

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.

parts of the world, the most of which at that time were subject and tributary unto Rome, her faith and obedience unto the gospel of Christ so openly professed, so generally known and taken notice of at home, were spread abroad, and carried far and near by strangers in their return from Rome into their own countries. Then the church of Rome was truly apostolical, being "built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. ii. 20.) And so long as she kept this foundation, her building was of "silver, gold, precious stones;" (1 Cor. iii. 12;) so long she did shine with true lustre and glory. But, in process of time, this so famous a church did decline, and by degrees degenerate; so that at length she became an infamous apostolical church, and the seat of Antichrist himself, the greatest enemy (next the devil) whom Christ hath in the world. When she left her foundation, her glorious building of purer metals and precious stones was changed into an infirm and coarse building of "wood, hay, and stubble," which is under the curse, and whose end is to be consumed with fire; (verse 13;) then her golden head fell off, and was strangely metamorphosed into feet of iron and clay, which the stone hewn out of the mountain without hands will dash to pieces. (Dan. ii. 31—45.)

This defection and apostasy of the church of Rome was foreseen and foretold by the apostle Paul, in this epistle to Timothy, as also most plainly in his second epistle to the Thessalonians. In the text he that runneth may read a true description of the apostate church of Rome: "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.

The church of Rome doth assume to herself to be "the house of God, the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth," spoken of in the fifteenth verse of the former chapter. If it should be granted that she was so at the first, and when the apostle did write this epistle; (although he spake not of her in particular then, but of the Christian church in the general, of which she was a part;) methinks, since her corruption and apostasy, since her great degeneration into Antichristianism, she might apply unto herself (sure I am, that others do, with firm reason) what is asserted and foretold in the text; which, in every particular, is very applicable unto her.

*Now the Spirit speaketh expressly*—By "the Spirit," we are to understand the Spirit of God, who speaketh expressly by the mouth of this apostle, a man full of the Holy Ghost; whereby he was infallibly guided in what he here writeth and foretellet. Or, "*the Spirit speaketh expressly*, that is, in some other place of Divine writ," saith the learned Mr. Joseph Mede upon the place: and he instanceth in Dan. xi. 36—39, which he interpreteth and accommodateth to this scripture.

*That in the latter times*—"The latter times" is sometimes taken for the last age of the world, which includeth all the times of the gospel. But I rather think, by "the latter times" we are to understand the latter age of the Christian church, which must be removed some considerable time from the times of the apostle, and so is suitable to the apostasy of the Roman church.

*Some shall depart, &c.*—"Hereby," saith Mr. Mede, "we are not to understand a small number, but only the exception of some particulars: thus *some* is of the same import with *many* in scripture-usage. (John vi. 60, 66, compared with verse 64; Rom. xi. 17; 1 Cor. x. 7—10.)"

*Some shall depart from the faith*—That is, they shall depart from the doctrine of faith; and thus the Papists do most grossly, as in many other, so particularly in their doctrine of justification by works, so corrupt and contrary unto the doctrine which this same apostle taught in his epistle to the Romans. Or, "some shall depart from the faith;" "that is," saith Mede, "they shall break their oath of fidelity unto Christ that in and through him alone they should approach and worship the Divine Majesty:" and he interpreteth this apostasy to signify no other than idolatry, according to the ordinary acceptation of the word in the scripture, which the church of Rome, above all churches, is guilty of.

*Giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils*—"By 'seducing spirits,'" saith Calvin, "is meant false prophets and doctors, who boast of the Spirit of God, but are acted by Satan, who is a lying spirit in their mouth, as 1 Kings xxii. 22." "By *doctrines of devils*," saith the same author, "is meant the devilish doctrines of these hellishly-inspired false prophets." *Prophetas aut doctores intelligit, quos idè sic nominat, quia Spiritum jactant. Satan aliquando Spiritus est mendax in ore pseudo-prophetarum. "Doctrinis dæmoniorum:" quod perinde est ac si dixisset, attendentes pseudo-prophetis et diabolicis eorum dogmatibus.*—CALVINUS in locum. Thus the Papists are under strong delusions, in their giving heed unto and belief of those lies and false doctrines, at first forged by the devils in hell, and vented afterward by the mouths and pens of their ministers upon earth. Mr. Mede interpreteth the *διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων*, to be doctrines, not of devils, which they are the authors of, but of demons, as the word signifieth, or concerning demons, as the inferior deified powers were called by the Gentiles, whom they thought a middle sort of divine powers between the sovereign and heavenly gods and mortal men; whose office was to be agents and mediators between the heavenly gods and men, whose original was the deified souls of worthy men after death, and some of a higher degree that never were imprisoned in bodies, unto whom they consecrated images, pillars, and temples, adoring them there and their relics: and he telleth us, that "the doctrine of demons" comprehends, in most express manner, the whole idolatry of the mystery of iniquity, the deifying and invocating of saints and angels, (those middle powers between God and mortal men,) the bowing to images, the worshipping of crosses as new idol-columns, the adoring and templing of relics, the worshipping of any other visible thing upon supposal of any divinity therein. "What copy," saith he, "was ever so like the example, as all this to the doctrine of demons? And is not this now fulfilled which was foretold in Rev. xi. 2,—that the second and outmost court of the temple, (which is the second state of the Christian church,) together with the holy city, should be trodden down, and over-trampled by the Gentiles (that is, overwhelmed with the Gentiles' idolatry) forty and two months?" The parallel may be read at large in that ingenious piece of Mr. Mede's, called,

“The Apostasy of the latter Times,” upon this text in Timothy; and I am very prone to think, that he hath more fully expressed and explained the mind of the Holy Ghost in this place, than any that went before him.

The second and third verses of this chapter do set forth the quality of the persons, and the means whereby this defection should enter:—

*Speaking lies in hypocrisy*—Or “through the hypocrisy of liars.” This the same author applieth to the Popish doctrines, which have obtained, 1. By lies of miracles: 2. By fabulous legends of the acts of saints, and sufferings of martyrs: 3. By counterfeit writings under the name of the first and best antiquity.

*Having their consciences seared with a hot iron*—“And who,” saith Mr. Mede, “could have coined, or who could have believed, such monstrous stuff as the Popish legends are stuffed with, but such as were cauterized, past all feeling and tenderness both of conscience and sense itself?”

*Forbidding to marry*—The applicableness of this to the Papists will appear in what I have now to say; and my discourse must be confined to the latter clause of the text, “Forbidding to marry.” From which the QUESTION which I am to speak unto is this:—

*Whether the Popish doctrine which forbiddeth to marry be a devilish and wicked doctrine?* This I affirm; and this, through God’s help, I shall prove. And that my proceeding herein may be the more clear, I shall,

I. *Show how far the Popish doctrine doth forbid to marry.*

II. *Prove that their doctrine which forbiddeth to marry is a devilish, wicked doctrine.*

III. *Answer the arguments which are brought for this doctrine.*

IV. *And lastly, I shall shut up my discourse with some uses.*

I. *How far the Popish doctrine forbiddeth to marry.*

First, *Negatively*. This doctrine doth not forbid all marriage: and yet this I may truly say,—that Popish writers speak so disgracefully and contemptuously of marriage in their argumentations against the marriage of some, that if all were true which they affirm, it would be unlawful for any, as they hope for salvation, to link themselves in the bonds of matrimony.

Secondly, and *Positively*. The Popish doctrine forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, particularly of bishops, priests, and deacons, and of all that enter into holy orders; and not only of all those men who are employed in the service of the church and ministry, but also of all those women and virgins who have vowed continency, and have entered themselves into nunneries. Beside what is generally asserted by the Popish doctors who write of this point, the canon of the council of Trent, which the Papists universally do subscribe unto, and own for infallible truth, is plainly this: *Ex octavâ sessione Tridentini Concilii, can. ix.*—*Si quis dixerit, clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel regulares castitatem solenniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege ecclesiasticâ vel voto, et oppositum nil aliud esse quàm damnare matrimonium, posseque omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt, se castitatis (etiãmsi eam voverint) habere donum,*

*anathema sit ; cum Deus id rectè petentibus non denegat, nec patitur nos supra id quod possumus tentari.* “ If any say, that the clergy, who have received holy orders, or regulars who have solemnly professed chastity, may contract marriage, and that such contract (notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law and their own vow) is valid ; and that the contrary assertion is no other than to condemn marriage ; and that all (although they have vowed chastity) may contract marriage that do not find they have the gift of chastity ; let him be accursed ; forasmuch as God will not deny this gift unto those who rightly seek it, neither will he suffer us to be tempted above what we are able.”

The Popish ecclesiastical laws admit none into sacred orders before they solemnly vow chastity, or, as they interpret it, abstaining from marriage ; and it is required of nuns, that they solemnly vow to preserve and persevere unto death in their virginity, or single estate, without any regard unto any unforeseen necessity for marriage ; and amongst all the dispensations that are granted by the pope, amongst all the indulgences which he makes sale of, to allow grossly moral evils absolutely forbidden by the Lord, no dispensations or indulgences are granted by him for the marriage of such as are under this celibate vow, although they are not able to contain, and although God doth command such to marry. I shall do the Papists no wrong in saying that they account it a greater crime for ecclesiastical persons to marry, than for them to commit fornication or sodomy. The learned Chamier doth give several instances of Popish writers to this purpose ; namely,

HOSIUS, who doth defend “ the saying of Pighius, as not only true, but pious, that a priest, through the infirmity of the flesh falling into the sin of fornication, doth sin less than if he should marry ; and telleth us, that although this assertion seem foul, yet the Catholics account it most honest : ” *Reprehenditur Pighius qui, non verè magis quàm piè, scriptum reliquit, minùs peccare sacerdotem, qui ex infirmitate carnis in fornicationem sit prolapsus, quàm qui nuptias contraxit. Turpis videtur hæc oratio ; contra, Catholicis honestissimum.*—HOSIUS, *Confessionis* capite 56.

COSTERUS, who doth assert that “ a priest who doth fornicate or nourish a concubine at home in his house, although he be guilty of great sacrilege, yet he doth more heinously offend if he contract matrimony : ” *Sacerdos si fornicetur, aut domi concubinam foveat, tametsi gravi sacrilegio se obstringat, gravius tamen peccat, si contrahat matrimonium.*—COSTERUS *De Lætib. Sacerd.*

CARDINAL CAMPEGIO, who doth aver, “ that for priests to become husbands, is by far a more heinous crime than if they should keep many whores in their houses : ” *Quòd sacerdotes fiant mariti multò esse gravius peccatum, quàm si plurimas domi meretrices alant.*—CARDIN. CAMPEG. *apud SLEIDANI Commentar. libro quarto.*

MATTHIAS AQUENSIS, who doth profess his opinion, that “ such who marry after their vow of continency, do offend more than such an one as through human frailty doth deviate ” (as he terms it, which, in plain English, is, *who through the power of burning lust is unclean*) “ with a hundred divers persons : ” *Qui post continentiae votum devovet potestatem corporis cuivis mulieri, magis offendit, quàm iste qui humanà fragilitate deviare cum centum diversis personis.*—MATTHIAS AQUENSIS.

Our MOLINÆUS telleth us, that by the rules of the Roman church, a sodomist may exercise the priesthood, and by that abominable vice doth not run into irregularity; whereas marriage is judged altogether incompatible with sacred orders;” and he quotes Navarrus, saying, “The crime of sodomy is not comprehended amongst the crimes that bring irregularity;” and giveth several reasons for it.—DU MOULIN’S “Novelty of Popery,” book vii. chap. 5.

