obvious, that the absurdity of it may be comprehended by the meanest capacity, as appears in the following authentic instance; When *Martin Luther*, A. D. 1517, opposed *Tetzel*, one of Pope *Leo's* venders of indulgences, who engaged life everlasting to the purchaser. It happened, that a tradesman's wife, in the village of Hagensberg, in Germany, that she might evade all *Purgatorial* torments, and become an immediate citizen of heaven, purchased one of his *Indults* for a ducat. She, some time after, was seized with a violent sickness, and foreseeing her hour near

at hand, sent for a Priest, made a confession of her sins; produces, from under her head, the Papal passport, and entreats his Reverence to impart its blissful contents to her emigrating soul. She dies, but her husband, angry that she expended so much money, buries her without a requiem.* The Parish Priest storms, accuses them both of heresy, and cites him before a Magistrate. He appears, and is asked whether his wife be dead; he answers in the affirmative. Have you caused any Masses, says the Magistrate, to be said for the expiation of her sins, and the ease of her soul? Not one, says he; because, if his Holiness has not deceived her, her soul is in paradise e'er now. In the mean time he produces the Pope's bull, and requests it may be read; the Magistrate hands it to the Priest, who, struck with confusion, refuses to read it, but is, at length, importuned by the Magistrate. The tradesman having vindicated his character, and the charge of heresy imputed to his wife, walked off, leaving the Priest and Magistrate to digest their confusion, and examine whether the Pope or Priest was the greater knave of the two.

Besides what has been said of the infinite value of the *Mass*, it is contrary to the express Word of God, in *St. Paul's* epistle to the Hebrews, x. 10, 14, "By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of Jesus Christ once for all." For, "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;" that is, baptized and received into the bosom of Christ's Church; as by baptism they acquire real sanctity and justifying grace. If Christ Jesus offered himself *once* for all, and has perfected for ever them who are sanctified, how is it possible to reconcile the self-evident contradiction that follows from this tenet of their's, sacrificing, in their supposition, our Lord Jesus Christ

* The Mass said or chaunted for the dead, is called a *Requiem*.

over and over every Day. In answer to this they will say, that their oblations are of an unbloody kind, and not the same, though in effect the same with that which was offered on the cross for our redemption. But whether their oblations or sacrifices be bloody or unbloody, if frequently repeated and offered, they plainly shew (O, unheard of blasphemy!) that the first oblation, (Christ's sufferings on the cross,) did not sufficiently sanctify us. In vain, then, was the second Person of the most Holy Trinity made incarnate! In vain did Christ suffer, if his merits be as yet incompleated and unapplied to us!

The unbloody sacrifice in their Mass is as directly opposite to Scripture doctrine, as any two contraries one to another. For, in the first place, Heb. ix. 22, it is said, that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins;" therefore, there can be no remission of sins, through the channel of their unbloody sacrifices. Secondly, Jesus Christ cannot be offered without suffering, as the Apostle asserts, Heb. vi. "Jesus Christ offereth not himself often, otherwise he should have often suffered." But the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, with suffering, is a bloody sacrifice, therefore, there can be no unbloody sacrifice of him. Thirdly, the bloody sacrifice on the cross, being of an infinite value, has purchased an eternal redemption, Heb. ix. 12; and, consequently, has taken away all sins, past, present, and to come. Whence it follows, that there is no other sacrifice, either bloody, or unbloody, that can purchase the pardon of our sins, as the sacrifice of the cross has abundantly effected it. Fourthly, the justice of God requires, that sins should be expiated by the punishment that is due to them; this is so evidently true, that the wrath of God could not be appeased, but by the blood and death of Jesus Christ on the cross. Therefore, the justice of God must have

changed its nature, if sins can be expiated in the Mass without pain, or suffering. Hence it appears, that the pretended sacrifice of the Mass is not of the same effect (as is most falsely alledged) with Christ's sacrifice on the cross. But after all, the Romanists would prove their real presence by miracles. I will instance a few, and submit them to the judgment of the reader, looking upon them myself as fabrications unworthy of belief, and a scandal to human credibility.

St. Odo,* who lived in the ninth century, to confute some Priests of Canterbury, who maintained that the Bread and Wine after consecration, remain in their former substance, and are not Christ's true Body and Blood, but a figure of it, appointed a day (as the story goes) to say Mass in their presence. When he was come to confraction the fragments of the Body of Christ, which he held in his hands, began to pour blood into the chalice, upon which he shed (good man) tears of joy, and beckoning to them who wavered in their faith, to come near and see the wonderful work of God. As soon as they beheld it, they cried out, O holy Prelate, to whom the Son of God has been pleased to reveal himself visibly in the Flesh, pray for us, that the blood we see here present to our eyes, may again be changed, lest for our unbelief the divine vengeance fall upon us. Accordingly he prayed, after which, looking into the chalice, he saw the species of Bread and Wine, where he had left the blood.

* *Odo*, of whom we lately made mention, lived in the ninth century, laid the foundations of the celebrated Order of *Clugni*, left behind him several productions in which the grossest superstition reigns, and in which it is difficult to perceive the smallest marks of true genius or solid judgment.—The learned reader will form a different opinion of *Rabeir*, Bishop of Verona, whose Works yet extant, give evident proofs of sagacity and judgment, and breathe throughout an ardent love of virtue.—See *Histoire Littéraire de la France*. tom. vi. p. 229.

See the ample account that is given of this eminent Prelate in *Collier's Ecclesiastical History of England*, vol. i. cent. x. p. 181, 183, 184, 185, 197, 203.

In a book called the Festival, or Homilies upon the Festivals, before the Reformation, we read, That a Jew went with a Christian to hear Mass : when the Mass was over, the Jew told him, if he had eaten as much as he saw him eat, he would not be hungry in three days ; the Christian told him, he eat no sort of meat this day. Then said the Jew, I saw thee eat a child, which the Priest held up at the altar ; then came a fair man that had many children in his lap, and he gave each Cristen man a child.

We are told by *Bollan*, Jan. 7, p. 384, that *Saint Wittkendus*, in the administration of the Eucharist, saw a child enter into every one's mouth, playing and smiling when some received him, and with an abhorring countenance, when he went into the mouths of others ; that is, Christ shewed this Saint, in his countenance, who were worthy, and who were unworthy receivers.

Bellarmino relates the following story, which is an extract out of *Ribadeneira*, as a notable miracle, and a proof of the opinion of the Church of Rome, concerning the presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist. As *St. Anthony* was disputing concerning the Truth of the Lord's body in the Eucharist, with a certain Heretic near Toulouse (for at that time the *Albigenses* vexed the Church, and they, with many more were infected with this error,) the Heretic required this sign of *Anthony*, knowing him to be endued with the gift of miracles : (those last words are *Bellarmino's* addition, not to be found in the fore-named Author, or in *Antoninus*, or *Surius*, and a foolish one also ; for if he knew him to have the gift of Miracles, why did he not believe him without any farther trial ?) Says the Heretic, I have a mule, which I will keep fasting for three days ; after three days, come thou with the Sacrament, and I will come with

my mule, and lay provinder before it; if the mule leave his provender and comes and venerates the Sacrament, I will believe. These conditions being accepted, *St. Anthony*, after three days, accompanied with a multitude of the faithful, and holding the venerable Sacrament in his hand, thus accosted the mule; in virtue and name of thy creator, whom I, though unworthily, truly hold in my hand, I require and command thee, O animal, that thou immediately approach, after thy manner, and shew reverence to him; that heretical pravity may understand, that every creature is to be subject to his Creator, whom the priestly dignity daily handles at the altar. No sooner said than done; the mule, though hungry, left his provender, went towards the saint, and bowing his head and bending his knees, adored the Lord as well as he could and confuted the Heretic.

Though such ridiculous nonsense as this deserves no confutation, the very relation of it being sufficient to blast its credit, yet I will dive further into the matter: for, I believe, I will make it appear, that this fabulous story was not so old as the age in which it is recorded to have happened; nor so much credited heretofore, even in their own Church. If this had been a current miracle in *St. Anthony's* time (he died A. 1231,) and a triumphant victory after a challenge and a formal dispute with a Heretic; it must be presumed that *Cæsarius*, who picked up all miraculous reports about the time he lived, (he was writing his dialogues A. 1222,) would have written it, and transmitted it to us in his writings; especially as his ninth book contains more examples than one concerning brute beasts venerating the Eucharist. But if this did not come to his knowledge, yet I am sure it might to another writer of the same age with *Anthony*, viz. *Thomas Cantapratanus*, A. 1265, Suf-

fragan to the Archbishop of *Cambray*, who collected the miracles and memorable events of his time, and yet says not a word of *this* miracle, though he mentions some of the same nature. But, because this may seem less convincing, as he says not a syllable of *St. Anthony*, I will add another Frenchman of the same age, A. 1250, viz. *Vincentius*, Bishop of *Beauvais*, whose *Speculum Historiale*, (Lib. xxx. Cap. 131, 132, 133, 134, 135,) has a large account of *St. Anthony*, and mentions his disputations with Heretics, and his converting an Arch-heretic, but yet is wholly silent as to *St. Anthony's* mule, though said to be done in his own country, which is a manifest sign that this was a story not then in being, but since coined and fabricated; for if it had been done in his days, it could neither have escaped his knowledge nor been omitted in his history, it being the most remarkable thing belonging to it. This is further confirmed by another observation, that among thirty-six lessons in the Breviary (where so many fine things are told of him) this is not to be found, though in one of them I meet with these words, *Lef. 3. infra Oct. Anthony* confuted the perverse opinions of Heretics, by the most congruous reasons. At *Ariminium* now *Rimini*, a city in *Italy*, he converted many Heretics to the soundness of Christian faith, among whom he reduced to the light of truth an Arch-heretic called *Bonovillus*, who, during the space of thirty years had been blinded with the darkness of pestilent error. *Ribadenura*, p. 247 in his life of *Anthony*, either wilfully or ignorantly makes a great mistake, and differs from the other writers of his life, he making the disputation, wherein the mule acted such a wonderful part, to have been betwixt the Heretic *Bonovillus* and *St. Anthony*: whereas all who mention the veneration of the mule expressly say, that this happen-

ed in *Partibus Tholosanis*, near *Toulouse*; and all who speak of *Bonovillus's* story, determine it to have been at *Rimini*; that is, the one was in *Italy* and the other in *France*. The sum of what I have said amounts to this:—That if all the writers of his life had agreed in the mention of this miracle about the Eucharist, it would not be a sufficient proof of its truth; whereas they are all known to abound with lies. But so many of them omitting it, especially those of that age, wherein it is pretended to be done, and whose design such a story would have served, argues, that it had not *then* so much as the credit of a common or current *fable*. *Beatus Antonius*, *sed parm beatus in hoc*, who lived two hundred and twenty-eight years after *Anthony*, was the first writer who mentions it, and others of later date seem to have copied it from him, so that nothing remains but *oral tradition* to help them out, the inconsistency of which I noticed in the beginning of those papers. There is a certain time when the Priest says Mass, that he lifts up the wafer that the people may adore it. As *St. Ivo* was elevating it, a globe of light of wonderful splendour encompassed the body of Christ, and also the Chalice, and after the elevation of both presently disappeared. *Catharino Gonzales*, though employed at a distance in the bakehouse, often saw the Host when it was elevated by the Priest, (I suppose that she should not be deprived of the benefit of adoration) though there were many walls to intercept her sight. *St. Sibyllina*, which is yet more strange, though she was blind, yet knew when the Host was elevated by her inward sense; on a time when a Priest presumed to carry an unconsecrated Host to a sick person, neglecting to carry a consecrated one, at the sound of the bell, as it came along, she worshipped it, but not finding that inward plea-

sure in her spirit, she was wont to have, upon her examination of the Priest she made him confess that he did not carry the body of Christ.

St. Bonaventure, (who, for several days, through his great humility and fear, had abstained from receiving the communion) as he heard Mass, and was meditating upon the passion of Christ, God mercifully put into his mouth a particle of the consecrated Host, which an Angel took out of the hand of the Priest who held it. But he received a far greater favour than this. When he was near death, and through weakness vomited every thing he took, he knew not what to do. However, he resolved to have the Lord's body brought to him that he might die more comfortably when it was in his presence; he applied the pix, in which it was carried to his side, hereby manifesting his desire to receive it; and then, O wonderful, his side opened in the form of a red rose, at which place a Christ's body starting out of the pix, though fast closed went into his very heart, and his side closed again without any remaining sign of its having been opened!!! The old English Homily tells this story in another manner:—"There was an Earl of *Venice*, called Sir *Ambright*, that loved the Sacrament of the Awter passing well, and he did it all the worship and reverence that he might; so when he lay sick and should die, he might not receive the Sacrament for casting, then was he sorry and made dole, and then he let make olean his right side, and to cover it with a fayr cloth of sendall, and layd God's body therein, and sayd thus to the Host:—Lord thou knowest that I love thee with all my heart, and would feign receive thee with my mouth, and I durst, and because I may not, I lay thee on the place that is next my heart, and so I shew thee all the love of my heart, that I can or may; wherefore, I beseech thee good Lord, have

mercy on me; and even therewith in the sight of all the people that were about him, his syde opened and the Host went there into his syde, and then it closed again, and so anon, after he dyed, *Festival* in die Corporis Christi," F. 52.

In the sense Romanists entertain of the Eucharist, I thought it was only designed for the food of souls, and that it never became an aliment for the body. Yet *St. Nicholas de Rupe*, it seems found it incredibly nutritive. We hear that he lived twenty years without human food, except by receiving the Eucharist every fifteen days, that is, he lived on the accidents of whiteness, roundness, &c. for the substance being, according to them, changed into Christ's body, which is a spiritual body, cannot materially nourish, Act. Sanctor. in ejus vita Mart. xxii. p. 411 & 429.— Let us hear a little more concerning the strange effects its presence has produced upon brute creatures. An ancient Priest, as he was carrying the Sacrament out of town to a sick person, met a company of asses laden with corn in a very narrow and deep miry way. He, who went before him with the lantern, with much ado, passed by them. The Priest seeing this, and considering his age and weakness, began to tremble, and fearing that he might be tumbled into the mire with the Sacrament by the asses, he cried out to them, O asses, what is it that ye do? Why do you not consider whom I carry in my hands? stand still, fall down, and give honour to your Creator, for I command it in his name. Behold, says *Cæsarius*, the relator of this story, Cap. xviii. the wonderful obedience of those animals. They all stood still and all fell down together, and, O wonderful! though the asses could not fall down but with much difficulty, yet not one of the sacks of corn fell from their backs.

This story is famous to this day in the city of *Cologne*, a city as famous for lies as this story.

St. Coleta had a lamb, who without instruction would kneel at the elevation of the Eucharist and rise when it was over, Act. Sancto. Mart. vi. p. 554.

A ploughman (his name or country is not mentioned.) early in the morning was at work in the field, and suddenly, with all his whipping could not make his oxen stir a foot. Thinking the devil was in them he redoubles his blows, but in vain, but he soon found his mistake, for looking about him he saw the pix, (a little box in which they carry the wafers) with the Sacrament in it, lying before the feet of the oxen, (which thieves who broke open the Church had stolen away and scattered there) and they, in admiration stood still, and would go no farther. The Priest of the parish hearing this wonderful story, came into the field, and after the cattle plowed as usual, Act. Sancto. ad Mart. vi. p. 554.

A woman who kept bees that did not thrive, was advised to place the Lord's body in the hive, and that would advert the plague that infested them; hereupon she went to the Church and received the communion from the Priest, but she took it out of her mouth as soon as she went away from him and put it in one of the bee-hives. But, Oh, the wonderful power of God! The bees acknowledging their Creator, built a Chapel to this their welcome guest, of an admirable structure, where they erected an altar, and put the most holy body of Christ upon it; and God blessed their works. All this mystery appeared when the woman took up her hive. Amazed at the sight, she ran and confessed to the Priest what she had done and what she saw; who coming thither with the parishioners, drove away the bees that flew about and hummed the praise of the Creator; and after admiring

the chapel, walls, window, roof, steeple, bells, door, organ, and altar, they brought back the Lord's body with praise and glory, *Cæsarius* in Dial. dist. ix. c. 7. *Thomas Cantapratanus* relates a parallel fable concerning bees that had lodged the Sacrament in their hive in a pix, made of the purest wax, and that the owner of them saw in the night, the whole air illuminated above them: these bees were more contemplative than the former, for they left off working, and addicted themselves to singing, which they continued in the night-time, contrary to their custom, Lib. ii. de Mirae. sui temp. c. 40. p. 398. These follies, neither you nor I can call them by any other name, I will pursue no farther, but that I may make a good conclusion of the present subject, I will insert out of one of the Homilies of the Festival, the story of the *Black Horse*, which exceeds that of *St. Anthony's Mule*, and all the rest I have named. And thus it follows in the old english style, as I find it:—

“In Devonshyre besyde Exbridge, was a woman that lay sick, and was nye deed, and sent after a holy person about midnight, to have her ryghts. Than this man, in all haste he might, arose and went to the Church, and took Goddes Body in a box of Ivory, and put it into his Bosome, and went forth toward this woman. And as he wente thorough the Forest in a fayre mede that was his next waye, it happed that his box fell out of his bosome to the ground, and he wente forth and wyst it not, and came to this woman, and herde her Confession. And than he asked her yf she wolde be houseled, and she sayd, ye Syr. Than he put his hande into his bosome, and sought the box, and when he found it not, he was full sory and sad, and sayd, Dame, I will go after Goddes Body and come agayne anon to you; and so he wente forth sore wepinge for his Sympleness.

P

And so as he came to a wylowe tree, he made thereof a rodde and stryped himself naked and bette himself, so that the blode came down by his sydes, and said thus to himself:—O thou simple man, why hast thou lost thy Lord God, thy Maker, thy Fourmer and Creatour: and when he had thus bette himselfe, he did on his clothes and wen the forth; and than he was ware of a pyller of fire that lasted from erth to heven, and he was all astonyed thereof, yet he blessed him and wente to it; and there lay the Sacrament fallen out of the boxe into the grasse, and the pyllar shone as bryght as the sunne, and it lasted from Goddes Body to Heven: and all the beests of the Forest were comen about Goddes Body and stode in compasse round about it, and all kneeled on four knees, save one black Horse that kneeled but one knee. Than said he, yf thou be any beest that may speke, I charge thee, in Goddes name, here present in four me of Breed; tell me why thou knelest but on one knee. Than said he, I am a fende of hell, and will not knele, and I might, but I am made against my will, for it is wrytten, that every knelynge of heven and of erthe shall be to the Worship of the Lord God. Why art thou like a hors? And he sayd, to make the people to stele me: and at suche a towne was a man hanged and at such a Towne another. Than sayd the holy persone, I commande thee by Goddes fleshe and his blode, that thou go into Wyldernesse, and be there, as thou shalt never dysease crysten man more. And than he went his way, he might no longer abyde, and than this man went forthe to the woman and did the ryghtes, by the which she was saved and went to everlasting salvacyon. Lo the whiche he brynge us, our blessed Savyour Thesus." *Festival in Die Corp. Christi*, fol. 53.

The preceding stories are a scandal to Religion, and a Romish invention suggested by the Father of lies to bereave men of their rational faculties, to uphold Transubstantiation. When A. D. 1215, this system was first publicly avowed, and carried by a majority of the Pope's creatures, and was decreed an article of faith, at the fourth council of *Lateran*, under *Innocent* the III. the world was then as much surprised, as when it found itself *Arian* under Pope *Liberius*, who signed his name to the *Arian* Creed, and by that means, denied the Consubstantiality of the three Divine Persons in the Godhead. When Transubstantiation was first introduced, as it could not be proved from Scripture or Reason, a method was soon invented in the Conclave, far more convincing, in the leaden ages in which it was hatched, than Scripture, or the former belief of the church. Falsehood took the lead of Truth, and pretended Miracles supported a new invented system. Transubstantiation was to be upheld: Confederacies in different parts of the world are appointed: Wonders are promulged. Some who before adhered to Scripture doctrine, but now become more credulous, are gradually frightened into a compliance with this new principle. The irrational beasts of the field, bees, women, a black horse, confederated priests and the devil give a full testimony to Transubstantiation. When a miracle takes wing from an Archbishop of Canterbury, who dare suspect so dignified a Prelate to be a cheat and impostor. Yet I must either suspect him, or his biographer *Cressy*, the noted miracle-monger, when he tells me, that when the roof of *St. Odo's* Church wanting repair, he suspended all rain for the space of three years, that it should not hinder his work. This amongst many more, is another production of *Cressy's* History.

This Mr. *Cressy* produces, in his History, *St. Clarus*, an English Hermit, Lib. 17. c. 3. *St. Ositha*, *St. Decumanus*, and *St. Juthwera*, who all carried their heads in their arms, after they were cut off; but if he omitted all these, that one story he relates concerning *St. Justinian*, may suffice a credulous Romanist; who when he had been slain, and his head cut off by his own wicked servants, his body immediately arose, and with his head between his hands, as if nothing ailed him, walked thence to the sea, passed over to a port called by his name, and fell down at a place, where a Church was built to his memory.

Frenchmen may boast of their *Dennis*, but I challenge any Frenchmen of them all, to produce such a saint as this. Their *Dennis's* journey was not, by their account, above two miles, and that upon plain, firm ground; and what's that, I pray, to going over sea, without one's head? Till *Cressy*, the author of the story of *St. Odo*, and those above related, can produce sufficient motives of credibility to assent to the truth of them; I am, I think, at liberty to withdraw my belief from the story of *Odo*, as well as the rest, and some hundreds more of the like stamp, which I might produce from the same author.

But to come home to the miracle of *St. Odo*, when he broke the host, (rude treatment of the body of Christ, to be torn and mangled, and drowned at last in wine,) he saw drops of blood, pouring from it. But this is inconsistent with their notion of the Eucharist, because the host is not broken till some time after the consecration, which presupposes that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and the wine into his blood. How then, could the blood that was in the chalice, drop from the body which he held in his hands? "It being the property of heavy bodies, to be attracted to the centre and to rest there, till they

acquire motion by the impulsive force of another body acting upon them." Miraculous as the transaction was, no one, as the story goes, saw the drops of blood in the beginning but *Odo* himself, (by this he seemed to doubt the miracle of Transubstantiation) as he pretended, and the cunning Bishop to coincide with his injunctions from Rome, might have that day, substituted red wine instead of white, which may very well impose upon their credulity, if they were not confederates in the juggle.

