

THOMAS MORTONUS, *episcopus Dunelmensis* : *Non est igitur quod in hæc causâ, lector, hallucineris : neque enim te fugit nos primò antiquitatem novitati, secundò devotionem sanctam et divinam cæcæ et fanaticæ superstitioni, tertio animæ consolationem spiritualem rigidæ stupiditati, quartò infantie prudentiam, quintò torpori consensum, sextò fictis et ementitis periculis commoda penè infinita, septimò sacrosanctam denique Spiritûs Sancti sapientiam humanæ stultitiæ ac temeritati, anteponeere.* (*Apol. Cathol. pars ii. lib. i. cap. 31, de vernac. Precibus, p. 108.*)

“There is, therefore, reader, no room for a mistake in this cause : for thou canst not but know that the Protestants prefer, 1. Antiquity, before novelty ; 2. Holy and divine devotion, before blind and” (properly so called) “fanatic superstition ; 3. The spiritual comfort of the soul, before rigid stupidity ; 4. Prudence, before childishness ; 5. Consent, before carelessness ; 6. Almost infinite advantages, before feigned and imaginary dangers ; 7. The holy wisdom of the Spirit of God, before the folly and rashness of men.”

SERMON XVIII. (XIX.)

BY THE REV. SAMUEL ANNESLEY, LL.D.

THE POPE AND HIS CLERGY, BY FALSE, PRESUMPTUOUS PARDONS AND INDULGENCES, HAVE HEINOUSLY INJURED CHRIST, THE CHURCH, AND SOULS OF MEN.

OF INDULGENCES.

For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.—
Hebrews x. 14.

THE apostle gives the reason why Christ hath now no more offering to make, no more suffering to endure : *For—That is, Because.* *By one offering—That is, one in specie,* [“in kind,”] in opposition to the four kinds of legal oblations before mentioned ; and one *in numero,* [“in number,”] in opposition to the repeating of them every year. As if he had said, “By Christ’s once offering of himself.” *He hath perfected—That is, all things are consummate, there remains nothing to be done, for the satisfying [of] Divine Justice and our reconciliation with God. Christ hath once satisfied ; and that for ever—That is, to the end of the world, and that which shall be of value to eternity. Plainly : “Christ by his death hath completely done the work once for all.” For them that are sanctified—That is, either those that are separated from the world in God’s purpose and decree ; plainly, the elect : or “them that are sanctified,” that is, those that are renewed by grace, and consecrated to be vessels of honour unto God. In short : Christ hath not so purchased remission of sins, as to leave some satisfaction to be made by themselves or others. No ; he hath perfectly satisfied for them, and perfectly*

expiated all their sins. Which if so, then from this, as well as from other scriptures, fairly results this

PROPOSITION.

That Papal indulgences are the worst of cheats, and abominably injurious to Christ and Christians.

My work here is to rake in the very sink of Papal filthiness. There is no head of divinity that is not mischievously hurt by this putrid plaster. It was not without God's singular providence that the detecting [of] the pageantry of that flesh-pleasing religion began here; for herein their seeming tender mercies are real cruelties.

To evidence what I assert, I shall in my poor manner endeavour,

I. *To show you what the indulgences are which we justly condemn;*

II. *The unsound hypotheses upon which they stand;*

III. *Demolish the main thesis; and,*

IV. *Raise some profitable instructions above exception.*

I. *Let us begin with the name and definition of "indulgences."*—

Which (to pass-by more than thirty different opinions among themselves *) I shall give you in Bellarmine's own words. After he hath, like a wary champion, attempted to reconcile or excuse his own dissenting party, in the close of his eighth chapter, he gives us this entire definition; namely, "Indulgence is a judicial absolution from the guilt of punishment, owing to God, in the penitentiary court; given over and above the sacrament, by the application of the satisfactions which are contained in the treasure of the church." † He had before told us, ‡ that the church and the Schools call indulgences "the remissions of punishment," which often remain to be endured after the remission of faults, and reconciliation obtained in the sacrament of penance; which pardons the popes use to grant, at certain times, and not without some just and reasonable cause, out of their fatherly gentleness and condescension toward their children, pitying their infirmity. This is his, and I will at present wave any interfering, description. Let us then examine the hypotheses of this profitable structure.

II. *The unsound hypotheses, or "suppositions," upon which they build this profitable structure, are such as these.*—I will name four of them:—

1. That when the fault is pardoned, the punishment is not pardoned; but there remains an obligation to punishment, (which is changed from eternal to temporal,) for which God must be satisfied, either by patiently bearing his strokes; or by undergoing the penance enjoined by the priest; or by laborious works freely undertaken, such as prayers, fasting, and alms; or by indulgences.

Now the quagmire-foundation of this distinction may thus appear,—both by testimony, by reason, and (which is more than both these) by scripture. I need but touch upon each, it being done more largely by a better hand: and therefore I will produce but one *testimony*; and that is of the archbishop of Spalato: "In pardon, to distinguish between fault and punishment, so as to separate them, is a most vain thing, and not to be admitted, especially in respect of God." §

* VOETH *Selectæ Disputationes*, pars II. sect. 2, p. 287.
tom. III. *de Indulgentiis*, lib. 1. cap. viii. p. 24, Lugd. 1599.

† BELLARMINI *Disput.*
I *Idem*, cap. 1. p. 9.

§ MARCUS ANTONIUS DE DOMINIS *De Rep. Eccles.* lib. v. cap. viii. n. 1.

For reasons: "It is against the nature of the thing, that there should be punishment where there is no fault: take away the cause, and the effect must cease. What Bellarmine saith,—that the house will 'stand when the carpenter that built it is dead,'—doth not infringe what we affirm; for we speak here of a meritorious and moral, not of an efficient and physical, cause. Whereas it is further said, 'A king may pardon a malefactor, and yet enjoin him to make satisfaction;' I answer, The king and the party offended are different persons; the king may not give away another's right: we must not confound the court of heaven and the court of earth. I might add, It is against the ordinary manner of speech, to say [that] a judge pardoneth a malefactor whom he punisheth. It is against the justice of God to punish one sin twice. It is against the mercy of God, to be reconciled to a sinner, and to torment him. But beyond all this, it is against *the practice of Christ*: what temporal punishment did Christ lay upon Mary Magdalene, (Luke vii. 48,) upon the paralytic, (Matt. ix. 2,) the great debtor? (Matt. xviii. 24.)" *

2. A second false hypothesis is this:—One righteous man may satisfy for another; and there are some that need no satisfaction for themselves, and therefore theirs may go for others': for example: if Peter fast for Paul, then Paul need not fast; but God pardons him the punishment which he should have satisfied-for by fasting, &c.† The groundlessness of this hypothesis may be thus evidenced:—

Jesus Christ hath perfectly satisfied for our sins; and therefore men are not bound to satisfy in part for themselves. Christ is "the propitiation," (1 John ii. 2,) our "redemption." (1 Cor. i. 30.) "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." (2 Cor. v. 19.) I need name no other text than that [which] I am discoursing of: "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." (Heb. x. 14.) To say, "Christ satisfied, that our satisfaction might be accepted; and ours depends upon his;" this is to illude scripture; as if it had been said, "Christ once satisfied, that we might always satisfy; Christ perfectly satisfied *for* us, that he might imperfectly satisfy *in* us; Christ hath satisfied for eternal punishments, but doth satisfy for temporal when believers themselves satisfy." ‡ O excellent way of answering! Again: if men must in part satisfy for their sins, then they are not freely pardoned. But how easy is it to multiply express scriptures! Take notice but of one epistle: "Justified freely by his grace." (Rom. iii. 24.) "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." (Rom. iv. 4.) "If by grace, then it is no more of works," &c. (Rom. xi. 6.) Now if none can satisfy for themselves, then they cannot satisfy for others: "If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself: but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it." (Prov. ix. 12.) But, should we suppose what can no way be granted, how can they speak of the communication of men's good works, while they explode the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and scornfully call it "a putatitious justification?" But more of this in the next.

3. A third absurd hypothesis is this:—that the superfluous satisfac-

* FRANCISCUS TURRETINUS *De Satisfac. Christi Perfec.* n. 24. p. 330, et seqq. † VON-ETIUS, *ibid.* p. 289. ‡ ANTONIUS SADEEL *De ver. Peccat. Remiss.* p. (mihl) 97, &c.

tions of Christ and eminent saints are laid up in a treasury, to be laid out for those that want.

