
S E R M O N VIII.

Mr. William No Sin Venial. *Jenkin.*

ROMANS 6. 23.

The Wages of Sin, is Death.

IT was a Censure more true than smart, which a late learned Pen, publickly in this expreffion pronounced againſt Popery, *Romana Religio in quantum differt a noſtra, eſt mera Impoſtura: The* Doctor *Prideaux* Lect.
 (now Roman Religion) *(as it differs from ours) is a meer Cheat, Juggle,* or (kind of) *Religious Legerdemain.* And herein the Impoſture of that Religion eminently appears, in that under the Yarniſh of *Chriſtian*, moſt of it ſeems calculated only for hooking in of *worldly gain*, and promoting of ſecular advantage. What Bp. *Senhouſe* (the *Cambridg. Chryſoſtom* of his time) ſaith In his Sermon upon *Acts 19. 28.* concerning *Demetrius* and his Fellow Crafts-men, their crying of, *Great is the Diana of the Ephesians; the Shrines of Diana cauſing their Shrieks for Diana, and their great Gain by her, raiſing up their great Cry for her, ſhewed there was dolus in Idolo, deceit in their Contention for the Idol;* may as truly be ſaid of the *Romiſh Demetrius*, the Pope and the Popiſh Priests, their eager out-cry in the Defence of the Points of Popery, it being not *Chriſt* but *Mammon*, not *Piety* but *Money*, not *God* but *Gold*, that ingageth them in their advancing of their Doctrines and Devotions. As *Saint Ambroſe* ſpake of *Benjamins Sack*, *Sacco ſoluto apparuit argentum*, when the *Sack* was looſed, the *Silver* appeared; reſolve the moſt of their Theology into that whereof 'tis Conſtituted, and *Silver* (Gain I mean) will be found to be the chief Element of its Conſtitution. Of this their own Writers are fitteſt Witneſſes, whom I have cited in their own words; for proving of this my Accuſation. *Aneas Silvius* (afterwards Pope) informs us, That the Roman Court gives nothing without *Silver*; It ſells (ſaith he) the Impoſition of Hands, the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt; nor is Pardon of Sin

Gen. 44. 11,
12.
Nihil eſt quod
abſq; argento
Romana Curia
dedat; Ipſa
manuum im-
poſitio & Spi-
ritus Sancti
dona vendun-
tur, nec pec-
carorum venia
niſi nummatis
impenditur.
Aneas Silvius
Ep. 56.

Venalia nobis
Templa, Sa-
cerdotes, Al-
taria, Sacra,
Corona, ignis,
thura, preces,
Cælum est ve-
nale, Deusq;
Mantu. l. 2.

Si quid Roma
dabit, nugas
dabit, accipit
aurum, verba
dat; heu Ro-
mæ nunc so-
la pecunia
regnat. B. Man-
tuan. Eclog. 5.
& 9.

In proverbium
jamdudum abiit Ro-
mana permu-
tio, plumbi
videlicet cum
auro. Duaren.
de Sac. Ec. Min.
l. 1. c. 6.

Regina rerum
pecunia, divi-
tibus licitum
facit quod in
pauperibus est
illicitum.

Claud. Espens.
Digr. 2. ad cap.
1. Ep. ad Tit.

Si spes reful-
serit nummi,
quod interd-
ctum fuit pri-
us, jam liberè
fit & impune.

Quod vetatur,
numerata pe-
cunia Dispen-
satur, quasi
nullum sit
peccatum ma-
jus, quam

nummis carere, ut Ille apud Horatium Ec. 2. Credidit ingens pauperiem vitium; & ut alter, l. 3. nunc sit Barbaries grandis habere nihil. Taxa non excipit Presbytericidas, paricidas, matricidas, incestos, deniq; Contra naturam cum Brutis, &c. Esthen. in Tit. p. mihi 478, 479. Si nihil numeraris, indispenfatus manes. Id.—Clericos cum pellicibus cohabitare, liberofq; procreare sinunt, accepto ab eis quotannis certo censu, atque adeo alicubi a continentibus; habeant, aiunt si velint.

given to any but such as are well-Monied. A Poet of their own faith, That with them, Temples, Priests, Altars, Prayers, yea Heaven, and God himself, are all set to Sale for Money; and that Rome gives Trifles and takes Gold. Another relates, That Romana permutatio auri cum plumbo, The Roman change, of Lead for Gold, was grown into a Proverb. Only Money reigns at Rome (thus speaks another) and makes that lawful for the Rich which is unlawful for the Poor; and (as he goes on) lay down but Money, and then that which was forbidden before as an heinous wickedness, shall now be dispensed with, and made no sin; but without Money, there is no Dispensation: and (as my Author Claudius Espensæus mournfully proceeds) the vice they esteem greatest, is to want Money; and to have nothing, is the greatest piece of Barbarity among them; and (as that plain-dealing Papist adds) to beighten their abomination, they allow their very Clergy-men to dwell with Whores and Harlots, and to beget Bastards for a certain Tax, which they do not only receive of the Adulterous, but even of the Continent and Innocent persons; alledging for this, that even these might have taken Whores also if they had pleased. I blush to translate what he adds, namely, That Bastards, Thieves, Adulterers, perjured Persons, are not only absolved for Money, but admitted to all Dignities and Spiritual Benefices; and for Money, Dispensations are granted for Murders, though of Presbyters, Fathers, Mothers, Brothers, Sisters, yea, for Wives, nay, for Witchcraft, Incest with the nearest of kin; and (which is most amazing) for uncleanness, Contra naturam cum Brutis, for the (not-to-be-named) Sin of Bestiality. And Rivet tells us in his Castigation of Petra-Sancta the Jesuit, That there came to his hands a Book, written by one Toffanus Denys, printed 1500. at Paris, Cum Privilegio, where in fol. 38, are taxed at a certain Rate, all Absolutions in the Court of Rome for murdering of Brethren and Sisters, Fathers, Mothers, Wives, and for the carnal knowledg of a Mans Sister or Mother, pro eo qui Sororem, Matrem carnaliter cognovit, in his 37 page of his Jesuita vaspulans. Chemnitzius in his Examen concerning the Point of Indulgences, gives us a Copy of Verses written over the Altar in a Popish Cathedral, of which Verses when I read them in Chemnitzius, I could hardly say whether they more proved my foregoing Accusation of, or provoked my just indignation against Popery, that Master-piece of painted Atheism. All the Verses of that pitiful piece of Poetry, are too many to set down, some of them are these:

Ut tibi sit pœnæ venia sit aperta crumena,
Hic dicitur exponi Paradisus venditioni,
Hic si large des, in Cælo sit tua sedes,
Pro solo nummo gaudebis in æthere summo.

The sum whereof, and the rest, is but this, *Lay down your Money, and doubt not of getting up to Glory.* The *Romish Jeroboam*, I mean the *Pope*, sets up the two *Calves* of his golden *Faith* and *Worship* to preserve to himself his carnal Kingdom; of which *Faith* and *Worship*, the greatest part is purely subservient to the *Popes*, either *Coffer* or *Kitchen*, and of which *Kingdom*, more truly than of *War*, Money may be said to be the *Soul* and *Sinews*. If their *Doctrines* may be witnesses to prove so clear an accusation, I might produce a far greater number than is needful to make up an *ordinary Jury*, by mentioning those of *Auricular Confession*, *Pilgrimages*, *Penance*, *Images*, *Prayers for the Dead*, *Indulgences*, *Purgatory*, *Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Merits*, *Holiness of places*, *breaking faith with Hereticks*, *the Popes Superiority over Princes*, *dispensation with Oaths*; and this before us, of *Venial Sin*. All these arrows, if they were not level'd at the mark of *Gain*, yet sure I am, they most exactly hit and center in it (strange they should meet so unitedly if shot at rovers); if you consult the generality of their *Doctrines*, most of the *Questions* in the *Popish Catechism*, may easily be reduced to this one, *What shall we get for our Pouches and Purfes?* A *Catechism* not compos'd by *Peter* the *Popes* pretended Predecessor (who though he said, *Silver and Gold have I none*; yet also said, *thy Money perish with thee*); but by *Judas* his bag-bearing pattern, in that question of his for betraying of *Christ*,--- *Quid dabitis? What will you give me?* 'Twas ingenuously spoken by a late Poet, when he thus verifiy'd;

*An Petrus Romæ fuerit, sub iudice lis est
Simonem Romæ nemo fuisse negat.*

We are not sure that Peter ever sat

In Rome, but Simon did, w'are sure of that.

Simon, that *Simon* who barter'd and chaffer'd for the *Spirit* with *Money*, is constant Resident at *Rome*, where some hundreds of years, in many thousands of *Bargains*, he hath been as *successful* in *selling to fools*, as ever was his Predecessor *insuccessful* in his attempt to buy of the *Apostles*. Among all their *Doctrines* of this *earthen* and *muddy* complexion, we shall this day, more particularly produce this of *Venial Sin*, principally both set up, and shor'd up, that the pretended punishment of those in *Purgatory*, may be bought off by money; and that without any *beholdingness* to the *blood of Christ*, provided the *Purse* will but bleed freely, as drawn by *Romish Priests*, the common *Purse-leeches*, or religious *Cut-purses* of the *Christian World*; and from hence it was, that *Sins*, by *Papists* call'd pardonable, have been rather termed *saleable*, *venalia* not *venialia*, with a very small and *venial* alteration of the word *venial*.

I wonder not therefore that *Bellarmino* in his first Chapter of *Venial Sin*, thus sets out, *We teach* (saith *Bellarmino*) *by common consent*, *That there are some Sins which of their own nature, do not render a man guilty of eternal death, but only of temporal punishment.* To which Expredion of his; *Orthodox Amesthus* replies, *Nos unanimi consensu negamus illud quod* *Bellar-*

Nos docemus communi consensu, peccata quædam, ex natura suâ, hominem non reddere mortis æternæ reum, sed tantum supplicii temporalis.

Bellar. c. 1. de Pec. Ven.

Nos unanimi consensu negamus illud quod *Bellar-*

minus affirmat communi consensu doceri. Amesthus, Bellar. Tit. l. 2. c. 1.

minus affirmat, communi consensu doceri. We (Protestants) deny with an unanimous consent, that which Bellarmine affirms is taught (among them) with common consent. My Work this day, is to declare my Concurrence with our Protestant Divines, in their denial and detesting the blasphemous Doctrine of Venial Sin. Only I cannot but mention as an encouraging entrance into this approaching Employment, the *wariness* of Bellarmine's Expression, in these words, *Communi consensu docemus*; we teach by common consent; for he could not say (as Dr. Ames his Answerer)

Quâ ratione distinguatur peccatum veniale à mortali, non una est sententia Doctorum, sed variant in infinitum Doctores. *Medin. in them eternally without injustice. Gregory de Valentia saith, That Venial* 1, 2. q. 88. a. 1.

we teach our Doctrine herein with unanimous consent. For (as Medina an eminent Papist confesseth) *the Popish Doctors are infinitely at odds, and disagree among themselves in finding out, how a Venial and a Mortal Sin differ.* 'Tis true the black Regiment, or rather the forlorn Adventurers of the Antichristian Army, strike home, and speak out for their General the Pope, and his Cause in this Point. Bellarmine tells us, That some Sins are so far from deserving eternal punishment, that God cannot punish

Cum multi ex hac vitâ migrant, à lethali bus quidem criminibus immunes; levioribus tamen aliis magis implicatus, quorum tamen nemo, sine ob plura, sine pauciora hæc delicta quotidiana,

brother Bonaventure asserts, That for Venial Sins we do not so much as need Repentance. The Provincial Council of Mentz dictate, *That many depart this life, free from Mortal Sins, and for lighter Sins they shall never be damned; and that it can hardly be understood how God should be just, should he punish any for Venial Sins with eternal punishment.* And that Council Senonense declares, *That he who dies involv'd in Venial Sins (among which it particularly mentions idle words, of which Christ saith, We must give an account, and by which we shall be condemned, Mat. 12. 37.) though he be unfit for Heaven, yet neither is it fit he should go to Hell, as being a partaker of Grace, but is to be purged by the fire of Purgatory, out of which he is to be delivered by the prayers of the living; and that whosoever thinks otherwise, is guilty of the Lutheran, Wiclevian and Waldensian Heretical pravity.*

As for that Council (if we may so call the *Conventicle*) of Trent, it requires that all Bishops should take care, that Prayers and the Sacrifices of the Mass, should be devoutly offered for the dead, and accurately performed to free them from the punishment of Venial Sin. The same Trent-Assembly Deus (qui est in omnibus & erga omnes justissimus) non injustus videretur, si non post hanc vitam, per temporales & non æternas poenas, omnium compensatio expectaretur. *Bin. Tom. 9. c. 46. p. mibi 322.* Cum peccati tantum venialis reus, repente nonnunquam intereat; de omni verbo etiam otioso rationem redditurus, nec illi pateat aditus ad Cœlestem Hierusalem, in quam nihil intrat coinquinarum; nec item Gehennæ subjeat, quippe qui gratiæ sit particeps, ac poenæ tantum temporalis debitor; sit ut primum purgetur ex iis quæ gessit in corpore, salvus tandem aliquando futurus, sic tamen quasi per ignem. *Bin. Tom. 9. p. mibi 198.* Curent Episcopi ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, miserarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, elemosynæ, aliæque pietatis opera quæ pro fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, piè & devote fiant. *Bin. Tom. 9. Sess. 25. Conc. Trid. p. mibi 419 & Sess. 14. c. 7. p. mibi 389.*

clearly

clearly discovers that they hold, that 'tis not necessary to confess Venial Sins. 'Tis true therefore (as I said), that those bored slaves of the Pope, thus *tearfully* express themselves in the asserting of *Venial Sin*. But yet 'twas honestly said by *Bellarmino* however, That this Doctrine of the *Veniality of Sin*, is taught (in the Antichristian Synagogue) only with a *common* (not an *unanimous*) consent. For the learnedst of the Papists, as *Vega*, *Alvissodorenfis*, *Almain*, *Azorius*, *Durand*, *Fisher* of *Rocheſter*, (who loſt his Head for his maintaining the Popes Headſhip) but eſpecially *Gerſon* Chancellor of *Paris*, liberally aſſert that all *Sin* is *mortiferous* or *deadly*; and that none is *Venial*, or deſerving of Pardon: To all which I add that for the firſt ſeven hundred years after Chriſt, the Doctrine of *Venial Sin* was *never* taught by any *Father*, or *Doctör*, or maintain'd in any *Council*. Nor can *Bellarmino*, after his ſtricteſt ſearch into the *Fathers*; nor could he, nor dares he name *one* of them that ever us'd the very name or word of *Venial Sin*. This being premiſed as an encouragement to our conflict, namely that the beſt Soldiers of the *Enemies Army*, are come over to our ſide (a ſign of their enſuing overthrow,) you may take up the truth of this Doctrine concerning *Venial Sin*, either in an affirmative or negative Propoſition (which you pleaſe): If in an *Affirmative*, receive it thus; *Every Sin is of its own nature mortiferous and deadly, deſerving eternal puniſhment*. If in a *Negative*, take it thus; *No Sin deſerves pardon*; or thus, *No Sin is exempted from deſerving eternal death*; or (as 'tis uſually expreſt), *No Sin is Venial in its own nature*. In the diſcuſſing this great Truth, I ſhall (God willing) diſcourſe,

The main Point.

