





**THE REAL
PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLICS.**

1607/2607.



THE REAL
PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLICS ;

OR, A

CATECHISM

BY WAY OF GENERAL INSTRUCTION,

EXPLAINING

THE PRINCIPAL POINTS OF THE DOCTRINE AND CEREMONIES

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY THE

RIGHT REV. DR. HORNIHOLD,

AUTHOR OF

THE "DECALOGUE," AND "SACRAMENTS EXPLAINED."

I will teach the unjust thy ways, and the wicked shall be converted to thee.
PSAL. 1. 15.

Haec est via, ambulate in ea. ISA. XXX. 21.

Fifth Edition.

DUBLIN :

RICHARD GRACE, CATHOLIC BOOKSELLER,
45, CAPEL STREET.

1838.



P R E F A C E .

CAN christian hearts be so easily moved, and so sensibly affected, by the mere representation of that deplorable state of ignorance, by the sole consideration of those unhappy clouds of darkness and error which obscure the light of faith, and obstruct the way of salvation, to distant pagans and foreign infidels; whilst the no less miserable condition of our relations and kindred, our friends and neighbours, our countrymen and fellow citizens, is passed by unregarded, and seems to make little or no impression on us? The pagan, the infidel, knows not the true deity nor supreme being, and therefore, he neither adores nor worships him. And among us, alas! there are some who merely bear the name of Christians; to whom may be applied the words of the royal Psalmist, "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God:" or indeed, the small concern they seem to have, either in acquiring a knowledge of him, or the method or manner of adoring, worshipping, and serving him, seems to intimate a like folly. The disregard of the divine precepts is so common, the observance of them, as well as the gospel maxims is so neglected, that the words of the prophet Isaiah are truly applicable: "Ah! sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, seed of evil doers, children that are corrupters; they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward;" not only through their sordid ignorance and supine

negligence of his commands in general, but by their constant vile practice of belching out maledictions and imprecations, oaths and curses, perjuries and blasphemies, obscene words, and lewd discourse, contumely and reviling, calumny and detraction, raillery and defamation, of fraud and deceit, over reaching and trickings, corruption and bribery, subornation, and even such villainies, as would not only scandalize, but even shock a moral heathen. Justly then may we bewail our lamentable case, since neither religion can be secured from the libertine's scoff, nor the rake's disdain from the preacher's raillery, or the divine's misrepresentation, no more than gospel truths, from being made pliable and conformable to every one's turn, every man's private judgment, and scripture traduced to favour every cause.

Well may we complain, to find the narrow path, the straight way, so little trodden, so slightly frequented, and the broad way, the wide gate, so greatly thronged, so immensely crowded. But to what purpose is it to bewail the unhappy effects, unless we endeavour to find and point out the miserable cause? which can be no other than error, supported by prejudice, fomented by invectives: whose influence is, not only to gall the ears, but poison the hearts of those, who are but too readily disposed to receive them: It is not only the topic of private, but even public, nay, pulpit discourse, to represent Roman Catholics as idolators, worshippers of stocks, stones, and wooden gods: To brand them with the odious title of damnable, tyrannical, blood-thirsty Papists, to assert them destitute of all human faith, in regard to those they deem heretics; as abettors, and universal supporters of the deposing power, and king-killing doctrine, and not only the toleration of equivocation, and mental reservation, is frequently imputed to them, but even breaking the most solemn oaths, vows, and protestations, in order to support their cause, and gain their ends. Now infallible truth has positively declared, "that a house divided in itself cannot stand long;" whence, as

an evident consequence, it must necessarily follow, that the doctrine and practice of the Catholic church, and her members, either cannot be what her adversaries make it, or she could never have stood her ground for so many ages past, as she has done, against an infinite number of most potent enemies, who have been continually striving to blast her, and even sap her very foundation, over whom she still remains triumphantly victorious. As the Jews frequently accused, but never could convict her sacred spouse of sin; so have her adversaries calumniated, reviled, and constantly misrepresented her, yet her innocency, purity, and integrity, have still appeared with greater lustre, and darted forth more brilliant rays.

To find her persecuted by heathen emperors, pagan princes, and infidel nations, as she was in her infancy, is neither so much to be admired at, nor so shocking, as to find her traduced and misrepresented, calumniated and abused, blackened and defamed, even by those who stile themselves professors of christianity. What can be more undutiful than for a son, by force and violence, to extort an inheritance from a father? What can be more injurious than for a daughter to blast the fame, and ruin the reputation of a virtuous loving mother? What can be more base and vile, more unnatural and inhuman, than for a child to ridicule and revile, decry and expose, an affectionate and indulgent parent? This, alas! this is the very, this is the present unhappy case of our ancient and holy mother church; her undutiful children, charge their disobedience upon her rigorous discipline; their profligate lives and practice, they impute to her indolence and immorality; and she, in fine, must bear the burden, blame and shame of their vices and crimes. Notwithstanding she has been ever unanimous in her profession of faith, indefatigable in the propagation of morality, faithful in the exposition of her doctrine, and most exact and careful in supporting and maintaining good discipline; her professions are not to be credited, her expositions are baffled, her morals de-

cryed, and discipline exploded. Nevertheless, as in the primitive church, when either persecution was threatened, or actually arose, it was a frequent practice, among the christians, to address to their adversaries expository epistles, to obviate the calumnies and aspersions cast both upon the faith and practice of their church.

I therefore presume in like manner, to address all whom it may concern, in the following sheets, as a summary of more copious expositions, of the faith, doctrine, and practice of the Catholic church, and her members; and also to answer some late ungenerous proceedings practised, and endeavours used to improve popular prejudice; and lest the public should be thereby affected to conceive a worse opinion of us than heretofore. They are, I say, published with no other view or intent, than to do justice to truth, to promote charity, put a stop to the current of prejudice conceived, disperse those clouds thence not only arising, but rather too much spread abroad. And as the sole aim is to establish love and unity, to concur to the spiritual welfare and eternal salvation of my countrymen, fellow creatures, and christians, so as no one can reasonably except against such motives, neither will they, I hope, make any exceptions against the means proposed, as in consort with the angels, at the birth of the author of life, I not only sing, but wish and seek for "glory to God on high, and peace to men of good will."



INTRODUCTION.

A DEFENCE or vindication of the Roman Catholics, being a most solemn declaration of their abhorrence of the following tenets, vulgarly laid at their door; who do hereby oblige themselves, that if the ensuing curses be added to those appointed to be read, on the the first day of Lent, in the liturgy of the church of England, as by law established, they will seriously and heartily answer, Amen to them all.

Cursed is he, who commits idolatry; that prays to images or relics, or worships them for Gods. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is every goddess worshipper, who believes the Virgin Mary to be any more than a pure creature, that honours her, worships her, or puts his trust in her as much as in God; that believes her above, or even equal to her Son, or that she can in any thing command him. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who believes the saints in heaven to be his redeemers, that prays to them as such, or that gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who worships any breaden God, or that looks upon the empty elements of bread and wine to be his God. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who believes there is authority in the Pope, or any other, that can give leave to commit sins: or that can forgive him his sins for a sum of money. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who believes that (independently of the merits and passion of Christ) he can merit salvation by his own good works, or make condign satisfaction for the guilt of his sins, or the eternal pains due to them. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who contemns the word of God, or hides it from the people; on design to keep them from the knowledge of their duty, and in ignorance and error. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who undervalues the word of God, or that, forsaking scripture, chuses rather to follow human traditions than it. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who leaves the commandments of God to observe the constitutions of men. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who omits any of the ten commandments, or keeps the people from the knowledge of any of them, to the end they may not have occasion of discovering the truth. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who preaches to the people in unknown tongues, such as they understand not, or use any other means to keep them in ignorance. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who believes that the Pope can give to any one, upon any account whatsoever, dispensation to lie, or swear falsely; or that it is lawful for any one, at the last hour to protest himself innocent in case he be guilty. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who encourages sins, or teaches men to defer the amendment of their lives, on presumption of their death-bed repentance. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who places religion in nothing but a pompous shew, consisting only in ceremonies; and which teaches not the people to serve God in spirit and truth. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who loves or promotes cruelty, that teaches people to be bloody-minded, and to lay aside the meekness of Jesus Christ. *R. Amen.*

Cursed is he who teaches it lawful to do any wicked thing, though it be for the interest and good of our mother church: that any evil action may be done, that good may be done by it. *R. Amen.*

Cursed are we, if among all these wicked principles, and damnable doctrines, commonly laid at our doors, any one of them be the faith of our church. And cursed are we, if we do not as heartily detest all these hellish practices, as they who so vehemently urge them against us. *R. Amen.*

Cursed are we, if in answering and saying Amen, to any of these curses, we use any equivocation, mental reservation, or do not assent to them in the common and obvious sense of the words. *R. Amen.*

And can the Papists then, thus seriously, and without check of conscience, say Amen to all these curses? Yes they can, and are ready to do it whensoever, and as often as it shall be required of them. And what then is to be said of those, who either by word or writing, charge these doctrines upon the faith of the church of *Rome*? *Is a lying spirit in the mouth of all the prophets? Are they all gone aside? Do they backbite with their tongue, do evil to their neighbour, and take up reproach against their neighbour?* I will say no such thing, but leave the impartial considerer to judge. One thing I can safely affirm, that the Papists are foully misrepresented, and shewn in public as much unlike what they are as the Christians were of old by the Gentiles; that they lie under a great calumny, severely smart in good name, persons, and estate, for such things, which they as much and as heartily detest, as those who accuse them. But the comfort is, Christ has said to his followers, You shall be hated of all men. Again, St. Paul says, We are made a spectacle unto the world. And we do not doubt, but that those who bear this with patience, will for every loss here receive a hundred fold in heaven.

As for problematical disputes, or errors of particular divines, in this or any other matter whatsoever; the Catholic church is no wise responsible for them: nor are Catholics, as Catholics, justly punishable on their account.

But as for the king-killing doctrine, or murder of

princes and their subjects, excommunicated for heresy ; it is an article of faith in the Catholic church, and expressly declared in the general council of Constance in the year 1415, (Sess. 15.) that such doctrine is damnable and heretical, being contrary to the known laws of God and nature.

Personal misdemeanours of what nature soever, ought not to be imputed to the Catholic church, when not justifiable by the tenets of her faith and doctrine.

It is an article of the Catholic faith to believe, that no power on earth can licence men to lie, forswear, and perjure themselves ; to massacre their neighbours, or destroy their native country, on pretence of promoting the Catholic cause, or religion : furthermore, all pardons, and dispensations granted, or pretended to be granted, in order to any such ends or designs, have no other validity or effect than to add sacrilege and blasphemy to the above mentioned crimes.

All these, and a great many other calumnies, which are laid to the charge of the church of Rome, you will find in the following sheets to be no part of her faith or doctrine.

THE
REAL PRINCIPLES
OF
CATHOLICS, &c.

THE CREED EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is the Creed?

A. It is a short collection of articles, and the sum of what Christians ought to believe.

Q. By whom were they drawn up, and to what purpose?

A. By the twelve Apostles, to the end they might be more easily retained by the faithful, and to distinguish them from all societies of unbelievers.

Q. Do they contain the whole of what a Christian ought to believe?

A. No, only the general heads; yet so, that all other particular articles are deducible from them; especially if we believe the ninth article, viz. The holy Catholic Church.

Q. How many are these heads, and in what order are they disposed?

A. They are twelve, distributed with respect to the three Persons of the blessed Trinity. The first part has a relation to God the Father, and the creation; the second to God the Son, and man's redemption; the third to God the Holy Ghost, and man's sanctification, and glorification.

Q. Which is the first article?

A. I believe in God the Father Almighty, creator of heaven and earth.

Q. What is God?

A. I conceive him as a being eternal, self-existent, independent, from whom all other things are derived, and upon whom all and every thing entirely depends.

Q. What inducement have you to think there is such a Being?

A. Faith, reason, conscience, the testimony of my senses, and the general concurrence of all mankind, oblige me to be of that persuasion.

Q. In what manner does Faith convince you of God's existence?

A. Because he has revealed his existence, and confirmed the truth of the revelation, by undeniable proofs, and motives of credibility, fully declared in the Old and New Testament.

Q. How can your reason prove the existence of God, who appears by your description, to be an incomprehensible Being, above the reach of man's reason?

A. My reason tells me, that he is, but not what he is: My reason informs me of some of his perfections: Others I learn by Faith; but as to a comprehensive knowledge of that great Being, he would not be God could we comprehend the whole that belongs to him.

Q. Let me hear your proofs from reason of God's existence?

A. In the first place, it is demonstrable from the effects. I see a multitude of things in this visible world, which not being capable of producing themselves, recourse must be had to some self-existent, and original cause, which gave them being; for without such a necessary and self-existent Being, all things would remain in the state of indifferency, and nothing could receive a being. Again, I have within me a silent monitor, which is that fear I am seized with, as often as I commit a wicked action; which can proceed from nothing else, but an apprehension of being called to an account, and punished by some power I ought to have obeyed.

Q. What do your senses declare in proof of a Deity?

A. Those surprizing great bodies, the earth, the sea, and air, with the sun, moon, and stars, as they could not be produced by any mortal hand, make me conclude, they are the effect of some great and omnipotent power; to which, if we add the beautiful variety of trees, fruits, herbs, and flowers, which cover the earth, the rich mines which are

lodged within its bowels, the several species of beasts, and insects, which range and creep upon it, with the various kinds of fish, which swim in the waters; and birds that fly in the air, they all inform me of some wise and omnipotent power, which gave them being, which I am still farther convinced of, when I consider the admirable structure of their bodies, the regularity of their motions, their specific propagation, their wise economy, and how dexterously they labour, to obtain their respective ends.

Q. Do all mankind join in a belief of this supreme Being?

A. No nation was ever so ignorant or barbarous, as not to acknowledge some sort of Deity, though they were involved in many errors, as to the qualities belonging to him.

Q. You seem then not to allow there were ever any atheists. What do you say to the objections which those sort of people are said to make, against your proofs of a Deity? Why might not the visible world be produced by chance? We may conceive things producing one another, by an infinite succession of causes and effects, without arriving at a necessary and self-existent Being. Is not this as conceivable, as a self-existent and eternal Being? Again, atheists will tell you, that there is no real distinction between good and evil, but what is learned from education, especially by human policy and priestcraft.

A. I cannot be persuaded, there was ever any such person as a real atheist, who denied a supreme Being, interiorly, to whom he owed obedience. I own some have attempted to bring arguments for that purpose, but it was rather to shew their pretended wit, or from the corruption of their morals, which prompted them to wish there were no God to punish them for their sins; which the royal prophet alludes to, when he says, the fool said in his heart there is no God. Ps. xiii. 1.

Q. What answer do you make to the objections of those pretended atheists?

A. To say that the world was produced by chance, is a manifest contradiction to the common reason of all mankind. What happens by chance, has nothing of regularity, either as to time, place, or disposition of parts: Whereas the world is a regular subordination of causes and effects. Can chance produce a book by shuffling together the letters of the alphabet? When we behold a watch, a house, a ship, we conclude they were the effects of some intelligent and

skilful operator, who joined their parts together; and, by consequence, the parts of this visible world are so artfully united, that they are a convincing proof of some wise and powerful operator, who brought them under that regularity. As to what is alleged, concerning things making one another, that can have no reference to several parts of the universe, viz. The earth, sea, sun, moon, stars, and many other bodies, which receive not a *being by generation, but are single*, and incapable of multiplication. As for other creatures, viz. The fruits of the earth, birds, beasts, fishes, and the rest, which seem to produce one another, they cannot be conceived to act as *principal*, but only as *instrumental* causes; because as some are void of sense, and others of reason, they cannot be conceived as *principal* authors of those artificial parts, and wonderful properties, which are produced; but on the contrary, they manifestly point out a wise and all-powerful author, who acts as *principal*. The like inconvenience, and contradiction appears, in an infinite succession of causes, and effects, without arriving at some necessary and self-existent being, for no effect we know of, is producible originally, without a wise and omnipotent power: and though we cannot have a comprehensive idea that there is such a power as to all its perfections, yet without having recourse to that necessary Being, we cannot account for the existence of the world, and the parts which compose it. Whereas an infinite succession, is not only inconceivable in itself, but leaves us in the dark, how the parts of the universe were capable of being produced with so great beauty and variety.

Q. Can you shew there is any essential distinction between good and evil, besides what arises from education, policy and priestcraft?

A. It is true, education gives us a more specific knowledge; but heathens, without any instructions from faith, or education, makes a difference between good and evil actions; yet some things are only bad, because they are forbidden, but others are forbidden because they are bad in themselves. But you will say, why are they bad in themselves? To which I answer, not because they are forbidden by the laws of men, or suggested either by priests or politicians; but because they are contrary to man's reason, which is a law ingrafted in his heart, by God himself, to answer all the purposes of this life and the next.

Q. By what I can learn from your arguments, you have only a confused idea of God's existence, and cannot describe him by any characteristics, or essential properties which belong to him, and distinguish him from the visible world?

A. I own God is invisible, ineffable, and incomprehensible. The corporal eye only sees him, in the effects he produces; no words are capable of giving a description of him; and though we are convinced, both by faith and reason of his existence, yet we cannot have an adequate idea, or a comprehensive knowledge of the perfections which are essential to him, it being his peculiar property to know himself.

Q. However, let us hear what idea you have of his divine properties, as far as either faith, or reason, has informed you?

A. The chief of his divine properties are these—He is infinite in his essence, from whence do flow his omnipotency, immensity, simplicity, omnipresence, omniscience, immutability, veracity, goodness, holiness, perfection, and providential care.

Q. What do you understand by infinity?

A. It is the property of a thing that is without limits, or that has neither beginning nor end; and may be considered with regard to time, place, and all sorts of perfections. Hence, God is infinite as to duration, because he is eternal, and always was, and always will be; he is infinite as to place, because he exists every where; he is infinite as to power, because he can do all things. The same infinity belongs to his wisdom, goodness, and the rest of his perfections.

Q. Are not angels, and human souls infinite, as to duration? They will never cease to be.

A. God is eternal essentially; angels and human souls are only immortal by participation, and dependently on God, whom he may destroy at pleasure; besides they had a beginning, though they will have no end.

Q. In what sense is God omnipotent?

A. Omnipotency is a power to do every thing that can be done.

Q. Then there are some things he cannot do; how shall we know what he can do, and what he cannot do?

A. In general he cannot do things which involve a con-

tradiction, or are inconsistent with his divine perfections. He cannot make the same thing to be, and not to be, at the same time: He cannot deceive or lye; because, by such actions his veracity and goodness are destroyed; again, they proceed not from power, but from a defect of power.

Q. Can God do more things than what he has done?

A. Yes; infinitely more. He can create more worlds; he can make things infinitely more perfect; he can break through the established laws of Nature; produce fruit without trees, corn without ploughing or sowing, &c.

Q. You say God cannot do things which involve a contradiction; how shall we know what things those are?

A. There is no certain rule, or hopes of ever arriving at this knowledge, in the whole latitude of the inquiry, this being a secret only belonging to God himself. However, some things there are, which all mankind own to be contradictions: Others are only seemingly so, or at most, are pretended to be so by private persons, and parties of men. When all mankind agree upon what is a contradiction, it is no rashness to say, God cannot do it: If it is only seemingly so, we are to proceed with caution, and inform ourselves, how far faith and authority may be interested, and have a right to pronounce upon the case, as it happens in the mysteries of religion, which seemingly contradict reason, but indeed are only above it; because in these cases, it is reasonable to have recourse to faith and authority, when our private understanding is incapable of penetrating into the nature of those mysteries: As to what private judgments, and parties often esteem contradictions, we are not to measure God's power by their weak capacities. Besides, what one man esteems to be a contradiction, to another it appears otherwise.

A. Can God communicate his omnipotency to any of his creatures?

A. By no means; because it is an essential attribute of the Deity: However, he can bestow upon creatures a power of doing many things, that are out of the course of nature, as he actually does, in the working of miracles, and producing grace by means of the sacraments, where the effect demonstrates an omnipotent power in God, who is the principal agent, but not in creatures, who only concur instrumentally.

Q. What idea have you of God's immensity?

A. I conceive God to be a spiritual substance existent every where, and not confined to any particular place, and by virtue of this ubiquity, to be present in all parts of the world, and whole in every part.

Q. Give us a more particular account, in what manner God is present every where?

A. God is present every where, after three ways, viz. By his power, in creating and preserving all things in their being by his knowledge, in having all things in his view; and by his essence or substance, in being present every where. To which may be added three other ways more special, viz. He is present to the just, by his grace; to the saints and angels, by his glory; and to human nature, by the incarnation, and hypostatical union.

Q. But why is it usually said, that he is in heaven, if he resides in all other places?

A. Because, heaven is, as it were, his palace, or principal seat, where he displays his glory to the blessed; whereas in other places he appears indeed but as it were under a veil.

Q. Did God leave heaven, when he descended upon earth to unite himself to human nature?

A. That and such like expressions are to be understood in a metaphorical sense: They only signify the effects produced on the earth, and as it were, a new way of exhibiting himself present, where he was really present before.

Q. In what sense is simplicity, a property belonging to God?

A. Simplicity is non-composition, the property of a thing which has no parts: a thing which has parts, may be divided and dissolved, but God is indivisible, and incapable of dissolution, and by consequence cannot be a body.

Q. The Scriptures mentioning the eyes, ears, hands, and feet of Almighty God, seem to import that he has a body, and by consequence is not an uncompounded being.

A. These are only metaphorical expressions, to signify the various effects he produces. Seeing, is understanding; hearing, is diligent attention; hands, notify power; and feet, the motions made, in shewing mercy or justice.

Q. Why is not simplicity a property of angels and human souls? They are neither compound beings, nor capable of dissolution.

A. In one sense they may be called simple, or uncompounded beings, as not consisting of material parts: but there is a kind of composition, consisting of power and act, in created spiritual substances, which makes them liable to several alterations, so as often to change their affections, and become both active and passive. Now God's simplicity requires him always to be the same, never passive, but always active.

Q. If simplicity, as you have explained, is a property belonging only to God, the unity or singularity of the Deity seems to follow from it. What have you to say to that point?

A. You say right as to unity in itself, which is the same as simplicity.

Q. You take my meaning—shew me then that there is but one God?

A. In the first place, the unity of the Deity is plentifully asserted in the Holy Scriptures. And besides, it necessarily follows, from the notion we have of a supreme Being, an infinite Being, an independent Being, a Being, including all perfections, can admit of no competitor: for supposing, two or more such Beings, one of them would not be infinite, as not possessing the perfections of the other. And in case we conceive them as different Beings, they would either differ in something, or in nothing; if in nothing, they would be the same; if in something, the others would not be infinite, but want the differential quality.

Q. But the Scripture frequently makes mention of more Gods than one. How do you expound those expressions?

A. Sometimes the property of the language requires the plural number: other times it speaks according to the opinion of the infidels, who allowed of a multitude of Gods: and often they are stiled Gods who are his representatives, as kings, priests, prophets, and in general all superiors.

Q. Is not the mystery of the blessed Trinity, a proof that there are at least three Gods?

A. By no means; because the three persons have the same nature, and possess the same essential perfections, viz. the same power, knowledge, will, &c.

Q. I cannot conceive the heathens could be so blind and stupid, as to believe a plurality of Gods, especially as to attribute divine perfections to the sun, moon, and stars; nay, even to images formed out of stone, timber, and

metals. What account does the Scripture give of their system and practice?

A. Their system was not uniform, but varied according to men's capacity and circumstances: most of the learned philosophers, as St. Paul observes, not only believed one God, but had a knowledge of some of his divine perfections, though for want of faith they were involved in many errors concerning his power, knowledge, and providential care. Others, especially the ignorant, and superstitious priests, though they did not believe the idols themselves to be Gods, yet they seemed to be of opinion, that some Deity was lodged within them. As for the generality of the ignorant people, they were under a delusion to imagine that the very idols themselves were Gods.

Q. What reflections do you make upon this threefold system of heathenism?

A. In the first place, I observe, that the learned were rather hypocrites than idolaters; because, in practice, they followed the notions of the common people, (and durst do no otherwise) though they were persuaded, that neither the idols were Gods, nor any Deity lodged within them. However, even the learned were far from being orthodox in their opinion of the Deity; many of them allowing of several inferior Deities, under the inspection of one that was supreme. This error they fell into, for want of faith, and not attending to the nature of an independent Being; as to their priests, ignorance and avarice, made them cultivate a belief in the people, that certain Deities lay lurking in the idols, and they found their ends in partaking of the money and victuals which were offered to them. Lastly, the stupid mob, who comprehended no more than what they saw with their eyes, are the persons exclaimed against, and reproached by Almighty God for their ignorance, blindness, and stupidity, in adoring the works of their own hands, that had eyes, but could not see, ears, but could not hear, feet, but could not walk. As for the learned heathens, the accusation against them is, for not worshipping that God, whom they owned to be master of so many perfections, and the author of their temporal blessings.

Q. You have observed above, that God is present every where by his knowledge; what farther account can you give of that divine property? How does he know things, and

in what manner are we to express ourselves as to that point?

A. The divine knowledge differs from that of men after three ways. First, he knows all things, and is omniscient. Secondly, he knows things before they happen, by prescience. Thirdly, he knows things all at one view, by intuition. Whereas, man knows but a few things, and those very imperfectly; he only knows what is past and present, and often forgets them; he only knows things by their effects and causes, and not all at once.

Q. How does immutability belong to the divine nature? He is, it is true, unchangeable as to any distinction, or divisibility of compounding parts: but was there no alteration in him when he created the world, when he assumed human nature, or when, as it is said of him in Scripture, he changes his will, is sorry, repents, &c.?

A. To conceive God capable of any alteration, is entirely to destroy his nature: he can neither be changed as to substance, time, place, knowledge, will, or any affections whatever. What he is, when he is, where he is, what he knows or wills, were all the same from eternity. As for the world, creation, incarnation, &c., they only imply a change in the outward object: as for his being angry, repenting, and the like, they are metaphorical expressions, upon account of his doing those things, and giving those tokens, which men usually do, who are subject to such passions.

Q. What is veracity, and in what manner does it belong to God?

A. It is a moral virtue or perfection, inclining persons to judge, speak, and act, according to truth, or as things really are in themselves. For example; truth in judging, is when we have formed an idea of a thing, without any misrepresentation: truth in speech, is when our words are conformable to our opinion: truth in actions, is when our behaviour is conformable to our words. From hence I conclude, that God's veracity requires all these perfections; for instance, could things be misrepresented to him, could he speak otherwise than he thinks or judges, could his actions be contrary to his divine ideas, or words, it would destroy his omniscience, goodness, and the rest. So that as he is essentially true, he can neither be deceived, nor deceive.

Q. Does veracity belong only to God, and how far may that perfection be ascribed to mankind?

A. God alone is essentially the origin of truth ; men judge, speak, and act according to truth, only by participation ; nature has made them capable of truth in many cases, where the light of reason is only required, though here they often proceed contrary to truth, through ignorance, misinformation, passion, &c., yet being supported, by the divine assistance, they may be rendered incapable, of either being deceived or deceiving others : as we believe the prophets, the apostles, and such as were inspired by God, were the authors of truth, though considered as men, they could claim no such privilege.

Q. What is goodness ? in what sense is God, and other things called good ?

A. It is a beauty resulting from perfection ; and may be considered either absolutely or relatively ; a thing is good absolutely when it wants nothing to render it perfect in its kind : a thing is good relative when it communicates itself to others suitably to their exigencies. Hence, God is infinitely good absolutely, because he possesses all perfections, as also relatively, because the first person communicates infinite goodness to the second, and third person ; as likewise God communicates his goodness to creatures, to every one according to their exigencies, and is capable and willing to confer infinitely more.

Q. Are creatures also good ?

A. Yes ; though after another manner. God is good essentially, creatures only dependently on God. Creatures are good absolutely, because they possess those perfections, which belong to their respective beings ; and also they may be good relatively, as often as they endeavour to make others better by those perfections they themselves possess.

Q. You say goodness is a result from perfection. Pray what is perfection ?

A. A thing is perfect, when nothing is wanting to make it complete in its nature. Hence, God alone is absolutely perfect, because he contains all perfections, both uncreated and created, though after a different manner. Some properly, as wisdom, justice, power ; others improperly, as all sensible and material beings which exist in God, (Eminent,) as in their cause and principle. Creatures are perfect, when they have all their constituent parts : but still they are imperfect when compared with God, who alone is essentially perfect.

Q. What is holiness, and in what sense are God and creatures holy?

A. Holiness, or sanctity, is a spiritual perfection, and consists in purity from sin, which is a deformity of the soul. God only is essentially holy, being incapable of sin. Men are holy, only by participation: not that God's holiness is only imputed to them, but they are really, absolutely, and intrinsically holy in themselves.

Q. Are other creatures properly called holy?

A. All creatures may be called holy relatively, but not absolutely; not that they are capable of an inherent holiness, but because they are instruments, or channels of holiness; as the sacraments, or things put to a holy and religious use, as holy water, altars, churches, &c.

Q. What is God's will, how are we to conceive it, and in what manner is it fulfilled?

A. God has only one will, though according to our way of conceiving it, we distinguish several kinds: for example, first, we conceive that nothing happens contrary to his absolute will: now, his will is made known to us by certain outward tokens, viz. By precepts, prohibition, permission, advice, &c. Hence, a good life consists in obeying the will of God; his absolute will is always fulfilled, but his conditional will is not, as in the reprobates whom he permits to follow their own free-will; though he has a real will that they should be saved; as a merchant when he casts his goods overboard, has a will to save them, but permits the mariners to destroy them.

Q. What is love and hatred, and how is love capable of such affections?

A. Love is a desire of good, either in itself, or to ourselves or others. There are several kinds: a love of complacency, that is, when we love a thing for itself; a love of concupiscence, when we desire it for our own sakes; a love of benevolence, when we desire it for the sake of others; a love of beneficence, when we actually confer the good we desire; a love of friendship, is a reciprocal love of benevolence. God's love for man, is of complacency, benevolence, beneficence, and in the just, of friendship. Hatred is an aversion to evil, either grounded in the thing, or personal; one is called abomination, which God has against sin; the other of enmity, which God is incapable of, because he cannot wish evil to man.

Q. What is providence, and after what manner does God govern the world?

A. It is a direction of all things to their proper end, by suitable means: all things I say, both great and small, natural and supernatural; so that he concurs immediately both to necessary agents, and free agents. Hence, predestination and reprobation belong to God's providence.

Q. What is predestination, and in what manner are we to speak of it?

A. Predestination is an eternal purpose of saving some persons: reprobation is an eternal purpose of permitting some persons to be damned: they both are inclusive of merits and demerits; yet, with this difference, a foresight of sin, or the ill use of grace, is the motive of reprobation: but whether persons are predestined upon a foresight of merit, or good use of grace, is not determined by the church; it is more conformable to the scriptures to say, predestination is gratuitous; and as predestination includes the preparation of means, especially the first grace, it is a point of faith that is gratuitous.

Q. What errors are condemned by the church, concerning predestination and reprobation?

A. First, that of Origen, who affirmed, that men's souls were created before the world, and were predestinated upon account of the good works they had performed before they were united to bodies. Secondly, the Pelagians, who taught, that good works without grace, by nature alone, might be a motive of predestination. Thirdly, the Semi-pelagians who, though they owned salvation could not be obtained without grace, (wherein they differed from the Pelagians,) yet they affirmed, God predestinated mankind, upon a foresight of some natural endeavours towards obtaining grace. Fourthly, the Calvinists, who think themselves infallibly certain of their predestination. Fifthly, Calvinists, Lutherans, Jansenists, and others, who say, God has not a will, or gives not sufficient grace to all persons to be saved. Sixthly, Calvinists, &c. who affirm that God has an absolute will to damn some persons, without any foresight of their sins.

Q. Which are the principal effects of predestination?

A. 1. An efficacious call. 2. Justification and perseverance. 3. Glorification.

c

Q. What difference do you make in believing a God, believing God, and believing in God? *

A. To believe a God, is to believe there is such a being. To believe God, is to believe all to be true that he has revealed. To believe in God is to love him, and to put our trust in him, as our last end.

Q. Having explained what belongs to the divine attributes, we are to proceed to some other matters; and first, why do you call God Father?

A. A Father is he, who begets children, and gives them a being: in which sense God is the Father of all mankind, whom he produced by creation, preserves their being, and provides them with all necessaries and conveniencies, which is the character of a kind father, but in a more particular manner, he is the father of all good christians, whom he has adopted, and made heirs of his kingdom.

Q. What farther instructions can you draw from the word Father?

A. Several very useful, in order to pay a grateful acknowledgment to the Divine Majesty for all the benefits we are made partakers of. Creation in the first place, is so surprising a meditation, that words cannot express what we are indebted to him on that account. There is nothing that happens between man and man, in the way of being obliged to one another, that can have any resemblance to it: it is so extraordinary a subject of humility, that it strikes us dumb, and in a manner thoughtless with confusion; preservation has in a manner the same influence upon us, for as we were created out of nothing, so we should in an instant be reduced to nothing, unless the same hand which created us continued to support us; this reflection obliges us to have recourse to him upon all occasions. I might descend to many more particulars, as his providential care in supplying us with all things we want, our redemption, vocation, justification, perseverance, and everlasting happiness, which are the effects of his being our father.

Q. You have given rather the moral and metaphorical sense of the word father; what is the literal meaning of the word as it stand in the creed?

A. Literally the word father points out the mystery of

* 1. *Credo Deum.* 2. *Credo Deo.* 3. *Credo in Deum.*

the Trinity, and namely the first person, who is called father, upon account of his begetting the second person, by an eternal generation.

Q. A father is prior to his son; how does this agree with the son's eternal existence?

A. We are not to conceive any priority among the divine persons, as to time and dignity, but only as to origin, so that the Father is called the first person, because he is unbegotten, and proceeds from no other person; whereas the second person is begotten by the Father, and the third person proceeds from the Father and the Son.

Q. Pray explain in few words what we are obliged to believe concerning the Trinity, and how the learned explained their thoughts upon this high subject?

A. The mystery of the Trinity is one God in three persons, or more distinctly, three persons that have the same nature, essence, or substance; which are equivalent terms, according to the use that is made of those words upon the present occasion.

Q. Are there no more, or less than three persons in God, and how are they distinguished from one another, and from the divine essence?

A. It was an error against faith of the Sabellians and others, that in God, as there was only one essence, or nature, so there was only one person, and that the three names given to God in the Scriptures, did not import different persons, but took their appellations from different operations of the same person. Other heretics, among which were the Arians, held, that as there were three persons in God, so there were three natures, not substantial. Now the doctrine of the Catholic Church is, that the three persons, though really distinct in themselves, are not distinct as to the same nature wherewith they are identified.

Wherein the error of Gilbert of Poiree, bishop of Poitiers is condemned, in the Council of Paris, in the year 1147; as likewise, in the Council of Rheims, in the following year, who was of opinion, that the three persons were really distinct from the divine essence, whereby he seems obliged to assert a quaternity of persons.

Q. What do divines mean by procession?

A. By procession they understand the emanation, or flowing of one thing from another. Hence, they distinguish in God two processions, one, whereby the Son pro-

ceeds from the Father; the other, whereby the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. And it is an article of faith, that there are neither more nor less.

Q. Why is God's omnipotency inserted in this article, rather than any other of the divine attributes?

A. Chiefly for two reasons. First, because mention is there made of the world's creation, which requires an omnipotent power. Secondly, because the first person is the origin of all power.

Q. Are not the second and third persons likewise omnipotent?

A. Yes, equally; they all having the same essential and absolute perfections. Yet works of power are commonly attributed to the first person, upon account of his being the origin of power; works of wisdom to the second person, on account of the wisdom he shewed in our redemption: works of goodness to the third, on account of our sanctification and divine assistance; though at the same time all the three persons are equally concerned in all outward works of power, wisdom and goodness.

Q. In the next place, you call God, the Father Creator, may not each person be called Creator?

A. Yes; but creation is there attributed to the first person, for the reasons above recited.

Q. What is creation?

A. It is the production of a thing out of nothing.

Q. What errors have men fallen into concerning the world's creation?

A. Aristotle, and several other of the heathen philosophers had no notion of creation: And hence, they established the principle, *Nothing is made out of nothing.* (Ex nihilo nihil fit.) And farther, those who believed God was an eternal Being, conceived the material world to be also eternal; and as it were an essential property belonging to God. But we have a more perfect account of the Deity from the Scriptures, which gives the particulars of the world's creation, and reason tells us, that no material thing can belong to God essentially, only originally, as a first cause. Gen. 1.

Q. What do you understand by heaven and earth, which you say was created?

A. By heaven, I understand every thing in heaven; by earth, every thing on earth.

Q. What are angels, and what properties belong to them ?

A. Angel is a word according to its etymology, which signifies a messenger: as the word apostle signifies a public messenger; so that they imply not a nature, but a power or office. If an angel be considered as to its nature, it is a spiritual substance, created by God, without a body.

Q. Is it an article of faith that the angels have no bodies ?

A. I cannot say it is; but it is approaching that way, and generally held by the church.

Q. Are they not commonly painted with bodies and wings ?

A. Yes, not that they really have bodies, but because they assume them, when they appear to men. They are represented with wings, to signify that their motions are quick as thought.

Q. What other properties belong to them ?

A. They have a clear knowledge of nature, both as to causes and effects: they have also great power proportioned to their vast knowledge, and were created in grace with free will, which some made a good use of, but others abused it.

Q. Who are they who abused it ?

A. The wicked angels, we call devils.

Q. Have these also still great knowledge and power ?

A. They lost not their natural perfections by their rebellion against God, but only such as were supernatural; so that their knowledge still extends to all the secrets of nature; and God permits them to exercise great power over men, so as to tempt them to sin, possess their bodies, but not force their will; which is always free, and out of their power.

Q. Divines tell us, there are several orders and degrees among those spiritual beings: pray give an account of them, and the grounds you have to make a distinction among them ?

A. Divines gather this distinction of spiritual beings from the Scriptures, especially from the prophets, Isaiah and Ezekiel, which are particularly described by St. Gregory the Great, in his 34th homily upon the gospels, where he tells us the scriptures make mention of nine orders, or degrees of these blessed spirits, viz. seraphims, cherubims, thrones, dominations, principalities, powers, virtues, arch-

angels, and angels. Isaiah vi. 1. Gen. iii. 24. Heb. ix. 5. Ephes. i. 21. Colos. i. 16. Thessal. iv. 15.

Q. Has every man an angel-guardian allotted him?

A. Yes, all mankind, but especially christians, who after baptism has a particular care of, and protects them from the devil's power and stratagems.—As also our angel-guardian is appointed to hinder us from falling into any temporal calamities, or any misfortune. This doctrine of having an angel-guardian appointed for every one is a certain truth universally held by the church against Calvin and others, who contradict it.

Q. Can you produce any proof from the scriptures and fathers that every one has an angel-guardian appointed him?

A. Yes I can, from the 18th chapter of St. Matt. ver. 10. Where Christ saith, "*See that you despise not one of these little ones: For I say to you, that their angels in heaven always see the face of my father who is in heaven.*" Again, out of the 12th chapter of the Acts, ver. 15. "*And they said it is his angel.*"—Also out of the 33d and 90th psalm, ver. 8. and 11. Now as to the fathers, nothing can be more clear and fully expressed, than what St. Basil, St. Ambrose, and St. Chrysostom write in confirmation of this doctrine.*

Q. What account have we in the scripture concerning man's creation? When was he created?—What does his nature consist of? What condition or state was he in upon and after his creation?

A. Adam and Eve were made on the sixth day, his body formed from clay, and her's from one of Adam's ribs. Man in the whole consists of a body and soul united together, in such a manner, that the body was in subjection to the soul. As to the condition and state man was in, it was far different at his creation, from what he found himself in afterwards.

Q. What condition was man placed in at his creation?

A. It was in his power not to die, had he made use of the means: his soul was created in grace, accompanied with other supernatural gifts: his body was entirely submissive to his soul, free from concupiscence, or any irre-

* Vide St. Bas. Serm. 3. Adver. Eunomium. St. Ambr. expo. in Psal. 118. h. 9. St. Chrys. Hom. 60. cap. 11. Matt.

gular appetites ; and no creature whatever was capable of giving him any pain or affliction. Again, his soul was an immortal being, created according to God's likeness, with a will, memory, and understanding, and entirely free in his actions, which are prerogatives that other people could not pretend to, who were either inanimate or animal beings.

Q. Do men still claim all these perfections, or only some of them, or if they lost any of them, how, and what are they ?

A. Man lost God's grace, and all supernatural gifts by his disobedience, and as an effect of this, was made liable to death, concupiscence, pain, trouble, and all those vexations which are incident to human life. Whereby the Pelagian heresy is condemned, which consists in this, that man was not created in grace, that he was not to be immortal, though he had not sinned, and that death, concupiscence, and the miseries of human life were not the consequences of Adam's sin, but circumstances belonging to the state wherein he was first placed ; and from hence they inferred, as the Calvinists do, that there was no other sin transferred by Adam to posterity, besides concupiscence, which they maintain to be that original sin so often mentioned in the scriptures.—However, though man lost these advantages, he still retained free will, but the Lutherans and Calvinists pretend, we only enjoy free will in regard of evil, not in regard of good. Indeed, free will is much impaired by the misfortune of original sin, but not destroyed.

Q. What particulars have we concerning the creation of other things in the world ?

A. The first chapter of Genesis gives a description how it was performed, viz. in six days, and all things contained in it. The first day God created an undigested heap of matter, out of which all bodies were afterwards formed ; and the same day he made the heavens, and a luminous body. The second day, he divided the earth and the waters. The third day, he separated the earth from the waters, so as to allot them their proper channels ; and the same day, he gave the earth a prolific quality, so that it produced all sorts of fruits, minerals, &c. and at the same time, he planted the terrestrial paradise. The fourth day, he made the sun, moon, and stars. The fifth day, he made the birds, and fishes, &c. On the sixth day, he made the

beasts and reptiles; and the same day, he made Adam and Eve, and placed them in the terrestrial paradise afterwards.

Q. Why did God form things by degrees, who might have done all at one instant?

A. It was his divine pleasure, and to shew that nature and grace, by degrees, make things perfect; and to give us a more distinct idea that all things were created by him.

THE SECOND ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the second article of the creed?

A. And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord.

Q. What is chiefly contained in this article?

A. A Belief or faith in the second person of the blessed Trinity, his incarnation, or assuming human nature.

Q. Why is he called Jesus, and who gave him that name?

A. The name was given by God's appointment, when the angel Gabriel saluted the Blessed Virgin Mary, and it imports as much as a Saviour; to signify that he was to be the redeemer of mankind, as well as to comply with the custom among the Jews, whereby the names they gave to things, was explanatory of the office or use they were to be put to. Matt. i. 21. Hence, Josue the leader of God's people was called Jesus, because he overcame their enemies, and introduced them into the land of Promise.

Q. In what manner did he become a Saviour, or Redeemer of Mankind?

A. By being a mediator between God and man, which he was capable of effecting, not precisely as he was God, nor precisely as man; but as he was both God and man, his divine person rendered his actions infinitely satisfactory and redemptive; his human nature rendered him capable of suffering, and being a mediator.

Q. You say that Jesus Christ is both God and man, pray can you produce any proofs from scripture that he is both God and man?

A. Yes I can, out of St. John's Gospel. C. i. v. 1. & 14. "*In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God—and the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.*" Again out of the epistle of St. Paul to the Phillippians. C. ii. v. 6, 7. Where he says, that "*Christ when he was in the form of God, thought it*

not robbery to be equal with God ; but he hath debased himself, taking the form of a servant ; being made in the likeness of men, and in habit found as a man."

Q. Is not Christ, as God, a mediator ?

A. No, because as God he is equal to the Father, and cannot be conceived to make any supplication to him.

Q. In what sense are the saints in heaven, mediators between God and man ?

A. In the same manner, as all upon earth are mediators for one another ; by praying for one another ; that is, they are mediators, by way of intercession, not by way of redemption.

Q. Why do catholics shew a particular respect, and bow at the name of Jesus, rather than at any other name of Christ, or God ?

A. All God's names are equally worthy of respect ; but the custom of bowing at the name of Jesus is observed on account of its being particularly given, to signify the work of man's redemption ; and therefore St. Paul says, that every knee is to bow when it is mentioned. Phil. ii. 10.

Q. What signification has the word Christ, and in what manner is it attributed to the second person, in the mystery of the incarnation ?

A. Christ, in the Greek language, signifies anointed. Hence the Messiah, by the ancient prophets is called the Christ, or the anointed.

Q. Why was the Messiah anointed ?

A. From the three fold character he bore, viz. as being a king, prophet, and a priest, who were all according to the ceremonies of the old law, usually anointed with oil, at their consecration and installation.

Q. Was our blessed Redeemer visibly anointed with oil ?

A. No, he was anointed invisibly by grace emblemed by oil. First, by having his human nature united to the divine person, the fountain of grace. Secondly, by having his soul replenished with all sorts of supernatural gifts and graces.

Q. What particular meaning is there, in the ceremony of unction, that it was made use of upon the aforementioned occasions ?

A. The meaning is mystical, and very instructive. Oil has three excellent qualities ; it heals wounds, strengthens

the limbs, and preserves metal from rust: and upon these accounts, is well adapted, to signify those spiritual gifts, which ought to distinguish persons in authority, who are obliged to direct, strengthen, and heal all those who are subject to them.

Q. How is Christ a king, had he any regal power?

A. He had a claim to regal power, being God and king of the whole universe. Again, as man, being the redeemer of all mankind, who were subjects of his spiritual kingdom. A temporal king he was not, his kingdom not being of this world. However, he was of the royal stock of David. Luke i. 32, 33.

Q. How was Christ a prophet?

A. So he is styled by the inspired writers of the old law, and fully answered the character by foretelling many things which happened to the Jewish nation, and to himself, viz. his passion and sufferings, his resurrection, the destroying of Jerusalem, and conversion of heathenish kingdoms. Deut. xviii. 15.

Q. In what does Christ's priesthood consist?

A. He was not a priest according to the old law, which office was propagated by descent in Blood, and executed by offering up beasts, &c. But he was a priest according to the new law, offering himself up as a sacrifice upon the cross; as also a priest, according to the order of Melchizedech, in offering himself at the last supper, under the appearances of bread and wine. Ps. cix. 5.

Q. Are there no priests in the new law, besides Christ? Has he none to succeed him in his priesthood?

A. A God, a religion, a priesthood, and a Sacrifice, are correlatives, and depend upon one another. They are frequently mentioned and asserted in the new law. The manner is this, as to priesthood. Christ was the only priest that offered himself up, as a bloody sacrifice upon the cross, for the redemption of mankind: As to this character, he has no successors. But then as he was a priest, according to the order of Melchizedech, in offering up himself under the forms of bread and wine, in this, he has as many successors as there are priests in the new law, who offer him up in the same manner. But even here, Christ is still the chief high priest, and though others are really priests, they are only ministerially so, both jointly at the same time offering up the same sacrifice; so the sa-

crifice of the cross, and the sacrifice of the mass, are the same sacrifice as to substance, though after a different manner, one being bloody, the other unbloody; and the latter a commemorative sacrifice of the former, as to the manner.

Q. In what manner did Christ complete this great work he came about?

A. First, by appearing as a Redeemer, and paying the full ransom required, according to the strictest demands of justice, merit, and satisfaction. Secondly, as a master, by delivering lessons proper for all stations and circumstances. Thirdly, as a pattern, by practising himself, what he taught others.

Q. Why is the second person's assuming human nature, called the incarnation, and in what manner do you explain this wonderful union?

A. It is called incarnation, from the Latin word *caro*, flesh, not that the union is only with man's flesh, but partly because flesh is a word commonly used in the scriptures for the whole man; and partly to shew God's goodness and humility, who was pleased to join himself to the more ignoble part of man's nature.

Q. Was the second person united both to man's soul and body?

A. Yes; and that in such a manner as to be liable both to grief and trouble of mind, with the defects of the body, as hunger, thirst, cold, pain, &c. nay, even to death; and in general all inconveniencies, excepting ignorance, and sin, with other moral defects, which the divine person was incapable of.

Q. According to the description you give of this mystery, Christ consists of one divine person, having two natures, one divine, and the other human, and no human person to be admitted. Now this is altogether unintelligible.

A. It is entirely a mystery, and above human understanding, as all other mysteries of faith are, wherein we are to captivate our understanding in obedience to faith, and divine revelation.

Q. Which are the effects produced in mankind, by means of the redemption?

A. In general these three; grace, justification, and merit.

Q. What is grace?

A. In general, it is a gift bestowed on a person, without any inducement from the party on whom it is bestowed; and this includes all gifts whatsoever, both natural and supernatural.

Q. What is the difference between natural and supernatural gifts?

A. Natural gifts or graces, are such as are given by God, for man's well-being in this life, viz. man's body, soul, free-will, with all sorts of temporal conveniences. Supernatural gifts are such as immediately conduce towards procuring man's eternal happiness; whereof some are outward; for instance, instruction in the true faith, and practical duties of religion, good example, miracles, &c. Others are internal, as good thoughts, and pious affections, whereby the understanding is enlightened, and the will moved, and excited to perform such actions, as lead us on to future happiness.

Q. What is properly the grace of Christ, or the grace obtained by redemption?

A. It is every inward, or outward means which immediately tend to make man eternally happy, and which are produced only through the merits of Christ.

Q. Is there any difference in the grace which is purchased by our redemption?

A. Yes, some of the differences I have hinted at already, others there are, observable from the following divisions of those supernatural gifts. For instance, there is grace given on account of our neighbour, and grace given on our own account only. The first is called, grace gratis given, (*Gratia gratis data*;) the other, grace that makes us acceptable to God. (*Gratia gratum faciens*.) There is actual grace, and habitual grace; there is sufficient grace and efficacious grace.

Q. What do you mean by grace given, on account of our neighbour? Why is it called gratis given, for is not all grace gratis given?

A. St. Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians, reckons above nine of the first kind, viz. Working of miracles, speaking of languages, curing diseases, prophesying, &c. which were bestowed upon the apostles, and others afterwards in order to facilitate the world's conversion. Now these are called gratis given, because they are sometimes

given to such as want sanctifying grace, which renders them acceptable to God.

Q. What is actual grace, and how distinguished from habitual grace?

A. Actual grace, is a passing motion given by God, disposing the soul for good actions, whereby she may become happy, and working its effect, by enlightening the understanding, and producing pious affections in the will. Habitual grace is an established state of the soul, whereby she is entirely placed in God's favour, and made capable of advancing herself more and more, by subsequent actual grace.

Q. What difference is there between sufficient and efficacious grace, and why so called?

A. We call it sufficient grace, when God does bestow all requisites to enable us to perform good actions and produce supernatural effects, though something intervenes to hinder the said effects. Grace is said to be efficacious, when it infallibly produces its effects, in concurrence with man's free will; which is no ways lessened or taken away by efficacious grace, but still enjoys the liberty of assenting, or dissenting, as the church has defined against Calvin.

Q. Give me the true system of actual grace, as it is maintained in the Catholic church.

A. It requires chiefly these particulars, viz. to make our good actions meritorious, and capable of obtaining salvation, besides the natural efforts of the soul, and outward helps; as instructions, example, &c. It is required, that the mind be illustrated, and the will excited, by certain inward motions of grace. The contrary opinion is condemned by the church, against the Pelagians, who asserted the sufficiency of nature without grace. That the said grace is necessary, not only for carrying on meritorious works, but even to begin them: as the church has defined against the semi-pelagians. That this actual or exciting grace is purely gratuitous, without any consideration of the creature's merits, is decreed against the aforesaid heretics.

Q. Can nature of herself, without the grace aforesaid, arrive at the knowledge of truth, either natural or supernatural? Can nature alone perform any good action,

D

overcome temptations, love God, and keep all his commandments, avoid venial sins, and persevere in goodness to the end.

A. The doctrine of the Catholic church is this; certain natural truths may be known by man, by the light of reason alone, without the special assistance of grace: but grace is required to know supernatural, or revealed truths, both speculative and practical, for faith is a special gift of God. As for good works, it is the general opinion of divines, that nature without grace can perform several works that are morally good, but not profitable towards obtaining future happiness; because several circumstances are wanting to make them serviceable in that way. Hence those who presume to teach, that infidels, &c. are incapable of performing any action that is morally good, are in danger of incurring the censure of that condemned proposition, every action of a sinner is sinful: which is prescribed in Hus, Michael Bains, and Calvin. As to temptations, slight ones may be overcome without grace, but not great and frequent ones; and neither small nor great, without grace, can be overcome, so as to dispose persons thereby for a supernatural reward: much less, morally speaking, can God be loved above all things, and the commandments kept by nature only, without the special assistance of God's grace; neither can a person, without the said special grace, avoid all venial sin or persevere to the end.

Q. What are the properties of habitual grace.

A. It is inherent in the soul, and an habitual state, whereby a person lives in God's favour, even when he ceases to act, as it appears in infants after they are baptized, though incapable of acting by exciting grace; yet it is not so permanent a state, but it may be lost by subsequent offences, the just often falling both from faith and grace. Hence habitual grace being inherent in the soul, a person becomes by it intrinsically just, and not only by the imputation of God's extrinsical justice, so that God does not only pardon his sin, by not imputing it, but inwardly purifies his soul from sin, by inherent grace. In the next place, habitual grace puts a person in a condition of meriting properly; that is, deserving both more grace, and internal reward; (*De Condigno.*) for by the works proceeding from it, he applies Christ's merits, which works are the

immediate effects of God's grace. These are the chief articles of our faith, concerning habitual grace defined in the council of Trent.

Q. What is justification, and how performed?

A. In general it is an infusion, and reception of habitual grace; which is common to angels, to our first parents in the state of innocence, and to the blessed Virgin Mary; who were just without remission of sin. But as it regards sinners, it is a translation of a person from the state of sin to the state of grace: so that it includes infusion of grace, and remission of sin.

Q. What dispositions are required for a person to be justified before God?

A. These six following, according to the doctrine delivered in the council of Trent, viz. first, faith. 2dly, fear. 3dly, hope. 4thly, the love of God. 5thly, a detestation of sin. 6thly, a purpose of offending no more, and keeping God's commandments.

Q. Why is faith required? why does the scripture ascribe justification to faith; does faith always justify?

A. St. Paul assures us, that it is impossible to please God without faith. Heb. xi. 6. The scripture ascribes justification, first to faith, because it is the foundation on which justification is built. And again, because faith in the language of the scripture, often includes all the speculative, and practical duties of the gospel, which concur to man's justification. But faith alone, which is only the assent we give to revealed truths, cannot justify, as St. James assures us; because the greatest sinners, are capable of such a faith. St. James ii. 24.

Q. But is there not another kind of faith, viz. a belief and confidence that our sins are forgiven us, by the merits of Christ, and that thereby we are of the number of the elect?

A. This cannot be called faith, but a vain presumption, if we pretend to be infallibly certain of our justification in particular; or that we are of the number of the elect: and in case we had such a faith, it could not justify us, as St. Paul and St. James declare, without the concurrence of charity and good works. 1 Cor. xiii. 2, 3. St. James ii. 24.

Q. What sort of fear is required in justification? methinks fear is rather an obstacle than a disposition, fear being opposite to love.

A. The fear of God and his punishments is every where

recommended in the holy Scriptures, and proceeds from an impulse of actual grace; and moreover, it is a disposition towards coming into God's favour, and the beginning of love. Hence arises the other dispositions, viz. hope of salvation through Christ's merits; the love of God, as the fountain of justice; the detestation of sin, and the purpose of amendment. Yet these dispositions are not required in infants, who are justified otherwise, by the infusion of grace, and incapable of preparing themselves by acts.

Q. What is merit?

A. Merit in general is a work that one way or other deserves a reward, either rigorously, according to its intrinsic value, or by virtue of a promise, or out of a kind of decency. Christ merited our redemption in the first manner; good works of just men produced by actual grace merit heaven in the second manner, and the good works of sinners, without habitual grace, but with the assistance of actual grace, may be said to merit some spiritual reward in the third manner. The two first are called merit properly; (*De Condigno.*) the last is called merit improperly. *De Congruo.* Yet, all our merit proceeding from Christ's merits, being God's pure gift, and only applying his merits, the whole body of our good actions are ascribed to him. From hence commonly five things are required in merit properly. *De Condigno.* First, that it be good in itself, and all its circumstances. Secondly, that a person be in the state of habitual grace. Thirdly, he is to be upon earth, because there can be neither merit or demerit either in heaven, hell, or purgatory; the work of salvation and damnation being entirely completed. Fourthly, that it be free. Fifthly, that there be a promise of reward from Almighty God for such works.

Q. What conditions are required to merit improperly? *De Congruo.*

A. Neither the state of grace, nor any compact, or promise of reward; all that is required is, that the action be good, and proceed from actual grace; for it is congruous, and seems agreeable to the infinite goodness of God, that such works, even of a sinner, should one way or other be considered, in order to dispose him towards happiness.

Q. It remains now that you say something of the following words of the second article, viz. His only Son our Lord. In what sense is Christ the son of God, and how his only son?

A. Christ is the natural son of God, by virtue of his eternal generation. And again he is the only son of God upon the same account. However, God has more sons than one by adoption, viz. all men that are in the state of grace, whom he makes choice of as heirs to his kingdom.

Q. What errors are prescribed by this article?

A. Several, the chief whereof are, first, that of the Arians, who affirmed, that the second person of the blessed Trinity was not equal to the Father; had not the same nature or essence; that there was a time when he was not, that he was created, &c. Secondly, the Eutychians are condemned, who affirmed Christ had not two distinct natures: they were condemned in the general council of Chalcedon, in the year 451. Thirdly, the Nestorians are condemned who affirmed the union of the two natures in Christ, was not really physical and hypostatical in the same person, but only moral and denominative, and by consequence, that in Christ there were really two persons, divine and human; and that the Virgin Mary was not really the mother of God. They were condemned in the general council of Ephesus, in the year 431. Fourthly, another error of the Arians, (which was condemned in the council of Sardica, in the year 347) was, that Christ was only the adopted, and not the natural son of God, which followed from their capital error, that he was only a creature. Now adoption is assuming a foreign person to a right of inheritance, which cannot be ascribed to Christ, whose person was divine. By the same rule, Felix and Elipandus are convinced of an error; they maintained that Christ as man, was the adopted son of God, which must not be allowed, because adoption falls upon the person. From the whole, it appears that two nativities or generations are to be conceived in Christ; one eternal, whereby he proceeds from the Father, the other temporal, whereby he was born of the mother; and by this means he is God's only son, and she the mother both of God and man.

Q. Now give us the sense of the last words of this article, our Lord.

A. He is our Lord, first by the title of his divine person and nature: and again, he is our Lord as man, because he is our Redeemer, and purchased us with the price of his most precious blood.

THE THIRD ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the third article ?

A. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

Q. In what manner did the blessed Virgin Mary conceive ?

A. Not by the help of man, but by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who formed Christ's body out of hers, and furnished it with a human soul.

Q. How was this article opposed by the heretics of the primitive ages ?

A. By the Manicheans, who contended that Christ's body was not real, but had only the appearance of human flesh, contrary to the first chapter of St. John, ver. 14, where he says, The word was made flesh; by the Appollinarists, who contended, that Christ's flesh was created from eternity; contrary to St. Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, where it is said, he was made from a woman in the plenitude of time. Chap. iv. ver. 4. By Valentin and Appelles, who attributed to him a body from heaven, and an aërial body, which passed through the blessed Virgin, as it were through a channel, contrary to the epistles of St. Paul to the Hebrews and Romans, where Christ is said to be from the seed of Abraham and David. Heb. ii. 16. Rom. i. 3. By the Monothelites, who maintained that Christ had only one will; contrary to the 22d chap. of St. Luke, ver. 42, where he says, not my will but thine be done.

Q. Why is the conception attributed particularly to the Holy Ghost; did not all three persons of the blessed Trinity concur ?

A. Yes they all concurred in that wonderful work as they do in all other outward performances. But the conception is particularly attributed to the Holy Ghost for several reasons. First, because it was a work of goodness and love, and the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the mutual love of the father and the son, so works of that kind are ascribed to him. Secondly, because it was a work of grace, without any merits of man, and the Holy Ghost being stiled the fountain of grace, therefore this extraordinary work of grace is attributed to him. I omit several other congruities.

Q. What particularities are there in Christ's conception, to distinguish it from that of the rest of mankind?

A. Several very remarkable and miraculous, viz. First, the conception was without the help of man. Secondly, the body was formed, and perfected in an instant, and immediately inspired with a soul. Thirdly, at the same instant the divine person was united both to the body and soul. Fourthly, from the same instant, the soul was endowed with a perfect use of reason. Fifthly, at the same instant the soul was made happy by the beatifical vision. Sixthly, the soul was replenished with all perfections, natural and supernatural, that were not inconsistent with the qualifications above recited, viz. He was without servile fear, but not without reverential fear; he could not be said to have either faith or hope; and though his body was by right impassible, yet it was capable of suffering, by a miraculous suspension of the rays of beatitude.

Q. If Christ's body was formed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, why is not Christ called his son?

A. Because a son is only produced by generation, which has nothing like it in the incarnation.

Q. How can the Virgin Mary be stiled the mother of God, as being only the mother of Christ? The second person has a father, but not a mother.

A. She is so stiled by St. Elizabeth, as we read in the 1st chapter of St. Luke, ver. 43- Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? Again, she is the mother of God, as being the mother of Christ; who is truly God. And Nestorius was condemned in the Council of Ephesus, for denying that she was the mother of God.

Q. Was the Virgin Mary always a virgin?

A. Yes, both before, at, and after she had conceived and brought forth the son of God.

Q. How before?

A. So it was foretold by the prophets in several places. Isa. vi. 14. Mat. ii. 23.

Q. How at her conception?

A. Because, according to St. Luke she did not conceive by the help of man, but by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Luke i. 31, 35.

Q. How after her conception? Was not St. Joseph

her husband? Besides the gospel makes mention of the brethren of Christ.

A. By a constant tradition, the doctrine of all the fathers, and the decency of the thing itself, she never knew man, either before or after. Hence Helvetius and Jovinian were condemned by the Church, for saying that she had children afterwards by St. Joseph; indeed she was married to St. Joseph, but this was to screen her from the law, which stoned an adulteress, of which St. Joseph might have justly suspected her, and even prosecuted her as being conscious he had not known her, had he not being informed of the mystery. Hence, St. Jerome is of opinion, that she had made a vow of virginity with the consent of her husband. As to those who were called Christ's brethren, they were only kinsmen, called brethren, according to the Jewish custom.

Q. For what end did God take human flesh? Could the world be redeemed by no other means?

A. The second person of the blessed Trinity became man for the abolishing of sin, both original and actual. And though this method was not absolutely necessary, yet it was necessary to comply with the demands of strict justice, where the satisfaction ought to be equal to the offence, which was done superabundantly in this mystery, where the actions of Christ were infinitely meritorious and satisfactory, and the offence only respectively infinite, as being against an infinite goodness.

THE FOURTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the fourth article?

A. Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried.

Q. How was Christ capable of suffering? as God it was impossible: again, his union with the divine person, as also the state of beatitude he enjoyed from the beginning excluded suffering.

A. As the union of the divine and human nature was a miraculous work, so it was attended with many other supernatural circumstances; among which one was, the suspension of the properties of a glorified body, whilst Christ was upon earth. By this means he was in a capacity of

suffering, both in body and soul, and obnoxious to all the infirmities of human nature, excepting sin and ignorance, viz. grief, fear, heat, cold, hunger, thirst, and even death, which last circumstance is the most inconsistent with a glorified body, had not a miracle interposed.

Q. Why is the name of Pontius Pilate inserted in the creed?

A. Though it may seem not to be a material circumstance, yet he is taken notice of, chiefly upon two accounts. First, by fixing the date of Christ's suffering, the truth of the history was confirmed, and might be compared with the public records of the Roman Empire, under which Pontius Pilate then governed Judea. Secondly, to signify that the predictions were fulfilled, whereby it had been frequently foretold, that Christ should suffer both from Jews and Gentiles.

Q. Why is particular mention made of the manner of Christ's death by crucifixion?

A. This was specified to shew that the prophecies were fulfilled by his dying that death, which was not only foretold, but the several instruments, &c. were mentioned, which were employed on that occasion. Again, to put us in mind of Christ's great humility and love for mankind, in suffering a death which was ignominious, both among the Jews and Gentiles, and inflicted upon none but notorious malefactors: such a death was a folly to the Gentiles, and a scandal to the Jews.

Q. What occasion is there to specify Christ's death, after his crucifixion, or that he was buried? We may reasonably suppose that he died and was buried from his being crucified. Again, how could he die, and what difference is there between his death and that of the rest of mankind?

A. It was requisite to specify he was dead against those who held his crucifixion was only in appearance, and by consequence, that Christ did not really die, which was an error of some primitive heretics; and also of the Manicheans, contrary to all the four evangelists, who agree that he gave up the Ghost. Mat. xxvii. 50. Mark xv. 37. Luke xxiii. 46. John xix. 30. As to his burial, that was also a circumstance proper to be inserted, to be a proof of his resurrection, which might have been contested with more shew of truth, had not his body been laid in the grave.

