

THE
MORNING EXERCISE AGAINST POPERY.

SERMON I. (V.)

BY THE REV. CHRISTOPHER FOWLER, A. M.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF RATON COLLEGE.

THE SCRIPTURE WAS WRITTEN FOR THE USE OF THE LAITY, AND SHOULD BE TRANSLATED INTO KNOWN TONGUES, THAT THEY MAY UNDERSTAND IT; AND SHOULD BE HEARD AND READ BY THEM.

THE SCRIPTURE TO BE READ BY THE COMMON PEOPLE.

THE controversy before us is, Whether the scriptures are to be read, and heard, of and by the lay-people; and whether they are to be translated into the vulgar tongues. The Papists deny; we affirm. My business will lie in three propositions:—

I. *That the people are to hear and read the scriptures.*

II. *That THEREFORE the scripture is: the word of God was written for them, and to them.*

III. *Therefore it is to be translated into vulgar tongues.*

The first is an express precept; the second is a reason to prove the first; the third is an inference from both.

And seriously, when I have been musing upon this question, I profess heartily, I have been surprised with amazement, how such a controversy should arise among Christians (if Christians). Might not a man as well dispute whether a carpenter should have his line and rule to work by, or a soldier wear his sword in the midst of enemies? Shall I question whether the air be necessary for breath, or bread for life, or the light of the sun for our secular affairs? Sure enough, the word of God is all this,—a rule most perfect, a sword most victorious, air most fragrant, food most wholesome, and light most clear. The word of an angel, precisely considered, is no ground for faith, nor rule for life, duty, and worship. The word of God, read and heard, saith our church, is so great a good, “that the benefits arising thence are inexpressible, unconceivable.” “The Bible!” saith that painful, pious, learned bishop Hooper: “Why,” saith he, “God in heaven, and the king in earth, hath not a greater friend than the Bible,” in his Epistle Dedicatory to King Edward VI. But I shall say no more of these nor of any Protestants, because they are parties, and therefore their testimony, though most true, is not proper. This word is for the soul; and is not the soul more than life? This light is “to give the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus

Christ ;” and is not this infinitely beyond all our natural and civil concerns? All these things here below, either within us or without us, are short-lived and vexation ; but this makes a man wise, and that to salvation, and that through the knowledge of and faith in our Lord Jesus : and after all this and much more that might be said concerning this treasury of all wisdom and knowledge, shall it be a question whether the people, so highly concerned in these things,—shall they hear or read the scripture? This, to me, is wonderful.

But the question is put beyond all question as to our adversaries : it is defined, determined, by the council (as they call it) of Trent, in the negative,—that the lay-people shall not read, or hear the scriptures read ; no, nor have a Bible in the vulgar tongue, under great penalties. Nay, the priest reads it not in their public worship. The words are these : *Si quis legere aut habere præsumpserit*, “If any shall presume to read or have a Bible :” what then? Why, the penalty is this : *Absolutionem peccatorum percipere non posset* : “He may not,” nay, “He cannot,” “be absolved from his sins :” they exclude such a man from remission of his sins ; it seems, the reading of the Bible is a sin unpardonable. The people are taught to believe, that what the Pope binds on earth is bound in heaven. Surely, then, I judge this must be the sense of the canon ; namely, If a man that reads the scripture, or hath a Bible in his house, comes to confession, and is absolved, that absolution is invalid : he is not *subjectum capax* [“a capable subject”] ; he doth *ponere obicem* [“place an obstacle”] ; there is a bar lies in his way to hinder his absolution ; and that bar is his reading or having the Holy Bible. My reason is this : though he had a thousand Bibles, and did confess it to the priest as his fault, he would absolve him, and the absolution would stand good : so that, to have a Bible and *read* it, puts a man into the state of damnation ; and no man can read the scriptures but under the greatest penalty ; namely, under the pain of damnation. By this Trent *conciabulum*, “conventicle,” you see, woe be to the Bible, and all the friends thereof! Benedict Turret, in his Preface to the *Index Librorum prohibitorum et expurgandorum*, tells us, that *misericiæ erga Dei librum nullus locus est*, “there is no place of mercy left to the book of God.” “Men fly from the gospel,” saith he, “in the Italian or Spanish tongue,” *peste citius*, “faster than they would run from the plague of pestilence.”

OBJECTION. But you will say, “The council’s prohibition of the Bible is with a limitation ; namely, if you have a Bible without a licence from the bishop. They do not forbid licensed men the reading ; and therefore wrong them not.”

ANSWER. I answer, It is true, they do speak to that purpose ; I will not wrong them ; but give me leave to do the truth and you right, by telling you that their pretence of a licence is a very flam, a mere gullery, an abominable cheat, as I shall show you in its place.

Further : that this book may not spread abroad, the high priest and elders in this council straitly charge and command all booksellers and all dealers in books, that they sell not or any other way part with any

one of these books to any person, upon the forfeiture of the price of the said books, and to undergo all other punishment according to the *arbitrium*, "will and pleasure," of the bishop. I confess, this is drawn up very cunningly, with much craft; as indeed all their doctrines are expressed with artifice and subtilty. But if you read the mandate of the archbishop of Toledo by the authority of Paul V., there the punishment is this; namely, "For the first time, he shall be punished" *suspensione officii*, "[with] suspension from his office, loss of his trade, for two years; banishment twelve miles from the town" *ubi bibliopolium habuit*, "[where he had his book-shop,] for two years; and fined twelve hundred ducats," *mille ducentorum ducatorum mulctâ puniendus*. This for the first fault. But for the second time, *si recidat*, then "the punishment to be doubled, and other punishments," *ex inquisitoris arbitrio eroganda*, "according to the will of the inquisitor." And all this, *si quis habere aut emere vel vendere ausit*, "if any dare be so hardy as to have or buy or sell a Bible. And those traders that are not so skilful as to understand the catalogue of books prohibited, must either take a man of skill into their shop, or shut up their shop-windows: for whosoever shall offend in this case,"—though *per neglectum* or *ignorantiam*, *a pœnâ nullâ ratione exemptum iri*,—"though they offend through neglect or unskilfulness, shall not be exempted from punishment upon any account whatsoever."

And Paul V., by his *breve sub annulo piscatoris*, dated at Rome, 1612, forbids all persons, *ne legant aut teneant*, "that they should not read or keep those books, under the punishment of the greater excommunication, and other censures;" but bring them, by a certain day, to be prefixed by the holy inquisitor-general, into the holy office of the Inquisition. And accordingly the said inquisitor in his *Pontificalibus* specifies in his mandate this to be done within ninety days,—all books prohibited in the Index to be brought into the office. Now amongst the books in the Index which are prohibited by pontifical authority, the Bible is the special book forbidden. And to make all sure as much as may be by men and others, there are toward a hundred of Latin versions of the Bible prohibited in this catalogue; and to be yet more sure that the Bible, of all books, may not escape, this inquisitor-general, by the Pope's authority, doth call-in, not only books prohibited in the Index, but *librum aut libros in regulis generalibus comprehensos*, "book or books comprehended in the general rules." Now the fourth general rule (observe, I pray) is made solely against the Bible in any vulgar tongue;—they are not to be endured;—nay, against any parts of it;—as, suppose, some of David's psalms, or some of Paul's epistles;—nay, "whether they be printed or written," *sive excusa, sive manuscripta*; nay, all summaries or brief heads of the Bible; nay, *quantûmvis historica*, "although it be a compendium of the historical parts of it:" all is forbidden. And "if any man, of what calling or dignity soever, be he bishop or patriarch, be he marquis or duke;" (where is the tradesman or farmer or gentleman now?) "if any of these shall dare the contrary, they are rebels to our mandate," *immorigeri*, "disobedient to holy church;" and shall be sus-

pected of heretical pravity : and, I promise you, that is a fair way to the Inquisition ; that is, the loss of liberty, pains of the body, forfeiture of goods, and loss of life, *ut plurimum* [“ as is generally the case ”].

OBJECTION. “ But, whatever you say, the council doth permit reading the Bible in the vulgar tongue, provided you have a licence.”

ANSWER. I told you before, this licence was a mere blind, a fallacy, a flam : but because I am in hand with my author, and to stay your stomachs till I come to handle this in its due place, for present I will only tell you this ; namely, that pope Paul V., in his brief lately quoted, doth recall all such licences. I will give you the sum of it. It begins thus : *Ad futuram rei memoriam* : * “ Since, as we understand, the licences of reading the books of heretics, or books suspected of heresy, or books otherwise prohibited and condemned,” (there comes in the Bible,) “ obtained under certain pretences, do too much increase in the kingdoms of Spain,” *in regnis Hispaniarum* ; “ and understanding that there is more danger to the unlearned than profit to the learned by and from the said licences : we, therefore, upon whom the burden of watching over the Lord’s flock is incumbent, being willing to provide a seasonable remedy, and walking in the steps of our predecessors, popes of Rome ; ” (mark that for anon ;) “ we do annul, cass, revoke,” *irritamus et viribus penitus evacuamus*, “ utterly make void, all such licences, faculties, and grants ; and by the tenor of these presents we do decide [decide] and declare the same to be cassate, void, and null,” *easque nemini suffragari posse* : † “ granted by whomsoever, whether our predecessors, ourselves, our penitentiary, ordinaries, or bishops whomsoever ; and granted to what persons soever, whether abbots, patriarchs, marquesses, dukes, or any other persons ecclesiastic or mundane ; ” *quicumque autoritate fulgeant*, ‡ “ whether they have had their licence by letters apostolical, in form of a brief under the seal, or any other peculiar way to make the licence firm and lasting ; we revoke and annul all to the utmost ; ” *non obstantibus constitutionibus, ordinationibus apostolicis*, “ any constitutions and ordinations apostolical to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding ; under the pains and censures of the church to the highest ; ” *et invocato, si opus est, brachio seculari* ; § that is, under the penalty of a gaol, a dungeon, a fagot. “ And we command all archbishops, &c., to take care that these our letters be forthwith published in all provinces, cities, diocesses,” *absque aliâ requisitione eis desuper faciendâ* ; that is, “ without demurring, disputing, demanding why or wherefore.”

Here is sure work ; not a crevice, a chink, left unstopped. Do you not see what care here is taken to suppress all licences ; nay, though under the pope’s seal ? See what a roaring Bull here is ; and what is your licence now, I pray ? A fig-leaf. In the midst of this brief his Holiness gives a *mandamus* to the inquisitor-general, the archbishop of Toledo, to prosecute this brief to the utmost ; not to suffer any person, though never so great, to have or keep or read or buy or sell a Bible : which accordingly he did execute, as before.

* “ For the future remembrance of the thing.”—EDIT.

† “ And that they can

avail no one.”—EDIT.

‡ “ With whatever authority they may glitter.”—EDIT.

§ “ And, if needful, invoking the arm of the magistrate.”—EDIT.

For other books I am not concerned; for bastardly patches added to the fathers, which are many; and castrations of them, which are gross; if I could, I may not, meddle with that affair. I only take notice of the *Index Expurgatorius*,—how these fathers of Rome blot out, and command to be blotted out, the sayings of the ancient fathers, as they are placed in the indexes made either by the interpreters or the publishers of them: as, for instance, in Athanasius, set forth Græco-Latin; in the index there was set down thus: *Scripturæ sacræ etiam plebi et magistratibus cognoscendæ. Deleatur.* That is, “The holy scriptures are to be known even of the common people and the magistrates.” “Blot that out,” say they. Again: *Scriptura sacra ita clara est ut quisque, &c.*: “The holy scripture is so plain that any one may understand.” “Blot that out.” Five more sayings there are about the sufficiency of the scriptures, and that they only are to be heard. *Deleantur*, “Blot them all out: these sentences will puzzle young students, confirm the heretics.” But, indeed, the true reason is, “They will discover our wickedness and heresies.” So they deal with St. Austin’s works. (*Basileæ, ex Officinâ Froben.*) *Purgatorium non inveniri in scripturâ*: “Purgatory not to be found in the scripture.” *Deleatur*, “Let it be expunged,” say they. And good reason; for, such passages will make your kitchen cold. And special order is given by these fathers that care be taken to “blot out all such passages” *ex quocunque alio indice* [“from every other index”]: specially the fourth edition there named; *et ex aliis similibus* [“and from other similar ones”]. And, *lib. ii. De Bapt. contra Donat.*, there is this short passage: *Non est in evangelio*: “There is no such thing in the gospel.” *Dele*, “Blot it out.” So they serve Chrysostom. (*Basileæ, ex Offic. Frob., 1558.*) *Sine scripturâ nihil asserendum; scripturæ divinæ omnibus volentibus perviæ et faciles; scripturarum lectio omnibus facilis; scripturas continere omnia; scripturas legere omnibus etiam*; with some others; as, *Apostolorum doctrina facilis et omnibus perviæ*: that is, “The scriptures are plain to the willing; they are to be read of all, even artificers; the scriptures contain all things necessary;” and the like. “Away with these,” says holy mother church; “blot them out every one: and good reason; for, open that door once, then farewell all.”

Hitherto we have had two acts of the pope and his council: one, to call-in the Bibles condemned that were abroad; the other, to prevent their going abroad for the future. But all too late: alas! this would not do. Therefore they take two other courses. *The first* was this: “The holy synod decreeth that no man dare” (*audeat*) “to interpret or expound scripture in another sense, save that” *quam sancta mater ecclesia tenuit*, “which holy mother church hath holden and doth hold; whose right it is,” *cujus est*, “to whom it belongs,” “to judge of the interpretation of the holy scripture,” although such interpretations were never uttered before. They that shall oppose this, let them be “declared by the ordinaries, and punished according to the statutes.” So that if the pope (for he is the “church,” as you must know) shall affirm,—John xxi. 16: *Pasce oves*, “Peter,

feed my sheep ;” if he shall say that the meaning of that text is this, —that by these words our Lord Christ gave to Peter an universal headship over the church, and, *in ordine ad spiritualia*, [“with regard to things spiritual,”] a sovereignty absolute over all kings, to plant and pluck up ; and that all this power is given to the pope as Peter’s successor : why, then you are to believe it ; you must not take any other sense ; though this be nonsense and never heard of before, that is all one.

So the second council of Nice, quoted and approved by the council of Trent, countenanced by the legates and lies of Adrian I., proves images to be worshipped thus : “ ‘ No man lights a candle, and puts it under a bushel :’ therefore the holy images are to be placed upon the altars.” *O res inconsequens et risu digna !* * said Carolus Magnus. But what is that ? Let it be never so “ridiculous and worthy to be hissed at,” you may not dare to take any other sense ; you may not quarrel at the inference, though it be monstrously irrational. If you do, they have two swords : and with one they will cut you off from the church ; and with the other, namely, the secular, they will cut you off from the earth. For the church saith, *that is the meaning of Ecce duo gladii*, “Behold, here are two swords :”—the one shall unchristian you, and the other shall unman you.