- By way of {
 1. Explication.
 2. Confirmation.
 3. Application.

- I. In the Explication I ſhall proceed by way of
 1. *Conceſſion*, or granting what is not to be deny'd.
 2. By way of *Negation*, or denial of what is not to be granted; that by both, the queſtion may be clear'd, by being freed from the *fogs* of *Popiſh* Objections.

I. For the firſt way of *Explication*, viz. of *Conceſſion*, I grant,
 1. *All private offences of man againſt man, have a pardon from man due to them*; and that 'tis ſo, the Scriptures fully diſcover, *Ephes. 4. 32. Col. 3. 13. Rom. 12. &c.* in requiring *mutual forgivenesſ*. 'Tis well expreſt by *Chamier*, *There's no ſin of any againſt us, but is Venial*. But how weak is *Bellarmines* argument from hence, to prove that *Venial Sins* do not hinder God from loving us. *If all offences* (ſaith he) *dissolve the love of God; by the ſame reaſon ſhould they diſſolve love and friendſhip between man and man; but this they do not, therefore, &c.*

Nullum eſt peccatum cuiuſquam in nos, non veniale. *Chamier Panſtr. de pec. ven. p. mibi 182: Eadem ratio ne concludere poſſit Bellarminus Deum teneri peccata hominibus re-*

mittere quia homines inimicos ſuos diligere debent, & injurias ipſis quoad vindictam condonare. *Antes, Bellar. Exerc. de Ven. pec. p. 11.*

Non est æquum, hominum in homines officia æquari officiis hominum in Deum, itaque neque peccata. Ac proinde nullum est peccatum cuiusquam in nos, non veniale, at hominum in Deum nullum veniale; multa certe mortalia ipsis fatentibus Papistis. Cham. Panstr. de pec. Ven. Id. *ibid.*

I answer; The consequence is not only false, but *blasphemous*, for the favour of God, and the reasons for which that is preserved or dissolved, are not to be paralleled with the friendship of man, and the reasons for which this is either maintain'd or destroy'd. Nor are the Offices of man to man to be equaliz'd with the Duties of man to God, and so neither the offences. To make this plain, I argue,

1. From Popish Principles.
2. From undeniable Reason.

1. From Popish Principles. For,
 1. Do they not constantly declare, That though a man, be he never so high, he neither doth nor should inflict great punishments upon his inferiors for light and small offences, yet that God inflicts grievous torments upon his Children for the least, even *Venial Sins*, even the torments of *Purgatory*, not less than those of Hell, but only in *duration*, (if you'll believe *Bellarmino*;) the least whereof (as *Aquinas* tells us,) is greater than the greatest in this life?

2. Do not the *Papists* grant that there are *many* kinds of offences which *do not* destroy Humane friendship (nor ought) which yet exclude from *Gods love*? As when a man out of a *good intention* of helping or benefiting his friend, proves *hurtful* or *offensive* to him; this excludes not a man from his friends favour; but when a man out of a *zealous intention* to please God, doth offend him (as *Paul* did who thought *he did God good service* in persecuting the Church), he doth with *Paul* in that case, sin *mortally*, and deserve exclusion from the favour of God.

2. I argue from undeniable reason: The sum whereof is this; *Man* offended by *man* hath causes to continue still his love to *man*, which *God* offended hath *not*.

1. Man by the bond of a *Precept*, is bound to forgive man; but God is not *capable* of such a *bond*.

2. Man offended, is a *finite* creature, and therefore offences against him, are comparatively *small* and *inconsiderable*; but offences against God are against an *infinite* Majesty, and therefore *infinite*.

3. Offences against Man are *mutual*, the *offended to day*, may be the *offender to morrow*; but God never can *wrong* his Creature, no, though *he hurts it*; *What iniquity have your fathers found in me?* Jer. 2. 11.

4. Man offended may be, and perhaps hath been *benefited* by the *Man* offending; but to God *no good of ours* can extend.

5. A man offended, oft *warns not* the offender that he should not offend or wrong him, but God hath a *thousand times* admonish'd, exhorted, *intreated*, *threatned* against offending of him.

2. I grant, though all Sins deserve eternal punishment, and though no Sins are Venial, yet that *all Sins are not equal*, nor do they deserve equal punishment. The *Papists* would willingly fasten this *Stoical dotage* upon us, of holding the equality of Sin (as did the *Jovinianists* of old) in requital for our maintaining the *damnableness* of all Sin; but what they

Second
Concession.

they say herein of us, is a meer slandering of us. This Calumny *Durae* in his Eighth Book against our famous *Whitaker* (*Quantum nomen!*) hath cast upon learned *Calvin*, That he held all Sins were equal, because he held all were mortal. The like also saith *Gautierus* in his Chronological Table of the fourth Age, where speaking of the *Jovinianists* their making all Sins equal, he impudently tells us, *Calvins Doctrinae est conformabilis* to those who held all Sins equal, because it makes them all mortal. But blessed *Calvin* both purgeth himself from the Calumny, and confutes the argument on which 'tis grounded, in the third Book of his *Institutions*, cap. 4, by this invincible answer; *Scio* (saith he) *quam inique Doctrinam nostram calumniantur*, &c. I know how unjustly the Papists calumniate our Doctrinae; they say, By our making all Sins mortal and damnable, we set up the Paradox of the Stoicks, of the equality of Sins; but (saith he) the very Doctrinae of the Papists themselves will fully clear us; for I demand of them, Do they not acknowledg that among those Sins they call Mortal, there is an inequality, and that one Mortal Sin is greater than another, and therefore they cannot charge me with making all Sins equal, because I hold they are all Mortal. How is then the Doctrinae of Equality of Sins, more to be fathered upon *Calvin*, than upon the Papists themselves? 'Tis our constant Doctrinae, That Sins and their punishments are unequal, though all Sins are Mortal. We teach, Though all Sins deserve eternal punishment, yet not the same degree of eternal punishment, but some a lesser degree than others. Though all Sins deserve a punishment extensively infinite, yet not intensively equal. We agree to that old expression of a *mitius ardent nonnulli*; the flames of Hell shall be less torturing to some, than to others; for some, it will be more tolerable at the day of judgment than for others; some are beaten with more, others with fewer stripes, Luk. 12. 47, 48. As among the Jews there were several degrees of capital punishment for several offences, so are there in Hell several degrees of punishment suted to the degrees of Sin. Of which truth the words of Christ, *Mat. 5. 22*, are a clear proof, which tell us of the punishment inflicted by the Judgment, which was the *Confessus singularum Civitatum*, the Assembly belonging to every City, consisting of three and twenty, by whom the punishment inflicted was (according to the best Writers) *killing with the Sword*. In the same Scripture next we read of the punishment inflicted by the Council or *Sanedrim* consisting of seventy Elders, for greater offences, which punishment was *Stoning*. And lastly, there is mentioned the punishment of *Γέεννα πυρός*, call'd *Hell-fire*, which was by the old Idolaters exercised upon their Infants, who were sacrificed in the Valley of *Hinnom*: Christ by the similitude of these Earthly punishments which passed one another in sharpness & severity, setting forth the

confessus 23, virum singularum civitatum; summus autem ille Synedrion vocatur. Κρίσιμος poenalis usitatissima erat gladius. Cum autem supra lapidationem, nulla poena in usu Judaico esset, quaesivit Christus aliunde nomen horrendi cruciatus, qui & gladium & lapidationem excederet, scilicet Gebenne ignis. Grot. in loc.

In eo Calvinus peccata paria facit quod omnia mortalia, & aeternis digna suppliciiis censuerit. *Durae. cont. Whitak. Lib. 8.* Non parum conformis est Doctrina Calviniana, nolentis audire peccata venialia, sed omnia definiens mortalia. *Gaut. Tab. Chron. sec. 4ti.* Scio quam inique Doctrinam hanc nostram Calumniantur. Dicunt enim paradoxum esse Stoicorum de peccatorum aequalitate. Sed suo ipsorum ore, nullo negotio convincuntur. — Quare enim, annon inter ea ipsa peccata, quae mortalia fatentur, aliud alio magis agnoscant? Non igitur procius sequitur paria esse peccata, quae simul mortalia sunt. *Calv. Instit. l. 3. c. 4. sec. 13.*

Κρίσιμος est

Vid. Grot. in loc.
 Tres iracundia species totidem facit homicidii species, & per hoc lethales omnes coram Deo, licet impariter. Dav. Pareus contr. Bellar. de amf. Grat. p. 90, 91.
 Non solum qui occidit, reus est occisionis ad damnationem, sed qui irascitur sine causâ fratri. f. o. Iren. l. 2. c. 46.
 Tres hi gradus supplicii pœnam significant Gehennalem. Barnad. l. 7. c. 17.
 Per Confilium, capitalem pœnam intelligit, per civilem capitis pœnam, sempiternam animæ mortem intelligit.
 Christus & eum qui irascitur, & eum qui fratrem suum levem, & eum qui solum appellat eadem inferni pœna, non eadem pœnæ gravitate dignum docet. Maldon. in Mat. 5. 22.

degrees of punishments, in the place of the damned. This will yet be clearer, if we duly consider the case to which Christ is speaking, concerning which we may thus understand Christ expressing himself: *Heretofore men have been deter'd from murdering others, because the Law commands that murtherers should be cut off by the sword; But I would have you take heed of anger, because that is to be punisht in the next world as severely as murder is punisht in this. But if any to his anger, shall add evil-speaking he shall be punisht with a greater punishment; as Stoning is a greater than that by the Sword. And if his evil-speaking be very grievous and hainous, he shall suffer more exquisite torments, such as those sustained who were burnt in the Valley of Hinnom.* See Grotius on the place. And hereby Bellarmine's Cavil is answered, who to prove that all Sins are not Mortal, and deserving eternal punishment in Hell, argues thus; *Here are (saith he) two Temporal punishments less than that of Hell-fire; and because he is only guilty of Hell-fire, who breaks out into such an outrageous anger as to call his brother fool, therefore the other degrees of anger are Venial Sins, as being only threated with Temporal punishments.* But this erroneous Sophister perverts the true sense of this Text, not considering that the true import thereof is this, That all the three degrees of anger here mentioned by our Saviour, are *totidem homicidia*, so many murders (as Pareus speaks) and that the three degrees of punishment expressed here, are three degrees *unius specie pœnæ*, of one punishment in kind and nature, which is eternal punishment in Hell, and that a less degree of torment in Hell is understood by the *Judgment*, than by the word *Council*, and a less by *Council* than by *Hell-fire*, and that all the three degrees of punishment here expressed by Christ, *equally intend the punishment of the damned in Hell*, though not in equality of punishment to be inflicted on the offenders. Thus Irenæus of old interpreted this Text: *Not only (saith he) is he guilty of killing to damnation, who kills his brother, but even he who is angry with him without a cause.* So Saint Austin de verb. Domini; *Omnes cruciabantur, sed minus ille, minus ille;* All shall be tormented, though some more, some less. Thus also Barradius and Maldonat, Bellarmine's fellow-Jesuits, (though not greater Sophisters, yet better Expofitors than Bellarmine) interpret this Text, ingenuously confessing, That by *Judgment* and *Council* as well as by *Hell-fire*, the eternal death of the Soul is to be understood, though with a gradual difference of the punishment.

3. My third Concession is this. *Though no Sin be venial but every Sin deserves eternal death, yet no Sin of its own nature necessarily and infallibly damns, but the Sin against the Holy Ghost.* All other Sins may possibly be pardoned, Mat. 12. 31. every Sin that admits of Repentance, is pardonable. All Sins are remissible *secuslo finalis impenitentia respectu*, which are not followed with final impenitence, as is that against the Holy Ghost. Other Sins make a man liable to death, this pertinaciously opp site to the terms of life. This is that Sin unto death mentioned 1 Job. 5. 16 17.

And

And hereby the argument of *Baily* the Jesuite for Venial Sin is obviated, who from this Scripture, which mentions a *Sin not unto death, and a sin that is unto death*; argues, that some Sins are of their own nature venial, and not deserving death, though other Sins are mortal, and do deserve death. 'Tis true St. *John* distinguisheth between a *Sin not unto death*; and a *Sin unto death*; but by both expressions he intends Sins mortiferous in their own nature, and such as deserve eternal death. By the *Sin not unto death*, he understands a Sin notwithstanding which, a man may avoid eternal death, and may be pardoned though it deserves eternal death; and by a *Sin unto death* he intends a Sin which whosoever commits, can never be pardoned, and therefore can never escape eternal death; and hence he would not have such a Sinner as commits it, pray'd for. And that by the *Sin not unto death* he doth not mean a venial Sin that deserves not death, is plain from this very Text, where the Apostle saith, *That life shall be given for them that have not sin'd unto death*, by the prayers of the faithful; but I desire to know why life should be given for him that sins not unto death, if his Sins were venial & did not at all deserve death. Certainly the sin which the Apostle calls a *sin not unto death*, had meritoriously taken away the life of the Soul, and so cannot be accounted venial, but in some kind mortal; and 'tis as plain from the Text, that by the *Sin* which is unto death, the Apostle means not a Sin which is mortal, or only deserving death, as distinguish'd from Venial Sin; because the Apostle forbids the praying for him that commits that sin which is unto death. Now if the Apostle forbids praying for him whose Sin is mortal, as only deserving death, then it would unavoidably follow that none should be pray'd for that commit mortal Sins or Sins deserving death, but only they who commit Venial Sins; which is contrary to Christs, both Precept and Example, who both commands us to pray for Persecuters, (and no Papist can deny that *Persecution* is a *Mortal Sin*.) and did himself, as also did after him that Blessed Martyr *Stephen*, pray for his Persecuters. And so clearly true is this, that *Bartholomæus Petrus* a Papist, and Professor of *Doway*, in his Continuation of *Estius's* Comment on the Epistles, on 1 *Joh. 5. 16.* ingenuously confesseth, That by a *Sin not unto death* is to be understood, a Sin from which a man may arise by repentance, and that by a *Sin unto death*, we are to understand a Sin from which a man can never arise by repentance. And that a Mortal Sin may be said to be not unto death, he illustrates by the speech of *Christ* concerning *Lazarus's* Sicknes. *This Sicknes* (saith *Christ*) *is not unto death*; namely, because *Lazarus* was to be recall'd to life, and so a *Sin not unto death*, is a Sin from which, and from death by which, a man may be recall'd; as a *Sin unto death* is a Sin from which, and from death by which, a man cannot

mortem esse; sed meminisse debet quod salvator *Joan. 11.* dicebat, infirmitas hæc non est ad mortem, cum tamen *Lazarus* ex eâ infirmitate mortuus fuerit; sic in proposito peccatum mortale, cujus vera pœnitentia agitur, non est ad mortem. *Barth. Pet. in 1 Joh. 5. 16.*

Peccatum non ad mortem dicitur Apostolo, quod est mortale quidem sed agitur ejus pœnitentia. Videbitur hoc mirum alicui, quod peccatum quoddam mortale dicatur non ad

Comparatio
hæc inter
peccata aptius
fit, intelligendo

de peccato, non veniali, sed mortali. *Lorin. in loc.* Peccatum non ad mortem; non potest peccatum significare veniale, cum enim dicat *Johannes*, Oranti pro peccato non ad mortem dandam esse vitam, plane indicat hoc peccatum non ad mortem, spiritualem vitam adimere, quod si spirituali vitâ destituitur qui peccat non ad mortem, mortifero scelere obstringatur, necesse est. *Julin. in loc.*

The fourth
Concession.