The absurdity of this is manifest more ways than I have time to mention. Beside the absurdity of parcelling out the death of Christ, to apply one part of it to one use, and another part to another use ;* whereas all and every part of it is offered and applied to every believer : it is further absurd to divide that which is sufficient from that which is superfluous, when what is infinite is indivisible ; and to say that one drop of the blood of Christ is sufficient for the saving of a thousand worlds, and to reckon all the rest superfluous, and not so much as one person saved by it that would not have been saved without it, what can be more absurd and blasphemous ? I would further inquire, whether under the Old Testament believers were bound to satisfy God for temporal punishments. If they were, let them prove it : if they were not, then God dealt more mercifully with them under the Old Testament than with believers under the New, and the satisfaction of Christ not exhibited is more efficacious than since his exhibition. Once more : if the satisfaction of Christ be more than enough, what need the addition of human satisfactions ? They say, "Lest they should be in vain." So, then, it is no matter though Christ's satisfaction be in vain : saints must not lose *their* glory ; it is no matter with them though Christ lose *his*. In their account, Christ and saints must share the work of redemption between them. Saints must be our priests, our sureties ; we must believe in them, and place our hope in their satisfactions. But before we do so, it is advisable to solve this doubt :—whether the treasury of saints' superfluous satisfactions be infinite or finite. If infinite, then they are sufficient to redeem the world ; which, I think, none hath impudence to affirm : if finite, what security may we have, ere we part with our money, that the treasury is not exhausted, upon the large grants already made ? But they will tell them, "The bank is inexhaustible." In the next place, therefore, let us consult the treasurer.

4. The fourth tottering hypothesis is this :—that the pope hath the chief power of dispensing this treasury to those members that need it.

Though I might turn off this with that trite maxim, "That which hath no being, hath no accidents ;" if there be no such treasury, there need be no controversy about the dispensing of it : and though I might bespeak them to agree among themselves, whether hath greater power,—the pope or a council, before they quarrel with us about what themselves are not agreed [upon] : and though I may well suppose, that the pope's supremacy is already confuted in this Exercise : but, to let pass all this, what a fair dividend do they make of the satisfaction of Christ, while they allow every priest to dispose of it for the pardon of faults and of eternal punishments, but reserve the disposal of that part of it to the pope whereby to pardon temporal punishments !† How egregiously also do they trifle, while they distinguish between satisfaction and the payment of satisfaction ! "Satisfaction," they say, "was made by Christ and saints ; but the payment of it is by the pope : that was done long since ; this is still in doing : " as if the satisfaction of Christ were like a sum of money laid up in a chest, to be laid out upon occasion ; whereas

* (PLACÆI) *Theses Salmurienses*, pars ii. p. 72, et seqq.

† *Idem, ibid.* p. 81, &c.

we know no other gospel-treasury but what is dispensed by the Spirit of God, by the word and sacraments. It is "the gospel" that "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth;" and "therein is the righteousness of God revealed." (Rom. i. 16, 17.) But I shall speak more to this in my next attempt,

III. *To overturn their main thesis.*—Which is this:—

THE PAPISTS' THESIS.

That the pope, through the fulness of apostolical power, may grant a most full pardon by indulgences.

This is expressed most fully by Clement VI., who speaketh thus: "Of that infinite treasure that is obtained for the church militant, God would not have it to be laid up in a napkin or hid in a field; but hath committed it to Peter, that bears the keys of heaven, and to his successor-vicars on earth, to be wholesomely dispensed upon fit and reasonable causes, sometimes for the total, sometimes for the partial, remission of temporal punishments, both generally and specially due for sins; to be mercifully applied to the truly penitent and confessed."*

In the anatomy of this thesis, I shall endeavour to discover these things; namely, 1. *The falseness of it*; 2. *The novelty of it*; 3. *The contradictions in it*; 4. *The cheats of it*; 5. *Its injuriousness to Christ*; 6. *Its mischief to Christians*.

1. To convince you of *the falseness of this position*, I shall first give you plain scripture-proof that there is no pardon of sin but by the mercy of God, through the blood of Christ, received by faith. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." (Eph. i. 7.) "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. v. 1.) "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died," &c. (Rom. viii. 33, 34.) Many more texts might be alleged; but I had rather say only what is enough, than [say] all.

But our adversaries pretend also to scripture-warrant: though Durand confesseth, that concerning indulgences there can but little be said upon certainty, because the scripture doth not speak expressly of them; for that which is said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind," &c., (Matt. xvi. 19,) is to be understood of the power given unto him in the court of penance, and it is not clear that it ought to be understood of the granting indulgences.† But Bellarmine saith, "Although indulgences be not warranted by particular scripture, yet they are in general by the power of the keys; and they may be warranted by divine authority, known by tradition of the apostles."‡ (By the way, let me observe, I do not remember that ever I read any thing in their authors about the pope's power in any kind: but this text is pressed into the service of their design, though ordinarily to as little purpose as any text in the Bible.) But scriptures they bring; let us examine them a little.

* *Decret. GRATIANI*, tom. ii. *Extrav. Com.* lib. v. cap. 2, p. 352. † DURANDUS, lib. iv. dist. xx. quæst. 3, p. 791. ‡ *De Indulgentiis*, lib. ii. cap. 10, p. 46.

They argue from those words of the apostle, "Ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him," &c. ; (2 Cor. ii. 7, &c. ;) in short : "The apostle gave indulgence ; so may the pope." There is enough in the text to answer their allegation. For example : (1.) Paul never limited a time for his repentance,—that it must be so many days or years. (2.) Paul took no price to pay his debt out of the Corinthians' works of super-erogation. (3.) The penitent gave no money for his indulgence. And, (4.) (Which is more than all the rest,) He saith, "To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also." (Verse 10.) This is no-way to be endured,—that the pope hath no more power to forgive any thing than other priests : * I doubt not but, rather than yield that, they will let go that text.

Another text [which] they urge is, "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." (Col. i. 24.) Upon which they say, that Paul satisfied for the sins of other believers ; and by this means did contribute to the enriching [of] the church's treasury of satisfactions, which the pope disposeth of by indulgences. But this is presupposing their opinion, not proving of it. They grant our exposition of the text to be right :—(1.) That Paul's afflictions are "the afflictions of Christ ;" that is, he suffered them for Christ, for the name of the Lord. (2.) They made up the last part of the apostle's task, being the remainder of the afflictions [which] he had to sustain. (3.) They contain an illustrious evidence of his gratitude toward the Lord ; that, as Christ had suffered for his salvation, he suffered in his order for the glory of his gracious Master.† So that here is not a word of satisfactions or treasury or indulgences.

Another text [that] they urge is, "That your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want : " (2 Cor. viii. 14 :) as if he had said [that] the church of Jerusalem was poor, and abounded in merit ; the church of Corinth was rich, and wanted merit. Take but the plain meaning of the text, and that will rescue it from such an abuse :—The Corinthians received the gospel from some of the Jewish church ; and therefore they ought to relieve their necessities.

Beside their wresting of scripture, they argue from that article of the Creed, "The communion of saints : " "Therefore those that neither do nor suffer what they ought for themselves, are to be supplied out of what others have done and suffered more than they need." Is not this a consequence of the largest size ? May they not by such arguing prove every thing out of any thing ? Briefly : the church is called a "communion of saints" because, (1.) They are all members of one mystical body. (2.) All the benefits of Christ are communicated to every believer : they are all called, justified, sanctified, saved. (3.) They are to do all offices of charity one for another, while in this world. But what is all this to works of super-erogation ? Let this suffice for this first particular ; and the rather, because the proof of the rest will also prove this. Therefore,

2. *Indulgences are a novelty.*—The ancient church neither knew nor

* CHEMNITII *Exam. Conc. Trid.* p. 714, &c.

† DAILLE *in loc.* pp. 120, 121.

practised any such thing. That they may not say [that] we slander them, hear their own authors. Cajetan, who was employed both as legate and champion against Luther, begins thus: "If certainty could be had concerning the beginning of indulgences, it would help us to search out the truth: but because no written authority, either of the holy scripture or of the ancient Greek or Latin doctors, hath brought this to our knowledge; but this only, from three hundred years;—it is written concerning the ancient fathers, that blessed Gregory instituted the stationary indulgences," &c.* Which should we grant, (though let them tell us where to find it in his writings,) it would not prove them very ancient. And Roffensis himself, as that Italian quotes him,† (for I have him not by me,) acknowledgeth that till people were frighted with (the bugbear of) purgatory, nobody minded indulgences; and *that* he likewise acknowledgeth to be but of late years. To convince those of novelty who slander us with it, I will give you a brief historical account of them, how they crept in, and to what a monstrous height they rose, till they were so top-heavy that their fall broke off several branches of that tree which overspread the western churches. (Dan. iv. 11, &c.)

