

through faith in Christ, the Spirit of God witnessing with his spirit that he is a child of God; may study to have a conscience void of offence, both toward God and toward man: He may freely enjoy every blessing which God hath bestowed upon our own Church; and may make advantage of whatever good the providence of God has still preserved in the Church of Rome: He may cheerfully look for a happy death, and a blessed eternity; and at length, by resting on Christ alone, and patiently partaking of his sufferings, he may, with certain hope of a resurrection to eternal life, without any fear either of purgatory or hell, resign his spirit into the hand of God, and so be ever with the Lord.

POPERY CALMLY CONSIDERED.

TO THE READER.

IN the following Tract, I propose, First, to lay down and examine the chief doctrines of the Church of Rome: Secondly, to show the natural tendency of a few of those doctrines; and that with all the plainness and all the calmness I can.

SECTION I.

OF THE CHURCH, AND THE RULE OF FAITH.

1. THE Papists judge it necessary to salvation, to be subject to the Pope, as the one visible head of the Church.

But we read in Scripture, that Christ is the Head of the Church, "from whom the whole body is fitly joined together." (Col. ii. 19.) The Scripture does not mention any visible head of the Church; much less does it mention the Pope as such; and least of all does it say, that it is necessary to salvation to be subject to him.

2. The Papists say, The Pope is Christ's Vicar, St. Peter's successor, and has the supreme power on earth over the whole Church.

We answer, Christ gave no such power to St. Peter himself. He gave no Apostle pre-eminence over the rest. Yea,

St. Paul was so far from acknowledging St. Peter's supremacy, that he withstood him to the face, (Gal. ii. 11,) and asserted himself "not to be behind the chief of the Apostles."

Neither is it certain, that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; no, nor that he ever was there.

But they say, "Is not Rome the mother, and therefore the mistress, of all Churches?"

We answer, No. "The word of the Lord went forth from Jerusalem." There the Church began. She, therefore, not the Church of Rome, is the mother of all Churches.

The Church of Rome, therefore, has no right to require any person to believe what she teaches on her sole authority.

3. St. Paul says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

The Scripture, therefore, being delivered by men divinely inspired, is a rule sufficient of itself: So it neither needs, nor is capable of, any farther addition.

Yet the Papists add tradition to Scripture, and require it to be received with equal veneration. By traditions, they mean, "such points of faith and practice as have been delivered down in the Church from hand to hand without writing." And for many of these, they have no more Scripture to show, than the Pharisees had for their traditions.

4. The Church of Rome not only adds tradition to Scripture, but several entire books; namely, Tobit and Judith, the Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two books of Maccabees, and a new part of Esther and of Daniel; "which whole books," says the Church of Rome, "whoever rejects, let him be accursed."

We answer, We cannot but reject them. We dare not receive them as part of the Holy Scriptures. For none of these books were received as such by the Jewish Church, "to whom were committed the oracles of God:" (Rom. iii. 2:) Neither by the ancient Christian Church, as appears from the 60th Canon of the Council of Laodicea; wherein is a catalogue of the books of Scriptures, without any mention of these.

5. As the Church of Rome, on the one hand, adds to the Scripture, so, on the other hand, she forbids the people to read them. Yea, they are forbid to read so much as a summary or historical compendium of them in their own tongue.

Nothing can be more inexcusable than this. Even under the law, the people had the Scriptures in a tongue vulgarly known; and they were not only permitted, but required, to read them; yea, to be constantly conversant therein. (Deut. vi. 6, &c.) Agreeable to this, our Lord commands to search the Scriptures; and St. Paul directs, that his Epistle be read in all the Churches. (1 Thess. v. 27.) Certainly this Epistle was wrote in a tongue which all of them understood.

But they say, "If people in general were to read the Bible, it would do them more harm than good." Is it any honour to the Bible to speak thus? But supposing some did abuse it, is this any sufficient reason for forbidding others to use it? Surely no. Even in the days of the Apostles, there were some "unstable and ignorant men," who wrested both St. Paul's Epistles, and the other Scriptures, "to their own destruction." But did any of the Apostles, on this account, forbid other Christians to read them? You know they did not: They only cautioned them not to be "led away by the error of the wicked." And certainly the way to prevent this is, not to keep the Scriptures from them; (for "they were written for our learning;") but to exhort all to the diligent perusal of them, lest they should "err, not knowing the Scriptures."

