



Asbury Theological Seminary

1.800.2.ASBURY • WWW.ASBURYSEMINARY.EDU

204 N. Lexington Avenue • Wilmore, KY 40390 • 859.858.3581

8401 Valencia College Lane • Orlando, FL 32825 • 407.482.7500

The Copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

**By the using this material, you are consenting to abide by this copyright policy. Any duplication, reproduction, or modification of this material without express written consent from Asbury Theological Seminary and/or the original publisher is prohibited.**

© Asbury Theological Seminary 2007

Herbert H. Hill  
to E. H. H.  
1893.

# TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

---

BY

MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

---

VOL. IV.

FOR

1836-7.

---

“ If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?”

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL:

& J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

---

1838.

[No. 82.]

LONDON:  
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

It has been thought, that a Letter which appeared in a periodical in the early part of this year, in defence of certain portions of this work, might suitably be prefixed to the present Volume; both as explaining some statements and views contained in former Tracts, and as likely, some time hence, to form a curious record of the mistakes of the day on the main subject of which they treat. Since these are the only objects for republishing the Letter in question, the names both of the Magazine and the writer are here dropped: and one or two omissions are made of expressions in the Letter, which were, perhaps, more discourteous towards the Magazine than the occasion required.

OXFORD,  
*The Feast of All Saints, 1837.*

## LETTER TO A MAGAZINE

ON THE SUBJECT OF

### DR. PUSEY'S TRACT ON BAPTISM.

---

IN answer to a Correspondent who had asked, "on what authority," certain "statements" in Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism, pp. 133—135, rested, the Editor of the Magazine in question had made the following remarks :—

We are not sure that we perfectly understand all H. C.'s remarks; and we differ from his opinion that Bishop Burnet "ought to be allowed to have great weight in controversies respecting the doctrines of our Church." But, in reply to the question which he puts to us, as to "what authority" the doctrine which he quotes from the Oxford Tracts rests upon, we can only say, Upon the authority of the darkest ages of Popery, when men had debased Christianity from a spiritual system, a "reasonable service," to a system of forms, and ceremonial rites, and *opera operata* influences; in which, what Bishop Horsley emphatically calls "the mysterious intercourse of the soul with its Creator," was nearly superseded by an intervention of "the church"—not as a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments are "duly administered according to Christ's ordinance," as the Church of England defines it—but as a sort of "mediator between God and man," through whom all things relating to spiritual life were to be conveyed. Those who could not understand that "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth," and those who had neither the reality nor "the appearance of spiritual life," readily allied themselves to a religion of ceremonials, in which the Church stood in the place of God. And as the Popish priesthood found their gain in encouraging these ritual and non-spiritual views of Christianity, they eventually prevailed throughout Christendom, till the Reformation restored the

pure light of Scripture, and taught men to look less to the priest and more to God; less to "outward and visible signs," and more to "inward and spiritual graces;" and not to infer, that, because their names stood upon the register of baptism, it was therefore enrolled in the Lamb's book of life, when there was no "appearance" of spiritual vitality in their heart or conduct.

This fatal reliance upon signs, to the forgetfulness of the things signified, was rendered more proclivous, from the circumstance that in the early church persecution so purified its ranks, that there was little temptation for men to call themselves Christians who were not such in heart; and as adult converts were the first candidates for baptism, the outward and visible sign of regeneration was not resorted to till the inward and spiritual grace was already actually possessed; for there had been spiritually "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," before the party applied to make a public confession of his faith in Christ, at the risk of subjecting himself to all the secular perils which it involved.

We have devoted so many scores, nay, hundreds, of pages to the questions propounded in the extract from the Oxford Tracts (especially at the time of the Baptismal Controversy, upon occasion of Bishop Mant's tract, when not a few of our readers were thoroughly wearied with the discussion), that we are not anxious to obtrude a new litigation; but we have readily inserted the extract furnished by our correspondent, because, nothing that we could say would so clearly show the unscriptural character of the whole system of the Oxford Tracts, as to let them speak for themselves. When the Christian reader learns that Noah, and Abraham, and Moses, and Job, and David, and Isaiah, and Daniel, were not regenerate persons, were not sons of God, were not born again, but that Voltaire was all this, because he had been baptized by a Popish priest, we may surely leave such an hypothesis to be crushed by its own weight. It is the very bathos of theology, an absurdity not worthy to be gravely replied to, that men were "sanctified," "greatly sanctified;" were the friends of God, that "the Spirit of God dwelt in their hearts, and wrought therein incorruption, self-denial, patience, and unhesitating, unwearied faith;" who yet, having been "by nature born in sin; and the children of wrath," and never having been baptized, so as to be made "the children of grace," were still "unregenerate," and therefore, in Scripture language, "children of the devil." Sanctified, unregenerate friends of God! The Spirit of God dwelling in men, who, not being "born again," were of necessity, being still in their natural condition, "children of the devil!" What next?

We defy a score of Dr. Hampdens, even were they to give lectures in favour of pure Socinianism, to do so much mischief to the cause of religion, in a high academical station, as is done by setting forth such

doctrine as that contained in the following passage from one of the Oxford Tracts;—for Socinianism makes no pretensions to be the doctrine of the Church of England, nor do any members of that church profess to find it in Scripture; whereas the absurdity, the irrational fanaticism, the intellectual drivelling under the abused name of faith, which dictates such sentiments as the following, must disgust every intelligent man, and make him an infidel, if he is really led to believe that Christianity is a system so utterly opposed to common sense. The writer complains, that “ We have almost embraced the doctrine, that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or (what is called) communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which the church and her Sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen. For example, would not most men maintain, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord’s Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, was a superstition? and yet both practices have the sanction of primitive usage. And does not this account for the prevailing indisposition, to admit that Baptism conveys regeneration? Indeed, this may even be set down as the essence of Sectarian doctrine (however its mischief may be restrained or compensated, in the case of individuals), to consider faith, and not the Sacraments, as the *instrument of justification* and other Gospel gifts.”

Did ever any man, but the most ignorant Popish fanatic, till these our modern days, write thus? Administering the Lord’s Supper (by which we feed upon Christ, “ *by faith, with thanksgiving*”—that is, in a purely spiritual banquet) to infants, or to the dying or insensible, is not superstition, if it can be proved that there were in some former age some persons weak and ignorant enough to act or advocate such folly and impiety! Why not equally vindicate the Pope’s sprinkling holy water upon the horses, or St. Anthony’s preaching to the fishes? We will only say, Let those who adopt a portion of this scheme, and not the whole, mark well whither they are tending. Upon the showing of the Oxford Tracts themselves, the whole system hangs together. You are to adopt some irrational mystical system, by which grace is conveyed—not through “ *faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or (what is called) communion with God,*” but—in the same manner that the Lord’s Supper conveys grace when administered to an infant, or an insensible person. We have never been extreme in our views respecting the language used in our Liturgy concerning Baptism. We have thought that the words might be consistently used, either in reference to the undoubted privileges of Christian baptism; or in faith and charity, upon the principle stated in the Catechism, where it is

said, "Why then are infants baptized, when, by reason of their tender age, they cannot perform them? (faith and repentance.) Because they promise them both by their sureties; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." Upon either of these principles we can cheerfully use our Baptismal Service. But if the use of it is to sanction the doctrine stated in this tract; if we are to believe that baptism "conveys to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen," in the selfsame way that the Popish wafer is alleged to convey grace to infants and insensible persons—(why not to idiots?)—and if our Church Service is to be tortured to bear this meaning; then we confess, that the sooner such a stumbling-block is removed the better. The Oxford Tract writers will not allow us to connect the outward and visible sign of Baptism, or the Lord's Supper, with the inward and spiritual grace, through the medium of "faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or (what is called) communion with God," but only through the selfsame channel by which "primitive usage" supposed grace to flow to an infant or insensible person, when operated upon with the holy Eucharist. Nay, they sneer at and ridicule "what is called" communion with God (poor Bishop Horsley's "mysterious intercourse of the soul with its Creator"), as being something so "called," but without warrant; whereas true communion with God is through the intervention of "the Church:" by which intervention there is this communion when the priest puts a consecrated wafer upon the lips of an infant or insensible person. The Church of England teaches, after Holy Scripture, that we are "justified by faith;" Professor Pusey teaches that the Sacraments are the appointed instruments of justification. The learned Professor ought to lecture at Maynooth, or the Vatican, and not in the chair of Oxford, when he puts forth this Popish doctrine. It is afflicting beyond expression to see our Protestant Church—and in times like these—agitated by the revival of these figments of the darkest ages of Papal superstition. Well may Popery flourish! well may Dissent triumph! well may Unitarianism sneer! well may all Protestantism mourn, to see the spot where Craumer and Latimer shed their blood for the pure Gospel of Christ, overrun (yet not overrun, for, blessed be God, the infection is not—at least so we trust—widely spread) with some of the most vain and baneful absurdities of Popery. We ask Professor Pusey how, as a conscientious man, he retains any office in a church which requires him to subscribe to all the Thirty-nine Articles, and to acknowledge as Scriptural the doctrines set forth in the Homilies? Will any one of the writers, or approvers of the Oxford Tracts, venture to say that he does really believe all the doctrines of the Articles and Homilies of our Church? He may construe some of *the offices* of the Church after his own manner; but what does he do with the Articles and Homilies? We have often asked this question in private, but could

never get an answer. Will any approver of the Oxford Tracts answer it in print?

The demand here made had been met; and the following number of the Magazine had contained the following notice on the subject.

In reply to the communication of the Rev. —, of — College, requesting to know whether we will insert a letter in which he says he is prepared "both as regards Dr. Pusey and the Oxford Tracts" to furnish an answer to our inquiry, how the writers reconcile some of the statements in them respecting the Sacraments, with some of those in the Articles and Homilies; we can only say, that we are surprised that he should think it necessary to ask the question; for what honesty or love of truth would there be in our putting a query, and refusing to insert a responsible and properly written reply?

The following letter was the consequence of this permission.

*Letter to the Editor of the ———.*

PART I.

— College, Jan. 11, 1837.

Sir,—Through that courtesy, which is on the whole characteristic of your Magazine, in dealing with opponents, I am permitted to answer in its pages the challenge, made in a late number, to Dr. Pusey and the writers of the Tracts for the Times, on certain points of their theology. The tone of that challenge, I must own, or rather the general conduct of your Magazine towards the Tracts, since their first appearance, has been an exception to its usual mildness and urbanity. However, I seize, as an ample amends, this opportunity of a reply, which, if satisfactory, will, as appearing in its pages, be rather a retraction on your part than an explanation on mine.

One would think that the Tracts had introduced some new articles of faith into English theology, such surprise have they excited in some quarters; yet, much as they have been censured, no attempt, that I know of, has been made to prove against them—I will not say, article of faith, but—even any theological opinion, which is not consonant to that religious system which has been received among us since the date of the Ecclesiastical Polity. Indeed, nothing is more striking than the contrast exhibited in the controversy between the great definiteness and precision of the feelings, and the vagueness of the outcry, raised against these Tracts. From the excitement on the subject for the last three years, one would think nothing was more obvious and tangible

than the offence they contained; yet nothing, not only to refute, but even to describe their errors definitely, has yet been attempted. Extracts have been made; abuse has been lavished; invidious associations excited; irony and sarcasm have lent their aid: their writers have been called Papists, and Non-jurors, and Lauds, and Sacheverells, and that not least of all by your own Magazine: yet I much doubt whether, as far as you have thrown light on the subject, its readers have, up to this hour, any more definite idea of the matter than they have of Sacheverell himself, or of the Non-jurors, or of any other vague name which is circulated in the world, meaning the less the oftener it is used. If they were examined, perhaps they would not get beyond this round of titles and epithets: or, at the utmost, we should but hear that the Tracts were corruptions of the Gospel, human inventions, systems of fallible men, and so forth. These are the fine words which you give them to feed upon, for bread.

Even now, Mr. Editor, when you make your formal challenge concerning Dr. Pusey, you do not distinctly and pointedly say, as a man who was accusing, not declaiming, *what* you want answered. You ask, "will any of the writers or approvers of the Oxford Tracts venture to say that he [Dr. Pusey]<sup>1</sup> does really believe *all* the doctrines of the Articles and Homilies of our church?" How unsuitable is this! Why do you not tell us *which* doctrine of the Articles you have in your mind, and then prove your point, instead of leaving us to guess it? One used to think it was the business of the accuser to bring proof, and not to throw upon the accused the *onus* of proving a negative. What! am I, as an approver of the Tracts, to go through the round of doctrines in Articles and Homilies, measuring Dr. Pusey first by one, then by the other, while the —— sits still, as judge rather than accuser? What! are we not even to have the *charge* told us, let alone the proof? No; we are to find out both the dream and the interpretation.

So much for the formal challenge which your Magazine puts forth; and I can find nothing, either in the remarks which precede it, nor in its acceptance of my offer, precisely coming to the point, and informing me *what* the charge against Dr. Pusey is. It is connected with the Sacraments: you wish him and his friends, according to your subsequent notice, "to reconcile *some* of the statements in them [the Tracts] respecting the Sacraments, with *some* of those in the Articles and Homilies!" In your remarks which precede the challenge, you do mention two opinions which you suppose him to hold, which I shall presently notice; but you are still silent as to the Article or Homily transgressed. This is not an English mode of proceeding; and I dwell on it, as one of the significant tokens in the controversy, what is the

<sup>1</sup> The Editor meant by "he," not Dr. Pusey, but "any of the writers," &c.

real state of the case and its probable issue? Here are two parties: one clamorous loudly and profusely against the other, and does no more; that other is absorbed in its *subject*, appeals to Scripture, to the Fathers, to custom, to reason, in *its* defence, but answers not. Put the case before any sharp-sighted witness of human affairs, and he will give a good guess which is in the right. If, indeed, there is one thing more than another that brings home to me that the Tracts are mainly on the side of Truth—more than their reasonings, their matter, and their testimonies; more than proof from Scripture, or appeal to antiquity, or sanction from our own divines; more than the beauty and grandeur, the thrilling and transporting influence, the fulness and sufficiency of the doctrines they desire to maintain—it is this: the evidence which their writers bear about them, that they are the reviled party, not the revilers. I challenge the production of any thing in the Tracts of an unkind, satirical, or abusive character; any thing personal. One Tract only concerns individuals at all, No. 73; and that treats of them in a way which no one, I think, will find to be any exception to this remark. The writers nowhere attack your Magazine, or other similar publication, though they evidently as little approve of its theology, as your Magazine that of the Tracts. They have been content to go onward; to preach what is positive; to trust in what they did well, not in what others did ill; to leave truth to fight its own battle, in a case where they had no office or commission to assist it coercively. They have spoken against *principles, ages, or historical characters*, but not against persons living. They have taken no eye for eye, or tooth for tooth. They have left their defence to time, or rather committed it to God. Once only have they accepted of defence, even from a friend<sup>1</sup>, a partner he indeed also, but not in those Tracts which he defended. This, then, is the part they have chosen; what your Magazine's choice has been, is plain even from the article which leads me to write this letter. We are there told of Oxford writers, "relying on the authority of the darkest ages of Popery," of their advocating "the bathos in theology; an absurdity not worthy to be gravely replied to," of their "absurdity," "irrational fanaticism," "intellectual drivelling," of their writing like "the most ignorant Popish fanatic," of their "sneering and ridiculing," of their reviving the "figments of the darkest ages of Papal superstition," "some of the most vain and baneful absurdities of Popery;" and all this with an avowal you do not wish to discuss the matter. Brave words surely! Well and good, take your fill of these, Mr. Editor, since you choose them for your portion. It does but make *our* spirits rise cheerily and hopefully *thus* to be encountered. Never were such words on one side, but *deeds* were on the other. We know our place, and our for-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Pusey's Earnest Remonstrance.



tunes ; to give a witness and to be contemned, to be ill used and to *succeed*. Such is the law which God has annexed to the promulgation of the truth ; its preachers suffer, but its cause prevails. Be it so. Joyfully will we all consent to this compact ; and the more you attack us personally, the more, for the very omen's sake, will we exult in it.

With these feelings, then, I have accepted your challenge, not for the sake of Dr. Pusey, much as I love and revere him ; not for the sake of the writers of the Tracts ; but for the sake of the secret ones of Christ, lest they be impeded in their progress towards catholic truth by personal charges against those who are upholding it against the pressure of the age. As for Dr. Pusey himself, and the other writers, they are happy each in his own sphere, wherever God's providence has called them, in earth or in heaven ; and they literally do not know, and do not care, what the world says of them.

Now, as I have already said, I cannot distinctly make out the precise charge brought against Dr. Pusey ; that is, I cannot determine *what* tenet of his is supposed to be contrary to *which* of the 39 Articles. However, you condemn two, the notion that the Sacraments may, for what we know, in certain cases be of benefit to persons unconscious during their administration ; and next that Regeneration is a gift of the new covenant exclusively. I will take them in the order you place them.

1. And first of Regeneration, as a gift peculiar to the Gospel.—You remark upon a passage from Dr. Pusey's work on Baptism (in which he contrasts regeneration and sanctification, and says, that the former is a gift of the Gospel exclusively, the latter of all good men), thus : “ We have devoted so many scores, nay, hundreds of pages to the questions propounded in the extract from the Oxford Tracts (especially at the time of the Baptismal controversy, upon occasion of Bishop Mant's Tract, when not a few of our readers were wearied with the discussion), that we are not anxious to obtrude a new litigation ; but we have readily inserted the extract furnished by our correspondent, because nothing that we could say would so clearly show the unscriptural character of the whole system of the Oxford Tracts, as to let them speak for themselves.”—Now, it might seem at first sight as if they were an inconsistency in persisting for some years in speaking *instead of us*, then suddenly saying it is best to let the Tracts “ *speak for themselves*,” and then, in the very next sentences, relapsing *in eandem cantilenam*, into the same declamatory tone of attack as before ; but there is really none. In each case you avoid discussion, which, as you candidly confess, and very likely with good reason, you are tired of. I doubt not you are discouraged at finding that you have still to argue what you have already done your utmost to settle. Or rather, if you will let me speak plainly, and tell you my mind, perhaps there has been that in the religious aspect of the hour, which has flattered

many who agree with you, and perhaps yourself, that the day of mere struggle was past, and that of triumph was come; that your principles were professed by all the serious, all the active men in the Church, the old defenders of opposite views drooping or dying off; and that now, by the force of character, or by influence in high places, they would be secured a permanent impression upon our religious system. And if so, you are not unnaturally surprised to find “*uno avulso, non deficit alter;*” to find a sudden obstacle in your path, and that from a quarter whence you looked not for it; and, in consequence, you feel stimulated to remove it hastily rather than courteously. And hence, partly from weariness, partly from vexation, you prefer to act as if you were judge rather than —, and to pronounce sentence by acclamation, not after discussion. If all this be so, you are quite consistent, whether you quote our words without comment, or substitute your own comment for them. In one point alone you are irretrievably inconsistent, to have inserted your challenge at the end of the article.

But what is the very doctrine that has created this confusion? Dr. Pusey's asserting (after the primitive teachers) that the old Fathers, though sanctified, were not regenerated. Is *this*, after all, the doctrine which is against the Articles, and such that he who holds it should quit his Professorship? In which of them is a syllable to be found referring to the subject, one way or the other—except so far as they tend our way, as implying, from their doctrine of regeneration *in* baptism, that those who are not baptized, and therefore the Old Fathers, are not regenerate? If, then, the plain truth must be spoken, what your Magazine wishes is to *add* to the Articles. Let this be clearly understood. This Magazine, which has ever, as many think, been over-liberal in its interpretations of our Services, and in concessions to Dissenters, desires to forge for us a yoke of commandments, and, as I should hold, of commandments of men. Years ago, indeed, we heard of much from it in censure of Bishop Marsh's Eighty-seven Questions; but it would seem that your Magazine may do what a Bishop may not. In reviewing those Questions, in 1821, it pointedly spoke of the wisdom of the framers of the Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles, which prescribes that they shall be taken in no new or peculiar sense; contrasting, to use its own words, “the spirit of peace, of moderation, of manly candour, and comprehensive liberality, which breathes throughout this Declaration, with the subtle, contentious, dogmatical, sectarian, and narrow-minded spirit which,” it proceeded, “we grieve to say, pervades the Bishop of Peterborough's Eighty-seven Questions.” (— March 1821). But why is liberality to develop on one side only? Why must Baptismal Regeneration be an open point, but the Regeneration of the Patriarchs a close one? Why must Zuinglius be admitted, and the school of Gregory and Augustine excluded? Or do persons by a sort of superstition so cleave to the word Protestant, that

a Saint who had the misfortune to be born before 1517 is less of kin to them than heretics since? But such is your Magazine's rule: it is as zealous against Bishop Marsh for coercing one way, as against us for refusing to be coerced the other.

Will it be said that Dr. Pusey and others would do the same, if they could; that is, would limit the Articles to their own sense? No; the Articles are confessedly wide in their wording, though still their width is within bounds; they seem to include a number of shades of opinion. Your Magazine may rest satisfied that Dr. Pusey's friends will never assert that the Articles have any *particular* meaning at all. They aspire, and (by God's blessing) intend, to have a successful fight; but not by narrowing the Articles to Lutheranism, Calvinism, or Zuinglianism, but as feeling that they are contending for the Truth, and that Providence seems wonderfully to be raising up witnesses and champions of the Truth, not in one place only, but at once in many, as armed men from the ground.

But to return. It is hard to be put on our defence, as it appears we are, for opinions not against the Articles; but be it so. Let us hear the form of the accusation. Your Magazine speaks thus: "When the Christian reader learns that Noah, and Abraham, and Moses, and Job, and David, and Isaiah, and Daniel, were not regenerate persons, were not sons of God, were not born again; but that Voltaire was all this, because he had been baptized by a Popish priest; we may surely leave such a hypothesis to be crushed by its own weight." To be sure the hypothesis *is* absurd, if your Magazine's own sense is to be put upon the word "regenerate;" but it will be observed, that it all depends upon this; and it is not evident that it will be absurd when Dr. Pusey's own sense is put upon his own words. If all who are sanctified are regenerate, then I say, it *is* absurd to say that Abraham was *not* regenerate being sanctified. On the other hand, if *only* Christians are regenerate, then it is absurd to say that Abraham *was* regenerate, being not a Christian. What trifling upon words is this! what is the use of oscillating to and fro upon their different meanings? Your business, Mr. Editor, was to *prove his sense wrong*, not to assume your sense and interpret his words by it; else, when *you* assert, "no one shall enter heaven, unless regenerated on earth," *he*, in turn, might accuse you, quite as fairly, of denying the salvation of Abraham, because, in his view, Abraham was not regenerated on earth.

I will now state briefly the view of Dr. Pusey, derived from the goodly fellowship of the Fathers, proved from Scripture, and called by your Magazine "the very bathos of theology." All of us, I suppose, grant that the Spirit in some sense is given under the Gospel, in which it was not given under the Law. The Homily (2d on Faith) says so expressly: "Although they," the Old Testament saints mentioned Heb. xi., "were not named Christian men, yet was it a Christian

faith that they had : God gave them then grace to be His children, as He doth us now. But now, by the coming of our Saviour Christ, we have received *more abundantly* the Spirit of God in our hearts, whereby we may conceive a greater faith, and a surer trust, than many of them had. But, in effect, they and we be all one : we have the same faith," &c. Though man's duties were the same, his gifts were greater after Christ came. Whatever spiritual aid was vouchsafed before, yet afterwards it was a Divine presence in the soul, abiding, abundant, and efficacious. In a word, it was the Holy Ghost Himself ; who influenced indeed the heart before, but is not revealed as residing in it. Now, when we consider the Scripture proof of this in the full, I think we shall see that this special gift, which Christians have, is really something extraordinary and distinguishing. And, whether it should be called Regeneration or no, so far is clear, that all persons who hold that there *is* a great gift since Christ came, which was not given before, do, in their degree, incur your Magazine's censure, as holding a "very bathos of theology." You might say of them, just as of Dr. Pusey, "When the Christian reader learns that Abraham was sanctified, yet 'had not the Spirit because that Jesus was not yet glorified,' we may leave the hypothesis to be crushed by its own weight."

Now, according to Scripture, I contend, first, that there is a spiritual difference between Christians and Jews ; and, next, that the accession of spiritual power, which Christians have, is called Regeneration. Let it be understood, however, that I am not desirous here to bring *proofs* of the doctrine, for which you have no claim on me ; but to show your readers that, even at first sight, it is not so utterly irrational and unpalatable a notion as to account for your saying, "What next?" in short, to show that the "absurdity" does not lie with Dr. Pusey.

The Prophets had announced the *promise*. Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27 : "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean . . . a *new heart* also will I give you, and a *new spirit* will I put *within* you . . . and I will put *My Spirit within you*." Again, xxxvii. 27 : "My *tabernacle* also shall be with them." Vid. also Heb. viii. 10. In Isai. xlv. 3, the gift is expressly connected with the person of the Messiah : "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground : I will pour *My Spirit* upon Thy seed, and My blessing upon Thine offspring."

Our Saviour refers to this gift as the *promise* of his Father, Luke xxiv. 49 ; Acts i. 4. He enlarges much upon it, John xiv—xvi. It flows to us from Him : "Of His fulness have all we received." (John i. 16.)

St. John expressly tells us it was *not given before* Christ was glorified (John vii. 39). In like manner St. Paul says, that, though the old fathers lived by faith, yet they received not the *promise*" (Heb. xi. 39). And St. Peter, that even the prophets, though they *had* the prophetic

Spirit—"the Spirit of Christ which was in them"—yet, after all, had not "the glory which should follow;" which was "the Gospel *with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven;*" the Spirit, in the special Christian sense. Consider also St. Paul's use of the term "spirit," e. g., Rom. viii., as the characteristic of the Gospel.

It is described in the New Testament under the same images as it is promised in the Old,—a tabernacle, and a fount of living water (1 Cor. iii. 17; vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16—18; John iv. 14; vii. 38).

Nothing, I think, but the inveterate addiction to systematising so prevalent, can explain away texts which so expressly say that we have a Divine presence which the Jews had not.

Now, secondly, is this gift to be called Regeneration? I grant that in one sense all the terms applicable to Christian privileges are also applicable to Jewish. The Jews were "sons of God," were "begotten" of God, had "the Spirit," saw "the glory of God," and the like; but, in like manner, the Saints in heaven, as their peculiar gift, will see "the glory of God," and Angels are "sons of God;" yet we know that Angels and Saints are in a state different from the Jews. The question, then, still remains open, whether, in spite of the absence of discriminating terms, Christians also have not a gift which the Jews had not, and whether the word regeneration, in its *proper* sense, does not denote it.

Our proof, then, is simple. The word regeneration occurs twice only in Scripture: in neither can it be interpreted to include Judaism; in one, most probably in both, it is limited to the Gospel; in Titus iii. 4, 5, certainly; and in Matt. xix. 28, according as it is stopped, it will mean the coming of Gospel grace, or the resurrection.

Such is some small portion of the Scripture notices on the general subject, which I bring to show that Scripture does not so speak as to make the view maintained by Dr. Pusey, with all Saints, guilty of absolute "absurdity" on the face of the matter, and a "bathos in theology." And the following consideration will increase this impression. In truth the view in question is simply *beyond*, not *against*, the opinion of your Magazine. It is a view which the present age cannot be said to deny, because it does not see it. The Catholic Church has ever given to Noah, Abraham, and Moses, all that the present age gives to Christians. You cannot mention the grace, in kind or degree, which you ascribe to the Christian, which Dr. Pusey will not ascribe to Abraham; except, perhaps, the intimate knowledge of the details of Christian doctrine. But he considers that Christians have a something beyond this, even a portion of that heaven brought down to earth, which will be for ever in heaven the portion of Abraham and all saints in its fulness. It is not, then, that Dr. Pusey defrauds Abraham, but your Magazine defrauds Christians. That special gift of grace, called "the glory of God," is as unknown to the so-called religious world as to the "na-

tural man." The Catholic Religion teaches, that, when grace takes up its abode in us, we have so superabounding and awful a grace tabernacled in us, that no other words describe it more nearly than to call it an Angel's nature. Now mark the meaning of this. Angels are holy; yet Angels before now have become devils. Keeping this analogy in view, you will perceive that it is as little an absurdity to say that Abraham was not regenerate, as to say that he was not an Angel; as little unmeaning to say that Voltaire was regenerate, as to say he became a devil, as Judas is expressly called. Let me suit one or two of your sentences to this view of the subject, and then I will release you from the trouble of hearing more upon it. You will then speak thus: "When the Christian reader learns that Noah, Abraham, and Moses, were not Angels, yet that Voltaire was a devil, we may surely leave such an hypothesis to be crushed by its own weight. It is the very bathos of theology—an absurdity not worthy to be gravely replied to—that men are sanctified, the friends of God, had the grace of God in their hearts, and yet were not Angels. Sanctified, non-angelic friends of God! grace dwelling in any but Michael, Gabriel, the Cherubims and the Seraphims? What next?"

Alas! sir, that you should so speak of your own privileges! Perhaps it is my turn now to ask you, "What next?" and this I mean to do. Before proceeding to the other opinion attributed to Dr. Pusey, I wish to see what you will say to what is now offered you. Only I would remark, that the subjects which I have not yet touched upon *are* to come, when due attention shall be shown to your remarks about Justification, the Homilies, and kindred points.

## PART II.

March 3, 1837.

2. I now proceed to the second of the charges which you made against Dr. Pusey. After saying what is necessary, I shall, as I promised, notice the subject of Justification, the Homilies, and the Articles; and shall intersperse the discussion with some remarks, as brief as is practicable, on the various matter "ramblingly and cursorily set before your readers," as you happily express it, in your animadversions on the portion of my letter already published.

That portion occupies not so much as seven pages of your larger type, and that in the course of two numbers. It has elicited from you in answer about sixty pages of your closest. I think then I have a claim in courtesy, nay in justice, that you should put in the *whole* of this reply without a word of your own. I will not embrace the entire subject in it, but leave one portion for an after Number of your Magazine, that you may not say I burden you with too much at once. But what I send, I hope to see inserted without mutilation. Do grant me

this act of fairness—you will have months upon months, nay, the whole prospective duration of your Magazine, for your reply; I, on the other hand, limit myself to *one* letter. All I ask is the right of an Englishman, a fair and uninterrupted hearing.

The second charge you bring against Dr. Pusey is this:—that he holds that the sacraments may, for what we know, in certain cases, be of benefit to persons unconscious during their administration. You quarrel, however, with this mode of stating his supposed opinion; you say, “Mr. — misstates what we said. We were denying the utility of administering the Lord’s Supper to infants or insensible persons, as the Papists employ extreme unction; which Mr. — skilfully turns into a charge of our denying that there is any benefit in Infant Baptism” (p. 124). Now, I must think you leave the matter as you found it. You have said, the notion of the Holy Eucharist benefitting infants was “an absurdity,” “intellectual drivelling,” “irrational fanaticism,” &c. I ask, then, *why* is not the doctrine that Holy Baptism benefits them, all these bad things also? Surely you are speaking of the very *notion* of infants being benefitted by means of external rites, when you say it implies “a system utterly opposed to common sense.” You must mean there is an *antecedent* absurdity; antecedent to a consideration of the particular case. You speak, just as I have worded it, against the very notion that “the sacraments,” one as well as the other, “may, for what we know, in certain cases, be of benefit to persons unconscious during their administration.” What is an absurdity when supposed in one case, is an absurdity surely in the other. I cannot alter my wording of your objection.

Next let us consider the very passage which has led you to use these free epithets. It stands thus: “We have almost embraced the doctrine that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplation, or (what is called) communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which the church and her sacraments are the ordained and direct invisible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen. For example: would not most men maintain, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord’s Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, was a superstition? and yet both practices have the sanction of primitive usage. And does not this account for the prevailing indisposition to admit that baptism conveys regeneration? Indeed, this may even be set down as the essence of sectarian doctrine (however its mischief may be restrained or compensated in the case of individuals), to consider faith, and not the sacraments, as the instrument of justification and other Gospel gifts.”—These words you attribute to Dr. Pusey. You say, “Professor Pusey teaches that the sacraments are the appointed instruments of jus-

tification; the learned Professor ought to lecture at Maynooth, or the Vatican, and not in the chair of Oxford, when he puts forth this Popish doctrine." Again, in pp. 118, 119, you speak of Dr. Pusey's saying that the grace of the sacrament is unconnected "with the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or what is called communion with God;" (here you interpose of your own "for shame, Dr. Pusey, to speak thus lightly of 'communion with God!'" ); that "to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible," is not "superstition," but "a practice having the sanction of primitive usage;" and "primitive usage," you add, "the Oxford Tracts" [Tracts for the Times] "teach is of Apostolical authority." It is quite clear you attribute the above sentences to Dr. Pusey.

Now, Mr. Editor, let me ask you a question. Should any one accuse *you* of having written them, should you not be startled? Supposing I boldly attributed them to you, and retorted your interjection of indignation upon yourself, would you not consider it somewhat outrageous? Should I have any reason to complain if you accused me of exceeding assurance, of being under a delusion, or at least of unpardonable carelessness? Be judge, then, in your own case. Those sentences no more belong to Dr. Pusey than to you. They are not in his Tract. They are not his writing. No one man is chargeable with the work of another man. Not even were Dr. Pusey to profess he approved the general sentiment of the passage, would you have any right to charge him with the very wording of it. Every man has his own way of expressing himself; I have mine, and you have yours. Dr. Pusey might approve the sentiment, yet criticise the wording. All these strong sayings then against Dr. Pusey, are misdirected. Learn, Mr. Editor, to be sure of your man, before you attack him.

To proceed. The words occur in the Advertisement to the second volume of the Tracts. Let us examine them, whosoever they are. Now, in what they say about administering the Holy Eucharist to children or the insensible, they do not enforce it, as you suppose, on "Apostolical authority." A usage may be primitive, yet not universal; may belong to the first *ages*, but only to some *parts* of the Church. Such a usage is either not apostolical, else it would be every where observed; or at least not binding, as not being delivered by the apostles *as* binding. For instance; the Church of Ephesus, on St. John's authority, celebrated the Easter-feast after the Jewish manner, on the fourteenth day of Nisan; yet such a custom is not binding on us. Now supposing I said, "the great reverence in which the Jewish dispensation was held in the best and purest ages, is shown in this, that the quartodeciman usage has primitive, nay, Apostolic sanction;" must I necessarily mean that all Christendom, and all the Apostles, observed Easter on the fourteenth day? must I mean that we are bound to keep it on that day? must I mean to extol such a usage, and to advocate it?



Apply this instance to the sentence of this writer who is not Dr. Pusey, this Pseudo-Pusey, as I may call him; and see whether it will not help your conception of his meaning. He does not say, he does not imply, that to administer the Second Sacrament to infants is Apostolic; he does not consider it a duty binding to us. He does but say, that, since it has a sanction in early times, it is not that "absurdity," "irrational fanaticism," and so forth, which your Magazine says it is: and his meaning may be thus worded: "Here is a usage existing up and down the early church, which, *right or wrong*, argues quite a different *temper* and *feeling* from those of the present day. This day, *on the first view of the subject*, calls it an absurdity; that day did not." Surely it is fair to estimate inward states of mind by such spontaneous indications. To warn men against the religious complexion of certain persons at present, I should point to the Pastoral Aid-Society, though some who agree with them in general sentiments may not approve it. To describe that of our Bishops 130 years since, I should refer to the then attempt, nearly successful, of formally recognising the baptism of Dissenters. Again, the character of Laud's religion may be *gathered* even from the exaggerated account of his consecrating St. Catherine Cree's church, without *sanctioning* that account.

When such indications occur in primitive times, though they are not of authority more than in modern times, yet they are tokens of what is of authority,—a certain religious temper, which is found every where, always, and in all, though the particular exhibitions of it be not. In like manner the spiritual interpretations of Scripture, which abound in the Fathers, may be considered as proving the Apostolicity of the *principle* of spiritualizing Scripture; though I may not, if it so happen, acquiesce in this or that particular application of it, in this or that Father. And so the administration of the Lord's Supper to infants in the church of Cyprian, Saint and Martyr, is a sanction of a *principle*, which your Magazine, on the other hand, calls "an absurdity," "intellectual drivelling," and "irrational fanaticism." For my part, I am not ashamed to confess that I should consider Cyprian a better interpreter of the Scripture doctrine of the Sacraments, of "the minding of the Spirit" about them, than even the best divines of this day, did they take, which I am far from accusing them of doing, an opposite view. You, however, almost class him among, and at least make him the associate and abettor of, "ignorant fanatics," p. 119.

Now, if this interpretation of the passage in question be correct, as I conscientiously and from my heart believe it to be, it will follow that you have not yet made good even the shadow of a shade of a charge of opposition to the Articles—not only against Dr. Pusey, but against the Tracts generally; for no one can say that any one of the Articles formally *forbids* us to consider that grace is conveyed *through* the out-

ward symbols; while, on the other hand, one of them expressly *speaks* of "the body of Christ" as "given," as well as "taken, in the Supper;" words, moreover, which are known to have meant, in the language of the day, "given by the administrator," and therefore *through* the consecrated bread. At the same time, let it be observed I do not consider the writer of the Advertisement to say *for certain* that the outward elements benefit true Christians when insensible; only as much as this, that we cannot be sure they do not.

Before closing this head of my subject I shall remark on the words upon which you exclaim, "For shame, Dr. Pusey!" though he has no reason to be ashamed of what he did not write. They are these: "or what is called, communion with God." You often mistake, Mr. Editor, by not laying the emphasis on the right word in the sentence on which you happen to be commenting. This is a case in point. The stress is to be placed upon the word "*called*,"—"what is *called* communion with God." The author meant, had he supplied his full meaning, "what is *improperly* called." There is nothing to show that he denies "the communion of saints" with God and with each other, and, in subordination to the mystical union, the conscious union of mind and affections. He only condemns that indulgence of mere excited feeling which has now-a-days engrossed that sacred title.

To show that this is no evasion or disingenuousness on my part (for you sometimes indulge in hints about me to this effect), I will give your readers one or two more instances of the same failing in your mode of arguing, and one a very painful instance.

For example: I said, in the former part of my letter, that Dr. Pusey's friends insist on no *particular* or *peculiar* sense of the Articles, —a fault which I had just charged upon you. I had said you were virtually imposing additions: then I supposed the objection made, that *we* should do so, had we the power,—as is often alleged. To this I answer, "Your Magazine may rest satisfied that Dr. Pusey's friends will never assert that the Articles have any *particular* meaning at all." You have missed the point of this sentence: accordingly, you detach it from the context, and prefix it to the opening of the discussion, before it appears in its proper place in print; and when it does appear, you print it in italics. This is taking a liberty with my text. However, to this subject I shall have occasion to recur.

Another instance occurs in your treatment of the Homilies and Mr. Keble. The Homily speaks of "the stinking puddles of *men's* traditions." You apply this as an answer to Mr. Keble's sermon, who speaks of *God's* traditions, even those which St. Paul bids us "hold;" and who considers, moreover, that no true traditions of doctrine exist but such as may be proved from Scripture; whereas the Homily clearly means by *men's* traditions, such as *cannot* be proved from

Scripture. You would have escaped this mistake, Mr. Editor, had you borne in mind that traditions “devised by men’s imagination” are not Divine traditions, and that it as little follows that Catholic Traditions are to be rejected because Jewish and Roman are, as that the Christian Sabbath is abolished because the Jewish is abolished. But you saw that Mr. Keble said something or other about tradition, and you were carried away with the word.

The last mistake of this kind is a distressing one. I hardly like to mention it; so serious is it. I must call it an “idle word.” It is a charge brought against Dr. Pusey. He has said; “To those who have fallen, God holds out only a light in a dark place, sufficient for them to see their path, but not bright or cheering, as they would have it; and so, in different ways, man would forestall the sentence of his Judge; the Romanist by the *sacrament* of penance, a modern class of divines by the *appropriation* of the merits and righteousness of our blessed Redeemer.” You add three notes of admiration, and say, “We tremble as we transcribe these awful words,” p. 123. I dare not trust myself to speak about such heedless language as it deserves. I will but say, in explanation of your misconception, that Dr. Pusey compares to Roman restlessness, not the *desiring* and *praying* to be clothed, or the *doctrine* that every one who is saved must be clothed, in “the merits and righteousness of our blessed Redeemer,” but the *appropriation* of them without warrant on the part of individuals. He denies that individuals who have fallen into sin have any right to *claim* them as their own already; he denies that they may “*forestall* the sentence of the Judge” at the last day; he maintains they can but flee to Christ, and adjure Him by His *general* promises, by His past mercies to themselves, by His present distinct mercies to them in the Church; but that they had no personal assurance, no right to appropriate again what was given them *plenarily* in baptism. This is his meaning; whereas you imply that he denies the duty of looking in faith to be saved by Christ’s merits and righteousness; that he denies backsliders the *hope* of it. If you do not imply this, if you really and simply mean that the *act of claiming* Christ’s merits by this or that individual (for of this Dr. P. speaks) is, as you express it, “a most Scriptural and consoling truth,” and that it is “blasphemous,” but for “the absence of wicked intention in the writer,” to compare to the Roman penance the *confidence* which sinners are taught to feel that their past offences are *already* forgiven them,—if this be your meaning, I am wrong, but I am charitable, in saying you have mistaken Dr. Pusey.

Now I come to the consideration of (1) the Homilies, (2) the Articles, and (3) Justification. And first concerning the Homilies.

1. You ask, “How do these clergymen . . . . *reconcile their con-*

sciences to such declarations as those which abound in the Homilies, affirming that the Church of Rome is 'Antichrist,' &c. ? And you say that you are considered "persecutors" or a persecutor, because you ask how I and others "reconcile such things in the Homilies with the Oxford Tracts." Who considers you a persecutor? not I; nor should I ever so consider you for asking a simple question in argument. What I have censured you for, has been the use of vague epithets, calling names, and the like, which I really believe you in your sober reason disapprove as heartily as I do. For instance: I am sure you would think it wrong to proclaim to the world that such a one is an ultra-Protestant. It is classing him with a party. There are ultra-Protestants in the world, we know; but we can know so little of individuals that we have seldom right to call them so, unless they take the name. A person may hold certain ultra-Protestant notions, and we may say so; this is deciding about him just as far as we know, and no farther. The case is the same in the more solemn matters of heaven and hell. We say, for instance, that they who hold anti-Trinitarian doctrines will perish everlastingly; but we dare not apply this anathema to this or that person; the utmost we say is, that he holds damnable errors, leaving his person to God. To say nothing of the religiousness of such a proceeding, you see how much of real kindness and consideration it throws over controversy. Of course I do not wish to destroy what are facts; men *are* of different opinions, and they do act in sets. There is no harm in denoting this; many confess they so act. In conversation we never should get on, if we were ever using circumlocutions. But in controversy it does seem both Christian and gentlemanlike to subject oneself to rules; and as one of these, to make a distinction between opinions and persons; to condemn opinions, to condemn them *in* persons, but not to give bad names to the persons, till public authority sanctions it. If I think you have ought of the spirit of persecution in you—(and to be frank with you, and in observance of my own distinction, though you are not "a persecutor," you speak in somewhat of a persecuting *tone*;) it is not for perplexing me with questions, or overwhelming me with refutations, but because your style is "rough, rambling, and cursory." I think it *like* a persecutor to prefer *general* charges, to use unmeasured terms, to be oratorical and theatrical, and when challenged to speak definitely, to accuse the party challenging, of complaining, being angry, and the like.

Now to return to the Homilies. You ask how I reconcile my conscience to the Homilies calling Rome Antichrist, I holding the doctrines of the Tracts. To this I answer by asking, if I may do so without offence, how *you* reconcile to your conscience the Homilies saying that "the Holy Ghost doth teach" in the book of Tobit? how you reconcile to your "subscription" that they five times call books of

the Apocrypha "Scripture;" that Baruch is quoted as a "prophet" and as "holy Baruch," Tobit as "holy Father Tobit," the author of Wisdom and the Son of Sirach as "the Wise Man," and the latter is said "certainly to assure us" of a heavenly truth; in a word, that the Apocrypha is referred to as many as fifty-three times? Here you see I have the advantage of you, Mr. Editor. Though I believe the Old and New Testaments alone to be *plenarily* inspired, yet I do believe, according to the Homily, what you do not believe, that the Holy Ghost spoke by the mouth of Tobit. Here you see is the advantage of what you call my "scholastic distinctions." p. 193. When I said that the great gift of the Holy Ghost, called regeneration, was reserved for Christians, and yet that the Jews might be under His blessed guidance, you said I was drawing a scholastic distinction. This is one instance on your part of *calling names*. What do you mean by *scholastic*? Beware, lest, when you come to define it, you include unwittingly the most sacred truths under it. There are persons who think the Catholic doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement "scholastic;" and so they are, but they are something more, they are Apostolic also. The church went down into Egypt before it came out of it; nor is it any proof that the distinction in question is not Scriptural, that it is, if it is, scholastic. However, any how, it serves me in good stead in this instance from the Homilies; it enables me to *understand* and to assent to their doctrine concerning the Apocrypha. I consider the gifts and operations of the Blessed Spirit are manifold. What He is towards Angels, towards glorified Saints as Moses and Elias, towards the faithful departed, towards Adam in Paradise, towards the Jews, towards the Heathen, towards Christians militant; what He is in the Church, in the individual, in the Evangelist, in the Apostle, in the Prophet, in the Apocryphal writer, in the Doctor and Teacher, is one and the same so far as this, that it is *holy*; but it may differ in kind in each case. Life is the same in all living things; yet there is one flesh of men, another of fishes, another of birds: and so the spiritual gift in like manner may be the same, yet diverse; it may be applied to the heart or to the head, as an inward habit or an external impression, plenarily or partially; for one purpose, not for another; for a time, or for ever. This view of God's gracious influences you call scholastic. I, on the other hand, call the common division into miraculous and moral or spiritual, jejune and unauthorized. However, whether I be right or you, I am at least able to do with mine, what you cannot,—agree with the Homily. If you will not take my explanation, which I sincerely believe to be the right one, you must "reconcile your conscience" to a better; till you find one, you must reconcile it to a disagreement with the Homily.