The discipline of the ancient church was such, that they did neither lightly nor suddenly re-admit unto communion those that denied the faith or sacrificed to idols in time of persecution, or those that at any time fell into heresy or any other scandalous wickedness, till the church was satisfied in the truth of their repentance. To evidence which, they required such public, visible testimonies, such as, they judged, might most probably speak the grief of their heart for sin, the seriousness of their desire of reconciliation, and their full purpose of amendment. The manner of their repentance was thus, as Nicephorus relates it: "After it was looked upon as burdensome for the offender to confess his fault publicly as upon a theatre, they chose a minister that was holy, prudent, and secret, to whom those that had offended might open their case, and receive directions what to do, that their sin might be pardoned. The Novatians took no care of this matter: for they refused to communicate with those that denied the faith in the persecution of Decius; and it is said [that] this rite was instituted for their sake, that they might be restored upon their repentance. There was a certain place appointed for the penitents, where they stood with a dejected countenance, greatly bewailing their sin, till what they might not partake of was ended; and then they threw themselves at *his* feet *that* administered. Then he that was appointed to direct them, ran to them, and, mourning with them, lay down upon the ground; and the whole multitude of the church stood about them, with many tears lamenting over them. Then the minister rose up, and bade the penitents to rise, and, praying for them as the matter required, dismissed them. Then every one betook himself to what was enjoined him,—to macerate themselves by fastings and watchings and frequent prayers and abstinence from delights; which when they had performed, they were received into communion. This they did, to keep the ordinances pure, and the church from reproach. But I think," saith he, "that the church is fallen from that ancient,

* CAJETANI *Opusc.* tom. i. tract. xv. cap. i. p. 46.
Rerum Inventoribus, lib. viii. cap. 11, p. (mihi) 613.

† POLYDORUS VIRGILIUS *De*

venerable gravity, and hath by little and little departed from that accurate discipline." *

The church prescribed rules for repentance according to the variety of offences; some for the space of several days, others for several years, and others during life; allowing the bishop to abate or add to the time enjoined, as he saw occasion.† It was judged convenient in all cases to try their repentance; and if the penitents did, by their fear and patience and tears and good works, demonstrate the unfeignedness of their conversion, they were to be more gently dealt with.‡ But they, as wise physicians, still imposed fit remedies; namely, humbling exercises to the vain-glorious, silence to the babblers, watching to the sluggards, hard labour to the slothful, fasting to the gluttonous, &c.§ And in those things that were imposed, we are not so much to consider the length of the time, as the depth of the grief; such as may satisfy *the church* (pray, mark that: it is the church) in the truth of their repentance; *not God's justice*, so that they might challenge a pardon.|| We are firmly to believe that the purging away of sin is done by the blood of Christ, through the greatness of God's mercy and the multitude of his compassions.¶ But they were only enormous sinners upon whom the ancient church imposed severities, to evidence the truth of their repentance. Let Augustine speak for all, who mentions a threefold repentance:—**

"The first before baptism; which is conversion; when a man repents of his former course of life, and gives up himself to live in newness of life: and upon these they imposed no ecclesiastical censures." (Cap. 1.) "The second was a daily repentance; and for sins of daily incursion we are taught to pray, 'Forgive us our trespasses,' &c.: of these the church took no notice." (Cap. 2.) "But there is a more grievous and mournful repentance; in the managing of which, offenders are properly called 'penitents:' this is a grievous thing, but that the Almighty Physician can cure such. But, O my beloved," saith he, "let no man propose this kind of repentance unto himself: if he have fallen, let him not despair; but let no man venture upon sin in hopes of repentance." (Cap. 3.)

So that you may see, that whoever will be at the pains to compare the satisfactions of the Papists with the satisfactions of the ancients, they will find them far different. In short: "They never used them as necessary for the pardon of sin; neither did they hold that these satisfactions must be made in this life or endured in purgatory: which two things if you take away, you overthrow the tables of indulgence-sellers. But they enjoined them, (1.) That the name of God might not be blasphemed among the Heathen; as if the church were a receptacle of Belialists, where they might sin with impunity. (2.) That they might not partake of other men's sins. (3.) That others might not be in-

* NICEPHORI *Hist. Eccles.* lib. xii. cap. 28, p. 279, et seqq. † *Decret. GRATIANI*, tom. ii. *Canones Pœnit.* p. 2053, et seqq.; *Concilium Ancyranum*, can. 4-7, 20-22, &c. in *Concil. BINIO edit.* tom. i. p. 275, et seqq. ‡ *Concilium Nicæanum*, can. 12, 13, *ibid.* p. 343. § BASILIUS, tom. ii. *Regule fusiùs disput.* respons. ad interrog. 50, p. 601. || AUGUSTINI *Enchiridion*, cap. 65, tom. (mihi) iii. p. 230. ¶ BASILIUS, *ibid.* *Regule Breviores*, respons. ad interrog. 10, p. 627. ** AUGUSTINUS *De Util. Pœnitent.* tom. ix. p. 1284, et seqq.

fect; for sin is a catching disease. (4.) That offenders might be more feelingly convinced of the greatness of their sin. (5.) That they might do what was possible to pull-up sin by the roots," &c.* Whereas the Papists now [act] as the degenerate church of Israel formerly: "They eat up the sin of my people, and they set their heart on their iniquity." (Hosea iv. 8.) The patrons of indulgences look at their gain. The ancients, when they absolved their penitents, exhorted them to sin no more, but to bring forth fruits worthy of amendment of life; they put them upon the exercise of the contrary virtues: but there is nothing of this in Papal indulgences. In a word: the ancients carried on a design of heavenly interest in their severities; and the Papists, of earthly in their indulgences.

But the severities of the ancients were by degrees mollified. Our learned countryman gives us the canons of a council, in the year 786; where, in the last canon, it is decreed "that if any one died without penance and confession, he should not be at all prayed for."† (Where then were indulgences, as since granted?) But he gives us the canon of another council, in the year 967. Where the council closeth the penitential canons with four concerning the penance of noblemen, (they say expressly in the last canon, that poor men are not to have any such privilege,) there they give this direction for him that is enjoined seven years' fasting: "Let him," say they, "for three days have twelve companions to fast with him; that is, to eat nothing but bread and water and herbs; and let him somewhere else get seven times one hundred and twenty men, to fast every one for him for those three days: and so he will fast so many fasting-days as there are in the whole seven years."‡ But if yet this be too much, they may have relief by the provision before made for those that are sick. Is it not enough to make a great man sick, to put him upon three days' fasting? Which if it do, "for one penny he may buy off a day's fasting; and for thirty shillings, a year's fasting."§ Is not this fair? But yet this comes not near the later markets. But I must not multiply particulars: when they had churches to build, hospitals to endow, bridges to repair, or the like; then indulgences were granted, to fetch-in money. And even then, while these good works were proposed, Gregory IX. decrees "that the alms-gatherers appointed be modest and discreet persons; that they lodge not in taverns or unfitting places; that they be not profuse in their expenses," &c. "Because," saith he, (pray mark his words,) "by the indiscreet and superfluous indulgences which some are not afraid to grant, the keys of the church are contemned, and penitential satisfaction is enervated;"|| and therefore he set limits to the granting of them.

But notwithstanding all the little checks [which] they met with, they were more freely granted in the year of jubilee. In the year 1300, Boniface VIII. instituted a jubilee every hundredth year; wherein he granted not only a full, but "a most full, pardon of all sins, to all those that in such a time shall visit the churches of the prince of the apostles at Rome."¶ To me the beginning of the Bull seems consider-

* CHEMNITII *Exam. Conc. Trid.* p. 725, et seqq.

† SIR HENRY SPELTMAN'S *Concil.*

Brit. in Conc. Calchuth. can. 20, p. 300.

‡ Idem, *Canones dati sub Edgardo rege,*

p. 474, &c. § *Ibid.* can. 18, p. 473.

|| *Decret. GRATIANI,* tom. iii. *Decret.*

GREG. lib. v. tit. xxxviii. cap. 14, p. 1874.