And no wonder, when John Casa, archbishop of Benevento, and dean of the apostolical chamber, printed a book at Venice in defence of sodomy. Sleidan saith, that “he wrote a sodomitical book, than which nothing more foul could have been thought upon by man; neither did he blush to celebrate with praises that most filthy sin, too much known in Italy and Greece:” *Ille quem diximus, archiepiscopus Beneventanus, libellum conscripsit planè cinædum, et quo nihil fœdus excogitari possit; nec enim puduit eum, scelus omnium longè turpissimum, sed per Italiam nimis notum, atque Græciam, celebrare laudibus.*—SLEIDANI Comment. lib. xi. p. 652. This was that Casa by whom Francis Spira was seduced to revolt from his profession, the cause of such hideous terrors of conscience afterward, and so miserable an end.

It is evident, then, that the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, is forbidden by the Popish doctrine.

II. The second thing is, to prove that *the Popish doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, is a devilish, wicked doctrine*: and this I shall do by several ARGUMENTS.

ARGUMENT 1. *That doctrine which is a false doctrine, and contrary unto the word of God, is a devilish, wicked doctrine: But the Popish doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, is a false doctrine, and contrary unto the word of God: Therefore it is devilish and wicked.*

All such doctrine as is false, is devilish; the devil being the father of lies, especially of lying, false doctrine, whereby he doth blind the eyes of them who believe not, and corrupt the minds of them who are his children and followers. Likewise that doctrine which is contrary unto the word of God, is of the devil; who is the greatest enemy which the word of God hath, because of the great mischief which the word of God hath done to his cause, and the interest of his kingdom. And be sure, that all such doctrine as is devilish, is wicked; the devil being such a foul and wicked spirit as is wholly void and empty of all moral good, and from whom nothing but wickedness doth proceed.

If there be any question, it will be of the minor proposition, which is this,—*that the Popish doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, is a false doctrine, and contrary unto the word of God.* I need no other proof that it is false, than that it is contrary unto the word of God; this word proceeding from the Fountain of light and truth, I mean, from God who is all Light, and with whom dwelleth no darkness at all, who is Truth itself, and with whom it is impossible any lie or mistake should be found. The chief thing, then, that is to be proved is this, *that this Popish doctrine is contrary unto the word of God.* And this will appear in that,

1. *This doctrine forbiddeth that which the word of God alloweth.*

2. *This doctrine forbiddeth that which the word of God in some case commandeth.*

1. *The Popish doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, forbiddeth that which the word of God alloweth.*—And this is evident in that,

(1.) *The word of God alloweth marriage, and maketh no exception of the clergy, or any under the celibate vow.*—That which God did at first institute and appoint, surely the word of God doth allow. Marriage being God's ordinance, none will deny that it hath God's allowance: and that the word of God maketh no exception of the clergy, or any under the celibate vow, is plain, because the Popish writers can bring no scripture in the whole Bible which maketh such exception. No scripture that doth this *directly*, is urged by any of them. What firm *scripture-consequence* they may plead, will be seen when we come to speak to their arguments for this doctrine. In the mean time it may be evident unto all, that the scripture alloweth the marriage of all, without such exceptions as the Papists make, by one clear scripture which admitteth of no contradiction by any other: "Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." (Heb. xiii. 4.) All that are unclean without marriage, such as whoremongers, all that defile the marriage-bed, such as adulterers; are guilty of a shameful and great God-provoking sin; for which God will judge them, (if they, before, do not make their peace with him, and forsake such wicked practices,) and punish them everlastingly in hell. But "marriage is honourable," and therefore lawful; and that not only in some, but "in all" without any exception.

(2.) *The word of God is so far from excepting the marriage of the clergy, that it doth plainly allow the marriage of such persons.*

(i.) In the Old-Testament times the prophets, priests, Levites, and all those who attended more immediately the service of God, and at the altar under the law, were allowed to marry. Abraham, who was a prophet and priest in his own house, did not take Sarah to be his wife without God's allowance; otherwise, surely, God would not have so signally owned his marriage, as to make promise of the Blessed Seed unto him hereby. Rebekah was a wife of God's choosing for Isaac. God never blamed Moses, that great prophet, for marrying Zipporah; neither was Aaron faulty because he had his wife and children. Isaiah, that evangelical prophet, was married, and had children too, in the time of his prophecy; which the scripture, in the recording of it, doth not impute to him for any iniquity. The priests and Levites generally did marry; and, however some of them are reproved in scripture for divers sins, yet matrimony is never in the least charged upon them for any crime. If then such whose office and employment under the law was to administer about holy things, did marry, and might do it without any sin against God; by parity of reason, ministers and all those of the clergy who administer about holy things in the times of the gospel, have allowance and liberty, without any offence to God, to make use of marriage. The reply of the Papists is frivolous, and scarce worth mentioning. The chief thing that they reply unto is, concerning the marriage of the priests and Levites; "who," they say, "had their courses to attend the

service of the temple and altar, and that then they were to separate from their wives, which was at that time as if they had none: whereas the clergy now are to attend the service of God in their work continually, and therefore ought to abstain from marriage altogether." But, beside that they can never prove that the priests and Levites did separate from their wives in the time of their courses, what will they say unto the marriage of those priests and Levites who continually and daily did administer at the altar before the division of them into courses, namely, before the time of David?

(ii.) In the New-Testament times ministers have a plain and express allowance to marry, as will appear by two or three places of scripture.

The first scripture which doth allow the marriage of ministers, is 1 Cor. ix. 5: "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" The words are written by the apostle Paul, who himself was an unmarried man, as he telleth the Corinthians in the seventh chapter of this epistle; yet in this chapter and verse he doth assert his power, which he lawfully might have taken, "to lead about a sister, a wife," which, in another phrase, is the same as if he had said, to marry. And he giveth instance in the use which others of his function had made of their power, not only other ministers, but "other apostles," yea, and the chiefest of the apostles, "the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas," that is, Peter himself, of whose wife and marriage the scripture doth take notice in more than one place. If then some of the apostles did marry, and the other apostles had power to do the like, then any ministers of the gospel have the same power and allowance to marry. This consequence is plain and undeniable, because the apostles were ministers of the gospel; and what was lawful for them as ministers, is lawful for any other ministers: and it is as plain in this scripture that some of the apostles did marry, and that others had power to do the like. The great exception of the Papists against this scripture is, that "this word translated 'wife' is *γυναίκα*, which," they say, "signifieth a woman, and therefore that 'the leading about a woman' doth not imply marriage:" and they interpret the meaning of this place, "that the apostles had power to lead about women to be helpers to them, as our Saviour had women following of him, who did minister unto him." But, beside that the ordinary signification of this word is "wife," it may be evident to an unprejudiced mind, that it must signify "wife" and nothing else in this place, because of the word "sister" used before it, of which the word *γυναίκα* is exegetical, or explanatory: for, all truly believing women being sisters, that the apostle might be understood what kind of *sister* he speaketh of, he addeth *γυναίκα*, which cannot be interpreted with good sense *woman*, unless there had been sisters who were men and not women. How could the sister whom the apostle had power to lead about be distinguished from other sisters whom he did not lead about? Were they not women as well as she? Therefore the signification must needs be "wife;" and hereby the "sister" [whom] he had power to lead about, is distinguished from all other sisters whom he did not marry. If any should further reply, that, "supposing the word *γυναίκα* to signify *wife*, the apostle might speak, not of taking a wife himself, but of leading about the wife



of another to be his helper :” I answer, that the apostle speaketh of something wherein he had power, and which he did not make use of ; and this, in reference unto women, was marriage. But as to other women, he did lead some about, and they were helpers unto him ; as, for instance, Priscilla, who, with her husband Aquila, “ sailed with Paul into Syria,” (Acts xviii. 18,) and he calleth them his “ helpers in Christ.” (Rom. xvi. 3.) And in the second verse of the same chapter he commendeth Phebe to the Romans, because she had been the “ succourer of many, and of himself also ;” and in the sixth verse he greeteth Mary, “ who had bestowed much labour on him.” The apostle, then, frequently making use of the help of other women, and here speaking of the power which he had to lead about a sister, a wife, which he did not make use of, it must be needs understood of his leading about a wife of his own, or of his marriage. When the apostle saith, “ Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife ?” two things are implied : First. That he did not “ lead about a sister, a wife ;” that is, that he did not marry ; for he had sisters to be his helpers, as hath been shown. Secondly. That he had “ power to lead about a sister, a wife,” or that it was lawful for him to marry ; this interrogative implying a strong affirmative. And this power which he had, he proved by the marriage of other apostles, and expressly of Peter : for if the great apostle of the Jews (who was Peter) was married, then the great apostle of the Gentiles (who was Paul) might marry too ; and if the apostles themselves, the most eminent ministers, might marry, then it is lawful for any other ministers to do it, who are their successors in the ministerial work.

Another scripture which giveth allowance to the marriage of ministers, is Titus i. 6 : “ If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly.” The apostle is here speaking of the elders or ministers who were to be ordained in every city, as in the former verse ; and in this verse he showeth how such as are ministers should be qualified : “ If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children :” here the qualification of “ blameless” is used in conjunction with “ the husband of a wife,” and “ the father of children,” in the person of a minister. It is evident, then, that a married minister may be “ blameless ;” and one that is a spiritual father may be a natural father too, without any offence unto God. Indeed, if a minister should have had at that time two wives together, as the custom of the Jews was of old, this would have been offensive unto God ; but to be “ the husband of *one wife*” then was, and still is, inoffensive in ministers.

The third scripture is like unto this : “ A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife,” &c. ; “ one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity ; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God ?) Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well.” (1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, 5, 11, 12.) It was not without special providence that ministers should have this qualification affixed once and again unto them in their function,—that they must be “ husbands of one wife ;” which is not so to be under-

stood, as if they must of necessity be husbands, or else they must not be ministers; but that if they be "husbands," it must be but "of one wife" at one time: so that though the scripture doth not command all of them to marry, yet it doth not forbid any, but alloweth every minister to marry, so that he taketh not many, or more than one wife at a time. The Papists are forced to wink hard to keep out the light of these places; and they are greatly put to it to find out shifts for the evading [of] the plain and clear truth, that ministers have allowance by these scriptures to marry. Some of them expound the meaning of the words, "the husband of one wife," to signify the pastoral charge of one church, unto which a minister hath relation as a husband to his wife. But this cannot be the meaning, because the apostle doth here distinguish between the "house" of the minister where he is "the husband of one wife," from "the church of God;" and the "children" of the minister by this "one wife" whom he is to rule over, cannot be understood of spiritual children, but of natural children, as is plain in the fourth and fifth verses: "One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)" Others interpret the words, "the husband of one wife," to be meant of what the minister to be chosen was before he entereth into this sacred function, not that he hath liberty for "one wife" after he engageth in the ministry; and therefore the Papists, if they admit any married persons to this high function, they force them to abandon their wives. But this cannot be the meaning of the apostle, because he speaketh not of such who *have been* "the husbands of one wife," but of those that *are* so: and as they must be "blameless, vigilant, sober," and retain the other qualifications there required after they are ministers, so they may retain their wives too; there being not the least hint given in this scripture, or any else, that ministers must put away their wives when they become ministers. Amongst the causes of divorce in the scripture, *this*, be sure, is none; and when God hath joined ministers and their wives together, what human power may lawfully put them asunder? Yea, on the contrary, the apostle supposeth in this place that ministers should live with their wives by his directions: First. *In general*, in reference to their "own houses," of which the wife as well as the children are a part, whom he would have to "rule well." Secondly. *In particular*, in reference to their wives, whose qualifications he sets down, that they should be "grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things," that they might be the more meet helpers of their husbands in their work, and the better examples to the flock: and surely then this doth imply, that ministers may, yea, ought to live with their wives after they become ministers.