Now I will put another difficulty to you, which will be found in the event to put you into a greater strait as regards the Homilies, than

you suppose me to be in. The last Homily in the volume is "Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion." It is one of the most elaborate of them, consisting of no less than six parts. It advocates unreservedly the doctrine of passive obedience to the authorities under which we find ourselves by birth. I hold this doctrine, you do not<sup>1</sup>. Let me put before you some of the statements of this Homily,—the direct, explicit, developements of its title. "If servants," it says, "ought to obey their masters, not only being gentle, but such as be froward, as well, and much more, ought subjects to be obedient, *not only to their good and courteous, but also to their sharp and rigorous princes,*" Part I. "A rebel is worse than the worst prince," *ibid.* "But what if the prince be indiscreet and evil indeed, and it is also evident to all men's eyes that he so is? I ask again, what if it belong to the wickedness of the subjects, that the prince is indiscreet and evil? shall the subjects both by their wickedness provoke God, for their deserving punishment, to give them an indiscreet and evil prince, and also rebel against him, and withal against God, *who for the punishment of their sins did give them such a prince?*" (*ibid.*) Now, considering the high Tory doctrine, as it is called, contained in extracts such as these, I call upon you, Mr. Editor, as you would earn the meed of consistency and impartiality, to designate the writers and abettors of them, and all "subscribers" to them, "Lauds and Sacheverells."

I think I have now shown that *you* are not the person to take my conscience to task for not receiving every sentence of the Homilies as a formal enunciation of doctrine. I might, indeed, were it worth while, enlarge upon the venturesomeness of a writer, who seems, according to my apprehension, to hold that baptism is not a *means* of grace, but only "a sign, seal, and pledge," p. 167, and yet uses the Liturgy, being the man to make appeals to the conscience of others. But let this pass. Here, in the very instance you bring, you do not come into court with clean hands. You shrink from certain portions of the Homilies; and yet you use strong language about my supposed difference from other portions. Under these circumstances, were I merely writing for you, I should leave you to marvel at my conscience, or to turn to your own; but I write to your readers; and in what I say in explanation of my own behaviour towards the Homilies, I may perchance do something towards excusing yours.

I say plainly, then, I have not *subscribed* the Homilies, though you say I have, pp. 151, 153; though you *add* to my subscription to the Articles this further subscription also; nor was it ever intended that

<sup>1</sup> The charge against the Magazine was not of disloyalty, but of holding the *doctrine* that subjects may, under circumstances, rebel against their civil governors, *e. g.* as in the instance of the Revolution of 1688 in England, in Greece in 1821, in Spain in 1823, in France in 1830.

any member of the English Church should be subjected to what, if considered as an extended *confession*, would indeed be a yoke of bondage. Romanism surely is innocent, compared with that system which should impose upon the "conscience" a thick octavo volume, written flowingly and freely by fallible men, to be received exactly sentence by sentence. I cannot conceive any grosser instance of a Pharisaical tradition than this would be. No: the Reformers would have shrunk from the thought of so unchristian a proceeding—a proceeding which would render it impossible (I will say) for any one member, lay or clerical, of the Church to remain in it, who was subjected to such an ordeal. For instance: I do not suppose that any reader would be satisfied with the political reasons for fasting, though indirectly introduced, yet fully admitted and dwelt upon in the Homily on that subject. He would not like to subscribe the declaration that eating fish was a duty, not only as being a kind of fasting, but as making provisions cheap, and encouraging the fisheries. He would not like the association of religion with earthly politics.

How, then, are we bound to the Homilies? By the Thirty-fifth Article, which speaks as follows: "The Second Book of Homilies . . . doth contain a godly and wholesome *doctrine*, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies." Now, observe, this Article does not speak of every statement made in them, but of the "doctrine." It speaks of the view or cast or body of doctrine contained in them. In spite of ten thousand incidental propositions, as in any large book, there is, it is obvious, a certain line of doctrine, which may be contemplated continuously in its shape and direction. For instance: if you say you disapprove the doctrine contained in the Tracts for the Times, no one supposes you to mean that every sentence and half sentence is a lie. If this were so, then you are most inconsistent, after denouncing them, to imply, p. 167, that they "contain much that is godly and edifying, much that you are grateful for, and much that, if separated from its adjuncts, would be highly valuable in these days of liberalism and laxity." You even give logical reasons to show that there is no inconsistency, and protest against the notion. Now, sir, I am going to turn your "medium not distributed" against yourself. I say then, that, in like manner, when the Article speaks of the *doctrine* of the Homilies, it does not measure the letter of them by the inch, it does not imply they contain no propositions which admit of two opinions; but it speaks of a certain determinate line of doctrine, and moreover adds, it is "*necessary for these times*." Does not *this*, too, show the same thing? If a man said, The Tracts for the Times are *seasonable* at this moment, as their title signifies, would he not speak of them as taking a certain line and bearing a certain way? Would he not be speaking, not of phrases or sentences, but of a "doctrine" in them tending one way, viewed as a whole? Would

he be inconsistent, if after praising them as seasonable, he continued, " Yet I do not pledge myself to every view or sentiment ; there are some things in them hard of digestion, or overstated, or doubtful, or subtle?"

Let us, then, have no more such superfluous appeals to our consciences in such a matter. Reserve them for graver cases, if you think you see such. If any thing could add to the irrelevancy of the charge in question, it is the particular point in which I dissent from the Homilies, even if I do, which will not be so easy to prove ;—a question concerning the fulfilment of prophecy ; viz. whether Papal Rome is Anti-Christ ! An iron yoke indeed you would forge for the conscience, when you oblige us to assent, not only to all matters of *doctrine* which the Homilies contain, but even to their opinion concerning the fulfilment of *prophecy*. Why, *we* do not ascribe authority in such matters even to the unanimous consent of all the Fathers. But *you* allow us no private judgment whatever ; your private judgment is all particular and peculiar.

I will put what I have been saying in a second point of view. The Homilies are subsidiary to the Articles ; therefore they are of authority so far as they *bring out* the sense of the Articles, and are not of authority where they do not. For instance, they say that David, though unbaptized, was regenerated, as you have quoted. This statement cannot be of authority, because it not only does not agree, but it even disagrees, with the Ninth Article, which translates the Latin word " *renatis*" by the English " baptized." But, observe, if this mode of viewing the Homilies be taken, as it fairly may, *you* suffer ; for, the Apocrypha *being the subject of an Article*, the comment furnished in the Homily is binding on you, whereas you reject it.

A further remark will bring us to the same point. Another test of acquiescence in the doctrine of the Homilies, is this : Take their table of contents ; examine the headings ; these surely, taken together, will give the substance of their teaching. Now I maintain that I hold fully and heartily the doctrine of the Homilies under every one of these headings : nor, (excepting the question of Justification, on which I am myself thoroughly convinced I hold it, and which I intend to discuss ; and of Repentance, in which the Homily says not a sentence which I do not hold ;) will you yourself be inclined to doubt it. The only point to which I should not accede, nor think myself called upon to accede, would be certain matters, subordinate to the doctrines to which the headings refer—matters not of doctrine, but of opinion, as that Rome is the Anti-Christ ; or of historical fact, as that there was a Pope Joan, which, by the bye, I doubt whether you hold any more than I do. But now, on the other hand, can *you* subscribe the doctrine of the Homilies under every one of its formal headings ? I believe you *cannot*. The Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion is in



many of its elementary principles decidedly opposed to your sentiments. And yet *you* are the writer to tax another with not holding by the Homilies! Unless I had some experience that to be represented as "troublers of Israel" and "pestilent fellows" is the portion of those who fight against the Age, I should feel astonished at this.

I verily and in my conscience believe, that whether we take the text or the spirit of the Homilies, I do hold both the one and the other more exactly than those who question me. Do not, then, in future appeal to me, as if I for an instant granted that the Homilies were on your side;—but I propose to say more on this subject when I come to speak on Justification.

2. It follows to speak of the Articles. You imply that I put no sense at all upon them, but take them to mean any thing; and subscription to be no test or engagement of my opinions. Now is not this somewhat a strong charge to bring against a Clergyman, and particularly a member of a University which has, within the last two years, shown extraordinary, and almost unanimous, earnestness in maintaining the necessity of subscription, even in the case of undergraduates, against the external pressure? Why did not Dr. Pusey's friends quietly sit by, and leave others to set them free? Surely the facts of the case are strong enough to excuse a little charity, had persons any to give. Persons really do astonish me, after all—prepared as I am for such exhibitions—by the ease and vigour with which they fling about accusations; showing themselves perfect masters of their weapon. In one place you say that we hold that there is "not one baptized person, not one regenerated person, not one communicant, among all the Protestant churches, Lutheran or Reformed, except the Church of England and its daughter churches," p. 122. Now, what would you say if we affirmed that you held that men could be saved by faith without works? You would think us very unscrupulous, and might use some strong words. Well, then, there is not a word, which you would apply to such a statement, that I might not with perfect sincerity and truth apply to yours. You have touched on a large subject, on which we have no where ventured any opinion whatever, and in which we do not hold what you have expressed—the subject of lay baptism—but on which an opinion is forthcoming when needed.—Another remarkable exhibition of the same science is your asserting that one of the Tracts calls the Dissenters "a mob of Tiptops, Gapes, and Yawns," pp. 172, 174, 177, 185, 186. Five times you say or imply it. Now it so happens the Tract in question has nothing to do with Dissenters; but with persons who wish alterations in the Liturgy on insufficient grounds, a circumstance which in itself excludes Dissenters. To those of your readers who do not know this Tract (it is one of the parts of Richard Nelson), the following explanation will be acceptable. The subject of the Tract is the shortening of the Church Service. Tiptop

is a "travelling man from Hull or Preston," who "quarters at" a public-house at Nelson's village, "sometimes for a fortnight at a time," and "dabbles in religion *as well* as in politics;" a man who is praised by his admirers as "talking beautifully, and expounding on *any* subject a person might choose to mention, politics, trade, agriculture, learning, religion, and what not." He "lectures about the Church Prayers" among other things; and I suppose it is this word "lecture" which has caught your eye, and led you into error; if so, it is a sort of indication what attention you give to the matter of the Tracts. But to continue. Yawn is a farmer whose sons go to the Church school; and he himself "scarcely ever," as he boasts, "misses a Sunday," coming into the service "about the end of the First Lesson." Ned Gape too is a church-goer, though a late one. In what sense of the words, then, Mr. Editor, do you assert that when Richard Nelson, in the end of the story, says that he "cannot stand by and see the noble old Prayer-book pulled to pieces, just to humour a mob of Tiptops, Gapes, and Yawns," that the writer calls Dissenters by those titles?

I shall give one more instance of this freedom, and then return to the consideration of the Articles. I said in the former part of my letter, that you called Dr. Pusey's belief that the old Fathers were not regenerated on earth, "the very bathos of theology." On this you observe, "Mr. — still finds it necessary to misapply our statement. The remark respecting 'the bathos of theology' referred to the doctrine, quoted from some old writers, of the conveyance of Divine grace to an insensible person, by placing in his lips the bread and wine by which believers partake mystically of Christ's body—not however in a state of insensibility, but 'by faith, with thanksgiving.' This obsolete superstition we did and do consider the bathos of theology; but Mr. —, not venturing to defend it, *turns aside our remark*, as if we had said that it is the bathos of theology that 'by the coming of our Saviour Christ,' quoting the Homily, 'we have received more abundantly the Spirit of God.'" p. 192. Now, without dwelling on the unreasonableness of saying "Mr. — not *venturing to defend it*," when the doctrine I did not defend was to be the subject of the *second* head of my letter, and I was engaged upon the *first* head; and when, after all, I was not engaged in *proving* my belief on these points, but *demanding* proof that they were against the Articles; waiving all this, let the reader reflect upon your Magazine's original words, which you now accuse me of misstating. "It is the very bathos of theology, an absurdity not worthy to be gravely replied to, that *men were 'sanctified,' 'greatly sanctified,' 'were the friends of God,' &c. &c.* yet . . . were still 'unregenerate.'" (p. 790.) Thus you *do* call the non-regeneration of the Patriarchs "the bathos of theology;" and when I say so in my letter, "No," you retort, "it is a misstatement; I said

the doctrine of insensible persons benefitting from the Sacrament is the bathos." It is kindest to account for this strange mistake of yours by attributing it to what you yourself are partly conscious of, your "rough and rambling" ways.

And with a like heedlessness you imply that I hold the Articles as a *nasus cereus*, to use the controversial term. And you wish me to caution "indiscreet 'approvers'" of the Tracts against saying that "the Articles are the *weak point* in our Church; we may indeed sign them, for 'is there any taste in the white of an egg?'" All this being as pertinent, when addressed to me, as if I were to accuse you of teaching salvation by faith without works. However, such unfounded charges are, I repeat, our omen of ultimate success; I cheerfully bear them; and now proceed to disabuse at least some of your readers, and perhaps to silence yourself.

You seem to me to confuse between two things very distinct; the holding a certain sense of a statement to be *true*, and imposing that sense upon others. Sometimes the two go together; at other times they do not. For instance, the meaning of the Creed (and again, of the Liturgy) is *known*; there is no opportunity for doubt here; it means but one thing, and he who does not hold that one meaning, does not hold it at all. But, the case is different (to take an illustration), in the drawing up of a Political Declaration, or a Petition to Parliament. It is composed by persons, differing in matters of detail, agreeing together to a certain point and for a certain end. Each narrowly watches that nothing is inserted to prejudice his own particular opinion, or stipulates for the insertion of what may rescue it. Hence general words are used, or particular words inserted, which by superficial inquirers afterwards are criticized as vague and indeterminate on the one hand, or inconsistent on the other; but, in fact, they all have a meaning and a history, could we ascertain it<sup>1</sup>. And, if the parties concerned in such a document are legislating and determining for posterity, they are respective representatives of corresponding parties in the generations after them. Now the Thirty-nine Articles lie between these two, between a Creed and a mere joint Declaration; to a certain point they have one meaning, beyond that they have no one meaning. They have one meaning, so far as they embody the doctrine of the Creed; they have different meanings, so far as they are drawn up by men influenced by the discordant opinions of the day. This is what I have expressed in the former part of my letter: "the Articles," I say, "are confessedly wide in their meaning, but still their width is within bounds: they seem to include a number of shades of opinion."

Next, as to those points (whatever they are) in which they cannot be said to have one meaning. Each subscriber indeed attaches that

<sup>1</sup> Hence *faith, justification, infection, &c.*, are used, not defined in the Articles.

meaning which he at once holds and thinks the meaning ; but this is his "particular" meaning, and he has no right to impose it on another. In saying, then, I shall put no "particular meaning" on portions of the Articles, I spoke, not of *my own belief*, but of my enforcing that belief upon others. I do sincerely and heartily consider my sense of the Articles on certain points to be presently mentioned, to be the true sense : but I do not feel sure that there were not present, at the drawing up of the Articles, persons or feelings which led the framers (not as doing so on a principle, but spontaneously, from the existing hindrances to perfect unanimity), to abstain from perfect precision and uniformity of statement. What can be more truly liberal and forbearing than this view ? yet for thus holding that Calvinists and others, whom I think mistaken, may sign the Articles as well as myself, I am said myself to sign them with "no meaning whatever." And you actually take my own sentiment out of my mouth, clothe it in the words of the Royal Declaration, and then gravely make a present of it to me back again, as if it were something wise and high of your own. "The Royal Declaration," you say, "prefixed to the Articles, congratulates the Church that all the clergy had 'most willingly subscribed' to them, 'all sorts taking them to be for them :' which shows that each conscientious individual had carefully examined into their meaning, and not that he signed them without attaching any 'particular meaning at all.'" p. 191. Of course, these are just my sentiments.

Accordingly I go on to say, that I look forward to success, not by *compelling* others to take one view of the Articles, but by *convincing* them that mine is the right one. And this will explain what you call my "pugnacious terms." Were I fighting against individuals or a party in the Church, *this* would be party spirit : but then I should wish to coerce them or cast them out ; whereas I am opposing principles and doctrines—so, I would fain persuade and convert, not triumph over those who hold them. I am not pugnacious ; I am only "militant."

It will explain, too, what you consider my overweening and provoking language. For I consider I am but speaking what the Catholic Fathers witness to be Christ's Gospel. I am exercising no private judgment on Scripture ; and while I will not enforce it coercively, having no authority to do so, I will never put it forward hesitatingly, as if I did not think all other doctrines plainly wrong.

So much about myself. On the other hand, my charge against you is, and I repeat it, that you do wish to *add* to the Articles ; that is, in the same sense in which you accused Bishop Marsh of wishing to do so. You wish to impose upon me your particular or peculiar notion that the Patriarchs were regenerated ; which is an invasion of private judgment, as permitted in our Church, as gross as if I strove to enforce on you my particular notion, in accordance with the Homily, that the

Holy Ghost spoke "by the mouth of Tobit." Till you name the particular points of opinion for which you call on Dr. Pusey to resign his Professorship, and state the Article or determination of the Church which he transgresses, I will never cease to say that you do unwittingly—not of course with bad intention—that you do wish and aim to add to the Articles of subscription.

To sum up what I have said, and be at the same time more specific. I consider that the first five Articles have one definite, positive, dogmatic view, even that which has been, from the beginning, the Catholic and Apostolic Truth on which the Church is built.

From the Sixth to the Eighteenth, I conceive to have one certain view also, brought out in that particular form at the Reformation; but, as in the Seventeenth, not clearly demonstrable to be such to the satisfaction of the world.

In the remaining Articles, taken *as a body*, I think there is less strictness, perspicuity, and completeness of meaning. Some, though clear and definite in their meaning, are but negative, or protestant, as being directed against the Romanists; others, which are positive, are derived from various schools; in others the view is left open, or inchoate.

The first division I humbly receive as Divine, proveable from Scripture, but descending to us by Catholic tradition also. The next I admit and hold as deducible from Scripture by private judgment, tradition only witnessing here and there. The last division I receive only in the plain letter, according to the injunction of the Declaration, because I do believe in my conscience that they were not written upon any one view, and cannot be taken *except* in the letter; because I think they *never* had any one simple meaning; because I think I see in them the terms of various schools mixed together—terms known by their historical associations to be theologically discordant, though in the mere letter easy and intelligible.

And now, lastly, I will mention *why* I take these last Articles in that one particular meaning in which I do take them, and not in another. This again is from no mere private liking or opinion; it is because I verily think the Church wishes me so to take them. We at this day receive the Articles, not on the authority of their framers, whoever they were, English or foreign, but on the authority, *i. e.* in the sense, of the Convocation imposing them, that is, the Convocation of 1571. That Convocation, which imposed them, also passed the following Canon about Preachers:—"In the first place, let them be careful never to teach any thing in their sermons, as if to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, *and collected from that very doctrine by the catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.*" This is but one out of the hundred appeals to Antiquity, which, in one way or other, our Church has put

forth; but it is rendered unique by its originating in the Convocation from which we receive the Articles. It is quite impossible that that Convocation wished us to receive and explain the doctrines contained in them in any other sense than that which "the catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops" drew from Scripture. Far from explaining away, I am faithfully maintaining them, when I catholicize them. It were well for themselves, had others as good a reason for Calvinizing or Zuinglizing them.

And all this shows how right I am in saying that the Articles must not be viewed as in themselves a *perfect system* of doctrine, p. 189. They are, on the face of them, but protests against existing errors, Socinianism and Romanism. For instance, how else do you account for the absence of any statement concerning the *Inspiration* of Scripture? On the other hand, the Canon of 1571, just cited, is a proof that the whole range of catholic doctrines is professed by our Church; not, only so much as is contained in the Articles. Its reception of the primitive Creeds is another proof; for they reach to many points not contained in the Articles without them. To these documentary evidences may be added the 30th Canon of 1603. Speaking of the use of the Sign of the Cross, it says, "The abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the church of God nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen, both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical churches, which were their first founders."

It is clear, then, that the English Church holds all that the primitive church held, even in ceremonies, *except* there be some particular reason assignable for not doing so in this or that instance; and only does not hold the modern corruptions maintained by Romanism. In these corruptions it departs from Rome; therefore these are the points in which it thinks it especially necessary to declare its opinion. To these were added the most sacred points of faith, in order to protest against those miserable heresies to which Protestantism had already given birth. Thus the Church stands in a *via media*; the first five Articles being directed against extreme Protestantism, the remaining ones against Rome. And hence, when the Royal Declaration says that they "contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's word," which you quote, p. 169, as if it made against me, it speaks of the doctrine of the English church so far as distinguished from other churches: it does not say the doctrine of the Gospel, the doctrine of the church catholic, or the whole faith; but it speaks of it in contrast with exist-

ing systems. This is evident from its wording; for the clause "agreeable to God's word" evidently glances at Rome; and the history of its promulgation throws abundant light on the fact that it was aimed against Calvinism and Arminianism. There is nothing, then, in these words to show that the Articles are a system of doctrine, or more than the English doctrine in those points in which it differs from Romanism and Socinianism, and embraces Arminianism and Calvinism.

No: our Apostolical communion inherits, as the promises, so the faith, enjoyed by the Saints in every age; the faith which Ignatius, Cyprian, and Gregory received from the Apostles. We did not begin on a new foundation in King Edward's time; we only reformed, or repaired, the superstructure. You must not defraud us, Mr. Editor, of our birthright, by turning what is a salutary protest into a system of divinity.

Before proceeding to the subject of Justification, I will conclude what I have otherwise to say on your sixty pages, by adducing some further instances of what I consider misconceptions in them.

(1.) You say (p. 120) that Mr. — in his Parochial Sermons "most unscripturally" expresses himself to this effect:—even "the most hardened sinner" may "recollect those times of his youth when he was free [pure] from sin." You say this doctrine involves a "confidence of boasting," and is "fearful." Now he uses the word "sin" in the same sense in which our Church prays that Christ may "vouchsafe to keep us this day without *sin*;" and "that this day we fall into no *sin*." It seems, then, all we of the English Church pray every morning of our lives that we may be preserved through the day in a state which involves "a confidence of boasting." Your misconception has arisen from not observing there are different kinds of sin. You may call me indeed, and the Church in consequence, "scholastic" in this distinction; I call you "technical," and my epithet is as availing as yours.

(2.) You speak, p. 146, of Mr. Hook's University Sermons as embodying some of the leading principles of the Oxford Tracts. But you do not, I suppose, mean thereby to imply that he has taken his opinions from the Tracts. No, Mr. Hook is an independent witness, who has boldly put forth the Catholic doctrines in less promising times than these, and before some of the writers of the Tracts had any formed views upon the subjects he treats of. His sermons were listened to with extraordinary interest, and have made a deep impression on the minds of his hearers. In his instance, indeed, two distinct lines of usefulness are united, which have been granted together to no other clergyman of the day; viz. the successful preaching of Catholic truth both to a manufacturing population, and to the young. I say this, lest you

should seem to be paying the Tracts an honour which they cannot claim, that of having influenced Mr. Hook's opinions.

(3.) You say of the Fathers, p. 147, "they were discrepant in their opinions, so that, beyond their general testimony to a few striking particulars, above all the Divinity of our Lord, they cannot be referred to with any certainty or confidence, for the opinion of one might not be that of another, much less of the Catholic Church." Now, Mr. Editor, observe what I am going to say, and never again accuse me of wishing to enslave the Protestant mind to the Fathers. I, as well as you, hold the Fathers not to demand our assent, except on those points in which they agree together, in the same sense in which they agree in witnessing "the Divinity of our Lord." You will find nothing in the Tracts for the Times stronger than this doctrine, which it appears is your own also. You and I, then, agree in *principle* in the matter; we differ in the *matter of fact*, what doctrines are unanimously attested, and what not.

This mistake is the more remarkable, because the exposition of our view on the subject occurs in the very Tract which you analyze and discuss at length, No. 71. It is there said, "It is quite impossible that *all countries* should have agreed in that which was not Apostolic. They are a number of concordant witnesses to certain definite truths; and while their testimony is one and the same from the very first moment they publicly utter it, so, on the other hand, if there be bodies which speak otherwise, we can show historically that they rose later than the Apostles. This majestic evidence, however, *does not extend to any but to the articles of the Creed, especially those relating to the Trinity and Incarnation*<sup>1</sup>," p. 28. For the future, then, do not accuse us of what we do not hold, that one Father is of authority in a point in which others are against him. This instance will be sufficient to show your readers, that at least you cannot guide them into our views concerning tradition. They had better have recourse to Mr. Hook and Mr. Keble, if not to be converted, at least to ascertain how things stand.

(4.) Here let me observe, you attribute most gratuitously, and (I must even say) officiously, this same Tract, No. 71, to Dr. Pusey; and, as assuming it to be his, you accuse him of saying that it is "safest not," p. 149, to pray to the saints; and that "what the Fathers held" would be an "irrefragable argument" against transubstantiation. Again you say, "Professor Pusey considers the Eleventh Article as having been the cause of infinite mischief, by leading to 'the wildest Antinomian doctrine;' yet that, upon the whole—bountiful concession

<sup>1</sup> A misconception in unexpected quarters makes it just necessary to observe, that in the language of the Primitive Church, here used, "the Incarnation," was taken to include under it the doctrine of the Atonement.



for an Oxford Professor to the glorious Eleventh Article of the Anglican Church—it was ‘innocently intended!!’” p. 155; see also p. 189. I do really think this is a very great liberty to take with Dr. Pusey’s name. It is the second instance of the kind into which you have been betrayed. This is very heedless. This Tract is not Dr. Pusey’s writing. Dr. Pusey has written nothing to which he has not put either his name or his initials. One should have thought even the internal evidence of style would have saved you from such an awkwardness. The writer of it is as unwilling to surrender his claim to it, as to let others bear the imputation; nor is he in danger, of losing, or Dr. Pusey of being laden with, a property which all careful readers will see to want the exuberance of thought and language which is Dr. Pusey’s characteristic.

As to the principal charge brought against this Tract, that it attacks the Eleventh Article, it will be best answered by quoting the passage referred to. It is as follows. “For specimens of the *perverse reception by the nation*, as above alluded to, of what was innocently intended, I would refer to the *popular sense* put upon the Eleventh Article, which, *though clearly and soundly explained in the Homily on Justification or Salvation*, has been *taken* to countenance the wildest Antinomian doctrine; and is now so associated *in the minds of many*, with this *wrong* interpretation, as to render almost hopeless the recovery of the *true meaning*.”

(5.) You quote Dr. Comber against us as an “*argumentum ad hominem*.” But a single divine is no authority with us; it is as one of a *catena*, it is as coinciding with the consensus Patrum, in matters of doctrine, that he is valuable. There are things in Jeremy Taylor, Hooker, Ussher, Laud, and Field, which one may well scruple to admit.

(6.) You say, “As Dr. Pusey considers this anointing” in baptism “as Apostolical (and if so, it is a Divinely appointed, and therefore an essential portion of baptism), we do not see how he can use the Church of England office, which omits it; thus violating a sacred precept of transmissive religion,” &c. &c.—By “ordinance of our Lord” Dr. Pusey meant baptism. But, again, he holds with the Thirty-fourth Article: that “traditions and ceremonies may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s word. He only questions the *adviseableness* of the alteration in the particular instance, not the legality of the act.

(7.) You say that “Mr. Palmer must surely have learned” certain “language” in his learned work on the Prayer-book, “at Trent,” p. 163. Mr. Palmer does not need defence from me. I notice him merely as an additional instance how certain a writer of our Church is to be called Popish by you, if he has any learning. Depend upon it, Mr. Editor, your only chance of maintaining your ultraism, is by keep-

ing men in ignorance of theology. If even your staunchest advocate were to study theology, he would become either a professed Rationalist, or what *you* would call a Papist.

(8.) You say, speaking of Sacraments, "the Church of England, you believe, has gone *as far* as Scripture, and not beyond it, in the three-fold expression of a sign, a seal, and a pledge." p. 167. *vid. also pp.* 169, 180. Now it has gone further; it considers them "*means of grace.*" Since, then, our Church would, according to you, have gone *as far* as Scripture in making them "signs, seals, and pledges," it follows that, in making them *means*, it has gone beyond Scripture. This again is heedless.

(9.) You find fault with Ussher's argument against Purgatory (*viz.* that it is distinct from the objects contemplated in the primitive prayers for the dead in Christ), as "injudicious." It is as I said, Mr. Editor, you cannot endure a learned man. Ussher even, in spite of his alleged Calvinism, is not enough of a Protestant for you.

However, I shall now close for the present. One subject, and a most important one, remains; that of Justification. Before I commence it, I invite you to do, what you cannot decline. You have accused me frequently of "evasions," though not intentional ones, of course. I on the other hand accuse you, instead of coming to the point, of vague and illogical declamation, though not intentional either. Now, then, state definitely *what* Dr. Pusey's opinions are, for which he ought to give up his Professorship; and state also *why*, that is, *what statements* of our Church his own oppose. *Till you do this*, I shall persist in saying you wish to add to the Articles of subscription. I challenge you to do this, and call your readers to attend to your answer; and then, in my next, I will do my best to meet it.

---

The letter was not continued further, partly on account of the mode in which the above was printed in the pages of the Magazine, and partly because the challenge, repeated in its closing words, had not been met.

# CONTENTS.

No. 78.

## CATENA PATRUM, No. III.

TESTIMONY OF WRITERS IN THE LATER ENGLISH CHURCH  
TO THE DUTY OF MAINTAINING QUOD SEMPER, QUOD  
UBIQUE, QUOD AB OMNIBUS TRADITUM EST.

List of Authors cited :—	PAGE
Jewell.—A Sermon preached at Paul's Cross .....	4
Bilson.—On Subjection and Rebellion.—Perpetual Govern- ment of Christ's Church.....	7
Hooker.—Ecclesiastical Polity.....	10
Overall.—Letter to Grotius .....	11
Morton .....	12
Field.—Of the Church.....	ib.
White.....	15
Hall.—Conc. ad clerum. 1623 .....	16
Laud.—Conference with Fisher .....	ib.
Montague .....	18
Jackson.—On the holy Catholic Faith and Church.....	ib.
Mede.—Epistle lxxx. to Mr. Hartlib .....	28
Ussher.—On the Universality of the Church of Christ.....	ib.
Bramhall.—Answer to M. de la Mitière .....	33
Sanderson .....	43
Cosin.—Preface to his Notes on the Common Prayer.—Judg- ment betwixt the Church of England and Church of Rome.....	46
Hammond.—Of Heresy.—Practical Catechism .....	ib.
Thorndike.—Of the Principles of Christian Truth.—Just weights and measures.—The due way of composing the Differences on foot, preserving the Church .....	55

	PAGE
Taylor.—Dissuasive from Popery .....	59
Heylin .....	61
Commissioners of A.D. 1662.—Appointed to review the Book of Common Prayer .....	62
Pearson.—On the Creed .....	ib.
Barrow .....	63
Bull.—Apol. pro Harm. i. 6. ....	ib.
Stillingfleet.—Grounds of Protestant Religion .....	64
Kenn .....	65
Beveridge.—Preface to Codex Canonum Eccles. Prim. vindicatus ac illustratus .....	ib.
Patrick.—On Tradition .....	75
Sharpe.—Sermons .....	83
Potter.—Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford ....	84
Grabe.—Præfat. in Spicileg.—De forma Consecrationis Eucharistiæ .....	93
Brett.—On Tradition.—Introduction to the Independency of the Church .....	95
Hicks.—Sermons, No. 3 .....	101
Collier.—Vindication of the reasons and defence, .....	ib.
Leslie.—Letter to a Gentleman converted from Deism.—Dissertation concerning Ecclesiastical History .....	102
Waterland.—Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity .....	104
Bingham.—Antiquities of the Christian Church .....	108
Jebb .....	112
Van Mildert.—Bampton Lectures .....	114

No. 79.

ON PURGATORY.

Against Romanism, No. 3 .....	1
§ 1. Statement of the Roman Doctrine concerning Purgatory .....	4
§ 2. Proof of the Roman doctrine concerning Purgatory .....	14
§ 3. History of the rise of the Doctrine of Purgatory and opinions in the early Church concerning it .....	29
§ 4. The Council of Florence .....	53

No. 80.

ON RESERVE IN COMMUNICATING RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

PART I.

FROM THE EXAMPLE OF OUR LORD.

1. General allusions to this mode of concealment .....	3
--	---

	PAGE
2. The general Historic Narrative of our Saviour's Life and Resurrection .....	4
3. Some particular expressions of this kind.....	5
4. The teaching by Parables .....	8
5. The manner of our Lord's Miracles,—their concealment, &c. ....	11
6. The same secret mode of teaching, observable in some actions and incidents .....	20
7. Our Lord spoken of by others, and speaking of Himself..	21
8. The instructions to the Disciples, and their conduct illustrating the same. ....	25
9. The same system in the Epistles .....	26
10. Passages in Scripture on the other side explained. ....	28
11. Confirmed by the analogy of God's present dealings with mankind.....	29
12. Subsequent manifestations of Christ's Presence in His Church .....	33

## PART II.

## THE EXAMPLE OF OUR LORD'S LIFE CONFIRMED BY HIS MORAL GOVERNMENT.

1. That all Moralists consider vice and virtue as states of Darkness and Light .....	34
2. That Scripture attributes these effects to the immediate agency of God .....	35
3. This knowledge is considered as something Infinite and Divine .....	38
4. It is of a moral, and not of an intellectual nature.....	40
5. That we may perceive intimations of what it may be.....	41
6. That God punishes with blindness those who approach sacred truths with a speculative mind .....	45
7. That Christ, as seen in the conduct of good men, thus conceals Himself .....	50
8. That the whole subject contains something analogous in each particular to the circumstances of our Lord's life.....	58

## PART III.

## SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FOREGOING OBSERVATIONS.

1. That the principle was fully recognized by the Ancient Church .....	61
2. That the present aspect of the world is much opposed to it.	62
3. Practical rules afforded by it in the investigation of Truth .	65

	PAGE
4. This principle of Reserve applied to prevailing opinions on promoting Religion . . . . .	68
5. On the necessity of bringing forward the Doctrine of the Atonement . . . . .	74
6. On Reserve in speaking of Sacred Things . . . . .	80
7. The important practical conclusion . . . . .	82

## No. 81.

## CATENA PATRUM, No. IV.

TESTIMONY OF WRITERS OF THE LATER ENGLISH CHURCH TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST SACRIFICE, WITH AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CHANGES MADE IN THE LITURGY AS TO THE EXPRESSION OF THAT DOCTRINE.—p. 1—60.

List of Authors cited :—

Jewell.—Defence of the Apology. Part II.—Replie unto M. Harding's Answer . . . . .	61
Bilson.—Of Subjection and Rebellion . . . . .	84
Hooker.—Ecclesiastical Polity, book v. § 67 . . . . .	69
Overall . . . . .	70
Field.—Of the Church.—Appendix to Book iii. . . . .	75
Buckeridge.—Discourse concerning Kneeling at the Communion.—Funeral Sermon for Bishop Andrews . . . . .	83
Morton.—Catholic Appeal, ii. 7 . . . . .	92
Andrews.—Sermon of the worshipping of Imaginations.—Responsio ad Apologiam Card. Bellarmini, cap. viii.—Sermons of the Resurrection. No. 7.—Answer to Cardinal Perron.—MS. Notes upon the Common Prayer.—Preces Privatæ . . . . .	94
Mason.—Vindication of the Church of England, book v. . . . .	100
White.—Reply to Fisher . . . . .	101
Laud.—Conference with Fisher, § 35.—MS. Introduction to the Liturgy.—Daily Office.—History of his Troubles and Trial . . . . .	102
Hall.—No Peace with Rome, § xix. . . . .	106
Montagu.—An Answer to a late Gagger of Protestants—Appeal to Cæsar . . . . .	107
Forbes (William).—Considerationes Modestæ, lib. iii. c. 1. . . . .	108
Mede.—The Christian Sacrifice. Mal. i. 11. . . . .	109
Duppa . . . . .	126
Compilers of the Scotch Prayer Book.—Sentences for the Offertory . . . . .	126

	PAGE
Nicholson.—Exposition of the Catechism.....	130
Bramhall.—Answer to M. de la Milière's Epistle to the King.—Protestants' Ordination defended .....	ib.
Cosin.—Collection of Private Devotions.—Notes on the Common Prayer.—Paper concerning the Differ- ences, &c.....	134
Heylyn.—Antidotum Lincolnense...Life and Death of Arch- bishop Laud. Necessary Introduction .....	140
Sparrow.—Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer ....	148
Ferne.—Certain Considerations, &c.....	154
Hammond.—Practical Catechism.—View of the New Direc- tory, sec. 39.—Preface to "Dispatcher dispatched" ..	159
Barlow.....	165
Thorndike.—Epilogue, book iii. chap. v.—Just Weights and Measures.—Judgment of the Church of Rome.....	ib.
Taylor.—Life of Christ, Disc. xix.—On the Institution and Reception of the Sacrament.—Holy Living, sect. x. chap. iv.—Collection of Offices:—Office for the Holy Communion.—Worthy Communicant, chap. i. § iv. .	180
Brevint.—Christian Sacrifice and Sacrament.—Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass.....	190
Sancroft.—MS. Corrections of the Common Prayer.....	200
Scrivener.—Course of Divinity. Book. i. chap. 44 .....	203
Fell.—Paraphrase and Annotations .....	204
Patrick.—Mensa Mystica.—Christian Sacrifice .....	206
Towerson.—Explication of the Catechism, Part iv. ....	219
Bull.—Sermon xiii. Common Prayers, ancient, useful, and necessary.—Corruptions of the Church of Rome ....	221
Stillingfleet.—Conferences concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.....	228
Smith.—Sermon on frequent Communion.....	229
Beveridge.—Private Thoughts upon Religion.—Great Ne- cessity and Advantage of frequent Communion.— Church Catechism explained.—Sermon VIII. Christi- anity an holy Priesthood.—Codex Canonum Eccles. Prim. vindicatus ac illustratus. Lib. ii. cap. x. §§ 3, 4 ..	ib.
Hooper (George).—Christian Ordinances derived from the Jews.....	ib.
Dodwell.—Discourse concerning the one Altar, and one Priest- hood.....	243
Hickes.—The Christian Priesthood asserted.—Second Collec- tion of Controversial Letters.....	249
Comber.—Companion to the Altar.....	284
Collier.—Reasons, &c.....	288

	PAGE
Nelson.—The great duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice.....	ib.
Wake.—Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England.....	295
Johnson.—Propitiatory Oblation in the Holy Eucharist.—Unbloody Sacrifice.—Primitive Communicant.....	298
Wilson.—Short Introduction to the Lord's Supper.—The Lord's Supper practically explained. (Sermon lxxvi.)—Holy Bible, with Notes.—Parochialia, or Instructions to the Clergy.—Sacra Privata.....	351
Sherlock (William).—Practical Discourse of Religious Assemblies.....	359
Grabe.—MS. Adversaria.....	361
Leslie.—Case of the Regale and Pontificate. §. xix.....	372
Brett.—Brief Answer, &c.—The Christian Altar and Sacrifice. A Sermon.—True Scripture Account, &c.....	374
Bennet.—Rights of the Clergy.....	388
Potter.—Discourse of Church Government.....	392
Hughes.—Dissertationes Procemiales, &c.....	396
Laurence.—The Bishop of Oxford's Charge considered.....	398
Law.—Demonstration, &c.....	401
Wheatly.—Illustration of the Common Prayer.....	403
Ridley (Glocester).—The Christian Passover.....	406
Jones.—The Churchman's Catechism.....	409
Compilers of the American Prayer-book.....	ib.
Horsley.....	410
Daubeny.—Discourses.—Appendix to Guide to the Church.....	411
Jolly.—Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist.....	412
Phillipotts.—Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, 1836.....	413



## TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

## CATENA PATRUM.

## No. III.

TESTIMONY OF WRITERS IN THE LATER ENGLISH CHURCH TO THE  
DUTY OF MAINTAINING QUOD SEMPER, QUOD UBIQUE, QUOD AB  
OMNIBUS TRADITUM EST.

---

THE following extracts from English Divines, are but expositions and comments upon the celebrated Tract of Vincentius Lirinensis<sup>1</sup> on Heresy, which has been so generally adopted by them, that it may justly be considered as the formal manifestation of our Church as regards all the controversies of the last three hundred years. In selecting them, it has been thought advisable, as in the two previous Catenas, not to include the writings of the Reformers of the 16th century, because the particular complexion of their opinions is the very subject keenly debated and claimed by opposite schools of opinion at the present day. It has been thought safer to show that the Succession of our Standard Divines ever since their times, understood them to hold that view of doctrine which it has been the endeavour of these Tracts to recommend; and that no other can be taken without contradicting both that illustrious Succession itself, and its judgment concerning the Reformers.

And in the next place, were the Reformers directly appealed to in these Catenas, it might be plausibly asked why the list stopped with them, and did not ascend to the generation

<sup>1</sup> This Tract has just been republished with a translation at Oxford, and should be carefully studied by all who wish to understand in what sense the English Church upholds tradition.

before them, as if they were to be considered the founders of our Church, instead of being as they are really, one link in a chain. No greater injury can be done them than to make it appear, (as is too often done at this day,) that they occupied or professed a position which belongs only to heretics, that of originating the faith they maintained. Against such a notion especially, the subject of the present selection of Testimonies is expressly directed; in which it is maintained that no individuals, since the Apostles, are by themselves expositors of the will of Christ; that the unanimous witness of Christendom is the only, and the fully sufficient, and the really existing guarantee of the whole revealed Faith; that Catholicity is the only test of truth.

Considering the copiousness and value of the following extracts, the doctrine maintained in them need not here be discussed. With relation to the supreme authority of inspired Scripture it stands thus:—Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it; Scripture is the document of Faith, tradition the witness of it; the true Creed is the Catholic interpretation of Scripture, or Scripturally proved tradition; Scripture by itself teaches mediately and proves decisively; tradition by itself proves negatively and teaches positively; Scripture and tradition taken together are the joint Rule of Faith.

Acknowledgment must here be made for the kind assistance of two friends of the compiler, who have supplied him with many valuable references.

*List of Authors cited.*

- |                                 |                            |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Jewell.                      | 22. Taylor.                |
| 2. Convocation of 1571.         | 23. Heylin.                |
| 3. The Queen's Council of 1582. | 24. Commissioners of 1662. |
| 4. Bilson.                      | 25. Pearson.               |
| 5. Hooker.                      | 26. Barrow.                |
| 6. Convocation of 1603.         | 27. Bull.                  |
| 7. Overall.                     | 28. Stillingfleet.         |
| 8. Morton.                      | 29. Kenn.                  |
| 9. Field.                       | 30. Beveridge.             |
| 10. White.                      | 31. Patrick.               |
| 11. Hall.                       | 32. Sharp.                 |
| 12. Laud.                       | 33. Potter.                |
| 13. Montague.                   | 34. Grabe.                 |
| 14. Jackson.                    | 35. Brett.                 |
| 15. Mede.                       | 36. Hicks.                 |
| 16. Ussher.                     | 37. Collier.               |
| 17. Bramhall.                   | 38. Leslie.                |
| 18. Sanderson.                  | 39. Waterland.             |
| 19. Cosin.                      | 40. Bingham.               |
| 20. Hammond.                    | 41. Jebb.                  |
| 21. Thorndike.                  | 42. Van Mildert.           |

JEWELL, BISHOP.—*A Sermon preached at Paul's Cross.*

YET are there some that whisper in corners, that the Mass is a blessed and a Catholic thing, and that the holy Communion, which now GOD of His great mercy hath restored to us, is wicked and schismatical, and therefore they murmur against it, therefore they refrain it, and will not come to it. O merciful GOD, who would think there could be so much wilfulness in the heart of man! O Gregory! O Augustine! O Hierome, O Chrysostom! O Leo! O Dionyse! O Anacletus! O Sistus! O Paul! O CHRIST! if we be deceived herein, ye are they that have deceived us. You have taught us these schisms and divisions, you have taught us these Heresies. Thus ye ordered the holy Communion in your time, the same we received at your hand, and have faithfully delivered it unto the people. And that ye may the more marvel at the wilfulness of such men, they stand this day against so many old Fathers, so many Doctors, so many examples of the primitive Church, so manifest and so plain words of the holy Scriptures, and yet have they herein not one Father, not one Doctor, not one allowed example of the primitive Church to make for them. And when I say, no one, I speak not this in vehemency of spirit, or heat of talk, but even as before GOD, by the way of simplicity and truth, lest any of you should haply be deceived, and think there is more weight in the other side, than in conclusion there shall be found. And therefore once again I say, of all the words of the holy Scriptures, of all the examples of the primitive Church, of all the old Fathers, of all the ancient Doctors, in these causes they have not one.

Here the matter itself that I have now in hand, putteth me in remembrance of certain things that I uttered unto you, to the same purpose, at my last being in this place. I remember I laid out then, here before you, a number of things that are now in controversy, whereunto our adversaries will not yield. And I said, perhaps boldly, as it might then seem to some men, but as I myself and the learned of our adversaries themselves do

well know, sincerely and truly, that none of all them, that this day stand against us, are able, or shall ever be able to prove against us, any one of all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by example of the primitive Church, or by the old Doctors, or by the ancient general Councils.

Since that time it hath been reported in places, that I spake then more than I was able to justify and make good. However, these reports were only made in corners, and therefore ought the less to trouble me. But if my sayings had been so weak, and might so easily have been reprov'd, I marvel that the parties never yet came to the light, to take the advantage. For my promise was, and that openly here before you all, that if any man were able to prove the contrary, I would yield and subscribe to him and he should depart with the victory. Loth I am to trouble you with rehearsal to such things as I have spoken afore; and yet because the case so requireth, I shall desire you that have already heard me, to bear the more with me in this behalf. Better it were to trouble your ears with twice hearing of one thing, than to betray the truth of God. The words that I then spake, as near as I can call them to mind, were these: If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor, or Father, or out of any old general Council, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after CHRIST; or that there was then any Communion ministered unto the people under one kind; or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue, that they understood not: or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal Bishop, or the head of the universal Church; or that the people was then taught to believe that CHRIST's Body is really<sup>1</sup>, substantially, corporally, carnally or naturally in the

<sup>1</sup> Jewell must not be considered to differ from the words "verily and indeed" in our Catechism. He interprets "really" by "carnally;" the Catechism

Sacrament, &c. . . . If any man alive were able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures or of the old Doctors, or of any old general Council, or by any example of the primitive Church : I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him.