¶ *Bullarium Magnum,* tom. i. p. 204.

able, that grounds it upon a report that great indulgences were granted (though nobody knows when nor where) to the visitors of those churches. Well, but though there never was any such thing before, yet, now [that] this easy way of pardon is broached, it is pity the time should be so seldom. Clement VI., therefore, in the year 1350, upon the prayers of the people of Rome, reduced the jubilee to every fiftieth year; and for so doing, he doth not go upon report, but finds it upon the law of Moses.* Urban VI. reduced it to thirty-three years:† and Paul II. gives the reason of it; namely, he providently considered [that] men do not live so long as formerly, and desired that very many more might receive benefit by them, &c. Which when he hath done, as also [shown] how that reduction was confirmed by Martin V. and Nicholas V., he then expresseth his greater kindness in reducing the jubilee to every twenty-fifth year.‡ And Alexander VI., in the year 1500, enlarged the jubilee to those that could not, or neglected to, come to Rome.§

And thus I have (though with omitting more than I have expressed) brought them down to Leo X., who exercised such an excessive power in this matter, that “there is not,” saith Ranchin, “a good Catholic but is sorry for it.”|| Take the matter of fact from that excellent historian Thuanus; who wrote only the “History of his own Time,” and therefore might well be more exact. “In the year 1515, Leo X., a man giving himself to all licentiousness, by the instigation of cardinal Lorenzo Puccio, a turbulent man, to whom he ascribed too much,—that he might from all parts scrape up money for his vast expenses, he sent his Bulls of indulgences through all the kingdoms of the (Papal) Christian world; wherein he promised the expiation of all sins, and eternal life: and there was a price set, what every one should pay, according to the grievousness of his sin. To which end he appointed collectors and treasuries throughout the provinces; adding to them preachers, to recommend to the people the greatness of the benefit. These, by sermons artificially composed, and by pamphlets openly published, immoderately extolled the efficacy of these indulgences. These Bulls were executed with too much licentiousness in many places, but especially in Germany; where those that farmed them from the pope did lavish out their power of drawing souls out of purgatory, shamelessly spending it every day in whore-houses and taverns, at dice and most filthy uses.”¶

I shall forbear to insist upon the abominable expressions of those that preached up these indulgences; such as this, namely, that “there is no sin so great, but that if a man should (which is impossible) deflower the mother of God, he might by indulgences be pardoned both fault and punishment.” Chemnitius mentions several stories, to whom I refer you; ** and [I] shall somewhat more largely acquaint you with the very words of some of the “Hundred Grievances” of the princes of the Roman empire, assembled at Nuremberg, in the years 1522 and 1523. The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth Grievances are under the title of “The Burdens of Papal Indulgences.”

* CIACONII *Vite Pontif.* p. 903.

† Idem, p. 998.

‡ Bullar. Mag. tom. i.

pp. 401, 402.

§ CIACONII *Vite Pontif.* p. 1343.

|| “Review of the Council of

Trent,” lib. v. cap. 1, p. 249.

¶ THUANI *Hist.* lib. i. p. 13.

** CHEMNITII

Exam. Conc. Trid. pp. 744, 745.

Their third Grievance is about “the increase of the intolerable burden of indulgences; when, under the show of piety, for the building of churches, or an expedition against the Turks, the popes suck the marrow of their estates; and, which heightens the imposture, by their hiring criers and preachers, Christian piety is banished; while, to advance their market, they cry up their wares, for the granting of wonderful, unheard-of, peremptory pardons, not only of sins already committed, but of sins that shall be committed, by those that are alive, and also the sins of the dead. So that, by the sale of these wares, together with being spoiled of our money, Christian piety is extinguished; while any one may promise himself impunity, upon paying the rate that is set upon the sin [which] he hath a mind to commit. Hence whoredoms, incests, adulteries, perjuries, murders, thefts, &c., and all manner of wickedness, have at once their offspring. What wickedness will mortal men be afraid to commit, when they may promise themselves licence and impunity of sinning while they live, and for a little more money indulgences may be purchased for them after they are dead? especially the Germans, who are of a credulous temper, and easy to be persuaded by pretences of piety and a show of religion.”

A fourth Grievance was this,—that “the indulgences were sold for defence against the barbarians; but the money was laid out to maintain the luxury of kindred, and to advance their families.”

The fifth was this,—that “the pope, and the rest of the bishops and pillars of the Roman church, have always some cases reserved, for which you must make a new bargain and pay more money, or no dispensation.”

The sixth was this,—that “if any one have wherewithal to pay, he may not only be indulged the present transgression of these constitutions, (about reserved cases,) but they may be permitted to transgress them for the future; whence those that are dispensed with, take occasion to commit perjuries, murders, adulteries, and such-like wickedness; which all springs from the cursed covetousness of some ecclesiastics.”

I might add more out of their seventh Grievance, about the stationary preachers of indulgences; of whom the princes complain that “they devour the very blood and marrow of the poor, and themselves live in more than Sybaritical luxury and delights.”* But I will transcribe no more of this: I would not, indeed, have transcribed so much, but that the book whence I have it is but in few hands. And that what I have said may not be tedious, I will refresh you with a story. A nobleman told Tecelius, [Tetzel,] the chief publican of indulgences, that he had a mind to commit a very heinous sin; and he desired *present* pardon of that *future* sin. Tecelius, for a great sum of money, gives him the indulgence: the nobleman pays down the money, and receives his Bull. Afterwards the nobleman took occasion in a certain wood to rob Tecelius, and break open his chests of indulgences: and when Tecelius threatened him with all manner of curses, the nobleman showed him his Bull of indulgences that he paid so dear for, and, laughing at him, told him [that] this was the sin that he had a mind to commit when he was so fully absolved.†

* *Fasciculus Rerum expetendarum*, fol. 177, 178.

† CHEMNITIUS, *ibid.* p. 745.

It would drive out this discourse into too great a length, to (but particularly) mention the several conferences, disputations, writings, Diets, that passed for above twenty years, ere the council was assembled at Trent; and to mention what was done there at several times for above twenty years more, ere they so much as attempted to debate the business of indulgences; and when it was attempted, how they durst not meddle with that fistula,* but shuffled up a decree about them, the last day of their session; in which decree they acknowledge "such abuses in them, that give the heretics," as they call us, "occasion to blaspheme them;" and they acknowledge "such wicked gains in the sale of them, that are very much a cause of abusing Christian people;" and they acknowledge also "other abuses, through superstition, ignorance, irreverence, and otherwise, which they refer to be reformed by the pope, who," they say, "hath alone power to dispense them."† And, to give us a demonstration what we may expect for the reforming of the abuses of them, themselves break the law the same day they made it: Cardinal Morone, as chief president, granted to every one that was present in the session, or had assisted in the council, a plenary indulgence;‡ when they had but then decreed, that the sole dispensing of them belongs to the pope. But I will say no more to the history of indulgences.

3. The next thing I am to show you is, *the contradictions of them.*—And herein I shall take Bellarmine for their oracle, and give you a gleanings of contradictions in five things [which] he saith about indulgences; namely, "To an authentical indulgence, there must be, (1.) Authority in the giving, (2.) Piety in the cause, (3.) A state of grace in the receiver. (4.) The thing pardoned is, not the fault, but the punishment. (5.) The punishment pardoned is neither natural, nor those that are inflicted in any outward court that is contentious, whether ecclesiastical or secular."§ Now do but observe some few (of many) gross contradictions about all these; for instance:—

(1.) *As to the authority of granting indulgences.*—He saith that Christ, in giving the keys to Peter and the rest of the apostles, gave to them the power of order, and to Peter the power of jurisdiction; so that the pope holds from Peter a peculiar power of jurisdiction: every ordinary priest may pardon sin, deliver the soul from hell; but he cannot discharge them from temporal satisfactions. How many contradictions there are in this, I cannot say; but pray take notice of these:—

(i.) The keys were given equally to all the apostles; therefore not so [particularly] to Peter. I question not but this hath been evidenced to you in a former Exercise.

(ii.) What a contradiction is it to say [that] the pope cannot pardon the penance enjoined by a priest, and yet can pardon what is required by God! that is, he cannot take off the sentence of an inferior court, but he can take off the sentence of a superior! As if a man should say among us, "A justice of the peace cannot discharge a man from the stocks, that is set there by a constable; but he can give a man a pardon for his life, that is condemned by the judge." Whereas this is obvious to all,—that no

* "History of the Council of Trent." lib. viii. p. 801.
p. 433. † "History of the Council," p. 813.

† *Concil. BINIO edit.* tom. ix.
§ BELLARMINUS *De Indulg.*

lib. i. cap. 11, et cap. 7.

inferior judge can take off the sentence of a superior. What will not these men dare do, that dare cry up the pope to be superior to God himself?

(2.) *As to piety in the cause.*—The pretended causes are such as these; namely, the building of churches, the endowing of hospitals, the making of bridges, the warring against infidels or heretics, or some other acts of charity.

(i.) This contradicts the scripture-conditions for pardon of sins: but what care they for scripture?