The second course [which] the council hath taken to help themselves is this :—They have added to the Holy Bible (despairing of any relief there) the Apocrypha ; and make Tobias and Judith and the two Maccabees, with the rest of the stories of Bel and the Dragon, a rule for faith and life : and whosoever shall not take them for the word of God, sacred and canonical, they curse him : “Let him be anathema ;” they send a man to hell, if he refuse Toby. They have also stitched or patched to the Holy Bible their traditions, under the name of “apostolical,” containing “matters appertaining to faith and life :” and these traditions (which are *in scrinio pectoris papæ*, “under lock and key in the pope’s breast”) they command, under the pain of anathema, to be received *pari pietatis affectu et reverentiâ*, “with an equal pious affection and reverence” as we receive the word of God. O horrible !

The first of these courses, namely, to oblige men to understand scriptures as the church, that is, the pope, expounds them ; this is a reproach to the reason of mankind : *bubalum eum esse, non hominem* ; “it degrades men into brutes.” The second goes higher, and is a reproach to the sovereignty, goodness, wisdom, faithfulness of our Lord Jesus. They do by this means horribly reproach the apostles : for if the administration of the sacrament under one kind, and invocation of saints, merit of works, worship in an unknown tongue, with others ; if these be “traditions,” as their learned men say ; and if their traditions be apostolical, from the mouth of Christ, and dictates of the blessed Spirit, as the council saith ; O, then, what an ugly and black reproach is here cast upon the apostles ! Nay, it is a most prodigious blasphemy against the Lord Christ and his Holy

* “O unconnected consequence, and deserving to be laughed at !”—EDIT.

Spirit,—that the apostles should teach and practise and write one thing to the churches, and after whisper the clean contrary to some others, who should convey it by word of mouth to posterity.

Any man sees that these four points of faith which they would prove by tradition are directly contrary to what the apostles preached and practised, and wrote to the churches. But this is not my business : I only touch upon this.

QUESTION. But perhaps you will demand, upon what reason the council did thus decree.

ANSWER. I answer, They tell you, *scilicet, Cùm experimento manifestum sit*, “ It is manifest by experience that the sufferance of the Bible in the vulgar tongue doth more harm than good, through men’s rashness : *ergo* we forbid it :” a doughty reason, no question of it ! As if, some soldiers rashly abusing their weapons, therefore the general should command—and that upon grievous penalties, and that when they are faced by their deadly enemies—all the army to be disarmed. Should a Protestant decree against prayer, because prayers of Papists are blasphemous ; or against the use of the Lord’s supper, because the Mass is impious and idolatrous ; what decrees were these ! Must God’s appointment be annulled, because of men’s abuse ? Why did they not decree that men should be prohibited the use of the light of the sun by day and moon by night, because thieves and others abuse it ? Doubtless, such decrees had not been so irrational and mischievous as this : for, that light is for my body, for the face [of] and converse with man, for my secular affairs, and but for a time ; but the light of the scriptures (which they forbid with a curse) is for my soul, for the face of Jesus, for spiritual concerns, and for eternity. The truth of the case is this : the “ experience ” of the council was of that kind which Demetrius and the craftsmen feared would be theirs : “ If Paul be suffered, down goes Diana, and our market is spoiled.” I will tell you, as briefly and fully as I can, the story of this “ experience.”

About the year 1516, the friars are sent by Leo X. abroad with their pardons, to raise money for his Holiness. Indulgences for horrid sins are sold at easy rates. Into Germany come the friars. Luther, who had, some years before, quitted the study of the law, and applied himself to the close and daily study of the scriptures, and had been blessed with some taste of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, unexpectedly began to stir against these pardon-mongers ; yet at first very mildly ; not simply against the thing, but against the impudence and covetousness of the friars. The friars scornfully and publicly traduce Luther : he takes heart, and begins to dispute, write, and preach against them. This spark, thus blown, suddenly becomes a great flame. The pope begins to storm, and writes about this affair to cardinal Cajetan. Cajetan disputes [with] Luther, and quotes against him the Bull of Clement VI., which runs thus : “ Whereas,” *una guttula*, “ one drop of the blood of Christ had been sufficient for redemption ; and streams of blood came from his body : all that blood which was over and above, Christ had deposited as a precious treasure in the hand of Peter,” *claviger*, “ the key-keeper of heaven, and to his successor, to be dispensed ” (that is, “ to be sold ”) “ to

penitents; and so likewise the surplusage of the merits of the Virgin Mary and all the saints;” *tanquam inexhausta condonandi materia*, “ [as] an inexhaustible storehouse of pardons.” Luther refels the Bull by scripture. Frederic of Saxony shows him favour; the university of Wittemberg defends him. Frederic the duke of Saxony sends him Cajetan’s letter. Luther entreats [that] the controversy may be decided in Germany: the emperor summoned him upon safe-conduct to appear at Worms. Accordingly he appears there: in the imperial assembly, and after in the lodgings of an archbishop before some other princes, he humbly but vehemently offers himself to be tried by the scriptures, or evident reason. He is banished Germany, and appeals to a general council: the pope fears a council as the shadow of death. All this and much more was done in five years: it was day-light all abroad in several places by this time; the gospel had dispelled the darkness of Popery without any great noise or bustle. The council of Trent convened not till the year 1546, about thirty years after the preaching of the gospel began; and was carried on by men of renown for learning, piety, and pains. The council prohibits the Bible *ob temeritatem*, “for the rashness of men;” but doth not tell us what men, nor in what. Our excellent and learned translators, in their Epistle Dedicatory to king James, say that they expect to be “maligned for their work by the Papists, because they desire to keep the people in ignorance and darkness.” Dr. White, in his “Defence,” chap. li., saith that “from men’s rashness they dishonestly, nay, most dishonestly, conclude the utter suppressing of the scriptures: not that they care how they are used; (for never any men used them so vilely as themselves, either in applying, reviling, or corrupting of them;) but because they are mad at the Bible, which discovers their heresy.”

And if ever they get power again, it is probable [that] they may learn more wit by their experience; and Rome-papal may serve the book of God as Rome-pagan served the oracles of the sibyls heretofore; namely, take it out of their Popish world, and chain it fast in the Vatican, there to be inspected only by a few confidants, and to be expounded as the pope pleaseth. Origen said of old, that “the reading of the scriptures was the torment of the devil:” surely it torments somebody else of later years; but in Origen’s time it was not so: the Bible burns the devil, and the pope burns the Bible.

Thus we have seen the council biting sore, but not opening much. That is left to their doctors, whose clamours have been loud and importunate, and their tongues set on fire from beneath, against this holy word, from that day to this. They that do evil hate the light: the thief curseth the candle; the malefactor would despatch his judge; the design of these doctors is, to make the most sound and fully perfect scripture to be as the people at the pool of Bethesda,—halt, blind, lame, withered. Albertus Pighius (a prime man, I promise you) gives this advice: “They should,” *declamitare*, “often declaim against the scripture,” and that *rhetoricis artificijs*, “with rhetorical artifices and flourishes;” complain of their difficulty, darkness, shortness, lameness, imperfections, blemishes. On the other side, they should strenuously contend for the necessity, authority, certainty,

perfection, clearness of traditions unwritten ; and then," *nullo negotio*, "no doubt they shall easily carry the day." And what Pighius advised his fellows to do, he practised himself sufficiently. Andradus, a great stickler in the council and a daring man, takes the same course : and good reason ; for he confesseth that "many and weighty points too of their religion would reel and stagger, if they were not supported by traditions." (*Orthod. Explic.*, lib. ii.)

Canus, a considerable man, bishop of the Canaries, tells his fellows that "there is more force and strength to confute heretics in traditions than in the scripture." And, after that he had wrested the fathers, compared his adversaries to the devil quoting scripture, alleged Plato and Tarquin to justify their practice, spit his venom into the face of the Bible, and urged a nonsensical argument ; namely, *Dabo legem*, "I will put my law in their hearts : ' ergo, there are traditions : "—I say, After this stuff he tells us the reason of it. *Quorsum hæc ?* * saith he. *Nempe, omnem fermè disputationem, &c.* : "That well-nigh all disputation with heretics is to be decided rather by tradition than scripture." (*De Locis Theologicis*, lib. iii. cap. 3.) That is, in plain English, We must resolve our faith and practice in the things of God into the pope's breast, rather than into the word of Jesus Christ.

So likewise Bristow, teaching his scholar how to grapple with the Protestants, teacheth him thus :—that he must "first get the proud heretics out of the weak and false castle of only scripture," (do you not observe his reverence ? He calls the scripture "weak and false ;" *os durum et impium !* †) "and bring him into the plain field of traditions ; and then the cowards will run." That is, Set the pope in the throne, and Christ at his footstool ; and then no doubt of the victory. For, you must know, the pope hath the plenitude of all power, to mint and stamp traditions, to allow miracles, and to expound councils and fathers as he pleaseth ; and then all is our own. (BRISTOW, *ult. Motive.*)

I am weary of this : it were endless to repeat their blasphemies in advancing the Papacy, and abusing scripture. I will name but one doctor more, when I have told you a story out of a good author. About the year 1523, seven years after Luther began to preach, they were so mad against the scriptures, and so vexed at the light, "that they burned two Austin friars at Brussels only for this,—that they preferred the scriptures above the pope's decrees." There appears nothing else in the history : *Cùm in eo persisterent, damnati sunt capitibus et exusti.* † Send men out of the world in fiery flames, because they will prefer Christ the Lord above the pope!—this is somewhat hard.

The doctor [whom] I mean is Coster, the Jesuit. He, in his *Enchiridion*, cap. i., divides God's word into three parts. The *first* part is "that which he wrote himself in the two tables : " the *second* part, "that which he commanded to be written by others ; the Old

* "What is the consequence to which these arguments lead ?"—EDIT. † "O rude and impious lips!"—EDIT.
 † SLEIDANI *Comment.* lib. iv. "When they persisted in this, they were capitally condemned and burnt."—EDIT.

and New Testament :” the *third* part, “that which he neither wrote himself nor rehearsed to others, but left it to them to do themselves ; as traditions, the pope’s decrees, and the decrees of councils.” And he makes this application of his distinction,—that “many things of faith are wanting in the two former ;” (very good ! It seems, God by himself and by his prophets and apostles gives out his mind defectively ;) “neither would Christ have his church [to] depend upon them.” (O horrible daringness !) “The latter,” saith he, “namely, the traditions and pope’s decrees, are the best scripture, the judge of controversies, the expositor of the Bible, and that whereupon we must wholly depend.” That is, Blot out the sun, and set up a stinking farthing-candle : this is the design. However, you may observe in a few words a great deal of blasphemy and some honesty. *The blasphemy* lies in these particulars :—

1. That God hath revealed his will short and scanting : a horrid reproach to the glory of his wisdom and mercy !

2. That the Lord Christ would not have us trust to his word : a most vile reproach to his care and faithfulness over his own house !

3. That musty, dusty traditions and the pope’s decrees are the word of God.

4. That the decrees of men—of whom some have been necromancers, conversers with the devil, poisoners, murderers, adulterers, nay, traitors, blood-suppers, ignorant—are the rule of faith.

The honesty is in this :—

1. That he joins hand-in-hand together traditions and pope’s decrees : and well they may [be so joined] ; for they are brethren, and have one and the same parent.

2. In that he confesseth that traditions were not rehearsed or delivered from God by word of mouth : and therefore the council of Trent put a sad and miserable blind and cheat upon princes and people, while they say that traditions were either spoken by Christ, or dictated by the Holy Ghost.

Lest any man should say that these doctors were private men, (which is their common and last shift,) I will shut up all with their new creed. Know, then, that Paul IV. set forth a creed of his own, consisting of twelve articles, added to the twelve of the Creed called “the Apostles’ ;” out of which I shall take only three, proper to my business. The title of it is, “The public Profession of the Orthodox Faith to be uniformly observed and professed.”

ARTICLE I. The first article is : “The apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and other observances and constitutions of that church, do I firmly admit and embrace.”

ART. II. “Also the sacred scriptures do I admit according to that sense which our mother the church hath holden and doth hold ; whose right it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the scriptures.”

ART. III. “I do vow and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome : and all other things likewise do I undoubtedly receive and confess, which are delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred

canons and general councils, especially the holy council of Trent : and withal I condemn, reject, and accurse all things that are contrary hereunto ; and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and accursed by the church. And this true Catholic faith I will maintain inviolate to the last gasp ; and I will take care of those who shall be under me, or such as I shall have charge over in my calling, to be holden, taught, or preached, to the uttermost of my power. This I promise, vow, and swear. So God he help me, and his holy gospel."

Thus the bow is bent, and the arrow upon the string, to shoot through the heart of the scripture. The foundations of the prophets and apostles must be cast down, or else Babel will fall : there is the origin of these and such-like outrageous reproaches upon the oracles of the blessed God. "Pass over to the isles of Chittim ;" go to Kedar : did ever any nation do this to their oracles ? (Jer. ii. 10.) Did the Pagans ever do such indignities to the dictates of their Druids or their Brachmans [Bramins] ? or the Turks, to their Alcoran ?

This controversy, then, *Whether the people of God should read and hear the word of God ;* (which would make a man wonder that ever such a question should be moved ; the duty being so solemnly enjoined, the practice of it so necessary, the fruit of it so profitable ; which made David wiser than his enemies, than his teachers, than the aged, [and was] better to him than all treasures, "sweeter than the honeycomb ;") I say, This controversy [I] shall, through God's assistance, discuss, and deliver you my thoughts upon it, from 1 Thess. v. 27 : that is my text.

I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.—1 Thessalonians v. 27.

THIS text is a constitution scriptural, one of the true canons of the apostles ; directly opposite to the constitutions of the pope, and the canons of the council of Trent, as we shall see by-and-by. It may be resolved into these parts :—

1. *An injunction to a duty* : that is, reading : "That it be read."
2. *The subject, or matter to be read* : that is, "This epistle." And by the same reason all the rest ; for the wit of all the Jesuits in the world cannot frame an objection against the reading of any, which may not be as well made against the reading of this one.
3. *The object, or parties to whom* : "The holy brethren ;" that is, the people.
4. *The extent* : to all : "All the holy brethren."
5. *The solemnity of this injunction* : "I charge you." Not, "I beseech or entreat," or, "I exhort ;" (as sometimes he doth ;) but, "I charge : " and that not simply a bare charge, but the highest that can be ; and [this was] the only time that ever Paul did give this, which is so high that none can be higher. He doth indeed charge Timothy solemnly in 1 Tim. vi. 13 : but there it is, "before," *ενωπιον του Θεου*, "in the presence of God ;" but in my text it is, *τον Κυριον*,

that is, *νη τον Κυριον*, "by the Lord:" there it is *Παραγγελια*, *Præcipio*, "I charge, I command;" but here it is, *Ορκιζω*, "I charge, I adjure." *Ορκιζω* is, *Juramento obstringo*; ["I bind with an oath;"] it hath the force of an oath; and that under the curse. "I adjure thee," saith the high priest to our Lord Christ: *Εξορκιζω σε*, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us;" (Matt. xxvi. 63;) implying an execration in case of speaking falsely. The apostle Paul doth not deal with them in this place *obsecrando*, as the Latins used to do, *per deos deasque omnes*,* as some think: (yet even in that sense the words had been very vehement, and, in case of failure of not reading, would import vengeance on them for it:) but here he deals *execrando*; his charge hath the form of an oath, "obliging under pain of the curse." And so Dr. Hammond renders it: "ἰοῖβησθι, in *hiphil*, is literally and critically 'to make swear, to adjure;' and is expressed by Paul's *Ορκιζω*, (1 Thess. v. 27,) 'I bind you under the curse of God that this epistle be read.' The law concerning this we have in Num. v. 21; where we have not simply an execration, but there we have the oath of execration." Thus he upon Matt. xxvi., note 1.