As for the blood of Christ, it is gloriously united to his body in heaven, as it was hypostatically united to the word, not only when he was alive, but also whilst he lay in the grave. For all the blood that flowed from the body of Christ, as it belonged to the reality of his human nature, rose in the body of Christ without any diminution; otherwise it had not been a perfect resurrection. Consequently Christ's glorious blood as well as his body cannot be seen or handled, much less drank, as they are spiritualized in heaven, which plainly destroys *St. Odo's* miracle of Transubstantiation. To make Transubstantiation in this miracle of *St. Odo* more wonderful, he is not content with his supernatural change of the bread and wine, but he must have the blood of Christ descend from heaven and become impanated in the bread, otherwise it could not flow from it, and then by its tincture, turn the wine in the chalice red; and anon, another miracle is introduced, to change it to its former colour. Such a juggle as this transcends all human belief; it confounds the law of nature, multiplies fictitious miracles, to promote infidelity; destroys true religion by inventing and propagating such incredible stories, and would make an Indian infidel believe, that the Popish Priests of the Christian religion, surpass by many degrees, the Chinese Jugglers, the most expert in the world, in the tricks and sleights of Legerdemain.

Your wonder of the miracle of *Odo*, will cease when you hear that another Archbishop of Canterbury, the famed *Thomas Becket*, of whom hereafter, when at Rome turned a capon, upon a fast day, into a carp. And that the same *Thomas Becket*, though a traitor to his king, and the Pope's avowed partizan, in a bad cause, restored his privities to one *Eilwardus*, a robber, who was condemned to have them cut off. Principio quidem valde parva, sed in majus proficientia, very small in the beginning, but growing still greater. The old Roman breviary tells us, that *Thomas* stretched out his powerful hand to unusual and unheard of wonders; for even they that were deprived of their eyes and of those parts by which mankind is propagated, by his merits, had the favour to receive new ones. I will subjoin the hymn, which confirms this, out of their own old breviary. Lec. 8.

Novis fulget *Thomas* miraculis
 Membris donat castratos masculis
 Ornat visu privatos oculis,
 Mundat lepræ conspersos maculis,
 Solvit mortis ligatos vinculis.

Another Rhyme which contains wonders shall close
Thomas's scene for the present.

Aqua *Thomas* quinque varians colorem,
 In lac semel transit, quater in cruorem;
 Ad *Thomas* memoriam quater lux descendit,
 Et in sancti gloriam cerceos accendit.

Five times his water changed its colour quite,
 Four times blood-red, and once not milk more white;
 And that *St. Thomas's* fame might never dwindle,
 Four times did light descend, and torches kindle.

Brev. Sarum. Lec. 9. in Trans. *Thomas*. Jul. 7.

Having disproved the foregoing miracles of *St. Odo*, the rest I leave to the reader to amuse himself with, making no doubt, when he finds the chief actors in the different dramas, to be a Jew, (a known enemy to

Christianity) brute beasts, women, a black horse, Romish confederated Priests, the Pope, and the devil, but he will be satisfied in his mind, that the Church of Rome is supported by fiction and falsehood, and the credulity of its subjects as mentioned before.

Didst not thou, O Lord, free all those who have embraced your holy laws, and evangelical commands, from the thralldom and tyranny of sin? Didst not thou, by thy sufferings, deliver us from the guilt of protoparental iniquity? Didst thou not utterly abolish the sacrifices of the Old Law, by the *one* only sacrifice of thyself? Didst thou not, thro' your dolorous passion and triumphant resurrection, open the gates of heaven for us, if we were only observant of thine easy rules, thy life-giving mandates? Dost thou not incessantly present thy sacrificed body to the Eternal Father, by whose consent and approbation, it has been substituted for the sins of the world? Dost thou not exhibit thy wounds, out of which thy most precious blood has issued, as a full and complete ransom for the depraved race of *Adam*? Is not the efficacy of thy blood as powerful and prevalent, as fresh and unimpaired, as when thou first presented it to thy father in heaven? And yet, (I shudder, I tremble at the thought) must thou, by forged miracles, and the inconsistent inventions of crafty Priests, dance attendance (which is incompatible with thy bodily existence) at thousands of Romish altars at once, to renew and complete our redemption.



OF PURGATORY.

HAVING thus pointed out the inconsistencies of the Romish Mass; let us, in the next place, take an impartial view of *Purgatory*. The most evident and

perspicuous method, I imagine, that can be taken, is, to examine such texts of Scripture, as may, in any light, favour it; and then, to consider whether Scripture or Reason, be for or against it.

The first seeming Scripture proof of *Purgatory* that occurs, is taken from the 2d Book of Machabees, xii. 43, &c.* But will you not be surprised, when you are told, that the Jews, for a certainty, never received the Books of the Machabees as canonical, or divinely inspired. The 2d Book in particular, is rejected by several very eminent Divines; such as *Eusebius, Cæsariensis, St. Amphilochius, St. Basil, Gregory, Nazianzene, Richardus, Cajetanus, Ostramus, &c.* How, then, can any man in his reason, lay any value upon a book whose character is so dubious? Even one of the Romish divines, *Dominic Soto*, professedly owns, that the doctrine of *Purgatory* is more certain and evident, than the authority of the 2d Book of the Machabees; and upon the same subject, says, that more evident things should not be proved by those that are less so.

If *Judas Machabeus* and his brethren fought valiantly for the security of their laws and country; what is that to an article of faith? How many instances of the like nature could be produced out of the Roman and Grecian histories? If they found gifts, offered by the Gentiles to their idols, under the cloaks of their slain soldiers, and sent an equivalent to them, to Jerusalem, to the High Priest, to mitigate and appease by

* In the reign of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, King of Asia, *Onias*, being then High-Priest in Jerusalem; there was a Priest, whose name was *Mathathias*, who had five sons, *John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar, and Jonathan*, commonly called *Assamoneans*, from *Simon* their great grand-father: or, as some will have it, from the Hebrew word *Hasmanim*, which signifies a prince or chief-ruler, *Machabees* from *Judas*, the most valiant and stoutest captain of his brothers, who carried in his standard these words written in golden letters,—*Mi Camoca Be Eloim Jehovah?* “Who is like thee among the Gods, O, Jehovah?” Exod. xv. 11. The initials of which words put together, with dots instead of vowels, make the word *Machabei*, but the letter *m*, sounding harsh in the middle of a word in the Hebrew language, being omitted, *Machabei*.

sacrifice, the wrath and indignation of God, against whom his army rebelled, in the persons of those slain soldiers: how far is *Purgatory* thence to be deduced? Peruse but impartially the xii. 43, &c. of the 2d. Book of Machabees, and ingeniously compare it with the 7th and 8th chapters of the Book of Joshua, and you will find, that the sin of the slain soldiers was of the same sort with the sin of *Achan*. For, as "*Achan* took the goodly Babylonish garment, and the two hundred shekels of silver, and the wedge of gold of fifty shekels weight," and was very justly stoned to death, for contaminating himself with them, as most strictly "forbidden, and accursed to the Lord," chap. vi. 17; and a peace-offering sacrificed by *Joshua* to the Lord for the contracted sin of his people; chap. viii. 31. So in like manner, did the soldiers of the Machabees transgress the Law, Deut. vii. 5. Exod. xxiv. 13, by stealing the gifts, offered to idols, from the neighbouring temples, or groves of *Jaxia*. But what was to be done upon this occasion, the soldiers were slain, and consequently, could not undergo the rigor of the law, which was inevitable death? All, then, that could be done, was, to send an equivalent to the stealth (equal to about £41. 4s. of our currency,) to Jerusalem, to appease the Lord with a peace-offering, in imitation of *Joshua* at Mount Ebal. The case, then of *Achan* and the soldiers being similar; nay, the transgression of the soldiers was far greater, as they died in the actual commission of sin, and consequently, impenitent, proves rather (even though we should grant the second book of the Machabees to be canonical) the undoubted reprobation of the soldiers, than the slightest glimpse of *Purgatory*.

Here, it will be, perhaps objected, that I have industriously passed by the main proof of *Purgatory*,

viz. "It is, therefore, an holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins." Before we proceed any further, it will be necessary to illustrate this matter with a recital of the fact. The words, literally translated from the Greek, are as follow.—"And upon the day following, as the use had been, Judas and his company came to take up the bodies of them that were slain, and to bury them with their kinsmen in their fathers' graves. Now under the coats of every one that was slain, they found things consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites, which is forbidden the Jews by the law. Then every man saw that this was the cause wherefore they were slain. All men, therefore, praising the Lord, the righteous Judge, who had opened the things that were hid, betook themselves unto prayer, and besought him, that the sin committed might wholly be put out of remembrance, besides that noble Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forso much as they saw before their eyes the things that came to pass; for the sins of those that were slain. And when he had made a gathering throughout the company to the sum of 2000 drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering, doing therein very well, and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection (for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous, and vain to pray for the dead). And also, in that he perceived that there was great favor laid up for those that died godly, it was an holy and good thought: whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin."

Having thus stated the subject, it appears in the first place, that to enhance the value of their sacrifices they deal disingenuously with the Greek text, "Katakeupnasmata eis argurion drachmas dischilias;" that

is, "vessels or ornaments to the value of two thousand drachms of silver," by rendering it in their *vulgate*, twelve thousand. The sum, according to the Greek text, amounts to no more than £41. 4s. supposing them to be Attic money, and if Jewish, but to double the sum. Thence, it appears, they have superadded £417. 12. Can this, in any sense of the word, be deemed an honest translation of a book supposed to be suggested by the Holy Ghost? Their translation of the last verse, upon which they ground their *Purgatorial* proof, is as disingenuous as the former. Instead of the above, which is correctly genuine, they render it, "It is therefore an holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins." Against all the rules of reason and logic, they would prove an universal custom from one particular instance. Supposing, which is false, that *Judas Machabeus* thought sacrifices in the old law to be available for the dead, how is it thence to be concluded, that universally in the law of grace, they must be equally available, especially, as all sacrifices terminated in the one only sacrifice of Christ? Moreover, it will, upon a little reflection appear, that the latter part of v. 43, viz. from the word *sin-offering* exclusive, to the end of the chapter was feisted into the book, in the ages of darkness and ignorance, by some old doating purgatorial Priest, or Monk, who had not sagacity enough to foresee the difficulties and absurdities that would arise from it. For how is it reconcileable with reason and the nature of the thing, that *Judas*, and his surviving army could possibly think of making an atonement for men, who in consequence of their prevarication and sin, were slain by the just permission of the Lord. "Then every man saw that this was the cause wherefore they were slain," v. 40. If *Achan* was damned for the trans-

gression of the law, as *Austin*, *John Cassianus*, and the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, under *Pipin*, affirm; no Romanist will question their doctrine; what are we to think of the soldiers who died in the actual commission of sacrilege? If *Achan* was doomed to misery for his stealth, why should not the soldiers be deemed equally miserable, whereas their stealths, as well as that of *Achan* were equally prohibited by the law? *Judas* could not therefore offer a sin-offering upon any other terms, but to appease the Lord, for the contracted sin of his army, lest he, and such as survived the late action might be utterly vanquished by the enemy, (see *Joshua* vii. 12.) There can be no application of that text, "He perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly," to any one preceding passage of the chapter, to the reverse, it is contrary, as is evident to every part of it where mention is made of the slain, who are said to have died in their sins. Moreover, it is an open contradiction to suppose them to have died godly, and to have died in their sins, as is recounted in the latter part of v. 42; because sin and holiness are, at the same time, incompatible in one and the same subject. To conclude, their argument, in short, must be summed up thus:—The soldiers were damned for transgressing the law; therefore it is an holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead. Thus circumvented with absurdities, and divested of all rationality, ends this forged proof of *Purgatory*.

What! it seems the *Jews* from the beginning of the world were in a mass of perdition for the space of about 3853 years, until *Jason* wrote the second book of the *Machabees*. How stupid must *Moses* and the *Prophets* have been, who have not even hinted a word concerning *Purgatory*? How stupid, I say, must they

have been, because if it can be looked upon at any time as an article of faith, it must necessarily have been one from the fall of *Adam*, as man was then, as well as now, subject and incident to trivial transgressions. Does one of the *Casaites* (the most unprejudiced sect amongst the *Jews*) admit it? No; and yet the Romanists to shew the antiquity of their doctrine, endeavour to prove it out of a rational *Jewish* history, at best, unanimously rejected by them and several Romish divines and councils as not canonical or divinely inspired. If this be not an absurdity, I know not what to call one.*

* The 76th and last canon of the Apostolical Canons runs thus:—Let every one, both clergymen and laymen, have by him the venerable and Holy Bible, *i. e.* the Old Testament, containing the five books of *Moses*; one of *Jesus*, son of *Nave*; one of the Judges; one of *Ruth*; four of the *Kings*; two of the *Paralipomena*; two of *Esdras*; one of *Esther*; one of *Job*; 150 *Psalms*; three of *Solomon*, viz. the *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*, *Canticles*; 12 of the lesser Prophets; one of *Isaias*; one of *Jeremiah*; one of *Ezekiel*; one of *Daniel*; (besides, let it be remembered, that novices be taught the wisdom of the most learned *Syrach*;) of the *New Testament*, the four Gospels of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*; 14 Epistles of *Paul*; two of *Peter*; three of *John*; one of *James*; one of *Jude*, and the *Acts of the Apostles*. In this canon there is no mention of the books of the *Machabees*; and it is to be remarked, that it not only permits, but enjoins the laity the use of the Holy Scriptures.

The 59th and last canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, A. D. 367, runs thus:—That *Psalms* composed by *private men*, or uncanonical books, ought not to be read in the Church, but only the canonical books of the *Old and New Testament*. What books of the *Old Testament* must be read; *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Numbers*, *Deuteronomy*, *Jesus*, the son of *Nave*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, *Esther*; four books of *Kings*; two of *Paralipomena*; two of *Esdras*; the book of 150 *Psalms*, *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*, *Canticles*, *Job*, 12 *Prophets*, *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, and *Baruck's Lamentations* and *Epistles*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*. Of the *New*, four Gospels, *Acts of the Apostles*; seven *Catholic Epistles*; fourteen of *St. Paul*.

St. Gregory Nazianzen, about the year 375, in his canon of Scripture, in verse, reckons in the *Old Testament* twelve books of History, five of *Moses*, *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*; two of the *Kings*, (two books of *Samuel*, two books of *Kings*), *Esdras*, (to which *Nehemiah* was formerly thought an appendix) the *Chronicles*, which he takes for one book.

He reckons five poetical books, viz. *Job*, the *Psalms*, *Ecclesiastes*, the *Song of Songs*, *Proverbs*.

He reckons five books of Prophets, viz. the twelve minor Prophets (whose names he particularly rehearses, and all whose books are but one in his account.) *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, in all twenty-two according to the number of the Hebrew letters.

The canon of the *New Testament*, as now commonly received with us only he mentions not the *Apocalypse*, and adds, if there be any more than these, they are not reckoned among the genuine.

The next text which the Romanists would prove their *Purgatory* from, is that of Matt. xii. 32, "It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Hence they deduce, that some sins are to be forgiven in the world to come; and consequently in their opinion, there must be a *Purgatory* wherein those sins are remitted. But as far as I can see, there can be no such inference made from this passage; nay, the very reverse appears, if we consider that those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, become so stiff-necked and obdurate, that they will receive no instruction; grow thoughtless of repentance; nay, directly oppugn the very means whereby they may be inspired to do it. Moreover, they reject, scorn, and contemn the divine goodness and bounty, and all internal, mental illumination, and inspiration of the spirit, from which, whilst they are estranged, they become more and more blinded and hard hearted; and finally, like the obdurate *Pharaoh*, are cast headlong into the mass of reprobation and perdition, and will not be forgiven in this world, no, nor in the world to come, which, according to an *Hebraism*, signifies *never*. If this exposi-

He says, *Matthew* wrote his Gospel for the *Jews*, *Mark* for the *Italians*, *Luke* for the *Grecians*, *John* for all.

The canon of Scripture, according to *Amphilochius*, *Bishop* of *Iconium*, in *Lycaonia*, taken out of his Greek Iambicks to *Seleucus* about the year 390. He divides the books of Scripture into three classes.—Some are false, others of a middle sort, and near neighbours of the true; others divinely inspired. By the false he means, probably, the Gospel of the *Nazarenes*, and the many false Gospels then familiarly known. By the middle sort, what we now commonly call Apocriphal. The true, says he, are the *Pentateuch*, *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, the four books of *Kings*, two of *Chronicles*, two of *Ezra*, (the latter of these we call *Nehemiah*) the five poetical books, as in the canon of *Gregory Nazianzen*, the twelve lesser Prophets, the four greater; some, says he, add *Esther*. In the *New Testament*, the four *Evangelists*; the *Acts*, the fourteen Epistles of *St. Paul*; some, says he, call that to the *Hebrews*, spurious, but he asserts it genuine; some, says he, receive seven canonical Epistles, but others only three; some add the *Apocalypse* of *John*, but more say that it is spurious.

What has been hitherto alledged must appear sufficient to uncannonize the Books of the *Machabees*, as there is no mention made of them in the foregoing references.

tion of the text does not content you, compare *Matthew* with *Mark*, iii. 29, where he speaks on the same subject, "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." And *Matthew* and *Mark* with *Luke* xii. 10, "And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him, but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, it shall never be forgiven." The concurring harmony of the three Evangelists, treating on the same subject, plainly assures us, that the sense of the text is, that those who commit the sin against the Holy Ghost shall *never* be forgiven. And their evidence, it must be allowed, is of greater weight than that of all the purgatorial Priests or Monks that ever existed. Is it possible that any man in his senses, can believe, that because the sin against the Holy Ghost will never be forgiven, that *Purgatory* must be thence deduced and proved? Lay aside prejudice and prepossession, and you will find that it is the same case, as if you would endeavour to prove the existence of a spiritual substance from the idea of a material one; or the greatest absurdity and inconsistency from the clearest assurances of truth and demonstration. No man but a prepossessed Romanist, can see the least pretensions for *Purgatory* in that of *Matthew* v. 26, "Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." Christ, alluding to the insolvency of a man reduced to the lowest ebb of poverty, who owes a prodigious sum, and can by no possible means redeem himself out of prison, to enlighten the *Pharisees* and dispel the damnable mist of error they were involved in, cautions and admonishes them to be reconciled with the offended party, previous to their offering their gifts upon the altar. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of

old time, thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, *raca*, (empty) shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say thou fool," (a despiser of the divine law, which is the greatest folly) "shall be in danger of hell fire." Here he undoubtedly made use of this sermon to confound the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, who were of opinion, that they could atone for any guilt or offence committed against their neighbour by sacrifice alone, even though they still retained rancor and malice in their hearts. But Christ hinting at the most rigid sentence of the *Sanhedrin*, earnestly entreats them, to reject that opinion, as contrary even to the law of nature, and consequently damnable; and on the other hand, threatens them if they should persist in that erroneous system of non-reconciliation, with the prison (hell) out of which they should, by no means be freed, until they should have paid the uttermost farthing, that is, *never*. That this is the true meaning of the text, appears from the Evangelists mentioning *hell* in three different passages upon the same occasion, and in the same context, as v. 22, 29, 30, out of which there never was, or will be a redemption.*

Christ, perfectly acquainted with the Jewish laws, alludes in this sermon, to the three different Courts of Judicature held amongst the Jews. The first consisted of a political tribunal of 7, or sometimes 11 men, Ruth iv. 2, which they called *Mispat*, or Judgment; according to this, all trivial litigated causes were de-

* It was confidently believed in the eighth century, upon the bare authority of *John Damascene*, that *Gregory the Great*, and *Tecla*, prayed the souls of the Emperor *Trojan* and *Falconilla*, out of hell. So utterly unacquainted were men, in that, and the next following ages, with the doctrine which we are taught in the Scriptures!

cided. The second consisted of twenty-one men, and was called *Dine Nephasoth*, or the determination of lives, in which matters of greater weight and importance were determined. But the third was the sacred tribunal of the *Sanhedrim*, or seventy-two elders, in which causes of the most grievous natures were examined, and consequently, the severest punishments determined. To those, I say, Christ alludes, and compares a man's punishment, "who is angry with his brother without a cause," to the sentence of the Tribunal of Judgment. In the second place, he assimilates a man's punishment, who calls his brother, *Raca*, with the punishment inflicted by the Tribunal of the *Determination of Lives*. But, in the third place, he tells them, as the most rigid sentence of the *Sanhedrim*, with regard to notorious delinquents, was both dreadfully shocking and unavoidable, that in like manner, he that should "call his brother a fool (the greatest reproach that could be offered) would be, unavoidably, in danger of hell-fire. Though the punishment of the two first transgressions might be somewhat mitigated, or an appeal lodged, yet the crime of the third was of so heinous a nature, that it could not be in the least, palliated, but rather prosecuted with the utmost rigor of the law. Christ having explained this metaphor, admonishes those, who call their brothers, fools, and who, by their speech, seemingly exclude them from the inheritance of heaven (the result of foolishly despising the law of God) to be forthwith reconciled with the offended party, or else, that death would waft them into the mansions of eternal fire, from which they could not depart till they had paid the uttermost farthing, which in the Oriental style (in allusion to an impossibility of solvency) signifies *never*; as most evidently appears by impartially considering the subject.

The only support that can be claimed out of that text is the word *until*, but this, very often, in the Scripture phrase, signifies what was *undone*, and *not what was to follow after*, as you can see in the following passages. We read in Genesis, that “*Noah sent forth a raven, which went to and fro, until the waters were dried up from off the face of the earth.*” Now it is a revealed truth, that the raven never came back, even though the waters were dried up; notwithstanding the word *until*, seems to imply the contrary. *David*, divinely inspired, prophecies, Ps. cx. 1, 2, that “*Christ should sit on the right hand of God, until he would make his enemies his footstool.*” Will any man be so audacious as to say, that he is then to be sequestered, when his enemies are utterly vanquished? No, and yet, if the word *until* was to be taken in the obvious sense and meaning of it, we could deduce nothing else, but that Christ was to depart from the right hand of God, after the general Day of Judgment, which would be an assertion not only heretical, but in the highest degree blasphemous. In Matt. i. 25, we read, that “*Joseph knew her (Mary) not until she had brought forth her first-born son:*” The Romanists, I am persuaded, will not concede that she had any children after, and yet, the word *until*, if taken in that rigorous and *purgatorial* sense, that it is taken in by them in the 5th of St. Matthew, would undeniably prove, that she had children after. Now, if *until*, in the forementioned passages (and many more of the like nature, which can be produced both out of prophane and sacred writings) denotes things which never did, or will happen; I see no reason, why *until*, in the 5th of St. Matthew, may not be taken in the same sense; especially, as reason in conjunction with Scripture makes it clearly and demonstratively evident, as has been proved.