Now, how Christ could die, being God, it must be observed that death did not effect his divinity, but only his humanity. For what is death? It is a separation of the soul from the body, and in this manner Christ was subject to death, as he was to the other infirmities of man's nature; yet at the same time Christ was immortal, by the hypostatical union, and it was a miraculous condescension, which made him capable of dying, and of being subject to the other infirmities: the difference on his side was, his death was miraculous and voluntary, though in obedience to his father's will and precept. John x. 17, 18. And again, his body was not liable to corruption, as other bodies are, according to that of the psalmist, "thou wilt not suffer thy holy one to see corruption." Psalm xv. 10.

Q. Was the divine person, during the three days of the body and soul's separation, still united to them both?

A. Yes, though the soul descended into the lower parts of the earth, the body still remaining in the grave.

Q. Which are the principal benefits derived from Christ's death?

A. He died for all mankind, and not only for the predestinate, as Calvin erroneously taught, and the Jansenists assert, who esteem it semi-pelagianism to say that Christ died for all mankind. 2 Cor. ver. 15. Whereas St. Paul says, "that Christ died for all," and in another place he says, "that Christ gave himself a redemption for all." 1 Tim. ii. 6. At the same time though Christ died, merited, and satisfied for the sins of all mankind, all are not partakers of those favours, unless they apply them by faith, the sacraments, and good works, which are the channels through which they are conveyed. Again, every action of Christ, from the beginning, was infinitely meritorious, but the whole work of man's redemption was consummated by his death. Lastly, it was by his death and upon the view of his merits, that all in the law of nature and law of Moses were justified, and that the gates of heaven were first opened to them.

THE FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the fifth article?

A. He descended into hell, the third day he arose again from the dead?

Q. What signification has the word hell in the holy scriptures?

A. The word in the original Hebrew is *sheol*, that is a place below. The Latin word is *infern*.

Q. Does the scripture use that word only for one particular place, or are there several places, or states, distinguished by that appellation?

A. There are several places, or states, distinguished by it. First, the place or state of the damned, sometimes called Gehenna, the abyss, and properly hell, as being the lowest and remotest place from heaven. Secondly, death, or the state of man's soul after it is separated from the body. Thirdly, the state of those persons who died in God's favour, in the law of nature, and law of Moses: before Christ appeared to release them and introduce them into heaven: this place is distinguished by the name of Abraham's bosom, or *Limbus Patrum*. St. Luke xvi. 22. Fourthly, a state of purgation; where the souls of those are detained, who have died in the guilt of lesser or venial offences, or not sufficiently satisfied for former mortal sins, for which they are punished in that state which is therefore called purgatory.

Q. Now you are to tell me the meaning of the word hell, as it stands in the Creed: and which of the aforesaid places Christ descended into, whether into all, or only some?

A. In the first place, by hell, cannot be understood the place of the damned, the souls there being out of the reach of redemption, which was the design of Christ's descending: much less did Christ suffer the pains of the damned, as Calvin impiously maintains. Again, hell cannot signify the grave, or state of death; because his soul did not remain in the grave: neither can it be understood of the state of death, which is expressed in the former article, where it is said he was dead and buried. The true meaning of the word hell therefore is, that Christ descended into that place, where the souls of the just were preserved until he released them, called *Limbus Patrum* or Abraham's Bosom. And in this exposition all the fathers agree, and prove it from the Scriptures; particularly from the prophecy of Zachary, where he says, "By the blood of the Testament, thou hast sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit. Chapter ix. 11. From the epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians. iv. 8, 9. Where he says, Christ ascending on

high, hath led captivity captive ; he gave gifts to men : and that he ascended : what is it but because he descended first into the lower parts of the earth ? See also, Col. ii. 15.

Q. Did Christ descend into purgatory, and release the souls there from their punishment ?

A. There is nothing clearly expressed, either in the Scriptures or Fathers, as to this point, so as to make it an article of faith : but that he did descend thither and release either all or some, is very probable from the first of St. Peter, iii. 19, 20. Where we read, that Christ being dead came in spirit, and preached to them also that were in prison, who had been incredulous in the days of Noah, when the ark was building. And again, out of the acts of the Apostles, (chap. ii. 24.) where it is said, God raised him up, loosing the sorrows of hell. Besides it is conformable to the goodness of God, and the great design of man's redemption ; and several strong conjectures favour this opinion.

Q. You say Christ descended : but how is this to be understood ? Did he descend as to his divinity, as to his body, or as to his soul ?

A. Christ as God, can neither be said properly to ascend, or descend ; because he is actually every where at all times : his body remained in the sepulchre till the third day, and by consequence, that did not descend with him : what descended therefore was, his soul in conjunction with the divine person, from which it was inseparable.

Q. Why did our Saviour rise again ? In what manner, and how upon the third day, and what proofs are there that his followers have not imposed upon the world by that article ?

A. Christ's resurrection was the re-uniting of his body and soul, and shewing himself again. Now there were several reasons why this should be. First, to fulfil the predictions, whereby both the ancient prophets, and he himself had declared that he would rise again, specifying three days time : which is not to be understood of three complete days, but only the parts of three days ; for dying on Friday, he rose again on Sunday. Mark xiv. 58. Secondly, had he not risen, and appeared again, the Jews might have taken an occasion from thence, to have questioned both his power and doctrine, and looked upon the whole business of his life as artifice and contrivance. Hence, St. Paul tells us, his resurrection confirmed all he had said and done, and ought

to be regarded as the main and fundamental point of the christian religion. Thirdly, he rose again, to confirm the doctrine of the general resurrection, which was a truth denied by the sect of Jews called Sadducees, who also denied the immortality of the soul. To these we may add, that raising himself from the dead, was a proof of his divinity: for though others have been raised from the dead, yet he alone raised himself.

Q. But now as to the truth of the fact, what proofs can you produce, that his disciples did not impose upon the world? The Jews suspected some such fraud, and therefore they placed guards at his sepulchre, lest they should steal his body, and so spread about a report, that he was risen again.

A. No fact could be better attested. Ten apparitions are mentioned in the Scriptures, when sometimes more, sometimes less were present, and at one apparition above five hundred persons were present; and we may very well suppose, that during the forty days between his resurrection and ascension, he frequently conversed with his disciples; and the scripture tells us positively he did.

Q. The Jews look upon these proofs as insufficient. They allege, that the guards might be asleep or bribed, while his body was conveyed away. Besides, (say our modern unbelievers) the witnesses of these apparitions were all party men. Why did he not appear to the chiefs of the synagogue, and shew himself publicly in the temple?

A. The Jews neither then, nor ever since, could produce any arguments, either that the guards were asleep, or corrupted by bribery to conceal the fact. They were reproached by the apostles for forging this report, without any reply. Besides it is not improbable but that several great persons, not of the party, might be present at some of these apparitions, as several thousands were immediately after converted, upon the truth of the fact being asserted: nor could the Jews have any grounds to suspect forgery, when they saw the apostles work so many miracles, expressly in proof of his resurrection. As to the queries, why did he not appear to the chief of the synagogue, and publicly in the temple? Such arguments would have prevailed very little with a people hardened in wickedness, who would not be convinced by so many undeniable miracles, which he had wrought for three years together among

E

them, and were so obstinate that when they could not deny the fact, they attributed the miracles he wrought to his corresponding with the devil. What likelihood was there, that those who would not believe their own senses, upon so many other occasions, would be convinced by apparitions, which might be subject to the same cavilling. And if we may judge of the true reason why the chiefs of the synagogue were not favoured with such apparitions, it was because they did not deserve the favour; and had it been granted, they were so exasperated, blind, and obstinate, that it would have been of no use to them, only to have aggravated their crimes.

THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the sixth article?

A. He ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

Q. When did he ascend into heaven?

A. Forty days after his resurrection.

Q. How was he employed during those forty days?

A. He instructed his apostles and his disciples, in several matters belonging to the church he had established; particularly by frequent apparitions, he confirmed the truth of his resurrection. He explained to them the nature of the sacraments, with the ceremonies to be used, as also what was required in the government of his church, relating to power and church discipline.

Q. What grounds have you to believe such matters were the subject of his conversation?

A. Very good grounds. The Scripture tells us in the Acts of the Apostles, that he was speaking of the kingdom of God. Chapter 1. ver. 3. It was the part of a law-maker, to speak of such matters. Hence, the Fathers generally agree, that several customs and practices observed in the church, were ordered by him at that time, whereof they mention several particulars only known by tradition, and no where expressed in the scriptures.

Q. Explain the manner of his ascension: did he ascend as to his divinity, or only as to his soul and body; and why did he ascend?

A. As to his divinity, God being a pure spirit, and present every where by his immensity, he was incapable of

local motion, and by consequence, could neither properly ascend or descend. What is meant therefore is, that his body and soul ascended visibly in the sight of the apostles, to heaven, though they were both before in a state of bliss, but imperceptible to human eyes. Acts i. 9. Again, it is said, he ascended, that is by virtue of his own power, and was not carried to heaven, as Elias was by outward help, which was a proof of his being God. He ascended into heaven, not only to open the gates for himself but for his followers; not only to take possession of his own inheritance, but also to make us joint heirs with him; not for his own happiness alone, but that we may for ever (if we please) be happy with him. He went to take care of our eternal interest; and so he told his apostles. "I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am there you also may be." John xiv. 2, 3. He ascended in order to draw our hearts after him, and that our thoughts, our wishes, and desires, may be always aiming higher than this miserable world, and so aspiring towards him in heaven. Thus says St. Paul, "our conversation is in heaven." Phil. iii. 20

Q. Why is he said to sit, and why at the right hand? Why are the words of Father and Almighty made use of on this occasion?

A. Sitting is a posture signifying ease, honour, and the stability of the state of supreme glory and sovereign power, he was placed in; so that we do not understand that Christ is always in a sitting posture. The right-hand, though only metaphorically applied to God, (for we do not imagine that God has any hands or feet, he being a pure spirit, without any body at all) denotes preference and power, and that Christ as man excelled all created beings, and was a powerful intercessor. Lastly, the words Father and Almighty insinuate, that those who apply themselves to him, might expect to be treated in the same manner as a tender parent treats his child, and have the comfort of being succoured by a power which could not be withstood.

THE SEVENTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the seventh article?

A. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

Q. What difference do you observe between the first, and this latter coming of our Saviour?

A. At his first coming, he appeared in quality of a Redeemer, shewing to mankind continual instances of mercy, and in his behaviour conformed himself, as if he had been only a common person, deprived of all those advantages, which otherwise were due to his character. At his second coming he will appear as a judge, pronouncing sentence to the utmost rigour of justice, and clothed with all the outward marks of authority and majesty.

Q. Are not all mankind judged at their death? What occasion is there for a second and general judgment?

A. Yes they are, but a second and general judgment is requisite upon several accounts. First, to justify before the whole world, the conduct of divine providence, in regard of the different treatment of the just and the wicked, the one being permitted to live under tribulation, whilst the other flourished and enjoyed their ease; for then it will be made appear by the difference of their fate, that the just were not deserted by Almighty God, seeing that they are considered with an eternal reward, for their past sufferings.

A second reason why a general judgment is appointed, is, to do public justice to the injured part of mankind, who suffered in their reputation, or otherwise; for all their fraudulent dealings, rash censures, sinister intentions, and other insincere practices, will be laid open, and every man appear in his true colours, to the comfort of the injured, and confusion of the oppressor. A third reason for this general judgment is, that whereas at a person's decease, sentence was only pronounced upon the soul, at the general judgment the soul and body being re-united, it will pass upon the whole man; that as they had mutually concurred in good and bad actions, they may receive a sentence suitable to their behaviour in both respects.

Q. What is meant by the quick and the dead? Are those that are living at the approach of the general judgment to appear alive before the judge?

A. By the quick and the dead, we understand all mankind, that ever inhabited the earth, from the creation down, of all nations and states, both infidels, Jews, Turks, heretics, and true believers, all who lived under the law of nature, the old law, and the law of grace. And as for those

persons who are alive upon the approach of the last day, (Ps. xcvi. 3.) it is the most probable opinion they will all be consumed by fire, when the world shall perish, by a general conflagration, and immediately make their appearance before the judgment seat.

Q. But then as to the time, when this general judgment will happen, and the place where it will be executed, how shall we come to know these matters ?

A. The time when, is a secret locked up in the breast of the Almighty. Matt. xxiv. 36. And for the same reason, that we are not made acquainted with the time of our death, viz. that being always prepared we may not be surprised, and called to an account, when we are unprovided to give it; which appears to be a rational way of proceeding; seeing that if the time was revealed persons would be apt to defer their repentance, until that hour approached, as they now commonly do, though uncertain that they should be allowed a moment; and would be much more inclined to defer it, in case they had any certainty of the time when death would happen. However, as sickness, and age, give persons notice of approaching death, so there will be certain visible tokens, forerunners of the general judgment: besides universal wars, plagues, and famines, anti-christ will make his appearance, who by persecution, and false miracles, will for three years exercise a tyrannical power over the world, and draw unto his party a great part of mankind; but at last will be baffled by Enoch and Elias, who are still reserved to return again upon the earth, for that purpose. As the day of judgment approaches nearer, there will be visible tokens in the heavens, earth, and seas, which will strike a terror into all mankind, and make them wither and pine away with fear.

Q. Methinks these visible admonitions will be capable of working men up to repentance, and make them prepare themselves against that great day ?

A. Much to the contrary: our blessed Saviour tells us, they will be in a state of insensibility, as mankind was, when Noah foretold the destruction of the world at the general deluge; for though he frequently admonished them of it, for a hundred years together, they still continued in their wickedness, until the judgment fell upon them.

Q. Can you give me any information as to the place, or any other circumstance? Will the trial be general or par-

ticular, and what have sinners to apprehend upon the occasion?

A. We are informed in the scriptures, that the place will be the valley of Josaphet, near Jerusalem, in the sight of mount Calvary. Joel iii. 2. So that the Son of God will exercise the severity of his justice, where he shewed such tokens of his mercy; a sad remembrance to the Jews, who put him to death, and to wicked christians, who crucified him by their scandalous lives. Whether the trial will be general or particular, with such like circumstances, is only known to God. Thus much we may be certain of, that though it may be general, and pass over in an instant, yet it will effect every one in particular, as much as if he were the only person that was called to the bar. Lastly, as to the apprehensions sinners will lie under upon the occasion, there are three circumstances which will throw them into the utmost confusion, viz. The qualities of the judge, who cannot be imposed on by bribes, nor inclined, through partiality, to favour: the nature of the evidence, which will be a man's own conscience, with the corroborating proofs of the devil, and all those he has injured, will appear against him: the severity of the scrutiny, which will take in all our thoughts, desires, wishes, affections, words, and works, though never so secret; the intention, motive, and circumstances of them; the use of our will, memory, and understanding; all the faculties of both body and soul: the use of God's holy graces; the neglect of doing good, and mispent time: and not only all our own sins, but others, which we have any ways occasioned: for our Saviour assures us, "That nothing is covered that shall not be revealed, nor hid that shall not be known." Matt. x. 26.

Q. Are there any more circumstances to be considered in this general judgment? Will Christ sit to judge, as God, or as man? What kind of punishment will the wicked be condemned to? Will their punishment be everlasting, or have an end, or at least be subject to a mitigation? Will the fire spoken of in scripture really affect the soul, or is it only a metaphorical expression, to signify the sharpness of pain?

A. All the three divine persons will sit in judgment, which is attributed to the Son, because it is a work of wisdom; at the same time, Christ as man, will hear and give sentence, according to St. John, chap. v. 27, "The

Father hath given him power to do judgment because he is the son of man." As to the punishment, fire is commonly expressed, which we are to understand literally and properly; but in what manner it will affect the soul, is not declared. This punishment will have no end, no intermission, as Origen erroneously taught.

Q. How shall the just and reprobate be placed, and what shall be the sentence of the just, and that of the wicked?

A. The just shall be placed on the right, and the reprobate on the left-hand of the judge. The judge will say to the just, "Come ye blessed of my Father possess you the kingdom prepared for you; for I was hungry, and you gave me to eat, I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink," &c. Matt. xxv. 34, 35. How joyful this sentence will be to them, all the tongues of men and angels are not able to express: nor is it easier to describe the envy, malice and despairing rage of those on the left hand; when having heard this sentence, they begin to hear the thunder of their own. "Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels; for I was hungry, and you gave me not to eat, I was thirsty, and you gave me not to drink, &c. Matt. xxv. 41, 42. To depart from God, by losing him and all that's good; never to see God's face, nor ever to enjoy his favour, this is that hell of hells, which the divines call pain of loss. But then not only to lose all good, but also to be sunk for ever into the abyss of everlasting evils, without any hope of comfort, is that pain of sense, which even the worst of sinners cannot firmly believe without trembling.

THE EIGHTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the eighth article?

A. I believe in the Holy Ghost.

Q. What do you profess in this article?

A. As the former articles contained what we are to believe concerning the first two persons of the blessed Trinity, this regards the third person, which in sum is, that the Holy Ghost is consubstantial to the Father and the Son, and therefore true God, that he proceeds from them both, and is equal in all things to them: this is proved first from the Creed itself, where the form of belief is expressed the same

way, I believe in the Holy Ghost, as well as in the Father, and in the Son. Secondly, from St. Peter's words to Ananias. Acts v. 3, 4. "Why hath Satan tempted thy heart that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied to men, but to God." Here you see the Holy Ghost is called God. Thirdly, from St. John, in his first epistle, chapter v. ver. 7, where he says, "There are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." Fourthly, from the form of baptism, where the Holy Ghost is equally mentioned with the Father and the Son, which ought not to be, if he was not God. Again from St. Paul, 2 Cor. xiii. 13, where he thus concludes his epistle: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communication of the Holy Ghost be with you all." From hence we prove the Holy Ghost to have the same divine nature with the Father and the Son; as also to be a different person from them both: So that we ought to glorify, and worship him equally with the Father and the Son, as the last end and object of all our affections. Hence, the Macedonian heresy condemned by the church, which denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Anno. 381.

Q. The scriptures, it is true, tells us that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, but makes no mention of his proceeding from the Son?

A. Though one is not so expressly mentioned in the scriptures as the other, yet it is sufficiently asserted; particularly where Christ says, in the 15th chapter of St. John, ver. 26, "The Paraclete whom I shall send you from the Father, he shall give testimony of me."

Q. What is the proper signification of the word Ghost?

A. In our ancient language it is the same as Spirit.

Q. What names are commonly given to the Holy Ghost in the scriptures?

A. He is called the Paraclete, that is, the Comforter, the Advocate, the Finger of God, Goodness, the Gift, &c. Which appellations signify the offices and effects that are ascribed to him.

Q. What are the gifts proceeding from the Holy Ghost?

A. These seven, enumerated in the eleventh chapter of the prophet Isaiah, ver. 2. First, wisdom, which teaches us to direct our lives and actions to God's honour, and the salvation of our souls. Secondly, understanding, which

makes our faith lively, enabling us to penetrate the highest mysteries. Thirdly, counsel, which discovers the snares of the devil. Fourth, fortitude, which overcomes the difficulty of temptations, and enables us to undergo all dangers for God's sake. Fifthly, knowledge, by which we know and understand the will of God. Sixthly, piety, by which we are zealous in doing his will. Seventhly, the fear of God, which curbs us from sin, and makes us obedient to his law.

Q. Which do you call the fruits of the Holy Ghost ?

A. St. Paul reckons these twelve. First, charity, which fills us with the love of God, and our neighbour. Second, joy, which enables us to serve God with cheerfulness. Third, peace, which keeps us unmoved in our minds, amidst the storms and tempests of the world. Fourth, patience, which enables us to suffer all adversities for the love of God. Fifth, longanimity, which is an untired confidence of mind, in expecting the good things of the life to come. Sixth, goodness, which makes us hurt no man, and do good to all. Seventh, benignity, which causes a certain sweetness in our conversation and manners, so as to profit and advance others in virtue thereby. Eighth, mildness, which allays in us all the motions of passion and anger. Ninth, fidelity, which makes us punctual observers of our covenants and promises. Tenth, modesty, which observes a fitting mean in all our outward actions. Eleventh, continency, which makes us not only temperate in meat and drink, but in all other sensible delights. Twelfth, chastity, which keeps a pure soul in a pure body.

Q. In what manner is the Holy Ghost given ?

A. Two ways, visibly and invisibly. He was both ways given to the apostles; invisibly, when after the resurrection Christ breathed upon them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." John xx. 22. Visibly, ten days after his ascension, when he sent them to preach, and the Holy Ghost appeared over them in fiery tongues. Again, he is given invisibly in man's justification, when grace is bestowed; and in the sacrament of confirmation.

Q. Under what appearances has the Holy Ghost shewn himself to mankind ?

A. Chiefly two, in the shape of a dove, when our Saviour was baptized by St. John the Baptist: and in fiery tongues, at his descending on the apostles at Pentecost.

Q. What was meant by his appearing under these representations?

A. By the dove, was signified innocence, and purity. The fiery tongues had several significations; the tongues imported the gift of languages; the fire signified zeal; and they appeared split, that they might represent the variety of gifts that were bestowed, viz. working miracles, prophesying, &c.

Q. Did these visible marks always attend the giving of the Holy Ghost?

A. In the first age, and during the apostles' time they continued, as requisite to the first establishment of the gospel, but ceased by degrees.

Q. You say the Holy Ghost appeared in the figure of a dove; and I suppose this is the reason why he is still represented by pictures and images under that form. Can a pure spirit and immortal being be truly expressed by such like representations?

A. You judge right as to the ground and rise of that custom, but seem not to understand the true meaning of it. We pretend not to express the true likeness of a spirit, much less of an infinite spiritual substance. The design is only to assist the memory, preserve the remembrance of the mystery, and receive instruction, from what is signified by such outward tokens.

Q. If this be all you mean, I see no reason why the Father and the Son, and even the whole Trinity, may not either separately, or conjunctively, be represented in the same manner, either by painting or carving; though indeed the custom is more authorised, by representing the second person under the figure of a man, because he took human flesh upon him; whereas the other persons did not?

A. You still talk coherently, there being as much for the one, as for the other; neither is the circumstance you mention of the second person only being united to a human body, any objection against representing the other persons by visible tokens. For as we do not pretend to express Christ's divinity by pictures, or images, but only his body; so neither do we intend to represent the divinity of the other persons, by any figure or image, but only the outward shape of the thing, under which they made their appearance.

Q. This argument may hold good as to the persons se-

parately considered. The first person may be represented as an old man, as he appeared to Daniel: The second, as a man, whose nature he assumed; and the Holy Ghost as a dove, for the same reason. But you pretend besides to make pictures and images representing the Trinity, which was never represented by an outward appearance.

A. This difficulty is easily removed, by the same rule. And in the first place, it is far from truth that we have no representation of the Trinity; it is frequently represented both by facts and words in the holy scriptures: I shall only mention the three men who appeared to Abraham, whom he addressed as if they were but one; and these words in the first epistle of St. John, chapter v. ver. 7, "These three are one." Is not this a sufficient ground to form an image, representing one and three? What are words, but images representing to the ear, what pictures do to the eye; and if it be lawful to make use of the words, to signify the mystery of the Trinity, why may not a picture be drawn to the same purpose? Words and pictures can neither express the nature of the thing, but still they are serviceable to put us in mind, and keep up the memory of the mystery.

THE NINTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the ninth article?

A. The holy Catholic church, the communion of saints.

Q. What is the signification of the word church?

A. According to its etymology in the Greek, it is a congregation, or assembly of people, called together, upon any account whatever, and is sometimes taken for the place where they meet.

Q. It is not our present purpose to take notice of what signification it bears among secular, and profane authors, but what sense it carries in the scriptures, and ecclesiastical writers?

A. In the scriptures it has sometimes a limited, other times a more extensive signification: one, while it signifies the society of saints and angels: another, while a society of the faithful on earth: sometimes the congregation of the wicked; and again that of the elect, or predestinated only. Hence, divines have distinguished the church into triumph-

ant in heaven, and militant upon earth : to which they add the suffering church in purgatory.

Q. I easily conceive that the name of church may be given to all these congregations, as the general signification of the word imports. But did not Christ establish a particular congregation on earth ; pray what do you call that ?

A. The church Christ established on earth, was a congregation of people baptised, and united together, by believing and professing the same faith he had taught ; and governed by lawful pastors and bishops subordinate to his vicar upon earth, as he had appointed.

Q. Is it suitable to the divine wisdom, that in establishing a community of such, a regulation should be observed to prevent the inconveniencies of errors in belief, and disobedience in practical duties ; yet we find in the scripture mention made of several churches even of true believers ; as the churches of Jerusalem, Smyrna, Athens, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, &c. Is the church founded by Christ divided into several bodies ?

A. These different appellations are not designed to signify their different societies, either as to faith or government, but only the different districts, where the faithful assembled, under the same universal church ; and were so distinguished in the apostolic letters, accordingly as there was occasion of being instructed in their respective duties ; a different address being requisite, to make a proper application of what they were to be informed of.

Q. I observe some difference in wording this article, and the former : in the former you say, I believe in God the Father, in Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost. Here in this article you only say, I believe the holy catholic church, not, I believe in the holy catholic church.

A. The difference you observe is not accidental, but premeditated and designed. To believe in God is to place our last end in him : now the church being only the means and not the end, what therefore we profess in her regard, is, that there is a church, whose voice we ought to hear and obey, in order to obtain our last end.

Q. But here another difficulty may be started : objects of faith are obscure, and lie not within the cognizance of our senses : now the church being a visible society, how can it be known by faith ?

A. I own the church, as to its visible being, is not an object of faith, but only known by the senses and reason, and by the undeniable marks it carries, explained in the scripture, the apostles' creed, and answerable to all the requisites that prudence can suggest, to submit to its authority. What is the object of faith in the church? Is the divine authority conferrèd upon it, in being directed by the Holy Ghost, having a power of binding and loosing, and producing grace, and all sorts of supernatural effects, by means of the sacraments? These are invisible, and the objects of faith only; and of this we have a parallel case in our blessed Saviour, whilst he was upon earth. His humanity was the object of sense and reason, but his divinity was the object of faith.

Q. By the definition you give of the particular church of Christ, which was his kingdom on earth, it is requisite that three things concur, to become a member of it, viz. First, that the persons be baptized, either actually, or in desire. Secondly, that they believe the doctrines Christ delivered; and thirdly, that they be obedient to the authority he placed them under. Now we find there are a great many, who pretend to be members of Christ's church, who are divided in their faith, teaching doctrines directly contrary to one another, and by separating themselves into different congregations, do not all pay subjection to the same authority, but either to none, or to those of their own choosing. Did Christ give this liberty to any distinct body of men, to believe and pay obedience to whom they pleased? This does not seem consistent with the wisdom of so wise a legislature. If every civil community is provided with rules against divisions, certainly the God of peace and unity would not establish a church to be exposed to all the inconveniencies of errors and disobedience, but prescribe some certain method how to obviate them.

A. The three things required, to become a member of Christ's church, are requisite, as you properly observe; so that notwithstanding there are a great many congregations, who pretend to belong to God's church, and lay claim to it, by making a profession of christianity, yet not believing what Christ taught, and disobeying the authority appointed by him, when the matter is strictly enquired into, they are not members of his church.

Q. Pray let me understand who those persons are, with

F

the reasons in particular, why you cannot allow them to be members of Christ's church?

A. The congregations I mean are heathens, Turks, Jews, and heretics of all denominations; to whom we may join schismatics and persons excommunicated.

Q. Why are not schismatics members of the church?

A. Because they are separated from it, by disobeying the governors appointed by Christ, and are branches cut off from the tree of life.

Q. Why are not persons excommunicated to be esteemed members of the church?

A. They are cut off from the body, for obstinately violating the church's order, and therefore enjoy not the privileges.

Q. Are sinners, (that is to say, such as are in mortal sin,) members of the church?

A. Yes; but rotten members. Hence, the scriptures compare the church to Noah's ark, which contained animals, clean and unclean; to a sheep-fold, where goats are mixed with sheep; to a granary, that contains straw, chaff, and corn; to a great house, with vessels of gold, silver, and wood. Thus argued St. Austin against the Donatists, who excluded sinners. Thus it defined against Calvin, who makes the church consist only of the elect. Sinners that are reprobates, are members to the present state, but not as to the future state of the church.

Q. I easily conceive why heathens, Turks and Jews, ought not to be esteemed members of Christ's church; because they either deny God, or Christ the Redeemer. But as for the rest, the case is not so plain: they acknowledge one only true God; they acknowledge Christ to be their Redeemer; they believe the holy Scripture, which is the rule of instruction, both as to what Christ taught, and what is to be practised: and by this compliance, seem to have a right to be esteemed members of Christ's church. I do not see any thing else that can be required of them?

A. You have mentioned requisites, but not all. To believe a God, and that Christ is our Redeemer, are a good foundation: but unless we believe all that Christ taught, and obey those whom he ordered to be obeyed, we fail in the two essential parts of a christian's duty; for our Saviour assures us, (Mat. xvi. 16.) that "He who believes not shall be condemned;" and again, that "He who will

not hear the church, let him be to thee as the Heathen and Publican." Mat. xviii. 17. The scriptures, it is true, are good rules, but then we are at a loss, unless we are rightly instructed in the sense of them; neither can the scriptures alone satisfy us which books are to be allowed as scripture, and which to be rejected. Many have perverted the sense of scriptures to their own damnation, who, at the same time, pretended to be members of Christ's church, but were not.

Q. Has not every one, who enjoys the use of his reason; a capacity to understand as much of the scriptures, as is necessary to inform him of, and comply with any christian duty? What occasion has he to descend to every particular point, or what power has any congregation to draw up forms of belief, and oblige others to subscribe to them?

A. Were men's reasoning faculty free from mistakes, passion and prejudice, much might be said in its favour; but as it is exposed to those inconveniencies, it must be set to rights by proper means. Woful experience has demonstrated the insufficiency of reason, as it is under the direction of private persons. All affairs whatever, have been thrown into confusion under a pretence of reason, both public and private, civil and religious. Servants have their pretended reasons not to obey their masters, and subjects have theirs not to obey their prince; and it is no wonder, if many who stile themselves christians should be disobedient to the laws of Christ's church, upon a pretence, that their reason sufficiently informs what, and whom they ought to obey. By thus relying upon private reason, dissensions happen in families, rebellion in kingdoms, and heresies in Christ's church: such were the heresies even in the apostolic and primitive ages; some denying the resurrection, others Christ's divinity, and the divinity of the Holy Ghost, with many other errors; all taking their rise from the liberty private reason took to expound the scriptures, according to their own taste. Now it is plain, from the censures that were always passed upon such persons, that they were never esteemed members of Christ's church, notwithstanding their belief in a Redeemer, and their allowing the scriptures to be a rule of belief, and the practical duties of a christian, their faith was defective, and obedience was wanting.

Q. All you alleged only amounts to this; that those

heretics were not members of Christ's visible church, as being separated from that visible society which bore that name. But why might they not be members of Christ's church invisibly, as being invisibly united to Christ their head, and only separated from the visible society through mistake and innocent errors?

A. This notion is inconsistent with the nature of a visible society, and more especially with that of Christ's establishing, and indeed a contradiction in itself. In visible societies no regard is had to inward dispositions, but only to outward actions, in point of misbehaviour: a general protestation of allegiance to a prince will not excuse a rebel, who is declared an outlaw, for opposing the administration of justice, upon the idle pretence of expounding the laws in his own sense. On the other hand, how can heretics be united to Christ, their invisible head, who reject the means of that invisible union; christians are united invisibly to Christ by faith and obedience, now where is their faith, who do not believe every thing Christ teaches? Where is their obedience, who resist the authority placed over them? As to what you insinuate concerning mistakes, and the innocent errors of many, who believe wrong, and separate themselves only on that account, for want of opportunity of being better instructed, these are out of the case, we only speak of those who can have no such pretences; however, even those who have invincible ignorance to excuse them, for not believing with, and obeying the church, cannot be esteemed visible members of Christ's church, as not being placed in the ordinary road, that he has chalked out for their salvation; yet they are not out of the road of his extraordinary grace, insomuch, that the invincible ignorance they labour under, in regard of the common road appointed by Christ, will not be imputed to them as a crime; but, on the contrary, if they are good livers in all other respects, and carefully comply with the law of nature, they may be invisibly united to Christ, and invisible members of his church.

Q. This is a charitable condescension; but then it seems to be contrary to the universal rule and doctrine of your church, which says, that none are saved out of the catholic communion, which is very uncharitable, if it be understood of a church in one communion only?

A. It never was the universal doctrine of the Catholic

church, that none are saved who die out of the Catholic communion; for they always except invincible necessity, and invincible ignorance. Now invincible necessity is that which is not in a man's power to hinder, though he desire it ever so much; or it is a real impossibility under the present circumstances, of obtaining something which we desire; as if a person, for example, who lived out of the Catholic communion, is sensible of his error, and desires to be reconciled to the Catholic church, but dies before a priest can be brought to him; such a one has invincible necessity. Invincible ignorance, is that which is not voluntary: so, that if persons would gladly embrace the truth, and sincerely use their best endeavours to find it out, and to know the whole compass of their duty, and would both faithfully and immediately comply with the most difficult parts of it, when known, how contrary soever they may be to their passions, to their prejudices, to the conveniencies of life, to their interest in this world, and to the expectations of their friends; their ignorance is invincible, and may be excused from the sin of heresy. When Catholics therefore say, as they have always said, that none are saved out of the Catholic communion, their meaning is, that no one is saved unless he be in the Catholic communion, either actually or virtually; either in fact or in desire; and that there is no sure and safe way to heaven out of the Catholic communion. This general rule of the Catholic faith, that none are saved out of the communion of the orthodox and universal church, follows by a plain and necessary consequence from the scripture, as well as from the apostolical and Nicene creed. For if Christ has only one holy Catholic and apostolical church, which is the communion of saints; if he has only one church, which is built upon a rock, and against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail;" (St. Mat. xvi. 18.) if he has only one church "which is the pillar and support of truth;" (1 Tim. iii. 15.) and with which he promised to continue always, "even to the consummation of the world;" (St. Mat. xxviii. 20.) and which is therefore the church of all ages, as well as the church of all nations; if he has only one church to which the Lord added, and adds daily, "such as should be saved," (Acts ii. 47.) then it is at least a general rule of divine faith, that none are saved out of the communion of this church. Nay, setting aside invincible necessity and

invincible ignorance, the rule is universal and without exception. This doctrine of the Catholic church is so unquestionable, that many protestants have taught the same. Calvin says, that out of the bosom of the visible church no remission of sins, no salvation is to be hoped for. L. iv. inst. chap. i. sect. 4. Beza, the great disciple of Calvin says, there is only one true church: and there always was, and always will be a church, out of which there is no salvation. In Confess. Fidei. chap. v. sect. 2. *ibid.* sect. 1. Trelactius says, it is a thing of absolute necessity, if we will be saved, to embrace the communion of the Catholic church, out of which there is no salvation. L. ii. Instit. de Eccles. part 2. sect. 10. The learned bishop Pearson, bishop of Chester, in his exposition of the creed, page 349, says, that "the necessity of believing the holy Catholic church appears first in this, that Christ has appointed it as the only way unto eternal life. We read at the first, says he, that the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved; and what was then daily done, has been done since continually: Christ never appointed two ways to heaven: nor did he build a church to save some, and make another institution for other men's salvation. "There is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus;" (Acts iv. 12.) and that name is no otherwise given under heaven than in the church. As none were saved from the deluge, but such as were within the ark of Noah, framed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the first-born of Egypt lived, but such as were within those habitations, whose door-posts were sprinkled with blood, by the appointment of God for their preservation: as none of the inhabitants of Jericho could escape the fire and sword, but such as were within the house of Rahab, so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, which belong not to the church of God. The Protestants of Switzerland say, in their profession of faith,* "we have so great a value for being in communion with the true church of Christ, that we say, those cannot have life in the sight of God, who are not in communion with the true church of God, but separate themselves from it." The Protestants of

* Confess. Helvetica. C. xvii. An. 1556, et in Syntag. Confess. Fidei Geneva. An. 1654, p. 34.

Scotland, anno 1568, in their profession of faith, say, "as we believe in one God, the Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit; so we firmly believe that there was from the beginning, that there now is, and that to the end of the world there will always be, one church, which is the Catholic, that is, the universal church, out of which church, there is neither life, nor everlasting happiness."

The French Huguenots, in their catechism on the tenth article of the creed say, "Why is this article of forgiveness of sins put after that of the church? Answer. Because no one obtains pardon for his sins, unless he be first incorporated with the people of God, and continue in unity and communion with the body of Christ, and so be a member of the church: for none of those who withdraw themselves from the communion of the faithful, to make a sect apart, ought to hope for salvation, as long as they continue separated from them." Thus you see that it is not only the Catholic doctrine, that none are saved out of the Catholic communion, but it is also the doctrine of many protestants.

As to what you say, that this doctrine is uncharitable; I answer, it is not; nay, I affirm it to be the reverse: for is it not charity to publish what the word of God, the creed, and tradition of all ages obliges us to think, concerning salvation out of the Catholic and undivided communion? Is it not charity to put them in mind, that no religion is safe to any one, because he and his friends were bred up in it, because it suits best with his interest, and is the prevailing religion of the place? was it not charitable in St. Luke to tell us, that "the Lord increased daily to the church," (Acts ii. 47.) in one undivided communion, "such as should be saved?" In like manner, is it not charity in us to declare openly, that people cannot be saved without baptism, nor without keeping the commandments; for in all this we declare nothing from ourselves, but from the word of God. True charity always was, and always will be, unknown practically, to those who want it. Wicked men think it highly uncharitable to have their pleasures disturbed by the unwelcome news of death and hell. Can any thing appear more uncharitable to infidels, or unbelievers, than these words of charity itself: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned?" St. Mark xvi. 16. And will not heretics always think these words of our

Saviour Christ uncharitable : " He that will not hear the church, let him be unto thee as the heathen or publican." Mat. xviii. 17. But must not saving truth be told, because we are pretty sure beforehand, that it will not be believed? Must charity neglect its duty, because heresy is deaf? True charity flatters not, nor does it invent new ways to heaven, but does all it can to help all thither according to the old way, the only way. On which account it admonishes, proves, and endeavours to convince all people of the mistakes and errors in which they are engaged. And it is plain to the world, that this is what the priests, and preachers of the Catholic church have continually done, even to the loss of thousands and thousands of their lives: so that this very charge of uncharitableness against us is not only groundless and weak, but is itself uncharitable in a high degree.

Q. But does not the scripture say, that a remnant of all religions shall be saved?

A. No; the scripture no where says so; but men who are resolved to live and die in error will never want a text for it. The prophet Isaiah, it is true, says, that a remnant only of the Jews was to return from Babylon. *Isaias* x. 20, 21, 22. And St. Paul quoting these words of *Isaias*, tells us, " If the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant (that is a small part of them) shall be saved." *Rom.* ix. 27. Which remnant the apostle himself explains of such of the Jewish nation, as at that time, by entering into the church, were saved by God's grace. *Rom.* xi. 5. But what relation has this to the saving of a remnant of all religions, of Christians, Jews, Turks, and Pagans; which even Protestants themselves, in the 18th of the XXXIX Articles say, " They are to be had accursed who presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature," &c. Art. 18.

Q. You satisfied me as to those points, that all who are actually and visibly members of Christ's church, ought to believe the doctrine that he taught: and also, obey the authority he has placed over them: but you say nothing to two other matters, viz. how any human power can presume to impose creeds and forms of belief upon the members of Christ's church; methinks as to this, every one

ought to be at liberty as to certain articles : is it not sufficient to believe the gospel in general, without troubling one's self about this or that opinion ? Besides, the whole body of revealed religion contained an endless number of articles which the greatest part of Christ's members are never acquainted with, and by consequence, they can give no assent to them. Again, where is there any obligation of submitting to this or that person, who pretends a commission to oversee and govern Christ's church.

A. We find by daily experience, that a great many take the liberty to expound the gospel truths according to their own meaning, and by this method have denied many of those revealed articles which were delivered by God, and necessary to be believed to support his veracity, and promote virtue, so that there is scarce one article of the christian religion but what has, by some heretic or other, been questioned, and flatly denied. To obviate this inconvenience, it was requisite to prepare an antidote to expel the poison ; which was, by giving the true meaning of God's laws, and obliging those that were members of Christ's church, to make a profession of such articles as were necessary to support the fabric, and preserve the church from ruin. And whose business was it to speak in these matters, but theirs, who were appointed by Christ to govern his church ? As to what you allege concerning the vast number of revealed articles, which can neither be known, nor distinctly assented to by every member, you seem to mistake the case : every one is called upon to give his assent according to his knowledge and capacity, whereby it happens that a more explicit belief and obedience to more articles is found in some than in others, though all are alike disposed to admit of every article, when distinctly known and proposed. And in this the civil and ecclesiastical authority observe the same method ; every subject is not acquainted with all the laws of a nation ; yet a true subject is supposed to obey them all when it is required of him.

Q. So that you place the authority of the church, and the civil power upon the same footing, as to obedience ; and, by consequence, that christians are as much obliged to subscribe to forms of belief, as subjects are to a form of human laws ?

A. The difference is not very great, only that of the

authority of the church is more conspicuous, more necessary, and better recommended in the scriptures; because the church is an universal establishment, under which the great concern of salvation is carried on, and therefore, Christ founded it himself in person, and promised to guard it against all enemies, for which purpose, he bestowed several privileges upon the governors.

Q. What are those privileges that Christ's church enjoys, which cannot be claimed by any civil powers?

A. The first is to be judge in all spiritual cases, viz. that belong to faith in expounding the law: according to that of Malachi, "The priest's lips shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth." Chap. ii. 7. And our Saviour Christ says, "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me." Luke x. 16. Again, "He that will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen or publican." Mat. xviii. 17. And such are they who will not believe the teaching or doctrine of the church. The second is infallibility. The third is perpetuity.

Q. How do you prove the church of Christ to be infallible?

A. St. Paul assures us, that "She is the pillar and ground of truth." 1 Tim. iii. 15. Now if she be the pillar and ground of truth, she must in her pastors and prelates be, to all christians, according to the promise of Christ, a sure and infallible guide in deciding controversies of religion. And he assures us, that "The gates of hell shall not prevail against her." Mat. xvi. 18. Again, "I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the spirit of truth; He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind." John xiv. 16, 26. "He has given us pastors and doctors for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all meet into the unity of faith, that henceforth we be no more children tost to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men." Eph. iv. 11, 12, 13. All which, though much more might be added from the holy scriptures, together with the article of our creed, "I believe the holy Catholic church," gives us assurance above all exception, that God's church cannot err; if she should, the gates of hell should certainly prevail against her; she would not be the pillar and ground of

truth, neither would the spirit of truth, nor Christ abide with her pastors for ever, neither would any be obliged to hear and obey her, as Christ requires, under pain of damnation, "He that will not hear the church let him be to thee as the heathen or publican." Mat. xviii. 17. Neither would there be any certain means to know truth from falsehood, could she err? whom could we consult or rely upon in matters of faith, what assurance can we have of our religion, of all mysteries of our belief, of holy scriptures, and what else concerns our salvation, could she err? and would not Christ's order of treating as heathen and publican those who disobey, and the church's punishment be unjust, could she err? and what can we think of those who teach that the church may err, and has erred, who persecute severely those (though they themselves, even according to their own tenets, may be in error) who cannot subscribe to their erroneous doctrines, against the belief of all the fathers, councils, creeds, scripture, and of all the faithful in all ages; believing, professing, and teaching, that the church cannot err.

Q. How do you prove the perpetuity or perpetual continuance of the church of Christ?

A. From several plain texts of scripture, in which it is promised or foretold, that the church, or kingdom, established by Christ, shall stand to the end of the world: "Behold I am with you to the consummation of the world," (says our Saviour,) Mat. xxviii. 20. "They shall fear thee," says the Psalmist, "as long as the sun and moon endure throughout all generations." And the prophet Daniel tells us, that the church of Christ shall never be destroyed, but that it shall stand for ever. Dan. ii. 44. Again, as we believe in the creed, so every article thereof must be always true; therefore, there must always be a holy Catholic church.

Q. You have satisfied me as to this point; but let me hear what proofs you can bring of the church of Christ being always visible and known?

A. I can prove it from many texts of scripture, as from the fifth chapter of St. Matthew, ver. 14, where our blessed Saviour compares it to a city placed upon a hill which cannot be hid. Now, it is certain, nothing can be more conspicuous or visible, than a city placed upon a mountain. The prophet Daniel calls it, "A great mountain which fills

the whole earth." Dan. ii. 35, 44. The prophet Isaiah calls it, "A mountain on the top of mountains," and says, that "All nations shall flow unto it." Isa. ii. 2. Besides, how can the universal church of Christ be invisible or unknown; since she shall always profess her faith, and the terms of her communion, and having ministers preaching, baptizing, and administering the sacraments: these are all outward and sensible actions, which are inconsistent with an invisible society of men. Therefore, the church of Christ must of necessity be always visible, and not invisible, as some would have it, upon account of their being convinced that there were none of their religion, or way of thinking, to be seen or heard of in the world about two hundred years ago.

Q. I need not ask what is meant by the church, the nature of the thing requiring that it should be understood principally of the superiors who govern. But there may be some difficulty in finding out this church, since there are so many different congregations who pretend to it. Are there no visible marks whereby it may be known; otherwise the ignorant part of mankind will be at a loss for a director. They are not capable of discussing every point in particular, and even the learned, when they rely upon that method to find out truth, run into a thousand errors and absurdities. It seems requisite, therefore, that the church established by Christ, should be undeniably conspicuous, by certain tokens and marks, which cannot be applied to any other congregation.

A. Providence, and the particular goodness of God, hath taken care of all these matters, to the full conviction and satisfaction of all who will not shut their eyes at noon-day. All visible creatures whatever, have certain outward marks, whereby they are distinguished, and known from one another. A man, a beast, a ship, a house, are known by their outward form, and different structure of their parts. The same is observable in moral beings, and societies of men: kingdoms, corporations, cities, courts of judicature, families, &c. carry many outward marks, by which they are known from one another. It is after the same manner that the church of Christ is known, which is a visible society of men, upon whom such outward marks are fixed, that none can be ignorant of them, who do not wilfully shut their eyes against them.

Q. Pray give me a general notion of these outward marks, which I expect you will explain in particular.

A. The chief of these outward marks are expressed in the present article of the creed under our consideration, viz. the unity, sanctity, universality, and apostolical succession of the church; the last mark being added by the first general council of Constantinople: to which may be added, several other outward marks, which cannot be applied to any other society of men, namely, miracles, conversion of nations, morality of doctrine, obedience, patience in suffering, martyrdom, antiquity, &c.

Q. These outward marks make a good appearance, and plead strongly for truth, where they are found: but there are two difficulties that occur to me, before we proceed any further. The first is, how you will account for their behaviour, who stand off, and are not convinced by such plain proofs, and cannot see the city which is placed upon a high hill, nor behold the sun that shines upon them, nor find out the way wherein fools cannot err, (for such the church of God is described to be in the holy scriptures,) and it is inconceivable, that such multitudes of men, of the greatest penetration, learning and zeal, should not discover, and own the church recommended by such advantageous circumstances. Another difficulty I have, is, you take no notice of the inward and more essential marks of Christ's church, viz. adhering to God's word, the true administration of the sacraments, zeal for God's glory, and the performing of good works, and an innocent life. These are the marks whereby Christ's church is to be known.

A. I own it is a melancholy reflection to consider the blindness and stupidity of judgment, which is occasioned in mankind, through pride, interest, and the love of pleasures. Who can but be astonished at the stupidity of Pharaoh, and the learned Egyptians, who could not, or would not, discover the finger of God in so many miracles that were wrought among them by Moses and Aaron? What a thick veil of darkness was thrown over the Jews, when they would not acknowledge the Messiah; and the undeniable proofs of his miracles made no impression upon them? Could there be a greater stupidity than that of the whole world, when they adored stocks and stones, and acknowledged the vilest creatures to be their Gods? And what wonder is it, if heretics should lie under the same

infatuation, and not see the church, though represented to them by so many outward marks. I say this upon a supposition, that it is an error in the judgment, which obstructs their sight, though we have reason to think, great numbers, like Pharaoh, are persuaded that the hand of God is with the church, but other motives carry their affections another way, and the world has too strong a hold of them, to act according to what they think, which is both the case of heretics, as also of many true believers, and true members of God's church, who, though fully persuaded of the great truths of the christian religion, yet live directly contrary to what they profess, as to all particular duties of a christian. And the stupidity and perverseness of the will, is equally as unaccountable as the blindness of the understanding. The other difficulty you take notice of is a plain evasion. Heretics being destitute of all visible marks of being God's people, have recourse to tokens, which being invisible, cannot distinguish them from the wicked. Can the adhering to God's word be a true token of truth, if they pervert the sense of it? The true administration of the sacraments is the point in question, and cannot be a mark of truth, where the substance of the ceremony may be destroyed by inward indispositions. As for zeal for God's glory, and a pretended innocence of life, they may all be under a wrong management, and the effects of hypocrisy, and no marks of truth in the regard of men, God alone being able to make the discovery.

Q. You have clearly convinced me that these pretended marks of the true church are not the real ones, but vain subterfuges of heretics. It remains now, that you give a particular explanation of the marks mentioned in the creed; and first, what is meant by the unity in Christ's church.

A. In the first place, it imports, that Christ established only one church upon earth, not churches. And the church, in the general council of Nice, held in the year 325, made this unity a part of her creed, I also believe one holy, Catholic and apostolic church. Which is plainly expressed by St. Paul to the Ephesians, where he says, there is one body, and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, chap. iv. verse 4, 5. And St. John declares, "There shall be one fold, and one shepherd." John x. 16. Again, as the church of Christ is a kingdom which shall stand for ever, it must be

always one: for every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand, says our Saviour Christ. Mat. xii. 25. It was upon this account, that when the Novatians erected a separate community, St. Cyprian attacked them in his book of the Unity of the Church; "There is," says he, "but one God, one Christ, one Church, and one Faith: unity is incapable of division; to leave this original unity, is to forfeit life, being, and the state of salvation." St. Augustin upon the like occasion attacked the Donatists, who had also established themselves as a church distinct from the rest of christians. "You are with us," said he, "in baptism, in the creed, and in the other sacraments of God, but in the spirit of unity, and bond of peace; lastly, in the Catholic church, you are not with us." L. de Unst. Eccles. cap. 4. For which he gives this reason, "Because they do not communicate with the whole, wheresoever it is spread." How then can any one, without a manifest delusion, persuade himself, that the Catholic church, which we profess in the creed, is in more communions than one.

Q. It is plain to me, both from what the scriptures declare, and from the general design of our Saviour, that his intent was not to form different societies and governments, much less to allow them to be divided in their belief. But pray what was this unity or union chiefly to consist in?

A. Chiefly in these two points, viz. to agree to the articles of faith, and be governed by the same authority. Hence, the faithful in the Acts of the Apostles, are described to be in one heart, and one soul. Chap. iv. 32. St. Paul says, they are to mark those who study to make divisions, and do not follow the doctrine delivered to them.

Q. I shall not trouble you with enquiring how the faithful can all believe the same articles; I know you will tell me, that upon account of their capacities and circumstances, some may have a more explicit belief than others, but that all are equally disposed, in regard of other articles when proposed, and that no one ought to maintain any doctrine, opposite to what the church teaches. But at the same time, when I consider the different opinions and behaviour of those who pretend to be members of the church, I am not able to reconcile it with that unity you speak of.

What is that clashing among the divines, and dividing themselves into Thomists, Molinists, and Scotists: what are all those religious orders ranged like different camps and armies, and commanded by generals, who appear to be of different opinions and interests? Instead of union, here is nothing but divisions and confusion.

A. We do not carry the union to such a height, as to make the faithful of one and the same mind, in all the controversies of life, but only where the essential points of religion are concerned, and so as not to tear the seamless garment of Christ. The divisions of divines and schoolmen have no relation to faith, and all their contentions are carried on, with a perfect submission to the authority of the church. And as for the several societies of religious orders, their particular rules and practices are under the same regulation. All communities, both civil and ecclesiastical, have the liberty of dividing themselves into different bodies, and observing different methods in private economy, without encroaching upon the rights of the supreme power, to which they owe obedience, or any danger of becoming either rebels or heretics; nor is it any breach of unity to use a different dress, different language, or be of different interests in regard of property, or in different opinions in matters foreign to faith, provided they refuse not communion in the same places of worship, nor maintain any articles inconsistent with the doctrine of the church.

Q. If these marks are peculiar to any one society of men, such as observe this unity bid fair for the claim of being Christ's church; but why are they not applicable to those societies, which since the reformation are separated from the church of Rome?

A. It is evident to any considerate person, that no sect or body of men, separated from the church of Rome can ascribe to themselves any such marks of unity. Lutherans, Calvinists, the Church of England, Anabaptists, Quakers, and the other sects almost without number, though they are in perfect union in their attacks upon the church of Rome, yet they are divided among themselves, not only in indifferent matters, but in the two essential points of faith and obedience. They erect chair against chair, refuse communion, frequent not the same places of worship; they are under no regulation as to belief, every one striking out a scheme from the scriptures, according to his own

fancy. They have no method of bringing different civil governments to a unity in faith. Every independent government in civil matters claiming the like independency in religious matters, so that Babylon and Jerusalem, representing confusion and unity, are the true emblems of the pretended reformed bodies and the church of Rome.

Q. I still want to be informed by what method this unity in Christ's church is effected, for it appears to be a difficult matter to preserve unity of faith where there so many occasions of contention, and where (as we find by daily experience) worldly considerations are so prevailing as to cause a rupture?

A. I told you before, that the divine goodness had provided against this inconvenience by appointing governors in his church, who were to reconcile all differences where faith was concerned.

Q. That indeed you mentioned to me in general, but I want to be informed of more particulars, for I suppose it may be with Christ's church, as it is with all other regular societies who have a head to preside over them, and pronounce upon causes, when particular members misbehave themselves, and lay claim to more than their due.

A. You have touched upon a point which when duly considered, will fully instruct you by what means Christ does preserve unity in his church, which cannot be better explained than by comparing the church with a temporal monarchy, the peace whereof is preserved by appointing a head, in whom the executive power is lodged, in order to see the laws of the kingdom observed. This method Christ observed in forming his church, among the twelve apostles, who were fellow labourers in building the church and propagating the gospel: one was appointed by Christ himself, as we learn both from St. Matthew and St. John, viz. Mat. xvi. 18. St. Peter, to be head of the rest, and to stand as the centre of unity when the church was threatened with divisions, by disobedience of refractory members. John xxi. 15, 17. Now the church being established not only for the apostles' time, or for any set number of years, but for perpetuity, it was requisite, that there should always be one continued, as Peter's successor, to preserve the same unity. And a person of this authority has constantly claimed and exercised the said supreme supervisorship from the apostles' time down.

Q. By this system you seem to lodge the whole authority of the church with St. Peter's successors. I thought Christ had been the head of his own church. Do you allow nothing to the rest of the apostles, upon whom the church was also founded? Nothing to all the bishops, who were the apostles' successors? Nothing to general councils, who represent the church? Nothing to a national church, governed by their own bishops and clergy? Nothing, in short, to temporal princes, who by divine appointment claim a natural obedience and superiority over all members, both civil and ecclesiastical?

A. These reflections you make when justly applied, confirm what I have said, as to preserving of unity of the church; for the headship I mentioned, allows every power the claim they can pretend to, either by natural or divine right in their proper district. Christ, who founded the church, is still the invisible head, and governs it invisibly by his divine assistance, and visibly by his representatives, who take care that his laws are duly complied with. Now St. Peter and his successors may be called the visible and ministerial heads of the church, while Christ is the chief and invisible head. In the same sense, God is the only visible king, father, and master of all mankind, yet so that there are other visible kings, fathers, and masters, who under him govern all visible societies.

Q. But still methinks the rest of the apostles might claim a power equal with St. Peter: they were priests and bishops unconfined in their jurisdiction, as being commanded to preach all over the world.

A. That they were priests and bishops is not denied; but that they had the same power with St. Peter will not be allowed without a distinction. They had the same power as to the essential parts of the sacerdotal and episcopal character, but not without a subordination to St. Peter, to whom Christ gave in charge all his sheep. St. John x. 21, 15. And consequently of the apostles themselves, and bid him confirm his brethren. St. Luke xxii. 32.

Q. I am satisfied, let us proceed to the second mark of the church. Why is it called holy?

A. Upon many accounts. 1st, Because it was founded by Christ, and put under the direction of the Holy Ghost, the origin of holiness. 2dly, The doctrine it delivers all tends towards holiness, viz. the lessons are such as are

agreeable to reason, and serviceable towards making men good, and both good neighbours, good subjects, and good christians. 3dly, It has appointed and provided us with instruments of becoming holy, viz. the use of the sacraments, which are the channels of grace. 4thly, Because true holiness is not to be found in any other society. 5thly, It abounds with the fruits of holiness, even visible as to the eye, which are no where so conspicuous.

Q. Some of these reasons are very intelligible, but it does not appear they all answer your purpose, which I presume is to insinuate, that only one church can lay claim to holiness?

A. You judge right, but pray be pleased to inform me wherein I fail in the application.

Q. I mean the two last points. Are all the members of Christ's church holy? Are there no good and holy persons to be found among the several bodies of reformers? Is it not visible to the eye that great numbers of them practise all the methods of the gospel, and shew plentiful fruits of holiness by their good works and innocent lives?

A. I will endeavour to set you right as to all these particulars. First, by shewing you what grounds the church of Rome has to claim the title, and then demonstrate the unjust pretensions of those who are divided from her. The title of holy is not given to Christ's church, to signify that all the members are holy, but that they ought all to be holy, and that numbers in effect are so: as also upon account of the reasons above mentioned, and therefore in the beginning, all the faithful were stiled Saints, or holy persons, because they made profession of a religion truly holy. Now in order to make good the first point, I am to set before you the marks of holiness, which always were conspicuous in the church of Rome, and which cannot be more effectually performed than by shewing the conformity it has with what the gospel requires to make men holy. Are not fasting, prayer, and alms, the three great duties of a christian, recommended in the gospel, as the means of becoming holy, and outward tokens of a mind well disposed towards God; and where are these practises more duly performed than in the church of Rome? When one day every week, the Ember days, Rogation days, the eves of every feast, with the forty days of Lent, are deputed for fasting, in order to keep corrupt nature from

committing excess, and mortify the flesh, that it may not rebel against the spirit? By whom is the great work of prayer more exactly performed, and the words of the scripture better fulfilled, of praying at all times and without intermission, than by those who are constantly employed in it both night and day, not only privately in their bed-chambers, morning and evening; not only on the sabbath day, but upon a great number of holy-days, throughout the whole year; nay, all the night long, thousands of religious persons, deprive themselves of their sleep, and rise at all hours to spend the night in prayer? Where can we behold such monuments of charity to the poor, both public and private, as have been, and still are to be seen, within the districts of the church of Rome? Where that religion flourishes, every city, village, and province, can shew buildings, erected for the blind, the lame, the sick, the incurable, with not only a fund for their maintenance, but an infinite number of persons employed, for no other business, but to take care of them? Nay, the marks of holiness are still more visible: they aim at carrying holiness to the highest pitch, by observing what they are advised to do, as well as what is commanded. The gospel exhorts us to be obedient to every living soul, to deny ourselves, and if we will be perfect, give all we have to the poor. Where are there any instances of this practice but in the church of Rome? What are all the religious houses, whereof there are many thousands, but schools established for this purpose? Are not poverty, chastity, and obedience, holy and evangelical practices: can there be a greater self-denial, than to submit to the will of others? Do not those who oblige themselves, by vowing a single life, find more opportunities of applying themselves to God's service, than if they were entangled in worldly incumbrances? What can it be but an effect of holiness, that makes so many forsake the world, part with their substance, and be content with only food and raiment?

Q. I cannot deny but these tokens of holiness are apparent in the church of Rome, but they cannot be accounted a distinguishing mark, if other societies do also lay claim to them?

A. They are obliged to lay claim to what is essential to the true religion. But the right of their claim is disputed.

Q. How can that right be refused them? Do they not fast, pray, and give alms; have they not erected, and still do continue to erect many hospitals for the poor? And though they do not make vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, they practise the substance of those pious admonitions, and comply with them strictly, as far as the law of God obliges?

A. There is a shew of holiness, in all societies whatever, both in Infidels, Turks, Jews, and Heretics; but it is no distinguishing token of truth, upon several accounts. First, in some societies, those holy practises are joined with many abominable sins, against the law of nature, so that their profession is directly destructive to holiness: by other societies they are practised only, as mere ceremonies, not contributing towards inward holiness, and by consequence are only an equivocal mark; but what is chiefly to be regarded on the present occasion is, that the instances of holiness among other christian societies, are so very few, in comparison of what we observe in the church of Rome that they are nothing; and the church of Rome is left in full possession of the distinguishing mark of holiness.

Q. I will not dispute the case, as to those societies, whose practises are directly opposite to the law of nature; it is pretty plain, holiness cannot be found among them; but as for those who make a profession of observing both the law of nature and the law of the gospel, what hinders them from the claim to holiness? and in the first place, do not they pray?

A. Yes, they pray, but when, and how? what they do privately is only known to themselves; their public prayers are very rarely performed: midnight prayers are banished and ridiculed; and the whole duty has lain under the greatest discouragement, ever since the demolishing of some thousands of religious houses, filled with persons deputed to serve God by continual prayer.

Q. I own this had no good aspect, neither did it look as if they, who had a hand in such works, were any great friends to prayer, seeing they destroyed the method of carrying on that duty. But you cannot deny what is visible to the eye, I mean the colleges, hospitals, work-houses for the poor, and other pious foundations, which are a lasting proof of their good dispositions, and an undeniable mark of holiness?

A. What in fact cannot be denied, nor will I presume to question the good intention of the founders; but when some circumstances are considered, those pious works will come far short of answering the present purpose, or entitling their religion to the name of holy, or making those foundations a distinguishing mark in the way of holiness. For to omit that the colleges in both our universities, and all the churches in a manner, throughout the whole kingdom, were the marks of other peoples' holiness: did they not by methods contrary to holiness, destroy many hundreds of hospitals, collegiate churches, and other pious foundations; distribute their lands and revenues among courtiers and flatterers, and load the nation with innumerable taxes for maintaining the poor, which were formerly provided for by those pious foundations? And what are those few establishments which have since appeared to demonstrate their holiness? Indeed, while death was laying his hands upon them, some have been willing to part with what they could no longer keep, and by their last will and testament have ordered some charitable benefactions; but who among them have done any thing considerable in that way, either to deprive themselves of all, or part of their substance, whilst they were in their bloom, and able to enjoy what they had; much less to forsake the world personally, retire from it, and content themselves with mere necessaries the remainder of their days? These are instances of holiness they are unacquainted with. It would be too invidious a reflection to charge the founders of many of their charitable establishments with worldly and politic views; but their workhouses, and the rest, are not out of the reach of such a charge; the manner of their management affords but too much grounds to make such a reflection.

Q. You have made so nice an enquiry into this mark of their holiness, that I must give up the cause, when their holiness is compared with that of the church of Rome, which infinitely surpasses it, both in the motives and extent of their charities. But what observations do you make as to their fasting: a practice recommended by the scriptures for promoting holiness, and subduing the flesh to the spirit? This is so conspicuous in other christian societies, especially in the church of England, that it is ordered in their canons and liturgies; Ember-days, Lent, and occa-

sional fasts are publicly exhibited in their calendars and almanacks, and enforced by statutes, proclamations, and other sanctions, both civil and ecclesiastical ?

A. I am apt to think, those whose cause you plead would not be well pleased to hear you insist upon this topic, or to mention fasting as a mark of holiness. The whole duty of fasting is become among them a mere politic contrivance, wherein religion, virtue, and holiness, are not the least concerned ; this evidently appears, both from the laws relating to it, and the manner of practising it.

Q. I can scarce believe, that a practise of that kind which is so frequently recommended, both in the old and new scriptures, and so serviceable of itself, towards the extinguishing of vice, and promoting of virtue, can be so much misrepresented by any who profess christianity, as not to look upon it as a religious and holy work ?

A. And yet so it is that fasting is not only misrepresented, but it is neglected, and ridiculed when practised for any such purposes, and as the days appointed for it are marked down in their calendars, it seems to be a kind of providential management, that their tongues shall not go together with their hearts, but contradict one another, and make their religion destroy itself. It would be plain dealing, rather to expunge those fasts out of their calendar, than let them stand there a reproach to their cause. What precedent do they find in the scriptures, that fasts are ordained for encouraging the breed of cattle, or augmenting the number of sailors, by employing them to catch herrings, &c. as their statutes for fasting specify ? Act v. Eliz. chap. 5. The ancient prophets tells us, it was ordained for a sinner's conversion ; our Saviour says, for expelling the devil ; St. Paul says, for subduing the flesh to the spirit. Let reformers view themselves in this glass, and see whether their way of fasting can be a mark of holiness. Now as to other marks of holiness, poverty, chastity, and obedience, they are not only strangers to them in practice, but they scarce know even the meaning of the words. There are many poor, it is true, among them, but it is always against their wills : they never strip themselves of all their substance, upon a religious account, or scarce ever dispose of any part of it, till they can keep it no longer. Chastity lies under the greatest discouragement, when they contradict what our Saviour taught, and decry a spiritual cas-

tration, and advise the ministers of the church to involve themselves in the cares of the flesh, and break their promise made to God, for observing virginity, contrary to St. Paul's doctrine. And as for obedience or self-denial, they never could shew one instance of it: a general obedience to superiors, placed over us by nature, or God's positive law, does not answer what is expected from us by self-denial, which specifies times, places, and persons; when, where, to whom, and how the virtue of obedience may be carried to the greatest height, by a voluntary self-denial.