The text, thus explained, (methinks,) among sober men should quickly decide the controversy. For whether we should obey the Lord Christ, or the council of Trent: whether we should believe Paul the apostle, speaking by the Holy Ghost; or Paul the pope, speaking by a pack of parasites: judge ye. Which curse of the two should we dread,—this of God in the text, or that of man at Trent? Surely there is no difficulty to determine this point.

The words thus opened will to our business afford us three observables: 1. *The state of the series of popes, or Antichrist*; 2. *His character*; 3. *His confutation*.

1. *His state is a state accursed*.—I offer my proof thus: They † that do not read the scriptures to the people in the vulgar tongue, according to the duty of their office, nor suffer the people to read [them] themselves; nay, that do prohibit them to have a Bible, and that by a severe law under a grievous penalty;—these, for so doing, are bound under the curse of God: But Antichrist doth all this: Therefore the state of Antichrist is a cursed state. The proposition, or major, is the text, the truth of God: the assumption is notorious, the practice of Rome or Antichrist: the conclusion is regular and natural.

Add to this the woe [which] our Lord Jesus denounceth against the scribes and Pharisees, because they did "shut up the kingdom of heaven," (Matt. xxiii. 13,) "took away the key of knowledge; they neither went in themselves, nor suffered those that were entering to go in." (Luke xi. 52.) Yet these never suppressed the Bible in their own tongue, much less prohibited the reading of it by the people; neither did the scribes omit the reading of it to the people. The argument holds from the less to the greater: in both these the scribes were saints in comparison to the Popish doctors: and the non-expounding [was] by far a less sin than the prohibition; and that by

* "Beseeching them by all the gods and goddesses."—EDIT.

a law under grievous penalty, nay, death itself, as it will appear anon.

2. *Here we have the marks of Antichrist.*—Daniel (for it cannot with truth and sense be understood of any other) saith of him, “He shall think to change times and laws,” namely, of “the Most High.” (Dan. vii. 25.) Paul giveth this mark of him: “He shall not only “exalt himself above all augustness,” (σεβασμα·ὁ Σεβαστος, *Augustus*, *scilicet*, *Cæsar*, Acts xxv. 21,) not only above the emperor and princes; but “show himself as God;” (2 Thess. ii. 4;) namely, in changing laws divine, and making new laws, new creeds, to bind the conscience. This mark is visible in many particulars. But to my business, thus:—

The Lord Christ commands the people to “search the scriptures:” the pope commands, “No; no such matter.” Christ commands them to search “Moses and the prophets,” the Old Testament: the pope forbids them to search either Old or New. Christ saith, “In them ye think to have eternal life:” the pope saith the contrary: “There is more danger of eternal death.” Christ gives this reason: “They testify of me:” (John v. 39:) the pope saith, “No; they are very dark and obscure, very short and defective; therefore no competent witness.” Christ saith, “Let my word dwell in you richly:” the pope saith, “No; not dwell, no, not in your houses.” Christ saith, “Teaching and admonishing one another:” (Col. iii. 16:) the pope saith, “Brabbling and perverting one another.” Christ saith, “Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do it according to my word:” the pope saith, “Do my word, observe our decrees; or else I will burn you.” Christ commands in my text that this epistle be read:” the pope commands the contrary: “No reading.” Christ saith, “Unto all the brethren:” the pope saith, “No; not to any lord or duke or prince.” (Franciscus Encænas, as learned a man as Spain afforded, was imprisoned fifteen months, expecting death every day, but marvelously delivered; only for presenting the New Testament in Spanish to the emperor Charles V.) Christ saith, “I charge you to read:” the pope saith, “I charge you [that] you do not read.” Christ saith, “I charge you under my curse:” the pope saith, “I charge you not to do it, under the curse of the church.” Christ saith, “I charge you under the pain of hell-fire:” the pope saith, “I charge you, do not, under the pain of hell, and the stake in Smithfield too.”

Thus you see his mark: and it is the same in many other particulars; as, for instance, Christ commands in the supper, “Drink ye all of this:” (Matt. xxvi. 27:) the pope prohibits it: “Not a man of you shall drink a drop.” But that is eccentric, now [that] it is the business of another.

3. *Here we have the confutation of the Popish doctrine and practice.*—And this ariseth out of the premisses thus: If the Lord Christ frequently commands the reading of the scriptures by the people, and solemnly charged the reading of them to the people; then Popish doctrine and practice is false and wicked: But Christ doth do so: Therefore their doctrine is false, and their practice wicked. On the

other side: If the premisses be true, that Christ hath commanded and charged this; then the doctrine and practice of the Protestants is holy, just, and good: But Christ hath so done: Therefore their practice is good. Observe from hence, that Popery is not only an addition to the doctrine of Christ, (as some pretend,) but an opposition, a flat opposition, to it; and where it is an addition, as in the great business of justification by the righteousness of Christ alone, there the addition is a destruction. It is such an addition as Agrippina made to the meat of Claudius Cæsar; such an addition as destroys religion and poisons the soul. So the invoking of God *meritis et intercessione*, "by the merits and intercession" of saints; and the formal invocation of saints and angels, requesting their *opem et auxilium*, (very large words, and the very words of the council,) entreating their "help and assistance;" is not a bare addition, but horrid blasphemy and palpable idolatry. For which things' sake our famous English divines have held the church of Rome to be no more a true church, than a murderess and a whore can be a true subject and a true wife: a metaphysical verity is an idle whimsey in moral concerns. And they have held also, that a man living and dying a full Papist, could not be saved. "Every one," saith one, "may be saved from Popery: that is not the business; but whether he may be saved in it." They say, "No."

In opposition to the Popish doctrine this day, I have three things (as I have told you) to assert:—

I. *That the scriptures are to be read by and to the people of Christ.*

II. *That THEREFORE the scripture is scripture; the word of God was THEREFORE written.*

III. *That it is to be translated into the mother-tongue.*

The first is a plain duty and constant practice: the second is a reason to prove it: the last is a manifest inference from them both. For if the word of God were *therefore* written, that it might be read to and by the people; then it follows of course, that it is lawful, honourable, necessary to be translated. For if the shell be not broken, how can we come to the kernel? "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" If the stone be not removed from the well's mouth, how shall the maidens draw water?

I. Of the first: "When this epistle is read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle of Laodicea." (Col. iv. 16.) "Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." (Eph. iii. 4.) This epistle, it is very probable, was written to all the churches of Asia; as that to Corinth was to all the churches of Achaia: and it is likely, the epistle to the Laodiceans (being one of these churches) was the same with this to Ephesus. If any would see more of it, he may consult Dr. Usher's "Annals," *ad annum Christi* 64; or Dr. Hammond upon Col. iv., note (a.) All that we get by it is no more than what we had reason to believe before for the substance; namely, that this epistle was communicated to all the churches of Asia; only it seems very probable, that this epistle was

inscribed to the several churches by name, one by one. Now these two texts throw Dagon upon the threshold : for, observe,

1. The apostle takes it for granted, that they would read it ; nay, he commands them to take care that others may read, and that they read his epistle written to others.

2. He takes them for men of understanding ; he doth not look on them as brutes :

3. Not only understanding more obvious truths, but even “ the mystery of Christ.” He doth not tell them, “ These are hard, obscure ; they are not for the vulgar, the rabble, the lay-people, in whom there is not ” *mens, consilium, or ratio*, [“ understanding, judgment, or reason,”] but a mere *bellua multorum capitum*, a “ many-headed ” and a mad-headed “ beast.”

4. He doth yield or submit his own understanding of that mystery to the discerning of these Ephesians.

The third text shall be that of James in the council at Jerusalem : “ For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath-day.” (Acts xv. 21.) This was the old practice from ancient times, and still is, saith James. Again : “ After the reading of the law and the prophets the rulers of the synagogue sent unto ” Paul ; (Acts xiii. 15 ;) it being the custom of the Jewish doctors, after reading, to expound some scripture for the instruction of the people : so the rulers sent to Paul and Barnabas ; and Paul preached. One would think this might suffice,—the testimony of such a council ; the universal, ancient practice of the Jews in their worship ; practised by our Lord Jesus : “ He went into the synagogue, as his custom was, on the sabbath-day, and stood up for to read.” (Luke iv. 16.)

Again : the Lord Jesus often in his answers to their questions appeals to their own reading ; very often this is his practice. For instance, in the case of divorce : “ Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female ? ” (Matt. xix. 3, 4.) And again : “ For this cause shall a man forsake father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife : and they twain shall be one flesh.” (Verse 5.) So, when the children cried, “ Hosanna,” “ Have ye never read,” saith hé, “ Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise ? ” (Matt. xxi. 16.) And, “ Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner : this is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes ? ” (Verse 42.) And, “ Have ye not read ” in the scripture “ so much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungred, and they which were with him ; how he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shew-bread, and gave also to them that were with him ; which it is not lawful to eat but for the priests alone ? ” (Luke vi. 3, 4.) And, “ Have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath-day the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless ? ” (Matt. xii. 5.) Very frequently he quotes the scripture, but mentions not the prophet nor the section : they were so well acquainted by reading, and hearing it read, they

knew very well the text. The Sadducees put a case out of the scripture : "Moses said, If a man die," &c. : he tells them, they "err, not knowing the scriptures ;" answers their argument out of the scripture ; appeals to their own reading. "Have ye not read," saith he, "that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" (Matt. xxii. 23—32.) Pray observe, God spake that to Moses sixteen hundred years before they were born ; and Christ saith [that] God spoke it to them : then it did concern them to know it ; then they ought to use the means ; then they ought to read : "Have ye not read what God spake to you?" So, when he speaks of "the abomination standing in the holy place, spoken of by Daniel the prophet ;" he doth not beat them off ; and tell them it is dark and difficult ; no, but directly the contrary : "Let him that readeth understand," saith he. (Matt. xxiv. 15.) And so, in the Revelation, (and surely Daniel's prophecy and John's Revelation are the difficultest pieces in the Holy Bible,) he is so far from affrighting his people from reading of it, as a thing unfit or dangerous, that he begins the Revelation with a blessing to the reader : "Blessed is he that readeth." Yea, but every one cannot read : why, then, "Blessed are they that hear." But why read and hear? Why, that they may understand and "keep" the sayings of this book. (Rev. i. 3.) The sealed book with seven seals is opened ; and in the little book the time determined is expressed by days, months, and years ; and in every of these things there is an agreement to a tittle. We know not indeed where to commence ; and I think it is *felix nescientia*, "a profitable nescience : " but surely the book is profitable.

I wonder with what face the Jesuits of Rheims, in their preface on their "Annotations," could scurrilously scoff at the heretics for reading the Revelation. Did they set themselves on purpose against the testimony of Jesus Christ? "They" (the Protestants) "read—and to see out of pride of heart, and we know what spirit they vaunt—the *Cantica Canticorum*, the Romans, and the Apocalypse." O ye Jesuits, what makes you to rage and revile? What harm [do] these books do to you? I guess, this is the reason : the Canticles in a heavenly way treat of the near union of the church to Jesus Christ, and her daily communion with him by faith, love, blessing, prayer, meditation, and obedience to him. Doth this offend you?

But why, I wonder, do you mention the Romans, as if it were so great a fault for the people of God to read the Romans. Avaunt, impudence, joined with spite and malice! Had you no more discretion but to tell the world in print, that *that* epistle did torment you? The truth is, that epistle heweth Popery all to pieces : their mincing original sin, their cursed distinction of sins into venial and mortal, (which one distinction ruins more souls than any one in the world, and brings them in more gain than any other,) their justification by works, their doctrine of apostasy, election conditional, with the rest, are all confuted and confounded by that epistle. Besides, in Paul's numerous salutations of the saints at Rome in the sixteenth chapter, he never mentions Peter, nor anywhere else in the epistle ; never men-

tions his care over them or pains amongst them, nor their respect or duty to him: a shrewd suspicion; and it is no way fit the people should know so much.

For the Revelation, every one knows the reason why they cannot abide that book to be known and read: for *there* is described the great whore, intoxicating princes and the inhabitants of the earth with the wine of her fornications. The city is so plainly described to be Rome, that every reader presently understands it of the Papacy. And well they may: for the attempts of learned men to apply the Revelation to Rome-Pagan are lighter than vanity; and the attempts of the Jesuits to accommodate it to an Antichrist at Rome, three years and a half before the end of the world, are most fabulous and ridiculous, and yet a horrible cheat. In France, Spain, and Italy, and other places where the Papists dwell, that chimerical Antichrist goes for current.

But, to proceed: there are scriptures yet behind; and they are principal ones, none beyond them. Perhaps you think, "What need [that] you prove it any more? It is as clear as the sun." I answer, I have told you [that] my thoughts have been the same. I have wondered how our divines could be so copious, so laborious, so exact, in a point so plain, till I considered that it is one of the main points of greatest moment. Let this be for a wonder to us,—that the popes, the councils, cardinals, doctors, men of parts, convenienced with all helps of libraries, arts, languages, should either be so blind or blinded as not to see it, or else so daring as to deny it, or else so desperate (this is the case) as, tooth and nail, by all means,—flattery, fallacy, force, wrestings, perverting scriptures, fathers, councils,—to oppose it, to disparage, to blaspheme it; and all to rob the people of God of it, and to make merchandise of their souls; for that is the meaning of that text,—Rev. xviii. 13.

The first [scripture] is that of Christ: "Search the scriptures." (John v. 39.) The context tells you that Jesus had healed the cripple that lay at the pool: (verses 1—9;) the Jews cavil at him for carrying his bed; (verse 10;) he defends himself by the command of Him that cured him. (Verse 11.) He comes and tells them, namely, the Jews, "that it was Jesus, which had made him whole:" (verse 15:) upon this the Jews sought to kill Jesus. (Verse 16.) Upon this Jesus began to preach to them; (verses 18—47;) and in this thirtieth verse he commands and exhorts them to "search the scriptures." As if he had said, "You will not believe me, though you see my works; and I would not have you believe the scribes, to whom you give too much credence: between us both, believe your own eyes, 'search the scriptures.' Moses and the prophets wrote of me." There is the first.

The second is that of the Bereans: "That they searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so;" and they are highly commended for it by the blessed Spirit, "These were more noble." (Acts xvii. 11.) Ah, the poor Rhemists! (yet they had their best wits, and did their best endeavours, and many a-year they were a-contriving their "Annotations,") how are they confounded and puzzled here!

Something they would seem to say ; but it is worse than nothing, because it is nothing to the purpose. And indeed what can be said ? A man had need to have a special faculty in railing and casting mists before so clear a light ; for this text avows three things which are the very state of the controversy :—

1. That the scriptures were in the vulgar tongue.
 2. That, as they were in their own tongue, so the laity had them in their own hands.