(ii.) Where is piety in the cause, when the pope upon the day of his coronation, sitting upon a throne set upon the top of the stairs of St. Peter's church, throws indulgences among the people, as one would throw a handful of farthings among a company of beggars, to scramble for them, "catch as catch can?"* But do they say that *piety* is in the cause? The real cause is, to get money. I know, Bellarmine is very angry with us for charging this upon them; but let them answer their own authors in this matter. Matthæus Parisiensis tells us, that when several were drawn in, under Innocent IV., unto the holy war, the pope compelled them to redeem their vows. Leo X. gave out indulgences for the repairing of St. Peter's church; whereas Julius, his predecessor, left an infinite treasure to that end; and the money gathered by indulgences was laid out about the palace of the Medici in Florence, much of it distributed among the cardinals and his minions.† And the indulgences of Saxony he gave unto his sister Magdalene, wife unto Franceschetto Cibo, bastard son of Innocent VIII.; by reason of which marriage this Leo was created cardinal at the age of fourteen years.‡ But what need I mention particulars? See but the *Taxa Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*, and there you have the several sums set upon the several sins. I will name some few;§ namely, "For the carnal knowledge of his mother, sister, or other kinswoman by blood or marriage, or his godmother; five grossus," (grossus is near about a groat of our money; but I will reckon it high enough,) five sixpences. "For the deflowering of a virgin; (six gros. ;) six sixpences. For perjury; (six gr. ;) six sixpences. For a woman that drinks any potion, or doth any other aet, to destroy her live child within her; (five gr. ;) five sixpences. For him that kills his father, mother, brother, sister, wife; (d. one. Carl. five;) one crown and five groats." And in the table for dispensing about marriages, when the rates are stated for the first and second degree, there is added, "Note diligently, that favours and dispensations of this kind are not to be granted to the poor;" and the reason is given: "Because they are not," (that is, not capable of paying for them,) "therefore they cannot be comforted." Voetius tells us that the Papists [whom] he conversed with, deny that ever there was any such thing or any such book, and say [that] we slander them: || whereas Espencæus tells us that it was openly sold; and he tells us so with this remark: "It is a wonder that at this time, in this schism, such an infamous index of such filthy and to-be-abhorred wickedness is not suppressed." (It was printed at Paris, in the year 1520.) "There is

* DU MOULIN'S "Novelty of Popery," p. 465.

† "Review of the Council of Trent," pp. 91, 92.

‡ *Apost.* fol. 36—38, 41.

§ "History of the Council of Trent," p. 6.

¶ *Taxa Cancell.*

|| VOETII *Selectæ Disput.* pars ii. p. 296.

neither in Germany, Switzerland, nor in any other place where there is a defection from the Roman see, a book more to their reproach; and yet," saith he, "it is not suppressed by the favourers of the church of Rome. It teacheth and encourageth to such wickedness as we may be afraid to hear named; and a price is set to all buyers."* Is not this enough to show the piety of them?

(3.) The third requisite is, *The receiver of indulgence must be in the state of grace.*—It is ordinarily said [that] they must be confessed and contrite; though others deny the necessity of it. Every way here is a swarm of contradictions. I will name one or two.

(i.) They deny that any one can know whether he be in a state of grace or not. Pray unriddle me this: the decree about indulgences saith that indulgences are very profitable to Christian people, and damns those that say otherwise; and the same council damns those that shall so far own their Christianity, as to affirm their faith to be certainly saving.† But I will quit this, and request you to consider the next.

(ii.) Whether is there any infallible evidence of a person's not being in a state of grace? If there be, what is it? Will the living and dying in all manner of mortal sins,—such as blasphemy, witchcraft, murder, incest, adultery, perjury; reckon up all the wickedness that you can in the world,—will these speak a man to be graceless? Indulgences provide for a full pardon of all these sins. The stationary indulgences of the city of Rome, that is, the indulgences annexed to every church, granted to those that visit them, amount to a million of years. (To gratify Bellarmine for telling me why they grant so many, I will not make any observations upon Gregory's dedication of the church of Lateran,‡ when he gave as many days of indulgence as there fall drops of rain when it rains without ceasing for the space of three days and three nights; and when Gregory feared lest the treasury of grace would be emptied by that profuseness, Christ appeared unto him, and told him [that] He was willing he should grant more indulgences; for the people had need of them: but I will take Bellarmine's word that he hath not read this in any author [whom] he likes; and for the reason before-said I will let it go.) I might reckon up an innumerable company more in several places. But now why so many years? A man can do penance in this world no longer than he lives; and their purgatory, they say, lasts no longer than the day of judgment: what use is there, then, of so many millions of years of indulgence? Bellarmine (I thank him) tells me: "We cannot deny but that some are bound by the penitential canons to some thousands of years' penance: for if to every deadly sin there be due by the canons so many years' penance; as, to some, three; to some, seven, &c.; then he that hath accustomed himself to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commits murders, thefts, sacrileges, adulteries,—without doubt the popes had respect to such as these, when they gave indulgences for ten or twenty thousand years."§ So, then, if they commit all the sins before-mentioned so often, that the penance due for them would amount to millions of years; yet they need fear nothing;

* ESPENCEUS in *Titum* i. digr. ii. p. 479.

† *Concilia generalia et provincialia*

BINIO edita, tom. ix. p. 362, *Conc. Trid.* sess. vi. can. 15, 16, 23. &c.

‡ CHEMNITII

Erabi. p. 739.

§ BELLARMINUS *De Indulgentiis*, lib. i. cap. ix. p. 25.

they are provided of indulgences; they shall go to heaven, as sure as the pope has the key of it. Well, let us lay these things a little together. He tells us, "Those that receive benefit by indulgences, must be in the state of grace;" and he also tells us that "without doubt the pope had respect" (great kindness, certainly!) "for those that accustom themselves to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commit murders, thefts, sacrileges, adulteries," &c. Now, then, either indulgences profit those that are not in a state of grace, or these Belialists pass for saints with their infallible Judge; either of which is an abominable contradiction.

(4.) *As to what is pardoned by indulgences.*—He saith, "The fault is never pardoned, but the temporary punishment." Here I have two questions to ask, and one story to tell; and all from themselves.

QUESTION I. What mean those clauses usual in indulgences, of pardon of fault and punishment?

QUESTION II. What say they to venial sins? They are faults; and there, they grant, both fault and punishment are pardoned.

But, to let these pass: I will give a story that smells rank, out of "St. Francis's Conformities," a folio stuffed with as prodigious lies as ever paper was stained with. Among other whisks, take this about indulgences: "While blessed Francis stood in his cell at St. Mary's *de Portiuncula*, and most fervently prayed to God for sinners, there appeared an angel of the Lord unto him, who bade him go to the church; for there Christ and blessed Mary, with a great multitude of angels, expected him. He presently went; who, when he saw Christ, with his mother standing at his right hand, and a great multitude of angels, he fell upon his face for fear and reverence. And then our Lord Jesus Christ said to him, as he lay prostrate before him and his mother, 'Francis, thou and thy companions are much solicitous for the salvation of souls. Ask what thou wilt about the salvation of nations and the comfort of souls and the honour and reverence of God; because thou art given for a light to the nations and a reparation of the church.' And he lay a while, as rapt up in the sight of God: but at length, when he came to himself, he begged indulgence, for all and every one that came to that place, that entered into that church, of all their sins, universally and generally of all their sins, of which they had made confession to the priest, and received his command. And he besought His blessed mother, the advocate of mankind, to intercede for the grant of this. The most blessed and most humble queen of heaven, being moved with the prayers of blessed Francis, presently began to supplicate her Son; telling him, it became him to have regard unto the prayers of blessed Francis his servant. His Divine Majesty presently said, 'It is a very great thing [that] thou hast asked; but, brother Francis, thou art worthy of greater things, and thou shalt have greater things. But I will that thou go to my vicar, to whom I have given power of binding and loosing in heaven and in earth; and, from me, ask of him this indulgence.' Whereupon he took his companion brother Masseus, and went to pope Honorius; and told him that he had repaired a church to the honour of the blessed Virgin, and he desired that he would grant indulgence there without offerings: who answered, 'That cannot conveniently be done; for he that receives indulgence, must

put-to his helping hand. But tell me,' saith he, 'how many years' indulgence wouldest thou have?' He answered, 'I will that whosoever comes to this church, confessed and contrite and absolved by the priest, as he ought, that he be absolved from fault and punishment from the day of his baptism, unto the day and hour of his entering into the church aforesaid; and I ask it in the behalf of Christ, who sent me to thee.' The pope said three times publicly, 'It pleaseth me that thou have it.' So blessed Francis bowed his head, and went out: which when the pope saw, he called, 'O simpleton, whither goest thou? What dost thou carry away of this indulgence?' Francis answered, 'Your word is enough; I will have no other instrument. Let blessed Mary be the paper; Christ, the notary; and angels, the witnesses,'" &c.* Miracles are related by the dozen to confirm this indulgence; I will mention but one: "Upon the day of indulgence, (the first of August,) brother Corradus saw the blessed Virgin with her child in her arms; and the sweet babe† did without intermission, with his own hands, bless all the people that were, out of devotion, present, and imparted to them his grace." Well, you see here both fault and punishment pardoned by indulgences; and yet indulgences can only pardon the punishment: reconcile these.

(5.) A fifth (and the last) thing [that] I shall name, of what is fruitful of contradictions, is, *the kind of punishments that are pardoned by indulgences*.—Bellarmine saith, "They are neither natural, nor those that are inflicted by any contentious court, whether civil or ecclesiastical."