Thus the Popish doctrine forbiddeth that which the word of God doth allow.

2. *The Popish doctrine, which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and all under the celibate vow, forbiddeth that which the word of God in some case doth command.*—And the case is this: When single or unmarried persons, although they apprehend that they might bring most glory unto God in their single estate upon supposition that they had the gift of continency, yet really do find themselves to be without this gift, after

they have earnestly prayed unto God for it, after fasting, self-denial, watchfulness, and diligent use of all means to keep under their body; and, notwithstanding all this, they do feel in themselves such burning lusts as do defile their minds, disturb them in the service of God, and endanger their commission of the sin of fornication as they have opportunity for it, and meet with any temptation unto it: in such a case, it is the express command of God, that such persons should marry for the quenching of those burning lusts, and the preventing of that filthy and abominable sin of fornication. This is plain: "It is good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." (1 Cor. vii. 1, 2.) If the man be in danger of fornication, let him have "his own wife;" if the woman be in danger, let her have "her own husband." And when is it that they are in danger? It is when "they cannot contain:" this supposeth the use of means, otherwise the word would not have been "cannot contain." "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." (Verses 8, 9.) Now this may be, and too, too often is, the case of some of the clergy, and others under the celibate vow; all which persons, without the exception of this case, the Popish doctrine doth forbid to marry; therefore the Popish doctrine is contrary unto the word of God, in forbidding that which the word of God commandeth.

I know, the canon of the council of Trent, to evade the force of this scripture, doth assert, that "God will not deny this gift of continency unto those who rightly seek it; neither will He suffer us to be tempted above what we are able." Unto which I answer, that God will not deny any gift which he hath promised unto those that rightly seek it. But the Papists will never prove, while their eyes are open, that God hath absolutely promised the gift of continency unto all those that diligently and most rightly seek it. Whatever gifts are necessary unto salvation, God hath absolutely promised unto those that rightly seek them. But this gift of continency in a single estate is not numbered by the scripture, and therefore ought not to be so by any, amongst those gifts: for if so, then none could be saved that are without it; and hence it would follow, that all who are married should certainly be damned: which the Papists themselves will not affirm. This gift of continency God doth bestow upon some of his children, but not upon all his children. When the disciples say unto our Saviour, "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry;" our Saviour answereth, "All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given." (Matt. xix. 10, 11.) And the apostle, speaking of this gift, telleth us: "I would that all men were even as I myself," that is, unmarried. "But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." (1 Cor. vii. 7.) By "all men," whom our Saviour speaketh of, and "every man," whom the apostle Paul speaketh of, we are to understand, not all and every one of the children of the world, but all and every one of the children of God: all these cannot receive the saying, to be without marriage. When God in conversion doth work a change in their souls, he doth not alter the constitution of their bodies; and

there are some both men and women, [who,] although truly religious, yet are of such constitution of body that they cannot contain without marriage, they cannot receive the saying to be without marrying, and withal without burning. Some of God's children have a proper gift of God to live chastely in a single estate, and others have a proper gift of God to live chastely only in a married estate. If then the gift of continency be not a gift which God hath in common promised unto all his children that rightly seek it, (as it is plain that it is not,) then the council of Trent doth assert a falsehood, "that God will not deny this gift unto all that rightly seek it," if they mean by "rightly seeking," *diligently seeking*; for God oftentime doth deny it unto such seekers. If they mean by "rightly seeking," *seeking in faith*, I deny that any can seek this gift in faith absolutely, because there is no absolute promise of it. And so it is true, that God will not deny this gift to those that rightly seek it; and it is false, that any can seek it rightly, that is, in faith absolutely.

What the council doth further assert, "that God will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able," is true, because it is the express word of God; but it is not rightly applied here. God will not suffer his children "to be tempted above what they are able," by affliction; neither will he suffer them "to be tempted above what they are able" unto sin; no, not to the sin of fornication: but then it must be understood upon supposition *that they make use of all lawful means for the prevention of this sin*; and one both lawful and commanded means is marriage, without which some of them may be tempted above what they are able unto it, so as to be overtaken by it, and live in the practice of it.

I have done with the first argument, which, being the chiefest and most comprehensive, I have been the largest in the handling of. I shall be more brief in the rest.

ARG. II. *That doctrine which, under the show of piety, doth lead unto much lewdness and villany, is a devilish, wicked doctrine: But the Popish doctrine, which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, under the show of piety, doth lead unto much lewdness and villany: Therefore this doctrine is a devilish and wicked doctrine.*

Whatever it be that leadeth unto much lewdness and villany, is devilish and wicked. "He that committeth sin is of the devil." (1 John iii. 8.) He is led to it by the devil; he is "of the devil;" that is, he is a servant of the devil, or a child of the devil. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." (John viii. 44.) But when any are led unto much lewdness and villany under the show of piety, they are led by the devil hereunto more especially: Therefore that doctrine which, under the show of piety, doth lead unto much lewdness and villany, must needs be a devilish, wicked doctrine. That such is the Popish doctrine, is evident:—

1. The Popish doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, hath a show in it of piety. The presence of such prohibition is, that these persons forbidden to marry might be the more mortified, chaste, and holy, that they might be the more free from worldly cares, and more at liberty to addict themselves unto the service of the Lord without distraction. Here is a fair show of piety, not in an ordinary, but in an eminent, degree.

2. This Popish doctrine doth lead unto much lewdness and villany ; namely, unto fornication, adultery, incest, sodomy, murder, and the like lewd practices, which have been the product of this prohibition to marry.

But, because I would not have this argument swell bigger than the former, I shall reserve the proof of this to the USE OF INFORMATION concerning the devilish wickedness of the Popish church.

OBJECTION. If it be said, that "there are and have been many of the Popish clergy eminent for their chastity ; that the uncleannesses of some cannot be charged upon the generality ; that whatever lewdness any of them have been guilty of, it is not the proper effect of this prohibition, but proceedeth from the wickedness of man's heart : " I answer :—

ANSWER 1. Some may be eminent for chastity in the esteem of men, that secretly are guilty of the basest filthiness in the sight of God ; and [of] such of them as really do abstain from grosser pollutions, some may thank their constitution more than their vow that they are restrained. But if it should be granted, that some few of them do deny themselves, and keep under their bodies, that they may "possess their vessels in sanctification ;" yet this doth not invalidate the argument drawn from the woful effect which this prohibition to marry hath upon so many others.

2. If we cannot charge the generality of the Popish clergy with the grosser sins of adultery, fornication, sodomy, and the like ; yet why may we not, without breach of charity, imagine that their own consciences will charge them sufficiently herewith?—(1.) When the most of such sins which are committed by them are done in secret. (2.) When so many of those sins are come to light, and their own historians do accuse them thereof. (3.) When so many of their popes themselves, their fathers and examples, have been guilty so grossly. (4.) When indulgences for stews, for sodomy, for priests keeping concubines, have been so generally granted. (5.) When their principles do encourage unto such sins. All which I shall make evident in the use.

3. It is true, that the lewdness of the Popish clergy doth primarily proceed from the wickedness of their own hearts ; and it is as true, that their prohibition to marry doth lead unto this lewdness. If a river have but two channels to run in, he that dammeth up and stoppeth the course of the river in one of these channels, may be said to lead the river into the other channel : even so, when the constitution of some men's bodies is such, that their burning desires will have their course and vent, and cannot be quenched except by matrimony or by adultery, either by their own wives or by strange women ; such as prohibit marriage, and cut off the use of the only remedy in some persons against adultery or fornication, they do lead hereby unto the practice of these abominable sins, and others as abominable, which are the attendants or consequents of them.

ARG. III. *That doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of any, that hereby they may merit the kingdom of heaven, is a devilish, wicked doctrine : But the Popish doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, forbiddeth the marriage of such, that thereby they may merit the kingdom of heaven.*

This will appear by what Chemnitius doth assert and prove out of their

own writings: *Pontificii quando de causâ finali virginitatis, seu cœlibatûs disputant, quo consilio, quo fine, et propter quam causam suscipiendus vel servandus est cœlibatus, palam docent, idèd suscipiendum et servandum esse cœlibatum, quia sit satisfactio pro peccatis, et meritum salutis et vitæ æternæ.* ALBERTUS PIGHIUS in *Controversiâ* xiv. *De Votis monasticis, exertis verbis dicit: "Illa eligimus ed opinione et confidentiâ, quia existimamus illis Dei gratiam et benevolentiam promereri."* Item *monastice assumitur a profitentibus, quia creditur valere ad satisfactionem pro peccatis.* PETRUS A SOTO in Confessione suâ Catholicâ dicit: "*Virginitatem seu cœlibatum, coram Dei tribunali magni meriti, quia sit satisfactio peccatorum maxima et meritum vitæ æternæ.*"—CHEMNITII *Examen Conc. Trid.* sess. viii. cap. 1. In quibus Cas. &c., pp. 9, 10. Item, p. 11: *Fingunt Pontificii se per cœlibatum supererogare; idèd conjugium vocant statum imperfectionis, cœlibatum verò statum perfectionis; et propter illam persuasionem sui merita et supererogationis opera vendunt, communicant, et applicant aliis qui sunt in statu imperfectionis. Hinc Bernhardinus fingit monachos et sanctimoniales substantialibus suis votis, non pro suis tantùm peccatis, verùm etiam pro fundatorum et aliorum benefactorum peccatis satisfacere.* "The Papists," saith he, "when they dispute concerning the final cause of virginity, or the celibate vow, for what end and for what cause it should be taken and kept, they openly teach, that therefore this should be done, because it is satisfaction for sin, and doth merit salvation and eternal life." And he citeth PIGHIUS, saying, "that such vows do merit God's grace and favour, that they are of force to satisfy for sins." And PETRUS A SOTO in these words, "that virginity, or the celibate state, is of great merit before God's tribunal, because it is the greatest satisfaction for sins, and doth merit eternal life." And he telleth us: "The Papists feign, by this celibate state, that they supererogate; and that therefore they call the conjugal state a 'state of imperfection,' but the celibate state 'a state of perfection;' and their meritorious works they sell and apply to others." And he citeth Bernhardinus, who doth affirm, "That monks, and others under this celibate vow, do satisfy hereby not only for their own sins, but also for the sins of their founders and other benefactors."

Now the doctrine of merit in man of eternal life is devilish and wicked; which will necessarily infer that the doctrine which introduceth this, and which propoundeth this as its chief motive and inducement, is devilish and wicked too.

That the doctrine of merit in man of eternal life, is devilish and wicked, I shall show in three propositions:—

1. *It is devilish and wicked to assert, that any really good works which God hath commanded are meritorious of eternal life.*

2. *It is much more devilish and wicked to say, that works of supererogation, such as the Papists make this celibate vow to be, are thus meritorious.*

3. *It is most of all devilish and wicked to assert the celibate vow (which really is, especially to some, a great sin) to be thus meritorious.*

PROPOSITION I. *It is devilish and wicked to assert, that any really good works which God commandeth are meritorious of eternal life; because,*

1. *This leudeth back unto the covenant of works.*

2. *This proceedeth from ignorance.*

3. *This leadeth unto pride and boasting.*

4. *This casteth a disparagement upon the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ.*

1. *This leadeth back unto the covenant of works, the tenor of which is, "Do this and live."*—Such as hope for life for any really good works which they do, they fall off from the covenant of grace, and they fall back unto the covenant of works, which will prove altogether insufficient for life unto any in their lapsed estate. "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." (Gal. iii. 21.) Therefore such are bewitched by the devil and his instruments, who, forsaking the way of life which God hath appointed by the promises of grace in the gospel, do look for life by any of the works of the law. And hence it is that the apostle, in the beginning of this chapter, doth blame the Galatians for their folly and fascination in their seeking righteousness and life by the merit of any works; and he proveth by several arguments that this was attainable only by faith.