6. "But seeing the Scripture may be misunderstood, how are we to judge of the sense of it? How can we know the sense of any scripture, but from the sense of the Church?"

We answer, (1.) The Church of Rome is no more the Church in general, than the Church of England is. It is only one particular branch of the catholic or universal Church of Christ, which is the whole body of believers in Christ, scattered over the whole earth. (2.) We therefore see no reason to refer any matter in dispute to the Church of Rome, more than any other Church; especially as we know, neither the Bishop nor the Church of Rome is any more infallible than ourselves. (3.) In all cases, the Church is to be judged by the Scripture, not the Scripture by the Church. And Scripture is the best expounder of Scripture. The best way, therefore, to understand it, is carefully to compare Scripture with Scripture, and thereby learn the true meaning of it.

SECTION II.

OF REPENTANCE AND OBEDIENCE.

1. THE Church of Rome teaches, that "the deepest repentance or contrition avails nothing without confession to a Priest; but that, with this, attrition, or the fear of hell, is sufficient to reconcile us to God."

This is very dangerously wrong, and flatly contrary to Scripture; for the Scripture says, "A broken and contrite heart, thou, O God, wilt not despise." (Psalm li. 17.) And the same texts which make contrition sufficient without confession, show that attrition even with it is insufficient. Now, as the former doctrine, of the insufficiency of contrition without confession, makes that necessary which God has not made necessary; so the latter, of the sufficiency of attrition with confession, makes that unnecessary which God has made necessary.

2. The Church of Rome teaches, that "good works truly merit eternal life."

This is flatly contrary to what our Saviour teaches: "When ye have done all those things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: We have done that which was our duty to do." (Luke xvii. 10.) A command to do it, grace to obey that command, "and a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," must for ever cut off all pretence of merit from all human obedience.

3. That a man may truly and properly merit hell, we grant; although he never can merit heaven. But if he does merit hell, yet, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, he need never go there. For "the Church has power to grant him an indulgence, which remits both the fault and the punishment."

Some of these indulgences extend only to so many days; some, to so many weeks; but others extend to a man's whole life; and this is called a plenary indulgence.

These indulgences are to be obtained by going pilgrimages, by reciting certain prayers, or (which is abundantly the most common way) by paying the stated price of it.

Now, can anything under heaven be imagined more horrid, more execrable than this? Is not this a manifest prostitution of religion to the basest purposes? Can any possible method be contrived, to make sin more cheap and easy? Even the Popish

Council of Trent acknowledged this abuse, and condemned it in strong terms; but they did not in any degree remove the abuse which they acknowledged. Nay, two of the Popes under whom the Council sat, Pope Paul III., and Julius III., proceeded in the same course with their predecessors, or rather exceeded them; for they granted to such of the Fraternity of the Holy Altar as visited the Church of St. Hilary of Chartres during the six weeks of Lent, seven hundred and seventy-five thousand seven hundred years of pardon.

4. This miserable doctrine of indulgences is founded upon another bad doctrine, that of works of supererogation; for the Church of Rome teaches, that there is "an overplus of merit in the saints; and that this is a treasure committed to the Church's custody, to be disposed as she sees meet."

But this doctrine is utterly irreconcilable with the following scriptures:—"The sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us;" (Rom. viii. 18;) and "Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God." (Rom. xiv. 12.) For if there be no comparison betwixt the reward and the sufferings, then no one has merit to transfer to another; and if every one must give an account of himself to God, then no one can be saved by the merit of another. But suppose there were a superabundance of merits in the saints, yet we have no need of them, seeing there is such an infinite value in what Christ hath done and suffered for us; seeing He alone hath "by one offering perfected for ever them that are sanctified." (Heb. x. 14.)

5. But where do the souls of those go after death, who die in a state of grace, but yet are not sufficiently purged from sin to enter into heaven?

The Church of Rome says, "They go to purgatory, a purging fire near hell, where they continue till they are purged from all their sins, and so made meet for heaven."

Nay, that those who die in a state of grace, go into a place of torment, in order to be purged in the other world, is utterly contrary to Scripture. Our Lord said to the penitent thief upon the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Now, if a purgation in another world were necessary for any, he that did not repent and believe till the last hour of his life might well be supposed to need it; and consequently ought to have been sent to purgatory, not to paradise.