Q. Two points yet remain wherein I am not fully satisfied. Why may not persons be esteemed holy without these voluntary practises? Is it not sufficient to comply with what the law of nature, and God's law has ordained in such cases? Besides it does not appear that those voluntary practises can be complied with, or that any vow can be binding, whereby persons oblige themselves to practise them?

A. I do not say, but that persons may be holy, by observing the laws mentioned, but there is a greater appearance of holiness; the more zeal persons shew in observing the law. Did not the apostles and primitive christians excel others in perfection? And when persons oblige themselves by vow, to perform particular religious and holy practices, as those of renouncing the things of this life, by a vow of poverty; denying themselves, by vowing to obey such particular persons, and by renouncing the pleasures of the flesh, by a vow of chastity; then they may justly be said to comply with the will of God in the most perfect manner, and in this we place the marks of holiness. I will not enter into a detail of that controversy, how far such vows are lawful and possible to be kept, &c. only inform you that vows of particular good actions, not commanded either by the law of nature or the law of God, have been made, as we read in the scriptures, where they are ordered to be kept. And as to the lawfulness and possibility of giving our possessions to others, or obliging ourselves to follow the will of others, does it not every day happen, in all contracts between man and man, confirmed by promise or oath? Nor is there any special difficulty in vowing chastity, unless we deprive God of the power of preserving it by his grace; which he does by prayer, and

other helps, whereby grace is obtained for avoiding sins of the flesh, as well as other sins. And I believe when the behaviour of thousands who enter into a matrimonial state is looked into, it will be found that it is not the only, nor always the most effectual help to preserve chastity. Now that the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, are practised in the church of Rome, is as plain a fact as that they are religious performances, and a mark of holiness.

Q. There is one thing you have not as yet considered, which is this: I own all these performances are outward tokens of holiness, but true holiness consists in the purity of the heart, and such performances may be all shew, and proceed from hypocrisy. An invisible thing as holiness is, cannot be a visible mark of the church.

A. Here you run again to invisible things, which belong not to the present enquiry, which is all about the visible tokens of that society of men, God has established upon earth. And as this article of the creed declares his church is holy, we are to judge of true holiness by the outward behaviour; which though it may be an equivocal mark in particular persons, or where there is a remarkable defect in the outward behaviour of any society, who neglect and despise the methods of becoming holy, yet when all the outward methods of becoming holy, are professed and practised by a church, it deservedly claims the title of holiness.

Q. We have dwelt long enough upon this subject. The next mark of the church is Catholic, pray tell me what you mean by that word?

A. The word signifies universal, and it may be considered as a true mark of Christ's church upon two accounts; First, merely attending to the name. Secondly, by attending to the thing signified.

Q. How can the name only distinguish the true church? it was not called catholic, but only christian in the apostles' time. Besides how could it be catholic before it was universal? Nor could universality be ascribed to it when the apostles were supposed to make the creed: hence the word catholic is not found in some ancient creeds, as Rufinus tells us. Again, heretics of old stiled themselves Catholics, and the modern reformers still lay claim to it.

A. The creed is as ancient as the apostles, and there is no inconvenience if the church had then the appellation of catholic, upon the account of the ancient prophets fore-

telling its universality; as also because in the apostles' days it was preached over several parts of the world. In some churches, indeed, there was some small difference in the words of the creed, upon account of heresies that sprung up in the apostles' days, and immediately after, so that it was necessary to add some words in opposition to them; as Rufinus observes, no such alteration in the creed was made use of at Rome. However, in all the first ages, the true church was always known by the name of catholic, as it appears by the writings of the ancient fathers. I own the Donatists, and some other ancient fathers, coveted to be esteemed and called catholic, but St. Augustine and the orthodox party shewed the absurdity of their claim. First, because the Donatists made a particular society, were confined to Africa, and by consequence could not be the Catholic or universal church. Secondly, because their distinguishing names were taken from those persons who were authors of the defection, as Montanists, Manicheans, Palegians, Arians, Novatians, Donatists, &c. Thirdly, because those who were indifferent persons called none catholics but such as were in communion with the universal church. Fourthly, those very heretics themselves were so convinced that they had no right to that appellation, that they seldom called themselves by that name, and if they were asked to shew a person the church where catholics assembled, they durst not point at their schismatical meetings, but sent them to those who communicated with the churches abroad. These are St. Augustine's reasons, (St. Aug. cont. Ep. Fundament. c. 41.) and may be applied to all the modern reformed societies.

Q. I see plainly those in communion with the church of Rome have the name of the true church, and that according to St. Augustine's arguments, the name alone, as it is circumstantiated, is a mark of the true church, and I suppose this was the reason why the very name catholic held him in the communion he was of. But then as to the things signified, how will you make it appear that universality belongs to the church in communion with Rome? What do you mean by universality? If universality be a mark of the true church, Heathens, Turks, Arians, Greeks, nay the late reformed bodies, may pretend to lay claim to it.

A. Universality is not so strictly to be taken as to exclude all other things in every kind and respect, but only

comparatively to other societies, and chiefly as to time, place, and doctrine; in these three respects the true church is universal, and no other. It flourished in many parts of the earth in every age since it was established, and the very same creed was always its rule. Heathens are not under our consideration, but only those bodies who believe in the true God, and were separated from the church universal; and though heathens might be called an universal body, as to place, they were not so as to time or doctrine. It is probable there were no heathens before the deluge, that is for above 1500 years at least, among the sons of Seth; till all flesh had corrupted their ways some time before the flood. During that time the church flourished under the law of nature, though men were depraved in their morals. Again, they were not universal as to doctrine, being divided into numberless sects, and paying worship to different Gods; and though they have laid claim to a great universality ever since, as to place, yet soon after the apostolic age they lost even that claim.

Q. But the Turks, the Arians, and the Greek church once were, and still some are, a very spreading body, and might dispute universality.

A. The Turks can dispute no universality as to time or doctrine; their rise was not till six hundred years after our Saviour's time; they are divided in their faith, and many large kingdoms are strangers to their faith and discipline. The Arians never were, nor at present are universal in any respect; when they were most numerous, they came far short of the true believers, and even then counted heads by fraudulent subscriptions. They were divided into many sects. Their rise was not till about three hundred years after our Saviour's time; they continued not many years, and at present are almost reduced to nothing. As for the Greeks, they were for near a thousand years divided from the true church, and under her might claim an universality, as to time, place, and doctrine, but upon their schismatical defection, they lost all the three advantages, and are now contemptible to the rest of God's church, upon each account.

Q. I will leave these, and the rest I mentioned, to make out their universality, which I find they can have no pretensions to, and come nearer to our own times. Are not our modern reformers extended all over Europe, and equal

in number to the whole body of those in communion with Rome?

A. It is true the number of pretended reformers is greatly increased in several northern kingdoms; but it is far from equalling what may be found adhering to the church of Rome, even in Europe. They reckon the British dominions, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and some principalities in Germany. Those in communion with Rome reckon France, Flanders, Spain, the greater part of Germany, Italy, and all the islands in those seas; they reckon also Portugal, with their dominions in the East and West Indies; the two great kingdoms of Mexico and Peru, where they are all in communion with the church of Rome, without any mixture of other professions; whereas in Holland, Ireland, and among the protestant princes in Germany, there is so great a mixture, that in some of these kingdoms there is a superior number of the inhabitants in communion with the church of Rome; in some an equal, and in others a number little inferior. If to this we add, that the kingdoms in communion with Rome, do far exceed the reformers in power, riches, universities, episcopal sees, and all the outward advantages and appearances of an universal church, there is no room for making a comparison as to place. But then as to the other two requisites, universality of time and doctrine, the reformers cannot have the least pretence to insist upon them. As to time, they appeared but as it were yesterday; they were so far from being universal as to time and place, that for above twelve hundred years they covered not a foot of land, and have been so divided as to doctrine, that they are of different professions, and different communions; so that their church in no sense can be called universal.

Q. But pray give me leave to make one observation in their favour, especially with regard to universality of place. Do they not possess several tracts of land, and have they not colonies abroad, in both the Indies?

A. Those are mere rays of a church, and no part of Christ's seamless garment, when compared with those vast countries, which are united to the church of Rome, where we meet with so many archbishoprics, bishoprics, parishes, and great numbers of religious communities, who are governed regularly by and under one spiritual pastor, the bishop of Rome. What are a few planters of sugar and

tobacco, a strong fort erected on the shore, half a dozen of tipping houses to entertain sailors, and warehouses for their merchandize? What is a consul residing at Aleppo, at Constantinople, Venice, or Lisbon, in order to obtain the name of an established and universal church in those parts, especially considering, that they profess a different religion, one from another, and are of different communions? Now the case is quite otherwise with those in communion with Rome, who observe the rule, and carry the mark of universality, mentioned by Vincentius Lyri-nensis, viz. professing a faith that is the same without any difference in doctrine and government.

Q. Let us now proceed to the fourth mark of the church, viz. Apostolic. What is imported by that title?

A. The immediate and express meaning is, that the true church of Christ ought to have the apostles for its founders.

Q. This all must pretend to, because the apostles were the first builders, employed by Christ: but what follows from hence, in order to fix a distinguishing mark upon the true church?

A. What I infer from thence is, that the true church must be very ancient, viz. as old as the apostles. And the next inference is, that antiquity is a mark of Christ's church, or that the society of true believers was prior in time to any body of men divided from them. And, thirdly, it follows, that the true church of Christ must derive its succession from the apostles.

Q. The two first inferences are plain and undeniable, and that succession is also a mark of the true church, by what I have sometimes observed in the writings of Tertullian, St. Augustine, and other orthodox fathers, who urged the antiquity of the church, and in order to prove it, trace the succession of the true pastors to the apostles: whereas those who were taxed with novelties, could run up no higher than certain persons, who first broached those errors, since the apostles' days; and to render their proof more plain, and as it were to the eye, they produced a list of the orthodox bishops, but particularly of the bishops of Rome, successors to St. Peter. But what I farther desire is, to be convinced that the bishops and pastors, and such as now are in communion with Rome, do succeed the apostles?

A. This succession appears by the catalogues in every nation, faithfully preserved, of all the kings, popes, archbishops, bishops, &c. who in all parts of the world have governed every kingdom, and diocese, and constantly professed what their ancestors taught, and practised. I shall not run abroad into foreign nations, but only observe, how the succession was carried on, in the British isles, and some neighbouring countries. France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Denmark, Swedeland, &c. can produce lists of their kings and bishops, from their first conversion to christianity, without any interruption, all living in communion with Rome, till some dropped off, upon Luther and Calvin's appearing. As for the British dominions, the reformers themselves own, and Catholic writers have demonstrated from public records, and the histories and writings of every age, that every king, archbishop of Canterbury, and so respectively, that every bishop and learned man lived in communion with Rome, and made profession of the Romish faith; from Henry the VIII's reign upwards for five hundred years to the Norman conquest. The same unity of doctrine and church government, is owned by the reformers, and proved in the same manner, by catholic writers, as to the Saxon monarchs, and during the heptarchy from the conquest, till the Saxons were converted from paganism, which comprises about five hundred years. So that there is an uncontested succession of the church, in communion with Rome, for a thousand years without any interruption. As to the British church, it lay under great oppression after its first establishment, the latter end of the second century, by the Roman governors, the Dioclesian persecution, the Pict's invasion, and Saxon usurpation, who being all pagans, gave a disturbance to the succession; yet as far as their imperfect records are able to inform us, we have an account of several of their princes, bishops, and monks, who lived in communion with Rome, and professed the same faith, with the universal church abroad, and joined with the Saxons upon their conversion.

Q. I cannot see any way reformers can have to refuse this mark of apostolical succession; and therefore they endeavour to evade the force of the argument, by rendering the mark of antiquity insignificant.—Hence they distinguish, between a personal and doctrinal succession. The first, they say, is not material, because a personal suc-

cession may be continued by intruders, and false teachers ; whereas a doctrinal succession is made out, by shewing a conformity of doctrine, with the scriptures, the primitive pure ages, at, and soon after the apostles' time, as also by adhering to such as had an apostolic spirit, and undertook to reform the church ; this makes it apostolic.

A. This doctrine, between a personal and doctrinal succession, is a mere evasion, and in itself a contradiction : there cannot be a quality, without a subject of adhesion, nor a doctrine conveyed without hands to convey it ; so that what you call a succession of doctrine, supposes a succession of persons. I own a personal succession only, is not a sufficient mark of truth, for the reasons you insinuate ; but other circumstances are required, to shew that the persons are not innovators ; but then a succession of doctrine is unintelligible, when conveyances are wanting.

Q. I do not see that such a succession of doctrine is unintelligible, (though I own it is very improperly called succession, for want of persons to convey it) yet, at the same time, if the doctrine is conformable to the scriptures, to the faith of the apostles, and the primitive ages, it may truly be called apostolical in the sense of the article.

A. By this method of appealing to scriptures, &c. all heretics whatever, may have a pretence of justifying their innovations ; and it was the method they made use of in every age, when they appeared. The Marcionists, Manicheans, Arians, Donatists, &c. constantly appealed to the scriptures, and had passages ready to allege in defence of every error they maintained. But how did Tertullian, St. Epiphanius, St. Augustin, and the other orthodox fathers, proceed against them ? They owned the scriptures were a good rule for enquiring into the truth, but could not be a judge in the case, if either any of the books were rejected, or erroneously expounded ; and therefore, they urged the authority of the church, which was commissioned to determine these matters. They produced catalogues of bishops, and ancient fathers, to give testimony of what was the true sense of the scriptures. They called upon heretics to name the persons who had handed down their errors, from the apostles ; now if ancient heretics, who lived so near to the times of the apostles, were at a loss upon this account, how can modern reformers make out their succession, after so many ages of interruption, or

what pretence can they have of justifying themselves who have no arguments to urge, but what all heretics made use of, viz. appealing to scriptures, expounded according to their own private judgment? as for the noise they make about the primitive and pure ages, which they pretend to follow, they can have no claim, either to the doctrine or discipline of those times, and therefore, they refuse to stand by any such evidence, but appeal both from fathers and councils to the word of God.

Q. I own the want of personal succession is a great inconvenience; and therefore, some of the reformers have attempted to avoid it, and to this purpose, have offered a list of persons, through whose hands the truth has been conveyed to them, viz. The Albigenses in France, the Hussites in Bohemia, and the Wicklifites in England; who were forerunners of the reformation, and held out a light for Luther and Calvin, &c.

A. What can this chain of a few broken links effect to their purpose? Can it reach through so many ages as is required? Or can the reformers, with all their skill, join the links together? The defects which may be observed in this pretended succession, plainly shews the desperation of the defence: I will only mention some of them. Those pretended successors of the apostles were heretics condemned by the universal church at that time. They did not immediately succeed one another, there being a gap of some ages between them. They had no communication, but lived in different places, and at different times. They varied in essential points from each other. (See Bossuet's *Hist. of the Variat. L. 11.*) They were only a few ignorant obstinate persons, without government, bishops, or pastors, and a mere mob; and in open rebellion against the lawful powers under whom they lived. In fine, they were all reduced to nothing, long before the reformation, and innovation of Luther and Calvin; and therefore, could not be their immediate predecessors as to time, much less as to doctrine; their tenets being directly opposite to the reformation in many essential points; and this kind of succession can be no more prejudicial to the claim of God's church, than a list of rebels can be prejudicial to the royal succession of kings, if by beginning with Oliver Cromwell, a catalogue should be made of all the rebels, that opposed the crown in every reign since the conquest.

Q. I own these are but scandalous and dirty channels for conveying the waters of life, and the reformers appear to have dug themselves cisterns which cannot hold them. But they have still another way of maintaining their succession; they might lurk invisibly in the body of the universal church, and as they received the scriptures with all the necessary points of the christian religion, excepting the additional articles, and superstitious practices of the church of Rome, they might claim a succession through the channel.

A. The more the reformers struggle, the more they are entangled. Was there ever any system more inconsistent with itself, and more absurd in all its consequences? a system destructive to all government, both civil and ecclesiastical; a system that opens a gap to rebellion, disobedience, schism, and heresy; and puts it in the power of any body of men, or even single persons, to justify their defection, both in church and state. And in the first place, what proofs are there of this invisible state of the church? Would it not be a madness to pretend, there is now an invisible army of Spaniards lurking in our kingdom, without any farther proof? But as they cannot be serious upon this point, as it imports a total invisibility, they have recourse to the members of the church of Rome, as the channels of truth, and chain of their succession. And pray how was this? Why during those ages, wherein the reformers were destitute of a regular succession of pastors, this want was supplied by Popish pastors, who during all those ages are to be conceived as monsters, consisting of two opposite natures; half papist, and half reformed clergy; if considered as holding all the points essential to Christ's church they were reformers, and continued the succession as true pastors. If considered as practising, holding and imposing additional articles contrary to the gospel, they were false teachers, and in that respect had no succession from the apostles. Now reformers claim their succession under the first consideration, and allow popish teachers to have been the channel, through which passed all the essentials of the true religion: but now observe the circumstances of this whimsical succession.—Is not the true faith as much destroyed by the additional articles, as by subtracting from them? If the popish pastors, during several ages, imposed additional articles inconsistent with the true

faith, they could not be orthodox teachers. No man can act lawfully without a commission, and what commission can false teachers give, who are themselves without commission? But the absurdity of this plea will appear farther, when the late reformers fly to the church of Rome for their consecration, episcopal, and sacerdotal; such as sufficiently qualifies them to preach and govern the church. For in the first place, few of them ever pretend to this consecration, being neither bishops, nor priests: others cannot make out their consecration, and scarce any of them esteem that consecration to be necessary. But of what advantage is consecration, in case they could be favoured with it? The ancient heretics, viz. Arians, Donatists, Pelagians, &c. received the orders of episcopacy and presbytery from orthodox pastors, but this gave them no authority to teach heretical doctrine: and though both they, and the late reformers, received the scriptures from the orthodox party, they are not well qualified thereby, to expound it in their own sense. Those who laid hands upon them, gave them no such commission, but on the contrary obliged them to submit to the powers that ordained them, both as to jurisdiction, or doctrine.

Q. After all, I do not see why pastors sufficiently qualified by ordination, parts, learning, and zeal, may not have a right of reforming the church, when those who consecrated them neglect their duty, which was the pretended case of the reformers, in these latter times. No commission is required to perform good actions; but the law and the gospel give every man a commission in those circumstances; so that all the noise about succession is little to the purpose.

A. You now touch the heart of the cause, and the plea has a plausible appearance, but it lays open the nakedness of the pretended reformation, in all its parts. The thing signified by reformation, is making things better. Now the character, parts and zeal, are very useful qualifications; yet they are not sufficient, without other ingredients. We are to enquire into their power, what it is that wants reformation? Their motive, the effects, &c. It is an easy matter to cry out reformation, reformation: but in the first place, who were to be reformed? In what were they to be reformed? Who undertook to reform? What motive had they; what was their method? Did they actually

reform the faith of the church? This I will enquire into, through each particular. They pretend to reform those whom Christ had given a special commission to govern and reform others, and to whom he had given frequent promises of his assistance, that they should always teach the truth; so that there could be no occasion for the reformation, unless Christ broke his promise. They pretend to reform the church, in matters of faith, and points of discipline. As to the first, there could be no occasion for it, since Christ has promised in the 16th chapter of St. John, and 28th chapter of St. Matthew, that he, and his holy spirit, will abide with his church, and teach her all truth to the end of the world, and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her; by which it is evident, that she could not err in matters of faith. As to her manners, if there was any occasion, it was to have been done, and was continually done in every age, by councils, general, national and provincial, as it appears by the canons, still extant for that purpose. Nor would our late reformers have done amiss, had they proceeded no farther, and observed the usual methods of reforming, and shewn due respect to superiors in the undertaking. Those who pretended to reform, were persons of scandalous lives, and such instruments as God never would make use of to carry on a good work. As to their motives they were avaricious, ambitious, sacrilegious, carnal and rebellious; opening a gap to any private person, to reform the established laws, both of church and state, upon a pretence of errors committed by the supreme powers. Now whether they actually did reform the church or no, appears by the consequences. The doctrines they advanced tended to liberty, and vice: They destroyed all church authority, and gave it to the laity, contrary to the doctrine of the gospel. The denying of free will, merit of good works, confession, fasting, and decrying of voluntary poverty, chastity, and obedience, were manifest oppositions to a good life: destroying pious foundations, designed for the poor, and God's service; seizing their lands, and throwing them away among debauched court favourites, were the very reverse of a reformation.

Q. In the next place you are to satisfy me as to the two other marks of the church, viz. miracles, and the conversion

of heathen nations. And as to the first, what is it you call a miracle?

A. It is a surprising work, above the reach of art or nature, and which speaks an Almighty power.

Q. A work of that kind cannot be mentioned as a mark of truth, upon several accounts. First, because jugglers are often known to impose upon men by tricks, which appear to be above either art or nature. Secondly, the devil, and wicked persons, by combination with him, do often perform surprising things, which fall not under the power either of art or nature, that we can discover. Thirdly, to make wonderful performances a certain mark of truth, or that the divine power is employed in them, we must be capable of discerning how far art and nature can extend in their productions. Again, heathens can work miracles.

A. As to the first, what jugglers perform are easily discovered by the inquisitive and learned, as we find by experience. As to the second, the devil, it is true, has a great insight into both art and nature, and is capable of performing wonderful things, which we cannot account for; but there being many things he cannot effect, and even what wonders he does perform are always detected, and proved not to be the works of divine power. As to the third, though we cannot dive into all the secrets of art and nature, so as to discover every particular effect, and form a judgment that it proceeds not from a divine power; yet there are several performances which we are sure can have only God for their author, as, namely, raising the dead to life, prophesying or foretelling future contingencies, and curing distempers naturally incurable, without any applications either from art or nature. As for miracles being performed by heathens, and heretics, they were commonly detected to be impostures, and not miracles; and though God should have made use of such instruments to perform miracles, yet we never find he did it in confirmation of their doctrine.

Q. What construction then do you put upon the wonders performed by Pharoah's magicians, by Simon Magus, by Apollonius Tyaneus, and those that antichrist will perform? These are to be performed to confirm the doctrines he will teach?

A. Great numbers will be carried away by them, not

merely by the force of those proofs, but by blindness and obstinacy, in punishment of sin, for God never permits false prophets and magicians, but he raises up the workers of miracles to oppose them, and detect their forgery. Moses and Aaron detected Pharaoh's magicians. St. Peter detected Simon Magus, and Enoch and Elias will confound antichrist. So that as God's power is employed in working true miracles, his goodness and justice interposes to detect false ones.

Q. When miracles are true and done by the power of God, all the world must confess, protestants as well as catholics, Jews and heathens, themselves, that those who work miracles to confirm their doctrine, are true apostles, and that the faith they teach is true, for miracles are certainly a divine attestation of truth, and such are urged in the scriptures both old and new, appealed to by Christ himself, as a testimony greater than that of St. John, to prove himself the Messiah. St. John, v. 33, 36. And by St. Paul, as the signs and seal of his apostleship. 2 Cor. xii. 12. And if it were once clearly proved, that you have had any of these extraordinary persons in the church of Rome, professing the faith of that church, who have been workers of miracles, like Christ and the apostles, in curing the sick, the lame, the blind, and raising the dead to life; we should be worse than infidels, if we did not own the church of Rome to be the true church, and the Roman faith the true faith. Have you any authority that may be depended upon, that such miracles have been done by the saints of your communion?

A. We have as good authority for the truth of many surprising miracles, done by such as believed and preached the Roman faith, as can be had for the truth of any historical fact: for instance, the miracles wrought by St. Augustine, our apostle at the conversion of England, in confirmation of the Roman Catholic faith; viz. the mass, transubstantiation, invocation of saints, prayer for the dead, &c. attested by venerable Bede, and all our chronicles; Hollingshead, Stow, Goodwin, and others. The miracles done at St. Stephen's relics, related at full length by St. Augustine the great, (L. xx. de Civ. Dei. chap. 8.) as an eye witness to many of them: and can any one doubt, but St. Stephen himself, as well as St. Augustine, the relator of these miracles, preached the same faith, as those persons

did, who came to venerate his relics, and implore his intercession, for the cure of their sick, and raising of their dead? The public miracles done by St. Bernard, (before thousands of people) preaching the Roman catholic faith against the Henricians, and Albigenses, who were a branch of the Manichean sect; attested by all the histories of those times. The miracles done by St. Dominick, and St. Francis; one the founder of the Dominican, the other of the Franciscan order, both strongly united to the church, and see of Rome, related by St. Antonius. Hist. part ii. l. 23. The miracles done by St. Francis Xaverius at the conversion of the Indies: Mr. Pory of Cambridge, in his Geographical Dictionary, page 410, witnessing, that this great saint and Jesuit, and preacher of the Roman Catholic faith, did miraculously cure the deaf, the dumb, the lame, the blind, the sick, and raised the dead to life. In a word, a volume would not suffice to relate the miracles done by the saints of our communion, public, certain, uncontested, and prodigious miracles; the truth whereof is so undoubted, that they are published to the world for truth by protestants themselves, as may be seen in the Protestant Centuriators of Magdeburgh, in the 13th chapter of their history for every century. The truth of these miracles, the learned part of protestants own, and the most incredulous part have nothing to object against them, but what might formerly, with as good reason, have been objected by the Jews and heathens, against the miracles of Christ and the apostles: for all they can say against them is, that they are reported by catholics, and that they will not believe catholics: and may not Jews and heathens say, that the miracles of Christ and his apostles were reported by christians, and that they will not believe christians? whereas miracles being facts, can have no other proof but the credit of historians, to recommend the truth of them: they being the last and highest proof of doctrine, can have no other proof for themselves but the evidence of sense, to those who saw them done, and their testimony, and report to others. In the proof of miracles, no one can go higher than to make it appear by the most creditable authors that such miraculous things were done, at such a time and place, in the sight of whole multitudes of people; by which means we may be as certain of the truth of a miracle, as of any other fact we see or hear. Cannot I prudently believe such persons as

St. Antonius, venerable Bede, St. Augustine the Great, St. Ambrose, &c. On the other hand, if such men may be reputed forgers, this will overthrow the credit of those men, and writings, which convey all the proofs we have for the miracles of the primitive christians, and the divine establishment of the christian religion; either then own our miracles to be true, or if you take the liberty to give the lie to all the world, who attest the truth of them, any one inclined to be an infidel may with as good reason question all the facts by which the christian religion is proved to be divine, or any other facts, under pretence that there is no geometrical or metaphysical certainty of such things. In a word, we have all the evidence that the nature of miracles can admit of; the highest human testimony that can be had for the truth of them, and all the authority that can be had for the truth of any; and he that requires more is a prejudiced and unreasonable man.

Q. It only remains, concerning the marks of the church, that you add a word or two, of the conversion of infidels, which appears to me an unquestionable proof, if the facts be true. And in the first place, let me understand the nature of this argument; what nations have been converted, and who were the instruments employed by Almighty God in that great work?

A. The propagation of the Christian religion, has always been looked upon as an undeniable effect of divine power, as the circumstances plainly declare. The persons first employed, were unqualified as to any human means. The doctrine they established was directly opposite to the interest, and affections of all mankind, and the method they made use of, in all appearance, was destructive to the cause they undertook; the apostles were persons without power, interest or learning, the doctrine they taught was a denial of all the pleasures of life; and the conquest they gained was by their being overcome, and being put to death by their enemies, so that nothing but the force of truth, and the justice of their cause could prevail upon mankind and bring about their conversion. As to the truth of the fact, it depends upon historical credit, which informs us that there were such persons as Christ and his apostles, and that by their means such a conversion was made.

Q. All this must be owned by every party that professes itself christian, but the apostles not living long enough to

complete the work, how was it carried on? The heathenish worship was the prevailing religion, for three hundred years after, in all parts of the world, and in some nations nothing was done in order to their conversion till several ages after.

A. What you have insinuated is very much to our present purpose. Christianity was but gradually propagated during the first three hundred years after Christ, and even after that time only few nations entirely embraced it. The remaining part of the labour was undertaken and completed by persons in communion with the see of Rome, who professed the same doctrine that is now taught by Roman Catholics. The conversion from paganism to christianity is entirely owing to them; they were the instruments employed in converting the French, Spaniards, English, as also Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, and all the principalities of Germany; and of late years persons of the same religion have brought to the Christian faith infinite numbers of the inhabitants of both the East and West Indies.

Q. These are facts that cannot be called in question, as being supported by the same historical credit, which gives testimony of the propagation of christianity during the first three hundred years.

A. And if this be so, there cannot be a stronger proof of the truth of a religion, and that they who were employed in the work were instruments of heaven. And that on the contrary all those sects who are divided from the church of Rome, not being able to shew, or even pretending to lay claim to the conversion of any one heathenish nation, are entirely destitute of the divine assistance. They cannot complain of want of opportunities, being daily conversant in the way of trade with the infidel nations. They have learned men among them capable enough to instruct them in christianity, and of late have made little subscriptions to carry on that work, but without any effect. God will not concur with such instruments, who are more zealous to fill their warehouses than to propagate the gospel.

Q. What is meant by the last words of this article, the communion of saints?

A. By saints are to be understood all the blessed in heaven, all the faithful on earth, and all the suffering souls in purgatory: between whom there is a communion or corres-

pondence conformable to their stations. The blessed in heaven pray for the faithful on earth: and the faithful on earth give thanks to God for their glory, and honour them, and beg their prayers. The faithful on earth pray for one another, by being united under the same invisible head, Christ Jesus, and under the same visible head to avoid schism, in the same faith to avoid heresy, and in the same sacraments and sacrifice, and bonds of love, whereby they partake of each other's merits, and the prayers of the church.

Q. Does not the communion of saints reach to infidels, heretics, schismatics, &c.

A. No more than the branches are nourished by the tree from whence they are cut off; they may pretend a communion with Christ, but by not submitting to the superiors he has appointed, by rejecting the true faith, by not making use of the sacraments, the communion is broke; all they partake of are prayers for their conversion.

THE TENTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the tenth article?

A. The forgiveness of sins.

Q. How do you explain this matter?

A. We believe that God has given a power to his church, to forgive sin; for though it is God alone that can forgive sin, as the principal agent, yet he may employ others as instruments to confer grace, and by consequence to forgive sin.

Q. Where is this power expressed in the holy scriptures?

A. First, when original sin is forgiven by the sacrament of baptism. Secondly, when Christ said, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, St. John xx. 53. Again, when Christ having cured the lame and sick man of a palsy, and told him, his sins were forgiven him, the Jews were scandalized, saying within themselves, that only God could forgive sin, this man blasphemeth; but our Saviour seeing their thoughts, said, which is easier to say, thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say, rise up and walk; therefore to let you see, says he, that the son of man has power to forgive sins, (Matt. ix. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.) he ordered the sick man to rise and take up his bed and walk. He wrought that mi-

raclé to convince them that such a power was conferred upon him as man.

Q. But is not this power an usurpation of the divine authority? It encourages people to commit sin, seeing that the priest has a power to absolve whom he pleases; nay farther, why may he not give them leave to commit sin.

A. It is rather an acknowledgment of the divine power; because an instrument has no virtue of itself, but derives all its efficacy from the principal agent; whereof there is a plain instance, in working miracles; where God is honoured, and his power illustrated by those who cure distempers and raise the dead, by being the instruments he employs for those purposes. As for priests having a power to forgive whom they please, or to give persons leave to sin; those are ignorant surmises, and downright calumnies. The power of absolving from sin, is granted with such restrictions, that no one is capable of receiving any benefit, but only such as bring proper dispositions, and are esteemed worthy of absolution in the sight of God.

Q. Pray what are those dispositions?

A. There are several. First, a sinner must be inwardly and sincerely sorrowful for having offended God. Secondly, he must make a firm resolution not to offend him any more. Thirdly, he must humbly and sincerely declare all his mortal or deadly sins by confession. Fourthly, he must promise to restore the good name, or goods of others, he has unjustly detained. Fifthly, he must promise to avoid the occasions of sinning, &c.

Q. When these things are complied with, the power of absolving seems useless, and the power is only declarative, not executive?

A. When those dispositions are accompanied with a perfect love of God above all things, and with a will to confess, the sin is forgiven before absolution; but when the love of God is only weak and imperfect, absolution completes the work; not unlike to a blast, which recovers a few sparks of fire, which otherwise might disappear and come to nothing. Thus a sinner who begins to love God, by an humble acknowledgment and confession of his sins, renders himself capable of receiving a farther grace, by the power God has left to his church.

Q. Has the church a power of absolving from all sins

whatever? This I mention upon account of some expressions in the scriptures, which seem to insinuate, as if certain sins could not or would not be forgiven, even by God himself, much less by the church?

A. The scriptures only speak of the greater difficulty there is, in having some sins forgiven, more than others: for instance, habitual sins, blasphemy, impugning the known truth, &c. and where there is a direct opposing of God's grace, upon which forgiveness entirely depends: but even in these cases, the scriptures assures us, that God's mercy cannot be limited, and mentions several particulars where such sins have been forgiven. The only sin that God can be said to be incapable of forgiving, is final impenitence, whereby a sinner renders himself incapable, for want of proper dispositions; not that there is a want of either power or will in God, but because forgiveness in that case is inconsistent with his divine justice, and nature of the offence. Now as to the power of the church, it is under no limitations where the offender brings proper dispositions, hence, the Novatians (who affected a strictness of discipline, in order to seduce the people, and make them believe they were more holy than others) were condemned for heretics, pretending that the church had not power to forgive some sort of sins.

Q. Is this all that is meant by the forgiveness of sins?

A. No: by the power of forgiving sin, we are to understand another power flowing from it, viz. a power of granting indulgences.

Q. What is an indulgence?

A. This will be specified when we come to explain the sacrament of penance.

THE ELEVENTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the eleventh article?

A. The resurrection of the body.

Q. In what does this mystery consist?

A. We believe that at the consummation of the world, all mankind shall have their souls and bodies re-united, in order to share equally of their eternal fate.

Q. What necessity is there for this union? And how is it possible to resume the same bodies, which are changed into other substances, especially in case of cannibals, who

eat one another, and may be supposed often to have but one body, the substance of one being become the substance of some other, by digestion, &c.?

A. There is no absolute necessity, only it is God's pleasure it should be so: though there are some congruous reasons for that re-union. First, man in the state of innocence, was designed not to die, so for the recovery of that state, the body and soul must be re-united. Secondly, as the body and soul concurred in good and bad, it is proper they should mutually partake of the effects, in a future state; besides without that re-union, man is not a complete being, but imperfect.

Q. Why was this article inserted in the creed?

A. To prevent and guard against certain errors of those days. First, against the Sadducees, a sect among the Jews, who denied the resurrection and immortality of man's soul. Secondly, against Hymeneus, and Philetus (who as St. Paul says, 2 Tim. chap. ii. ver. 17, 18.) said the resurrection was then over, expounding the doctrine only of a spiritual resurrection from sin to grace.

Q. Why is the resurrection of man called in the creed, the resurrection of the body?

A. To shew us, that (whereas man doth consist of two parts, viz. soul and body) it is only the body which perishes by death, the soul being immortal, and consequently incapable of resurrection; for nothing is revived but that which is first dead.

Q. How do you prove the immortality of the soul?

A. Abstracting from faith and divine revelation, I prove it. First, because the soul is a spiritual being, and consequently of a superior nature to the body, entirely distinct from it, and independent of it; and therefore it is not liable to be destroyed by that which destroys the body. Secondly, as the soul is a spirit, it has no parts, no extension, and so of its own nature it is indivisible, and incorruptible, and by consequence immortal: for death consists in a dissolution or separation of one part from another, which dissolution can have no place in that which has no parts.

Q. How do you prove man's soul to be a spiritual substance or being?

A. Because man's soul is endowed with a vast extent of thought and knowledge; with a memory of innumerable things; with a free will, which nothing controuls; with rea-

son and an understanding capable of contemplating the highest truths, and such as are the most abstract from matter, even the most subtle notions of metaphysics, the first principles of sciences, the laws of argumentation, and infinite series of demonstrations, &c. capable of reflecting upon herself, and her own operations, and the manner how she acts; unconfined by time or place as to her ideas, and not to be satisfied in her desires, with any thing less than one true and sovereign good. Now, no matter or corporeal substance alone can be endowed with reason, understanding, and a conscious life; it being repugnant to the common ideas of all mankind, that mere matter should be conceived thinking, understanding or reasoning; and daily experience teaches us, that this principle of life within us, which we call our soul, is endowed with a capacity of reflecting upon itself, and its own faculties, upon the very power of reflection, and the act thereof, and the manner how it reflects. Therefore this principle of life within us, cannot be material; for it is evident that matter can only act upon that which is material, whereas the soul of man conceives and contemplates many things which are entirely abstracted from matter, and have no connection with matter, such as the ideas of universality, spirituality, infinity, eternity, truth, wisdom, &c. all which are entirely abstracted and distinct from matter. Therefore the soul of man must be a spiritual being.

Q. How do you prove the general resurrection of the body?

A. From many texts of scripture. St. Paul says, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, your faith is vain." 1 Cor. xv. verse 13, 14. "I know," says holy Job, "that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth, and in my flesh I shall see my God—I myself and not another. Chap. xix. verse 25, 26, 27. "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. verse 22. "This corruptible body," says St. Paul, "must put on incorruption, and this mortal body must put on immortality." 1 Cor. xv. verse 53. Again, St. John in the Apocalypse, speaking of the wicked at the general resurrection says, "They shall seek death and shall not find it; they shall desire to die, and death shall fly from them." Chap. ix. verse 6. Besides the soul being immortal, and only one part of the whole man, it is

imperfect without the other; it is not in that state for which it was created, it is therefore in a state of violence unsuitable to its nature, and it is not likely that a separation so unnatural is intended to last for ever; but it seems more agreeable to human reason to believe there is a certain time appointed by Almighty God, in which all separated souls shall resume their bodies. This argument our Saviour urged against the Sadducees, and proved the resurrection of men's bodies by the immortality of their souls. Mat. xxii.

Q. The manner of the resurrection is not very intelligible. Will the same body rise as to every part? At what age or size? Will the wicked arise as well as the just?

A. Mysteries of faith are not within the reach of man's understanding; however, it is easy to conceive, that he who made all things out of nothing, is able to collect the scattered parts of man's body, and replace them. As to cannibals being nourished so as to claim the same body, it is a false and whimsical conceit; they are not nourished entirely by human flesh: besides, as there is an increase, so there is a continual waste in human bodies, so that at last every one may recover his own. As to the rest that regards this mystery, the scriptures seem to say, that every body will be perfect, and as it were at man's estate, no blemish or deformity: the wicked, as well as the just, will resume their bodies, but not with the same circumstances; the bodies of the just will be glorified, free from the clogs we now carry about us, and embellished with many rare qualities.

Q. Can you give me any account of the excellent qualifications the bodies of the just will be favoured with upon their resurrection?

A. The scriptures tell us first in general, that they will be so pure, as in a manner to be spiritualized, that is to say, free from any pain or inconveniencies. Secondly, clear as light, that is, transparent, every body having a clarity, proportionable to its merits. Thirdly, agility, that is to say, a capacity of moving as quick as thought, from place to place, without any impediment.

THE TWELFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED.

Q. WHICH is the twelfth article ?

A. Life everlasting.

Q. What is the capital point to be believed by this article ?

A. That there is a future state, wherein both the just and wicked shall remain for eternity. The wicked in everlasting punishment, and the just in everlasting pleasures, by enjoying the sight of God himself. Whereby are condemned all atheistical principles of those who denied the soul's future being and immortality, especially the Epicureans, who placed man's happiness in riches, honours, pleasures, or a pretended content of mind.

Q. This is what, I suppose, you call true happiness, or beatitude. Pray give me a general description of it ?

A. Beatitude, or the final happiness of the just, is a state wherein we are freed from all that is evil, and enjoy all that is good.

Q. Why is beatitude everlasting ?

A. Because, otherwise it would not be perfect, since the fear of losing it would be a continual torture to the mind.

Q. Can you give me a description of happiness in the next life, as to the particulars following, viz. What is it to see God ? Will the corporal eyes behold him ? Did any one ever see God whilst living ? What is it the blessed see in God ? Have all the just an equal share of happiness ? Will the just be happy immediately after their decease, or not till after the general resurrection ?

A. As to those particulars, some points we are to believe as articles of faith ; in others, the learned are divided, and may be free to judge at pleasure. God cannot be seen by the corporal eye, because he is a pure spirit : hence the Anthropomorphites were condemned as heretics, for affirming God had a body essentially belonging to him. The corporal eye can only see God's visible effects. Again, no man living can see God, according to the general law of providence ; for though the scriptures sometimes seem to say, that the ancient patriarchs and prophets saw God ; yet it is to be understood only of angels, or some visible thing representing him, not that they saw God in his own

substance. I purposely say, according to the general law of providence; for it is a disputed point among divines, whether Moses, St. Paul, and St. Stephen, were not by a particular privilege, favoured with the sight of God, even while they were alive. It is an article of faith, that the soul is not naturally adapted to see God, without some supernatural assistance, which divines call the light of glory. The contrary doctrine being condemned by the general council of Vienna, against those heretics, called Begardi and Beguines, anno 1311. As to what the blessed will see in God, the scriptures affirm, (1 John iii. 2,) that they will see him as he is in himself, face to face. 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Which imports, that they will see the divine nature, and three persons with his attributes, and what is essential to the deity. Psalm xxxv. 10. As is defined by the council of Florence against the Armenians, anno 1438. It is also a certain truth, that the saints will one way or other, have the knowledge of several things, especially such as belong to them, particularly the prayers that are directed to them, by the faithful on earth; it being defined in the council of Trent, that it is not a foolish practice to address ourselves to the saints by prayer: and from hence we may infer, that it is a rashness to affirm, that they do not hear or know our petitions; after all, we must not pretend that we can have a comprehensive knowledge of God. As to the equality of happiness, all equally share it, as to the primary blessings of seeing God; but there is an inequality in the manner, according to every one's deserts, this distribution is required by the divine justice, which rewards men proportionably. As to the time when the saints shall be admitted to see God, it is an article of faith, defined in the council of Florence, that with regard to such as have nothing to be purged away, it will happen immediately upon their decease.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS EXPOUNDED.

Q. When, by whom, and upon what occasion, were the ten commandments delivered?

A. They were delivered by Almighty God to the people of Israel, through the hands of Moses, soon after they were freed from the bondage of Egypt. The occasion was, that

they might have a more distinct knowledge of their duty, by several particulars being specified.

Q. Had they no knowledge of their duty before?

A. Yes; but not sufficient for their direction: not only the Jews, but all other nations were provided by the light of nature, to distinguish between good and evil; but the world was become so corrupted, that it was requisite to explain matters more clearly, and recommend under distinct heads, the obligations they lay under, in regard of God and their neighbour.

Q. Do the ten commandments contain the whole of man's duty?

A. They express only some general points, yet so, that all particular duties are reducible to them.

Q. As how?

A. This will appear when we come to explain every commandment in particular: meantime, it is sufficient to observe in general, that the worshipping of God implies all religious duties that immediately regard the Supreme Being. Honouring father and mother, speaks obedience to all sort of superiors. The commandments not to kill, steal, commit adultery, &c. extend to all the duties we owe to our neighbour.

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHICH is the first commandment?

A. Thou shalt not have strange gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, nor in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth: thou shalt not adore nor worship them.

Q. What is imported by this commandment?

A. Some things are commanded, other things are forbidden, other things are not forbidden.

Q. What is commanded?

A. Religion.

Q. What is religion?

A. It is a worship due to God.

Q. By what methods do we pay this duty?

A. By honour, by oblation, sacrifice, prayer, vows and oaths, also by erecting altars and churches.

K

Q. What do you call honouring, and how is it commonly expressed in our language?

A. Honouring, is giving a testimony or acknowledgment of some excellency or qualification, and is called adoration, worship, respect, reverence, &c.

Q. Which are the excellencies or qualifications to be honoured?

A. There are several: some are infinite, belonging only to God; others are the perfections of creatures, whereof some are natural, as wit, beauty, strength, and such like qualifications, either of body or mind: others acquired, as authority, and all arts and sciences; others are supernatural, as grace, virtue, &c.

Q. Is honour equally due to all who are masters of these perfections?

A. No; not equally, but proportionably to the excellency of the object.

Q. How do you explain this inequality of honour?

A. Divine honour is paid only to God. Civil honour to persons who enjoy natural or acquired perfections; and a religious honour betwixt both, to supernatural qualifications. The holy fathers called divine honour, *latria*, and religious honour, *dulia*, to which divines add *hyperdulia*, an honour given on account of some singular excellency, as that given to the Blessed Virgin Mary, as being the mother of God.

Q. I easily grant, that civil honour is due on account of natural and acquired qualifications: and that persons are to be revered and respected on those accounts, and that the same is due to others who possess supernatural perfections. But is it not a harsh expression to say, that creatures are to be adored, or worshipped, or to stile that honour religious that is given on that score?

A. Words are to be taken in the sense, custom or intention has fixed upon them. I own the word worship or adoration, in the language of the church of England, is generally taken for divine honour; though the Latin and Greek words, (*adoratio, προσκύνησις*) are frequently in the scriptures applied to creatures; sometimes the word worship or adoration, signifies bowing or respect, in a more general sense. The Latin word *cultus* has a much larger signification, and has been used even by Protestant divines, to comprehend an inferior honour. See Camierus,

tom. ii. l. 18. chap. 1. and Junius against Bellarmin, related by bishop Montague in his Appeal, page 255. So that speaking in the language of the church of England, it is the greatest calumny in the world, to say, or suppose, that Catholics worship any created being whatever, with the adoration that belongs to God.

Q. I should be glad to be informed, in what manner these matters may be explained, so as not to deprive God of the honour which is proper to him alone?

A. This may be done by distinguishing worship into several branches, viz. relative, absolute, external, internal. Relative honour or worship, is when a thing is honoured, not on its own account, but for the thing it represents, as that paid to images. Absolute honour is, when a thing is honoured for some excellency inherent in the thing itself, as learning, holiness, &c. though all honour may be said to be relative to God, because all excellencies are derived from him, and have a relation to him. External honour or worship is paid by visible tokens, as kneeling, prostrating, bowing, uncovering, &c. Internal honour, is an acknowledgment of some excellency in a thing without any outward tokens.

Q. Which of these honours do you call religious, and which civil?

A. The honour we pay to God, angels, saints, to their images, pictures, and relics, may be stiled religious. The honour we pay to things on account of civil qualifications we call civil. The reason why the first is called religious is, because they tend towards the good of religion, either absolutely or relatively: absolutely, when they are placed on God, his angels and saints, who are qualified for it by divine or supernatural perfections inherent in them: or relatively, as to images, pictures, &c. which, though they have no supernatural perfection inherent in them, yet they promote religion, by being a means of suggesting religious thoughts.

Q. Which are the exterior tokens of honour belonging only to God?

A. Sacrifice, altars, churches, vows and oaths.

Q. What is sacrifice?

A. It is the offering of some visible thing to God, by some real change in acknowledgment of God's supreme dominion over all created beings. This action in all ages

and by all nations, was appropriated only to God, as also were altars, churches, vows, and oaths.

Q. The practice seems to import more ; otherwise, why does the church of Rome offer sacrifice, erect altars and churches to saints ? Do we not also make vows and promises to men, and swear by creatures ?

A. Churches, altars, &c. are only consecrated to God, though they are distinguished by the names of saints and angels, who are also honoured by those foundations : but as for sacrifice, it is directed or offered only to God. Promises indeed are made to men, but not vows, and if we swear by creatures, such oaths are either an express or implicit invocation of God.

Q. What do you say to the other outward tokens of honour, viz. kneeling, bowing, &c. especially as to burning incense ?

A. Such outward tokens are indifferent of themselves, to signify supreme or inferior honour, and depend upon the intention of the performer. Heathens made use of these to signify a supreme honour to the false Gods : christians often make use of them, only to signify an inferior relative honour : hence to bow to princes, kneel to parents, to be uncovered in churches, &c. are actions no ways derogatory to the honour we pay to God. As for burning incense, though formerly it was a token of divine, supreme honour, custom has imposed another signification on it ; it signifies no more now than to represent the prayers of the faithful mounting up into heaven.

Q. What is prayer, another duty ordered by the first commandment ?

A. It is a raising up of our minds to God, whereby we beg for good things, and to be freed from all evil ; or in general, it is a petition directed to another, in order to obtain something, returning thanks for what is obtained, and celebrating the donor's praises.

Q. To whom may prayers be directed ?

A. First, to God, the original author of all gifts.— Secondly, to the saints and angels, that they may use their interest with Almighty God for us. Thirdly, to the faithful on earth, who pray for and desire each other's prayers.

Q. I thought prayer had been an act of religion directed only to God ?

A. All prayers are directed to God, either immediately,

or by the mediation of others, and even then they directly implore God, though jointly they regard saints and angels.

Q. What occasion is there for prayer, seeing that God knows our wants, without our informing him, and will grant what we want if he thinks it convenient? Again, what occasion is there to pray to saints or angels, since we may, and are ordered to apply ourselves to God himself immediately?

A. Though God knows our wants, he expects we should be sensible of them, and express them, the subjection we are under requiring that duty, and that we may return thanks and glorify his name. It is true we are ordered to pray to God immediately, which we do by praying to saints, the prayers directed to them including an express invocation of God. When we desire the prayers of the faithful on earth, it does not exclude the duty of praying to God, for as God orders us to pray for one another, it is expressly complying with the duty of prayer to God.

Q. How many sorts of prayer are there?

A. Vocal and mental, public and private. Vocal prayer is expressed by words; mental is conceived only in thoughts, and if it proceeds not to ask any thing it is called contemplation. Public prayer is pronounced by the ministers of the church. Private prayer by private persons not deputed for that office by character.

Q. Do we only pray with a voice and mind? Are there not other ways of praying?

A. The voice is the means whereby we petition and give thanks; but all the ceremonies accompanying prayer, are a part of prayer, viz. music, with other solemn decorations; for these have a voice and are instruments of God's praise, though not so as to articulate words; hence ceremonies have the force of prayer when religiously performed.

Q. What dispositions are required in prayer, and what are the things we are to pray for?

A. On the petitioner's part there is required attention, because prayer is both a rational and a christian action.

Q. What is attention?

A. It is an application of our thoughts, to what we are employed about, and is two-fold, external and internal; the first regards the pronounciation only, the other the sense of the words, or some other pious object in general.

Q. Can those be said to pray, who make use of a language they do not understand?

A. Yes, provided their minds be always fixed upon God and good things. God is praised in any voice, though inarticulate, as by music, &c. 1 Cor. xiv. 2.

Q. What other dispositions are there to render prayer more perfect?

A. Devotion and fervour. The first is a promptitude of the soul for that duty; the other is an uncommon activity exclusive of weariness.

Q. When is the duty of prayer to be performed?

A. The scripture tells us we are always to pray, which St. Augustin expounds thus; we are not to understand the words literally, but that those are always a praying who are employed in their respective duties. St. Luke, xxiii. 1. and 1 Thes. v. 17.

Q. Which are the prefixed times for prayer?

A. Chiefly these, morning and evening, public days assigned for that purpose, times of trouble, sickness, and temptations.

Q. What things are we to pray for?

A. Some things absolutely, others conditionally, viz. absolutely we pray for all supernatural gifts, graces, the conversion of sinners, infidels, a happy death, heaven, &c. Conditionally, health, peace, fair weather or rain, yet with all submission to the divine will. As for riches, honours, and the pleasures of life, they are not the proper subject of prayers, because they are commonly prejudicial to the soul.

Q. What is a vow?

A. It is a promise made to God of performing some good action.

Q. Explain it more at large.

A. The promise must be, with an intention to oblige one's self, and the thing promised must be good, possible, and better done than undone.

Q. What is a promise?

A. It is an engaging of one's faith, and a breach of it is a lying to the person to whom it is made.

Q. Are vows made to saints?

A. No, only to God, saints are called upon as witnesses.

Q. How many sorts of vows are there?

A. Several; the chief are absolute, not expressing or implying a condition. A conditional vow is, when a condition is expressed or implied; an express vow is when the thing promised is expressed in words or thoughts. A tacit vow, is when the thing promised is acknowledged to have a vow annexed; as in the vows of priests, where chastity, &c. are not expressed but implied. A simple vow is, that which is made without ceremonies, appointed by the church. A solemn vow is, that which is made in the profession of religious persons, &c.

Q. In what cases are vows lawful and valid, and when are they neither lawful nor valid?

A. In the first place, a purpose or intention to do a thing is no vow, unless a person does actually in words or thoughts oblige himself. If a person actually makes a vow in words, but declares he has no intention inwardly to comply with it, or oblige himself, the church will oblige him to stand to his vow, and he sins mortally, at least in matters of consequence. Vows made by persons in sickness, in danger of death, or by young persons, if they have a sufficient presence of mind, are obligatory. A vow to do things which are unlawful or bad, or things out of one's power, or things that are vain, indifferent, and of no consideration, in order to promote goodness, is invalid, and it is an offence to make such vows. Things that are indifferent of themselves, may become good by circumstances, in which cases they may be vowed.

Q. Why do vows oblige? When do they oblige? How does the obligation cease? Are persons obliged to perform vows made by others?

A. Vows are obligatory of their own nature, because not to keep our promise with God is derogatory to his honour, and we lie to him in fact. Hence the scriptures command us to comply with our vows, otherwise we offend God. Num. xxx. 3. Prov. xx. 25. Isa. xix. 21.

Q. Vows destroy freedom?

A. Those who vow enjoy freedom both before and after; they were at liberty to vow or not to vow, and when they had vowed, the obligation they laid upon themselves no more destroyed their freedom, than the commandments of God destroyed freedom.

Q. What occasion is there of vows to do good, are we

not all obliged to do good, both by the law of nature and God's positive law.

A. True, the law of nature, and divine laws oblige us to do good, but still we may use means, and impose a law upon ourselves, in order to be more punctual in observing those laws, viz. by submitting to pains and forfeitures, if we disobey God; again, the law of nature, and law of God, though they command good in general, and several species of doing good, yet they do not particularize matters, as to time, place, person, or how they are to be complied with. For instance, the law of God commands obedience, charity, &c. but it does not specify every particular person whom we are to obey, or to whom we are to bestow charity, or when, or how: these we may impose upon ourselves by vows. I am not obliged to give such a sum, or to such a person, or at such a time, unless I oblige myself by vow.

Q. What do you say as to the time, when a vow is to be fulfilled?

A. The rule is given in the 23d chapter of Deuteronomy, ver. 21. "When thou hast made a vow to our Lord thy God, thou shalt not delay to pay it: because the Lord thy God will require it, and if thou delay it shall be imputed to thee for a sin." Hence a vow of immediately doing a thing, is to be done the first opportunity: if no time is mentioned, it is not to be deferred too long, lest a person become incapable.

Q. Is an heir obliged to perform the vow of his parent?

A. A distinction is to be observed between personal and real vows. For instance, an heir is not obliged to visit Rome or Jerusalem, because his father made such a vow; but if his father made a vow to bestow an alms, he is obliged to perform it, if he tied himself to it by promise and consent, or if that incumbrance is expressed in the settlement, because it is a debt of charity and justice.

Q. How does the obligation of performing a vow cease?

A. There are three ways to make a vow not to be any longer binding, viz. irritation, commutation, and dispensation. By the first, the vow is declared never to be binding. By the second, it is changed into another vow of equal or greater good. In the third, the obligation is destroyed upon a just account: but in all these cases, superiors are to be consulted and followed. Again, the ob-

ligation of a vow ceases, when the matter becomes impossible. Secondly, when it cannot be performed without danger of death, or some great detriment to the body, or temporal losses, in which cases a dispensation is to be obtained. Thirdly, when the fulfilling the vow becomes unlawful, for instance, in subsequent marriage, after a simple vow of chastity, especially if the other party insists upon it. Fourthly, when the matter becomes indifferent. Fifthly, when it hinders a greater good. Sixthly, when superiors have a just reason to grant a dispensation.

Q. What is a vow of religion, and at what age are persons capable of taking it?

A. It is a vow of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and is either simple or solemn. A simple vow of religion may be made by men at fourteen; by women at twelve, and if before, it is in the power of parents to render it void, because they are then under tutelage. A solemn vow of religion cannot be made either by man or woman before they have completed the sixteenth year of their age. Hence the council of Trent has declared all such vows null which are made before that age.

Q. What is a vow of poverty?

A. It is a voluntary renunciation of property in all worldly goods, confirmed by vow.

Q. What grounds have you for this practice?

A. Very sufficient grounds; because worldly goods withdraw us from God's service. Hence, though we happen to possess them, we are not to set our hearts upon them, but enjoy them with indifferency, and make use of them, as St. Paul says, as if we did not make use of them. 1 Cor. vii. 31. Hence, our blessed Saviour advises those that would serve him perfectly, to give all they have to the poor. Mat. xix. 24. Conformably to this advice, vows are made to renounce property, and be content with the use of necessaries only.

Q. What is a vow of chastity?

A. It is a promise made to God, of entirely renouncing the pleasures and allurements of the flesh, and whereby a person obliges himself never to marry.

A. What motives can persons have, to lay such an obligation on themselves?

A. Several, very much conducing to the good of religion, especially for such as are designed for spiritual of-

fices: for the goods of this life, the pleasures of the flesh, and the care of providing for children, occasion a continual dissipation, and call men off from attending to their functions, as St. Paul observes, and therefore, in the same chapter, he advises such persons to live single. 1 Cor. vii. verse 8, 32, 33.

Q. Is it not unlawful to vow, what is not in our power; now chastity is entirely a gift of God, not in our power?

A. I own chastity is a gift of God, so are all other supernatural gifts; but yet God bestows grace sufficient to obtain them; so they cannot be said to be things out of our power.

Q. Which are the means provided by God to obtain his supernatural gifts?

A. The sacraments, prayer, corporal mortifications, &c. by which means we obtain grace, and overcome vicious habits, and the natural inclination we have to sin. The sacraments are continual channels of grace; by prayer we may hope to obtain whatsoever we ask for; by mortifying the flesh we are disposed for chastity, sobriety, &c.

Q. I own these are the usual means God has left in his church to avoid several sins, but as for chastity, marriage is the proper remedy appointed by God, and a vow not to marry, rejects this remedy; no man ought to place himself in a state, where he is incapable of making use of that remedy?

A. It is true, marriage is one remedy to preserve chastity, and therefore, all persons are at liberty to make use of it, unless they oblige themselves by vow to make use of other remedies, which are also assigned for that purpose, and are sufficient when rightly applied.

Q. It appears that marriage is the only remedy to preserve chastity, and by consequence, a vow to the contrary is unlawful?

A. If marriage were the only remedy, all would be in a state of damnation unless they married; besides, it is found by experience, that marriage is not always an effectual remedy, seeing that thousands are found to sin against chastity, notwithstanding a married life. As on the other hand, multitudes live chastely though unmarried, which is a proof that other remedies are sufficient; and, by consequence, a vow of chastity does not put it out of a person's power of living chastely.

Q. Marriage is what God commands, therefore, the forbidding priests and religious to marry is a wicked doctrine?

A. Is the obliging men to keep their vows, which they freely made, a wicked doctrine? If so, how will you excuse either Solomon, David, Moses, or St. Paul, who teach us to pay that which we have vowed. "It is much better," says Solomon, "not to vow, than after a vow not to perform the thing promised." Eccl. v. 4. "Vow ye, pay it," says holy David, "unto the Lord your God." Ps. lxxv. 11. "When thou hast made a vow to the Lord thy God," says Moses, "thou shalt not delay to pay it." Deut. xxiii. 21. St. Paul says, "That widows, who marry after they have vowed continency, have damnation, because they have made void their first faith." But because the reformation was built upon many thousands of broken vows, it must therefore be a wicked doctrine in the church to forbid so horrible a sacrilege.

Q. St. Paul says, "If they cannot contain, let them marry." And in another place, "The spirit and the flesh are contrary one to the other, so that you cannot do the things you would." Again, St. Paul says, "That marriage is honourable in all?"

A. The two first mentioned texts, are a mere corruption in the Protestant bible, which wants a reformation much more than the Catholic church ever did. St. Paul here speaking of persons who lie not under the restraint of a vow, says thus, (according to the Greek text,) "If they do not contain themselves, let them marry." 1 Cor. vii. 9. And again, "The spirit and the flesh are contrary one to the other, so that you do not do the things that you would." Gal. v. 17. For which the Protestant bible put, "If they cannot contain, &c.—so that you cannot do the things that you would." The reason of this gross and scandalous corruption is to make it patronize the lewdness and intemperance of the first ecclesiastical reformers. As to the words of St. Paul, where he says, "That marriage is honourable in all," (Heb. xiii. 4,) we must not imagine from hence, that it is honourable among all sorts of men, as you seem to insinuate; for if so, the marriage of a brother and a sister would be honourable, and that of those who vowed continence, to whom the same apostle says, "It is damnable." 1 Tim. v. So that the meaning of the apostle is,

that marriage is honourable in all things, that is, in all its parts and circumstances, &c.

Q. What is a vow of obedience?

A. First; we are to consider what obedience is, which is a virtue, whereby we comply with the will of a superior; for as in natural and artificial things, inferiors are moved by superiors, so in human actions the same is to be observed, as both the law of nature and the law of God do expressly require, to preserve unity in a community.

Q. What if a superior commands any thing against God's law, or things which no ways conduce to God's honour, but only to try obedience?

A. In the first case, he must not obey unless the case be doubtful. If the thing commanded tends towards preserving the rules of the order he is to obey. If the thing be manifestly indifferent, and no ways conducing to virtue, as to lift up a stone, or the like, it is the perfection of obedience to comply, but not required by his vow.

Q. What things are forbidden by the first commandment?

A. All superstitious practices.

Q. What is superstition?

A. It is a false worship of God, either by paying supreme honour to any thing but the true God, or by honouring the true God after an unjust manner.

Q. Pray give me examples of both kinds?

A. Of the first kind is idolatry, which pays divine honour to creatures.

Q. In what manner may persons commit idolatry?

A. First; when they regard idols as gods. Secondly; when they worship a false god, represented by an idol.

Q. Is it not superstition and idolatry to worship the true God, as he is represented by pictures and images?

A. By no means. The whole substance of worship centers in the true God; for what respect is paid to the representation is only relative.

Q. But the Jews were condemned by Almighty God, for worshipping the true God by representations?

A. This is a false gloss put upon their practice. The Jews were condemned on several accounts: First, for esteeming the images themselves to be gods. Secondly, because they mingled the adoration of idols with that of the true God, pretending thereby to adore him.

Q. In what manner is superstition committed, by paying worship to the true God, in an undue manner?

A. In general whenever religious ceremonies are made use of, which either have a false significaticn, or are designed to produce effects, which cannot be ascribed to God, or to any natural or artificial cause.

Q. What instances are there of this kind?

A. There are several kinds of superstitious practices. The chief whereof are divination, or foretelling what is to happen, or discovering secrets without proper means, which not being made use of, the devil, either tacitly or expressly, must interfere in the matter.

Q. Give me an account of the most vulgar superstitions of ignorant people?

A. To believe dreams, to judge from the motion of the planets and stars, which may serve to pronounce on natural effects, but not on the effects of man's free will. To foretell a person's fortune by the lines of his hand: to imagine some days are more lucky than others; to pretend to cure distempers, by applying things which have no virtue, capable of effecting the cure, &c.

Q. How do you excuse the sacraments from superstition, seeing that the elements, neither by art or nature are capable of producing the effects attributed to them?

A. Because they have that virtue by divine institution.

Q. What else is forbidden by the first commandment?

A. Sacrilege, perjury, and blasphemy.

Q. What is sacrilege?

A. It is abusing things which are consecrated to the service of God and religion; and it regards persons, things, and places, viz. priests, ornaments, images, and churches.

Q. What is perjury?

A. It is a false oath, when a person swears what is not true, or to do what he does not perform, or even intend.

Q. What is blasphemy?

A. It is injurious language against God, his saints, or holy things.

Q. What things are not forbidden by the first commandment?

A. It is not forbidden to make pictures, or images of God, saints, and angels, nor to place them in churches, or give them due respect. It is not forbidden to preserve relics of holy persons, and shew them due respect. It is

not forbidden to honour and desire the saints to pray for us. It is not forbidden to bless bread, water, candles, or any other thing appropriated to religious uses.

Q. Does not the commandment expressly forbid making the likeness of any thing in heaven, or in earth? And though it were lawful to make images, they are not to be honoured in a religious way, but only used in an historical way?

A. It does not absolutely forbid images, only conditionally, so as not to worship them, nor adore them as gods. Nay, God himself commanded Moses to make two cherubims of beaten gold, and place them at the two ends of the mercy seat, over the ark of the covenant, in the very sanctuary. Exod. xxv. He also commanded a serpent of brass to be made, for the healing of those who were bit by the fiery serpents: which serpent, according to St. John, was an emblem of Christ. John iii. 14. Besides, if all images or likenesses were forbid by this commandment, we should be obliged to fling down our sign-posts and deface the king's coin. And because a person by his image is capable of respect or disrespect, an historical use of them is not sufficient.