2. *This proceedeth from ignorance.*—Such as hold really good works to be meritorious of eternal life, they are either ignorant of the imperfection of such works, or they are ignorant of God, who requireth the most absolute and exact perfection in the works for the sake of which he will give eternal life. Such as do not see the defects and imperfections of their best works, are unacquainted with themselves, and the strictness of God's law; and they who are without the Spirit to discern this,—their works (whatever they may think of them) are so far from being perfect, that they are not really, spiritually, and acceptably good in the sight of God: and such who imagine a meritoriousness in imperfectly good works, in works mingled with sin, (as the best works of the best men since the fall are,) they are unacquainted with the infinite holiness and righteousness of God, which would engage him to punish the most holy men for the sins of their most holy performances, had they not interest in the perfect righteousness of Christ by faith. But the god of this world (namely, the devil) hath so far blinded the eyes of his children the Papists, as to keep them ignorant both of God and themselves too, in his persuading them that any of their works are meritorious of eternal life.

3. *This leadeth unto pride and boasting.*—"Where is boasting? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith." (Rom. iii. 27.) "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory." (Rom. iv. 2.) Such as assert the meritoriousness of life in really good works, they assert justification by such works, there being a concatenation between the one and the other; and hence do arise boasting, and the glorying of pride; which sin being "the condemnation of the devil," he is the great promoter of it and prompter unto it, in his subjects the Papists, by filling them with arrogant thoughts of the meritoriousness of their works, whereby they "sacrifice to their own nets," and rob God of the glory which is due to his name.

4. *This casteth a disparagement upon the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ.*—As if there were either no merit, or but an imperfect merit, of eternal life in his righteousness. If Christ's perfect righteousness be alone meritorious of eternal life and happiness, (as the truth is,) then

there is no need of our righteousness to merit this life; although there be need upon other accounts, namely, by way of gratitude to the Lord, by way of evidence to ourselves of our sincerity, and to prepare us for eternal life. But if our righteousness or good works, however imperfect, are meritorious of eternal life, (as the Papists affirm,) then there is no need of Christ's merit and righteousness; and the Papists could well enough spare him, supposing they might be happy by the merit of their own good works. But I question whether Christ will spare them in another sense, when he cometh to reckon with them for the contumelies and disparagements which they have cast upon his merits by this devilish doctrine concerning the meritoriousness of good works, whereby they gratify the devil, Christ's great enemy, unto the ruin of their own souls. And if it be devilish and wicked to assert the meritoriousness of really good works,

PROP. II. *It is much more devilish and wicked to assert works of super-erogation to be meritorious.*—Works of super-erogation, according to the Papists, are such works which we have no precept for; but for which there are evangelical counsels, in order to the attainment of more than ordinary perfection; and by these works the Papists affirm that a man or woman may merit not only for themselves, but also for others; and such a work they assert this of the celibate vow and state to be. The devilishness of this assertion will appear in that,

1. *There are no such works as works of super-erogation.*—For those works which the Papists so term are either good or evil. *If evil*, they are beneath those which are commanded; *if they are good works*, they are commanded, otherwise they could not be good works, their goodness arising from their conformity to the command. Whatever work transgresseth the command, is sin; whatever work transgresseth not the command, is duty, and so cannot be a work of super-erogation. Unto which argument I may add another,—that if all men fall short of their duty, they cannot do any work of super-erogation, which is more than their duty. The former is so great a truth, that every truly humble Christian will acknowledge: and therefore the latter will follow,—that there can be no works of super-erogation; which none but a proud Papist will assert. What the Papists plead as to evangelical counsels, when they have proved them to be more or other than evangelical commands, some question may be made of the firmness of my argument; but this they will never do.

2. And if there be no such works of super-erogation, be sure *there can be no merit in them; no, not for themselves that do them, and much less for others.*—The scripture is clear against the meritoriousness of all good works which are commanded: "So likewise ye, when ye have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." (Luke xvii. 10.) And if those works which are commanded be not meritorious, much less can those works be meritorious which are not commanded; and if the best works cannot be profitable to ourselves by way of merit, much less can they be profitable by way of merit unto others. I have sometimes wondered that any of the Papists that are learned should be so far befooled and deluded by the devil, as really to believe that there can be



such works of super-erogation, whereby men make God their debtor for more than he doth or can pay to themselves, and therefore that he is obliged to pay it unto others upon their account; the assertion being so horribly impious and absurd, so dishonourable unto God, and so derogatory unto Jesus Christ!

PROP. III. But, thirdly, *It is of all most devilish and wicked to assert the celibate vow and state* (which really is, especially to some, a great sin) *to be meritorious of eternal life.*—I have already proved that it is a sin for any to vow and live in a celibate state, who have not the gift; and yet the Papists, being taught by the devil, do assert that this is meritorious. I grant, indeed, that it is meritorious of eternal death and damnation; but to say it is meritorious of eternal life and salvation, is as much as if they should say that *the wages of sin is eternal life*; which none but the devil can put into the minds of any to imagine, when it is so contrary unto reason, and the express words of the apostle.

ARG. IV. *That doctrine which is a badge or character of Antichrist is a devilish, wicked doctrine: But the Popish doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, is a badge or character of Antichrist: Therefore this Popish doctrine is devilish and wicked.*

The badge and character of Antichrist is devilish and wicked; Antichrist being called in scripture, “the wicked one,” “the man of sin,” “the son of perdition.” (2 Thess. ii. 3, 8.) He styleth himself “Christ’s vicar,” but he is Christ’s great antagonist; and though he be called “holy father,” by such as are of the Romish church, yet he is indeed the first-born son of the devil. He is called, in regard of his power, “the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit, and goeth into perdition;” (Rev. xvii. 8;) and is described to be “full of names of blasphemy;” (verse 3;) and “his coming” is said to be “after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.” (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10.) Antichrist, then, being inspired and acted by the devil, and so fraught with wickedness, that doctrine which is a badge and character of him, must needs be devilish and wicked. Now that this Popish doctrine which forbiddeth the marriage of the clergy, and of all under the celibate vow, is the badge and character of Antichrist, is evident in the text.

As the scripture doth foretell that Antichrist should arise in the latter times, so it doth give several characters whereby Antichrist might be known when he should make his appearance in the world, that the true church of Christ might be aware of him. And as there are several plain characters of Antichrist together in 2 Thess. ii. from the third to the thirteenth verse; so the same apostle doth give several characters of the same Antichrist in the text; all which are applicable unto the Roman Papacy, or church of Rome, as I have shown in the explication of the text; amongst which characters this is one,—that it forbiddeth to marry. The reply of Popish writers unto this text, is this, that “the prohibition of marriage here spoken of is the prohibition of *all* marriage, whereas they do not forbid all marriage; and that the apostle hath here a respect unto the Manichees, who condemned marriage itself.” For answer unto which, 1. There is no such thing in the text as

prohibition of *all* marriage; and it is certain that such who forbid the marriage of some do forbid to marry. 2. St. Austin telleth us, that the Manichees did *not* forbid the marriage of all. They allowed the marriage of them which they called "auditors," although not the marriage of them which they called "elect;" therefore by all that the Papists can say, they cannot stave-off this character of Antichrist from the Roman Papacy.

This shall suffice for the proof, that the Popish doctrine, which forbiddeth to marry, is devilish and wicked.

III. The third thing I am to do, is *to answer the Popish arguments which they bring to prove the unlawfulness of the marriage of the clergy, and such who are under the celibate vow.*

ARGUMENT I. Their first argument is drawn from the uncleanness which they affirm to be contracted by marriage; such as the clergy, and all who are more immediately devoted unto God, must abstain from. This they endeavour to prove, 1. By the Levitical uncleanness, which we read of, Lev. xv.; and the speech of Abimelech unto David, 1 Sam. xxi. 4. 2. Such as are married, they say, "are in the flesh," therefore unclean, and so "cannot please God." (Rom. viii. 8.) 3. They argue, that if such as would "give themselves to prayer and fasting," must abstain for a while; (1 Cor. vii. 5;) and that because of the uncleanness herein; then ministers "who give themselves wholly to the ministry of the word, and to prayer," (Acts vi. 4,) must abstain altogether; and therefore they ought not to marry, because of the uncleanness they will hereby contract, which is unbeseeming their sacred function.

ANSWER 1. There is no uncleanness or unholiness in marriage itself, or in any use thereof; which is evident, because marriage was instituted in Paradise, in the state of man's innocency; and marriage, being God's ordinance, must needs be holy, because all God's ordinances are so. Moreover, the scripture calleth marriage "honourable in all," where "the bed is undefiled" by adultery. (Heb. xiii. 4.) And if "marriage be honourable in all," then it is holy, (for every sin is dishonourable,) and therefore it is not unbeseeming the most sacred function. When the apostle doth exhort, "that every one should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour," it is not by abstaining from marriage, but by "abstaining from fornication." (1 Thess. iv. 3, 4.) Adultery and fornication, indeed, do both wound and stain the spirit, as well as pollute the body; but there is a real innocency, holiness, and chastity in marriage, and the use of it according unto God's ordinance.

2. The Papists will find it difficult to prove that there was ever any Levitical uncleanness by the use of marriage; that scripture in Lev. xv. speaking of something else, as will appear unto such as read and seriously weigh the place. What they urge from Abimelech's speech unto David, will appear not to be uncleanness by the lawful use of marriage; for then it would have been unlawful for the married priests continually to eat of the hallowed bread, which who will say they were not allowed to do? But Abimelech's speech was either concerning the unlawful use of women, or of their coming near their wives in the time of their separation. But, beside this and more which might be said, did not modesty forbid, if the Papists could prove Levitical uncleanness to have

been herein, which they cannot do ; yet what can thence be argued, the Levitical law being now abrogated ? Can they say, that which rendered the Jews in those days *legally* unclean, doth now render Christians *morally* unclean ? May we not from hence argue for the marriage of ministers, rather than find any show of argument against their marriage ? For if the priests, notwithstanding this Levitical uncleanness, which the Papists do here understand, did marry without sin ; how much more may ministers without sin now marry, when all Levitical uncleannesses are at an end !

3. It is a gross misinterpretation of Rom. viii. 8, to apply it unto married persons, as if they were the persons spoken of by the apostle "that are in the flesh," and "cannot please God." Who will or can, upon scripture-grounds, say, that all married Christians, though never so holy and unblamable in their conversation, "are in the flesh ?" Can none please God that are married ? Hence then it will follow, that no married persons can be saved ; because none "in the flesh," none that do "not please God," shall attain his salvation. But, surely, the Papists will not damn all married persons : however they may deal with ours, surely they will spare their own.

4. As to their inference from 1 Cor. vii. 5,—because such as would "give themselves to fasting and prayer," must abstain for a while, therefore ministers must abstain from marriage altogether, is such a *non-sequitur*, ["false conclusion,"] as the Schools will hiss at. (1.) The apostle maketh no such inference all along the chapter against the marriage of ministers ; but, on the contrary, prescribeth marriage as the duty of all who cannot contain. (2.) There is a great difference between the abstaining which the apostle speaketh of, and the not marrying which the Papists plead for : although the apostle exhorts married persons to separate themselves by consent for a time, that they might "give themselves unto fasting and prayer ;" yet, in the same verse and breath, he bids them to "come *soon* together again," lest Satan should "tempt them for their incontinency." And who can rationally infer hence the duty of ministers to abstain from marriage ? (3.) The fasting and prayer here spoken of, which calls for married persons' abstaining, it is fasting and prayer upon some extraordinary occasion, either public or private, when "the bridegroom is to go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet," as in Joel ii. 16 ; and not of ordinary prayer and seeking of God. And unless ministers were always to be engaged in solemn fasting and prayer, there is no show of reason why from this place they should be obliged not to marry. And why may not the Papists as well argue, "Because married persons are to abstain from eating, that they may 'give themselves to fasting and prayer ;' therefore there is uncleanness and evil in eating ; and that ministers who are to 'give themselves unto the ministry of the word and prayer,' ought to abstain from eating altogether ?" For this will follow as well as the other.