If this be so, then there is nothing forgiven; for what sufferings more are there to be pardoned, but those that are natural or imposed? † If any more were due for sins, without doubt God would inflict them upon the damned: But God inflicts no other upon them: Therefore, &c. But Bellarmine tells us, they are those punishments that are inflicted in the penitentiary court, which we voluntarily fulfil, to which we are no way compelled but by the fear of God and the stings of our conscience. Pray, who gives the priest power to inflict any punishment upon those whose sins are pardoned? But if we are bound in conscience and in the fear of God to perform them, how dare the pope release them? But pray, let us again consider, what are the punishments usually inflicted. They are prayers and alms and fasting. Must not that be a famous church, think you, where fasting and prayer are punishments, and, as it were, laid in the balance with the pains of purgatory; which pains are as grievous as the torments of hell, bating the duration? Let them never boast more of their devotion or charity: they are with them penalties, with us privileges. We are so far from giving any thing to be excused these duties, that we would not be hired out of the performance of them. Should any of our ministers but preach such dispensations, we should account them the devil's apostles, "deceitful workers." (2 Cor. xi. 13.) What? teach men how to sell themselves to work wickedness, and then how to purchase heaven with their wages of unrighteousness! "O my soul, enter not into their secret." But, in short, *we* understand neither

* *Liber Confor. Vitæ B. et seraph. Pat. Francisci ad Vitam I. C. D. N.*, pp. 198, 199, impress. Bonon. 1590. † Is he a child still? ‡ *Theses Salmuriensis*, pars ii. n. 11, &c. p. 77.

the grammar nor the divinity of pardoning, of repentance, *who* think there is nothing but sin or punishment that needs a pardon.*

And thus I have showed you some of their contradictions. The next thing [which] I promised to speak-to was their cheats: and I may well be briefer here; for what is all that hath been spoken of, but a grand cheat?

4. *The cheats of indulgences* will be notorious.—Bring them but forth into the light, and every one may discern them. I need produce but a pattern; for they are all of a piece.

How shall a man be sure [that] he is not cheated of his money, when he cannot know what he buys? And how can a man know what he buys, when they are not agreed among themselves what they sell? For instance: they are not yet agreed, whether an indulgence be a judiciary absolution, or a payment of the debt by way of compensation of punishment out of the treasury, or both.† (I may add, “or neither,” ere I have done with this particular.) Could they get over this, here is another difficulty in the way; namely, What bond is loosed by indulgence? that is, What sins, what punishments, are we any way freed from? Though Bellarmine (as you have heard) say, “Without doubt the popes had respect to the worst of men;” yet he himself elsewhere saith, “That we are neither absolved nor solved from the guilt of any fault, whether mortal or venial, by indulgences.”‡ Among several reasons given, I will name but one: “As a dead member receives not influence from the other members of the body that are living, so he that is in mortal sin is as a dead member, and receives not indulgence from the merits of living members.”§ I know, Bellarmine saith, “The saints cannot merit for others; but they may satisfy for others; there being in the actions of the righteous a double value; namely, of merit and satisfaction.” (Though the distinction is every way a nullity, there being neither merit nor satisfaction: but let that pass for the present.) “Without controversy,” saith he, “one man’s merit cannot be applied to another.”|| Yet, by his favour, Hadrian, though he speaks less than Bellarmine in other things, he speaks more in this; for he saith, “He that is in mortal sin himself, may merit for another,” &c.¶ He calls paying for the indulgence, “meriting of it:” and, I think, well he may; for his money is well worth it. I might add, they are not yet agreed what is meant by “a year’s pardon;” whether three hundred and sixty days of penance, or only all the fasting-days in the year.** If the former, what is meant by that usual clause in indulgences, “For so many years, and so many quarantines,” or forty days of penance beside those that are contained in the general account of the year? They are not yet agreed about the value and efficacy of indulgences; whether they are worth what they pretend, or not. Some do not stick to say, [that] their holy father may do by his children as a mother by hers; that promiseth her child an apple, if he will do such a thing; but when he hath done it, she doth not give it. Neither are they yet agreed, whether they may not be

* CHAMIERI *Panstratia*, tom. iii. lib. xxiv. cap. xv. sect. 15.

Indulg. lib. i. cap. v. p. 19.

† *Idem*, cap. vii. p. 21.

tom. i. p. 1146.

‡ BELLARMINUS *De Indulg.* lib. i. cap. 2.

† BELLARMINUS *De*

§ RAYNERII *Pantheologia*,

¶ HADRIANI VI.

Quest. de Sacram. in quartum Librum Sentent. fol. 163.

** *Idem*, fol. 162.

effectual, though the condition of them be not performed. But why do I inquire into those things that will not bear a scrutiny? I have said enough to evidence that neither seller nor buyer understand the ware of their market; and these two things more may be enough to prove them a cheat:—

(1.) When Bellarmine saith [that] they are all agreed that an indulgence is not valid, unless the cause be just; and he names several things [which] must concur to make it just; but concludes, “It belongs not to the pope’s subjects to judge whether the cause be just or unjust; they ought simply to account it just;” and instanceth, how the pope may grant the greatest indulgences upon the lightest cause: for example: when a plenary indulgence is granted to all those that stand before the doors of St. Peter’s church, while the pope upon Easter-day solemnly blesseth the people: * we count this condition ridiculous. “O no,” saith he elsewhere; “they thereby show their obedience to the pope.” Is that it? Mark this, I pray you: by this doctrine, a man may live in disobedience and rebellion against God all his days, and at last so far obey the pope as to go [to] see a fine show, without parting with any one sin; and he shall be saved. Who but those that are given up to “strong delusion, to believe a lie,” can believe this? (2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.)

(2.) Neither those that grant, nor those that receive, nor those that plead for, indulgences, dare themselves trust to them. Witness the solemn services performed for them after their death; yea, for the pope himself. Now those that plead for the validity of plenary indulgences, when they are asked, “What need then of funeral obsequies?” they answer, “Some sins may be forgotten,” &c. What? and yet the deceased hath had their “full,” their “plenary,” and their “most full” indulgences! What these mean, take from one of their infallible oracles, Hadrian VI., in his book that was printed at Rome in the very time of his papacy: and so this is as it were out of the chair. He tells us, that a full indulgence respects penance enjoined for mortal sins; a plenary indulgence respects penance enjoined for mortal and venial sins; and a most full indulgence respects the penance that might have been enjoined for mortal and venial sins.† Tolet, almost a hundred years after, gives us a little more light into that gradation of indulgences; and tells us that a full indulgence respects the remission of the punishment enjoined; a fuller indulgence respects that punishment that might have been enjoined according to the canons; the fullest respects that punishment which may be required by the divine judgment.‡ Now, then, if indulgences pardon all manner of sins, mortal and venial, all manner of repentance that God or man can require, and all manner of punishment that God or man can inflict; and yet those that receive these indulgences, when they are dead, need the same means for pardon that those do that never had any indulgences; doth not this evidence that the chief patrons of indulgences do in their own consciences believe them to be a cheat? I shall next show you how they are injurious to Christ.

5. *Indulgences are injurious to Christ.*—And, which is to me consider-

* BELLARMINUS *De Indulg.* lib. i. cap. 12, pp. 28, 29.
fol. 163.

† HADRIANUS, *ibid.*

‡ TOLETI *Instruc. Sacerd.* lib. vi. cap. 24, p. 676.

able, they are most injurious to Christ where they seem most to honour him: what they speak of Christ with the greatest reverence, is, at the bottom, full of falsehood, injustice, and blasphemy. For instance: they say, "One drop of the blood of Christ was enough to redeem the world." "Doth not this assertion put an inestimable value upon the blood of Christ?" Examine it a little; and you will find that, Judas-like, they betray him with a kiss. For,

(1.) This takes away the necessity of Christ's death, which the scripture doth so often inculcate.* What need the Son of God undergo such a painful, ignominious, and cursed a death, if one drop of his blood was sufficient? How can we believe that the Father, who delighteth not in the death of a sinner, would delight in the cruel and cursed death of his most innocent, only-begotten Son, if it were not necessary for our redemption? Can we think that God, who will not punish his damned enemies beyond what they deserve, would exact a punishment of his Son so much more than there was need? Is the death of Christ superfluous? I dare not say of the Captain of our Salvation, as David said of the captain of the host of Israel: "Died Abner as a fool dieth?" (2 Sam. iii. 33.) No; death was the debt; and such a death must be the payment as may pay the debt; and that by the sinner, or (through grace) by his Surety.

(2.) If one drop of the blood of Christ be sufficient, and all the rest to be laid up in a treasury, and the satisfactions of saints likewise added; then there needs more to redeem us from temporal punishments than from eternal wrath, and Christ is not a complete Saviour: than which nothing is more absurd in itself, or more reproachful to Christ. To prove this, it is easy to multiply scriptures; but, to produce their own authors, at present I will name but one,† who expressly tells us that "it is only Christ, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, that can with plenary authority grant all manner of indulgence from fault and punishment: and it is Christ alone that can grant so many thousand thousand years of pardon as we find in some popes' grants; for no temporal punishment can endure the thousandth part of that time."