Q. How do you prove that there is a relative honour due to the images or pictures of Christ and his saints?

A. From the dictates of common sense and reason, as well as of piety and religion, which teach us to express our love and esteem for persons whom we honour, by setting a value upon all things that belong to them, or have any relation to them: thus a loyal subject, a dutiful child, a loving friend, value the pictures of their king, father, or friend; and those who make no scruple of abusing the pictures, or images, of Christ and his saints, would severally punish the man that should abuse the picture or image of his king. Besides, a relative honour is allowed of, and even practised by Protestants themselves. It is allowed of by bishop Montague,* a learned Protestant divine, who grants that there is a reverence or veneration, an honour or respect, due to the images or pictures of Christ and his saints. It is practised by them in the honour they give to their churches, to the altar, to the bible, to the symbols of bread and wine in the sacrament, to the name of Jesus,

* Part 2. Originum. Sect. 145, et in Epistomio, p. 318.

which is an image or remembrance of our blessed Saviour to the ear, as a picture or crucifix is to the eye. Such also was the honour which the Jews gave to the ark and cherubims; such was the honour which Moses and Joshua gave to the land on which they stood, as being holy ground. Exod. iii. 5. Josh. v. 15. And such is the honour which Catholics give to the images or pictures before which they kneel or pray; so that they do not give divine honour to them, (Con. Trid. Sess. xxv.) no nor even to the highest angel or saint, much less to images or pictures, as some maliciously slander them with, and call them idolators on that account; but I would have our adversaries consider, that misrepresentations, slander, and calumny, are as much forbid by the commandments as idolatry.

Q. What grounds have you for paying a veneration to the relics of saints?

A. Besides the ancient tradition and practice of the first and purest ages, attested by the best monuments of antiquity, we are warranted so to do by many illustrious miracles done at the tombs, and by the relics of the saints, which God, who is truth and sanctity itself, would never have effected, if this honour paid to the precious remains of his servants was not agreeable to him.*

Q. I own there is no harm in preserving relics, but we are not to use them superstitiously, ascribe miracles to them, and impose upon the world false relics.

A. The church is free from superstition in the use of relics. They are preserved in memory of the saints, and to proclaim God's glory. And miracles being wrought in all ages by them, makes the practice more authentic. As for false miracles and false relics, all the care imaginable is taken to discountenance such abuses.

Q. You believe then that great miracles have been done by relics?

A. A man must have a good share of confidence that can deny it; it is what the devil could never do. And I think at present no learned Protestant doubts of it. I refer you particularly to Dr. Cave, and to the translators of Monsieur du Pin, whose words are these—"It pleased God for the testimony of his doctrine and truth to work great

* See St. Aug. L. 22. de Civ. Dei. Cap. viii. et St. Ambr. Epist. 86, et Serm. 95.

miracles by the dead bodies of his saints, in witness, that they had been his messengers and instruments of his will." Cent. 8, page 120.

Q. Have you any instances in scripture of miracles done by relics?

A. Yes; we read of a dead man raised to life by the bones of the prophet Elisha. 2 Kings, xiii. 21. And that the handkerchiefs and aprons which had but touched the body of St. Paul, cast out devils and cured all diseases. Acts xix. 12.

Q. Then as to praying to saints, God only is the author of all spiritual blessings, and by consequence, the only object of prayer. Christ is our only mediator. The saints neither knew our necessities, nor can hear our prayers. God commands us to apply ourselves immediately to him. We have no precept or example in scripture to apply ourselves to saints?

A. These difficulties are easily removed when the following points are considered. First, that God by his divine providence has appointed certain means whereby men are to obtain their ends, both temporal and spiritual. Marriage, to propagate their species; ploughing and sowing, to procure bread and preserve life. For spiritual ends he has prescribed instruction in religion, prayer, fasting, alms, frequenting the sacraments, and all moral duties, in order to practice virtue, and become happy hereafter. Among other spiritual practices, he prescribes that of praying for one another; and if this be useful while living, why is it not after death, when saints are more capable of being serviceable by their prayers.

Q. Before we proceed any farther, pray tell me what you mean by praying to saints?

A. We mean no more than desiring them to pray to God for us, so that we do not pray or address ourselves to them, as the authors and givers of grace and glory; because in this sense, we hold it our duty to pray to God alone.

Q. Why are not these prayers to saints an usurpation of God's authority, who is the author of all spiritual blessings?

A. For several reasons. First, because we desire no more of the saints than that they would pray for us, and with us, to our common Lord, by the merits of him who

is both our and their mediator, that is, Jesus Christ our Saviour: and surely no one will say, that prayer for one another is derogatory to God's authority while we are upon earth. Secondly, we acknowledge God at the same time to be the origin of all blessings. Thirdly, saints are applied to only as court favourites, whose interest is prevailing with a prince, and does not lessen his authority. Fourthly, prayers to saints illustrate and extend God's authority, because they are an instance of his esteem for virtuous persons, whose petition he grants on their account.

Q. How do you prove that it is good and profitable to pray to the saints, and that it is an ancient custom so to do?

A. Because it is good and profitable to desire the prayers of God's servants here upon earth, as St. Paul often does in his epistles. Heb. xiii. 18. "Brethren pray for us." 1 Thess. v. 25. And St. James says, "For the continual prayers of a just man availeth much." James v. 16. Moses by his prayers obtained mercy for the children of Israel. Exod. xxxij. 11 and 14. Samuel by his prayers defeated the Philistines. 1 Sam. vii. 8, 9, 10. And God himself commanded Eliphaz, and his two friends, to go to Job, that Job should pray for them, promising to accept of his prayers. Job iv. 8. Now if it be acceptable to God, and profitable to ourselves, to seek the prayers of God's servants here on earth, how much more of the saints and angels in heaven. It has been always the constant custom and practice of the church, in all ages, to desire the prayers or intercessions of the saints. This is acknowledged by Mr. Thorndike, a learned Protestant author. "It is confessed," says he, "that the lights both of the Greek and Latin church, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory Nyssen, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, St. Fulgentius, St. Gregory the Great, St. Leo, more, or rather all after that time have spoken to the saints, and desired their assistance or prayers. In Epil. par. iii. p. 358.

Q. But is not this practice of desiring the prayers or intercession of the saints and angels superfluous, and derogatory to our Saviour Christ, since Christ is our only mediator?

A. No, by no means; no more than to desire the prayers of our brethren here below. Christ is the only

mediator of our redemption, but this does not exclude others from being mediators of intercession: and this distinction is to be observed in the prayers for one another on earth. In this sense Moses is called the mediator between God and the Israelites. However, those of the church of England have no reason to cry out and exclaim against us, for desiring the prayers and intercessions of the saints and angels, since they themselves, according to their own language, worship the angels: we, it is true, desire their prayers, but they their succour and defence, as may be seen in their common prayer book, in the collect for Michaelmas-day, the 29th of September.

Q. How can saints and angels hear our prayers at such a distance? Has God any occasion to be informed by them of our wants?

A. Distance of place is no obstruction, because they hear not by ears, but by understanding, the manner whereof is not conceivable, no more is the nature of any spiritual substance. Again, by seeing God, they see all things which belong to complete their happiness, and it is a part of their happiness to know the state of those for whom they are concerned; and were they not concerned in prayers directed to them, their condition in this would be worse than when alive; because they would not be able to assist their friends when in distress. Do not the angels rejoice at the conversion of a sinner? St. Luke says they do. Luke xv. 10. If then they know our repentance, and rejoice at it, have we not reason to believe they know our petitions too. Do not the devils, by the light of nature alone, know our actions, and accuse us of our sins. Rev. xii. 10. Again, the saints know we are in want of assistance, in general at least, and being sensible of it, may pray for us in general, as we on earth pray for another at a distance, though ignorant of each other's necessities, in particular. Lastly, there is no occasion that God should be informed, either by the living, or saints dead, but the nature of prayer requires, that we should mention what we want.

Q. We are ordered to pray to God himself immediately?

A. Why then do you make use of prayers for one another living? Again, all prayers to saints are directed also immediately to God, viz. through our Lord Jesus

Christ. Besides, the order of the divine providence requires, that we should make use of the means he has assigned to obtain our ends, both in a natural and spiritual way; the husbandman applies himself immediately to God by sowing, and the faithful by prayer.

Q. There is no precept or example in the scriptures of praying to saints and angels?

A. While we are advised to pray for one another, and commanded too, it implies both a precept and example. The creed supposes as much by the communion of saints. The instance of Dives and Lazarus imports, there was a communication between the living and the dead. Are not the prayers of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, &c. mentioned in the scriptures, and their names invoked after their decease? Do not the twenty-four elders offer to God the prayers of the faithful? Did not Jacob, when he gave his blessing to the sons of Joseph, desire also the angel to bless them? (Gen. xlviii. 16,) saying, the angel that delivered me from all evils, bless these children. Besides, what occasion is there for a precept for a voluntary practice. There are many practices, and even precepts, whereof there are no mention in the scriptures, as observing Sundays, infant's baptism, &c.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHICH is the second commandment?

A. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

Q. What is forbidden by this commandment?

A. It is forbidden to mention the name of God in common conversation, or upon any frivolous occasion; also cursing, swearing, common oaths and perjury.

Q. What is an oath?

A. It is calling upon God to witness.

Q. How many sorts of oaths are there?

A. Several, viz. assertory, promissory, execratory, solemn, simple, explicit, implicit, an oath by God, or by creatures. An assertory oath, is calling God to witness a thing either is or is not. A promissory oath is to call God to witness, that a person purposes either to do or not to do a thing. An execratory oath, is to call God to witness, that a person wishes some evil to himself or others, and it

is called a curse. A solemn oath, is before a court of judicature. A simple oath, is in private conversation. An explicit oath, is expressed by words. An implicit oath, is signified by signs, as holding up the hands, kissing the gospel, &c. An oath by God, is expressed by invoking God, or some of his divine attributes. An oath by creatures, is when they are called upon as depending upon God's power and influence.

Q. Are oaths lawful?

A. Yes, when duly performed; because they are an act of religion, publishing God's omniscience and veracity, when we call upon him as a witness.

Q. What conditions are requisite to make an oath lawful?

A. Chiefly these three mentioned in the scripture, (Jer. iv. 2,) truth, judgment, or discretion and justice: that is to say, what we swear to be true. Secondly, it is to be upon rational inducements; and thirdly, what we swear must not be to do evil or indifferent things. Without the first condition, it is perjury; without the second, it is taking God's name in vain; and there is danger of perjury and scandal, as swearing in common conversation; without the third, it is an addition to the evil we threaten, and accompanied with many bad circumstances.

Q. What is the just cause of an oath?

A. God's honour, our own, or our neighbour's lawful good or defence.

Q. Does not the gospel forbid swearing on any account whatever, since it says; swear not at all? Mat. v. 34.

A. The gospel only forbids oaths where the necessary conditions are wanting. Again, Christ only forbids customary swearing, which was frequent among the Jews. Thirdly, he forbids them to swear to things that are unlawful of themselves; for it appears by Herod and others that they thought themselves obliged to fulfil unlawful oaths.

Q. What use can oaths be of, though lawful? A just man will do his duty without an oath, and a wicked man it cannot bind?

A. St. Paul says, "Oaths are used to confirm truth." Heb. vi. 16. And they are as a support for corrupt nature; and in practice are beneficial to the public: for though wicked men regard not their oath, yet their honour is engaged by it, and they are kept to their duty by tem-

poral punishment, which they are liable to by the breach of their oaths.

A. In what state are they, who swear often without regard to truth, or falsehood, swearing without necessity, or for trivial matters?

A. In a very dangerous state, "For the Lord will not hold him guiltless, that shall take the name of the Lord his God in vain." Exod. xx. 7. "Swear not, neither by heaven, &c. that you fall not under judgment." James v. 12. "A man that sweareth much, shall be filled with iniquity, and a scourge shall not depart from his house." Eccl. xxiii. 12. And no wonder, seeing such live in a daily profanation of God's holy name, in the violation of God's commandment, and the contempt of Jesus Christ and his gospel, consequently, in the way of perdition.

Q. What should they do, who would quit this ill custom of swearing?

A. They must, for the love of God, watch carefully over their senses, curb their passions, fly all occasions of anger, choler, company, drinking, or whatever they find occasions them to swear: resolving rather to die than swear deliberately; obliging themselves to some prayers, alms, or penal works, every time they swear, desiring others to mind them thereof; seriously considering, that "Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall render an account for it in the day of judgment." Mat. xii. 36. What account have they to give for profaning the holy name of God, by cursing, swearing, blaspheming, &c.?

Q. What are we commanded to do by this commandment?

A. As in the former, we are commanded to honour God with our hearts; so in this we are commanded to honour him with our tongues; as by prayer, edifying discourse, and the like.

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHAT is the third commandment?

A. Remember thou keep holy the sabbath-day.

Q. When was this day first appointed to be kept holy?

A. God sanctified it, and ordered it should be a day of rest on the seventh day after the creation, and that men might give thanks for the benefit of the creation. Gen. ii.

2. And it is highly probable, the true believers in the law of nature observed it as a day of rest and devotion.

Q. How came it to be altered to Sunday, the first day of the week, which is the first day after the sabbath ?

A. Because it was only a ceremonial law, obliging the Jews, as to the seventh day, though it was a moral precept in the main, obliging all persons to return thanks to God, for the creation, and all other blessings. Now the day was altered by the apostles', in commemoration of our blessed Saviour's resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, which happened the first day after the sabbath.

Q. What things are forbidden on that day ?

A. As the day was ordered to be kept holy by the authority of the church, so the church has commanded all persons to abstain from servile works, traffic, and courts of judicature.

Q. What things are strictly commanded by this commandment ?

A. As the two former commandments contain our duty in heart and words, so by this we are commanded to sanctify the sabbath, or Lord's day, to Almighty God, by actual service. Exod. xx. Jer. xvii. 27. In giving him that public worship which the church prescribes, viz. To hear mass, and spend the day in prayer, in hearing instructions, reading good books, examining and detesting what we have done amiss, and the like : and therefore those who spend this day in idleness, sports, vanity, idle visits, drinking, gaming, and the like, do not comply fully with the end of this commandment, nor with the churches desire concerning it.

Q. When is it that persons may be dispensed with to work upon Sundays ?

A. Only in cases of absolute necessity, or when the work is very inconsiderable.

Q. When may persons be excused from being present at mass ?

A. In case of sickness, necessary business, or want of opportunity, so that they are at too great a distance.

Q. Let me hear some particular cases, where persons may be excused or are excusable in labouring and omitting to hear mass on Sundays ?

A. Servile works are such as are usually performed by servants only, as digging, ploughing, mechanical works,

but not writing, studying, &c. Apothecaries are excused in making up medicines, and cooks in preparing victuals by necessity: so cattle may be fed, or any great loss hindered by labouring on that day; as the loss by fire or water: so glass-makers and labourers in forges may attend their fires; yet mass, and the rest, is to be attended to. Servants sweeping rooms, &c. are excused, but not washing, without absolute necessity. Journeys ought not to be performed unless in necessity; but in these and all other cases, mass is always to be heard.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHAT is the fourth commandment?

A. Honour thy father and thy mother.

Q. What is the general sense of this commandment?

A. By father and mother, are to be understood all superiors whatever?

Q. Why are all superiors to be honoured and obeyed?

A. Chiefly because they are God's representatives: and again, because they preserve peace and unity in every community; lastly, because they are authors of many favours to inferiors.

Q. Name the persons distinctly, who are concerned in this precept?

A. Subjects in regard of princes, and all subordinate civil magistrates. All the faithful, in regard of the Pope, bishops, and priests; children, in regard of parents; servants, in regard of masters; young persons, in regard of their seniors.

Q. What are the obligations of children, in regard of their parents?

A. Respect, both in words and actions, obedience, love and assistance, when they are in necessity; and in consequence of this, they are not to enter into a married state, or any other station, without consulting and expecting their approbation, unless they are unreasonable. Deut xxvii. 16. Col. iii. 20. They are also to pay their parents' debts, as far as justice and charity obliges them, and if their parents have wronged any person, either in money or land, children are to restore it, in case they are in possession of it. Acts v. 20. However, if parents lay any unjust commands, or hinder their children from becoming religious,

when they are come to years of discretion, they are not to be obeyed ?

Q. What are the punishments and blessings relating to this precept ?

A. Obedient children are blessed with a long life, and temporal felicity : disobedient children with temporal miseries, and a short life.

Q. Is a short life always a punishment ?

A. No, it is sometimes a blessing, as the wise man says, in the book of Wisdom, " He was taken away lest wickedness should alter his understanding, or deceit beguile his soul." Chap. iv. ver. 11.

Q. What are the obligations of parents towards their children ?

A. In general they are to see that they are provided with all necessaries, both temporal and spiritual, viz. To take care they are instructed in their youth in the christian rudiments : that they observe good hours and regularity : that they correct them with discretion, neither with severity, nor too much indulgence ; for " He that spareth the rod, hateth his son, but he that loveth him correcteth him betimes." Prov. xiii. 24. To give them good example by a regular life, neither speaking, or acting indecently before them : to exhort them to keep Sundays and holy-days holy, and to frequent the sacraments : to settle them in the world, in some commendable station, and not to deprive them of their due, by spending their substance : not to threaten them into marriage, or by ill usage compel them in some manner to enter into a religious state ; nor disinherit them, unless there be the highest provocation : not to shew any remarkable partiality to one child more than another, which is often followed with great discontent and ruin of him who is less esteemed.

Q. What are the obligations of servants and labourers to their masters ?

A. They are to be obedient, respectful, and exactly faithful in every trust and concern committed to them ; punctually and carefully doing what is given them in charge, and belongs to their place ; rightly spending their time, labour and industry, in their master's service, as they know he expects and requires, not letting him lose by their idleness, nor by making advantage to themselves of what belongs to their master. According to that of St. Paul,

where he exhorts servants, "To be obedient to their masters in all things pleasing, not gainsaying, not defrauding them, but in all things shewing good fidelity." Tit. ii. 9, 10. And in another place he commands them saying, "Servants obey in all things your masters, according to the flesh, not serving to the eye, as pleasing men, but in simplicity of heart, fearing God. Col. iii. 22. They are likewise under a strict obligation of restitution of whatever damage the master shall suffer by their fault, idleness, connivance, concurrence, &c. They must also live in peace, love and charity with their fellow servants.

Q. What are the obligations of masters to their servants and labourers?

A. The apostle St. Paul informs us in these words, "Masters," says he, "do to your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that you also have a master in heaven," (Col. iv. 1.) to whom all masters must be accountable. They are obliged to stand to the promise or agreement they made with their servants; to give them sufficient and wholesome meat and drink, fit lodging, &c. They are not to employ them in any ill office, work, and the like, or require more of them than they can do, nor be too harsh or severe with them; nor make them labour on Sundays and holy days; they are obliged to instruct, admonish, and give them good example, &c. "If any man have not care of his own, and especially for those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel," says St. Paul. 1 Tim. v. 8.

Q. What are our obligations towards our spiritual superiors?

A. We must love them because they are our spiritual parents, who in Christ, through the gospel, have begot us, (1 Cor. iv. 15.) that is, are authors of our spiritual life; who are nursers of our souls, and under God are the instrumental causes of our spiritual good. "We beseech you, brethren," says St. Paul, "to know them who labour among you, that you esteem them more abundantly in charity, for their work's sake." 1 Thess. v. 12. We must hear, respect, and obey them as Christ's ambassadors: the hearing or despising them, is the same as the hearing or despising Christ. "He that heareth you, heareth me," says our Saviour, "and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." Luke, x. 16. So that we ought to submit to them in all things

M

belonging to faith, and the government of our souls." "Obey your prelates," says St. Paul, "and be subject to them, for they watch, as being to render an account of your souls." Heb. xiii. 17. We must pray for them, that they may discharge their duties for the good of their flock. We must also maintain or assist them with necessaries for this life, since their study, labour, and employ, are to afford us necessaries for the life to come. "Let him," says St. Paul, "that is instructed in the word, communicate to him that instructeth him in all things good. Gal. vi. 6. "Also the Lord ordained, that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel." 1 Cor. ix. 14.

Q. What are our obligations towards our Sovereign, and such temporal governors as are placed over us?

A. We must love them, honour them, obey them, and not speak ill of them. "Thou shalt not speak evil of the prince of thy people." Acts xxiii. 5. We must duly pay without fraud to such, all due taxes, customs, &c. "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." Matt. xxii. 21. Again, "Render tribute to whom tribute is due, and custom to whom custom," &c. Rom. xiii. 7. "We must pray for them, I exhort you," says St. Paul, "that supplications, prayers, &c. may be made for kings, and all that are in stations, that we may lead a quiet and a peaceable life in all piety, and chastity." 1 Tim. ii. 1. We must obey them in all lawful things. "Be ye subject, for God's sake, to every human creature, whether it be the king as excelling, or to governors as sent by him, for the punishment of evil doers." 1 Pet. ii. 13.

Q. What are the obligations of superiors, both spiritual and temporal?

A. They are many and great, and in all their degrees ought to govern those under their charge, with charity and justice; to procure their good, and defend them from evil; to correct and punish those who obey not their just laws; and to encourage such as duly observe them; wherein if they fail, they are answerable to God; but their failing in their duty will not excuse the failing of subjects on their side.

Q. What is forbidden by this commandment?

A. All disrespect, stubbornness, and disobedience to parents; and all lawful superiors, both spiritual and temporal.

THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHICH is the fifth commandment ?

A. Thou shalt not kill.

Q. Is it always unlawful to kill another ?

A. No, only where murder is committed.

Q. What is murder ?

A. It is a voluntary taking away a person's life by private authority.

Q. In what case is killing no murder ?

A. When it is done by public authority, as when malefactors are punished with death, by the magistrates, and in time of war.

Q. What other things are forbidden by this precept ?

A. Interior thoughts of murder, or the desire of any person's death : anger, and study of revenge, injurious words, that provokes persons ; quarrelling, striking and maiming another. Matt. v. 38. To desire one's own death, to procure abortion, &c.

Q. Is it lawful to kill one's self, or to hasten one's own death, by excesses in drinking, &c. or expose one's self to danger of death ?

A. Suicide is murder, because God alone is master of life and death. When excesses manifestly hasten death, or the dangers are manifest, and persons expose themselves to them, without just cause, there is a kind of murder.

Q. Do not catholics hold, that it is lawful for them to kill and murder heretics ?

A. Not at all ; this is a mere calumny imposed upon them ; (Matt. v. 44.) for we know that we are commanded to love them, (Rom. xviii. 20.) and help them in their necessities, and to wish them all the good we wish ourselves, even when they would oppress and persecute us : and as the church prays for their conversion, so ought we, after the example of our Saviour Christ and all his saints, to have great compassion for them, and to pray to God for them, that he may mercifully enlighten and bring them to the knowledge of the true faith, that we may all make one fold under one shepherd. Luke xxiii. 34. 1 Tim. ii. 1.

Q. What do you say as to nursing out children, and displaying them ?

A. The fathers exclaim against putting them out to nurse; and when it is necessary, wholesome, virtuous, and good natured nurses are to be provided; otherwise the child may be ruined. The same care is required, in not overlaying; for many children are smothered.

Q. What say you to ignorant physicians, surgeons, &c.

A. They are often guilty of murder; although they do not do it on purpose, but by gross and culpable ignorance; for ignorance is esteemed malice in him who is obliged to know.

Q. You say that anger, hatred, revenge, injurious words, fighting, quarrelling, &c. are forbidden by this commandment, if so, what must a christian do when he is affronted?

A. St. Peter says, "He must not render evil for evil, nor railing for railing." Our Saviour says, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that persecute and calumniate you." Matt. v. 44. He must therefore receive the affront with humility, meekness, and patience.

Q. But must a christian quietly permit himself to be beaten, wounded, killed, and the like?

A. No, in all these cases a necessary and moderate defence is lawful; and as long as the assault continues, he may do his utmost to defend himself. But if once the attack ceases, it is no longer a defence, but an unjust revenge, to use any farther violence against an assailant.

Q. You have said enough concerning the murder of a man's body; pray let me hear what you have to say of the murder of a man's soul, and who those are that are guilty of it?

A. You do well to enquire into this point, for alas! there are but few to be found who duly weigh and well consider what a great crime it is to murder a man's soul. One murdered body gives alarm to a whole country, all that hear it are concerned, for fear the case may shortly be their own, if it should escape unpunished; and therefore they pursue the murderer, that he may rather die than do so any more. But though the number of poor murdered souls be much greater, yet there are many so profanely wicked as to make it their diversion, and few so truly good as to be struck with horror at the thoughts of it. A man who makes his neighbour drunk is a downright murderer of his soul; and yet so stupid and wicked.

as to laugh at his exploit, and triumph in his iniquity. All those are guilty of this murder who either by word or ill example incite others to sin, or divert them from doing good; so that a man who thus gives scandal to his neighbour, and draws him into any great sin, "It were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were cast into the sea." As often as he makes his neighbour guilty of some grievous sin, so often he multiplies the heavy weight which will one day sink him into the pit of hell. Such a man not only deserts God and serves the devil, but as many men as he engages in his wickedness, so many volunteers he raises for the same service; and these raise as many more to fight the cause of hell against the God of heaven: and thus the murder of men's souls encreases and multiplies to the end of the world.

Q. What is commanded by this commandment?

A. To defend our own and innocent neighbour's life; to exercise works of charity; both spiritual and corporal, as our neighbour's need requires; to render good for evil, and to pray for our persecutors, as Christ commands us. Rom. xii. 14.

THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHICH is the sixth commandment?

A. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Q. What is forbidden by this precept?

A. Not only adultery, which is a carnal act, with another's wife or husband, but also fornication, incest, sacrilege, wilful pollution, sin against nature, (1 Thess. iv.) and all other exterior acts which proceed from lust.

Q. What are the things forbidden, which tend to adultery, fornication, or lust?

A. All unchaste touching of ourselves or others, as also unchaste or lewd discourse, lustful kisses, filthy songs and books, immodest pictures, &c.

Q. How do you prove fornication and voluntary pollution to be grievous sins?

A. Out of St. Paul in his epistle to the Colossians, (chap. iii. v. 5.) where he says, "Mortify your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, lust, evil con-

cupiscence, &c. for which things the wrath of God cometh upon the children of unbelief."

Q. Which are the particular kinds of lust?

A. These will be specified when we come to explain the seven deadly sins.

Q. Why is adultery named in the prohibition of this commandment, rather than any of the other kinds?

A. Because, besides the impurity of the act, and the injustice against our neighbour, and the injury to the sacrament of matrimony, it contains also a wrong done against the commonwealth, in regard, that lawful heirs are deprived of their due by bastards: and therefore a married woman, who knows for certain she has bastards, who are accounted as her lawful children, is bound by sparing and other means, to endeavour to recompence the loss, that her husband's lawful children, or next heirs, shall receive by her bastards.

Q. Is it lawful for a man to dismiss his wife upon account of adultery?

A. Yes, if the fact be evident.

Q. Can he who hath so dismissed his wife marry another during her life?

A. No, by no means, "For he that dismisseth his wife," says our Saviour Christ, "and marries another, committeth adultery." Matt. v. 32. And St. Luke says, "He that marries her that is so dismissed commits adultery." Luke xvi. 18.

Q. Can a wife that is so dismissed from her husband marry again, during her husband's life?

A. No, she cannot.

Q. How do you prove she cannot marry again?

A. From the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, where he says, "To them that are married, not I but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband: but if she depart, that she remain unmarried." Chap. 7. ver. 10, 11. And in the same chapter he says, "a woman is bound by the law, as long as her husband liveth: but if her husband die, she is at liberty to marry whom she will."

Q. What is commanded by this commandment?

A. It commands husbands and wives to love and be faithful to one another, which is a mutual and unchange-

able right, not transferable to any other during life. Whoever entices a wife to this sin, robs her of her innocency, the husband of the love and faithfulness of his wife, to which he has an incommunicable right, and may bring other irreparable mischiefs.

Q. How is this abominable sin of the flesh to be avoided?

A. The best means of avoiding it, are to beware of bad company, and the occasions of sin, to shun intemperance, and especially idleness; to fast and pray, confess often, and communicate with much devotion.

THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHICH is the seventh commandment?

A. Thou shalt not steal.

Q. What is forbidden by this commandment?

A. All unjust taking away or detaining our neighbour's goods, either by stealth or robbery, or any other way: also all fraudulent ways of buying or selling, exchanging, or in other contracts: all neglect of trust or promise; all unjust gain, all deceit by words, or deeds; finally, all unjust ways whatever, which cause damage to another. 1 Cor. vi. 10. Lev. xix. 35. Prov. xi. 1.

Q. What is theft, and how many ways are there of committing this sin?

A. Theft in general is a taking away or detaining what belongs to another: if it be done privately, it is called simple theft: if by violence, it is called rapine: if it is a thing consecrated to God, or taken from a church or any sacred place, it is sacrilegious theft: if the public is robbed, it is called in the law *peculatus*: if cattle are stolen, it is called *abegatus*, or driving. And it is to be observed, that the sin is so much the greater or less, as the prejudice which is done, is greater or less, and so it is a mortal sin, when the thing that is taken is of a considerable value in itself, or when it is considerable in respect of the person from whom it is taken; as a penny is a considerable loss to a beggar, and twelve pence to an ordinary man.

Q. How many particular ways are there of stealing, or depriving others of their right?

A. They are almost numberless, according to different stations and circumstances: whereof the chief are servants

who give away their masters' goods, meat and drink, without their knowledge and consent, or who put more upon their masters' account than they have laid out, or who by their negligence permit their masters' goods to be lost. Gamblers, who cheat or take advantage of the ignorance or incapacity of those they play with. Agents or stewards, who take premiums without leave of those who employ them. Dealers, who conceal any considerable fault in the goods they dispose of. Tailors, and others, who retain a part of the stuff of which they make clothes, or other things. All those who to the loss of their creditors do defer and put off paying their debts when they are able; as also those who defer to make restitution. Physicians and surgeons, who prolong their patients' diseases on purpose to gain by them. Usurers and notaries, who make contracts of usury. Judges, who knowingly judge a cause wrongfully. All lawyers and advocates, who prolong processes with a design to gain by them. Those who buy of children, or of such as know not the true value of things. Such as buy or receive stolen goods, knowing them to be such. Exaction for service, where the price is not fixed by law or custom. Wives who dispose of considerable things without the knowledge of their husbands. Also, those who coin false money. All those who do not give alms to the poor, according to their ability; and such as feign themselves to be poor, and receive alms when they have no need, so take that which belongs to others.

Q. When may persons be excused from sin, though they take or detain what belongs to others?

A. A person in extreme necessity may take bread or other food where he finds it. A presumptive leave of the master may excuse a servant disposing of some small matters. In other cases when the thing is only a trifle, it is but a venial sin.

Q. Is it a theft to keep what we find?

A. The rule is this, if it is a hidden treasure of long standing, we are to observe the laws of the country; if it is a thing casually lost or misplaced, public inquiry is to be made after the owner, and when he is found out, it is to be restored. If he cannot be found, it belongs to the poor, according to the custom of the church, and if he who finds it is poor himself, he may keep it with the advice of his confessor.

Q. What is the great obligation all persons lie under who are any ways guilty of theft?

A. They are obliged to make restitution according to that of St. Paul. "Render to all men their due."

Q. What is restitution?

A. It is an act of justice, whereby the thing is restored to the true owner, and all loss and damage repaired.

Q. Who is the person that is to make restitution?

A. In the first place, he who steals or detains what belongs to another. Secondly, all those who are accomplices, and concur with him.

Q. By what means do persons usually become accomplices, so as to be obliged to restore?

A. A servant who is employed by his master. He who commands. He who approves of the injustice. He who protects thieves, and knowingly receives stolen goods. He who by his office is obliged to inform and hinder persons from committing injustice.

Q. How are these concurrences to be understood?

A. When the concurrence is the occasion of the theft, or of non-restitution, they are obliged to restore the whole, or the part, accordingly as they partake of the things that are stolen; otherwise they lie under no obligation of restitution, though they sin in the injustice.

Q. If a person buys goods, which he certainly knows are stolen, is he obliged to restitution?

A. Yes, or otherwise an equivalent, if the owner is known, and requires it.

Q. What are those obliged to, who consume by eating and drinking the things that are stolen?

A. They are obliged to restore an equivalent to what they have destroyed.

Q. What if a person buys a stolen thing, not suspecting it was stolen?

A. If he buys it at a less price, when he knows the owner, he is obliged to restore the thing, or the full price, being first indemnified as to the change.

Q. When is restitution to be made in cases of damages?

A. Wilful damages are a sin, and require restitution, but damages that happen by accident, and where there is great diligence used to hinder them, are not a fault in the sight of God, and oblige not to restitution, unless by contract, or that the civil law orders it. When there is a ne-

glect, or not a sufficient care, it is more or less a sin, and some kind of restitution is required, both in the court of conscience and law.

Q. Is he who receives money, eatables, or other things, consumable by use, called loan, obliged to restitution?

A. Yes, because in those things the dominion is inseparable from the use, and transferred by the contract, so that the borrower is to make good the loss.

Q. Is he who borrows a thing, by the contract called *accommodatum*, that is, whereby not the dominion, but the use only is conferred, obliged to make good the loss, or damage, as in hiring a horse, or the like?

A. If he does not wilfully abuse it, and takes great care to have it returned safe, he is not obliged to restitution, unless the bargain be otherwise: yet in some cases, he is obliged to make all good, viz. If he returns it not by a careful and creditable person. If he puts it to any other use, than for what it was lent, as riding a horse out of the way, or keeping it longer than the time: though, if it be stolen in the road, for which it was hired, he is not obliged to make it good, unless he borrowed at all events. If a person borrows a thing that is faulty, and does not know the fault by the lender's information, the borrower is not obliged to make good the damage.

Q. Is a person obliged to stand by the loss of a house, that is damaged by fire, water, or falling down, &c.

A. If it happens by the hirer's fault, he is obliged to make restitution; or without his fault, if that be specified in the contract.

Q. What restitution is to be made for the loss of goods, loss of life, corporal damages, and loss of reputation?

A. As for goods, the same in specie are to be restored, otherwise an equivalent. If the goods were capable of fructifying, such damages are also to be made good, by a prudent arbitrator's opinion. In the case of killing, restitution is to be made to the family, or heirs, where proper judges are to make an estimate of the loss, considering the person's age, usefulness, gains, &c. The like estimate is to be made, in the case of wounding or occasioning the loss of a leg, an arm, a hand; and what might be the damage, considering the person's age, and occupation, or employment. As to the restitution of reputation, three things are to be considered. First, whether a person has

really suffered in his reputation. Secondly, whether his reputation was not lost before. Thirdly, whether he has not recovered his reputation. Now if a person has lost his reputation, or it is lessened, the defamer is obliged to restitution, and to make good all the loss he suffers in his vocation, by the defamation.

Q. What method is to be used in restoring a person's reputation?

A. If a person is defamed, by spreading a calumny, the calumniator is to own the fiction, before those he has spoke it to, and confirm it with an oath, if thought necessary: if what he said was true, but divulged to those who were before ignorant of it, he ought to own he was in the wrong, in speaking evil of him, and to take all opportunities to praise him, and speak well of him, on account of his many good qualities. If he cannot re-establish his reputation by this method, he is to make him satisfaction some other way, by the advice of his confessor, and especially by repairing his loss in a pecuniary way.

Q. What restitution is to be made by such as take game?

A. Several things are to be considered. All wild creatures, birds, beasts, and fish, are common, and belong to the captor, if taken without trespass to others. Taking of wild creatures may be prohibited to some, by human laws; but then such as are qualified are obliged to make damages good, unless something is expressed by contract to the contrary. When wild creatures are enclosed by persons qualified, it is theft to kill them in the inclosure, or even out of the inclosure, if they are accustomed to return into the inclosure, and there is an obligation of restitution: if they return never into the inclosure, it is not theft to kill them out of it; as birds, hares, &c. The same is to be said of fish; and though the law may forbid such captures, under penalties, the captor is not obliged to restitution. Such wild beasts as feed upon the unqualified person's goods, and by the law of nature, being no man's property, belong to him who first takes them. Binsfield says, it is not lawful to use art in drawing pigeons to one's own dove-house.

Q. What restitution is to be made in point of gaming and wagers?

A. What is won by gaming, from those who have not dominion, as children, drunken persons, or manifestly

unskilful, is to be restored ; much more what is won by cheating, or any indirect way of drawing in persons. In those cases human laws are to direct. He who certainly knows he shall win a wager, is obliged to restore.

Q. To whom is restitution commonly to be made ?

A. To the person injured, or in case of his death, to his heirs ; but if the person injured cannot be found, after diligent inquiry, restitution is to be made to the poor.

Q. What other circumstances are to be observed in restitution ?

A. As to the manner, public injustices are to be recompensed by the person offending, private injustice by proxies, on account of reputation. Things in kind are to be restored first, then an equivalent. As to debts, the laws of the kingdom are to be observed, and commonly debts by contract are to be satisfied before those by theft, &c. unless where a great necessity intervene. When the owner cannot be found the advice of the confessor is to be followed.

Q. When is restitution to be made ?

A. The precept being negative, it obliges always, and at all times ; so that restitution is to be made immediately, unless there be a just cause of delay, and without this the sin increases. Hence a person who either denies to restore, or notably defers it, or will not restore till death, is incapable of absolution : but if he has a leave from his creditors to delay, then he is not obliged to restore immediately.

Q. Can a person be excused from making restitution ?

A. Never, only in two cases. First, when the person injured forgives the debt. Secondly, when the debtor labours under an absolute incapacity.

Q. What rules are there to judge of a person's incapacity ?

A. If he is always in extreme necessity, he is absolutely incapable. No one is obliged to deprive himself of the means of living, in a moderate way ; yet he is obliged to cut off all superfluous expenses, and so time after time pay part, and bring himself into a less compass ; but if the creditor is under any want or oppression, the debtor is more obliged to want conveniences, than the creditor.

THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHICH is the eighth commandment?

A. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

Q. What is forbidden by this precept?

A. All injustices against others, by words.

Q. Which are the principal matters to be considered on this occasion?

A. All false proceedings by words; both in open court, and public or private conversation, viz. of judges, witnesses, informers, pleaders, and by secrecy, promises, liars; as also equivocation, mental reservation, hypocrisy, flattery, whispering, rash judgment, detraction, &c.

Q. What is a judge?

A. He who is appointed by the supreme power to administer justice, according to law.

Q. Which are the qualifications of a judge?

A. Chiefly these three, authority, justice, and knowledge, in defect whereof his sentence is either null, unjust, or rash.

Q. How upon defect of authority?

A. When he acts without commission; when persons are judged who belong not to his jurisdiction; when he judges matters where persons are exempted; when he passes sentence upon hidden matters, viz. spiritual matters in open court.

Q. How upon defect of justice?

A. When he omits to do justice, out of fear of offending some great person. When he is drawn away by gifts and bribes. When he offends in passing sentence, either out of particular affection or hatred against the person.

Q. How upon a defect of knowledge and prudence?

A. When he is ignorant of the law. When he goes upon conjectures and slight proofs. When he observes not the methods of the law, as to witnesses, and by attending to their character, &c.

Q. In what things is the judge to be directed, in order to act with knowledge and prudence?

A. He is not to follow his own private opinion, but proceed according to the proofs, which appear in court.

He is not to pardon crimes, without the licence of the supreme power, unless the crimes be contained in his commission : there must likewise be a just cause for the pardon, and it is never to be granted, until justice is done to the injured party, both as to body, goods, or reputation.

Q. Is a judge obliged to restitution, when he passes sentence without authority, justice or knowledge?

A. He is to make good the losses, the innocent person sustains by such a sentence.

Q. What obligation is there of informing against a criminal?

A. When a crime manifestly tends towards the subversion of the public good, all public officers in the first place are obliged to inform, and even all other private persons, when the public is in danger. Some divines extend the obligation, to become an informer in the court of judicature; others think a private information satisfies the obligation without being a prosecutor.

Q. What are the obligations of a witness?

A. First, he is obliged to appear and give in his testimony, when he is called, according to law, by a lawful superior. Secondly, when he is called in the aforesaid manner, and refuses to appear, he sins mortally, and is answerable for the damages another suffers, for want of his evidence. Thirdly, if the accused has nothing alleged against him, but his crime is a secret, and causes as yet no infamy, a witness who can speak plain to the fact, is not obliged to appear. Fourthly, if a person can free an innocent from death, or infamy, by appearing as a witness, he is obliged in conscience to give his testimony, though not required by the law: otherwise no one, unless commanded, is obliged to become witness against another.—Fifthly, to take money to become a witness, is a mortal sin, unless it be what is allowed for the expenses of his journey. Lastly, a false witness is obliged to restore what damages is occasioned by his evidence.

Q. What is the obligation of a counsellor, or pleader at the bar?

A. If he undertakes a cause, which he knows to be unjust, he sins, and is obliged to restitution. If he undertakes it out of ignorance, he is culpable according to the degree of his ignorance. If he is doubtful of the justice of the cause, he may undertake it, but is obliged to acquaint his

client with his doubts, and he must desist, as soon as he finds the cause is unjust.—He may take a fee proportionably to the cause, labour and time, but is not to exact what is unreasonable, but be guided in his demands by the laws and customs of the country. He is obliged in charity to undertake the cause of the poor innocent parties, otherwise he sins mortally. He sins, if he contracts with his client to have the half, the third, or fourth part of what is contended for; because this administers occasion of using knavery, by so large a compensation.

Q. What is a lawyer, &c. obliged to, who for want of skill, draws a will, whereby the right heir is deprived of his inheritance he was designed to enjoy?

A. He sins, and is obliged to make good the loss. He is also guilty in the same manner, who conceals and produces not a writing, which is requisite to do justice to another.

Q. What is a secret?

A. It is a thing private from the world.

Q. How many secrets are there?

A. Some are strictly so, and only known to a man's self; others in a larger sense, only known to few; again, some are secrets of their own nature, as thoughts; others may be known by others, as all outward actions.

Q. By how many ways are secrets committed to others?

A. Chiefly three ways, viz. In sacramental confession. Secondly, by an occurrence, whereby a person out of confession, becomes acquainted with a thing, which if farther published may become detrimental to his neighbour. Thirdly, when a thing is communicated to another, with a promise of not publishing it, either in express words, or tacitly, by asking advice, and with such circumstances, that the person to whom it is revealed, may easily perceive he is under an obligation not to publish it any farther.

Q. In what cases is it lawful to reveal or not reveal secrets?

A. The secrets of sacramental confession are not to be revealed, under a most grievous sin, unless the penitent allow of it. Yet if a person out of confession says, I will tell you this as under confession, he is obliged to conceal it, by the law of nature, though not under the seal of confession. When a person knows, by any way, the secret sin of another, if he reveals it so that the person is damaged, either in his goods, body, or reputation, he sins

grievously; and Sylvius says, both against charity, and justice, so as to be obliged to restitution. When a person promises to keep a secret, he sins grievously if he reveals it even to a superior, unless it is a trivial matter, and then it is only a venial sin. Yet if a secret is committed to a person, which of its own nature tends to the public loss, or any great private detriment to another, if he cannot hinder it, by fraternal correction, it is lawful, and he is obliged to reveal it to proper persons, and according to law.

Q. Is it allowed to open others' letters, to pry into secret writings?

A. Not without express or presumptive leave, unless a parent, or tutor take that liberty: much less is it lawful to have a hand in defamatory libels.

Q. What is a lie?

A. It is speaking contrary to what one believes, with a design to deceive.

Q. Is it in no case lawful to lie?

A. No, it is ill in itself, so never lawful: Secondly, it is unlawful, because veracity is necessary to the preservation of human society. Thirdly, it is absolutely forbid by God. "Thou shalt not lie, neither shall any man deceive his neighbour." Lev. xix. 11. "A thief is better than a man that is always lying; but both of them shall inherit destruction." Eccl. xx. 27. "Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord." Prov. xii. 22. "Lie not one to another." Col. iii. 9. Says St. Paul, "The terrible examples of Ananias and Sapphira, and of Giezi, should terrify liars." Acts v. "Their part shall be in the pool, burning with fire and brimstone."—4 Reg. v. Apoc. xxi. 8. As theirs must be, who slander, detract, belie, or deride the church of God, her faith, worship, sacraments, ministers, &c. which alas! is too commonly done, to the ruin of many souls.

Q. How many sorts of lies are there?

A. Chiefly three, viz. officious, jocular, and pernicious. The first, hurts nobody. The second, is to divert others. The third, is with damage to others.—The two first are only venial sins; the third is mortal, when the damage is considerable. Lies are called material lies, when a person says what is false in itself but is judged true by the speaker; otherwise it is a real and formal lie.

Q. What opinion have you of equivocations, mental reservations, dissimulation, hypocrisy and flattery?

A. They are also lies either in words or fact.

Q. How do you understand them to be unlawful?

A. Equivocation is, when words may have a double sense, or meaning; if both are usual, it is no lie; if one is extraordinary and unusual, it is a lie. Mental reservation is when a person keeps in his mind a sense, wherein the words are true, but not in the sense as they are usually understood, and as those he spoke to understand them. Some divines allow of mental reservations, when the words are only equivocal, and so as they may be true in either sense, according to common constructions, as are all metaphors; as also in particular cases, where life, or great damage, or injustice would follow; (but some hold that to be very loose doctrine,) though not in common use and conversation. Dissimulation is, when outward actions are contrary to man's mind and opinion, which is a lie in fact. Hypocrisy is a dissimulation of sanctity, and a lie in fact. Flattery is to attribute to another some perfection which he has not, or to praise a person who deserves no praise.

Q. What is whispering?

A. It is speaking evil to some by way of secrecy, to break friendship between others, the worst way of slandering, because such oblige all they speak to not to give them up for authors; whereby the slandered, for want of knowing what is ill spoke of them, have no possibility of clearing themselves, or detecting the author. "The whisperer and the double tongued is accursed, for he hath troubled many that were at peace." Eccl. xxviii. 15. "Whisperers are placed among those whom God gives over to a reprobate sense, and are worthy of death, and not only they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them," (Rom. i. 28, 29, &c.) which make the hearers equally guilty, if they do not discourage such, much more those who are inquisitive to hear.

Q. What is rash judgment?

A. It is to judge ill of a person upon light or insufficient grounds, proceeding from mere jealousies, surmises, or hear-says, which our Saviour Christ forbids. "Judge not," says he, "that you may not be judged." Matt. vii. 1. Again, "As you would that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner." Luke vi. 31. Not judging evil of any, as you would no one should judge of you without sufficient grounds. Less grounds may suffice to

suspect than judge, and less to doubt than suspect or judge positively. But passion, self-interest, malice, hatred, or some evil affection, from which such usually proceed, make things appear quite otherwise than they really are; prudence joined with charity should move us to interpret doubtful things to the best, or at least to suspend our judgment, even when there appears some reason to move otherwise our assent. We may notwithstanding be so circumspect with whom we converse or have business with, as that they shall not deceive us, though they shall prove knaves; which caution may be used without rash judgment, suspecting, or doubting of the honesty of our neighbour.

Q. What is detraction?

A. It is a secret staining of another's good name, which may be done directly, or indirectly. They do it directly; First, who accuse any of a false crime.—Secondly, who make it worse than it really is. Thirdly, who discover a secret crime. Fourthly, who put an ill construction upon a good action, or intention.—They do it indirectly, who deny a person's good qualities. Secondly, who lessen them. Thirdly, who conceal them, when a person wants defence. Fourthly, who coldly commends a person, &c. which are sins either from malice, passion, envy, ill-will, or for want of charity; and always contrary to the law of God and nature. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Matt. xxii. 39. "Brethren," says St. James, "detract not one another," James iv. 11. "Refrain your tongue from detraction," says the wise man. Sap. i. 11.

Q. What is a promise, and why ought it to be kept?

A. It is a verbal engagement to another, to do or not to do a thing; and when not complied with, it is a lie in fact, and unlawful on the same account.

Q. What conditions are required to make a promise valid, or binding, and not binding?

A. The thing promised must be possible, and lawful, and a person must have an inward intention of fulfilling it, otherwise he is not obliged before God, yet he is guilty of a lie. Again, it must be made with deliberation. To break a promise in a trifle, is only a venial sin, yet it lessens a man's character. Lastly, if any thing intervenes before the promise is performed that would have hindered it, it is a condition making it void; as for example, to marry one whom he thought chaste, but she fornicates.

Q. What is commanded by this commandment ?

A. To speak and witness the truth in all things.
 "Speak ye truth every one to his neighbour." Zach. viii. 16.

THE NINTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHICH is the ninth commandment ?

A. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.

Q. What is forbidden by this commandment ?

A. Concupiscence, or unlawful desires against chastity ; as also all voluntary delight and complacency in impure thoughts.

Q. How do you prove that unchaste thoughts and desires, which are voluntary, are mortal sins ?

A. Out of St. Matthew, "It was said to them of old, thou shalt not commit adultery, but I say to you, that whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart." Chap. v. 27, 28.

Q. Were not such sins forbidden by the sixth commandment ?

A. The sixth commandment forbids all outward actions against chastity ; this forbids all inward actions, as thoughts and desires.

Q. Why was a particular prohibition given of inward actions ?

A. Because the Jews, even the most learned sort, were apt to think there was no offence, only where the outward action was committed.

Q. What is concupiscence ?

A. In general it is an appetite, desire, or inclination.

Q. When is concupiscence a sin ?

A. When we concur voluntary.

Q. How do we concur ?

A. There are three degrees in concurring. The first, is an involuntary motion, or bare impression from nature, which is not sinful. The second, is voluntary, by dwelling on it with delectation ; but this is sinful. The third is a consent to what is unlawful ; this is also more sinful. There is also a consent in the delectation, but this is not a consent to the outward action as in the third degree.

Q. What are we commanded by this commandment ?

A. To entertain chaste and modest thoughts and desires.

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT.

Q. WHICH is the tenth commandment?

A. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods, &c.

Q. What things are forbidden by this commandment?

A. All unlawful desires, that tend to the prejudice of our neighbour's goods or substance.

Q. Were not these things forbidden by the seventh commandment?

A. The seventh commandment forbids only outward action against justice; the tenth forbids inward actions, on account of the Jews, who imagined such desires were not sinful. Some join these two last commandments into one, and divide the first into two; but that division is contrary to St. Augustine's opinion, which is the more common, and generally received in the church, and agrees with that division of the commandments which I have here set down.

Q. How do you prove covetous desires to be great sins?

A. From the first epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, where he says, "They that will become rich, fall into temptation, and into the snare of the devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires, which drown men into destruction and perdition." Chap. vi. ver. 9.

Q. In what manner do persons become guilty of this commandment?

A. In the same manner as they offend by carnal concupiscence, viz. by taking a pleasure in thinking of and inwardly consenting to unjust actions.

Q. Give me some particular instances of this kind?

A. It is a sin to wish a scarcity of provisions, upon a view that a person may sell his goods dearer, or to hoard up corn to the prejudice of the poor. It is a sin to envy another for his riches, honours, and preferments, praises, or any other external goods, or internal gifts of nature or grace. In fine, it is a sin to desire what belongs to others, unless it be accompanied with lawful circumstances, &c.

Q. What are we commanded by this commandment?

A. To entertain honest thoughts and desires, and to be contented with our own state and condition.

Q. Is it possible for us to keep all the ten commandments; for are there not some things in the second table of the law, which seem to be impossible? See St. Luke, i. 6. Matt. xix. 17. Matt. xi. 29. 30.

A. Yes, it is possible to keep them, and not only possible, but even necessary and easy, by the assistance of God's grace; for there is nothing commanded by them, but what the law of nature, and right reason dictates to us, and therefore ought to be observed and done even if it were not commanded us: neither is there any thing commanded in the second table, but what every body expects and desires others should do to him; therefore we must do the same to others, according to that. "All things therefore whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them, for this is the law." Matt. vii. 12. Besides it would be making God unjust, and a mere tyrant, to command impossibilities under pain of eternal damnation (as we find in the scriptures, he does the keeping of his commandments) if it was not in our power to keep them. See Exod. xx. 5. Deut. xxvii. 26. Matt. v. 19. Matt. xx. 17.

Q. Why then do so many protestant writers, and even Luther himself, pretend and say, that it is impossible to keep all the commandments?

A. Because they are not willing to oblige themselves to the observance of them, but had rather make God the author of sin, by commanding impossibilities (a most high blasphemy) and justify their own iniquities, by saying, they cannot help it, than humbly acknowledge and confess their sins, with purpose to amend with compliance, and acceptance of the law of God.

THE COMMANDMENTS OR PRECEPTS OF THE CHURCH EXPOUNDED.

Q. Has the church the power to make laws binding in conscience?

A. Yes.

Q. For what reason?

A. First, Because the scriptures say, all superiors are to be obeyed. Rom. xiii. 2. Secondly if the civil magistrate has that power, and with more reason the church may pre-

tend to it. Thirdly, because the scriptures command obedience to the church. Matt. xviii. 17.

Q. Is it sufficient to obey the law of nature, and God's law. What need then is there obeying the laws of the church?

A. Both the law of nature, and the law of God demand obedience to all superior powers. Again, human laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, specify obedience, as to particulars of time, place, and persons, which the law of God mentions commonly in general. Besides, if we do not obey the church, we are not entirely obedient to God; for according to the word of God, whatsoever despiseth the church, despiseth God himself. Luke x. 16. Therefore we must obey the precepts of the church.

Q. Is it a sin to break any of the church precepts?

A. Yes; because God commands us, under pain of damnation to obey the church: for our Saviour enjoins us to look on every one, who will not hear and obey the church, as a heathen and a publican. Matt. xviii. 17. And as they who break the just laws of a kingdom offend God, and deserve punishment, so they who oppose the church's laws offend God, and deserve punishment. They "who resist power, resist the ordinance of God; and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation." Rom. viii. 2.

Q. How many are the precepts of the church?

A. Chiefly six, relating to holy-days, fasting, confession, communion, tithes and marriage.

Q. Which is the first precept of the church?

A. It concerns the keeping of holy days.

Q. What are holy days?

A. They are days consecrated, and set apart, for the practice of religious duties.

Q. Has the church authority to ordain the keeping of feasts or holy-days?

A. Yes, she has, for Christ's church is no way inferior to the synagogue, which ordained and kept many, which Christ himself approved, when he kept the dedication of the temple. Deut. xvi. Lev. xxiii. Macc. iv. John x. 22. She has the example of the church in the apostles' days, which translated the solemnity of the sabbath to Sunday, and appointed the feasts of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide. St. Clement (who was St. Peter's disciple) records in his

eighth book of the apostolical constitutions, that the apostles ordered the celebrating of St. Stephen's, and other of their fellow apostles' days, after their death. Acts xv. 41. And we read that St. Paul went through Syria and Celicia, confirming the churches, (Acts xvi. 4.) commanding them to observe the precepts of the apostles, and of the seniors or ancients. And accordingly we keep the feasts commanded by the church. Protestants themselves command many, but they keep few, and as they please.

Q. For what ends in particular were holy days appointed ?

A. To return thanks to God for some remarkable favour, and to preserve it in our memory. As namely, Sunday, to return thanks for the creation, preservation, and providing us with all the necessaries, and conveniencies. As also because Christ rose again and sent down the Holy Ghost on that day.

Q. Why are holy days appointed for saints ?

A. First, to return thanks to God, for the favour he has done mankind, by making them instruments of his glory, by their doctrine and good example : and therefore we celebrate their nativity, death, and any other remarkable passage of their lives.

Q. What is the principal end of those commemorations ?

A. That we may invoke their assistance, and make good resolutions to imitate their example, where we may find it applicable to our circumstances ; and to fill our souls with holy desires and longings after that blessed state they now enjoy in heaven.

Q. Why have we no command or instance in the scriptures to celebrate those feasts ?

A. We are advised by the scriptures, to do any thing that tends to God's glory, and to our own spiritual profit : nor is there any occasion of a particular precept for that purpose. Besides, the old scripture mentions holy days, without any command from God. Exod. xxiii. Numb. xxix. And from the beginning of the new law, Sundays, and other days, were appointed by the church without any express mention in the scriptures. It is sufficient that we are commanded to hear and obey the church in religious practices.

Q. What is forbidden and commanded by this precept ?

A. The obligations are the same with those of Sundays,

viz. hearing mass, abstaining from servile works, and spending the day in religious duties, as reading good books, going to confession and communion, &c. Yet dispensations for labouring are more easily granted; but still mass is to be heard, and the church must judge of the reason for dispensing.

Q. Which is the second precept of the church?

A. Fasting.

Q. What is fasting, and how many sorts of fasting are there?

A. Fasting is abstaining from nourishment. But there are several ways of fasting, viz. fasting from sin, which is the end of all fasting. Natural fasting, which is abstaining from all meat and drink, which the church requires from those who go to communion. Ecclesiastical fasting, which is abstaining from all flesh-meats, and eating but one meal in the four and twenty hours, on such days as the church commands.

Q. Is there any precept of the law of nature or divine law for fasting.

A. The law of nature obliges all persons to abstain from all such nourishments as are prejudicial to the body or soul by committing excess. There was a precept of fasting when the fruit was forbidden to our first parents. Gen. ii. 17. God gave several precepts of fasting in the law of Moses, both as to the distinction of meat, and the time when they were to abstain. The gospel advises fasting, and commands it in general: but the distinction of meats, time, and manner are only a precept of the church. 2 Par. xx. Joel. i. 2. Jona. iii. Luke ii. 37. Matt. xvii. 20. Matt. vi. 17.

Q. Does not the apostle St. Paul say that the distinction of meats is the doctrine of devils?

A. Yes, and so do we call it a doctrine of devils, in the sense of the Manichees, and other heretics, who taught that certain meats were created by the devil, and consequently bad in themselves. But the meats we abstain from we know to be from God, and good in themselves; (See *Tillemont*, tom. ii. p. 231. et 280.) we eat them with thanksgiving the day before and the day after the fast; we take them to be the most substantial and the most nourishing food: for which reason we abstain from them in order to subdue the lust of the flesh, or do penance for our sins:

and neither this great apostle, nor any one that understands and follows him, ever said that this laudable and pious distinction is the doctrine of devils; it being manifest, that that every one can, for the good of his soul or body, lawfully abstain from what meat he pleases; nay, the same apostle says, "Wherefore, if meat scandalize my brother, I will never eat flesh, lest I should scandalize my brother." 1 Cor. viii. 13. Besides, if all distinction of meats were unlawful, the great St. John Baptist had been guilty of the doctrine of devils, for he drank neither wine nor strong drink; and his food was locusts and wild honey. Matt. iii. 4. Matt. xi. 18. The prophet Daniel had been guilty, for he says of himself, "Neither flesh nor wine entered into my mouth for three weeks." Dan. x. iii.

Q. But does not our Saviour Christ himself say, that what enters into the mouth does not defile a man?

A. Yes, these are indeed his words, but do not belong to this point; for no one surely will urge this text, which may seem to be against fasting in general, except libertines and impious persons, who give full scope to their evil inclinations, and would fain discredit all restraining and mortification of the flesh; who impose upon ignorant and weak people, and manifestly profane the word of God, in pretending to prove that Christ declared fasting to be an idle and useless action. When even our Saviour commends St. John Baptist's rigorous abstinence and other austerities; and fasted himself forty days and forty nights for our instruction, (Matt. xi. Matt. iv. 2.) when he also tells us that certain devils, "cannot be overcome but by prayer and fasting;" (Mark ix. 28.) and that the children or companions of the bridegroom, that is, his own disciples or followers, should fast when he was gone from them; (Luke v. 35.) which they undoubtedly did: witness what St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says of himself, and the preachers of the gospel. 2 Cor. vi. 5. In a word, the body of the scripture, the practice of the servants of God, nay, even the liturgy or common prayer book of the modern church of England will rise in judgment against those loose livers, "whose God is their belly, and whose end is perdition." Phil. iii. 10. To explain now the meaning of our Saviour's words, it must be observed, that the Scribes and Pharisees were very careful to wash their hands, their dishes, and cups, before they eat or drank, lest they should

be defiled ; although they were inwardly full of uncleanness and iniquity : they saw our Saviour's disciples eat bread without washing their hands, and therefore they boldly reproached him for it, upon which he answered them, saying ; " Not that which goeth into the mouth, defileth a man ; but what cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man ; but the things which proceed out of the mouth, come forth from the heart, and those things defile a man." Mat. xv. 11, 18. Now it is plain that our Saviour says nothing here against fasting, for even after Christ had spoken the aforesaid words, eating of hog's flesh would have defiled the souls of the apostles, and of the whole Jewish nation ; the primitive christians would have been defiled by eating blood or strangled meat which was forbid : and though all meats is clean in themselves, yet to eat meat that is forbidden, doth defile the soul, as the apple defiled Adam's, and as taking of drink to excess defiles the drunkard : not that it was the forbidden fruit but the sin of disobedience that defiled Adam, nor is the wine or strong liquor but intemperance or drunkenness that defiles the drunkard.

Q. Now although I clearly see that it is both lawful and laudable to fast, yet I do not well see that the church can command us to fast ?

A. The Jewish church often ordained fasts. The people of Ninive ordered an universal fast. The church of England do sometimes proclaim and order a general fast ; it is therefore manifest that the catholic church can more warrantably oblige us to fast, after the example of the apostles, who commanded the primitive christians to abstain from blood and strangled meat. 1 Esdr. viii. 21, 2 Chron. xxii. 2. Jer. xxxvi. 9. Jona iii. 5. Acts xv. 20.

Q. Why is fasting commanded by the church, and what are the benefits ?

A. There are several inducements for fasting, viz. First, out of obedience to God and his church. Secondly, as it is a part of religion, hence it is recommended in the scriptures as a token of humiliation, a bridle to the concupiscence of the flesh, a part of prayer, a means to obtain grace and the remission of sins, appeasing God's anger, casting out the devil, and in satisfaction for sin.

Q. Is it not a Jewish ceremony, and only a mere outward performance ?

A. So it is made by some, who fast only out of policy

and interest, viz. (5 Eliz. c. v.) To increase the breed of cattle, to promote the fishing trade, in order to establish a nursery of sailors, and for the manning of the fleet. But it was always practised in the old law; and since christianity was established, as a religious duty, and had the same effect as prayer, alms, and other outward practices, when accompanied with due dispositions, as intention, attention, and good motives: for certainly fasting, in order to chastise the flesh, and keep in subjection to the spirit, and promote virtue, is as much a religious performance as prayer, and alms, though when proper dispositions are wanting, both prayer, alms, and all other outward practices are vain, and hypocritical; hence there are three sorts of fasting, viz. politic, hypocritical, and religious.

Q. In what manner is fasting commanded by the church?

A. By abstaining from certain meats upon certain days.

Q. What sorts of meats are forbidden on days of fasting?

A. Chiefly flesh, and sometimes eggs, and white meats, as milk, butter, cheese, &c.

Q. Are not all meats good, and where is there any example, or precept in the scriptures, to make a distinction of meats?

A. All meats are good in themselves, but bad when they are abused, viz. when they are used with excess, the law of nature forbids them, and when they are made use of, contrary to the law of God or of his church (which we ought to obey) they are bad, because they are forbidden. Was not the forbidden fruit good in itself? were not unclean beasts good of themselves? were not blood and strangled meats good, though forbidden by the apostles? Hence we have both examples and precepts for the distinction of meats. Acts xv. 20.

Q. On which days is fasting chiefly commanded?

A. The forty days of Lent; the vigils or eves of several particular feasts; the ember days and Fridays; with abstinence from flesh on the rogation days and Saturdays, and other times according to the custom of nations, or laws of the universal church.

Q. By whom was Lent instituted, and why do you fast those forty days?

A. The fast of Lent is supposed to be apostolical institution, according to St. Augustine, Tertullian, St. Jerome,

and other ancient fathers of the church.* But be this as it will, it is certainly of a very ancient date: for it appears from the fifth canon of the first general council of Nice, that in the fourth century the Lenten fast was well established both in the east and west. We fast the forty days of Lent, that we may in some sort imitate the forty days' fast of our Saviour Christ, and that all may do penance, and obtain pardon of God for their sins; that all may be duly disposed for a worthy celebrating Christ's passion and receiving the blessed sacraments at Easter; and that thereby we may partake of the merits of Christ's sufferings; and that we may rise from sin, and live united to Christ by his holy grace, obtained by the worthy fruits of penance.

Q. Why do you fast on vigils?

A. That mortifying our appetites and doing penance thereon for our sins, we may better prepare ourselves for a devout celebrating the feasts that follow, and recommend to God, by fasting and prayer, the present necessities of the faithful.

Q. Why are ember days made fasts, and why so called?

A. They are so called from embers, or ashes, used formerly on days of public penance, to humble and put us in mind, that dust we are, and into dust we must return. There are three of them, at the four seasons of the year, viz. spring, summer, autumn, and winter, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, of the first week in Lent, of Whitsun week, of the third week in September, and of the third week in Advent. They are commanded to be kept in prayer and fasting, according to the example of the apostles. Acts xiii. 2, 3. First, in order to prevail with Almighty God to provide the flock of Christ with able and virtuous pastors, and to beseech him, that he would permit none (who are ordained at those times) to enter into the sacred order of priesthood, but such as are called by him to the ministry of his church. Secondly, to thank and beseech God for the received and expected fruits of the earth, to satisfy him for the abuses of his gifts, and to do penance for the sins committed within these seasons.