ARG. II. The second Popish argument is drawn from 1 Cor. vii. 1, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman ;" and, verse 8, "I say therefore unto the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I." If it be good for the unmarried and widows to abide in a

single estate like unto the apostle, then, say they, it is evil for such to marry; and therefore the clergy should abstain from this evil.

ANSWER 1. If it were an evil of sin for the unmarried and widows to marry, then it would not only be unlawful for the clergy and all under the celibate vow to marry, but it would be unlawful for any Christians whatsoever to marry; because all ought to abhor, refrain, and flee from that which is an evil of sin; and where is the concernment of ministers, more than others, in this scripture?

2. That may be good for some, which is evil for others. A single estate may be good and best for such as have the gift of continency, and are persuaded in their heart that in this estate they may most glorify God; whereas this estate may be evil for such as are without this gift, or in likelihood may most glorify God in a married estate.

3. It may be good at some time not to marry; namely, in the time of the church's persecution; and all that have the gift at such a time, should choose the celibate estate, that they might be the more ready both to do and suffer for Christ, and be the more free from temptations to apostasy. And the most that can be said of the good here spoken of, is, that it is the good of *conveniency*, not the good of *absolute duty*; unto which is opposed the evil of *inconveniency*, not the evil of *sin*. Indeed, it is an evil of inconveniency, and an aggravation of calamity, to be married in times of persecution; for, "such," saith the apostle, in verse 28 of this chapter, "shall have trouble," that is, greater trouble than others, "in the flesh." But it is the duty of all to make choice rather of this evil of greater trouble and inconveniency, than to expose themselves unto the evil of sin by uncleanness and incontinency.

4. The apostle is so far from asserting it to be an evil of sin for any in the worst of times to marry, that he asserteth the quite contrary when there is a necessity for it: "If need so require, let him do what he will, he sinneth not: let them marry;" (verse 36;) and, verse 38, "So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well." It is plain, then, by all to be seen, that the Popish argument from this place is frivolous, and that it carrieth no shadow of good consequence in it against the marriage of the clergy.

ARG. III. The third Popish argument is drawn from 1 Cor. vii. 32—34: "But I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife. There is a difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, how she may be holy both in body and spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband." The argument from hence, in reference unto ministers, is this: Ministers, above all others, are warned to take heed of entangling themselves with the affairs and cares of this life; (2 Tim. ii. 4;) and being devoted unto the Lord more immediately by the office of their ministry, they ought always "to care for the things which belong to the Lord, how they may please the Lord." And because marriage doth engage in the former, and taketh off from the latter, as this text doth intimate, therefore they ought to refrain [from] marriage.

ANSWER 1. It is not universally true, that all who are "unmarried do care for the things which belong to the Lord, how they may please the Lord," and that hereby they are taken off from minding and caring for the things of the world. As to the latter, who intermeddle more with secular affairs than many of the Popish unmarried clergy? Why do any of them exercise temporal jurisdiction, if their celibate state be in order to free them from worldly cares and business? As to the former, if so be that adultery, fornication, murder, sodomitical uncleanness, and other vile practices be pleasing to the Lord, there are and have been many popes and Popish bishops, many priests, Jesuits, friars, and other unmarried persons under the celibate vow among the Papists, that with great industry have "cared for the things which belong unto the Lord, how they may please the Lord," as I shall make evident in the use. But hereby they will be found to have taken care not only of the things of the world, but of the things of the flesh, how they may please the flesh; and the things of the devil, how they may please the devil, whose servants and children they are.

2. Neither, secondly, is it universally true, that such as "are married do care for the things of the world" chiefly, so as to neglect the things of God; as instance may be given in the holiness of many married persons, which the scripture doth take notice of. It is said, that "Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuselah three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters." (Gen. v. 22.) Abraham, who is called "the friend of God;" Moses, unto whom the Lord "spake face to face;" Samuel, who was so highly in favour with God; David, who was "a man after God's own heart;" Isaiah, Ezekiel, and almost all the prophets, were married persons: and we hardly read of any in the Old Testament that were famous for integrity and zeal for God, but they were such as were married. I have also given instance already in the New-Testament times of married apostles; and did not they care for the things that belonged to the Lord, how they might please the Lord? And how many ministers are there now in the conjugal state, as eminent as any others whatsoever for their holy and strict lives! Will not many of them say, that their wives have been so far from engaging and entangling them in worldly cares, that, on the contrary, they have proved real helpers of them, and have taken off, in a great measure, the burden of those worldly cares which lay more heavy upon them in their single estate?

3. It is granted that marriage is oftentimes an occasion of more worldly care than a single estate; and that single persons, who really are endowed with the gift of continency, have ordinarily the advantage of most freedom from perplexing trouble and thoughtfulness about the world, and for attending upon the Lord with the least distraction. Yet such single persons as are without the gift, are exposed unto more distraction, and, that which is worse, unto so much sin, such burnings of lustful desires, that they cannot attend upon the Lord acceptably, without the use of the remedy which God hath provided against incontinency.

4. Men may "care for the things that belong unto the world" *moderately*, and labour to please their wives in the Lord *subordinately*,

and not transgress the bounds of their duty ; (yea, to neglect this would be their sin ;) and yet at the same time they may “ care for the things that belong to the Lord, how they may please the Lord ” *chiefly* : for if the one had been inconsistent with the other, the apostle would have forbidden marriage absolutely, it being the absolute indispensable duty of all, and necessary unto salvation, that they labour *chiefly* to please the Lord. But the apostle professeth the contrary, that “ concerning virgins he had no command from the Lord,” (verse 25,) that is, to forbid them from the Lord to marry ; but in case of necessity he lets them know that marriage was their duty. Yet, because both men and women are more prone to exceed the bounds as to worldly cares and distraction in God’s service when married, especially when full of children, and little in the world to provide for them, or in a time of persecution, than in the single estate, endowed with the gift ; therefore he doth express himself thus as we read in the scripture urged. But none can infer hence, that it is the will of the Lord that ministers should not marry, who—though they be devoted to the service of God more immediately, and ought always to care for the things that belong to the Lord, above all others to please him—may do this in a married estate, as hath been shown : and if there be any argument in it against marriage, it is an argument against the marriage of all Christians, rather than against the marriage particularly of ministers ; the persons the apostle writing unto, and unto whom he gives the advice in this chapter, being not ministers, but ordinary Christians amongst the Corinthians. The uttermost that can be argued from this place in reference unto ministers, is, that such of them as are unmarried, and have the gift of continency, in the time of the church’s persecution, or in such circumstances of their condition in the world, that by marriage they are likely to be plunged and encumbered with more worldly cares and distraction, and to be less serviceable unto the Lord in a married estate than they are in the single ;—that in such a case they ought to continue single, so long as God doth continue the gift unto them. But this is no argument for the Popish forbidding the marriage of the whole clergy.

ARG. IV. The fourth Popish argument is drawn from 1 Tim. v. 11, 12 : “ But the younger widows refuse : for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry ; having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.” Now the interpretation of and the arguings of the Papists from this scripture, may run thus : 1. That there was a society of widows maintained by the church, more immediately devoted unto God, who were to continue in supplications and prayers night and day ; (as verse 5 ;) and that these widows were under a vow to continue in their single estate unto their lives’ end, that they might be the more fit for their employment ; and this vow was “ their first faith,” spoken of, verse 12, because they entered into this vow when they were first admitted into this society. 2. That such widows as after this vow did marry,—they “ waxed wanton ” hereby from Christ, and “ had damnation ” upon the account of their “ casting-off this their first faith,” or breaking their celibate vow. 3. That if widows, then virgins too, might be gathered into societies to sequester themselves from all worldly affairs, for the more immediate service of God, and enter into the same celibate

vow. 4. That the clergy of all ranks being by their office devoted more immediately unto God, they ought to enter into the celibate vow, which they impose upon all in their admission into sacred functions. 5. That all who have made this celibate vow, if afterward they attempt to marry, —they incur the penalty not only of deprivation from men, but also of eternal damnation from God.

ANSWER 1. We grant that there was in the primitive times a number of widows devoted more immediately unto the service of God, whom the church did maintain, and who were to be qualified according to what the apostle doth mention, verses 9, 10.

2. It is as easy for us to deny, as for them to affirm, that these widows did enter into a celibate vow upon their first admission into this number; this scripture making no mention of any such vow, and therefore they can never prove it.

3. By the “first faith” here spoken of, it is more rational to understand it not of any celibate vow, but of their vow in baptism, (which is the first faith of Christians,) whereby they were devoted unto the fear and service of the Lord all their days; and this, by their wantonness from Christ, or lascivious practices, and turning aside after Satan, spoken of, verse 15, they did cast off; and for this they had damnation.

4. We deny that the sin of these widows lay in their marrying, but in their wantonness and breach of faith with Christ; otherwise the apostle would not have given direction that these “younger women” (although received into this number) should “marry, bear children, guide the house, and give no occasion” (through wantonness) “to the adversary to speak reproachfully,” as he doth, verse 14. That the apostle speaketh of younger women of the number, it is evident, because he saith that some of them had “waxen wanton from Christ, had cast off their first faith, had turned aside after Satan;” and therefore he doth direct concerning the rest of the younger women, to prevent these evils, that they should marry: and surely he would not have directed them to this, had it been a sin, and had their marriage itself been a casting-off of their first faith.

5. If we should suppose (although we do not grant) that by “the first faith” is meant a celibate vow; yet it doth not follow from hence, that either virgins or younger widows have leave from God to enter into such a vow: for the apostle doth straitly charge, that no widow for the future should be admitted into this number under threescore years old, at which years there is no such danger of their falling into wanton practices; (verse 9;) and “younger widows” he would have refused. (Verse 11.) And what plea then can there be from hence for the society of nuns, and their celibate vows, when most of them are young at their first admission?

6. And if there can be from this place no good plea for younger women to enter into celibate vows, much less can there be any hence for the celibate vows of the clergy.

7. Therefore it is sinful for any, especially younger men or women, to make celibate vows, when such vows may not be in their own power to keep; and such who have rashly made them, it is a greater sin for them to keep, when they have not the gift of continency, than to break them

360 SERMON XIX. THE POPISH DOCTRINE WHICH FORBIDDETH  
by holy wedlock, which they may do without the penalty of eternal  
damnation.

ARG. V. The fifth and last Popish argument is drawn from authority. Bellarmine, after sufficient weakness betrayed in his scripture-proofs, doth annex, 1. The testimony of divers councils, Eastern, African, Italian, French, Spanish, and German. 2. The testimony of divers popes or bishops of Rome. 3. The testimony of divers fathers, both Greek and Latin. Should I repeat all which he maketh these to speak, I should weary both myself and the reader; and how infirm his argumentation is from hence, will appear in the answer.