3. That they did read them, and heard them read : there was nothing of any imperial or pontifical power, to hinder them ; no monks nor friars, to discourage them, and impeach them too.

The question being thus cleared, add to this, *ex abundantia*, [“over and above,”] the practice of these Bereans ; which was “searching,” and that “daily, these scriptures ;” for which they are commended, and that by God himself, for so searching ; and any sober man would think it impossible for any to gainsay it. Let the people, whose souls are precious and immortal, in other countries enjoy the same privileges as the Bereans had ; and then, if they do not read and hear and search, their destruction will lie at their own door : but if they be debarred, and die in their sins through ignorance, if they perish for want of knowledge, their blood will be required elsewhere. “Woe be to the parish-priests ! woe be to the bishops ! woe to the prelates !” said one of their own.

The third and last is that of Moses in the year of release : “When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law : and that their children, which have not known any thing, may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it.” (Deut. xxxi. 11—13.) I say nothing of the king ; who is commanded to have “a copy of the law, and to read therein all the days of his life :” (Deut. xvii. 18, 19 :) nor of Joshua, the captain-general : “This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth ; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night :” (Joshua i. 8 :) nor the chamberlain of the queen, who was reading in his chariot the Book of Isaiah : (Acts viii. 28 :) nor Peter’s exhorting the twelve tribes to take heed to walk according to the scriptures, “as a light, and a more sure word of prophecy” than any particular voice from heaven, though that was most sure also : (2 Peter i. 19 :) nor Paul’s bidding believers to “try all things ;” (1 Thess. v. 21 :) which trial must be by a rule, which is the word of Christ ; with which rule they must be well acquainted, or else they will be but sorry triers.

These and many others I must pass over, and desire you to consider what you heard. The adversaries to this truth know all this full well ; but what care they for Moses ? Tell them that “Moses took the blood, and sprinkled the altar, and read the book of the covenant in

the audience of the people;" (Exod. xxiv. 6, 7;) what care they for Moses's precept or practice or threatening? For why? they assert that *papa potest dispensare contra Mosen*. If you argue from the apostles, why, then *papa potest dispensare contra Paulum*.* To be short, a learned Frenchman (no Huguenot) tells us,—Dr. Glossatour, upon the canon-law avowed by the Rota in Rome, affirms,—that "the pope may dispense against the apostle, against the Old Testament, against the four evangelists, against the law of God." ("Review of the Council of Trent," book v. chap. 3.) To what purpose should I stuff my discourse with quotations? *Papa potest*, "The pope can dispense," when we see he doth do it; and it is so determined by the council, with an anathema to the gainsayer, in the business of marriage: *Si quis dixerit ecclesiam non posse dispensare in nonnullis, &c.*: (*De Matrimonio*, can. iii.): "If any shall affirm, the church cannot dispense in some things forbidden about marriage in Leviticus; let him be accursed." If a man reply, that these marriages were abominable among the Heathen before Moses was born, and for these sins God cast them out, and therefore they were sins against the light of nature; and by that reason the pope cannot dispense: pish! the answer is easy: *Papa potest dispensare contra rationem*, "The pope can dispense against reason." If you reply, that Paul did deliver to Satan the Corinthian for one of these marriages prohibited; the answer is, *Paulus non potuit*, "Paul could not dispense, but Peter could." Thus, you see, there is no defending of Popery in this and other controversies, but by setting the pope above God. The damned angels would be as God; but here is one that acts superiority over Christ, "who is God over all, blessed for ever." (Rom. ix. 5.)

II. The second point to be discussed is this, *that the Bible had never been, but for the use of the people of God*.—God therefore commanded the doctrines, precepts, promises, providences, prophecies, to be written for them: and therefore they are to read it, and to hear it read. Nay, more: as they were written *for* the people, so by God's appointment they were written *to* the people: therefore the people are not to be debarred from the reading and hearing of them. A man that denies these arguments must be (to refresh myself with J. G.'s language) "the first-born of impudence and nonsensicality." The two antecedents I shall prove by parts.

1. The first [that the scriptures were written *for the people*] is proved by Rom. xv. 4: "Whatsoever things were written beforetime were written for our learning;" and the best learning, too, in the world; "that we" all "through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." "For *our* learning," mine and yours, ye saints at Rome! tent-makers, artificers, men, women, old, young! "for *your* learning" faith, hope, patience, waiting upon God, keeping his ways, and comfort in so doing, strength, courage to do, to suffer; and "whatsoever things," doctrinal, preceptive, promissory, historical, all written, all "written" for you, "for your learning:" *ergo*, surely they may read them, and hear them. The next is John

* "The pope can dispense against Moses and against Paul."—EDIT.

xx. 31: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." This gospel was the last; written (our books tell us) upon the request of some Asian presbyters, for the good of the churches, and against the Ebionites, and Cerinthians, and such-like, who denied the Deity and satisfaction of our Lord Jesus. Surely it was written for the churches; (and so to all, to the end;) and it was written for their knowledge of, faith in, and salvation by, our Lord Jesus: these are expressly in the text. So, again, 1 John v.: What a chapter have we there, so sublime and heavenly! Yet in the thirteenth verse he tells us that these things are written to believers, to all believers, that they might "know that they have eternal life." And so begins his Epistle: (chap. i. :) when he had spoken something of their fellowship with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ, "These things," saith he, "I write unto you, that your joy may be full." (Verse 4.) "I write unto you, little children;" (chap. ii. 12;) "unto you, fathers; unto you, young men." (Verse 13.) The Epistle is high, yet very plain: it treats of the blessed Trinity, communion with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ, cleansing by his blood from all sin, remission of sins through his name, the teachings and witness of the Holy Spirit; and treats of these things so, that writing of them to all sorts for their good, together with the doctrines written, is abundantly able to confound the Romans, and Poland adversaries, abroad and at home.

What need I mention any more that of the king? He must "write a copy of the law: and it must be with him, and he must read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them." (Deut. xvii. 18, 19.) Joshua must have the book, that he may observe those precepts, and prosper. (Joshua i. 8, 9.) It were endless to name all: I will form the argument, and go to the next. Thus it runs:—

The truths which God appointed to be written on purpose that the people might read and hear, for their learning, instruction, faith, obedience, comfort, joy; these truths the people ought to read and hear: But the Bible is the book wherein these truths are written for that purpose: Therefore they are to read and hear the Bible read one to another.

2. But, secondly, as they were written *for* them, so they were written *to* them; not to the clergy, but *the people* especially. The seven epistles to the seven churches [were] written to them for their good. (Rev. ii., iii.) "What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia," saith the Lord Christ to John. (Rev. i. 11.) So Jude 1. So Peter: "This second Epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance." (2 Peter iii. 1, 2.) Thus he writes *to* them and *for* them. So Paul, to the saints at Rome; (Rom. i. 7;) to them at Corinth; (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1;) "to the faithful in Christ Jesus at Ephesus." (Eph. i. 1.) So in the rest, as every child knows.

Now when God gives his truth by inspiration, and appoints it to be written, as profitable to conviction, to conversion, to instruction in righteousness, that his people may be thoroughly furnished to every good work and word; what audaciousness, what wickedness is it, for any sinful man to interpose and hinder this; and that by a law, and that under a curse! Shall some mighty prince signify his will, to the people under him, of the greatest concernment in the world for their advantage; and shall any man stand up and forbid them to read it or hear it read, and punish them with death for having a transcript in their houses? Search and look into stories, whether such a thing was ever done under heaven. Ambrose saith, that *scriptura est epistola Dei ad creaturas*; * and, behold, here is one that opens his mouth against heaven, and establisheth wickedness by a decree, expressly forbidding all men of all degree to read or keep this letter! Is not this he to whom "the dragon gave his power, and his seat, and great authority?" to whom "was given a mouth speaking great words and blasphemies, and power to continue two-and-forty months?" (Rev. xiii. 2, 5.) Well, the argument is this:—

They to whom God appoints the scriptures to be written, they are to read and hear them read: But the scriptures were thus written to the people: Therefore they are to read them.

The next thing is, to evidence our assertion by the judgment of the ancient fathers: but that seems needless; for their own do confess that the fathers, to a man, were of our persuasion and practice. Claudius Espencæus, a learned man, tells us of himself, *Equidem in patribus orthodoxis per Dei gratiam, &c.* "Truly," saith he, "by the grace of God, I have been conversant in the orthodox fathers; and marvel very much," *non potui non mirari*, "that the custom of reading scriptures by the people should now be accounted capital and pestilent, which to the ancient orthodox fathers seemed so commodious and profitable." (ESPENCÆI *Comment. in Tit. ii.*, p. 266.) If it be said that this bishop was before the council of Trent; and that possibly, if he had been in that convocation, he would have been of another mind; there were learned men there more excellent, that might have better informed him: to this I answer, I will give you one instance for all, a little after that council; and it is worth your observation.

About the year 1560, bishop Jewel, preaching at Paul's Cross before a very great and venerable assembly, makes this offer:—that if any man alive, or men whatsoever, of the Popish side, could prove, by any one plain sentence out of scriptures, or fathers, ancient doctors, or general councils, for the first six hundred years, any one of the seven-and-twenty articles which he there rehearsed, he would then yield and submit. Among these articles the fifteenth concerns our business; it runs thus: "If any one can prove by scriptures, fathers, doctors, councils, for the first six hundred years, that the lay-people were forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue; I will yield and submit." Great discourse, you must think, arose upon this

* "The scriptures are an epistle addressed by God to his creatures."—EDIT.

among all sorts ; for such a man (indeed incomparable) to make such an offer, so seemingly daring ; in such a place, so public ; in such a way as in a public ordinance of God ; before such an assembly, so solemn and learned ! great discourse there was, no doubt. Some few months after, he comes into the same place, and remembers [reminds] the audience of his proffer with a great deal of Christian humility ; and modestly tells them, it was not vain-glory or self-confidence, (for what was he ?) but the vindication of truth, the glory of Christ, and the salvation of souls, that had engaged him in this business. Then and there he repeated the same articles, and renewed the same proffer. Whisperings, censurings, railings there were great store in private concerning him ; but no man makes an attempt to answer him. The bishop's "Apology for the Church of England" is printed and translated into several languages, dispersed abroad in France and Spain and other parts. One of the many notable, home-learned passages I have transcribed to our purpose :—

"If we be heretics, (as they would have us called,) and they be Catholics, why do they not convince and master us by the divine scriptures, as catholic fathers have always done ? Why do they not lay before us, how we have gone away from Christ, from the prophets and apostles, and from the holy fathers ? Why are they afraid of this ? why stick they at this ? I pray you, what manner of men be they, which fear the judgment of God's word ; that are afraid of the holy scriptures, and do prefer before them their own dreams and cold inventions ; and, to maintain their own traditions, have defaced and corrupted now these many hundred years the ordinances of Christ and the apostles ?"

This is somewhat close and warm. Well, but still here is a great silence. Dr. Cole, (late dean of Paul's,) a man reputed learned, enters into a letter-combat with him. The bishop begs of him to give one father, one scripture, one doctor. "Good Mr. Doctor," saith he, "do not deceive the people : their souls be precious." The doctor sends him back a taunt, a quibble ; but never a word of scripture, council, or father : he pretends he was afraid of forfeiting his recognisance. "No, no," replies the bishop, "there is no fear of that ; why should you fear the forfeit of your recognisance more for quoting Austin and Chrysostom, than for quoting Horace and Virgil ?" At last, about five years after, out comes Dr. Harding and his fellows ; and when he and they (for you may be sure the main strength of Rome was engaged in this quarrel) come to make their reply to this fifteenth article, the words are these ; I will read them to you in their own expressions : "That the lay-people were then forbidden to read the scriptures in their own tongue, I find it not." This is honest, however ; but then the next clause is knavish : "Neither do I find they were commanded to read."

ANSWER. The fathers did not take upon them to command, but they pressed the command of Christ : that clause was impertinent, on purpose to beguile the reader. The fathers did exhort the people vehemently for reading, and rebuked them sharply for not reading.

Give me a roll of parchment as long as my arm, of the ordinary breadth; and I dare undertake, a man shall fill it full within and without with the sayings of the fathers to our purpose in a short time. Indeed, the work is done already to our hands: our reverend fathers have wrought hard with great judgment and success; we have (or might have) entered upon their labours. Is it not a fault amongst us, that we make no more use of so shining lights? I will name a few: bishop Jewel in his "Reply and Defence," Morton in his "Appeal," Whitaker *De Scripturâ*, Dr. White's "Way" and "Defence," Cartwright on the Rhemists' Preface, the renowned Du Plessis, and the great Chamier. What an abundance of sayings of the fathers have they quoted for the people's reading and hearing of the scriptures, within this hundred years and upward! And none hath adventured to gain-say them therein, that I know.

QUESTION. But you will say, "Do not the learned Papists (for there are learned men amongst them) give some answer to the scriptures you quote, and the old doctors too?"

ANSWER. I answer, There be four questions [which] I have to speak to, before we come to speak something of translating the scriptures; and this question shall be the first. The second is, "What artifices they do use to bring people out of conceit with the scriptures." The third is, "What objections they usually bring against us." The last, "What may be the design in all this?" And I shall here make use of the fathers.

QUESTION I. First, then, *what have they to say?*

ANSWER. I answer, To that scripture, (which is a principal one,) "Search the scriptures;" (John v. 39;) they would fain have it to be the indicative mood, not the imperative; to be a practice, not a precept. Poor men! they would get little by this, if it were so: for this practice was lawful and commendable; and then Christ appeals to the scriptures, in which they were practised, to which they did pretend. Their own doctor, bishop Espencæus, thinks it a very great shame, that the Jews did practise themselves, and train up their children, in the knowledge of the scriptures; and Christians did neglect it. Yea, but they would willingly shift it off from being a command; for then it is still binding, and people that have any sense of God and their souls, and any thoughts of another world, will conceive [that] it is their duty, let all the popes in the world say what they will to the contrary. This is that which pincheth: therefore they would by any shift or wriggle put it off from being a command; but it will not be. The fathers take the words in the imperative: *Utinam omnes faceremus*, "Would to God we would all do that which is written: 'Search the scriptures.'" (ORIGENES in *Isai. Hom. ii.*) *Εκλευσεν, Ερευνηατε* "He commands us, 'Search the scriptures.'" (ATHANASII *Comment. tom. ii. p. 248.*) *Εντολη δοθη*, "When a commandment is given, let us obey our Lord." (BASIL.) Chrysostom, the same. So Theophylact, his follower, the same: *Διδασκων πως δυνασονται*, "Teaching of them how they might have the word of God abiding in them, he saith, 'Search the scriptures.'" (THEOPHYLACTUS in *loc.*)

There needs no more; for Jansenius doth confess it: *Communitèr quidem accipitur ut sit imperativi modi*: "It is commonly taken for a command." *Non dicit, Legite*, "He doth not say, 'Read,' but, 'Search;'" *non has aut illas, sed omnes*; "not 'this' or 'that,' but 'all the scriptures,' law and prophets." (*Concordia Evangelica*, cap. 36, *in loc.*) So doth Maldonate: "Theophylact, Augustine," *et omnes, opinor, præter Cyrillum, graves auctores*, "all grave authors, I suppose, except Cyril, take these words for a command." *In eo enim vis testimonii et gratia orationis consistit*.* Why so? *Ad suas ipsorum scripturas mittit*; "Christ sends them to their own Bibles;" *in quibus omnem illi gloriam suam collocabant*, "of which they chiefly gloried. As if he should say," *Quandoquidem tantum scripturis tribuitis*, "'Since you ascribe so much to the scriptures, that in them you think to have eternal life; search the scriptures; and all things do well agree: they testify of me.'" *Chrysostomus et Euthymius benè adnotarunt, Non dicit, Legite, sed, Scrutamini*.† So that this text doth stand for a command from Christ, and the countermand stands (among others) for a brand of Antichrist.