4. My fourth Concession is this; *Though no Sin be Venial in its own nature, and deserving of pardon; yet this binds not but that Sin is Venial by an extrinsick cause, namely, the grace and mercy of God in Christ.* Though Venial Sins (as the Papists call them) in themselves are Mortal; yet Mortal Sins through Grace are Venial. All the Sins of the Elect, and of those in the state of Grace, are, though in themselves damnable, yet pardoned through Grace, and not damning. There is no condemnation to them (saith the Apostle) that are in Christ Jesus. Though the least Sin makes us guilty of damnation if God should deal with us strictly, and secundum legis rigorem, according to the rigour of the Law; yet the greatest cannot effect this guiltiness of damnation, where mercy through Christ is confer'd upon the most unworthy. Sins in themselves unworthy of pardon, are Venial to the guilty, ex benignitate judicis, by the goodness of the Judg, and remissible to the debtor, ex liberalitate Creditoris, by the bounty of the Creditor. Though ex peccati natura, every Sin excludes from Salvation; yet ex misericordia Dei, no Sin doth so. Though Sin be not exempted from desert of punishment, quia vindicari non debet; yet 'tis exempted, quia Deus vindicare nolit. Though not because it ought not to be punished; yet because God through Christ will not punish it.

Rom. 8: 1.

Venialia dicuntur peccata, ab Eventu, non quòd per se venia digna sunt. Sunt venialia reis ex benignitate judicis, remissibilia debitori ex creditoris liberalitate.
Rivet. Tr. 4. Q. 13.

And hence, 1. It follows, that as all the Sins of Reprobates are deadly, not only ex merito, because of their merit; but also ex eventu, and in the event; because no Sin is Venial in it self, but only by Gods mercy: So likewise, 2. That the reason why the Sins of the Regenerate exclude them not from the favour of God, is not from their own nature, but merely from Gods mercy, all Sins deserving that exclusion. Yea, 3. Hence it follows, that though damnation be actually inflicted upon some for their Sins, viz. Unbelievers; yet remission and salvation may be bestow'd upon others, notwithstanding they have committed those very Sins for which others are damned. To Unbelievers Whoredom is damning, and excludes them from the Kingdom of God, Ephes. 5. 5; and yet Davids Adultery excluded not him from that Kingdom. The murdering of Christ was imputed to Judas and Pilate; and yet not to those Act. 2. 23, 38. who slew Christ with wicked hands, whom Peter wills to repent, and be baptized, for the remission of sins. God pardoned Davids Adultery with Bathsheba, but might not Antonies with Cleopatra; Lots Incest

was,

was, Herods might not be forgiven. Solomons Idolatry was, and Jeroboams might not be remitted. Yea hence I fear not to assert, that greater Sins may be pardon'd to some, when smaller may damn others: An idle word may destroy one, when Murder and Adultery may not another.

And this fully answers Bellarmines Argument for the Veniality of Sin. 'Tis this, *If all Sins be Mortal of their own nature, and only Venial to Believers, because of their Faith; then all Sins should be Mortal to Unbelievers, and Venial to Believers: But this (saith he) is false, that all Sins of Unbelievers should be Mortal, and all Sins of Believers Venial; for if they be Venial to Believers, then much more are they so to Unbelievers.* But why so, O Cardinal? Because (saith he) the Sins of Believers are more grievous and hainous than the Sins of Unbelievers, as being committed against more light and love. Now this Argument is easily answer'd by my fourth Concession. 'Tis not false that Sins though smaller in genere peccati, in the kind of Sin, should be Mortal to Unbelievers, and greater Sins Venial to Believers; for as they are Mortal to both of their own nature, so by accident, through the mercy of God, pardoning to Believers both their smaller and greater Sins, their Sins become Venial in the event; which accident being deficient to Unbelievers in their sinning, *Nequaquam eorum peccata facit venialia, sed ut sunt sunt mortalia*; It makes not their Sins Venial, but leaves them as they are in themselves Mortal, as learned Pareus in answer to Bellarmine. We grant (as Gerard expresseth it), that the pardoned Sins of Believers are more hainous than those of Unbelievers; but hence it cannot be infer'd, that some Sins of Unbelievers are Venial: For that the Sins of Believers are Venial, 'tis not from the nature of their Sins, but from the meer Grace of God pardoning, and not imputing their Sins; and therefore to all Unbelievers their Sins remain such as they are of their own nature, that is, Mortal or Mortiferous. This also stops the mouth of that desperate or despairing Papist Cotton, who thus argues, to hold that all Sins deserve eternal punishment, and that none can live without Sin, *is the ready way to drive men to the precipice of despair*, especially when dying (he should have said; 'Tis the ready way to drive the Priests, those silly Quacks, into despair of purging the Purse with the pill of Purgatory): But the answer is easie, This Argument only becomes those *quibus Dei misericordia est ignota*, (as Chamier speaks), who are strangers to

Fideles gravius peccantes, venialiter peccant; ergo multo magis venialiter peccant infideles, levius peccantes; sic Bellarminus.

Responder Pareus. Ansecedens falsum est intellectum per se, verum est ex accidenti, propter misericordiam Dei venia delentis non levia tantum, sed omnia peccata fidelium respicientium; quod accidens cum in peccatis infidelium deficiat, nequaquam ea venialia facit, sed mortalia sinit, ut sunt sua natura omnia eorum peccata. Pareus contr. Bell. de amiss. Grat. c. 11. Certum est renatos per peccata mortalia contra conscientiam commissa, gravius Deum offendere quam infideles, quibus tantum cognitionis lumen, ac tantus beneficiorum divinatorum cumulus non obrigit; sed ex eo nondum inferri potest, quaedam peccata infidelium esse sua natura venialia; quod enim in renatis quaedam sint venialia, id non est a natura peccatorum, sed ex sola Dei misericordiae, & peccata non imputantis gratia. Ergo in non-renatis & infidelibus, omnia omnino peccata sunt & manent talia, qualia sunt ex natura sua, hoc est, mortalia. Gerb. loc. Com. de pec. act. p. 306.

tum, sed omnia peccata fidelium respicientium; quod accidens cum in peccatis infidelium deficiat, nequaquam ea venialia facit, sed mortalia sinit, ut sunt sua natura omnia eorum peccata. Pareus contr. Bell. de amiss. Grat. c. 11. Certum est renatos per peccata mortalia contra conscientiam commissa, gravius Deum offendere quam infideles, quibus tantum cognitionis lumen, ac tantus beneficiorum divinatorum cumulus non obrigit; sed ex eo nondum inferri potest, quaedam peccata infidelium esse sua natura venialia; quod enim in renatis quaedam sint venialia, id non est a natura peccatorum, sed ex sola Dei misericordiae, & peccata non imputantis gratia. Ergo in non-renatis & infidelibus, omnia omnino peccata sunt & manent talia, qualia sunt ex natura sua, hoc est, mortalia. Gerb. loc. Com. de pec. act. p. 306.

the mercy of God in Christ, and will not trust to it for Salvation. 'Tis not the *smallness* of Sin, but the *greatness* of Christ, that saves us. This pitiful Papist draws a damnable *conclusion* from a *Divine* principle. The *principle* is, *No sin is Venial*; therefore (saith he) *despair*; but therefore say we, believe, go out to *Christ* for free remission through his blood, whereby all *Sin Mortal* in its nature, is *Venial* to the Believer. And let me tell thee (O thou blind Papist) though thou sinnest *much* in making *Sin small*, yet thou sinnest *more* in making my *Saviour* so. I shall conclude this fourth *Concession*, with manifesting the consent herein of the learnedest of the *Papists* with our *Protestant Divines*. *Aquinas* saith, *Eternity of punishment is due to every Sin of the unregenerate, ratione conditionis subjecti*, in respect of the state of him that commits it, *who wants that Grace whereby Sin is only remitted*. And *Cajetan* upon those words of *Aquinas*, tells us, that *Grace is the only fountain whence floweth remission of Sin, and nothing maketh Sin venial or remissible but to be in Grace; and that nothing maketh Sin irremissible and not venial, but the being out of a state of Grace*; and that which maketh *Sin Venial* or not *Venial*, is the state of the subject wherein 'tis found. For if we respect the nature of *Sin* as 'tis in it self, it will remain (without grace) eternally in stain and guilt, and so will subject the Sinner to eternal punishment, and 'is mortal. So that *remissibility* or *irremissibility* of *Sins* must not be considered according to the *sins themselves*, but according to the *subjects being, or not being in the state of Grace*. *Fisher* Bishop of *Rochester*, though a most bitter adversary to *Luther*, yet concerning the *Veniality* of *Sin*, he thus speaks to *Luther*; *In this that Sin is Venial by the mercy of God, I am, Luther, wholly of thy mind*. *Azorius* confesseth, *That the remission of Venial Sin is of a free and supernatural benefit, and afforded to none that are not in a state of Grace*.

Peccato non debetur poena aeterna ratione suae gravitatis, sed ratione conditionis subjecti, scilicet hominis, qui sine gratia invenitur, per quam solum fit remissio poenae. *Aquin.* 1, 2. Qu. 87. Art. 5. ad 1. p. mihi 275.

Sola gratia est principium remissionis poenae. Remissibilitas, & irremissibi-

litas tam culpae quam poenae attenduntur penes statum subjecti, scil. esse in gratia vel non, statui gratiae convenit remissibilitas positive, statui vero culpae extra gratiam convenit irremissibilitas positive. *Cajet. in loc. praedict. p. mihi 275.* Quod peccatum veniale solum ex misericordia Dei veniale fit, hoc ego tecum, *Luthere*, sentio. *Contra Luther. Art. 32.* Venialis remissio peccati, gratulum & supernaturale est beneficium Dei, nemini extra gratiam Dei constituto peccatum veniale dimittitur. *Azor. l. 4. c. 10.* Nisi quia est ab homine justo Dei gratia & charitate praedito commissum, perpetuo puniretur. *Azor. l. 3. c. 9.*

2d. Branch. of Explicat.

Agnoscimus quorundam deliria, qui, quod dicitur de alieno corio sunt liberales, stultitiam debitorum qui adversus creditorem suum, judicium proferunt in propria causa. Certè reus qui coram iudice suo culpam extenuat, cum res tota iudici perspecta est, imprudenter valde se gerit, nec minus stultè facit, qui debitum suum vel negat, vel minuit apud eum qui convincere potest & cogere. *Rivet. Sum. contr. Tr. quant. Quest. 13.*

Thus far are our *Concessions* concerning the *Veniality* of *Sin*, or our granting what is not to be denied, which was the *first* part of my *Explication*; I come now to the *second Branch* of *Explication*, which is to be by way of *Negation*, or denial of what is not to be granted.

That which I *preemptorily deny* is this, *That any Sins are exempted from deserving eternal punishment, upon the account of any imaginary, or imaginable smallness or levity of Sin*.

'Tis ingeniously express'd by *Learned Rivet* in his *Catholicus Ortho-*

doxus,

doxus, against Baile the Jesuite upon this occasion, That there are some who *de alieno corio sunt liberales*, cut large thongs out of an Hide that's none of their own, That (he means) of Gods mercy; who measure Gods judgment according to their own rule; and like foolish debtors will be judges of their own cause against their Creditor. That guilty Malefactor (saith he gravely) is unwise, who extenuates his fault before his Judge, to whom his whole cause is known; nor is it less imprudent to diminish our Sins before that God, who can both convincere & cogere, convince us of our debts; and compel us to make satisfaction. Bellarmine then and his Complices are none of the wisest or honestest, who dictate to us, that some Sins are so light and little, that they deserve no eternal punishment, but are Venial; 1. Some in genere suo, in their kind of Sin, as when the Will is carried out to that, which contains in it self a kind of inordination indeed, but yet such as is not contrary either to the love of God or our Neighbour, as an officious lie, or an idle word; and that, 2. Some Sins are Venial ex imperfectione operis, by the imperfection of the work; and these (saith Bellarmine) are of two sorts; 1. Some are Venial ex surreptione, by their unexpected stealth and creeping into the Soul, and these are sudden motions of lusts, anger, revenge, &c. which get into the mind before reason can deliberate, whether they are to be admitted or no; and so they are not perfecte voluntaria, have not the full consent of the Will. 2. Other Sins are Venial by the imperfection of the matter, ex parvitate materie, which are committed in a light and small matter; as the stealing of an half-peny, which neither hurts our Neighbour, nor destroys Love. Against these we oppose, That there's no Sin but deserves eternal punishment. per propriam naturam & intrinsecam rationem, by its own proper and intrinsecal nature. As the least drop of water is water, as truly as the whole Sea, so the least Sin is as truly Sin as the greatest; and the least Sin according to the rigour of the Law deserves an everlasting penalty. The imperfection of Sin as to degree, takes not away from it either the reason of Sin, or the merit of penalty, as Medina, Azorius, Durand, and others confess. Azorius tells us from Durand, Vega, Cajetan; That the Law of God forbids Venial Sins, even all Sin both great and small; and that the Arguments of the Protestants prove, that Venial Sin is against the Law of God. To which I add, that it implys a gross contradiction, to say that the least Sin should be said to be a Sin, and yet to be Venial and deserve pardon; for if it deserves pardon, then also freedom from punishment, and if freedom from punishment, then it hath no guilt, and if it have no guilt, then it is no Sin. Most true is that speech of Alenstzig, in his Lexicon Theologicum; Nullum peccatum habet rationem ad merendam veniam, imo potius demeretur; Sin as Sin cannot deserve to be pardoned, but it deserves not to be pardoned. Nor can Bellarmine with his Sophistry prove, that the small Sins before mention'd, are in their nature Venial: 'Tis little less than blasphemy what he dictates concerning a Sin Venial, ex genere suo, as an idle word, an officious lie, &c. that

Vid. Bellar. l. 1. de amif. Grat. cap. 3.