6. *Indulgences are abominably injurious to souls.*—They came in upon the declining of piety, and they are the product of the later and worse times.‡ The plain truth is, indulgences do in the nature of the thing promote wickedness; for it is only wicked men that need indulgences. Those that they account saints, do so much more than they need, that their superfluous good works constitute a treasury for others. Surely, then, we may reckon, that their middling sort, though they have no satisfactions to spare, yet they have so many [that] they need not be beholden to others: so that it is only the worst of men that need indulgence. And what can "more oblige them to redouble their crimes and misdemeanours, to abandon themselves to all manner of vice and lewdness, than to be sure that all the sins [which] they can commit shall be forgiven them? yea, to have them pardoned beforehand, in having indulgences for sins already committed and to be committed, with this express

* *Theses Salmurienses*, pars ii. p. 71, &c.
Indulg. viii. consid. 5, fol. 191.

† GERSONI *Opusc.* tom. i. de
 ‡ FORBESII *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae*,
 lib. xii. cap. viii. p. 655.

clause, "Be they never so heinous?"* Marcus Antonius de Dominis may well say that "indulgences are one of the great secrets of the Papacy; they are famous gold-mines, out of which a great power of gold hath been digged for the apostolical see: but they have utterly banished true repentance from the Popish churches."† Navarrus goeth further; (if I may credit Peter Du Moulin's quotation of him; ‡ I having not the book by me;) for although he was the pope's penitentiary, yet, when he writ for indulgences, he could not abstain from saying, "The grant of them is odious; because the collectors seek not the good of souls, but the profit of money," &c. In short: what wicked man is there that gives any credit to their doctrine of indulgences, but will gratify his lusts; that he may have the pleasures of both worlds? For, according to that doctrine, "There are none but fools and friendless can miss of heaven."

But enough, enough, and more than enough, of this mischievous doctrine.

IV. *Let us therefore, in the last place, try whether it is possible to make any good use of so bad a doctrine.*

USES.

USE I. *Let them henceforth be ashamed of their absurd reproaches of the Reformed churches, as if they were not pure enough or strict enough for them.*—What doctrines have we, that the devil himself can charge us with, like theirs of indulgences? Those days are passed with them, wherein it was harder for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven, than for a camel to go through the eye of a needle; (Matt. xix. 24;) for now those need never doubt of salvation. It is for such dull souls as we are, to harp upon such harsh strings as these: "They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him: for the redemption of his soul is precious, and it ceaseth for ever," &c.: (Psalm xlix. 6—8:) and that other word of Christ: "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (Matt. xvi. 26.) We dare not answer these scriptures with that interpretation of Prov. xiii. 8, [with] which *he* doth *that* glosseth upon Gerson in the fore-cited place: "The ransom of a man's life are his riches;" as if a man need do no more but purchase an indulgence, and all is well. We like the apostle's counsel better: "Let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another;" and that for the very reason which the apostle gives: "For every man shall bear his own burden." (Gal. vi. 4, 5.) We are neither to be proud of being better than others, nor trust to share benefits with those that are better than us. The wise virgins had no oil to spare, when the foolish had their oil to seek. (Matt. xxv. 8, 9.) We bless God that we have a Christ to trust to; and not any that may, like Hermannus, be many years worshipped for a saint, and then his bones dug up and burnt for a heretic, by that very Boniface who

* "Review of the Council of Trent," lib. v. cap. 1, p. 250.
lib. v. cap. viii. n. 13, p. 240.

† *De Rep. Eccles.*

‡ "Novelty of Popery," lib. vii. cap. 2, p. 467.

appointed the first jubilee, and that with a singular respect to the visiting [of] the sepulchres of the saints.* Commend which you will,—whether his worshipping, or his burning, of the bones of any [whom] they call “saints;” we think, he might well have acknowledged, with Eugenius, that “what key he had of opening and shutting, through his folly he did not prudently make use of it.” † Our common people can read in their Bibles that they are “fools” who “make a mock at sin,” (Prov. xiv. 9,) playing with it both in the commission and expiation. But we dare not do so; we dare not play the mountebanks in religion,—to make some whiffing about the conscience, and then stupify it with a cheat. We ingenuously confess, we have not better esteem of indulgences than had the citizens of Prague; who put the indulgent merchant into the same cart with some common whores, about whose breasts they hung the Papal indulgences; and so drew him and the whores, with the indulgences hanging about their necks, exposing them to scorn, through every street of the city; and then took the Bulls of indulgences, and publicly and solemnly burnt them. ‡ Such honour may they meet with wherever they come!

USE II. I will no longer forbear acquainting you with that, by way of use, which you might well expect in the opening of the doctrine; namely, *to state how far God may be said to punish sin after he hath pardoned it.*—We deny not but those whose sins are pardoned meet with many bitter calamities in this world; but the question between the Papists and us is, whether they are punishments of sin properly so called. § We grant [that] they are *materially* punishments, but not *formally*: that is, the same things, when suffered by wicked men, are punishments; but to *them* they are only fatherly chastisements, not judicial punishments; wholesome medicines, not penal executions. For example: a malefactor hath his hand cut off for striking in a court of judicature; that is properly a punishment: an innocent person hath his hand cut off, because it is gangrened; that is not a punishment, but a kindness. Plainly: a punishment is properly to satisfy revenging justice; a judge (as such) hath no respect to the offender’s repentance: but God always chastiseth “for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness.” (Heb. xii. 10.) We deny not but God chastiseth for sin: but the question between the Papists and us is not about the *impulsive* cause, but the *final*; that is, whether God, in punishing his children, do it to satisfy his justice with another satisfaction beside that [which] he hath received by the death of his Son. || The shortest and the plainest answer to this question will be, to clear up those scriptures which they press into their service.

They urge David’s case: “Because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die.” (2 Sam. xii. 14.) We grant that, because of David’s sin, his child died; but we deny [that] it was properly a punishment. Nathan makes a plain difference between the

* PLATINA *De Vita Bonifacii VIII.* p. 247.
 † CHEMNIUS *Exam.* p. 741.
 ‡ RIVETI *Cathol. Orthod.* tom. ii. tract. iii. quæst. 13, p. 63.

† B. Bp. tom. xv. p. 614, *Eugenius Pontifex Hildegardi.*
 § DALLÆUS *De Pœn. et Satisfac.* lib. 1. cap. 2, pp. 4, 5, et seqq. sparsim.

punishment due to David for the sin which is pardoned,—“The Lord hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die,” (verse 13.)—and the discipline whereby he would take off the scandal of wicked men. God, as it were, put off the person of a Judge, and assumed the person of a Father. Whereas they say, “David prayed against it, and therefore it was a punishment;” the answer is easy. The sick man begs of his physician, that he may have no more nauseous physic, no more corroding plasters, &c.: are his medicines therefore punishments? God would cure David, and prevent others from taking encouragement to sin by his example: to this end God makes use of dreadful physic; yet it is but physic. The like may be said to Miriam’s case, who was struck with leprosy: God would have her to be ashamed and repent of her molesting his servants in the discharge of their duty. (Num. xii. 13.)

But there are other instances of pardoned persons struck with death for their offences; of whom they jeeringly ask us, “Did God strike them dead, that they might mend their lives?” For example: 1. *Moses and Aaron*; to whom God said, “Ye shall not enter into the land which I have given unto the children of Israel, because ye have rebelled against my word,” &c. (Num. xx. 24.) I answer, Their death was not properly a punishment, but matter of instruction to other believers. There is a singular mystery in Moses’s death,—to teach that the law brings not into the heavenly Canaan; that must be done by Christ. 2. *That of the old prophet*; to whom the very person that deceived him said from God, “Forasmuch as thou hast disobeyed the mouth of the Lord, thy carcass shall not come unto the sepulchre of thy fathers. And when he was gone, a lion met him by the way, and slew him.” (1 Kings xiii. 21, 22, 24.) God by the threatening brought him to repentance; and by his death warns us to take heed how we swerve, though never so little, from his command. There was his own amendment to salvation, and the profit of the church by so memorable a monument of God’s severity.

But what need I spend time in particular instances? while the scripture speaks of believers in general, that death is to them a privilege, not a punishment; and death itself is inventoried among their treasures; (1 Cor. iii. 22;) that whenever or however it seizeth upon them, it will be their gain and matter of triumph. (Phil. i. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 55.) In a word, therefore, this, dear Christians, would I charge upon you:—Above all things secure your reconciliation with God, and then practically learn to answer God’s ends in all your chastisements and trials; set yourselves to hate sin, to be exemplary in holiness, to live in the continual exercise and growth of grace, till God translate you to glory.