But, soft, not so hasty: Stapleton and others say, "Christ there speaks to the scribes and Pharisees; and they were to search the scriptures by their office." This they prove by verse 33: "Ye sent unto John:" now the scribes and Pharisees sent unto John; therefore to them he speaks.

ANSWER. The chapter speaks not a word of the scribes and Pharisees, but of the Jews: besides, the scribes and Pharisees did not send unto John, but the Jews. The text is express: "The Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to John." (John i. 19.)

As to the fathers' urging the Bible upon the people, they say, "It is true; but," say they, (Sixtus Senensis, and others,) *Patres dispensarunt, indulserunt libertatem*.‡

ANSWER. Out upon it! a mere forgery, to cheat the simple! *Venia et indulgentia locum non habet ubi non præcesserit prohibitio*: that is Chamier's answer: "An indulgence doth presuppose a prohibition. How could the fathers indulge that that was never forbidden?" Was the reading or hearing of the Bible ever forbidden by the fathers or Christian magistrates in their time? Indeed, Antiochus did burn it, and Julian scoffed at it, and Diocletian did burn it also; but of Christians never any did so. The destroyers and prohibitors of scriptures are of another sort; they do like the pagan princes, Antiochus and Diocletian.

But they plead the fathers: they say, the fathers (as Jerome and Austin) say the scriptures are obscure and hard to be understood; and from thence infer, that in the judgment of the fathers the lay-people should not meddle with them.

ANSWER. It is true, most of them urge this; but very sophistically and, indeed, wickedly. Austin saith that the scripture, like a familiar

* "For in it consist the force of testimony and the grace of speech."—EDIT.
 † MALDONATUS *in loc.* "Chrysostom and Euthymius have well remarked, that he does not say, 'Read,' but, 'Search.'"—EDIT. ‡ "The fathers allowed this liberty as an indulgence."—EDIT.

friend, speaketh those things [which] it containeth to the heart *doctorum et indoctorum*, “of the learned and the unlearned.” (*Epist.* 3.) “The scriptures are easy to be understood, and exposed to the capacity of every servant, ploughman, artificer :” so Chrysostom, Cyril, Jerome, Isidore ; and, indeed, all to the same purpose. True, they say (as we do) that there are some things obscure, to stir up diligence, frequency, prayer : “Some scriptures are dark ; therefore Christians must pray more, and read more attentively, diligently :” that is the inference of the fathers. “Therefore they must not read at all :” that is the inference of the Jesuits. What sophistry, how bald, is this ! fit to be hissed out of the company of rational men. Chrysostom is most earnest upon all sorts,—artificers, tradesmen, men, women, young, old,—to be much in reading and hearing ; answers all their shifts ; tells them that they have more need than others, than students, than monks, because they are “in the midst of many temptations.” Our divines cite him much : the compiler of our “Homilies” quotes scarce any father beside. What say the Jesuits to this ? Why, some say, “He dealt like a pulpit-man, not like a reader in a desk ; like an orator, not a disputant :” others, “He was a vehement man :” others, that he spake hyperbolically ; that is, he spake more than was needful. Whereas the truth is, the angels would sooner want words wherewith to commend, than the Bible want worth to commend itself. But of all men the Rhemists are most impudent ; who would make as if Chrysostom were so vehement, only, or mainly, to take people off from cards and dice and stage-plays : whereas Chrysostom’s great business is, to take them from their excuses of their families, trades, callings. (RHEMISTS’ Preface to their “Annotations,” with CARTWRIGHT’S “Answer :” see there at large.) To conclude this : the fathers speak of the scriptures according to the scripture ; namely, that “they are a light, a lamp ; a light that shineth ; that they give understanding to the simple ; if men speak not according to them, it is because there is no light in them :” yet these men reject all. Some few are constrained to confess that in points generally to be believed the scriptures are plain ; but yet they will not yield at any hand that they shall come into the hands of the people. You shall hear their reasons by-and-by.

QUESTION II. The second question is, *what artifices their learned men do use to debase the scriptures ; that the people may have a vile esteem of them, bring them to disdain, and loathe them.*

ANSWER. I answer, Many ways, by word and deed.

1. *By word.*—Shall I say, They disparage them ? Sure enough, they blaspheme ; they call them “a dead letter, a dumb judge,” *theologiam atramentariam*, “inken divinity,” (do you hear, ye Quakers, who were your tutor ?) “a Lesbian rule, a nose of wax.” “Without the pope,” saith cardinal Hosius, “they have no more authority than *Æsop’s Fables*,” *non plus autoritatis quam Æsopi Fabulas*. Here is a Rabshakeb, whom the Babylonish king hath preferred to a red hat to blaspheme the living God. The same man compares David’s Psalms to ballads, with a verse out of Horace :

Scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim.—HORATII *Epist.* lib. ii. ep. i. 117 ;

which the excellent bishop Englisheth thus: "We write ballads tag and rag." Dr. White, in "The Way," tells us that Peresius said, that he thought verily it was the devil's invention to permit the people to read the Bible. Is not this enough to scare and affright poor souls from touching it or attending to it? (MARTIN. PERESIUS *De Trad.*, p. 44.) And Thyrræus saith, that he knew certain husbandmen possessed of the devil; because, being but husbandmen, they were able to discourse of the scriptures. (THYRRÆUS *De Dæmoniac.*, cap. xxi. thes. 257.) Methinks, here I have an idea of a friar preaching, that reading scripture is the way to be possessed of the devil.

2. *By deeds and practice.*—And that many ways.

(1.) *They cry up the good of ignorance.*—They tell us, it is more rewardable to be ignorant than knowing: they require no knowledge of the things we pray for. The Jesuits tell us, (after a long harangue, in some things impertinent, and in others very false,) that devout people may, and ought [to,] in their ancient right, still use their Latin prayers, beads, and Primers as ever before, notwithstanding what Paul saith in 1 Cor. xiv.; and that they doubt not but it is acceptable to God, and available in all their necessities: nay, more; that they pray with great consolation of spirit, and with as great devotion and affection, nay, oftentimes more than they that pray in the vulgar tongue. Well, and what prayers be these? Why, they be prayers, psalms, and holy words: they are the Pater-noster, the Ave-Maria, the Creed, Our Lady's Matins, and the Litanies, and the like. O the impudence of men, that have made their faces harder than a rock, to print such things as these! ("Rhemish Annotations" on 1 Cor. xiv.) So also they require no ability to profess their faith, if they were to suffer for it: "If a Catholic, called before the commissioners, hath courage to say, 'I am a Catholic,' he defendeth himself sufficiently, (though he can say no more,) and that 'I will die a Catholic.'" But what, if the commissioners ask him a reason of his faith? "he answers enough by telling them, that the church can give them a reason of all their demands." ("Rhemish Annotations" on Luke xii. 11.) They say that ignorance in most things is best of all; to know nothing, is to know all things. (HOSIUS.)

(2.) *They cry up to the skies an implicit faith.* (This is distinct from the other, though near akin.)—This is the collier's faith, and doeth wonders. The story is:—The collier was sick; and being at the point of death, he was tempted of the devil, what his faith was. The collier answered, "I believe and die in the faith of Christ's church." Being demanded by the devil, what the faith of the church was; "That faith," quoth he, "that I believe in;" and thus clearly baffled and nonplussed the devil. "He put him to flight," said Staphylæus. "I should not have believed this story," saith my author, "upon the report of such a base companion as Staphylæus: but when I saw the same conceit set forth as gravely by learned Clerdes than that renegade," (so bishop Jewel calls him,) "then I conceived that the collier's faith was canonized for the Papists' creed." These

learned men were no less than Albertus Pighius, (*De Hierarch. Eccles.*, lib. i. cap. v. p. 38,) and Hosius, (*Cont. Proleg. Brentii*, lib. iii. p. 136,) with two other considerable men. Dr. Cole shall conclude this, with what he did once conclude the convocation at Westminster in the beginning of [the reign of] queen Elizabeth. The story in short is this:—A disputation is appointed by the council at Westminster, saith Fuller in his “History:” * nine Popish bishops and doctors on that side; eight Protestant doctors on the other side; Sir Nicholas Bacon, lord-keeper, moderator. The first question was about service in an unknown tongue. The first day passed with the Protestants. The second day the Popish bishops and doctors fell to cavilling against the order agreed on; (alas! what should they do? They could not now *petere argumenta ex officinis carnificum*; †) they fell to sauciness, as well as disorder: the meeting is dissolved. Dr. Cole stands up and tells that honourable assembly thus, with a loud voice: “I tell you, saith he, “that ignorance is the mother of devotion.” So said the Valentinians of old, (as Irenæus tells us, lib. ii. cap. 19,) that the ignorance of truth is knowledge.

(3.) They have one trick more, to debase the scriptures, and dull the edge of people's affection to them. *Some of their doctors write most unworthy things of the Bible, as before: these they applaud; that so they may instil silyly and insensibly into the minds of men by their authority a very coarse esteem of the word of God.*—As, for example: Catharinus testifieth of cardinal Cajetan, that he denied the last chapter of St. Mark, some parcels of St. Luke, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of John, and the Epistle of Jude. This man they applaud very highly, call him “the incomparable divine,” fill their people with high admirations of him, and then publish in their books these things; and so instil by drops an evil opinion of the scriptures. And if the Protestants object this to them, they put it off, saying [that] he was but a private doctor; what is that to their church? The priests and friars tell the people what Hosius and others, their admired men, say of the scriptures: “A dark, lame, mute, dumb, sorry book:” and all this, to disparage the holy truth of God, and to keep poor souls in ignorance: which they do by this means, both priest and people.

Their very *priests* understand not their own Mass-books. A young man, within these three months, entered into discourse with some priests at Malaga in Spain: he saluted them in Latin, and proposed some questions in Latin to them; they understood never a word. Archbishop Spotswood tells us, in his “History of Scotland,” that the cardinal persecuted men in Angus for reading the New Testament: and, it is said, the ignorance of these times was so great, that even “the priests did think that the New Testament was one of Martin Luther's books.” (“History of the Church of Scotland,” *ad annum* 1544.) He tells us, also, of a great contention among the churchmen,

* FULLER'S “Church-History of Britain,” vol. ii. p. 446, 8vo edition, 1842.—EDIT.
 † “They could not now seek arguments from the offices of the executioners.”—EDIT.

whether the Pater-noster might be said to the saints. It was brought to the university: they (some of the doctors) said, it might be said to God *formaliter*, to the saints *materialiter*; to God *principaliter*, to the saints *minus principaliter*; to God *capiendo strictè*, to saints *capiendo largè*.* The doctors meet several times; and not agreeing, it was referred to a provincial synod to be decided. When the synod convened, the question was agitated again: at last it was resolved that the Pater-noster might be said to saints. (*Ibid.* anno 1553.)

It is impossible to conceive what a thick fog and mist of ignorance and darkness, was upon the souls of the *people*. I will mention but one story from Dr. White upon his own experience; it is this:—He saw and learned (dwelling among them) how they said their prayers. The Creed [they said] thus: “*Creezum xuum Patrum onitentem Creatorum ejus anicum Dominum nostrum qui cum sons Virgini Mariae crixus fixus Douche Pilati* ;” and so on, to, “*Eccli catholi remisserue peccaturum communiurum, obliviorum bitam and turnam* again.” “It would make a man’s heart tremble,” saith my author, “at their most horrid ignorance: yet to hear them pronounce their prayer,—it moves laughter; and I confess, upon this account I durst not preach it.” In him you may see a great deal more of this pitiful stuff. (“The Way to the true Church,” in the “Preface to the Reader.”) The Jesuit in his “Answer,” calls him to an account for this; but in his “Defence” he tells the Jesuit, that is the case of the better sort, as well as the poor; they are all ignorant, and say their prayers much at one rate. “And this,” saith he, “I will stand to, if all the seminaries in England had it in chase. My experience of some,” saith he, “allows me to speak that the ignorance is general.” (“Defence,” chap. xii.) He asked an ancient woman, what Jesus Christ was: she told him, she could not tell; but sure it was some good thing; it would not have been with the Lady else in her Creed. But no more.

(4.) Lastly. They take this way to put down the scriptures; namely, *by destroying and burning them, and those that love them*.—I will give three or four instances. The first:—King Henry VIII. writes to the French king for licence to print the Bible in English in Paris, because there was store of paper and good workmen; as also to Bonner, then lieger in France, to further it. This was by the means of Cromwell. At great charges it is effected; but, by the means of Gardiner and his fellows, seized and burned openly in the Maulbert-place in Paris; two thousand five hundred Bibles burned at one fire. (See Fox’s “Martyrology:” there is much more to this purpose.)

Upon the persecution of the duke of Guise against the Protestants, at Amiens all the Bibles, Testaments, Psalters, were sought for and openly burnt; at Troyes the Bibles were all rent and torn in pieces; at Angers they openly burnt the Bibles in the market-place. One fair gilt Bible was hung upon a halberd, and carried in procession; the Papists saying, “Behold truth hanged! the truth of the Huguenots, the truth of all the devils!” (With much collected by Mr. Clarke, in his

* “To God formally, to the saints materially; to God principally, to the saints less principally; to God in a strict acceptation, to the saints in a wider sense.”—EDIT.

“Martyrology.”) In Ireland, within memory, the Bible was dragged, kennelled, cut, torn, stamped upon. Bishop Jewel tells of a martyr in [the reign of] queen Mary, [who] pleaded the scripture before the bishop in his own defence. The bishop, turning to a justice, said, “Nay, if he prates of the Bible, we shall never have done.” *Habemus legem*, “We have a law,” said he, “and by our law he ought to die.” (“Reply to Cole.”) John Porter, a young man, reads in the Bible set up in Paul’s by Bonner in the lord Cromwell’s time. When Cromwell was dead, Bonner sends for him; accuses him for expounding the Bible to the people: Porter denies any such thing. Bonner sends him to Newgate; where he is loaded with irons, hands and legs, and a collar of iron about his neck. By a friend’s means to the keeper he is somewhat eased, and put among the felons; whom he reproves and instructs, being well acquainted with the scriptures. He is complained of; the bishop commands him into the dungeon. It is thought, he was put into the engine called “the devil in the neck:” in the night he was heard to groan sadly, in the morning found dead.