These words are the very like, I remember, I spake here openly before you all. And these be the things that some men say, I have spoken and cannot justify. But I, for my part, will not only not call in any thing that I then said, (being well assured of the truth therein,) but also will lay more matter to the same : that if they that seek occasion, have any thing to the contrary, they may have the larger scope to reply against me.

Wherefore, besides all that I have said already, I will say further, and yet nothing so much as might be said. If any one of all our adversaries be able clearly and plainly to prove, by such authority of the Scriptures, the old Doctors and Councils, as I said before, that it was then lawful for the Priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely and in silence to himself; or that the Priest had then authority to offer up CHRIST unto His Father : or to communicate and receive the Sacrament for another as they do, or to apply the virtue of CHRIST's death and passion to any man by means of the Mass : or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that the Mass *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin, &c. &c. . . . if any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, Doctors, or Councils, as I have required, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence. And because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye haply should be deceived<sup>1</sup>.—*Works*, pp. 57, 58.

opposes "verily and indeed" to *figuratively* and *nominally*. A mystical, spiritual, true, and positive presence of Christ's blessed Body and Blood, is at once not *carnal* and not *figurative*.

<sup>1</sup> Vide also *Apol.* pp. 43. 53—5. 62, 63. *Defence*, pp. 614—617.

CONVOCATION OF A.D. 1571.

They shall in the first place be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and collected out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers, and ancient Bishops.—*Canon about Preachers.*

THE QUEEN'S COUNCIL. A.D. 1582.

If the Papists shall show any ground of Scripture, and wrest it to their sense, let it be showed by the interpretation of the Old Doctors, such as were before Gregory I. But if they can show no Doctor that agreed with them in their said opinion before that time, then to conclude that they have no succession in that doctrine from the time of the Apostles, and above four hundred years after (when doctrine and religion were most pure), for that they can show no predecessor whom they might succeed in the same.—*Rules given to the Bishops; vide Strype's Whitgift, p. 98.*

BILSON, BISHOP.—*On Subjection and Rebellion.*

PHI. What one point of our Religion is not Catholic?

THEO. No one point of that, which this realm hath refused, is truly Catholic. Your having and adoring of images in the Church: your public service in a tongue not understood of the people: your gazing on the Priest while he alone eateth and drinketh at the LORD's table: your barring the people from the LORD's cup: your sacrificing the Son of God to His Father for the sins of the world: your adoring the elements of bread and wine with Divine honor instead of CHRIST: your seven sacraments: your shrift: your releasing souls out of Purgatory by prayers and pardons: your compelling Priests to live single: your meritorious vowing and performing pilgrimages: your invocation of Saints departed: your rules of perfection for Monks and Friars: your relying on the Pope as head of the Church, and

Vicar General unto CHRIST: these with infinite other superstitions in action, and errors in doctrine, we deny to have any foundation in the Scriptures, or confirmation in the general consent or use of the Catholic Church.

PHI. We stick not on your words, which you utter to your most advantage: but be not these things as we defend them, and you reject them, Catholic?

THEO. Nothing less.

PHI. What count you Catholic?

THEO. You were best define that: it toucheth you nearest.

PHI. I mean Catholic, as Vincentius doth, that wrote more than one thousand one hundred years ago.

THEO. So do I. And in that sense no point of your Religion, which this realm hath refused, is Catholic.

PHI. All.

THEO. None.

PHI. These are but brag.

THEO. Indeed they are so. Nothing is more common in your mouths than Catholic: and in your Faith nothing less.

PHI. Who proveth that?

THEO. Yourselves, who after you have made great stir for Catholic, Catholic, and all Catholic, when you come to issue, you return it with a *non est inventus*.

PHI. Will you lie a little?

THEO. I might use that sometimes, which is so often with you: but in this I do not.

PHI. I say you do.

THEO. That will appear, if you take any of those points which I have rehearsed.

PHI. Which you will.

THEO. Nay, the choice shall be yours, because the proof must be yours.

PHI. Take them as they lie. Having and worshipping of images in the Church, is it not Catholic?

THEO. It is not.

PHI. Eight hundred years ago the General Council of Nice, the second, decreed it lawful, and ever since it hath been used.



THEO. Catholic should have four conditions by Vincentius' rule, and this hath not one of them. There can nothing be Catholic, unless it be confirmed two ways : first by the authority of God's law, and next by the tradition of the Catholic Church, not that the Canon of Scripture is not perfect and sufficient enough for all points of Faith, but because many men draw and stretch the Scriptures to their fancies, therefore it is very needful that the line of the Prophetical and Apostolical interpretation should be directed by the rule of the Ecclesiastical and Catholic sense. Now in the Catholic Church herself we must take heed we hold that which hath been believed at all times, in all places, of all persons, for that is truly and properly Catholic.

By this rule your erecting and adoring of Images in the Church is not Catholic. For first, it is prohibited by God's law : and where the text goeth against you, the gloss cannot help you. If there be no precept for it in the word of God, in vain do you seek in the Church for the Catholic sense and interpretation of that which is no where found in the Scriptures. If it be not Prophetical nor Apostolical, it cannot be Catholic nor Ecclesiastical.

Again, how hath this been always in the Church, which was first decreed seven hundred and eighty years after CHRIST? It is too young to be Catholic that began so late ; you must go nearer CHRIST and His Apostles, if you will have it Catholic or ancient.

Thirdly ; all places and persons did not admit the decrees of that Council. For besides Africa, and Asia the greater, which never received them, the Churches of England, France and Germany did contradict and refute both their actions and reasons. And in Greece itself not long before, a synod of three hundred and thirty Bishops at Constantinople condemned as well the suffering as reverencing of Images.—p. 546.

*Id.—Perpetual Government of Christ's Church.*

“ Were the word of God in this point indifferent, which for aught I yet see is very resolute against them, the general consent

of all Antiquity, that never so expounded St. Paul's words, nor ever mentioned any Lay-Presbyters to govern the Church, is to me a strong rampire against all these new devices." . . . "For my part what I find generally received in the first Church of Christ, I will see it strongly refuted before I will forsake it."—*Epistle to Reader, and p. 280.*

HOOKE, PRESBYTER AND DOCTOR.—*Ecclesiastical Polity.*

But our naming of JESUS CHRIST our Lord is not enough to prove us Christians, unless we also embrace that Faith which CHRIST hath published unto the world. To show that the Angel of Pergamus continued in Christianity, behold how the Spirit of CHRIST speaketh, "Thou keepest my name, and thou hast not denied my Faith:" concerning which Faith, "the rule thereof," saith Tertullian, "is one alone, immoveable, and no way possible to be better framed anew!" What rule that is, he showeth by rehearsing those few articles of Christian belief. And before Tertullian, Ireney: "The Church though scattered through the whole world, unto the utmost borders of the earth, hath from the Apostles and their Disciples received belief." The parts of which belief he also reciteth, in substance the very same with Tertullian, and thereupon inferreth, "This Faith, the Church being spread far and wide, preserveth, as if one house did contain them: these things it equally embraceth, as though it had even one soul, one heart, and no more: it publisheth, teacheth, and delivereth these things with uniform consent, as if GOD had given it but one only tongue wherewith to speak. He which amongst the guides of the Church is best able to speak, uttereth no more than this; and less than this the most simple doth not utter" when they make profession of their faith.—Book iii. § 1.

CONVOCATION OF A.D. 1603.

. . . Following the royal steps of our most worthy King, because he therein followeth the rules of the Scriptures and the practice of the Primitive Church, we do commend to all the true members of the Church of England, these our directions and ob-

servations ensuing. . . . The honour and dignity of the name of the cross begat a reverend estimation even in the Apostles' times (for aught that is known to the contrary), of the sign of the cross, which the Christians shortly after used in all their actions. . . This use of the sign of the cross in baptism was held in the Primitive Church, as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and great applause. . . This continual and general use of the sign of the cross is evident by many testimonies of the ancient Fathers. . . But the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which do neither endamage the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical churches which were their first founders.—*Canon 30.*

OVERALL, BISHOP.—*Letter to Grotius.*

I believe there are few things in your book, which will not be approved by the Bishop of Ely (Launcelot Andrews) and the rest of our more learned Divines: unless, perhaps, they may hesitate respecting those passages which seem to give to lay powers a definitive judgment in matters of Faith; to deny the true power and jurisdiction of Pastors of the Church; and to rank Episcopacy among unnecessary things. For our Divines hold, that the right of definitive judgment, in matters of Faith, is to be given to Synods of Bishops, and other learned Ministers of the Church, chosen and convened for this purpose, according to the usage of the Ancient Church: who shall determine, from the Holy Scriptures, explained by the consent of the Ancient Church, and not by the rival spirit of Neoterics<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Vide Bp. Jebb's Pastoral Instructions, p. 306.

## MORTON, BISHOP.

I do therefore here solemnly profess, in the presence of Almighty God, that by His grace preventing and assisting me, I have always lived, and purpose to die, in the true Catholic Faith wherein I was baptized; firmly believing all the Canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament, and fully assenting to every article of all those three Creeds, (commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed, and the Athanasian Creed,) which in the Ancient Church were accounted the adequate rules of Faith, and have accordingly been received as such, by the Church of England.

As for Councils, that are free and generally consisting of competent persons, lawfully summoned, and proceeding according to the word of God, such as were the four first, viz. those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon; I do reverence them as the supreme tribunals of the Church of CHRIST upon earth, for judging of heresies, and composing differences in the Church. And as I utterly condemn all heresies that have been condemned by any of them, so I heartily wish that all the present differences in the Church of God might be determined by such a free General Council, as any of those four were already mentioned.—*His last Will*<sup>1</sup>.

FIELD, PRESBYTER.—*Of the Church.*

For first, we receive the number and names of the authors of books Divine and Canonical, as delivered by tradition. This tradition we admit, for that, though the Books of Scripture have not their authority from the approbation of the Church, but win credit of themselves, and yield sufficient satisfaction to all men, of their Divine truth, whence we judge the Church that receiveth them, to be led by the Spirit of God; yet the number, authors, and integrity of the parts of these Books, we receive as delivered by tradition.

<sup>1</sup> Vide *Christian Remembrancer*, Nov. 1823, p. 658.

The second kind of tradition which we admit, is that summary comprehension, of the chief heads of Christian doctrine, contained in the Creed of the Apostles, which was delivered to the Church, as a rule of her Faith. For though every part thereof be contained in the Scripture, yet the orderly connexion and distinct explication of these principal articles gathered into an epitome, wherein are implied, and whence are inferred all conclusions Theological, is rightly named a tradition. The third, is that form of Christian doctrine, and explication of the several parts thereof, which the first Christians receiving of the same Apostles, that delivered to them the Scriptures, commended to posterities. This may rightly be named a tradition, not as if we were to believe anything without the warrant and authority of the Scripture, but for that we need a plain and distinct explication of many things, which are somewhat obscurely contained in the Scripture : which being explicated, the Scriptures which otherwise we should not so easily have understood, yield us satisfaction that they are so indeed, as the Church delivereth them unto us.

The fourth kind of tradition, is the continued practice of such things, as neither are contained in the Scripture expressly, nor the examples of such practice expressly there delivered, though the grounds, reasons, and causes of the necessity of such practice, be there contained, and the benefit, or good that followeth of it ; of this sort is the Baptism of Infants, which is therefore named a tradition, because it is not expressly delivered in Scripture, that the Apostles did baptize infants, nor any express precept there found, that they should so do. Yet is not this so received by bare and naked tradition, but that we find the Scripture to deliver unto us the grounds of it. The fifth kind of tradition, comprehendeth such observations, as in particular, are not commanded in Scripture, nor the necessity of them from thence concluded, though in general without limitation of times, and other circumstances, such things be there commanded. Of this sort, many think, the observation of the Lent fast to be, the fast of the fourth and sixth days of the week, and some other. . . .

Thus having set down the kinds and sorts of traditions, it

remaineth to examine, by what means we may come to discern, and by what rules we may judge, which are true and indubitate traditions. The first rule is delivered by Augustine; *quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate Apostolicâ traditum, rectissime creditur.* Whatsoever the whole Church holdeth, not being decreed by the authority of Councils, but having been ever holden, may rightly be thought to have proceeded from Apostolic authority. The second rule is, whatsoever all, or the most famous and renowned in all ages, or at the least in diverse ages, have constantly delivered, as received from them that went before them, no man contradicting or doubting of it, may be thought to be an Apostolical tradition. The third rule, is the constant testimony of the Pastors of an Apostolic Church, successively delivered: to which some add the present testimony of an Apostolic Church, whose declinings when they began, we cannot precisely tell. But none of the Fathers admit this rule. For when they urge the authority and testimony of Apostolic Churches, for the proof, or reproof of true or pretended traditions, they stand upon the consenting voice, or silence, of the Pastors of such Churches, successively in diverse ages concerning such things. Some add the testimony of the present Church: but we inquire after the rule, whereby the present Church may know true traditions from false; and besides, though the whole multitude of believers, at one time in the world, cannot err pertinaciously, and damnably, in embracing false traditions instead of true; yet they that most sway things in the Church may, yea even the greater part of a general Council; so that this can be no sure rule for men to judge of traditions by. And therefore Canus reasoneth foolishly, that whatsoever the Church of Rome practiseth, which she may not do without special warrant from God, and yet hath no warrant in Scripture so to do, the same things and the practice of them she hath received by tradition. He giveth example in the present practice of the Romish Church, in dispensing with, and remitting vows and oaths, and in dissolving marriages, (not consummated by carnal knowledge,) by admitting men into orders of Religion. But this

practice of the Romish Church, we condemn, as wicked and Antichristian.—pp. 375. 378.

WHITE, BISHOP.

The Holy Scripture is the fountain and living spring, containing in all-sufficiency and abundance the pure water of life, and whatsoever is necessary to make God's people wise unto salvation. The consentient and unanimous testimony of the true Church of CHRIST in the primitive ages thereof, is *canalis*, a conduit-pipe to derive and convey to succeeding generations the celestial water contained in the Holy Scriptures, . . . The Ecclesiastical story reporteth of Nazianzen and Basil, that in their studying the Holy Scriptures they collected the sense of them, not from their own judgment or presumption, but from the testimony and authority of the ancients, who had received the rule of the true intelligence of Scripture from the Holy Apostles by succession. . . . The reformed Churches reject not all traditions, but such as are spurious, superstitious, and not consonant to the prime rule of faith, to wit, the Holy Scripture ; but genuine traditions, agreeable to the rule of faith, subservient to piety, consonant with holy Scripture, derived from the Apostolical times by a successive current, and which have the uniform testimony of pious antiquity, are received and honoured by us. Now such are those which follow the historical tradition concerning the number, integrity, dignity, and perfection of the books of Canonical Scripture, the Catholic exposition of many sentences of Scripture, the Apostles' Creed, the baptism of infants, the perpetual virginity of the blessed Virgin Mary, the righteous observation of the Lord's Day, and some other Festivals, as Easter, Pentecost, &c. baptizing and administration of the holy Eucharist in public assemblies and congregations, the service of the Church in a known language, the delivering of the Communion to the people in both kinds, the superiority and authority of Bishops over Priests and Deacons in jurisdiction and power of ordination, &c.—*On the Sabbath*, pp. 12. 14. 97.

HALL, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Conc. ad clerum.* 1623.

In truth he who heartily subscribes to the Word of God, con-  
signed, as it is, to the everlasting record of letters, to all the  
primitive Creeds, to the four General Councils, to the concordant  
judgment of the Fathers for the first six hundred years from  
Christ, which we of the Reformed Church religiously profess to  
do, even though he be not exempt from error in minor points, yet  
he shall never be an heretic. Any particular Church may easily  
err, by affixing heresy to an opinion undeserving of it, whether  
a truth, or but a light error ; but heavily neither soul nor Church  
can err, which walks heedfully in the steps of the universal and  
ancient Church.

LAUD, ARCHBISHOP AND MARTYR.—*Conference with Fisher.*

The third particular I consider is, Suppose in the whole  
Catholic Church Militant, an absolute infallibility in the prime  
foundations of Faith absolutely necessary to Salvation ; and that  
this power of not erring so, is not communicable to a General  
Council, which represents it, but that the Council is subject to  
error. This supposition does not only preserve that which you  
desire in the Church, an infallibility, but it meets with all incon-  
veniences, which usually have done, and daily do perplex the  
Church. And here is still a remedy for all things. For if  
private respects, if bandies in a faction, if power and favour of  
some parties, if weakness of them which have the managing, if  
any unfit mixture of State Councils, if any departure from the  
rule of the Word of God, if any thing else sway and wrench the  
Council ; the whole Church upon evidence found in express  
Scripture, or demonstration of this miscarriage, hath power to  
represent herself in another Body, or Council, and to take order  
for what was amiss, either practised, or concluded. So here is a  
means without any infringing any lawful authority of the Church,  
to preserve or reduce unity, and yet grant, as I did, and as the  
Church of England doth, that a General Council may err : and



this course the Church heretofore took ; for she did call, and represent herself in a new Council, and define against the heretical conclusions of the former, as in the case at Ariminum, and the second of Ephesus, is evident ; and in other Councils named by Bellarmine. Now the Church is never more cunningly abused than when men out of this truth, that she may err, infer this falsehood, that she is not to be obeyed. For it will never follow she may err, therefore she may not govern. For he that says, " Obey them which have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls" (Heb. xiii. 17.), commands obedience, and expressly ascribes rule to the Church. And that not only a Pastoral power, to teach and direct, but a Prætorian also, to controul and censure too, where errors or crimes are against points fundamental, or of great consequence, else St. Paul would not have given the rule of excommunication, (1 Cor. v.) Nor CHRIST Himself have put the man that will not hear and obey the Church into the place and condition of an Ethnic and a Publican, as He doth, (Matt. xviii.) And Solomon's rule is general, and he hath it twice : My son, forsake not the teaching or instruction of thy mother. Now this is either spoken or meant of a natural mother ; and her authority over her children is confirmed, (Ecclus. iii.) And the fool will be upon him that despiseth her, (Prov. xv.) or 'tis extended also to our Mystical and Spiritual Mother, the Church, and so the general note upon the place expresses it. And I cannot but incline to this opinion, because the blessings which accompany this obedience are so many and great, as that they are not like to be the fruits of obedience to a natural mother only, as Solomon expresses them all, (Prov. vi.) And in all this here is no exception of the Mother's erring. For *Mater errans*, an erring Mother loses neither the right nor the power of a Mother by her error. And I marvel what Son should show reverence or obedience if no Mother that hath erred might exact it. 'Tis true, the Son is not to follow his Mother's error, or his Mother into error. But 'tis true too, 'tis a grievous crime in a Son to cast off all obedience to his Mother, because at some time, or in some things she hath fallen into error. And howsoever this consideration meets with this incon-

venience, as well as the rest, for suppose (as I said) in the whole Catholic Militant Church an absolute infallibility in the prime foundations of Faith absolutely necessary to salvation: and then, though the Mother Church, provincial or national, may err, yet if the Grand Mother, the whole Universal Church, cannot in these necessary things, all remains safe, and all occasions of disobedience taken from the possibility of the Church's erring, are quite taken away. Nor is this Mother less to be valued by her children because in some smaller things age had filled her face fuller of wrinkles. For where 'tis said, that CHRIST makes to Himself a Church without spot or wrinkle, (Eph. v.) that is not understood of the Church Militant but of the Church Triumphant. And to maintain the contrary is a branch of the spreading Heresy of Pelagianism. Nor is the Church on earth any freer from wrinkles in Doctrine and Discipline than she is from spots in Life and Conversation.—p. 256.

MONTAGUE, BISHOP.

Where is it bidden in Scripture to baptize infants, or to administer to communicants in the Lord's Supper under both kinds? There are ever so many such instances in sacred matters, instituted by God, committed to the Church, practised by the Church, of which notwithstanding it may be declared, Scripture teacheth nothing such, Scripture does not preach these things.—*Orig. Eccles. ii. 67.* p. 396.

JACKSON, PRESBYTER AND DOCTOR.—*On the holy Catholic Faith and Church.*

The three special notes of the Catholic Faith or Church, by him required, are Universality, Antiquity and Consent. Whether these three members be different or subordinate, and oftentimes coincident, I leave it to be scanned by Logicians. According to the author's limitation, all three marks agree to us, not to the Romanist.

First, concerning Universality, the question is not, whether at

this present time, or in any former age for these thousand years past, there are or have been more, which profess the present Romish Religion established in the Church of Rome, than the Religion established in the Reformed Churches since the separation was made. If we should come to calculate voices after this manner, whether will you be a Roman Catholic, or a Protestant: they might, perhaps, have three for one amongst such as profess themselves Christians, ready to cry, I am not for the Protestants; but for the Roman Catholics will I be. But it was far from Vincentius his meaning, that Universality should be measured after this fashion; for he very well knew that the Arian faction had prevailed especially by this tumultary kind of canvass or calculation. The multitude of voices thus taken for them, may prove their faction to be stronger and greater than our Church; it cannot prove their Faith to be so universal as our Faith is. The fallacy by which the Romanists deceive poor simple people, is in making them believe, that our Religion and their Religion, our Faith and their Faith are *duo prima diversa*, or so totally distinct, that part of the one could not be included in the other. But for the universality of our Faith we have every member of the Roman Church a suffragant or witness for us. First, nothing is held as a point of Faith in our Church, but the present Romish Church doth hold the same, and confess the same to have been held by all orthodoxal antiquity. So that for the form of Faith established in our Church, we have the consent of the Primitive Church, of the four first General Councils, of all succeeding ages unto this present day, the consent likewise of the present Romish Church, and of ourselves. Now as France is a great deal bigger than Normandy, if we compare them as distinct and opposite, and yet France and Normandy is bigger than France without Normandy: so likewise though the present visible Romish Church be much greater than the Church of England, yet seeing the Romish Church, how great soever, doth hold all the points of Faith which our Church doth, for Catholic and orthodoxal; our consent, and their consent, our confession and their confession, is more universal than their consent without ours. But if their consent unto the points of Faith believed by

us, prove our Faith to be universal, and our Church by consequence to be Catholic; why should not our consent unto the points of Faith believed by them, prove their Faith to be universal, or their Church to be Catholic? Because it is not enough to hold all points of Catholic Faith, unless the same points be kept holy and undefiled. The Romish Church, we grant, doth hold all points of Catholic Faith, and so far as she holds these points, we dissent not from her: yet dissent from her we do in that she hath defiled and polluted the Catholic Faith, with new and poisonous doctrines; for which she neither hath the consent of antiquity, nor of the Reformed Churches. And in respect of these doctrines, she stands convicted of schism and heresy, by Vincentius his rules. For it is with him a fundamental rule, that no present visible Church, hath any authority to commend anything as a point of Faith to posterity, which hath not been commended to the said Church by antiquity derived from the Apostles' times. A proficiency or growth in Faith, he allows and granteth, *modò sit in eodem genere*, so it be in the same kind, or proceed from the same root; but for additions or new inventions, he takes them for the marks of schism and heresy.

So then we hold the Catholic Faith, and they hold the Catholic Faith. And seeing they hold the Catholic Faith in the same measure that we do, is it not reason they should be termed Catholics as well as we, though not so good Catholics as we? No reason they should be termed Catholics at all. Where is the difference? In this. We hold it pure and undefiled, they have defiled and polluted it for many generations, and do still defile it with many loathsome additions and inventions. Now in this case the denomination followeth the worsier part, that is, they are not so much to be reputed Catholics for that they hold the Catholic Faith, as to be adjudged heretics and schismatics, because they have defiled and polluted it with many new inventions, and being admonished hereof and reprovèd, will not purify their Faith, will not reform their religion according to the rule of Faith and the practice of antiquity. Their Faith not purified from the additions of the second Nicene and Trent Council, can

be no Catholic Faith. Their religion not reformed, can be no true religion, save only in reference to Paganism, Judaism, or Mahometism. For as Dionysius saith, *Bonum non est nisi ex integra causa, malum ex quolibet defectu*. Nothing is good which is not entire and sound, evil ariseth from every defect. Every new addition or invention in matters of Faith or Doctrine, is enough to make that Church schismatical, which before was Catholic and orthodoxal. Catholic and orthodoxal no Church can be, unless it hold all points of Faith without admixture of human inventions or of new articles. The admixture of a great deal of man's meat with a little swine's meat, makes the whole dish to be no man's meat, but swine's meat. Our Church according to Vincentius his rule admits a growth or proficiency in Faith, in that it holds not only those propositions which are expressly contained in Scripture, but such as may by necessary consequence be deduced out of them, for points of Faith, and this growth is still in *eodem genere*, from the same root. Other points of Faith besides these, our Church admitteth none, but ties even her Prelates and Governors, to obtrude no other doctrines as points of Faith upon their auditors, than such as are either expressly contained in Scriptures, or may infallibly be deduced from them. And this is the fundamental and radical difference between our Church and the Romish Church, which admitteth such an illimited increase or growth of Faith as is in heaps or congests of Heterogeneals.

The pain-worthiest inquiry in this argument, were first to make search what additions, or adinventions unto the ancient or primitive Canon of Catholic Faith have been made, received or authorized by the Romish Church, since the Council of Ephesus, which was some three years before Vincentius Lirinensis wrote his admonitions concerning this point; and in what age and upon what occasions, such additions have been made or received. Secondly, to make proof or demonstration, how far and in what manner such additions do corrupt or contaminate the holy Catholic Faith; and how far each or all of them, jointly or severally, do undermine or overthrow the holy Catholic Faith.

The first addition or adinvention of moment, which comes into my memory, is the invocation of Saints and veneration of images. Both which points were added as Articles of Faith or parts of the Creed, which all were bound to believe and profess by Tharasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and President of that illiterate, parasitical and factious assembly, which hath been commonly styled the seventh general or second Nicene Council. In these and the like abominable decrees the then Bishop of Rome was Tharasius's accomplice, his instigator and abettor, as may appear from the speeches of his Legates in that Council, and by his own Epistles, although part of the Epistle may be justly suspected to have been framed since. But by what spirit this Council was managed, or in whose name they met together. I refer the reader unto that learned Treatise in the Book of Homilies (whereunto we have all subscribed) concerning the peril of idolatry, especially the third part. What ingenuous minds of this kingdom thought of that Council, before either the author of these Homilies or Luther was born, may in part be gathered from an ancient English Historiographer, who saith the Church of God did hold this decree in execration.

The selfsame points, with a great many more of like or worse nature, all whatsoever any council which the Romish Church accounteth general or oecumenical, or any Canons which the same Church accounteth Catholic, even all decrees whereto the Trent Council hath affixed their Anathemas, have been annexed by Pius Quartus to the Nicene Creed, and are inserted as principal points of that oath which every Roman Bishop at his consecration is to take; one part of which oath or solemn vow it likewise is, that every Bishop shall exact the like confession of his inferiors to be ratified by oath or solemn vow, *Cætera omnia à sacris, &c.*

The particular decree concerning invocation of Saints and adoration of images, is much enlarged by the Trent Council, and by Pius Quartus. But of the equivalency of idolatry in Rome Heathen, and Rome Christian, elsewhere at large. In this one point, to omit others, the present Romish Church far exceeds the

Eastern Church, in the time of the second Nicene Council, in that it ratifies the worshipping of all such Saints as are canonized by the Pope.

The second addition made by the Roman Church unto the ancient Canon of Faith, is a transcendant one, and illimited; and that is, the making of Ecclesiastical tradition to be an integral part of the Canon of Faith. This doth not only pollute, but undermine the whole fabric of the holy, primitive and Catholic Faith. That there is a certain rule or authentic Canon of Faith, is a principle, wherein the ancient primitive Church, the modern Roman, and all reformed Churches agree. The first point of difference betwixt us, is about the extent of the written Canon, especially of the old Testament. The main points of difference are these. First, we affirm with antiquity, and in particular with Vincentius Lirinensis, that the Canon of Scripture is a rule of Faith, perfect for quantity, and sufficient for quality; that is, it contains all things in it, that are necessary to salvation, or requisite to be contained in any rule; and so contains them as they may be believed and understood, without relying on any other rule or authority equivalent to them in certainty, or more authentic in respect of us, than the Scriptures are. The modern Romish Church denies the Canon of Scripture to be perfect and complete in respect of its quantity, or sufficient for its quality or efficacy. To supply the defect of its quantity, they add tradition, as another part of the same rule, homogeneal and equivalent to it for quality. To supply the insufficiency as well of Canonical Scriptures as of tradition in respect of their quality or efficacy towards us, they add the infallible authority of the present visible Church. The former addition of unwritten tradition as part of the infallible rule doth undermine: this latter addition of the Church's infallible and absolute authority as well in determining the extent, as in declaring the true sense and meaning of the whole rule, utterly pulls down the structure of Faith: yet when we reject Ecclesiastical tradition from being any part of the rule of Faith, we do not altogether deny the authority or use of it. Howbeit that Ecclesiastical tradition, whereof there was such excellent use in the primitive

Church, was not unwritten tradition, or customs commended or ratified by the supposed infallibility of any visible Church. That Ecclesiastical tradition which Vincentius Lirinensis so much commends, did especially consist in the confessions or registers of particular Churches. Now the unanimous consent of so many several Churches, as exhibited their confessions to the Nicene Council, being not dependent one of another, not overruled by authority, nor misled by faction to frame the confessions of their Faith by imitation, or according to some pattern set them, but voluntarily and freely exhibiting such confessions as had been framed and taught before these controversies arose, was a pregnant argument to any impartial, understanding man, that this Faith wherein they all agreed, had been delivered unto them by the Apostles and their followers, by the first planters of the Churches thus agreeing; a pregnant argument, likewise, that these first planters had been inspired and taught by one and the same Spirit. Each particular Church was a competent or authentic witness of every other Church's integrity and fidelity *in servando depositum*, in carefully preserving the truth committed to their special trust. On the contrary, in that Arius, Eutyches, Nestorius, and other Heretics, did obtrude such constructions of Scriptures upon their auditors as had nowhere been heard of before, but sprung up with themselves, or from the places where they lived, this was an argument more than probable, that if the Apostles had delivered the whole form of wholesome doctrine unto posterity, (a point questioned by no Church in those times) these men, or the particular Churches which abetted them, had not kept the doctrine delivered unto them by our SAVIOUR and His Apostles; but had corrupted or defiled it with the idle fancies of their own brains, or with the muddy conceit of their discontented passions.

To speak more briefly, though perhaps more fully: the unanimous consent of so many distinct visible Churches, as exhibited their several confessions, catechisms, or testimonies of their own and their forefathers' Faith, unto the four first Œcumenical Councils, was an argument of the same force and



efficacy, against Arius and other Heretics, for whose conviction these Councils were called, as the general consent and practice of all nations in worshipping some Divine power or other, hath been, in all ages, against the Atheists. Nothing, besides the ingrafted notion of a Deity or Divine power, could have inclined so many several nations, so much different in natural disposition, in civil discipline and education, to affect or practice the duty of adoration. Nothing besides the evidence of truth delivered unto the Christian world by CHRIST and His Apostles, could have kept so many several Churches, as communicated their confessions unto the Councils of Nice and Ephesus, &c. in the unity of the same Faith.

Howbeit this unanimous tradition Ecclesiastic, was not in these times held for any proper part of the rule of Faith, but alleged only as an inducement to incline the hearts of such as before acknowledged the written word for the only rule of Faith, to believe that the interpretations or decisions of those Councils, did contain the true sense and meaning of the rule acknowledged by all. So that the written tradition which Vincentius so much commends, was not by the Nicene Council used to any such purpose as the Romanists now use unwritten traditions. The only use of it was to direct the present Church in her examination of the Catholic truth, or points of Faith. The chief authority which the visible Church then challenged, did consist in the unanimous consent of the Ecclesiastic tradition, and that (as was said before) but an inducement to embrace the interpretations of the present Church, and reject the interpretations of upstart Heretics.

But was it a received truth in these primitive times, or a truth acknowledged by Vincentius, (the pretended patron of Roman Catholic tradition) that the joint consent of so many Bishops, as were assembled in the first Council of Nice, or the joint confessions of so many several Dioceses as were then delivered to that Council, should unto the world's end, continue an argument or inducement of like force or validity, as it then was, either for establishment of the Canons which succeeding Councils should make, or for condemning such opinions as with the consent of

as many (or more) Bishops, as were there assembled, should be condemned for Heresies? No, the same Vincentius hath given posterity a caveat, as full of wisdom, as of religion; in some cases not to admit of his former admonition, concerning the trial of Catholic Faith, either for refelling Heresies, or for establishing the truth. The limitation of his former admonition is, in his own words, thus. As for ancient and inveterate Heresies, they are not in any wise to be refuted by the former method, because continuance of time (after Heresies be once set on foot) may afford Heretics many opportunities of stealing truth out of the writings of the ancient, or for exchanging orthodoxal antiquity with profane novelties.

Now what opportunities of falsification did these eight hundred years last past afford, which the Roman Church was not always ready to take? The opportunities afforded by dissolution of the Roman Empire and variance of Christian Kings, first made the Roman Clergy such sacrilegious thieves, as Vincentius supposeth any opportunity may make Heretics to be. And the Roman Church, being flesht with the spoil of CHRIST'S flock and Christian Churches through the West, have not been wanting unto themselves in devising new opportunities in coining a new act of falsifying antiquity, of stealing the consent and suffrages of the Christian world, from orthodoxal and primitive truth. So that if this controversy may be examined and discussed by Vincentius's rules, since the first acknowledgment of the Pope's supremacy, since the making of edicts for the acknowledging of it, since the exemption of Clerks from royal or civil jurisdiction; all the written testimonies, or unwritten traditions, which the children of the Romish Church do or can rake together, are void in law, and void in conscience: there is not so much as one legal single testimony, but all are as a multitude of false and illegal witnesses, of parties or conspirators in their own cause.

But although Heresies of long standing and continuance cannot be refuted, nor may not be assaulted, in Vincentius's judgment, by the former method, that is, by multitude of suffragants, or joint consent of several Provinces, is there therefore no other

means left to convince them, no way left to eschew them? Yes, we may eschew them, (saith he), as already condemned by ancient and orthodoxal Councils; or we may convince them, so it be needful or expedient, by the sole authority of Scriptures. Now if the Scriptures be sufficient to convince Heresies of long continuance or long standing, and to confute such Heretics, as want neither wit, will, nor opportunity to falsify ancient records, and imprint traditions of their own coining with inscriptions of antiquity, I hope the same Scripture was (in Vincentius's judgment) a rule of Faith neither incomplete for its quantity, nor insufficient for its quality: a rule every way competent for ending controversies in Religion, without the assumption either of tradition or Decrees of Council, as any associates or homogeneal parts of the same rule.

Unto what use then did Ecclesiastical tradition, or general Councils serve for quelling Heresies? Ecclesiastical traditions or unanimous consent of particular Churches throughout several Kingdoms or Provinces in points of Faith, was in ancient times and yet may be an excellent means, by which the Spirit of God leads general Councils into the truth. And the Councils whose care and office it was to compare and examine traditions exhibited, were the sovereign and principal means, under the guidance of God's Spirit, by which as many as embraced the love of truth, were led into all those truths, which are at all times necessary to salvation, but were much questioned and obscured by the jugglings and falsifications of former Heretics. Into the same truths which these Councils were then, we now are led, not by relying upon the sole authority of the Councils which the Spirit did lead, but by tracing their footsteps, and viewing the way by which the Spirit did lead them. And this was, by necessary deductions or consequences, which reason, enlightened by the Spirit, and directed by the sweet disposition of Divine Providence, did teach them to make, and doth enable us to judge that they were truly made by them. — Vol. iii. p. 888.

MEDE, PRESBYTER.—*Epistle LXXN. to Mr. Hartlib.*

It grieves me not a little, yea perplexes me, to hear that Mr. Dury is come off with no better success from my L . . . . I am loth *malè augurari* ; but I like it not. I fear it is *mali ominis*, and that our State and Church have no mind to put their hand to this work: *Deus avertat omen!* But our Church, you know, goes upon differing principles from the rest of the Reformed, and so steers her course by another rule than they do. We look after the form, rites and discipline of antiquity, and endeavour to bring our own as near as we can to that pattern. We suppose the Reformed Churches have departed farther therefrom than needed, and so we are not very solicitous to comply with them; yea, we are jealous of such of our own as we see over-zealously addicted to them, lest it be a sign they prefer them before their Mother. This, I suppose, you have observed, and that this disposition in our Church is of late very much increased. Well then, if this union sought after be like to further and advantage us in the way we affect, we shall listen to it. If it be like to be prejudicial, as namely to give strength and authority to those amongst us who are enamoured with the foreign platform, or bring a yoke upon our own by limiting and making us obnoxious; we'll stand aloof and not meddle with it, lest we infringe our liberty.—*Works*, book iv. p. 865.

USSHER, ARCHBISHOP.—*On the Universality of the Church of Christ.*

That the multitude of teachers dispersed over the world, without any such dependency or correspondency, should agree together in laying the foundations of the same faith, is a special work of God's Spirit. And it is "the unity of the spirit" which the Apostle here speaketh of, and exhorteth us to "keep in the bond of peace." Whereas the unity of which our adversaries boast so much (which is nothing else but a wilful suffering of themselves to be led blindfold by one man, who commonly is

more blind than many of themselves) is no fruit of the Spirit, but of mere carnal policy ; and may serve, peradventure, for a "bond of peace" betwixt themselves and their own party, such as the priests of Antichrist were to have, and as many as would be content to yield themselves to the conduct of such a commander, but hath proved the greatest block that ever stood in the way for giving impediment to the peace and unity of the universal Church, which here we look after. And therefore Nilus, Archbishop of Thessalonica, entering into the consideration of the original ground of that long-continued schism, whereby the West standeth as yet divided from the East, and the Latin churches from the Greek, wrote a whole book purposely on this argument, wherein he sheweth "that there is no other cause to be assigned of this distraction, but that the Pope will not permit the cognizance of the controversy unto a General Council, but will needs sit himself as the alone teacher of the point in question, and have others hearken unto him as if they were his scholars ; and that this is contrary both to the ordinances and the practice of the Apostles and the Fathers." Neither indeed is there any hope that ever we shall see a general peace for matters of religion settled in the Christian world, as long as this supercilious master shall be suffered to keep this rule in God's house, how much soever he be magnified by his own disciples, and made the only foundation upon which the unity of the Catholic Church dependeth.

Now in the next place, for the further opening of the "unity of faith," we are to call unto mind the distinction which the Apostle maketh betwixt *the foundation* and that which is *builded thereupon*, betwixt the *principles of the doctrine of CHRIST* and that which he calleth perfection. The "unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God" here spoken of hath reference, as we have heard, to the foundation ; as that which followeth, of a "perfect man," and "the measure of the stature of the fulness of CHRIST," to the superstruction and perfection. In the former there is a general *unity among* all true believers ; in the latter a great deal of *variety* ; there being several degrees of perfection to be found in several persons, "according to the measure of the gift of CHRIST." So we see in a material building that still there

is but one foundation, though great disparity be observed in sundry parts of the superstruction; some rooms are high, some low, some dark, some lightsome, some more substantially, some more slightly builded, and in tract of time some prove more ruinous than others; yet all of them belong to one building, as long as they hold together and stand upon the same foundation. And even thus is it in the spiritual building also, whether we respect the *practical* part of Christianity or the *intellectual*. In the practical we see wonderful great difference betwixt Christian and Christian; some by God's mercy attain to a higher measure of perfection, and keep themselves unspotted from the common corruptions of the world: others watch not so carefully, &c.

The oracles of God contain abundance of matter in them, and whatsoever is found in them is a fit subject for faith to apprehend; but that all Christians should uniformly agree in the profession of those truths that are revealed there, is a thing that rather may be wished than ever hoped for. Yet the variety of men's judgments in those many points that belong to theological faith, doth not dissolve the unity which they hold together in the fundamental principles of the Catholic faith. The "unity of faith" commended here is a Catholic unity, and such as every Christian attaineth unto. "Till we ALL come in the unity of faith," saith the Apostle. As there is a *common salvation*, so is there a *common faith*, which is *alike precious* in the highest Apostle and the meanest believer. For we may not think that heaven was prepared for deep clerks only, and therefore beside that larger measure of knowledge whereof all are not capable, there must be "a rule of faith common to small and great," which, as it must consist of few propositions (for simple men cannot bear away many), so is it also requisite that those articles should be of so much weight and moment, that they may be sufficient to make a man "wise unto salvation;" that howsoever in other points learned men may go beyond common Christians, and exceed one another likewise by many degrees, yet in respect of these radical truths which is the necessary and common food of all the children of the Church, there is not an unity only but such a kind of equality also, brought in among all sorts of Christians, as was heretofore

among the congregation of the Israelites in the collection of their manna, where "he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack."

If then salvation by believing these common principles may be had, and to salvation none can come that is not first a member of the Catholic Church of Christ, it followeth thereupon, that "the unity of the faith" generally requisite for the incorporating of Christians into that blessed society is not to be extended beyond those common principles which may further be made manifest unto us by the continual practice of the Catholic Church herself in the matriculation of her children and the first admittance of them into her communion; for when she prepared her Catechumeni for baptism, and by that door received them into the congregation of Christ's flock, we may not think her judgment to have been so weak that she should omit anything herein that was essentially necessary for the making of one to be a member of the Church. Now, the profession which she required of all that were to receive baptism, was for the *Agenda*, or practical part, an ab-renunciation of the devil, the world, and the flesh, with all their sinful works and lusts; and for the *Credenda*, the things to be believed, an acknowledgment of the Articles of the Creed; which being solemnly done, she then baptized them "in this faith;" intimating thereby sufficiently that this was that "one faith" commended unto her by the Apostles, as the other that "one baptism" which was appointed to be the Sacrament of it.

This Creed, though for substance it was the same every where, yet for form was somewhat different, and in some places received more enlargements than in others.

That which in the time of the ancient Fathers was accounted to be "truly and properly Catholic," namely, "that which was believed everywhere, always, and by all," that in the succeeding ages hath evermore been preserved, and is at this day entirely professed in our Church. And it is well observed by a learned man, who hath written a full discourse of this argument, that "Whatsoever the father of lies either hath attempted or shall attempt, yet neither hath he hitherto effected, nor shall ever bring it to pass hereafter, that this Catholic doctrine, ratified by the

common consent of Christians always and everywhere, should be abolished; but that in the thickest mist rather of the most perplexed troubles it still obtained victory, both in the minds and open confession of all Christians, no ways overturned in the foundation thereof; and that in this verity that one Church of Christ was preserved in the midst of the tempests of the most cruel winter, or in the thickest darkness of her wanings."

Thus, if at this day we should take a survey of the several professions of Christianity that have any large spread in any part of the world, as of the religion of the Roman and the Reformed Churches in our quarters, of the Egyptians and the Ethiopians in the south, of the Grecians and other Christians in the eastern parts, and should put by the points wherein they did differ one from another, and gather into one body the rest of the articles wherein they all did generally agree, we should find, that in those propositions which without all controversy are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much truth is contained as, being joined with holy obedience, may be sufficient to bring a man unto everlasting salvation. Neither have we cause to doubt, but that "as many as do walk according to this rule," (neither overthrowing that which they have builded by superinducing any *damnable heresies* thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their "*holy faith*" with a lewd and wicked conversation) "peace shall be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

Now these common principles of the Christian faith, which we call *κοινόπιστα* or things *generally believed* of all, as they have "universality," and "antiquity," and "consent," concurring with them, which by Vincentius's rule are the special characters of that which is truly and properly Catholic; so for their duration we are sure that they have still held out, and been kept as the seminary of the Catholic Church in the darkest and difficultest times that ever have been: where, if the Lord of hosts had not in his mercy reserved this seed unto us, we should long since "have been as Sodom, and should have been like unto Gomorrah." It cannot be denied indeed, that Satan and his instruments have used their utmost endeavour either to hide this light from men's



eyes by keeping them in gross ignorance, or to deprave it by bringing in pernicious heresies; and that in these latter ages they have much prevailed both ways, as well in the West and North as in the East and South. Yet far be it, for all this, from any man to think that "God should so cast away his people," that in those times, there should not be left "a remnant according to the election of Grace."

The Christian Church was never brought unto a lower ebb than was the Jewish synagogue in the days of our Saviour CHRIST, when, &c. pp. 700—713.

BRAMHALL, ARCHBISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Answer to de la Militiere.*

If your intention be only to invite his Majesty to embrace the Catholic Faith, you might have spared both your oil and labour. The Catholic Faith flourished one thousand two hundred years in the world, before Transubstantiation was defined among yourselves. Persons better acquainted with the Primitive times than yourself (unless you wrong one another) do acknowledge that the Fathers did not touch either the word or the matter of Transubstantiation. Mark it well, neither Name nor Thing. His Majesty doth firmly believe all supernatural Truth revealed in Sacred Writ. He embraceth cheerfully whatsoever the holy Apostles, or the Nicene Fathers, or blessed Athanasius, in their respective Creeds or Summaries of Catholic Faith did set down as necessary to be believed. He is ready to receive whatsoever the Catholic Church of this Age doth unanimously believe to be a particle of saving Truth.

But if you seek to obtrude upon him the Roman Church, with its adherents, for the Catholic Church, excluding three parts of four of the Christian world from the communion of CHRIST; or the Opinions thereof, for Articles and Fundamentals of Catholic Faith, neither his reason, nor his Religion, nor his Charity, will suffer him to listen unto you. The truths received by our Church, are sufficient, in point of Faith, to make him a good Catholic. More than this, your Roman Bishops, your Roman

Church, your Tridentine Council, may not, cannot, obtrude upon him. Listen to the Third General Council, that of Ephesus, which decreed, that it should be lawful for no man to publish or compose another Faith or Creed than that which was defined by the Nicene Council; and that whosoever should dare to compose or offer any such to any persons willing to be converted from Paganism, Judaism, or Heresy, if they were Bishops or Clerks, should be deposed; if Laymen, should be anathematised.