Vid. Medin. in 1, 2. Q. 88. a. 1. Azor. l. 4. c. 8. Durand q. 6. Dicendum est ut docerunt Durandus, Cajetanus & Vega, veniale peccatum est quidem contra legem Dei, quia revera lex Dei prohibet & gravia & levia, id quod adversariorum argumenta comprobant. Azor. Inst. Mor. l. 4. c. 8. Sub Tit. peccatum.

it is *not* against a perfect and a rigorous Law; that the Law which forbids it, is not perfectly a Law, and hath not perfectly *rationem legis*: But this is false (to say no worse): For *that* Law truly binds the Conscience to perform it, and therefore 'tis truly a Law; and that it truly binds the Conscience, is clear, both because it is made by him who hath *jus leges condendi*, a right of making Laws, and also because it hath a sanction, a threat, viz. the giving an account; and condemnation also, *Mat. 12. 31.* And when Bellarmine argues that Sins which he calls *venial ex surreptione*, by stealth into the Soul unawares, are not perfectly voluntary, and therefore are venial; 1. 'Tis acutely observed by the learned Chamier, *That a sin may be by surreption, or inconsiderateness, and yet it may be voluntary also, surreption not being properly opposed to voluntariness, but to election, when upon weighing of circumstances a thing is chosen; for it often falls out, that the will is carried to a thing, though by a sudden and inconsiderate motion, as Peter deny'd Christ with his will, though suddenly, and inconsiderately, and yet thereby Peter committed a mortal sin: And though a Sin of surreption be not voluntary in the highest degree, yet is it with a true and proper consent, (as Ames speaks).* 2. But besides, the nature of Sin, its *formale* or that wherein it consists, is not its voluntariness, but its transgression of the Law. The Law of the Creator, not the will of the creature, is the Rule of right and wrong. *Voluntariness aggravates, but involuntariness excuseth not Sin.* 3. 'Tis excellently observed by the learned Davenant, *That may be said to be voluntary, not only which is committed with an express and actual willingness, but that which is not hindered by the will when it is bound to hinder it; but the will is bound to command its reason, that it should be wakeful and watchful, to suppress all the motions of inordinate concupiscence.* 4. Further, doth not the Law prohibit and condemn all affections and motions, whether deliberate or by surreption and indeliberate? and hence it was, 5. That holy Paul complaining of the Sin that dwelt in him, *Rom. 7. 19.* was afflicted, not only for the deliberate motions of sin, but also for those that were indeliberate and involuntary; and would he have mourned under them, if they had not been sinful? To conclude this, Doth not, sixthly, the surreption and indeliberate stealing of depraved motions into the Soul, proceed a *pravitate damnabili*, from a *damnable and depraved principle* of nature? must it not then be sinful and depraved also?

Surreptionem existimamus opponi, non voluntati, sed in προαιρέσει, id est, electioni, cum omnibus cognitis, circumstantiis, unum eligitur denique; nam sæpe accidit ut motu subitaneo, & inconsiderato voluntas ipsa ad aliquid feratur; ut voluntate Petrus negavit sed subitanè, & peccavit tamen mortaliter: Itaque & hæc quoq; quæ per surreptionem fiunt, voluntaria sunt, ideoque & peccata, verè, inquam peccata. Chamier l. 6. c. 10.

Est voluntarium non quidem in summo gradu, sed vero & proprio consensu, Ames, Bellarm. *Enerv. de pic. ven. pag. mihi 16.* Voluntarium reputatur, non modò quod expressè & actuali voluntate committitur, sed quod ab ipsa voluntate non impeditur, quando tenetur impedire. Tenetur autem voluntas imperare rationi, ut pervigil sit in comprimendis omnibus inordinatæ concupiscentiæ motibus. Davenant Q. 31. *Determ. p. mihi, 145.*

And when Bellarmine argues for the Veniality of Sin from the *parvitas materiæ*, the smallness and slightness of the matter in which Sin is committed, as the stealing of an half-penny, or a penny; I wish he had remembered, That

That according to this Doctrine, if *Bellarmino* should steal a Penny from his poor Neighbour ten thousand several times, he should not yet after all, commit a Mortal Sin; since if the stealing of *one penny* be but a *venial Sin*, ten thousand Venial Sins cannot make up or amount to one Mortal Sin. Besides, the finalness of the matter in which a sin is committed, is so far from extenuating, that it often aggravates the sin committed; as 'tis a greater sin to murder a man for Sixpence than for an hundred pounds, to deny my starving Friend a penny-Loaf, than twenty Seam of Wheat; and thus Divines commonly aggravate *Adams Sin* by his breaking the Command of God in so small a matter as was the *forbidden fruit*. And whereas *Bellarmino* tells us that the stealing of an half-penny or a penny is not *against the Law*, because (saith he) *Lex non diserte prohibet furtum oboli*, *The Law doth not expressly mention any prohibition of stealing an half-penny or a penny*. What if I should ask Cardinal *Robert*, whether the Law any where expressly forbids the stealing of *a thousand pounds*? and whether the stealing of such a Sum is therefore *not against the Law*, because the Law *expressly* forbids it not? Doth not the general prohibition of *Theft* contain under it, all *the kinds of Theft*? Doth not this Command, *Thou shalt not steal*, forbid the stealing of *any thing* that is anothers, whether the thing be *great or small*? even as the Law forbidding *Adultery*, forbids *that Sin with any Woman*, noble or ignoble, rich or poor, bond or free. In the overthrow of *Jericho* it was not expressly forbidden to steal a *Babylonish Garment*, or two hundred Shekels of Silver, or a *Wedge of Gold*; and yet because of the general prohibition *Achan* dyed for stealing that Garment, the two hundred Shekels of Silver, and the Wedge of God. Besides, that which violates one *apex or tittle* of the Law, breaks the Law and offends God. How deeply holy *Austin* was humbled for stealing of an Apple, though stoln when he was a *Child*, appears by his Confessions. Surely in *Bellarmines* Divinity, *Adams* taking but an *Apple*, and that from his *Wife*, was but a Venial fault. In Military Discipline, a Souldier is hang'd for stealing of a *Trifle*, or of what is of a very inconsiderable value. The stealing of the *least thing* is against a *great both Command and Commander*. And whereas *Bellarmino* argues, that the stealing of so small a thing as an *half-penny*, *hurts not* our Neighbour, and therefore 'tis Venial and not forbidden; 'tis answered, the Law forbids not only the *hurting* of our Neighbour, in forbidding to *Steal*, but it forbids the *violation of Justice too*. The Law forbids *inward lust*, but how doth *inward lust* hurt our Neighbour? God in his Commands respects his own *purity* as well as our Neighbours *utility*. Further, 'tis evident that the *veniality* of a Sin committed against our Neighbour, cannot be gathered from its not *hurting* him*; for in many Cases even *Bellarmino* will grant that a sin against our Neighbour is *damnable*, though it hurt not our Neighbour at all, yea though it prove very *profitable and advantageous* to him. Take an instance in this true Story. A worthy Physician, some years since,

Vid. Petrum
Molinæum in
Thestibus. Seda-
nensibus.

John. 6: 19.
7. 22.

* Josephs Bre-
thren sinned
mortally in
selling their
Brother,
though by
that selling
him, he was
highly advan-
ced.

had

Vid. Theſ. Sed. a. n. ſide pec. ven. Neque illud rectè dicitur, hujusmodi peccata non pugnare cum charitate: Revera non expectorant, aut expugnant charitatem hominis renati; Sed pugnant tamen cum illà perfectà charitate, quam Lex imperat, & oriuntur ab illà inordinata concupiscentià quæ est charitati, & legi divinæ contraria.

Davenant. ubi ſupr.

In eo labuntur adverſarii quod peccati naturam mortiferam ex ſola extinctione charitatis dijudicant, cum illa in qualibet declinatione a charitate & lege divinâ ſe exerat. Id. ibid.

Gerard loc. Com. c. 19. de pec.

Serpentina diaboli primævus homines decipientis calliditas,

non poterat ſpecioſiori ſchemate pingi atque velari, quàm quòd primordialis illa lex de non comedendo arboris vetitæ fructu, ſit præceptum, de re minima ac proinde non perfectè, & in rigore præceptum, cujus transgreſſio magnopere a Deo curetur. Ger. de pec. Al. c. 19. propè fin. Ei qui non dederit operam ut redeat in gratiam cum læſo a ſe fratre, contingit, ut carceri inferni traditus, ſine aliquâ debiti remiſſione exactum jus experiatur. Jansen. in Mat. 5. 26. Senſus eſt, ſummo tecum jure agetur, non liberaberis donec pœnas lueris extremas, tantas quantas exiget extrema juſtitie rigor. Brugens. in Mat. 5. 26.

had a female Patient under Cure, to whom her leud Husband firſt gave the Foul Diſeaſe; and ſoon after, he gave her alſo a draught of rank Poiſon to kill her; but the Poyſon meeting with the Diſtemper, by its violent operation overcame the Diſeaſe, and cured the Woman: According to *Bellarmines* Divinity, he ſhould not, by giving her the poyſon, have ſinned mortally, becauſe he was not only, by his murderouſ endeavours, not hurtful, but very beneficial to his Wife. Still I follow *Bellarmine*, urging this Argument, That the ſtealing ſo ſmall a thing *oppoſeth not Charity to man, or Love to God*. I anſwer, though a ſmall Theft do not *expectorare* or *expugnare charitatem* (as Doctor *Davenant* expreſſeth it) deſtroys not Love & Charity, yet it doth *pugnare cum illa perfectâ charitate*, oppoſe that perfect Love and Charity which the Law requireth; and it ariſeth from that *inordinate luſt* which the Law forbids, and which is contrary both to the Law and Love which the Law requireth. I add herein lyes the great miſtake of *Bellarmine* in this point; in that he judgeth of the nature of mortal Sin by the *extinction of charity*, whereas it conſiſts in any *ſwerving* or *declination* from the Law of God, and Charity. And when *Bellarmine* argues, That *præcepta de minimis non ſunt proprie præcepta; Commands concerning the leaſt things, are not properly Commands*: Beſides that full anſwer I have formerly given, as to proving thoſe Commands are moſt truly Commands, I cannot but here ſubjoyn that ſmart Expreſſion of *Gerard*, who tells *Bellarmine*, thus arguing, *Satan himſelf was deficient in this Piece of Bellarmine's Sophiſtry; and that Satan could not more ſpecioſly have covered his temptation to the eating the forbidden Fruit, than by ſaying, Tuſh, this is but a little Command, about a Triſtle, an Apple, and indeed 'tis properly no Command at all*. And truly I ſhould ſay, That *Bellarmine* might have taught *Satan* in this point, were it not that I look upon him in this, and in the greateſt part of his Polemicks as taught, even to an *high* degree of proficiency, by that *School-Maſter*, both of *himſelf* and his *blackeſt Society*, I mean that of the *Jefuits*. As wild and weak is that Argument which *Bellarmine* grounds on that of *Luk. 12. 59. Thou ſhalt not depart thence, till thou haſt paid the laſt mite*. Lo; here (ſaith *Bellarmine*) the laſt mite can intend nothing but ſome *ſmall, venial ſin* to be expiated in the Priſon of *Purgatory*. But this bold *Sophiſter* perverts this Text, and plays too *ſaucily* with a moſt ſerious and *ſevere* Scripture. For by the *laſt mite* or farthing we muſt not underſtand *ſins*, but the *puniſhments due* to ſins, and the *minutiſſimas partes pœnarum*, the ſmalleſt parts of puniſhment in Hell. Thus the learnedſt of, even *Popiſh* Expoſitors, expound that place; As *Brugens* and *Jansenius*, who

make, and that truly, the meaning thereof to be this, *Then shalt in the suffering of eternal punishment, poenas luere extremas, quantas exhibet extremus iustitiae rigor; Thou shalt undergo the extremity and rigor of punishment from justice*: So that the Prison there mentioned, v. 58. is not meant of Purgatory, but of Hell (as *Tertullian* expressly saith) and utter darkness (as *Augustine*) and the payment of the last mite or farthing (as *Augustine* expounds it) imports as much, as *nihil relinquatur impunitum*; No part of the punishment shall be abated, but the wicked shall be there punished (as he expresseth it) *usque ad facem*, to the drinking the last drop and dregs of the Cup of Gods wrath. 'Tis but a wretched shift of *Bellarmino*, when he tells us that his venial or lesser sins, are not *contra*, but only *præter legem*, not against, but only besides the Law; by which distinction, this blasphemous Sophister not only falls foul upon *Andrew de Vega*, and other Papists, (whom he very roundly reproves for granting that venial sins are properly against the Law, telling them, That upon that Principle, they can never maintain the possibility of a perfect impletion of the Law, because (as he saith) they can never get off cleverly from that Scripture, *(he that offends in one is guilty of all)*; but which is worse, he audaciously wounds the purity and perfection of the Divine Law, to shelter his venial sins. Further (as that learned *Baronius* observes) were these venial small sins of *Bellarmino* only besides, and not against the Law, we ought not to call them sins, but indifferent actions, and so account them *lawful*; for that which is forbidden by no Law is *lawful*. And further, if this Doctrine were true, he that abstains from Venial sins, should do a work not of *precept*, but of *counsel* only, and so of *supererogation*, the Papists teaching that every good work not commanded by God, is a work of supererogation: But how absurd would this be to say, That by abstaining from a sin, a man doth a work of supererogation. I shall only add that Censure past upon *Bellarmino* by *Doctor Featly*, who saith, That here *Bellarmino* for saying some Sins are not against but only besides the Law, may well be accounted to be besides himself. And as for *Cotton* that proud Papist, who tells us there is no proportion between eternal death, and an idle word, and therefore an idle word is not to be so severely punished: I answer, That as the great and righteous Judge of Sin and Sinners, is fitter to judge of the proportion between the least Sin and eternal punishment, than any weak and guilty Malefactor; So, the will of God forbidding any Sin under an eternal penalty, is a sufficient reason of that penalty, and makes the punishment proportionable to the demerit of the Sin. I shall only chastise the intolerable insolence of this Popeling by asking him one question, and 'tis but this, *What proportion is there between eternal death, and the eating a morsel of Flesh in Lent, or a Womans spinning a Yard of Thread on an holy day*. If you Papists forbid these under pain of damnation (as you do), and that meerly because the Church appoints it so, ye blind Hypocrites, may not *divine prohibition* be allowed to make a proportion between a Sin, and eternal punishment,

Serm. Dom.
in MOR. l. 1.

L. 4. de justif.
c. 14.

Jam. 2. 10.
Videndum est
illis quid re-
spondeant A-
postolo Jaco-
bo, dicenti
quicumque to-
tam legem
Servaveriat,
offendat autem
in uno, factus
est omnium
reus. *Bellar.*
de justif. l. 4.
c. 14.
Baron. de pec-
ven. p. 98.