* See St. Aug. Epis. xxxvi. alias lxxxvi. ad Casu. chap. xi. N. xxv. Tert. L. de jeju. paulo post initi. St. Jer. Eps. liv. ad Marcell.

Q. Why on Fridays?

A. In memory that Christ suffered for us on a Friday : and to move us to do penance for our sins, which was the cause of his sufferings : and this custom agreeable to our ancient canons has the force of a law.

Q. Why do you abstain from flesh on the rogation days ; which be they, and why so called ?

A. The rogation days are the three days immediately following the fifth Sunday after Easter ; and they are so called from the Latin word *rogo*, which signifies to ask or request. These days are solemnized throughout the whole church with abstinence from flesh, and public prayers for the fruits of the earth, on which also, in Catholic countries, a procession is made, that the whole church, both laity and clergy may be represented as present to acknowledge God's goodness and providence over us, and to pray for a continuance thereof.

[By two Rescripts, dated May 17, 1830, Pope Pius VIII. dispenses with the observance of abstinence on all Saturdays, which are not fasting days, and on St. Mark's day, and the three rogation days ; also to transfer the obligation of hearing mass, and resting from servile work upon the annunciation of the B. V. Mary, to the Sunday following, and to allow Easter Monday and Whit Monday to be observed only as days of devotion.]

Q. Why is the litany read, procession and abstinence made on St. Mark's day ?

A. To supplicate and beseech God to preserve us from all pestilential distempers.

Q. In what manner is fasting performed on the aforesaid days ?

A. Some times by only eating one meal a day, and abstaining from flesh. Other times by abstaining only from flesh, but with liberty of eating more meals than one, and these are called days of abstinence.

Q. Is it allowed to take a collation at night ? When is the one meal to be eaten ? Is it allowed to drink any time of the day ?

A. A moderate collation, viz. a crust of bread, or the like, at night, is allowed, by a general custom of the church. The meal is to be eaten about noon, and not sooner, unless in case of a journey, or some other good reason. As for drinking, it is the more common opinion, that it is no

breach of the fast to take a little drink when dry or thirsty, or for some other real necessity; yet it is not supposed that it is allowed to sit tippling for the sake of company, or through a love or desire of drink, and the reason is, because strong drink excites and inflames the inordinate desires of the flesh as much or more than meat; besides as I have already said, fasting was instituted by the church, in order to subdue our disorderly passions, to do penance, and make satisfaction for our sins.

Q. How is the obligation to be understood of eating but one meal?

A. It is to be understood so, that after once eating, or breaking the fast, it is a new sin as often as a person eats.

Q. In what cases are persons excused in eating flesh, and more meals than one on fasting days?

A. The cases are reduced to these three in general, viz. incapacity, necessity, and labour.

Q. What sort of incapacity does excuse, and what necessity?

A. As to one meal a day, young people, till they arrive at the age of one and twenty, are excused; as they advance in years, they are advised to accustom themselves to the usage of the church more or less. Also old persons who are very weak or feeble are excused; but it is to be observed that no persons, how old soever, are exempt, unless a considerable weakness does accompany their age; for by all that I can find, the notion of people being exempt from fasting when arrived at the age of 63 is groundless, as may be seen in a book entitled a Treatise of Fasting, by R. P. Thomas Cong, Orat. part the 1st. chap. xvii. *Ej ex St. Basil. Hom. ii. de Jeju.* Also infirm persons, breeding women, and those who give suck, are excused: as likewise common beggars, and such as are not in a capacity to make one full meal by reason of their poverty.

Q. What sort of labour will excuse to eat more than one meal?

A. When the labour is hard and impairs the strength, for instance, labouring men and tradesmen, as smiths, carpenters, and all such as are forced to gain their living by the sweat of their bodies; as also such as are upon tedious and necessary journies.

Q. Are persons in the aforesaid cases permitted to eat flesh?

A. No, they are not, unless their case requires it, and then they are in all cases to observe the rules of the church, in order to obtain a dispensation.

Q. What are the methods in order to obtain a dispensation?

A. They are to advise with, and have the consent both of their physician and spiritual director, and observe their orders, both as to the substance and manner.

Q. What if the case be evident or doubtful, and access cannot be had either to the physician or director?

A. If the case be evident, and access cannot be had to the persons aforesaid, in that case a person is to follow his own conscience, with the advice of some knowing religious person. If doubtful, he must wait till he can consult his physician or director, and not incline to favour himself.

Q. Is a person dispensed with at liberty to eat flesh, &c. as often as he pleases?

A. No, that is to be specified in particular.

Q. Who are to grant dispensations?

A. The Pope for the whole church; bishops for their diocese; and pastors to particular persons under their charge.

Q. Which is the third precept of the church?

A. It concerns the time when people ought to confess their sins.

Q. Are all persons obliged by the divine law to confess their sins, and is it absolutely necessary to salvation?

A. It is necessary for all persons, who have been guilty of mortal sin after baptism: Num. v. 6. John xx. 23. James v. 16. Acts xix. 18, 19. For confession accompanied with due requisites is commanded by God as the ordinary means for remission of sins committed after baptism: but it is not absolutely necessary actually, but only in desire, when it cannot be made.

Q. What has the church commanded as to confession?

A. The fourth general council of Lateran, which was held in the year 1215. (Can. xx.) has ordered all to confess their sins once a year, without specifying the time (and that it be made to one's own priest) though the church in the council of Trent, (sess. xiv. c. v. et c. viii.) seems to specify that the annual confession be made in Lent, in order for the better disposing of the faithful for their paschal communion. Now the reason why the church commands

all the faithful to confess at least once a year, is because she is sensible of the negligence of many in their souls concern: and therefore as a tender mother, puts them in mind of their obligation in this point.

Q. Who is one's own priest?

A. The Pope, our bishop, and our own pastor and parish priest.

Q. Is the confession that is made to a priest, who is not approved of by the bishop, invalid?

A. Yes, and it is even so defined by the church in the fourth general council of Lateran, &c. Can. xxi. et Concil. Baj. chap. viii. et Concil. Rhem. And it is to be observed that the confession made to any priest not empowered by the bishop, is not only invalid, but the penitent likewise becomes guilty of a grievous sin, by a breach or violation of this third precept of the church.

Q. At what age are we obliged to go to confession?

A. When we are come to the use of reason, which is ordinarily conceived to be at eight years of age, for then we generally come to the knowledge of good and evil, and may fall into sin.

Q. Is it certain that we are not obliged to go to confession, but once a year?

A. The church obliges us to no more; but then it is to be observed, that the church by this precept does not take off the obligation which every one may have of confessing oftener: since all who are guilty of mortal sin are obliged to confess as often as there is any apparent danger of death, by sickness, war, sea, or any dangerous undertaking; as likewise before receiving any of the sacraments (except baptism) the benefit whereof, if duly considered, should move us often to confess our sins, and not to neglect it as is too commonly done: for he who defers his eternal welfare from day to day, and from week to week, is both void of reason and conscience; since it depends of himself (with the grace of God) to repent and confess his sins. Besides our Saviour himself commands us to be always prepared, because we know not the day nor the hour when death will call upon us. Luke xii. 40. Moreover it is to be feared, as it commonly happens, that those careless christians, who confess their sins but once or twice a year, do make a bad confession.

Q. Which is the fourth precept of the church?

A. It concerns the time when persons ought to communicate, or receive the blessed sacrament.

Q. What is the precept of the church concerning communion ?

A. In the primitive ages, christians received it every day; by degrees they were ordered to receive upon several great feasts: at last, the fourth general council of Lateran, (Can. xxi.) decreed, under Pope Innocent the III. that all of both sexes were obliged to communicate once a year, at the time of Easter, and that within their own parish church: and this decree is ratified by the council of Trent.

Q. How do you compute the time of Easter, when people are obliged to communicate ?

A. From Palm-Sunday, until Low-Sunday inclusively by a decree of Eugenius the IVth.

Q. Are there no exceptions, as to the decree of Innocent III. in the Lateran Council ?

A. Yes, by a licence from the Pope, our bishop, or pastor, persons may communicate out of their parish church. Again, it is left to the discretion of the confessor, if there is occasion to defer communion until after Easter.

Q. Are people obliged to receive the blessed sacrament at any other time of the year ?

A. Yes, when persons are in danger of death, which is an ecclesiastical custom all over the church, and has the force of a law: and several national councils do expressly command it. Hence several divines hold there is a divine precept for it, grounding themselves on the council of Nice, where it is called a necessary viaticum. Besides, it is to be observed, that though the church only obliges us to communicate once a year; yet she exhorts us to a frequent communion, provided we come with the necessary dispositions; and the reason is, because great fruit is reaped from this heavenly nourishment. Matt. xi. 28. And that it is to be feared that those who make use of the food of eternal life but once or twice a year, make no great account of their salvation.

Q. At what age are we obliged to receive the holy communion ?

A. When we come to sense and understanding, so as to be capable to discern the greatness of this mystery, which

is conceived ordinarily to be, at about twelve years of age ; but it is first requisite, that we be well instructed in the catechism, or christian doctrine.

Q. What punishment does the church inflict on those who comply not with this precept, and that which we spoke on last ?

A. She orders them to be banished from the communion of the faithful, and deprived of christian burial. Conc. 4. Later. But this excommunication does not fall upon those whom the pastor puts off for a time, in order that they should do penance, and duly prepare themselves.

Q. Is there any divine precept of receiving the blessed sacrament incumbent upon all, and is it necessary for salvation ?

A. It is not absolutely necessary for salvation, as baptism is for infants, and penance for sinners : yet there is a divine precept, of receiving one time or other, either actually or in desire, founded in these words of our Saviour Christ, "Except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." John vi. 54.

Q. What do you say concerning infants receiving the blessed sacrament ?

A. There is no divine precept for infants receiving the holy sacrament, for they cannot prove themselves, as St. Paul requires. 1 Cor. xi. 28. And they have a right to heaven by baptism alone.

Q. Which is the fifth precept of the church ?

A. Payment of tithes.

Q. What are tithes ?

A. The tenth part of the products of the earth ?

Q. To whom are tithes payable ? On what account ? And by what law ?

A. They are payable to the ministers of the church, in order to support them creditably, without any interruption to their spiritual duties. They are demanded as a part of religion, and an acknowledgment of God's supreme dominion over all the earth, and the fruits thereof are assigned for the benefit of his representatives, employed in religious matters : they are also due by the law of nature, "For a labourer," as St. Paul says, "is worthy of his hire or reward." 1 Tim. v. 18. And in another place he says, "That they who serve the altar, partake with the altar."

1 Cor. ix. 13. They are likewise due by human laws, civil, and ecclesiastical, established for that purpose. Hence we read in the 14th chapter of Genesis, ver. 20. and the 7th of the Hebrews, ver. 2. that Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedec, who was the high priest. Hence in the law of Moses, the Levites, or sacerdotal race, were ordered by Almighty God to have all the tithes paid to them; and besides had five large cities settled upon them, with all their dependencies and lands belonging to them. Lev. xxvii.

Q. Is the tenth part precisely due by the law of nature, or law of God?

A. It was due precisely by God's appointment among the Jews, but the Mosaic law being all abolished by the gospel, all the church could demand was a competent subsistence for the ministry, till by degrees the tithes were again ordained for the ministry, by civil and ecclesiastical laws, as they now stand, according to the different customs of nations. Num. xviii. ver. 21, 28. Mala. iii. 10.

Q. Which is the sixth precept of the church?

A. It concerns the time of celebrating marriage.

Q. When are marriages not to be solemnized, according to the precept of the church?

A. From the first Sunday of Advent, until the Epiphany, or Twelfth-day, be past; and from Ash-Wednesday, until Low-Sunday be past.

Q. Why is the celebration of marriage forbidden at these times?

A. Because they are times appointed by the church for penance, prayer, or devotion; and therefore, not proper to be spent in carnal pleasures, and public feasting. This prohibition is of ancient date, and confirmed by the council of Trent: * and is agreeable to the advice of the holy scriptures.

Q. Are there no exceptions?

A. Yes; when there is danger of scandal, or a foreign long journey to be taken, &c. But then the marriage is to be performed privately, and the reasons are to be allowed of by the superiors of the church.

* Sess. 24. decret. de reform. Matri. Cap. x. See Joel C, xi. 16. et 1 Cor. c. vii. 5. et 1 Pet. c. iii. 7.

THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is the signification of the word sacrament?

A. Among profane writers it has several significations, but as it is used in the scriptures and ecclesiastical authors; it is taken for a hidden or mysterious work; and in general is a visible sign of some holy thing.

Q. In what other sense, are the sacraments of the new law a sign?

A. St. Thomas says, they are a commemorative of Christ's passion and merit; a demonstrative of grace present, and a prognostic of future glory.

Q. What is a sign, and how many sorts of signs are there?

A. A sign in general is what puts us in mind of something else; of which there are two kinds, one natural, the other arbitrary. For instance, smoke is a natural sign of fire; the rainbow, is a sign of God's promise, that there should not be another deluge. Gen. ix. Some signs are practical, others speculative. Of the first kind are the sacraments, which produce grace; of the second kind was the brazen serpent, representing Christ's crucifixion.

Q. What is properly a sacrament of the new law?

A. It is a visible sign of inward invisible grace, instituted or appointed by Christ for man's sanctification.

Q. Can only God institute sacraments?

A. As God is the only author of grace, so he only can ordain signs that are capable of producing grace.

Q. What has the council of Trent defined concerning Christ being the author of the sacraments?

A. So as to be understood, that Jesus Christ immediately instituted them: though such a power might have been given to his church instrumentally. Sess. vii. Can. i. de Sac. in gen.

Q. What sort of sacrament was St. John Baptist's baptism?

A. The council of Trent defines, it had not the same effect with the baptism of Christ. Sess. vii. Can. i. de Baptis.

Q. Are not holy water, blessed bread, and other consecrated things, sacraments?

A. No; we call them sacramentals, or signs only of holiness. They give not sanctifying grace, but only actual grace, as being outward parts of prayer; they cause not actual grace by their own force, nor has man power to assign actual grace to such things. *Ex opere operato*.

Q. Were there no sacraments before the law of grace? Which are they, and what effect had they?

A. The divine worship always required the use of visible signs suitable to the state man lived in.

Q. What sacraments belonged to the law of nature?

A. The sacrifices and other outward tokens signifying a belief in the Messiah.

Q. What sacraments belonged to the law of Moses?

A. They were very numerous, viz. circumcision, the paschal lamb, ordination of priests; and in general all their sacrifices were signs of what would happen under the law of grace.

Q. What effect had those sacraments?

A. They were only speculative signs of sanctifying grace: yet they conferred a legal sanctity, which consecrated the performers so far as to make them obedient to the law of Moses.

Q. What are we to believe as to the matter and form of the sacraments, and how are they to be conceived?

A. Eugenius the IVth, in his decree in the council of Florence, which was held in the year 1439, declares, that every sacrament requires matter, form, and intention of doing what the church does. Now the matter and form are not to be taken strictly and properly, but only metaphorically; that is, for some sensible thing, action, words or signs, to determine the meaning.

Q. What is Calvin's opinion concerning the form of sacraments?

A. He pretends the words are not consecratory, but only concionatory or instructive, and serve only to nourish the faith of the receiver. An opinion condemned by the council of Trent, (Sess. vii. Can. v. de Sacr. in gen.) and manifestly false, as appears in the sacrament of baptism, where the infant has no faith, and is incapable of instruction.

Q. Were the matter and form of the sacraments determined and specified by Christ?

A. Most of them were specified. Yet several divines

are of opinion, that the matter and form of ordination was only determined in general, it being left to the church, to specify the particular matter and form; which always were to be such, as expressed the power that was given. Whereby these divines easily reconcile the rituals of ancient times, among the Latins; and the difference between the Græcian and Latin rituals, where there is some variety in the matter and form. According to these divines, though Christ appointed the contract to be the matter of the sacrament of matrimony, yet the church has a power to specify the nature of the contract: as the council of Trent did, (Sess. xxiv. decret. de Reform. Matri.) by declaring clandestine contracts, which before were only unlawful, to be afterwards void or null, and not a sufficient matter.

Q. Is it lawful to change the matter and form of the sacraments? And in what cases is it forbidden or allowed?

A. An essential variation makes the sacrament invalid. Now a variation is essential, if a different matter is made use of, or the sense of the form altered: but if the alteration happen only in the ceremonies, it is only accidental, and destroys not the sacrament: for instance, the form of baptism is valid in any language: as also, if through ignorance of the Latin tongue, one should say, *ego te baptizo in nomine patris, et filio, et spiritus sanctus*. If there be a doubt of the form it is to be repeated conditionally. The form of baptism is invalid, if a person should say, I baptize thee in the name of God, or in the name of the Trinity. Because they are not equivalent to the true form.

Q. Who are the ministers of the sacraments?

A. Only bishops and priests by their office, though the laity in some cases are the ministers; as for instance, a layman, in case of necessity, where a priest is not to be had; as also heretics, schismatics, &c. may validly baptize, if they make use of the true matter and form, and intend to do what the church does: as it is defined in several councils against the Donatists. Neither is the state of grace requisite to the validity of the sacrament, in the minister; as it is defined against Wicklif. Con. Trid. Sess. vii. Can. xii. de Sac. in gen. Women may also baptize validly and lawfully, in case of necessity.

Q. Are ministers the causes of grace in the sacraments?

A. They are only the instruments; God is the only principal cause, as he is in working miracles.

Q. Does the minister sin mortally, if he administers a sacrament in the state of mortal sin?

A. Yes; but the ritual says, that if he has not an opportunity of confessing, he is to make an act of contrition.

Q. What if a minister is in the state of mortal sin, can a person receive a sacrament from him?

A. In extreme necessity he may: He may also without extreme necessity, if the minister is not denounced by the church; and even otherwise, if there is any urgent occasion; but if there is no urgent occasion, he co-operates with the sin; yet care must be taken, not to judge rashly of the minister's state.

Q. What intention is required in the minister? What effects do the sacraments produce? In what manner do they produce grace? What is the proper grace of every sacrament? What number of sacraments are there in the new law?

A. In the first place, intention in general, is a volition, or act of determining of a thing by the means: it is requisite to every rational action, and much more to every religious action.

Q. How many kinds of intention are men capable of?

A. Chiefly three, viz. actual, which is accompanied with an actual intention of the mind, to the thing we are about. A virtual intention is, when the actual intention is judged to remain in its force, by not being expressly retracted, or interrupted by too long a time. An habitual intention, is the facility of performing a thing, obtained by habit or custom, without any actual reflection, or virtual influence upon the work.

Q. Apply these matters to the ministers of the sacraments?

A. An actual intention is most desirable; a virtual intention is sufficient; an habitual intention is not sufficient.

Q. In what cases is there a defect of a sufficient intention?

A. If a minister performs the work in a ludicrous manner. If he retracts his intention. If he is asleep, drunk, or mad; he has either no intention, or only an habitual one.

Q. Is it necessary to intend the effect of the sacrament?

A. No; otherwise heretics and pagans could not baptize

validly. It is sufficient to have an intention of doing what the church of Christ does, without considering which is the true church.

Q. What intention is required in those who receive the sacraments?

A. At least an habitual intention, and generally an actual, or virtual intention, that they may receive lawfully. Yet there is something particular in the case of extreme unction, when an interpretative intention is sufficient, according to the practice of the church.

Q. Are not dispositions required in the receivers?

A. Yes, several; as faith in some, and charity in others; not that the sacrament is not given without them, but that grace is not given without them.

Q. What benefit has the receiver who partakes of a sacrament without due dispositions?

A. He receives the character in the three sacraments of baptism, confirmation, and orders, though not the particular sacramental grace; which, however, is bestowed upon him, when the fiction or impediment is removed by true penance (at the same time he is supposed, when he receives the said sacraments, to have the general dispositions for the character, viz. intention, &c.) This recovering of the sacramental grace is expressly asserted by St. Augustin, and is the opinion of the church.

Q. What is particularly to be observed, concerning those who receive the sacraments?

A. First, as to infants, no dispositions are required. As to adult persons, several dispositions are required to make the sacraments valid, viz. intention and consent, excepting the sacrament of the eucharist: other dispositions are required in the adult, to receive the effect, viz. sanctifying grace, faith, contrition, or attrition, &c.

Q. What effect have the sacramentals, viz. exorcisms, crossing, agnus Dei, holy water, &c. and how do they produce their effects?

A. The chief effects are pious thoughts, or actual grace; the remission of venial sin, by means of such grace; the remission of temporal pain; driving away temptations, and the devil; restoring to corporal health. But these effects are not infallibly produced by virtue of the sacramentals alone: so that they produce their effects, as being an out-

ward part of the prayers of the church, and of the pious prayers of those who make use of them.

Q. You say the sacraments produce grace, in what manner is this done? Do they all produce the same sort of grace?

A. They all produce grace in the nature of channels or vehicles, where God is as principal, the minister as joint instrument, the elements as separate instruments. As to the grace conferred, it is different in most of the sacraments; some confer the first grace, as baptism and penance, and they are called the sacraments of the dead; others confer an increase of grace, and are called the sacraments of the living, as are all the rest of the sacraments.

Q. Give me a distinct account of the specific grace conferred by each of the sacraments?

A. The grace of baptism is regenerative, it remits original sin, entitles to the name of Christian, and gives a right to partake of the other sacraments. The grace of confirmation is strengthening and gives courage to profess the true faith. The grace of the holy eucharist is nutritive, and unites us to Christ. The grace of penance is remissive of actual sins, and occasions sorrow for them, and protection against a relapse. The grace of extreme unction strengthens the sick person against temptations, at that time, and procures health. The grace of order disposes the ministry to perform their functions with spiritual profit. The grace of matrimony enables the parties to comply with the burdens of their state.

Q. Is not a character the effect of some of the sacraments, and what are the properties belonging to it?

A. A character is a spiritual power in the soul, whereby a person is distinguished from others, and made capable of receiving, and giving other sacraments, and performing what belongs to the divine worship.

Q. Which are the properties of the sacramental character?

A. It is given only in three sacraments, viz. baptism, confirmation, and orders. Con. Trid. Sess. vii. Can. ix. de Sac. in gen. It is indelible. It is a quality distinct from the soul, but some divines say the contrary.

Q. How many sacraments are there in the new law?

A. Seven, viz. baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony. The divine will was the chief reason of the number. But there is a certain analogy between a corporal and spiritual life. A

christian is born spiritually by baptism ; the spiritual life is increased, and strengthened by confirmation ; it is nourished by the eucharist ; when sick it is purged by penance ; when dangerously ill, it is restored by extreme unction ; economy is preserved in spiritual matters by order ; the species is preserved by marriage, and grace given to answer the ends of that state.

Q. Why do the scriptures and ancient fathers never mention the number of the sacraments to be seven ?

A. They never mention the number to be two ; it is sufficient to mention the things. So the scriptures never mention that there are twelve principal articles of our belief ; to which all the rest are reduced ; neither do they ever mention the word Trinity, or consubstantiality. There was no occasion to mention the number, until the dispute arose, and this it was, which made the church mention the number, which she defined in the general councils of Florence and Trent. Trid. Sess. vii. Can. 1. de Sac. in gen.

Q. Does not the number of orders, viz. episcopacy, priesthood, deaconship, &c. increase the number of sacraments ?

A. No ; they are all resolved into priesthood, which is the plenitude of orders : all the others are, as it were, species or branches of priesthood.

Q. What do you say as to the dignity and necessity of the sacraments respectively ?

A. It is defined by the council of Trent, that they are not all equal in dignity, and that the eucharist is the most excellent, as being the foundation of all grace. Sess. vii. Can. iii. de Sac. in gen. As to the necessity, it is defined by the council of Trent, that they are necessary to salvation ; but some in one manner, and some in another. Sess. vii. Can. iv. de Sac. gen. For instance, baptism is absolutely necessary for children. Baptism and penance are necessary for the adult, either actually or in desire. Matrimony is necessary for the whole, but not for every particular. Order is necessary for those who perform the sacerdotal functions. The eucharist, confirmation, and extreme unction, are necessary according to the precepts of God and his church, at certain times, but not absolutely, when not obtainable.

Q. As there are a great number of ceremonies made use of in administering the sacraments, let me have your opinion of them ?

A. Ceremonies are external performances, made use of either by Christ, the apostles, or the church afterwards; not essential to the sacraments, but instituted for decency, and to promote devotion.

Q. Is it lawful for any particular person, or even national church to alter the ceremonies?

A. No; if they are approved of, and practised by the whole church, and handed down by tradition, from the earliest times of christianity; because these have been supposed to have been in use from Christ and his apostles. Such as those are exorcisms, sufflation, the sign of the cross in baptism, anointing, imposing of hands, &c.

Q. Is it not superstition to make use of ceremonies?

A. By no means; superstition is to make use of outward performances, expecting blessings from them, which neither nature, nor appointment, can promise or produce. The ceremonies the church make use of are in the nature of prayer, of which they are a part. Now God has annexed certain blessings to prayer.

Q. But are not many of the ceremonies ridiculous, and a hindrance to true devotion, by their number?

A. Not at all; they are significative, and represent all the pious duties of the christian religion; and if any appear ridiculous, the church takes care to retrench them, and reform herself in all matters of discipline.

BAPTISM EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is baptism?

A. It is an exterior washing of the body under a certain form of words; or thus, it is the first and most necessary sacrament, instituted by Christ, to free us from original sin, and all actual sin committed before baptism; it makes us children of God and his church; it is the first sacrament, because before it no other sacrament can be validly received; it is the most necessary, for unless a man be born again of water, and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Jo. iii. 5.

Q. How many sorts of baptism are there?

A. We commonly reckon three, viz. 1st, baptism of water; 2d, of the spirit; 3d, and of blood. (1st, aquæ; 2d, flaminis; 3d, sanguinis.) But the first is only properly a sacrament.

Q. What is the baptism of the spirit, and what effect has it?

A. It is a true contrition, with an ardent desire of baptism, if it cannot be otherwise obtained; it remits both original and actual sin, but not always the temporal pain due to sin. St. Aug. l. 4, de Bap. chap. 22, 23, 25.

Q. What is the baptism of blood, and what are its effects?

A. It is martyrdom, and remits original and actual sin, with all the temporal pain. Hence, the holy innocents are esteemed martyrs, as being baptized in their own blood. St. Cypri. Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaianu.

Q. When was the sacrament of baptism first instituted by Christ; and when were christians first obliged to receive it?

A. It was instituted before Christ's passion; some holy fathers and divines say, it was instituted when Christ was baptized by St. John; others, when Christ said, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. St. John iii. St. Greg. Naz. Orat. in nat. St. Aug. Serm. 29, 36, et 27, de Bap. St. Augustin says, Christ baptized the apostles; but be this as it will, it is certain they baptized all persons, after the ascension of our Saviour, according to the commission they received from Jesus Christ, when he said, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. xxviii. 19. And that the obligation then began, as the gospel was promulgated.

Q. Which is the essential matter of baptism?

A. Natural water, as it is defined in the council of Trent: (Sess. vii. Can. ii, de Bap.) so artificial water, or other liquids, are not a proper matter. It must also be applied by ablution, so that ice, unless dissolved, is not sufficient. Besides, the water ought to be consecrated, according to the ritual; but this is not absolutely necessary, only upon account of the precept.

Q. After how many ways may this ablution be performed?

A. Three, by immersion, that is, plunging and dipping the body. Secondly, by infusion or effusion. Thirdly, by aspersion upon some particular part. It is probable the apostles baptised by aspersion, or effusion; because 3000

were baptized in one day. Acts, ii. 41. Yet in the primitive ages, the practice was to baptize by three immersions, which the church has altered for three infusions. One infusion is sufficient as to the validity of the sacrament, as also without making the sign of the cross.

Q. Which is the form of baptism, and how is it to be explained?

A. The necessary form are these words. I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Some add the word, Amen, but it is not in the Roman Ritual. Again, we are to baptize in the name, as St. Augustine says, and not in the names. Neither is baptism valid, in the name of Christ, in the name of God, or in the name of the Trinity; because they do not express the mystery; and tradition requires a distinct signification. Again it is to be observed, that the same person who applies the matter, must pronounce the form, otherwise the baptism is invalid.

Q. Why are the apostles in the scripture said to have baptized in the name of Christ? Acts viii. 12.

A. St. Cyprian and other Fathers say, that in the name of Christ, signifies by the authority of Christ; but that they at the same time made use of the distinct form. St. Thomas, as also the Roman catechism say, if the name of Christ was only made use of, it was by a particular dispensation, to the end the power of Christ might particularly be established at that time.

Q. Is it necessary to salvation that all persons, even infants, should be baptized?

A. It is absolutely necessary for all adult persons to be actually baptized if they can; or in desire where it cannot be actually obtained: as for infants they are to be actually baptized; as it is defined against the Pelagians; and since, against the Calvinists in the council of Trent. Sess. vii. Can. viii. de Bap. This doctrine is grounded upon the words of our Saviour Christ, where he says, "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." St. John, iii. 5.

Q. Is baptism to be deferred until infants are able to answer for themselves?

A. No; the contrary is defined against the anabaptists, by the council of Trent.

Q. Is a child half born to be baptized ?

A. If life appear, it may : if life be doubtful, the Ritual orders baptism under condition. Sub conditione.

Q. Which are the effects of baptism ?

A. A total remission of original and actual sin, with the pains due to them. Hence no satisfaction is appointed, when adult persons are baptized. Again all spiritual and supernatural gifts are given at the same time. It is an entire regeneration, or new life ; it gives a right to all the other sacraments ; it opens the gates to heaven ; it gives a character, and cannot be reiterated. All these points are defined by the council of Trent.

Q. What is to be said concerning the minister and place of baptism ?

A. Every man is a minister, in case of necessity, that is to say, when a priest cannot be had, using the true matter and form, with an intencion of doing what the church does : but only the bishop or parish priest is the proper minister by office, (*Ex officio*,) or one deputed by the ordinary. Hence chaplains are not to baptize by office, nor superiors of religious orders. Hence there is a regulation to be observed, when there is urgent necessity ; viz. a man is to be preferred to a woman, and those in higher orders, to those in lesser. As to place, the Rituals order it to be in the church, unless in princes' children, and even then, it is to be done in an oratory, and the water fetched from the parish church.

Q. Is it lawful to receive baptism ?

A. No, it is not lawful to receive it upon any account more than once, (*Heb. vi. 4, 6,*) and the reason is, because it imprints a spiritual character in the soul which shall remain for ever, either to our great joy in heaven, or our confusion in hell.

Q. What are the penalties for re-baptizing ?

A. By the old civil law it was death ; and now by the canons of the church, it is irregularity, and otherwise punishable.

Q. What is required of him who has a mind to receive baptism ?

A. It is required of him, and he promises to God, to renounce the devil, his works, his pomps, and all his vanities. Moreover, it is necessary for him, who is come to the use

of reason, before he receives baptism, to have faith, a true and hearty sorrow and detestation for all his sins, and to begin to love God. Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. c. 6.

Q. What do you understand by the works, pomps, and vanities of the devil?

A. By the works of the devil, we understand all kinds of sin. By the pomps and vanities of the devil, we understand vain-glory, worldly ambition, and every other kind of pride.

Q. For what end are godfathers and godmothers appointed us, and what is the discipline of the church to this point?

A. That they may answer for, and instruct us in case our parents should die, or be wanting or negligent in that part of their duty; which obligation lies on them. At present, since the council of Trent, there is to be only one godfather and one godmother, and no more; and they ought both to be catholics, and of a good reputation. According to the council of Trent, a spiritual affinity is contracted between the baptized and the sponsors, as also between the father and mother of the baptized, and the sponsors; but not between the sponsors themselves. This affinity is an impediment, (*Impedimentum dirimens*), not only making marriage unlawful, but also invalid between the parties. It is also to be noted that he who baptizes the child, contracts a spiritual affinity with the child, and with the child's parents: but where the child is baptized without the ceremonies, in case of necessity, there is no affinity contracted, when the ceremonies are performed afterwards; and the reason is because that ceremony is not a sacrament. This is declared by Innocent the Third.

Q. Are we bound to fulfil all that our godfathers and godmothers have promised in our name?

A. We certainly are; for it is upon that condition we are admitted to baptism, and were made members of the church, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven. Gal. v. 3, 6,

Q. What obligation does baptism lay upon us?

A. To believe firmly all that the catholic church teaches. Secondly, to keep faithfully all the commandments of God and his church. Rom. vi. 3, 4. And lastly, to follow diligently the example of our Saviour Christ, and his saints, 1 Pet. ii. 21,

CONFIRMATION EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is confirmation?

A. It is a sacrament conferred by a bishop, by imposition of hands, and unction of chrism, under a certain form of words, and instituted to confirm the baptized in the faith of Christ and his church, and to resist all temptations against it.

Q. What grounds have you properly to believe it is a sacrament?

A. First, from the scriptures, where we read in the Acts of the Apostles, chap. viii. When Peter and John were sent to confirm the Samaritans, by imposition of hands, to receive the Holy Ghost, though they had already been baptized. Heb. vi. 2. 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. Acts xix. 5, 6. Secondly, from the holy fathers, who all agree that confirmation is a sacrament.*

Q. That ceremony was used only in those times, to give the Holy Ghost visibly, in order to work miracles and other gifts.

A. That was one effect proper then, but it also gave sanctifying grace, and was practised in every age since, for the latter purpose, as the fathers all assert.

Q. Do protestants hold it to be a sacrament?

A. No; only a ceremony, for instruction of youth in their faith, after they have arrived at the use of reason, and to put them in mind of their baptismal vows. But though they will not in formal terms call it a sacrament, yet they will own the antiquity and use of it, from the apostles' time; and by their book of common prayer, it is ordered: "That as soon as the children can say in the mother tongue, the creed, the Lord's prayer, the ten commandments, &c." they be brought to the bishop, by one that shall be their godfather and godmother, and the bishop shall confirm him, &c. "for as much as confirmation is administered to them who are baptized, that by the imposition of hands and prayer, they may receive strength and

* See St. Ambr. de Sacr. L. 3. C. 2. et L. de Spir. Sanc. C. 6. et 7. St. Aug. de Trinit. L. 15. C. 26. et in Ps. 26. Tertul. S. de Bap. C. 8. et L. de resur. C. 8. St. Hier. contr. Lucifer, tom. iv. Part 2.

defence against all temptations to sin, and the assaults of the world and the devil." Now what is the strength and defence, which they receive against the temptations of sin, the world, and the devil, but the grace of God; if then they own grace to be given thereby they ought to own it to be a sacrament, as having all requisites to a sacrament, viz. matter, form, and a proper minister. And it is in the Acts of the Apostles, (chap. viii.) that the visible sign of the imposition of hands has annexed to it an invisible grace, viz. the imparting of the Holy Ghost; consequently, confirmation is a visible sign of invisible grace, and therefore is a sacrament.

Q. What is the matter of this sacrament?

A. Imposition of hands and unction with chrism.

Q. The scriptures make no mention of unction with chrism?

A. This is known by constant traditions of the primitive fathers, who expressly assert it. The immediate matter is the anointing; the remote matter is the chrism. Both scripture and fathers make imposition of hands part of the ceremony; as also chrism is mentioned by all the fathers,* And it is defined by the council of Trent, that virtue is to be ascribed also to the chrism. Some divines think the apostles made use of chrism, otherwise their immediate successors would not have used, and imposed it. This opinion seems to be agreeable to St. Paul, where he says, "He that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and that hath anointed us is God; who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the spirit in our hearts." 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

Q. What is chrism, and why was it assumed for that use?

A. It is an ointment, made of oil of olives and balsam: any other oil is not sufficient matter. Now oil has several qualities, which signifies the effect of this sacrament, viz. spiritual strength and purity of conscience, and preservation from rust, that is, from sin: and the sweetness of balsam, the odour of a good life.

Q. Is it requisite that the chrism be consecrated, and that by a bishop?

* St. Aug. in Ps. 44. ver. 9. et L. 3. de Trini. C. 27. St. Greg. in 1. C. Cant. St. Amb. in Ps. 118. et L. de Spirit. Sanc. C. 3. Conc. Laod. C. 28. Conc. Trid. Sess. vii. Can. ii. de. Confr.

A. Yes ; it is requisite to the validity of the sacrament ; though some divines are of a contrary opinion.

Q. Who is the minister of confirmation ?

A. A bishop is the only ordinary minister, as it is decreed in the general council of Florence. Besides the council of Trent has defined, that a bishop is the only ordinary minister, (Sess. vii. Can. iii.) ; and this appears from the scripture itself, where we read in the eighth of the Acts, that Peter and John were sent to confirm the Samaritans. This has been the constant tradition and practice of the church, as we learn from St. Cyprian, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, &c. However, St. Thomas and some other divines hold, that the Pope can dispense with a private priest, to administer this sacrament, provided he makes use of the chrism consecrated by a bishop. But St. Bonaventure, and others think, no such dispensation can be granted by the Pope.

Q. What is the form of this sacrament ?

A. It is the prayer^h made use of, to implore the assistance and bestowing of the Holy Ghost : And the words joined with the unction, viz. N. I sign thee with the sign of the cross, I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Q. Why is no mention made of the aforesaid form of confirmation, in the writings of the fathers, and ancient rituals ?

A. The fathers purposely declined mentioning the nature of the sacraments, especially the form. As for rituals, the form of words sometimes was varied, though it was always a prayer signifying the nature of the sacrament.

Q. What are the particular effects of confirmation ?

A. It bestows, in the first place, an increase of our baptismal grace ; it also confers upon us the Holy Ghost with all his gifts : again, it gives a particular grace, - confirming persons in their faith, and protecting them against heresy, and gives a spiritual courage and strength to resist all the visible enemies of our faith ; it also makes us perfect christians : and lastly, gives a character of being compleat soldiers of Christ ; (2 Cor, i. 21, 22.) which character is indelible, and therefore this sacrament cannot be repeated. Hence those that are to be confirmed, are obliged to be so much the more careful to come to this sacrament worthily,

since it can be received but once ; and if they then receive it unworthily they have no share in the grace which is thereby communicated to the soul, instead of which they incur the guilt of grievous sacrilege.

Q. Who are capable of receiving confirmation, and what dispositions are required ?

A. In the first place the person must be baptized. Again, infants are capable, because it was the custom formerly to confirm children immediately after they were baptized ; but now, not until the perfect use of reason ; and then they are obliged to know the principal articles of their faith, to confess their sins, and by a true contrition, to be in the state of grace ; it is also advisable to receive it fasting, but this is not of strict obligation.

Q. What say you as to the necessity of receiving this sacrament ?

A. It is not of that absolute necessity, but that persons may be saved without it ; yet there is a precept for receiving it, which obliges all adult persons when they have a fit opportunity ; or else they are guilty of a mortal sin, if it be omitted out of contempt, or any gross neglect ; and that they foresee they cannot have an opportunity hereafter : but as the ritual expresses, or when persons are exposed to dangerous temptations, either inward or outward, of losing their faith ; for in such circumstances they omit the proper means provided by the law of God to resist them.

Q. What ought to be done after receiving confirmation ?

A. We ought to give most hearty thanks to God, for the abundance of grace we have received from him ; to take a firm resolution to spend our lives christianly, and to profess our faith openly ; “ For with the heart we believe unto justice, but, with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation.” Rom. x.10. We ought earnestly to ask of God the fruits of the Holy Ghost, &c.

Q. What is the obligation that a christian takes upon him in confirmation ?

A. He lists himself there for a soldier of Christ ; and consequently is obliged, after having received this sacrament, to fight manfully the battles of his Lord.

si.

THE EUCHARIST EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is the holy eucharist?

A. It is a sacrament wherein are contained the body and blood of Christ, under the forms, or appearances of bread and wine, given for our spiritual nourishment.

Q. By what names is it usually known?

A. It was called in the primitive church, and by the holy fathers eucharist, which is a Greek word, and signifies thanksgiving; and is applied to this sacrament, because of the thanksgiving which our Saviour Christ offered in the first institution of it, according to St. Matthew, xxvi. 27. St. Mark, xiv. 23. St. Luke, xxii. 19. And because of the thanksgiving with which we are obliged to offer and receive this great sacrament and sacrifice, which contains the fountain of all grace, the standing memorial of our redemption, and the pledge of a happy eternity. It is called the Lord's supper, because it was instituted by Christ at his last supper. It is called the Viaticum, as being the bread of a christian during the journey of this life. It is called the Holy Communion, because all partakers are joined in faith and love by it. It is called the sacrifice, being by immolation offered to God.

Q. Is it a memorial, and of what?

A. It is in general a memorial of love, being the greatest of legacies. It is a memorial of Christ's passion. It is demonstrative of grace, present, and prognostic of future glory.

Q. How does the eucharist differ from the rest of the sacraments?

A. First, in dignity; hence it is called the holy sacrament. Secondly, it contains the fountain of grace. Thirdly, there is a miraculous conversion, by destroying the matter. Fourthly, it consists not only in use but in a permanent thing.

Q. What figures were there formerly of the eucharist, and how did they represent it?

A. It was prefigured by Melchisedech's offering bread and wine, as to the matter; for Christ was a priest, according to the order of Melchisedech. As to the effect, it was prefigured by the manna, which had all sorts of delicious tastes.

As to the thing contained, Christ's body had suffered, it was prefigured by all the sacrifices, immolated by the law of Moses. Hence Christ is called the "Lamb slain from the beginning of the world." But the most express figure was the killing and eating of the paschal lamb. The blood of the lamb was sprinkled on their doors, whom the destroying angel spared. So the blood of Christ is sprinkled, to redeem men from sin. Christ again, is called the innocent lamb. Again, the paschal lamb was eaten with unleavened bread.

Q. What is the faith of the Catholic church concerning this sacrament ?

A. That the substance of bread and wine is changed, by the words of consecration, into the real body and blood of Jesus Christ. That under each form is truly and really the body and blood ; as also the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, which by the hypostatical union is inseparable from his body and blood. That whosoever receives under one kind alone, receives whole Christ, as much as if he received under both. That by dividing the species, the body of Christ is not hurt, but remains entire under the least particle.

Q. In what manner is Christ present at this sacrament ?

A. By the true and real presence of his divine and human nature, and not in figure only, as some would have it.

Q. Is the body of Christ present in the eucharist, after a natural, corporeal, and visible manner, as he was upon earth before he suffered ?

A. No ; for according to St. Paul, there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body ; so that it may be called a spiritual body in the sense of St. Paul, speaking of the resurrection of the body, where he says, " It is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body." 1 Cor. xv. 44. Not but it still remains a true body, as to all that is essential to a body ; for surely no one will pretend to say that the body of Christ, which is now in heaven, is not the same true and real body which was born of the blessed Virgin Mary, and which suffered upon the cross. And as Christ's body has now the qualities of a glorified body, as being spiritualized, so it partakes in some measure of the qualities and properties of a spirit. Therefore, it is easier

conceived how Christ's body may be in the sacrament, without extension or greatness of place ; for as a spirit requires no extension for its being, so neither does a body when it is become spiritual and immortal ; and since Christ's body is in the eucharist in the manner of being, as it was in after his resurrection, viz. incorruptible, immortal, and impassible, (Christ rising from the dead, dies no more, death shall no more have dominion over him. Rom. xi. 9,) so it is not to be imagined Christ suffers when the sacrament is broken, eaten, and the like. Thus may be conceived how Christ's body may be whole and entire in every part, after the sacred host is divided, and also how it may be in many places at once ; for though we cannot easily understand this possible to an extended body, remaining in its corporeal manner of being, yet there is no such difficulty in relation to a spirit, or any other thing in its manner of being like a spirit : because a spirit has no dependence on place, nor is confined either to it or by it. Neither is it more strange for Christ to be in the blessed sacrament, and at the same time in heaven, than it was for him to be in heaven, and at the same time on earth, when he appeared to St. Paul. Acts ix. 29. Nor after all our senses to guide us in this, nor in any other mystery of faith, but faith itself, viz. the word of God, of Jesus Christ, who says, " This is my body." 1 Cor. xv. His power and truth make it to be what he solemnly asserts ; this we believe as well as all other mysteries upon his word, proposed unto us by his church : upon his word we rely, by which he made all things out of nothing, and changed the nature of things, when and as he pleases ; as when he changed Lot's wife into a pillar of salt. Gen. xix. Water into blood, Exod. vii. As likewise water into wine, John ii. 9. Neither is the difficulty greater here in believing upon God's word against our senses, than in believing upon God's word the young man to be an angel. Mark xvi. Matt. xxviii. The dove and fiery tongues to be the Holy Ghost, (Matt. iii. Acts ii.) when to our senses they appear otherwise. God's word makes things infinitely surer to us than our senses ; for alas, how often and easily are our senses deceived ? While God's word can never deceive us : we ought therefore always to submit to it, when we know it to be God's word.

Q. How do you prove from God's word the real presence of the body and blood of Christ to be in this sacrament?

A. I prove it from no less than four different places in the New Testament, delivered by Christ himself, viz. from the 26th chapter of St. Matthew, from the 14th of St. Mark, from the 22d of St. Luke, and from the 11th of the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians; in all these places Christ himself assures us, that what he gives us in the sacrament is his own body and blood. First, in the 26th of St. Matthew, ver. 26, 27, 28, we read, "And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and broke, and gave to his disciples, and said, Take ye and eat, this is my body: and taking the chalice, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins."

2dly, In the 14th of St. Mark we read, ver. 22, 23, 24, "And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessing, broke, and gave to them, and said, Take ye, this is my body; and having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them, This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many."

3dly, In the 22nd of St. Luke we read, ver. 19, 20, "And taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them saying, This is my body which is given for you; do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner, (he took) the chalice also, after he had supped, saying, This is the chalice of the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

4thly, In the 11th of the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, we read, ver. 23, 24, 25. "I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke, and said, Take ye and eat; this is my body, which shall be delivered for you; this do for the commemoration of me. In like manner also, (he took) the chalice after he had supped, saying, this chalice is the New Testament in my blood, as often as you shall drink for the commemoration of me, this do ye."

Q. Why do you take these words of Christ at his last

supper according to the letter, rather than in a figurative sense?

A. I have many reasons to offer why we take the words of Christ, which he spoke at his last supper, in their plain and literal sense. First, because whatever Christ has plainly and expressly said in scripture ought to be understood by us in the literal and proper sense of the words, where the case will admit of it; this is what our adversaries themselves either do or must allow, otherwise it is not possible to prove by scripture that any one text of the gospel ought to be taken literally and properly. Now, it is certain, that Christ has plainly and expressly said in scripture, that what he instituted at his last supper, was the same body and blood which he gave for the life of the world; and there is no doubt, but that the body which he gave and sacrificed for us, and the blood which he shed for us, was his true and real body and blood; Christ, says St. Paul, gave himself for his church. Ephes. v. 26. And in another place, St. Paul says, that Christ entered by his own blood into the sanctuary. - Heb. ix: 12. Therefore, the words of Christ, which he spoke at his last supper, in the institution of the blessed sacrament, ought to be taken in the literal and proper sense of the words. Secondly, when God speaks in the holy scripture, with an express design to make known to us some new institution or command, upon which our salvation depends, or to discover some high mystery of faith which was entirely new to the world, and which was necessary for the world to know, but could not be known only from his words; then, if ever we have good reason to believe the word of God speaks plainly, and ought to be taken in the natural and literal sense of the words. Now here, our Saviour spoke those words, This is my body, this is my blood, at the institution of a great sacrament upon which our salvation depends, with an express design to reveal a high mystery of faith, which was entirely new to the world, and which was necessary for the world to know, but could not be known to his disciples only from his words. We conclude then, that his words upon such an occasion ought in all reason to be understood in the plain, obvious, and literal sense; especially as there is no absurdity or contradiction in the literal sense which can oblige us to have recourse to a figurative meaning, since there is nothing

in the belief of the real presence, but what is clearly within the sphere of infinite power; nay, it is an easier thing to comprehend that God can change one thing into another, than make all things out of nothing, as he did the world. Thirdly, because Christ was at that time making a covenant which was to last to the end of the world. He was enacting a law which was for ever to be observed in his church. He was instituting a sacrament which was to be frequented by all the faithful. In fine, he was making his last will and testament, and therein bequeathing to his disciples, and to us all, an admirable legacy and pledge of his love. Now such is the nature of all these things, viz. of a covenant, of a law, of a sacrament, of a last will and testament, that he who makes a covenant, a law, a last will and testament, &c. always designs that what he covenants, appoints, or ordains, should be rightly observed and fulfilled: so, of consequence, he always designs that it should be rightly understood; and therefore, he always expresses himself in the most plain and clear terms. This is what all wise men ever observe in their covenants, laws, or last wills, industriously avoiding all obscure expressions which may give occasion to their being misunderstood. This is what God himself observed in the old covenant, in all the ceremonies and moral precepts of the law; all are expressed in the most clear and plain terms. It then can be nothing less than impeaching the wisdom of the Son of God, to imagine that he should institute the chief of his sacraments, under such a form of words, which in their plain, natural, and obvious meaning, imply a thing so widely different from what he gives therein, as his own body is from a bit of bread; or, in fine, to believe that he would make his last will and testament in words affectedly ambiguous and obscure; which, if taken according to that sense, which they seem evidently to express, must lead his children into a pernicious error concerning the legacy which he bequeaths them. In effect, it is certain that our Saviour Christ foresaw that his words would be taken according to the letter by the greatest part of christians; and that the church, even in her general councils, would interpret his words in this sense. It must be then contrary to all probability, that he who foresaw all this, would affect to express himself in this manner in his last will, had he not really meant what he said; or that he should not have somewhere explained

himself in a more clear way, to prevent the dreadful consequence of his whole church's authorizing an error in a matter of the greatest importance; particularly when he was then speaking alone to his beloved apostles' and bosom friends, to whom he was always accustomed to explain in clear terms (as St. Mark assures us,) whatever was obscure in his parables, or other discourses to the people. Chap. iv. ver. 11, 34. Fourthly, because I have the authority of the best and most authentic interpreter of God's word, viz. the holy catholic church, which has always understood these words of Christ, in their plain literal sense, and condemned all those who have presumed to wrest them to a figurative one: witness the many synods held against Berengarius, and the decrees of the general councils of Lateran, Constance and Trent. Now against this authority the scripture assures us, the gates of hell shall never prevail. St. Matt. xvi. ver. 18. And with this interpreter Christ has promised that he and the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, will abide for ever. St. Matt. xx. St. John xiv.

Q. But are not many of Christ's sayings to be understood figuratively, as when he says, I am the door, I am the true vine, &c. Why then may not the words of the institution of the last supper be also understood figuratively?

A. It is a very bad argument to pretend to infer, that because some of Christ's words are to be taken figuratively, therefore all are to be taken so; at this rate an Arian might pretend, that when our Saviour in holy scripture is called God, and the Son of God, it is only figuratively, because he is in other places figuratively called a door, a vine. There is a manifold disparity between the case of the expressions you mention, viz. I am the door, the vine, &c. and the words of the last supper, this is my body, this is my blood. First, because the former is delivered as parables and similitudes, and consequently as figures; the latter are the words of a covenant, sacrament and last will, and therefore are to be understood according to their most plain and obvious meaning. Secondly, because the former are explained by Christ himself in the same place in a figurative sense, but the latter are not. Thirdly, because the former are worded in such a manner as to carry with them the evidence of a figure, so that no man alive can possibly take them in any other than a figurative meaning, for he who will pretend to say that our Saviour was really

a door, or a vine tree : but the latter are expressed, and so evidently imply the literal sense, that they who have been the most desirous to find a figure in them, have been puzzled to do it. This was the case of Luther himself, as we learn from his epistle to his friends at Strasburg, (tom. 5, fol. 502,) and of Zuinglius, as we learn from his epistle to Pomeranus, fol. 256.

Q. But may not the sign or figure be called by the name of the thing signified ? And have we not instances of this in scripture ?

A. In certain cases, when a thing is already known to be a sign or figure of something else, which it signifies or represents ; it may, indeed, be said, according to the common laws of speech, and the use of the scripture, to be such or such a thing, that is, it signifies or represents such a thing ; as in the interpretation of parables, ancient figures, and the like. But it is not the same in the first institution of a sign, or figure, because when a thing is not known beforehand to be a sign or representation of some other thing, to call it abruptly by a foreign name, would be contrary to all laws of speech, and both absurd and unintelligible, as if you should say that a morsel of bread is London-bridge, or that a bit of cheese is Canterbury church ; because, by an art of memory, they put you in mind of those buildings : but this would be justly censured as nonsensical and unworthy of a wise man ; just so it would have been if our blessed Saviour, at his last supper, without acquainting his disciples beforehand, that he designed to speak figuratively, should have abruptly told them, This is my body, this is my blood, had he not meant that they were really so. For abstracting from the change which Christ was pleased to make in the elements by his almighty word, a bit of bread has no more similitude to Christ's body, than a morsel of bread has to London-bridge ; so that nothing but the real presence of Christ's body and blood, could verify his words at his last supper, or vindicate them from being highly absurd and unworthy the Son of God.

Q. But do not these words which our Saviour spoke, viz. Do this in remembrance of me, (Luke xxii. 19,) determine his other words to a figurative sense ? For the remembrance or commemoration of a thing supposes it to be absent ?

A. These words, Do this in remembrance of me, inform

us, indeed, of the end for which we are to offer up, and receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ, viz. for a perpetual commemoration of his death and passion, as St. Paul teaches us, 1 Cor. xi. 26. But they no ways interfere with these other words, This is my body, and this is my blood; so as to explain away the real presence of Christ's body and blood. It is certain St. Matthew and St. Mark never looked upon these words, Do this in remembrance of me, as a necessary explication of the words of the institution, this is my body, this is my blood, as any ways altering or qualifying the natural and literal meaning of them; since they have in their gospels quite omitted those words, do this in remembrance of me. As to what you allege, that the remembrance of a thing supposes it to be absent, I answer, that whatsoever things we may be liable to forget, whether really present, or really absent, may be the object of our remembrance; for what can be more intimately present to us than God, and yet the scripture commands us to remember our Creator, (Eccl. xii. 1,) though in him we live, move, and have our being. Acts xvii. 28. So that this command of remembering Christ, is no ways opposite to his real presence; but the most that can be inferred from it is, that he is not visibly present; which is very true; and therefore, lest we should forget him, this remembrance is enjoined.

Q. But notwithstanding all that has been said, is it not the greatest absurdity, and even blasphemy, to say that a man can make his God, or that a priest can turn a wafer or a bit of bread into his Saviour?

A. It never was the belief of the catholic church that the bread is changed by the priest into the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. We believe indeed, as I have already said, that by the almighty power of God, making use of the ministry of the priest, the bread is changed into the body of Christ: but we neither do nor ever did believe and teach, that the bread which is a material substance is changed into the soul, which is a spirit; much less do we believe and teach, that it is changed into the divinity; nay we believe it to be blasphemy, and heresy to imagine any such thing: we believe it is true, that the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ are truly and really present in the blessed sacrament, and that Christ is contained whole and entire under either kind:

not that the bread and wine are changed into Christ's soul and divinity, but that the bread and wine are only changed or converted into his body and blood, however by the natural connexion by which Christ's body and blood (which is now risen from the dead to die no more) is always accompanied with the soul, and the divinity with both body and soul, by reason of the hypostatical union of the divine and human nature in Christ, we therefore believe that Christ's soul and divinity are also present, not by change or conversion, but by circumstance. See Conc. Trid. Sess. xiii. C. 3. et 4. Therefore it is not our belief, that a priest can make his God, &c.

Q. Have you any thing more to add by way of proof out of scripture, in favour of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the blessed sacrament?

A. Yes, I have several more strong proofs, as first, from the words of Christ spoken to the Jews in the sixth chapter of St. John; and secondly, from the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, the tenth and eleventh chapters; thirdly, from the ancient figures of the eucharist, which demonstrate that there is something more noble in it than bread and wine, taken only in remembrance of Christ; fourthly, from the unerring authority of the church in her decisions, in relation to this controversy; all which I shall here pass over for brevity sake, since they are already excellently well explained by an eminent divine, in a book entitled *The Catholic Christian*, &c.

Q. Besides these arguments from scripture and church authority, have you any thing else to allege in proof of the real presence?

A. Yes, first, the authority of all the ancient fathers, whose plain testimonies may be seen in an appendix to a book entitled *a Specimen of the Spirit of Dissenting Teachers*, &c. Secondly, the perpetual consent of the Greeks, and all the oriental christians, demonstrated by Mons. Arnaud, and others, in a book entitled *La Perpetuite de la Foy*, &c. (L. v. c. 10, 11, et 13. t. i.) confirmed by the authentic testimonies of their patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, &c. By the writings of their ancient and modern divines, and by all their liturgies: and even acknowledged by many protestant writers. See Sir Edwin Sandy's relation of the religion of the West, p. 233.—Dr. Potter's answer to *Charity Mistaken*, p. 225.—Bishop Forbes on

the Eucharist. Dr. Nicholai on the kingdom of Christ, &c. (L. i. c. 3. p. 22.) Now what can be a more convincing evidence of these doctrines having been handed down by tradition from the apostles, than to see all sorts of christians, who have any pretensions to antiquity agreeing in it.— Thirdly, both ancient, and modern church history furnishes us with many instances of miracles, the best attested, which from time to time have been wrought in testimony of this same truth, of which in divers parts of christendom there are standing monuments to this day. My last proof is, from the doctrine of the church of England, as it is delivered in her catechism, which is printed in the common prayer-book, which acknowledges that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper. This is the doctrine of the church of England, which expresses the real and substantial presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament as fully as any catholic can do: for if verily and indeed, be not the same as really and truly, and of as full force to exclude a mere figurative presence, I confess I am yet wholly ignorant of the signification, even of the most common words, and it will be impossible to know what men mean, even when they deliver themselves in the plainest terms. So that it must either be owned that the words of Christ's institution import a real and substantial presence of his body and blood, even according to protestant doctrine, or we must suppose the church of England guilty of a most scandalous equivocation or gross contradiction; for how that can be verily and indeed taken and received which is not verily and indeed there, is a greater mystery than transubstantiation.

Q. You have satisfied me as to this point, but pray what is the doctrine of the church, concerning the matter of this sacrament?

A. The matter is bread and wine, viz. wheaten bread, and wine of the grape, which Christ made use of, and without them the consecration is not valid.

Q. Why are bread and wine made use of?

A. It is in the first place the divine will. Again, by reason of the analogy, with respect to the end and effect. They signify a spiritual nourishment. They represent Christ's passion or separation of his blood from his body.

Q. Is the bread to be leavened or unleavened?

A. It is certain that Christ used unleavened bread, because he celebrated the last supper, on the first day of the Azyma, or unleavened bread, (see St. Matt. xxvi. 7, 17. St. Mark xiv. 12. St. Luke xxii. 7.) when the Jews were forbid, under pain of death (as we read in Exodus xii. 15. &c.) to eat any leavened bread, for those seven days; nay, they were even forbid to keep it in their houses. However, there is no divine precept. Hence the Greek church are allowed to consecrate in leavened bread.

Q. Is water to be mixed with the wine?

A. Yes, by the church precept; and it is probable after Christ's example. Water represents the water which flowed from our Saviour's side: not but that consecration without water is valid.

Q. Is the consecration valid in wine only, or in bread only?

A. Yes, but there is a divine precept not to separate them, from these words of Christ, do this for a commemoration of me, &c. St. Luke xxii. 1 Cor. x. Besides unless they are consecrated together, they do not represent Christ's passion distinctly.

Q. What is the form of this sacrament?

A. The sufficient and necessary form of the consecration of bread are these words, "This is my body." Of wine, "This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and everlasting Testament, a mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, to the remission of sins." The prayer and words before and after, are only necessary, by reason of the church precept. These forms are known by the scripture and constant doctrine of the fathers: for as the catechism of the council of Trent argues, *do this*, (*hoc facite*,) falls upon the words, as well as upon the signification.

Q. What is transubstantiation?

A. It is the conversion or change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.

Q. In what manner is it performed? Is the substance of bread and wine annihilated? Is Christ's body created anew, or does it forsake heaven?

A. No; it is done by a total change of one substance into another, by the Almighty power of God, to whom nothing is hard or impossible; who daily changes bread and wine by digestion into our body and blood.

Q. How can there be a change of substance, seeing that on one hand, the bread and wine still remain in their natural properties, viz. their quality, extension, colour and taste; they are tangible, they retain their usual property of nourishing, nay they are subject to corruption? Are Christ's body and blood subject to these affections? Are they extended? Are they seen, touched? Can they be moved, or subject to corruption?

A. What appear to the senses are not the substance, but only the accidents of bread and wine; and even local extension is not essential to a body; so that though the substance of bread and wine are changed, they still retain their natural properties, under the new substance into which they are miraculously changed. Now these properties which are still retained, belong not to Christ's body and blood immediately, but are the accidents of the former substance. Hence extension, motion, visibility, tangibility, nourishment, and corruption are not ascribed to Christ's body and blood, only indirectly, and in appearance.

Q. By this transubstantiation, the evidence of all our senses, and reason too, seems to be destroyed, which God bestowed upon rational creatures, as a rule or guide to judge of all matters whatever; so that they cannot be deceived without injury to the divine goodness and veracity, in providing us with a deceitful guide.

A. The senses are commonly the mediums of true information, but in no cases the judges; judgment being an act of the understanding. However, in some cases, the senses are not proper mediums, or true informers, being detected of false information, both in natural and supernatural things. For instance, our sight gives false information concerning the bigness of the celestial bodies, that the stars are no bigger than wallnuts, and the sun no bigger than a plate, when at the same time they are bigger than the whole earth; the senses all give a wrong information concerning the divine nature of Christ, as also that he who appeared to the women in the monument was a man, though the scripture says he was an angel. St. Mark, xvi.—St. Matt. xxviii. In the same manner, the reasoning faculty is not a true judge, when it is under the direction of ignorance, passion, malice, &c. There is a distinction to be made between the faculty of reason and the right use of it. For instance, the faculty of reason is a false informer, when

it pretends to penetrate into the mysteries of faith. Hence both the senses and reasoning, though in other things true informers, yet in the mysteries of faith are liable to mistake, as in the Trinity; so that though our senses speak bread and wine, faith and reason rightly made use of correct their information; for to say you believe your senses rather than God is blasphemy.

Q. Do not miracles entirely depend upon the testimony of the senses? Why then shall we not believe that to be only bread, where all our senses declare it to be so?

A. We believe not miracles purely upon the testimony of the senses, but from reason. But the case is not parallel. In miracles there is no contrary circumstance or precept to neglect their information; but in the eucharist we are to believe Christ's words, which are inconsistent with the information of sense. In many cases all our senses are wrong informers, as reason tells us, and why should we depend upon them, when both faith and reason informs us of their misrepresentation.

Q. When Christ changed water into wine, the people judged there was the substance, from the qualities it had of wine. If therefore bread retains the same qualities, we may conclude it has the substance.

A. The case is not parallel. The testimony of the senses was sufficient to convince them it was true wine, since there was no circumstance or words made use of by Christ to signify there were only the accidents or species of wine in the substance of water. Now in the eucharist, the words of Christ, "This is my body," cannot be verified if the substance of bread remained: otherwise our Saviour should have said, "In this bread is my body, and in this wine is my blood." But as our Saviour said no such thing, but on the contrary, absolutely declared that what he gave to his apostle was his body, in this latter case the senses cannot be true informers.

Q. By what power is this change made, and why is it called transubstantiation, seeing there is no such word in the scriptures, and why may not the Lutherans' opinion be allowed, who affirm there is consubstantiation, that is, that both the substance of bread, and Christ's body are present.

A. We have it by constant tradition, that the change is made by the words pronounced in consecration, whereby

God himself acts as principal, and the priest as instrumental, in the person of Christ: and therefore the priest does not say, "This is the body of Christ," but "This is my body." It is true there is no such word as transubstantiation in the scripture, in express terms, but only equivalently, and therefore the council of Trent says, it is a proper word to express that mystery. In the same manner there are no such words in the scripture as consubstantiation, Trinity, person or original sin, but are all found there equivalent. As for consubstantiation, condemned by the council of Trent against the Lutherans, it does not verify Christ's words, for then he should have said, "Here is my body. (*Hic est corpus meum.*) So there is a necessity of a change by transubstantiation; this is what many learned protestants urged against Luther, and his followers. See the bishop of Meaux's history of the variations of the protestant churches. (Lib. 11. Numb. 31, 32, 33.)

Q. Is not the eucharist often called bread after the consecration, and why, if it is not really bread?

A.—It is still called bread, and nothing can be more agreeable to the common practice of men, and the rules of speech. First, because it has to our senses all the natural appearances and effects of bread and wine; for this reason, angels in the scriptures are called men. Josh. v. 13. Gen. xix. Luke xxiv. 4. Acts i. 10. Secondly, because it was bread and wine before consecration. Thus God said to Adam, "Dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return." Gen. iii. 19. Aaron's rod, which was changed into a serpent, (*Exod. vii. 10.*) is still called a rod, because made from it. Thirdly, it is called bread, because it is the bread of life, the spiritual food and nourishment of the soul.

Q. But what will you say to our Saviour's calling the sacrament the fruit of the vine? St. Matt. xxvi. 29.

A. If it were certain that our Saviour had so called the consecrated wine of the blessed sacrament, it would prove no more than St. Paul's calling the consecrated host bread; (1 Cor. x. 11.) that is, it would only shew that the name of wine, or the fruit of the vine, might be given to it, from having the accidents and appearance of wine, and having been consecrated from wine. But there is all the reason in the world to think that this appellation of "the fruit of the vine" was given by our Saviour, not to the consecrated

cup or chalice, but to the wine of the paschal supper, which they drank before the institution of the sacrament; this will appear evident from the 22d chapter of St. Luke, to any one who will but read from the 14th verse to the 21st, where it is plain, that it was not the sacramental cup, but that which was drank with the passover, to which our Saviour gives the name of "the fruit of the vine."