Suffer us to enjoy the same Creed the Primitive Fathers did, which none will say to have been insufficient, except they be mad, as was alleged by the Greeks in the Council of Florence. You have violated this Canon, you have obtruded a New Creed upon Christendom. New I say, not in words only, but in sense also.

Some things are *de Symbolo*, some things are *contra Symbolum*, and some things are only *præter Symbolum*. Some things are contained in the Creed, either expressly or virtually, either in the letter or in the sense, and may be deduced by evident consequence from the Creed, as the Deity of CHRIST, his Two Natures, the Procession of the Holy Ghost. The addition of these was properly no addition, but an explication; yet such an explication, no person, no assembly, under an Œcumenical Council, can impose upon the Catholic Church. And such an one your Tridentine Synod was not.

Secondly, some things are *contra Symbolum*, contrary to the Symbolical Faith, and either expressly or virtually overthrow some article of it. These additions are not only unlawful, but heretical also in themselves, and after conviction render a man a formal Heretic; whether some of your additions be not of this nature, I will not now dispute.

Thirdly, some things are neither of the Faith, nor against the Faith, but only besides the Faith; that is, opinions or truths of an inferior nature, which are not so necessary to be actually known; for though all revealed truths be alike necessary to be believed when they are known, yet all revealed truths are not alike necessary to be known. It is not denied, but that General or Provincial Councils may make constitutions concerning these for

Unity and Uniformity, and oblige all such as are subject to their jurisdiction to receive them, either actively, or passively, without contumacy or opposition. But to make these, or any of these, a part of the Creed, and to oblige all Christians under pain of damnation to know and believe them, is really to add to the Creed, and to change the Symbolical, Apostolical Faith, to which none can add, from which none can take away, and comes within the compass of St. Paul's curse : " If we, or an angel from Heaven, shall preach unto you any other Gospel (or Faith) than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." Such are, your universality of the Roman Church, by the institution of CHRIST, (to make her the Mother of her Grandmother the Church of Jerusalem, and the Mistress of her many elder Sisters) your doctrine of Purgatory and Indulgences, and the worship of Images, and all other Novelties defined in the Council of Trent, all of which are comprehended in your New Roman Creed, and obtruded by you upon all the world to be believed upon pain of damnation. He that can extract all these out of the old Apostolic Creed, must needs be an excellent chymist, and may safely undertake to draw water out of a pumice.—*Works*, p. 22.

Concerning the proper expounders of Scripture, we do believe that the Gospel doth not consist in the words, but in the sense ; *non in superficie, sed in medullâ* ; and therefore that, though this infallible rule be given for the common benefit of all, yet, every one is not an able or fit artist to make application of this rule, in all particular cases. To preserve the common right, and yet prevent particular abuses, we distinguish judgment into three kinds :

Judgment of Discretion ; Judgment of Direction ; and Judgment of Jurisdiction.

As in the former instance of the law (the ignorance whereof excuseth no man) every subject hath judgment of discretion, to apply it particularly to the preservation of himself, his estate and interest ; the advocates, and those who are skilful in the law, have moreover a judgment of direction, to advise others of less knowledge and experience ; but those who are constituted by the sovereign power, to determine emergent difficulties, and

differences, and to distribute and administer justice to the whole body of a Province or Kingdom, have moreover a Judgment of Jurisdiction, which is not only discretionary, or directive, but authoritative, to impose an obligation of obedience unto those who are under their charge. If these last shall transgress the Rule of the Law, they are not accountable to their inferiors, but to him or them that have the Sovereign power of Legislative Judicature; *Ejus est legem interpretari, cujus est condere.*

To apply this to the case in question concerning the exposition of the Holy Scripture. Every Christian keeping himself within the bounds of due obedience and submission to his lawful superiors, hath a Judgment of Discretion; "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." He may apply the rule of Holy Scripture for his own private instruction, comfort, edification, and direction, and for the framing of his life and belief accordingly. The Pastors of the Church (who are placed over God's people as watchmen and guides) have more than this, a Judgment of Direction, to expound and interpret the Holy Scriptures to others, and out of them to instruct the ignorant, to reduce them who wander out of the right way, to confute errors, to foretell dangers, and to draw sinners to repentance. The chief Pastors, to whose care the regiment of the Church is committed in a more special manner, have yet an higher degree of judgment, a Judgment of Jurisdiction, to prescribe, to enjoin, to constitute, to reform, to censure, to condemn, to bind, to loose, judicially, authoritatively, in their respective charges. If their Key shall err, either their key of knowledge, or their key of jurisdiction, they are accountable to their respective superiors, and in the last place to a General Council, which under CHRIST, upon earth, is the highest Judge of controversies. Thus we have seen what is the Rule of Faith, and by whom, and how far respectively, this Rule is to be applied.—

This hath always been the doctrine, and the practice of our English Church; First, it is so far from admitting Laymen to be Directive Interpreters of Holy Scripture, that it allows not this liberty to clergymen so much as to gloss upon the text until they be licensed to become preachers. Secondly, for Judgment of

Discretion only, it gives it not to private persons above their talent, or beyond their last. It disallows all phantastical and enthusiastical presumption of incompetent and unqualified expositors. It admits no man into Holy Orders, that is, to be capable of being made a Directive Interpreter of Scripture, howsoever otherwise qualified, unless he be able to give a good account of his faith in the Latin tongue, so as to be able to frame all his expositions according to the analogy thereof. It forbids the licensed preachers to teach the people any doctrine as necessary to be religiously held and believed, which the Catholic Fathers, and Old Bishops of the Primitive Church have not collected out of the Scriptures. It ascribes a Judgment of Jurisdiction over Preachers to Bishops, in all manner of Ecclesiastical Duties, as appears by the whole body of our Canons. And especially where any difference or public opposition hath been between Preachers about any point or doctrine deduced out of Scripture. It gives a power of determining all emergent controversies of Faith above Bishops to the Church, as to the witness and keeper of the Sacred Oracles; and to a lawful Synod, as the representative Church.

We receive not your upstart supposititious traditions, nor unwritten Fundamentals; but we admit Genuine, Universal, Apostolical Traditions; as the Apostles' Creed, the Perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God, the Anniversary Festivals of the Church, the Lenten Fast. Yet we know that both the duration of it, and the manner of observing it, was very different in the Primitive times. We believe *Episcopacy*, to an ingenious person, may be proved out of Scripture without the help of tradition; but to such as are froward, the perpetual practice and tradition of the Church, renders the interpretation of the text more authentic, and the proof more convincing. What is this to us who admit the practice and tradition of the Church, as an excellent help of exposition? Use is the best interpreter of laws, and we are so far from believing, that we cannot admit tradition without allowing the Papacy, that one of the principle motives why we rejected the Papacy, as it is now established with Universality of Jurisdiction, by the Institution of CHRIST, and superiority above Œcu-

menical Councils, and Infallibility of Judgment, was the constant tradition of the Primitive Church.—*Works*, p. 33.

*Vindication of the Church of England.*

The Communion of the Christian Catholic Church is partly internal, partly external. The internal Communion consists principally in these things : To believe the same entire substance of saving necessary truth revealed by the Apostles, and to be ready implicitly in the preparation of the mind to embrace all other supernatural verities when they shall be sufficiently proposed to them : to judge charitably one of another ; to exclude none from the Catholic Communion and hope of Salvation, either Eastern, or Western, or Southern, or Northern Christians, which profess the ancient Faith of the Apostles and Primitive Fathers, established in the first General Councils, and comprehended in the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds ; to rejoice at their well-doing, to sorrow for their sins, to condole with them in their sufferings, to pray for their constant perseverance in the true Christian Faith, for their reduction from all their respective errors, and their reunion to the Church in case they be divided from it, that we may be all one sheep-fold under that One Great Shepherd and Bishop of our souls ; and lastly, to hold an actual External Communion with them *in votis*, in our desires, and to endeavour it by all those means which are in our power. This Internal Communion is of absolute necessity among all Catholics.

External Communion consists first in the same Creeds, or Symbols, or Confessions of Faith, which are the ancient badges or cognizances of Christianity. Secondly, in the participation of the same Sacraments. Thirdly, in the same external worship and frequent use of the same Divine Offices, or Liturgies, or Forms of serving God. Fourthly, in the use of the same public Rites and Ceremonies. Fifthly, in giving communicatory letters from one Church, or one person, to another. And lastly, in admission of the same discipline, and subjection to the same Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority, that is, Episcopacy, or a General Council : for as single Bishops are the heads of particular

churches, so Episcopacy, that is, a General Council, or Œcumenical Assembly of Bishops, is the head of the Universal Church.—*Works*, p. 57.

*Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon's Survey.*

No man can justly blame me for honouring my spiritual Mother the Church of England, in whose womb I was conceived, at whose breasts I was nourished, and in whose bosom I hope to die. Bees, by the instinct of nature, do love their hives, and birds their nests. But God is my witness that, according to my uttermost talent and poor understanding, I have endeavoured to set down the naked truth impartially, without either favour or prejudice, the two capital enemies of right judgment. The one of which, like a false mirror, doth represent things fairer and straighter than they are; the other like the tongue, infected with cholera, makes the sweetest meats to taste bitter. My desire hath been to have truth for my chiefest friend, and no enemy but error. If I have had any bias, it hath been desire of peace, which our common SAVIOUR left as a legacy to His Church, that I might live to see the reunion of Christendom, for which I shall always bow the knees of my heart to the Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. It is not impossible but that this desire of unity may have produced some unwilling error of love, but certainly I am most free from the wilful love of error. In questions of an inferior nature, CHRIST regards a charitable intention much more than a right opinion.

Howsoever it be, I submit myself and my poor endeavours, First, to the judgment of the Catholic Œcumenical Essential Church, which if some, of late days, have endeavoured to hiss out of the schools as a fancy, I cannot help it. From the beginning it was not so. And if I should mistake the right Catholic Church out of human frailty or ignorance, (which, for my part, I have no reason in the world to suspect; yet it is not impossible, when the Romanists themselves are divided into five or six several opinions, what this Catholic Church, or what their Infallible Judge is) I do implicitly, and in the preparation of my mind,

submit myself to the true Catholic Church, the Spouse of CHRIST, the Mother of the Saints, the Pillar of Truth. And seeing my adherence is firmer to the Infallible Rule of Faith, that is, the Holy Scriptures, interpreted by the Catholic Church, than to mine own private judgment or opinions; although I should unwittingly fall into an error, yet this cordial submission is an implicit retractation thereof, and I am confident will be so accepted by the Father of mercies, both from me and all others who seriously and sincerely do seek after Peace and Truth.

Likewise I submit myself to the representative Church, that is, a free General Council, or so general as can be procured; and until then to the Church of England wherein I was baptized, or to a National English Synod. To the determination of all which, and each of them respectively, according to the distinct degrees of their authority, I yield a conformity and compliance, or at the least, and to the lowest of them, an acquiescence.

Finally, I crave this favour from the courteous reader, that because the surveyor hath overseen almost all the principal proofs of the cause in question, (which I conceive not to be so clearly and candidly done,) he will take the pains to peruse the vindication itself. And then in the name of GOD let him follow the dictate of right reason. For as that scale must needs settle down whereinto most weight is put, so the mind cannot choose, but yield to the weight of perspicuous demonstration.—*Works*, p. 141.

*Schism guarded.*

The great bustling in the controversy concerning Papal power, or the Discipline of the Church, hath been either about the true sense of some texts of Holy Scripture; as, “thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and to thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven”, and “feed my sheep”: Or about some privileges conferred upon the Roman See by the Canons of the Fathers, and the Edicts of Emperors, but pretended by the Roman Court, and the maintainers thereof, to be held by Divine right. I endeavour in this treatise to disabuse thee, and to shew that this challenge of Divine right is but a



blind, or diversion, to withhold thee from finding out the true state of the question. So the hare makes her doubles and her jumps before she comes to her form, to hinder tracers from finding her out.

I demonstrate to thee, that the true controversy is not concerning St. Peter, we have no formed difference about St. Peter, nor about any point of Faith, but of interest and profit; nor with the Church of Rome, but with the Court of Rome, and wherein it doth consist, namely, in these questions; who shall confer English Bishopricks? who shall convocate English Synods? who shall receive Tenths, and First-fruits, and Oaths of Allegiance and Fidelity? Whether the Pope can make binding laws in England, without the consent of the King and Kingdom, or dispense with English Laws at his own pleasure, or call English subjects to Rome without the Prince's leave, or set up Legantine Courts in England against their wills? And this I shew not out of the opinions of particular authors, but out of the public laws of the Kingdom.

I prove, moreover, out of our Fundamental Laws, and the writings of our best Historiographers, that all these branches of Papal power were abuses, and innovations, and usurpations, first attempted to be introduced into England above eleven hundred years after CHRIST, with the names of the innovators, and the precise time when each innovation began, and the opposition that was made against it by our Kings, by our Bishops, by our Peers, by our Parliaments, with the groans of the Kingdom under these Papal innovations and extortions.

Likewise, in point of doctrine, thou hast been instructed that the Catholic Faith doth comprehend all those points which are controverted between us and the Church of Rome, without the express belief whereof no Christian can be saved: whereas, in truth, all these are but opinions, yet some more dangerous than others. If none of them had ever been started in the world there is sufficient to salvation for points to be believed in the Apostles' Creed. Into this Apostolical Faith professed in the Creed, and explicated by the four first General Councils, and only into this faith we have all been baptized. Far be it from

us to imagine, that the Catholic Church hath ever more baptized, and doth still baptize but into one half of the Christian Faith.

In sum, doth thou desire to live in the communion of the true Catholic Church? So do I. But as I dare not change the cognizance of my christianity, that is, my Creed, nor enlarge the Christian Faith (I mean the essentials of it) beyond those bounds which the Apostles have set, so I dare not (to serve the interest of the Roman Court) limit the Catholic Church, which CHRIST hath purchased with his blood, to a fourth or a fifth part of the Christian world.

Thou art for tradition, so am I. But my tradition is not the tradition of one particular Church contradicted by the tradition of another Church, but the universal and perpetual tradition of the Christian world united. Such a tradition is a full proof, which is received *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*; always, everywhere, and by all Christians. Neither do I look upon the opposition of an handful of heretics (they are no more, being compared to the innumerable multitudes of Christians,) in one or two ages, as inconsistent with universality, any more than the highest mountains are inconsistent with the roundness of the earth.

Thou desirest to bear the same respect to the Church of Rome that thy ancestors did; so do I. But for that fulness of power, yea, co-active power in the exterior Court, over the subjects of other Princes, and against their wills, devised by the Court of Rome, not by the Church of Rome; it is that pernicious source from whence all these usurpations did spring. Our ancestors from time to time made laws against it; and our Reformation, in point of Discipline, being rightly understood, was but a pursuing of their steps. The true controversy is, whether the Bishop of Rome ought, by Divine right, to have the external regiment of the English Church, and co-active jurisdiction in English Courts, over English subjects, against the will of the King and the Laws of the Kingdom.—*Works*, p. 289.

*Ibid.*

As for Essentials of Faith, the pillars of the earth are not

founded more firmly than our belief upon that undoubted rule of Vincentius, *Quicquid ubique semper et ab omnibus, &c.* Whatsoever we believe as an Article of our Faith, we have for it the testimony and approbation of the whole Christian world of all ages, and therein the Church of Rome itself. But they have no such perpetual or universal tradition for their twelve new Articles of Pope Pius. This objection would have become me much better than him. Whatsoever we believe, they believe, and all the Christian world of all places, and all ages, doth now believe, and ever did believe, except condemned heretics. But they endeavour to obtrude new essentials of Faith upon the Christian world which have no such perpetual or such universal tradition. He that accuseth another, should have an eye to himself.

Does not all the world see that the Church of England stands now otherwise in order to the Church of Rome, than it did in Henry the Seventh's days? He addeth further, that it is confessed that the Papal power in Ecclesiastical affairs was cast out of England in Henry the Eighth's days. I answer that there was no mutation concerning Faith, nor concerning any legacy which CHRIST left to His Church, nor concerning the power of the Keys, or any jurisdiction purely spiritual, but concerning co-active power in the Exterior Court, concerning the Political or External Regiment of the Church, concerning the Patronage or Civil Sovereignty over the Church of England, and the Legislative, Judiciary, and Dispensative power of the Pope in England, over English subjects, which was no more than a re-infranchisement of ourselves, from the upstart usurpations of the Court of Rome, of all which I have shewed him expressly the first source, who began them, when, and where; before which he is not able to give one instance of any such practices attempted by the Bishop of Rome, and admitted by the Church of England.—*Works*, p. 342.

SANDERSON, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

Nor will their flying to tradition help them in this case, or free them from Pharisaism; but rather make the more against them. For to omit that it hath been the usual course of false

teachers, when their doctrines were found not to be Scripture-proof, to fly to tradition: do but inquire a little into the original and growth of Pharisaical traditions, and you shall find that one egg is not more like another, than the Papists and the Pharisees are alike in this matter. When Sadoc (or whosoever else was the first author of the sect of the Sadducees) and his followers began to vent their pestilent and Atheistical doctrines against the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and other like: the best learned among the Jews, (the Pharisees especially) opposed against them by arguments and collections drawn from the Scriptures. The Sadducees finding themselves unable to hold argument with them, (as having two shrewd disadvantages; but a little learning, and a bad cause;) had no other means to avoid the force of all their arguments, than to hold them precisely to the letter of the text, without admitting any exposition thereof, or collection therefrom. Unless they could bring clear text, that should affirm *totidem verbis* what they denied, they would not yield. The Pharisees on the contrary refused (as they had good cause) to be tied to such unreasonable conditions; but stood upon the meaning of the Scriptures, as the Sadducees did upon the letter; confirming the truth of their interpretations partly from reason, and partly from tradition. Not meaning by tradition (as yet) any doctrine other than what was already sufficiently contained in the Scriptures; but merely the doctrine which had been in all ages constantly taught and received with an universal consent among the people of God, as consonant to the Holy Scriptures, and grounded thereon. By this means, though they could not satisfy the Sadducees (as Heretics and Sectaries commonly are obstinate), yet so far they satisfied the generality of the people, that they grew into very great esteem with them; and within a while carried all before them: the detestation of the Sadducees and of their loose errors also conducing not a little thereunto. And who now but the Pharisees: and what now but tradition? in every man's eye and mouth. Things being at this pass, any wise man may judge, how easy a matter it was for men so revered as the Pharisees were, to abuse the credulity of the people and the

interest they had in their good opinion, to their own advantage; to make themselves lords of the people's faith, and by little and little to bring into the worship whatsoever doctrines and observances they pleased; and all under the acceptable name of the traditions of the Elders. And so they did, winning continually upon the people by their cunning and shows of religion, and proceeding still more and more, till the Jewish worship by their means was grown to that height of superstition and formality, as we see it was in our SAVIOUR'S days. Such was the beginning, and such the rise, of those Pharisaical traditions.

Popish traditions also came in and grew up just after the same manner. The orthodox Bishops and Doctors in the ancient Church, being to maintain the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, the Hypostatical union of the two natures in the Person of Christ, the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and other like articles of the Catholic Religion against the Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, and other Heretics; for that the words Trinity, Homousion, Hypostasis, Procession, &c. (which for the better expressing of the Catholic sense they were forced to use), were not expressly to be found in the Holy Scriptures; had recourse, therefore, very often in their writings against the Heretics of their times, to the tradition of the Church. Whereby they meant not (as the Papists would now wrest their words) any unwritten doctrine not contained in the Scriptures, but the very doctrine of the Scriptures themselves, as they had been constantly understood and believed by all faithful Christians in the Catholic Church, down from the Apostles' times till the several present ages wherein they lived. This course of theirs, of so serviceable and necessary use in those times, gave the first occasion and after-rise to that heap of errors and superstitions, which in process of time (by the power and policy of the Bishop of Rome especially), were introduced into the Christian Church under the specious name and colour of Catholic traditions. Thus have they trodden in the steps of their forefathers the Pharisees; and stand guilty even as they of the superstition here condemned by

our SAVIOUR, in teaching for doctrines, men's precepts.—*Ad Clerum*, v. p. 85.

COSIN, BISHOP—*Preface to his Notes on the Common Prayer.*

In truth we have continued the old religion ; and the ceremonies which we have taken from them that were before us, are not things which belong to this or that sect, but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof ourselves being a part, we have the selfsame interest in them, which our fathers before us had, from whom the same descended to us. To abrogate those things without constraint of apparent harm thence arising, had been to alter unjustly the universal practice of the people of God, and those general decrees of the Fathers, which (in St. Augustin's language) is madness and insolence to do, both in respect of the universal authority of the Church, which no particular Church has power to controul, and also in regard of reasons before mentioned.—p. 50. (*in Nicholls' Commentary.*)

*Ibid.*—*Judgment betwixt the Church of England and Church of Rome.*

If the Roman Catholics would make the essence of their Church (as we do ours) to consist in the following points, we are at accord with them : in the reception and belief of . . . . the unanimous and general consent of the ancient Catholic Fathers, and the Universal Church of CHRIST in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, and the collection of all necessary matters of faith from them, during the first six centuries downwards to our own day<sup>1</sup>.

HAMMOND, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Of Heresy.*

1. This then being the adequate object of the Christian's Faith, those verities which have been revealed to us by GOD to be thus believed to righteousness, called therefore *ἡγιαίνοντες λόγοι*, words

<sup>1</sup> Vide Bp. Hickeys's Letters, vol. i. Ap. paper iv.

not only true but wholesome, the belief whereof is required in order to our souls' health; the next enquiry is, how we that live in the same distance from CHRIST and His Apostles in respect of time, that we are situate from heaven, which now contains CHRIST, in respect of place, may come within the reach of these revelations of CHRIST, or to any competent undoubted assurance, that those are such indeed, which are pretended to be so.

2. And to this also my concession shall be as liberal as any Romanist can wish, that there are *two* ways of conveying such revelations to us; one in writing, the other by oral tradition; the former in the Gospels and other writings of the Apostles, &c. which makes up the Sacred Writ, or Canon of the New Testament; the latter in the Apostles' preaching to all the Churches of their plantations, which are nowhere set down for us in the Sacred Writ, but conserved as *deposita* by them to whom they were entrusted.

3. And although in sundry respects the former of these be much the more faithful, steady way of conveyance, and for want thereof many things may possibly have perished, or been changed by their passage through many hands, thus much being on these grounds confest by Bellarmine himself, that the Scripture is the most certain and safe rule of belief; yet there being no less veracity in the tongues, than the hands, in the preachings, than the writings of the Apostles; nay, *Prior sermo quam liber, prior sensus quam stylus*, saith Tertullian, the Apostles preacht before they writ, planted Churches before they addrest Epistles to them: on these grounds I make no scruple to grant, that Apostolical traditions, such as are truly so, as well as Apostolical writings, are equally the matter of a Christian's belief; who is equally secured by the fidelity of the conveyance, that as one is Apostolical writing, so the other is Apostolical tradition.

§ IV. 1. Next then the enquiry must proceed by examining what is this equal way of conveyance, common to both these, upon strength of which we become obliged to receive such or such a tradition for Apostolical.

2. And this again is acknowledged not to be any Divine testimony; for God hath nowhere affirmed in Divine Writ, that the

Epistle, inscribed of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, consisting of so many periods as now it is in our Bibles, was ever written by that Apostle, nor are there any inward characters or signatures, or beams of light in the writing itself, that can be admitted, or pretended for testimonies of this, any more than the like may exact to be admitted as witnesses, that the Creed called the Apostles, was indeed in the full sense of it, delivered to the Churches.

3. It remains then, that herein on both sides we rest content with human testimonies of undoubted authority, or such as there is not any rational motive to distrust, and of which alone the matter is capable. For as in case of question concerning the Epistle to the Romans, whether this be it, which was address by St. Paul to that Church, the only regular way of satisfying the question, is, 1st, By devolution or appeal to the authority of those Fathers and Councils, to whom it was *de facto* sufficiently testified and approved, (*viz.* by examination of the records of that Church to whom it was written, and by whom received, through the hands of some trusty messenger of that Apostle, such as Phœbe that ministered unto him, and by other creditable ways of confirmation) and 2ndly, and by that consequence, to those very original records and proofs of undoubted fidelity: so the way of trial of any tradition, pretended to be Apostolical, whether it be such or no, is by devolving it to those same, or the like Fathers and Councils, which having occasion and commodity to examine the truth of the matter by the records or testimonies of those Churches, to which it was delivered, found it sufficiently testified by them, that it was in truth according as is pretended.

4. And from hence it follows, that as we of this age have no other way of judging of the Canon of Scripture, or of any book, or chapter, or period contained in it, but by the affirmation and authority of those testifiers in the first ages of the Church, either by their writings, or by the unquestioned relations of others, brought down and made known to us; so are we as unable to judge of Apostolical traditions unwritten, whether this or that doctrine be such or no, unless it be thus by the



undoubted affirmations of the ancients (who are presumable by their antiquity to know the truth, and by their uniform consent, neither to mistake themselves, nor to deceive us ;) communicated and conveyed to us.

5. 'Tis not possible for any man or men of the greatest understandings or integrity, to see or know what is not done within the reach of their faculties, unless either they be inspired by God, or otherwise informed either mediately or immediately from those, who had really knowledge of it. Stories of former times are not wont to be written by the strength of men's natural parts, invention, or judgment, but only by consulting of those records, either dead or living, by whose help such matters of fact have been preserved. Every thing else is but conjecture, and that very uncertain, the utmost probability in such matters being little worth, that being oftentimes done which really was (and much more to us, who know not the motives of actions far removed from us, is) of all things least probable to have been done. Only a creditable witness, such as no prudent man hath reason to distrust either as nescient or false, is worth considering, or able to found belief in this matter.

§ V. 1. Now then comes the upshot of the inquiry, what qualifications there are of a testimony or testifier, without which, it or he may not be thus deemed creditable, *οὐκ ἀξιόπιστος* worthy to be believed by a sober Christian; and where these qualifications are to be found, which when we have once resolved, it will also be possible for us to pass some judgment of traditions duly styled Apostolical, which as such must be allowed to be the object of our Faith.

2. And herein I shall hope also that the resolution will be unquestionable, if it be bounded by those three terms, to which Vincentius Lirinensis in his defence of the Catholic Faith against Heresies and innovations hath directed us, *Universitas, Antiquitas, Consensio*, Universality, Antiquity, Consent, viz. That the testimony we depend on, be the result of all, the ancients, consenting, or without any considerable dissent. Or, in yet fewer

words, a Catholic testimony, truly such, *i. e.* universal in all respects; (1) of place, (2) of time, (3) of persons.

3. For first, if it be not testified from all places, it is not qualified for our belief, as Catholic in respect of place, because the Faith being one and the same, and by all and every of the Apostles preached, and deposited in all their plantations, what was ever really thus taught, by any of them in any Church, will also be found to have been taught, and received in all other Apostolical Churches.

4. To which purpose the words of Irenæus are express, lib. i. cap. 3. The Church disseminated over all the world, having received this preaching and this Faith, preserves it diligently, as the inhabitants of the same house, believe them alike, as having the same soul and heart, and teach, and preach, and deliver them alike, as having the same mouth, for though their languages are unlike, the virtue of tradition is one and the same, and neither do the Churches which are found in Germany believe or deliver otherwise than those which were constituted in Spain, in France, in the Orient, in Egypt, in Africk, in the middle of the world, but as one and the same sun shines through the whole world, so doth the light and preaching of the truth in every place, where it is received, disperse itself.

5. So also Tertullian de Præscript. c. 20. Presently, therefore, the Apostles having first in Judea testified the Faith and instituted Churches, and then taken them over all the world, made known to the nations the same doctrine of the same Faith, and so planted Churches in every city, from which the rest of the Churches afterward borrowed their seeds of Faith and doctrine, and so daily continue to do and are formed into Churches.

6. From which premises his conclusion is just that which I here deduce; if so, then it is evident that every doctrine must be deemed true which conspires with the Apostolical Churches, which are the wombs and originals whence the Faith came out, as maintaining that without any question, which the Churches received from the Apostles, the Apostles from CHRIST, and

CHRIST from God ; and that all other doctrine is under the prejudice of being false, which is contrary to the truth of the Churches of the Apostles, of CHRIST, and of GOD.

7. It is true, indeed, that whatsoever one Church professeth to have received from the Apostle that planted it, is of itself sufficient, without the confirmation of all others, to beget and establish belief in him, to whom it thus testifies: whereupon Tertullian refers the inquirer to that Apostolic Church which is next to him, be it Corinth, if he live in Achaia, Philippi, or Thessalonica, if in Macedonia, Ephesus, if in Asia, or if he be near Italy, Rome. But this is no farther to be extended, than while we suppose without inquiry, that other Apostolical Churches have received, and are ready to testify the same ; which presumption or supposal must then cease, when upon inquiry we find the contrary ; there being then none of this first kind of universality ; viz. of place, and so far, no validity in the testification.

8. Secondly, for the universality of time, that must be cautiously understood ; not so as to signify it a prejudice to any doctrine, if in some one or more ages it have not been universally received ; for then there could be no Heretics at any time in the world : but so as to extend to the first and purest, and not only to the latter ages of the Church.

9. That which was delivered by the Apostles was certainly received in that first age, wherein they lived ; and by careful inquiry will be found from their monuments to have been among them. And that which by this trial is discerned to be of latter date, not to be descried in the first times, nor testified by sufficient authority to be derived from thence, falls short again of this second part of universality in respect of time.

10. Thirdly, for the consent of testifiers, that is also necessary to the rendering it a Catholic and authentic testimony ; any considerable number of dissenters being of necessity to weaken our belief, and infuse reasons of doubting, and a preponderancy of dissenters the other way, to weigh down (at least to incline) the belief to the contrary.

§ VI. 1. This, therefore, being thus established, and the

conjunction of all the three sorts of universality being in all reason required to the authentic testifying of tradition, it is soon defined, where these qualifications are to be looked for, and where they may be found.

2. Questionless not in any one Bishop, or succession of Bishops in any See for many latter ages, not including the Apostles; for whatever his pretensions may be to authority and supremacy over all other Churches, this can never convert a particular whether man or Church, into the universal, nor make his testimony authentic according to those rational and Christian rules, which we have learned from Lirinensis.

3. There are many Apostolic Churches beside that of Rome: great difference of Rome in these latter ages from the Primitive Apostolic Rome, to which the depositum was intrusted. And there are many dissenters to be found, who have always lived and flourished in the Catholic Church, which never acknowledged those doctrines to be delivered to them by the Apostles, which the Church of Rome hath of late assumed to be such. And for any privilege annexed to that Bishop's chair, or to that society of men, which live in external communion with him, that he or they can never define any thing to be (*de fide*) part of the Faith, which is not so, as that is, beyond all other their pretensions, most denied by us, and least attempted to be proved by the Romanist, and not so much as consented on among themselves; so must it in no reason be supposed in this dispute, or taken for granted by them, but is rejected with the same ease that it is mentioned by them.

4. As for other pretenders, I know not any, save only that of the universal consent of the Doctors of the first ages, or that of an universal Council. And both these we are willing to admit with such cautions only as the matter exacts, and the grounds of defining already laid.

5. The universal consent of the Doctors of the first ages, bearing testimony that such or such a doctrine was from the Apostles' preachings delivered to all Churches by them planted, or their general conform testimony herein, without any considerable dissenters producible, is, I acknowledge, authentic or

worthy of belief, and so hath been made use of by the orthodox of all times, as sufficient for the rejecting of any new doctrine.

6. So likewise is the declaration of a general Council, free, and gathered from all quarters, and in such other respects, truly so called, founded in the examination of the monuments of the several Apostolical plantations, either produced in Council, or authentically confirmed from the letters of the several Churches, either formerly prepared in provincial and national Councils, or otherwise sufficiently confirmed to them, and this declaration conciliarly promulgated, and after the promulgation universally received and accepted by the Church diffusive; or else it is evident all this while, that it is not a Catholic (truly so styled) testimony.

7. For that any Council of Bishops, the most numerous that ever was in the world (much less a but major part of those few, that be there present) is not yet really the universality of Christians, is too evident to be doubted of.

8. It can only then be pretended, that it is the universal representative, or such an assembly, wherein is contained the virtue and influences of the whole universal Church. And thus, indeed, I suppose it to be, as often as the doctrines there established by universal consent (founded in Scripture and tradition) have either been before discussed and resolved in each provincial Council, which have sent their delegates thither from all the parts of the world, or else have *post factum*, after the promulgation, been accepted by them, and acknowledged to agree with that Faith which they had originally received.—*Works*, vol. i. p. 545.

Id.—*Practical Catechism*.

But what if the particular Church wherein I was baptized, shall fall from its own stedfastness, and by authority or law set up that, which if it be not contrary to plain words of Scripture, is yet contrary to the doctrine or practice of the universal Church of the first and purest times; what will meekness require me to do in that case? Meekness will require me to be very wary in passing such judgment on that Church; but if the

light be so clear and the defection be so palpably discernible to all, that I cannot but see and acknowledge it, and in case it be true, that I am actually convinced, that the particular Church in which I live, is departed from the Catholic Apostolic Church; then it being certain that the greater authority must be preferred before the lesser, and that next the Scripture the Catholic Church of the first and purest times, (especially when the subsequent ages do also accord with that for many hundreds of years) is the greatest authority, it follows that meekness requires my obedience and submission to the Catholic Apostolic Church, and not to the particular wherein I live: so far I mean, as that I am to retain that Catholic Apostolic, and not this novel, corrupt, not Catholic doctrine. And if for my doing so I fall under persecution of the rulers of that particular Church, meekness then requires me patiently to endure it, but in no case to subscribe to or act anything which is contrary to this Catholic doctrine.—Some other obligations there are upon every Christian (wherein meekness interposeth not) which do require me not to depart from any Catholic Apostolic truth or practice, at least not to submit to (or act) the contrary, or to do anything which is apt to confirm others in so doing, or to lead those that doubt (by my example) to do what they doubt to be unlawful. For in all these particulars, the Christian law of scandal obliges me, not only not to yield to any schism from the Catholic Apostolic Church, or other the like corruption, but not to do those things by which I shall be thought by prudent men to do so.—Meekness permits me also to seek out for some purer Church, if that may conveniently be had for me. Nay, if I am by my calling fitted for it, and can prudently hope to plant (or contribute to the planting) such a pure Apostolic Church where there is none, or to reconcile and restore peace between divided members of the Church Catholic, my endeavour to do so is in this case extremely commendable, and that which God's providence seems to direct me to, by what is thus befallen me. . . . The authority by which it stands in the whole Church, is that of the practice of the primitive universal Christian Church; not that we have any certain evidence of the time of its beginning, but

that the immemorial observation of it is an argument of the primitive, if not Apostolic institution of it.—Lib. ii. § 1. & 12.

*Ibid.*

The practice and writings of the ancient Church, which is the best way to explicate any such difficulty in Scripture, is a clear testimony and proof, that both the bread and the wine belong to all the people, in the name of his Disciples at that time. But why may it not be said, that laymen may baptize also, and do those other things, for which CHRIST gave power to His Disciples, as well as this bread and wine, divided among the Disciples, should belong to them? The answer is given already, that the Apostolical practice and the universal consent of the ancient primitive Church have defined the one, and defined against the other, and that ought to satisfy any sober man's scruples; it being no way probable that CHRIST's institution would be presently frustrated and corrupted by His own Apostles, or their practice so falsified by the universal agreement of all that lived next after them, especially there being no universal Council, wherein it were possible for them all uniformly to agree on such an opposition.—Lib. vi. § 4.

THORNDIKE, PRESBYTER.—*Of the Principles of Christian Truth.*

Whatsoever then is said of the rule of Faith in the writings of the Fathers, is to be understood of the creed; whereof, though it be not maintained, that the words which pretenders were required to render by heart were the same, yet the substance of it, and the reasons and grounds which make every point necessary to be believed, were always the same in all Churches, and remain unchangeable. I would not have any hereupon to think, that the matter of this rule is not, in my conceit, contained in the Scriptures. For I find St. Cyril (Catech. v.) protesting, that it contains nothing but that which concerned our salvation the most, selected out of the Scriptures. And, therefore in other places, he tenders his scholars evidence out of the Scriptures, and wishes them not to believe that whereof there is no such evidence. And

to the same effect, (Eucherius in Symb. Hom. 1. Paschasius de Sp. S. in Præf., and after them Thomas Aquinas *secunda ii. Quest. 1. Art. ix.*) all agree that the form of the Creed was made up out of the Scriptures ; giving such reasons as no reasonable Christian can refuse. Not only because all they whose salvation is concerned have not leisure to study the Scriptures, but because they that have, cannot easily or safely discern, wherein the substance of faith, upon the profession whereof our salvation depends, consisteth ; supposing that they were able to discern between true and false, in the meaning of the Scriptures. To which I will add only that which Tertullian and others of the Fathers observe of the ancient Heretics, that their fashion was to take occasion, upon one or two texts, to overthrow and deny the main substance and scope of the whole Scriptures ; which, whether it be seen in the sects of our time, or not, I will not say here, (because I will not take any thing for granted which I have not yet principles to prove) but supposing it only a thing possible, I will think I give a sufficient reason why God should provide tradition as well as Scripture, to bound the sense of it ; as St. Cyril also cautioneth in the place aforementioned, where he so liberally acknowledgeth the Creed to be taken out of the Scripture. For (saith he) “ the Faith was not framed as it pleased men, but the most substantial matters collected out of the Scripture do make up one doctrine of the Faith.” For, I beseech you, what had they, whosoever they were that first framed the Creed, but Tradition, whereby to distinguish that which is substantial from that which is not ? Hear Origen in the Preface to his books *περι ἀρχῶν*. “ There being many that think their sense to be Christian, and yet the sense of some differs from their predecessors ; but that, which the Church preaches, as delivered by order of succession from the Apostles, being preserved and remaining the same in the Churches ; that only is to be believed for truth, which nothing differs from the Tradition of the Church. This, notwithstanding, we must know ; that the Holy Apostles, preaching the Faith of CHRIST, delivered some things, (as many as they held necessary) most manifestly to all believers, even those whom they found the duller in the search of Divine knowledge ; leaving the reason why they affirmed them



to the search of those that got to receive the eminent gifts of the Holy Ghost, especially of utterance, wisdom, and knowledge, by the Holy Ghost. Of other things they said that they are, but how, or whereupon they are, they said not. Forsooth, that the more studious of their successors, loving wisdom and knowledge, might have some exercise wherein to show the fruit of their wit; to wit, those that should prepare themselves to be worthy and capable of wisdom. Now, the particulars of that which is manifestly delivered by the preaching of the Apostles are these, which he proceedeth to set down. But Vincentius Lirinensis hath writ a Discourse on purpose to show that this rule of Faith, being delivered by succession to the principal, as St. Paul requires Timothy to do, and by them to those that were baptized, was the ground upon which all heresies, attempting upon the Faith, were condemned. So that, so many heresies, as historical truth will evidence, to have been excluded the Church from the Apostle's time, for matter of belief, so many convictions of this rule; which, because all agreed that they transgressed, therefore they were excluded the Church. But Vincentius, besides this, advanceth another mark to discern what belongs to the Rule, that is, what the ground and scope of our Creed requires. For it might be said, that perhaps something may come in question whether consistent with the rule of Faith or not, in which there hath passed no decree of the Primitive Church, because never questioned by that time: wherein, therefore, we shall be to seek, notwithstanding the decrees past by the Church upon ancient heresies. Which to meet with, Vincentius saith further, that whatsoever hath been unanimously taught in the Church by writing, that is, always, by all, everywhere, to that, no contradiction is ever to be admitted in the Church. Here the style changes; for whereas Irenæus, Tertullian, and others of former time, appeal only to that which was visible in the practice of all Churches; by the time of the Council at Ephesus, (the date of Vincentius's book) so much had been written upon all points of Faith, and upon the Scriptures, that he presumeth, evidence may be made of it all, what may stand with that which the whole Church had taught, what may not. p. 44.

ID.—*Just weights and measures.*

It is not the decree of the present Church, but the witness and agreement of the whole Church, that renders any thing infallible.—Seeing, therefore, that the malice of man, by dividing the Church, rendereth it invisible, as hard to be seen, though not invisible, as not possible to be seen, what remaineth, but that all public persons, and whosoever is interested in the divisions of the Church, understand and consider what account they owe, for the souls that must needs miscarry by the divisions which they maintain, when they need not? For how shall he be clear, that professes not a desire of condescending to all that which truth will allow on either side, for the advantage of peace on both sides? And seeing neither side can make peace without the consent of both, but either may have truth alone; what remaineth, but that all reformation be confined within those bounds, which the faith and the law of the Catholic Church fixeth?—The true sense of the Scripture is not to be had, but out of the records of antiquity; especially of God's ancient people first, and then of the Christian Church. The obligation of that sense upon the Church at this time, is not to be measured against the Primitive practice of the whole Church. The reformation of the Church is nothing but the restoring of that which may appear to have been in force.—It is, therefore, necessary, that both sides professing the Reformation, should agree upon the true ground of Reformation; and so upon the rule which that ground will maintain and evidence; that is, to submit all that is in question to the visible practice of the primitive times, before those abuses were brought in, which the reformation pretendeth to restore.—There is the same ground to believe—that there is, for the common Christianity, namely, the Scriptures interpreted by the perpetual practice of God's Church.—And seeing the abating of the first form under Edward VI. hath wrought no effect, but to give them that desired it an appetite to root up the whole; what thanks can we render to God for escaping so great a danger, but by sticking firm to a rule that will stick firm to us, and carry us

through any dispute in religion, and land us in the haven of a quiet conscience, what troubles soever we may pass through, in maintaining that the Reformation of the Church will never be according to the rule which it ought to follow, till it cleave to the Catholic Church of CHRIST in this particular? p. 50, 51. 98. 159.

*Ibid.*—*The due way of composing the Differences on foot, preserving the Church.*

The chief ground that I suppose here, because I have proved it at large, is the meaning of that Article of our Creed, which professeth one Catholic Church. For either it signifies nothing, or it signifies that GOD hath founded one visible Church, that is, that he hath obliged all churches (and all Christians of whom all churches consist) to hold visible communion with the whole Church in the visible offices of GOD's public service. And therefore I am satisfied, that the differences upon which we are divided, cannot be justly settled upon any terms, which any part of the whole Church shall have just cause to refuse, as inconsistent with the unity of the whole Church. For in that case we must needs become schismatics, by settling ourselves upon such laws, under which any Church may refuse to communicate with us, because it is bound to communicate with the whole Church. p. 225.

TAYLOR, BISHOP.—*Dissuasive from Popery.*

It was the challenge of St. Austin to the Donatists, who (as the Church of Rome does at this day) enclosed the Catholic Church within their own circuits: "Ye say that CHRIST is heir of no lands, but where Donatus is co-heir. Read this to us out of the law and the Prophets, out of the Psalms, out of the Gospel itself, or out of the letters of the Apostles: read it thence, and we believe it:"—plainly directing us to the fountains of our faith, the Old and New Testament, the words of Christ, and the words of the Apostles. For nothing else can be the fountain of our faith: whatsoever came in after these, "*foris est,*" it belongs not unto Christ.

To these we also add, not as authors or finishers, but as helpers of our faith, and heirs of the doctrine apostolical, the sentiments

and catholic doctrine of the Church of God, in the ages next after the Apostles. Not that we think them or ourselves bound to every private opinion, even of a primitive bishop and martyr ; but that we all acknowledge that the whole church of God kept the faith entire, and transmitted faithfully to the after-ages the whole faith, *τύπον διδαχῆς* “ the form of doctrine, and sound words, which was at first delivered to the saints,” and was defective in nothing that belonged unto salvation ; and we believe that those ages sent millions of saints to the bosom of CHRIST, and sealed the true faith with their lives and with their deaths, and by both gave testimony unto JESUS, and had from him the testimony of his Spirit.

And this method of procedure we now choose, not only because to them that know well how to use it, to the sober and moderate, the peaceable and the wise, it is the best, the most certain, visible and tangible, most humble and satisfactory : but also because the Church of Rome does, with greatest noises, pretend her conformity to antiquity. Indeed the present Roman doctrines, which are in difference, were invisible and unheard of in the first and best antiquity, and with how ill success their quotations are out of the fathers of the three first ages, every inquiring man may easily discern. But the noises, therefore, which they make, are from the writings of the succeeding ages ; where secular interest did more prevail, and the writings of the fathers were vast and voluminous, full of controversy and ambiguous senses, fitted to their own times and questions, full of proper opinions, and such variety of sayings, that both sides, eternally and inconfutably, shall bring sayings for themselves respectively. Now although things being thus, it will be impossible for them to conclude from the sayings of a number of fathers, that their doctrine, which they would prove thence, was the catholic doctrine of the church ; because any number that is less than all, does not prove a catholic consent ; yet the clear sayings of one or two of these fathers, truly alleged by us to the contrary, will certainly prove that what many of them (suppose it) do affirm, and which but two or three as good Catholics as the other do deny, was not then matter of faith, or a doctrine of the church ; for if it had, these had been accounted heretics, and not have remained

in the communion of the church. But although for the reasonableness of the thing, we have thought fit to take notice of it; yet we shall have no need to make use of it, since, not only in the prime and purest antiquity, we are indubitably more than conquerors, but even in the succeeding ages, we have the advantage both ‘*numero, pondere, et mensura,*’ in number, weight, and measure.

We do easily acknowledge, that to dispute these questions from the sayings of the fathers, is not the readiest way to make an end of them; but, therefore, we do wholly rely upon Scriptures, as the foundation and final resort of all our persuasions, and from thence can never be confuted; but we also admit the fathers as admirable helps for the understanding of the Scriptures, and as good testimony of the doctrine delivered from their forefathers down to them, of what the church esteemed the way of salvation: and therefore, if we find any doctrine now taught, which was not placed in their way of salvation, we reject it as being no part of the Christian faith, and which ought not to be imposed upon consciences. They were ‘wise unto salvation’ and ‘fully instructed to every good work;’ and therefore, the faith, which they professed and derived from Scripture, we profess also; and in the same faith, we hope to be saved even as they. But for the new doctors, we understand them not, we know them not; our faith is the same from the beginning, and cannot become new.