Let us, in the next place, consider what St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 13, 14, 15, says, "Every man's work shall be made manifest. For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Here is an invincible proof of *Purgatory*! What can we say, even from considering what they would prove from this passage, but that their greatest proofs are the deepest obscurities, and their clearest light the profoundest darkness. But how unfortunately has it happened for the Romish Cause, that none of the Greeians could see the Doctrine of *Purgatory* in this passage. The most celebrated amongst them, viz. *Jerome*, *Chrysostom*, and *Cyprian*, and amongst the Latins, *Ambrose* and *Austin* agree, that the fire spoken of, is the general conflagration, and the day that is to reveal it, the Day of Judgment. Nay, to this very day, few Greeians receive or believe the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, though so plain to the Romanists, in this text. *

* The Romanists pretend that the doctrine of *Purgatory* was defined and agreed upon at the Council of Florence, A. D. 1438, (strange never before defined) by the Greeks, in the presence of the Emperor *John Paleologus*. But the very reverse will appear (if you except *Bessarion*, Bishop of Nice, whom Pope *Pius* the 2d, gained over to his party, by creating him a Cardinal) by examining the process of that part of the Council relative to *Purgatory*.

The debate about *Purgatory* was as follows;—In the fifteenth Session of that Council we read, that four Metropolitans, at last consented to this determination, that the middle souls are in a place of torment; and whether it be fire, or mist, or tempest, or any thing else, they contend not. When the article, in the same Session, was drawn up into this form, that they which had sinned, and confessed, and were in the number of penitents, and had not performed works of satisfaction, should go into *Purgatory* fire, and there being purged should be placed in the number of those who behold God's essence immediately. The Greeks answer was, that they had no power from their Emperor to answer any thing, but as private friends, they answered, that they receive that which they said of *Purgatory*, and they truly admitted, that the souls see the essence of God, and being pressed to receive their writing, having not the Emperor's man-

The Apostle's main scope and design was, to censure some, who held the Fundamentals of Christianity, but built upon it such doctrines and practices as would not, if not sincerely retracted, bear trial; which he represents as *wood, hay, and stubble*, that cannot withstand the violence of fire. If God's chosen and elect who have inviolably observed his law, and pursued its

date, they received it not. Some time after the Emperor called all the prelates of the Church, as well Latins as Greeks, and the determination was, that they should by no means, speak of *Purgatory*, being a thing, as he thought, of which they could form no true determination. Then the Romans resisted the Emperor, and told him, that it is impossible for the Church to be united, unless controversy be ended. But the Emperor would not be persuaded. Then the Latins pressed, that there should be no more inserted in the decree, but the bare name of *Purgatory*. Then, after a while, the Emperor having pressing occasions to depart, tells them, he has no more to say, but he can stay no longer. Then Cardinal *Julian* does what he can to mollify the Emperor, and all going to his palace, earnestly constrained him. The only question was, that the souls of penitent sinners are purged by prayers, and therefore piously entertaining the Emperor, requested he would finish the work, but he would not. After that the Emperor called the Proxies of the three Patriarchs, *Gregory*, the Patriarch of Alexandria, and *Marcus*, the Metropolitan of Ephesus, Proxy of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. But this produced nothing in favour of the decree, but on the contrary, *Marcus* and *Scholarius* disputed largely against it. To conclude, the Greek Bishops returned home and would not stand to the agreement. Thus, *Laonicus Chalcocondylus* L. vi. p. 407. "Græci domum reversi non amplius his quæ convenerant in Italia, stare voluerunt, verum apprehendentes sententiam diversam, noluerunt amplius in religionis negotio adhærere Romanis. The Greeks, returning home, would not stand to the Italian Concord, but espousing a contrary opinion, would not adhere to the Romans, in the business of religion." On this, the Pope sent learned men to Constantinople to dispute the matter, but, says he, the Greeks received not the Concord, and "ubi ad colloquium et disputationem ventum est, Romani nihil efficere potuerunt, verum re infecta, domum reversi sunt. When they came to discourse and debate, the Romans could not prevail, but returned home without doing any thing.

What the Greeks presented at the Council of Basil, a year before that of Florence, clears their opinion in this point. For *Purgatory*, say they, in their apology, p. 119, of Hanov. edit. "and temporary punishment by fire, we have not received it from our Doctors, nor do we know that the Eastern Church is of that mind." And again, p. 123, "We have not received it from any of the Doctors: and we are afraid, lest if we should define this temporary punitive *Purgatory*, we should do mischief to the whole body of the Church, giving this reason, because God having pronounced that the wicked shall go into everlasting fire, and all believers' ears being acquainted with this from their youth, and dreading it above all things, and guiding their words and actions accordingly, if they shall now accede to this *new* style of temporary fire, it is to be feared that Christians will believe all fire to be such as this, and that all fire shall have an end, as *Origen* thought, and by this means bring in great store of fuel for the eternal fire. From which and other ill consequence, their resolution is express, that they never until that day had said any such thing, nor ever

dictates, shall be tried with fire at the general day of judgment, (*the fire shall try every man's work,*) with what anguish and confusion must that incestuous Corinthian (*whose flesh is delivered unto Satan, that his spirit may be saved in the Lord,*) and others, who superstruct innovations upon the pure doctrines of Christ, be then, seized? In consequence of this immutable, this tremendous judgment. The Apostle earnestly exhorts them to renew their lives, and amend their morals, and that then, (God knowing whether their repentance was sincere; or not) though perilous and dangerous their situation may be, a possibility of their salvation may not utterly be despaired of; yet, so as by fire, or out of the fire, which signifies a narrow escape out of great danger. If we consider it as a Scripture phrase, used upon the like occasion, by the sacred Penmen, we shall find this to be the genuine sense of it, as may be seen, by comparing it with that of Jude xxiii. "Others save with fear, plucking them out of the fire." Amos iv. 11, "Ye were as a firebrand plucked out of the burning." And Zacharias iii. 2. "Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?"

Should we seriously examine the system of Popery, we may really conclude, that the Apostle has hinted at it in a prophetic manner, in this passage. They had the pure doctrine of Christ, viz. *gold, silver, and pre-*

would. Again, p. 124, they affirm that any Doctors of their Church never made any mention of this, insisting on *St Chrysostom's* testimony to the contrary, on that text of 1 Cor. iii. and asserting his skill, and the assurance of God's Spirit in interpreting those Epistles, against whatever could be pretended by the Latins from any of their Doctors; vindicating their assertion, that none of their Doctors ever mentioned any such matter, and p. 147, charging the Latins with a citation of their's out of *Theodoret*, which was no where to be found in his writings.

To conclude this note, when the Cardinal of Guise wanted to know from the Greek residents at Venice, what was their sense of *Purgatory*, their answer is, We, by no means believe that there remains any *Purgatory* fire after death. *Nequaquam post mortem restare Purgatorium quemnam ignem credimus.* *Leunclavius*, Ad. Qu. 9.

cious stones, but not content with that, they super-
 structed *wood, hay, and stubble*, upon the fundamen-
 tals of the Christian religion; that is, doctrines and
 tenets not able to bear the trial of Scripture fire. If
 the Apostle smartly rebuked the Corinthians for their
 innovations, how much more will the living God cha-
 sten and punish those, who build upon his holy law,
 superstitions and blasphemous idolatries? Let them
 be aware not alone of the general fiery conflagration,
 but of the unrelenting, the everlasting fire of hell.—
 These are the mighty proofs of *Purgatory*, which,
 when ingenuously and impartially brought to light,
 cannot appear to public view, without being con-
 foundedly abashed. They remind me of that passage
 in *Horace's Art of Poetry*, which paraphrased, runs
 thus,—

When you begin with so much pomp and show,
 Why is the end so little and so low?*

This is the very case with *Purgatory*, it makes the
 most glaring show at first appearance, but dwindles,
 upon scrutiny, into a mere nothing.

Having thus refuted their chief *Purgatorial* asser-
 tions, let us, now, take a view of such texts of Scrip-
 ture, as assert the happiness and rest of those, who de-
 part in peace with God. *Isaias*, chap. lvii. 1, 2, says,
 “that the righteous is taken away from the evil to
 come. He shall enter into peace, they shall rest in
 their beds.” Is it to be taken away from the evil to
 come, to be stationed in a *Purgatorial* fire, which differs
 as they say, from that of hell, in nothing, but in res-
 pect of duration? Is this the peace they are to enter
 into, are those the beds they are to lie upon, to be tor-
 mented, to be tortured in the most cruel manner?
 Welcome all the calamities and casualties of this

* Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

wretched life, and all other misfortunes incident to human nature, rather than the torments of an hell, though but of a month's duration.

St. John, chap. v. 24, introduces Christ, saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Here, you see, it is not said, that he who believes in Jesus Christ, shall pass from death unto torment, but shall pass from death to life, that is, a blessed life. If the true believer was to pass from death to *Purgatory*, it would be to pass from death to death; nay, worse than death itself.—The Apostle Philip, i. 23, says, "I am in a great strait betwixt two, desiring to be dissolved, and to be with Christ, which is far better." Does not this most obviously imply, that he had no manner of doubt, but that he was to go instantly to heaven, without striking at the port of *Purgatory*, where if he had been obliged to remain, it would have been far better for him to abide longer in the body, than to have his soul dissolved or separated from it. Notwithstanding all the toils and fatigues; all the hardships and dangers; all the sufferings and persecutions which *St. Paul* underwent and suffered for the establishment of the Christian religion; yet it cannot be denied, but he might have contracted the guilt of some trivial transgressions; for, "who is he that liveth and sinneth not." Had he but imagined, that those were to be atoned for in a *Purgatory*; he would not have been anxious for a dissolution. But he is not in the least dismayed; to the reverse, with a confident hope in God's mercy, says v. 21, "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain:" that is, whether I live or die, the gain which I wish for, I will obtain, viz. Christ. For, if I live,

Christ will be glorified by my preaching and good example : and, if I die, by my martyrdom on earth, and beatitude in Heaven.

St. John, Rev. xiv. 13, says, " Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth : yea, said the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them ;" that is, their good works, but yet, dependent of the free and gracious reward and remuneration that is given them. This is what follows them to the other life, and not their venial sins, or *Purgatorial* punishments. For, all that die faithfully in Christ, die in the Lord : " for, whether we live, we live unto the Lord ; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord, whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's," Rom. xiv. 8. If they belong to the Lord, if they enjoy the beatific vision they consequently rest from all their labours, and their sufferings are at a full period. But to be tormented in *Purgatory*, to be deprived of the light of the Lord, surely is not to rest from their labours, but to undergo infinitely severer punishments than could be inflicted upon them in this life.

St. Paul, 1 Thess. iv. 13, &c. says, " But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others, which have no hope ; for if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God : and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the

air : and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." The Apostle, if he knew any thing of *Purgatory*, must have been very remiss in this his instruction to the faithful. Should he not, instead of comforting them, rather have said, cause numberless masses to be chaunted, extend your alms with free and bountiful hands, and incessantly pray for the release of your afflicted brethren straitly confined in the dismal dungeon of *Purgatory*? How could he pass by in silence, a matter of such moment, of such importance, if he deemed it an article of faith necessary to be believed by the Church of God. This he was an utter stranger to, as appears, and therefore exhorted his brethren not to be sorry for their dead, (and how could they restrain their grief, if their friends were consigned to *Purgatory*? inasmuch as Christ would transport all true believers to the mansions of glory, at the last solemn review of mankind. Strange, indeed, not a word of *Purgatory*, or any thing similar to it, in this text, wherein alone express mention is made of the dead !!!

The Apostle *Philip* ii. 10, manifestly declares, there are but three different states, and consequently excludes *Purgatory*. " At the name of JESUS, he says, let every knee bow of things in heaven, in earth, and under the earth." If the Apostle knew any thing of *Purgatory*, this would have been as proper a passage to mention it as any in Scripture, whereas it is his design to summon all created beings, whether celestial, terrestrial, or infernal, incessantly to glorify that Christ, who, by his mighty works and miracles, enforced his mission ; who, by his passion and sacrifice on the cross, cured and healed the world from the contagion and leprosy of sin, whether actual or original ; and who, by his glorious resurrection and triumphant ascension, proved the reality of his Godhead. Had

the Apostle known any thing of *Purgatory*, it is more than probable, that he would have mentioned it, in so particular and singular a passage as this. But he, to preclude all cavils, is silent upon this head; and thus negatively proves the non-existence of *Purgatory*.— But it may be, perhaps objected, that the bosom of *Abraham*, where, before the ascension of Christ, the holy fathers were detained, intimates a quaternity of states, and consequently a *Purgatory*. What? Was the bosom of *Abraham* a place of punishment? Did the souls therein detained suffer the supposed intolerable torments of a *Purgatory*? Was there a sacrifice in the old law for the mitigation of their sufferings? Did they ever take a trip to this world to acquaint their friends with their calamitous and deplorable situation? No, they were only there detained in a state of joyous expectancy, till the gates of heaven were opened, through the bitter passion and triumphant ascension of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which were occluded in consequence of the fatal transgression of our proto-parent *Adam*.

Having thus surveyed a few, amongst the many texts of Scripture that are diametrically opposite to the doctrine of *Purgatory*, let us see what reason can produce against it. The Father of Mercies, who to save the depraved race of man, sent his only begotten Son into this world, does not subdivide the indulgences of his gracious dispensation. The incarnation of our Lord would have been of none effect, if some sins were forgiven and others retained; because we should be then as liable to perish, as if none were remitted us. By one only sin mankind was rendered obnoxious to perdition; how can we then be deemed exempt from condemnation, if a single sin appears against us? Christ would not have said to the penitent thief, "this day thou shalt be with me in Paradise," had he not

previously granted him a full and complete remission of *all* his sins. To what other end does the retention of some, and the remission of other sins (which is an impossibility) contribute, than to render the criminal, as yet obnoxious to judgment? He who only forgives part, and not the entire debt, retains the debtor within the power of his jurisdiction.

If *all* our sins are not forgiven, the greater or the lesser are retained. Your choice of those two opinions will be found derogatory to God's boundless clemency; to what purpose should the greater be forgiven, if the lesser are still unremitted? Should you not deem that man deranged, who would forgive a debt of ten thousand pounds, and yet insist upon the debtor's paying a few farthings of it, which was as much out of his power as the entire debt? And though such a crazy man might be, possibly, singled out, how can such a proceeding be ascribed to a merciful God without betraying the most wretched ignorance and stupidity of the assertor? If the lesser sins are only forgiven and the greater still kept in account against us, how will this kind of imperfect grace be available to our justification, especially as we, wretched mortals, cannot, of ourselves satisfy divine justice for one solitary sin, even the most trivial? If so, what then remains but final destruction if all our sins are not forgiven? This assertion, as you must see, totally defeats God's clemency who sent his Son into this world merely to seek the salvation of degenerate man. Our Lord corroborates this in the parable which he gives us of a full and complete remission, where he introduces a rich man benignly forgiving an insolvent servant ten thousand talents, a prodigious sum! This servant, devoid of humanity, and forgetting his master's clemency towards him, screws his fellow-servant and denies him the like grace in a trivial

matter ; upon which he gets this soul-rending rebuke, Thou wicked servant, did I not, when you besought me, forgive you the full balance of all my accounts against you, should you not therefore take compassion on your fellow-servant, as I have done on you. By this parable it appears, that we should cheerfully forgive all the injuries of our offending brethren, whereas God, through the merits of our Saviour, grants us a full remission. How then can a partial forgiveness be, by any means, applicable to God, especially, as he requires, in favour of the offender, a full release of all trespasses ? How is the clemency of God represented to us in the person of this powerful man, if God, through Christ, does not forgive us all our trespasses against him ? When this great man forgave his servant in full, he not only forgave him the debt, but also (otherwise the servant might retort) all the obligations annexed to it for the debt. For the debt here spoken of, is not the sin itself, nor the punishment of the sin, but rather an obligation to satisfy God's justice for the sin committed.

The soul, after its separation from the body, must be incontestably allowed to be no longer an active agent, and if in *Purgatory*, consequently incapable of any sort of merit. This presupposed, let us, if compatible with the nature of ideas, form an idea of a soul taking a trip to *Purgatory* with a sack full of venial sins, (it could not have committed fewer, if it arrived to a tolerable age) must this soul, in a state of inactivity, and incapable of relieving itself, remain in *Purgatory*, until it draws a bill upon its friends, who perhaps forgot it, and yet, ten thousand to one, but it will be protested by the Romish sacrificants, if the money is not told down. Thus disappointed, must it be constrained to make its appearance in this world to frighten its late friends into a compliance. Let us even sup-

pose this bugbear ; yet, though a considerable sum is told down for its release from the expiatory flames, the Romish sacrificants take particular care not to enlarge it at once, it being too good a perquisite to part with upon such easy terms ; they only give it some little ease, by rendering the fire which purges it less vehement ; they order those who attend the *Purgatorial* forge to blow the coals more or less, in proportion to the sum of money they receive. Must the poor soul, I say, in a state of inactivity, and incapable of redressing itself (as supposed) remain in the most cruel torments of an hell until the avarice of Romish sacrificants is satiated, which will never be until the system of Popery is extirpated root and branch ? In a word, must a soul be committed to a place to glut the lucrative interests of more designing people than the Priests of the *Delphic Oracle*, never known to the Jews, Christ, or the Apostles, if you are not credulous enough to believe Romish oral traditions ? I would willingly be informed, how the system of *Indulgences* can be reconciled with *Purgatory*. To say nothing of the Pope's infinite power, there is not a Romanist that has a spark of devotion but can acquire, by the least computation, an hundred thousand years of pardon, every day of his life : what a cargo, then, of remittances must he not have at the hour of his death ? This presupposed, as undeniable, there is not one of them, if they choose, but may depart this life with Romish merit in abundance, and, consequently, without the least stain or pollution of sin. But when there are no sins or temporal penalties to be atoned for, of what service, of what avail can a *Purgatory* be ? To do them justice, they say, that *Indulgences* operate no further, than as they are obtained by those who are in a state of grace and sincerely penitent for their sins. Behold the absur

dity of this ; If a man be in the state of grace, and in perfect favour with God, how can it be, by any means imagined, that he stands in need of *Indulgences* ? But of these in the next place.



OF ROMISH INDULGENCES.

INDULGENCES, such as are exposed to sale at many markets in Rome, were utterly unknown until the system of *Purgatorial* expiation was imposed upon a silly, deluded, and frightened world: until sprights, the screechings in *Purgatory*, and the consequent terrors of the great vulgar and the small planned a foundation for the crafty men of those times to build upon ; abusing, in the mean, nay, totally destroying the primitive canons and ordinances of the Church,*

It was the practice of the Church, before it was contaminated by *Popery*, to expel from its society notorious and abandoned sinners ; until the sorrow of their crimes and amendment of their lives procured them re-admittance. They were directed to fast, to pray, to curb, and mortify their flesh ; in a word, to

* *Cardinal Fischer*, a favourite author of the Church of Rome, has the following words in pages 486 and 497 of his writings against *Martin Luther*, printed at Wirtzbourg, A. D. 1597, in folio.

“ There are many things of which there was no enquiry in the primitive Church, which yet upon doubts arising, are now become perspicuous, by the diligence of after times.”

“ No orthodox man now doubts, whether there be a *Purgatory* of which, yet among the ancients there is no mention, or exceeding rarely ; it is not believed by the Greeks to this day,—neither did the Latins conceive the truth at once, but by little and little.”

And for an Epiphonema he closes it thus :—“ Considering that *Purgatory* was a good while unknown, after partly by Revelations, partly by Scripture, came little by little to be believed by some, and so at last the belief of it was generally received by the Catholic Churches.”—Who can wonder concerning *Indulgences*, that in the primitive Church there was no use of them? *Indulgences* therefore began after men had trembled a while at the torments of *Purgatory*.

exercise themselves in such spiritual works and austerities, as might improve their lives, and declare their inward compunction and sorrow. Some were obliged to these austerities a year, some two, some seven, some ten, some twenty, &c. and some according to the heinousness and enormity of the transgression, all the days of their lives. This was the most prudent course that could be taken by the Rectors of the respective Churches; by this they had a moral certainty, that the acquiescing and complying sinner was pardoned by God, and, consequently, may be re-admitted into the communion and bosom of the Church*.

Sometimes there happened such cases, as not only permitted but even influenced them to be less rigorous in their punishments. As when the sinner gave signal and undoubted proofs of extraordinary and unfeigned sorrow; when, with fortitude, he publicly and openly professed and supported the Christian Religion: when a Christian, under censure, was to be comforted to undergo martyrdom; when undaunted confessors, deemed equal to martyrs, interceded for some of their penitent friends. These and other rational and pious motives induced the pious Rectors of the Primitive

* The retainers to the discipline of the primitive Church were either *Mourners*, *Catechumens*, or *Learners*, *Hearers*, *Demoniacs*, *Prostrators*, and *Costanders*.

The *Mourners* were such, as having been guilty of very gross crimes, were not admitted to Penance, but stood without the Church doors begging of Clergy and people as they went in to intercede for them.

The *Catechumens* stood within the Church door, but were not baptised until they were instructed in the Principles of Christianity.

The *Hearers* were a less perfect sort of *Catechumens*, such as did not yet desire, or intend to be baptised, but were, as it were *Seekers* or *Sceptics* in religion.

Behind those stood the *Demoniacs*.

Prostrators, though they were dismissed with the *Catechumens*, yet not before they had prostrated themselves before the Bishop, Clergy, and Communicants, who also all fell down in devotion together with them; and then the Bishop rising up did also erect those penitents, and used a proper prayer on that occasion.

The *Costanders* had their places amongst the Communicants, with this difference, that they were not admitted to the Holy Communion until the time of their Penance was completed,

Church to ease their contrite penitents from part, and sometimes from the entire burthen and penance they lay under ; and thus, before the time prescribed, they were re-admitted into the Church.