A poor bookseller in Avignon was burned to ashes for setting to sale some French Bibles: his defence [is] worthy the reading. His questions utterly silencing the bishop of Aix, with the rest of the prelates; they gnashed upon him with their teeth, and cried, “To the fire presently!” He was led to his execution with two Bibles about his neck; one hanging before, the other behind; as showing the cause of his condemnation. So the good man and the Bibles were burnt together. (Fox’s “Martyrology,” Henry VIII.)

A woman of Sansay in France was accused by her servant for having a Bible in her house, in reading whereof was her whole delight. The maid-servant complains of this to the Jesuits; the Jesuits complain to the judges: she was apprehended and imprisoned. The judges told her [that], if she would confess upon the scaffold that she had broken the law, and cast her Bible into the fire, she should have her life. “We would have you,” said they, “imagine it to be but paper; and you may buy another: only throw this into the fire, to give the Jesuits content.” Thus they laboured to persuade her for the space of two hours. “What a scandal shall I give,” said she, “to the people, to burn God’s book! No, certainly; I will never do it: I will rather burn my body than my Bible.” Upon this she was committed close prisoner, fed with bread and water; at last condemned to be set upon the scaffold, her Bible burnt before her face, herself to be strangled, her body to be dragged through the streets to a dunghill; which was accordingly done.

A woman in Ireland [being] required by Fitzpatrick to burn her Bible, she told him that she would rather die than burn her Bible: whereupon, the sabbath-day morning after this, she and her husband were cruelly murdered. But the murderer, tormented in conscience, and dogged (as he conceived) and haunted with apparitions of them, with inward horror pined away. (CLARKE’S “Martyrology,” in France and Ireland.)

There is no end of these sad stories. Dr. Story shall conclude.

"Thou pratest," said he to a martyr, "of the Bible: bible, babble; all is bible, babble: thou shalt prate at a stake."

So much of the second question.

QUESTION III. The third is this: *What objections do they make against reading and having scripture? They are men of learning; some of them give some reason for their proceedings.*

ANSWER. They do so: and you shall hear them fairly proposed; I will not wrong them.

OBJECTION I. The first is this: "'Cast not holy things to dogs, nor pearls before swine;' therefore the people must not have the use of Bibles."

ANSWER. Verily this argument is so horribly injurious to the wisdom and mercy of God, and so inhuman and barbarous to the rationality of man, that one would think it were rather slanderously and designedly imposed upon them, than proposed by them. But it is notoriously true in all their books. Harding and his fellows allege it in their "Answer" to bishop Jewel: Hosius doth the same also: the Jesuits, in their preface to the "Rhemish Annotations," but more subtilly and slyly; and are rebuked sufficiently by Mr. Cartwright. Salmeron and Costerus give the same reason why the people are not to know the church-traditions, they must be kept locked and safe in the pope's breast: the pope is not to let the people know traditions, or at least doth not, because holy things must not be thrown to dogs. Canus doth the same; and because he speaks out, I will write his words: *Si apostoli quibus formis sacramenta essent conficienda, quibusque ritibus administranda, aliaque id genus religionis secreta, passim vulgo tradidissent, quid esset aliud quàm, adversus Christi legem, sanctum dare canibus et inter porcos spargere margaritas? Imò, quid esset aliud quàm omnia mysteria Christianæ religionis abolere? Nec enim mysterium est quod ad populares aures effertur. Hæc itaque prima ratio est cur apostoli quædam sine scripto tradiderunt; nempe, ne aut ab Ethnicis irriderentur sacra nostra, aut vulgo etiam fidelium venirent in contemptum.* The long and short is this:—that "the apostles did by word of mouth deliver the secrets of the gospel to some men, and did not write and preach the whole of faith and duty to the churches: for if they had done so, they had gone against the command of Christ; who saith, 'Give not holy things to dogs, and cast not pearls before swine.'" (CANUS *De Locis Theologicis*, lib. iii. cap. 3.) Thus the poor people—whose souls are immortal and precious; the people, that are the church of God; for whom Christ died, to redeem [them] with his blood; for whom, and to whom, the scriptures were on set purpose written—must have nothing: not the scriptures, because holy things must not be given to dogs; nor traditions, (which also contain matters of faith and worship,) because pearls must not be cast to swine.

Mr. Harding, and they with him, tell us that, whereas the Hebrew letters had no vowels, the seventy elders only could read; and the people were kept from reading of it, as it is thought, by the special providence of God, that precious stones should not be cast before

swine. ("Reply to the fifteenth Article.") A notorious daring untruth! For, whether they had points or not, is not to the question: sure enough, the people could read; for they were expressly commanded to write the words of the law, (Deut. xi. 20,) and they could write a bill of divorce. Paulus Fagius saith, from the rabbins, that through the whole country every town had a school, and that in Jerusalem there were some hundreds of schools: and in so many schools was there no scholar [that] did know his letters? For him to say they could not read, and that by a special Providence they were kept from it, and that because holy things should not be cast to dogs; what daring men are these! But the truth is, they will adventure upon any thing to serve their own turn, by keeping the people in midnight doleful darkness.

OBJECTION II. Their second objection is, "The people will pervert the scriptures; therefore they are justly prohibited. The good old gentleman, out of his fatherhood, takes away the knife out of his children's hands: they will abuse themselves and cut their fingers."

ANSWER. This objection is a hundred years old, and thirty to boot; and everywhere among their bishops and Jesuits to be found: but I stood amazed to read it of late in a reply to Dr. S. It seems, they think it is a very sharp argument. Alas! one of the martyrs in [the reign of] queen Mary broke the edge of it; indeed, battered it all to pieces. The story in short is this:—Stephen Gratwick, convented before Dr. Watson, bishop of Winchester, in St. Mary Overy's in Southwark, tells the bishop of his cruelty in taking away the New Testament from him, which he had for the health of his soul, which all men ought to have for their souls' comfort; and so he did treat them more like brute beasts than Christian men. "No," quoth the bishop; "we will use you as we will use the child: for if the child will hurt himself with the knife, we will take away the knife from him; so, because you will damn your soul with the Bible, you shall not have it." "My lord," quoth Gratwick, "this is a simple argument to maintain and cover your sin: are not you ashamed to make the word the cause of our damnation? But if your argument be good, you may take away from us our meat and drink, because some men do abuse them; and you may make an argument to take away all other mercies, as well as the scriptures." "My lords," quoth Winchester, "we lose time: this fellow is perverse; he speaks nothing but sophistry; we shall get no advantage against him. Have at ye now: wilt thou recant? I will pronounce sentence. There, there it is: who shall stand before this argument?"

But if perverting scriptures be any reason for the non-reading of them, then, of all men in the world, the popes, cardinals, priests, Jesuits, should be prohibited; of all men, they should never touch a Bible. Instances are many: I will present you with a few. Dr. Harding, and the Louvainists with him, argue thus: "The Son of man came not to destroy, but to seek and save that which is [lost]:" *ergò*, in the sacrament the accidents of bread and wine remain without their subjects. "The axe may not boast himself against him that

lifteth it up :” *ergò*, no man may dare to judge the pope ; if he leads thousands of souls to hell, no man may mutter or say, *Domine, cur ita facis ?* * “To the pure all things are pure ; to the unclean all things are unclean :” *ergò*, it is not lawful for priests to marry. “Give not holy things to dogs :” *ergò*, prayers must be in a strange tongue [which] the people do not understand. “I will sprinkle clean water upon you :” *ergò*, the priest must sprinkle the people with holy water. Christ said, “Without me ye can do nothing :” *ergò*, the bishop alone must consecrate the church. Paul saith, “The rock was Christ :” *ergò*, the altar must be of stone. “The earth is the Lord’s, the round world, and all that dwell therein :” *ergò*, the host of sacramental bread must be round. “God made the sun to rule the day, and the moon the night :” *ergò*, the dignity of the pope is fifty-six times bigger than the emperor’s dignity. The thief upon the cross repented himself of his life : *ergò*, the priest at Mass must fetch a sigh and knock his breast. Judas kissed Christ : *ergò*, the priest must kiss the altar. “Take the money in the mouth of the fish, and pay for me and thee :” *ergò*, the pope is the head of the church. “Babylon is a cup of gold in the hand of the Lord :” *ergò*, the chalice must be of silver or gold. Thus I have given you a full dozen of instances of their horrible abusing of the scripture ; and if it were serviceable, I could furnish you with a dozen more ; [they being] the greatest abusers of the scripture that ever were, and the greatest blasphemers that ever were in applying that to ignorant, sinful men, which is peculiar to the Lord Jesus ; as, “The pope is ‘the light that cometh into the world ;’” and the ambassadors of Sicily thus supplicate the pope : *Tu qui tollis peccata mundi*, “O thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. O thou that takest away the sins of the world,” *dona nobis pacem*, “grant us thy peace.” And these, (with much more that might be added,) I say, these illogical, non-sensical inferences and blasphemous applications are asserted by bishop Jewel at Paul’s Cross, and Chemnitius. (*Examen Concilii Tridentini.*)

OBJECTION III. They object that “the reading of the scriptures, or hearing them read, breeds heresy ; therefore they [the people] ought not to have the use of them.”

ANSWER. This objection is common amongst all their writers. The council of Trent (as was above said) saith, that the scriptures do more harm than good. What harm, they do not tell : though they did resolve to prohibit them, and did spitefully speak against them ; yet in their decree they durst say no more than that they did harm in general : and they could not for shame and policy say less ; for then they had not mentioned any pretence for their prohibition. Why did not they speak out and name the harm [which] they did, by whom, in what country, to whom, in what particulars ? And all their ground is experience : *Cùm experimento manifestum sit.* † But whose experience is this ? None, surely, but their own : they found and felt—and feared more would follow—that the scriptures had discovered to the

* “Lord, why doest thou thus ?”—EDIT.

† “Since it is manifest by experience.”—EDIT.

world their tyranny, heresy, and idolatry; their pride, covetousness, filthiness, and innumerable villanies. This was the "experience," and this is the rise of their rage and enmity; and continueth so to this day amongst some of them, it may be feared, to spiteful persecution against knowledge.

"Woe be to our parish priests! woe be to our bishops! woe be to our prelates!" said a learned man of their own. Yea, woe be to them indeed! They have not only taken away the key of knowledge, but they reproach it to be the key of heresy. "Heretics," say Dr. Harding and his complices, "suck-in the venom of heresy out of the scriptures; *ergò*, if the people read the scriptures, they will prove heretics." This is the common cry of them all; and bishop Jewel shall answer them all; the conclusion is this: "Every man may read the Jesuits' and priests' books; but God's book they may not read: every man may read the Jesuits' and priests' books without danger; but the book of God they cannot read without danger. Would you know the reason?" saith he. "The reason is this: God's book is full of truth, and their books are full of lies."

The scripture breeds heresy, even as much as light breeds darkness, or physic diseases. "Yea, but men do pervert them." That is answered before. "Yea, but now heresies are abroad; therefore it is not safe." And were there not tradition-mongers and heresies in Christ's time? Were not false teachers very many, and in very many points, and those very dangerous and destructive, in the apostles' time? Were there not some that denied the resurrection of the body, and turned all into an allegory of a rising within us, then, as well as now; and of late the Familists and Quakers? Did not some deny the Deity of our Lord Jesus? the Ebionites and others then, as well as the Socinians now? Did not some let go the Head, Christ, and introduce a wicked practice of worshipping of angels, through the pretence of humility?—"Holding not the Head." (Col. ii. 18, 19.) Were there none that did overthrow the foundation, (if making Christ of none effect will overthrow the foundation, then surely they did it,) by justification by works, as a less principal cause? Certainly there were all these and others: yet the apostles did never forbid the people reading [the] scriptures, for fear they might be infected; as if an antidote should cause or occasion, (if you will have it so,) I say, occasion an infection. The apostles did the contrary. John bids them "try the spirits;" (1 John iv. 1;) and Paul bids them "try all things;" (1 Thess. v. 21;) and Jude exhorts them "to contend earnestly for the faith delivered once to the saints:" (Jude 3:) "Take" unto them "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." (Eph. vi. 17.)

It is to little boot to light up a candle where the sun shines: [for] what should I name the fathers? Were there not heresies in their times? Doth not Irenæus, and after him Epiphanius, name them in numbers eighty? Doth not Austin, after them, and others, reckon up about eighty? Did they now forbid the people to read and search the scriptures? The clean contrary every one knows that knows any thing of them. Nay, they chide them because they were not skilful:

“The Manichees and heretics deceive the simple; but if we had our ‘senses exercised to discern good and evil,’ we might easily refute them: how shall we have our senses, but by the use of the scriptures, and frequent hearing?” (CHRYSOSTOMUS, in *Epist. ad Heb.*, Hom. viii.) Οὐδεν ἰσχυσε σοφισασθαι, “Nothing can deceive those that search the scriptures; for they are a light, which shining,” ὁ κλεπτης φαινεται και εὑρισκεται, “the thief is discovered.” (THEOPHYLACTUS *De Lazaro*.) “We must read the scriptures” *omni studio*, [“with earnest application,”] “that we may be skilful exchangers,” *trapezitæ*, “to discern between gold and copper.” So Jerome, long before Theophylact. *Malleo scripturarum, &c.*, “That we beat out the brains of heresies with the mallet of the scriptures.” (Idem.)