But because we shall make it to appear, that they do greatly innovate in all their points of controversy with us, and show nothing but shadows instead of substances, and little images of things instead of solid arguments; we shall take from them their armour in which they trusted, and choose this sword of Goliath to combat their errors; for *non est alter talis*; it is not easy to find a better than the word of God, expounded by the prime and best antiquity.—Part i. book i. § i. *Works*, vol. x. p. 129.

#### HEYLIN, PRESBYTER.

Things that have been generally in the Church of Christ are generally conceived to have been derived from apostolical tradi-

tion, without any special mandate left in Scripture for the doing of them. Praying directly towards the East is conceived to be of that condition; why may we not conclude the like of setting up the altar along the wall? Many things come into our minds by a successional tradition, for which we cannot find an express command, which yet we ought to entertain, *ex vi Catholicæ consuetudinis*; of which traditions there are many, which still retain their force among us in England. This Church (the Lord be thanked for it) hath stood more firm for apostolical traditions, than any other whatsoever of the Reformation.—Antid. Lincoln, p. 87<sup>1</sup>.

COMMISSIONERS OF A. D. 1662.—*Appointed to review the Book of Common Prayer.*

Ancient Liturgies in the Church, St. Chrysostom's, St. Basil's, St. James's, and others, and such things as are found in them all consistent with Catholic and Primitive doctrine, may well be presumed to have been from the first, especially since we find no original of these Liturgies from General Councils.—*Reply to Presbyterians*, § 16.

PEARSON, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*On the Creed.*

As our religion is Catholic, it holdeth fast that 'faith which was once delivered to the saints,' and since preserved in the Church; and therefore I expound such verities, in opposition to the heretics arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who of all the rest have most perverted the articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new body of divinity in opposition to the Catholic theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is, upon the word of God delivered in the Old and New Testament, alleged according to the true sense, and applied by right reason; not urging the authority of the Church which they reject, but only giving in the margin the sense of the primi-

<sup>1</sup> As extracted in "the Canterburians' self-conviction," 1640. p. 63.

tive Fathers, for the satisfaction of such as have any respect left for antiquity, and are persuaded that Christ had a true Church on the earth before these times.—*Preface.*

BARROW, PRESBYTER AND DOCTOR.

It can indeed no wise be safe to follow any such leaders (whatever pretences to special illumination they hold forth, whatever specious guises of sanctity they bear) who in their doctrine or practice deflect from the great beaten roads of holy Scripture, primitive tradition, and Catholic practice, roving in by-paths suggested to them by their private fancies and humours, their passions and lusts, their interests and advantages: there have in all ages such counterfeit guides started up, having debauched some few heedless persons, having erected some *παρασυναγωγὰς* or petty combinations against the regularly settled corporations; but never with any durable success or countenance of Divine Providence; but like prodigious meteors, having caused a little *gazing*, and some disturbance, their sects have soon been dissipated, and have quite vanished away: the authors and abettors of them being either buried in oblivion, or recorded with ignominy; like that Theudas in the speech of Gamaliel, who “rose up boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men about four hundred joined themselves; who were slain, and all as many as obeyed him were scattered and brought to nought.”—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 206.

BULL, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*Apol. pro Harm.* i. 6.

God knows the secrets of my heart; so far am I from the itch of originality in Theological Doctrines, . . . that whatever are sanctioned by the consent of Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops, though my own small ability attain not to them, yet I will embrace them with all reverence. In truth I had already learned by no few experiments, in writing my *Harmony* while yet a young man, what now in my mature age I am most thoroughly persuaded of, that no one can contradict Catholic

consent, however he may seem to be countenanced for a while by some passages of Scripture wrongly understood and by the illusions of unreal arguments, without being found in the end to have contradicted both Scripture and sound reason. I daily deplore and sigh over the unbridled license of prophesying which obtained for some years in this our England, . . . under the tyranny of what some considered a wretched necessity. In a word, my hearty desire is this, Let the ancient customs, doctrines remain in force<sup>1</sup>.

STILLINGFLEET, BISHOP.—*Grounds of Protestant Religion.*

The Church of England doth very piously declare her consent with the ancient Catholic Church, in not admitting any thing to be delivered as the sense of Scripture, which is contrary to the consent of the Catholic Church in the four first ages. Not as though the sense of the Catholic Church were pretended to be any infallible rule of interpreting Scripture in all things which concern the rule of faith; but that it is a sufficient prescription against anything which can be alleged out of Scripture, that if it appear contrary to the sense of the Catholic Church from the beginning, it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of the Scripture. All this security is built upon this strong presumption, that nothing contrary to the necessary Articles of Faith should be held by the Catholic Church, whose very being depends upon the belief of those things which are necessary to salvation. As long therefore as the Church might appear to be truly Catholic by those correspondencies which were maintained between the several parts of it, that what was refused by one, was so by all; so long this unanimous and uncontradicted sense of the Catholic Church ought to have a great sway upon the minds of such who yet profess themselves members of the Catholic Church. From whence it follows, that such doctrines may well be judged destructive to the rule of faith, which were so unanimously condemned by the Catholic Church within that

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Nicæn. Can.



time. And thus much may suffice for the first enquiry, viz. What things are to be esteemed necessary, either in order to Salvation, or in order to Ecclesiastical Communion. p. 55.

KENN, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.

As for my religion, I die in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Faith, professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West; more particularly I die in the Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan Innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross.—*His last Will.*

BEVERIDGE, BISHOP.—Preface to *Codex Canonum Eccles. Prim. vindicatus ac illustratus.*

To such a degree of temerity has this our senseless age advanced, that there is scarcely any thing in Christianity itself which is not either called into doubt in private, or made matter of controversy in public. So much so, that even those doctrines and rites which, during many ages back, and from the very beginnings of the Church, have every where been received, at last in these our days come into hazard, and are assailed, just as if we were the first Christians, and all our ancestors had assumed and borne the mere name of Christ, and nothing more; or at least, as if all had been constantly involved in the gravest errors, whoever before this time embraced the faith made known in the Gospel. Forsooth in these full late times, it seems new lights are boasted of, new and greater gifts of the Holy Spirit are pretended, and therefore new forms of believing, new forms of praying, new forms of preaching, new forms in the use of ecclesiastical administrations, are daily framed and commonly adopted. And, what is most absurd, nothing now is esteemed of before novelty itself, but the newer any thing is, so much the greater number and the more does it please, and the more anxiously is it defended. Hence these tears, hence so many horrible schisms in the Church!

For whilst individuals, indulging, beyond what is meet, their abilities, or rather their own wanton fancies, devote themselves to the introduction of novelties into religion, the whole body, through the infinite diversity of opinions, comes to be rent into contrary schools and factions.

But if we will only even now recollect ourselves, and weigh things with that temperate and fair spirit which is right, it will at once be clear that we, who now inhabit this and other countries around, are not either the first or the only worshippers of Christ, but only a small part of that great body whose head is Christ : inasmuch as that body, by the exceeding mercy of God, hath been spread abroad into all parts of the earth, and that, from the very times of the Apostles ; so that there is no age, and scarcely any country, in which there have not been very many who, by the faith which we profess, have attained unto heaven. According to this view, if we attentively survey this vast body of all Christians of every age, which is commonly called the *Catholic or Universal Church*, as constituted every where and always, we shall find in it certain, fixed, and, as it were, common principles, which run through the whole, and connect all its parts both with each other and with the head. The first of these, and that from which the rest arise, is, *that Holy Scripture, or the Old and New Testament, is divinely inspired*. In this all Christians every where agree, and have always agreed ; and therefore he who denies it, is pronounced unworthy of their fellowship and of their name. Still further, this holy Scripture, although in these precepts, which are absolutely necessary for every man's salvation, it be most clear and evident to all, yet, as to what respects doctrine and external discipline of the Church, it is not, from its very depth, received by all in one and the same sense, but "the divine sayings of this same Scripture are by one man interpreted in one way, and by another in another ; so that it would seem to admit almost as many meanings as there are men," as formerly *Vincent of Lirin*s observed, and as is more than sufficiently proved from the case of heretics and schismatics, inasmuch as, among them, every individual elicits his own erroneous opinions and practices out of the holy Scriptures interpreted after his own manner. In

things therefore of this nature, if we would be secured from error and falling, first of all, beyond all doubt, we must beware that we do not over pertinaciously adhere to the private opinions and conjectures of ourselves and others, but do rather carefully examine, what the ancient Church, or, at least, the great majority of Christians, have held in these matters, and must acquiesce in that decision which has obtained the consent of Christians in all ages. For as, according to Cicero, on every subject, "the consent of all men is the voice of nature," so also in things of this sort, the consent of all Christians may be deservedly accounted the voice of the Gospel. But there are many things which, although they are not read in express and definite terms in the holy Scriptures, are yet by the common consent of all Christians drawn out of these Scriptures. For example; "that there are in the ever-blessed Trinity three distinct Persons to be worshipped, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that these are, each of them, truly God, and yet that there is but one God: that Christ is God and man, *θεάνθρωπος*, truly God and truly man, in one and the same person." These and such like, although they are not, either in the Old or New Testament, declared in so many words and syllables, yet have they, as founded on both, ever been agreed on by all Christians, certain few heretics only excepted, of whom no more account is to be had in religion, than of monsters in nature. So also, "that infants are to receive the ablution of holy Baptism, and that sponsors are to be used for that Sacrament. That the Lord's day, or the first day in every seven, is to be religiously observed as a festival. That our Lord's passion, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, as also the coming of the Holy Ghost, are to be commemorated every year. That the Church is every where to be administered by Bishops, distinguished from Presbyters, and set over them." These and others of this sort are no where in the sacred Scriptures enjoined directly and by name, yet have they notwithstanding, during fourteen hundred years from the Apostles, been every where received into public use of the Church; nor can there be found any Church during that period not agreeing to these things. So that there have been, as it were, certain

*common notions* from the beginning implanted in the minds of all Christians, not so much from any particular passages of holy Scripture, as from all ; from the general scope and tenor of the whole Gospel ; from the very nature and purpose of the religion therein established ; and, finally, from the constant tradition of the Apostles, who, together with the faith, propagated ecclesiastical rites of this sort, and, if I may so speak, general interpretations of the Gospel. For on any other supposition it would be incredible, or even impossible, that they should have been received with so unanimous a consent every where, always, and by all.

3. From these premises, it is clear at the first glance what will follow. For seeing that no one doubts but that more confidence is to be placed in the whole body than in individual Christians, and more in the Universal Church than in any particular Churches whatsoever : seeing also that there are very many points in which the Universal Church, during many ages after the Apostles, agreed : seeing, finally, that this consent of the Universal Church is the surest interpretation of holy Scripture on those points on which it may be had : it hence most clearly follows, of what and how great use the ancient Fathers, and other writers of all ages of the Church, must be, and how necessary to be consulted by them, who, in the prosecution of ecclesiastical controversies, have at heart either their own salvation, or the peace of the Church. For, were there no commentaries of the ancient Church, no acts of councils, no monuments of ecclesiastical history, extant at this day, in how great darkness should we be involved respecting our very religion itself? How easy would it be for any subtle heretic, or even for any the most flagitious impostor, under the mask of piety, to deceive the generality, and to lead them into the most pernicious errors of every description? Who could then convict the Church of Rome, or any other even the most corrupt communion, of fault or error, in those particulars which are not expressly prohibited in holy Scripture? For whence could it be proved, whether those things which are in use in that Church had, or had not, been handed down from the very Apostles, and approved by the consent of

the Universal Church? Finally, how many and how great disadvantages of every kind would arise hence? But there is no reason that we should occupy our time in the enumeration of these things, seeing that amidst so many and so great confusions of empires, convulsions of particular Churches, and perturbation of all human affairs, it hath been so ordered by the most wise and merciful providence of Almighty God, that from the very times of the Apostles even unto these our own times, there is no age whose ecclesiastical memorials are not preserved to us. From which memorials accordingly we are enabled to conceive a perfect idea of the Universal Church, and to feel assured and certain, what has through all ages been admitted and what rejected; what rites and doctrines have prevailed, what heresies and schisms have been disapproved and condemned. Finally, from these and these alone we may see, on what points of doctrine and discipline agreement hath ever prevailed among all Churches, and on what again controversy hath existed between them, and consequently what is more, and what less, necessary to be believed and observed. For whatever is to be said of other things, those things at any rate in which all Churches every where have agreed, cannot but be most certain, and necessary, even at this very time, to be retained of all.

4. This consent however, be it remembered, of which we are speaking, of the Universal Church, on any articles of Faith or ecclesiastical rites, is not to be sought from one or two writers, much less from any one or two passages in any particular writer, apart from the rest, but from all combined, or at least from the greatest part of those, who, in all ages of the Church, (and especially the earlier) were the authors of any written works, in which they treated on these subjects. For in all societies, such as is the Church, the majority takes place of the minority, and has the same right as the whole. The words of the civil law are, "What is done by the majority of the court, is accounted the same as if done by all." Nay, this is one of the ordinary rules of that law. "That is ascribed to the whole, which is publicly done by the majority." That therefore which is by the majority either appointed or affirmed, that is rightly to be con-

sidered the act of the Universal Church ; much more that which is confirmed by the united testimonies of all, or nearly all. To which class very many things in ecclesiastical matters may easily be reduced. For although we have not the express opinions of every individual Christian, through all ages, handed down to us, yet we possess what is to the same effect. For, first, when we speak of the consent of the Universal Church, it is not necessary that we regard the opinions of the people also, or laity. For they have never been admitted to deliver their judgment on the doctrine or discipline of the Church, in that it was presumed that in all things they, as is right, followed, not led, the opinions of their pastors. And besides, seeing that the people were anciently wont to vote in the election of their own bishops, and to give their testimony concerning those to be elected ; by that very act they shewed openly enough that they agreed to their doctrine and discipline ; so that whatever might be the opinion of any one bishop, the people over whom he presided might fairly be held to be guided by the same. In consequence, that this consent of the Church is to be sought not from the people, but from their bishops, from the teachers and priests, *Vincent of Lirin*s formerly rightly observed : “ Consent also in like manner we shall arrive at,” says he “ if in this very antiquity we follow the definitions and expressed opinions of all, or, at any rate, of nearly all, the priests and teachers.” And indeed this position, namely, “ that the consent of the Universal Church is to be sought not from the people, but from the bishops and clergy,” is one of those very many points in which we have the Universal Church itself agreeing ; seeing that when about to discuss ecclesiastical matters, she hath rarely suffered the people to be present, never to deliver an opinion, or to vote. For neither, in all the councils which have ever been held on matters of that sort, do we read, that any one from among the people set his name to the decrees. But in each age the common affairs of the Church were transacted by bishops alone in council assembled, with, occasionally, certain presbyters, holding the places of their respective bishops. Which councils, if held in any one province, represented that *provincial* Church alone ; but if attended by all conjointly, or by

the majority of them, they then represented the *Universal Church*. "By which" (councils), as Tertullian says, "both such points as are of a deeper character are discussed in common, and the very assembly, as representing the whole Christian name, is held in great reverence." But councils of this sort, as well *provincial*, held by particular provinces, as *Universal*, held (as the origin of their name declares) by the Universal Church, such councils are even now extant, with many of their acts and decrees. There are extant also very many commentaries of individual bishops and presbyters, not indeed of all, but yet of those who, in each age, were most learned, and best acquainted with the doctrines and rites of the Church. From all of which, we are able most clearly to see (if any other thing) the common opinions both of all, and each of, the Churches, and so to collect most assuredly what we are to hold on these points. For although we grant it to be doubtful whether others, who either were not authors, or whose writings are not now in existence, may not perchance have held otherwise, yet since that is not capable of proof, and not to be capable of proof, in causes of this sort, is manifestly the same as not to exist; whatever all, or the majority of those, whose genuine works have been left us, taught, as it were in common, that is without any doubt, to be held for the common and constant doctrine of the Universal Church. Especially when the Universal Church also has itself fully enough testified her agreement to that doctrine, which is preserved in the ancient writings of Councils and Fathers, from this fact, that, the providence of God so ordering, she hath preserved to us those writings in which that doctrine is contained, the commentaries, in the mean time, of others, who held otherwise, having been buried in so deep oblivion, that scarcely have their names been transmitted to posterity. From all which things, as briefly and summarily premised, we may rightly conclude, that all, both separate works of individual fathers, and acts and monuments of Synods, as well provincial as universal, which exist at this day, are, in the first place, of this very great and remarkable use to us, in that from them we may consider as certainly proved, what the Universal Church hath ever believed and openly taught, on necessary

articles of Faith and rites ecclesiastical, and therefore what is to be ever believed and taught in the Church. For no one can doubt, but that it is both most safe, and supremely necessary, in all things, as far as is possible, religiously to walk in the steps of the faith and customs of the Universal Church.

5. But perhaps some one may say, "that the Fathers, both separately as individuals, and many of them conjointly, erred in various points of religion; and that they at times disagree among themselves, and that indeed, sometimes, on matters of great moment." These objections, I confess, against the ancient Fathers of the Church, and their authority in the settlement of ecclesiastical controversies, have been of late introduced. But whether they be true or false, is a point which we need not now discuss. For, even if we grant them true to the fullest extent, yet can no argument be drawn from them against our judgment concerning the *right use of the Fathers*. Inasmuch as we are speaking of the Fathers, not as individuals taken separately, but as taken all conjointly. And therefore how many errors soever may have been detected in one or more, and how much soever in some things, possibly, of great moment, they may even disagree with one another, or at least may appear to disagree, yet our position remains firm enough and stable, since there are certainly, after allowance made for them, many things, on which an agreement prevails among all the Fathers universally, and very many, to which a majority of them have given their united assent. But all the dissensions which have been raised among them on certain subjects, take nothing from their supreme authority on those points in which they agree, but rather in an eminent degree confirm it. For the fact, that in other things they have differed, most plainly manifests, that those things, on which they have agreed, they have handed down, not from any compact or agreement, not from any party formed, not from any communication of design, nor finally, from their own private opinions, but naked and unadulterated, as derived from the common and general interpretation and tradition of the Universal Church. And, indeed, although on certain less necessary points, as well of faith as of discipline, the ancient Fathers do in some little degree differ



one from another, yet that very many things have been received with the fullest agreement by all, is so clear, that we may judge of it with our own eyes. For there are many things which we see have been defined by the Universal Church in councils truly œcumenical, many things which have been approved by the consent of several, many things again by the consent of all the writers of the Church; many things, finally, concerning which there was in ancient times no controversy moved, some of this class have been mentioned by us above, to which very many others may be added. Those especially which, although not definitively prescribed in holy Scripture, have yet been retained by our very pious and prudent reformers of the English Church.

6. For when this our English Church, through long communion with the Roman Church, had contracted like stains with her, from which it was necessary that it should be cleansed, they who took that excellent and very necessary work in hand, fearing that they, like others, might rush from one extreme to the other, removed indeed those things, as well doctrines as ceremonies, which the Roman Church had newly and insensibly superinduced, and, as was fit, abrogated them utterly. Yet notwithstanding, whatsoever things had been, at all times, believed and observed, by all Churches, in all places, those things they most religiously took care not so to abolish with them. For they well knew, that all particular Churches are to be formed on the model of the Universal Church, if indeed, according to that general and received rule in ethics, "every part which agreeth not with its whole is therein base." Hence therefore these first reformers of this particular Church directed the whole line of that reformation, which they undertook, according to the rule of the whole or universal Church, casting away those things only which had been either unheard of, or rejected by, the Universal Church, but most religiously retaining those which they saw, on the other side, corroborated by the consent of the Universal Church. Whence it hath been brought to pass, that although we have not communion with the Roman, nor with certain other particular Churches, as at this day constituted, yet have we abiding communion with the

Universal and Catholic Church, of which evidently ours, as by the aid of God first constituted, and by his pity still preserved, is the perfect image and representation.

7. But, that we digress no further from our proposed object, when we are speaking of the *Universal* Church, and its agreement, without any doubt, regard is to be had especially to the *Primitive* Church: inasmuch as, although it be only a part of the whole, yet is it universally agreed that it was the more pure and genuine part. For the same hath happened to the Church, which hath happened to each several commonwealth, namely, that, ancient customs passing by degrees into disuse, new institutions are devised by the wanton imaginations of men's minds, which very fault is above all other to be eschewed in religion. For it is agreed among all Christians, that the Apostolic Church as constituted by the Apostles of our Lord in person, under the guidance of Divine inspiration, and by them whilst yet living administered, was of all Churches the purest and most perfect. Furthermore nothing seems more at variance with the common faith of Christians than that the doctrine or discipline instituted by the Apostles, should have been corrupted or any way changed by their immediate successors. For all confess, that the Apostles were most faithful men, and of consequence willed to ordain none as their successors, except those whose faith and integrity was fully approved by themselves personally. Therefore the first successors of the Apostles doubtless kept inviolate and uncorrupted the Church, whose government had been entrusted to them; and in like manner handed it down to their own successors, and these again to others, and so on; insomuch that there can exist no doubt, but that at least during two or three ages from the Apostles, the Church flourished in her primitive vigour, and, so to say, in her virgin estate, that is, in the same condition in which she had been left by the Apostles themselves; except that from time to time new heresies burst forth even in those days, by which the Church was indeed harassed, but in no way corrupted; clearly no more than the Church, strictly Apostolic, was perverted by those errors, which arose whilst the Apos-

ties were yet living. For they had scarcely time to rise up, before they were rejected by the Catholic Church. Which things therefore notwithstanding, the Universal Church which followed ever held that *Primitive Church* to be most pure, and, in refuting all heresies which afterwards arose, appealed to her as the rule of other Churches. For if any one endeavoured to bring any thing new into the doctrine or discipline of the Church, those Fathers who opposed themselves to him, whether individually or assembled together in a body, sought their arguments, as out of the holy Scriptures, so also out of the doctrines and traditions of the Church of the first ages. For this is observable in nearly all acts of councils, and commentaries of individual Fathers, wherever, that is, ecclesiastical controversies are discussed. And indeed nothing still is more rational, nothing certainly more desirable, than that all particular Churches at this day wherever constituted, were reformed after the model of the *Primitive Church*. For this measure would immediately cast forth whatever corruptions have crept in during later ages, and would restore to their ancient original, on the other hand, all things which are required for the true constitution of a Christian Church.

PATRICK, BISHOP.—*On Tradition.*

And farther we likewise acknowledge, that the sum and substance of the Christian Religion, contained in the Scriptures, hath been delivered down to us, even from the Apostles' days, in other ways or forms, besides the Scriptures. For instance, in the Baptismal Vow, in the Creed, in the Prayers and Hymns of the Church, which we may call Traditions, if we please; but they bring down to us no new Doctrine, but only deliver, in an abridgement, the same Christianity which we find in the Scriptures.

Upon this there is no need that I should enlarge; but I proceed farther to affirm,

That we reverently receive also the unanimous Tradition or Doctrine of the Church in all ages, which determines the meaning of the holy Scripture, and makes it more clear and unques-

tionable in any point of Faith, wherein we can find it hath declared its sense. For we look upon this Tradition as nothing else but the Scripture unfolded ; not a new thing, which is not in the Scripture ; but the Scripture explained and made more evident.

And thus some part of the Nicene Creed may be called a Tradition ; as it hath expressly delivered unto us the sense of the Church of God, concerning that great Article of our Faith, that *JESUS CHRIST* is the Son of God, which they teach us was always thus understood : the Son of God, “ begotten of his Father before all worlds, and of the same substance with the Father.”

But this Tradition supposes the Scripture for its ground, and delivers nothing but what the Fathers, assembled at Nice, believed to be contained there, and was first fetched from thence. For we find in Theodoret (L. i. 66.) that the famous Emperor Constantine, admonished those Fathers, in all their questions and debates, to consult only with these heavenly inspired writings ; “ because the Evangelical and Apostolical Books, and the oracles of the old Prophets, do evidently instruct us what to think in Divine matters.” This is so clear a testimony, that in those days they made this complete rule of their faith, whereby they ended controversies, (which was the reason that in several other Synods we find they were wont to lay the Bible before them,) and that there is nothing in the Nicene Creed, but what is to be found in the Bible ; that Cardinal Bellarmine hath nothing to reply to it, but this : “ Constantine was indeed a great Emperor, but no great Doctor.” Which is rather a scoff, than an answer ; and casts a scorn not only upon him but upon that great council, who, as the same Theodoret witnesseth, assented unto that speech of Constantine. So it there follows in these words : “ The most of the Synod were obedient to what he had discoursed, and embraced both mutual concord and sound doctrine.”

And accordingly St. Hilary a little after extols his son Constantius for this, that he adhered to the Scriptures ; and blames him only for not attending to the true Catholic sense of them. His words are these, (in his little Book which he delivered to Constantine) “ I truly admire thee, O Lord Constantius the Em-

peror, who desirest a Faith according to what is written." They pretended to no other in those days; but (as he speaks a little after) looked upon him that refused this, as Antichrist. It was only required that they should receive their Faith out of God's Books, not merely according to the words of them, but according to their true meaning, (because many "spake Scripture without Scripture, and pretended to Faith without Faith," as his words are); and herein Catholic and constant Tradition was to guide them. For whatsoever was contrary to what the whole Church had received and held from the beginning, could not in reason be thought to be the meaning of that Scripture which was alleged to prove it. And, on the other side, the Church pretended to no more than to be a witness of the received sense of the Scriptures; which were the bottom upon which they built this Faith.

Thus I observe Hegesippus saith, (in Euseb. his History, L. iv. c. 22.) that when he was at Rome, he met with a great many Bishops, and that "he received the very same Doctrine from them all." And then, a little after, tells us what that was, and whence they derived it, saying, "That in every succession of Bishops, and in every City, so they held; as the Law preached, and as the Prophets, and as the Lord." That is according to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament.

I shall conclude this particular with a pregnant passage which I remember in a famous Divine of our Church, (Dr. Jackson, in his Treatise of the Catholic Church, chap. 22,) who writes to this effect:—

That Tradition which was of so much use in the Primitive Church, was not unwritten Traditions or Customs, commended or ratified by the supposed infallibility of any visible Church, but did especially consist in the confessions or registers of particular Churches. And the unanimous consent of so many several Churches, as exhibited their confessions to the Nicene Council, out of such forms as had been framed and taught before this controversy arose, about the Divinity of Christ; and that voluntarily and freely (these Churches being not dependent one upon another, nor overpowered by any authority over them, nor misled by faction to frame their confessions of Faith by imitation, or ac-

ording to some pattern set them), was a pregnant argument, that this faith wherein they all agreed, had been delivered to them by the Apostles and their followers, and was the true meaning of the holy writings in this great Article; and evidently proved, that Arius did obtrude such interpretations of Scripture, as had not been heard of before; or were but the sense of some private persons in the Church, and not of the generality of believers.

In short the unanimous consent of so many distinct visible Churches, as exhibited their several Confessions, Catechisms, or Testimonies of their own or forefathers' Faith, unto the Council of Nice, was an argument of the same force and efficacy against Arius and his partakers, as the general consent and practice of all nations, in worshipping a Divine Power in all ages, is against Atheists. Nothing but the ingrafted notion of a Deity, could have induced so many several nations, so much different in natural disposition, in civil discipline and education, to affect or practise the duty of Adoration. And nothing but the evidence of "the ingrafted word" (as St. James calls the Gospel) delivered by CHRIST and his Apostles in the holy Scriptures, could have kept so many several Churches as communicated their confessions unto that Council, in the unity of the same Faith.

The like may be said of the rest of the four first General Councils; whose decrees are a great confirmation of our belief, because they deliver to us the consent of the Churches of Christ, in those great truths which they assert out of the holy Scriptures.

And could there any Traditive Interpretation of the whole Scripture be produced upon the authority of such original Tradition, as that now named, we would most thankfully and joyfully receive it. But there never was any such pretended; no, not by the Roman Church, whose Doctors differ among themselves about the meaning of hundreds of places in the Bible. Which they would not do sure, nor spend their time unprofitably in making the best conjectures they are able, if they knew of any exposition of those places in which all Christian Doctors had agreed from the beginning.

But more than this, we allow that Tradition gives us a consi-

derable assistance in such points as are not in so many letters and syllables contained in the Scriptures, but may be gathered from thence, by good and manifest reasoning. Or, in plainer words perhaps, whatsoever Tradition justifies any Doctrine that may be proved by the Scriptures, though not found in express terms there, we acknowledge to be of great use, and readily receive and follow it, as serving very much to establish us more firmly in that truth, when we see all Christians have adhered to it.

This may be called a confirming Tradition: of which we have an instance in the Doctrine of Infant Baptism, which some ancient Fathers call an Apostolical Tradition. Not that it cannot be proved by any place of Scripture; no such matter: for though we do not find it written in so many words that Infants are to be baptized, or that the Apostles baptised Infants: yet it may be proved out of the Scriptures; and the Fathers themselves, who call it an Apostolical Tradition, do allege testimonies of the Scriptures to make it good. And therefore we may be sure they comprehend the Scriptures within the name of Apostolical Tradition; and believed that this Doctrine was gathered out of the Scriptures, though not expressly treated of there.

In like manner we, in this Church, assert the authority of Bishops above Presbyters, by a Divine right; as appears by the Book of Consecration of Bishops, where the person to be ordained to this office, expresses his belief "that he is truly called to this Ministration according to the will of our LORD JESUS CHRIST." Now this we are persuaded may be plainly enough proved to any man that is ingenuous, and will fairly consider things, out of the holy Scriptures, without the help of Tradition: but we also take in the assistance of this for the conviction of gainsayers; and by the perpetual practice and Tradition of the Church from the beginning confirm our Scripture proofs so strongly, that he seems to us very obstinate, or extremely prejudiced, that yields not to them. And therefore to make our Doctrine in this point the more authentic, our Church hath put both these proofs together, in the preface to the form of giving orders, which begins in these words: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scrip-

ture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

I hope no body among us is so weak, as to imagine, when he reads this, that by admitting Tradition to be of such use and force as I have mentioned, we yield too much to the Popish cause, which supports itself by this pretence. But if any one shall suggest this to any of our people, let them reply, that it is but the pretence, and only by the name of Tradition, that the Romish Church supports itself: For true Tradition is as great a proof against Popery, as it is for Episcopacy. The very foundation of the Pope's Empire (which is his succession in St. Peter's Supremacy) is utterly subverted by this; the constant Tradition of the Church being evidently against it. And therefore let us not lose this advantage we have against them, by ignorantly refusing to receive true and constant Tradition; which will be so far from leading us into their Church, that it will never suffer us to think of being of it, while it remains so opposite to that which is truly Apostolical.

I conclude this with the direction which our Church gives to Preachers in the Book of Canons, 1571, (in the Title *Concionatores*.) That "no man shall teach the people any thing to be held and believed by them religiously, but what is consentaneous to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament; and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have gathered out of that very doctrine." This is our Rule whereby we are to guide ourselves; which was set us on purpose to preserve our Preachers from broaching any idle, novel, or Popish Doctrines; as appears by the conclusion of that injunction: "vain and old wives' opinions, and Heresies, and Popish Errors, abhorring from the Doctrine and Faith of CHRIST, they shall not teach; nor any thing at all whereby the unskilful multitude may be inflamed either to the study of novelty, or to contention."

But though nothing may be taught as a piece of Religion, which hath not the fore-named original, yet I must add, that those things which have been universally believed, and not contrary to Scripture, though not written at all there, nor to be



proved from thence, we do receive as pious opinions. For instance, the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of GOD our SAVIOUR, which is so likely a thing, and so universally received, that I do not see why we should not look upon it as a genuine Apostolical Tradition.

I have but one thing more to add, which is, that we allow also the Traditions of the Church, about matters of Order, Rites, and Ceremonies. Only we do not take them to be parts of GOD's worship; and if they be not appointed in the holy Scriptures, we believe they may be altered by the same or the like authority with that which ordained them.—

As for what is delivered in matters of Doctrine, or Order, by any private Doctor in the Church, or by any particular Church, it appears by what hath been said, that it cannot be taken to be more than the private opinion of that man, or the particular decree of that Church, and can have no more authority than they have: that is, cannot oblige all Christians, unless it be contained in the holy Scripture.

Now such are the Traditions which the Roman Church would impose upon us, and impose upon us after a strange fashion.—

Our people may hereby be admonished not to suffer themselves to be deceived and abused by words and empty names, without their sense and meaning. Nothing is more common than this, especially in the business of Traditions, about which a stir is raised, and it is commonly given out, that we refuse all Traditions. Than which nothing is more false, for we refuse none truly so called; that is, Doctrine delivered by CHRIST, or His Apostles. No, we refuse nothing at all, because it is unwritten, but merely because we are not sure it is delivered by that authority to which we ought to submit.

Whatsoever is delivered to us by our LORD and His Apostles, we receive as the very word of GOD, which we think is sufficiently declared in the holy Scriptures. But if any can certainly prove, by any authority equal to that which brings the Scriptures to us, that there is any thing else delivered by them, we receive that also. The controversy will soon be at an end, for we are ready to embrace it when any such thing can be produced.

Nay, we have that reverence for those who succeeded the Apostles, that what they have unanimously delivered to us, as the sense of any doubtful place, we receive it, and seek no farther. There is no dispute whether or no we should entertain it.

To the Decrees of the Church also we submit in matters of Decency and Order; yea, and acquiesce in its authority, when it determines doubtful opinions.

But we cannot receive that as a Doctrine of CHRIST, which we know is but the tradition of man, nor keep the ordinances of the ancient Church in matters of decency, so unalterably as never to vary from them, because they themselves did not intend them to be of everlasting obligation. As appears by the changes that have been made in several times and places; even in some things which are mentioned in the holy Scriptures, being but customs suited to those ages and countries.

In short, Traditions we do receive, but not all that are called by that name. Those which have sufficient authority, but not those which are imposed upon us, by the sole authority of one particular Church, assuming a power over all the rest.—

It is a calumny to affirm, that the Church of England rejects all tradition, and I hope none of her true children are so ignorant, as when they hear that word, to imagine they must rise up and oppose it. No, the Scripture itself is a tradition; and we admit all other traditions which are subordinate, and agreeable unto that; together with all those things which can be proved to be Apostolical by the general testimony of the Church in all ages: nay, if any thing not contained in Scripture, which the Roman Church now pretends to be a part of God's word, were delivered to us by as universal uncontrolled tradition as the Scripture is, we should receive it as we do the Scripture.

But it appears plainly that such things were at first but private opinions, which now are become the doctrines of that particular Church, who would impose her decrees upon us under the venerable name of Apostolical universal tradition; which I have shown you hath been an ancient cheat, and that we ought not to be so easy as to be deceived by it. But to be very wary,

and afraid of trusting the traditions of such a Church, as hath not only perverted some, abolished others, and pretended them where there hath been none; but been a very unfaithful preserver of them, and that in matters of great moment, where there were some; and lastly, warrants those which it pretends to have kept, by nothing but its own infallibility. For which there is no tradition, but much against it, even in the original tradition, the Holy Scriptures; which plainly suppose the Roman Church may not only err, but utterly fail and be cut off from the Body of CHRIST; as they that please may read, who will consult the eleventh chapter to the Romans, v. 20, 21, 22. Of which they are in the greater danger, because they proudly claim so high a prerogative as that now mentioned, directly contrary to the Apostolical admonition in that place: "be not high-minded, but fear."—pp. 11. 16. 32.

SHARPE, ARCHBISHOP.—*Sermons.*

We see from hence how groundlessly, how unreasonably, we Protestants are charged with Heresy by our adversaries. They make no scruple of calling us Heretics, and telling us we shall be damned upon that account, unless we come over to their Belief. Why, what is it they would have us believe? We believe all that JESUS CHRIST and His Apostles taught to the world, so far as we have knowledge of it. We believe all the holy Scriptures, and not only so, but we make them the rule of our Faith. We believe all those articles of Faith, into which all Christians in every country, from CHRIST's time to this, have been baptized, and which by all the ancients have been accounted a perfect summary of the Christian Faith; nor do we hold any thing inconsistent with them. We own both CHRIST's Sacraments; and we administer them entirely. We renounce all the Heresies that were condemned by the ancient general Councils; nay, we are ready to refer ourselves to those Councils, and to the primitive Fathers who lived at that time, for the trial of all the points which are disputed between us. And lastly, we are sure we are not obstinate in our errors, if they should prove so; we are sure

we have no secular ends to serve in the maintaining them ; and most of all sure we are, that we are not self-condemned, that our own conscience doth not accuse us for being of this way ; (which yet is one of those things that go to the making of an Heretic). Now if all these things can be truly said of us, (as I think they may be truly said of the Church of England, and of all the honest members of it) how is it possible that we can in any sense be guilty of Heresy ? In the sense of the Scriptures and of the Fathers I am sure we are orthodox Christians ; and in the sense of the greatest Divines, even in the Roman Communion, I am sure we are no Heretics. And if after all that, we must be branded with that name, all that we can say is, that “after the way which they call Heresy, so worship we the God of our Fathers.”—Vol. vi. p. 5.

*Ibid.*

We do not find, that in the controversies which arose in the ancient Church about matters of Faith, the guides of the Church ever made use of this argument of the Church's infallibility for the quieting and ending of them : which yet, had they known of any such thing, had been the properest and the easiest means they could have used. Nay further we know, that the ancient Fathers had another method of confuting Heretics and Schismatics than by appealing to the Church's infallibility : namely, by bringing their doctrines to be tried by the ancient usages and doctrines of the Apostolic Churches, and especially by the Divine oracles of Scripture, which they looked upon as the entire and only Rule of Faith.—Vol. vii. p. 61.

POTTER, ARCHBISHOP.—*Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford.*

To begin with Faith, the foundation of all other Christian duties. You cannot be ignorant, what attempts have lately been made, and are still daily further advancing, to destroy some of the principal doctrines, not of ours only, but of the Catholic Church in all ages ; and I wish I could not say, to weaken and

undermine all the rest: "these things have not been done in a corner."

Great industry hath been used, and that with too much success, to revive the Arian and Semi-arian Heresies; and with the professors thereof to unite almost all other sects of Christians, however they may differ from one another as to opinion, in the same visible Communion. So that instead of rejecting those, who deprave the Christian Faith, as St. Paul commands; or, in obedience to St. John, of refusing even to "receive them into our houses," or to "bid them God speed;" should this design prevail, we must pray with them, and partake with them of the LORD'S Table, and associate together in all other parts of religious worship; and those alone will be reputed Schismatics, who separate themselves from the Communion of Heretics.

Some have so far proceeded in this scheme of general comprehension, or rather confusion, as to assert, that all sorts of error, except those which immediately relate to practice, are innocent and unblameable. With these men one may, perhaps, deserve the name of an Heretic, who outwardly professeth something he inwardly disbelieves, and in that sense condemns himself: but in any other case, besides this of acting directly against the dictates of conscience, under which it is on all hands confessed to be a fault to defend the truth itself, they plainly intimate, that there is no harm in maintaining even the doctrine of Mahomet, or any other, though ever so opposite to the Christian Revelation. We must not, therefore, wonder to hear it affirmed, that in order to be justified before God, there is no need of anything more, than to act agreeably to our present inward persuasion, or in other terms, with sincerity; or, that equal degrees of this quality will in all cases (for I find no exception made) entitle men to equal degrees of Divine favour: whence it follows, that they who denied, or even crucified our SAVIOUR, provided they did it without remorse or hesitation, might deserve an equal reward with those, who are martyrs for Him.

We have been accustomed, and this agreeably to the judgment of all other Churches, and the most evident principles both of

Natural and Revealed Religion, to think it the duty of Christian princes to maintain God's true Religion and virtue; and the Church, our Mother, hath taught us in the Communion office to pray, that all in authority under them may do the same. Now, if by God's true Religion nothing be meant, but that moral virtue, from which it is plainly distinguished in this place, then our new masters may still perhaps allow the magistrate to execute this part of his office; but, if God's true Religion signifies that, which it always hath signified among Christians, the worship of One True God, as opposed to that of idols and false gods, or the way of worship prescribed in the Holy Scripture, in opposition to Heathenish, and other superstitions; or, if God's true Religion be understood to imply the belief of Three Persons in one Godhead, of the Incarnation, sufferings, and satisfaction of CHRIST, of the Resurrection of the Body, or of any other doctrine ever so plainly revealed by God; then it is openly declared, that for Christian magistrates to discourage false Religion, even in the least degree, or to favour and encourage that which is true, is to do something highly inconsistent both with the nature and ends of their own authority, and with the kingdom of CHRIST.

This may seem strange doctrine in a Christian country: but, since the Faith was for several ages maintained without the favour or protection of the civil magistrate, they, who advance these and the like novel opinions, may perhaps be thought more excusable, if they endeavour to recompense for the loss of these temporal advantages by their hearty concern and just zeal for that spiritual power, which our LORD hath left in His Church. But, instead of this, these men describe the Church, rather as a number of persons disunited from, and independent on one another, than as an orderly society under lawful governors of Divine, or necessary appointment; and thus root up, as far as in them lieth, the very foundation of all Ecclesiastical authority at once. It might easily be shown, how by the schemes lately published, every branch of this authority hath been very much weakened and impaired; or, rather, totally subverted and destroyed: but I shall confine myself to the subject, of which I have been

chiefly speaking, viz. the Christian Faith; in things relating to which, it hath been thought, not only highly inconvenient, but absurd and impracticable for the Church to have any sort of authority whatsoever. Our own Church, indeed, in her twentieth article hath expressly declared, that the Church hath authority in controversies of Faith; and therefore some of them, who do not approve this passage, have taken great pains to persuade the world, that it was not originally in the article, but inserted there by some, who affected more power, than of right belonged to them: but this attempt not succeeding according to their desires, the rest always speak of it with such reservations and evasions, as plainly show they heartily wish it were quite expunged. One of the chief causes of their complaint, is the obliging men to declare their assent to human decisions, as they are called; that is, to articles of Faith, or doctrines, which however clearly deduced from the Holy Scriptures, are not found there in express words. For, when "unlearned and unstable" men, to use the words of St. Peter, "wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction," it was always customary, even from the most primitive ages, for the Church, in order to prevent the spreading of such infections, to require her members, especially such of them as had been distinguished by any public character, to make an open and solemn confession of their Faith; not in the very words of Holy Scripture, which had been perverted and misunderstood, because that would have been ineffectual to the purpose intended; but in others more fully, and distinctly setting forth the true sense and interpretation of those words. With this view it was, that the Fathers of Nice inserted into their Creed those clauses, which declare the true Divinity of our Blessed Lord, against Arius; that not long after, in opposition to the Heresy of Macedonius, others were added by the general Council of Constantinople, to assert the Divinity of the Holy Spirit; and that in the next century, though no further change was made in the Creed, other declarations of the true Faith, concerning the Incarnation of CHRIST, and the Personal Union of His two Natures, were composed by general Synods assembled at Ephesus and Chalcedon, when the two opposite Heresies of

Nestorius and Eutyches first showed themselves in the world. In these later times, indeed, this authority hath been very much abused; instead of articles of Faith, men have been compelled to declare their assent, not only to disputable opinions, but to such, as are evidently contrary, as well to the principles of natural reason, as to the Holy Scriptures, and the doctrine of the best ages; and those worthy men, whom God endued with power from on high, to withstand these unjust impositions, have been exposed to so many and great trials, as even the first Christians endured in the Heathen persecutions. These practices, together with the principles from which they proceed, can hardly be too much detested: but shall we then, instead of reforming these or the like abuses, quite discard that sacred authority which hath been abused? . . .

But I am in hopes, that in the opinion of every true son of this Church, it will be a sufficient confutation of all innovations, which have been, or hereafter shall be, advanced, to say with St. Paul, "we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God;" or, in the words of our Blessed LORD, "from the beginning it was not so." To become the author of new Hypotheses in Religion, or to call those doctrines into question, which have always been firmly believed in the Church, even from the most early ages to our times, savours more of the pride and arrogance of some vain-glorious philosopher, who by making strange discoveries, and contradicting the rest of the world, seeks to raise in others a great esteem of himself, than of the humility of a good Christian; whose chief glory consists in the entire resignation of his understanding, and the stedfast belief of all the truths, which God hath revealed to him, whether he doth, or doth not, clearly comprehend them. I speak not of improvements in the liberal arts and sciences; which had their rise from study and observation, and therefore must be advanced, and perfected in the same method: whereas the Christian Religion having been completely published to the world by our Blessed LORD, and His Apostles, no addition can be made to it without a new Revelation. Here, then, is no room for invention or discovery; but, on the contrary, if any doctrine be new, if it be not truly primitive and



Apostolical, we may, safely, without further examination, reject it as false and spurious, and no part of "the Faith once delivered to the Saints." Whence our best writers, as well in their controversies with the Papists, as with other Sectaries and Heretics, constantly appeal to the judgment and practice of the Church in the next centuries after the Apostles: which as she had better means of information, than can be pretended to in any succeeding age, so cannot reasonably be supposed, either through negligence or design, and this, in all parts of the world at once, to have depraved the Faith, whilst her Pastors, and other chief members, were daily suffering martyrdom in its defence: and few there are, or rather none at all, as far as I have been able to observe, who refuse to allow the testimony of the primitive writers its due weight and authority, such only excepted, as have not read them, or are afraid of their evidence, and, therefore, in order to divert us from the true sense of the Holy Scriptures, (in discovering which those interpreters have commonly the best success, who most carefully compare them with other books of the same or the next ages, as the best critics always do in explaining other authors) would strictly confine us to the mere words, because these alone, and unsupported, may more easily be forced to countenance their innovations.—*Works*, vol. i. pp. 283. 296.