6. Very near akin to that of purgatory, is the doctrine of *Limbus Patrum*. For the Church of Rome teaches, that "before the death and resurrection of Christ, the souls of good men departed were detained in a certain place, called *Limbus Patrum*, which is the uppermost part of hell." "The lowermost," they say, "is the place of the damned; next above this is purgatory; next to that, *Limbus Infantum*, or the place where the souls of infants are."

It might suffice to say, there is not one word of all this in Scripture. But there is much against it. We read that Elijah was taken up into heaven; (2 Kings ii. 11;) and he and Moses "appeared in glory." (Luke ix. 31.) And Abraham is represented as in paradise, (Luke xvi. 22,) the blessed abode of good men in the other world. Therefore, none of these were in the *Limbus Patrum*. Consequently, if the Bible is true, there is no such place.

SECTION III.

OF DIVINE WORSHIP.

1. THE service of the Roman Church consists of prayers to God, angels, and saints; of Lessons, and of Confessions of Faith.

All their service is everywhere performed in the Latin tongue, which is nowhere vulgarly understood. Yea, it is required; and a curse is denounced against all those who say it ought to be performed in the vulgar tongue.

This irrational and unscriptural practice destroys the great end of public worship. The end of this is, the honour of God in the edification of the Church. The means to this end is, to have the service so performed as may inform the mind and increase devotion. But this cannot be done by that service which is performed in an unknown tongue.

What St. Paul judged of this is clear from his own words: "If I know not the meaning of the voice," (of him that speaks in a public assembly,) "he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me." (1 Cor. xiv. 11.) Again: "If thou shalt bless by the Spirit," (by the gift of an unknown tongue,) "how shall the unlearned say Amen?" (Verse 16.) How can the people be profited by the Lessons, answer at the

Responses, be devout in their Prayers, confess their faith in the Creeds, when they do not understand what is read, prayed, and confessed? It is manifest, then, that the having any part of divine worship in an unknown tongue is as flatly contrary to the word of God as it is to reason.

2. From the manner of worship in the Church of Rome, proceed we to the objects of it. Now, the Romanists worship, besides angels, the Virgin Mary and other saints. They teach that angels, in particular, are to be "worshipped, invoked, and prayed to." And they have Litanies and other Prayers composed for that purpose.

In flat opposition to all this, the words of our Saviour are, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." To evade this, they say, "The worship we give to angels is not the same kind with that which we give to God." Vain words! What kind of worship is peculiar to God, if prayer is not? Surely God alone can receive all our prayers, and give what we pray for. We honour the angels, as they are God's Ministers; but we dare not worship or pray to them; it is what they themselves refuse and abhor. So, when St. John "fell down at the feet of the angel to worship him, he said, See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant: Worship God." (Rev. xix. 10.)

3. The Romanists also worship saints. They pray to them as their intercessors; they confess their sins to them; they offer incense and make vows to them. Yea, they venerate their very images and relics.

Now, all this is directly contrary to Scripture. And, First, the worshipping them as intercessors. For, as "there is but one God to us, though there are gods many, and lords many;" so, according to Scripture, there is but one Intercessor or Mediator to us. (1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.) And suppose the angels or saints intercede for us in heaven; yet may we no more worship them, than, because "there are gods many on earth," we may worship them as we do the true God.

The Romanists allow, "There is only one Mediator of redemption;" but say, "There are many mediators of intercession." We answer, The Scripture knows no difference between a mediator of intercession and of redemption. He alone "who died and rose again" for us, makes intercession for us at the right hand of God. And he alone has a right to our prayers; nor dare we address them to any other.

4. The worship which the Romanists give to the Virgin Mary, is beyond what they give either to angels or other saints. In one of their public offices, they say, "Command thy Son by the right of a mother." They pray to her to "loose the bands of the guilty, to bring light to the blind, to make them mild and chaste, and to cause their hearts to burn in love to Christ."

Such worship as this cannot be given to any creature, without gross, palpable idolatry. We honour the blessed Virgin as the mother of the Holy Jesus, and as a person of eminent piety: But we dare not give worship to her; for it belongs to God alone.