Q. The ancient fathers often called this sacrament a figure and sign, which seems not to import grace present.

A. It cannot be a sacrament without being a figure or sign; but the fathers in no place call it a symbol or figure only, so as to deny or exclude the verity and substance of Christ's body and blood from being contained under them. The eucharist is called the figure or sign of Christ's body, upon account of the species which represent it, not as absent, but really present. Hence Tertullian says, Christ did not doubt to say, "This is my body," when he gave the figure of his body; so divines say, it was a full figure, not an empty one. *Figura plena non vacua.*

Q. Which are the articles of the faith that follow from the real presence, and are defined by the church?

A. First, against the Lutherans, that the reality subsists without the use, and not only while it is taken. Again, that every particle contains the true body and blood in the consecration of both species. Again, that the soul and divinity of Christ are also present. Again, that the body and blood are present by force of the words of consecration, and both present under each species, by concomitance. Again, that Christ in the sacrament is to be adored with divine worship. That when the species are divided or broken, the whole body of Christ is in every particle, but undivided in itself. That when the species are corrupted, the body of Christ is not corrupted, but ceases to be present. Lastly, that the body of Christ is not every where as the ubiquitarians affirm, but only in heaven locally, and in the eucharist sacramentally.

Q. What is the principal effect of the eucharist?

A. To bestow nutritive grace, and in greater plenty than any other sacrament: but though it does not confer first grace, but supposes it already given by penance. Hence remission of sin is not the proper effect. The eucharist, as a sacrament, only profits those who receive it. *Ex opere*

operato. But as it is a sacrifice, it profits others. Venial sins hinder not the nutritive grace, yet they slacken the growth of virtue like bad a soil.

Q. Who are rightly disposed to receive the eucharist?

A. Divines distinguish three sorts of persons, First, such as receive the sacrament only, without the effect. Secondly, those who receive the effect only by faith, and ardent charity, not having an opportunity to receive the sacrament itself; yet these do not receive the proper sacramental grace. Thirdly, such as receive both the sacrament and the effect. The first communion is called sacramental only, the second spiritual only, the third sacramental and spiritual. Hence it is defined by the council of Trent, (Sess. xiii. Can. xi.) that faith alone is not a sufficient preparation; but there must be a true contrition, and not a supposed one, but acquired by confession, if there be an opportunity of having a confessor. All which are required by St. Paul, when he says, "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." 1 Cor. xi. 28. The church so expounds the preparation that is required. Again, this precept of confessing, extends even to priests, who are obliged by office to celebrate, unless a confessor is wanting, and then the council of Trent says, they are to make an act of contrition, and afterwards, *quam primum confiteri*, which words, as Pope Alexander the VIIth declares, import the first opportunity, and not the stated time of the priest's usual confession. In fine, in order to receive the blessed sacrament worthily, and the effects thereof, we must be in the state of grace, that is, free from all mortal sin, and affection to all venial sin; we must also approach with a right intention. First, to glorify God, and give him thanks for so great a favour and blessing, in bestowing upon us his only son. Secondly, to strengthen our souls in spiritual life, and to gain an increase of charity, and all other virtues. And, thirdly, to obtain the grace and assistance of Almighty God, in order to correct all our failings and imperfections, and to overcome such and such temptations.

Q. How is fasting required in the case of communion?

A. There is an ecclesiastical precept, which St. Augus-

tine says, (Epist. ad. Janu. 54. alias 118. n. 6.) was all the church over in his time, that no communicant should either eat or drink from the midnight before. Yet St. Augustine observes, that on Maunday-Thursday, it was a custom to receive, not fasting, in honour and memory of Christ's last supper. However, when the sacrament is given, by way of viaticum, in danger of death, fasting is not necessary.

Q. Is there an obligation of receiving under both kinds ?

A. There is no divine precept. There is indeed a divine precept of taking the body and blood, which is complied with under one kind alone ; because, as I said before, under either kind is contained both the body and blood of Christ.

Q. Yet, methinks, the precept is divine, and that it falls upon eating and drinking, which requires both kinds. For in the first place the institution was such, and the apostles received at Christ's hands in both kinds. Again, it was expressed by these words, unless you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. St. John vi. 54. Besides, it was the practice of the primitive ages, to receive both kinds. Again, Pope Gelasius I. who lived in the fifth century, commanded communion under both kinds ?

A. It is owned, both kinds were given to the apostles at the institution, but every circumstance at the institution was not a divine precept. As to the words, " Except you eat and drink," (John vi. 54.) they are not to be understood of the distinct actions, but only of partaking of the body and blood ; for in the same chapter, life everlasting is promised to those who eat only ; " He that eateth this bread shall live for ever." ver. 59. Again, " He that eateth me, the same also shall live by me." ver. 58. You see eating alone will suffice. Again, the scripture in many places, speaking of the holy communion, makes no mention of the cup ; see St. Luke, &c. chap. xxiv. 30, 31. Acts ii. 42, 46. et chap. xx. 7. Besides, it is to be observed, that whosoever receives the body of Christ, must certainly receive his blood at the same time, since the body which he receives is a living body, (for Christ can die no more, says St. Paul, Rom. vi. 9.) which cannot be without his blood : there is no taking Christ by pieces ; whosoever receives him, receives him wholly. So that the faithful are no ways

deprived of any part of the grace of this sacrament, by receiving in one kind only: and the reason is, because the grace of this sacrament being annexed to the real presence of Christ, who is the fountain of all grace, and Christ being as truly and really present in one kind as in both; consequently he brings with him the same grace to the soul, when received in one kind, as he does when received in both. Again, many learned Protestants have acknowledged, that there is no command in Scripture for all to receive in both kinds. See Luther, in his epistle to the Bohemians. Bishop Forbes, lib. 2. de Euch. cap. 1, 2. White, bishop of Ely, in his treatise on the Sabbath, p. 97. And bishop Montague, Orig. p. 97. But abstracting from what has been said, our adversaries have no reason to object against us, for defrauding the laity of part of the grace of this sacrament; since they deprive them of the whole, viz. both body and blood, as receiving neither one nor the other, but only a little bread and wine. As for the practice of the primitive ages, both kinds were commonly taken, but not always: for the ancient fathers give an account, that in time of persecution, christians took only the consecrated bread, which they carried home with them. Also abstemious persons, who had an aversion to wine, only received the consecrated bread. Again, infants received only the consecrated wine. Pope Gelasius indeed ordered both kinds to be given, in order to detect the Manicheans, who abstained from wine, on account that they held wine to be a liquor of the devil's invention, and communicated only in the other kind, upon that belief. This was the ground of Pope Gelasius's prohibition: but afterwards, in Pope Leo the Second's time, it was free to communicate in one, or both kinds.

Q. When did the custom of communicating in both kinds cease, and what reasons were there to order only one kind?

A. It ceased by degrees. And the reasons were, First, there was danger of great irreverences, by spilling the consecrated wine, when the communicants were very numerous. Secondly, lest the wine being reserved for the sick, it should grow sour and be corrupted. Thirdly, to confound those heretics, who believe Christ's body was without his blood. And lastly, his discipline of the church was con-

firmed by the general council of Constance, in the year 1414, to put a stop to the Hussites, and other heretics, who held that both kinds were of divine precept.

Q. Can the church still order or permit both kinds to be received?

A. Yes, if she shall judge the reasons to be sufficient.

Q. But did not Christ expressly command the receiving in both kinds when he said, drink you all of it? Matt. xxvii.

A. These words were addressed to the twelve apostles only, no other being present at the last supper, and the precept was by them fulfilled; "And they all drank of it." St. Mark xiv. 23. And this command is constantly observed by the bishops and priests of the Catholic church, as often as they consecrate. But this is no more an argument for the laity's being obliged to drink the cup, than their being obliged to consecrate, to forgive sins, or preach the gospel. St. Luke xxii. 19. St. John xx. 22. St. Matt. xxviii. 19. Because we find in the scripture Christ commanded his apostles so to do.

Q. Are priests obliged to receive both kinds?

A. Yes, when they consecrate, and the reason is, because the eucharist is a sacrifice, as well a sacrament. Now unless both kinds are consecrated, and offered by the priest, and received, it does not represent Christ's passion.

A. May not deacons consecrate?

A. By no means; *do this*, (*hoc facite*,) was directed to bishops and priests only. However deacons may be the extraordinary distributors of the sacrament; as it was sometimes a practice in the primitive ages.

Q. What is a sacrifice, and how does that appellation agree with the eucharist?

A. A sacrifice properly so called, is an external oblation, or offering made to God alone, by a lawful minister, with a change in the thing offered by consumption, in testimony of his supreme power. Now this agrees with the eucharist, because the eucharist is an oblation of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, offered under the outward and sensible signs of bread and wine to God alone, by the ministry of priests of the church, lawfully consecrated and empowered by Christ; and this oblation is accompanied with a real change and destruction of the bread and wine, by the con-

separation of them into the body and blood of Christ, and a real exhibiting of Christ our victim, heretofore immolated upon the cross, and here mystically dying in the separate consecration of the two different species; and this oblation is made to God, to acknowledge his sovereign power, to render him our homage, and for all other ends for which sacrifices are offered to his divine Majesty.

Q. What are the ends for which sacrifice in the old law was offered, and is still to be offered to God?

A. For these four ends; First, for God's own honour and glory, by acknowledging his sovereignty and paying him our homage. Secondly, to give God thanks for all his blessings. Thirdly, to beg pardon for our sins. Fourthly, to obtain grace and all blessings from his divine Majesty.

Q. Have the servants of God, from the beginning of the world, been always accustomed to honour him with sacrifices?

A. Yes, they have. Witness the sacrifice of Abel; (Gen. iv.) the sacrifice of Noah; (Gen. viii.) the sacrifice of Melchisedech; (Gen. xiv.) the sacrifices of Abraham; (Gen. xv. et xxii.) The sacrifices of Job; (i. et xiii.) And the many different kinds of sacrifices prescribed in the law of Moses.

Q. How is a sacrifice properly so called, distinguished from other oblations, viz. prayer and good works, and a contrite heart?

A. These want requisites, viz. they are either spiritual oblations only, or are not offered only by a priest; nor is there any change to testify God's supreme dominion?

Q. How many kinds of sacrifice belonged to the old law?

A. Chiefly five: first, holocaust, where the whole was consumed or burnt, and thereby given fully to God without reserve, for the more perfect acknowledgment of his sovereignty. Secondly, propitiatory, or sin offerings, for appeasing God's anger and remitting sin. Thirdly, eucharistic, for returning thanks. Fourthly, impetratory, for obtaining blessings; and fifthly, pacific, or peace offerings, which were both eucharistic and propitiatory.

Q. Why are all those sacrifices now abolished?

A. Because they were but figures of the sacrifice of Christ; and therefore were to give place to his sacrifice, as being only figures of the truth.

Q. Were the sacrifices of the old law figures of the sacrifice of the new ?

A. Yes, both of Christ's passion, and of the eucharist.

Q. What is the mass, and from whence is the word derived ?

A. The mass in one sense may be called the liturgy of the catholic church ; but properly speaking, it is the sacrifice or oblation of Christ's body and blood, under the appearance or species of bread and wine : and consists in the consecration of the bread and wine, into the body and blood of Christ : and the offering up of this same body and blood to God, by the ministry of the priest, for a perpetual memorial of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross. As to the word mass, some are of opinion that it comes from the Hebrew word *missach*, which signifies a voluntary offering. Deut. xxi. 10. But others are of opinion, that it is derived from the Latin word, *missio*, or *missa*, that is, dismissal, or sending away ; because the catechumens and others were formerly dismissed, as not being permitted to be present at this sacrifice, only from the beginning to the offertory, and the gospel and sermon being ended, the deacon publicly said, *Ite missa est*, Go out all you who are infidels, catechumens, and penitents : for the mass of the faithful is now to begin. Hence, at the end of the mass, the words, *Ite, missa est*, are still retained, and now the meaning is, Depart, for the mass is ended. But be this as it will, the name is of very ancient use in the church, as appears from St. Ambrose, St. Leo, and St. Gregory.*

Q. How does the sacrifice of the mass differ from the sacrifice Christ made upon the cross ?

A. There is no difference as to the host, or thing offered, nor as to the principal priest who offers ; the chief offerer being Christ himself. The difference therefore is only in the manner of the offering ; the one was bloody, the other unbloody ; for in the sacrifice on the cross Christ really died, and therefore it was a bloody sacrifice ; in the sacrifice of the mass, he only dies mystically, inasmuch as his death is represented in the consecrating apart the bread and wine, to denote the shedding of his sacred blood from his body at the time of his death, and therefore this is an

* St. Amb. L. 2. Epis. 14. ad sororem. St. Lev. Epis. 81. ad Dioscoru. St. Greg. Hom. 6. in Evang.

unbloody sacrifice, and of course a commemorating sacrifice, which has all its virtue from the sacrifice of the cross.

Q. Is the sacrifice of the mass offered to saints ?

A. No ; only to God ; the saints are only mentioned, to give praise, and thanksgiving to God for them, and that they may join in prayer with us, and for us.

Q. Is the mass a true and proper sacrifice ?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. How can it be a true and proper sacrifice, since a true sacrifice requires a change, or mactation, or immolation, in the thing offered ? now in the mass these things are not to be found.

A. In bloody sacrifices a mactation, or slaying, was necessary, but not in others ; Melchisedech's was a true and proper sacrifice, and so were the pacific sacrifices of the old law : however, in the sacrifice of the mass there is a real change, by the real conversion of the bread into his body, as also a mystical immolation, or death ; when the body and blood, are, as it were, separated by distinct consecrations.

Q. Have you any texts of scripture for proof of the sacrifice of the mass ?

A. Yes ; besides many figures of this sacrifice in the old testament, (of which the most evident is that of the bread and wine offered by Melchisedech, the priest of the most high God ; according to whose order, Christ is said to be a priest for ever, (Gen. xiv. 18. Psalm cx.) and that as the Holy Fathers * take notice, by reason of this sacrifice of the eucharist) we have the prophecy of Malachi, i. 10, 11, where God, rejecting the Jewish sacrifices, declares his acceptance of the sacrifice of pure offering, which should be made to him in every place among the Gentiles ; which text the ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin urge, to shew that the eucharist is a sacrifice. See St. Justin, St. Irenæus, St. Chrysostome, St. Augustine, &c. † In the New Testament, St. Paul tells us, that under the new law we have an altar (and consequently a sacrifice) whereof

* See St. Cypr. epist. 63. St. Chryst. Hom. 35. St. Jerom. epist. 126. ad. Evan. St. Aug. Conc. 1. in Ps. 33. L. 15. de Civ. Dei. &c.

† St. Just. in Dial cum Trypho. St. Irenæ, L. 4. C. 32. St. Chryst. in Ps. 92. St. Aug. L. 18. de Civ. Dei. C. 35.

they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle, (Heb. xiii. 10.) that is, they who continue in the service of the old law. And in the 10th chap. of his epistle to the Corinthians, from the 14th ver. to the 21st, he makes a parallel between the partakers of the Christian sacrifice, and those who partake of the Jewish or Heathenish victims, so as evidently to suppose, that the Christian table, which he mentions, (ver. 21.) is an altar where Christ is mystically immolated, and afterwards eaten by the faithful, as in the Jewish and Heathenish sacrifices, the victim was first offered on the altar, and then eaten by the people. From whence the apostle St. Paul infers, (ver. 16.) that they who were partakers of this great sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, ought not to be partakers with devils, by eating the meats sacrificed to idols. The sacrifice of the mass is also mentioned in the Acts of the apostles, (xiii. 2.) where we read in the Protestant testament, "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted," &c. In the Greek original it stands thus, as they were sacrificing (*Αιςυπερταυ*) to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Where the Greek word, which we have rendered in English, sacrificing, is the self-same which to this day is used by the Greeks, to express the sacrifice of the mass. Besides these arguments from scripture, for the sacrifice offered to God in the blessed eucharist, we have the authority and perpetual tradition of the Catholic church, from the days of the apostles. Witness the most ancient liturgies of all churches and nations. Witness the manifold testimonies of councils and fathers of all ages. Witness the frequent use in all christian antiquity of the names of altar, sacrifice, oblation, priest, &c. Witness, in fine, the universal consent of christians of all denominations before Luther's time, in offering up the eucharist as a sacrifice, which is a matter of fact that cannot be contested.

Q. But does not St. Paul say, that Christ by one offering, viz. that of the cross, hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Heb. x. 14. What room then can there be for the sacrifice of the mass?

A. What the apostle says is certainly true, that the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, is that one offering by which we were perfected for ever; because the whole world was redeemed by that one sacrifice, and all other means of

our sanctification or salvation have their force and efficacy from that one offering: yet as that one offering, by which Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified, is no way injured by his supplications, which as man he makes for us to his father in heaven; whereas the same apostle tells us, "Always living to make intercession for us," (Heb. vii. 25.) so neither is it in any ways injured, but highly honoured by the representing of the same offering to God in the sacrifice of the altar.

Q. But St. Paul tells us that Christ does not offer himself often. Heb. ix. 25. What say you to this?

A. St. Paul speaks there of his offering himself in a bloody manner, by dying for the redemption of the world, which was to be but once. But though the price of our redemption was to be paid but once, yet the fruit of it was to be daily applied to our souls, by those means of grace which Christ has left in his church, that is, by the sacraments and sacrifice.

Q. Have you any thing more to allege for proof of the sacrifice of the mass?

A. Yes; we have the words of the institution, as they are related by St. Luke, xxii. 19, 20, "This is my body which is given for you. This is the chalice of the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you." Now, since we really believe by the words of consecration, that the bread and wine are truly changed into the body and blood of Christ; and consequently that our victim, which for us was immolated upon the cross, is in the mass exhibited and presented to God, the mass therefore is properly an offering or sacrifice, and it is also a propitiatory sacrifice; for if the cup, viz. the blood of Christ, be shed for us, that is, for our sins, it must needs be propitiatory, at least by applying to us the fruit of the bloody sacrifice of the cross.

Q. But what need was there of the sacrifice of the mass, since we were fully redeemed by the sacrifice of the cross?

A. First, That we might have in the sacrifice of the mass a standing memorial of the death of Christ. Secondly, That by the sacrifice of the mass the fruit of his death might be daily applied to our souls. Thirdly, That his children might have until the end of the world an external sacrifice, in which they might join together in the outward

worship of religion: as the servants of God had always done, from the beginning of the world. Fourthly, That in and by this sacrifice they might unite themselves daily with their high priest and victim Christ Jesus; and daily answer the four ends of sacrifice.

Q. What effects has the eucharist as a sacrifice?

A. The council of Trent (Sess. xxii. Can. iii.) has defined that it is more than a sacrifice of praise, or a mere commemoration of Christ's passion, and that it is *latreuticum*, that is to say, by it we give to God divine honour; *eucharisticum*, that is, by it we give thanks to God, for his benefits and mercies bestowed upon us; *propitiatorium*, that is, by it we obtain pardon and remission of our sins; *impetratorium*, that is, by it we obtain new graces and blessings.

Q. Does it remit sin, or the pain due to sin, by way of satisfaction?

A. It is propitiatory, and satisfactory, by virtue of the divine institution, as to pain, both in this world and purgatory, when it is applied with due dispositions, and according to the intention of the church, it being the best of satisfactory or good works.

Q. Is the mass of a wicked priest as valuable as that of a just one?

A. It has the same effect absolutely, because a wicked man offers in the person of Christ and the church; yet the private devotion of the good priest may add to the efficacy in other respects.

Q. For whom is mass offered?

A. For all the faithful both living, and dead, as also for all infidels, heretics, &c. that they may be converted: yet their particular names are not to be mentioned in the mass.

Q. What advantage is the sacrifice of the mass to the living and the dead?

A. It procures to the living the merits and the fruit of the sacrifice of the cross, that is, the grace we stand in need of, especially to those for whom it is said and to those who assist devoutly at it. As to the dead it lessens their pains in purgatory, and hastens their deliverance out of it. St. Aug. L. 9. Confess. 2. Mach. xii. ver. 43, &c. Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii. Cp. ii. Can. iii.

Q. What mean all the ceremonies of the mass, and

how can addition be made to the sacrifices instituted by Christ?

Q. They have a spiritual meaning, and are instructive: they are added some by Christ himself, others by the apostles, others since by the church, but are not essential, yet they cannot be omitted without a great sin. We shall explain these ceremonies hereafter.

Q. How ought persons to hear mass, and with what affection?

A. With great respect, devotion, and attention, (Jer. xviii. 10.) and with that affection, for which sacrifices were instituted, that is, with a devout acknowledgment of our duty to God; with an earnest desire to appease the wrath of God, which we have deserved for our sins; and also with thanksgiving to our blessed Saviour, that he has vouchsafed to leave to his church, his own precious body and blood, as a pledge of his love, to be offered up to his eternal father by us, in testimony of the aforesaid acknowledgment, and as a means to appease his deserved anger.

Q. But what think you of those, who during the time of mass, instead of attending to this great sacrifice, suffer themselves to be carried away with wilful distractions?

A. Such as these do not hear mass, that is, they do not fulfil the church precept, nor satisfy the obligation of the day, but rather mock God, whilst they outwardly pretend to honour him, when their heart is far from him. The like is to be said of those, who in time of mass are laughing or talking, or who pass the greater part of their time in criminal amusements; these sort of persons must also answer for the scandal they give by their ill example, and for their hindering others from attending to their duty; as well as for their profaning these most sacred mysteries, by such an unchristian behaviour at this holy time.

Q. Is it not prejudice to the faithful that mass is said in an unknown tongue?

A. No; for the mass contains only those prayers, which the priest alone is commanded to say, as the mediator between God and his people. Neither are the people ignorant of what is said, since they have the mass expounded, and englished in their ordinary prayer books: and it is visible to any unprejudiced eye, that there is far more devotion

among catholics at mass, than there is at the protestant's common prayer.

Q. Can you explain to me by some example, how a person may devoutly and profitably assist at this sacrifice, though he be ignorant of the prayers which the priest is saying?

A. Yes we can; for what do you think if you, or any good Christian had been present upon mount Calvary, when Christ was offering himself upon the cross, a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world; would not the very sight of what was doing, (provided you had the same faith in Christ as you now have) have sufficed to excite in your soul most lively acts of the love of God, thanksgiving for so great a mercy, detestation for your sins, &c. though you could neither hear any word from the mouth of Christ your high-priest, nor know in particular what passed in his soul? just so in the mass, which is the same sacrifice as that which Christ offered upon the cross, because both the priest and the victim are the same; it is abundantly sufficient for the people's devotion, to be well instructed in what is then doing, and to excite in their souls suitable acts of adoration, praise, thanksgiving, repentance, &c. though they understand not the particular prayers used by the priest at the time. Besides, it is not necessary for the devout and profitable, concurring in sacrifice offered to God, that the people should hear or recite the same prayers with the priest; nay, even the very seeing of him is more than what God was pleased to require in the old law. Hence we find, that the whole multitude of the people were praying without, when Zachary went into the temple to burn incense. St. Luke i. 10. And it was expressly ordered that there should be no man in the tabernacle or temple when the high-priest went with the blood of the victims into the sanctuary to make atonement. Levit. xvi. 17.

Q. But does not St. Paul condemn the use of unknown tongues in the liturgy of the church? 1 Cor. xiv.

A. Whoever will but read that whole chapter with attention, will easily see, that St. Paul speaks not a word of the liturgy of the church; but only reprehends the abuse of the gift of tongues, which some among the Corinthians were guilty of, who out of ostentation affected to make exhortations, or extemporary prayers in their assemblies, in languages utterly unknown, which for want of an interpre-

ter could be no edification to the rest of the faithful. But this is far from being the practice of the Catholic church; where all exhortations, sermons, and such like instructions are made in the vulgar language, where there is no want of interpreters, since the people have the church offices interpreted in their ordinary prayer books; and the pastors are commanded to explain often to them, particularly upon sundays and holy-days, (Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii. cap. viii.) the mysteries contained in the mass. Besides, after all, though the Latin be a dead language, yet in the sense of St. Paul, it cannot be called an unknown tongue, since there is no language in Europe more universally understood, there being scarce a village without somebody who understands it.

Q. But why does the church celebrate the mass in Latin, rather than in the vulgar language?

A. First, because it is her ancient language, used in all her sacred offices, even from the apostles days throughout all the western parts of the world, and therefore the church, who hates novelty, desires to celebrate her liturgy in the same language as the saints have done for so many ages. Secondly, for a greater uniformity in the public worship, that so a Catholic in whatsoever country he chances to be, may still find the liturgy performed in the same manner, and in the same language to which he is accustomed at home. Thirdly, to avoid the changes to which all vulgar languages, as we find by experience, are daily exposed. Nor is this method peculiar to the Catholic church alone: for all the oriental schismatics, how different soever, use in their liturgies, their ancient languages, which have long since ceased to be understood by the people; as we learn from Monsieur Renaudot, in his dissertation upon the oriental liturgies, chap. vi. The Greeks say mass in the old Greek, of which the common people (as Mr. Brerewood in his enquiries says) understand little or nothing. C. ii. p. 12. The Ethiopians and Armenians say mass in the old Ethiopian and Armerian tongue, which none but the learned understand. The Syrians, Indians, and Egyptians, say mass in the Syriac, though Arabic is their vulgar language. The Muscovites say mass in Greek, though it is not the language of the people, who speak nothing but a kind of Slavonian. So that those who declaim so violently against the Roman Catholic church, for not having the public service in the vul-

gar tongues, have the universal practice of Christendom against them. And what is very remarkable, is, that the Protestants have furnished us with an excellent argument against themselves, for having the divine service celebrated in such a language as the people do not understand: for we read in Dr. Heylin's history of the Reformation, p. 128. &c. that in Queen Elizabeth's time, "The Irish Parliament passed an Act for the uniformity of common prayer; with permission of saying the same in Latin, where the minister had not the knowledge of the English tongue. But for translating it into Irish there was no care taken. The people are required by that statute, under several penalties to frequent their churches, and to be present at the reading the English liturgy, which they understood no more of than they do of mass."

PENANCE EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is the signification of the word penance?

A. It is much the same with repentance, and according to the Latin and Greek, is used to signify a change of the mind.

Q. What is the ecclesiastical sense of the word?

A. It is sometimes taken for a certain virtue belonging to justice, and is a sincere grief, for having offended God, with a firm purpose to offend him no more. Again, it is taken for a sacrament, which is a sorrow for sins committed after baptism, including confession, and a purpose of making satisfaction. So that it is a sacrament, whereby the sins we commit after baptism are forgiven us.

Q. When was this sacrament first instituted?

A. There was an intimation and promise of it, when our Saviour said, "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." St. Matt. xviii. 18. Which promise was actually performed after our Saviour's resurrection; when he breathed upon his apostles, and said to them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." St. John, xx. 22, 23.

Q. How do you prove from hence that penance is a sacrament?

A. From the notion and definition of a sacrament, viz. an outward or visible sign of inward grace ordained by Jesus Christ. The outward or visible sign is the sinner's confession, and the form of absolution pronounced by the priest; the inward grace, is the remission of sins promised by Jesus Christ: see St. John, xx. 22, 23. The institution of Christ is gathered from the same place, and from St. Matt. xviii. 18.

Q. What is the matter and form of this sacrament?

A. The matter is twofold, viz. remote and immediate; the remote matter is sin, mortal and venial; the immediate, are the acts of the penitent, viz. contrition, confession and satisfaction. The form are the words of absolution.

Q. To what end is this sacrament instituted?

A. For the remission of sins committed after baptism.

Q. Is this sacrament necessary for salvation?

A. Yes, it is as necessary as baptism, in regard of those who fall into mortal sin after they are baptized.*

Q. Are not the words importing a power of forgiving and retaining sin, sufficiently verified by the power given to the apostles to preach the gospel?

A. This indeed the Calvinists pretend, but falsely, there being two distinct ceremonies instituted for that purpose, viz. baptism, and penance, as the fathers expressly affirm, besides preaching: see St. Ambrose in his book of penance.

A. In baptism sin is forgiven, by a true contrition, as a necessary preparation in the adult: it requires no confession: it remits the whole pain due to sin: it absolves not juridically: it gives a character, and cannot be repeated. It is absolutely necessary to infants, and to adults, at least in desire, if otherwise not obtainable. As for penance, jurisdiction is necessary: it requires certain dispositions, viz. a sorrow and purpose to sin no more: it may be repeated: it requires confession, but it does not remit all the pain due to sin: lastly, it requires satisfaction.

Q. What is it to forgive sin?

A. It is to pronounce the words of absolution ministe-

* St. Cypr. Ep. 57. ad Cornel. St. Chrys. L. 3. de Sacred. St. Ambr. L. 1. de Pœnit. Cp. 2. St. Aug. Ep. 228. ad Honorat. Con. Trid. Sess. vi. C. xiv.

rially, under Christ, the principal cause. So that we do not believe that man can forgive sins by his own power, as no man by his own power can raise the dead to life ; because, both the one and the other equally belong to the power of God. But as God has sometimes made man his instrument in raising the dead to life, so we believe that he has been pleased to appoint that his ministers should, in virtue of his commission as his instruments, and by his power absolve repenting sinners. And this is what the Protestants pretend to believe as well as we ; for we find in their common prayer-book, in the order for the visitation of the sick, where they prescribe a form of absolution, the same in substance as that used in the Catholic church, which is as follows :—“ Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his church to absolve all sinners, who truly repent, and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences : and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, amen,”

Q. What is it to retain sins ?

A. It is to refuse or defer absolution for sin, or to inflict penalties for sin.

Q. Pray tell me in what cases a confessor is to refuse, or defer absolution ?

A. The rule of the church is to defer absolution, (excepting the case of necessity) to those of whose disposition the confessor has just cause to doubt ; and to refuse or deny absolution to those who are certainly indisposed for it ; which is the case of all such as refuse to forgive their enemies, or to restore ill-gotten goods, or to forsake the habits or immediate occasions of sin ; or, in a word, to comply with any part of their duty, to which they are obliged, under mortal sin.*

Q. What is contrition, and why so called ?

A. It is an inward sorrow of the mind for having offended so good a God, with a firm purpose not to offend him any more. It is so called, because the word contrition signifies a bruising, or breaking a thing into pieces, which is metaphorically applied to the heart, which is, as it were, bruised and broken by grief.

* See Rit. Rom. de Sacram. Pæni. et Doert. Inn. XI. contr. 65. Prop. 1679. Conc. Trid. Sess. xiv. Cap. 4.

Q. How many sorts of contrition are there ?

A. Two, perfect and imperfect.

Q. What is perfect contrition ?

A. It is a hearty sorrow for having offended God, including a love of God above all things, as he is good in himself.

Q. What is imperfect contrition ?

A. It is a sorrow for having offended God, upon account of the pains of hell, the turpitude of sin, or some other imperfect but supernatural motive.

Q. By what name do you call imperfect contrition, and how does it differ from perfect contrition ?

A. It is called attrition. Now as to the difference they differ in their motive. The motive of perfect contrition is God, as he is good in himself. The motive of attrition is fear of punishment, &c. Yet here also the motive must be supernatural, and the sorrow must proceed from actual grace. Again they differ in their effects. The first is capable to justify a person, without the sacrament of penance, who has a desire, but not the opportunity of a confessor. The second only disposes a person for justification in the sacrament.

Q. When are we obliged to make an act of contrition ?

A. Chiefly upon the following occasions, viz. In danger of death. Again, as often as we receive any other of the sacraments, if we have not the convenience of confessing.

Q. Are we obliged to make so many distinct acts of contrition, according to the number of our sins ?

A. No ; one true act of contrition extends to all, yet a diligent examen of every sin, is to be premised, before we make our confession.

Q. What is confession, and how many sorts are there ?

A. Confession in general is a declaration of a person's sins, which may be either general or particular, public or private, to God or to man, by way of advice, or sacramental ?

Q. What is sacramental confession ?

A. It is an accusation of our sins to a proper priest ; that is to say, to a priest who is approved of by the bishop, &c. in order to receive absolution.

Q. Can you bring any scripture, which recommends the confession of our sins to the minister of God, and can you prove it to be commanded by Christ ?

A. In the first place I can produce the precept of God in the old Testament, where he expressly commands, that when a man or woman shall commit any sin, that men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that the person be guilty, then they shall confess their sins which they have done, &c. Numb. v. 6, 7. Secondly, the example of the people who hearkened to the preaching of St. John the Baptist, who were baptized by him, confessing their sins. St. Matt. iii. 6. Thirdly, the command of St. James, Confess your sins one to another, (chap. v. ver. 16.) that is, to the priest of the church. Fourthly, the practice of the first Christians, "Many of them that believed came, confessing, and declaring their deeds." Acts xix. 18. Now as to the command of Christ, for the confession of our sins to his ministers, I prove it from the commission which he gave to them, when he said to his apostles, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." St. John xx. ver. 22. 23. Here he gave them, and their successors, viz. the bishops and priests of his church, commission or power to remit sin. Again, the apostles and their successors were made spiritual judges, by Christ our Lord, and had a power from him to bind and loose from sin, as we read in the 18th chapter of St. Matthew, ver. 18. "Amen, I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven." Here he made them judges and physicians of our souls: and therefore it follows by a necessary consequence, that the laity were obliged to confess their sins to them: for how could they exercise this power, and pronounce sentence, unless they first knew the state of the sinner's conscience, neither could they prescribe such remedies, and give such advice as was necessary for the penitent's cure, or amendment, unless they first knew the particular qualities and condition of the several sins the penitent commits, which cannot be without confession; so that we conclude with St. Augustine, that to pretend that it is enough to confess to God alone, is making void the power of the keys given to the church, that is, contradicting the gospel, and making void the commission of Christ. Hom. xlix. St. Matt. xvi. 19.

Q. Are Christians obliged to confess all their sins?

T

A. Yes : all mortal sins that can be remembered after a diligent examen. Moreover, the penitent is to declare their number, species, and circumstances : not only the circumstances as alter the kind or nature of the sin, but also according to some divines, such as very much aggravatẽ the guilt. Now as to venial sins there is no strict obligation to confess them ; but if it be doubtful whether the sin be mortal or venial, he is to confess it under that doubt.

Q. But by what rule shall a person be able to know whether his sins are mortal or venial ?

A. All those sins are to be esteemed mortal, which the word of God represents to us as hateful to God, against which it pronounces a woe, of which it declares that such as do those things shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Of these we have many instances both in the old and new Testament. See Isai. v. Ezek. xviii. Rom. i. 29, 30, 31. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. Ephes. v. 5. Apoc. xxi. 8.

Q. In what cases is confession sacrilegious and void ?

A. If any mortal sin is wilfully omitted or a diligent examen neglected, either as to number or species of the sins, or for want of true sorrow for sin, or a firm purpose of amendment. The confession is also invalid, if the priest to whom he made it has not the necessary faculties and approbation. But in case the penitent omits any sin, after a diligent examen, the confession is valid : however, if afterwards he call to mind any sin he omitted, he is to confess it ; if he remembers it before communion, it ought to be confessed before he goes to communion ; if he remember it after communion, he must confess it in his next confession.

Q. Is it a great sin to conceal, through shame or fear, any mortal sin in confession ?

A. Yes, it is a grievous sin, because it is lying to the Holy Ghost, for which Ananias and Saphira were struck dead by a just judgment of God. Acts v. James ii. 10. It is acting deceitfully with God, and that in a matter of the utmost consequence. It is a sacrilege, as being an abuse of the sacrament of penance, and is generally followed by another great sacrilege, in receiving unworthily the body and blood of Christ. And what is still more dreadful, such sinners seldom stop at the first bad con-

fession and communion, but usually go on for a long time in these sins, and very often die in them. But it is not only a great crime, but also a great folly and madness to conceal one's sins in confession; because such offenders know very well that these sins must be confessed, or that they must burn for ever in the flames of hell for them; and they cannot be ignorant that these bad confessions do but increase their burden, by adding to it the dreadful guilt of repeated sacrileges, which they will have far more difficulty of confessing, than these very sins of which they are now so much ashamed.

Q. But suppose the sinner has been so unfortunate as to make a bad confession, or perhaps a great many bad confessions; what must he do to repair this fault, and to reinstate himself in God's grace?

A. He must apply himself to God by hearty prayer for his grace and mercy: and so prepare himself to make a general confession of all his sins, at least from the time he first made a bad confession; because all the confessions he has made since he began to conceal his sins, were all sacrilegious, and consequently null and void; and therefore must be all repeated again.

Q. What observation do you make concerning the secrecy of confession, both in regard of the penitent and the confessor?

A. In the first place, there is no obligation of a public confession of private sins. Again, we are not to discover other person's sins, but only our own. As to the confessor he is obliged to perpetual secrecy, both by the law of nature, the law of God, and his church; so that whatever is declared in confession, the confessor can never discover it either directly or indirectly to any one, upon any account whatsoever, nay not even to save his own life. (Decr. Inno. xi. 1682.) The violation of this secrecy is punished with deposition and perpetual penance.

Q. Tell me now, in short, how many, and what are the conditions necessary for the worthy receiving the sacrament of penance?

A. There are five; First, to examine our conscience. Secondly, to conceive a hatred and detestation against sin, and a sorrow for having fallen into it, and incurred the displeasure and wrath of God. Thirdly, to make a firm resolution of sinning no more. Fourthly, to make a good

confession of all our sins to a priest, who is approved by the church. Fifthly, a resolution of making satisfaction to God, and our neighbour, according to our ability.

Q. Who is the proper minister of penance, and qualified to hear confessions?

A. Only those who are lawfully ordained to offer up the sacrifice of the mass, and have priest's orders.

Q. Has every priest power to absolve from sin?

A. I answer to this we are to observe, that there are two powers a priest is endowed with. One is a power of binding and loosing the soul, called the power of order: the other is a power of exercising the power of binding and loosing, and is called the power of jurisdiction. The first power is given when a priest is ordained, and made capable of absolving: the other, a priest does not receive until subjects are allotted him, on whom he is to exercise that power, which is conferred upon him by the Pope, bishop, or other prelate, who have jurisdiction. So that every priest has not the power of jurisdiction, and by consequence every priest cannot absolve from sin. How much therefore does it behove all penitents to be very careful to make use of a priest who has the power of jurisdiction, that is, of one who is rightly approved; because, if they confess to one who is not approved of by the bishop of the place, their confession is null, and the priest's absolution is of no force or value. As to what may be objected, that there are some priests who are exempt from the power and jurisdiction of the bishop, as having faculties from the superior of their own order, by virtue of a privilege granted to them by the Pope: to this I answer, that there are no such privileges and exemptions: for all such privileges and exemptions which had formerly been granted, are all recalled by Innocent XII. decree in the year 1695, as also by the decree of Benedict XIV. in the year 1745, (See Dodd's Church Hist. vol. 3. p. 528.) which expressly obliges all regular priests of what denomination soever, to a strict submission and obedience to the bishops in respect to the jurisdiction, or power of administering the sacraments.

Q. What is the form of absolution?

A. Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee, and I by his authority absolve thee, as far as I have power, and thou standest in need, from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Q. What is satisfaction ?

A. It is doing what is sufficient, or what is required from a person for the injury he does to another.

Q. What is sacramental satisfaction ?

A. It is undergoing the penalty imposed by the priest, towards repairing the injury done to God's honour, and redeem the temporal pain due to sin.

Q. Which are the penalties whereby we may satisfy our sin ?

A. In the first place, all calamities human life is subject to, when they are willingly embraced for that purpose. Again, fasting, prayer, and alms, with all other pious works.

Q. In what manner do we repair God's honour, by the aforesaid pains, and why ?

A. They are all recommended, and commanded in the scriptures, by Almighty God. We are to submit with patience to all temporal calamities, in compliance with divine providence. By prayer, we submit our soul, and regulate all its faculties to the divine will. By fasting, we punish the body for committing excesses. By alms, we satisfy for the ill use we make of the goods of fortune. For as all sins are committed against God, our neighbour, and ourselves, so all duties to God are contained under prayer, both internal and external; duties towards our neighbour, as acts of fraternal love, &c. are contained under alms. Duties towards ourselves, as mortification and the like, are contained under fasting.

Q. Whence have priests the power of imposing penalties, or satisfactory works ?

A. From Christ, who gave them power of binding and loosing, both from sin and the penalties due to sin : as in temporal tribunals, the power that frees from death, extends to assign, or pardon punishment, proper to reform the offender.

Q. Which are the chief properties of the penalty imposed ?

A. They satisfy for the temporal pain, and ought to be medicinal, that is, proper to reform the sinner.

Q. Is satisfaction an essential part of the sacrament of penance ?

A. An intention of satisfaction is essential, but actual satisfaction belongs only to the integrity of the sacrament ;

for the absolution is valid, before the satisfaction is performed; though in some cases it is requisite that satisfaction precede absolution.

Q. This doctrine of satisfaction supposes a false thing viz. that some pain is due to sin after the fault is pardoned.

A. Divines distinguish between eternal pain and temporal pain; the eternal pain is forgiven, but the temporal pain commonly remains, as it appears both from the necessity of the thing, the instance of David, who was punished by the death of his children, after his sins were forgiven; (2 Kings xii.) and other instances of temporal calamities, inflicted for offences, though pardoned. And this method of temporal pain is the foundation of our faith, as to sacramental satisfaction, indulgences, purgatory, and prayer for the dead.

Q. Can one person satisfy for another?

A. Yes: it is defined by the church, and appears in the prayers of persons, &c. Yet medicinal satisfaction is personal, and cannot be communicated to another.

Q. What is an indulgence?

A. It is a remission of the temporal punishment due to sins, after the sins themselves, as to the guilt and the eternal punishment are forgiven by the sacrament of penance, or perfect contrition. Hence nothing can be more grossly misrepresented than indulgences are by our adversaries; for the generality of protestants imagine that an indulgence is a leave to commit sin, or at least, that is a pardon for sins to come; whereas it is no such thing. For we believe there is no power in heaven or earth that can give leave to commit sin; and consequently there is no giving pardon before-hand for sins to come.

Q. How do you prove that the church has received a power from Christ to grant indulgences, that is, to discharge a penitent sinner from the debt of the temporal punishment which remains due to sins?

A. I prove it from the promise which Christ made to St. Peter, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; (St. Matt. xvi. 19.) and whatsoever thou shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." (Conc. Trid. Sess. xxv. Decr. de Indul.) Which promise, made without any exception, reservation or limi-

tation, must needs imply a power of loosing all such bonds as might otherwise hinder, or retard a Christian soul from entering heaven.

Q. How does an indulgence take off the obligation of personal satisfaction ?

A. It takes off the penal but not the medicinal part.

Q. Do indulgences for the dead remit the pains in purgatory ?

A. Not by way of absolution or jurisdiction, but only by way of prayer, or suffrage accepted by God. Bellar. L. 2. de purga.

Q. What dispositions are required to gain an indulgence ?

A. The person must be in the state of grace, confess, and communicate, and perform the things required while he is in the state of grace.

Q. What is a plenary indulgence ?

A. If duly obtained, it is a remission of all the temporal punishment due to past sins.

Q. What is a particular indulgence ?

A. It is a remission of part of the temporal punishment due to sin.

Q. I suppose this is meant by an indulgence of seven, ten, twenty, thirty, or forty days or years. But I comprehend not the meaning of this calculation.

A. According to the ancient canons or discipline of the church, temporal punishments of such a number of days or years were decreed for certain sins: and when there was sufficient reason to shorten the time it was called an indulgence.

Q. But these canons being no longer in force, I do not see what can be the present meaning of an indulgence, for so many days or years. If a sinner is obliged no longer to those punishments, he is free, and stands not in need of any indulgence ?

A. Though those canons are not in force, the law of God is still in force, which requires temporal punishment for sin, (Bellar. L. L. de Indul.) and the church by the power it has relaxes as much punishment as was formerly inflicted by the ancient canons.

Q. Has not Christ abundantly satisfied, both for sin, and the punishment due to it, both temporal and eternal ?

Can the church dispose of the merits and satisfaction of Christ ?

A. Christ has abundantly satisfied and laid up the treasure for that purpose, but the remedy is to be applied accordingly as he has ordered. It is applied by the sacraments, and good works for the remission of sin ; it is applied by indulgences for the remission of temporal punishment, as there shall be found just occasion.

Q. What is a jubilee ?

A. It is a solemn plenary indulgence, accompanied with certain privileges, relating to censures and dispensations, granted to the inferior pastors of the church by the supreme pastor, and specified in his bulls, or orders directed to them for that purpose : and it is so called from the resemblance it bears with the jubilee year in the old law (which was a year of remission, in which bondsmen were restored to liberty, and every one returned to his possession;) Levit. xxv. 27. But according to some it is so called from the Latin word *jubilatio*, which signifies joy or exultation, because it causes a spiritual joy in the souls of all who are made partakers thereof ; it is granted every twenty-fifth year, as also upon other extraordinary occasions, to such as being truly penitent, shall worthily receive the blessed sacrament, and perform the other conditions of fasting, alms, and prayer, usually prescribed at such times.

Q. What are the fruits or effects, which usually are seen among Catholics at the time of a jubilee ?

A. At that time the church most pressingly invites all sinners to return to God with their whole hearts, and encourages them by setting open her spiritual treasure in their favour ; so that the most usual effects of a jubilee are the conversion of the great number of sinners, and multiplying of all sorts of good works among the faithful. So far it is from being true, that indulgences are an encouragement to sin, or an occasion of a neglect of good works, as our adversaries unjustly object.

Q. What is irregularity ?

A. It is a disability of becoming a clerick, or exercising clerical functions, occasioned either by nature, or personal faults, ordained by the law, for the greater honour of God, and the sacred function.

Q. How many defects render persons irregular ?

A. Chiefly seven, viz. of the mind, as gross ignorance, &c. of the body, as eunuch, deformity, &c. Birth, as bastards, &c. Servitude, as slaves, &c. Want of age, required by the council of Trent. Again, bigamy, want of lenity, as murderers, hangmen, butchers, judges, and witnesses, in case of death, &c.

Q. What criminal defects renders persons irregular ?

A. Chiefly five, viz. re-baptizing ; receiving or exercising spiritual functions, contrary to the canons ; heresy ; all concerned in murder, or voluntary mutilation ; and an infamous life.

Q. Does irregularity annul ordination ?

A. No ; it not only renders the receiving and exercise unlawful and sinful.

Q. How prove you that there is a power in the church of excommunicating ?

A. First from the power of the keys ; also from the 18th chapter of St. Matt. where it is said, " If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen, and publican." ver. 17. And from the 2d Epistle of St. John, where he says, " receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed you." ver. 10. And likewise from the 1st Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, 5th chapter, " With such a one do not so much as eat," ver. 11. and in the same chapter, " Deliver such a one to Satan." ver. 5.

EXTREME UNCTION EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is extreme unction, and why so called ?

A. It is anointing the sick by a priest under a certain form of words. It is called extreme, because it is applied only to dying persons, and with respect to former unctions, as in baptism, confirmation, &c. it is the last.

Q. How do you prove that this anointing of the sick is a sacrament ? When and by whom was it instituted ?

A. Because it is an outward sign of an inward and spiritual grace. The anointing, together with the prayers that accompany it, are the outward sign ; the inward grace is the forgiveness of sins, promised in the words of St. James, " If he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." chap. v. ver. 15. It is uncertain when this sacrament was instituted. But the council of Trent (Sess. xiv. Can. 1. de Extr. Unct. et Can. iii.) has declared, that it was insti-

tuted by Christ, promulgated by St. James, in the 5th chapter of his Epistle, where it is commanded, "Is any man sick among you, let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins they shall be forgiven him." ver. 14, 15. It is also intimated by St. Mark, in the 6th chapter, where it is said, The apostles anointed with oil many that were sick. ver. 13.

Q. What is the matter and form of this sacrament? Who is the minister of it, and is it necessary for salvation?

A. The immediate matter, is oil of olives blessed by a bishop, as the council of Trent declares. See Sess. xiv. de Inst. Sacra. Extr. Unct. Can. 1. The form are these words, by this holy unction, and his own most tender mercy, may the Lord pardon thee whatsoever sins thou hast committed by thy sight, by thy hearing, and so of the other senses. The only minister is a bishop or a priest. And though this sacrament is not absolutely necessary, yet it is necessary, both by divine and ecclesiastical laws. All these points are declared by the words of St. James, above quoted.

Q. Who may receive this sacrament?

A. Only adult persons, and such as are in danger of death, by sickness, or by wounds: but not infants, and such as are fools, and always mad. Some divines say children of seven years of age may receive it, being capable of venial sin, though they never communicated.

Q. Are persons to be anointed before a battle, or persons condemned, or in a shipwreck?

A. No.

Q. When ought this sacrament to be given?

A. In every sickness where there is danger of death; but it is to be observed, that we ought not to defer it till the last hour, or agony of death; because it is much more profitable for the sick person to receive it whilst he has leisure, reason, and memory, to prepare himself for it.

Q. How ought a person to prepare himself for this sacrament?

A. If he be in mortal sin he must clear his conscience by a true and sincere confession: he ought also to make

an act of contrition, at the time he receives it, and to beg of God to forgive him the sins which he has committed, by every organ, or part that is anointed.

Q. But suppose he has lost his speech, and therefore cannot confess his sins, what ought he then to do ?

A. In that case he must make an act of contrition, or sorrow for his sins, and give signs, that he has a desire to obtain the forgiveness of them, and to receive the extreme unction ?

Q. Can this sacrament be given to persons out of their senses ?

A. Yes, if they desire it before, or very probably would have desired it.

Q. What parts are to be anointed ?

A. The eyes, ears, nose, lips, hands, and feet, and in some places, the reins ; but not in women. When any member is wanting, the nearest part is to be anointed.

Q. What are the effects of this sacrament ?

A. First, it remits all venial sins, and mortal sins forgotten ; 2dly, it remits something of the debt of punishment due to past sins : 3dly, it heals the soul of her infirmity and weakness, and a certain propensity to sin, contracted by former sins, which are apt to remain in the soul, as the unhappy relics of sin ; 4thly, it gives strength and grace to the soul, to bear with patience the pains and illness of the body, and it arms her against the temptations of her spiritual enemies ; 5thly, it restores corporal health, if God sees it expedient for the good of the soul.

Q. Can the same person receive this sacrament more than once ?

A. Yes ; but not in the same illness, unless it should be of long continuance, and that the state of the sick person should be changed so as to recover out of danger, and then fall into the like case.

HOLY ORDERS EXPOUNDED,

Q. WHAT is holy order ?

A. It is a sacrament by which the ministers of Christ are consecrated for their sacred functions, and receive grace to discharge them well.

Q. How do you prove that holy orders are a sacrament ?

A. Because they are a visible sign instituted by Christ to confer grace. The outward and visible sign is found in the imposition of the bishop's hands and prayer. Acts vi. 6. et xiii. 3. After which manner we find the seven deacons were ordained: as also St. Paul and St. Barnabas. The invisible grace conferred by this imposition of hands is attested by St. Paul in his 2d Epistle to Timothy, where he says, "Stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by the imposition of my hands." chap. i. 6. Hence it is evident, that this sacrament was instituted by Christ; for the apostles of themselves could not annex the gift of grace to any outward sign or ceremony.

Q. When did Christ institute this sacrament?

A. At his last supper, when he said to his apostles, "Do this for commemoration of me." St. Luke xxii. 19. And after his resurrection he confirmed it with a new power, when breathing on them, he said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain they are retained." St. John xx. 22, 23. These two powers being the essential parts of priesthood, viz. to consecrate and offer the unbloody sacrifice of his body, and blood, and to forgive sins.

Q. Who is the minister of this sacrament?

A. A bishop only, as it is defined in the council of Trent. (Sess. xxiii. Can. vii.) Hence it says, Confirming and ordaining is not common to priests. Titus. i. 5.

Q. Can any bishop confer orders?

A. Heretics and schismatics may validly, but not lawfully ordain: yet by the decree of the council of Trent, no alien bishop can ordain priests, without dismissory letters from the proper bishop.

Q. To whom does the right of mission, vocation, and election of the ministry belong?

A. To the pastors of the church, viz. the bishops and the Pope.

Q. But suppose some should pretend, as the first reformers did to an extraordinary calling or mission?

A. Let them prove their extraordinary mission from God by some miracles, or the like, and then they say something to the purpose?

Q. Is it not lawful for any one to take upon him priestly power, without the ordination of the Catholic church?

A. No, it is not ; because it is usurping a power which no ways belongs to them ; which we find has been severely chastised by Almighty God, in the person of Ozias : as also in the person of Core, Dathan, and Abiram. 2 Paral. xxvi. 19. Numb. xvi. 32, &c.

Q. What need is there for ordaining those who have already the spirit of God in them, viz. the inward unction of the Holy Ghost, which of itself sufficiently authorizes any one to administer and preach the word of God, without any farther ceremony ?

A. This doctrine was unheard of in the church whilst it was governed by the apostles : for in those times we read, that bishops, priests, and deacons, were constantly ordained by the imposition of hands ; nor was it lawful for any one to presume to preach, and administer the sacraments, unless he were first so ordained and sent by the lawful pastors of the church. Acts xiv. 23. 1 Tim. iv. 14. Nay, even St. Paul and St. Barnabas, though they were immediately called to the apostleship by God himself, as the Scriptures testify, yet we see they were afterwards ordained with the usual ceremony of laying on hands. Acts ix. 15. Acts xiii. 2. This extraordinary example recorded in holy writ, is a most convincing proof that ordination is indispensably necessary to all who enter into the sacred ministry, since St. Paul himself was not excepted, who, if he had not been ordained, had not partaken of the priesthood. It is therefore a high and sacrilegious presumption for any man, to take upon him to preach the gospel, to administer sacraments, and have the care of souls, unless he is first ordained, and sent by those who were ordained, by lawful pastors in the church, before him, according to the sacrament which Christ has instituted for that purpose, " Amen, amen, I say to you, he that entereth not by the door, into the sheep-fold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief, and a robber." St. John x. 1. Now it is evident that none but the bishops and priests of the catholic church derived their ordination and mission from the Apostles, and that the pastors of all other churches have climbed up into the fold by another way.

Q. What and how many are the conditions necessary for him who is to receive holy orders ?

A. There are five principal ones.

Q. Which is the first ?

A. That he be called by God as Aaron was. So that he must not chuse this holy state of his own head.

Q. How shall a person know whether he be called by God.

A. If he has the conditions we are going to speak of; and if his spiritual director, after a due trial, counsels or advises him to it, and then he may well presume he is called by God: yet after all, he ought to fear and tremble; for Judas, though he was called by God himself, was miserably lost. St. Matt. x. 4. St. John xvii. 12.

Q. Is it not sufficient that he has a great desire to be of the church, and that his parents design him for it?

A. No; for it often happens, that this great desire comes not from God, but either from the love of idleness and ease, or from an expectation of gaining honour and esteem in the world, or from some other disorderly passion, which deserves the curse of God. As for parents, they are often as worldly, and as vain as their children: moreover, they are commonly ignorant of the obligations of a churchman, and of the dangers of this high calling; so that, as our Saviour said to the children of Zebedee and their mother, They "know not what they ask." St. Mat. xx. 22.

Q. What is the second condition?

A. A resolution, and sincere desire of spending his health and life, in promoting the glory of God, and in working out his own salvation, and that of his neighbours.

Q. What is the third condition?

A. An honest, virtuous, and exemplary life. See Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiii. Cap. xii.

Q. What is the fourth condition?

A. He must be free even from all hidden mortal sins, at least for a long time before he receives this sacrament, and be in love and peace with God and man: for it is to the ministers of the church God spoke saying: be ye clean, who carry the vessels of the Lord. Levit. xxi. 8.

Q. What is the fifth condition?

A. A learning, and knowledge enough to instruct and guide others, both by word and example, according to the law of God, and his church; for God warns the ignorant, saying; "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee; that thou shalt not do the office of priesthood to me." Osee iv. 6. And it is to the minister of the church Christ says, "you are the light of the world—let your light shine before men, that they may see your

good works, and glorify your Father, who is in Heaven." St. Matt. v. 14, 16. See the epistle of Pope Benedict, Dec. 14. 1740.

Q. Which are the virtues that are most requisite in those persons who aspire to the ecclesiastical state ?

A. The spirit, or love of prayer, chastity, temperance, prudence, humility, contempt of the world, patience in adversity, fortitude, or strength of mind, love of retirement, to be laborious and given to study. 1 Tim. iii. 2 Tim. iii.

Q. What persons are incapable of receiving holy orders?

A. All those who are not baptized, all hermaphrodites, and all women. I permit not a woman to teach, says St. Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 12. 1 Cor. xiv. 34. Hence the Pepusiani, who ordained women, were declared heretics, as St. Epiphanius gives an account.

Q. How many orders are there ?

A. Only one total, but seven partial, which makes but one sacrament of ordination ; for they have all a reference to, and are included in priesthood.

Q. How are they called ?

A. Priest, deacon, sub-deacon, acolyth, exorcist, lector, and porter ?

Q. Why are not bishops to be reckoned among the rest ?

A. If you reckon episcopacy, then indeed there are eight orders : but commonly it is not named with the rest, because it is an eminent degree which surpasseth them all, as being the source from whence all the rest are derived ; for they all proceed from it, and end in it ; and as in a kingdom, the king is not reckoned in the number of officers that govern under him, because his power is transcendant, and runs through all the magistrates of the kingdom ; so in like manner the bishop is not ordinarily reckoned in the number of the other orders, for he is in his church, as the king in his kingdom, the prince and head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, or holy principality.

Q. What is the respective function of each order ?

A. The office or function of a priest, is to consecrate, or offer sacrifice, to forgive sins, administer the sacraments, and preach God's word, &c. A deacon is to assist the bishop or priest in the sacrifice of the mass, to read the gospel, &c. A sub-deacon offers the sacred vessels to the deacon, and reads the epistle, &c. An acolyth prepares the cruets, and carries the lights, &c. A lector reads the

prophecies, &c. A porter takes care to admit none but the faithful into the church, and keeps the church decent.

Q. Why are some orders called lesser, others greater, and which be they?

A. The greater orders are priesthood, deacon, and sub-deacon; and they are so called, because they regard the sacrifice immediately. The others lesser, because more remotely.

Q. Are all orders holy?

A. No; only the greater, for the reason given.

Q. What is hierarchy?

A. It is a holy government of sacred ministers, viz. bishops, priests, and ministers, instituted by Christ, for the sanctification of mankind. Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiii. Can. vi.

Q. Are the ministers all equal?

A. No; the Pope is by divine right the head, and bishops are by divine right above priests, both by the power of order and jurisdiction; that is, a bishop can ordain and confirm, and demand obedience over priests. See St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19. St. John xxi. 15. St. Luke xxi. Phillip i. Tim. iii. 2. Tit. i. 7. Acts xx. 28.

Q. Does not St. Hierome say, that bishops and priests are the same?

A. No; on the contrary he expressly says, priests cannot ordain: indeed he says, in the beginning they were promiscuously stiled presbyters, or seniors, in the scriptures; moreover, that simple priests had a share in jurisdiction; but not that simple priests could claim jurisdiction by divine right. Hence the Arians were declared heretics, for making priests and bishops equal.

Q. What is the proper function of a bishop?

A. To govern in chief; to chastise the wicked and disobedient, by excommunicating them; to preach and exhort; to administer the sacraments of confirmation, and holy orders.

MATRIMONY EXPOUNDED.

Q. What is matrimony?

A. It is a lawful contract between a man and a woman, whereby they deliver up a right to each others bodies, in order to propagate their species.

Q. When was this contract first instituted?

A. It was first instituted by Almighty God, between

our first parents, in the earthly paradise. Gen. ii. And this institution was confirmed by Jesus Christ, in the New Testament, where he says, "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." St. Matt. xix. 6. And our Blessed Saviour, in order to shew that this state is holy, and not to be condemned, or despised, was pleased to honour it with his first miracle wrought at the marriage of Cana in Galilee. St. John ii.

Q. For what end was matrimony instituted?

A. For the procreation of children which may serve God here, and people heaven hereafter; as also for a remedy against concupiscence; and for the benefit of conjugal society, that man and wife may mutually help one another, and contribute to one another's salvation.

Q. Is matrimony a sacrament?

A. Yes.

Q. How do you prove it to be a sacrament?

A. Because it is a conjunction made and sanctified by God himself, and not to be dissolved by any power of man, as being a sacred sign, or mysterious representation of the indissoluble union of Christ and his Church. Hence St. Paul expressly calls it a great sacrament, (Eph. v. 31, 32.) or mystery, with regard to Christ and his church. And the Holy Fathers all agree, it confers grace for the purposes above-mentioned; see St. Amb. L. i. de Abra. C. 7. St. Aug. L. de bono Conjug. C. 18. et L. de Nup. et Corc. C. 10.

Q. Was matrimony always a sacrament?

A. No; not till it was elevated to that dignity by Christ in the law of grace.

Q. Is marriage between Jews and Infidels, and persons unbaptized, a sacrament?

A. No; yet it is a natural contract among them, and obliges the parties as such.

Q. What is the matter and form of this sacrament?

A. As the church has not decided this point, there are two opinions concerning it: the one is, that the matter is the mutual delivery of their bodies; and the form, the words, or outward signs, whereby this delivery is accepted. Others, especially Melchior Cano, Estius, and Sylvius, think the delivery, or contract to be the matter; but the form to be the words of the priest, I join you together in matrimony, &c. or some other words equivalent. Now

the difference in these opinions is; the former makes the contractors to be the ministers of the sacrament, but the latter make the priest to be the minister of the sacrament, and the contractors only ministers of the civil contract?

Q. What is the effect of this sacrament?

A. It gives a special grace for the religious educating of children, and bearing with the difficulties, and complying with the obligations of the state, and to be faithful and loving to each other.

Q. How comes it then that so many marriages are unhappy, if matrimony be a sacrament which gives so great a grace?

A. Because the greatest part do not receive it in the dispositions they ought; they consult not God in their choice, but only their own lust or temporal interest; they prepare not themselves for it, by putting themselves in a state of grace; and too often are guilty of freedoms before marriage, which are not allowable by the law of God.

Q. In what dispositions ought persons to receive this sacrament?

A. They ought to be in a state of grace, by confession; their intention ought to be pure, viz. to embrace this holy state for the ends for which God instituted it; and if they be under the care of parents, &c. they ought to consult them, and do nothing in this kind without their consent.

Q. What are the obligations of the married couple?

A. First, to be united and live together during life. St. Mark x. Secondly, to be faithful to one another, as they have promised in marriage. 1 Cor. vii. 4, &c. Thirdly, to assist one another in their distress; to bear patiently the indiscretion, weakness, and burthens of each other. Gal. vi. 2. Col. iii. Fourthly, to get their children baptized as soon as possible; and to instruct and bring them up christian-like. Eph. vi. Fifthly, to give good example to their children, and to their whole family, and to engage all to serve God, and pray to him, especially morning and evening. 2 Cor. xii. 14. Hence all jealousies, bitterness, hatred, reproaches, contentions, scolding, fretfulness, abuses, and excessive love of their children and the world, are to be avoided; as also all immoderate affection, without reason or decency, for one another, whereby they make slight account of the law and love of God. St. Peter iii. 1. Again,

the wife is obliged to be submissive and obedient to her husband in all things that are not contrary to the law of God; for the man is the head of the woman, as Christ is the head of the church. Eph. v. She must likewise be careful that she does not miscarry through her own fault; nor must she let the infant sleep in the same bed with her, or its nurse, for the space of a twelvemonth, for fear it should be overlaid. Rom. Rit. The husband is obliged to be loving and careful of his wife, and provide for her and his family. Eph. v. 28, &c.

Q. Can man and wife separate, or break the marriage contract, so as to be at liberty to marry another?

A. There are several cases wherein they may separate, so as to cohabitation, with the approbation of the church; but the contract can never be broke or annulled, so as to have liberty to marry again, as the Council of Trent has defined against late heretics, who allow of parting, and re-marrying in case of adultery. Sess. xxiv. intitio.

Q. Can marriage be dissolved (*quoad vinculum*) by a person's entering into religion?

A. The Council of Trent (Sess. xxiv. de ref. Matr.) has declared, that if the marriage be not consummated, it may be annulled, by entering into religion; and the reason is because as yet they are not one flesh.

Q. Were not the Jews accustomed to break the marriage contract, and marry again?

A. Such a custom was permitted by their law, (upon account of the hardness of their hearts, St. Matt. xix. 8.) and a bill of divorce granted in some cases; but they abused the law, extending it to cases not allowed of; besides it was not approved of, but only permitted by divine appointment; however, our Saviour recalled that law. St. Mark x.

Q. Is it lawful to have more wives than one?

A. No; for it is expressly forbid by the law of God. See St. Matt. xix. St. Mark x. St. Luke xvi. 1 Cor. vi.

Q. Did not the ancient patriarchs keep several wives at the same time?

A. This was done by divine dispensation, as the Council of Trent (following St. Augustin, &c.) declares. Polygamy not being against a first, but only a secondary precept of the law of nature, which God can dispense with. However, it never was permitted for a woman to have more

husbands than one, this being against the first precept of the law of nature, viz. the procreation which would be obstructed thereby.