ANSWER 1. It is well known by those that are versed in councils, and have written on this subject, that the councils of Ancyra, Nice, Gangra, and Trull, (the most ancient which Bellarmine and other Papists do cite,) do not really favour this Popish doctrine. One canon of the council of Ancyra hath this passage in it: *Διακονοι ὅσοι καθίστανται, &c.* "All deacons that are established in their charges, if they have declared that they have need to marry, and cannot remain as they are, let them remain in their service after they are married." And let any judge whether this could be consistent with a general prohibition of the marriage of the clergy. The council of Nice indeed did decree, "That no bishop, presbyter, or deacon, should have any women in their houses except mother, sister, or aunt;" "therefore they were prohibited," saith Bellarmine, "the having wives, and so ought not to marry:" whereas it is evident unto all that are unbiassed by prejudice, and make an impartial search into the records of that council, that this prohibition did not shut out the wives, but unmarried associates, from the houses of ecclesiastics that were single, for the prevention of scandal by fornication, which single persons living together, especially in their youth and privacy, might be tempted unto.

Let us see what Socrates in his "Ecclesiastical History" doth relate concerning the transactions of this council about this point: which we shall find to this purpose: "Some would have brought-in a new law, to forbid the clergy to cohabit with their wives; but Paphnutius, a confessor, and although unmarried himself, stood up and vehemently cried out, that marriage was honourable, congress with the wife chaste, and therefore did counsel them not to lay such a heavy yoke upon persons in holy orders which they could not bear, and hereby give occasion both to them and their wives to live incontinently. Upon which speech of Paphnutius, the council did both approve and praise his sentence, made no such law, but left it to every man's liberty to do what he would in that point."—SOCRATES, lib. i. cap. 11. SOZOM. lib. i. cap. 23. Here we see that this law (now established amongst the Papists) is called "a new law," it was never enacted before, and it was only a law which some would have brought in, and therefore was not enacted then: it was called "a heavy yoke," and, not being found by that council to be Christ's yoke, it was laid aside. The council of Gangra (all those canons the council of Trull doth approve of) hath this canon: *Εἰ τις διακρινόιτο, &c.* "If any make a difference of a married priest, as if none ought to partake of the oblation when he doeth the service, let him be anathema." I might give other instances of passages in other councils, which Bellarmine doth



make mention of, to show how he doth corrupt many of their sayings in favour of this doctrine; but I refer the learned reader unto Chamier's answer, and to Junius's "Animadversions upon Bellarmine's Controversies." It is most certain, (if history may be believed,) that the most ancient and most authentic councils, according to their most authentic copies, did never (like the Papists) forbid the marriage of the clergy, whatever some of them may seem to do in the corrupt translations of them and false glosses upon them by the Papists. The canons of some particular councils, or rather Popish synods, of latter date, are of no great signification in the proof of this point.

2. The testimonies which Bellarmine bringeth of popes, or the bishops of Rome, carry no weight. It is acknowledged by the most, that pope Syricius first did forbid the marriage of the clergy; but what he did was very unjust. Hear what Junius doth say of it: *Syricius contra verbum Dei et jus naturale ipsum voluit istud cœlibatûs jugum ecclesiasticis imponere, et juris ignorantia, et superstitionis cœcœliâ.* "Syricius, against the word of God, and the law of nature itself, would needs lay the celibate law upon ecclesiastics through ignorance and superstitious zeal." I shall readily grant, that the bishops of Rome, especially of latter years since the apostasy of that church unto heresy, antichristianism, and idolatry, have been generally against the marriage of the clergy. But wherefore hath this been? Not out of true zeal for chastity, and the purity of all in sacred orders, as is pretended; but out of carnal policy, for the enriching of their church hereby, and the preserving of its revenues, which might be too profusely expended and alienated in the providing for wife and children.

3. The testimonies which are brought out of ancient fathers for the most part are either corrupted, or they do not militate against the marriage, but against the incontinency, of the clergy; and the purity which the fathers speak of, as requisite in persons of that function, is as well consistent with a married as with a single estate, and more ordinarily to be found in the former than in the latter. But if some of the fathers were against the marriage of ecclesiastics, this doth not prove the unlawfulness of such marriages, unless it could be proved to be so by the word of God; and this the Papists can never prove unto such who do look into the scriptures with an unprejudiced mind, when they are so plain and clear for the universal lawfulness of marriage without any particular exceptions.

#### IV. USES.

USE 1. Here you may see the devilish wickedness of the church of Rome: it would both spend too much time, and carry me beside my purpose too far, to set forth the wickedness of this apostate church in the full latitude thereof. I shall only speak of the wickedness which this doctrine, that forbiddeth to marry, is the occasion of. There are three woful effects which this wicked, devilish doctrine hath produced: 1. *Wicked indulgences of their popes.* 2. *Wicked principles of their Jesuits.* 3. *Wicked practices both of their popes and others under the celibate vow.*

1. The popes or bishops of Rome, however severe against the marriage of their clergy, yet they have given indulgences for whoredom,

*sodomy, and such-like most foul abominations.*—Hear the complaints as well as acknowledgments of Espencæus, a writer of their own. (*De Continentia*, lib. ii. cap. 7.) His words are these: *Pro puro mundoque calibatu successit impurus et immundus concubinatus; ut quod eleganter “de persecutione,” cap. 29, conquerebatur D. Bernardus, latere, nec præ multitudinè queat, nec præ impudenti quærat. Hæc, inquam, tolerantia altius radices egit, permissis alicubi sub annuo censu clericis atque laicis cum suis concubinis cohabitare: Quod utinam falso et immerito extaret inter Gravamina Germaniæ; adedque etiam continentibus ad omnem censum persolvendum coactis, quo soluto iis liceret, vel continentibus vel incontinentibus esse. O rem execrandam!* “Instead of the pure and clean celibate, there hath succeeded an impure and unclean concubinate; which, as Bernard elegantly complaineth in his twenty-ninth chapter concerning persecution, neither can be concealed, it is so frequent, neither doth seek to be concealed, it is so impudent. This toleration or indulgence hath got firm footing, both the clergy as well as laity having permission given unto them to cohabit with their concubines, upon the payment of a yearly sum of money. And I wish that these things were falsely and undeservedly extant amongst the Grievances of Germany, who complain that even such as are continent are forced to pay the annual rent; which being paid, they are at their own choice whether they will contain or not, whether they will have a concubine, otherwise called ‘a whore,’ or not. O execrable wickedness!” And the same author in his comment upon Titus, doth further acknowledge in these words: *Episcopi, archidiaconi, et officiales plerunque dum dioceses et parœcias obegitant, non tam fucinosos et criminum reos pœnis et correctionibus a vitii deterrent, quàm pecuniâ emungunt et exugunt tum clericos, tum laicos; et hos cum concubinis, pellicibus, et meretriculis cohabitare, liberosque procreare sinunt, accepto ab iis certo quotannis censu, atque aded alicubi accipiunt a continentibus; habeat (aiunt) si velit, et quoties enim quisque talis (cùm tales tamen tam multi sunt) hodie aliter punitur?* “Bishops, archdeacons, and officials, do ride about their diocesses and parishes for the most part, not to deter the wicked by corrections and punishments from their vice, but to draw out and defraud both clergy and laity of their money; whom, upon the payment of a yearly revenue, they permit to cohabit with concubines and whores, and to procreate children. And this revenue they receive in some places of the continent: ‘For he may have a concubine or whore,’ (say they,) ‘if he please.’ And how often are such priests as keep whores (although so many) punished otherwise?” There is a book lately published by Anthony Egans, B.D., late confessor-general of the kingdom of Ireland, and now minister of the gospel according to the Reformed religion. The title of it is this: “The Book of Rates now used in the Sin-Custom-House of the Church and Court of Rome, containing the Bulls, Dispensations, and Pardons for all manner of Villanies and Wickedness, with the several Sums of Moneys given and to be paid for them.” In page 13 there are these dispensations for priests and others under the celibate vow: “A priest or friar having lain or carnally sinned with a woman of whatsoever sort or degree, whether a nun, or kinswoman, or a relation, or with any other whether married or single, whether within the bounds or cloisters of his

monastery, or elsewhere, whether the absolution be made in the name of the clergy or no, it gives him power to exercise his function, and to hold his livings, and that together with the inhibitory clause, he paying £36. 9s. 6d. And if beside this there be an absolution for buggery, or for unnatural sin committed with brute beasts, a dispensation, together with the inhibitory clause, will come to £90. 12s. 1d. A simple absolution for the sin of buggery or the sin contrary to nature, that is to say, with brute beasts, together with a dispensation, and the inhibitory clause, is £36. 9s. A nun having played the whore very often, *aut intra aut extra septa monasterii*, 'within or without the bounds of the monastery,' is to be absolved and rehabilitated to hold the dignity of her order for £36. 9s. An absolution for one that keeps a whore at bed and board, with a dispensation to hold a benefice, is £4. 5s. 6d." Prideaux telleth us of pope Sixtus IV. that "he made a grant unto the cardinal of Lucia to use unnatural lusts for three months in the year, namely, June, July, and August." But whether the cardinal had the dispensation gratis, or paid a sum of money for it, the author doth not relate. This is that pope who built a stews at Rome of his own cost; and well might he do it, when the popes do receive such revenues from such base houses. See CORNELIUS AGRIPPA, *De Vanitate Scientiarum*, cap. 64. "Lycurgus and Solon," saith he, "those Heathen lawgivers, erected public stews: but that is no marvel; for of late years pope Sixtus IV. builded a goodly stews in Rome. The Corinthians, Cyprians, and Babylonians did increase their revenue by the gain of stews, which in Italy also at this day is no unusual matter; for whores of Rome do pay weekly to the pope a julio, the whole revenue whereof in the year doth often exceed twenty thousand ducats." Hence it is that one of their poets doth complain,

*Roma ipsa, lupanar  
Reddita, nunc facta est toto execrabilis orbe;*

that "Rome was become a brothel-house, and grown execrable throughout the whole world."

The pope, indeed, will not allow of marriage in his clergy; but by his indulgences he doth make provision for their flesh, that they may fulfil their lusts by fornications and all manner of uncleannesses, which may bring-in filthy lucre into his coffers.

Thus concerning the wicked indulgences of the pope.

2. *The wicked principles of the Jesuits* is another effect of this Popish doctrine which forbiddeth to marry.—The Jesuitical doctors pretend to more sanctity, learning, and subtilty than others. Let us see what some of their principles be, and positions, in their stating of cases of conscience concerning uncleannesses. I shall refer the reader only unto a book called "the Mystery of Jesuitism;" see vol. i. p. 147. Father Bauny hath this assertion, as it is cited out of his *Theolog. Mor. trac. 4, De poenit.*, p. 94: "It is lawful for all persons of all qualities and conditions to go into the places of common prostitution, there to convert sinful women, although it be very probable that they will commit the sin there themselves; nay, haply though they have found by frequent experience that they are drawn into sin by the sight and insinuations of those women." Who seeth not that this assertion doth give encourage-