USE III. *Let us bless God for being delivered from the devilish delusions of that religion.*—“Religion” did I call it? How do they forfeit the very name, while they industriously strive to make men atheists, that they may make them Papists! And what bait can be more alluring, than that they can afford them indulgence at so cheap a rate? Their Seraphical Doctor tells us of some indulgences granted, to help to build some church, or the like: those that gave a penny toward it, should be pardoned the third part of their repentance; and for another penny, another third part; and for another penny, the last third part:* so that for

* BONAVENTURA in *Senten.* tom. iv. p. 323, Venet. edit.

threepence ("for three halfpence," saith Altissiodorensis.* And among other proofs for the value of indulgences, he brings this:—that the head of John the Baptist was given to the damsel; by which damsel is meant the church of the Gentiles: so that the church of the Gentiles hath the head of John; that is, the head of grace: therefore she may grant indulgence to her subjects. A profound demonstration! So that) he may be discharged from the troublesome work of repentance. This the Seraphical Doctor thinks to be false and ridiculous; and therefore he thus resolves the value of indulgences:—in respect of him that grants them, they are of as much value as he says they are; but in respect of him that receives them, they are of more or less value according as he is disposed: so then, if they are fit for none, they are worth nothing. Angles reckons up six other opinions; † but all such as will rather torment than satisfy an awakened conscience. O what a miserable plunge must that soul be in, that, trusting to indulgences, commits sin with greediness; and never considering till he comes to die, he finds too late that the largest indulgences are only valuable according to the disposition of the receiver, and so he that most needs them shall have least benefit by them! Some of the very popes themselves have been ashamed of these cheats, and would have recalled them; but his kindred opposed it with the same argument that Demetrius did Paul: ‡ "By this craft we have our wealth." (Acts xix. 25.) In short: though they tell us that pope Gregory delivered Trajan out of hell, yet we dare trust to none but Christ to deliver us from the wrath to come, and we bless God that we have no other to trust to. We had rather now cry to God for mercy, than too late cry out in our misery, "Good God, upon what a frail spider's web doth hang the vast weight of Papal omnipotency!" § "Now we feel with a vengeance [that] the pope is not infallible!" But I will close all with what may be more profitable than such fruitless complaints.

USE IV. In the last place, therefore, *I would seriously caution you against that mock-religion, which is little else than an engine of carnal interest.*—As you love your souls, take heed of all sinful tendencies, of either head, heart, or life, toward those pernicious doctrines, of which this is one of the chief. I freely confess, I see no cause of fear (the Lord keep us from all confidence in any strength of our own!) that ever that religion shall reign in the consciences of those that have been once delivered from it; but it is an easy matter to persuade those that are of no religion to be of that religion. How many are there that walk in darkness in this noon-day light! And it is an easy process from ignorance to error; and to be devout, too, in that religion where ignorance is the mother of it. How many are there that will rather part with heaven than with their lusts! An easy temptation must needs proselyte them to that religion that promiseth infallibly to secure both. In short: indulgences are the softest arguments for delicate sinners, and the Inquisition the most cogent argument for the refractory. To prevent,

* ALTISSIODORENSIS in *Sent. Lib. quartum*, tract. vi. cap. 9, fol. 40. † ANGLES in *quartum Lib. Sent. pars ii. quest. de Indulg.* p. 1416. ‡ PLATINA De *Vita Bonifacii IX.* p. 275. § MARCUS ANTONIUS DE DOMINIS De *Rep. Eccles.* lib. v. cap. viii. n. 28, p. 245.

therefore, the charms of the one, and to establish against the knocking argument of the other, I shall only commend these two things to you :—

1. *Do not make light of sin, and you can never be a friend to indulgences.*—Augustine speaks like himself when he saith, “It is most difficult to find out, and most dangerous to define, what sins they are for which we may have indulgence by the merits of the saints our friends.” He professeth [that] he could not by his search come to the knowledge of them ; and the lesson he would learn and teach from it, was this : “To avoid all sin, and not at all to trust to the merits of others.”* We may cry out concerning this doctrine, “Without controversy, great is the mystery of ungodliness !” I grant, there is a great controversy between them and us about it : but yet, when I consider that I do not find two of them of a mind, but that they every one charge one another with something faulty in their particular sentiments about them ; and their darling council, before they made the decree about them, censured all the money-gatherers upon them to be incorrigible, and that they had no hopes of their amendment ; † I need not fear to say, “Without controversy, great is the mystery of ungodliness !” For one who is himself guilty of mortal sin at his pleasure to grant, to as many as he please, ‡ guilty of the most prodigious villanies, as large indulgences as they can desire ; § if this be not to encourage and propagate wickedness, what is ? I would therefore commend this to you : look upon sin to be not only the greatest, but *the only, evil* ; and that not so much as the least can be pardoned without the blood of Christ ; (Heb. ix. 22 ;) and that, as ever you expect benefit by Christ, you must “depart from iniquity ;” (2 Tim. ii. 19 ;) and that whosoever saith, we may venture to “do evil, that good may come,” his “damnation is just.” (Rom. iii. 8.) Whosoever, therefore, makes the remedies so light, so easy, so obvious, doth not only lessen, but takes away, the terror of the disease, and brings it into contempt. I would, therefore, with all possible importunity, beg of you to set yourselves against every sin ; watch against the temptations, occasions, and first risings of sin ; be as shy of sins of omission and mal-administration, as of open wickedness : and then indulgences will be no temptations to you to alter your religion. Then the jubilee, (next year,) which pseudo-catholics esteem as “the pleasant phantasies of Popery, the refuge of sinners, the grief of purgatory, the terror of devils, the mart of Rome, and the triumph of the pope,” || will be no more to them than a Bartholomew Fair. Do you study all the doctrine and practice of faith and repentance, and you will abhor all fellowship with this “doctrine of devils.”

2. *Make use of your Bibles ; and while you do so, you will neither be wheedled nor frightened out of your religion.*—Let but scripture-truth be your “shield and buckler,” and you need not fear this Romish “pestilence that walks in darkness,” and you may also hope that God will preserve you from their barbarous “destruction that wasteth at noon-day.” (Psalm xci. 4, 6.) “The sword of the Spirit” is the only offen-

* AUGUSTINUS *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi. cap. 27, p. 664. † *Conc. Trid.* sess. xxi. cap. 9, p. 401. ‡ AQUINATIS *Suppl. pars* iii. quest. xxvi. art. 4, p. 33. § BELLARMINUS, *ibid. sup.* || CHAMIERI *Panstrat.* tom. iii. lib. xxiv. cap. i. n. 5, p. 517 ; et cap. v. n. 11, p. 524.

sive arms in the Christian armoury; (Eph. vi. 17;) and there is no weapon [that] wounds them like this: and therefore they wrap it in a cloth, and throw it behind the ephod. But, my brethren, take it out; "there is none like it." (1 Sam. xxi. 9.) "Hold fast the form of sound words," which the scripture teacheth, "in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus," (2 Tim. i. 13,) and you can never be seduced: for there can be no heresies but by the misunderstanding of scripture; * which we are not to hear only with our ears, but with our minds.† I take it to be a good way to prevent the perverting of scripture, whenever a text is alleged for the proof of a doctrine in question:—first lay by that doctrine, and search what is the genuine meaning of the Holy Ghost in that place; and then consider what the mind of the Holy Ghost is in that question. But I will not be tedious. Bellarmine is the person [whom] I have most opposed: I will make a fair offer; namely, to be determined by his decision of the question, if they will stand to what he hath left upon record; which is as applicable to this business, as to that about which he wrote it; namely, "Concerning those things which depend upon the Divine Will, we are not to assert any thing but what God himself hath revealed in the holy scripture." ‡ Do but stand to this, and farewell indulgences.

SERMON XIX. (XVII.)

BY THE REV. THOMAS VINCENT, A.M.

OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

THAT DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH OF ROME WHICH FORBIDS TO MARRY, IS A
WICKED DOCTRINE.

THE POPIISH DOCTRINE, WHICH FORBIDDETH TO MARRY, IS A
DEVILISH AND WICKED DOCTRINE.

Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; FORBIDDING TO MARRY, &c.—1 Timothy iv. 1—3.

THE church of Rome hath been in her day as famous and truly worthy of renown, as any church which we read of, either in scripture or ecclesiastical history: I mean, in the primitive days of Christianity, whilst she retained her primitive faith and purity. Her fame was great and growing, even whilst the apostle Paul was alive; who, writing unto her, giveth thanks unto God for her, "that her faith was spoken of throughout the whole world." (Rom. i. 8.) This church had the advantage of being seated in the mistress-city of the earth, where the court then was of the chief empire; unto which resort being made from all

* TERTULLIANUS *De Resur. Carn.* cap. xi. p. 417. † Idem, *Adversus Gnosticos*, cap. vii. p. 595. ‡ BELLARMINUS *De Amis. Grat. et Stat. Pec. lib.* vi. cap. 3, p. 345.