Meantime, we cannot but wonder at the application which the Church of Rome continually makes to her, of whose acts on earth the Scripture so sparingly speaks. And it says nothing of what they so pompously celebrate, her assumption into heaven, or of her exaltation to a throne above angels or archangels. It says nothing of her being "the mother of grace and mercy, the Queen of the gate of heaven," or of her "power to destroy all heresies," and bring "all things to all."

5. The Romanists pay a regard to the relics of the saints also; which is a kind of worship. By relics, they mean the bodies of the saints, or any remains of them, or particular things belonging or relating to them when they were alive; as an arm or thigh, bones or ashes; or the place where, or the things by which, they suffered. They venerate these, in order to obtain the help of the saints. And they believe, "by these many benefits are conferred on mankind; that by these relics of the saints, the sick have been cured, the dead raised, and devils cast out."

We read of good King Hezekiah, that "he brake in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made." (2 Kings xviii. 4.) And the reason was, because the children of Israel burnt incense to it. By looking up to this, the people bitten by the fiery serpents had been healed. And it was preserved from generation to generation, as a memorial of that divine operation. Yet, when it was abused to idolatry, he ordered it to be broke in pieces. And were these true relics of the saints, and did they truly work these miracles, yet that would be no sufficient cause for the worship that is given them. Rather, this worship would be a good reason, according to Hezekiah's practice, for giving them a decent interment.

6. Let us next consider what reverence the Church of Rome requires to be given to images and pictures. She requires "to kiss them, to uncover the head, to fall down before them, and use all such postures of worship as they would do to the persons represented, if present." And, accordingly, "the Priest is to direct the people to them, that they may be worshipped." They say, indeed, that, in falling down before the image, they "worship the saint or angel whom it represents." We answer, (1.) We are absolutely forbidden in Scripture to worship saints or angels themselves. (2.) We are expressly forbidden "to fall down and worship any image or likeness of anything in heaven or earth," whomsoever it may represent. This, therefore, is flat idolatry, directly contrary to the commandment of God.

7. Such, likewise, without all possibility of evasion, is the worship they pay to the cross. They pray that God may make the wood of the cross to "be the stability of faith, an increase of good works, the redemption of souls." They use all expressions of outward adoration, as kissing, and falling down before it. They pray directly to it, to "increase grace in the ungodly, and blot out the sins of the guilty." Yea, they give *latria* to it. And this, they themselves say, "is the sovereign worship that is due only to God."

But indeed they have no authority of Scripture for their distinction between *latria* and *dulia*; the former of which they say is due to God alone, the latter that which is due to saints. But here they have forgotten their own distinction. For although they own *latria* is due only to God, yet they do in fact give it to the cross. This then, by their own account, is flat idolatry.

8. And so it is to represent the blessed Trinity by pictures and images, and to worship them. Yet these are made in every Romish country, and recommended to the people to be worshipped; although there is nothing more expressly forbidden in Scripture, than to make any image or representation of God. God himself never appeared in any bodily shape. The representation of "the Ancient of days," mentioned in Daniel, was a mere prophetic figure; and did no more literally belong to God, than the eyes or ears that are ascribed to him in Scripture.

SECTION IV.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

1. THE Church of Rome says, "A sacrament is a sensible thing, instituted by God himself, as a sign and a means of grace.

"The sacraments are seven: Baptism, confirmation, the Lord's supper, penance, extreme unction, orders, and marriage.

"The parts of a sacrament are, the matter, and the form, or words of consecration. So in baptism, the matter is water; the form, 'I baptize thee,' &c.

On this we remark, Peter Lombard lived about one thousand one hundred and forty years after Christ. And he was the first that ever determined the sacraments to be seven. St. Austin (a greater than he) positively affirms, "that there are but two of divine institution."

Again: To say that a sacrament consists of matter and form, and yet either has no form, as confirmation and extreme unction, (neither of which is ever pretended to have any form of words, instituted by God himself,) or has neither matter nor form, as penance or marriage, is to make them sacraments and no sacraments. For they do not answer that definition of a sacrament which themselves have given.

2. However, they teach that "all these seven confer grace *ex opere operato*, by the work itself, on all such as do not put an obstruction." Nay, it is not enough that we do not put an obstruction. In order to our receiving grace, there is also required previous instruction, true repentance, and a degree of faith; and even then the grace does not spring merely *ex opere operato*: It does not proceed from the mere elements, or the words spoken; but from the blessing of God, in consequence of his promise to such as are qualified for it.