It were tedious to tithe the quotations of the fathers to this purpose. “The scripture breeds heresies:” “Nay,” saith Irenæus, one thousand four hundred and fifty years since, to the mad, fantastic Valentinians; *hæc omnia contulit, &c.*, “the ignorance of the word of God is the cause of all these heresies.” This the holy learned father pithily discourseth [of] in many chapters, (lib. iv., especially from the eleventh to the seventeenth,) to confound the Marcionites, Carpocratians, and other Gnostics,—that “it was the same God and Father Almighty, Maker of the world, then and now; and the same Lord Jesus, the Saviour, both now and then: that Abraham was saved by faith in Christ.” *Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater; nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filius, et quibuscumque Filius revelaverit. Revelaverit enim non solum in futurum dictum est, quasi tunc inceperit Verbum revelare Patrem cum de Mariâ natus; sed communiter per totum tempus positum est. Ab initio enim Filius, assistens suo plasmati, revelat omnibus Patrem, quibus vult et quod vult et quemadmodum vult Pater: et propter hoc in omnibus et per omnia unus Deus Pater, unus Filius, et unus Spiritus, una fides, et una salus omnibus credentibus in eum.* (Cap. 14.) *Propheta cum ergo esset Abraham, et videret in spiritu diem adventus Domini et passionis dispositionem, per quem ipse et omnes [qui] similiter ut ipse credidit credunt Deo, salvari inciperent, vehementer exultavit; novit quod Deo beneplacuit Filium suum dilectum et unigenitum præstare sacrificium in nostram redemptionem.* (Cap. 13.)* And he saith also before, that the accursed heretics, Gnostics, of all sorts and names, did beget their heresies and spread them from the ignorance of the scripture: *Hæc omnia contulit eis ignorantia scripturarum et dispositionis Dei; namely, in the scriptures. Nos*

* “No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and they to whomsoever the Son shall have revealed him.” (Matt. xi. 27.) For the expression, ‘shall have revealed him,’ is used not merely in a future sense, as if the Word then began to reveal the Father, when he was born of Mary; but is spoken with reference to all time in common. For from the beginning the Son, standing by his own workmanship, reveals the Father to all, to whom the Father wills, as well as *what* and *how* He pleases: and therefore in all and through all there is one God the Father, one Son, and one Spirit, one faith, and one salvation to all believing in Him.—Since, therefore, Abraham was a prophet, and saw in spirit the day of the Lord’s advent and the arrangement of His passion, by whom he and all who believe God as he did would begin to be saved, he rejoiced greatly; he knew that it was well-pleasing to God that his beloved and only-begotten Son should be offered as a sacrifice for our redemption.”—EDIT.

autem et causam differentie Testamentorum, et rursùm unitatem et consonantiam ipsorum, in his quæ deinceps futura sunt, referemus. (Lib. iii. cap. 12.) *

But, lastly, if the scriptures must not be read by the people, because they will pervert them and engender heresies; then, of all the men in the world, learned men, the clergy, popes, cardinals, Jesuits, priests, academics, ministers, should not read them: for he must be a great stranger in history, primitive and modern, and in common experience, who doth not know, that these men in all ages have been the broachers of errors and heresies, the false apostles, the ministers of Satan. The Gnostics—their ring-leaders, were they not learned? Arius, Pelagius, Photinus, Macedonius, and the rest,—they were either presbyters or bishops. Come to our times: look into Poland and Transylvania within these eighty years past. The Socinuses, uncle Lælius, and nephew Faustus, Crellius, Smalcius, Volkelius, and the rest, the ministers of Transylvania,—were they lay-people? Who did expound the ninth of Isaiah, and applied it to Hezekiah? and the fifty-third of Isaiah, and apply it to Jeremiah? or the fifth of Micah, and apply it to Zerubbabel? Who invented such a trick as to say [that] these texts might be applied to Jesus Christ, and ought to be so, *modo eminentiori* [“in a more eminent manner”]? a villainous trick in itself, and very apt to deceive young students. Who are those that affirm, publicly affirm, that Abraham was not saved by faith in Christ? Are they laymen? They would take it very heinously if a man should not say that they were learned men, admirable and incomparable men. Did *the people* in Holland revive and vent Pelagianism? Do *the people* in England, contrary to the scriptures and the doctrine of the church, vent Photinianism or Pelagianism? I have reason to believe that brain-sick Quakerism did not arise from the people, but from learned seducers, that have a mystery amongst them, to do any thing, or spread any falsity, so it be for the advance of the catholic cause. Sabbatarianism, for the Saturday’s sabbath; antisabbatarianism, against the Lord’s-day; *jure divino* [“by divine right”]; Anabaptism hath risen from, and been supported by, men of learning.

OBJECTION IV. The fourth and last objection [that] they make, or that I shall name, is the obscurity of the scriptures: “The scriptures are obscure and dark; therefore the lay-people shall not read them.” This also is a common, threadbare, baffled argument: how do they prove the antecedent? “Why, there are some things dark and hard to be understood in Paul’s epistles.”

ANSWER. Though there be some few dark places in Paul and other scriptures, yet generally they are plain; and there is nothing dark in those few places that concern faith and holiness, but the same is abundantly plain in other texts. “Some places are obscure; most places are plain and facile: *ergò*, the people must read none at all:” this is the proper, but most absurd, inference of the Jesuits. “Some

* “Ignorance of the scriptures and of the divine economy has involved them in all these errors. But we will unfold, in what shall follow, both the cause of the difference of the Testaments, and, on the other hand, their unity and agreement.”—EDIT.

texts are somewhat dark : therefore the people should read the oftener, pray the more, compare text with text, consult and confer the more, be well skilled and settled in the doctrines of faith and practice in plainer places the more." These inferences are proper and natural ; but, that they should not read at all, is such a wild, doltish *non sequitur*, that nothing can be more [so].

David saith that they are "a light, a lamp ;" (Psalm cxix. 105 ;) that they "enlighten the eyes, give understanding to the simple." (Psalm xix. 7, 8.) Yet how little was there of the Bible in David's times ! no more but the five books of Moses, and two or three other books, and these mostly historical. What a light and glory shining is there now, by the accession of Solomon, the history of the Kings, the prophets, evangelists, apostles ! And yet shall bold men reproach them, and say, "They are dark ?" It will be tedious to you and me to quote fathers in this point ; take two or three : *Universæ scripturæ, et prophetica et evangelicæ, sunt in aperto et sine ambiguitate ; et similiter ab omnibus audiri possunt* : "Prophets and apostles are without ambiguity, and may be heard (understood) of all." (IRENÆUS, lib. ii. cap. 46.) He discourseth against the Valentinians, and the other Gnostics, who would pick out a mystical meaning where it never was ; and if that they met with any number, what wild work would they make with it for their fantastic *æones* ! much at the [same] rate as the Papists out of *Pasce oves* collect the pope's supremacy ; and out of the eighth psalm, "Thou hast put all things under his feet ;" *scilicet, sub pedibus pontificis Romani*, "under the pope's feet : *pecora campi*, 'the beasts of the field ;' that is, men on earth : 'the fish of the sea ;' that is, souls in purgatory : *volucres cæli*, 'the birds of heaven ;' that is, the souls in heaven canonized by the pope." "Go to," saith Irenæus to the Gnostics, "with your wild notions !" So say we to our adversaries : *Scripturæ in aperto sunt* : "The sense of the scriptures is plain enough." So Clemens Alexandrinus persuades the Heathen to leave their fables, which are much like the popish legends ; and their statues which they worshipped with uncouth ceremonies, like the Popish images ; and invites them to heavenly knowledge in the prophets and apostles : *Audite, qui estis longè, qui estis propè : nullis celatum est verbum ; lux communis innotescit omnibus ; nullus est in verbo Cimærius* : "The word is evident ; the light shineth ; there is no darkness in the word." (CLEMENTIS ALEXANDRINI *Orat. adhort. ad Gentes.*) "Whatsoever things are necessary are manifest in the scriptures." (CHRYSOSTOMUS.)

Dr. Prideaux in the chair was wont to tell us, that *scriptura est obscura in aliquibus cognoscendis a theologo ; sed non est obscura in credendis et agendis a Christiano*.* If the scriptures be hid, they are hid indeed to the learned Papists. How do they write and determine contrary to one another ! How plain is Pighius in the point of justification and the imputation of Christ's righteousness, as also Gropper and the divines of Colen [Cologne] ; and, long before them, Aquinas

* "The scripture is obscure in some things to be known by the theologian ; but it is not obscure in what is to be believed and done by the Christian."—EDIT.

also! How dark and ignorant and shuffling is the council of Trent in that great point! Canus tells us that Cornelius Mus, the bishop of Bitonto, did affirm in the council of Trent, that "Christ in the supper did not offer sacrifice:" *Christum in cœnâ corpus suum et sanguinem suum non obtulisse*: "Christ did not offer up his body and blood at the supper." A most undoubted truth; and that that throws the Mass with all its attendants upon the face; it gives a deadly blow to almost all of Popery. And this Cornelius was not alone in this point. But what say the fathers to it? Canus tells us that *jure a patribus et universis theologis explosus est*: "Cornelius and his opinion were justly exploded and cast out by the fathers and all the divines in the council." They decree the contrary, and curse the gainsayer. Canus undertakes to confute him; but indeed his arguments are very watery and childish. (CANUS *De Locis Theologicis*, lib. xii. cap. 12.) There is scarce an article in which they do agree among themselves; no, not in the point of the pope's supremacy. Men receive not the truth in the love of it; and God justly lets them wander in the dark, and believe a lie. The darkness is not in the sun, but the eye is bleared and dim; the fault is not in the object, but in the faculty; the scripture is light, but we are dark.

OBJECTION. "But they do not prohibit men to read, so they have a licence."

ANSWER. I told you before that this was a mere flam; and if men might have a licence, yet it is and would be a mere innovation and a piece of tyranny. But it is a very cheat; the licences, I have proved already, are forbidden by Paul V. For the further discovery of this, let us observe what Clement VIII. tells us in his observation upon this decree of the council. "It is to be observed," saith he, "concerning this rule of Pius IV.; that no new power is granted to bishops or inquisitors to license the buying, reading, or keeping the Bible in the vulgar tongue; seeing hitherto, by the commandment and practice of the holy Roman and universal Inquisition, all such power of granting licences hath been taken from them." [So] "that, whatsoever the pope and his crew," saith Dr. White, "might make a show of, to blind the eyes of the world; yet in very deed they meant no such thing as a licence at all."

Ledesiman hath written a tract about this question; and he well understood their sense. He tells us, *Quamvis aliquis bono animo, &c.* "Although," saith he, "any man with an honest mind shall desire a licence, and shall pretend that he desires it for devotion and the profit of his soul;" (*si se dicat petere bono animo*;) "yet that of our Saviour may be answered to him: 'You ask you know not what:' (Matt. xx. 22:) it is a fallacious devotion; a zeal, but not according to knowledge; or rather it is a spirit of division and error at all adventures." *Concedendum non est*: "No licence is to be granted." Nay, more: (and somewhat dangerous, too:) *Radix istius petitionis est hæresis*: "Heresy is the rise and root of such a request; it is *hæresis interior*: therefore they crave a licence to read, because they are sick of an 'inward heresy;'" (*quia hæresi interiori laborant*;) "because they think [that] the thing is necessary, and it ought to be

so ; at least, it is more expedient ; and the contrary not to be lawful." (*Lib. de Lect. sanct. Script. Ling. vern.*) So that, it seems, it is inward heresy for a man to desire leave to read the Bible: it is inward heresy to think that the council of Trent hath done any thing inexpedient in forbidding people to read, under pain of non-absolution ; or the bookseller to sell, under such a penalty. In the *Taxe Cam. Apostol.*, a man may buy an indulgence for incest under twelve shillings : but if a man sell a Bible, it is no less mulct than twelve hundred ducats. The noble Mornay shall conclude this : *Prisci patres, &c.*, "The ancient fathers did chide the people for not reading ; the council doth curse them if they do read. *Then*, before the art of printing, Bibles were scarce and dear ; *now* they might have plenty and cheap. *They* laboured to open the eyes of the people of God ; *these* endeavour to put them out, and to keep them in ignorance all their days." And now, I pray, judge what is become of your licence.

QUESTION IV. And last. *What design have the Papists in all this ? Why do they thus vilify, disparage, prohibit the scriptures ; when their decrees are so manifestly repugnant to, and confuted by, scriptures, the old fathers, and universal practice, and evident reason ? Surely they have some end that moves them to it.*

ANSWER. Yes ; they have divers.

1. They reproach the scriptures as lame and insufficient, *that they may advance their own traditions.*—"Traditions are not additions to the word," saith Canus ; *quin potius sunt verba divina, non aliter ac illa quæ sacris libris scripta sunt.** So Hosius, Bannes, Bellarmine, Coster, Alphonsus a Castro, with all the herd, speak at this rate. And indeed it is time for the pope to make a new Bible : for the Bible of God is his enemy ; and therefore they are enemies to it : "I hate it ; for it never speaks good of me." The pope must beget traditions ; and the Jesuits, to cozen the people, must name them "apostolical."

The monks of Hildebrand's breeding were kept back from the scriptures, to the end that their rude wits might be nourished "with the husks of devils, which are the customs of human traditions ;" (*siliquis dæmoniorum, quæ sunt consuetudines ;*) that, being accustomed to such filth, they might not taste how sweet the Lord was. (BISHOP USHER, out of Waltram, "Answer to Malone.") Hildebrand was a fit tool for such a work ; a murderer, a poisoner of several popes, a necromancer ; conversed with the devil ; threw the host into the fire, because it would not answer his demands, as the oracles were wont to do. (See BALE'S "Acts of English Votaries.") This was the man that trampled scripture, and advanced traditions. And so it came down from hand to hand ; from monks to friars, from them to priests and bishops : hence came the ungodly practice of keeping the common people from reading [the] scriptures, that they might be "drawn to human traditions." (USHER, *ibid.*)

2. The second reason is, *to maintain their pride, the bishops' state,*

* *De Locis Theologicis*, lib. iii. cap. ult. "But they are rather divine words, just in the same degree as those which are written in the sacred books."—EDIT.

the priests' imperiousness; to be accounted some great ones; to be called "rabbi," and magister noster ["our master"].—They keep away the scriptures, that the people may depend upon them. "I fear," saith Erasmus, "that the people must" *nihil attingere*; that is, in plain English, "be sots and stocks and brutes." The reason and ground of this is, not so much the danger the people may run into by knowledge; (that is a sorry, but wicked, pretence;) *sed sui respectu*; they keep the people in ignorance (more than Indians) "upon their own account;" namely, that they may be looked upon as oracles; that the people may resort to them as oracles, and may ask them, "What is the meaning of this, or that?" and they in a proud magisterial way may answer, "Understand thus," (*Sic senti, sic loquere,*) "speak thus." To maintain their pride and stateliness, they make the people brutes, to be led by the nose; and not men, to be masters of reason.

3. The third reason may be this: *If the light comes in, the moth-eaten, braided* ware will easily be discovered; therefore you must keep the shop dark: if the people have the scriptures, they will quickly desert us.*—Of all men to this purpose, commend me to Petrus Sutor: *Cum multa palam traduntur observanda*, "Whereas many things are openly taught to be observed, which are not to be had expressly in holy scriptures; will not the simple people," *idiotæ, hæc animadvertentes*, "observing these things, quickly murmur and complain? Will they not also easily be withdrawn from the ordinances of the church, when they shall find there is no such thing contained in the word of Christ?" (PETRUS SUTOR *De Tralat. Bibl. cap. 22.*) Indeed, here is the nail upon the head; or, rather, the sow by the right ear.

Dr. Harding gives this as one reason why the people must not have the Bible; namely, "They will despise and mock the simplicity of the church, and of all those things which the church useth as pap and milk to nourish her tender babes withal." (HARDING'S "Reply," art. xv.) That is, they will despise that which God would have them despise; namely, false worship. The people by the light of the scriptures will despise the antic, mimic postures, gestures, vestures, in their superstitious, idolatrous worship in an unknown tongue: "Therefore we will take a course [by which] they shall not have them. They will see and know our Aves and Credos to be no prayers; Our Lady's Litany, and prayers to saints, to be old Paganism revived: they will espy many a hole in our coat; they will contemn holy church, and despise her pap; and we shall be made a scorn." Indeed here is the finger upon the sore: down goes Diana. In short, bishop Jewel answers Harding thus: "The people despise nothing but what should be despised; for they despise nothing but superstition and idolatry." (*Ibid.*) But these are but private doctors; therefore let us see what the pope himself saith in the case. There is a very considerable passage to this purpose, and I find it quoted by Dr. Stillingfleet and Dr. Moulin. The story is this:—

* "Faded, having lost its colour."—EDIT.