*Defence of the Charge.*

There is not, therefore, the least ground to think, that the practice of the Church in this respect is contrary to Scripture. Let us now see, whether this writer hath succeeded better in another accusation he hath brought against it, viz. that it is Popish. I have allowed that this practice hath been abused to very ill ends by the Church of Rome; which, instead of explaining the true sense of Scripture, hath invented and imposed new Articles of Faith, contrary both to Scripture and reason. Which doth by no means satisfy this writer, who will, therefore, have the practice itself to be Popish; for unless he means this, he would, instead of contradicting me, say only the same thing I have done before. He pretends, that "by this engine it was that

step by step came on the claim of Infallibility." (p. 252.) Whereby if he understands that the authority of the Church was through the ambition of some men, and the negligence of others, so far by degrees increased and abused, that at length a claim of Infallibility was set up, he affirms nothing more than what I have allowed, that this authority hath been much abused; but then I must still put him in mind, that the abuse of authority in one age is no just ground for laying it aside in another. But if he would have it thought that the claim of Infallibility is a certain or necessary concomitant, or consequent, of this authority as exercised at the Council of Nice, or the other general councils mentioned by me, he must pardon me if this be not granted; for there is nothing more evident in History, than that no such authority was either then, or for many hundred years after claimed by any person in the world. Nay, so far was anything done in these councils from giving birth to the exorbitant power of the Pope, who claims this Infallibility, that the popish writers have never been able to prove, that in several of them he was allowed so much as to preside; and even in the last of them, that at Chalcedon, the See of Constantinople was, notwithstanding the warm and earnest opposition of the Pope's Legates, put upon the level with that of Rome, agreeably to what had been before decreed at Constantinople in the second General Council. These councils, therefore, are so many plain proofs against the Pope's authority, and are commonly insisted on as such by the Protestant writers. Neither doth it appear, that any authority was there exercised in relation to the interpretation of Scripture, which is not exercised or approved by the Church of England and other Protestant Churches: for in these there are Creeds, or Confessions of Faith; and such as reject any of the principal Articles of these Creeds, or Confessions, are commonly debarred both from Holy Orders, and also from Communion. This, therefore, having been the practice of Protestant Churches, and particularly of the Church of England, ever since the Reformation, which cannot be questioned, will, I hope, be excused from the imputation of serving the popish claim of Infallibility; unless it can be supposed, that the Protestant Churches, and this, from the very

beginning, have generally so far misunderstood, or acted inconsistently with their own principles, as to retain the very essence of popery. But to give some show or colour of popery to the practice of which I have been speaking, this writer hath filled his discourse with long and heavy complaints of the injustice of denying Christians the liberty of examining, and judging for themselves; in which unfair proceeding of his, I desire leave once more to say, that I am no farther concerned than the body of Protestants; who, as they invite men to read the Scriptures, and to see with their own eyes, so have never denied the Church authority to judge what persons are qualified for her Communion and for Holy Orders.

I must not forget under this head, that I am again charged not only with favouring Popery, but with being a Papist in disguise, with "acknowledging the Protestant principles for decency sake, but steadfastly adhering to the Popish" (p. 275), and all this, as it seems, for having referred you to the practice and writers of the Primitive times, and of the next ages after the Apostles; whereby I am represented to understand the reign of Constantine, which happened, as he saith (pp. 270—274.), almost three hundred years after. Now I am not in the least apprehensive of my being suspected as a favourer of Popery by any man, who knows the true meaning of Popery; but sure it is such a compliment to the Popish Religion, as no Protestant would have made, who understands his own principles, to date its rise from the time of Constantine; the claim of Infallibility, and of the Papal Supremacy, as now exercised, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, Image Worship, Prayers in an unknown tongue, forbidding laymen to read the Scriptures, to say nothing of other peculiar tenets of the Church of Rome, having never been heard of during the reign of this great Emperor, or for a long time after; as a very little insight into the Popish Controversies, or Ecclesiastical Historians, would have informed this writer. It would have been much more to his purpose, and equally consistent with truth and justice, to have told his readers that by the next ages after the Apostles, I meant the times immediately preceding the Reformation: but then one oppor-

tunity would have been lost of declaiming against the times wherein the Nicene Creed was composed, and Arianism condemned. As to the primitive writers I am not ashamed, or afraid to repeat, that the best method of interpreting Scripture seems to me to be the having recourse to the writers, who lived nearest the time wherein the Scriptures were first published, that is, to the next ages after the Apostles; and that a diligent inquiry into the Faith and practice of the Church in the same ages, would be the most effectual way, next after the study of the Scriptures themselves, to prevent innovations in doctrine; and, lastly, that this hath been practised with great success by some of our best advocates for the Protestant cause, as Bishop Jewel, for example, Archbishop Laud, Archbishop Ussher, Bishop Cosins, Bishop Stillingfleet, Dr. Barrow, Bishop Bull, with many others at home and abroad. To which it will be replied: That "our best writers, at least, in their controversies with the Papists, are so far from appealing to the judgment of the Church in the next centuries after the Apostles, in any such sense as the Bishop is arguing for against his adversaries; that the very best of them, Mr. Chillingworth, has declared upon the most mature consideration, how uncertain generally, how self-contradictory sometimes, how insufficient always he esteemed this judgment to be. He had seen Fathers against Fathers, Councils against Councils, the consent of one age against the consent of another; the same Fathers contradicting themselves, and the like, and he found no rest but in the Protestant Rule of Faith. He was willing to yield to every thing as truth, *Quod semper, ubique et ab omnibus*; because he well judged that nothing could be conceived to be embraced as truth at the very beginning, and so continue in all places, and at all times, but what was delivered at the beginning. But he saw, with respect to some controverted points, how early the difference of sentiment was." (p. 265. 266.) In answer to this, I shall not take upon me to determine what rank Mr. Chillingworth ought to bear among the Protestant writers; it being sufficient for my purpose, that many others, and those of chief note for learning and judgment, in their controversies with the Papists and others, have appealed, and this in the manner I have

recommended, to the Primitive writers, as every one may soon learn who will take the pains to look into their books. In the next place, it appears from this very passage of Mr. Chillingworth, as here represented, that this design was to prevent appealing to Fathers and Councils as a Rule of Faith; agreeably whereunto I have all along declared, that, in my opinion, the Scripture is the only Rule of Faith, and have no farther recommended the study of the Primitive writers, than as the best method of discovering the true sense of Scripture. In the third place, here is nothing expressly said by Mr. Chillingworth of the most Primitive writers or Councils, or of any who lived in the next ages after the Apostles; but he may very well be understood, notwithstanding any thing here produced, of those latter ages, wherein both Fathers and Councils degenerated from the Faith and doctrine of those who went before them; which is the more likely, because mention here follows of the Article which divided the Greeks from the Roman Communion; this having not been openly disputed before the seventh century. Fourthly, he is introduced as speaking in express terms of controverted points, but saying nothing of any principal point of Faith, nothing of any Article which was originally in the Nicene Creed. On the contrary it may be observed, in the last place, that he plainly speaks of doctrines received by the Church in all places and at all times, even from the very beginning, which, for that reason, he presumed not to reject. Now it cannot possibly be known what these are, without having recourse to the writers of the Primitive ages. So that, upon the whole, the method I have recommended is so far from being contradicted, that it is rather enforced by what this writer hath cited from Mr. Chillingworth.—p. 358.

GRABE, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Præfat. in Spicileg.*

It is the contempt of the Ecclesiastical Tradition, reaching down from the Apostolic age to our own, which causes Christians who are called to one Faith and to one hope, to split into various sects; each of which professes Scripture for its Rule of Faith, but bends our Lord's declarations to its private likings and

wishes, and refuses communion to all who differ from it, depriving them of all privileges, bodily and spiritual. On one side upon Traditions truly Catholic and Apostolic, are superadded new opinions and superstitions which falsely pretend to the name; on the other that is torn away, overlooked, nay, sometimes rejected which has been believed and practised in the Church always, everywhere, and by all, and for this sole reason, because it is inconsistent with the new decrees and determinations, or altogether hostile to them.—Meanwhile, till public peace is restored to the world, we must see to our own private peace and safety, lest we be involved in the aforementioned evils, and perish in the ruin of others. We shall escape this mischief if we build ourselves up upon the faith once delivered to the Saints, and best unfolded in the writings of the ancient Fathers, not admitting aught which beyond or against it be latterly added, uncertain, false, vain, superstitious, idolatrous, nor agreeing with those who detract from the traditions of the Catholic Church, and contentiously revile the most ancient doctrine and discipline, nay, those who do not obey it with their whole heart.

*Id.—De forma Consecrationis Eucharistiæ.*

The form of consecration and opinion of the consecrated elements, in which both Catholics and Heretics, in the age immediately succeeding the holy Apostles, have agreed together, and which, ever since, has been kept in all ancient Churches, and is by some of the Fathers expressly reckoned amongst the unwritten apostolical traditions, and is moreover hinted at in the very writings of the New Testament, cometh undoubtedly from the Apostles, if not from our LORD himself, and ought, therefore, by no means to be changed, otherwise it will make the consecration doubtful, or at least unlawful for them that understand this matter. It is, therefore, an indispensable duty incumbent upon every Christian Church, and every priest in it, strictly to keep to the same matter and form, which our LORD JESUS CHRIST and his holy Apostles have used in the first institution and celebration of this sacred mystery, and to do in and with it what these have done, lest if they diminish or take aught off it, they

should lose either the substance or the benefit of this most holy Sacrament, and consequently, if through ignorance or mistake a fault or defect hath happened any where in these things, it is the bounden duty of the bishops and priests of that Church to rectify the same, the received customs and human laws notwithstanding; and of every one who, by reading the holy Scriptures and writings of the ancient Apostolical Fathers, is come to the knowledge of such fault or defect, to put them in mind of it, and to shew the same in order that it may be amended, since every one who knoweth the truth and doth not declare it, shall be judged by the LORD on the last day.—p. 75. 84.

BRETT, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*On Tradition.*

Since then the will of GOD being once revealed, is to be known afterwards by tradition only, it behoves us to inquire how we may be satisfied that this tradition does not deceive us: for it is a general opinion here that tradition is very deceitful and not at all to be relied upon; and I do readily grant that mere oral tradition delivered from father to son, corroborated by no written evidence, is by no means to be relied upon for any long succession. And, therefore, we find that no nation or country, can give any tolerably satisfactory account of the state and condition of their ancestors, before they come to have the use of letters amongst them, by which their manners, laws, customs, and acts, might be transmitted to posterity. But this is no argument against such a tradition as is delivered or corroborated by written evidence, of such things, and in such manner, as we cannot think ourselves deceived by it. All our knowledge of laws, customs, and facts, which we are not ourselves eye-witnesses of, must be delivered to us by evidence, such as we have reason to believe, and we have no other way of coming to the knowledge of them. Now we could not be eye-witnesses of what happened before we were born, therefore, we must either say that we can come to the true knowledge of nothing which happened before we were born, which I think none but downright Sceptics will pretend to say, or else that we must believe

such tradition as deserves the name of a just and proper evidence; and I conceive that to be just and proper evidence, which we receive from those who could not be themselves deceived in what they relate, nor could have any design or purpose to deceive us in the relation, but on the contrary, must have exposed themselves to all their contemporaries, if they had given a wrong account of those matters. Therefore when an author of credit speaks of the customs or practice of the Church at a time when he lived, we have all the reason imaginable to believe him; for in that case it is certain he could not be deceived himself, neither could he write what was false in such a case without exposing himself to all that were living at that time. Thus for instance, if any one at this time should tell the world, that it is the custom or practice of the Church of England to carry the Host or consecrated Eucharistical Bread in a solemn procession, as they do in the Church of Rome, he must expose himself as a shameless liar, and could never be esteemed an author of any credit, because every man now living in England would know the thing to be false. Nay, if he should say that this was the practice in this realm an hundred and fifty years ago, or any time since the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, every Englishman would know it to be false, though there is no man now living that can remember what was done in her reign. And the like may be said with regard to any other public part of Divine worship. No man can impose upon the world so far, as to make them believe that any thing is a public practice, which he himself does not know, or see to be so. And though a man might possibly put upon a stranger, who may be supposed ignorant of the customs of the people, to whom he is a stranger; yet he that had the least value for his own reputation, would not dare to do this to a stranger living among the people of whose customs he pretends to give him an account, especially, if by that account he hopes to obtain a favour from that stranger, and may have just apprehensions of suffering through the displeasure of that stranger, if he should go about to deceive him. We may therefore be satisfied that St. Barnabas, for instance, would not have told the Jews that God had



appointed us to keep holy the eighth day, or first day of the week, in memory of CHRIST'S resurrection, and abolished the observation of the Sabbath day, if the Apostles had not taught this as the will of GOD: for he could not be deceived in this matter himself, being a companion of the Apostles, and well acquainted with the doctrine which they taught. Neither could he, if he would, put a deceit in this case upon any others, because all the Christians then living could have refuted him if he had uttered a falsehood in this particular. Therefore, though we do not place his Epistle among the inspired writings, yet we cannot question his evidence as to this matter. And the same may be said of Justin Martyr; if he had told the Emperors any falsehood with relation to the practice of the Christians, it was impossible but they must easily have discovered it, not a Christian then living but must have known it to be a falsehood, if it had been so; consequently he would not only have exposed himself as a shameless liar, but would likewise have made himself liable to the just displeasure of the Emperors, if he had not spoke the truth: nay, if any thing that he told the Emperors had been a new practice, and such as had not been the constant practice of the Christian Church from the beginning, he durst not have pleaded in behalf of such a practice as a Christian institution, for which so many Christians then living could have convicted him of falsehood, it being but forty years from the death of the Apostles when he wrote, and many of the Apostles' disciples who learned the Christian institutions immediately from them, being then alive. Justin then could not be deceived himself with regard to the Christian institutions, since he had opportunity of informing himself from the immediate disciples of the Apostles, and he durst not pretend to impose upon the Emperors, nor could have any interest either to write a false relation to them, or to put a cheat upon those that should come after. Therefore what we find to have been delivered as a custom of the Church, by St. Barnabas, or St. Justin, or any writers contemporary to them, that we firmly believe to have been of Apostolical institution. And we may say the same also of those that fol-

lowed them for one hundred and fifty years after the Apostles, such as Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, and their contemporaries, who could no more be put upon, and made to believe that any thing was an Apostolical institution, and publicly practised by the whole Church, than any man of sense and learning could now be put upon, and made to believe that such a thing (though really it was not so) was established here at the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth, and had continued to be the practice of the English Church ever since. And the same may be said if we add fifty or sixty years more to the account, which brings us down to the time of the Council of Nice. A Christian Synod could no more be deceived at that time in declaring the doctrine and practice taught and practised by the Apostles, than a bench of English Judges could be deceived in any law or custom which should be pretended to have been begun here in the reign of King Henry VII. And, therefore, where we have the declaration of that Council, or of any authors contemporary with it, or with any members of it, I conceive we may very reasonably depend upon their testimony for the truth of an Apostolical tradition. The testimony of the Church, therefore, is thus far at least to be esteemed a certain evidence of Divine or Apostolical institutions, and hitherto we may safely follow it without danger of being led into error by so doing; and that which may confirm us that hitherto the Church had not been deceived with regard to Apostolical institutions and practices is, her unanimity in those matters. Whatever was held as derived from Apostolic authority by one Church, was esteemed as such also by all other Churches, which could not have been if there had been a failure in the tradition; for error is various, and all Churches from East to West, from North to South, from one end of the world to another, could never have agreed in an erroneous tradition. Therefore where we find all Churches agreed in the same doctrines and forms of worship, and we are not able to trace the beginning of them, we may safely conclude that they are derived to us from the Apostles: for this is the rule laid down by St. Austin on this occasion: "what-

soever the universal Church holdeth, and which was not instituted by any Council, but has been always observed, that we most rightly conclude to have been a tradition derived from Apostolical authority." And in another place he says, "many things which are not to be found in their writings," (that is, in the writings of the Apostles) "nor in the Councils of later ages, yet because they are observed by the whole Church, are believed not to have been delivered or recommended by any authority but of them." Again, says he, "there are many things which the universal Church holds, and which for this reason are rightly believed to be commanded by the Apostles, although they are not found written." But it is to be observed, that it is only such traditions as have been held by the universal Church in all ages, and all places, such as we can trace up to the Apostolical age, and have the evidence of some of the Fathers, who living either in the Apostolical times, or so near to them, that they could not but distinguish between Apostolical traditions and later institutions, have given their testimony concerning. And therefore we justly reject the doctrine of purgatory, invocation of Saints, worship of relics and images, and other corrupt traditions of the Church of Rome, because we cannot find any evidence for their universality and antiquity. We can trace the original of all of them, and find them many years later than the times of the Apostles: but on the contrary we find the doctrines and customs of the ages nearest to the Apostles to be directly opposite to these modern traditions. It is not then every tradition that lays an obligation upon Christians, but only such traditions as we have good evidence to believe to have been derived from the Apostles, that is, the testimony of those who lived either in the Apostles' age, or so near to it, that they could not easily be imposed upon in this case, and made to believe that to be of Apostolical tradition which really was not so, that is to say, about the time of the Council of Nice, about two hundred years after the Apostolical age. And we may also believe the testimony of those who lived in the century following that Council, since in that time they could not be deceived in the tradition of what was acknowledged at the time of that Council to be Apostolical. But there

is no better rule for the judging concerning the authority of tradition, than that which is given by Vincentius Lirinensis in the beginning of his Commonitory.—§ ix. pp. 35—42.

*Ibid.—Introduction to the Independency of the Church.*

If any other matters not yet received or practised in our Church, should be found to be of equal Antiquity and Universality, I declare it to be my hearty desire that they also may be restored: for I am well assured, that from the beginning of the Gospel of Christ to the time of the Council of Nice, and long after during the fourth century, the Catholic Church all over the world was united in one holy doctrine, discipline, and manner of worship.—The practice of the Church therefore at the time of the Council of Nice is certainly best fitted to be the standard for every reformation of the Church.—Since then we have seen and experienced the folly of deviating so far from the Primitive plan to gain those who cannot be gained by any thing but the utter extirpation of Episcopacy and Liturgy, and all that is not according to their own novel fancies, why should we not entirely restore our Liturgy to the Primitive standard, and revive those usages,—by returning to which we shall plainly lead the van for the introduction of Catholic unity into the Church of Christ. For we shall then want nothing (as we now most certainly do) that is agreeable to the practice of the Primitive Church, when a Catholic uniformity was universally preserved.—The only means to remove this disunion, is by every Church returning to a closer union with the Primitive Church in doctrine, discipline, and worship: for as the church never was so strictly and firmly united as in the Primitive times, and particularly about the time when the Council of Nice was celebrated:—so if ever the Church be as firmly united again, it must be upon the same principles, and practices. The Church never was united but upon the principles and usages which obtained at the time of the Nicene Council: and we have therefore good reason to believe that it never can be united but upon those principles and usages. That Church then, which shall first restore all those principles and

usages, may be justly said to lead the way to Catholic Union.—  
p. 7—10.

HICKS, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Sermons*, No. 3.

But if any modern writer who is of yesterday, will otherwise interpret these words upon his own head, I will reply unto him what our late blessed Sovereign, the Martyr for the Apostolical Government, said unto Mr. Henderson in his second paper, “If the practice of the primitive Church (saith he) and the universal consent of the Fathers be not a convincing argument, when the interpretation of Scripture is doubtful, I know nothing.” And elsewhere; “Although I never esteemed any argument equal to the Scriptures, yet I do think the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the universal practice of the primitive Church to be the best, and most authentical interpreters of God’s word; and consequently the fittest judges between me and you, till you find me a better.” According to what St. Augustin said of Infant Baptism, but may with much more reason be said of Episcopal Government, that which the Universal Church doth hold, and was never instituted by Councils, but hath always been retained in the Church, we most justly believe to have descended from no authority but the Apostles’.—Vol. iii. p. 82.

COLLIER, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Vindication of the reasons and defence.*

I desire to know, what authority any particular society of Christians of the sixteenth century had to desert from the custom of the Universal Church, from early and more enlightened ages, and which, as our author observes, were better *guides, as being much nearer the fountain’s head*, than those so long behind them. And if they had no good warrant for stepping out of the old paths, the fences of a modern constitution signify little.—That this was the practice of the Universal Church, St. Augustin is clear and decisive. And since nothing but *certain evidence* will satisfy our author, here he has it. Here is the attestation of all

Christendom. Here is number, weight, and authority, with a witness ; and is not the practice of the Universal Church a good ground for reliance? What? Not in those early and unblemished ages? In those happy times when learning, and piety, and right belief had so visible an ascendant?—It was a maxim with Luther and his adherents, to resign to nothing but a text of Scripture, of which themselves were to be the expositors. The Bible was God's, but the comment was their own; as for Antiquity, they had no regard for it. Calvin likewise was much of the same mind. He gives no deference to Antiquity, and seems to confine the rule of worship to express declarations of Scripture. These men, though they discovered some errors, fell into others. Particularly Calvin and his followers held some principles very destructive of the public peace.—Knox rails upon the Emperor and our Queen Mary.—Part 2. pp. 72. 81. 164—166.

LESLIE, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Letter to a Gentleman converted from Deism.*

But there is an infallibility in the Church, not personal in any one or all of Christians put together; for millions of fallibles can never make an infallible. But the infallibility consists in the nature of the evidence, which having all the four marks mentioned in the short method of the Deists, cannot possibly be false. As you and I believe there is such a town as Constantinople, that there was such a man as Henry VIII. as much as if we had seen them with our eyes: not from the credit of any historian or traveller, all of whom are fallible; but from the nature of the evidence, wherein it is impossible for men to have conspired and carried it on without contradiction if it were false.

Thus, whatever doctrine has been taught in the Church, (according to the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis,) *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, is the Christian doctrine; for in this case, such doctrine is a fact, and having the foresaid marks must be a true fact, *viz.* that such doctrine was so taught and received.

This was the method taken in the Council called at Alexandria against Arius; it was asked by Alexander, the Archbishop who

presided, *Quis unquam talia audivit?* who ever heard of this doctrine before? And it being answered by all the Bishops there assembled in the negative, it was concluded a novel doctrine, and contrary to what had been universally received in the Christian Church. Thus every doctrine may be reduced to fact; for it is purely fact, whether such doctrine was received or not?

And a council assembled upon such an occasion stands as evidence of the fact, not as judges of the faith: which they cannot alter by their votes or authority.

A council has authority in matters of discipline in the Church; but in matters of faith, what is called their authority, is their attestation to the truth of fact; which if it has the marks before mentioned, must be infallibly true: not from the infallibility of any or all of the persons, but from the nature of the evidence, as before is said.

And this is the surest rule whereby to judge of doctrines, and to know what the Catholic Church had believed and taught, as received from the Apostles.

And they who refuse to be tried by this rule, who say we care not what was believed by the Catholic Church, either in former ages or now, we think our own interpretation or criticisms upon such a text of as great authority as theirs; these are justly to be suspected, nay it is evident that they are broaching some novel doctrines which cannot stand this test. Besides the monstrous arrogance in such a pretence, these overthrow the foundation of that sure and infallible evidence upon which Christianity itself does stand, and reduce all to a blind enthusiasm.—*Works*, vol. i. p. 70.

*Ibid.*—*Dissertation concerning Ecclesiastical History.*

In Ecclesiastical History, and there only, I may say, is the decision of all controverted points in Divinity, either as to doctrine or discipline. For every one of them must be determined by matter of fact. It is not refining, and criticisms, and our notions of things, but what that faith was, which at first was delivered to the Saints. This is matter of fact, and must be de-

terminated by evidence. And where any text of the New Testament is disputed, the best evidence is from those Fathers of the Church, who lived in the Apostolical age, and learned the faith from the mouths of the Apostles themselves, such as St. Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, &c. These must know the best sense and meaning of the words delivered by the Apostles. And next to them, they to whom they did deliver the same, and so on through the several ages of the Church to this day. And those doctrines and that government of the Church, which has this evidence, must be the truth. And they who refuse to be determined by this rule, are justly to be suspected, nay, they give evidence against themselves, that they are departed from the truth.— p. 411.

WATERLAND, PRESBYTER.—*Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity.*

It is not at all likely, that any whole Church of those early times should vary from Apostolical Doctrine in things of moment: but it is, morally speaking, absurd to imagine that all the Churches should combine in the same error, and conspire together to corrupt the doctrine of Christ. This is the argument which Irenæus and Tertullian insist much upon, and triumph in over the heretics of their times: and it is obliquely glanced upon by Hegesippus and Clemens Alexandrinus of the same second century, and by Origen also of the third. The argument was undoubtedly true and just as it then stood, while there were no breaks in the succession of doctrine, but a perfect unanimity of the Churches all along, in the prime articles: though, afterwards, the force of this argument came to be obscured, and almost lost, by taking in things foreign to it, and blending it with what happened in later times. The force of it could last no longer than such unanimity lasted. I say, while the Churches were all unanimous in the main things, (as they were in Irenæus's time and Tertullian's and for more than a century after,) that very unanimity was a presumptive argument that their faith was right, derived down to them from the Apostles themselves. For it was highly unreasonable to suppose, that those several Churches,



very distant from each other in place, and of different languages, and under no common visible head, should all unite in the same errors, and deviate uniformly from their rule at once. But that they should all agree in the same common faith, might easily be accounted for, as arising from the same common cause, which could be no other but the common delivery of the same uniform faith and doctrine to all the Churches by the Apostles themselves. Such unanimity could never come by chance, but must be derived from one common source : and therefore the harmony of their doctrine was in itself a pregnant argument of the truth of it. As to the fact, that the Churches were thus unanimous in all the prime things, in those days, Irenæus, who was a very knowing person, and who had come far east to settle in the west, bears ample testimony to it. Tertullian, in the two passages last cited from him, testifies the same thing, as to the unanimity of the Churches of those times in the fundamentals of Christian doctrine. Hegesippus, contemporary with Irenæus, gives much the same account of the succession of true doctrine, down to his own time, in the several Churches. Clemens of Alexandria means the same thing, where he recommends the faith of the Universal Church as *one*, and as more ancient than heresies. And Origen, of the third century, testifies the same of the Church in his time, and argues in the same manner from it. Irenæus and Tertullian were both of them so strongly persuaded of the certainty, first of the fact, and next of the inference from it, that they scrupled not to urge it as a very full and convincing proof of the Apostolical faith singly considered, and abstracting from Scripture proof ; an argument which there is no need to be jealous of, if it be but rightly understood, and limited to such circumstances as it was grounded upon. For the meaning was not, that Apostolical Churches could never err, nor that tradition would be always a safe rule to go by : but such tradition as that was, which might easily be traced up to the Apostles, by the help of writings then extant, (as easily as we may now trace up the doctrine of our Church to the reign of Charles, or of James the First,) such a tradition might be depended upon. Besides that the unanimity of the Churches all the world over (which

could not be rationally accounted for on any other supposition but that they had been so taught from the beginning) confirmed the same thing. The argument in this light, and in those circumstances, was a very good one. But when those circumstances came to be altered, and there had been several breaks in the succession of doctrine, and that too even in the Apostolical Churches, then there could be no arguing in the same precise way as before: only thus far they might argue in after times (upon a supposition that their faith could be proved to be the same as in the former ages), that since their doctrine was still that very doctrine which the Churches held while they were unanimous and had admitted no breaks, therefore it is such as was from the beginning in the Church of Christ. In this manner we can reason even at this day, and can thereby make Irenæus's or Tertullian's argument our own: provided we have first proved that the faith we contend for is the very same that obtained in the Churches of that age.....

It has been objected, that our sixth Article condemns the method of interpreting Scripture by antiquity, or at least supersedes it; because it says, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or necessary to salvation." The article says nothing but what is perfectly right, and perfectly consistent with all we have been pleading for. We allow no doctrine as necessary, which stands only on Fathers, or on tradition, oral or written; we admit none for such, but what is contained in Scripture, and proved by Scripture, rightly interpreted. And we know of no way more safe in necessities to preserve the right interpretation, than to take the ancients along with us. We think it a good method to secure our rule of faith, against impostures of all kinds; whether of enthusiasm or false criticism, or conceited reason, or oral tradition, or the assuming dictates of an infallible chair. If we thus preserve the true sense of Scripture, and upon that sense build our faith, we then build upon Scripture only; for the sense of Scripture is Scripture. Suppose a man were to prove his legal title to an estate;

he appeals to the laws ; the true sense and meaning of the laws must be proved by the best rules of interpretation ; but, after all, it is the law that gives the title, and that only. In like manner after using all proper means to come at the sense of Scripture, (which is Scripture,) it is that, and that only, which we ground our faith upon, and prove our faith by. We allege not Fathers as grounds, or principles, or foundations of our faith, but as witnesses, and as interpreters, and faithful conveyers.

That the Church of England has a very particular regard to antiquity, may sufficiently appear from a canon set forth in the same year when our Articles were first perfected and authorized by Act of Parliament, namely, in the year 1571. By that canon it is provided, "that preachers shall not presume to deliver any thing from the pulpit, as of moment, to be religiously observed and believed by the people, but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament and collected out of the same doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and the Bishops of the ancient Church." A wise regulation, formed with exquisite judgment, and worded with the exactest caution. The Canon does not order, that they shall teach whatever had been taught by Fathers; no, that would have been setting up a new rule of faith; neither does it say that they shall teach whatsoever the Fathers had collected from Scripture; no, that would have been making them infallible interpreters, or infallible reasoners: the doctrine must be found first in Scripture: only to be the more secure that we have found it there, the Fathers are to be called in, to be, as it were, constant checks upon the presumption or wantonness of private interpretation; but then again as to private interpretation, there is liberty enough allowed to it. Preachers are not forbidden to interpret this or that text, or hundreds of texts, differently from what the Fathers have done; provided still they keep within the analogy of faith, and presume not to raise any new doctrine: neither are they altogether restrained from teaching any thing new, provided it be offered as opinion only, or an inferior truth, and not pressed as necessary upon the people. For it was thought that there could be no necessary article of faith or doctrine now drawn from Scripture, but what the ancients had drawn out before, from the same Scripture: to say

otherwise, would imply that the ancients had failed universally in necessities, which is morally absurd.

From this account it may appear, that the Church of England is exactly in the same sentiments which I have been pleading for. And indeed, if there be any Church now in the world, which truly reverences antiquity, and pays a proper regard to it, it is this Church. The Romanists talk of Antiquity, while we observe and follow it.—*Works*, vol. v. p. 265, 316.

BINGHAM, PRESBYTER.—*Antiquities of the Christian Church.*

If it be now inquired what articles of Faith, and what points of practice were reckoned thus fundamental, or essential to the very being of a Christian, and the union of many Christians into one body or Church, the Ancients are very plain in resolving this. For as to Fundamental Articles of Faith, the Church had them always collected or summed up out of Scripture in her Creeds, the profession of which was ever esteemed both necessary on the one hand and sufficient on the other, in order to the admission of members into the Church by baptism; and consequently both necessary and sufficient to keep men in the unity of the Church, so far as concerns the unity of Faith generally required of all Christians, to make them one body and one Church of Believers. Upon this account, as I have had occasion to shew in a former book, the Creed was commonly called by the ancients the *κάνων*, and *Regula Fidei*, because it was the known standard or Rule of Faith, by which Orthodoxy and Heresy were judged and examined. If a man adhered to this rule he was deemed an Orthodox Christian, and in the union of the Catholic Faith; but if he deviated from it in any point, he was esteemed as one that cut himself off, and separated from the communion of the Church, by entertaining heretical opinions and deserting the common Faith. Thus the Fathers in the Council of Antioch charge Paulus Samosatensis with departing from the Rule of Canon, meaning the Creed, the Rule of Faith, because he denied the Divinity of CHRIST. Irenæus calls it the unalterable Canon or Rule of Faith, and says, This Faith was the same in all the world; men professed it with one heart and one soul: for though there were different dialects in the world, yet the

power of Faith was one and the same. The Churches in Germany had no other Faith or tradition than those in Spain, or in France, or in the East, or Egypt, or Libya. Nor did the most eloquent ruler of the Church say any more than this, for no one was above his master, nor the weakest diminish any thing of this tradition. For the Faith being one and the same, he that said most of it could not enlarge it, nor he that said least, take any thing from it. So Tertullian says, There is one Rule of Faith only, which admits of no change or alteration, 'That which teaches us to believe in one GOD ALMIGHTY, the Maker of the world, and in JESUS CHRIST HIS SON, &c.' This Rule, he says, was instituted by CHRIST Himself, and there were no disputes in the Church about it, but such as Heretics brought in, or such as made Heretics; to know nothing beyond this, was to know all things. This Faith was the Rule of believing from the beginning of the Gospel, and the antiquity of it was sufficiently demonstrated by the novelty of heresies, which were but of yesterday's standing in comparison of it. Cyprian says, It was the law which the whole Catholic Church held, and that the Novatians themselves baptized into the same Creed, though they differed about the sense of the Article relating to the Church. Therefore Novatian in his book of the Trinity makes no scruple to give the Creed the same name, *Regula Veritatis*, the Rule of Truth. And St. Jerome after the same manner, disputing against the errors of the Montanists, says, The first thing they differed about was the Rule of Faith. For the Church believed the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be each distinct in his own Person, though united in substance. But the Montanists, following the doctrine of Sabellius, contracted the Trinity into one Person. From all which it is evident, that the fundamental Articles of Faith were those which the Primitive Church summed up in her Creeds, in the profession of which she admitted men as members into the unity of her Body by baptism; and if any deserted or corrupted this Faith, they were no longer reputed Christians, but Heretics, who break the unity of the Church by breaking the unity of the Faith, though they had otherwise made no farther separation from her Communion. For as Clemens Alexandrinus says, out

of Hermes Pastor, Faith is the virtue that binds and unites the Church together. Whence Hegesippus, the ancient historian, giving an account of the old Heretics, says, They divided the unity of the Church by pernicious speeches against God and His CHRIST; that is, by denying some of the prime, fundamental Articles of Faith. He that makes a breach upon any one of these, cannot maintain the unity of the Church, nor his own character as a Christian. We ought therefore, says Cyprian, in all things to hold the unity of the Catholic Church, and not to yield in any thing to the enemies of Faith and Truth. For he cannot be thought a Christian who continues not in the truth of CHRIST'S Gospel and Faith. If men be Heretics, says Tertullian, they cannot be Christians. The like is said by Lactantius, and Jerome, and Athanasius, and Hilary, and many others of the ancients, whose sense upon this matter I have fully represented in another place. As, therefore, there was an unity of Faith necessary to be maintained in certain fundamental Articles, in order to make a man a Christian, so these Articles were always to be found in the Church's Creeds; the profession of which was esteemed keeping the unity of the Faith; and deviating in any point from them, was esteemed a breach of that one Faith, and a virtual departing from the unity of the Church.—

We are next to examine what communion different Churches held with one another, that we may discover the harmonious unity of the Catholic Church. And here first of all we are to observe, that as there was one common Faith, consisting of certain fundamental Articles, essential to the very being of a particular Church and its unity, and the being of a Christian; so this same Faith was necessary to unite the different parts of the Catholic Church, and make them one body of Christians. So that if any Church deserted or destroyed this Faith in whole or in part, they were looked upon as rebels and traitors against CHRIST, and enemies to the common Faith, and treated as a conventicle of Heretics, and not of Christians. Upon this account every Bishop not only made a declaration of his Faith at his ordination, before the Provincial Synod that ordained him, but also sent his circular or encyclical letters, as they were called,

to foreign Churches, to signify that he was in communion with them. And this was so necessary a thing in a Bishop newly ordained, that Liberatus tells us, the omission of it was interpreted a sort of refusal to hold communion with the rest of the world, and a virtual charge of heresy upon himself or them.

To maintain this unity of Faith entire, every Church was ready to give each other their mutual assistance to oppose all fundamental errors, and beat down heresy at its first appearance among them. The whole world in this respect was but one common Diocese, the Episcopate was an universal thing, and every Bishop had his share in it in such a manner as to have an equal concern in the whole; as I have more fully showed in another place, where I observed, that in things not appertaining to the Faith, Bishops were not to meddle with other men's Dioceses, but only to mind the business of their own: but when the Faith or welfare of the Church lay at stake, and religion was manifestly invaded, then, by this rule, of there being but one Episcopacy, every other Bishopric was as much their Diocese as their own; and no human Laws or Canons could tie up their hands from performing such acts of the Episcopal office in any part of the world, as they thought necessary for the preservation of Faith and Religion. This was the ground of their meeting in Synods, Provincial, National, and sending their joint opinions and advice from one Church to another. The greatest part of Church History is made up of such acts as these, so that it were next to impertinent to refer to any particulars. I only observe one thing farther upon this head, that the intermeddling with other men's concerns, which would have been accounted a real breach of unity in many other cases, was in this case thought so necessary, that there was no certain way to preserve the unity of the Catholic Church and Faith without it. And as an instance of this, I have noted in the fore-cited book, that though it was against the ordinary rule of the Church for any Bishop to ordain in another man's Diocese, yet in case a Bishop turned Heretic, and persecuted the Orthodox, and would ordain none but heretical men to establish Heresy in his Diocese, in that case

any Orthodox Bishop was not only authorised, but obliged, as opportunity served, and the needs of the Church required, to ordain Catholic teachers in such a Diocese, to oppose the malignant designs of the enemy, and stop the growth of Heresy, which might otherwise take deep root, and spread and overrun the Church. Thus Athanasius and the famous Eusebius of Samosata went about the world in the prevalency of the Arian heresy, ordaining in every Church where they came, such clergy as were necessary to support the Orthodox cause in such a time of distress and desolation; and this was so far from being reckoned a breach of the Church's unity, though against the letter of a Canon in ordinary cases, that it was necessary to be done, in such a state of affairs, to maintain the unity of the Catholic Faith, which every Bishop was obliged to defend, not only in his own Diocese, but in all parts of the world, by virtue of that rule which obliges Bishops in weighty affairs to take care of the Catholic Church, and requires all Churches in time of danger to give mutual aid and assistance to one another.—Vol. ii. pp. 2, 14.

JEBB, BISHOP.

But you will feel with me, that it is something in favour of Vincentius's rule, that it has been received, extolled, and acted upon, by such men as Ridley, Jewel, Grotius, Overall, Hammond, Beveridge, Bull, Hickes, Bramhall, Grabe, Cave, and our own Archbishop King; that it has been admitted expressly even by Chillingworth; and that it has been unreservedly acknowledged as a just and true guide by Bishop Taylor, in one of his latest works, his visitation sermon at Connor; a tribute, this last, the more remarkable, because, in his 'Liberty of Prophesying,' and in his 'Ductor Dubitantium,' he had spoken less respectfully of the principle; and his remarkable change of language can be accounted for only by his having undergone a correspondent change of sentiment. He had seen, felt, and weighed every difficulty; the result of all was, a deliberate persuasion, that Vincentius was right, and that he himself had been wrong. But, to say no



more of mere authorities, however strong, I own I cannot at present feel any difficulty in applying Vincentius's rule. If a doctrine is propounded to me, as vitally essential, that is, to speak technically, as matter of Faith, before I can receive it as such, I must go to the Catholic succession, and ascertain whether that doctrine has been held *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*; convinced, if it has not been so held, my assent is not due to it as a matter of Faith. If, again, a doctrine which I hold, is impugned as Heretical, next to the Scripture, and as interpretative of Scripture, I must go to the Catholic succession; and if I find this doctrine universally asserted, I cannot believe that it is any other than the sincere truth of the Gospel. The universality here mentioned, is not, of course, a mathematical, but a moral universality: the universality, to use Vincentius's own words, of those "*Qui in fide et communione Catholicæ, sancte, sapienter, et constanter viventes, vel mori in Christo fideliter, vel occidi pro Christo feliciter meruerint.*" And here, I may observe, that Vincentius himself has anticipated your great objection; a very fair one, no doubt, and which requires, and deserves an answer;—namely, 'that true Christianity, far from being diffused *ubique*, or received *ab omnibus*, was sometimes confined to a very narrow channel: when the great majority of the Bishops were Arians, what becomes of the rule?' Let Vincentius answer, *Quid si novella aliqua contagio, non jam portiunculam tantum, sed totam pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur. Tunc item providebit ut Antiquitati inhæreat.* Nor be it thought, that by this means, the *quod ubique*, and *quod ab omnibus*, are idly absorbed in the *quod semper*: they are, as above hinted, to be taken, not mathematically, but morally; and, so taken, they are an effectual guard to the *quod semper*. From the beginning, or, at least, from very remote antiquity, worthy individuals have frequently held, some one or more, unsound opinions; and looking to individuals merely, the *quod semper* might be alleged, as it has been alleged, in favour of every opinion: it is to be rectified, however, by looking to universality and consent: not universality without exception—for such is not to be found: but the concurrent, and consistent sentiments, of the

most, and greatest, doctors, in the whole body of the Church : not at any given period, but throughout the whole succession. Nor will such a research be so laborious as might be imagined ; for, in the first place, the Catholic verities, those to be believed for necessity of salvation, are but few ; and in the next place, the concurrent sense of Catholic Christians, on those few, but important points, has been amply elicited by controversy ; inso-much that, from the works of Bishop Bull, and a very few more, any candid and intelligent student might obtain competent and intelligent satisfaction, respecting the sense of the universal Church, on any and every of the Catholic verities. As to all other verities, and as to the interpretation of particular texts of Scripture, they are left at large, provided always that no Catholic truth be impugned, and that the analogy of the Faith be maintained inviolable.—*Life*, vol. ii. pp. 249—252.

VAN MILDERT, BISHOP.—*Bampton Lectures.*

Much discussion has from time to time arisen respecting the deference due to the writings of the Primitive Fathers of the Church, and the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity ; points of considerable moment, and deserving of attentive examination.

It seems to be indisputable, that the Primitive Fathers are not to be regarded as Divinely inspired, since otherwise their writings would necessarily have formed a part of the Sacred Canon. The question, therefore, is, whether, admitting them to have no more than human authority, they have any special claim to our reverential regard, which places them on higher ground than that of their ecclesiastical successors. And this question is to be determined by a fair consideration of any peculiar advantages they might possess, and of their ability and disposition to turn them to good account.

Against any such deference being had to these our spiritual forefathers, it has been sometimes contended, that their writings now extant are few in number ; that several of them, if not spurious, are adulterated, through the pious frauds, the sinister designs, or the ignorance of after ages ; that their style and reasoning are

obscure ; that in their zeal to defeat opponents, they occasionally suppress or disguise the truth ; that they are on certain points inconsistent with each other, and with themselves ; and that it is often difficult to ascertain whether the opinions they advance are meant to be declaratory of the judgment of the Church, or delivered only as their own private interpretations. For these and similar reasons it has been alleged, that their testimony as genuine witnesses of the Faith may deservedly be impeached ; and that neither Protestants nor Papists have hesitated occasionally to depart from their authority.

But of these charges it has repeatedly been shown, that many are greatly exaggerated ; some wholly unfounded ; while others affect not their writings, more than the writings of almost all controversial authors of ancient date, adverting (as they must necessarily do) to times and persons, and local circumstances, now but imperfectly known, and which cast a shade of obscurity over some of their narratives and their reasonings. These afford no good argument for laying their productions under a general interdict. Against an implicit submission to their authority, they are, doubtless, important considerations : but against the use and application of them as documents of more than ordinary value, they merit but little attention.

In answer, therefore, to such objections, it may suffice to observe, that supposing the Primitive Fathers to have been men of only common discernment and integrity, their testimony respecting the doctrines then actually received by the Church, and maintained against the heresies then prevailing, must have peculiar weight. . . . Those among them who had been personally conversant with the Apostles, and who derived their knowledge of the Christian Faith from what they continually heard of their preaching and discourse, as well as from their writings, seem to have claim to a regard only short of that which was due to their inspired preceptors. To place such men as Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, no higher in the scale of authority, with respect to the value of their testimony on these points, than Bishops and Pastors in later times, betrays an error of judgment which on any other subject of investigation analogous to this, would be

deemed preposterous. On the part of their immediate successors, somewhat of the same extraordinary claim to acceptance still presents itself, though with a certain diminution of its force. Descending still lower in the scale of history, this authority rapidly diminishes, and our judgment in their favour will be chiefly, if not solely, influenced, by the internal evidence their writings afford of some superior qualifications in the authors themselves. Yet, until the great schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, and the full establishment of the Papal usurpation, the Fathers of the Church appear to have been deeply sensible of the obligation laid upon them to "contend for the Faith once delivered to the saints," and to guard the sacred deposit committed to their charge against every vain imagination which the Heretic or Schismatic might labour to introduce.

Disclaiming, therefore, any superstitious reverence towards these venerable men, it may reasonably be urged, that their peculiarly advantageous circumstances demand especial consideration; and that unless their characters, both moral and intellectual, could be so successfully impeached as to prove them wholly unworthy of credit, their testimony is of the very first importance in ascertaining the Primitive Faith. In matters requisite to the formation of the Church; in framing Confessions of Faith, more or less explicit according to the errors it was necessary to discountenance; and in adopting means for the perpetuation of these benefits to the latest ages; they appear as having been at first deputed by the Apostles for purposes the most important, and as acting under impressions of a most awful responsibility. To them were also confided those Sacred Oracles on which our Faith now most essentially depends. Through their ministry we have received these invaluable treasures; to their zeal and fidelity, under Providence, we owe the transmission of the pure word of God to these present times: and the charge thus consigned to our care, we are bound to deliver unimpaired to succeeding generations.

If, in addition to these special grounds of confidence in the early Fathers, we admit what has been contended for by learned and judicious Divines, that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit,

(especially that of "discerning of Spirits,") were not entirely withdrawn from the Church till long after the time of the Apostles; this would give still stronger confirmation to their claims. For though we should not be warranted in a supposition that even these extraordinary gifts conferred authority for promulgating new articles of Faith, or infringing on any exclusive prerogative of the Sacred writers, yet it would go far towards establishing interpretations of Christian Doctrine thus received and sanctioned, on a firmer basis than any on which their less gifted successors can ground their pretensions.