Non afferamus stateras dolosus, ubi appendamus, quod volumus, & quomodo volumus. pro arbitrio nostro, dicentes, hoc grave, hoc leve est, sed afferamus divinam stateram de Scripturis sanctis, & in illa appendamus, peccata vel potius à Domino appensa recognoscimus: *Cont. Doct. nat. 2. 6.*

nishment; as well as that which is *Humane*, yea *Diabolical*; in the latter, of which expressions I am not too severe, as long as we hold, *1 Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3.* to be *Canonical*. The sum of all is but this: The *smallness* of Sin alters not the nature thereof. Its nature stands in this, that 'tis *against the Law*: If it be *not* prohibited, 'tis *no Sin*; If it be, 'tis *damnable* be it greater or smaller. I conclude this whole first part of my Discourse, its *Explicatory* part, with that holy and excellent advice of *St. Austin, Lib. 2. contr. Donatum. Non afferamus stateras dolosus, &c.* Let us *not bring deceitful Balances to weigh in them what we will, and how we will according to our own pleasure, saying, this is heavy, this is light; but let us fetch a Divine Balance out of the holy Scriptures, and in them let us weigh our Sins, or rather let us judg of them as they are there weighed.*

I have said what I intended as to the *Explication* of this great Truth, the denial of Venial Sin, both as to *Concession* and *Negation*; I proceed now to the *second Branch* of my Discourse about this Point, and that is the *Confirmation* of it.

And my first, and more immediately Scriptural Argument shall be this:

2d. Part:

Arg. 1. No Fault is Venial in it self, that deserves eternal death: But every Sin deserves eternal death: Therefore no Sin in it self is Venial.

The *first Proposition* or *major* is granted by the Papists, who tell us that the *nature* of Sins *Veniulity*, stands in its *not* deserving eternal death, and therefore no Sin is Venial that deserves eternal death.

The *minor* or *second Proposition*, *viz.* that every Sin deserves eternal death, I shall clearly prove by Scriptures and reason.

1. By *Scriptures*; and I shall name three. The *first* is that which I named for my Text, *Rom. 6. 23. The wages of Sin is death.* The *second* is, *Ezek. 18. 4. The soul that sinneth shall die.* The *third* is that of *Deut. 27. 26. Cursed be he that continues not in all the words of this Law, &c.* To these Scriptures *Bellarmino* answers, but very miserably.

To that of *Rom. 6. 23. The wages of Sin is death*; *Bellarmino* answers, That when *Paul* saith, *The wages of Sin is death*; 'tis only meant of *Mortal Sin*, and thus is he to be understood, *The wages of Mortal Sin is death.* But I answer, with as good reason; in all the places of Scripture, wherein we are dehorted from Sin; he may cast this *shameful* gloss upon them; and say, that we are in them, dehorted not from all Sin but only from *Mortal Sin*; as when the Scripture saith, *eschew evil*; *Bellarmino* may add this gloss, and say, we are not forbidden to shun all evil, but only *Mortal* evil. And so when *Paul* saith, *abstain from all appearance of evil*; that is, as *Bellarmino* expounds it, abstain from all appearance of *Mortal* evil; and *Rom. 12. 9. abhor that which is evil*; i.e. *Mortal* evil; yea when we pray to be deliver'd from evil, that with *Bellarmino's* comment, is only *Mortal* evil, not all sin. But further I would

1 Pet. 3. 11.

1 Thes. 5. 22.

Rom. 12. 9.

ask

ask any 'Papist, only these two easie questions, 1. What is the meaning of these words, *Rom. 6. 23.* [*The wages of sin is death?*] The Papist will answer, by these words, the Apostle means [that *Sin deserves death.*] Let *Benedict Justinian* the Jesuit upon *Rom. 6. 23.* speak for all, who gives it thus, *by the desert of sin, eternal punishments are inflicted.* 2. I demand, what is the meaning of this word [*mortal*] when *Bellarmino* thus expounds this Text, *the wages of [mortal] Sin is death?* All the Papists with *Bellarmino* readily answer, that the meaning of a *mortal Sin*, is a *Sin that deserves death.* Now, Reader, be pleas'd to add to the Apostles Proposition *the wages of sin is death*, that is, *Sin deserves death*, *Bellarmino's* Expolition, *the wages of [mortal] Sin is death*; That is, of a *Sin that deserves death*, and *Paul's* Proposition will be turn'd into a gross *Tautology*, and be made to speak thus, *Sin deserveth death that deserveth death*; a wretched depravation of the sacred Text, whereby they shew that rather than they will renounce a gross error, they will make the divinely-inspired Apostle, to speak gross non-sense. Besides, 'tis evident that in this sixth Chapter to the *Romans*, the Apostle dehorts the converted *Romans* from all Sin; particularly, *v. 2.* *God forbid that we should continue in sin; and how shall we live any longer therein.* Now will any dare so wretchedly to interpret *Paul*, as to say that the Christians are here dehorted only from some Sins, and not from all? If any would offer so to expound the Apostle, I would instantly stop his mouth by two Arguments taken from the Context, wherein the Apostle dissuades from Sin *v. 3*: 1. By a reason taken from being *baptized into the death of Christ*; now when we are so baptized, is not *all Sin* washt away and destroyed? And 2. the Apostle useth another reason to dissuade from continuing in Sin, and that is, the consideration of their *former yielding* themselves to Sin; Whence he argues, They ought now as much to serve *Righteousness* as formerly they had served *Sin*, *v. 19*; whence 'twill follow, That as they had formerly served not only greater but smaller Sins, so now they ought to cast off the latter as well as the former, even all Sin whatsoever. Now if *Paul* by these two Arguments dehorts from *all Sin*, why should he not then do so by this next Argument, *viz.* the *issue of Sin*, the *wages of Sin is death*?

As to that place of *Ezek. 18. 4.* *The soul that sinneth, it shall die*; *Bellarmino* answers, The Prophet only intends that threat against *Mortal Sins*, grievous and hainous abominations, not against *smaller Sins* which he calls *Venial*. But he abuseth the Scripture, for the Prophet there setting down the *standing rule* of Divine Justice, that none should die but for *his own Sin*, makes no exception of *lesser Sins* from being within the compass of that *Commination*, not saying the Soul that *grievously* sins, but the Soul that *sins*, shall die. *Universe dictum est*, 'tis universally exprest as *Pareus* notes; but to put all out of doubt, that *lesser* as well as *greater sins*, are threatned to be punish't with death by the Prophet, 'tis plain from the *31. vers.* of that Chapter, where the Prophet

Sempiterni
cruciatu pec-
cati merito
reddantur.
*Erod. Just. in
Rom. 6. p. 191.*

plainly declares his meaning to be of Sin in general without any restriction; *Cast away from you* (saith he) *ALL your transgressions, and make you a new heart, for why will ye die?* All Sins therefore which opposed a new heart, are they commanded to cast away, and are here clearly discovered to be deadly.

To that place of *Deut. 27. 26. Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them;* Bellarmine still gives the old answer: By the words of this Law (saith he) are not meant the words of the whole Law; as if God had threatned a curse against all Sins in general, but only of Mortal Sins, some grosser Sins of Murder, Incest, Idolatry, &c. But this is a cursed gloss put upon a Divine curse; for the words here used, the words of this Law, are the same with those of Verse the 8th. where the very same expression the words of this Law, intend the words of the whole Law; and evident it is that here all those Sins are intended which are opposed to Legal Righteousness, *Do this and live*; but such are all Sins in general. But the Apostle whom I ever took for a better Expofitor of Scripture than either Bellarmine or the Pope, leaves no place for dispute in this matter, who *Gal. 3. 10.* citing this very place of Deuteronomy, denounceth the Curse, not against those that commit some gross Sins against some part of the Law, but against those that continue not in all things that are written in the book of the Law; i.e. those that commit any Sin whatever.

Thus I have made good by Scripture this Proposition, viz. Every Sin deserves eternal death. I shall now proceed to prove it by two Reasons; the first whereof is this:

Every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death;

Every Sin is a Transgression of the Law:

Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The second Proposition, or minor, That every Sin is the transgression of the Law, is contain'd in the express words of Scripture, 1 *Job. 3. 4.* where Sin is call'd the transgression of the Law, from which every Sin is a swerving, and thence hath its both nature and name also; and 'tis granted by the learnedst among the Papiſts, that all Sins, even Venial are against the Law; so Durand, Gerson, Vega, Azorim, Cajetan, with others: And Augustin's old definition of Sin, that 'tis *dictum, factum concupitum contra legem*; that Sin is that which is either said, done, or desir'd against the Law, falls in with them, or rather they with it; and therefore Bellarmine's distinction of some Sins that are only *preter*, beside, and not *contra*, against the Law is grossly false; for if all Sins are forbidden by, all Sins are contrary to, the Law.

The major or first Proposition, That every transgression of the Law deserves eternal death, is most certain: But I prove it thus.

Whatever deserves the Curse of the Law, deserves eternal death; but every Transgression of the Law deserves the Curse of the Law: Therefore every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death.

The

The *major* or first Proposition cannot be deny'd unless we will hold that the Curse of the Law, only contains *temporal* evils, which is horridly false; for if that were true, then Christ hath not delivered us from eternal death by *delivering* us from the *Curse of the Law*.

The *minor* or second Proposition, That every *Transgression of the Law* deserves *the Curse of the Law*, I prove from that clear and full Scripture. Gal. 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continues not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law to do them*. According to the rigor of the Law, the least breach thereof makes us cursed, and this was the Laws unsupportable burden, that when we were bound to do *all things* in the Law, and were unable to do them, we were yet, cursed for not doing them.

2. My *second* reason to prove that every Sin deserves eternal death is this;

That which deserves an *infinite* punishment deserves eternal death; but every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment: Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The *major* or first Proposition is deny'd by none, there being no infinity of punishment mention'd, or imagin'd, but in that call'd in Scripture *eternal death*.

The *minor* or second Proposition, that every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment, I thus prove:

If *Christ* laid down an *infinite* price to *redeem* us from every Sin, then every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment; but *Christ* laid down an *infinite* price to *redeem* us from every Sin:

Therefore every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment.

The consequence is evident, That if *Christ* laid down an *infinite* price for every Sin, then every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment, because it had been an unjust exacting of punishment upon *Christ*, had there been required of him the laying down of an *infinite price* for a *finite evil*, that required only a *finite* punishment to be inflicted for it.

The *minor* or second Proposition, *viz.* That *Christ* laid down an *infinite price* to *redeem* us from every Sin, is undeniable by those that will neither deny Scriptures nor Catechisms: For that *Christ* redeem'd us by an *infinite price*, hath not only the consent, but 'tis the ground of the comfort of all Christians. *Infinite personæ facit infinitatem pretii*, an *infinite* person made the price of *infinite* value. And that *Christ* laid down this *infinite price* for all Sins, is with the like consent and comfort embraced by all that believe the Scriptures aright, which abound in Texts that express it, *Psal.* 130. *ult.* *He shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities.* *1 Joh.* 1. 7. *The blood of Christ cleanseth from all Sin.* *Tyt.* 2. 14. *He gave himself that he might redeem us from all iniquity.* Hence *Hos.* 14. 2. 'twas a prayer of Faith, *Take away all iniquity;* and *Isa.* 53. 10. *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all;* and *Job.* 1. 19. *The Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the World;* and *Mat.*

1. 21. *He will save his people from their sins; from every Sin, and every Sin perfectly.*

2d. Arg.

My second Argument to prove that no Sin is venial, is this :

Whatsoever is contrary to the loving of God *with the whole heart*, is not Venial but Mortiferous ;

But every Sin is contrary to the loving of God *with our whole heart*:

Therefore every Sin is Mortal, and so not Venial.

The *first* Proposition or *major* is undeniable; because he that loves not God with *his whole heart*, *sins* against the express words of the command, *Mat. 22. 37.* And the *loving God with all the heart*, is call'd *the great command*, and is prefer'd before the *love of our neighbour* by *Christ*, *Mat. 22. 38, 39.* Since therefore there are many commands of love to *our neighbour*, which cannot be violated but we must needs Sin mortally (as the Papists grant), 'twill evidently follow, That a transgression of the command of loving God with *all the heart*, must needs be a Mortal Sin.

The *second* Proposition or *minor*, That *every Sin* opposeth the loving of God *with all the heart*, and that whoever sins, loves not God with *all the heart*, is as true as the former.

Bellarmino therefore dares not here answer by denying this truth absolutely ; but by a lame and lamentable distinction, he answers here, That to love God *with all the heart*, may be taken two ways :

Non Prælati-
one.

1. To love God so intirely and perfectly as that nothing is *prefer'd* before Gods love ; and this love of God (saith *Bellarmino*) is both the meaning of the command, and such alone also which Venial Sins do not oppose.

Non Admissi-
one.

2. To love God so perfectly as that a man is so *wholly* taken up with the love of God, that no sinful and vicious thought at any time can creep or steal into a persons heart : But (saith *Bellarmino*) such a love of God as *this*, is not commanded in this life, and this love of God he confesseth is oppos'd by Venial Sins. For answer to this impious distinction of *Bellarmino*, 'tis both most *false* and *frivolous*.

Diliges Deum
ex toto corde,
& ex totâ ani-
mâ, & ex totâ
mente ; i. e.
omnes cogi-
tationes, omnem vitam, & omnem intellectum in illum conferas, à quo habes ea ipsa quæ confers. Quum autem ait toto corde, totâ animâ, tota mente, nullam vitæ nostræ partem relinquit, quæ vacare debet, & quasi locum dare, ut aliâ re velit frui; sed quicquid aliud diligendum venerit in animum, illuc rapiatur quo totius dilectionis impetus currit. *August. Lib. 1. de Doctr. Christi. cap. 22.*

1. As he tells us that 'tis not necessary to the love of God with all the soul, that all vicious thoughts be hindred from *admission* into a man ; for this is clearly oppos'd not only by *St. Austin* of old, but by others, even Papists of late. *St. Austin* tells us, That to love God with *all the the Soul*, is to confer all the life, thoughts and understanding upon him, from whom we have them all, and to suffer no part of the life to give way to be willing to enjoy any thing else, but whatsoever else comes into the mind to be

loved, is to be carried thither. Victor expresseth it thus: *A man shall burn with so hot a love to God, that nothing should creep into any faculty of the Soul, that either diminisheth love to God, or carries it any whither else.* Anselm excellently thus, on Mat. 22. *In the Understanding no place is to be left for Error; in the Will nothing is to be willed contrary to God, in the whole memory nothing is to be remembered whereby we may the least think of him.* Aquinas thus also; *A man must so love God, if with all the heart, as to subject himself to him, and follow the rule of his Commandments in all things; for whatsoever is contrary to his Law; is contrary to his Love.*

Reminem-
tando Dei a-
more flagrare
debere com-
monstrat, ut
nihil profess-
in ullam ani-
ma facultatem
irrepere snat
quod suam ex-
ga Deum dile-
lectionem di-
minuat aut

alio transferat. *Viñ. in Mar. 12. In intellectu nullam relinquis errori locum: In voluntate nihil velis illi contrarium, in memoria tuā nihil reminiscens quo minus de illo sentias.* Anselm in Mat. 22. *Est de ratione charitatis, quod homo sic diligat Deum, ut velit se in omnibus ei subicere, & regulam præceptorum ejus in omnibus sequi, quicquid enim contrariatur præceptis ejus, contrariatur charitati.* Thom. 2da. 2de. Q. 24. Art. 12.