The bishops meet at Bononia, to consult with the then pope, Paul III., how the dignity of the Roman see might be upheld; for now it began to totter. They offer many ways: at last they came to that which they thought the weightiest of all, and therefore did propose last; which was this; namely, "That by all means as little of the gospel as possibly might be, might be read in the cities of his jurisdiction; but especially as little as possibly could be, in the vulgar tongue: and that little that was in the Mass should be sufficient; and that it should not be permitted to any mortal man to read more: for as long as men were contented with that little, things went well; but quite otherwise, since more was commonly read. For this, in short, is that book" (mark that!) "which above all others has raised these tempests and whirlwinds with which we are almost carried away: and in truth whosoever diligently considers it, and compares it with what is done in our churches, will find them very contrary to each other; and our doctrines not only to be different from it, but repugnant to it."

A very honest, true, and ingenuous confession! and indeed it is no hard matter to show to every man, even the meanest capacity, how that their doctrines (not only their practices, but their very doctrines) are not only different [from], but repugnant to, the sacraments, Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. Here, here is the true reason for which they do vilify scripture. The people are lozels; they might meddle with their measures and distaffs; they will vent heresies; they are not fit; they will cut their fingers; the holy father would [not] "suffer them to harm themselves;" he will chew their meat first, and then they shall have their pap and milk:—these and such-like are mere pretences: the true cause is rendered by these bishops here at Bononia. This meeting, as I guess, was about twenty years after Luther, that man of God, (as he is called,) began to preach, and some years before the council of Trent began. And the council outdid their advice: for they advised as little of the gospel to be read as might be in the vulgar tongue; but the council decrees, they shall have none at all; neither poor nor rich, neither man nor woman, neither prince nor peasant, neither clerk nor layman shall read it or have it in the mother-tongue; as if the fear of Cain in some sort were upon them, that whosoever met them with a Bible should kill them. So much for this.

III. Now, lastly, to the third point in this controversy to be debated; namely, *that the scriptures are to be translated into vulgar tongues, into the people's language.*—For we have proved already [that] they are to read and hear them, and that therefore they were written by divine appointment for them and to them; therefore they ought to be translated. For what am I the better for the Indian Bible, [of which] I know never a word? What would you be the better for a Welsh one, unless there be an interpreter? Methinks, the gift of tongues in Acts ii. should convince any one, [that] gifts are for others, "for the work of the ministry, that the body may be edified." (Eph. iv. 12.) By the gift of tongues did so many nations—some of

Africa, some of Asia, some of Europe—hear the apostles speak the wonderful things of God in their own language in which they were born. This was extraordinary as to the attainment, since skill in the languages hath been attained by ordinary means in the use of study and prayer; and so by translations people have known, by reading, hearing, the great mystery of Jesus and salvation by him, in their own tongue. In gifts both ways—*extraordinary* then, upon a sudden, without their study; and gifts *ordinary*, attained by means, since—God, according to his infinite wisdom and mercy, made known his will, his grace, for man's salvation. So that I may say of translating the word, what Kentigern, a bishop in Wales about the year 550, was wont to say of preaching; namely, "They that are against preaching God's word, envy the salvation of mankind." So they that hinder translating, fill hell.

Ulphilas translated the Bible, about thirteen hundred years since, into the Gothish tongue: he invented the characters; translated, on purpose that the barbarous "might learn the mysteries and truth of God," *ut discerent eloquia Dei*. Many, very many, of the Goths were converted; and were martyred by Athanaricus, because they forsook the religion of their fathers, namely, Paganism: they did embrace death for Christ. (SOCRATIS *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 27.)

St. Jerome translated the scriptures into the Dalmatic tongue. Bellarmine and Harding would seem to doubt of it. Hosius and Alphonsus a Castro do both acknowledge it: and it is no wonder; for Jerome himself saith he did so, in his *Epistola ad Sophronium: Hominibus linguæ mee dedi*.* And when Sophronius desired him to translate the Psalms into Latin most accurately, because he would translate them into Greek, he adviseth him [that] there was no need; and quotes that of the poet: *In sylvas ne ligna feras*; that is, in English, "Carry not coals to Newcastle," or, "Cast not water into the sea;" there were so many translations into the Greek that it would be supernumerary. (*Ibid.*)

The same Jerome tells us that, at the burial of Paula, such companies came to the solemnities out of the cities of Palestine as passed again; and that they did sing psalms orderly, people of several nations, *Hebræo, Græco, Syro, Latino sermone*, "in Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, and Latin." (*Ad Eustochium de Epitaphio Paulæ.*)

They that have translated the Hebrew into Greek *numerari possunt*, "may be numbered;" they were many: "but they that translated it into Latin are numberless;" *Latini autem nullo modo*. (AUGUSTINUS *De Doct. Christ.* lib. ii. cap. xi.)

Basil affirms that translations were made into the Palestine, Theban, Phenician, Arabic, and Libyan tongues. (*In Epist. ad Clerum Neocæsariensem.*) Chrysostom, the same. Isidore saith, "Into all Christian tongues." (*De Eccles. Offic.* cap. 10.)

What should I speak of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, Origen, or the Syriac [version] of the New Testament, which is very ancient? (Some ascribe it to Mark.) For it is so evident, that Alphonsus a

* "I gave the scriptures to the men of my own tongue."—EDIT.

Castro doth confess it: *Fatemur sacros libros olim in linguam vulgarem fuisse translatos*: "We confess that of old time the holy books were translated into the vulgar tongue." I humbly conceive, it is remarkable (sure I am, to me it is so) that God gave to Jeremy what the Jews should say when they were in Babylon, not in the Hebrew, but in the Chaldee, tongue: for that tongue the Babylonians spoke, and not the Hebrew; and so the Babylonians might understand what they said to them: "Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish," &c. (Jer. x. 11.) It is in Chaldee there; that is the original. And so likewise Daniel expounds Nebuchadnezzar's dream to him in the Chaldee tongue; and several chapters in him are in Chaldee: so that here Chaldee is the original. I have mused sometimes, why Daniel in writing the historical part of his book did not write it in Hebrew; seeing the things were past and gone before he wrote, why should he historify those great passages in the Chaldee as he spoke them, and not in Hebrew? unless it be this,—that God would have us from hence observe, that it is his will that men should know their own concerns in their own tongue, that they themselves might read and hear. What an irrational, bloody, abominable thing, then, is it in the council of Trent to forbid the translating of the scriptures, on purpose to keep poor, and yet immortal, souls in ignorance! There are none [who] do thus that I know, but the Turk; the Grand Muftis at Rome and Constantinople in this are agreed. "The Turkish religion, framed to shed much blood," (*ad fundendum sanguinem facta*,) "delighteth much in rites and ceremonies, and commands belief most imperiously without any liberty to inquire what or why:" *unde librorum quos sanctos habent lectio plebi interdita est*: "whence it is that the people are forbidden to read their (holy) books; which very thing is a present and manifest token of iniquity." (HUGO GROTIUS *De Veritate Rel.*, lib. vi.)

But let us go a little further in this: Eusebius, in his *Præparatio Evangelica*, lib. xiii., inclines to judge that Moses was translated into Greek before the Persian monarchy. Numenius, a Pythagorean philosopher, said of Plato, that "what Plato wrote of God and the world, he stole it out of Moses;" (thus "when thieves fall out," &c. ;) "and what is Plato, but Moses turned into good Greek?" But whether there were any translation then, or whether they learned of the Jews, with whom they did much and long converse, (which is the more probable way of the two,)—I mean the prime philosopher Pythagoras, after him nigh one hundred and ninety years Plato, and then Aristotle, with others,—I do not determine: but sure I am, (though men love to cry up these, and neglect Moses,) that they were proud, puddling plagiaries or thieves.

Ptolemy Philadelphus caused the Hebrew [Bible] to be translated into Greek; and received it with great veneration, when he heard the law read in a tongue [which] he understood. (See at large JOSEPHUS'S "Jewish Antiquities," lib. xii. cap. 1, 3.) Other translations there were, that went under the name of "the Septuagint."

This the eunuch was reading in his chariot. (Acts viii. 26—40.) Luke sets it down according as it is in the Greek translation, and not in the Hebrew original. Philip expounds to him, and God blesseth; the eunuch believes in Jesus, is baptized, goes on his way rejoicing: a good argument for translation. Yet that translation of that text which the eunuch was in reading, was nothing accurate: "In his humiliation his judgment was taken away:" (verse 33 :) it is, "He was taken from prison," or "restraint," "and from judgment." (Isai. liii. 8.) Let us now see a little what our adversaries do object against us in this case. First, they say,

OBJECTION I. "This island hath continued in the faith these thirteen hundred years without Bibles, till of late."

ANSWER. Very false. Constantine commanded the Bible to be written and sent abroad into all countries, kingdoms, nations, of his dominions; whereof England, or rather Britain, was one. Adelstane, [Athelstan,] king of England, caused the Bible to be translated into the English tongue. Beda, almost a thousand years since, translated the Gospel of St. John into English. (BISHOP JEWEL, JOHN TREVISA, FULLER'S "Church History.") Beda saith, "Five nations did converse with one truth, one Bible,—Britons, English, Picts, Scots, Latins:" *Hæc insula quinque gentium linguis unam eandemque scrutatur veritatis scientiam.* (BEDÆ *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. i.) Cedman [Cædmon] translated the history of the creation, the departure from Egypt, the entrance into Canaan, the birth, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, the glory of heaven, the pains of hell: *De doctrinâ apostolorum, de terrore futuri judicii, de aliis plurimis scripturæ historiis.** *Multorum animi ad contemptum seculi et ad appetitum vitæ cælestis accensi fuere:* (BEDÆ *Hist. Eccles.*, according to mine, lib. iv. cap. 24 :) "Many men were mortified and made heavenly thereby," by Cedman's translation. Suppose they had none, what then? Should they never have? Time was [when] they were Gentiles and Pagans; should they continue so?

OBJECT. II. "Your translations are faulty." (HARDING, RHEMISTS.)

ANSWER. "This is said a thousand times, but never proved; an untruth, joined with slander;" so Jewel—"a spiteful lie;" so Cartwright—answers the Jesuits. "Show them," saith he. "Dr. Martin did attempt it, but was laughed at for his folly by his friend. The words may be short, but the sense is incorrupt."

OBJECT. III. "What? the scripture translated into a barbarous tongue!"

ANSWER. This makes a noise: "Barbarous, barbarous, vulgar tongues; for hostlers, tapsters, sempsters; idle, loose, sensual, brutal men." This is their rhetoric; but indeed it is a very rancorous, croaking noise. *Barbara lingua est quæ nescit laudare Dominum.*† (BEDA.) The Bible in any language is holy; and the language is

* "Concerning the doctrine of the apostles, the terror of a future judgment, and very many other scripture-histories."—EDIT. † "That is a barbarous tongue which knows not how to praise God."—EDIT.

holy that knows how to worship God and bless Jesus. What were the Canaanites? What was Terah, Nahor, Abraham, before God called him? When Abraham came into Canaan, was not the Hebrew the language of Heathens? Was not the Greek a Pagan tongue? "If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." (1 Cor. xiv. 11.) Paul calls every tongue "barbarous" that is not understood; and so all the prayers of the Papists are barbarous, because they are not understood by the people.

To conclude: they allow no translation but the old Latin: this the council makes authentical, prefers above the original. It hath been mended several times; but yet crawls with many very great faults, against their knowledge, on purpose to defend their errors and idolatries. I refer to CHEMNITII *Examen*, pars i. *De Script.*; our learned bishop Morton's "Appeal," lib. iv. cap. 18, sect. iii.: there it may be found.

Take an instance or two: in Gen. iii. 15: "He shall bruise the serpent's head:" so the Hebrew; so the Seventy translate it; so the learned Papists do acknowledge it. Yet in the last edition, set forth by Clement VIII., the Vulgar Latin read it, "She," namely, the Virgin Mary: "She shall break the serpent's head." And this, though it be a manifest, nay, a confessed corruption of the text, yet is still reserved by them; and no man, in writing, preaching, disputing, must dare to use any other but this: and this they do against knowledge, on purpose to keep up their blasphemous, idolatrous worship. Here is their reformation.

So, in Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, they read thus: "They saw his face horned;" Hebrew, "shining," as we read it. Hereupon they picture Moses with a pair of horns; for which the Jews do horribly curse the Christians, as though they thought Moses to be a devil.

So, Heb. xi. 21, they read it, "Jacob worshipped the top of his rod:" *Adoravit fastigium virgæ*: whereas in the Greek it is, "He worshipped upon his staff," "at" or "upon his staff." And this is confessed by their own men: *Græcè, Super fastigium; scilicet, nixus baculo ejus.* (SA, *Jes., in loc.*) Though our translators dealt honestly, putting "*leaning*" in a different character, because it is not in the Greek. How do they cry out of falsities! No man can think what a stir the image-mongers make for their idolatry by this corrupt translation of their Vulgar, that "Jacob worshipped his staff:" they catch at any sorry thing for advantage. So, in their own "Annotations" upon Matt. ii., the wise men that came from the east; they impudently and foolishly call them "the three kings of Colen, [Cologne,] and [tell] how their bodies were translated thither, on purpose to keep the old trade of pilgrimage and prayers for the sake of offerings. They durst not let the Bible go abroad without a keeper,—their frothy, foolish, false notes.

Well, let us seriously consider what a rich mercy we have, that we have it in liberty, purity, safety, in our mother-tongue. How do Jerome, Austin, and the rest of the fathers, Luther, Calvin, and our

own Reformers, strain for expressions to set forth their excellency ! Let us not be dull and stupid : let us abhor Popery, that will maintain their kingdom of darkness, though it be in darkness of souls,—the ready way to everlasting darkness.

Let us pray frequently for the life and safety of him that is supreme, and those that are subordinate under him. Assure yourselves, these are matters of near concernment.

Let us pray that God would blast Popery ; that God would preserve us from it. If that should, for our gospel-sins, prevail, you must lose your Bibles ; perhaps your bodies too, unless you will adventure to lose the truth and your souls. Assure yourselves, they have waded through the blood of men to destroy the word of God, and will do so still ; their strongest arguments are swords and stakes.

Lastly. By hearing, reading, praying, meditation, let every one of us labour to be expert in the word. Apollos was “mighty in the scriptures.” (Acts xviii. 24.) To stir up your hearts, consider these particulars :—

1. *The Author.*—It is infinitely the best, the most holy, only wise God. (2 Tim. iii. 16 ; 2 Peter i. 21.) It is seven times repeated in the seven epistles : “What the Spirit,” the Spirit of glory, of holiness, the Spirit of truth, “saith unto the churches.” (Rev. ii., iii.)

2. *The matter.*—It is our Lord Jesus. Here are “the treasures,” “all treasures,” “of wisdom,” divine wisdom, “and knowledge.” (Col. ii. 3.) Here are the commands of God ; full, plain, pure, everlasting. Here are the promises, “exceeding great,” free, “precious promises ;” (2 Peter i. 4 ;) “yea and Amen in Christ.” (2 Cor. i. 20.) Here are the works of God’s creation and providence, which the philosophers knew not.

3. *The office of it.*—It is to instruct, to give understanding, to convince of sin, of hell, of Jesus. It is to breed and increase holiness, peace of conscience.

4. Lastly. *The end.*—“To make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” (2 Tim. iii. 15.)