Q. Are all persons qualified to enter into the contract of marriage ?

A. No ; because sometimes the contract may be against the law of nature, the law of God, and human laws, both civil and ecclesiastical.

Q. Is the contract void where persons lie under incapacity from those laws ?

A. Impediments are of two kinds ; some annul the contract, others only render the contract unlawful.

Q. Has the church power to appoint those impediments ?

A. Yes ; for so it is expressly defined in the Council of Trent. Sess. xxiv. Can. iv. de Matr.

Q. Which are the chief impediments rendering the contract of marriage illegal ?

A. A simple vow of chastity, or to become religious. Secondly, espousals with another, or a mutual promise of future marriage. Thirdly, to solemnize marriage on days prohibited by the church.

Q. In what cases are espousals dissolvable ?

A. By mutual consent ; by marriage ; by entrance into religion ; a long absence, not returning at the time appointed, or thereabouts ; want of age ; affinity or consanguinity supervening ; a notable deformity of body happening after ; fornication ; heresy supervening ; if any condition promised is not fulfilled ; a capital crime ; holy orders ; an insupportable cruel temper ; if any thing happens after, which would have hindered the promise. Yet in all these cases the church is to be consulted.

Q. What age is required in the contractors of espousals and marriage ?

A. Espousals require seven years ; marriages require fourteen in men, and twelve in women.

Q. At what time is marriage prohibited by the church ?

A. From the first Sunday in Advent till the Epiphany, or Twelfth-day be past ; and from Ash-Wednesday, till after Low-Sunday. Con. Trid. Sess. xxiv. de reform. matr. chap. x.

Q. Which are the chief impediments that render the contract of marriage null ?

A. Holy orders, or solemn profession in any religious

order ; or if the contract is between persons a-kin, either in affinity or consanguinity, viz. within the fourth degree. Again, if either party be not baptized ; as also clandestine marriages, that is, without the parish priest, or one deputed by him, and at least two witnesses, but this is only an impediment where the Council of Trent is received. Sess. xxiv. de reform. matr. chap. i.

Q. How far is the consent of parents requisite in marriage ?

A. It is a great sin to marry without their knowledge and consent, unless there be plain reasons not to ask it ; for the scripture every where mentions, parents giving their children in marriage. However, the Council of Trent has decreed, that marriage without their consent is valid. Sess. xxiv. de reform. matr. Dap. i.

Q. Does the Catholic church allow those of her communion to marry with those who are of a different communion ?

A. She has often prohibited such marriages, as may be seen in the Councils of Illiberis, Laodica, Chalcedon, Agde, &c. See Concil. Illi. Can. xvi. Laodi. Can. x. Chal. Can. xiv. Agde, Can. lxvii. And the reason is, first, because she would not have her children communicate in sacred things, such as matrimony is, with those that are out of her communion. Secondly, because such marriages are apt to give occasion to disturbances in families, whilst one of the parties draws one way, and the other another. Thirdly, because there is a danger of the catholic party being perverted, or at least of not being allowed the free exercise of their religion. Fourthly, because there is a danger of the children being brought up in error, of which we have seen several bad instances. However, sometimes, and in some places, the pastors of the church, for weighty reasons, have been forced to dispense with this law, and tolerate such marriages. But it is to be observed, that these bargains are by no means to be allowed of, by which the contracting parties agree to have the boys brought up in the religion of the father, and the girls to follow the mother ; for God and his church will have no such divisions, nor give up their right to any one.

SIN EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is sin?

A. It is defined by St. Augustin to be any thought, word, or deed, against the law of God, (L. 22. cont. Faust. chap. xxvii.); which includes all sins of omission, which are interpreted in an affirmative sense. It also includes all human laws, civil and ecclesiastical, which are God's laws radically; for as St. Paul says, he who resisteth power, resisteth the ordinances of God. Rom. xiii. 2.

Q. Is it necessary to avoid sin above all things, and why?

A. Yes, it is necessary; and the reason is, because it is sin alone that makes us enemies to God, and damns us eternally. Jer. ii. 19. 1 John iii. 6, &c.

Q. What is required to make an action sinful?

A. It must be voluntary, and it is said to be voluntary, when it proceeds from knowledge and deliberation, and without force. For instance, the actions of children and madmen, and one dragged to idolatry, are not voluntary.

Q. What kind of fear mitigates sin, and how shall it be known?

A. The fear of great evil, as death, &c. whereby persons of the strongest resolutions are driven to evil actions. But there is a difference between the law of nature, and divine positive laws; human laws, ecclesiastical and civil. In the latter, viz. ecclesiastical and civil, the fear of death, or some great evil, may commonly excuse the offender totally, but not in the two first. I say commonly, for if the public good be concerned, he is not excused. For instance, a soldier cannot desert his post; nor can a Catholic eat flesh on prohibited days, when the honour of the church is concerned.

Q. Does concupiscence render an action involuntary?

A. No; it rather increases it.

Q. When does ignorance make an action involuntary?

A. In three cases, viz. when we are not obliged to know; when not affected; when otherwise we should not have done the action.

Q. What things are to be considered to know the nature of moral action?

A. Several ; viz. knowledge, will, intention, election, or choice, counsel, consent, and fact.

Q. How many sorts of moral actions are there, and how known ?

A. In general two, good and bad ; which are known by their object, end, and circumstances, so that no action is indifferent, (*in individuo.*)

Q. Pray tell me how many kinds of sins there are ?

A. Two ; viz. original and actual.

Q. What is original sin, and which are the evils we suffer by it ?

A. Original sin is the sin in which we are all born, through the disobedience of our first father Adam. Rom. v. 12. Eph. ii. 3. The evils which proceed from it, are death, sickness, labour and inclination, and facility to do evil, a slackness and difficulty to do good ; and lastly, an eternal loss of heaven, unless we are cleansed by baptism. St. John iii. 5.

Q. What is actual sin ?

A. It is the sin we commit ourselves, such as cursing, swearing, lying, stealing, &c.

Q. How many ways is actual sin committed ?

A. Several ; viz. by thoughts, words, deeds, or actions ; by infirmity, ignorance, malice, omission, &c.

Q. How many kinds of actual sins are there ?

A. Two, mortal and venial.

Q. What is mortal sin ?

A. It is a sin whereby we lose the grace and love of God, and make ourselves liable to eternal damnation. St. James i. 15.

Q. Why is it called mortal sin ?

A. Because it kills the soul.

Q. How can that be, since the soul is immortal ?

A. Because, as I said before, by mortal sin the soul loses the grace of God, which is its spiritual life ; and makes itself guilty of the eternal flames of hell, which is the worst of death. Rom. viii. 9, 10. Ps. xxxiii. 22.

Q. Can a person be damned for only one mortal sin ?

A. Yes, certainly ; for the devils have been damned for one bad thought.

Q. What is venial sin ?

A. It is a much less offence, whereby the grace of God

is not lost; but it lessens his love in our hearts. Prov. xxiv. 16. St. Matt. xii. 36.

Q. What rules can you give that we may know mortal sins from venial?

A. The principal rules are these. First, mortal sins are marked in the scriptures by the word *wo*; the threats of deserving death, eternal pain, excluding from heaven, &c. Secondly, the opinion of the fathers and divines, when they all agree; and when they differ to follow the safer part. The third general rule is reason, viz. when the dishonour done to God, and injury to our neighbour, is notoriously against the love of God and charity.

Q. What consideration may induce us to judge sins are only venial?

A. Chiefly two, viz. surreption or surprise, and smallness or trifle of matter.

Q. Can a sin that is venial become mortal?

A. No, because it is a contradiction. However venial sins dispose a person to commit mortal; for as Ecclesiasticus tells us, e. xix. 1. "He that contemneth small things, shall fall by little and little."

Q. Can a sin that is mortal of its nature, be only venial by accident?

A. Yes, in three cases chiefly, viz. to steal a trifle. Secondly, for want of deliberation. And thirdly, for want of sufficient use of reason, as in children, and persons half asleep. See St. Tho. i. 2. Ques. 83. art. 6. in Corp.

Q. Can a sin that is only venial of its own nature, become mortal by accident?

A. Yes, for instance, he who thinks a venial to be a mortal one, and yet commits it. Secondly, by contempt. Thirdly, by danger. St. Tho. i. 2. q. 88. art. in Corp.

Q. Which are most common venial sins?

A. These following, viz. idle works; small excesses in eating and drinking; too much pleasure in diversions; jocular lies, or lies out of excuse; coming late to prayers; neglecting alms; harsh words; flattering speeches; small thefts; distractions in the time of prayer not fully resisted, &c.

Q. Are we obliged to avoid venial sin, and why?

A. We ought undoubtedly; and the reason is, because they are a token of the want of zeal for God's service; they

likewise weaken the will, and incline it to mortal sin, for a wound neglected gangrenes, and a garment torn is to be immediately mended; besides it diminishes the grace of God, and makes us liable to grievous torments, which we must suffer in purgatory, if we do not make satisfaction in this life.

Q. Can venial sins be forgiven without the sacrament of penance?

A. Yes, by sacramentals, viz. holy water, signing with the sign of the cross, alms, fasting, &c. Yet these things suppose the performer to be in the state of grace, that is to say, free from all mortal sin, and that every work is accompanied with inward devotion, and acts of the mind; because they do not produce their effects by their own force.

Q. Which are the intrinsic causes of sin?

A. Ignorance of the understanding; passion of the sensitive appetite, and malice of the will.

Q. What is ignorance, and how does it concur to sin?

A. It is three-fold, viz. invincible, affected, and supine.

Q. What is invincible ignorance?

A. When it is not in our power to know a thing, and it excuses from sin. See St. Tho. i. 2. q. 76. art. 2. 2. St. Aug. de Gra. et de Lib. arb. c. iii. n. 5.

Q. What is affected ignorance?

A. When a person knows not a thing which he is obliged to know, and might have known it but neglected it. This does not excuse from sin.

Q. What is supine ignorance?

A. When a thing may be known with ease. This excuses not from sin.

Q. What are the things we are obliged to know?

A. First, all christian and religious duties. Secondly, what belongs to our particular state or calling.

Q. What is passion, and when does it excuse or aggravate sin? [N.B.—By passion we mean any strong or vehement emotion of the soul, as inclination, desire, &c.]

A. Sin of passion is called a sin of infirmity; it is grounded in self-love. Passion does not excuse from sin, yet strong passion diminishes it, because it renders sin less voluntary; if passion is so violent as to hinder reason entirely, it excuses from sin. But passion consequent, or which comes after sin, aggravates it, but antecedent, or going before diminishes it.

Q. What is a sin of malice ?

A. It proceeds from clear knowledge, reflection, or habit, and is a great aggravation.

Q. What is a sin of omission ?

A. It is the omitting to do what God or his church commands ; as for example, if a rich person neglects to give alms ; or any one should neglect to say his daily prayers ; or neglects to hear mass when he can, upon a Sunday, &c.

Q. What is a circumstance, and how many circumstances are there ?

A. It is something belonging to an action, but not of its substance. Aristotle and St. Thomas name seven, viz. who, what, where, with what help, why, how, when. Who, denotes the person as whether a religious man or layman, a relation or otherwise, a married person or single. This circumstance is to be declared in sins of impurity, murder, &c. What, denotes the quantity, as how much, or whether consecrated or not. This circumstance is to be declared in sins of theft. Where, denotes the place, as whether in the church, or any other sacred place: this circumstance is to be declared in sins of theft, murder, carnal sins in fact. With what help, denotes the scandal given, whereby others might be in danger of being drawn into sin, or whereby God may be dishonoured, and his church brought into contempt. This circumstance chiefly regards all public sins. Why, denotes the motive, intention, or end. This circumstance is to be declared when the end of doing an action is a mortal sin in itself, as for example, to steal a sword with a design to kill a man with it. How, denotes whether done out of ignorance, or knowledge. When, denotes the time how long. This circumstance properly belongs to the sins of desire, anger, and ill-will ; so that persons should declare how long they continued in the same dismal desires, anger, hatred, and the like, without interruption.

Q. What circumstances are we obliged to express in confession ?

A. All those which change the species or nature of the sin, as the council of Trent has defined. Sess. xxiv. c. v. et Can. vii. Again, all those circumstances which change not the species, but which very much aggravate, according to the most probable opinion are to be confessed, viz. stealing from the indigent, &c.

Q. Whence do sins derive their enormity ?

A. Sins derive their nature from the object, and the more worthy the object that is abused the greater is the sin. Hence sins immediately against God are greater than those against ourselves, or neighbours ; spiritual sins are greater than carnal ; sins against our neighbour's soul, are greater than those against his person or goods, but this is to be taken when equally compared ; as the ruin of a man's soul is worse than the destruction of his person, or goods. Again, the enormity may be compared as to the cause : hence sins of malice exceed sins of ignorance, and passion.

Q. Which are the degrees whereby sins are committed ?

A. These four, viz. suggestion, delectation, consent and fact.

Q. What is suggestion, and how far sinful ?

A. Suggestion is the first impression of a temptation ; it is not sinful if only resisted. In carnal sins it is often a venial sin, especially when occasion is given to it by dangerous objects.

Q. What is delectation ?

A. It is to take pleasure in thinking on what is sinful, though there be no consent to commit the fact. If the fact be a mortal sin, the delectation is a mortal sin, if the fact be venial the delectation is only venial. This delectation commonly happens in sins of the flesh, envy, anger, revenge, &c. Now this delectation may happen two ways, by taking a pleasure in the thought, or in the thing itself, and by consenting to the pleasure. When there is a delectation in the pleasure, it is called *morosa*, and is accompanied with consent, viz. in a voluntary delight.

Q. What is consent ?

A. When a person resolves to commit the sin.

THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHICH are the seven deadly or capital sins ?

A. Pride, covetousness, luxury, envy, gluttony, anger, sloth.

Q. Why are they called deadly or capital sins ?

A. Because they are the source and root of all other sins.

Q. What is pride ; and is it a great sin ?

A. It is an inordinate desire of esteem, and being above

others, viz. To think we have good from ourselves. To think we have good from another, but by our own merits. To pretend to have what we have not. By pretending to have things, so as to despise others, as if they had them not. There is not a sin more grievous or more dangerous; for it is the sin of the fallen angels, and of the first man; it is the sin which we have the greatest difficulty to preserve ourselves from, and the last we overcome. Eccl. x. 7. 1 Pet. v. 5. Isa. xiv. 12, &c. Gen. iii. 5.

Q. How many branches are there of pride?

A. Eight, viz. vain-glory, ambition, disobedience, boasting, hypocrisy, contention, obstinacy, and curiosity.

Q. Explain every particular?

A. Vain-glory is a manifestation of a person's own excellency before men: for instance, by expecting to be esteemed for things not worthy of praise, as for wicked things and the like. Secondly, by expecting esteem from those who are not competent judges, as from ignorant people. Thirdly, by expecting esteem, when the motive is bad, as it happens in prayer and alms. In these cases where the object is mortal, the sin is mortal. Ambition is an inordinate desire of honours. Disobedience, is preferring a man's own will, to the will of a lawful superior. Boasting, is a manifestation of a person's own excellency, by word. Hypocrisy, is a dissimulation of holiness, either by words or actions. Contention, is properly maintaining what is contrary to truth, by words. Discord, is adhering to a man's own opinion, with making a party. Curiosity, is a disordinate desire of knowing more than is necessary, or convenient, or profitable.

Q. What considerations will abate pride?

A. The defects of soul and body, ignorance, error, others perfections, follies, misfortunes, and to remember that holy lesson of our Saviour Christ, Learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart, (St. Matt. xi. 29.) and to consider that we are sinful dust, and shall soon return again to dust; and that whatsoever good we have to do, is the free gift of God. Its opposite virtue is humility, which inclines us to conceive a mean opinion of ourselves, (Gal. vi. 3.) to require neither esteem nor respect of others; to despise no person; and to suffer contempt and disrespect patiently and calmly. St. Luke xxi. 19. This is a virtue so necessary, that no one can be saved without it,

according to the express words of our Saviour Christ. St. Luke xviii. 17.

Q. What is covetousness?

A. It is a disordinate or immoderate desire or love of riches, or worldly goods.

Q. When is the love of worldly things immoderate?

A. When the heart of man is tied to them.

Q. How can we know when the heart is tied to the world?

A. By one of these four signs. First, when a person is over-joyed for possessing, over-sad for losing any earthly thing. Psalm li. 9. 2 Cor. vii. 10. 2dly, when he acquires, or keeps any thing unjustly. Isa. xxxiii. 1. 3dly, when he seeks greedily after worldly goods, or retains them with too great an affection. 1 Tim. vi. 9. 4thly, when he is not bountiful to the poor, according to his ability. St. Luke xi. 41.

Q. If this be true, there are but few who are not covetous?

A. Very right, there are but few; for every one is covetous, who is tied to his share of this world, although he came lawfully by it. Jer. viii. 10. Phil. ii. 21.

Q. Can the poor be covetous?

A. Yes; the poorest person is covetous, if he loves the riches he has not, (St. Matt. xiii. 22.) or if he thinks it a misfortune for him to be poor, and is impatient in his poverty.

Q. Which are the crimes that usually attend a covetous mind?

A. All sorts of injustices, viz. treachery, like Judas who betrayed our Saviour. Deceit, or fraud, falsehood, when fair words draw persons on, as trafficking. Perjury, when a false oath backs their words. Violence, when covetousness induces persons to steal. Solicitude, an unquiet mind, in obtaining and preserving riches. Obdurateness against the poor, in refusing to assist them in their wants.

Q. What considerations are profitable against covetousness; and what is the virtue opposite to it?

A. To consider that we brought nothing with us into the world, nor shall carry any thing out of it. 1 Tim. vi. 7. That God has promised, if we seek in the first place his kingdom and its justice, that all other things shall

be added unto us. St. Matt. vi. 33. To consider the threats pronounced against it in the scripture. The danger it exposes men to, and the difficulty of being saved; since our Saviour has told us, "It is easier for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of Heaven, than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle." Matt. xix. 24. To consider that amendment is almost impossible. The neglect of spiritual duties. The folly of the vice. The extravagancies of heirs. The shortness of this life. The pains of hell, and joys of heaven. The virtue opposite to this vice is liberality, which weans our hearts from earthly things, and inclines us to share our goods freely, not with the rich, and persons in easier circumstances, but with the poor, for it is much better to give than to receive. Acts xx. 35. And St. Paul says, that God loveth a cheerful giver. 2 Cor. ix. 7.

Q. What is luxury?

A. An inordinate desire of carnal sins, or delights of the flesh; which is an abominable sin, and ought not to be so much as named among christians. Eph. v. 3.

Q. Are all carnal pleasure inordinate?

A. All but between man and wife.

Q. When is a person guilty of this odious sin?

A. Not only when he commits the fact, but likewise when he wilfully, with delight or pleasure, (Job xxx. 1.) hearkens to, looks upon, or thinks of any thing whatsoever, which any ways moves him to this detestable sin. Eph. v. 4, 5. Matt. v. 28.

Q. What are the remedies against lust, and what is the virtue opposite to it?

A. Flying the occasion; fasting; avoiding idleness, and bad company; reading good books; guarding the senses, but most especially the eyes; meditating on hell; constant prayer; modest in dress; to confess often, and communicate with devotion. The virtue opposite to this vice is chastity, which is a purity of body and mind, making us abstain from carnal pleasures: it is an angelical virtue which God bestows upon people of prayer, upon the obedient, and humble. Wisd. viii. 21. James iv. 6. There is no virtue that renders persons more acceptable to God, than this of chastity. Rev. xiv. 4.

Q. What is envy?

A. It is a sadness or repining at the worldly or spiritual good of our neighbour, because it seems to lessen our own, or a rejoicing at his damage or distress.

Q. What branches has envy ?

A. Want of love for our neighbour ; whispering, or talking to break friendship ; detraction, a taking away another's reputation ; rash judgment, reproach, contempt of others ; hatred, &c. So detestable is this vice, that God warns us not to eat with an envious man. (Prov. xxiii. 6.) being contrary to charity, and human society ; it makes men like devils, whose nature is malice. By the devil's envy, death entered into this world. Sap. ii. 24. It caused Cain to kill his brother, (Gen. iv.) and the Jews our Saviour Christ ; and seeing it destroys in man the love of God, and our neighbour, and fills the world with innumerable mischiefs ; it is no wonder that it is put among the vices, that exclude from heaven. Gal. v. 21. 1 Pet. ii. 1.

Q. What are the remedies to cure envy ?

A. To consider the unreasonableness of the sin, which neither increaseth our happiness, nor diminishes that of our neighbours ; that it robs us of charity, and deforms us to the likeness of the devil, or evil spirits, who continually go about to devour us, for it is a kind of death to them, to see that man is happier than themselves. 1 Pet. v. 8. To consider the disturbance it gives to a person. To place our affections only on future happiness. The virtue opposite to this vice is charity, or brotherly love, which consists in doing and wishing as much good to our neighbour, as we would have others do to us. St. John xiii. 35. This is the chief badge of a christian. Again, humility is a very powerful virtue in order to overcome this odious vice : for whosoever is humble, is not sorry that his neighbour is more rich, more learned, and more esteemed than himself.

Q. What is gluttony ?

A. An inordinate desire of meat or drink.

Q. How many ways are there of offering in this kind ?

A. Chiefly five, viz. first to eat unseasonably to please the appetite. Numb. xi. 5. Prov. xxi. 17. 2dly, To desire delicacies, or not to be satisfied without choice meat and drink. Ezek. xvi. 49. 3dly, To eat or drink to excess, so as to make a person sick. Eccl. xxxvii. 32. 4thly,

To eat with greediness. 5thly, To seek for what is most pleasing.

Q. What is the worst and most destructive kind of gluttony?

A. Drunkenness?

Q. What is drunkenness?

A. A disordinate use, and desire of intoxicating liquor, so as by it to lose any share of our reason, or senses?

Q. How is it sinful or excusable?

A. It is excusable, if a person knows not the strength of the liquor; if out of surprise he drinks too much, more than to satisfy nature, it is only a venial sin; but if he knows the strength of the liquor, and will drink to excess, it is a mortal sin. 1 Cor. vi. 10. Isa. v. 22. It is likewise a grievous sin as often as it is a considerable prejudice either to body, estate or family: it is also a mortal sin to cause willfully another to be intoxicated.

Q. What are the effects of drunkenness?

A. Dullness and incapacity, both in regard of temporal and spiritual duties. Irregularity of the passions. Loquacity, or an unbridled use of the tongue, in lying, swearing, and profane discourse. Scurrility, in abusing and exposing our neighbour. Uncleaness, by pollution, vomiting, &c.

Q. What remedies are there against the sin of drunkenness, and what is the virtue opposite to it?

A. To consider that it makes a man worse than a beast; as also to consider the abstinence of Christ and his saints: that it brings beggary, diseases, and damnation. To reflect on the happiness of an abstemious life. The virtue that is opposite to it is temperance, which bridles the inordinate desire of meat and drink, as likewise all other disorderly passions.

Q. What is anger?

A. It is an inordinate desire of revenge, or of punishing those who displease us.

Q. How and when is anger innocent or sinful?

A. It is a natural passion of the soul, and may be either good or bad. A superior sins not in being angry, or desiring to punish a fault in a subject: but in others, it is both against justice and charity; and even superiors may sin in excess of anger.

Q. What branches are there in anger?

A. Scolding, when anger breaks forth in contradiction by words, and ends in threats and blows. Swelling with anger, as when a person ruminates in his mind, by how many ways he will take revenge. Contumely, when a person makes use of injurious words, reflecting upon other's morals, imperfections of body and mind, or misfortunes. Malediction, by wishing another some evil, from God, the Devil, or some misfortune. Indignation, when we refuse to see, or converse with others, through anger. Clamour, when we attack another with confused language, without any regard to what is said. Blasphemy, when in anger we use injurious words, either against God, his saints, or any holy thing. Lastly, manslaughter, and murder. All which are grievous sins, in the sight of God. St. Matt. v. 22. Gal. v. 20. Eph. iv. 31.

Q. What are the remedies against anger, and what is the virtue opposite to it?

A. Meekness, which suppresseth in us all passion and desire of revenge: patience, which is a voluntary suffering of all injuries, hardships, miseries, troubles, labour, and poverty, for God's sake, as Christ has done. St. Pet. ii. 23. To remember the example of our blessed Saviour and his sufferings, who calls upon all his followers; learn of me, because I am meek, &c. St. Matt. xi. 29. To consider the evil effects, as quarrelling, fighting, murder. Resisting the first attack; silence, which will pacify our neighbour; the obligation of brotherly love; to consider and do all things rationally and discreetly with the eyes and light of faith; and to beg earnestly the grace of God so to do. 2 Cor. iv. 17. St. James i. 17.

Q. What is sloth?

A. It is an unwillingness, or laziness of the mind to perform those duties which are required to save man's soul.

Q. When is a person guilty of sloth?

A. First, when he does not take proper care of his own serious affairs. 1 Thess. iv. 11. 1 Cor. xiv. 38. Secondly, when he does not take pains to know the things which every christian is obliged to know; or when he acts, not according to his knowledge, nor reaps any profit from it. Thirdly, when he neglects the obligations of his state and calling, and is given to idleness, &c. 1 Tim. v. 13.

Fourthly, when he spends his time in insignificant and frivolous affairs: such as unprofitable discourse, visits, plays, &c. Fifthly, when he neglects the service of God, and uses no diligence to overcome his failings, or to advance in virtue.

Q. Is sloth a great sin?

A. Yes, certainly it is a deadly sin; for our Saviour assures us, "That every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, shall be cut down and shall be cast into the fire." St. Matt. vii. 19. And again, cast, says he, the unprofitable servant into the exterior darkness, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Matt. xxv. 30. Hence an idle life is quite contrary to the gospel, which prescribes a watchful, laborious, and penitential life; it requires self-denial, forsaking the world, crucifying the flesh, abounding in every good work, the working our salvation with fear and trembling. Phil. ii. 12. Not to be weary in doing good; (Gal. vi. 9.) to walk circumspectly; to understand what is the will of God; to redeem time: to walk worthy of our vocation. Eph. v. 16. Wherein is sufficiently condemned an idle life, which exposes persons to many temptations and dangers, and brings them under the guilt of many sins, and the neglect of the greatest duties, in making this life a sacrifice to self-love, in wasting their time, their money, &c. For all which they stand accountable to Almighty God, and so should fly idleness, as the broad and large way that leads to perdition.

Q. Which are the effects of sloth?

A. Tepidity, which is a coldness in devotion: pusillanimity, which is a cowardice to undertake what a person has in his power, or is able to perform: aversion, for spiritual things: weariness of life: distrust of God's mercy: inconstancy, or a want of resolution to prosecute every christian duty.

Q. Which are the remedies against sloth; and by what virtues it is overcome?

A. To consider the labours of Jesus Christ, of his apostles, martyrs, confessors, virgins, &c. To consider the easiness of spiritual duties, and with what diligence men labour for temporal advantages. That every one is to account for the time he loses. That heaven is only bestowed upon labourers. To pass no day without doing some good action. To call to mind frequently the words of the pro-

phet Jeremiah, chap. xlvi. 10. Cursed is he who does the work of God negligently. Now the chief virtues that are opposite to sloth, is diligence, which makes us careful and zealous in performing our duties both to God and man; as also devotion, which is a sincere endeavour, and pious zeal for the service of God, and for every thing that regards our duty and calling. St. Mark xiii. 33.

THE THREE THEOLOGICAL VIRTUES EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHICH are the three theological virtues, and why are they so called?

A. Faith, hope, and charity; and they are called theological, because they regard God as their immediate object. 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

Q. What is faith?

A. It is a supernatural light, or divine virtue, infused by God into the soul, whereby we firmly believe and assent to all things that are revealed by God, and proposed by his church.

Q. Is faith a gift of God?

A. Yes; as it is defined against the Pelagians, and even without charity, as the Council of Trent has defined against the Calvinists. Phil. i. 28, 29.

Q. Is faith necessary to salvation?

A. Yes it is, as St. Paul assures us, where he says, that without faith it is impossible to please God. Heb. xi. 6. And St. Mark says, he who believes not shall be condemned. However, it does not follow from hence, that faith alone will save a man without good works, as Luther, and other heretics have taught. See Luther, i. 1. Vit. prop. 15, 18, f. 52. Serm. de Ind. 65. See Boss. Variat. tom. i. l. 1. p. 3, 9. For the fathers by their lives and writings; councils by their decrees; pastors by their preaching and exhorting, to do good and to avoid evil; to keep God's commandments, &c. universally shew, as the scripture does in several places, that faith alone without good works, will never save a man. "If I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing," says St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. And St. James declares, that "faith without works is dead." Chap. ii. 26. And our Saviour says, "if thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." St. Matt. xix. 17. All which is

more than sufficient to prove, that faith alone will save no man.

Q. What is the formal object or motive into which faith is resolved ?

A. The authority of God revealing who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Heb. vi. 18.

Q. Is not faith resolved into reason, human authority, miracles, &c. ?

A. No ; these are only the motives of credibility, which induce and dispose the mind to believe.

Q. Which are the properties of faith ?

A. It is so certain, as to exclude all doubting ; it requires a pious affection of the will ; it extends to every thing that is revealed, either explicitly or implicitly ; so that not to believe all articles, is at least, an imperfect faith, or rather human faith. Heb. xi. 1.

Q. What is the material object of faith ?

A. Every thing that is revealed, viz. the word of God, written or unwritten.

Q. Is it not sufficient to believe all that is written in the bible ?

A. No, it is not ; for we must believe all Apostolical traditions, as St. Paul declares ; “ therefore, brethren, says he, stand fast ; and hold the traditions which you have learnt, whether by word, or by our epistle.” 2 Thess. ii. 14.

Q. From whom do we receive the word of God, and the meaning of it ?

A. From the Catholic Church.

Q. How is faith divided ?

A. Into human and divine, actual and habitual, internal and external, living and dead, explicit and implicit.

Q. How do you explain these branches ?

A. Human faith depends upon the information of man. Divine faith, upon the information of God, proposed by motives of credibility. Habitual faith, is the gift of faith, infused by God, and inherent in the soul. Actual faith, is the actual assent we give to what God has revealed. Internal faith, is the inward assent given by the intellect. External faith, is the outward profession by words or signs. Living faith, is joined with charity, or the love of God, as in the just. Dead faith, is that which is void of charity, as in the wicked. Hence the council of Trent has defined, that true faith is separable from charity ; yet it may be lost

by its opposite vice, viz. infidelity. Explicit faith, is when an article is believed explicitly, distinctly, and in distinct terms, as the Trinity. Implicit faith, is when we believe in general, every thing that is revealed, and proposed by the church, or when we believe an article not in express terms, but by believing an article wherein it is contained; as he who expressly believes the Trinity, believes implicitly, that the second and third person are consubstantial with the Father: again, he who explicitly believes the incarnation, implicitly believes Christ to have a human soul, body, and will.

Q. When does an external act, or public profession of faith oblige?

A. As often as God's honour, or the good of our neighbour requires it. Acts iv. 20. Hence, no one is to deny his faith; for our Saviour says, "he that shall deny me before men, I will also deny him before my Father, who is in heaven." St. Matt. x. 33. Again, an internal act of faith obliges when baptism is received by adult persons; as also when we have a temptation against faith, or when we receive any of the sacraments, or when we are in danger of death, &c.

Q. Which are the vices opposite to faith?

A. Infidelity, apostasy, heresy. Infidelity, is either positive, that is, when a person has faith sufficiently proposed, or negative, that is, when faith is not sufficiently proposed. The first is sinful, the latter innocent. Apostasy, is either total, as when Christ and his doctrine is denied, as in Jews, Turks, and Atheists; or partial, as when some particular articles are rejected. Heresy, is an obstinate error of those who are baptized, against some particular articles which are of faith; so that it is to be observed, that if a person should deny or obstinately doubt of only one point of faith, he would thereby lose his whole faith; and the reason is, because true faith must always be entire, and he who fails only in one article is made guilty of all, by disbelieving the authority of God, upon which all are equally grounded.

Q. What is schism, and does it destroy faith?

A. It is a sin of disobedience against charity, and separation from the church, and is often joined with heresy.

Q. Is blasphemy against faith?

A. It is a sin opposite to the profession of faith; as

being an injurious speech, or thought against God, or holy things, which either attributes to God what does not belong to him, or denies what does belong to him; or gives to creatures what belongs to God.

Q. What is hope?

A. It is a gift of God, or divine virtue, whereby we certainly and confidently expect life everlasting, through Christ's merits, applied by our endeavours as the means. Rom. viii. 24, 25.

Q. On what is our confidence or hope grounded?

A. Upon the promises of God, who affirmed, that he would give eternal happiness to such as fulfil his law or commandments. Heb. vi. 18, 19. 1 John iii. 21. Secondly, on the superabundant merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, whereby God gives us his grace in this world, and promises us his kingdom and everlasting bliss in the world to come. St. John x. 10. Rom. v. 10.

Q. What are properties of hope?

A. It supposes faith. It is founded on moral certainty, excluding unreasonable solicitude; not in an infallible certainty, as the Calvinists pretend. It excludes not fear, but this fear must not be a worldly fear, which is an apprehension of worldly pain only, but a servile fear of eternal punishment; which is good as excluding the will of offending; but most especially the fear attending hope, is a filial fear, which is a fear of offending God.

Q. What is the object of hope?

A. The primary object of hope is life everlasting. The secondary object are the means of obtaining it, as grace, perseverance, and good works, proceeding from grace. Hence, the Quietists are condemned, who pretend that perfection consists in hoping for nothing, not even life everlasting.

Q. When are we obliged to make acts of hope?

A. When we come to the use of reason, and begin to know that God is our last end, for which he created us; being then obliged to hope for eternal salvation, and means to arrive thereto; also, when we are obliged to pray, to do acts of penance, or beg any thing necessary for our salvation, we must hope God will not be wanting on his side, if we do as we ought: blessed is the man, whose trust is in the name of the Lord, and who hath not had regard to vanities. Ps. xxxix. 5.

Q. What sins are opposite to hope?

A. First, despair by defect, when a person has a diffidence, that God will not save him, or provide him with the means, which he therefore neglects. St. Matt. xxvii. 5. Eph. iv. 19. Gen. iv. 13. Secondly, presumption, by relying wholly on God's mercy, without the means of good works. Rom. ii. 4, 5. These sins are sometimes joined with heresy, when a person believes that God cannot, or will not, pardon his sins.

Q. Can there be true hope without charity?

A. Yes; as there is true faith without charity, but then it is a weak and imperfect hope.

Q. What is charity?

A. It is a divine virtue, or gift of God, whereby we love God above all things, for himself; and our neighbour as ourselves for God's sake, as he requires, (St. Aug. l. 3, de Doct. Christ. chap. x. n. 16.) Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind, &c. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. St. Matt. xxii. 37, &c. God is charity, says St. John, and he that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him. 1 John iv. 16.

Q. What is it to love God above all things?

A. It is to prefer him, his divine will, and commands, before all things, purely for his sake, so as to be willing to lose all things, even life itself, rather than the grace or love of God by mortal sin. "If any one love me, he will keep my words." St. John xiv. 23. And again, "this is the charity of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John v. 3. He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me, (Matt. x. 37,) says our Saviour Christ. All transitory happiness is infinitely below the end for which God made us, and therefore, is as much below our love; God having made us for himself, nothing but God can make us happy; the love of the world ever leaves us worse than it found us, it fills us with a thousand disquiets and solitudes; the love of God is the only happy love; when once we come to taste how sweet it is to love God, the soul is charmed therewith, it despises all other things, as rivals infinitely below him; the more we love God, more still we shall discover in him perfections inviting us to love him: nor we cannot pretend to love God with our whole heart, soul, mind, and strength, as he re-

quires, if we prefer our life, liberty, riches, pleasures, or any created thing whatever before him; we must choose rather to lose all than him, who most, and only deserves our love. He is our Father, Creator, Conserver, Redeemer, &c. Ought we not then to give him our hearts, our souls, and all? Son, give me thy heart. Prov. xxiii. 26. And St. Paul says, If any man love not our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema. 1 Cor. xvi. 22. Set your affections on the things that are above, and not on the things that are upon the earth, (Col. iii. 2,) which never make any one happy, nor can be able to do it.

Q. What is it to love our neighbour as ourselves? who is our neighbour? and in what order is charity to proceed?

A. To wish him as much good, for body and soul as to ourselves; to do him no wrong, by thought, word, or deed; to be ready to do him good, and hinder any harm we can from befalling him, either in respect of soul or body, chiefly for the love of God, and to love him as ourselves, that is, as well as ourselves, not by equality, but by likeness: for as our Saviour says, All things whatsoever you would that men do to you, do you also to them. St. Matt. vii. 12. And again, This is my command, that you love one another, as I have loved you. St. John xv. 12. By this all men shall know that you are my disciples, if you love one another. John xiii. 35. Above all things, have mutual charity among yourselves, (1 Pet. iv. 8.) which surely they want, who, either upon account of religion, or any other pretence, hate their neighbour. Now our neighbours are all mankind, even our enemies, whom we are bound to love, according to that of our Saviour, I say to you, love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you." St. Matt. v. 44. The order of charity is this; First, love God. Secondly, our own souls. Thirdly, our neighbour's souls. Fourthly, our own life and body. Fifthly, the life and body of our neighbour. Sixthly, our own fame and temporal goods. Seventhly, the fame and temporal goods of our neighbour. Then in necessity, relations, carnal, spiritual, and civil, are to be preferred to others.

Q. What are the chief qualities of charity?

A. To esteem, love, praise, and obey God above all things, so that it is the greatest, or strongest affection of the soul, so as to prefer his honour, good, and will, to our

own, or any others. Again, charity loves God upon his own account, and for his own great perfections, because it is a love of perfect friendship, which immediately regards the good of the object that is loved, and not barely a love of concupiscence, which regards the good of the lover, which is only the secondary object of charity; so that charity has two arms, one regards God immediately, the other ourselves, which is likewise loving God, because it is obeying God's will to love, or wish the greatest good to ourselves. Hence, the Quietists are condemned, who pretend that true charity excludes the secondary object, and ought to make us indifferent to our own chiefest good, and exclude all other motives, even salvation, which they take to be a mercenary motive. Charity indeed, as St. Paul says, seeks not its own interest. 1 Cor. xiii. 5. But this is to be understood either with regard to temporal goods, or with regard to the primary object, but not exclusively of it. The scripture every where recommending God to be loved and served as our reward.

Q. Is charity necessary to salvation?

A. Yes, most certainly; for our Saviour says, he that loveth not, abideth in death. 1 John iii. 14. And St. Paul says, that if we distribute all our goods to feed the poor, and deliver up our bodies to be burnt, and have not charity, it profiteth us nothing. 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

Q. Who are they who have true charity?

A. They only who are so affected, as would rather die, and lose all that is most dear to them, than break any of God's commandments; this is the love of God, (says St. John,) that we keep his commandments. 1 John v. 3. O that all could truly say with the Apostle, who shall separate us from the love of Christ, &c. Rom. viii. 25. But alas! all seek the things that are their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's. Phil. ii. 21.

Q. What are the effects of perfect charity, and how is charity lost?

A. It remits sins; charity, says St. James, covers a multitude of sins. Chap. v. 20. It gives spiritual life to the soul; we know, says St. John, that we are translated from death to life, because we love the brethren. 1 John iii. 14. It renders man acceptable to God, for he that abides in love, abides in God, and God in him. 1 John iv. 16. Charity is lost by breaking any of God's com-

mandments in any weighty matter. If you love me, keep my commandments. St. John xiv. 14.

Q. Which are the acts of charity?

A. Some are interior, viz. a love towards the object, to wish it all good. Joy, when good happens to it. Peace, by labouring to procure, and join in doing good. Compassion, by being moved with its evil, as if it were our own. Other acts are exterior, viz. not only acts of benevolence, but of beneficence, viz. actually to assist in procuring his good, both spiritual by prayer, good example, instruction, &c.; as also the good of his body by alms, &c.

Q. What is alms?

A. It is an act of mercy, or compassion, whereby, for the love of God, we relieve our neighbour in all his wants, both corporal and spiritual.

Q. Which are the corporal alms, or works of mercy?

A. These seven: 1. To feed the hungry. 2. To give drink to the thirsty. 3. To clothe the naked. St. Matt. xxv. 35, 36. 4. To harbour the poor with lodging. 5. To visit the sick and imprisoned. 6. To redeem the captives, and pay the debts of others. 7. To bury the dead.

Q. Which are the spiritual alms, or works of mercy, and how many?

A. Seven, viz. 1. To give good advice or counsel to the doubtful. Job xxix. 21. 2. To correct or admonish those who do amiss. Gal. vi. 1. 3. To instruct the ignorant. Prov. xiv. 33. 4. To comfort the afflicted. Rom. xii. 17. 5. To forgive injuries and offences. 2 Cor. i. 4. 6. To bear patiently persons' ill humours. James v. 16. 7. To pray for the living and the dead, and for our persecutors. Matt. v. 44.

Q. When is it that a work of mercy is most meritorious?

A. When it is really done for God's sake, and applied to the person that stands most in need of it.

Q. What are the offences we ought to forgive?

A. All offences and injuries, let them be ever so great, or many. St. Matt. xviii. 21, 22.

Q. What is the reward of the works of mercy?

A. Mercy from God in this life, and the kingdom of heaven in the next.

Q. What shall be the lot of those who are hard-hearted to the poor?

A. God himself affirms, that judgment without mercy,

and the everlasting fire of hell, are allotted to those who shew no mercy to persons in distress. St. Matt. xxv. 41, &c.

Q. What sins are opposite to charity?

A. In the first place, every mortal sin, but not venial sins, which only lessen the fervour of charitable acts, and by breeding evil habits, dispose towards mortal sins. Also hatred of our neighbour, envy, discord, schism, fighting, duelling, unjust war, unmercifulness, and scandal, are all opposite to charity.

Q. What are scandal, and how many sorts of scandal are there?

A. Scandal, if we search the etymology and derivation of the word, signifies something laid out in our way, which is apt to make us fall; and so it is taken for the same as a stumbling-block; and in this sense the Psalmist says, they have laid me for a scandal or stumbling-block by the way side. Psal. cxxxix. 6. From this literal signification, scandal, by a metaphor, is taken to signify any thing that is the cause or occasion of another's falling into sin: And accordingly, scandal, by St. Thomas, the doctor of the schools, is said to consist in words or actions which are evil, and which occasion the spiritual ruin of another person's soul. Scandal, therefore, is a sin of bad example, which is apt to draw or induce other persons into sin, whether it be by words, actions, or omissions. Now there are several sorts of scandal, viz. direct, with an intention; or indirect, as bad example. Active, which is the scandalous action. Passive, which is the spiritual loss, or ruin.

Q. By how many ways may men scandalize, or concur to the spiritual ruin of their neighbour?

A. Six ways directly, viz. by command, and advice, by consent, by provoking, by praising, by concurring. Prov. xvii. 15. Three ways indirectly, viz. by silence, by not hindering, and by not discovering.

THE FOUR CARDINAL VIRTUES EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHICH are the four cardinal virtues, and why so called?

A. Prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance. Sap. viii. 7. They are called cardinal metaphorically, from the latin word *cardo*, which signifies a hinge; as being the hinges, or general rules, in the practice of all other moral

virtues ; and second in dignity to the theological virtues.

Q. What is prudence ?

A. It is a moral virtue which makes us wary in all our actions, that we may neither deceive others, nor be deceived ourselves, or which suggests to us what things are to be embraced, and what avoided, with regard always to God's commands ; and that we do all things, in their proper time and manner. St. Matt. x. 16. Eccl. iii. 32.

Q. What are the functions of prudence ?

A. Three, viz. previous consultations, sound judging, and execution.

Q. How are these functions to be performed ?

A. Eight ways, to consider things past. To attend to what is present : by providing against what may happen hereafter : by reasoning upon every point : by docility, or a promptitude to be informed : by sagacity, or quickness in taking, or judging : by industry, or quick execution in applying the means : by circumspection, in reflecting upon circumstances : by caution, in providing against evil events.

Q. Which are the defects of prudence ?

A. Precipitation, to engage without due reflection. Inconsideration, the want of attention, before the choice of means. Negligence or omission in the execution after a prudent choice.

Q. Which are the excesses in prudence ?

A. Carnal prudence, or diligence in seeking to please corrupt nature. Craft, a subtle and clandestine way of managing, which in fact is called deceit or tricking, cunning, or cheating, called *frans*. Solitude, an anxious care in obtaining or conserving worldly goods, or diffidence in providence, for fear of wanting hereafter.

Q. What is justice ?

A. It is a moral virtue, which inclines the will, to give every man his due as God requires. Rom. xiii. 7.

Q. In what is justice grounded ?

A. In dominion, in birth right, in contract, in gifts, in promises, &c.

Q. What vices are opposite to justice ?

A. Usurpation, theft, rapine, detraction, usury, acceptance of persons, &c.

A. Among what persons, and by what actions are injustices commonly committed ?

A. In purchases, in buying, selling, the price of goods : by judges, witnesses, last wills and testaments ; by servants, detractors, &c.

Q. What obligation arises from injustice ?

A. Restitution either in kind, or equivalent ; let it be goods or reputation.

Q. What is fortitude ?

A. It is a moral virtue, which gives us courage to endure all hardships, dangers, and even death itself, for our faith and the service of God. Prov. xxviii. 1. 1 Pet. v. 14, 15. St. Matt. x. 28.

Q. When is it chiefly practised ?

A. In bearing afflictions, whether providential, or maliciously designed, viz. heat, cold, poverty, imprisonment, danger of death, in time of battle, wounds, pains of the body, or mind, death or martyrdom.

Q. Which are the qualities of fortitude ?

A. Patience, not to repine at hardships, longanimity, not to complain of the dilatoriness of assistance.

Q. Which are the defects of fortitude ?

A. Cowardice, to want boldness in dangers, that are according to reason.

Q. What are the excesses of fortitude ?

A. To be rash and expose one's self to danger, contrary to reason, as in duelling, &c.

Q. What is temperance ?

A. It is a moral virtue, moderating man's affections or appetites in tasting, and touching, that is, eating and drinking according to right reason. Eccl. xxxvii. 34. 1 Thess. v. 21. 1 Pet. ii. 11.

Q. Which are the chief branches belonging to temperance ?

A. Abstinence, which moderates the use of eatables, and sobriety, which moderates the use of drink.

Q. Which are the opposite vices to temperance ?

A. Excess, as drunkenness, gluttony, and indecency.

Q. Is it necessary for a christian to be exercised in these virtues ?

A. Yes, it is ; for we must not only decline from evil, but do good. Psal. xxxvi. 27.

Q. What are the other virtues which our Saviour chiefly requires of us to pursue ?

A. Humility, patience, meekness, chastity, and vigilance. St. Matt. xi. 24. St. Mark xiii. 33, 34, 35, &c. Luke xxi. 19. Matt. v. 28.

RELIGION EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is religion ?

A. It is the worship we pay to God as the supreme being.

Q. How many sorts of worship are there ?

A. Several, viz. supreme, inferior, hyperdulia, religious and civil, absolute and relative.

Q. How do you explain these several kinds ?

A. Worship is paid to things upon account of their excellency. Supreme worship, is paid to God only, and it is called *Latria*. Inferior worship, is paid to Saints and holy things, and it is called *Dulia*. *Hyperdulia*, is paid on account of some singular excellency communicated only to one, as to the blessed Virgin Mary. Religious worship, is on account of some supernatural excellency. Civil worship, is on account of some natural or acquired excellency. Absolute worship, is on account of some inherent excellency. Relative worship, is on account of some relation it has to inherent excellency.

Q. Is the cross of Christ, and other instruments, the object of supreme worship ?

A. No, they are not.

Q. Which are the proper acts of religion ?

A. Interior and exterior. Devotion or a promptitude of the soul to worship God. Prayer, which is raising the mind to God, by meditation, or petitioning for what we want, viz. absolutely, grace and heaven ; conditionally, all things that conduce that way ; also praise and thanksgiving are parts of prayer. Prayer, is mental or vocal, public or private, in set form or extemporaneous, with attention or pharisaical ; actual attention is either to the words, or to God and pious objects ; an habitual intention is not sufficient.

Q. Which are the outward acts of religion ?

A. External worship ; by genuflexion, crossing, kneeling, uncovering, knocking the breast, incense, prostration, oblations, sacrifice, erecting altars, dedicating churches, vows, oaths, &c.

Q. Are all outward acts of religion indifferent, to signify supreme honour ?

A. All excepting altars, sacrifice and churches, which are all offered to God alone : as for other acts they are determined by the intention.

Q. Is God worshipped by counsel, or particular works not commanded ?

A. Yes, by vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience.

Q. Which are the vices directly opposite to religion ?

A. Superstition, to adore God by false ways, or expect supernatural effects, from improper causes ; also Idolatry, Judaism, Mahometanism, heresy, divination, conjuration, perjury, blasphemy, sacrilege, &c.

LAWS EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT are the laws ?

A. They are the ordinances and commandments of superior power, as rules to know what is to be performed and what avoided.

Q. How are the laws distinguished ?

A. Eternal and temporary, divine and human, natural and positive, old and new, ecclesiastical and civil, &c.

Q. Explain the nature of these laws ?

A. Eternal, is the divine will, in order to make our will conformable to his. The law of nature, is the impression made by nature, informing us of truth and falsehood, right and wrong ; whereby we first know general principles, both speculative and practical, viz. that something is certain, as for example our own existence, that the same thing cannot be, and not be at the same time ; Good is to be done, evil avoided ; do as you would be done by. The secondary principles are contained in the decalogue, or ten commandments, and regard God, our neighbour, and ourselves. The third are drawn from the former. Conscience, is an inward persuasion, that this or that particular action is good or bad : now conscience is sometimes rightly informed, other times erroneous, probable, scrupulous, doubtful or opinionative. God's positive law, is what is written in the old or new scriptures, or known by tradition. The old law, is what was delivered by Moses, either moral, judicial, or ceremonial. The new law are the writings and traditions of Christ and the Evangelists. The difference be-

tween the old and new law, is, they agree in the law of nature, and all moral laws: they differ in the judical and ceremonial part. The old law chiefly regarded temporal felicity, the new law, future happiness; the old law was the figure, the new law the substance. Human laws are given by men, and must proceed from a lawful power, they must be for the public good, and be promulgated. Ecclesiastical laws regard the good of the soul, civil laws regard life, liberty and property; both equally binding in conscience,

SCRIPTURE, TRADITION, COUNCILS, AND HEAD OF
THE CHURCH EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is the Scripture?

A. It is the word of God, written by persons inspired by God himself, to speak the truth: and it is divided into the old and new testament, which are called canonical books.

Q. Why are they called canonical?

A. They are so called from the Greek word canon, which signifies a rule; therefore we call them canonical books, that is to say, books which contain the rule of our faith.

Q. How many canonical books are there?

A. There are many, which are divided into five sorts, viz. legal, historical, sapiential, prophetic, and doctrinal. The legal books of the old testament are the five books of Moses, viz. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. The historical books are, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, the two first is called by some the books of Paralipomenon, or Chronicles; the two books of Esdras; the books of Nehemiah, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, and two books of the Macchabees. The sapiential books are those of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, or song of Solomon, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus. The prophetic books are the Psalms of David, (which are also sapiential, legal and historical) the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, with Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve lesser Prophets, viz. Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obediah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zachariah, and Malachi. The doctrinal chiefly regards those of the new testament, which are the four gospels of St. Matthew,

Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles; the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, viz. his Epistle to the Romans, his two Epistles to the Corinthians, his Epistle to the Galatians; to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, his two Epistles to the Thessalonians, and his two Epistles to Timothy; his Epistle to Titus, to Philemon, and to the Hebrews; the Epistle of St. James; the two Epistles of St. Peter; the three Epistles of St. John; the Epistle of St. Jude; and the Apocalypse, or Revelation of St. John. All these books are undoubtedly canonical, as being received and declared as such by the Catholic church. See the council of Laodicea, &c.* And consequently all and every part thereof are infallibly true; for otherwise as St. Augustin says, if any part was false or doubtful, all would be uncertain. However certain it is that some books are doubted of by the Catholic church, which we call apochryphal, that is to say, hidden, or not certainly known, as not being so evident whether they were divine scripture, because they were not in the Jews canon, nor at first in the churches canon, but were never rejected as false or erroneous; in which sense are the Prayer of Manasses, the third book of Esdras, and the third of the Macehabees. As for the fourth of Esdras, and fourth of Macchabees, there is more doubt. But as to the book ascribed to Enoch, the gospel of St. Andrew, St. Thomas, St. Bartholomew, and the like mentioned by St. Jerome, and St. Augustin,† they are in a worse sense called apochryphal, and are rejected as containing manifest errors.

Q. How do you know for certain which books are divine and canonical scripture, and which not?

A. By the testimony of the Catholic church, which without interruption succeed the apostles, and with whom our Saviour has promised to abide and teach all truth to the end of the world.

Q. You tell me the scripture is the infallible word of God; why then does your church forbid the faithful to

* Conc. Laod. Can. 60. et Conc. Cartha. 3. chap. 47. An. 397. et Cone. Trid. Sess. iv. An. 1546. et St. Atha. in Synop. St. Aug. L. 2. de Doct. Chris. C. 8. n. 12, &c.

† St. Jer. Ep. ad Letam, St. Aug. L. 15. C. 23. de civ. Dei.

read it, since nothing can be more clear and easy to be understood in all things necessary to salvation; this has an ill aspect, and looks as though it was with design to keep the people in ignorance?

A. You seem to mistake the case: the Catholic church never forbid her children the reading of the holy scriptures, on the contrary, she always did and does teach that the reading of the holy scriptures (provided it be with an humble and reverent mind, and with submission to the interpretation of the church, from whom we received them) is a good and laudable practice, and ought to be the daily exercise of every Christian. Now all the restraint there ever was, and even that not general, was by the fourth rule of the index of Pope Pius the Fourth, (Index in the council of Trent,) and this only relates to the reading of the scripture in the vulgar languages, by which he remits the people to their pastors and confessors, as the most proper judges of their capacities, and the disposition of their souls: the reason of this restraint was, in order to arm the people against the danger of novelty and error; which would necessarily follow, if every cobbler and tinker was allowed to interpret the scripture according to their silly fancies; since St. Peter assures us, that in St. Paul's epistles there are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable, wrest, as they do also the other scriptures to their own destruction. 2 Pet. iii. 16. Hence it follows that the scriptures are not so clear and plain as you pretend they are in all points that concern our salvation, otherwise it would not be truly said, that they wrest the scriptures to their own destruction. As to what our adversaries allege against us, that the true reason of not putting the scripture into the hands of every one, is to keep the common people from discovering the errors and follies of their religion. Nothing can be more abused than this: because, if there were any grounds to fear the making any such discovery, I ask, whether of the two would be best able to do it, the learned or unlearned? surely the learned; yet these are all allowed to read the scriptures, and are not clear-sighted enough to make this discovery. A man must be strangely blinded with prejudice not to see the absurdity of this calumny.

Q. Why may not every particular Christian have liberty

to interpret the scripture according to his own private judgment, without regard to the interpretation of the church ?

A. The reason is, first, because St. Peter declares that no prophecy of the scripture is of private interpretation. 2 Pet. i. 20. Secondly, because as men's judgments are as different as their fancies, such liberty as this must needs produce almost as many religions as there are men. Thirdly, because Christ has left his church, and her pastors and teachers to be our guides in all controversies relating to religion, and consequently in the understanding of holy writ. He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints; for the work of the mystery, for edifying of the body of Christ, until we all come in the unity of the faith; that we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive, &c. Eph. iv. 11, 12, &c. Lastly, Protestants themselves confess, that as the scriptures were not written without the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, so neither can they be rightly interpreted without the gift of the Holy Ghost; now this gift is not given to every one. For the one is given by the spirit, the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another prophecy, &c. 1 Cor. xii. 8. From whence we may conclude, that the gift of interpreting scripture is not a gift of every one, but chiefly as we may reasonably suppose, for such as God has given, apostles, pastors and doctors to his church. As to reformers in particular, it does not appear that they have hitherto been endowed with any other gift but that of contradicting each other's interpretation throughout all the reformed churches. Witness the Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Independents, Arians, Socinians, &c. The Lutherans say, that the scripture teaches them to hold the real presence; the Calvinists say, that it teaches them to deny it; those of the church of England say, that the scripture teaches them to baptize infants; the Anabaptists say, that it teaches them to condemn it; the Arians and Socinians say, that the scripture teaches them that Christ is a creature; and other Protestants say, that it teaches them to believe that he is the eternal Creator of all things. Now no one will say that this is the

gift of the Holy Ghost. So that Protestants themselves on the one hand confessing that the scriptures cannot be rightly interpreted without the gift of the Holy Ghost; and it being evident on the other hand that Protestant churches, from their contradicting one another, have not that gift, we therefore conclude that they have not a right to judge of the sense of scripture, and expound it for themselves. Besides, if the very disciples of Christ could not understand the scriptures, without an interpreter, as we find by St. Luke they could not; xxiv. xxvii. et liv. Can it be then supposed that every private man and woman among Protestants are better enlightened than they were? if the apostles themselves did not understand the holy scriptures, till our Saviour opened their understanding. St. Luke xxiv. 45. Let this at least teach reformers that natural talents alone are not sufficient for expounding scripture, unless their understanding be by our Saviour Christ in like manner opened.

Q. Are not all necessary points of doctrine contained in the holy scripture? and is not the scripture the sole rule of faith?

A. No; for we find that St. Paul taught many things to his flock at Thessalonica and Corinth, by word of mouth, which are not in his epistles, and yet nevertheless enjoins them to believe, as being of equal authority with what he had written. We command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not according to the tradition he received of us. 2 Thess. iii. 6. And again, I pray you, brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep my ordinances, as I have delivered them to you. 1 Cor. xi. 2. St. John likewise assures us, that all our Saviour did and taught for the salvation of mankind, is not written. John xxi. 25. In short, this doctrine implies a contradiction; for if nothing is to be believed with divine faith, but what is clearly contained in the scripture, then this very doctrine which our adversaries thus boldly affirm, is not to be believed, because it is no where to be found in the scripture; for where is it written in the holy scripture, that the apostles were commanded by our Saviour Christ to write all that he and themselves had taught? In a word, will the church of England say that the following articles are not to be believed, viz. That

the virgin Mary was always a virgin ; that the sabbath was by divine authority translated to the Sunday ; that the Christian passover, or Easter, is always to be celebrated on a Sunday ; that infants are to be baptized : that the baptism of heretics is valid ; and that the apostles' creed is of divine authority ? Yet certainly these articles are not clearly contained in the holy scripture, but Protestants receive them from the tradition of the church of Rome. Therefore it is plain, that all necessary points of doctrine are not contained in the holy scripture. Now from what has been said, it follows to a demonstration, that the scripture alone, without the tradition of the apostles, and interpretation of the Catholic church, cannot be the sole rule of faith ; because, as I have already proved, there are many things that are necessary to be believed, which are not contained in the scripture : besides, we do not find that there is one text in the whole scripture that clearly and expressly affirms, that the scripture alone is the whole and sole rule of faith. Again, the scripture alone cannot be the sole rule of faith, because one great article of the Christian faith, is to believe that these books are divine scripture : now this we could never have known, but by the tradition and declaration of the Catholic church ; for the scripture itself no where gives us a catalogue of the canonical books : it no where affirms, that all and every one of these books which are contained in the Protestant bible or testament, are the infallible word of God. Our adversaries, therefore, are very unhappy in their choice of a rule of faith, which is not only without any foundation from the scripture, but even excludes the scripture from being any part of their faith, as not coming under their only rule, by which they pretend to steer in matters of faith.

Q. What is tradition ?

A. All such points of faith, or church discipline, which are not clearly, or not at all expressed in the scripture, but were taught or established by the apostles, and have carefully been preserved in the church ever since.

Q. How many sorts of tradition are there ?

A. Chiefly two, viz. apostolical, and ecclesiastical ; the apostolical are those which had their origin, or instituted from the apostles : such as the number of the sacraments ; the apostles' creed ; infant's baptism ; the Lord's day ; re-

ceiving the blessed sacrament, fasting ; mixing water with wine in the eucharist ; and making the sign of the cross in baptism, &c. The ecclesiastical, or such as had their institution from the church ; as many ceremonies always in use time after time, such as fasts, feasts, blessing of water, candles, bread, &c.

Q. How are we to know what traditions are truly apostolical, and what not ?

A. In the same manner and by the same authority, by which we know what scriptures are apostolical, and what not ; that is, by the authority of the apostolical church, guided by the unerring spirit of God.

Q. What scripture can you bring in favour of tradition ?

A. From the 32d. chap. ver. 7, of Deuteronomy, " Ask thy father and he will shew thee, thy elders, and they will tell thee." 1 Cor. iv. 2. Psal. xviii. 5, &c. Again, out of the 2d Epistle of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, xi. 2. 2 Thess. iii. 6. " Therefore brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or epistle." 2 Tim. i. 13. et ch. ii. 2. et ch. iii. 14. ch. ii. 25.

Q. What are councils, and how many kinds ?

A. They are assemblies of the superiors of the church, to consult about faith, and other spiritual matters ; and they are either universal, national, provincial, or diocesan.

Q. Who presides over them ?

A. The Pope in an universal ; the primate in a national ; the metropolitan in a provincial ; and the bishop in a diocesan.

Q. How many general councils do you reckon, and which are they ?

A. They are commonly computed to be 20. The eight first are called the Eastern or Greek General Councils.

1. The council of Nice, held under Pope Silvester, anno 325, in which the Arian heresy was condemned.
2. The council of Constantinople, held under Pope Damascus, anno 381, against the Macedonians, Eunomians, and Apollinarists.
3. The council of Ephesus, held under Pope Celestinus I. anno 431, against the Nestorians.

4. The council of Chalcedon, held under Pope Leo I. anno 451, against the Eutychians.
5. The 2d council of Constantinople, held under Pope Vigilius, anno 553, against the Origenists.
6. The 3d council of Constantinople, held under Pope Agatho, anno 680, against the Monothelites.
7. The 2d council of Nice, held under Pope Adrian I. anno 787, against the Iconoclasts.
8. The 4th council of Constantinople, held under Pope Adrian II. anno 869, against Photius.

The Western or Latin General Councils.

9. The 1st council of Lateran, held under Pope Calixtus II. anno 1122, for the recovery of the Holy Land.
10. The 2d council of Lateran, held under Pope Innocent II. anno 1139.
11. The 3d council of Lateran, held under Pope Alexander III. anno 1179, against the Albigenses, who maintained the errors of the Manichæans.
12. The 4th council of Lateran, held under Pope Innocent III. anno 1215, against the Waldenses and Albigenses.
13. The first council of Lyons, held under Pope Innocent IV. anno 1245, for the recovery of the Holy Land.
14. The 2d council of Lyons, held under Pope Gregory X. anno 1274, in which the Greeks renounced their schism, but relapsed soon after.
15. The council of Vienna, held under Pope Clement V. anno 1311, against the Dulcinians and Beguards, as also for the recovery of all the Holy Land.
16. The council of Pisa, called in the time of Gregory XII. anno 1409, which put a stop to the schism, and deposed both the contending pontiffs, viz. Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. and chose Alexander V. by whom this council was approved.
17. The council of Constance, held under Pope John XXIII. anno 1414, which broke the neck of the long schism, and condemned the errors of Wickliff and Huss.
18. The council of Florence, held under Pope Eugenius IV. anno 1439, in which the Greeks renounced their schism.

19. The 5th council of Lateran, held under Pope Julius II. anno 1512, Pope Leo X. concluded it, anno 1517, for the recovery of the Holy Land. Some divines dispute whether this was a general council.
20. The council of Trent, held by Paul III. &c. anno 1545, against the errors of Luther and Calvin. Pope Pius IV. brought this council to a happy conclusion, anno 1563.

Q. Who is the Pope, and what power has he?

A. He is the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, visible head of the church, and has jurisdiction over the whole church.

Q. What is the catholic doctrine as to the Pope's supremacy?

A. It is comprised in these two articles: 1. That St. Peter, by divine commission, was head of the church under Christ. 2. That the Pope or Bishop of Rome is successor to St. Peter, is at present head of the church, and Christ's Vicar upon earth.

Q. How do you prove St. Peter's supremacy?

A. First, from the 16th chap. of St. Matt. v. 18, 19, where our Saviour says, "Thou art Peter, (that is a rock) and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be also loosed in Heaven." Secondly, from the 22d chap. of St. Luke, ver. 31, 32. The Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. Thirdly, from the 21st chap. of St. John, ver. 15, &c. Jesus said to Simon Peter, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? he saith to him, yea Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him, feed my lambs: he said to him again the second time, Simon son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him, yea Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him, feed my lambs. He said unto him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he had said to him the third time, lovest thou me? And he said to him, Lord, thou knowest all

things, thou knowest that I love thee; Jesus said to him feed my sheep. In the first of these texts our Lord promised that in the building of his Church Peter should be as a rock or foundation stone; and under the metaphor of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, ensured to him the chief authority in his church: as when a king gives the keys of a city to one of his courtiers, he thereby signifies that he gives him the government of that city. In the second text, our Lord not only declared his particular concern for Peter, in praying for him, that his faith might not fail: but also gave him the care of his brethren the other Apostles, in charging him to confirm or strengthen them. In the third text our Lord in a most solemn manner thrice committed to Peter the care of all his sheep, without exception, that is, of his whole church.