Alvarez expressly opposeth Bellarmine in these words; *To love God is to admit nothing into the heart contrary to God.* Theophylact most fully; *To love God with all the heart is to cleave to him with all the parts and faculties of the Soul; to give our selves wholly to God, and to subjct the nutritive, sensitive, and rational faculty to his love.* Now according to these Explications of the Love of God, the *least Sins* (which Papists call *Venial*) are contrary to it; for in them there's not a pleasing of God in all things, not a forsaking of all things contrary to his will; yea in these Venial Sins there's an admission of a contrary and unlawful Love of the Creature into the heart, and not a total subjecting thereof to God.

Diligere De-
um est nihil
in corde di-
vinæ dilectio-
ni contrari-
um admit-
tere. Alvarez
call Lib. 6. de Auv.
div. Grat. disp.
51. Sec. 4.
Αγαπᾶν τὸν
θεὸν ὀλοφύ-
χως τὸ ἴσον
τὸ δια παν-

ἴων ἢ τῆς ἰσχυρῆς μερῶν καὶ δυνάμεων αὐτοῦ πιστεύοντες ὅτι ὅλες ἐπιπέδους ὀφείλομεν διδόναι τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ὑποτάσσειν, καὶ τὴν εὐσεβειαν, καὶ τὴν ἀσθητικὴν, καὶ διανοητικὴν ἡμῶν δύναμιν τῷ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν θεόν. Theophil. in Mat. 22.

But secondly, in every Venial Sin, there's the preferring of something before God, and therefore a manifest transgressing of the Law of loving God. As to a formal and explicate preferring the Creature before God, so as to account the Creature a more excellent Good than God is, this all those do not, that live in the grossest and most mortal wickednesses, (as the Papists acknowledg); for men may live even in the heinous Sin of Persecution, and yet think thereby they serve and set up God: But as to a virtual and interpretative preferring the Creature before God, this men do in the least Sins, they carrying themselves so, as if the Creature were to be prefer'd before God, they fearing not for the love of the Creature to offend God; and injuriously to his Justice, to break his Commandments. And how may a man be said to shew by his carriage; more respect to the Creature than to God; if not by breaking the Com-
mands of God and contemning his will for the Creature. To shun the
dint of this Answer, the Papists are forced to this wretched shift, which

plainly declares his meaning to be of Sin in general without any restriction; *Cast away from you* (saith he) *ALL your transgressions, and make you a new heart, for why will ye die?* All Sins therefore which opposed a new heart, are they commanded to cast away, and are here clearly discovered to be deadly.

To that place of *Deut. 27. 26. Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them*; Bellarmine still gives the old answer: By the words of this Law (saith he) are not meant the words of the whole Law; as if God had threatned a curse against all Sins in general, but only of Mortal Sins, some grosser Sins of Murder, Incest, Idolatry, &c. But this is a cursed gloss put upon a Divine curse; for the words here used, *the words of this Law*, are the same with those of Verse the 8th. where the very same expression *the words of this Law*, intend the words of the whole Law; and evident it is that here all those Sins are intended which are opposed to *Legal Righteousness, Do this and live*; but such are all Sins in general. But the Apostle whom I ever took for a better Expofitor of Scripture than either Bellarmine or the Pope, leaves no place for dispute in this matter, who *Gal. 3. 10.* citing this very place of *Deuteronomy*, denounceth the Curse, not against those that commit some gross Sins against some part of the Law, but against those that *continue not in all things that are written in the book of the Law*; i.e. those that commit any Sin whatever.

Thus I have made good by Scripture this Proposition, *viz. Every Sin deserves eternal death.* I shall now proceed to prove it by two Reasons; the first whereof is this:

Every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death;

Every Sin is a Transgression of the Law:

Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The second Proposition, or minor, That every Sin is the transgression of the Law, is contain'd in the express words of Scripture, *1 Job. 3. 4.* where Sin is call'd *the transgression of the Law*, from which every Sin is a swerving, and thence hath its both nature and name also; and 'tis granted by the learnedst among the Papists, that all Sins, even Venial are against the Law; so Durand, Gerson, Vega, Azorius, Cajetan, with others. And Augustin's old definition of Sin, that 'tis *dictum, factum concupitum contra legem*; that Sin is that which is either said, done, or desir'd against the Law, falls in with them, or rather they with it; and therefore Bellarmine's distinction of some Sins that are only *præter, beside*, and not *contra, against* the Law is grossly false; for if all Sins are forbidden by, all Sins are contrary to, the Law.

The major or first Proposition, That every transgression of the Law deserves eternal death, is most certain: But I prove it thus.

Whatever deserves the Curse of the Law, deserves eternal death; but every Transgression of the Law deserves the Curse of the Law: Therefore every Transgression of the Law deserves eternal death.

The *major* or first Proposition cannot be deny'd unless we will hold that the Curse of the Law, only contains *temporal* evils, which is horridly false; for if that were true, then Christ hath not delivered us from eternal death by *delivering* us from the *Curse of the Law*.

The *minor* or second Proposition, That every *Transgression of the Law* deserves the *Curse of the Law*, I prove from that clear and full Scripture. Gal. 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continues not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law to do them.* According to the rigor of the Law, the least breach thereof makes us cursed, and this was the Laws unupportable burden, that when we were bound to do *all* things in the Law, and were unable to do them, we were yet cursed for not doing them.

2. My *second* reason to prove that every Sin deserves eternal death is this;

That which deserves an *infinite* punishment deserves eternal death; but every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment: Therefore every Sin deserves eternal death.

The *major* or first Proposition is deny'd by none, there being no infinity of punishment mention'd, or imagin'd, but in that call'd in Scripture *eternal death*.

The *minor* or second Proposition, that every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment, I thus prove:

If *Christ* laid down an infinite price to *redeem us from every Sin*, then every Sin deserves an *infinite* punishment; but *Christ* laid down an infinite price to *redeem us from every Sin*:

Therefore every Sin deserves an infinite punishment.

The consequence is evident, That if *Christ* laid down an infinite price for every Sin, then every Sin deserves an infinite punishment, because it had been an unjust exacting of punishment upon *Christ*, had there been required of him the laying down of an *infinite price* for a *finite evil*, that required only a finite punishment to be inflicted for it.

The *minor* or second Proposition, *viz.* That *Christ* laid down an *infinite price* to *redeem us from every Sin*, is undeniable by those that will neither deny Scriptures nor Catechisms: For that *Christ* redeem'd us by an *infinite price*, hath not only the consent, but 'tis the ground of the comfort of all Christians. *Infitas personæ facit infinitatem pretii*, an infinite person made the price of infinite value. And that *Christ* laid down this *infinite price* for *all Sins*, is with the like consent and comfort embraced by all that believe the Scriptures aright, which abound in Texts that express it, *Psal.* 130. *ult.* He shall *redeem Israel from all his iniquities.* 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. *The blood of Christ cleanseth from all Sin.* *Tit.* 2. 14. He gave himself that he might *redeem us from all iniquity.* Hence *Hef.* 14. 2. 'twas a prayer of Faith, *Take away all iniquity;* and *Iza.* 53. 10. *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all;* and *Job.* 1. 19. *The Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the World;* and *Mut.*

1. 21. *He will save his people from their sins; from every Sin, and every Sin perfectly.*

2d. Arg.

My second Argument to prove that no Sin is venial, is this :

Whatsoever is contrary to the loving of God *with the whole heart*, is not Venial but Mortiferous ;

But every Sin is contrary to the loving of God *with our whole heart* :

Therefore every Sin is Mortal, and so not Venial.

The *first* Proposition or *major* is undeniable; because he that loves not God *with his whole heart*, *sins* against the express words of the command, *Mat. 22. 37.* And the *loving God with all the heart*, is call'd *the great command*, and is prefer'd before the *love of our neighbour* by *Christ*, *Mat. 22. 38, 39.* Since therefore there are many commands of love to *our neighbour*, which cannot be violated but we must needs Sin mortally (as the Papists grant), 'twill evidently follow, That a transgression of the command of loving God *with all the heart*, must needs be a Mortal Sin.

The *second* Proposition or *minor*, That *every Sin* opposeth the loving of God *with all the heart*, and that whoever sins, loves not God *with all the heart*, is as true as the former.

Bellarmino therefore dares not here answer by denying this truth absolutely ; but by a lame and lamentable distinction, he answers here, That to love God *with all the heart*, may be taken two ways :

Non Prælati-
onc.

1. To love God so intirely and perfectly as that nothing is *prefer'd* before Gods love ; and this love of God (saith *Bellarmino*) is both the meaning of the command, and such alone also which Venial Sins do not oppose.

Non Admissi-
onc.

2. To love God so perfectly as that a man is so *wholly* taken up with the love of God, that no sinful and vicious thought at any time can creep or steal into a persons heart : But (saith *Bellarmino*) such a love of God as *this*, is not commanded in this life, and this love of God he confesseth is oppos'd by Venial Sins. For answer to this impious distinction of *Bellarmino*, 'tis both most *false* and *frivolous*.

Diliges Deum
ex toto corde,
& ex totâ ani-
mâ, & ex totâ
mente ; i. e.

omnes cogi-
tationes, omnem vitam, & omnem intellectum in illum conferas, à quo habes ea ipsa quæ con-
fers. Quum autem ait toto corde, totâ animâ, tota mente, nullam vitæ nostræ partem relinquit,
quæ vacare debet, & quasi locum dare, ut aliâ re velit frui; sed quicquid aliud diligendum venerit
in animum, illuc rapiatur quo totius dilectionis impetus currit. *August. Lib. 1. de Doctr. Christi.*
cap. 22.

loved

loved, is to be carried thither. Victor expresseth it thus; *A man shall burn with so hot a love to God, that nothing should creep into any faculty of the Soul, that either diminisheth love to God, or carries it any whither else.* Anselm excellently thus, on Mat. 22. *In the Understanding no place is to be left for Error; in the Will nothing is to be willed contrary to God, in the whole memory nothing is to be remembered whereby we may the less think of him.* Aquinas thus also; *A man must so love God, if with all the heart, as to subject himself to him, and follow the rule of his Commandments in all things; for whatsoever is contrary to his Law; is contrary to his Love.*

Hominem tanto Dei amore flagrare debere demonstrat, ut nihil profusus in ullam animæ facultatem irrepere sinat quod suam erga Deum dilectionem diminuat aut

alio transferat. *Vit.* in Mat. 12. In intellectu nullam relinquis errori locum: In voluntate nihil velis illi contrarium, in memoria tuâ nihil reminiscens quo minus de illo sentias. *Anselm* in Mat. 22. Est de ratione charitatis, quod homo sic diligat Deum, ut velit se in omnibus ei subicere, & regulam præceptorum ejus in omnibus sequi, quicquid enim contrariatur præceptis ejus, contrariatur charitati. *Thom.* 2da. 2da. Q. 24. Art. 12.

Alvarez expressly opposeth *Bellarmino* in these words; *To love God is to admit nothing into the heart contrary to God.* *Theophylact* most fully; *To love God with all the heart is to cleave to him with all the parts and faculties of the Soul; to give our selves wholly to God, and to subject the nutritive, sensitive, and rational faculty to his love.* Now according to these Explications of the Love of God, the least Sins (which Papists call Venial) are contrary to it; for in them there's not a pleasing of God in all things, not a forsaking of all things contrary to his will; yea in these Venial Sins there's an admission of a contrary and unlawful Love of the Creature into the heart, and not a total subjecting thereof to God.

Diligere Deum est nihil in corde divina dilectioni contrarium admittere. *Alvarez* Lib. 6. de Auro. div. Grat. disp. 51. Sec. 4. Ἀγάπην τὸ πρὸς θεὸν ἰλοψύχως τὸ πρὸς πάντα τὸ διὰ πάντα.

Ἰὼν πρὸς τῆς ψυχῆς μερῶν καὶ δυνάμεων αὐτῶν πιστεύειν ὡς ὅτι ὅτις ἐαυτὸς ὀφείλομεν διδόναι τὰ θεῷ, καὶ ποταπὴν, καὶ τὴν θρησκευτικὴν, καὶ τὴν αἰσθητικὴν, καὶ διασπονητικὴν ἡμῶν δυνάμιν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τοῦ θεοῦ. *Theophil.* in Mat. 22.

But secondly, in every Venial Sin, there's the preferring of something before God, and therefore a manifest transgressing of the Law of loving God. As to a formal and explicite preferring the Creature before God, so as to account the Creature a more excellent Good than God is, this all those do not, that live in the grossest and most mortal wickednesses, (as the Papists acknowledg;) for men may live even in the hainous Sin of Persecution, and yet think thereby they serve and set up God: But as to a virtual and interpretative preferring the Creature before God, this men do in the least Sins, they carrying themselves so, as if the Creature were to be prefer'd before God, they fearing not for the love of the Creature to offend God, and injuriously to his Justice, to break his Commandments. And how may a man be said to shew by his carriage, more respect to the Creature than to God, if not by breaking the Commands of God and contemning his will for the Creature. To shun the dint of this Answer, the Papists are forced to this wretched shift, which

is to answer; That he who sins Venially, prefers not the Creature before God, because he knows that Venial Sins will not dissolve that knot of love and friendship between God and him. But what a pittiful excuse is this for Venial Sin, since (as *Baronius* well observes, *pag. 106. de pec. ven.*) They who commit Venial Sins, thinking these Sins will not dissolve the favour of God, either think such Sins are so light and slight that they *deserve* not the dissolution of Gods favour; or they think though they do deserve that dissolution, yet that God will *deal* so *graciously* with them, as that for such Sins, he will not exclude them from his favour: If they think that they do not *deserve* the dissolution of Gods favour, they grossly err, yea *grievously sin* against God, by judging their Sins to be light and little, and by a bold fixing of limits to Gods Justice; as if God could not justly punish their Sins with that penalty which he tells us they deserve: But if they think that their Sins do deserve the dissolving of Gods favour, and that it is meerly from the Grace of God that they who commit them, are not excluded from it; then it follows, That they for the love of the Creature offending God by these Sins, prefer the Creature before God and his favour; for who-soever for any Creature, dares do that which may justly exclude him from Gods favour, doth prefer the Creature before the favour of God: Nor doth their knowledg that these Sins do not exclude them from the favour of God, when yet they will commit them, extenuate or excuse their contempt of Gods favour, of which they are guilty; but contrarily it aggravates that contempt; since though they know 'tis by Gods Grace and favour that their smaller Sins do not exclude them from his Love and Mercy, yet they abuse the Clemency and Goodness of God to a licentiousness in Sin, which is almost the highest contempt of Divine favour, imaginable.

Arg. 3. My third Argument to prove, That no Sin is Venial, or deserving to be pardon'd, shall be drawn from the *nature of pardon*; whence I thus argue.