Equally erroneous is that doctrine of the Church of Rome, that, "in order to the validity of any sacrament, it is absolutely necessary the person who administers it should do it with an holy intention." For it follows, that, wherever there is not this intention, the sacrament is null and void. And so there is no certainty whether the Priest, so called, be a real Priest; for who knows the intention of him that ordained him? And if he be not, all his ministrations are of

course null and void. But if he be, can I be sure that his intention was holy, in administering the baptism or the Lord's supper? And if it was not, they are no sacraments at all, and all our attendance on them is lost labour.

3. So much for the sacraments in general: Let us now proceed to particulars:—

"Baptism," say the Romanists, "may, in case of necessity, be administered by women, yea, by Jews, infidels, or heretics." No; our Lord gave this commission only to the Apostles, and their successors in the ministry.

The ceremonies which the Romanists use in baptism are these:—

Before baptism, (1.) Chrism; that is, oil mixed with water is to be consecrated. (2.) Exorcism; that is, the Priest is to blow in the face of the child, saying, "Go out of him, Satan!" (3.) He crosses the forehead, eyes, breast, and several other parts of the body. (4.) He puts exorcised salt into his mouth, saying, "Take the salt of wisdom." (5.) He puts spittle in the palm of his left hand, puts the fore-finger of his right hand into it, and anoints the child's nose and ears therewith, who is then brought to the water.

After baptism, First, he anoints the top of the child's head with chrism, as a token of salvation: Secondly, he puts on him a white garment, in token of his innocence: And, Thirdly, he puts a lighted candle into his hand, in token of the light of faith.

Now, what can any man of understanding say in defence of these idle ceremonies, utterly unknown in the primitive Church, as well as unsupported by Scripture? Do they add dignity to the ordinance of God? Do they not rather make it contemptible?

4. The matter of confirmation is the chrism; which is an ointment consecrated by the Bishop. The form is the words he uses in crossing the forehead with the chrism; namely, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

Then the person confirmed, setting his right foot on the right foot of his godfather, is to have his head bound with a clean head-band; which, after some days, is to be taken off, and reserved till the next Ash-Wednesday, to be then burnt to holy ashes.

The Roman Catechism says, "Sacraments cannot be instituted by any beside God." But it must be allowed, Christ did not institute confirmation; therefore it is no sacrament at all.

5. We come now to one of the grand doctrines of the Church of Rome,—that which regards the Lord's supper. This, therefore, we would wish to consider with the deepest attention. They say, "In the Lord's supper whole Christ is really, truly, and substantially contained; God-Man, body and blood, bones and nerves, under the appearance of bread and wine."

They attempt to prove it thus: "Our Lord himself says, 'This is my body.' Therefore, upon consecration there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the whole substance of Christ's body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; and this we term transubstantiation.

"Yet we must not suppose that Christ is broken, when the host, or consecrated bread, is broken; because there is whole and entire Christ, under the species of every particle of bread, and under the species of every drop of wine."

We answer: No such change of the bread into the body of Christ can be inferred from his words, "This is my body." For it is not said, "This is *changed* into my body," but, "This *is* my body;" which, if it were to be taken literally, would rather prove the substance of the bread to be his body. But that they are not to be taken literally is manifest from the words of St. Paul, who calls it bread, not only before, but likewise after, the consecration. (1 Cor. x. 17; xi. 26—28.) Here we see, that what was called his body, was bread at the same time. And accordingly these elements are called by the Fathers, "the images, the symbols, the figure, of Christ's body and blood."

Scripture and antiquity, then, are flatly against transubstantiation. And so are our very senses. Now, our Lord himself appealed to the senses of his disciples: "Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." (Luke xxiv. 39.) Take away the testimony of our senses, and there is no discerning a body from a spirit. But if we believe transubstantiation, we take away the testimony of all our senses.

And we give up our reason too: For if every particle of the

host is as much the whole body of Christ as the whole host is before it is divided, then a whole may be divided, not into parts, but into wholes. For divide and subdivide it over and over, and it is whole still ! It is whole before the division, whole in the division, whole after the division ! Such nonsense, absurdity, and self-contradiction all over is the doctrine of transubstantiation !