When they finished the time for undergoing these severities, if their repentance, upon examination, was found to be real, they were re-admitted into the Church by the imposition of the hands of the Clergy, (the penitent to be absolved kneeling before the Bishop), or in his absence, before a Presbyter delegated by him ; who, laying his hand upon his head, solemnly blessed and absolved him ; upon which, he was received with universal joy, and restored to a participation of the Holy Sacrament, and to all other acts of Church communion. Such was the discipline of the Church, in the first ages of Christianity, with regard to refragant and public sinners. *Romish Bulls, Indulgences, Dispensations, &c.* were then unknown. There was no re-admission, but through a sincere sorrow and unfeigned amendment. The merits of Christ, or the feigned meritorious superpluses of the saints were not, then, under the Pope's lock and key. *Scapulars, Rosaries, Pilgrimages, &c. &c.** were not the means whereby a

* The Bull of Pope John XXII. for the confirmation and approbation of the Holy Scapular. Gouanus Chron. A. 1321.

John, Bishop and servant of the servants of Jesus Christ, to all and every faithful, &c. While I was praying upon my knees, the Virgin of Mount Carmel appears to me, and addresses me in those words, *O, John, O, John*, the Vicar of my dear Son, as I will deliver thee out of the hand of thine adversary (the Emperor *Lewis IV.* whom he had excommunicated) and make thee Pope, so I will, that thou should grant to my holy and devout Order of Mount Carmel, founded by *Elias* and *Elisha*, the grace of a full confirmation ; namely, that whosoever, being profest, will observe the rule given by my servant *Albert*, the Patriarch, and approved by my well beloved son *Innocent*, the true vicar of my Son, giving his consent upon earth to what my Son has decreed in heaven. (*Divinus Imperium cum Deo Papa habet*) viz. that whosoever shall persevere in that holy obedience, (to the Pope) poverty and chastity, and shall enter into this order shall be saved. And that any other men, or women entering into this holy religion and wearing the sign of the holy habit, viz. the *Scapular*, calling themselves by the name of brothers and sisters of the said order and confraternity, shall be delivered and absolved from the third part of their sins, from the day of their admittance, promising, in the mean time, cha-

sinner was to make his peace with God. No, it was not by such silly means, or delusive methods, he was to be reconciled, but by a real, unfeigned, and penitent sorrow for his sins, with a settled and firm purpose and resolution of never transgressing the laws of God for evermore.

But, as soon as the Bishops of Rome, usurped the Vicarship of Christ, and arrogantly and impiously assumed an unlimited power and authority over heaven and earth; this soul-saving discipline was abrogated, and another, viz. *Indulgences*, a mere incentive to vice and dissolute morals, was gradually superstructed in its place. This plan being laid, who could withstand the gilded bait and alluring temptation? Who, but a man devoid of all reason, would not embrace a mechanical system of religion, through the means of which, he might, without struggle or strife, without labour or hardship, without sorrow or repentance, be reconciled to his Maker, notwithstanding he may be as great a villain as *Phocas*, or a more abandoned tyrant than *Nero*, or a more detested and devoted usurper than *Buonaparte*, or as great a patronizer of wickedness and cruelty as Pope *Gregory* the Great.* Let him

city, if she be a widow,—virginity, if a maid,—and conjugal fidelity if a married woman. And as to the profest brethren of this said order, they shall be delivered both from punishment and sin; and when they shall depart this world making speed to *Purgatory*, I, the glorious mother of God will go down thither the next Saturday after their death, and will rescue whomsoever I shall find in *Purgatory*, and will bring them up into the holy hill of eternal life. But those brethren and sisters, of the said confraternity, must say the canonical hours, after the rule of *St. Albert*, and if they be ignorant, they must abstain from eating flesh every Wednesday and Saturday, except some necessity hinders them, except on my Son's nativity." Having thus spoken, the apparition vanished away. Therefore, I, *John*, aforesaid, accept of this holy *Indulgence*, and do confirm and strengthen it on earth, just as Jesus Christ has, by the merits of his glorious mother, granted it in heaven. Therefore, let no man presume to annul, or contradict this page or writ of our *Indulgence*, or if he dare, let him know, that he shall incur the indignation of God Almighty, and of his blessed Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*. Given at *Avignon*, Indict. 3, and the first year of our Pontificate.

* *Gregory* I, or the Great, lavished such and so many praises on the tyrant *Phocas*, that he confirmed him in his wickedness: and bestowed so

send to Rome (he must send money, otherwise his pious designs will be frustrated,) for a cargo of *Indulgences*, such as they call *Pleniores* and *Plenissimæ*, with this tack annexed to them, *Ad instar Jubilæi*, or

many panegyrics on Queen *Brunchaud*, of Spain, that all who knew both were not only disgusted, but amazed at his flattering and unmerited incense, she being a woman abandoned to cruelty, ambition, avarice, lust, and capable of the greatest excesses. She was, moreover, accused of killing ten kings: for all of which she suffered an infamous and cruel death, A. D. 613. Wicked as *Brunchaud* appears to have been, she was surpassed in iniquity by *Phocas*, who, in a great mutiny, was from being a centurion, declared Emperor by the soldiers, A. D. 602. *Phocas*, being vested with the Imperial Purple, advanced, at the head of his army, directly towards Constantinople, where, when he arrived, he gave orders, that diligent search should be made for *Mauritius*, the late Emperor, designing to establish his own authority in the death of his competitor. As soon as he was found, he commanded him to be dragged with his children to Chalcedon, where, first, by the tyrant's orders, five of that Prince's sons were murdered before his face, during which he behaved himself with so much courage and submission to providence, that he frequently repeated these words, "Just, art thou, O Lord, and righteous in all thy judgments." After he had thus beheld the death of his children, he readily submitted his own neck to the executioner. Their heads were cast in a heap in a field near the Forum in Constantinople, where they lay until putrified, and then the tyrant suffered them to be buried with their bodies, *Constantina*, the wife of *Mauritius*, fled with her daughters into a church at Constantinople, from whence the murderers prepared to force her, but were opposed by the Patriarch and the people, who would not suffer any violence to be offered to them, so that they continued there in safety about three years; during which time, the tyrant could not get them into his power, until by fair words and mighty promises, he at length, enticed them out, and shut them up in a monastery; where in the end, they were all murdered by *Phocas*'s order; though he had given them all every imaginable assurance of the civillest and politest treatment. *Theodosius*, the eldest son of *Mauritius* flew towards Persia, for protection; but the bloody sentence of murder arrested him, before he could reach the confines.

Phocas, being owned and crowned Emperor in Constantinople, took care to have his election approved, and title acknowledged in Rome, and accordingly gave orders to have his own image, as the custom was, and that of his wife, sent thither; they were received with joyful acclamations, and *Gregory*, the Pope, commanded them to be reposed in the Oratory of *St. Casarius*, the martyr. After this, he writ letters to *Phocas* full of fulsome flatteries, unworthy of a person of his character and function; wherein, he in most exalted terms, extols *Phocas*, and congratulates him for his advancement to the throne, which was effected, as he said, by the peculiar designation of God, to relieve his people out of the tribulation under which they had a long time groaned.

Not long after *Phocas* was seated on the throne, he threw the most noble and deserving of the citizens, of whom he had the least suspicion, into prisons, which were so crowded, that several of them died for want of room, being suffocated with the stench of the place. He still proceeded in his inexorable cruelties, and having removed all who were allied to *Mauritius*, he extended it farther, and swept off all that were in the least degree suspicious, or distasteful to him. Being informed that his son-in-law *Priscus*, was offended at his barbarous proceedings, he sent to have him seized; but he narrowly escaped the tyrant's myrmidons.

Quantum se Claves extendunt. That is, in the ample form of a Jubilee, or as far as the power of the keys can reach, Upon the immediate receipt of them, he may, forthwith, abandon all moral and religious principles, live refragant to the laws of God and man; and finally, by the all-powerful virtue of his most plenary *Indulgence* (especially, if he be accoutred with a Scapular on his back and breast; the cord of *St. Francis*

Whilst his extreme cruelty rendered him terrible to mankind, his sordid covetousness and dissolute way of life exposed him to the contempt of all the world; and he scarce ever appeared at the public Circus, but he met with some affront from the people: his own guards often reviling him for his drunkenness and luxury; at which he was once so incensed, that he commanded his officers to seize a great number of them, as well innocent as guilty, some of whom he beheaded, others he dismembered, and binding them up in sacks threw them into the sea. Knowing his cruelties made him obnoxious to his subjects, and that he had nothing to depend upon but the attachment of the army, he required the Prelates of the Church to agree to a law, ordaining all those soldiers to be honoured as martyrs, who should die courageously fighting in the service and defence of their prince, but could never prevail with them to consent to it.

Phocas being set against the world, and the world against him, his fate began to press hard upon him. *Heraclius*, at the head of a powerful army engaged *Phocas*, and defeated him. *Phocas* being overthrown, fled to the Court, where an officer, called *Photinus*, whose wife the tyrant had formerly ravished, assisted by a party of soldiers pulled him from his throne, and led him bound to *Heraclius*, who in detestation of his cruelties, commanded, first, his hands and feet, then his arms and privy parts, and at last, his head to be cut off, and then delivered his trunk to the soldiers, who burnt it in the Forum.

As to his character, they say, he was of a mean stature, deformed, and of a terrible aspect; his hair was red, and his beard kept continually shaved, his eye-brows met, and his cheek was marked with a scar, which when he was in a passion, grew of a livid colour. He was addicted both to wine and women, being a great drunkard and a notorious adulterer; he was by nature fierce, and in his actions bloody; bold in speech; free from all compassion; furious in his disposition; and in principles a heretic; so that there was not so great a monster throughout the empire, except his wife, *Leontia*, who, in all these particulars, was as bad as her husband.

Sabinian, the immediate successor of *Gregory*, well knowing that *Gregory* had no Scriptural authority for broaching his new doctrine of *Purgatory*; and that it was only supported by lying fables, and the false apparitions of spirits; and that his endomiums on the tyrant *Phocas* and the wicked queen *Brunehaud* were mean and fulsome flatteries, and beneath the dignity of a Roman Pontiff; made diligent search and enquiry after the Dialogues and Letters of *Gregory*, fully determined to commit them to the flames; but they were so effectually secreted by *Gregory's* abettors, that they escaped the indignation they so justly merited; and are now much esteemed by the Church of Rome.

The above *Phocas*, of detested memory, was the man who dubbed *Boniface III.* with the title of Universal Bishop, or Head of the Church.

about his waist; a Pater-noster in his hand: a cruet of Holy-water at his elbow; some bones under his pillow, or in his breeches pocket, the nearer the more efficacious: and a painted flaming *Purgatory*, with all its imaginary horrors, *al Haliano*, at the foot of his bed) die in perfect peace with the Lord, and directly, without a *requiem*, or striking at any *Purgatorial* port, become a free denizen of heaven.

Before I proceed any further, I will indulge the reader with a specimen of some of these *Indulgences*, by which he can judge of the *Mare magnum*, or their ocean of *Indulgences*: and see what superior spiritual advantages Romanists may, very easily enjoy with little or no trouble.

In Rome, every month in the year, you can, by virtue of a particular *Indulgence*, save 25 souls. Suppose the number of inhabitants to be 50000, if they all piously correspond, they will have saved at the year's end.

souls,	15000000
--------	----------

Also, in Rome, every day in the month, if you be tolerably active in visiting the privileged Churches, seven in number, you can gain 30000 years of *Indulgences*, which may amount at the year's end to

years	1095000
-------	---------

If all the inhabitants gain them, they will have

years	547500000000
-------	--------------

In Venice, by visiting the chapel called the *Lord's Sepulchre*, (you are not required to pray, the bare visitation is enough) you have an *Indulgence* of

years	80000
-------	-------

If you visit it daily, you gain at the year's end an *Indulgence* of

years	29200000
-------	----------

If all the inhabitants, supposing them to be sixty thousand visit it daily, which they should in all conscience, they will have at the year's end,

years	1752000000000
-------	---------------

In Italy, you can every morning of your life, gain sixty thousand years of *Indulgences*, by saying *Sia laudata Maria*, or *Praised be Mary*; at the year's end a single person may have an *Indulgence*

of years 21900000

By saying an *Ave Maria* to the honor of the Virgin *Mary*, her Son, and *St. Anne*, you can gain an *Indulgence* of years 30000

By repeating but one hundred of these *Ave Marias* (which may be done in half-an-hour) every day, you will have at the year's end an *Indulgence*

of years 109500000

At *St. Laurence's extra muros*, on Easter Wednesday, or at *St. Athanasia's* the day before, you have an *Indulgence* of years 28000

By barely visiting the chapel *Misericordia*, if a Roman you gain an indulgence of years 1000

If a neighbour, years 2000

If from beyond sea, years 3000

At the great altar of *John* of Lateran you can every day obtain 48000 years of pardons, at the year's end you may have years 17520000

Also, at *John* of Lateran, such a complete, such a plenary *Indulgence*, that it is beyond all calculation; *Cardinal Rasponi* compares it with the small grains which you may find in a large handful of fine sand; or with the many small drops of water that can fall in three whole days and nights of rain; moderately speaking, let us suppose a million for each day, and then at the year's end you may have years 3650000000

To every repetition of the following prayer, in honour of the *Veronica*.* *Pope John XXII.* annexed an

* As the *Veronica* is supposed, by the Romanists, to have touched the body of Christ, it is worshiped with the worship of *Latria*, that is, with the supreme, or sovereign worship that is due to God, and has an altar consecrated to it in the Church of *St. Peter*, at Rome, called the *Altar of*

Indulgence of ten thousand days, "Hail holy face of our Redeemer, printed upon a cloath white as snow, purge us from all spot of vice." (Reasonable requests, indeed, to be made to a painted handkerchief) "and join us to the company of the blessed. Bring us to our country, O happy figure! there to see the pure face of Christ." Repeat this prayer but three times a day, and you shall have, at the year's end, an *Indulgence* of days, 10950000

By saying the salutation, *Ave Vulnus*, you gain days, 4000

By the prayer, *Dirupisti*, days, 6000

By *Domine Jesu*, years, 1000000

By *Adoro te*, by a bull of *Pope Sextus IV.* you have *Indulgence* of years, 65510

By saying, if a Romish Priest, *Ego volo celebrare Missam*, &c. you have, by a bull of *Gregory XIII.* an *Indulgence* of years, 50

Benedict XIII. granted an *Indulgence* of seven years, *toties quoties*, for the repetition of *Credo in te*, &c.

the most holy Handkerchief. But of this wonder-working picture, no mention is made, nor is the least notice taken by any writer whatever during the long dispute about the antiquity and lawfulness of images, nor indeed after the ten first centuries after Christ. And who can believe that such an image could have remained so long unknown to the Christian world; or if it had been known, that no writer would have mentioned it: that none of the advocates for images, not even the Fathers of the second council of Nice, who believed every old woman's story they had heard, would have availed themselves of it against their adversaries? An image of our Saviour, made by himself, would have been a stronger proof of the lawfulness of images, than one made by his night disciple *Nicodemus*. As for the miracles said and believed to be daily wrought by the *Veronica* at Rome, no less stupendous miracles are said and believed to be wrought at Alcantra, in Spain, and by another at Jerusalem. For in three different places *Veronicas* are shewn and worshiped with the worship of *Latria*, or supreme worship; and by their respective votaries proved to be originals, from the miracles they are said to work. This multiplication of *Veronicas* occasioned warm disputes, each of the contending parties pretending theirs to be the original, and the other two to be only copies, until a lucky discovery of *Gretser*, a subtle Jesuit, put an end to the quarrel. For, by him it was found out, that the handkerchief of *Veronica* had three foldings, that on the side of them our Saviour imprinted a distinct image, and, consequently, that they were all originals. It were to be wished that *Gretser*, had likewise discovered, and let us know, where these three originals were kept concealed from all mankind for the space of a thousand years and upwards. *Gretser* died at Ingolstad, 29th of January, 1625.

repeat it once a day, and at the year's end you will have years, 2555

By repeating the 15 O's of *St. Bridget*, that is, a prayer made of 15 ejaculations, beginning with *O Jesu*, you have 45 *Indulgences*, viz. 15 to deliver from *Purgatory* any 15 souls you please to name of your relations; 15 to convert to a good life any 15 sinful men or women, and 15 to keep 15 more in a constant and religious life. If you have the welfare of poor suffering departed souls and mankind at heart, you cannot repeat them less than three times a day; and then, at the year's end, you will have saved, whether of the living or the dead, souls, 49275

Pope John XXII. granted to those who shall thrice kiss the measure of the most holy foot of our Lady, (measuring exactly seven inches and a quarter) and rehearse three *Ave Marias* with devotion to her blessed honour and reverence, a freedom from many sins, and an *Indulgence* of years, 700

In Bohemia, for drinking sociably with your friend at dinner, in honour of *John of Nepomuck*, you acquire an *Indulgence* of days, 40

Besides these, which are comparatively as a grain to a large heap of sand, if compared with the Romish Indulgential Magazine, all Friars and Nuns, when dying, are delivered, not alone from hell but even from *Purgatory*, by virtue of a special plenary *Indulgence* *

* By a rule which begins thus, *Hæc pro majori securitate.* The Franciscans have the following form of absolution, to which the other different orders claim a right, *Vi Communicationis Privilegium.*

Dominus noster *Jesus Christus*, per merita sue sacratissimæ passionis, te absolvat, et gratiam suam tibi infundat, et ego, autoritate ipsius ac beatorum Apostolorum *Petri et Pauli* & summorum Pontificum mihi in hac parte commissa & tibi concessa, te absolvo ab omni vinculo excommunicationis majoris vel minoris, si quod in curristi, & restituo te unioni & participationi fidelium, nec non sanctis Sacramentis Ecclesiæ.

Item, eadem autoritate, ego te absolvo ab omnibus peccatis tuis, tibi que relaxo omnes penas *Purgatorii*, quas pro peccatis tuis meruisti, concedens tibi Remissionem & *Indulgentiam Plenariam* omnium peccatorum:

As Romish relics (see *Aulus Gelenius*) have *Indulgences* annexed to them, by which the devotion of people is wonderfully abused, I will mention some of them, though not one of a thousand which might be produced.

At Rome they exhibit the stone upon which *Abraham* offered to sacrifice his son *Isaac*; and another stone upon which our Saviour was placed, when he was presented in the temple. The top of the lance with which Christ's side was pierced, and the statue of *Longinus* under it. The smock of *St. Prisca*, in which she was martyred above 1600 years old. A thorn of that crown of thorns which was put upon our Saviour's head. The head of the Woman of *Samaria* who was converted by our Saviour. The arm of *St. Anne*, mother of the blessed Virgin, and the chain of *St. Paul*. The table upon which our Saviour eat the Paschal Lamb. *Scala Sancta*, or the 28 steps of white marble which Christ ascended, in his passion, to *Pilate's* palace, upon some of which are shewn the marks of his blood, sent by *Helena* from Jerusalem to *Constantine*. * A picture of our Saviour, said to be begun by *St. Luke*, and finished miraculously by an angel, or (as others say) that *St. Luke*, preparing to draw it, and addressing God that he might draw his Son to the life, when he arose found the picture finished. The holy crib of our Saviour. The pillar at which our Saviour was whipped.

& restituo te illi statui Innocentis in qua eras, quando baptisatus fuisti. In nomine Patris & Filii & Spiritus sancti. Amen.

Quod si hac vice non decesseris, reservo tibi hanc Gratiam, usque ad extremum mortis tue Articulum.

* How this flight of stairs could escape the general devastation, especially as Jerusalem was plundered, destroyed, burnt, and razed by order of *Titus* in such a manner, that what Christ said of it was literally accomplished, viz. that one stone should not be left upon another, surpasses my judgment; as no crack, flaw, or fracture appears in any of the steps, but they seemed a little worn in one place by the progression of people moving upon their knees from the bottom to the landing. I have often seen those stairs, and as often observed there was no devotion performed at, or to them.

In Prague, you may see the head and arm of *Longinus*, though his body is entire at Rome. Some reliques of *Abraham*, *Isaac*; and *Jacob*. The arm and part of the body of *Lazarus*. Two pieces of two girdles of the blessed Virgin. A part of the body of *St. Mark*; and a part of his gospel in his own writing. A piece of *St. John*, the Evangelist's coat. A piece of the staff of *St. Peter*; and another piece of the staff of *St. Paul*. A part of *St. Peter's* chain. A finger of *St. Anne*. A part of the blessed Virgin's veil. The head of *St. Luke*, the Evangelist; (another head of *St. Luke* is to be seen at Rome.) Some of the reliques of *St. Catherine* of Alexandria. The head and a finger of *St. Stephen*, and an arm of one of the *Holy Innocents*, &c.

At Venice, you may see some of our Saviour's blood, gathered at his passion, with the earth on which it was spilled. A thorn of the crown of thorns. A finger of *St. Mary Magdalen*. A piece of *St. John Baptist's* scull. A tooth of *St. Mark*, and one of his fingers, and his ring, with a stone in it. A piece of *St. John, Baptist's* habit. Some of the blessed Virgin's hair. The sword of *St. Peter*. A piece of Christ's white robe when he was mocked by *Herod*. One of the stones with which *St. Stephen* was stoned. The cough or breath of *St. Joseph*, which an angel inclosed in a vessel as he was cleaving wood; &c.

They shew, at Cologne, two pieces of *Aaron's* rod, and one of the rod of *Moses*. Some of the manna that fell from heaven, and part of *Elijah's* mantle, when he ascended thither. A part of the Prophet *Daniel*, and some of the grave of *Isaias*. Fifteen reliques of *St. Anne*, Christ's grandmother, among which are her arm, a finger, a tooth, part of her head, brains, ribs, and shank-bone. A part of the head of

Joachim, the blessed Virgin's father, and of the girdle of *St. Joseph*, her husband. They exhibit upwards of twenty reliques of the blessed Virgin, among which are her milk in four several Churches, part of her hair, of her shift, of her girdle, of the handkerchief she wore in the temple, of the garment she wore when Christ was in her womb, of her veil when she visited *Elisabeth*, and of the veil she had on at the cross, and of the cloth with which she wiped off her tears there.

No less than seventeen reliques of *St. John*, Baptist are to be seen, among which is some of his blood, of his head and beard, and of his raiment, five of his teeth, and the finger that pointed to Christ. Two reliques of *St. Simeon*, who took Christ in his arms.