An opinion that overthrows the *nature* of Gods *pardon*ing of Sin, is impious and erroneous; But this opinion that some Sins are Venial and deserve to be pardoned, doth thus *overthrow* the *nature* of Gods *pardon*-ing of Sin:

Therefore this opinion is impious and erroneous.

The *major* or *first* Proposition is evident.

The *minor* or *second* Proposition I prove thus: If pardonning of Sin designs an act of *free Grace* and favour, in pardonning, which God according to *strict justice*, might not have done; and if the Doctrine of Sins *Veniality* and deserving to be pardoned, makes pardonning an act of *justice*, so that God cannot but in justice do it, then the opinion of Sins *Veniality* overthrows the Doctrine of Divine pardon:

But the pardonning of Sin designs an act of *free Grace* and favour, which God might not have done unless he had pleas'd; and the Doctrine

of Sins *Veniality* makes the pardoning of Sin an act of *Justice* which God cannot but do; therefore the Popish Doctrine of *Venial Sin*, overthrows the Doctrine of Divine pardon.

The *Major* or *first* Proposition is evident, and will be granted by all.

The *Minor* or *second* I prove thus in both its parts. As to its first part, 'tis most manifest that pardon designs an act of *free Grace and favour*; 'tis needless to multiply Scriptures (which to do were most easie) in so clear a point; *Ephes. 1. 7. Forgiveness of sin according to his grace. Psal. 51. 1. According to thy mercy blot out my transgressions. 1 Tim. 1. 13. I obtained mercy, (saith pardoned Paul.)*

Misericordia
donatus sum.
Beza.

For the second part of the *Minor*, that the Doctrine of the Papists about the *Veniality* of Sin, makes the pardoning of Sin an act of *justice*, which God cannot but do if he will do justly, is no slander cast upon the Papists in this Point. I pray let them be judg'd in this case, by their own confessions. The Council of *Mentz* professeth (as we heard) *That they cannot understand how God should be just, if he punish any for Venial Sins with eternal punishment. Sonnius*, the Papist I mean, tells us that *Venial Sin is Venia dignum*, Venial Sin is worthy of pardon. And *Bellarmino*, That they hold with a general consent, that *Venial Sins make not a man guilty of eternal death*; and he asserts with intolerable blasphemy, *That God should be unjust if he punish Venial Sins eternally; justice requiring a forbearance to punish that offence which deserves not punishment.* From all which it follows, that Divine pardon is so far from being an act of *free Grace* in the account of a Papist, that when he recites his *Pater Noster*, if his Devotions agree with his Doctrines, he may rather say, Lord pay us, than forgive us our debts.

Bin. Tom. 9.
c. 46.

Injustum est
punire pecca-
ta venialia
poenâ aternâ:
Lib. 1. de Amiff:
Grat. c. 14.

My fourth Argument shall be taken from *Christ his rejecting of this Pharisaical depravation* of the Law of God, that some commands of the Law, and some Sins against those commands are so *small* and slight that God will not require a perfect fulfilling of the Law, as to lesser and smaller commands, nor the necessary avoiding of such Sins as are against those smaller commands. The words of Christ are these, *Mat. 5. 18. Till Heaven and Earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfill'd.* The Lord Christ by these words, wherein he shews 'tis impossible that any thing in the Law, though accounted never so *small*, should pass from it, but all must be fulfill'd with a perfect Satisfaction, opposeth the *Pharisees*; who taking it for granted, that there was necessarily required to righteousness and life, a perfect fulfilling of the Law, and yet finding that it was impossible to keep the *minutissima legis*, as to abstain from all sinful inward motions in the mind and heart, from every idle word, &c. to have such a perfect conformity to the Law, that there should be no lusting contrary to it, coyned this distinction, that some of the commands of the Law were *small*, and some *great*; and though none could in those little commands against sinful motions of the heart, perfectly satisfy the Law, yet if he kept the *great*

4. Arg;

Christus fortissimè negat esse quædam mandata in lege ita minuta, quæ Deus non multum curat, quorum etiam quamvis non impleantur, non sit habenda ratio in statuenda justitiâ legis coram Deo: Ut itaq; perfectissimam legis impletionem, necessariam esse Christus ostendat, ne unum quidem literæ apicem cadere pronuntiat, quod non sit necesse impleri. *Chemit. c. 51. Harm. p. 337. mibi. Cujus præstantissima Commentaria in hunc locum opto ut inspiciant lectores & perlegant.*

Commandments of the Law, concerning *outward acts* and *works* of the Law, he should be just before God; since those Commands of *little things* were but little Commands, and therefore would not condemn a man for transgressing of them, provided that he perform'd the *external works* commanded in those *great Commands*. Now *Christ* vehemently denies that there are any commands of the Law so small and minute, as that God would not much regard them, or of which in the stablishing the righteousness of the Law before God, a man should give no account for the breaking of them, but God would account him righteous whether he observed them or no. And therefore to shew the necessity of fulfilling the Law in the most perfect and exact manner, *Christ* assures, there should not pass from the Law one jot or tittle thereof that should not be fulfil'd; not a jot, the least letter, not a tittle, the least point, but was so highly accounted of by God, that before they should pass away without being fulfil'd, *Heaven and Earth* should pass away. So that there was required to the fulfilling of the Law, that all things in it, even to the least apex or tittle, should be fulfil'd. To which Doctrine of *Christ* agrees that of *Moses* and *Paul*, *Gal. 3. 10.* who denounced a Curse not only against those who continued not in the great things, but in all things written in the Law: And of *James 2. 10.* who saith, *Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one, shall be guilty of all*; and this one is here to be taken for any one. As *Luk. 15. 2.* *If he have an hundred sheep and lose one, that is, any one.* So *Mat. 10. 42.* *Whosoever shall give a cup of cold water to one, that is, to any one of the least Believers, &c.* So that unum, one, is equivalent to quodlibet, as here, one jot or tittle of the Law, that is, any one jot or tittle of the Law shall not pass away, but must be fulfil'd.

5. Arg.

Negari non potest hominem vere manere pollutum ex peccato veniali, quod semel commisit, donec ab eo justificetur; nam qui à peccato veniali justificatur, vere dicitur ab eo emundari. *Vasquez in 1a. 2æ. Disp. 139. c. 4.*

My fifth Argument is taken from that *macula*, or *stain*, or *filth*, that every Sin, even the least and lightest, leaves behind it. This stain left behind the commission of every Sin, is by several considered several ways: Either as an *habitual aversion* from God; or as an *habitual conformity* to the Law of God; or as the *impairing of inherent Grace*, (the beauty of the Soul), and the weakning of its acts; or as a greater *habit* and *inclination* to Sin; In regard of some, or all of these left upon the Soul after the commission of any Sin, 'tis said, *that Sin defiles and pollutes*, *Mat. 15. 11, 18. Rev. 22. 11.* and that every Sin is a spot, *Ephes. 5. 27.* and filthiness, *2 Cor. 7. 1. Jam. 1. 12. Ezek. 24. 13. Ezek. 36. 25.* and when a man repents of Sin, and hath Sin pardoned to him, he is said to be *wash'd* and *cleans'd*, *1 Cor. 6. 11. 2 Cor. 7. 1. Ezek. 36. 25, 33.* And because we are said to be *cleans'd*, *1 Job. 1. 7. from all Sin*, therefore all Sins, even such as Papists call *Venial*, leave a spot and stain upon the Sinner, even as *Vasquez* the Jesuit confesseth. Now since there's this stain and defilement befalls us after every Sin, there follows

an exclusion for all Sin, from the Kingdom of Heaven, into which no unclean thing shall enter, Rev. 21. 27. and that Exclusion Bellarmine tells us, is proper to Mortal Sins; and indeed that which excludes from Heaven, must needs deserve eternal death, and so be Mortal. And that this Exclusion is not to all, *perpetual*, 'tis not from the nature of *Sin*, nor from the cleansing virtue of any *Purgatory-fire*, but merely of God in Christ pardoning and purifying.

Lib. 1. de amif.
Grat. cap. 5:

My sixth Argument is taken from the *Power of God*, justly to forbid 6. Arg. the least Sin under the *pain of an eternal penalty*. Now if God can justly prohibit the least Sins, under an *eternal penalty*, then may he justly punish those *Sins prohibited*, with that *eternal penalty*. And that God may prohibit the least Sin under an eternal penalty, is evident, not only because the Will of God forbidding any Sin under an eternal penalty, is a sufficient reason of that penalty, and makes the punishment proportionable to the demerit of the Sin; but because God hath *actually* prohibited under pain of eternal punishment, things in themselves *lawful and indifferent*, as abstinence from several kinds of Meats, Blood, &c. and therefore surely he may forbid all Sin under that penalty: Yea God in the *Covenant of Works* made with *Adam*, actually prohibited *all Sin* under the penalty of *eternal death*: Which is evident, because if God *promis'd eternal life* to *Adam*, upon *condition of perfect Obedience*, certainly the commission of the *least Sin* would have made *Adam* liable to eternal death; for he that performs not the condition prescrib'd in the *Covenant*, cannot obtain the reward, but contrarily deserves the punishment appointed against those who violate the *Covenant*; But if *Adam* had committed the least Sin, he had not performed the condition prescrib'd in the *Covenant*, which was perfect Obedience; therefore he had deserved the penalty appointed against the violators of the *Covenant*. And if the *Covenant of Works* bound not *Adam* to avoid *every Sin* for the escaping of eternal death, then it bound him (as the *Covenant of Grace* binds us) to repent of Sin for the escaping of eternal death, there being no remission of any Sin, or avoiding of eternal punishment for it without repentance: But under the *Covenant of Works* there was no Obligation to *repentance* for Sin; for if there had been any Obligation to *repentance* for Sin, there must have been a promise of *pardon* upon *repentance*; but that's false, because the promise of pardon belongs only to the *Covenant of Grace*, pardon being only bestow'd through Christ.

Seventhly, I argue from the *Typical remission of Sins in the Old Testament*; for they were then commanded to offer Sacrifices, not only for greater and more enormous offences, but for their *lesser Sins*, as those of *infirmity and ignorance*, which the *Papists* call and account *Venial*. As is evident from *Levit. 4. 2, 12, 13, &c.* and *Lev. 5. 17*. Now those Sacrifices

Synopf. pur.
Theol. de pec.
act. pag. mihi
176.

fices respected that *only* Sacrifice of *Christ*, by which *all* our Sins are expiated, as *Christ* was *made a curse for us that he might deliver us from the curse*, Gal. 3. 13. And from this (saith the learned *Waleus*), *Invidie demonstratur*, 'tis invincibly demonstrated, That every Sin of it self is *Mortal*.

8. Arg.

Eightly, I argue from the *infinity of evil* that is in every Sin, to its desert of an *infinite punishment*. That every Sin is an infinite evil, is most certain; I mean not that 'tis infinite *intensivè*, as to it self or bulk, (as I may say) for as the Sinner is but finite, so Sin is a privation but of a *finite rectitude*; and if every Sin were infinite in its *intensiveness*, all Sins would be equal. But yet two ways Sin is infinite: 1. *Objectivè*, because committed against an infinite Majesty. 2. *Extensivè*, and in respect of its *duration*, because its *stain* and defilement last *for ever*, in regard of the Sinner, who *cannot* of himself *repent*. In like manner there's an infinite *punishment* due to Sin, (I mean not a punishment infinite *intensivè*; for a *finite* Creature cannot be capable of an *infinite* torture; but yet an infinite *punishment* is due to Sin) two ways, as *Sin* was said to be two ways infinite: 1. A punishment is due to Sin, infinite *Objectivè*, by the Sinners being deprived of that *infinite good*, against whom he hath here offended, and whom he hath here neglected and despised. 2. A punishment infinite *extensivè*, in respect of its *duration for ever*, because the *stain* contracted from Sin committed in this life, endures for ever; and therefore the wicked who continue for ever *fedi*, filthy and unclean, continue for ever *Dei Consortio indigni*, unworthy of ever having Communion with God: *Qui nunquam desinit esse malus, nunquam desinit esse miser*; he that never ceaseth to be evil, never ceaseth to be miserable. The most *Venial* fault therefore, being an *infinite fault*, deserves an *infinite* punishment. That 'tis an infinite fault, 'tis plain, because 'tis against the infinite Majesty of the Law-giver, and because its *stain* of it self, and without the mercy of God, endures for ever.

9. Arg.

Ninthly, That *all Sins*, even such as Papists call *Venial Sins*, deserve an eternal punishment is evident, because the *least Sins* of Reprobates, *idle words*, shall be punished with eternal punishment. That those *least Sins* shall be punished *eternally*, is plain from *Mat. 12. 36, 37*. *Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment; for by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned*. This *condemnation* here mention'd by *Christ*, plainly imports an *eternal punishment*; for in the day of Judgment there will be no condemnation to a *temporal* punishment. And that therefore the *least Sins* deserve eternal punishment is evident, because otherwise the punishment which shall be inflicted for these Sins, would not be just, and proportionable to their demerit.

Nor can the *Papists* shun the force of this Argument, by saying, That 'tis

'tis merely by *accident* that *Venial Sins* are punisht with *eternal death*, not in regard of *themselves*, but because of the *condition of the subject* of these *Venial Sins*; which Sins by accident in Reprobates cannot be repented of, because they are joined with *Mortal Sins* that exclude Grace necessary to repentance: This pittiful shift (I say) will not at all help the Papists; for these smaller Sins (which they call *Venial*) are of and by *themselves* the cause of *condemnation* to an *eternal punishment*, as is evident from this place, *Mat. 12. 36, 37.* where *Christ* proves that an *account* shall be given of *every idle word*, because by our *words we shall be condemned*; by which expression he manifestly shews, that those *idle words* of which he spake, though *Papists* count them *Venial*, are yet of *themselves* a *sufficient cause of condemnation to eternal punishment*; and besides, if it be *unjust* (as *Bellarmino* blasphemously speaks) to *punish Venial Sins with eternal death*, because they *deserve* it not; and if a *Venial Sin* by its conjunction with a *Mortal Sin* in a *Reprobate*, is not made greater or deserving of a greater punishment, but retains the *same nature* that it had before, it will then unavoidably follow, (if of *it self* and in its *own nature* it deserves not eternal punishment, that as 'tis in a *reprobate* joined with a *Mortal Sin*), it cannot *deserve* eternal punishment, and by consequence, it is not *punisht* with an eternal punishment; for if it were, God should punish Sins beyond their desert. Nor can the *Papists* come off (as *Baronius* well observes) by saying, Though a *Venial Sin* by a *conjunction with Mortal Sin*, is not made more *grievous* and *hainous*, yet it is more *durable* by that conjunction; as having thereby an *eternal duration* of that *stain*, which follows it, because without repentance, which by a *Mortal Sin* is hindred, there's no taking away of that *stain*. This subterfuge (I say) is very insufficient; for the faults in *Reprobates*, which *Papists* call *Venial*, either *in themselves* do, or do not *deserve* eternal death; if they do not deserve eternal death, then they are punished *beyond* their desert, (which is blasphemy to say), If they *do deserve* eternal death, then that desert of eternal death is founded in the *hainousness of the faults themselves*; and eternal death is inflicted, not alone for the *duration* of the *stain* of those Sins, but for the demerit of the offences *themselves*; to which the Scripture expressly agrees, which testifies, that eternal punishment in the day of Judgment, shall be inflicted for those things *done in the body*, *2 Cor. 5. 10.* so *Mat. 25. 42, 43.* And hence 'twas that *Scotus*, *Biel*, *Vega*, and *Medina*, because they saw that if *Venial Sins* were punisht *eternally*, they should be so punisht because of what they were in *themselves*, and in their own nature, and by the demerit of the offence, labour to put off all, by asserting, that the punishment wherewith the *Damned in Hell* are punisht for *Venial Sins*, is not *eternal*; but *temporal*, and that it shall at length have an *end*, though their punishment inflicted on them for *Mortal Sins* shall last for ever: But others of their own *Fraternity*, condemn this justly for an *absurd* opinion, particularly their great

Scot. in 4. sent.
distinct. 21.
qu. 1.