But, not to insist on any disputable points, the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity in general, and of its earliest productions in particular, is sufficiently evident, upon the ordinary principles of criticism and evidence. As works so nearly contemporary with those of the Sacred Canons, they illustrate the diction and phraseology of the inspired Penmen; they give an insight into the history of the age in which the writings of the New Testament were composed; they explain allusions to rites and customs, which otherwise might be involved in much obscurity; and, what is of still more importance, they assist in fixing the sense of controverted texts of Scripture, by the substantial evidence they afford of their generally received interpretation in the primitive ages of the Church. These advantages are derived to us from the public acts of the Church recorded in the most ancient ecclesiastical histories; from the prescribed formularies of Faith then in general use: and from the censures authoritatively passed upon such as departed from these standards of reputed orthodoxy. Hence we are assured of the care and solicitude manifested from the beginning by spiritual rulers, to preserve the truth from corruption: and when the importance of the doctrines themselves, as well as the opportunities they enjoyed of tracing them to the fountain head, are duly considered; it can hardly be conceived, that they who had the guidance and government of the Primitive Church, should either be universally uninformed as to any fundamental truth, or universally embrace any fundamental error.

It is, therefore, with no common reverence that these authori-

ties are to be regarded ; nor can we detract from their just pretensions without hazard to some of the main foundations of our Faith. " No man " says Bishop Bull, " can oppose Catholic consent, but he will at last be found to oppose both the Divine Oracles and sound reason." Nevertheless, we do not claim for them any infallibility, any commission to make further revelations of the Divine will, or any absolute authority as Scripture interpreters. The appeal still lies from them, as from all other religious instructors, to that Word itself, which was no less their Rule of Faith than it is ours : and the highest degree of deference that can be due to them, may be paid without any infringement of that inviolable maxim, " If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."—*Sermon v. p. 94.*

OXFORD.

*The Feast of the Purification.*

## POSTSCRIPT.

---

*On the particular subject of this Catena, may be profitably consulted,*

Laud's Conference with Fisher.  
Thorndike de ratione ac jure finiendi controversias Ecclesiæ.  
Patrick on Tradition.  
Brett on Tradition.  
Waterland on the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity.  
Allix—Judgment of the Jewish Church.

*The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts.—*

Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons.*  
Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—  
*Parker, Oxford.*  
Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake and Varty.*  
Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford.*  
Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons.*  
Newman's Sermons. 3 vols.—*Rivingtons.*  
Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons.*  
The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons.*  
Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie.*

Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan.*  
 Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns.*  
 Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons.*  
 Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons.*  
 Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
 Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons.*  
 Law's first and second Letters to Hoadley.—*Rivingtons.*  
 Bp. Andrews's Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering.*  
 Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons.*  
 Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.  
 Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons.*  
 Le Bas's Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons.*  
 Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.  
 Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons.*

*Larger Works which may be profitably studied.*

Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
 Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press.*  
 Waterland's Works.—*Do.*  
 Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do.*  
 Pearson on the Creed.—*Do.*  
 Leslie's Works.—*Do.*  
 Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London.*  
 Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press.*  
 Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Do.*

---

*In the Press,*

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES, No. 79, ON PURGATORY.

---

*These Tracts are sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.*

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,  
 ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.  
 1837.

---

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.



## TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

## ON PURGATORY.

*(Against Romanism.—No. 3.)*

THE extract from Archbishop Ussher's Answer to a Jesuit, contained in Tract 72, on the subject of the ancient Commemorations for the Dead in Christ, may fitly be succeeded by an inquiry as to what degree and sort of proof remains for the Roman tenet of Purgatory, after deducting from the evidence those usages or statements of the early Church, which are commonly supposed, but, as Ussher shows, improperly, to countenance it. Ussher's explanations have had the effect, it is presumed, of cutting away the *primâ facie* evidence, on which the doctrine is usually rested; and it now remains to see what is left when it is withdrawn. With this view it is proposed in the following pages to draw out in detail the evidence alleged by the Romanists in behalf of their belief, with such remarks as may be necessary, in order to form a fair estimate of it. A plain statement of the doctrine itself, and of its rise, shall be also attempted, as not unseasonable at a time when the strength of Romanism rests in no small degree in its opponents mistaking the points in debate, and making or refuting propositions which but indirectly or partially bear upon the errors which they desire to combat.

Before commencing, it is necessary to warn the reader against estimating the magnitude or quality of any of those errors by its apparent dimensions in the theory. What seems to be a small deviation from correctness in the abstract system, becomes considerable and serious when it assumes a substantive form. This is especially the case with all doctrinal discussions, in which the undeveloped germs of many diversities of practice and moral character, lie thick together and in small compass, and as if promis-

cuously and without essential differences. The highest truths differ from the most miserable delusions by what appears to be a few words or letters. The discriminating mark of orthodoxy, the Homocousion, has before now been ridiculed, however irrationally, as being identical, all but the letter *i*, with the heretical symbol of the Homoiousion. What is acknowledged in the Arian controversy, must be endured without surprise in the Roman, in whatever degree it occurs. We may be taunted as differing from the Romanists only in phrases and modes of expression ; and we may be taunted, or despised, according to the fate of our Divines for three centuries past, as taking a middle, timid, unsatisfactory ground, neither quite agreeing nor quite disagreeing with our opponents. We may be charged with dwelling on trifles and niceties, in a way inconsistent with plain, manly good sense ; but in truth it is not we who are the speculatists, and unpractical controversialists, but they who forget that *hæ nugæ seria ducunt in mala*.

But again there is another reason, peculiar to the Roman controversy, which occasions a want of correspondence between the appearance presented by the Roman theology in theory, and its appearance in practice. The separate doctrines of Romanism are very different, in position, importance, and mutual relation, in the abstract, and when developed, applied, and practised. Anatomists tell us that the skeletons of the most various animals are formed on the same type ; yet the animals are dissimilar and distinct, in consequence of the respective differences of their developed proportions. No one would confuse between a lion and a bear ; yet many of us at first sight would be unable to discriminate between their respective skeletons. Romanism in the theory may differ little from our own creed ; nay, in the abstract type, it might even be identical, and yet in the actual framework, and still further in the living and breathing form, it might differ essentially. For instance, the doctrine of Indulgences is, in the theory, entirely connected with the doctrine of Penance ; that is, it has relation solely to *this world*, so much so that Roman apologists sometimes speak of it without even an allusion to its bearings elsewhere : but we know that in practice it is mainly, if not alto-

gether, concerned with the next world,—with the alleviation of sufferings in Purgatory.

And further still, as regards the doctrine of Purgatorial suffering, there have been for many ages in the Roman Church gross corruptions of its own doctrine, untenable as that doctrine is even by itself. The decree of the Council of Trent, which will presently be introduced, acknowledges the fact. Now we believe that those corruptions still continue; that Rome has never really set herself in earnest to eradicate them. The pictures of Purgatory so commonly seen in countries in communion with Rome, the existence of Purgatorian societies, the means of subsistence accruing to the clergy from belief in it, afford a strange contrast to the simple wording and apparent innocence of the decree by which it is made an article of faith. It is the contrast between poison in its lifeless seed, and the same developed, thriving, and rankly luxuriant in the actual plant.

And lastly, since we are in no danger of becoming Romanists, and may bear to be dispassionate and (I may say) philosophical in our treatment of their errors, some passages in the following account of Purgatory are more calmly written than would satisfy those who were engaged with a victorious enemy at their doors. Yet, whoever be our opponent, Papist or Latitudinarian, it does not seem to be wrong to be as candid and conceding as justice and charity allow us. Nor is it unprofitable to weigh accurately how much the Romanists have committed themselves in their formal determinations of doctrine, and how far by God's merciful providence they had been restrained and overruled; and again how far they must retract, in order to make amends to Catholic truth and unity.

- § 1. STATEMENT OF THE ROMAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING PURGATORY.
- § 2. PROOF OF THE ROMAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING PURGATORY.
- § 3. HISTORY OF THE RISE OF THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY, AND OPINIONS IN THE EARLY CHURCH CONCERNING IT.
- § 4. THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.



- § 1. STATEMENT OF THE ROMAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING PURGATORY.

THE Roman doctrine is thus expressed in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

Constanter teneo Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari.

“I hold without wavering that there is a Purgatory, and that souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful.”

The words of this article are taken from the decree of the Council of Trent on the subject, (*Sess. 25.*) which runs as follows :

“Whereas the Church Catholic, fully instructed by the Holy Ghost, hath from the sacred Scriptures and ancient tradition of the Fathers, in sacred Councils, and last of all in this present Œcumenical Synod, taught that there is a Purgatory, and that souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the living, and above all by the acceptable sacrifice of the Altar, this holy Synod enjoins on Bishops, to make diligent efforts that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, handed down from the holy Fathers and sacred Councils, be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere proclaimed by the disciples of Christ. At the same time, as regards the uneducated multitude, let the more difficult and subtle questions, such as tend not to edification nor commonly increase piety, be excluded from popular discourses. Moreover let them disallow the publication and discussion of whatever is uncertain or suspicious; and prohibit whatever is of a curious or superstitious nature, or savours of filthy lucre, as the scandals and stumbling-blocks of believers. And let them provide, that

the suffrages of believers living, that is, the sacrifices of masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which believers living are wont to perform for other believers dead, be performed according to the rules of the Church, piously and religiously; and whatever are due for them from the endowments of testators, or in other way, be fulfilled, not in a perfunctory way, but diligently and accurately by the Priests and Ministers of the Church, and others who are bound to do this service."

Such is the Roman doctrine; and taken in the *mere letter* there is little in it against which we shall be able to sustain formal objections. Purgatory is not spoken of at all as a place of pain; it need only mean, what its name implies, a place of purification. There is indeed much presumption in asserting definitively that there is such a place; and assuredly there is not only presumption, but very great daring and uncharitableness in including belief in it, as Pope Pius' Creed goes on to do, among the conditions of salvation; but if we could consider it as confined to the mere opinion that that good which is begun on earth is perfected in the next world, the tenet would be tolerable. The word "*detentas*" indeed expresses a somewhat stronger idea; yet after all hardly more than that the souls in Purgatory would be happier out of it than in it, and that they cannot of their own will leave it; which is not much to grant. Further, that the prayers of the living benefit the dead in Christ, is, to say the least, not inconsistent, as Ussher shows us, with the primitive belief. So much as to the *letter* of the decree; but it is not safe to go by the letter: on the contrary, we are bound to take the universal and uniform doctrine taught and received in the Roman Communion, as the real and true interpreter of words which are in themselves comparatively innocent. What that doctrine is, may be gathered from the words of the Catechism of Trent, in which the spirit of Romanism, not being bound by the rules which shackle it in the Council, speaks out. The account of Purgatory which that formulary supplies, shall here be taken as our text, and Cardinal Bellarmine's Defence shall be used as a comment upon it.

The Catechism then speaks as follows :

"Est Purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum tempus cruciatæ

expiantur, ut eis in æternam patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur.”—Part i. De Symb. 5.

“ There is a Purgatorial fire, in which the souls of the pious are tormented for a certain time, and cleansed, in order that an entrance may lie open to them into their eternal home, into which nothing defiled enters.”

In like manner Bellarmine says,

“ Purgatory is a certain place in which, as if in a prison, souls are purged after this life, which have not been fully purged in it, in order, (that is,) that thus purged they may be enabled to enter heaven, which nothing defiled shall enter.”

A painful light is at once cast by these comments on the Synodal Decree. “ There is a Purgatory” in the Decree, is interpreted by Bellarmine “ there is a sort of *prison* ;” and by the Catechism, “ there is a Purgatorial *fire*.” And whereas the Decree merely declares that souls are “ *detained* there,” the Catechism says they are “ tormented and cleansed.” Moreover, both the Catechism and Bellarmine imply that this is the ordinary mode of attaining heaven, inasmuch as no one scarcely can be considered, and no one can be surely known, to leave this world “ fully purged ;” whereas the Decree speaks vaguely of “ the souls there.” So much at first sight ; now to consider the persons with which Purgatory is concerned, the sins, condition of souls, place, time, punishment, and remedies ; Bellarmine likening it to a *carcer*, the Catechism saying that the “ *animæ piórum ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur purgatorio igne*.”

#### 1. *The Persons who are reserved for Purgatory.*

THE Roman Church holds that Christians or believers only are tenants of Purgatory, as for Christians only are offered their prayers, alms, and masses. The question follows whether all Christians ? not all Christians, but such as die in God’s favour, yet with certain sins unforgiven. Some Christians die simply in God’s favour with all their sins forgiven ; others die out of His favour, as the impenitent, whether Christians or not ; but others, and that the great majority, die, according to the Romanists, in God’s favour, yet more or less under the bond of their sins. And so far we may unhesitatingly allow to them, or rather we our-

selves hold the same, if we hold that after Baptism there is no plenary pardon of sins in this life to the sinner, however penitent, *such* as in Baptism was once vouchsafed to him. If for sins committed after Baptism we have not yet received a simple and unconditional absolution, surely penitents from this time up to the day of judgment may be considered in that double state of which the Romanists speak, their *persons* accepted, but certain sins uncanceled. Such a state is plainly revealed to us in Scripture as a real one, in various passages, to which we appeal as well as the Romanists. Let the case of David suffice. On his repentance Nathan said to him, "The Lord also *hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die; howbeit*, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die." 2 Sam. xii. 13, 14. Here is a perspicuous instance of a penitent restored to God's favour at once, yet his sin afterwards visited; and it needs very little experience in life to be aware that such punishments occur continually, though no one takes them to be an evidence that the sufferer himself is under God's displeasure, but rather accounts them punishments even when we have abundant proofs of his faith, love, holiness, and fruitfulness in good works. So far then we cannot be said materially to oppose the Romanists. They on the other hand agree with us in maintaining that CHRIST'S death *might*, if God so willed, be applied for the removal even of these specific punishments of sins which they call *temporal* punishments, as fully as it really is for the acceptance of the *soul* of the person punished, or the removal of eternal punishment. Further both parties agree, that in matter of fact it is not so applied; the experience of life shows it; else every judgment might be taken as evidence of the person suffering it being under God's wrath. The death of the disobedient prophet from Judah would, in that case, prove that he perished eternally, which surely would be utterly presumptuous and uncharitable. As far as this then we have no violent difference of *principle* with the Romanists; but at this point we separate from them; *they* say these temporal punishments on sin are inflicted on the faults incurring them, in a certain fixed proportion; that every sin of a certain kind has a de-

finite penalty or price ; in consequence, that if it is not fully discharged in this life, it must be hereafter ; and that Purgatory is the place of discharging it.

2. *The sins for which persons are confined in Purgatory.*

The next question is, *what* are the sins which are thus punished ? not all sins of Christians, for some incur an eternal punishment. There are sins, it is maintained, which in themselves merit eternal damnation, are directly opposed to love or charity, quench grace, and throw the doer of them out of God's favour. These in consequence are called mortal ; such as murder, adultery, or blasphemy. Such sins do not lead to Purgatory ; hell is their portion if unrepented of. But all but these, all but *unrepented mortal* sins are in the case of Christians punished in Purgatory. Of these it follows there are two kinds, sins though *repented* of, and sins though not *mortal* ; concerning which a few words shall be said.

1. Mortal sins, though repented of, and though the offender cease to be under God's displeasure, yet have visibly their own punishment in many cases, as in the instance of David. But the Romanists consider that these sins have their penalty assigned to them as if by weight and measure ; moreover, that we can ourselves take part in discharging it, and by our own act anticipate and supersede God's judgment, according to the text : " If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged." This voluntary act on our part is called Penance, and is said to expiate the sin, that is, to wash away its temporal effects. Should we die before the full temporal punishment, or satisfaction, has been paid for all our mortal sins, we must pay the rest hereafter, *i. e.* in Purgatory.

2. Sins which are not mortal, are called *venial*, and are such as do not quench grace, or run counter to love. Bellarmine thus contrasts them :

" Mortal sins are they which absolutely turn us from God, and merit eternal punishment ; Venial those which somewhat impede our course to Him, but do not turn it, and are with little pains blotted out. The former are crimes, the



latter sins...Mortal sin is like a deadly wound, which suddenly kills; Venial is a slight stroke, which does not endanger life, and is easily healed. The former fights with love, which is the soul's life; the latter is rather beside than against love."—*De Amiss. Grat.* i. 2.

Venial sin differs from Mortal in two ways, in *kind* and *degree*. An idle word, excessive laughter, and the like, are sins in kind distinct from perjury or adultery. Again, anger is a venial sin when slight and undesigned, but when indulged interferes with love and is mortal; a theft of a large sum may be mortal, of a small venial.

Venial sins, being such, are considered by Romanists not to deserve so much as eternal punishment,—to be pardonable not merely by an express and immediate act of God's mercy, or again through the virtue of our state of regeneration, but to be intrinsically venial, to offend God, but not so as to alienate Him. They rest this doctrine upon such passages as the following: "Sin, when it is *finished*, bringeth forth *death*," James i. 15.; therefore, before it is finished or perfected, it has no such fearful power. Still they say it requires *some* punishment; which it receives in the next world, should it not receive it in this, that is, in Purgatory.

Such then are the sins of God's true servants, penitent believers, for which, according to the Romanists, they suffer in Purgatory; mortal sins repented of, and those sins of infirmity which befall them so continually and so secretly, that they cannot repent of them specifically if they would, and which do not deserve eternal punishment, though they do not. They consider the Purgatorial punishment of *venial* sins to be meant by the Apostle, when he speaks of those who, building on the true foundation "wood, hay, and stubble," are "saved so *as by fire*;" and the punishment for *mortal* sins, in our SAVIOUR'S declaration that certain prisoners shall not go out till they have "paid the very last mite." Luke xii. 59. It may be added, that Martyrdom is supposed to be a full expiation of whatever guilt of sin still rests on the Christian undergoing it; and therefore to stand instead of Purgatory. Martyrs then are at once admitted to the Beatific Vision, which is the privilege in which Purgatory terminates.

From this account of the inmates of Purgatory, and the causes why they are there detained, we gather what has already been hinted, that the one main or rather sole reason of the appointment, is *a satisfaction to God's justice*. The persons concerned are believers destined for bliss eternal; but before they pass on from earth to heaven, the course of their existence is, as it were, suspended, and they are turned aside to discharge a debt; *how* they effect it, or in what *length* of time, or with what *effect* on themselves, being questions as beside the mark, as if they were used with reference to the payment of a charge in worldly matters. It is an appointment altogether without bearing upon their moral character or eternal prospects; and after it is over, is wiped out as though it had never been.

### 3. *The moral condition of souls in Purgatory.*

Bellarmino well illustrates the supposed mental state of believers while in Purgatory by comparing them to travellers who come up to a fortified town after nightfall, and have to wait at the gates till the morning. Such persons have come to the end of their journey; they are not on the way, they have attained; they are sure of admittance, which is a matter of time only.

Accordingly the Romanists hold that souls in Purgatory become neither better or worse, neither sin nor add to their good works; they are one and all perfect in love, and ready for heaven, were it not for this debt, which hangs about them as so much rust or dross, and cannot be purged away except by certain appointed external remedies. They support this view of the stationary condition of the soul in Purgatory by such texts as the following: "The night cometh, when no man can work." "Where the tree falls, there it shall be." "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *done in his body*." John ix. 4. Eccles. xi. 3. 2 Cor. v. 10.

Next, with the exception of some few theologians, they consider that souls in Purgatory are comforted with the assurance that their eternal happiness is secured to them. Their state in consequence is thus described by Bellarmine (ii. 4.).

"You will object that they may be in doubt whether they are in hell or

in purgatory. Not so; for in hell God is blasphemed, in Purgatory He is praised; in hell there is neither habit of faith, nor hope, nor love of God, in Purgatory all of these. A soul then which shall understand that it hopes in God, praises and loves God, will clearly know it is not in hell. But perhaps it will fear it is to be sent to hell, though not there yet; neither can this be, for the same faith remains in it, which it had here. Here it believed according to the plain word of Scripture, that after death none can become of good bad, or of bad good, and none but the bad are to be sent into hell. When then it perceives that it loves God, and is therefore good, it will not fear damnation."

4. *The place and time of Purgatory.*

On this subject the Church has not formally determined any thing; but the common opinion of the Schoolmen is that it is one of four prisons or receptacles, which are situated in the heart of the earth, Hell for the damned, the *Limbus Puerorum* for children dying without Baptism, the *Limbus Patrum* for the just who died before the passion of CHRIST, and who since that time have all been transferred from it to heaven, and Purgatory for believers under punishment. In other words, whereas all punishment is either for a time or eternal, either positive (*pœna sensûs*), or negative (*pœna damni*), that of good men before CHRIST's coming, was the *pœna damni*, or absence of God's light and joy for a time, that of unbaptized infants is the *pœna damni* for ever, that of Purgatory the *pœna sensûs* for a time, that of Hell the *pœna sensûs* for ever. To these some Romanists have added a fifth, that is, of faithful souls, who without being yet admitted into heaven, are yet secured against all pain; but these according to Bellarmine, as at least enduring the *pœna damni*, are to be considered in Purgatory, though in the most tolerable place in it, as being but in the condition of the old Fathers before CHRIST came.

The time of Purgatory depends of course upon the state of the debt which is to be liquidated in each case, and varies consequently with the individual. Martyrs, as has been above stated, are supposed to satisfy it in the very act of Martyrdom; others will not be released till the day of judgment. Again, the period of suffering depends upon the exertions of survivors, by prayers,

alms, and masses, which have power not only to relieve but to shorten the pain.

##### 5. *The nature of the Punishment.*

Here the Roman Church has defined nothing; its catechism, as we have seen, and its theologians in accordance, consider it to be material fire, but in the Council of Florence, the Greeks would not do more than subscribe to the existence of Purgatory; they denied that the punishment was fire; the question accordingly remains open, that is, it is not determined either way *de fide*. The difficulty, how elementary fire or any thing of a similar nature can affect the disembodied soul, is paralleled by St. Austin by the mystery of the union of soul and body.

The pains of Purgatory are considered to be horrible and far exceeding any in this life; "*Pœnas Purgatoriæ esse atrocissimas; et cum illis nullas pœnas hujus vitæ comparandas, docent constanter Patres,*" says Bellarmine (ii. 14.), and proceeds to refer to Austin, Pope Gregory, Bede, Anselm, and Bernard. Yet on this point theologians differ. Some consider the chief misery to consist in the *pœna damni*, or absence of God's presence, which to holy souls, understanding and desiring it, would be as intolerable as extreme thirst or hunger to the body; and in this way seem to put all purgatorial pain on a level, or rather assign the greater pain to the more spiritually minded. Others consider the *pœna damni* to be alleviated by the certainty of heaven and of the continually lessening term of their punishment. With them then the *pœna sensûs*, or the fire, is the chief source of torment, which admits of degrees according to the will of God.

##### 6. *The efficacy of the suffrages of the Church.*

By suffrages are meant, co-operations of the living with the dead; prayers, masses, and works, such as alms, pilgrimages, fastings, &c. These aids which individuals can supply, alms, prayers, &c., only avail when offered by good persons; for he

who is not accepted himself, cannot do acceptable service for another. Moreover these aids may be directed either to the benefit of all souls in Purgatory indiscriminately, or specially to the benefit of a certain soul in particular.

There is one other means of escaping the penalties due to sin in Purgatory, which may briefly be mentioned, viz. by the grant of indulgences; these are dispensed on the following theory. Granting that a certain fixed temporal penalty attached to every act of sin, in such case, it would be conceivable that, as the multitude of Christians did not discharge their total debt in this life, so some extraordinarily holy men might more than discharge it. Such are the Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Ascetics, and the like, who have committed few sins, and have undergone extreme labours and sufferings, voluntary or involuntary. This being supposed, the question rises, what becomes of the overplus; and then there seems a fitness that what is not needed for themselves, should avail for their brethren who are still debtors. It is accordingly stored, together with CHRIST'S merits, in a kind of treasure-house, to be dispensed according to the occasion, and that at the discretion of the Church. The application of this treasure is called an Indulgence, which stands instead of a certain time of penance in this life, or for the period, whatever it be, to which that time is commuted in Purgatory. In this way, the supererogatory works of the Saints are supposed to go in payment of the debts of ordinary Christians.

§ 2. PROOF OF THE ROMAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING PURGATORY.

1. *Proofs from supernatural appearances.*

THE argumentative ground, on which the belief in Purgatory was actually introduced, would seem to lie in the popular stories of apparitions witnessing to it. Not that it rose in consequence of them historically, or that morally it was founded in them; only that when persons came to ask themselves why they received it, this was the ultimate ground of evidence on which the mind fell back; viz. the evidence of miracles, not of Scripture, or of the Fathers.

Bellarmino enumerates it as one of the confirmatory arguments. With this view he refers in particular to some relations of Gregory of Tours, A.D. 573; of Pope Gregory, A.D. 600; of Bede, A.D. 700; of Peter Damiani, A.D. 1057; of St. Bernard, A.D. 1100, and of St. Anselm, A.D. 1100. The dates are worth noticing, if it be true, as is here assumed, that such supernatural accounts as then were put forth, are really the argument on which the doctrine was and is received; for it would thence appear, first that the doctrine was not taught as divine before the end of the sixth century, next that when it was propagated, it was so on an (alleged) *new revelation*. The following miraculous narratives are found in a Protestant Selection from Roman writers, published in 1688, and entitled "Purgatory proved by Miracles."

"St. Gregory, the great, writes that the soul of Paschasius appeared to St. Germanus, and testified to him, that he was freed from the pains of Purgatory for his prayers.

"When the same St. Gregory was abbot of his Monastery, a monk of his, called Justus, now dead, appeared to another monk, called Copiosus, and advertized him, that he had been freed from the torments of Purgatory, by thirty Masses, which Pretiosus, Prefect of the Monastery by the order of St. Gregory, had said for his soul, as is recounted in his life.

"St. Gregory of Tours writes of a holy damsel, called Vitaliana, that she

appeared to St. Martin, and told him she had been in Purgatory for a venial sin which she had committed, and that she had been delivered by the prayers of the Saint.

“Peter Damiani writes, that St. Severin appeared to a clergyman, and told him, that he had been in Purgatory, for not having said the Divine Service at due hours, and that afterwards God had delivered him, and carried him to the company of the blessed.

“St. Bernard writes, that St. Malachy freed his sister from the pains of Purgatory by his prayers; and that the same sister had appeared unto him, begging of him that relief and favour.

“And St. Bernard himself by his intercession freed another, who had suffered a whole year the pains of Purgatory; as William, Abbot, writes in his life.”—*Flowers of the Lives of the Saints*, p. 830.

These instances among others are adduced by Bellarmine; and he adds, “*plura similia legi possunt apud, &c. . . . sed quæ attulimus, sunt magis authentica.*”—i. 11.

## 2. *Proofs from the Old and New Testaments.*

Bellarmino adduces the following texts from the Old and New Testaments; in doing which he must not be supposed to mean, that each of them contains in itself the evidence of its relevancy and availableness, or could be understood without some authoritative interpretation; only, if it is asked, “*is Purgatory the doctrine of Holy Scripture, and where?*” he would answer, that in matter of fact it *is* taught in the following passages, according to the explanations of them found in various writers of consideration.

1. 2 Macc. xii. 42—45. “Besides that noble Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forso much as they saw before their eyes the things that came to pass for the sins of those that were slain. And when he had made a gathering throughout the company to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem, *to offer a sin offering*, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the Resurrection; for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also, in that he perceived that there was great favour

laid up for those that died godly, *it was an holy and good thought*. Whereupon he made *a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin.*"

2. Tob. iv. 17. "*Pour out thy bread on the burial of the just, but give nothing to the wicked;*" that is, at the burial of the just, give alms; which were given to gain for them the prayers of the poor.

3. 1 Sam. xxxi. 13. "And they took their bones," [of Saul and his sons,] "and *buried* them under a tree at Jabesh, and *fasted seven days.*" Vid. also 2 Sam. i. 12. iii. 35. This fasting was an offering for their souls.

4. Ps. xxxviii. 1. "O Lord, rebuke me not in Thy *wrath*; neither chasten me in *Thy hot displeasure.*" By *wrath* is meant Hell; by *hot displeasure*, Purgatory.

5. Ps. lxi. 12. "We went through *fire* and through *water*, but Thou broughtest us out into a wealthy place," (*refrigerium.*) Water is Baptism; fire is Purgatory.

6. Is. iv. 4. "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have *purged* the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment and by the spirit of *burning.*"

7. Is. ix. 18. "Wickedness burneth as the fire; it shall devour the briars and thorns."

8. Mic. vii. 8, 9. "Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy; when I fall, I shall arise; when *I sit in darkness*, the Lord shall be a light unto me. I will bear the *indignation* of the Lord, because I have sinned against Him, *until He plead my cause*, and execute judgment for me: *He will bring me forth to the light*, and I shall behold His righteousness."

9. Zech. ix. 11. "As for Thee also, by the blood of Thy covenant, I have *sent forth Thy prisoners out of the pit*, wherein is no water." This text is otherwise taken to refer to the *Limbus Patrum*.

10. Mal. iii. 3. "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and He shall *purify* the sons of Levi, and *purge* them as gold and silver," &c.



From the New Testament he adduces the following texts :

1. Matt. xii. 32. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, *neither in the world to come*:" that means, "neither in Purgatory," for in hell the very supposition of forgiveness is excluded.

2. 1 Cor. iii. 15. "He himself shall be saved; *yet so as by fire*."

3. 1 Cor. xv. 29. "Else what shall they do, which are *baptized*" *i. e.* who undergo the baptism of tears and humiliation, who pray, fast, give alms, &c. "for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?"

4. Matt. v. 25, 26.—Luke xii. 58, 59. "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into *prison*. Verily, I say unto thee, *thou shalt by no means come out thence, till* thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." By the *way*, is meant this present life; by the *adversary*, the Law; by the *Judge*, our Saviour; by the *officer*, or executioner, the Angels; by the *prison*, Purgatory.

5. Matt. v. 22. "Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the *judgment*; and whosoever shall say to his brother, *Raca*, shall be in danger of the *Council*; but whosoever shall say, *Thou fool*, shall be in danger of hell fire." Here are three kinds of punishments spoken of. Hell belongs to the next world; therefore also do the other two. Hence there are in the next world, besides eternal punishment, punishments short of eternal.

6. Luke xvi. 9. "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." To *fail*, is to die; the *friends* are the Saints in glory, and they *receive* us, *i. e.* from Purgatory, in consequence of their prayers.

7. Luke xxiii. 42. "Lord, *remember* me, *when* Thou comest into Thy kingdom." That is, there is a remembrance and a re-

mission of sin, not only in this life, but after it, in Christ's future kingdom.

8. Acts ii. 24. "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the *pains* of death (*infern*); because it was not possible that He should be holden of it." Christ Himself was released from no *pains* on being raised, nor were the ancient Fathers in the *Limbus*; nor were lost souls released at all. Therefore the pains which God loosed, were those of souls in Purgatory.

9. Phil. ii. 10. "That at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, *and things under the earth.*" Vid. also Rev. v. 3. "And no *man* in heaven, nor in earth, *neither under the earth*, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon."

Now as to many of these texts, we who have not been educated in the belief of Purgatory, may well wonder how they come to be enlisted in support of Purgatory at all. This may be explained in some such way as the following,—which may be of use in helping us to understand the state of mind under which the Romanists view them. It is obvious, as indeed has been already remarked, that they do not of themselves *prove* the doctrine, nor are they chosen by Bellarmine himself, but given on the authority of writers of various times. Could indeed competent evidence be brought from other quarters, that the doctrine really was true and Apostolical, we should not unreasonably have believed that some of them did allude to it; especially if writers of name, who might speak from tradition, so considered. We could not have taken upon ourselves to say at first sight that it certainly was not contained in them, only we should have waited for evidence that it was. Some of the texts in question are obscure, and seem to desiderate a meaning; and so far it is a sort of gain when they have any meaning assigned them, as though they were unappropriated territory which the first comer might seize. Again, the coincidence of several of them in one and the same mode of expression, implies that they have a common drift, whatever that drift is,—that there is something about them which seems to have reference to secrets untold to man. Amid these

dim and broken lights, the text in the Apocrypha first quoted, comes as if to combine and steady them. All this is said *by way of analysing how* it is that such a class of texts, though of so little cogency critically, has that influence with individuals, which it certainly sometimes has. The reason seems to be that the doctrine of Purgatory professes to interpret texts which God's word has left in obscurity. Yet, whatever be the joint force of such arguments from Scripture, in favor of the doctrine, it vanishes surely, at once and altogether, before one single clear text, such as the following: "Blessed are the dead *which die in the Lord*, from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, *that they may rest from their labours.*" Or again, if any one is destined to endure Purgatory for the temporal punishment of sins, one should think it would be persons circumstanced as the thief on the cross,—a dying penitent; yet to him it is expressly said, "Verily I say unto thee, *to day* shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

### *3. Proofs from Antiquity.*

After Scripture, Bellarmine brings the testimony of early Churches in Council, as follows:

1. The African Church: "Let the Altar Sacrament be celebrated fasting; if, however, there be any Commendation of the Dead made in the afternoon, let prayers only be used."—Conc. Carth. IV. c. 79.

2. The Spanish enjoins that suicides should not be prayed for, &c.—Conc. Bracar. I. c. 39.

3. The Gallic: "It has seemed fit, that in all celebrations of the Eucharist, the Lord should be interceded with in a suitable place in Church, for the spirits of the dead."—Conc. Cabilon.

4. The German defines, (Conc. Wormat. c. 10.) that prayers and offerings should be made even for those who are executed.

5. The Italic declares (Conc. VI. under Symmachus) that it is sacrilege to defraud the souls of the dead of prayer, &c.

6. The Greek in like manner.

Moreover, the Liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, &c. all contain prayers for the dead.

Now these professed instances are here enumerated in order to show how plainly and entirely they fall short of the point to be proved. Not one of them implies the doctrine of Purgatory; or goes beyond the doctrine which Archbishop Ussher (vide Tract 72.) has shown to have existed in the early Church, that the Saints departed were not at once in their full happiness, and that prayers benefited them. One of these instances indeed is somewhat remarkable, the allowing prayers for malefactors executed; but all were the subject of prayer who were not excluded from hope, and malefactors are, even by us, admitted to Holy Communion, and are allowed the Burial Service. To pray for them was merely the expression of hope.

Next, Bellarmine appeals to the Fathers, of whom I shall only cite those within the first five hundred years; viz. Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, Paulinus, Augustine, Theodoret, and one or two others. Now in order to keep the point in controversy clearly in view, let it be recollected that we are not disputing the existence in the Ritual of the Church, of the custom of praying for the dead in Christ; but *why* prayer was offered was a question in dispute, a point unsettled by any Catholic tradition, but variously treated by various Doctors at various times. There is nothing contrary to the genius of religion, natural and revealed, that duties should be prescribed, yet the reasons for them not told us, as Bishop Butler has abundantly showed; and the circumstance that the ancients do agree in the usage, but differ as to the reasons, shows that the reasons were built upon the usage, not the usage on the reasons. And while this variety of opinions in the early Church, as to the meaning of the usage, forfeits for any one of these any claim to be considered apostolical, of course it deprives the doctrine of Purgatory of authority inclusively, even supposing for argument's sake it was received by some early writers as true. Purgatory is but a violent hypothesis to give meaning to a usage, for which other hypotheses short of it and very different from it, and equally conjectural with it, may be assigned, nay, and were

assigned before it, and far more extensively. Let it be remembered then, when the following list of passages, professedly in behalf of Purgatory, is read, that, what we have to look for, is, not evidence of a certain usage, which we grant did exist, but of an opinion, of a particular opinion explaining it; not of Prayer for the dead simply, nor of the opinion that Prayer for the dead profits, but that such Prayer is intended and tends to rescue them from a state of suffering. Further what we look for is not the testimony of one or two writers to the truth of this opinion, even if one or two could be brought, but an agreement of all in its favour. If however it be said that the usage of Prayer in itself tends to the doctrine of Purgatory, I answer, that so far from it, in its primitive form it included prayers for the Virgin Mary and Apostles, which while retained were an indirect but forcible standing witness against the doctrine.

Tertullian, in his *de Coronâ*, § 3. speaks of “*oblaciones pro defunctis*,” offerings for the dead.

Again, “Let her” [the widow] “pray for the soul of” [her deceased husband] “and ask for him a place of refreshment in the interval before the judgment, and a fellowship in the first resurrection, and let her offer on the anniversary of his falling to sleep.”—*De Monogam.* § 10. *Vid. also de Pudicit.*

Cyprian. “The Bishops our predecessors . . . decreed that no one dying should nominate clerics as guardians or executors, and if any one had done this, no offering should be made for him, or sacrifice celebrated for his sleeping well.”—*Epist. i. 9. et infra.*

Eusebius (*vid. Constant. iv.*) says that Constantine had wished to be buried in a frequented Church, in order to have the benefit of many prayers. On his death they offered the Holy Eucharist over his remains<sup>1</sup>.

Cyril of Jerusalem. “We pray for all our community who are dead, believing that this is the greatest benefit to those souls for whom the offering is made.”—*Mystagog. 5.*

<sup>1</sup> *Vid. also* passage in *Records of the Church*, No. xii. “The Adversary contrived that his [Polycarp’s] poor body might not be obtained by us, though many much desired to secure it, and to communicate over his holy remains.”

Gregory Nazianzen. "Let us commend to God our own souls, and the souls of those who, as men more advanced on the same road, have arrived before us at their resting place."—*Orat. in Cæsar. fin.*

Ambrose. "Therefore she is, I think, not so much to be lamented as to be followed with your prayers; she is not to be mourned over with your tears, but rather her soul is to be commended to God by your oblations."—*Ep. ii. 8. ad Faustinum.* Vid. also *de ob. Theod., &c. &c.*

Jerome. "Other husbands scatter on their wives' graves violets, roses, lilies, and purple flowers; but our Panmachius waters her holy ashes and reverend relics with the balsams of almsgiving; with such embellishments and perfumes he honours the sleeping remains, knowing what is written, 'As water quenches fire, so doth alms sin.'"—*Ad Pammach.*

Chrysostom. "The dead is aided not by tears, but by prayers, by supplications, by alms. . . . Let us not weary in giving aid to the dead, offering prayers for them."—*Hom. 41. in 1. ad Cor.*

Again. "Not without purpose has it been ordained by the Apostles, that in the awful Mysteries a commemoration should be made of the dead; for they know that thence much gain accrues to them; much advantage."—*Hom. 69. ad pop.* Vid. also *Hom. 32. in Matt. In Joan. Hom. 84. In Philipp. 3. In Act Apost. 21.*

Paulinus, writing to Delphinus, Bishop of Bordeaux: "Do thy diligence that he may be granted to thee, and that from the least of thy sacred fingers the dews of refreshment may sprinkle his soul."

Augustine. "We read in the book of Maccabees that sacrifice was offered for the dead; but, though it were not even found in the old Scriptures, the authority of the universal Church is not slight, which is explicit as to this custom, viz. that in the Priests' prayers which are offered to the LORD GOD at His altar, the commendation of the dead is included."—*De Cur. pro mortuis. c. ii. et alibi.*

Theodoret (*Hist. v. 26.*) mentions that Theodosius the younger fell down at the tomb of St. John Chrysostom, and prayed for the souls of his parents, then dead, Arcadius and Eudoxia.

Isidore. "Unless the Church Catholic believed that sins are remitted to the dead in Christ, she would not do alms, or offer sacrifice to God for their spirits."—*De off. div.* i. 18.

Gregory the Great. "Much profiteth souls even after death the sacred oblation of the lifegiving Sacrifice, so that the souls of the dead themselves sometimes seem to ask for it."—*Dial.* iv. 55.

Again: "They who are not weighed down by grievous sins, are profited after death by burial in the Church, because that their relatives, whenever they come to the same sacred places, remember their own kin whose tombs they behold, and pray to the Lord for them."

It is evident that the above passages go no way to prove the point in debate, being nothing more in fact than Ussher allows to be found in the early Fathers. They contain the musings of serious minds feeling a mystery, and attempting to solve it, at least by conjecture. They state that prayers benefit the dead in Christ, but *how* is either not mentioned, or vaguely, or hesitatingly, or discordantly. Accordingly, Bellarmine begins anew, and draws out a series of authorities for the doctrine of *Purgatory* expressly; and this certainly demands our attention more than the former. It contains such as the following:—

For instance, Origen says that "he who is saved, is saved by fire, that if he has any alloy of lead, the fire may melt and separate it, that all may become pure gold."—*Hom.* 6. in *Exod.*

Tertullian speaks of our being "committed into the prison beneath, which will detain us till every small offence is expiated, during the delay of the resurrection."—*De Anim.* 17.

Cyprian contrasts the being purged by torment in fire, and by martyrdom.—*Epist.* iv. 2.

Gregory Nazianzen speaks of the last Baptism being "one of fire, not only more bitter, but longer than the first Baptism."—*In Sancta lum. circ. fin.*

Ambrose speaks of our being "saved through faith, as if through fire," which will be a trial under which grievous sinners will fall, while others will pass safe through it.—*In Ps.* xxxvi.

Basil speaks of the "Purgatorial fire," in cap. ix. *Isa.*

Gregory Nyssen, of "our recovering our lost happiness by

prayer and religiousness in this life, or after death by the *purgatorial fire*."—*Orat. pro Mort.* Elsewhere too he speaks of the Purgatorial fire.

Eusebius Emisenus uses such determined words, as to require quoting. "This punishment under the earth will await those, who, having lost instead of preserving their Baptism, will perish for ever; whereas those who have done deeds calling for temporal punishments, shall pass over the fiery river and that fearful water the drops of which are fire."

Hilary declares that we have to undergo "that ever-living fire, which is a punishment of the soul in cleansing of sin."—In *Ps. cxviii.* Lactantius speaks to the same effect.—*Div. Inst.* vii. 21.

Jerome contrasts the eternal torments of the devil, and of atheists and infidels, with "the judgment tempered with mercy, of sinners and ungodly men, yet Christian, whose works are to be tried purified in the fire."—*In fn. comment. in Is.* In another place in a like contrast he speaks of Christians, if overtaken in a fault, being saved after punishment.—*Lib. i. in Pelag.*

Augustine has various passages in point, such as *Civ. Dei* xxi. 24, where speaking of believers who die with lighter sins, he says, "It is certain that these being purified before the day of judgment by means of temporal punishment, which their souls suffer, are not to be given over to eternal fire." Pope Gregory the first expresses the same doctrine, as do some others.

These instances are at first sight to the point, and demand serious consideration. Yet there is nothing in them really to alarm the inquirer whither he is being carried. I say this, that no one may be surprised at the deliberateness and over-patience with which I may seem to loiter over the explanation of them. First, then, let it be observed, were they ever so strong in favour of something more than we believe, it does not therefore follow that they take that very view which the Romanists take, nay, it does not necessarily follow that they take any one view at all, or agree with each other. Now it so happens neither the one or the other of these suppositions is true as regards those passages, though they ought both to hold, if the Roman doctrine is to be



satisfactorily maintained. These Fathers, whatever they teach, do not teach Purgatory, they do not teach any one view at all on the subject. Romanists consider Purgatory to be an article of faith, necessary to be believed in order to salvation; or in Bellarmine's words, "Purgatory is an article of faith, so that he who disbelieves its existence, will never have experience of it, but will be tormented in hell with everlasting fire." Now it can only be an article of faith, supposing it is held by Antiquity, and that unanimously. For such things only are we allowed to maintain, as come to us from the Apostles; and that only (ordinarily speaking) has evidence of so originating, which is witnessed by a number of independent witnesses in the early Church. We must have the unanimous "consent of Doctors," as an assurance that the Apostles have spoken; and much less can we tolerate their actual disagreement, in a case where unanimity was promised us. Now as regards Purgatory, not only are early writers silent as to the modern view of Rome, but they do not agree with each other; which proves they knew little more about the matter than ourselves, whatever they might conjecture; that they possessed no Apostolic Tradition, only at most entertained floating opinions on the subject. Nay, it is obvious, if we wished to believe them, we could not; for *what* is it we are to believe? If, as I shall show, various writers speak various things, which of their statements is to be taken? If this or that, it is but the language of an individual: if all of them at once, a doctrine results, discordant in its details, and in general outline, if it have any, vague and imperfect at the best.

Now as to the passages quoted by Bellarmine, it will be observed that in the number are extracts from the works of Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Hilary, St. Jerome, and Lactantius. He introduces the list with these words, "*Sunt apertissima loca in Patribus, ubi asserunt Purgatorium, quorum pauca quædam afferam,*" i. 10. "There are most perspicuous passages in the Fathers, in which they assert Purgatory, of which I will adduce some few." Will it be believed that in his second book these Fathers, nay, for the most part the very extracts, which he has given in proof of the doctrine, are enumerated as at variance with

it, and mistaken in their notion of it? He quotes a passage of Origen, (not the same) the very same two passages from St. Ambrose, the very same passage from St. Hilary, the very same from Lactantius, and a passage (not the same) from St. Jerome. Then he says, "*Hæc sententia, accepta ut sonat, manifestum errorem continet; for*" (he proceeds) "it is defined in the Council of Florence, &c." ii. 1. Next he observes, "*Addè, quòd Patres adducti, Origene excepto. . . videntur sano modo intelligi posse.*" At length, after he has given the two most favourable explanations assignable to their words, he adds of one of the two, "*Sane hanc sententiam [quæ docet omnes transituros per ignem, licet non omnes lædendi sint ab igne] nec auderem pro vera asserere, nec ut errorem improbare.*" "The only alleviation of this strange inconsistency," says a work which has recently appeared, "is that he quotes not the very same sentences both for and against his Church, but adjoining ones." The work referred to, thus comments on Bellarmine's conduct, as throwing light upon the state of feeling under which Romanists engage in controversy. "A Romanist," the writer says, "cannot really argue in defence of his doctrines. He has too firm a confidence in their truth, if he is sincere in his profession, to enable him critically to adjust the due weight to be given to this or that evidence. He assumes his Church's conclusion as true; and the facts or witnesses he adduces, are rather brought to receive an interpretation than to furnish a proof. His highest aim is to show the mere consistency of his theory, its possible adjustment, with the records of antiquity. I am not here inquiring how much of high but misdirected moral feeling is implied in this state of mind; certainly as we advance in perception of the truth, we all of us become less fitted to be controversialists. If this, however, be a true explanation of Bellarmine's strange error, the more it tends to exculpate him, the deeper it criminales his system. He ceases to be chargeable with unfairness, only in proportion as the notion of the infallibility of Rome is admitted to be the sovereign and engrossing tenet of his communion, the foundation stone, or (as it may be called) the fulcrum of its theology. I consider then, that when he first adduces the aforementioned Fathers in

proof of Purgatory, he was really but interpreting them ; he was teaching what they ought to mean, what *in charity* they must be supposed to mean, what they *might* mean as far as the very words went, *probably* meant *considering* the Church so meant, and might be taken to mean, even if their authors did not so mean, from the notion that they spoke vaguely, and, as children, really meant something besides what they formally said, and that after all, they were but the spokesmen of the then existing Church, which, though silent, held the same doctrine which Rome has since defined and published. This is to treat Bellarmine with the same charity with which he has on this supposition treated the Fathers, and it is to be hoped, with a nearer approach to the matter of fact. So much as to his first use of them ; but afterwards, in noticing what he considers erroneous opinions on this subject, he treats them, not as organs of the Church infallible, but as individuals, and interprets their language by its literal sense or by the context. . . . How hopeless then is it to contend with Romanists, as if they practically agreed to our foundation, however much they pretend to it ! Ours is antiquity : theirs the existing Church. Its infallibility is their first principle ; belief in it is a deep prejudice, quite beyond the reach of any thing external. It is quite clear that the combined testimonies of all the Fathers, supposing such a case, would not have a feather's weight against a decision of the Pope in Council, nor would matter at all, except for their sakes who had by anticipation opposed it. They consider that the Fathers ought to mean what Rome has since decreed, and that Rome knows their meaning better than they themselves did. That venturesome Church has usurped their place, and thinks it merciful, only not to banish outright the rivals she has dethroned. By an act, as it were, of grace she has determined, that, when they contradict her, though of no authority yet, as living in times of ignorance, they are not guilty of heresy but are only heterodox ; and she keeps them around her, to ask their advice when it happens to agree with her own.