ment unto the unmarried Popish clergy to run upon occasions and manifest temptations unto the sin of filthy fornication? For who are more fit, may they think, to convert those sinful women, than ecclesiastical persons? But for such to go into places of common prostitution to do it, is both scandalous for any, especially for ministers, and dangerous lest themselves be entangled and defiled hereby. But the Jesuit telleth us, they may venture into such places, although it be probable they will [be], and though they have been often, drawn into that foul sin hereby; and what is it that they can plead for the lawfulness of such practice? It is only this,—their directing their intention to convert sinful women. And may they run into their embraces that they may convert them? May they venture upon a probability of being drawn by them unto this sin, that without any probability of success they may draw them from it? And when they have been often enticed and overcome, may they put their foot again into the snare? Are such likely to persuade others to repentance and chastity, who have been often unclean in such places themselves? But let us see further what others of their doctors say. In the *Additionale*, page 96, Escobar doth assert, that “a man who hath the reputation of being extremely given to women, doth not commit any mortal sin in soliciting a woman to condescend unto his desires, when he doth not intend to put his design in execution.” This doctor goeth a step further: the former giveth allowance to go into places of common prostitution, so that the intention be the conversion of sinful women; and this telleth us that it is no mortal sin to solicit women to be naught, if a man can but hold off his intention from the thing. But who is there that is extremely addicted to women, and doth solicit, though he doth not actually intend the thing till he knows the mind of the party, but, if there be a compliance, that will forbear and withdraw himself, as Joseph from his mistress? May lecherous Mass-priests solicit women to lewdness without mortal sin? Who can deny this to be devilish, wicked doctrine? But although the Jesuits’ principles do lead their clergy to fornication and adultery, yet they would have them cautious that such impure facts of theirs may not be known. *Si non castè, tamen cautè*: “If they do not live chastely, they would have them sin warily;” and therefore they allow most horrid wickedness for the concealing [of] such shame. Page 19, Caramuel asserteth, in his *Fund. Theolog.* fund. 55, sect. vii., that “it is doubtful whether a religious man, having made use of a woman, may not kill her if she offer to discover what passed between them.” This doctor doth make a doubt whether it be not lawful for their priests to commit murder that they may conceal their adultery. But what, if the woman the priest is naught withal be a wife, and she reveal nothing, but her husband cometh unawares upon them, and discovereth the fact? See what Escobar saith in such a case, cited, page 94, out of his *Tract. Theol.* tract. 4, exam. 6, cap. 5: “An ecclesiastic surprised in adultery, if he kill the woman’s husband whom he hath abused, in his own defence, is not for that irregular.” Here the doctor doth favour, not only the murder of the wife if she reveal, but also the murder of the husband if he resist; and although the marriage of ecclesiastics doth make them irregular, yet their adulteries and murders do not so, but they may, according to these principles, continue in their

function, notwithstanding such horrid abominations. You see what provisions the Jesuits make for themselves and others of the Romish clergy, for their encouragement, reputation, and safety in their practice of the sin of adultery.

But do they take no care for the poor forlorn nuns, who are mewed \* up in cloisters, and are under the same celibate vow with themselves? The great danger is, when the priests and Jesuits come amongst them, of their proving with child, and so of their discovering their own shame. Is there no provision in this case? Yes; these kind fathers have a principle which may be of use to such, to encourage them with a *non-obstante* to this danger unto lewd embraces. See *Addit.* p. 19: Ægidius Trullench. in *Decal.* tom. 5, lib. 5, cap. 1, asserteth, that "it is lawful to procure abortion before the child be quick in the womb, to save a maid's life or reputation."

I shall add but one position more concerning the liberty which the Jesuits give unto the most impure persons to communicate immediately upon their confession. Page 88, Mascarennas, tract. 4, *De Sacr. Eucharist.* disp. 5, cap. 7, doth assert, "that either a secular person, or a priest, being fallen into any kind of impurity whatsoever, nay, though such as are against nature, may, without so much as the least venial sin, (nay, are to be commended for it if they do,) communicate the very same day after they have made confession thereof; that the confessor ought to advise his penitent to receive the eucharist the very same day that he is fallen into such crimes; and that the vow or resolution any one might have made not to come to the Lord's table in that condition, was null." Thus if the Jesuits acknowledge that a wound and defilement is contracted by some grosser impieties and impurities; yet they can, according to their principles, quickly lick themselves whole by their confessions, and wash themselves clean by their communicating: and what is this but an abominable profaning and polluting of the holy sacrament, and an opening a wide door to all manner of licentiousness? The harlot could say unto the young man, "This day have I paid my vows;" (Prov. vii. 14;) and so she was fitted for her wickedness. And if unmarried ecclesiastics, by confession and communicating, can so easily wipe off their guilt and filth, what encouragement must this needs give them to return presently again "with the dog to his vomit, and with the sow that is washed to her wallowing in the mire!" That the Jesuits are not belied by the author of "the Mystery of Jesuitism," in these and other gross principles and assertions which they hold, may easily be known by such as will consult their books in print, out of which they are extracted. I confess, I have not consulted all of them, not having them by me; but, having perused his citations of Escobar, whom I have, and finding him faithful there, I doubt not but he is faithful in the rest.

3. *The wicked practices both of popes and others under the celibate vow*, is another woful effect of this Popish doctrine which forbiddeth to marry.—And here I may well premise, that many thousand lewdnesses and foul abominations are and have been committed by Popish votaries so secretly, that they never saw the light, neither have come abroad unto

\* From the Icelandic *miöve*, "to coop or pent up," says Serenius.—EDIT.

the notice of the world, these works being works of darkness which fly the light, and shroud themselves, as closely as may be, in dark corners, those who are guilty endeavouring all they can to conceal their filthiness; which, however, at the last day of revelation both of men's sins and God's judgments, will be made known and exposed to the view both of men and angels, when the Lord "will bring to light the hidden works of darkness, and make manifest all the counsels of the heart." (1 Cor. iv. 5.) Yet the wickedness of some popes and their clergy in this kind, hath been so notorious, that their own historians have not thought fit to be altogether silent herein; and, as was said before, "their lewdness could not be concealed, it was so frequent; neither in many did it seek to be concealed, it was so impudent." It would spend more time than we have to be together (yea, although we should stay here on this long summer's day till dark night) to enumerate the instances that might be given of the uncleannesses of ecclesiastics in the church of Rome. I shall mention only a few of the most remarkable amongst many others; and begin with the viciousness and filthiness of the popes, whose title of Holiness, and severity against matrimony, and imposing the celibate vow upon others, one would think, should oblige themselves unto more than ordinary mortification of fleshly lusts, and exemplary chastity. But we shall find, by search into the history of the popes' lives, that they have generally been exceeding faulty as to women, and all sorts of filthy lusts. Platina doth complain, that riches had made the church wanton, and vice had no restraint.

Pope Sergius III. had his sweetheart Marozia, that famous strumpet, who was the mistress of his affections, and had no small government in the church; of whom, in wicked adultery, as Luitprandus doth record, he begat John XI., who afterward, by his mother's means, got the Popedom. Baronius doth acknowledge that in those days the power of harlots did so far prevail, that they both removed popes rightly appointed, and also thrust-in violent and wicked men into their room, at their pleasure. By this Marozia's means also it was that Octavianus (son to Albericus) obtained the Popedom, called John XII.; who, as Baronius doth relate, amongst other wickednesses, was accused in a synod for abusing the widow of Rainerius, for his filthiness with Stephana, his father's concubine, with Anna a widow and her niece. This is that pope who castrated divers of his cardinals, because they favoured Otho the Great: but if himself had been so served before he was made pope, possibly he might have been more chaste. And yet, whatever liberty this pope took himself to commit fornication and adultery, he would not give liberty for marriage to his clergy, which God doth allow; for he sends over an inhibition against priests' marriage into England, which at that time caused no small stir. At length the hand of God was remarkable in the cutting-off [of] this pope; for, being taken one night in adultery with another man's wife, he received such a wound in his temples, that within the space of eight days after he died of it.

Pope Gregory VII., saith Prideaux, had his minion Matilda, who left her own husband, to live with this holy father. This is that Gregory who caused the emperor Henry IV., with his empress and son, to come

bare-footed in the cold winter to his castle at Cannucium, and there to wait three days fasting before he could have audience, which at length was obtained by the mediation of Madam Matilda.

Platina doth relate that in pope Honorius II.'s time, one Arnulphus was put to death at Rome for his bitter inveighing against the pomp, luxury, and lasciviousness of the clergy, before whom he propounded the poverty of Christ, and his integrity of life, for their imitation. It was from this pope that John Cremensis was sent over legate into England, to dissolve the priests' marriages; but in the great heat of his urging his commission, he was found in bed with a whore. Good man! he would have all to live chastely without wives and matrimony, and he came over from Rome to show them an example.

Pope Martin IV. kept the concubine of his predecessor Nicolas, and removed all bears from his palace, lest the beholding of them should cause his sweetheart to bring forth a bear; so fearful was he, that his brutish lust would produce a brutish offspring.

Pope Benedict XII. is recorded to have bought a beautiful young woman of her brother with a great sum of money, that he might make use of her.

Pope Sixtus IV. before-mentioned, who built the stews at Rome, and allowed unnatural lusts to the cardinal, would not wholly deny himself, especially in those lusts which are more natural; for he had his concubine Tyresia, for whom he provided shoes covered with pearls.

Pope Innocent VIII. had many base children, gave a great dowry with his daughter Theodorina. Mantuan hath these verses on him:

*Octo Nocens pueros genuit, totidemque puellas;  
Hunc meritò poteris dicere, Roma, patrem.*

The signification of which is, that "this Nocent (not Innocent) person, had begotten eight boys, and as many girls, and therefore deserved the name of a *futher*." But I suppose none, except the Papists, will say that he was a "holy father."

Pope Alexander VI. did succeed him in the Papacy, and his history doth record that he exceeded him in lewdness and adultery; on whose daughter there are these verses:

*Hic jacet in tumulto Lucretia nomine, sed re  
Thais, Alexandri filia, sponsa, nurus.*

"Lucrece by name here lies, but Thais in life,  
Pope Alexander's child, spouse, and son's wife."

This pope had two bastards,—a son, and this daughter Lucretia, whom he married unto this son, and afterwards abused her himself; and it is storied of him, that, to complete his other wickednesses, he gave himself unto the devil.

Pope Julius II. was not much better, who abused two ingenuous youths sent by the queen of France to be bred in Italy.

Pope Clement VII. was so infamous, that, because of his own lewdness and that of his court, this distich was written:

*Roma, vale! Vidi; satis est vidiſſe: revertar  
Cum leno, aut meretrix, scurra, cinædus ero.*

“ Vile Rome, adieu !  
 I did thee view,  
 But hence no more will see,  
 Till pimp or jade,  
 Or punk or spade,  
 I do resolve to be.”

Paul III. prostituted his sister Julia Farnesia to Alexander VI., that he might be made cardinal ; committed incest with his own daughter Constantia ; poisoned her husband, that he might enjoy her the more freely ; was naught with his own sister, and taken in the act by her husband ; and, beside his incest, he is recorded to have been a necromancer : and from this pope's piety came the council of Trent.

Pope Julius III. was not inferior unto him, who gave his cardinal's hat unto a sodomitical boy whom he had abused. This is that pope who said he would have his pork, (forbidden by his physician,) in despite of God ; and maintained, he had more reason to be angry for the keeping back [of] his cold peacock-pie, than God had to cast Adam out of Paradise for eating an apple. Such a blasphemous as well as luxurious wretch was he ! Thus Prideaux.

I shall add but two instances more, of two famous women, one a pope, and the other a popess :—

The woman-pope was pope Joan, who succeeded Leo IV., sate in the Papacy two years and six months ; supposed to be a man, until at length, being with child, she fell in labour in the midst of a solemn procession, whereby her sex and lewdness were discovered together. Hereupon there was an image of a woman with child set up in the same place, where the pope was delivered both of her child and her life. Ever since the popes, when they go to the Lateran, shun that street, although the nearer way, in abhorrency of the fact, and memory thereof. There was moreover a chair of porphyry-stone kept in the Lateran, with a hole in the midst, to try the sex of the new-elected. No less than fifty Popish writers testify the truth of this history concerning pope Joan.