Q. How do you prove that this commission given to Peter, descends to the Pope or Bishop of Rome?

A. Because by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the tradition of the church in all ages, the Bishops of Rome are the successors of St. Peter, who translated his chair from Antioch to Rome, and died Bishop of Rome. Conc. Calced. Sess. 1, 2, 3. Hence the See of Rome, in all ages is called the See of Peter, the Chair of Peter, and absolutely the See Apostolic: and in that quality, has from the beginning, exercised jurisdiction over all other churches, as appears from the best records of ancient history. Conc. 4. Later. Can. v. Besides, supposing the supremacy of St. Peter, which we have proved above from plain scripture, it must consequently be allowed that this supremacy which Christ established for the better government of his church, and maintaining of unity, was not to die with Peter, no more than the church, which he promised should stand for ever. For how can any christian imagine that Christ should appoint a head for the government of his church, and maintaining of unity during the Apostles' time; and design another kind of government for succeeding ages, when there was like to be so much more need of a head. Therefore we must grant that St. Peter's supremacy was by succession to descend to somebody. Now, I would willingly know, who has half so fair a title to this succession as the Bishop of Rome?

THE FOUR LAST THINGS EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHICH are the four last things ?

A. Death, judgment, hell and heaven.

Q. What is death ?

A. It is a separation of the soul from the body.

Q. Which are the most useful considerations concerning death ?

A. First, that we frequently consider that we must certainly die, and, that but once. Heb. ix. 27. Secondly, that the time, place and manner of our death is uncertain. St. Matt. xxv. 13. St. Mark xiii. 35. Thirdly, that God commands us to be prepared, and always upon our guard; and assures us that death will surprise those foolish people who sleep and live in sin. St. Matt. xxiv. 44. Eccl. ix. 12. Fourthly, that generally speaking we shall die as we have lived; if we spend our life in the state of grace, we shall in all appearance die in the state of grace: or if we pass our life in the state of sin, we shall in all likelihood die in the state of sin. Prov. i. 24. Eccl. xli. 1. Rom. ii. 5, 6, 7, 8. Fifthly, that our eternal lot depends on the hour of death. Eccl. iii. 8, et c. ix. 10. Lastly, that we ought to submit to its stroke, as being the punishment of sin; for had not man sinned, he had never died, but have been translated alive to heaven.

Q. What is judgment, how many sorts, and what circumstances ?

A. It is the sentence upon men, pronounced by God. It is particular when man dies, and general at the end of the world. The circumstances are the signs that will fore-run it, viz. In the Heavens, earth, and seas: antichrist will appear, and against him, Enoch, and Elias. The world will be converted and consumed by fire. The general resurrection; and union of body and soul. The qualities of the judge, severity of the examen, in thoughts, words, and actions; and general and particular duties. The strength of the proofs, from conscience and the devil.

Q. How ought we to think of judgment ?

A. We ought, first, to consider that all our thoughts, words, actions, and omissions, since we came to the use

of reason, shall be judged. St. Matt. xii. 36. Secondly, that there can be no appeal from, nor revoking of the judgment. St. Matt. xxv. 46. Thirdly, that the law of God is the rule of our judgment, and that it will be put in execution upon the spot, without shewing us either pity or mercy. Rom. ii. 16. Heb. x. 31. Lastly, that the punishment and reward appointed for us by our judge, shall be everlasting. St. Matt. xxv. 46.

Q. What is hell?

A. A place of eternal punishment, with the pain of separation from God, and the pain of sensible torments for all eternity proportionable, as to heathens, christians, ignorance, and malice.

Q. How ought we to think of hell?

A. First, we ought to consider, that the damned shall never see the face of God. Psal. xlvi. 12. That they shall burn and be tormented both in body and soul during eternity. Apoc. xx. 10. Secondly, that they shall suffer all the evils and all the misery that can be thought of, without any comfort or rest, and that the worm of their conscience shall be gnawing and tearing them as long as God shall be God. St. Mark xi. 43, 45.

Q. What is heaven?

A. It is an eternal place of pleasures of body and mind, free from all evil, and enjoying all good, proportioned to every one's merits.

Q. How ought we to think of heaven?

A. We ought often to consider, that the blessed shall suffer no kind of evil, (Apoc. vii. 16, &c.) that they shall abound in all good things. Psal. xxxv. 9. That they shall see God and his saints face to face. 1 Cor. xiii. 12. That their bodies shall be glorious, immortal, active, vigorous, and bright. 1 Cor. xv. 42. That they shall possess everlasting joys and happiness, without any danger or apprehension of ever losing them. St. John xvi. 22. In a word, that the eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him. 1 Cor. ii. 9.

Q. Pray what do you mean by purgatory?

A. A middle state, wherein such souls are detained who depart this life in God's grace, yet not without some venial sins, or without having made such satisfaction for their sins as God's justice requires.

Q. Why do you say that those who die guilty of lesser sins go to purgatory?

A. Because such as depart this life before they have repented for those venial frailties and imperfections, (as many christians do, who either by sudden death, or otherwise, are taken out of this world before they have repented for these ordinary failings,) cannot be supposed to be condemned to the eternal torments of hell, since the sins of which they are guilty are but small, and which even God's best servants are more or less liable to. Nor can they go straight to heaven in this state, because the scripture assures us, that nothing defiled can enter there. Rev. xxi. 27.

Q. Pray tell me, upon what do you ground your belief of purgatory?

A. Upon scripture, tradition, and reason.

Q. What grounds have you for purgatory from scripture?

A. First, because the scripture in many places teaches us, that it is the fixed rule of God's justice to render to every man according to his works. See Psal. lxxii. 12. St. Matt. xvi. 27. Rom. ii. 6. Rev. xxii. 12. So that according to the works which each man has done in the time of his mortal life, and according to the state in which he is found at the moment of his departure out of this life, he shall certainly receive reward or punishment from God. Hence, it evidently follows, that as by this rule of God's justice, they that die in great and deadly sins, not cancelled by repentance, will be eternally punished in hell; so by the same rule, they who die in lesser or venial sins, will be punished some where for a time, until God's justice be satisfied, and this is what we call purgatory. Secondly, because the scripture assures us, that we are to render an account hereafter to the great judge, even for every idle word that we have spoken. Matt. xii. 36. And consequently, every idle word not cancelled here by repentance, is liable to be punished by God's justice hereafter. Now no one can think that God will condemn a soul to hell for every idle word; therefore, there must be another place of punishment for those who die guilty of those little transgressions. Thirdly, because St. Paul assures us, that every man's work shall be made manifest. 1 Cor. iii. 13, 14, 15. For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire. And the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he hath

built thereupon, (that is upon the foundation, which is Jesus Christ,) he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burnt he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved yet so as by fire. Here you see St. Paul informs us, that every man's work shall be made manifest by a fiery trial; and that they who have built upon the foundation, which is Christ, wood, hay, and stubble, (that is to say, whose works have been very imperfect and defective, though not to the degree of losing Christ,) shall suffer loss, but yet shall be saved so as by fire; that is, by a purging fire, as the fathers understand it; of which St. Augustin writes, they who have done things deserving temporal punishment, shall pass through a certain purging fire, of which the Apostle St. Paul speaks. Hom. xvi. cx l. 50. Hom. Again, on the 37th Psalm, n. 3, he says, this fire shall be more grievous than whatever man can suffer in this life. So he prays, purge me, O Lord, in this life, and render me such as may not need the mending fire, being for them that shall be saved yet so as by fire. Fourthly, because our Saviour says, that whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come. Which last words would be superfluous and absurd, if sins not forgiven in this world could never be forgiven in the world to come. Now if there may be forgiveness of sins in the world to come, there must be a purgatory, or third place, for in hell there is no forgiveness, and in heaven no sin. Besides, a middle place is also implied by the prison mentioned in St. Matthew, c. v. 26, out of which a man shall not come till he has paid the last farthing. And by the prison mentioned in St. Peter; where Christ is said by his spirit to have gone and preached to the spirits that were in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, &c. St. Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20. From this last text it appears, that at the time of our Saviour's death, there were some souls in a state of suffering (in prison) in the other world, on account of lesser sins not deserving of damnation, for certainly our Saviour would not have gone and preached to them, had they not been capable of salvation. These souls, therefore, were not in heaven, where all preaching is needless, nor in hell, where all preaching is unprofitable; but in the middle state of suffering souls they were, which is the purgatory maintained by the Catholic Church.

Q. Pray what do you say to that text of scripture, "if the tree fall to the south, or to the north, in what place soever it shall fall, there shall it be?" Eccles. xi. 3.

A. I say that it is no way evident that this text has relation to the state of the soul after death; but if it be so understood as to have relation to the soul, it makes nothing against purgatory, because it only proves what no Catholic denies, viz. that when once a soul is come to the south, or to the north, that is, to heaven or to hell, its state is unchangeable.

Q. But does not the scripture promise rest, after death, to such as die in the Lord? Rev. xiv. 13.

A. Yes, it does; but then we are to understand, that those are said to die in the Lord, who die for the Lord by martyrdom; or at least, those who at the time of their death are so happy as to have no debts nor stains to interpose between them and the Lord. As for others who die but imperfectly in the Lord, they shall rest indeed from their labours of this world; but as their works that follow them are imperfect, they must expect to receive from the Lord according to their works.

Q. Let me now hear what grounds you have for the belief of a purgatory upon tradition, or the authority of the church?

A. Because both the Jewish church, long before our Saviour's coming, and the Christian church, from the very beginning of all ages, and all nations, has offered up prayers and sacrifice for the repose,* and relief of the faithful departed, which evidently imply the belief of a purgatory, or third place: and it is as certain that the church of Christ always believed that there is a purgatory, as evident from the writings of the ancient fathers, and the express definitions of the general councils. See Tertullian, St. Cyprian, &c.

Q. What grounds have you for the belief of purgatory from reason?

* See 2 Mach. xii. Tert. 1. de Mil. Coro. c. 3. St. Cypr. Epis. lxvi. Euseb. 1. de Vit. Constan. c. 71. St. Jo. Chrys. Hom. iii. &c. Tertul. 1. 4, de Ania. c. 58, St. Cypr. Ep. iii. ad Antonin. St. Amb. in c. 3, Ep. ad Cor. St. Jer. in c. 5. Mat. St. Aug. 1. 20, de Civi. Dei. 24 et 1. 21, c. 13. Conc. Flor. Sess. Ult. Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. Can. xxx. et Sess. xxv. de ar. de Purga.

A. Because reason teaches these two things, first, that every sin, be it ever so small, is an offence to God, and consequently, deserves punishment from the justice of God; and therefore, every person who dies under the guilt of any such offence, unrepented of, must expect to be punished by the justice of God. Secondly, that there are some sins, in which a person may chance to die, that are so small, either through the levity of the matter, or for want of a full deliberation in the act, as not to deserve everlasting punishments. From whence it plainly follows, that besides the place of everlasting punishment, which we call hell, there must be also a place of temporal punishment for such as die in those lesser offences, and this we call purgatory.

Q. Do you then think that any repentance can be available after death, or that they are capable of relief in that state?

A. No repentance can be available after death; but God's justice must take place, which will render to every man according to his works: however, they are capable of relief; but not from any thing that they can do for themselves, but from the prayers, alms, and other suffrages offered to God for them by the faithful on earth, which God in his mercy is pleased to accept of, by reason of that communion which we have with them, by being fellow-members of the same body of the church, under the same head, which is Christ Jesus.

Q. How do you prove that it is lawful and profitable to pray for the dead?

A. If there be a place of temporal punishment where some souls are purged, and venial sins remitted after this life, as I have already proved there is, then that charity which obliges us to pray that the living may be saved, obliges us also to pray that the dead may be freed from their punishments. Besides, if we consult the scripture, or primitive tradition, with relation to the promise or encouragement given in favour of our prayers, we shall nowhere find the dead excepted from the benefit of them; and the perpetual practice of the church of God (which is the best interpreter of the scripture,) has from the beginning ever authorized prayer for the dead, as believing such prayer beneficial to them. See Conc. Nice. c. 65. Again, we find, that praying and making offerings for the dead

was practised by Judas Macchabees, (2 Macch. xii. 43, 44, 45,) and by the Jews before the coming of Christ, who were then the true people of God: now had this doctrine and practice of the Jews been unlawful and unprofitable, our blessed Saviour would certainly have condemned it, as he reprov'd all the evil doctrines and traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees; but we do not find that he ever spoke one word against this public practice. As to what several churchmen of the reformed church buzz so industriously from the pulpit into the people's ears, viz. that praying for the dead is only an invention to get money, it is a scandalous reflection upon Christendom, and even the primitive Christians, since it has always been the practice from the beginning, both among the Greeks and Latins, (see the translations of Mons. Du Pin, cent. 7, p. 3,) and all the ancient churches to pray for the dead, and so continues to this day. A little reflection might lead people to see, that these gentlemen have found out a much easier method to subsist by, than praying day and night, either for the living or the dead.

Q. St. John in his first Epistle, c. v. 16, says, that it is not lawful to pray for the dead, there is a sin, says he, unto death, for that I say not that any man ask?

A. What the apostle here signifies by a sin to death, is final impenitence, or a mortal sin persevered in until death, and for such a sin we are not taught to pray, but what is this to those who die guilty only of venial sins, or small failings; for such as these the apostle himself in the words immediately preceding seems to command, or at least encourages us to pray, where he says, he that knoweth that his brother committeth a sin, which is not unto death, let him ask, and life shall be given him. 1 John v. 16. Now some may object, that we pray for all who die in the communion of the Catholic church; this is very true, we do so; and the reason is, because we do not certainly know the particualar state in which each one dies; however, we are sensible that our prayers are available for those only that are in a middle state.

THE LORD'S PRAYER EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is the Lord's prayer?

A. It is a prayer made by Christ our Lord, to be said by

all Christians ; and delivered as a model, according to which all our petitions are to be drawn up. Matt. vi. 9, &c. Luke xi. 2.

Q. What are the general contents of this prayer ?

A. It mentions the good we petition for, and the evil we desire to be freed from.

Q. Which are the goods we desire, and the evils we petition to be freed from ?

A. The goods we desire are three, viz. the glory of God ; the salvation of our souls, and the obeying divine will. The evils are these four : want of necessaries, that we may be capable of honouring God, and labouring for our salvation. Secondly, to be freed from sin. Thirdly, to avoid temptations. Fourthly, to be protected in pain, and temporal calamities.

Q. Which is the preface to these seven petitions ?

A. Our Father who art in heaven.

Q. Why is this prayer addressed to God as a Father, and in what sense is he a Father ?

A. Father is the most endearing title, and rather used than King, Lord, or any other that is of a forbidding import ; for as fathers have naturally a love and tenderness for their children, so it gives the petitioner great hopes of succeeding, when he is ordered to approach the Almighty, in quality of a father. Now, God is our father on several accounts, viz. by creation, in giving us our being ; by preservation, in preserving our being ; by a providential care, in furnishing us with all things necessary and convenient for life, and often distinguishing favours of fortune, parts, &c. Again, by furnishing us with means to be happy hereafter, viz. faith, grace, and being his adopted children, of an eternal inheritance ; as also by the incarnation, by redeeming us from the slavery of sin, and the devil.

Q. Why do you say our father, rather than my father ?

A. To signify that we are all brethren of the same father, and therefore ought to love one another ; and respectively not only to pray for ourselves, but all mankind, viz. friends and enemies, and for the conversion of sinners, infidels, heretics, &c. So it is a common prayer.

Q. Why is the prayer addressed to God in heaven ?

A. Not that God is only in heaven, for he is every where ; but because heaven is the place where he resides,

with the greatest shew of majesty, and by his omnipotency, is capable of affording assistances to all petitioners.

Q. Which is the first petition?

A. Hallowed be thy name.

Q. Is not God's name always holy, and how do we petition that it may be made holy?

A. We do not petition that it may be holy in itself, it being always intrinsically so, neither can we add nor detract from the intrinsical holiness of his name. What we therefore are to petition for is, that his name may be honoured and treated with due respect, and not abused; with respect, by faith, hope, and charity; believing what he has revealed, and practising the holy things he has ordained, and not abuse his holy name by oaths, perjury, blasphemy, obscene and profane language. Rom. ii. 23, 24.

Q. Which is the second petition?

A. Thy kingdom come.

Q. Which are God's kingdoms?

A. All the temporal kingdoms of this world: the kingdom of his church; the kingdom of grace, whereby he reigns spiritually in man's soul, and the kingdom of glory in a future state.

Q. In what sense do we petition that each of these kingdoms may come?

A. We do not petition that temporal kingdoms may come, because they are come, and God actually governs all kingdoms; neither do we petition that the kingdom of the church may come, it being already established, yet we may petition for its greater extension, by adding to it all those parts of the earth which are separated from it, by infidelity or heresy. What we chiefly pray for is, that the kingdom of grace may be established in our souls, by believing and practising what he has ordered, and that by so doing, we may at last reign with him in his kingdom of glory, in a future state.

Q. Which is the third petition?

A. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Q. What is it to do the will of God?

A. It is to comply with all his commands, both as to what we are to believe, and what to practice, and that not only what himself immediately commands, but what is commanded by his representatives, viz. civil and ecclesi-

astical powers, and in a word, all subordinate powers, as parents, masters, &c.

Q. Can we perform the will of God as the saints and angels do in heaven?

A. No, not as to the equality, because they never deviate from God's will: but we are to endeavour at it, by a general desire, if corrupt nature would suffer us, and strive for it, with fervour and zeal.

Q. What else do we petition for?

A. That God would be pleased to discover to us his will in different matters which occur in human life, viz. in regard of a state of life, and in suffering all sorts of calamities.

Q. Which is the fourth petition?

A. Give us this day our daily bread.

Q. What is meant by bread?

A. Not only strictly what is so called, but all things that are necessary for life in general or our particular state of life, as far as it is God's pleasure, but not superfluities as to worldly conveniencies, much less are we to pray for riches, honours, and any other thing, that is apt to turn us from God's service. St. Matt. iv. 4. St. John vi. 35. Again, by bread is also understood, the spiritual bread whereby the soul is nourished; among which we may reckon God's grace, pious books, but most especially the blessed eucharist. Hence in the place of daily, (St. Matt. vi. 11.) has supersubstantial, that is, uncommon and supernatural bread.

Q. Which is the fifth petition?

A. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.

Q. What do we beg by this petition?

A. To have our sins forgiven, which being an injury, and debt owing to God, and we being unable to pay it ourselves, we may and do petition that he will pardon us.

Q. Does God immediately pardon us upon this petition?

A. No, unless we comply with the conditions, viz. a sincere sorrow for having offended him, and a firm resolution to offend no more: as also the forgiveness of others who have offended us, because we are obliged to love our neighbour, which requires of us to lay aside

all thoughts of revenge. St. Matt. xviii. 21. St. Mark xi. 25, 26.

Q. Is this petition to be made by all mankind ?

A. Yes, all are daily offenders, either mortally or venially ; none ever have been excepted but our blessed Saviour and his Virgin Mother.

Q. Which is the sixth petition ?

A. And lead us not into temptation ?

Q. Does God tempt us to sin, and what is it you call temptation ?

A. Temptation is provoking men to sin : in which sense God tempts no man ; such temptations are ascribed to the world, the flesh, and the devil : St. James x. 13. St. Matt. iv. 3. Rom. vii. 23. St. James i. 14. Yet God permits us to fall into several temptations or trials from those quarters, in order to try our fidelity, and gain a greater reward by resisting them ; what we pray for therefore is for the divine assistance, and grace that we may come off victorious upon such occasions, that he will not desert us : but most especially, we pray for the gift of perseverance.

Q. Which is the seventh petition ?

A. But deliver us from evil.

Q. Which are the evils we petition to be freed from ?

A. In the fifth petition we begged to be freed from the evils of sin, by having them forgiven, in this we beg to be freed from the devil and all his stratagems ; from evil company ; from all temporal evils that may happen to our body, soul, or fortunes, inasmuch as they may be an impediment to labouring in God's service, but this to be understood conditionally, and with resignation to the divine will. What we absolutely pray for on this occasion is, that we may bear with patience all temporal calamities, and that they may not oppress us, so as to make us deviate from our duty to God.

Q. Can we pray to be freed from the miseries of human life ?

A. We are not to pray for our death, wherein we are to submit entirely to God's holy will, but in St. Paul's sense we may desire to be dissolved. Philip i. 23.

Q. What means the word amen ?

A. It is a Hebrew word of confirmation or assent, sig-

nifying so be it, or let it be done; consequently, it confirms with a repetition and general wish all the seven petitions, and in the usual close of all prayers whatever, being as it were an abridgment.

THE HAIL MARY EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT is this prayer, and by whom was it drawn up, and for what end?

A. It is called the angelical salutation, and expresses the excellences of the blessed Virgin Mary. It was composed of three parts. The first, are the words of the angel Gabriel saluting her. The second, the words of St. Elizabeth when visited by her. The third, the words of the church, desiring her intercession; which is the chief motive for which it was appointed.

Q. Which part was composed by the angel Gabriel?

A. Hail Mary full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women. St. Luke i. 28.

Q. What means the word hail?

A. It is a word in the original tongue, signifying joy and peace, upon account of good tidings: and upon the present occasion, it imported not only a congratulation of comfort and joy to the Virgin Mary, that she was so much in favour with the Almighty, as to be made choice of, to bring forth the Saviour of the world; but a general joy to all mankind, for the news of their approaching redemption.

Q. What signifies the word Mary?

A. It was the proper name of the blessed Virgin, and signifies the excellency of her person, and employment, if we attend to the original sense of the word, which signifies a lady and a sea star. By the first, it is imported, that she was to be the lady, and queen of all mankind, by bringing forth the king and ruler of the world. Secondly, that she was the star, to guide us through the dangerous seas of this life, by the example of her virtues, and intercession.

Q. Why is she said to be full of grace?

A. By grace are understood all supernatural gifts, which made her acceptable to God, and preferable to all other creatures; and this is expressed by fulness, (See St. Epiph. tom. ii. p. 292.) and this was requisite, that her womb might be a suitable receptacle for the author of grace; but

most especially the fullness of grace, consists in the particularity of graces, viz. She was not only sanctified in her mother's womb, as some few others had been, but was exempt from the guilt of original sin, and as a consequence of that from concupiscence of the flesh, and never was guilty of the least sin: (St. Aug. L. de Nat. et Grat. c. xxxvi. n. 42. Conc. Trid. Sess. v. Decr. de Pec. orig.) for it was not proper, that the flesh from which the pure body of Christ was to be formed, should ever be corrupted, or defiled by any sin, either original or actual, mortal or venial: Besides she possessed all divine gifts in a most eminent degree, viz. faith, hope, charity, humility, obedience and chastity, with all the moral virtues, &c.

Q. What signifies our Lord is with thee?

A. It imports, that God was not only with her, in a general manner, by all the aforesaid gifts, but that the second person, at the very moment the angel spoke, was to be united to her, by forming a perfect human body of her flesh, and at the same time, a human soul was infused into it, and both united to the second person of the most blessed Trinity.

Q. What means blessed art thou among women, and what is it to be blessed?

A. To be blessed in general, is to be in the favour of Almighty God, and the more a person is in God's favour, the more blessed he is, and the more favours God shews a person, the greater is his blessing. Hence the Virgin Mary is (upon account of the favours shewn her) blessed above all other women. (See St. Jer. cont. Jovin, &c. l. 13. c. 44. in Ezech.) An abridgment of these favours are her purity from all sin; she being a mother and a virgin, and what is more, she being the mother of the world's Redeemer, and mother of God.

Q. What other sense is she to be called blessed?

A. Because all nations shall honour her and call her blessed, as St. Luke declares; c. 1. 48. All generations shall honour her, by invoking her as a common mother, and having great power with Almighty God.

Q. Which part was composed by St. Elizabeth?

A. Blessed is the fruit of thy womb.

Q. What is the meaning of these words?

A. The fruit of her womb was Jesus the Redeemer of the world, who was not only blessed in himself but a

blessed fruit, that spread itself every where, and to every person, who received a benefit from him, Jesus is added by the church.

Q. Which part of this prayer was composed by the church ?

A. Holy Mary mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Con. Epheus. anno 431.

Q. Explain the meaning of every word ?

A. The church calls her holy, because the angel declared she was full of grace: The church calls her Mary, that name being confirmed to her by the same angel: She calls her mother of God, from these words of the angel, thou shalt conceive and bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. Luke i. 31. As also because she is the true mother of Jesus Christ, who is both God and man, as the council of Ephesus has defined against Nestorius. Lastly, pray for us sinners, desiring her intercession: now, that is every moment, because every moment we are in danger; and at the hour of our death, because then we are most incapable of helping ourselves, and then the devil is most industrious, to tempt us, either by despair, or deferring our conversation.

Q. Why are we particularly exhorted to beg the Virgin Mary's intercession ?

A. For several reasons. First, her great power with Almighty God. Secondly, her flaming love, charity, and willingness to assist all who call upon her with their prayers. And lastly, because she is the common spiritual mother of all mankind,

CEREMONIES IN GENERAL EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHAT are the ceremonies, and how many kinds are there ?

A. Ceremonies are outward actions made use of for decency, honour, and instruction; and there are chiefly two sorts, civil and religious.

Q. Why are they necessary ?

A. Because man being composed of body, and soul, which mutually concur in all performances, both civil and religious; it is both requisite and necessary that these be attended, with certain visible ceremonies to distinguish

what we are doing, and render the performance of the duty more significant.

Q. I easily conceive the necessity of ceremonies in civil matters, which cannot be managed unless civil power be conferred, executed and obeyed, with proper ceremonies; but what occasion is there for ceremonies in religious matters?

A. For the same reasons that they are necessary in civil matters; and particularly that God may be served with decency, with more honour, and the people instructed in their duty.

Q. How with decency?

A. By churches, or places set apart for divine service, decently adorned, a thing not refused to men of distinction. For princes, nobility, gentry, &c. take care of commodious and decent places of abode.

Q. How for God's greater honour?

A. The ceremonies are to be answerable to the dignity of the person, both as to shew, riches, grandeur, &c.

Q. How for the person's instruction?

A. The ceremonies are to represent the mysteries of faith, to explain them to the eye, for the benefit of the illiterate, and ignorant, and capable of exciting them to piety.

Q. Do not ceremonies destroy the substance of inward devotion? Are they not sometimes superfluous, sometimes ridiculous, sometimes superstitious?

A. They are so far from destroying the substance that they preserve it, as leaves do the fruit, from the inclemency of the season, and for that reason are not superfluous, and as to the superfluity of their number they are all tending towards piety; and on that score very profitable. If any religious ceremonies appear ridiculous, it is owing to ignorance, or scoffing; as to superstition, there can be none, where no other effect is ascribed to them, than what God or nature has ordained.

Q. Who was the first author and contriver of religious ceremonies?

A. God himself in the law of nature, the law of Moses, and the law of grace.

Q. What religious ceremonies were in the law of nature?

A. We read of few, besides sacrificing of beasts, to acknowledge God's supreme power, which was attended with ceremonies of altars, &c. Gen. xv. And we may justly suppose that prayer was attended with the ceremonies of time, place and kneeling, lifting up hands, &c. Again, circumcision was a ceremony of the law of nature.

Q. What ceremonies were appointed by the law of Moses ?

A. An infinite number, generally regarding the consecrating of their kings, priests, and sacrifices, their temple, &c. Exod. xxix. xl. Which were ordained to declare God's majesty, and prefigure the law of grace, as the sanctum sanctorum, the manna, the paschal lamb, the shew bread, the curing of the leprosy, the priest's vestments, images of cherubims, their cleansing from legal impurities, their feasts, &c.

Q. Did Christ in the new law make use or appoint religious ceremonies ?

A. Yes, several ; he was circumcised, presented in the temple, baptised by St. John, performed the ceremonies of the pasch, ordered fasting, and water baptism, used clay and spittle in curing the blind, lifting up his eyes and prostrated himself, washing feet, &c. St. Mark vii. St. Luke viii.

Q. Did the apostles use and ordain religious ceremonies ?

A. Yes, several, viz. imposition of hands, the anointing with oil, abstaining from certain meats, the matter and form of the sacraments, which were delivered by Christ, during the forty days between the resurrection and ascension.

Q. Has the church authority to ordain ceremonies, and does she not ordain them that are superfluous ?

A. Yes, she has power to add or diminish, as being the proper judge, which are significant and instructive ; and though we are to adore God in spirit, this does not exclude ceremonies, but only directs us to attend to their spiritual meaning.

PARTICULAR CEREMONIES EXPOUNDED.

Q. WHEN and wherein are particular ceremonies made use of?

A. In adorning churches, in celebrating mass, in administering the sacraments, in priest's vestments, in celebrating Sundays, in celebrating feasts of our Lord, in celebrating feasts of the blessed Virgin, in celebrating feasts of the saints, in the devotion practised in holy week, in observing fasts, in consecrating and blessing several of God's creatures, in postures of the body, &c.

Q. Which are the chief ornaments in churches?

A. Pictures, images, crucifixes, altars, tabernacles, and candles.

Q. For what use are pictures, images and crucifixes?

A. They are the books of the ignorant, and illiterate, to put them in mind of several mysteries and passages belonging to religion.

Q. Are they to be honoured, worshipped, and prayed to?

A. We neither pray to pictures or images, nor do we believe any perfection inherent in them; we only pay them a relative honour, on account of the things and persons they represent; as we honour the king, and a friend, by keeping their pictures, and placing them decently: yet with this difference, that pictures in churches are regarded with a religious honour, because it is paid on account of some religious qualifications: but the honour we pay to the pictures of others is called civil honour, because it is paid on account of some natural or acquired perfection.

Q. Was it always customary, to place pictures and images in churches?

A. In the law of Moses such things were ordered as the brazen serpent in the desert, and the figures of seraphims, cherubims, and other images to adorn the tabernacle. As to the law of grace, for the first three ages, the christians not being permitted to have public churches, there was no occasion for that ceremony, nor was it much practised upon the conversion of the world, in Constantine's days, that the Heathens might not be scandalized, who placed idols in their temples; but by degrees, as idolatry was

abolished, it was customary to set up the images of Christ crucified, and the pictures of saints and martyrs?

Q. What are the altars, and why are they placed in churches?

A. They are tables on which the christian sacrifices is laid and offered, viz. the body and blood of Jesus Christ; and they represent Mount Calvary, where the bloody sacrifice was offered.

Q. What is the tabernacle?

A. As the Jews formerly were ordered to make a rich chest, to preserve their manna: so christians have one to keep, or preserve the blessed sacrament in, for the benefit of the sick, and whereof the Jewish tabernacle was a figure.

Q. Why are candles exposed and lighted?

A. To signify the light of the gospel, and the light that will shine eternally in heaven, not to give light to the eye.

Q. What is the mass? why performed in latin? was it always performed with so much ceremony, and what is the meaning of the chief of those ceremonies?

A. It is the christian sacrifice, which our Saviour offered at the last supper, viz. his body and blood, accompanied with certain prayers, which are usually said in latin, that being a public language, the best known of any other, in order to preserve unity among different nations. It is true, our blessed Saviour did not use all these ceremonies, at the first institution, which by degrees were appointed by the apostles, and their successors, for greater solemnity. The chief whereof are, the lessons taken from the gospels, and other parts of the holy scriptures, with prayers suitable to the purpose. As to the meaning of every particular ceremony, they are instructive, and represent some passages of our blessed Saviour's life, and passion, viz. the priest standing at the steps of the altar, and bowing, represents Christ humbling himself in the garden, to prepare for his passion. His turning to the people, and saying, *dominus vobiscum*; that is, the Lord be with you, puts them in mind to be attentive and to join with him in that oblation. Standing up at the gospel, imports their willingness to profess and defend it. The priest washes his fingers, to represent the cleanness from sin. He kisses the altar, to signify Christian peace, and willingness to embrace the cross.

Q. Why is there always a crucifix upon the altar at the time of mass?

A. That as the mass is said in remembrance of Christ's passion and death, the priest and people may have always before their eyes the image that represents his passion and death.

Q. What is the meaning of the frequent use of the sign of the Cross in the Mass, and the administration of the sacraments?

A. First, to signify that all good must come through Christ crucified. Secondly, it is to shew that we are no more ashamed of the cross of Christ, than the Apostle St. Paul was, who gloried in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. Gal. vi. 14. Thirdly, it is to make an open profession of our believing in a crucified God, although it was a scandal to the Jews, and folly to the Gentiles, so to do, (1 Cor. 1. 23.) and to help us to bear always in mind his death and passion. Fourthly, it is to chase away the devil, and dissipate his illusions, (St. Matt. xxiv. 30.) for the cross is the standard of Christ, (St. Cyril. Catec. St. Aug. Serm. 19.) and the evil spirit trembles at the very sight of the instrument of our redemption. See St. Matt. &c.

Q. At what time is it fit to make the sign of the cross?

A. At our rising, and going to bed; when we begin prayer, and every other work; and particularly in time of temptation, or any danger whatsoever. St. Jer. de Cust. Virg. ad Eust. St. Amb. Serm. 43.

Q. Was the sign of the cross made use of in the primitive church?

A. Yes; as it plainly appears from St. Augustin: if the sign of the Cross, says this great Father of the Church, (St. Aug. Tract 119. in Jon.) be not applied to the foreheads of the faithful; to the water with which they are baptized; to the chrism with which they are anointed; to the sacrifice with which they are fed, none of all these things are duly performed. The reason is, because all the Sacraments have their whole force and efficacy from the cross; that is from the death and passion of Jesus Christ, on the cross.

Q. Did the primitive christians only make use of the sign of the cross in the administration of the sacraments?

A. Not only then, but upon all other occasions: at every step, says the ancient and learned Tertullian, at every

coming in, and going out, when we put on our clothes, when we wash, when we sit down to table, when we light candles, or whatsoever conversation employs us, we imprint on our foreheads the sign of the cross. Tertul. L. de Coron. Milit. cap. 3.

A. Can you prove, that by means of the sign of the cross, we receive any favour from God ?

A. There are innumerable instances of it, in ancient church history, and in the writings of the holy fathers, which are too tedious to relate. I shall only recount that the cross was given by our Lord Jesus Christ to Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, as a token and assurance of victory, when he and his whole army in their march against the tyrant Maxentius, saw a cross formed of pure light above the sun with this inscription ; by this thou shalt conquer : and by it he forthwith conquered his enemies. Which account the ancient Eusebius, in his book of the life of Constantine, declares he had from that Emperor's own mouth.

Q. What ceremonies are made use of in the sacraments ; and what is their signification, and first as to baptism ?

A. There are a godfather and a godmother, who are to instruct the child, if the parents neglect it.—The priest breathes upon the infant, to signify spiritual life ; this ceremony St. Augustin (L. de Nupt. c. 18, 19.) makes mention of, and says it was universally practised in his time ; and it is used in contempt of the devil, and to drive him away, by the Holy Ghost, who is called the spirit or breath of God. The infant is signed with the cross, to signify that he is listed a soldier of Christ. Salt is put into the child's mouth, which is an emblem of prudence, and imports grace to preserve the soul incorrupt. Spittle is applied to the child's ears and nostrils, in imitation of Christ, who used that ceremony in curing the deaf and dumb.—The anointing signifies the healing quality of grace ; the head denotes dignity of christianity ; the anointing the shoulders, that he may be strengthened to carry his cross ; the breast, that his heart may concur in all duties ; the white linen cloth or crysom, put on the child, signifies innocence of behaviour, and the wax taper or candle signifies the light of faith he is endowed with, and the flame of charity.

Q. Which are the ceremonies and the signification of them, in the sacrament of confirmation?

A. Anointing with oil denotes that it gives strength to profess the faith, and makes the person a perfect christian. A stroke on the cheek signifies the persecution he is to undergo and endure. The imposition of hands signifies the overflowing of the Holy Ghost.

Q. Which are the ceremonies in the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, and what is their signification?

A. Bread and wine, and water mixed with the wine; the first signifies the nourishment of the soul; the second signifies the water flowing from Christ's side.

Q. What is meant by the ceremony of exposing the blessed sacrament to the view of the people, in a remonstrance set up upon the tabernacle or altar?

A. It is to invite the people to come there to adore Jesus Christ, and to excite in them a greater devotion by the sight of their Lord, veiled in these sacred mysteries.

Q. What is the meaning of the benediction given on certain days?

A. It is a devotion practised by the church, in order to give adoration, praise and blessing to God for his infinite goodness and love, testified to us in the institution of this blessed sacrament, and to receive at the same time the benediction or blessing of our Lord here present.

Q. What is the meaning of the blessed sacrament being sometimes carried in solemn procession through the streets?

A. It is to honour our Lord there present with a kind of triumph, and thereby to make him some sort of amends for the injuries and affronts which are so frequently offered to this divine sacrament, and to obtain his blessing for all those places through which he passes.

Q. Which are the ceremonies of the sacrament of penance, and the signification of them?

A. The penitent kneels, to shew his humility; the priest stretches his hands upon the penitent, to signify the grace he receives; the penitent confesses his sins, as a token of contrition.

Q. Which are the ceremonies of extreme unction, and what are their meaning?

A. The anointing with oil, signifies the strength of grace, and recovery of health, if God sees it convenient. The

seat of the five senses are anointed, as being the instruments whereby God is offended.

Q. Which are the ceremonies of holy orders, and their meaning?

A. Anointing is made use of to signify the grace that is given, as also power; hands are imposed to represent the giving of the Holy Ghost; and certain instruments are delivered, to distinguish the nature of the function.

Q. Which are the ceremonies of marriage, and their signification?

A. The ring signifies perpetual love, and is put on the fourth finger, because it is said a vein goes from thence to the heart; money is given to signify the communication of worldly goods, and that there be no strife about them: the married couple join hands to signify the dissolvability of marriage: they are blessed by the priest, in order to receive the grace belonging to the state, viz. for the education of their children, and to bear with difficulties, &c.

Q. What is the meaning of the churching of women after child-bearing? Is it that you look upon them to be under any uncleanness, as formerly in the old law, or to be any ways out of the church by child-bearing?

A. No, by no means; but what we call the churching of women is nothing else but their coming to the church to give thanks to God for their safe delivery, and to receive the blessing of the priest upon that occasion?

Q. Which are the principal Sundays distinguished from the rest?

A. The four Sundays before Christ's nativity, called Advent Sundays, from the word *Adventus*, that is, coming; to put us in mind that the birth of Christ approaches, and that we are to prepare for a worthy celebration of it; as also to prepare for the second coming of our Saviour, at the day of judgment.—Other remarkable Sundays are Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, and Quadregesima; which are designed to prepare ourselves for penance, and a worthy celebration of the passion and resurrection of our Lord. As also Passion Sunday, Palm Sunday, and Low Sunday. Passion Sunday is so called from the passion of Christ, then drawing nigh, and was ordained to prepare us for a worthy celebrating of it: Palm Sunday is a day, in memory, and honour of the triumphant entry of our Saviour Christ into Jerusalem, and is so

called from the palm branches which the Hebrew children strewed under his feet, crying Hosanna to the son of David, Matt. xxi. And hence it is, that yearly on this day, the church blesses palms, and makes a solemn procession in honour of the same triumph, all the people bearing branches in their hands. The palms are likewise an emblem of the victory which Christ gained over sin and death, by dying on the cross. Low Sunday is the octave of Easter day, and is called by the church *Dominica in Albis*, from the Catechumens, or Neophytes, who were on that day solemnly divested in the church of their white garments.

Q. What are the principal feasts of our Lord?

A. Christmas day, so called from the mass that is said in honour of our blessed Saviour's nativity, or birth at Bethlehem. And on this day we ought to give God thanks for sending his son into this world for our redemption: we ought also endeavour to study and learn those great lessons of poverty, of spirit, of humility, and of self-denial, which our blessed redeemer teaches us from the crib of Bethlehem.

Q. What is the reason that on Christmas day mass is said at midnight?

A. Because Christ was born at midnight.

Q. Why are three masses said by every priest upon Christmas day?

A. This ancient observance may be understood to denote three different births of Christ; his eternal birth from his father, his temporal birth from his mother, and his spiritual birth in the hearts of good christians.

Q. Is there any other feasts of our Lord?

A. Yes; the Circumcision, or New-Year's day.—It is a feast in memory of Christ's being circumcised the eighth day after his birth, as the law of Moses ordained, (Gen. xvii. 12.) and that he then first shed his blood, for the redemption of the world: and on this day we ought to study how we may imitate him by a spiritual circumcision in our hearts. It is called New-Year's Day; because on the first of January the Roman's reckoned the beginning of the new year, and Christ offered his blood as a gift. Hence the custom among christians, of new year's gifts.

The Epiphany, or Twelfth-day: Epiphany is a Greek word, signifying manifestation, because our Lord then began to manifest himself to the Gentiles, viz. to the three

kings in the east, who came and adored our blessed Saviour in the manger. It is called twelfth-day, because it is celebrated the twelfth day after the nativity exclusively, gold, myrrh, and frankincense were offered, to signify, he was a King, Man, and God. The devotion of this day is to give God thanks for our vocation to the true faith, and like the wise men to make our offerings of gold, frankincense, and myrrh; that is, of charity, prayer, and mortification, to our new-born Saviour. On this day the church also celebrates the memory of the baptism of Christ, and of his first miracle of changing water into wine in Cana and Gallilee.

The Resurrection, or Easter day, is a solemnity in memory and honour of our Saviour Christ's rising from death, on the third day. It is called Easter, from the East, so Christ is called Oriens, or rising. For as the prophet Zachariah says, his name shall be called Oriens, ch. iv. 12: Because as the material sun daily rises from the east, so he the Son of Justice at this day rose from the dead. The devotion of this time is to rejoice in Christ's victory over death and hell; and to labour to imitate his resurrection, by rising from the death of sin to the life of grace.

Ascension day: a feast kept the fortieth day after Christ's resurrection, in memory of his visible ascending into heaven, in sight of his Apostles and Disciples; and therefore it is a festival of joy, as well by reason of the triumphs of our Saviour on this day, and the exaltation of our human nature, by him now exalted above the Angels; as likewise because our Saviour has taken possession of that kingdom in our name, and is preparing a place for us. It is also a part of the devotion of this day, to labour to disengage our hearts from this earth and earthly things, to remember that we are but strangers and pilgrims here, and to aspire after our heavenly country, where Christ, our treasure, is gone before us, in order to draw our hearts thither after him.

Whitsuntide, or Pentecost: a feast in commemoration and honour of the Holy Ghost descending visibly upon the heads of the Apostles, in the shape of tongues, as it were of fire. It is called Whitsunday, because at the time the Catechumens, who were then baptized, were all in white. It was anciently called Wied Sunday, that is, Holy Sunday; for wïed, or wïhed, signifies Holy in the old Saxon lan-

guage. It is called Pentecost, from the Greek word signifying fiftieth, it being the fiftieth day after the resurrection, and the tenth after the ascension. The proper devotion of this time is to invite the Holy Ghost into our souls by fervent prayer, and to give ourselves up to his divine influences.

Trinity Sunday ; a feast celebrated on the Sunday after Whit Sunday, being the octave to Whit Sunday, to signify that the work of man's redemption was completed by the whole Trinity ; and the truth of the mystery of the Trinity being acknowledged solemnly on this day, against the several heretics that denied it.

Corpus Christi day : a feast instituted by the church, in honour and memory of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, really present in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist : during the octave of which feast, the blessed sacrament is exposed to be adored by the faithful, in all the principal churches in Catholic countries, and great processions are made in honour of it, and therefore it is called Corpus Christi day, or the day of the body of Christ ; a standing proof of the real presence.

The Transfiguration of our Lord, a feast in remembrance of Christ appearing in glory, upon Mount Tabor, to St. Peter, James and John ; and it is called from the Latin word *transfiguro*, which signifies, to transfigure or change shape.

Q. Which are the feasts in honour of the blessed Virgin Mary ?

A. These ; the conception, the nativity, presentation, annunciation, visitation, assumption, and purification.

Q. What is the conception ?

A. A feast in honour of the blessed Virgin Mary being conceived in her mother's womb.

Q. What is to be observed in her conception ?

A. First, she was conceived in her mother's old age, St. Anne being her mother, and St. Joachim her father ; 2dly, she was sanctified in her mother's womb ; 3dly, she was exempted from the guilt of original sin, as is piously believed, though not an article of faith.

Q. What is the nativity of the blessed Virgin ?

A. A feast in honour of her happy birth, of whom the author of all life and salvation was to be born to the world ; he was both God and Man, and by consequence she was

the mother of God, and in this, she is to be honoured above all other women.

Q. What is the presentation of the blessed Virgin ?

A. A feast in memory of her being offered by her parents, at three years of age, in the temple.

Q. What is the annunciation, or Lady-Day ?

A. It is a feast in memory of the most happy message, or embassy, brought to her by the Angel Gabriel, signifying that she was to be the mother of God, and a Redeemer. It is also the day of our Lord's incarnation, when he was first conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary ; and it is called the annunciation, from the message brought from heaven this day to the blessed Virgin. St. Luke i.

Q. What is the visitation ?

A. It is in memory of her visit made to St. Elizabeth, mother of St. John Baptist, after she had conceived the Son of God, at whose presence, St. John Baptist leaped in his mother's womb.

Q. What is the assumption ?

A. A feast in memory of her being assumed, or taken up into heaven, both body and soul, immediately after her decease.

Q. Is it an article of faith, that she was bodily carried into heaven ?

A. No ; it is only piously and generally believed to have happened, by a particular privilege, as by a particular privilege her soul was free from original sin, so it was congruous that her body should not be subject to corruption, for the church piously believes, agreeable to the doctrine of the ancient fathers and the council of Trent, that she was never guilty of any actual sin. St. Aug. Epist. 58. St. Amb. in Psalm cxviii. St. Bernd. Epist. 174. Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. Can. xxiii.

Q. What means the feast of the purification, or candle-mas day ?

A. It is a feast in memory both of the presentation of our blessed Saviour, and of the purification of the blessed Virgin, made in the temple of Jerusalem, the fortieth day after her happy child-birth : for it was a ceremony practised in the old law, and renewed in the new ; whereby a mother was obliged to appear in the temple, and return

thanks, forty days after the birth of her child. It was called purification, from the Latin word *purifico*, to purify; not that the blessed Virgin was tainted with any sin, or any thing by her child-birth, which needed purifying (as being the mother of purity itself) but in compliance with the ceremony, which was according to the law of Moses, as we read in Leviticus, chap. xii. 6. and as our Saviour Christ submitted to circumcision. Upon this day the church make a solemn procession with lighted candles, which are blessed by the priest before mass, and carried in the hands of the faithful, as an emblem of Christ, who is the light of the world; and from this ceremony it is called candlemas day.

Q. Has the church power to appoint feasts of saints? and what end has she in appointing them?

A. As the church has power of making laws that are binding: so particularly this power regards religious duties, as is honouring saints.

Q. How are the saints honoured at their feasts?

A. Not by dedicating churches and altars to them, but to God only, in acknowledgment of the benefit he has done to us by his saints, and on that account we give them such a name as St. Peter's church, St. Paul's, &c. and by recounting their birth, sufferings, and virtuous practices, we are induced to imitate their several kinds of martyrdoms and sufferings for the faith of Christ, as also for their several ways of virtue and perfection, by following their example in our behaviour, and begging their prayers, so that we honour God in his saints.

Q. Which are the principal feasts of saints, whose memory we celebrate?

A. The twelve apostles, which are common to all titular saints, or patrons of nations, by whom we were converted. The founders of religious orders, who have benefitted christianity, by establishing, and practising the evangelical counsels. And again, the saints of particular provinces, diocesses, and parishes, where holy persons have lived, and their memory been recorded by the miracles, and good example, and have churches erected to their memory.

Q. Are there no other feasts? and what are the meaning of their ceremonies?

A. Yes; Michaelmas, All Saints, All Souls, the Invention of the Cross, the Exaltation of the Cross, Shrovetide, Ash-Wednesday, &c.

Q. What means the feast of Michaelmas?

A. It is a solemnity, or solemn mass in honour of St. Michael, prince of the heavenly host, and likewise of all the nine orders of holy angels: as well as to commemorate the famous battle fought by him, and them, in heaven, against the dragon, and his apostate angels, which we read of in the apocalypse, or Revelations, ch. xii. 7. As also to recommend the whole church of God to their patronage and prayers. And it is called the dedication of St. Michael, by reason of a church in Rome dedicated on that day to St. Michael, by Pope Boniface.

Q. What is the meaning of All Saints?

A. It is a feast instituted by the church in honour of all the saints, and that we might obtain the prayers of them all, since the whole year is too short to afford us a particular feast of every saint.

Q. What is the meaning of all souls day?

A. It is a day instituted by the church in memory of all the faithful departed; by the prayers and suffrages of the living, that they may be freed out of their purging pains, and come to everlasting rest?

Q. What is the meaning of the invention and exaltation of the holy Cross, commonly called Holy-Rood days?

A. The invention of the Cross, is a feast kept in memory of the miraculous finding of the holy Cross, by St. Helen, mother to Constantine the Great, after it had been hid and buried by the infidels 180 years. The exaltation is kept in memory of setting up the said holy Cross by Heraclius the Emperor, who having regained it a second time, from the Persians, after it had been lost fourteen years, carried it on his own shoulders to Mount Calvary, and exalted it with great solemnity. It is called Holy-rood day, or holy Cross, from the great sanctity which it received by touching, and bearing the oblation of the most precious body of Christ; the word rood, in the old Saxon tongue, signifying cross. The chief devotion of this day, as well as that of the exaltation of the cross, is to celebrate the victorious death and passion of our blessed Redeemer.

Q. What is the meaning of Shrovetide?

A. It signifies the time of confessing ; for our ancestors were used to say, we will go to shrift, instead of we will go to confession ; and in the more primitive times, all good christians did then (as many do now) confess their sins to a priest, the better to prepare themselves for a holy observation of Lent, and worthy receiving the blessed sacrament at Easter.

Q. What signifies Ash-Wednesday ?

A. It is a day of public penance and humiliation in the whole church of God ; and it is so called from the ceremony of blessing ashes on that day, wherewith the priest signeth the people with a cross on their foreheads, to put them in mind of what they are made, repeating at the same time those words of Genesis, c. iii. 19. Remember man thou art dust, and into dust thou shalt return ; so to prepare them to do penance for their sins, as the Ninivites did in fasting, sackcloth and ashes.

Q. Which are the ceremonies of Holy Week ?

A. Tenebræ, Maunday-Thursday, Good Friday, Holy Saturday, washing feet, fifteen candles, the triangular candle, the paschal candle, &c.

Q. What is meant by the three days of Tenebræ, viz. Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, before Easter ?

A. It is a mournful office, in which the church laments the death of Christ : it is called the Tenebræ office, from the Latin word, which signifies Darkness, because at the latter end of the office, all the lights are extinguished in memory of the darkness which overspread the face of the earth, whilst Christ was hanging on the cross : and at the end of the office a noise is made to represent the earthquake, and our Lord's death.

Q. What means Maundy-Thursday ?

A. It is a feast in memory of our Lord's last supper, when he instituted the blessed Eucharist, or sacrament of his precious body and blood ; and began his passion by his bitter agony and bloody sweat. From the Gloria in Excelsis of the mass of this day, until the mass of Easter-eve, all the bells are silent throughout the Catholic church, because we are now mourning for the passion of Christ. Our altars are also uncovered and stripped of all their ornaments, because Christ, our true altar, hung naked upon the cross. It is called Maundy-Thursday from the first word of the antiphon, *Mandatum novum do nobis, &c.*

St. John xiii. 34. "A new commandment, (or mandate) I give unto you, that you love one another as I have loved you:" which is sung on that day in churches, when the prelates begin the ceremony of washing their peoples' feet.

Q. What is the meaning of the Prelates and Superiors washing the feet of their subjects upon this day?

A. It is a ceremony in imitation of Christ's washing the feet of his Apostles. St. John xiii.

Q. What is the meaning of visiting the sepulchres upon Maundy-Thursday?

A. The place where the blessed sacrament is reserved in the church, in order for the office of Good Friday, (on which day there is no consecration) is by the people called the sepulchre, as representing by anticipation the burial of Christ. And where there are many churches, the faithful make their stations to visit our Lord in these sepulchres, and meditate on the different stages of his passion.

Q. What means Good-Friday?

A. It is a day we keep in memory of the great work of our redemption, which was consummated by Christ in dying on the cross. The devotion proper for this day, and for the whole time in which we celebrate Christ's passion, is to meditate upon the sufferings of our Redeemer, and to study the excellent lessons of virtue, which he teaches us by his example in the whole course of his passion; especially his humility, meekness, patience, obedience, resignation, &c. And above all, to learn his hatred of sin, and his love for us; that we may also learn to hate sin, which nailed him to a cross; and love him who has loved us even unto death.

Q. What is the meaning of creeping to, and kissing the cross on Good-Friday?

A. It is to express by this reverence outwardly exhibited to the cross, our veneration, and love for him, who upon this day died for us on the cross.

Q. What is the meaning of Holy-Saturday?

A. It is Easter-Eve, and therefore in the mass of this day, the church resumes her Alleluias of joy, which she had intermitted during the penitential time of Septuagesima and Lent. This day, and Whitsun-Eve, were anciently the days deputed by the church for solemn baptism, and therefore on this day the fonts are solemnly blessed.

A. What signifies the paschal candle, which is blessed on this day ?

Q. It signifies the new light of spiritual joy and comfort, which Christ brought us at his resurrection ; and it is lighted from the beginning of the gospel until after the communion, betwixt Easter, and Ascension-day, to signify the apparitions which Christ made his disciples during that space.

Q. What is the meaning of the triangular candle ?

A. It signifies that the light of the gospel which Christ brought to us, in the work of the blessed Trinity, to whom we are to render thanks.

Q. What do you mean by exorcisms ?

A. The rights and prayers instituted by the church for the casting out the devil, or restraining them from hurting persons, or disturbing places, or abusing any of God's creatures, to their harm or prejudice.

Q. Has Christ given to his church any such power over the devils ?

A. Yes, he has, as we read both in St. Matthew, St. Mark, and Luke. Matt. x. 1. Mark. iii. 15. Luke ix. 1. Where this power was given to the Apostles ; and the seventy-two disciples, and the other believers. See St. Mark xvi. 17. St. Luke x. 19. And that this power was not to die with the apostles, nor to cease after the apostolic age, we learn from the perpetual practice of the church and the experience of all ages.

Q. Which are the things we bless, and why ?

A. We bless churches, and other places set aside for divine service ; altars, chalices, vestments, incense, bells, &c. by way of devoting them to God's service. We bless candles, Agnus Dei's, salt, water, &c. by way of begging of God, that such as religiously use them may obtain his blessing. We bless our meat, and other things which God has given us for our use, that we may use them with moderation, in a manner agreeable to God's institution, that they may be serviceable to us, and that the devil may have no power to abuse them to our prejudice.

Q. But is it not superstition to attribute any virtue to such inanimate things as blessed candles, Agnus Dei's, holy water, &c. ?

A. It is no superstition to look for a good effect from the prayers of the church of God, (see St. Epiph. Hær.

30. Theod. l. 5, Hist. Eccles. c. 21,) and it is in virtue of these prayers, that we hope for benefit from these things, when used with faith; and daily experience shews, that our hopes are not in vain.

Q. What warrant have you in scripture for blessing inanimate things?

A. From the first epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, (c. iv. 4, 5,) where he says, that every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected which is taken with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.

Q. What do you mean by Agnus Dei's?

A. Wax stamped with the image of the Lamb of God, blessed by the Pope with solemn prayers, and anointed with holy chrism.

Q. What do you mean by holy water?

A. Salt and water sanctified by the word of God and prayer.

Q. Can you shew me from holy writ, that water, salt, and the like, may be lawfully used to obtain any favour from God?

A. I can; for God himself ordered holy and purified waters to be made in the old law. Num. v. 17, et c. xix. Again, we read in the second and fifth chapters of the fourth book of Kings, that the Prophet Elisha miraculously healed the noisome waters of Jericho by casting salt in the spring.

Q. Why is salt blessed and mingled with the water?

A. To signify unto us, that as salt preserves meat from corruption, and gives it a relish, so does the grace which we receive in virtue of the prayers of the church, when we use this water with faith, defend us from unclean spirits, and give us a taste for heavenly things.

Q. What is the use of the holy water?

A. The church blesses it with solemn prayer, to beg God's protection and blessing upon those who use it, and particularly, that they may be defended from the power of darkness. Moreover, it may well serve to put us in mind of the covenant we made against the Devil, when by the water of baptism we were mercifully cleansed from sin; and of renewing our promise, or of making an act of contrition.

Q. Are the prayers of the church so prevailing with God, as to obtain us his assistance against the wiles and power

of the enemy of our salvation, when we use holy water with faith?

A. Nothing prevails more upon God than prayer in general; and the Apostle St. James, c. v. 16, exhorting us to pray for one another, assures us, the assiduous prayer of a just man avails much. Now if the prayers of particulars be so powerful, it is manifest, that the constant prayers of the whole church from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, are always graciously heard; and that God grants to all those who co-operate with his grace, the fruit of the perseverant prayer of the church, to which Christ said: Amen, amen, I say to you, if you ask the Father any thing in my name he will give it you. St. John xvi. 23.

Q. Is the use of holy water ancient in the church of God?

A. Yes, it is; as being mentioned in the apostolical constitution, and in the writings of the holy Fathers, and ancient Church historians. See Constit. Apost. l. 8, c. xxxv. St. Cyr. l. 1, Epist. 12. St. Hier. ib. St. Basil, l. de Spir. Sancto. c. xxvii. St. Greg. the Great, l. 9, Epist. 71. St. Epiph. Hær. xxx. Thod. l. 5, &c.

Q. How ought we to use holy water, or what advantage ought we to draw from it?

A. First, we ought to look upon it, and upon other sacred rites and ceremonies of the Catholic church with due reverence and esteem; to be persuaded that they are all instituted to help on the great affair of our salvation, either by putting us in mind of the unspeakable favours which we have already received from God; or by raising our affections to heaven, humbly begging the divine assistance, whereof we stand in need every moment of our lives; and ought never to imitate those mistaken people, who rail against all things which they understand not. St. Jude x. Secondly, we ought to use holy water with attention and devotion, always endeavouring to make an act of contrition, or some other act of religion: saying, Thou shalt sprinkle me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed, thou shalt wash me, and I shall be made whiter than snow. Psal. l. 9.

THE END.

Errata—Page 246, line 4, read “It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.” Page 259, line 10, for “are,” read “is.”

INDEX.

	Page
ADORATION, the signification of the word,	112
Adultery,	137, 246
Alms Deeds,	258
Angels,	29
Angel-Guardian—every one has an,	30
Anger,	248
Ascension of Christ,	50
Atheists, and their objections against the proofs of a Deity,	15
 Baptism	 175
Its ceremonies,	298
Beatitude,	107
Benediction,	294
Blasphemy,	127
Blessing of Creatures,	305
 Celibacy of Priests and Religious,	 119
Censures,	221
Ceremonies in general,	287
Ceremonies of Holy Week,	302
Ceremony of Churching Women,	296
Chastity,	84
Children's duty and obligation to their Parents,	131
Christ, the Son of God,	32
Christ's Conception in the Womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary,	42
Church of God,	59
Its being Apostolic,	89
Its Holiness,	85
Its Infallibility,	70
Its Perpetuity,	71
Its Personal Succession,	92
Its Visibility,	71
Its Unity,	74
Its Universality,	154

INDEX.

	Page
Commandments of God,	109
The possibility of keeping them,	152
Communion,	165
Communion of Saints,	100
Concupiscence,	151
Confession of Sins,	163
Confirmation,	180
Its ceremonies,	294
Contrition,	215
Covetousness,	245
Councils,	270
Counsellor, and obligations to his Client,	146
Conversion of Infidel Nations	99
Creation of Heaven and Earth, and all things therein,	28, 30, 31
Creed,	13
Cross—Sign of the,	293
Death,	274
Detraction,	148
Dissimulation,	149
Divination,	122
Drunkenness,	248
Envy,	247
Equivocation,	149
Eucharist,	184
Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist,	185
Exorcism,	304
Faith,	251
Fasting,	156
Father, the signification of the word, and how God is our Father,	26
Fortitude,	261
God's Existence,	14
God's Immensity,	19
God's Immutability,	22
God's Infinity,	17
God's Knowledge,	22
God's Omnipotency,	17

INDEX.

	Page
God's Veracity,	22
God's Unity,	20
God's Will,	24
Godfathers and Godmothers, and their Obligations	179
Goodness,	23
Grace,	36
Holy Ghost,	55
Its Gifts and Fruits,	56
Hail Mary,	285
Happiness eternal,	107
Hatred,	24
Hell,	274
What is meant by it in the Creed,	46
Heaven,	274
Holiness,	24
Holy Days,	154
Honour,	109
Honour, Civil,	111
Honour, Divine,	110
Honour, Religious,	112
Hope,	254
Idolatry,	121
Images and their use,	122
Immortality of the Soul,	107
Incarnation,	35
Indulgences,	222
Invincible Ignorance,	241
Judgment—The General,	52
Judgment, Rash	149
Judge, and his qualifications,	145
Justice,	260
Justification,	39
Laity's obligation and duty to the Superiors of the Church,	133
Laws,	263
Lawyer's obligations,	147
Lent,	159
Life Everlasting,	107
Love,	24

INDEX.

	Page
Marks of the True Church,	72
Mass,	205
Its ceremonies,	290
Why said in Latin,	291
Master's obligations to their Servants,	133
Matrimony,	232
Members of the True Church, and who they are	61
Merit,	40
Miracles performed in the Church,	96
Miracles wrought by the Relics of Saints,	124
Murder,	135
Oaths,	127
Obedience,	131
Orders, Holy,	227
Parent's obligations to their Children,	132
Penance,	213
Perfection,	23
Perjury,	128
Pictures and Images not forbidden by the law of God,	124
Honour due to them,	124
Pope's Supremacy,	272
Prayer,	112
Its dispositions,	113
Praying for the Dead,	279
Praying to Saints and Angels,	125
Praying to Pictures and Images,	290
Prayer—The Lord's,	280
Precepts of the Church,	153
Predestination,	25
Pride,	243
Processions,	206
Promise,	114, 150
Providence,	25
Prudence,	259
Purgatory,	275
Reformation of the Church,	94
Relics of Saints and their Veneration,	124
Religion,	109, 262
Reprobation,	25
Restitution,	141

INDEX.

	Page
Sacraments in general,	168
Sacrament of the Eucharist received under one kind,	208
Sabbath	129
Sacrifice,	111
Sacrilege,	121
Salvation not to be found out of the Catholic Church, held by many Protestants,	67
Scandal,	259
Scripture,	264
Its interpretation,	266
Secret, a	147
Servant's duty and obligations to their Masters,	132
Sin,	238
The forgiveness of,	101
Sloth,	249
Subjects, duty and obligation to their Sovereign, and other temporal Governors,	134
Superiors obligation,	134
Swearing,	127
Temperance,	261
Theft,	141
Tithes,	166
Tradition,	269
Transubstantiation,	195
The Trinity,	27
Unction, its ceremonies,	33
Unction, Extreme,	225
Unchaste thoughts,	151
Vows,	114
Vow of Chastity,	117
Vow of Poverty,	117
Vow of Obedience,	120
Water, Holy,	305
Whispering,	149
Witness, and his obligations,	146
Worship,	262
The signification of the word Worship,	109

CATHOLIC WORKS,

Just Published.

THE WAY OF SALVATION. Meditations for every Day in the Year. Translated from the Italian of Blessed Alphonsus Liguori. Price 3s. 6d.

“ Our most important affair is that of our eternal salvation ; upon it depends our happiness or misery for ever. This affair will come to an end in eternity, and will decide whether we shall be saved or lost for ever ; whether we shall have acquired an eternity of delights, or an eternity of torments ; whether we shall live for ever happy, or for ever miserable. O God, what will my lot be ? Shall I be saved, or shall I be lost ! I may be either. And if I may be lost, why do I not embrace such a life, as may secure for me life eternal ? O Jesus, thou didst die to save me ? yet have I been lost, as often as I have lost thee my sovereign good : suffer me not to lose thee any more.”

Way of Salvation, p. 1.

GERALDINE. A Tale of Conscience. By E. C. A
2 Vols. Price 12s.

ALTON PARK ; or, Conversations on Religious and Moral Subjects, chiefly designed for the Amusement and Instruction of Young Ladies. 1 Vol. 12mo. cloth. Price 6s.

THE PRIZE BOOK ; or, a Series of Instructions on some of the most Important Duties of Youth. Price 6s.

THE COMMANDMENTS AND SACRAMENTS EXPLAINED. In Fifty-two Discourses. By the Right Rev. Dr. Hornihold. Price 5s.

VILLAGE EVENINGS ; or, Conversations on the principal Points of Morality, interspersed with Entertaining Histories. Price 1s. 6d.

FATHER ROWLAND ; or, the Force of Truth. A Catholic Tale of North America. Price 1s. 6d.

THE CLOCK OF THE PASSION ; or, Reflections on the Sufferings and Death of our Redeemer. By Liguori. With a Memoir of the Author. Price 1s.

FAMILIAR INSTRUCTIONS IN THE FAITH AND MORALITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, adapted to the use both of Children and the young, compiled from the Works of the most approved Catholic Authors. By the Rev. Joseph Curr. Price 1s.