6. An evil practice attending this evil doctrine is, the depriving the laity of the cup in the Lord's supper. It is acknowledged by all, that our Lord instituted and delivered this sacrament in both kinds ; giving the wine as well as the bread to all that partook of it ; and that it continued to be so delivered in the Church of Rome for above a thousand years. And yet, notwithstanding this, the Church of Rome now forbids the people to drink of the cup ! A more insolent and barefaced corruption cannot easily be conceived !

Another evil practice in the Church of Rome, utterly unheard of in the ancient Church, is, that when there is none to receive the Lord's supper, the Priest communicates alone. (Indeed it is not properly to communicate, when one only receives it.) This likewise is an absolute innovation in the Church of God.

But the greatest abuse of all in the Lord's supper is, the worshipping the consecrated bread. And this the Church of Rome not only practises, but positively enjoins. These are her words : "The same sovereign worship which is due to God, is due to the host. Adore it ; pray to it. And whosoever holds it unlawful so to do, let him be accursed."

The Romanists themselves grant, that if Christ is not corporally present in the Lord's supper, this is idolatry. And that he is not corporally present anywhere but in heaven, we learn from Acts i. 11 ; iii. 21. Thither he went, and there he will continue, "till the time of the restitution of all things."

7. Consider we now what the Romanists hold, concerning the sacrament of penance.

"The matter of the sacrament of penance is, contrition, confession, and satisfaction ; the form, 'I absolve thee.'"

We object to this : You say, "The matter of a sacrament is something sensible," perceivable by our senses. But if so, penance is not a sacrament. For surely contrition is not something perceivable by the outward senses !

Again: They say, "Confession is a particular discovery of all mortal sins to a Priest, with all their circumstances, as far as they can be called to mind; without which there can be no forgiveness or salvation."

We answer: Although it is often of use to confess our sins to a spiritual guide, yet to make confessing to a Priest necessary to forgiveness and salvation, is "teaching for doctrines the commandment of men." And to make it necessary in all cases is to lay a dangerous snare both for the Confessor and the confessed.

They go on: "The sentence pronounced by the Priest in absolution, is pronounced by the Judge himself. All the sins of the sinner are thereby pardoned, and an entrance opened into heaven."

We cannot allow it. We believe the absolution pronounced by the Priest is only declarative and conditional. For judicially to pardon sin and absolve the sinner, is a power God has reserved to himself.

Once more: You say, "Satisfaction is a compensation made to God by alms, &c., for all offences committed against him."

We answer, (1.) It cannot be that we should satisfy God, by any of our works. For, (2.) Nothing can make satisfaction to Him, but the obedience and death of his Son.

8. We proceed to what they call "the sacrament of extreme unction." "The matter," they say, "of extreme unction is, oil consecrated by the Bishop, and applied to the eyes, ears, mouth, hands, feet, and reins of a person supposed to be near death." The form is: "By this holy anointing, God pardon thee for whatever thou hast offended by the eyes, ears, mouth, or touch."

We reply: When the Apostles were sent forth, "they anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them;" (Mark vi. 13;) using this as a sign of the miraculous cures to be wrought. And St. James accordingly directs: "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the Elders of the Church; let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick." (v. 14, 15.) But what has this to do with the extreme unction of the Church of Rome? In the first Church, this anointing was a mere rite: In the Church of Rome, it is made a sacrament! It was used in the first Church for the body; it is used in

the Church of Rome for the soul: It was used then for the recovery of the sick; now, for those only that are thought past recovery. It is easy, therefore, to see, that the Romish extreme unction has no foundation in Scripture.

9. We are now to consider what the Church of Rome delivers concerning ordination. "This," says she, "is properly a sacrament. He that denies it, let him be accursed."

"The orders received in the Church of Rome are seven: The Priest, the Deacon, the Subdeacon, the Acolythus, to carry the candle; the Exorcist, to cast out devils; the Reader, and Door-keeper."

On this, we observe, It is not worth disputing, whether ordination should be called a sacrament or not. Let the word then pass: But we object to the thing; there is no divine authority for any order under a Deacon. Much less is there any Scriptural authority for the forms of conjuration prescribed to the Exorcists; or for the rites prescribed in exorcising not only men, women, and children, but likewise houses, cattle, milk, butter, or fruits, said to be infested with the devil.

10. The next of their sacraments, so called, is marriage; concerning which they pronounce, "Marriage is truly and properly a sacrament. He that denies it so to be, let him be accursed."