Si vera fit sententia Scoti, sequitur posse nos orare pro iis qui sunt in inferno, ut citius solvantur à peccat. debitâ pro his peccatis; siquidem illa tandem, postquam fatis passum sit, à Deo dimittenda est. *Vasq. in 1a. 2da. Disp. 141. c. 2.*

great *Vasquez* the Jesuit, thus confuting it: If (saith he) *the opinion of Scotus be true, viz. That the Venial Sins of Reprobates shall not be punished in Hell eternally; It will follow, That we may pray for those in Hell, that they may be freed from the punishment due to their Venial Sins, if that punishment after they have suffered long enough, be by God to be taken off.*

10. Arg.

Confiteor, tundo, confpergor, Conteror, oro; Signor, edo, dono, per hæc Venialia pono.

At ego rursus quæro; istud peccatum sitne Mortale, an Veniale? Si Mortale, in Purgatorium non venit; si Veniale, cur non eodem jure censetur quo reliqua Venialia? *Sadeel de vera peccat. remis. p. mibi 609.*

Lastly, I argue from the *ridiculous absurdity* of the Doctrine of *Veniality of Sin*, to the *erroneousness of it*. The way, say the *Papists*, how *Sins Venial* come to be expiated and removed, is either in this life, or in the next: *In this life by, Sprinkling with holy Water, Confession to a Priest, beating the Breast, Whipping; saying the Lords-Prayer, Crossing, eating no Flesh, giving to the Church, &c.* In the next life Venial Sins are only expiated by the most torturing flames of *Purgatory*, greater than any tortures here in this life, yea as tormenting as *Hell-fire*, setting aside its duration (as the *Papists* say) and oft to be endured many hundreds of years. I demand then, If in this life a Venial Sin may be expiated with a *toy*, as sprinkling with holy Water, and Crossing, or the doing that which oft is, and always should be done with *cheerfulness*, as giving Alms, and yet in the next world it requires so many years of torturing flames to expiate it; what is the *reason of this difference* of the ways of expiating *Venial Sin*, that here it may be done with a *sport*, and there it requires such long and *inexpressible tortures* in fire a thousand times hotter than any here in this world, and as grievous as the torments of *Hell*? To this question the *Papists* answer, The *Sinner* is in the fault, who did not by so light and easie a way, expiate his Sin while here he lived; here he neglected his duty, and therefore there he snarts for it. But then I demand again, was that neglect of doing his duty in *this world* a *Mortal Sin*, or was it a *Venial Sin*? If a *Mortal* or damnable Sin, it should have carry'd the offender to *Hell*; If a *Venial Sin*, the difficulty again returns, Why may it not be expiated as easily as other *Venial Sins* are?

Non refert an uno quis excludatur peccato à beatitudine, an à pluribus, cum omnia similiter excludant. *Hieron. in 5. at Galat. Πασα ἀνάπλα θανάτου ἐστὶ ψυχῆς.* Nazianz. in Orat. Funeb. in Mort. patris. Peccata parva si contra nos collecta fuerint, ita nos opprimunt, sicut unum aliquod grande peccatum. Quid interest ad naufragium, utrum uno grandi fluctu navis obruatur, an paulatim subrepens aqua, nationed

Having now produced what I judg'd sufficient for *Confirmation* of this Truth against the *Veniality of Sin*, I could add many Allegations out of the *Fathers*, which abundantly testify their consent with Protestants, in this point. As out of *Jerome* who hath these words in *quintum at Galat.* *It matters not whether a man be excluded from blessedness by one Sin, or by more, since all alike exclude.* Out of *Nazianzen*, *Every Sin is the death of the Soul.* Out of *Augustine* especially, besides what I have formerly mentioned

tioned in this Discourse, who *Epist.* 108. saith, *Our little Sins, if gathered together against us, will press us down as much as one great Sin.* What difference is there between a *Shipwrack* caused by one great Wave, and by the Water that sinks the Ship, which comes into it by little and little. The same Father, *Tract.* 12. in *Job.* speaks thus, *Little Sins neglected, destroy as well as great ones.* But to avoid needless prolixity, I shall but very briefly dispatch this whole Discourse, with but naming the Heads of those many Inferences from it, which have taken me up much time elsewhere. And these Inferences might be,

Minuta peccata si negligantur, occidunt.
Tract. 12. in *Job.*

1. Speculative and Controversial.
2. Practical.

3d. General Application.

First, For Controversial Inferences.

I. If every Sin, even *Venial*, be damnable, as breaking the Law (as hath been proved) and none can live without them (as *Papists* confess) 'tis clear then, that now none can in this life perfectly keep the Law.

1.

Secondly, If no Sins be *Venial*, but all *mortiferous* and damnable, and make us guilty of Eternal Death, then down falls merit *ex condigno*, Merit by the worthiness of any works; for to be guilty of death, and to deserve eternal Life, cannot stand together.

2.

Thirdly, *Purgatory* is but a Fable, if no Sins be *Venial*; Why should that Fire burn, if it be not *purgative*? or rather, how can it burn, if it have no *Femel*?

3.

II. The Practical Inferences, which are many, I shall but name.

First, If every Sin be damnable and *mortiferous*; then Sin is of a very *bainous* Nature. There's more malignity in an idle Word, and Injustice against God in a *vain thought*, than that all the World can expiate, more weight in it, than all the strength of Angels are able to bear.

1.

Secondly, If the *least* Sins are *mortiferous*, *What then are the greatest?* If a Grain presseth to Hell; If an Atom can weigh down like a Mountain; What then can a Mountain do? If *whispering* Sins speak so loud; What then do *crying* ones, *Bloody Oaths*, *Adultery*, *Murder*, *Oppression*?

2.

Thirdly, If every *single* Sin be damnable, *What then are all our Sins?* Millions of Sins, Sins of all our Ages, Conditions, Places that ever we lived in, Relations? If all were (as *Saint Austin* speaks) *Contra nos Collecta*, gathered into one heap against us, what an *heaven-reaching mountain* would they make?

3.

Fourthly, If every Sin be damnable and *mortiferous*, *God is to be justified in the greatest temporal severities* which he inflicts upon us. As God never punisheth so severely here, but he can punish more; so he never here punisheth so severely, but we deserve more and greater severities. Pains, Flames, Sword, Pestilences, those *tonsure insolescentis generis humani*,

4.

mani, those *movings* down of so many Millions, are all short of damnation, deserved by Sin. God is to be justified in sending such Judgments, as the Fire of London, and the Tempest lately in *Utrecht*.

5. Fifthly, *They who instigate others to Sin are damnable* and mortiferous *Enemies to Souls*. They draw to an Eternal Punishment. Soul-Murder is the greatest, and Soul-Murderers most resemble the Devil in carriage, and shall in *condemnation*. How deeply dyed are those Sins and Sinners that are dipt in the Blood of Souls!
6. Sixthly, *'Tis no Covardise to fear Sin*. Of all fear, that of Sin is most *justifiable*. 'Tis not *magnanimity* but *madness*, not valour, but fool-hardiness, to be *bold to Sin*. Surely, the boldness of Sinners, since Sin deserves Eternal Death, is not from want of *danger*, but *discerning*.
7. Seventhly, How *excusable are Ministers* and all Christian *Monitors*, that warn against Sin. They bid you take heed of *damnation*. To warn against which with the *greatest*, is the *mercifullest severity*.
8. Eighthly, How *madly sinful is it to be merry in Sin!* to make a *mock of it!* What's this but to *sport with Poyson*, and to *recreate* our selves with *damnation*? If here men are counted to *play* before us, when they are sinning, 'twill be *bitterness* in the end. There's no Folly so great as to be pleased with the Sport that Fools make us, nor are any Fools like those that dance to damnation.
9. Ninthly, *Unconceivably great is the patience of God toward Sinners*, especially *great ones*: Gods patience discovers it self eminently, in that he spares *damnable* Sins, though he *sees* them, *hates* them infinitely more than we can do, is *able* to punish them every moment, is infinitely the Sinners *Superior*, yea seeks to *prevent* their punishment by warning, *intreaties*, threats, counsels; yea, puts forth daily Acts of *mercy* and bounty towards those who sin *damnably*; yea, he waits, and is long-suffering oft scores, and hundreds of years, though this waiting shews (not that he will *always spare*, but) that we should *now repent*.
10. Tenthly, *'Tis our Interest to be holy betimes*; 'tis good, that as much as may be of that which is so *damnable*, should be prevented. Shouldst thou be converted *in old age*, 'twill be thy extream sorrow that it was so *late*, though thy happiness it was *at all*. *Early repentance makes an easie Death-bed*, and makes joyful the last Stage of our journey unto Eternal Joyes.

II.

1. Parvitas materiz aggravat.
2. Parva difficilium caventur.
3. Parva viam manent ad majora.
4. Minuta & multa sunt ut animum grande.

Eleventhly, No *smallness of sin should occasion boldness to commit it*.
 1. In some Cases, the *smallness* of the inducement to Sin, the slightness of the matter of thy Sin, *aggravates* the offence. To deny a Friend a *Cup of Water*, is a greater unkindness than to deny him a thousand pounds: What, wilt thou stand with God for a *trifle*, and damn thy Soul for a *toy*? wilt thou prefer a *peny* before God and Glory? 2. *Small Sins* are more *difficultly shunned*; A small bone of a Fish easily gets into the Throat, and 'tis hard to avoid it: And 3. *Small Sins dispose to greater*; the Wimple makes way for the Auger. 4. *Sins many*, though *small*,

small, are as *one great one*; An heap of Sands preffeth to death as well as a Sow of Lead; A Ship may sink by *Water* coming in at a *Leak*, drop by drop, as well as when overwhelmed with a *great Wave*. As *Austin* speaks.

Twelfthly, I note, The great reason why *Christ* should be dear to us. Thou canst not be *without him*, no not for thy *little, thy least* Sins, and those of *dayly incurfion*. Oh! that this Doctrine might make you and me prize *Christ* more, as long as we live. Because the *Best* cannot live without *small* Sins, neither can they live without a *great Saviour*; none of us can live without these smaller Sins, (as the very *Papists* grant) but oh that we may take a wiser course to get pardon of them, than they do, by our looking upon *Gods pity* through *Christs Blood*, as our only *Purgatory*. The *Pharisees* (of old) saw that we could not live without breaking the Law in smaller things (as we have shewn before) but let us more study than they did, *Gods design* in giving a Law which *saln-Man* is not able to keep. The Apostle tells us *Gods design* herein; *He aimed at Christ*, Rom. 10. 4. who was *intended* by God as his end in giving such a Law which *saln-Man* could not keep; namely, that *Sinners* might seek after his *Righteousness*, by seeing their own inability to keep it. How much do we want *Christ* at every turn, for our smallest *inadvertencies*, *impertinent*, *wandering thoughts*, in the adjacent defects and defilements of our holy things! Lord, I want thy *Blood*, as often as I fetch my breath!

12.

Lastly, I infer the *happinefs* of *Believers* under the *Covenant of Grace*. *Ex rigore Legis*, the least Sins damn, and none of us but every day and in every *duty*, commit them; but here's the *Comfort*, we are delivered through *Christ*, from that *damnation* which we deserve for all those *unavoidable-defects* and evils, that attend the *Best* in their *best* observing the Law of God; we being loosed under the *Covenant of Grace*, from that *rigid exaction* of the Law, which suffers no Sin to go without *Eternal punishment*, and *delivered by Christ from the necessity of a perfect and exact fulfilling* the Law of God, under pain of *damnation*. 'Tis true, the Law still commands, even *Believers*, *perfect obedience*, and 'tis a Sin in *Believers* under the *Covenant of Grace*, that they do not obey the Law of God to the utmost perfection thereof; but here's our *happinefs*, that *Christ* hath obtained, that the *imperfection* of our *Obedience* shall not *damn* us, but that our *imperfect Obedience* to the Law, shall through him be accepted. If indeed there were only the *Law and no Christ*, no *Obedience* but that which is *absolutely perfect*, could be entertained by God; but now, though by the *Law*, *perfect Obedience* be required, yet by *Grace*, *imperfect* (if sincere) *Obedience* is accepted; For under the *Covenant of Grace*, *strictly and precisely under pain of damnation*, we are only obliged to that *measure of obedience* which is possible by the help of *Grace*; and hence it is, that *Christs Yoke* is called *easy*, which cannot be understood of the Law in its *rigor*, but as *mitigated* by the *Covenant of Grace*:

Ult.

Mat. 11. ult.

That Yoke would not be *ease* but *intolerable*, if it, propounded no hope of Salvation, but under that *impossible condition of perfect Obedience* to the Law. And 1 *Job. 5. 3. His commands are not grievous*; but so they would be, if their exactions were rigorous in requiring perfect Obedience *under pain of damnation*, of us that cannot perform it: But for ever blessed be God, that though our best Obedience be *imperfect*, yet the *perfect* Obedience of Christ imputed to us, supplies the *defect* of ours; yea, that our imperfect Obedience doth not only not damn us (though the imperfection thereof *deserves* damnation according to the rigor of the Law) but that it is ordained to be the *way* to our Salvation; I mean *not its imperfection*, but it, *notwithstanding* its imperfection. Reader, if thou art a Believer, till thy Love to Jesus Christ, prompts thee to a more sutable Ejaculation, accept of this for a Conclusion of this whole Discourse. A *saying*, *Eternity*, (Father of Mercy) *will be short enough to praise thee for Him, who hath delivered us from those many millions of Sins, the least whereof deserve a damning Eternity*: Dear Lord Jesus, *who hast saved us from the least Sin that ever we had or did, help us to serve thee with the greatest Love, that our Souls can either admit or express. And as (through Grace) the guilt of the least Sin shall not lye upon us; so neither let the Love of the least Sin lodg within us. Thou who hast made our Justification perfect, daily perfect what our Sanctification wants. And never (Lord) let us put limits to our thankful returns, for those satisfying sufferings of thine, that knew no Bounds, no Measure.*

SERMON