They pretend to shew some of the blood of Christ, (see page) and a cloth tinged with his blood; a piece of the linen which wrapped him at his birth, five pieces of the manger in which he was laid, some of the frankincense offered to him by the wise men. Three pieces of the loaves with which he fed the five thousand, some of the fragments that were left; part of the hem of his seamless garment which was touched by the woman with the bloody issue; part of the towel with which he wiped the disciples feet, and two pieces of the table at which he sat at meat with them; a piece of the stone upon which Christ sat when he prayed in the desert; seven pieces of the pillar at which he was whipped, part of the cords that fastened his body to it, and of the scourges that whipped him; three pieces of the white raiment in which he was mocked by *Herod*, and two pieces of the purple robe they put on him in derision; part of the towel that wiped his face at the passion; seven pieces of the sponge then used; a piece of the stone in which the cross was fixed, and of the stone rolled to the door

of the sepulchre; two pieces of the linen that wrapped Christ's head in the tomb; and as many of the holy syndon that wrapped his body; twenty several thorns of the crown of thorns they put on his head, and five pieces of the crown itself, (in which I suppose are some other thorns, how else can they pretend it is that crown); two parts of the spear that wounded Christ's side, and also the point of that very spear; some parts of a nail of the cross, and particularly of that nail that pierced his hand; as for the cross itself, they produce in several churches, above fifty pieces of the wood of it, * and as nothing had escaped them,

* If all the particles and pieces of the cross which were, and are dispersed all over the world, could be produced in one place, I am persuaded they would outweigh the timber of a first rate man of a war. What an immense treasure have the Popes acquired; as the stated price of the smallest particle of the cross is ten shillings and sixpence of our currency!

The invention of the cross is a festival, kept the third of May in the Church of Rome. It owes its origin to the following legend. *Festivale ac inventionis sanctae crucis*, p. 100.

Good frendes, such a daye ye shall have the inveneyne of the holy cross; ye shall not fast the even, but come to God and holy Chyrche as christen people sholde do, in worshyp of him that dyed on the cross. Than ye will understande, why it is called inventio sanctae crucis, the fyndyng the holy crosse; the whiche was founde in this wyse, as I shall tell you. When Adam our fyrste fader was seke for aage, and wolde fayne have been out of this worlde; Adam sent Seth his son to the aungele keeper of Paradyse. prayenge the aungele to sende him the oyle of mercy to anoint his body therewith, when he were deed. Then went Seth to Paradyse and sayd his message to the aungele. Than answered the aungele and sayd, that he might not have it tyl the yeres were fulfilled. But have this braunche of the tree that thy fader synned in, and set it on his grave, and when it bereth fruythe than shall he have mercy and not erete. Than toke Seth his braunche and came home and found his fader deed: than he set this braunche on his fader's grave, as the aungele badde him do; the whiche braunche grewed there tyl Solomon was kynge, and he made to fell it downe, for it was fayre to the worke of his temple, but it wolde not accorde to the worke of his temple. Solomon made to cast it downe into the earth, and was hydde there to the tyme that the bisop of the temple let make awayre in the same place theeres the tree laye to washe in shepe that wers offered to the temple. Than when this wayre was made; they called it in their language *Probativa Pisciana*. Lo, to whiche water came an aungele cartayne tymes fro heven, and dyde worshype to the tree that laye in the grounde of the wayre and moved the water; and what man or woman that came to the water next arter the aungele was made hole, what sickness that ever he had by virtue of the tree; and so endured many wynters to the tyme that Cryste was taken and sholde be done upon the crosse.— Than this tree by the ordynance of God swamme upon the water, and when the Jews had none other tree redy to make the crosse of, for gette haste that they had, they toke the same tree and made thereof a crosse. and so

a piece of that stone from which Christ ascended into heaven, on which he left the impression of his feet; there you may see the remains of holy places; where the Virgin *Mary* was conceived, and where *St. Anne* was delivered of her; where the blessed virgin saluted her cousin *Elisabeth*, and where the angel saluted her; where Christ was circumcised, and where he was baptised, and where he fasted forty days; where he taught the Apostles to pray, and where he prayed himself thrice in his agony; where he found the disciples asleep; where he was whipped; and of the

died our Lord thereon, and than the tree bare the blessed fruite Criste's body, of the whiche wellet the Oyle of Mercy to *Adam* and *Eve*, and all other of their offspring. But when Cryste was deed and was taken downe off the crosse from envy that the Jews had to him, they toke the crosse and two other crosses that the theves were hanged on either syde of Cryste and buried them depe in the erth, for crysten people sholde not wyse where they were done for to do it worahype; and there it laye a yere and more unto the tyme of *Elegyna*, &c. In the old Breviaries, before they were reformed by Pius V. after the Council of Trent, you have the following story in the 1, 2, and 3 lessons of the *Invention of the Cross*.

When the Emperor *Constantine* had obtained a victory by the sign of the Cross which appeared to him from heaven, he sent his mother *Helena* to Jerusalem to discover the wood of the Holy Cross. She, after her arrival, enquired for those who were best versed in the law: they, understanding what she meant said, why does the queen impose this burden upon us?—*Judas*, one of them answered, I know the reason, she will search for the wood of the cross, upon which our fathers hanged Jesus; see to it, let no one cofe as the matter to her.

Zacheus, my grandfather foretold this story to my father, and my father foretold it to me; observe son, said he, when enquiry shall be made for the wood of the cross to which our ancestors condemned the Me-sias, acknowledge it before you are tormented. Then, said I to him, Father, if they knew him to be Christ, why did they lay hands on him? He answered me, hearken, my son. I never approved of it, but because he reproved them they crucified him, and after he was buried he rose again the third day; upon which my brother *Stephen* believed, and was stoned. Others of them said, we never heard those things before. When they were called before the queen, she commanded them to be burned, they, to extricate themselves, delivered *Judas* to her; to whom the queen said, shew me the wood of the cross. *Judas* answered, I know not the place where it is, as I then had not existence. Upon which, by her commands, he was cast into a deep dry pit. When he remained seven days without food, *Judas* said, draw me out of the pit, I entreat you, and I will shew you the cross of Christ. When he was drawn out, he said, O Lord God, if it be thy will that the Son of *Mary* shall reign, cause that from the same place a fume of aromatic odours may ascend; after he had prayed the fume of odours ascended.—Then *Judas* said, in truth, O Christ, thou art the Saviour of the world. This story wants no comment, it is sufficiently larded with lying absurdities, and carries its confutation with it,

place where he ascended into heaven, and where his Apostles afterwards wrote the creed.

They shew twenty reliques of the Holy Innocents killed at Bethlehem, of which some are whole bodies, and many of their heads, feet, and other bones; If you enquire for the reliques of the Apostles, they have a great deal to produce of some of them, and something of every one of them. There are two pieces of *St. Peter's* staff, and one of the upper part of it; some ounces of the chain that bound him, and near twenty parts of his body, among which some of his brains, head, hair, teeth, jaw-bone, fingers and ribs. They have as many of *St. Paul's* body; about thirty remains of *St. Bartholomew*, near as many of *St. Andrew*, with a nail of his cross.* Of the rest of the Apostles they have too many to be reckoned. Of *John*, the Evangelist, they have but one remain of his body, but they shew you a part of his hair, shirt, and some of the dust of his grave; here they will shew you part of the jaw of *Lazarus*, and some of the dust of his grave; two notable parts of *St. Elizabeth*, mother of *John* the Baptist, and her shift which is as notable. They pretend to thirty reliques of *Mary Magdalen*, among which are her arm, in three places, some of her hair and four of her teeth. They tell you of no less than twenty belonging to *St. Stephen*, among which is some of his blood, and some of the stones that stoned him, (to be seen in six churches) and one of them with his blood upon it; there you can meet with part of *Joseph* of Arimathea, of *St. Timothy*, of *St. Ignatius*, and *Polycarp*. As for other Saints,

* When you behold, can you forbear to smile.—The instrument of *St. Andrew's* martyrdom is said to have been something peculiar in the form of the letter X, being a cross decussate, two pieces of timber crossing each other in the middle, and hence known by the name of *St. Andrew's* cross. He was not fastened to the cross with nails, but with cords, Euseb. lib. iii, c. 1.

the less truth you read in their lives, their reliques are the more numerous in their repositories. They shew more than twenty remains of *St. George*, among which are not only a tooth, a finger, a part of his scull, and a jaw, but also his entire arm and the sword it brandished; there are to be found seventeen reliques of *St. Christopher*, among which are a tooth, a finger, and a toe, part of his shoulderblade and back bone; there are more than twenty reliques of *St. Catherine* of Alexandria, among which her hair, many parts of her body, many of her tomb, and of the oil that flowed from it, of her head-dress, and the cloth that was under her when she was beheaded; there are above thirty belonging to *St. Barbara*, among which is the greatest part of her head, and in it the cleft of the wound her father *Dioscorus* gave her; they expose above twenty reliques of *St. Margaret*, among which is her precious girdle. *St. Apollonica* had her teeth knocked out at her martyrdom; they shew nine of them at Cologne, besides other reliques of her; among the many reliques of *St. Sebastian*, they have two of the arrows with which he was shot, and part of a third; they shew many of *St. Lawrence*, and among them the cloth in which he was wrapped when taken off the gridiron.

You have heard how they glory in being possessed of some hundreds of heads, and some thousand parts of bodies of the *eleven thousand virgins* that were slain at Cologne; they know them all so well asunder, that they will lead you to the head and bones *Pope Cyriacus* who accompanied them in that fatal journey, though in the catalogue of popes, you can find no such man.

To conclude, I will give the reader a remarkable instance of Popish credulity, delivered down from father to son without any sufficient authorities to support it; and yet unquestionably believed at Cologne. We read, *Luke vii*, of a young man, a widow's son,

of *Nain*, who was met by our Saviour as he was carried out to be buried, and by him raised to life again. This history has got the following additions by *traditional* conveyance; that the name of this young man was *Maternus*; that he was exactly nineteen years old when Christ restored him to life; that the time of this miracle was in autumn; that he lived nineteen years more; that being sent by *St. Peter* to preach the gospel, and coming with his companions to *Alsace*, he fell sick of a fever, of which he died, and after he lay buried forty days in his grave, he was raised from the dead a second time, by applying *St. Peter's staff* to his dead and corrupted body; and as many days as he lay dead, viz. forty, so many years he held, after this, the Episcopal Chair, being the first Bishop of *Cologne*. At the age of one hundred and fifteen years, in the year of Christ, one hundred and twenty-eight, on the sixteenth Sunday after *Trinity*, he caused that part of the gospel to be read, where he himself was raised from the dead at *Nain*, and died a third time, waiting for the general resurrection. In memory of this, they shew at *Cologne* part of *St. Peter's staff* that wrought the miracle, and the thumb of this *St. Maternus*. This requires no comment, except this, that you may be led to think, that the authenticity of the fore-mentioned reliques is as much to be depended on as the story of *Maternus*.

As *Popish Indults* are emanations of the Pope's spiritual power, I will, in the next place, give an extract of *Indulgences, Absolutions, and Dispensations* as I find them rated, taxed, and exposed to sale by *Pope John XXII.* in the *Vatican Chancery Office* at *Rome*. *Spectatum admissi, risum teneatis, Amicè?*

Of Matrimonial Contracts.

	£	s.	d.
For marrying in the fourth degree, the tax is	2	4	0
For having carnal knowledge of one another in this degree, previous to a dispensation	5	0	0
For the legitimation of a child in said degree,	2	16	10
For having carnal knowledge in said degree, though ignorant of the impediment,	2	16	10
For an ignorant contract and wilful consummation,	2	4	0
For a wilful contract without a consummation,	2	16	10
But when matrimony is knowingly contracted and consummated, in said degree; the matter is to be compounded with the datary, or chancellor,			
For the legitimation of a child previous to a divorce,	2	16	10
For marrying in the third degree of consanguinity, or affinity,	4	8	0
For do. in the second degree,	15	17	9
For do. in the first degree, in the tribunal of conscience, besides a composition with the datary,	9	5	3
For a simple divorce,	2	4	0
For marrying in spiritual alliance,	5	0	2½
If the alliance be double,	9	6	9
For a godfather marrying his Godchild	15	16	4½
For an uncle marrying his niece,	105	0	0
If a crowned head, an application is to be made to the Cardinal Protector of his kingdom.			
For committing adultery and marrying the same woman after your wife's death, you are dispensed with, for	11	5	0

For designing a wife's death, though it should not then succeed, and marrying her whom he had an intention of marrying, £2 17 6½

For a release from perpetual chastity, 4 12 9

For license to marry notwithstanding a vow of becoming a monk, 4 8 4

Semivir duos calculos gerendo, ejus pendendorum vice, in sacculo inclusos, atque ab ejus subuculæ fibulario retinaculo superiore pendentes, in sacerdotalem ordinem admittitur pro,* 9 5 6

A Priest's is dispensed with to marry (if kept secret) and may enjoy all conjugal liberties, by saying the office of the Blessed Virgin, at least on festivals, by way of commutative satisfaction, and paying . . . 4 8 4

Of Jews.—A Jew must pay for a synagogue in his own house, 9 8 7

For erecting a public synagogue, . . . 18 15 0

Of voluntary Murder.—If, in minor orders, you commit murder, you are dispensed with, to hold three benefices, if one, or two be not sufficient, for 3 17 9

And to enjoy all clerical privileges, . . . 5 14 9½

And all other immunities, 9 8 7

And three Benefices, 5 14 9½

If the deceased died otherwise than of his wounds; and that he was not designedly murdered, a dispensation is granted for the Ministry of the Altar, and all other ecclesiastical Benefices, for 9 15 0

For murdering a Bishop, Abbot, or General of any Order, you are absolved for 15 13 7

* Si illos calculos perdiderit, huic Misram publice legere religio est, sub pænâ censuræ quâ quis ab ecclesiæ communionem excluditur, dum novum par dedicatum eo suppeditatur.

For the murder of a prior, or Protonotary Apostolic,	12	10	0
For voluntary murder, provided it be secret, a clergyman is dispensed with in all ecclesiastical employments, with the clause Nullis, &c. for	9	15	0
If two have combined in the same murder, the tax is	15	13	7
If one assisted at many murders at the same time, and at the same conflict; he is absolved for	9	15	0
If a layman kills a Priest, the tax is ...	1	19	2
If he kills a Bishop or Abbot, ...	15	13	7
If a layman kills a layman, the tax is ...	1	1	0
And if he should happen to kill many, he is taxed only for one.			
For murdering a father, or mother, or brother, or sister, or wife, the tax for each is	1	8	8
And for each of the Assistants, ...	0	10	10
If the murderer desires a license to marry another,	2	17	6½
If either of the Parents kills their own child,	1	8	8
If they both conspire,	1	19	2
If they procure an abortion,	1	8	8
For a witch or enchantress, after abjuring her incantations,	1	19	2
An absolution from heresy, is taxed at	11	5	0
Sacrilege, theft, perjury, and the like are singly taxed at	11	5	0
Simony,	11	5	0
For carnal knowledge of a man, within or without the enclosures of a convent or monastery,	10	5	0
Pro coitione cum bellua census est, ...	26	10	3

The tax for Sodomy is	£11	5	0
A nun (quæ multos homines ad ejus amplexus recepit,) is entitled to all the dignities of her order, and may become an Abbess, by paying					
For simple fornication, the tax is	1	19	4
For adultery of both parties, each	1	19	4
The obligation of a solemn oath is dispensed with for	2	5	11½
And its infamy inhibited for	11	5	0
A Priest may receive the stipends of as many masses as he can procure, and have them afterwards reduced to an inconsiderable number, by paying					
For a license to eat butter, milk, cheese, &c. on fast days, the tax for one person is	1	19	9
In Leghorn the tax is reduced to	0	0	10
For an entire family,	4	7	9
For many in conjunction,	4	7	9
For a town and its district,	61	6	4
For license to say mass with a wig on,	4	7	9
For the like license for a Bishop or Abbot,	7	10	0
For a yearly license pro fornice, within pistol-shot of the vatican, upwards of	15000		

Should you be curious to know how the Pope has acquired the use and disposal of *Indulgences*, &c. the power of imparting blissful and sanctifying graces to dead men and women's bones, and of dispensing with crimes shocking to humanity; he, and his Romish partizans, the organs of the plenitude of his divine power, will have the effrontery to tell you, that he has in his treasury, the satisfactions of all the saints from Adam to Christ: the surplusage of the passion of Jesus Christ, one drop of whose blood was suffi-

*

cient to save all mankind: the merits, sufferings and passions of the *Virgin Mary*, and the supererogatory sufferings, and meritorious works of all the saints, whether real or canonized,* monks, nuns, and pilgrims.

What delusion, what mockery is this! How infatuated, how blinded must the votaries of Popery be, when they are thus misled by the crafts and wiles of Satan! Is it not downright blasphemy to assert, that one drop of Christ's blood could save mankind? But what do I say, what are not men capable of asserting when they have once forsaken truth, and prostituted their consciences to their private interests and ambitions?

Clement VI. who improved this doctrine, thus concludes upon the subject of *Indulgences*: "Whereas God spared not his Son; but put him to such a violent death, as forced out of him not only one single drop, but an entire stream and flood of blood; there must be somewhere a treasury to receive this most precious, but superfluous quantity, lest it be lost.

Could *Arius*, or *Socinus*, the known advocates against Christ's divinity, utter greater blasphemy than this? Could any thing be more impiously introduced to destroy Christ's satisfactions and sufferings? Is not his sacrifice on the cross by this rendered needless and unnecessary? Behold my reason. If one drop of Christ's blood was sufficient, he shed that and many more at his circumcision, and in the garden of olives, and, consequently his passion, in the Popish supposition, was useless. This is not what *Isaias*, who had our Saviour's passion represented to him in striking colours, said when he prophesied, that "from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head, there was no health in him."

* *Alexander III.* A. D. 1159, was the first Pope who assumed the canonization of saints.

A Romanist will tell you that God's mercy is so unbounded, that he does not punish the damned as rigorously as they deserve. From this lenity to the damned, you may conclude, upon their principles, that he has proceeded most tyrannically with regard to Christ, whom in the very acts of grace and the redemption of mankind, he afflicted and tormented, by extorting from him more insufferable punishments than he was, in equity, bound to suffer! Where was that love of God, that tenderness, that lenity for his only begotten, his only beloved Son? Did God desire, or Christ seek for any other Torments, but what were merely necessary to save mankind? With prayers, tears, and the most earnest solicitations and entreaties, he wished that cup, his foreseen sufferings on the cross, might be changed into a less rigorous sentence, but when he found it was in vain, he complied with the irreversible, the eternal decree, saying, "Not my will but thine be done." How then, can it be deemed a kindness in God the Father to subject his Son to vain and unnecessary tortures, and to exact of him a most ignominious kind of death, if one drop of his blood might have effected as much as the entire that was shed? But it seems he had the Pope's interest in view, by extracting so much blood out of the eternal Son of his bosom, and consigning it to his care and direction, merely to fill Romish purses.

What could be the source of this doctrine; what could betray men into that blind opinion, if not sordid and unreasonable covetousness? What else could have persuaded the Popes, that one drop of Christ's blood was sufficient to save all mankind, but the subdulous pretence of having all the rest at their own disposal to save souls from *Purgatorial* torments? Can any theologian, who has even saluted the threshold of divinity, be so stupidly, so grossly ignorant, as not to

know, that the punishments which our radical and actual sins deserved, were to be expiated, either by ourselves, which was impossible, or by our surety, by a real and cursed death, as the wrath of God could not be appeased, but by an infinite satisfaction? And is there any man of reflection, or reason ignorant enough to believe, that a drop of blood, shed without death, is a real and cursed death? How cheerfully would a malefactor walk to the place of execution, if he was to forfeit but one drop of his blood for his offences? This was not the condition of our suffering Redeemer, as *Isaias*, chap. liii. asserts, saying, "That he was despised and rejected; that he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; that he was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities," as being laid to his accepted charge of them; and that he was "cut off from the land of the living," for our radical consent and approbation of *Adam's* transgression. It is undeniable, that by virtue of the union of the divine and human nature, together in the person of Christ Jesus, one drop of Christ's blood was of infinite value; so were his prayers, his tears, his sufferings in *Gethsemane*; his bloody sweat, and his groanings also, and a part of his sufferings for our redemption; but, notwithstanding, not sufficient for our ransom. But why? Because no being whatsoever, either in heaven or earth, but what could be liable to, and undergo an infinite death, could be adequate to it; and, consequently, the effusion of a drop of blood which is neither death, much less a cursed death, nor a death of infinite worth could not effect it.

Bellarmin, a celebrated champion for the Romish cause, has laid another foundation for the Church of Rome to lay her treasure of *Indulgences* upon. He says, and every one of christian knowledge knows as well as he, that the death of Jesus Christ was abun-

dantly sufficient, not only to save the few who are saved, but to save all mankind besides, and thousands of men and worlds, if God had created them. He, however, sophistically and inconclusively endeavours to divide Christ's death and infinite ransom into two parts, viz.* that part of his death and ransom which has been really applied and made use of, and that which by the perversity and non-co-operation of refragant sinners has not been accepted. This latter part which is, by many degrees the greater, he challenges for the treasure of the Church of Rome, and this, if you are credulous enough to believe him, is what the Pope may daily† apply in *Indulgences*, or

* This partition of the merits of Christ by *Bellarmin* is not to be wondered at, if you consider, that he left at his death one-half of his soul to the *Virgin Mary*, and the other half to *Jesus Christ*, which division, to say nothing of its absurdity and impossibility, necessarily implied the mortality of his soul, as a spiritual substance is not capable of divisibility.