The other woman was a popess, as the pope himself called her, namely, Donna Olympia, the sister-in-law and mistress of pope Innocent X., who was perfectly at her devotion, not only in his younger years, and whilst he was bishop and cardinal, but also in his elder years when he was pope, and so continued until the very last. The history we have at large, written in Italian by Gualdi, and translated into English. The book is called, “The Life of Donna Olympia Maldachini, who governed the Church during the time of Innocent the Tenth.” In the preface of the book there is this passage : “By the great example laid before us, they must needs confess that the churchmen of the Roman faith will do any thing with a woman but marry her.” I shall refer the reader unto the history, which relateth the great familiarities between this Donna Olympia and the pope, having been too long in relating the viciousness of his predecessors, although I have passed-by many persons and things which might without wrong be spoken concerning them.

I must add something concerning the filthiness and uncleannesses of the Popish clergy, and others under the celibate vow. Platina doth record, that in pope Gregory the Great's time there were six thousand infants' skulls found in a fish-pond at Rome ; and what did this signify, but the



whoredoms and murders which this celibate vow was the occasion of? Nicholaus de Clemangis, a Popish archdeacon, who lived and flourished in the year one thousand four hundred and seventeen,—he wrote a book, *De corrupto Statu Ecclesiæ*, wherein he taketh notice of the viciousness of all sort of persons, beside the pope, that were under this celibate vow. Cap. 12: concerning THE CARDINALS, these are his words: *Nec enumerare volo eorum adulteria, stupra, fornicationes, quibus Romanam curiam infestant, nec referre obscenissimam illorum familiæ vitam, a dominorum tamen moribus nullatenus absonam.* “I will not relate the adulteries, rapes, fornications, whereby these cardinals do pollute the court of Rome, nor set out the most filthy life of their family, not at all dissonant from the manners of their masters.” Cap. 19: concerning THE PRELATES, he thus writes: *Qui totos in aucupio et venatibus agunt, qui noctes in conviviis accuratissimis et choreis cum puellis effœmâti insonnes transeunt, qui suo turpi exemplo gregem per devia abducunt in præcipitium.* “The prelates spend whole days in fowling and hunting; and, being effeminate, they spend whole nights in dancing and sports with young women; and by their filthy example lead their flock out of the right way upon a precipice.” Cap. 20: he calls THE REGULARS, *Ebrios, incontinentissimos, utpote qui passim et inverecundè prolem ex meretrice susceptam, et scortam vice conjugum, domi tenent. Et hos CANONICOS aliquis vocabit, qui sic ab omni canone seu regulâ sunt abalienati?* “Drunkards, and most incontinent persons, who ordinarily and shamelessly do keep whores instead of wives and children by them at home in their houses. And who will call them *regulars* who walk by no rule?” Cap. 21: of THE MONKS he saith, *Quantò magis continentes, magis obedientes esse debebant, minus vagabundi, et e claustrorum septis rarius egredientes in publicum; tantò ab his omnibus rebus licet eos videre magis alienos: pro labore desidia, pro continentid et æquitate libido et superbia invasere.* “By how much the more they ought to be continent and obedient, by how much the less they ought to wander about, and go forth into public from the bounds of their cloisters; by so much the more we may see in them a contrary carriage and course unto these things: instead of labour, sloth—instead of continence and justice, lust and pride—have invaded them.” Cap. 22: of THE MENDICANTS he writes: *An non hi lupi rapaces sunt sub ovili imagine latitantes, qui more sacerdotum Belis in suis penetralibus oblata devorant, mero et lautis epulis cum non suis uxoribus, licet sæpè cum suis parvulis, avidè satiantes, cunctaque libidinibus, quarum torrentur ardore, pollutentes?* “Are not these mendicants ravening wolves under the form of sheep, who, like the priests of Bel, do devour what is offered, with others’ wives and their own little ones, greedily satiating themselves in retired places with wine and costly banquets, and defiling all things by their filthy and burning lusts?” Cap. 23: concerning NUNS and their monasteries, he thus expresseth himself: *De his plura dicere verecundia prohibet, ne non de cœtu virginum Deo dicatarum, sed magis de lupanaribus, de dolis et proccacid meretricum, de stupris et incestuosis operibus, dandum sermonem prolixè trahamus. Nam quid, obsecro, aliud sunt hoc tempore puellarum monasteria nisi quedam, non dico Dei sanctuaria, sed Veneris prostibula, sed lascivorum et impudicorum juvenum ad libidines explendas recep-*

*tacula? ut idem hodie sit puellam velare, quod et publicè ad scortandum exponere.* "Modesty doth forbid to speak more concerning these, lest, instead of setting forth a society of virgins devoted unto God, we should describe a stews, and speak of the deceits and wantonness of harlots, of rapes and incestuous works. For what other are the monasteries of young women in these times, than execrable brothel-houses of Venus, than the receptacles wherein immodest and lascivious young men do fulfil their lusts? and at this day it is the same thing to put a maid into a monastery, and publicly to prostitute her, or put her forth to be a whore."

We see what kind of persons celibate persons were formerly; how well they kept their vow of chastity, as one of themselves acknowledged: and have we reason to think they are grown better of later years? We see what they have been in other countries; let us also see what they were before the breaking off [of] the Romish yoke in our own land. In king Henry VIII.'s time a search was made into monasteries and religious houses concerning the life and manners of these Romish votaries; and we shall find, in SPEED'S "History of Great Britain," a catalogue of vicious celibate persons there found out, their names and crimes. In Battle Abbey, fifteen sodomites. In Canterbury, eight sodomites, and one that kept three whores. In Chichester, two sodomites; in the cathedral church, one that kept thirteen whores. In Windsor castle, twenty-five whores were kept amongst them. In Shulbred monastery, nineteen whores were kept. In Bristol, the abbot kept four whores. In Maiden-Bradley, the prior kept five whores. In Bath monastery, one had seven whores, and was a sodomite. In Abingdon monastery, the abbot had three whores, and two children by his own sister. In Bermondsey monastery, John White, prior, called "the bull of Bermondsey," had twenty whores. FULLER in his "History of Abbeyes" doth relate this story:—"One sir Henry Colt, of Nether-hall in Essex, much in favour with king Henry VIII. for his merry conceits, suddenly took leave of the king late at night, promising to wait upon his Grace early the next morning. Hence he hastened to Waltham-Abbey, being informed by his letters, that the monks thereof would return in the night from Cheshunt-nunnery, where they had secretly quartered themselves: sir Henry pitched a buck-stall, (wherewith he used to take deer in the forest,) in the narrowest place of the marsh, where they were to pass over, leaving some of his confederates to manage the same. The monks, coming out of the nunnery, hearing a great noise made behind them, and suspecting to be discovered, put out the light which they had with them, whose feet without eyes could find the way home in so used a path. Making more haste than good speed, they ran themselves all into the net. The next morning sir Henry Colt brought and presented them to king Henry, who often had seen sweeter, but never fatter, venison." \*

I might add many more instances, had I room and time; but I list not any longer to rake in this dunghill. Being wearied myself in the search, I shall draw toward a conclusion, fearing lest I should trespass upon both the patience and modesty of my reader. If my subject did

\* FULLER'S "Church-History of Britain," vol. ii. p. 220; edition of 1842.—EDIT.

not naturally lead unto this discourse concerning the lewdness and wickedness of these celibate persons, and if I did not apprehend that such discourse might be of use, I would have passed by these things in silence.

USE II. What hath been said concerning the wickedness of the church of Rome, occasioned by this forbidding to marry, I hope may be a sufficient caution unto all of you to take heed, and move you to abhor both the principles and practices of this corrupt church. Indeed, if any of your hearts be set upon filthy lusts and the most abominable uncleannesses, and your consciences are ready under our Reformed religion, to molest and trouble you too much, so that you cannot, without secret lashes and stings within, prosecute your hearts' desires, and gratify your vile affections; if you have a mind like swine to wallow in the mire of the most nasty filthiness, and to get indulgences for such practices; I would advise you to turn Papists: I know no better way that you can take to sear and cauterize your consciences, that you may sin with the least control.

And you of the female sex, if you desire more secretly to be naught, and to veil all with a religious cloak, you may acquaint yourselves with the priests and fathers of this church, who though they will not marry, yet they will strain hard but they will gratify such an inclination in you; and, to stop the mouth of your clamorous consciences, they will give you forthwith an absolution, yea, and admit you unto the communion.

But if you would "deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts;" if you would "live soberly, righteously, and godly in the world," as the word of God and grace of the gospel do teach; if you desire to be sanctified here, and saved hereafter; abhor Popery; come not near the tents of this wicked church, lest you perish with them in the ruin which the Lord will certainly bring upon them. Drink not of "the cup of fornication" which the whore of Babylon would put into your hands. Receive not "the mark of this beast upon your foreheads." Read and consider one scripture, which speaketh of those who turn Papists, sufficient to affrighten all from admitting and embracing this religion, by the fearful consequences thereof. The place is, Rev. xiv. 9—12: "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."

USE III. Lastly: You that are married ministers, and live with your wives in holy wedlock according to God's ordinance, value not the Popish doctrine or decree which forbiddeth your marriage. So long as God is for it, no matter who they be that are against it. So long as God's word doth allow it, no matter though the pope doth forbid it. Only let it be your endeavour to "put to silence the ignorance and perverseness of foolish men," by being "blameless," as well as each "the

husband of one wife." Above all others, you that are ministers, and have wives, should be as if you had none in regard of all inordinacy of affection towards them ; and let it appear unto all, that, although married, you chiefly "care for the things that belong to the Lord, how you may please the Lord." You need not care, or be concerned at the barking of the impure Papists, like dogs who bark at the moon, so long as your conversations do shine.

---

## SERMON XX. (XVIII.)

BY THE REV. RICHARD FAIRCLOUGH, A. M.

FELLOW OF EMMANUEL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.\*

THE PAPAL DOCTRINE IN DENYING THE POSSIBILITY OF ASSURANCE IS FALSE, AND HATH A DANGEROUS TENDENCY TO DESTROY THE TRUE PEACE AND COMFORT OF SOULS IN THE CERTAIN HOPES OF EVERLASTING HAPPINESS.

---

THE NATURE, POSSIBILITY, AND DUTY, OF A TRUE BELIEVER'S ATTAINING TO A CERTAIN KNOWLEDGE OF HIS EFFECTUAL VOCATION, ETERNAL ELECTION, AND FINAL PERSEVERANCE TO GLORY.

*Wherefore the rather, brethren, give all diligence to make your calling and election sure : for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall.—*  
2 Peter i. 10.

THAT I may the more effectually discharge the duty incumbent on me, and the more fully confute that pernicious error of the church of Rome, which hath declared, that "a believer's assurance of the pardon of his sin is a vain and ungodly confidence," † "it being," say they, "impossible for any person to know that he is now pardoned, much less that he shall continue and persevere in the state of grace ;" ‡ I have made choice of this portion of scripture, as the foundation of my present discourse ; wherein it must be considered, that although controversial and polemical treatises are usually large and full, yet the few moments allowed for our present delivery, and the few pages allotted for the printing, of this discourse, necessitate me to manage things in a very contracted manner ; so as I must give you but only hints of some arguments on our side, and also must rather obviate and prevent, than formally answer, all our adversaries' objections. Avoiding all unnecessary amplifications and popular illustrations, which might make our style more smooth and pleasant, I shall only deliver what may rationally convince your judgment ;

\* In his "Account of Ministers, &c., ejected or silenced," Dr. Calamy adds this note concerning the authorship of the present sermon : "I cannot be positive whether this last be his or his father's ;" who was the Rev. Samuel Fairclough, A. M.—EDIT. † *Certitudo remissionis peccatorum est vana et omni pietate remota fiducia.—Conc. Trid. sess. vi.* ‡ *Primus hæreticorum error est, posse fideles eam notitiam habere de sud gratiâ ut certid fide statuunt sibi remissa esse peccata.—BELLARMINUS De Justif. lib. iiii. cap. 3.*