We answer, In one sense it may be so. For St. Austin says, "Signs, when applied to religious things, are called sacraments." In this large sense, he calls the sign of the cross a sacrament; and others give this name to washing the feet. But it is not a sacrament according to the Romish definition of the word; for it no more "confers grace," than washing the feet or signing with the cross.

A more dangerous error in the Church of Rome is, the forbidding the Clergy to marry. "Those that are married may not be admitted into orders: Those that are admitted may not marry: And those that, being admitted, do marry, are to be separated."

The Apostle, on the contrary, says, "Marriage is honourable in all;" (Heb. xiii. 4;) and accuses those who "forbid to marry," of teaching "doctrines of devils." How lawful it was for the Clergy to marry, his directions concerning it show. (1 Tim. iv. 1, 3.) And how convenient, yea, necessary, in many cases it is, clearly appears from the innumerable

mischiefs which have in all ages followed the prohibition of it in the Church of Rome; which so many wise and good men, even of her own communion, have lamented.

I have now fairly stated, and calmly considered, most of the particular doctrines of the Church of Rome. Permit me to add a few considerations of a more general nature.

That many members of that Church have been holy men, and that many are so now, I firmly believe. But I do not know, if any of them that are dead were more holy than many Protestants who are now with God; yea, than some of our own country, who were very lately removed to Abraham's bosom. To instance only in one: (Whom I mention the rather, because an account of his life is extant:) I do not believe that many of them, of the same age, were more holy than Thomas Walsh. And I doubt if any among them, living now, are more holy than several Protestants now alive.

But be this as it may: However, by the tender mercies of God, many members of the Church of Rome have been, and are now, holy men, notwithstanding their principles; yet I fear many of their principles have a natural tendency to undermine holiness; greatly to hinder, if not utterly to destroy, the essential branches of it,—to destroy the love of God, and the love of our neighbour, with all justice, and mercy, and truth.

I wish it were possible to lay all prejudice aside, and to consider this calmly and impartially. I begin with the love of God, the fountain of all that holiness without which we cannot see the Lord. And what is it that has a more natural tendency to destroy this than idolatry? Consequently, every doctrine which leads to idolatry, naturally tends to destroy it. But so does a very considerable part of the avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome. Her doctrine touching the worship of angels, of saints, the Virgin Mary in particular,—touching the worship of images, of relics, of the cross, and, above all, of the host, or consecrated wafer,—lead all who receive them to practise idolatry, flat, palpable idolatry; the paying that worship to the creature which is due to God alone. Therefore they have a natural tendency to hinder, if not utterly destroy, the love of God.

Secondly. The doctrine of the Church of Rome has a natural tendency to hinder, if not destroy, the love of our neighbour. By the love of our neighbour, I mean universal

benevolence ; tender good-will to all men. For in this respect every child of man, every son of Adam, is our neighbour ; as we may easily learn from our Lord's history of the good Samaritan. Now, the Church of Rome, by asserting that all who are not of her own Church, that is, the bulk of mankind, are in a state of utter rejection from God, despised and hated by Him that made them ; and by her bitter (I might say, accursed) anathemas, devoting to absolute, everlasting destruction, all who willingly or unwillingly differ from her in any jot or tittle ; teaches all her members to look upon them with the same eyes that she supposes God to do ; to regard them as mere fire-brands of hell, "vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction." And what love can you entertain for such? No other than you can believe God to have for them. Therefore, every anathema denounced by the Church of Rome against all who differ from her, has a natural tendency, not only to hinder, but utterly destroy, the love of our neighbour.

Thirdly. The same doctrine which devotes to utter destruction so vast a majority of mankind, must greatly indispose us for showing them the justice which is due to all men. For how hard is it to be just to them we hate? to render them their due, either in thought, word, or action? Indeed, we violate justice by this very thing, by not loving them as ourselves. For we do not render unto all their due ; seeing love is due to all mankind. If we "owe no man anything" beside, do we not owe this, "to love one another?" And where love is totally wanting, what other justice can be expected? Will not a whole train of injurious tempers and passions, of wrong words and actions, naturally follow? So plain, so undeniably plain it is, that this doctrine of the Church of Rome, (to instance at present in no more,) that "all but those of their own Church are accursed," has a natural tendency to hinder, yea, utterly to destroy, justice.