† *Boniface VIII.* recollecting what vast numbers of people were drawn to Rome in consequence of the *Secular Games* which were exhibited every 100th year, resolved to institute something analogous to them, by which his name might be rendered famous to posterity; the interest of the Romish religion, and the lucrative views of his Italian subjects promoted. The year 1300 seemed very favourable for the purpose; accordingly he invented some ceremonies, and pronounced that year the first Jubilee year. All the rich Romanists of the world flocked to Rome in consequence of the unbounded *Indulgences* promised and insured by *Boniface* upon certain pecuniary terms. *Clement VI.* displeased that the emoluments which might arise to himself and his subjects, should be so long locked up, abridged the period, and decreed a Jubilee every 50 years. *Urban VI.* reduced it to 30, and *Seatus V* to 25, where it now stands. The ceremony is performed after the following manner:—The Pope goes to *St. Peter's Church* to open what they call the Holy Gate, which is walled up and opened on this occasion only, knocking three times with a golden hammer, repeating the 19th verse of the 118th Psalm, "Open to me the gates of righteousness, and I will go into them, and praise the Lord;" at which time the masons break down the wall; the Pope then kneels down before it, whilst the Penitentiaries of *St. Peter* wash him with Holy Water, then taking up the Cross begins to sing *Te Deum*, and enters the Church, the Cardinals following him. In the mean time three Cardinal Legates are sent to open the three other gates, with the same ceremonies in the Churches of *St. John of Lateran*, *St. Paul*, and *St. Mary*, the greater; this is performed at the Vespers of Christmas-eve, and the next morning the Pope gives his Benediction in the Jubilee form. When the holy year is expired, they shut the gates in this manner, The Pope, after blessing the stones and mortar, lays the first stone, and leaves there twelve boxes full of gold and silver medals; innocently indicating thereby, that his Christian subjects all over the world should, as generously, extend their largesses to his Priests, as he did to the twelve Apostles; in whose honour he then deposited the twelve boxes of gold and silver. Some people shrewdly think the boxes

every twenty-fifth year in a *Jubilee*. Who can avoid an open declaration of his utmost abhorrence to such blasphemous doctrine? May he not as well rend the infinite wisdom, or power; or providence of God, and leave him that part he makes use of for regulating and ordering the world wherein we live, and assume to himself, or give to his holiness, the many other parts which might have been employed, and yet were not, for creating and regulating an infinite number of other worlds. In this point, I cannot avoid comparing *Bellarmin* and his adherents, with a man who would endeavour to treasure that part of sunshine that might illuminate the eyes of a vast army, when only beheld by one; or with him who would endeavour to reserve as much of an orator's voice, as may be heard by a numerous auditory, though only heard by one. But the same wisdom and power of God which is all-sufficient, both to create and regulate many worlds, is all necessary, and therefore indivisibly, wholly and entirely set to regulate one. The same sun shine that fills an entire hemisphere, or a voice which is heard by a great auditory will not subdivide themselves into lesser, or greater shares proportionably to the number of hearers and spectators. One ear receives as much of the voice (supposing a proper distance and medium) as the entire auditory; and one eye takes as much light for its own use as would supply a whole

are soon after conveyed away, and the twelve Apostles left to shift for themselves without them.

To say that this Romish Jubilee is in imitation of that of the Jews, is downright nonsense. In the time of this Romish Jubilee, are all debtors discharged? Are people, who mortgaged their estates, reinstated in their former patrimonies? Are slaves set at liberty? Are the lands of Romanists all over the world left uncultivated for a year; and what they naturally produce left in common to the poor as well as the rich? Is there then, a general goal delivery in all Popish countries? No such thing, the main, the darling object of this mummery, was and is, the amassing of money, as every Romanist in the universe, arrived at the years of discretion, must then pay the Priest to whom he or she confesses, more or less, according to their several circumstances.—See Leviticus. Chap. xxv.

Quid non mortalia pectora cogis auri sacra fames?

army; and yet both the light and the voice impart themselves wholly and indivisibly as weak to one, as to all the hearers and speculators. If this be so, how much more is the all-sufficient satisfaction and ransom of Jesus Christ indivisible, being by infinite degrees less divisible than light or sound? Though the infinite satisfaction and ransom of Christ could, per impossible, be divided, yet every sinner absolutely requires it all. As every man's sin is infinite; that is, deserves an infinite punishment, so agreeable to this, is that of the Apostle to the Ephesians, vi. 13, "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil," so must the satisfaction for it be, in like manner, infinite; that is, as great as can be presented to an infinite majesty, by a Saviour infinitely worthy; and, consequently the inconceivable mercies of God thro' Christ Jesus; and the infinite price offered to the divine justice by this Saviour, cannot be distributed or divided, as the price he was sold for into thirty pieces.* Whoever then applies to himself, by co-operating with the grace of God, that immense value of Christ's blood, applies it *all*, and *all*, being not too much for him, there is no redundancy to be spared. Hence you may collect, how far the Pope has the use and disposal of the blood and merits of Christ.

Should you examine the foundation upon which this doctrine is built, you would find it nothing less, than an open and avowed profession, that Christ has not, by his sacrifice on the cross, fully satisfied divine

* The pieces of silver which *Judas* received to betray Christ were sheekles of the Sanctuary, each worth about two shillings and three-pence farthing. Both at Rome and Paris there are pieces shewn, which are pretended to be the very same, that were part of the price of the purchase of our Saviour's blood. But well versed antiquaries assure us, that these pieces are only the ancient medals of Rhodes; on the one side stamped with a Coloss, which represents the Sun, and on the other, a Rose, which were the arms of that city.

justice; and that our sins are neither fully nor properly remitted in and through the merits of Christ. This is the ground upon which their repeated *Masses*, *Purgatory*, *Pilgrimages*, and all their imaginary *Indulgences* stand, viz. that God through Christ remits our sins without remitting the punishment; or if you will have it in more express terms, that God through Christ, remits our sins without remitting them at all. But if God, through Christ, fully and properly remits sins, why are they punished in *Purgatory* until they are atoned for by *Masses*, and *Indulgences*? How can we conceive a just, gracious, and appeased God demanding the most unsufferable torments of a supposed *Purgatory* to satisfy his justice, if his Son's sacrifice fully and completely satisfied it before? Is there any justice to exact of me, the same satisfaction and payment that Christ, my surety, has fully discharged already? To this a Romanist will reply, that Christ has fully satisfied divine justice for our sins, but not for that part of the punishment which must be either suffered in *Purgatory*, or dispensed with by the Pope's *Indulgences*. This, indeed, is so very absurd, that it does not deserve to be noticed, much less to be answered. But yet, to clear up that point, let us see what the severe justice of God can demand of trespassing sinners. Sin denotes two things, viz. the vice of the act and the punishment due by the trespass for that ill act. Divine Justice does not require the ill act, or the iniquity of it; on the contrary, it detests and forbids it; and, consequently, demands nothing else, but a sufficient punishment due to the sinful act. Now, Christ satisfied divine justice for our sins on the cross, and did take our sins upon himself, he did not take upon him our vices or sinful acts and dispositions, but took all our sins upon himself; that is, he took and paid all the punishment due to our

sins; therefore God, without Romish *Indulgences*, remits and forgives our sins, through Christ, when he accepts of his punishment in lieu of our's. Thus far, as to the satisfaction of Christ relative to the Papal treasury. Let us, in the next place, see how far the pretended supererogatory works and merits of Saints avail it.

The merits and supererogatory works of Saints, as deposited in the Pope's store-house, must necessarily, be conceived as expiations of the Divine vengeance. This, the Romanists grant, but I will beg leave to tell them, that by this doctrine, they either wrong the justice of God, or undervalue the satisfaction of Christ. For, if the saints must satisfy again for a debt, which Christ, already abundantly satisfied; for, this not only wrongs, but destroys the best known rules of justice: or, if justice requires any further satisfaction, it must be pre-supposed, it was not sufficiently satisfied; and this undervalues, nay, even mutilates the infinite satisfaction of Christ. To this they answer, that our Saviour's immense satisfaction is but a remote and general cause to help and qualify what we do, when we satisfy for ourselves; and that men's good works and penances, when applied by themselves during their lives, or by others when they are dead, are the proper and immediate causes which complete the deed. From this their concession, nothing else can be inferred, but that Christ's satisfaction only assists men's good works, as some chymical compounds help drugs, rather by actuating and reviving them to perfume, than by perfuming of themselves. This is what *Bellarmin* means, when he says, that "there are not two satisfactions, the one of Christ, the other our own, but one actual satisfaction only, and that ours.* This assertion is one of the tenets of *Pelagius*, which

* *Bellar. de Purgat. Lib. 1. cap. 14.*

plainly implies that men or saints, are more properly redeemers to themselves and others, than Christ, a Redeemer or Saviour to them. By these and such like blasphemous means, the Papal treasury is filled, and Christ's merits plundered from him, and others substituted in their stead !!!

They will also tell you, that the human and superfluous satisfactions, which their magazine is furnished with to satisfy Divine justice, are that redundancy and surplusage of great labours and mortifying penances, which their saints had no occasion of, for the expiation of their own sins. But this is absolutely inconsistent with what Christ, Matt. xix. says, "I say unto you, that every one that hath forsaken houses or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." If every little suffering is so liberally recompensed, so abundantly rewarded, where has the Pope any thing to corrade or scrape from it? If it receives an hundred fold reward in heaven, with what authority can it be dragged into the Romish magazine to be sold to the best purchaser for ready money? * Can any one

* Cardinal *Bembo* assures us, that Pope *Alexander VI.* sold Indulgences to raise an army for his son *Cesar Borgia*, and that in the dominions of Venice, alone, he disposed of to the value of 1600 marks of gold.

About the year 1518, *Arcemboldi*, legate to Pope *Leo X.* at Copenhagen, sold Indulgences publicly there; and such was his artifice, and, such the stupidity of the people, that he squeezed near two millions of florins out of that country, at that time, the poorest in Europe.

Dispensations were granted, not only for the past but future sins. In the archives of *Joinville*, was found an Indulgence, given to the Cardinal of Lorraine, and to twelve of his retinue, whereby the remission of three sins, whichever they chose to nominate, should be anticipated to each.

La Laboureur, relates of the Dutchess of Burgundy and Auvergne, sister to *Charles VIII.* that she and ten of her attendants had the privilege of obtaining general absolution from all their sins, during their lives, upon forty-seven festivals.

The above *Leo X.* under pretence of a war with the Turks, set up a public sale of Indulgences in most parts of Christendom. For this purpose, offices of Indulgences were opened, and they were farmed like Custom-house duties, *Leo* gave a great part of the money to his sister (who was pasquinaded under the fictitious name of *Lucretia* at Rome), and yet no one dare publicly complain. The preachers, declared openly from the

be so supinely ignorant, as not to know, that God will most amply remunerate the tribulations, anguishes and afflictions of the just? This is what the Apostle points at, Rom. viii. 18, where he says, that “the sufferings of this present life are not to be compared with that glory, (stupendous and gracious reward of all sufferings!) which shall be revealed in us.” Thus you see, how far the merits of Christ, and the supererogatory works of Saints, whether real or canonized avail the *Indulgential* magazine of Rome.

Let us now examine whether the written word of God or reason, countenances the merits and supererogatory works of the saints. Merit (I mean that of condignity) plainly contradicts the express and evident declarations of Scripture. The Apostle tells us, Ephes. ii. 8, “That we are saved by grace through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God;” and Tit. iii. 5, That “not by the works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.” These texts are so diametrically opposite to the meritoriousness of our actions, that, at first view, they totally subvert it, without any further disquisition. And Rom. vi. 23, speaking of eternal life in contrast with eternal death, he precludes all arguments upon this head: “The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eter-

pulpit ut etiamsi vim sanctæ Virgini Mariæ adferrent, illis remitteretur, si indulgentias compararent. Indulgencies, the most shocking to humanity, were, then exposed to sale, and consequently, a road paved for all manner of wickedness.

A Gentleman, who, with indignation, saw into the cheat, applied to *Tetzel*, who made a vast sum of this trade at Leipsic; and asked him for an Indulgence, for a certain crime, which he would not mention, but intended to commit. The bargain being closed, the Indulgence and absolution were delivered in form. The purchaser, apprized of *Tetzel's* departure, after selling his relics, bones, indulgences and absolutions, waylaid him, and robbed him of what money he had, and for his consolation, informed him, this was the crime for which he had purchased the anticipated Indulgence.

*

nal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ." This he corroborates in v. 21, of the same epistle, saying, that "Grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." He further proves xi. 6, by an unanswerable argument, that our works are, by no means, condignly meritorious, but that we utterly depend upon the grace of God; and thus sums up his reasoning in few but expressive words,—“ If our salvation be of grace, it is no more of works, otherwise, grace is no more grace, and if it be of works, then, it is no more grace, otherwise, work is no more work.”

We have every reason to be convinced, that *St. Paul*, was as holy a man, after his conversion, as ever had existence, however conscious that he had no merit, he declares, that it was by the grace of God, and not by his merits, he was what he was: and though he laboured more abundantly than the rest of the Apostles; it was not he, nor the meritoriousness of his actions, but the grace of God, that assisted him in his most laborious and perilous endeavours. These few texts, without adducing any more, evidently plain to the meanest capacities, obviously imply, that the meritoriousness of our actions is quite inconsistent with the doctrine of the Scriptures.

Besides that supererogatory works are repugnant to Scripture, reason condemns them most effectually. How can any creature as a creature, of ever so exalted a nature, merit, or deserve any thing at the hand of God, through the channel of communicative justice. This would be bartering our sorry services, for the never ending joys of heaven. There may be merited and reciprocal services and obligations, between one creature and another, but it is inconceivable; nay, even impossible, there could be any between the Creator and his creature, because one is an independent, and the other a dependent being, which positively

excludes all manner of merit or obligation on the creature's side, who is under the sole power and dominion of his Creator, and entirely dependent on him, for unmerited redemption.

Though our good works, the result of divine grace, may, and do extend to our fellow creatures, yet they cannot extend to God, so as to deserve remuneration. He is so perfectly unchangeable in all his attributes, that he is not capable of any addition or diminution. In all proper merit, there is an exchange of benefit, benefits being given for benefits, received or expected. Now there is an infinite difference, between the obedience and sufferings of our blessed Saviour, and our trivial best services: such was the worth, merit, and dignity of the second person of the most Holy Trinity united to our manhood, that he could, and did make reparation for the injury done by the transgression of our proto-parent *Adam*, and opened a way, through his glorious perfections, for our recovery and salvation. He, therefore, justly can be said truly to merit, though we cannot, because his sufferings were a valuable consideration for the blessings freely bestowed upon our forfeited souls. But such is our utter insufficiency, meanness, and poverty, that merit can have no place, on our part, in any of our transactions with him.

To conclude, there is no proportion between our best works, and the rewards Christ has promised, "For eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor can it enter into the heart of man, what God has prepared for them that love him." Are we not to behold his face in righteousness, and to be satisfied with his likeness upon us? Are we not to be in his presence, where there is fulness of joy and pleasures for evermore? Who then, can be so vainly ignorant, as to imagine, that our worthless services can be a consideration,

valuable enough, for all this glory? How few are our good works, the result of divine grace, and of how short a continuance? If we commence ever so soon, and continued ever so long, and suffered ever so much, in the service of God, all this would take in but the compass of a few years; but the promised, free, and unmerited reward, is eternal and immutable! "We are called by the God of all grace, unto his eternal glory by Jesus Christ," and "begotten again to the lively hope of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." Our light afflictions, which are but for a moment, if compared with eternity, effect for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. What, then, can be more evident, than that the services, good works and sufferings of the present life, (the result of Divine grace, and not of our own meritoriousness) are not worthy to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed in us, in heaven.

Take this point in question, in whatever light you will, whether of congruity or condignity, that is, to whatever mansion God is pleased to consign a sanctified spirit, as it best seems to his Divine will: or, that God, according to a Romish sentiment, is necessitated to balance accounts with the sanctified spirit, and precisely allot it such a place, as its merits deserved, without curtailing an iota of the condignity of them, and granting it a blissful abode, without charging to its account, the preventing and restraining graces, God, of his free good will, had, in this world, endowed it with, without which, all his efforts, I should think, would have been ineffectual towards the attainment of everlasting happiness. Let the departed spirit be supposed in heaven, whether by the free will of the all-wise Creator, or necessitated to it, by justice, in remunerating in full, the good works it performed in this life; with what degree of confidence can a Pope scale the

battlements of heaven, and rob a glorified spirit of the rapturous blisses he there enjoys? If his ecstatic enjoyments be in proportion to his works, a Pope cannot be supposed to take part of its merits without abridging its glory, in proportion to what he takes from it, for if its glory be proportioned to its merits, there is not a degree of that merit, which the Pope pretends to take to himself and sell to the highest bidder, but lessens its enjoyment, in the same ratio that the merit is taken away; and, as the bliss of saints is eternally augmented; so, in proportion, is it diminished by every subtraction the Pope may take from it, and, consequently, instead of encreasing its blisses; his Holiness will, by degrees, if he draws hard, put it out of the power of a happy spirit to advance in glory, by constantly drawing upon its merits.

This must be the reason, why the Pope, foreseeing if he drew upon one saint, in particular, the saint, in some time, might turn bankrupt, having his stock exhausted, musters them all together, (whether real or not, will appear in the sequel) judging that a little from each, especially, in the time of a jubilee or crusade, cannot be very prejudicial to their happiness. But I crave leave to beg his holiness might reflect, that however little he might corrade from them, it, yet, diminishes the encrease of glory, as the Colossus at Rhodes, or the stupendous rock at Gibraltar, might be reduced to nothing, by continual filing and sledging. And, as a pound sterling, after *Adam* was created, if put out at compound interest, would amount, at this day, to an incalculable sum, even so, *à contra*, a saint, whose powers of intellect are always expanded and exfoliated by the beatific vision, may, by degrees, become so transcendently happy, as from a simple saint to be advanced to the first order in heaven. To sup-

pose a Saint making no progress in holiness in heaven; would be to suppose him relinquishing his claim to it, and despising the goodness of God, who made him an inheritor of it. *Qui non proficit, deficit*, is an axiom in spirituals, he that does not improve falls short, which without blasphemy, cannot be applied to the inmates of heaven; consequently, we must conceive a sanctified spirit making the most rapid strides to perfection, and, as eternity is endless, its divine pursuits will never have a period. Had the Pope weighed the matter, and considered, that to him that hath, more will be given, he should rather, with the primitive Christians, address God for an increase of glory to his saints, than rob them of any part of it, as any diminution, in the supposition, would in the ratio, retard the progress. The Scripture tells, there are many mansions in heaven, many different degrees of glory; hence, I am led to think, as eternity advances, if the expression could be admitted, all the saints in heaven will enjoy such uninterrupted happiness, such progressive additional joys, such rapturous, such ecstatic pleasures; that, as if they all enjoyed equal shares of bliss, they will, with rivalling melody, everlastingly sing the ineffable praises of him, (without bestowing any of their glory, or their eulogies on the Pope,) that was, that is, and always will be. Of which transporting happiness that every Christian may be partaker. God of his infinite mercy, grant, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen. Amen.

OF THE VENERATION AND INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

AFTER making the minutest enquiry concerning the veneration of Saints, I cannot discover any symptoms

of it until towards the close of the fourth century. The source, from which it seems to arise, was the profound regard, which the Christians of those days, paid to the memory of the martyrs. They frequented their tombs, and there addressed their prayers to God, engaging themselves to a strict imitation of their morals and godliness. The highest strains of eloquence were lavishly bestowed in magnifying their glorious and truly Christian departure. The rectors of the respective meetings enrolled their names in their dyptichs; they gave their bodies the most honourable burials they could, in those sad and calamitous times; and as they had no churches, they appointed their graves, the most ordinary places of their meeting, thereby declaring, before all the world, that by thus assembling at their sepulchres, they prepared themselves to suffer, as they did. In a word, they did what they could to induce both themselves and others, to love and admire those holy souls, and to follow their examples.

But, by degrees, as the Church gained ground, men grew wanton and superstitious, and the homage and adoration they at first paid to God at the tombs of the martyrs, gradually dwindled into praises and eulogies of the saints themselves. Hence arose a superstitious regard to them: hence, by degrees, grew up a direct invocation and adoration not alone of them, but of the saints, whether consigned to bliss, by God or the Pope.

As Christian Rome adopted many of the rites and ceremonies of Pagan Rome, she thought herself equally authorised to establish as many gods of her own manufacture, as they did of old, and consequently looked upon herself equally entitled to pay them divine honours. She has, ever since her revolt, introduced into her sanctuary, more gods (saints) than the heathen world has ever produced, and as if this was

insufficient, has inserted some in her catalogue, whose existence could never be proved: and others, whose lives and immoralities, if not, through God's grace, finally repented of, were rather obnoxious to everlasting misery, than the smallest degree of worship and adoration, even if compatible with their beings.

It was in consequence of this, that Gregory XIII, in the sixteenth century, roused by the universal complaints against the legends of those days, and fully apprised of their absurdities, committed the charge of revising and correcting the Roman martyrology to *Baronius*, with full power to reject such as he should judge unworthy, and admit others in their room whom he should declare worthy of the public worship and a place there. *Baronius*, by virtue of his commission, having obtained the keys of infallibility, we cannot otherwise conceive him equal to the burden imposed upon him, unassistedly laid siege to the garrison of heaven, stormed it, and drove several from their blissful abodes to which they had a just claim, to make room for others who had not the least pretensions to them. All his *Emendations, Additions, Corrections, &c.* were confirmed by *Gregory*, by a special bull, bearing date the 14th of January, 1584, threatening with the indignation of the Almighty God, and of his Apostles *Peter and Paul*, all who should presume to find fault with his amendments, or make any further alterations in them. What an extensive knowledge of the secrets of men's hearts must *Baronius* have had? He must have known the final, and unfeigned, and unretracted contrition of those whom he left in possession of heaven; and also the real non-repentance of such as he excluded from it; nay, he must be perfectly acquainted with God's covenant, with both parties at their dying hours, to form such a decisive, such an accurate judgment, in so nice and arduous a point.

But we find by this canonizer's annals, that he had not the qualities required for an impartial and ingenuous historian; and several learned advocates for Popery frankly own, that he has not digested his writings with the accuracy required for such a work.* It would require a volume to point out his mistakes, and the many impositions to which he has subjected Romish credulity; but I will, for the present, only mention some of the most notorious.

In the first place, he stiles *Linus* first bishop of Rome, a martyr, and falsely, places his death under *Vespasian*; but it is well known this Emperor made no laws against the Christians, and that none of them suffered under him. Too credulous to any thing that may favour his cause, and mistaken by the acts of *St. Alexander*, which were composed in the seventh century, and are now universally rejected as fabulous; he makes *Alexander* I. fifth Bishop of Rome, who died A. D. 119, a martyr.† He assures us, that *Pius*, ninth Bishop of Rome, suffered martyrdom under *Antoninus Pius*; but we are historically certain, there was no persecution in that prince's reign. He leaves *Anicetus*, tenth Bishop of Rome, in quiet possession of heaven, contrary to the opinion of *Irenæus*. It was in consequence of this decisive word, that *Urban* VII. gave the Jesuits at Munich his head, and *Clement* VIII. his bones to the duke of Altëmp; to be solemnly worshipped. *Soter*, eleventh Bishop of Rome, is a mar-

* See *Pagi*, *Cardinal Noris*, *Tillemont*, and *Leonard Venturini*; who detected a vast number of his falsifications and blunders.

† *St. Alexandre* I. que *St. Irenée* compte pour le cinquième évêque de Rome succéda à *St. Evariste* l'an 109. J. C. & mort l'an 119. On ne sçait rien de sa vie & les Epîtres qu'on lui attribue sont supposées. Ladvocat sub Lit. A.

St. Alexander I. whom *Irenæus* reckons the fifth Bishop of Rome, succeeded *Evaristus*, A. 109, and died A. 119. This is barely the sum of what has reached our days concerning him. The letters which go under his name are supposititious.

tyr in his unerring opinion, but *Irenæus*, or any of the ancients knew not a word of it, or if they did, they made no mention of it. What is very remarkable, concerning this Saint is, that his bones are worshipped in the Church of St. Sylvester at Rome, and in the cathedral of Toledo in Spain. He gives *Zepherinus*, fourteenth Bishop of Rome, a place among the martyrs, but how can any one believe this, whereas the Church enjoyed a profound tranquillity from the death of *Securus* to the end of his Pontificate. Although *Alexander* was, of all the Pagan emperors, the most favourable and indulgent to the Christians, as is evident from all the ancient writers, both Christians and Pagans; yet he is represented in the martyrologies, and especially in the acts of *Callistus*, to which *Baronius* gives an entire credit, as the most barbarous and inhuman tyrant that ever shed Christian blood. If we reject those acts, and we must either reject them, or the authority of the most unexceptionable writings amongst the ancients, we expunge at once above three hundred martyrs out of the catalogue of Saints worshipped to this day by the Church of Rome, upon the bare authority of such acts. Of those is the Consul *Palmatus*, his wife, his children, and forty-two of his domestics; the Senator *Simplicius* with his wife and sixty-eight of his domestics; and what will be an irreparable loss, the so much celebrated *St. Cecilia*,* in whose honour Churches

* An Angel brought two crowns from paradise, made up of roses and lilies, and gave one to *Valerian* and the other to *Cecily*, his new married wife. On the marriage night when *Cecily* and her spouse *Valerian* were alone together in the bedchamber, she thus accosted him: O sweet and most loving youth, I have a secret to confess to thee, if thou wilt swear not to reveal it. Which *Valerian* swearing to, she said, I have an Angel a lover of mine, who, with the strictest jealousy keeps my body; and who, if he, in the least, perceives that thou touchest me with polluted love (an excellent character of the marriage bed and very reconcileable to their sacrament of matrimony) will presently stir up his fury against thee, and destroy the flower of thy youth; but if he knows that thou lovest me with

have been erected in every Christian kingdom. Here *Baronius* was really embarrassed, for on one side he could not presume to question the Emperor *Alexander's* kindness to the Christians, which, if he did, would be giving the lye, most flagrantly, to all the ancients; but on the other deeming it a sacrilege to rob his Church of so many valuable reliques, ascribes the cruel usage they are supposed to have met with in that prince's reign, not to him, but to *Ulpian* the celebrated civilian, who flourished under him. Had *Baronius* but perused those acts of *Callistus* with any tolerable attention, he would see, that they expressly mention all the torments of the martyrs, even minutely described; and that by the express command of the Emperor *Alexander*. With what colour could *Alexander* be said to favour the Christians; to have enjoyed a happy tranquillity under him, had one of his officers persecuted them with the utmost cruelty, in his name and by his authority? Not to say any more, the very first words of these acts are sufficient to make us suspect the truth of them, for they begin thus:—
In the time of *Macrinus* and *Alexander*—How came

a sincere and immaculate love, and preservest my virginity whole and untouched, he will then love thee as well as myself, and express his favour to thee. *Valerian* replied, if thou wouldest have me believe thy words, shew me the Angel, and if I find that he is, indeed, an Angel of God, I will do as thou sayest; but if thou lovest any other man better than me, I will slay with my sword both him and thee. So persuading him to become a Christian and be baptised, she shewed him the Angel. *Valerian*, upon seeing the Angel, adored it, (history does not record whether it was a he or she one) and begged that his brother *Tiburtius* might become a Christian: *Tiburtius*, afterwards coming into the house, smelt the odour of the roses and lilies, but saw nothing, and as he was wondering whence it came, *Valerian* informed him of their crowns which he was not permitted to see, until he became a Christian, and then he should see the crowns and the Angel of God also; whereupon he consented to be baptised, and thereupon obtained the grant of all he asked of God, and saw the Angels every day after, Brev. Rom. Antiq. Lect. 1, 2, in Vita S. Tiburtii & Valeriani. & Nov. Lect. 2. in Vita S. Cæciliæ.

You are to notice, that the writers from whom the Lives of the Saints in the old Breviaries were extracted, are omitted in the reformed Breviaries of *Pius V.* and the Prosas both in the Breviaries and Missals, are now entirely left out, dreading, as they had reason, both censure and investigation.

these two princes to be joined together? *Macrinus* reigned with his son *Diadumenus*, and *Heliogabulus* between them and *Alexander*. Soon after we read in them, that the Consul *Palmatius* was condemned without any form of judgment, without so much as being heard. But *Herodian* assures us, that *Alexander* was a strict observer of the law, and that no criminal was condemned in his reign, but according to the usual course of law, and by judges of the greatest integrity. *Callistus*, along with the rest, upon the sole authority of those fabulous and suppositious acts was decreed a place in heaven by *Baronius*. His bones are exposed to public adoration on the tenth of May, in the Church of *St. Mary*, beyond the Tiber, at Rome, and that of *Notre Dame* at Rheims, in France. *Urbanus* also, is left by him in quiet possession of his heavenly mansion upon the above account, and his bones now worshipped in an abbey of his name, in the diocese of Chalons on the Marne, and in the Church of *St. Cecily* at Rome. *Claudius II.* is represented by some fabulous legends an implacable enemy to the Christian name, but *Eusebius*, nor any other Christian writer of repute takes notice of that prince's having ever persecuted, or molested the Christians, therefore, unquestionably they ought to be looked on as fabulous, and consequently, *Dionysius*, twenty-fourth Bishop of Rome, together with three hundred and seventy-five more who are honoured by that Church as saints of the first class, should have been expunged out of the catalogue of martyrs, as *Baronius* had no other authority to intrude them into the seats of bliss but the above suppositious legends. *Marcellinus*, twenty-eighth Bishop of Rome is placed among the martyrs; and yet *St. Austin*, who flourished not long after his time, never mentions him, although it would have afforded him the strongest argument, by

could possibly use to silence the Donatists,* who loaded him with calumnies. *Marcellus*, twenty-ninth Bishop of Rome, is also inserted in the catalogue of martyrs, and is said to have suffered under *Maxentius*; but this Emperor who reigned at Rome during his pontificate, had no sooner made himself master of that city, than he put an end to the persecution, as we are told, in express terms by *Eusebius*. Yet, this pretended saint's bones, like the bones of several of their saints, are now worshipped in several places, viz. in a Church bearing his name at Rome; in the Abbey of Omont, in Hainault, not far from Maubeuge; at Cluni, in a parish Church of the diocese of Elne, in Roussillon, &c.

Baronius pretends that Lucifer, who is honoured by the Church of Rome as a Saint, and whose festival is kept the 20th of May, is a real and undoubted Saint. But *Rufinus*, his co-temporary, who, undoubtedly knew him better than *Baronius*, positively assures us, that he died in the schism which he had formed; this is authenticated most evidently by *Jerome*. *Dictinius*, who died in 420 is honoured as a Saint in Spain, though *Idatius* the chronologist, a native of Spain, and raised there to the Episcopal dignity about the 428, mentions him without saying any thing in his praise, or taking the least notice of his being then honoured as a Saint, which brings the reality of his bliss in question; yet *Baronius* did not drive him out of heaven, although no body can tell how he got in. *Zosimus*, fortieth Bishop of Rome, whom you may judge of by the letter which the African Bishops wrote to his im-

* They followed the errors of *Donatus*, Bishop of Carthage, who held that the Father was above the Son, and the Son above the Holy Ghost; they admitted no virtue or power in the Church, and re-baptised such as joined them; they insisted that any baptism but their's was null; that there was no Church but in Africa, &c.

mediate successor, *Boniface*, part of which runs thus: "We hope," say they, "that since it hath pleased the Almighty to raise you to the throne of the Roman Church, we shall no longer feel the effects of that worldly pride and arrogance, which ought never to have found Rome in the Church of Christ." In the same letter they complain of their having been made to endure such things as it was almost impossible for them to endure, which, however, they were willing to forget. How cruel and tyrannical must the treatment have been which they met with at the hands of *Zosimus*, since it extorted from so many venerable prelates a complaint of this nature, and that in a letter to his immediate successor? This very *Zosimus*, however, has been sainted, and is now worshipped by the Church of Rome as a great Saint, not so much in regard to his own merits, as you have seen, as by a blunder in *Barontus* in revising and correcting the Roman Martyrology. The case is somewhat extraordinary, and worth, perhaps, the reader's attention. In the Martyrology of *Bede* was marked *St. Zosimus*, martyr, who suffered for the confession of the faith. This martyr, an ignorant transcriber (printing was not known in those days), mistook for the Pope of the same name, and concerned to find so little said of a great Saint, set down all he knew of him that would, in any measure, redound to his praise. This copy, *Baronius* was not unacquainted with, and reading there what the transcriber had added of his own, concluded the Saint mentioned in that place to be Pope *Zosimus*, and, accordingly, allotted him, upon this authority, a place among the other Saints in the Roman Martyrology. *Baronius*, persuaded that *Zosimus*, the Pope did not suffer martyrdom, imputes the assertion of it to the ignorance of the transcriber, and contents himself by making one Saint out of two, though they

lived at to great a distance of time from each other ; for the real martyr lived in the earliest times, as is mentioned by *St. Polycarp*, who flourished two hundred years and upwards before the Pontificate of *Zosimus*, *Sixtus III.* forty-third Bishop of Rome is honoured by that Church as a saint, on account of his having supported, against the Bishops of Illyricum, the claims and pretensions of his See ; for you cannot find in his life, any extraordinary merit, that could have entitled him to that honour. *John*, fifty-fourth Bishop of Rome, is honoured to this day, as a martyr ; and no reason can be alleged in favour of his martyrdom, but his having died in prison, to which he was committed through his disobedience to his sovereign.

*Felix II.** elected Bishop of Rome, in opposition to *Liberius*, thirty-fifth lawfully chosen Bishop of that See, is now a pretended martyr, in the Church of Rome. But you are to know, that the apotheosis of this spiritual usurper, intruder, and anti-pope, should have never taken place, in future ages ; had it not been for the ignorance of the times. During the ages of darkness, he undisturbedly held the rank, to which he was raised ; but when the sun of knowledge illumined people, with the dawn of investigation ; then was Rome ashamed to own him among her saints. But, what was to be done in so critical a point as this ? To degrade a Pope, would have been a fatal blow to the Pope's authority, and rendering it, for ever precarious, in so material a point, as that of canonization. *Felix*, therefore, was to keep his place in heaven ; his sanctity was to be confirmed, and the world imposed upon by some contrivance or other, capable of defeating the testimony of cotemporary, unexceptionable and ancient writers.

* *Felix II.* Antipape & Archidiaque de l'Eglise Romaine fut intrus sur le liege par ordre de l'Empereur *Constance*, pendant l'exil du Pape *Liberius*, en 355. Trois ans apres ; Libere etant de retour a Rome, *Felix* en fut chasse honteusement, & mourut le 22 Novembre, 365.

That the world may be so foolish as not to imagine, that there was any deceit or underhand dealing with regard to the canonization of *Felix, Gregory XIII.* declared in 1580, his intention of having the cause of *Felix* impartially examined. In order to this, he appointed *Baronius*, employed at that time, in reforming the Roman Martyrology, as I told you before, to put in writing whatever could be objected against *Felix*,* and Cardinal *Santario* to answer his objections, and collect, likewise in writing, all that could be said in favour of his new client; that the Pope might be thoroughly acquainted with the merits of the cause; before he came to a final decision. This conduct in *Gregory* has been censured by some over zealous divines of the Church of Rome, as if he had thereby given the world occasion to think, that he questioned the infallibility of his predecessors; who had honored *Felix* as a saint. But *Gregory* knew well enough what he was about, and how the whole affair would end. In compliance with his orders, *Baronius* wrote a dissertation, to prove that *Felix* was neither a saint nor a martyr.† As he had truth on his side, Cardinal *Santario*, though a man of learning, could neither answer his arguments, nor offer any thing, in so desperate a cause, worthy of himself. He often addressed himself, in his prayers, to his client, entreating him to undertake his own cause, by suggesting to him what might be alleged in his defence. But the client was no less at a stand than the advocate. Some other person therefore, must interpose, and whom did the gaining or losing such a cause, more nearly concern than the Pope, whereas his authority, in a most essential point, was at stake? This was a nice, this was a momentous

* He who opposes a Saint's canonization, is called *Diabolus Rotæ*, the Devil of the Rotæ. An office in the Inquisition de *propaganda fide*.

† This writing was so effectually suppressed, that it never came to light.

affair, and it required to be managed with great art and dexterity. *Gregory*, therefore, having often heard both sides; at last in a full congregation of Cardinals, without seemingly betraying the least partiality for *Felix*, appointed them to meet, for the last time, on the 28th of July, the eve of the pretended Saint's festival, judging that, the most proper time to play off, with good success, the trick which he enshrined in his heart. The Cardinals met on the day appointed, *Baronius* silenced his adversary *Santario*; the whole assembly was convinced that *Felix* was no saint, no martyr; the Pope himself seemed to fall in with the rest, and accordingly, rose up to declare, as was thought, the unhappy *Felix* fallen from heaven, when a great noise, was all on a sudden, heard at the door, and immediately a messenger entered, who, after uttering these words, "*Holy Felix, pray for us,*" acquainted the Pope and the Cardinals, that the body of *Felix* was just discovered. Hereupon they all repaired in great haste, to the Church of *Cosmas* and *Damianus*, where the miraculous discovery had been made, and there saw in a marble coffin of an extraordinary size, on one side, the bodies of *Marcus*, *Marcellianus*, and *Tranquillinus*, and on the other, that of *Felix*, with this inscription on a stone that lay by it, "The body of *St. Felix*, who condemned *Constantius*. Upon this a *Te Deum* was sung, with great solemnity, for the triumph of truth. *Felix* was declared worthy of the veneration and worship, that had 'till then, been paid him amongst their other saints in the Roman martyrology; where it is said, and every year publicly sung, that "he was driven from his see for defending the Catholic faith, by *Constantius*, an Arian Emperor, and privately put to death at *Cere*, now *Cervetera*, in *Tuscany*. *Baronius*, transported with joy, as he himself declares, at so miraculous and seasonable a discovery, immediately

yielded, not to his antagonist *Santorio*, but to *Felix*, who had, evidently interposed, and taking that interposition for a satisfactory answer to all his arguments, he immediately retracted whatever he had said, and consigned to the flames whatever he had written in opposition to *Felix*. Thus to maintain a chimerical prerogative, they sport with truth; betray into error those who confide in them; and transforming the worst of men into saints, honour vice with the greatest reward they can bestow on virtue.

Who, versed in the history of those times, does not plainly see that this pretended discovery was nothing else but a contrivance to confirm the martyrdom of *Felix*, and impose upon the world. The Pontifical and its acts, on which his martyrdom was originally founded, were a no less palpable and gross imposition, may be easily demonstrated. In the first place, *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, who lived in the time of *Felix* and *Liberius* at Rome, tell us, in express terms, that *Felix*, who had been substituted to *Liberius*, died on the 29d of Nov. A. D. 365, that is, four years after the death of *Constantius*, by whom he is said, in his acts, and in the Pontifical, to have been martyred. *Athanasius*, *Philostorgius*, and the Chronicle of *Alexandria* assures us, that *Constantius* was not baptized, until at the point of death; when he received that Sacrament at the hands of *Euzoius*, the Arian Bishop of Antioch.* And, yet, both the Acts of *Felix*, and the Pontifical will have him to be twice baptized before his death; for it was on this account that *Felix* is said to have declared him a heretic, and not for being an Arian, which proves *Felix* himself to have been an Arian. This de-

* *Euzoius*, an Arian Deacon of Alexandria, was deposed at the same time with *Arius*, by the Bishop of that city, and both condemned at the first Council of Nice. But having presented, in 333, a confession of Faith, apparently orthodox, to the Emperor *Constantine*, he was afterwards appointed Bishop of Antioch, in 361.

claration *Baronius* improves into a solemn excommunication; and being become, after the above mentioned discovery, a most zealous advocate for *Felix*, tells us, that the holy martyr was no sooner placed upon the throne of *St. Peter*, than changing his conduct, he separated himself from the communion of those, by whom he had been raised, and boldly fulminated an anathema against the Emperor himself. What a pity that *Athanasius* was not better acquainted with the conduct of *Felix*! For, if he had, he would never have styled him, *a monster, placed on the See of Rome, by the malice of Anti-christ*. Such an attempt, as the excommunication of an Emperor, and especially, of an Emperor to whom he was indebted for his exaltation, unheard of until that time, must have made a great noise; and yet, we find it was heard by none but *Baronius*, who lived at so great a distance. It may be further added, that there was no room for an excommunication against *Constantius*, who was still a catechumen, and consequently, did not partake of any of the sacred mysteries. Thus far for the Popes.

In the next place, I will make bold to introduce *St. Thomas Becket*, Archbishop of Canterbury. He is one of the first rate, and a *primæ classis* saint of the Church of Rome, and has particular prayers, hymns, responses, and lessons appointed for his divine service, on the 7th of July,

ANTIPHONA.

Tu, per *Thomas* sanguinem quem pro te impendit,

Fac nos, *Christe*, scandere quo *Thomas* ascendit.

Vers. Glória & honore coronasti eum, Domine.

Resp. Et constituisti eum super opera manuum tuarum.

By that same blood *Thomas* for thee expended,

Christ raise us thither, whither he ascended.

Vers. With glory and honour, thou hast crowned him, O Lord.

Ans. And has placed him over the works of thine hands.

ORATION.

Deus, pro cuius Ecclesia gloriosus Martyr & Pontifex, *Thomas* spoliis impiorum occubuit, precata quiescens, ut omnes qui eius implorant auxilium; petitionis sue solentem consequantur effectum.

Per Christum, &c.

LET US PRAY.

O God, for whose church the glorious Martyr and Bishop, *Thomas* was slain by the swords of wicked men: grant, we beseech thee, that all they who implore his aid, may obtain the moving effect of their petitions.

Through Christ, &c.

AT HIS TRANSLATION.

Deus qui nobis translationem *B. Thomæ Martyris* tui atque Pontificis celebrare concessis; te supplices exoramus ut ejus meritis, & precibus a vitis ad virtutes & a carcere transferamur ad regnum.

Jesus Christe per *Thomæ* vulnera,
 Quæ nos ligant relaxa scelera,
 Ne captivos serant ad infera,
 Hostis, Mundus, vel carnis opera,
 Per te *Thomæ*, post lævæ munera,
 Amplexatur nos Dei dextera.

O God, who givest us leave to celebrate the translation of *St. Thomas*, thy Martyr and Bishop; we humbly beseech thee, that by his merits and prayers, we may be translated from vice to virtue, and from the prison to the kingdom.

By blest *St. Thomas* wounds, O Jesus, please,
 Sin's cruel chains which bind us to release;
 Lest world or flesh, or devil, our sworn foe
 Hurry our captive souls to hell below:
 Let gifts of God's left hand, O *Thomas*, grace us
 And then, by thee, may his right embrace us.

We find in the first lesson on the translation of *Thomas*, "that *Honorious III.* granted such *Indulgences* to those who came yearly to solemnize his translation, as were never remembered to have been granted by any former Popes;" which seems to indicate that *Thomas* was more the Pope's martyr than Christ's: otherwise he might have found more proper occasions for those liberal grants, by imparting them, if within the sphere of the plenitude of his power, to those many famous sufferers for Christ, who made a more glorious confession of him, than ever *Thomas* did.

To make the evidence of this undoubted, and to shew not only the absurdity, but impiety of the foregoing devotions, it is requisite to give an account of

Thomas's story, by presenting the reader (out of their own authors, especially *Baronius*) with the first occasion of the quarrel between him and his King; to what height the contest was afterwards carried, the many mediations for agreement, and the cause of their being unsuccessful, and the conclusion of all in the death of this prelate, whom (as the prayer tells us) they would make a glorious martyr. When this is done, we shall find, I believe, that *Thomas* was rather a *rebel* than a *saint*, and see the most extravagant abuse in the Pope of a pretended power to canonize.*

Neubrigensis, who lived at this very time, tells us expressly, that the contest between King *Henry* the Second, who began to reign A. D. 1154 and *Thomas*, arose super prærogativa ordinis clericalis, about the prerogatives of the clergymen.† At this time when the King commanded malefactors, without any difference to be extirpated, it was intimated to him by the judges, that many thefts, rapines, homicides, against due order and public discipline were committed by the clergy, whom the rigour of the common law was not permitted to reach. *Baronius* acknowledges, that a Priest, who had committed murder, was thrust into a monastery after he was degraded; but *Thomas* would not deliver him to the secular courts.‡ And *Neubrigensis* says, that it was declared to the King, that more than a hundred murders were committed by the clergy of England.§ The rise of the

* *Alexander* III. advanced to the Tiara, or triple Crown in 1159, was the first Pope who assumed the power of canonizing Saints. The expence attending the canonization of a Saint, is computed to amount to 80000 florins, or 100000 pounds sterling.

† *Neubrig. de rebus Ang.* l. ii. cap. 16.

‡ *Bar. annal. ad an. 1163.* p. 482.