Fourthly. Its natural tendency to destroy mercy is equally glaring and undeniable. We need not use any reasoning to prove this : Only cast your eyes upon matter of fact ! What terrible proofs of it do we see in the execrable crusades against the Albigenes ! in those horrible wars in the Holy Land, where so many rivers of blood were poured out ! in the many millions that have been butchered in Europe, since the beginning of the Reformation ; not only in the open field, but in prisons, on the scaffold, on the gibbet, at the stake ! For how

many thousand lives, barbarously taken away, has Philip the Second to give an account to God ! For how many thousand, that infamous, perfidious butcher, Charles the Ninth of France ! to say nothing of our own bloody Queen Mary, not much inferior to them ! See, in Europe, in America, in the uttermost parts of Asia, the dungeons, the racks, the various tortures of the Inquisition, so unhappily styled, *the House of Mercy* ! Yea, such mercy as is in the fiends in hell ! such mercy as the natives of Ireland, in the last century, showed to myriads of their Protestant countrymen ! Such is the mercy which the doctrine of the Church of Rome very naturally inspires !

Lastly. The doctrine of the Church of Rome has a natural tendency to destroy truth from off the earth. What can more directly tend to this, what can more incite her own members to all manner of lying and falsehood, than that precious doctrine of the Church of Rome, that no faith is to be kept with heretics ? Can I believe one word that a man says, who espouses this principle ? I know it has been frequently affirmed, that the Church of Rome has renounced this doctrine. But I ask, When or where ? By what public and authentic act, notified to all the world ? This principle has been publicly and openly avowed by a whole Council, the ever-renowned Council of Constance : An assembly never to be paralleled, either among Turks or Pagans, for regard to justice, mercy, and truth ! But when and where was it as publicly disavowed ? Till this is done in the face of the sun, this doctrine must stand before all mankind as an avowed principle of the Church of Rome.

And will this operate only toward heretics ? toward the supposed enemies of the Church ? Nay, where men have once learned not to keep faith with heretics, they will not long keep it towards Catholics. When they have once over-leaped the bounds of truth, and habituated themselves to lying and dissimulation, toward one kind of men, will they not easily learn to behave in the same manner toward all men ? So that, instead of "putting away all lying," they will put away all truth ; and instead of having "no guile found in their mouth," there will be found nothing else therein !

Thus naturally do the principles of the Romanists tend to banish truth from among themselves. And have they not an

equal tendency to cause lying and dissimulation among those that are not of their communion, by that Romish principle, that force is to be used in matters of religion? that if men are not of our sentiments, of our Church, we should thus "compel them to come in?" Must not this, in the very nature of things, induce all those over whom they have any power, to dissemble if not deny those opinions, who vary ever so little from what that Church has determined? And if a habit of lying and dissimulation is once formed, it will not confine itself to matters of religion. It will assuredly spread into common life, and tincture the whole conversation.

Again: Some of the most eminent Roman casuists (whose books are duly licensed by the heads of the Church) lay it down as an undoubted maxim, that, although malicious lies are sins, yet "officious lies, that is, lies told in order to do good, are not only innocent, but meritorious." Now, what a flood-gate does this open for falsehood of every kind! Therefore this doctrine, likewise, has a natural tendency to banish truth from the earth.

One doctrine more of the Romish Church must not here be passed over; I mean, that of absolution by a Priest; as it has a clear, direct tendency to destroy both justice, mercy, and truth; yea, to drive all virtue out of the world. For if a man (and not always a very good man) has power to forgive sins; if he can at pleasure forgive any violation, either of truth, or mercy, or justice; what an irresistible temptation must this be to men of weak or corrupt minds! Will they be scrupulous with regard to any pleasing sin, when they can be absolved upon easy terms? And if after this any scruple remain, is not a remedy for it provided? Are there not Papal indulgences to be had; yea, plenary indulgences? I have seen one of these which was purchased at Rome not many years ago. This single doctrine of Papal indulgences strikes at the root of all religion. And were the Church of Rome ever so faultless in all other respects, yet till this power of forgiving sins, whether by priestly absolution or Papal indulgences, is openly and absolutely disclaimed, and till these practices are totally abolished, there can be no security in that Church for any morality, any religion, any justice, or mercy, or truth.