§ *Neub. ibid.*

quarrel is further represented by the bishops and clergy of the province of Canterbury, in their letters to the Pope,* "That the King finding the peace of his kingdom much molested by the outrageous excesses of some insolent clerks, referred their crimes to the Bishops, the Judges of the Church, that one sword might assist another; but the bishops persisted in this judgment, that murder, or any other notorious crime should only be punished, in the clergy by degradation; the King, on the other side, being of opinion, that this punishment did not equidignly answer the offence, neither was it sufficient provision for maintaining peace, if a Reader or Acolyte killing a man, eminent for religion or dignity, should escape only with the loss of his order." Let any man judge by this, whether the King had not apparently more of the zeal of a Saint in him, than the Archbishop: Did ever any Saint before this claim an exemption of any men in the case of murder? Can there be any pretence that their punishment should be less than that of others, who committing the same enormous crimes, yet deserve less favour, as they sin with greater malice, and by the example of their vices do greater mischief? "If I have spoken evil," says our Saviour, "hear witness of the evil, John xviii. 23. He was only concerned that he might not be smitten when he was innocent, but if any plain proof, either of his saying or doing wickedly could have been brought against him, he would not have excepted against any legal court, before which he might be tried. I read of an apostle that appealed to *Cæsar*, but of none in any case that appealed from him; and I am confident, no martyr among the primitive bishops, would have desired for any priest under him that had been a thief

* Bar. ad an. 1167, p. 546.

or a murderer, an exemption from a legal trial. *Neubrigensis* speaks not so much like a politician (as *Stapleton* would traduce him),* as like a good man that was sensible of the mischief of such exemptions, when he expresses himself thus: "The bishops, whilst they are watchful, rather to defend the liberties and dignities of the clergy, than to correct or cut off their vices, think they serve God and the Church when they defend the wicked clergy against public discipline; whom, according to the duty of their office, they have either no mind, or neglect to restrain with the vigour of canonical censure; whence it comes to pass, that clergymen, who are called into the Lord's lot, and ought in life and doctrine to shine upon earth as stars placed in the firmament of heaven; taking license and liberty, through impunity, to do whatever they please; reverence neither God, whose judgment they seem to despise, nor men that are in authority; when the Episcopal care about them languishes, and the prerogative of their holy order exempts them from secular jurisdiction."†

* Qui homo magis politicus fuit, quam Monachum, aut clericum, aut bonum Christianum decuit, *Stapleton* de tribus *Thomis*, p. 26.

† *Neubrig*, loc. cital.—In the days of ignorance and her godly daughter superstition, when a Priest, or one of the lowest officers of the Church was tried and found guilty in the King's courts; he was remanded, without any civil punishment to the ordinary, to be further dealt with according to the ecclesiastical canons. Whereupon the ordinary, not satisfied with the proofs adduced in the profane secular court, set himself formally to work to make a purgation of the offender by a new canonical trial, although he had been previously convicted by his country, or perhaps by his own confession. The trial was held before the Bishop in person, or his deputy, and by a jury of twelve clergymen; and there first, the party himself was required first, to make oath of his own innocence; next, there was to be the oath of twelve compurgators, who swore they believed he spoke the truth; then witnesses were examined upon oath, but on behalf of the prisoner only; and lastly, the jury were to bring in their verdict upon oath, which usually acquitted the prisoner; otherwise, if a clergyman, he was degraded, or put to penance. The reader cannot but remark, with indignation, the vast complication of perjury and subornation of perjury in this solemn farce of a mock trial; the witnesses, the compurgators, and the jury being all of them partakers in the guilt; the delinquent party also, though convicted before, on the clearest evidence, and conscious of his own offence, yet was permitted, and almost compelled to swear himself not guilty; nor was the good bishop himself, under whose coun-

The King, vexed at the many scandalous reports he had heard, demands of the Archbishop, that the wicked clergymen in question might be delivered to the secular court, which he refused to grant; whereupon the King, being very angry, asked him and the rest of the Prelates, whether they would observe his Regal Customs observed by Archbishops and Bishops, private and privileged persons in his grandfather's time; to which *Thomas* answered, that he would, *salvo ordine suo*, saving his order; but *Hilary*, Bishop of Cichester said, he would observe them *bona fide*, inviolably without that reservation. The King told *Thomas* his answer was captious, and required him to promise absolutely without any addition, which he refused. The Pope, being advertised of all these proceedings by *Thomas*, wrote letters to the Bishops, that by virtue of their canonical obedience to the See of Rome, they should not attempt any thing against the Ecclesiastical liberty or engage themselves in any promise or oath, save that which Bishops make to their Kings; and if they had promised any thing of that kind to the King, they should not observe but revoke it, and reconcile themselves to God and the Church, (meaning himself.)

After this, the King, Bishops, and lords of the kingdom assembled at Clarendon, where the ancient customs were produced, and *Thomas* having made a promise at Oxford to change the words which offended the King, was then and there challenged with his promise, which, in the beginning, he refused to perform, but afterwards, by the advice of some bishops and nobles, he was, at length persuaded to give his consent,

tenance this scene of wickedness was daily transacted, by any means exempt from share of it. And yet by this purgation the party was restored to his credit, his liberty, his lands, his capacity of purchasing a fresh, and entirely made a new and an innocent man. This is yet the mode of proceeding, in like cases, where Popery is uncontrolled.

bona fide, to observe the regal customs, and swore to it as the rest did ; but yet refused to set his seal to it. This oath troubled him very much, being sensible how much the ecclesiastical liberties were invaded by it, and he resolves to desist from the exercise of his priestly office. But the Pope, soon after, absolves him from his oath, requiring him not to forbear celebrating Mass upon this account *.

The King, upon *Thomas's* refusal to seal the writing, sought by his messengers to the Pope, to hinder him from being his Legate, which was usually bestowed upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to confer it upon the Archbishop of York. The Pope grants this request, and writes to *Thomas* to behave himself prudently, and discreetly, and obligingly to the King, and to do every thing to regain his favour that was consistent with his ecclesiastical order. But the next account † we have of him is, that he is endeavouring to fly into France without the King's leave, but was driven back by contrary winds. He is soon after summoned to a parliament at Northampton by the King ; in the morning before the meeting, he began Mass with the words proper to St. Stephen's day, (though it was not his day) " Princes sat and spake against me, &c." (a good beginning to pacify the King.) When he was called to give his answer to the charges against him, he declined the judgment of the court ; appealed to the Pope, and then departed ; but the cry of traitor followed close at his heels. The Bishop of Chichester told him, in full hearing of the court, " You have been our Archbishop, whom we were bound to obey, but because you have sworn fidelity to our Lord the King, and to keep the customs

* Bar. p. 488.

† P. 490.

which he requires, and you endeavour to destroy them, though tending to his worldly dignity and honour; we therefore pronounce you guilty of perjury, and we are not bound any longer to obey a perjured Archbishop. *Thomas*, soon after, steals away to Flanders, and resigns his Archbishopric to the Pope, acknowledging his entrance into it not to have been canonical, but by intrusion; but the Pope, by return of post, absolves him, and restores him to his former dignity without any previous formality.

Matters were now carried very high. The King ordered that Peter's pence should not be paid to the See of Rome, but be gathered and disbursed as the King directed; and the Pope, the better to raise *Thomas* above his adversaries and humble them, made him Legate over all England, excepting the province of York,* and required by his mandate delivered to the Bishop of London, that those who had received, by the King's orders, the revenues of the Church of Canterbury, should within two months make restitution, or be anathematised, and that Peter's pence should be gathered and delivered to such as he should appoint. And here it may not be amiss, before I proceed farther, to observe what pride and insolence *Thomas* expressed in his own letters, and the account others give of him. In his letter to the King, he speaks with a petulency unbecoming a subject, and with such silly reasoning as is unworthy a divine. †

* Baron. ad. sh. 1106, p. 524.

† These are the words of Pope *Gregory* the VII, one of *Thomas's* great oracles, which are cited "Decret. distinct. 96, c. 9. Quis dubitet," &c. You have such another argument of another Pope in the "Distinct. c. 7. Satis evidenter ostenditur a seculari Potestate nec ligari prorsus nec solvi posse Pontificem, quem constat a pio Principe Constantino Deum appellatum, nec posse Deum ab hominibus judicari, manifestum est;" which words, if he foolishly spoke them, (*Eusebius*, who was present at the Council of Nice, where they are pretended to be spoken, does not mention any such words in his writings) are falsely attributed to the Pope, whereas the Gloss confesses, that he spoke them of all the Clergy,

Expectans, expectavi, &c. Expecting I have expected, that the Lord would look upon you, and that being converted you would do penance, departing from your perverse ways (an humble style for a subject). Bishops whatsoever they are, though as men they do amiss, yet, if they fall not from the faith, they neither can nor ought to be censured by the secular power. Who questions but that Christ's Priests are the masters and fathers of Kings and Princes, and all the faithful; that it is a point of madness for a son or scholar to endeavour to subject his father or master to him, and with unjust obligations to reduce him under his commands, by whom he ought to believe, that he may be bound and loosed, not only on earth, but in heaven also. A learned argument, as if *Alexander* had nothing to do with *Aristotle*, had he been a traitor, because he was his preceptor. "Yield therefore, speedily, with all humility, and all manner of satisfaction. It is written* that none ought to judge the Priests but the Church, nor does it belong to temporal laws to sentence them. Christian Princes obeyed the orders of the Church, and did advance their power before them, and humbled their heads to the Bishops, instead of judging them, &c.

In his letters to the Bishops of the province of Canterbury, he begins thus,† "Most beloved brethren, why rise ye not with me against the malignants; why stand ye not with me against the workers of iniquity? He tells them, he had too much forborn the King of England; That having endeavoured to recall him from his per-

"Omnes Clericos Deus appellare;" and adds, "secundum hanc Rationem, nec ab Episcopis possunt judicari." According to this reasoning, says the Gloss, Clergymen cannot be judged by their Bishops.

* A fine Saint, indeed, who quotes the words of Pope *Gelasius*, (*Decret distinct. 96, c. 12.*) as if they were Scripture: he deserves to be called the Pope's martyr, whose sayings are as sacred with him as the Bible.

† *Baron. An. 537.*

verse purpose, it was now dangerous and intolerable to leave his and his great officers excesses against the Church of God, and ecclesiastical persons unpunished.* After invocation of the Holy Ghost, he condemns and declares void the Constitution of Clarendon,† and excommunicates all observers, counsellors, assistants and defenders of the same, and absolves the Bishops from the promise they had made to observe them, and excommunicates several persons by name; and writes letters to the Pope, to acquaint him with what he had done, in which he complains of the King, and threatens him shortly with the sentence of excommunication; telling the Pope, "We have not yet pronounced our sentence of excommunication against the King's person, but are likely to do it, unless he repents, and by what we have done, embraceth discipline."

In his letter to *William*, Cardinal of Papia, who came as Legate to compose matters, he says, "That all men's eyes were upon him, expecting the conclusion of this negotiation, according to which, *the insolence of Princes will exalt its horns, or, as it deserves, be suppressed*; and would to God, by your coming, it may rather sustain loss than recover strength ‡ In another to the Pope, he complains of the Bishops, that they gave horns to the sinner, meaning the King.§

By what you have now heard, you see, that *Thomas* was a man after the Pope's own heart, the fittest instrument he could ever meet with, by his pride and obstinacy, to carry on his design of bringing the power of the empire and kingdoms of Europe under the slavery of the Papacy; and therefore, we need

* In a letter to the Bishop of Hereford, he had the insolence to say, that Christ was again judged before the tribunal of a Prince, reflecting upon the charges laid against him by the King.

† Baron. ad. an 1168, p. 562.

‡ Ibid. p. 579.

§ Ibid. p. 547.

not be surprised, that when upon his resignation of his Arch-bishoprick to the Pope, some of the Cardinals were of opinion, that by the election of another Bishop, the king might be appeased, and *Thomas*, otherwise provided for. The Pope rejected this advice, and told the Cardinals, that if *Thomas's* cause was supported* with a constancy becoming the See of Rome, he would be a pattern for others, in a like case, for resisting princes; (a worthy premeditated design of the pretended Vicar of Christ) but if he was suffered to fall, all other Bishops would fall after him, and none, for the future, dare resist the power of Princes; by which means, the state of the Catholic Church would stagger, and the Pope's authority perish.

Having discovered a little of *Thomas's* temper, the reports of others may be the better credited. The Bishops, who went on an Embassy to Rome, accuse *Thomas* before the Pope of immoderation and imprudence, and adhering too much to his own unwarrantable opinions, his disturbing the tranquillity of the Church, and respect towards the King.† The Bishops and Dignitaries of his own province, in their letters, both to him and the Pope, make similar complaints. In those to him they tell him, that they entertained great hopes, when they heard he gave himself up to reading, prayers, and fasting, &c. that matters would tend to a peaceable reconciliation, but their hopes vanished, when they heard he had sent a commination, in which, without the formalities of a salutation, he rigorously threatened interdiction or excommunication to be pronounced against the King.‡ They desire him “That setting threatenings apart, he would embrace patience and humility, that he would commend his

* Baron. ad. an. 1664. p. 501. † Baron. *ibid.* p. 498. ‡ *Ibid.* 541.

cause to the Divine clemency, and himself to the grace and mercy of his Sovereign. They remind him of the favours the King had conferred on him; the troubles the Church now groaned under; the possibility, thro' his bitter provocations, the king might revolt from the Pope. They will not say, the king has never offended, but confidently pronounce, that he is ready to give satisfaction to his Holiness."

In their letters to the Pope, they excuse the King, that not out of any ambitious ends, or designs to oppress the liberty of the Church, but for creating a firm and lasting peace, he had searched and produced the customs and dignities of his Kingdom,* "which had been anciently observed, and quietly submitted to, by ecclesiastical persons in the reigns of former kings. If there was any thing contained in them dangerous to his soul, or ignominious to the Church, he has saredly promised to reform the same by the advice and counsel of the Church of his kingdom. That these contentions had been quieted e'er now, had it not been for the turbulent provocations of the Arch-bishop, who had threatened the King with terrific letters, unbecoming the devotion of a Father, and by no means savouring of the meekness of a Bishop; who had excommunicated some of his Majesty's intimates, the chief Peers of the realm, by whom the counsels and affairs of the kingdom were managed, and this without citing them, or hearing their defence. They instance the Bishop of Salisbury, whom absent and unconvicted, he had suspended from his office," which they call a preposterous and disorderly way of proceeding, &c.

In the year 1165, in consequence of some correspondence between the king and the Pope a meeting was agreed upon; but *Thomas* persuaded the Pope, to de-

* Baron. ad. an. p. 547.

and the meeting, if he himself was not present; insinuating, in the mean time, the king's cunning and subtilty, which, as he said, he was well acquainted with. But the king knowing the furious spirit of *Thomas*, would not consent to a conference in his presence, and thus the appointment came to nothing.* Here it is proper to take notice of the report which *William* and *Odo*, whom I mentioned before, made to the Pope.† They tell him, they found the controversy betwixt the king and *Thomas*, aggravated to a greater pitch than they could have wished. That the king and many of the nobility affirmed, they had evident demonstrations, that *Thomas* endeavoured to incense the King of France against him, and induced his cousin, the Earl of Flanders to foment a misunderstanding with him; and raise as powerful an army, as he could levy against him. That the king offered, if any things were added, in his time, contrary to ecclesiastical laws, he would submit them to his holiness, with full liberty to cancel them, if he thought proper. That they had appointed a conference, which he, for some time declined, and at last would meet in no place but where he thought proper to appoint. That, when he came at last, to the conference, and was exhorted by them to demean himself humbly to the king, who had been his singular benefactor, he answered that he had sufficiently humbled himself to the king, saving his honour to God, the liberty of the Church, the reputation of his own person, the possessions of the Churches, and saving the justice due to him and his. We demanded whether he would submit himself to our judgment, as the king and bishops promised they would do, to which he replied, that he had received no documents from you (the Pope) for that purpose; but if he and his might first be restored, he would then proceed as he should be commanded by the Apostolic

* *Idem*. ad. an. 1168. † *Ibid*. p. 568.

See ; and so, say they, the conference ended, whereas his words tended neither to judgment nor agreement, neither would he, by any means enter into the matter ; and we, by your authority, absolutely forbade the Archbishop, that he should attempt nothing against the kingdom, persons, or churches of the realm.

We have an account from the above named *Odo* of the King's inclination to peace, and his many condescensions towards it. When this Cardinal, before he departed, seriously expostulated with the King, that he would be reconciled to the Arch-bishop ; the King answered him, " that for love he bore to the Pope and Cardinals, he would permit the Arch-bishop to return to his See, in peace, and dispose of his Church and what belonged to it : and because there had been long contests about the Customs, which *Thomas* falsely represented, as innovations, to the Pope, he said, that he and his children would be contented with those which should be made evident his ancestors enjoyed, by the oaths of an hundred Englishmen, an hundred Normans, and an hundred persons of Anjou, and other places belonging to him. That if this condition displeased the Arch-bishop, he said he was willing to submit to the arbitration both of the Bishops of England, and those beyond sea, viz. his French subjects. And if this did not suffice, he would submit to the judgment of the Pope, with this reservation, that he would not encroach upon his children's right ; for, during his own life he was contented, the Pope should abrogate what he pleased. Being farther asked what restitution he would make to the Arch-bishop and his adherents, his answer was, that what he had received, he bestowed it on the Churches and the poor.*

The same year the King of France interposed as a mediator, and procures a conference between the King

* *Idem.* p. 579.

and *Thomas* in his presence.* After a few ceremonies, *Thomas* fell down at the King's feet, saying, I commit the whole cause, whence the difference has risen between us, to your discretion, *saving the honor of God*, which last words the King was offended with, and said to the King of France, "Mark, my Lord, whatever displeases this man, he says it is contrary to the honor of God, whereby he challenges not only his own, but what belongs to me; but that it may appear that I neither oppose God's honor, nor his, I make this offer, There have been many Kings of England before me, of greater or lesser authority than myself, and there have been before him, many great and holy men, Arch-bishops of Canterbury; whatever the more eminent and virtuous of his predecessors have done to the least of my predecessors, let him do to me, and I shall rest satisfied." Upon this a general acclamation was heard "the King has more than sufficiently humbled himself." The King of France added, "My Lord Arch-bishop, will you be greater than holy men? Will you exalt yourself above *Peter*? What can you further desire? (*Thomas* was silent all this time;) Lo, peace is even at the door. The Peers of both Kingdoms were so little satisfied with his answers, that they all imputed the want of peace to his arrogance; one Earl openly protesting, that, as the Arch-bishop resisted the counsel and determination of both Kingdoms, he was not worthy, hereafter, of the assistance of either. Then, both Kings took horse, without saluting the Arch-bishop; and the Courtiers, who were mediators for peace, at their departure, charged him to his face, that he was always proud, high-minded, arrogant, wise in his own eyes, follower of his own will and opinion, adding, it was a great detriment to the Church, that he was ever made a governor of it.

* *Idem*, ad. an. p. 579.

The next year the Pope sent two other Nuncios, *Gratian* and *Vivian* * upon the same pretences of making peace, and a final adjustment of matters, (that is to try again whether the King would be brought to condescend to part with his ancient rights; you are to remark, there was no dispute whether they had been his rights or no, but the Pope and *Thomas* would either persuade, or threaten him out of them; and on their part, offer nothing towards peace upon any other terms.) But those Legates had ample commission to exercise ecclesiastical severity upon the King himself, or kingdom, or any part of the realm, as should seem expedient for the good of the Church. They had a conference with the King, from which he angrily withdrew † grievously complaining of the Pope, that he would not yield, in any measure, and swore he would take another course. To whom *Gratian* replied, "Threaten not, my Lord, for we fear no threats, we belong to a court accustomed to rule over Emperors and Kings." They had many conferences, but nothing finally concluded towards an accommodation; the Nuncios would not admit this clause which he would have inserted in the agreement, (saving the dignity of the kingdom) and the king would not agree without it. Now the *Vatican* begins to thunder, ‡ the Pope denounces the sentence of excommunication against such as received *Investitures*, or any *Ecclesiastical Benefices* from the hands of laymen, unless within forty days they resigned such benefices and the profits of them into the hands of those to whom they did appertain. Sometime after this, the Pope sends *Simon*, Prior of God's Mount, and *Bernard de Corilo*, with comminatory letters to the King, telling him, he is no

* *Idem*. ad an. 1169.

† *Idem* ad an. 1170, p. 606.

‡ *Baron*. p. 598.

longer resolved to tolerate the hardness of his heart against justice and the Pope's safety ; not to shut any longer the mouth of the Archbishop, but freely permit him to execute his office, and with the sword of ecclesiastical severity to revenge the injuries offered himself and his Church. This embassy was as fruitless as the former, because *Thomas* still used the old reservations of the " Honour of God and saving his order, and the King insisted that he should observe the deference which his predecessors paid to former kings."

The next year the Pope sent the Archbishop of Roan, the Bishop of Nivers, and the Bishop of Sens, as Legates, to make the following demands. That *Thomas* should return to his Church, and receive all the possessions taken from it ; that those who had been exiled for his sake, should be restored to their former dignities and estates ; that the King should grant *Thomas* a full peace and a holy kiss ; and should abolish the wicked customs contrary to the liberty of the Church, &c. which were to be performed in forty days time, and if, within that time, matters were not agreed upon, they should presently interdict the province on this side the seas, where the King then kept his court. Whilst these things were transacting, another difference arose. The King having declared that he would have his son crowned in his life time, and that it should be performed in *Thomas's* absence by the Archbishop of York ; the Pope sent letters to that Archbishop, and to the rest of the Bishops, requiring them, upon the peril of losing their office and order, not to crown or anoint him, while *Thomas* was in exile, † because that office was the prerogative of the

† This is manifestly false, for *Thomas* stole out of the kingdom contrary to the King's orders.

See of Canterbury. *Thomas* also forwarded letters forbidding the same. Upon this the King caused the Bishops to take an oath, not to obey the constitutions of the Pope and Archbishop forbidding the same. The young King being crowned by the Archbishop and his assisting suffragans, they were suspended by the Pope from the execution of their episcopal functions; and the Pope in his letters threatened the King,* that if the peace between him and *Thomas* was not concluded in the prefixed time, he must then expect the same sentence which he had pronounced against *Frederick* the Emperor, which so startled the King, that he promised his Legate to perform what the Pope commanded. But before the treaty began with the Legates, *Thomas* prepared them how to proceed with the King. He tells them, "They could not easily discover the manifold deceits of that *prodigy*, and, therefore, whatever the King says, whatever shape he puts on, they ought to suspect as full of deceit, unless approved of by his deeds; for if he perceives that he can corrupt you with promises, or terrify you with menaces, he will scorn and contemn you; but if he sees he cannot bend you from your purpose, he will counterfeit an outrageous passion; first, he will swear, then forswear, and change shapes as *Proteus* did, and will, at last, come to himself; and then, unless it be your fault you may become a God to *Pharaoh*, you may wind him as you please."

* Baron. *ibid.* 615.

END OF THE FIRST PART.