“ Let us then understand the position of the Romanists towards us ; they do not really argue from the Fathers, though they seem to do so. They may affect to do so on our behalf, happy if by

an innocent stratagem they are able to convert us ; but all the while in their own feelings, they are taking a far higher position. They are teaching, not disputing or proving. They are interpreting what is obscure in antiquity, purifying what is alloyed, correcting what is amiss, perfecting what is incomplete, harmonizing what is various. They claim and use all its documents as ministers and organs of that one infallible Church, which once forsooth kept silence, but since has spoken, which by a divine gift must ever be consistent with itself, and which bears with it its own evidence of divinity."

Leaving Bellarmine then, let us proceed to inquire what the opinion of the Fathers in the foregoing passages really is.

§ 3. HISTORY OF THE RISE OF THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY AND  
OPINIONS IN THE EARLY CHURCH CONCERNING IT.

The argumentative ground of the doctrine of Purgatory as far as the Infallibility of the Church has not superseded any, has ever been, I conceive, the report of miracles and visions attesting it; but the historical origin is to be sought elsewhere, viz. in the anxious conjectures of the human mind about its future destinies, and the apparent coincidences of these with certain obscure texts of Scripture.

These may be supposed to have operated as follows; as described in the work already cited. "How ALMIGHTY GOD will deal with the mass of Christians, who are neither very good nor very bad, is a problem with which we are not concerned, and which it is our wisdom, and may be our duty, to put from our thoughts. But, when it has once forced itself upon the mind, we are led in self-defence, with a view of keeping ourselves from dwelling unhealthily on particular cases, which come under our experience and perplex us, to imagine modes, not by which God *does*, (for that would be presumptuous to conjecture,) but by which he may solve the difficulty. Most men to our apprehensions, are too unformed in religious habits either for heaven or for hell, yet there is no middle state when CHRIST comes to judgment. In consequence it is obvious to have recourse to the interval before His coming, as a time during which this incompleteness might be remedied; a season, not of changing the spiritual bent and character of the soul departed, whatever that be, for probation ends with mortal life, but of developing it in a more determinate form, whether of good or of evil. Again, when the mind once allows itself to speculate, it will discern in such a provision a means, whereby those, who not without true faith at bottom yet have committed great crimes, or those who have been carried off in youth while still undecided, or who die

after a barren though not an immoral or scandalous life, may receive such chastisement as may prepare them for heaven, and render it consistent with God's justice to admit them thither. Again, the inequality of the sufferings of Christians in this life, compared one with another, leads the unguarded mind to the same speculations, the intense suffering, *e. g.* which some men undergo on their death-bed, seeming as if but an anticipation in their case of what comes after death upon others, who without greater claim on God's forbearance, live without chastisement and die easily. I say, the mind will inevitably dwell upon such thoughts, unless it has been taught to subdue them by education or by the experience of their dangerousness.

“ Various suppositions have, accordingly, been made, as pure suppositions, as mere specimens of the capabilities, (if one may so speak) of the Divine Dispensation, as efforts of the mind reaching forward and venturing beyond its depth into the abyss of the divine counsels. If one supposition could be produced, sufficient to solve the problem, ten thousand others are conceivable, unless indeed the resources of God's Providence are exactly commensurate with man's discernment of them. Religious men, amid these searchings of heart, have naturally gone to Scripture for relief, to see if the inspired word anywhere gave them any clue for their inquiries. And hence, and from the speculations of reason upon what was there found, various notions have been hazarded at different times; for instance, that there is a certain momentary ordeal to be undergone by all men after this life, more or less severe according to their spiritual state; or that certain gross sins in good men will be thus visited, or their lighter failings and habitual imperfections; or that the very sight of divine perfection in the invisible world will be in itself a pain, while it constitutes the purification of the imperfect but believing soul; or that, happiness admitting of various degrees of intensity, penitents late in life may sink for ever into a state, blissful as far as it goes, but more or less approaching to unconsciousness; infants dying after baptism may be as gems paving the courts of heaven, or as the living wheels of the Prophet's vision; while matured Saints may excel in capacity of bliss, as well as in dignity, the

highest Archangels. Such speculations are dangerous when indulged; the event proves it; from some of these in fact seems to have resulted the doctrine of Purgatory.

“ Now the texts to which the minds of the early Christians seem to have been principally drawn, and from which they ventured to argue, were these two: ‘ The fire shall try every man’s work,’ &c.; and ‘ He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.’ These texts, with which many more were found to accord, directed their thoughts one way, as making mention of ‘ *fire*,’ whatever was meant by the word, as the instrument of trial and purification; and that, at some time between the present time and the judgment, or at the judgment. And accordingly without perhaps having any definite or consistent meaning in what they said, or being able to say whether they spoke literally or figuratively and with an indefinite reference to this life, as well as to the intermediate state, they sometimes named fire as the instrument of recovering those who had sinned after their baptism. That this is the origin of the notion of a Purgatorial fire, I gather from these circumstances, first that they do frequently insist on the texts in question, next, that they do not agree in the particular sense they put upon them. That they quote them shows they rest upon them; that they vary in explaining them, that they had no Catholic sense to guide them. Nothing can be clearer, if these facts be so, than that the doctrine of the Purgatorial fire in all its senses, as far as it was more than a surmise, and was rested on argument, was the result of private judgment exerted in defect of Tradition, upon the text of Scripture. . . . .

“ As the doctrine, thus suggested by certain striking texts, grew in popularity and definiteness, and verged towards its present Roman form, it seemed a key to many others. Great portions of the books of Psalms, Job, and the Lamentations, which express the feelings of religious men under suffering, would powerfully recommend it by the forcible and most affecting and awful meaning which they received from it. When this was once suggested, all other meanings would seem tame and inadequate.

“ To these must be added various passages from the Prophets,

as that in the beginning of the 3rd chapter of Malachi, which speaks of fire as the instrument of judgment and purification when CHRIST comes to visit His Church.

“Moreover there were other texts of obscure and indeterminate bearing, which seemed on this hypothesis to receive a profitable meaning; such as our LORD’s words in the Sermon on the Mount, “Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing;” and St. John’s expression in the apocalypse, that “no man in heaven, nor in earth, *neither under the earth*, was able to open the book.”

“Further, the very circumstance that no second instrument of a plenary and entire cleansing from sin was given after Baptism, such as Baptism, led Christians to expect that that unknown means, when accorded, would be of a more painful nature than that which they had received so freely and instantaneously in infancy, and confirmed, not only the text already cited, “He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire,” but also St. Paul’s announcement of the “judgment and fiery indignation” which awaits those who sinned [sin] after having been once “enlightened,” and by CHRIST’s warning to the impotent man to sin no more lest a worse thing come unto him.

“Lastly, the universal and apparently apostolical custom of praying for the dead in CHRIST, called for some explanation, the reason for it not having come down to posterity with it. Various reasons may be supposed quite clear of this distressing doctrine, but it supplied an adequate and a most constraining motive for its observance to those who were not content to practice it in ignorance.”

Should any one for a moment be startled by any thing that is here said, as if investing the doctrine with some approach to plausibility, I would have him give God thanks for the safeguard of Catholic Tradition, which keeps us from immoderate speculation upon Scripture or a vain indulgence of the imagination, by authoritatively declaring the contents and the limits of the Creed necessary to salvation and profitable to ourselves.

There seem, on the whole, to be two chief opinions on the subject, embraced in the early Church. One of these is Origen’s,



which I shall first exhibit in the language of St. Ambrose, being the very passage referred to by Bellarmine. The notion is this, that the fire at the day of judgment will burn or scorch every one in proportion to his remaining imperfections. St. Ambrose then thus comments on Psalm xxxvii. (38) 14.

“‘Thou hast proved us by fire,’ says David; therefore we shall all be proved by fire, and Ezekiel (Malachi) says, ‘Behold the LORD ALMIGHTY cometh, and who may abide the day of His coming? &c.....for He is like a refiner’s fire and like fuller’s soap; and He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and He shall purify the Sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, &c.’ Therefore the Sons of Levi will be purged by fire; *by fire Ezekiel, by fire Daniel*. But these, though proved by fire, yet shall say, ‘We passed through fire and water,’ (Ps. lxxvi. 12.) Others shall remain in the fire; and the fire shall be as dew to them, (Song of Three Children, 27.) as to the Hebrew Children who were exposed to the fire of the burning furnace. But the Ministers of impiety shall be consumed in the avenging flame. Woe is me should my work be burned, and I suffer this worsting of my labour! Although the Lord will save His servants, we shall be saved by faith, but so saved as by fire. Although we shall not be consumed, yet we shall be burned. But how some remain in the fire, others escape through it, learn from another Scripture. The Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, the Israelites passed over; Moses escaped to land, Pharaoh sank, for his heavy sins drowned him. In like manner the irreligious will sink in the lake of burning fire.”

It is plain that St. Ambrose, so far from imagining a Roman Purgatory, definite in period, place, and subjects, speaks of an ordeal by fire which *all* Christians must undergo at the last day, and grounds it on the solemn text already referred to, 1 Cor. iii. 12—15. which whether *rightly* so interpreted or not, a point we cannot determine, since it is an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in Scripture, yet at least may be so understood without violence to the wording. “If any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man’s work shall be made manifest; for the Day shall declare it, because it (the Day) shall be revealed in fire; and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is. If any man’s work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.” Now it would seem plain that in this passage

the *searching process* of final Judgment, essaying our works of righteousness, is described by the word *fire*. Not that we may presume to *limit* the word fire to that meaning, or on the other hand to say it is a merely *figurative* expression denoting judgment; which seems a stretching somewhat beyond our measure. Doubtless there is a mystery in the word *fire*, as there is a mystery in the words *day of judgment*. Yet it any how has reference to the *instrument* or *process* of judgment. And in this way the Fathers seem to have understood the passage; referring it to the last Judgment, as Scripture does, but at the same time religiously retaining the use of the word *fire*, as not affecting to interpret and dispense with what seems some mysterious economy, lest they should be wiser than what is written.

Next let us turn to the same Father's 20th Sermon on Ps. cxix. which is also referred to by Bellarmine.

"As long as the Israelites were in Egypt, they were in the *iron* furnace, that is, in the furnace of temptation, in the furnace of affliction, when they were afflicted by cruel tyranny. Whence also it is written, 'I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, from the iron furnace.' The furnace was iron, because, while the people was yet in Egypt, no one's works were illuminated by holiness, no one's gold had been there assayed, no one's lead of iniquity burned away. It was a cruel furnace, a furnace of perpetual death, which none could escape, which consumed every one, in which pain and sorrow dwell only. But the furnace, in which Ananias, Azarias, and Misael sang their hymn to the Lord, was a golden furnace, not an iron; by means of which wisdom hath shown forth in the faith of true obedience all over the world. It was indeed in Babylon, where spiritual gold was not, unless perchance in captivity, for 'the Lord led captivity captive.' This is the gold in God's saints who were captives among the Babylonians in body, but in spirit were freemen with God, delivered from the chains of human captivity, and bearing the yoke of spiritual grace. And perchance the same furnace would be iron to the unstable, and gold to those who persevere.

"*All must be proved through fire*, as many as desire to return to paradise; for it is not said for nothing, that, when Adam and Eve were expelled from Paradise, God placed at the outlet a fiery sword which turned every way. *All must pass through the flames, whether he be John the Evangelist*, whom the Lord so loved as to say to Peter of him, 'If I wish him to tarry, what is that to thee? Follow thou me.' Some have doubted of his death; of his passage through the fire we cannot doubt, for he is in Paradise, not separated from Christ. Or *whether he be Peter*; he who received the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, who walked

upon the sea, must still say, 'We passed through fire and water, and Thou broughtest us out into a place of refreshment.' But the fiery sword will soon be turned by St. John, for iniquity is not found in him, whom righteousness itself loved. Whatever human defect was in him, Divine Love melted it away; for her wings are as the wings of fire. (Cant. viii. 6.)

"He who possesses this fire of love, will have no cause to fear there the fiery sword. To Peter, who so often exposed his life for Christ, He will say, 'Go and sit down to meat.' But he shall say, 'Thou hast tried us with fire, as silver is tried; for, when many waters do not drown love, how can fire consume then?' But he shall be tried as silver, I as lead; *I shall burn till the lead melts away.* If no silver be found in me, ah me! I shall be plunged down into the lowest pit, or consume entire as the stubble. Should ought of gold or silver be found in me, not for my works, but through the mercy and grace of Christ, by the ministry of the priesthood, I shall peradventure say, 'They that hope in Thee, shall not be ashamed.'

"The fiery sword then shall consume iniquity, which is placed on the leaden scale. One only could not feel that fire, Christ the Righteousness of God, who did no sin; for the fire found nought in Him which it might consume."

It is now sufficiently clear what St. Ambrose's belief was. The only point of approximation between it and the doctrine of Purgatory is this; that he conceived that for all but the highest saints, in whom love dissolved all remaining dross whatever, some transient suffering, more or less in duration, was in store in the day of judgment. And hence the force of the ordinary prayers of the early Church, as based on Scripture, (and described at length by Archbishop Ussher, in Tract, No. 72,) that departed believers might have "a merciful trial at the last day."

St. Hilary is another witness, whom Bellarmine, in his former book quotes, in his latter surrenders. He, too, will be found to hold this same view of the purgatorial nature of the fire of the last judgment.

"The prophet [the Psalmist] observes, that it is difficult and most perilous to human nature, to desire God's judgments: For, since no one is clean in His sight, how can His judgment be desirable? Considering we shall have to give account for every idle word, shall we long for the day of judgment, in which we must undergo that ever-living fire, and those heavy penalties for cleansing the soul from its sins? Then will a sword pierce through the soul of Mary, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed. If that Virgin which could compass God is to come into the severity of the judgment, who shall dare desire

to be judged of God? Job, when he had finished his warfare with all calamities of man and had triumphed, who, when tempted, said, 'The Lord gave,' and confessed himself but [dust and] ashes when he heard God's voice from the cloud, and determined that he ought not to speak another word. And who shall venture to desire God's judgments, whose voice from heaven neither so great a Prophet endured, nor the Apostles again, when they were with the Lord in the Mount?"—Tract, in Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) lit. 3. § 12. vid. also § 5.

Again,

"He [John the Baptist] marks the season of our salvation and judgment in the Lord, saying, 'He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire; for to those who are baptized in the Holy Ghost, it remains to be perfected in the fire of judgment.'—Comm. in Matt. ii. § 4.

Let us now proceed to Origen, who is historically the first who has put forward the theory under review. Even Origen, be it remembered, is at first alleged by Bellarmine, though afterwards absolutely relinquished. His words, as quoted by that author himself, are as follows :

"I consider that even after the resurrection from the dead, we need a sacrament to wash us thoroughly and cleanse us; for no one will rise without dross upon him, nor can the soul be found which at once is free from all defects."—Hom. 14 in Luc.

Again,

"We must all come to that fire, be we Paul or Peter," in Ps. xxxvii.

Lactantius expresses the same, or almost the same doctrine in the following passage, as referred to by Bellarmine.

"Moreover, when He shall have judged the just, He will also try them in the fire. Then they whose sins prevail in weight or number, will be tortured in the fire and partially burned; but they, who are mature in righteousness and ripeness of virtue, shall not feel that flame; for they have somewhat of God within them, to repel and throw off the force of the flame. Such is the force of innocence, that from it that fire recoils without mischief, as having received this property from God to burn the irreligious, to recede from the righteous."—Div. Inst. vii. 21.

Two more writers may be mentioned, as holding the same view, both of whom are quoted by Bellarmine in his favour. St. Jerome, as referred to by him, speaks as follows :

*Distinction between Catholic Tradition and Catholic Teaching.* 37

“The fire,” he says, commenting on Amos vii. 4, “being called for judgment, devours first the deep; that is, all kinds of sins, wood, hay, stubble, and afterwards consumes also a part, that is, reaches to his saints, who are accounted the Lord’s portion.”

St. Paulinus of Nola is the other, who thus writes to Severus :

“If we attain by these works to be citizens with the saints, our work shall not be burned; and that sagacious fire will, on our passing its ordeal, surround us with no severe heat of punishment; but as if we were commended to its care it will play around us with a kind caress, so that we may say, ‘We have passed through fire and water,’ &c.”—Ep. 28. (9.)

To these passages, others similar might be added from St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzen.

So much on this speculation or foreboding concerning the fire of the last judgment. Before proceeding to consider the second notion of a Purgatory, which existed in the early Church, I stop to make a remark. What has been said will illustrate what is meant by Catholic Tradition, and how it may be received without binding us to accept every thing which the Fathers say. It must be *Catholic* to be of authority; that is, all the writers who mention the subject, must agree together in their view of it, or the exceptions, if there be any, must be such as *probare regulam*. And again, they must profess it is Traditionary teaching. For instance, supposing all the Fathers agreed together in their interpretation of a certain text, I consider that agreement would invest that interpretation with such a degree of authority, as to make it at first sight most rash (to say the very least) to differ from them; yet it is conceivable that on some points, as the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy, they might be mistaken. It is abstractedly conceivable, that a modern commentator *might* on certain occasions plausibly justify his dissent from them:—this is conceivable, I say, *unless* they were explaining a doctrine of the creed, which is *otherwise* known to come from the Apostles,—or professed, (which would be equivalent) that such an interpretation had ever been received in their respective Churches as coming from the Apostles. Catholic Tradition is something more than Catholic teaching. Great as is the authority of the latter, (and we cannot well put it too high,) Tradition is something beyond

it. This remark is in point here, for it might be objected that so many Fathers agree together in the notion of a last-day Purgatory, that, were it not for the accident of others speaking differently, we should certainly have received it as Catholic Tradition. I answer, no; whatever the worth of so many witnesses would have been,—and it certainly for safety's sake ought to have been taken for very much,—still, Origen, Hilary, Ambrose, and the rest, do not approximate in their remarks to the authoritative language in which they would speak of the Trinity or the benefits of Baptism. They do not profess to be delivering an article of the Faith once delivered to the saints.—Now, to consider the second theory in the early Church on the subject of Purgatory.

While the Greek Churches, and thence the Italian held the doctrine of a judgment Purgatory, a doctrine far more like the Roman is found from an early age in the African Church; at the same time, it was so far from being considered as a necessary article of faith, that even St. Austin, who brings it out most fully, expresses his doubt about its truth. It was in fact only an opinion or conjecture.

Tertullian speaks thus, when discussing the question, whether souls suffer in the intermediate state, or wait till the resurrection of the body :

“In short, considering we understand that prison, which the gospel discloses, to be the places under the earth (*inferos*), and explain the very last farthing to mean, that every slightest fault is then to be washed away in the interval before the resurrection, no one will doubt that the soul pays something in those nether places without intrenching on the fulness of the resurrection also through the flesh.”—*De Anim. fn.*

Next comes St. Cyprian. Cyprian is arguing in favor of readmitting the lapsed, when penitent, and his argument seems to be, that, it does not follow we absolve them simply, by restoring them to the Church; we do but admit them to present privileges, the judgment being reserved in God's hands. He thus writes to Antonianus.

“Neither suppose, dearest brother, that the virtue of the brethren will be impaired, or martyrdoms fail, though penitence be indulged to the lapsed, and

hope of reconciliation set before the penitent. Strength unmoveable abides with those who have true faith; and to those who fear and love God with their whole heart, integrity endures in firmness and in courage. Even to adulterers a period of penitence is granted by us, and reconciliation allowed; yet not on that account does virginity decline in the Church, or the glorious resolve of continence languish through the sins of others. The Church is still embellished by the crown of so many virgins, and chastity and purity are as glorious as before; nor, though the adulterer is indulged with penitence and pardon, is the vigour of continence relaxed. It is one thing to stand for pardon, another to arrive safe at glory; one to be sent to prison, there to remain till the last farthing be paid; another to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one thing to be tormented for sin in long pain and so to be cleansed, and to be purged a long while in the fire, another to have washed away all sin in martyrdom; one thing in short, to wait for the Lord's sentence in the day of judgment, another at once to be crowned by Him."—Ep. 55. ad Antonian.

Rigaltius, Faber, and some others understand this passage to refer to the penitential discipline of the Church which was imposed on the penitent; and, as far as the context goes, certainly no sense could be more apposite. Yet, if I may venture on an opinion apart from such high authorities, the words in themselves seem to go beyond any mere ecclesiastical, though virtually divine censure, especially "missum in carcerem," and "purgari diu igne."

Further, the passage in Tertullian, weak in itself, for it was perhaps written after he was a Montanist, fixes a sense, though it rests for authority, on Cyprian's language. Tertullian explains Cyprian, Cyprian sanctions Tertullian. It should be recollected, moreover, that Cyprian used to call Tertullian his Master; and the inference deducible from all this is greatly strengthened, when we come to consider the views of St. Austin, another African. At the same time it is worth noticing, the *occasion* and *manner* of St. Cyprian's statement, whatever it means. He will be found to speak conjecturally, and as if in disputation. He is *accounting* for a difficulty; as if he said,—“You suppose that, should the lapsed be received, this makes it all one as if they had never fallen. Far from it; they do not receive an *absolute* pardon; they are reserved to the judgment of the great day. Had they endured and suffered martyrdom, they would have had their pardon sealed at once; as it is, it is uncertain, and *who*

*knows but* in God's judgments such a recompense is in store for them as will allow the Church to be merciful to them without God's ceasing to be just?"

St. Austin is lastly to be mentioned; who speaks neither in one uniform way, nor with one and the same degree of certainty. Sometimes he seems to hold the Greek opinion of the final purgatorial conflagration. In the following passage, after alluding to Abraham's sacrifice, (Gen. xv.) in which the beasts were divided but not the birds, and "when the sun went down," "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between those pieces," and interpreting the birds of the spiritual members of the Church, and the beasts of carnal men, some of whom are within, some outside the Church, he says,

"The smoking furnace will come; for Abraham sat there till the evening, and then comes the great terror of the day of judgment. For the evening is the end of the world, and the furnace is the coming day of judgment. It went between those things which were already divided, separating them to the right and left. Thus there are certain carnal men who are yet in the Church's bosom, living according to their own way, who are in danger of seduction from heretics. While they remain carnal, they are divisible; He did not divide the birds, but the carnal are divided. 'I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal . . . . Whoso shall remain such, and in a way of life suitable to the carnal, and yet has not receded from the bosom of the Church, not been seduced by heretics, so as to be divided off the other way, the furnace will come, nor will he be able to stand on the right without undergoing it. If then he would escape that furnace, let him be changed now into the turtle-dove and pigeon. Let him receive it, who can. But if not, but he shall have built on the foundation wood, hay, stubble; that is, if he has heaped over the foundation of his faith worldly likings,—yet if Christ be there, so as to have the first place in his heart, above all other objects, such are endured, are suffered. The furnace shall come, and shall burn the wood, hay, and stubble; and 'he shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' This will the furnace do; separating off some to the left,—others it will in a manner strain off unto the right: but it did not divide the birds."—In Ps. civ. Serm. iii. and de Civ. Dei. xvi. 24. vid. also, in Ps. vi. de Civ. Dei. xx. 25; xxi. 16, and in Gen. contr. Man. ii. 20. fin.

This is one notion St. Austin had of Purgatory; another was, that it would be of a certain duration, in proportion to the sins of each individual. Without asserting that this view is plainly inconsistent with the former, it fairly may be called a distinct one. The following passage will be found to contain it:



“Some suppose that those who do not renounce the name of Christ, and are baptized in his font in the Church, nor are cut off therefrom by any schism or heresy, whatever be their crimes, though neither washed away by penitence nor ransomed by alms, but persevered in obstinately to the last day of life, will yet be saved by fire, punished indeed according to the greatest of their excesses and wickednesses, but not with eternal fire . . . . But since those clear and positive apostolical testimonies to the contrary (James ii. 14. 17. 1 Cor. vi. 9, &c.) cannot be false, the former obscure text concerning those who build on this foundation, which is Christ, not gold, silver, precious stones, but wood, hay, stubble, . . . must be so explained as not to contradict passages which are clear. Wood, then, hay, stubble, may naturally mean such desires of lawful things of this world as cannot be forgone without some pain of mind. But when that pain burns, if Christ abides in the heart as a foundation, so that nothing is preferred to him, and the man who feels the fire of that pain, had rather lose the things which he so loves than Christ, he is saved through fire. . . . The trial of tribulation is a certain fire, of which Scripture speaks plainly in another place. ‘Earthen vessels are proved by the furnace, and righteous men by the trial of tribulation.’ That fire fulfils the Apostle’s words in this life; for instance, should it befall two Christians, one caring for the things of God, how he may please God; that is, building upon the foundation of Christ, gold, silver, precious stones; the other caring for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, that is, building on the same foundation wood, hay, stubble; the work of the former is not burned away, for he has not loved things, the loss of which would distress him; but the other’s work is burned away, since those things are not lost without suffering which are possessed with enjoyment. But since, when an alternative comes, he had rather lose them than Christ, nor from apprehension of losing such things renounces Christ, though he may feel a pain during the loss, yet he is ‘saved so as by fire;’ for, though the loss of what he loved is a burning pain, yet it does not subvert or consume one who is secured by the firmness and indestructibility of his foundation. *Such a suffering too, it is not impossible may happen after this life;* and it is a fair question, whether it can be settled or not; viz. that some Christians, according to their love of the perishing goods of this world, attain salvation *more slowly or speedily* through a certain purgatorial fire; not such, however, of whom it is said, ‘that they shall not inherit the kingdom of God,’ unless they repent suitably, and gain remission of their crimes.”—Enchirid. 68. 69. vid. also ad Dulcitium, § 6—13. de Fide et Operib. § 16.

In his *de Civitate Dei*, after speaking (as above noticed) of the fire at the judgment, he goes on to change its position in the course of the Divine Economy, and places it between death and the resurrection; yet, still he observes his hesitating and conjectural tone.

“ After the death of the body, until the arrival of that last day of condemnation and reward after the resurrection [of the body], should it be said that in this interval the spirits of the dead suffer a fire, such as they do not feel who had not habits and likings in the life of this body, which requires their wood, hay, and stubble to be burned up, but they feel who have not carried with them the like worldly tabernacles, whether these only, or how and then, or not then because here, though they experience the fire of transitory tribulation rescuing venial offenses from damnation by consuming them, I do not oppose, for perchance it is true.”

He then proceeds to speak, as before, of the other senses of the word *fire*, as used in the text, which affords matter for his inquiry.

And now the reader has before him the whole extent of Augustine's much-talked of admissions in behalf of Purgatory; and he may see how hesitating and incomplete they are. It is remarkable that the passages on which Bellarmine chiefly relies, are rejected by the Benedictines as not Augustine's; so that Romanists, if they would use this celebrated Father in the controversy, must betake themselves to such as the two extracts last quoted, in which Augustine speaks but doubtfully, and which (it is remarkable) Bellarmine introduces, not in his own favour, but on an opponent's challenge, to explain, as if from their conjectural tone rather making against him. It really would appear, as if in the African Church, there had been no advance in definiteness of doctrine in this matter since the days of Cyprian; but that what was a speculation then, remained as little insisted on or settled when St. Austin wrote.

If it were necessary to add any other evidence, how little the Fathers knew on this mysterious subject, I might mention, that in one place St. Austin implies that the impenitent are in Purgatory; and that St. Jerome seems to say, all baptized persons, however they suffer in Purgatory, are eventually saved<sup>1</sup>.

I have now finished my account of what the early Fathers said about Purgatory; but very imperfect justice is done to the subject, till the reader is put into possession of those decisive testimonies of the Fathers the other way, (that is, in favour of the peace and rest of the intermediate state to true believers,) which will

<sup>1</sup> Taylor. Dissuasive, vol. ii. p. 75. Bellarm. ii. 1

reduce the opinions already described to a mere conjecture, pious indeed and solemnly made, yet received one moment, and abandoned the next. Without determining whether the strict wording of the following passages be such as necessarily to exclude the doctrine of Purgatory, which is a poor way of seeking after what the fact really was, simply consider whether persons who *practically held* that doctrine, who kept it simply before them as the whole truth and acted upon it, could possibly have written them.

Cyprian, on occasion of the famous plague of A. D. 252,

“ Let him fear death, who has never been born anew of water and the Spirit, and is sold over to the flames of hell; him, who has not been given an interest in the cross and passion of Christ; who is to pass from temporal to the second death; whose departure from the world will be followed by the torments of eternal flame of punishment; who by a longer delay gains but a longer respite from pangs and groans. Many of our people are dying in this pestilence, that is, are delivered from the world; and what is truly a plague to Jews, heathen and enemies of Christ, is to God’s servants an end bringing salvation. That you witness righteous and wicked dying together without any distinction of man from man, is no reason for your supposing that destruction is common to good and evil; *the righteous are called to a place of refreshment, the wicked are hurried to punishment*, shelter is promptly afforded to the believing, punishment to infidels. We are undiscerning and ungrateful, well beloved brethren, in return for God’s benefits, nor do we recognize the mercy vouchsafed us. Lo the virgins depart in peace safe, and with their glory secured, without the dread of the threats, the seductions, and the impurities of approaching Anti-Christ; youths escape the perils of their anxious age, and happily receive the prize of continence and chastity; the delicate matron no more fears the tortures, the fury of persecution, the violent hands and the cruelties of the executioner, receiving the gain of a speedy death. By fear of the pestilence the lukewarm are kindled, the languid are braced, the slothful are roused, deserters are driven back, the heathen are constrained to believe; *the multitude of those who are already believers is called to peace*; recruits are collected in abundance and with increased strength, prepared to fight without fear of death, when the action comes on, as having joined in a season when death was busy.”—De Mortal. 9.

“ Our brethren should not cause us sorrow, whom the Lord’s call has delivered from the world, knowing as we do that they are not lost to us but sent before us, they do not recede, but precede: we should behave as towards men going a journey or a voyage, regret but not deplore them, nor go into mourning for those who have already put on white raiment,” &c.—Ibid. 14.

“ It is not an exit, but a passage, a travelling to things eternal, when time has been journeyed through. *Who would not hasten to what is better?*”—Ibid. 15.

That in this last passage St. Cyprian is speaking of heavenly felicity after the resurrection, is certain from the context; but it is as plain that he looks upon the intermediate state as the beginning of it, or the out-post, which he could not do, unless he thought that at least, on the whole, and to the generality, it was a state of rest and peace.

St. Ambrose;

“Death is in every way a good; because it puts away those principles in us which war against each other, and because it is a *sort of harbour for those who, after tossing on the wide sea of this life, seek for an anchorage of secure peace*; and because it puts an end to the chance of deterioration, but, as it finds a man, in that condition it consigns him to the future judgment, and comforts him with the rest itself, and withdraws him from such present goods as raise envy, and quiets him with the expectation of the future.”—*De Bono Mortis*. 4.

“Unwise persons fear death as the greatest of ills; but the wise desire it, *as if a rest after toil, and the end of ills*.”—*Ibid.* 8.

“Relying on these considerations, let us betake ourselves courageously to our Redeemer Jesus; courageously to the council of Patriarchs, to our father Abraham, when our day shall arrive; courageously to that holy assembly and congregation of the just. We shall go to our fathers, to our preceptors in the faith, so that, though our works fail us, our faith may succour us, our birthright plead for us. We shall go where holy Abraham opens his arms to receive the poor, as he received Lazarus; where they rest who in this life have endured heavy and sharp inflictions. . . . We shall go to those, who sit down in the kingdom of God with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, because when asked to supper they did not excuse themselves. We shall go thither, where there is a paradise of delight, where Adam, who fell among thieves, has forgotten to lament his wounds, where too the thief himself rejoices in the fellowship of the kingdom of heaven; *where are no clouds*, where no thunder, no lightning, no storm of wind, no darkness, no evening, no summer, no winter will vary the seasons. There will be no cold, hail, rain, nor the presence of this sun, moon, or stars; but the brightness of Light will alone shine forth.”—*Ibid.* 12.

St. Hilary.

“The vengeance of hell overtakes us at once; and immediately we depart from the body, if we have so lived, we ‘perish from the right way.’ The rich and poor man in the gospel show us this: the one placed by angels in the abode of the blessed and in Abraham’s bosom, the other at once received into the place of punishment. So quickly did punishment come upon the dead, that even his brothers were still alive. There is no deferring or delaying there.

For, as the day of judgment is the eternal award either of bliss or punishment, so the time of death orders the interval for every man by its own laws, committing every one to Abraham or to punishment till the judgment."—In Psalm ii. § 48.

Nazianzen thus speaks on the death of his father :—

" There is but one life, to look forward towards life ; and one death, even sin, which is the destruction of the soul. Whatever else men exult in, is but a vision in sleep in mockery of realities, and a phantom seducing the soul. If these be our feelings, O my Mother, we shall neither exult in life, nor be much distressed at death. What heavy misfortune has befallen us, if we have passed hence to the true life, released from meat and drink, from dizzinesses, from surfeiting, from base money-getting, and placed amid stable not transitory possessions, as lesser lights, circling in festive dance round the Great Luminary?"—Orat. 19 fin.

Macarius, in answer to the question what shall become of those who have two principles, of sin and grace, within them, answers that they will go to that place on which their heart is stayed : for

" The Lord, beholding thy mind, that thou fightest and lovest Him with thy whole soul, separateth death from thy soul in one hour, (for it is not for him to do so,) and receiveth thee unto His bosom and to light. For He snatcheth thee in an hour's turn from the mouth of darkness, and forthwith translates thee into His kingdom. For to God all things are easy to do in an hour's turn, so that thou hast the love of Him."—Hom. 26.

The hour's space spoken of seems to imply that the hour of death would supply the necessary purification of the soul from sin<sup>1</sup> ; but, whatever it means, the passage is quite irreconcilable with the Roman tenet, for the *state* of the dead is made one of bliss, and that " forthwith" upon death. The following passage is to the same effect ; after saying that the guilty soul is upon death carried away by the devil, he proceeds,

" When they" (the righteous) " depart from the body, the choirs of angels receive their souls to their own place, to the pure world, and so bring them to the Lord."—Hom. 22.

St. Jerome ;

" Let the dead be bewailed, but it must be he whom hell receives, whom the pit swallows up, for whose punishment the everlasting fire is in motion. We,

<sup>1</sup> Vide Athan. de vit. Ant. § 65.—Basil in Psalm. vii. § 2.

whose departure a crowd of angels accompanies, whom Christ goes out to meet, let us rather feel distress, if we have longer to dwell in this tabernacle of death, for as long as we delay here, we are pilgrims from the Lord."—Ep. 25.

So much on the theology of the first five hundred years. But it may be shown that not even Pope Gregory at the end of that period, held the doctrine of Purgatory in the modern Roman form of it. He seems to have gone little further than maintain the Greek notion of the fire of judgment, as above explained, but, from the circumstance of his considering the end of the world close at hand he so expressed himself as to give it a different character. Nothing has been more common in every age than to think the day of judgment approaching; and perhaps it was intended that the Church should ever so suppose. Perhaps so to suppose is even a mark of a Christian mind; which at least will ever be on its watch-tower to see whether it be coming or no, from desire of its Saviour's return. But any how, as at other times, so in St. Gregory's case, this expectation prevailed; and, as thinking that the end was all but arrived, he seems to have fancied that "fire upon earth" was almost "kindled," that last judicial and purgatorial trial, which the Greeks and some of the Latins had made attendant upon it. If then he speaks of Purgatory in language since adopted by Romanism, it was not as intending thereby to sanction the idea to which it is appropriated in that theology, viz. that of a regular and ordinary *system* of fiery cleansing in the intermediate state; but, because he imagined the world was on the eve and under the incipient symptoms of an extraordinary crisis, when the sun was to be darkened, and the earth dissolved, and the graves opened, and all souls to be judged which were in earth and under the earth. He says

"As, when night is ending and day beginning, before the sun rises there is a sort of twilight, while the remains of the departing darkness are changing perfectly into the radiance of the day which succeeds, so the end of this world is already mingling with the commencement of the next, and the very gloom of what remains has begun to be illuminated with the incoming of things spiritual." —Dial. iv. 41.

To the same effect he says :

"Why is it, I ask, that in these last times so many things *begin to be clear*

about souls which before were hidden ; so that by open revelations and disclosures the age to come seems forcing itself on us and to be dawning ?"—Ibid. 40.

Conformably with this view, he considered the pains of Purgatory to be diverse and various in their modes and circumstances, in this earth as well as under the earth, and consisting in other torments as well as those of fire, being but the pangs and shudderings of intellectual natures, when their judge was approaching, and disclosing themselves in a supernatural agony parallel to that trembling of the earth or the failing of the sun, which will precede the dissolution of the physical world. Occasion has already been taken to speak of the belief in visions and miracles, as occurring in attestation of the doctrine, and of the predispositions of the popular mind to receive it. The state of the evidence, of the popular feeling, and of the doctrine itself, is strikingly set before the reader in the following passage of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, though perhaps with somewhat less of considerateness in the wording of it, than such a subject might bear.

“ The people of the Roman Communion have been principally led into belief of Purgatory by their fear, and by their credulity ; they have been softened and enticed into this belief, by perpetual tales and legends, by which they loved to be abused. To this purpose, their priests and friars have made great use of the apparition of St. Jerome, after death, to Eusebius, commanding him to lay his sack upon the corpse of three dead men, that they, arising from death, might confess Purgatory, which formerly they had denied. The story is written in an epistle imputed to St. Cyril ; but the ill luck of it was, that St. Jerome outlived St. Cyril, and wrote his life, and so confuted that story ; but all is one for that, they believe it nevertheless ; but these are enough to help it out ; and if they be not firmly true, yet, if they be firmly believed, all is well enough. In the *Speculum Exemplorum* it is said, that a certain priest, in an ecstasy, saw the soul of Constantinus Turritanus in the eaves of his house, tormented with frosts and cold rains, and afterwards climbing up to heaven upon a shining pillar. And a certain monk saw some souls roasted upon spits, like pigs, and some devils basting them with scalding lard ; but a

while after, they were carried to a cool place, and so proved Purgatory. But Bishop Theobald standing upon a piece of ice to cool his feet, was nearer Purgatory than he was aware, and was convinced of it, when he heard a poor soul telling him, that under that ice he was tormented : and that he should be delivered if for thirty days continual he would say for him thirty masses. And some such thing was seen by Conrade and Udelric in a pool of water : for the place of Purgatory was not yet resolved on, till St. Patrick had the key of it delivered to him ; which, when one Nicholas borrowed of him, he saw as strange and true things there, as ever Virgil dreamed of in his Purgatory, or Cicero in his dream of Scipio, or Plato in his *Gorgias*, or Phædo, who indeed are the surest authors to prove Purgatory. But, because to preach false stories was forbidden by the Council of Trent, there are yet remaining more certain arguments, even revelations made by angels, and the testimony of St. Odilio himself, who heard the devil complain . . . that the souls of dead men were daily snatched out of his hands, by the alms and prayers of the living ; and the sister of St. Damianus being too much pleased with hearing of a piper, told her brother, that she was to be tormented for fifteen days in Purgatory.

“ We do not think that the wise men in the Church of Rome believe these narratives ; for, if they did, they were not wise ; but this we know, that by such stories the people were brought into a belief of it, and having served their turn of them, the master builders used them as false arches and centries, taking them away when the parts of the building were made firm and stable by authority. But even the better sort of them do believe them ; or else they do worse, for they urge and cite the *Dialogues of St. Gregory, &c.*”—*Dissuasive from Popery*, part i. ch. i. § 4.

Yet not even after Pope Gregory's times was the doctrine unhesitatingly received. Ussher (*Answer* ch. vi.) quotes the words of the Council of Aix la Chapelle in Charlemagne's time, near 250 years after Gregory, to the effect that there are “ three ways in which sins are punished ; two in this life, and the third in the life to come ; that of the former one is the punishment



with which the sinner, God inspiring, by penitence, takes vengeance on himself, the other the punishment which ALMIGHTY God inflicts; and that the third is that of everlasting fire. He also quotes the author of the tracts *de Vanitate Sæculi*, and *de Rectitudine Catholicæ Conversationis*, wrongly ascribed to St. Austin; the former of which says, "Know that when the soul is separated from the body, presently it is either placed in paradise for its good works, or plunged into the bottom of hell for its sins;" and the latter, "The departing soul, which is invisible to eyes of flesh, is received by the angels, and placed either in Abraham's bosom, if it be faithful, or, if a sinner, in the keeping of the prison beneath, till the appointed day arrive for it to receive its own body again and give account of its works before the judgment seat of CHRIST, the true Judge." Even in the days of Otto Frisingensis, A. D. 1146, the doctrine of Purgatory was considered but a private opinion, not an article of faith universally received; for he writes, "*Some affirm* there is in the unseen state a place of Purgatory, in which those who are to be saved are either troubled with darkness only, or are refined by the fire of expiation."

However, without entering further into the history of the gradual reception of the doctrine, which, if the circumstances of its rise be clear, is unnecessary, even could it be given, I conclude this head of the subject with one or two avowals on the part of Romanists confirmatory of what has been said.

As to the text of Scripture, we have the candid admission of the celebrated M. Trevern, present Bishop of Strasburgh, that it is silent as regards this doctrine, at least so Mr. Faber understands him.

"Instead of vainly labouring to establish the doctrine on some one or two misinterpreted texts of the New Testament, he fairly and honestly confesses, that we have received no revelation concerning it from JESUS CHRIST. Hence he judiciously wastes not his time in adducing passages of Holy Writ, which are altogether irrelevant. 'Had it been necessary for us,' says he, 'to be instructed in such questions, JESUS would doubtless have revealed the knowledge of them. He has not done so. We can, there-

fore, only form conjectures on the subject more or less probable<sup>1</sup>.”

It seems then the doctrine is not taught in *Scripture*. The silence of *Antiquity* concerning it is avowed by Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, Alphonsus à de Castro, and Polydore Virgil.

Of these the celebrated Cardinal Fisher speaks as follows :

“ It weighs perhaps with many, that we lay such stress upon indulgences, which are apparently of but recent usage in the Church, not being found among Christians till a very late date. I answer, that it is not clear from whom the tradition of them originated. They are said not to be without precedent among the Romans from the most ancient times; as may be understood from the numerous stations in that city. Moreover Gregory the First is said to have granted some in his own time. We all indeed are aware, that by means of the acumen of later times many things both from the Gospels and the other Scriptures are now more clearly developed and more exactly understood than they once were; whether it was that the ice was not yet broken by the ancients, and their times were unequal to the task of accurately sounding the open sea of Scripture, or that it will ever be possible in so extensive a field, let the reapers be ever so skilful, to glean somewhat after them. For there are even now a great number of obscure passages in the Gospel, which I doubt not posterity will understand much better. Why should we despair of it when the Gospel is given for this very purpose, to be understood thoroughly and exactly? Seeing then that the love of CHRIST towards His Church continues not less strong now than before, nor His power less, and that the Holy Ghost is her perpetual guardian and restorer, whose gifts flow into her as unceasingly and abundantly as from the beginning, who can question that the minds of posterity will be enlightened unto the clear knowledge of those things which remain still unknown in the Gospel ?”

After a sentence or two, he adds :

“ Whoever reads the commentaries of the ancient Greeks, will find no mention, as far as I see, or the slightest possible concerning Purgatory. Nay, even the Latins did not all at once, but only gradually enter into the truth of this matter. . . . For a while it was unknown, at a late date it was known, to the Church Universal. Then it was believed by some, by little and little, partly from Scripture, partly from revelations.”—Assert. Luther Confutat. 18.

It will be observed how accurately Bishop Fisher's words bear out, as far as they go, our foregoing account. First, he

<sup>1</sup> Faber's *Difficulties of Romanism*, i. 12. This reference to M. Trevern is made on the authority of Mr. Faber.

candidly gives up the Greek Church, and almost gives up the Latin. He says it was gradually introduced, that at length it became universal. What can we desire more in disproof of the Roman doctrine? He implies too, that the doctrine, though not suggested by the plain text of Scripture, was recommended by it, when once suggested in whatever way; as if what it did, was just what has been above supposed, viz. bring out in a touching way a certain possible deep sense which the sacred text could not be said to teach but might contain; else why should it be understood only after a long delay? Further, he illustrates and confirms what has above been observed, that the Church of Rome, relying on its supposed gift of enunciating the truth, cares not to *prove* its doctrines ancient, and rather interprets the Fathers by its present teaching than thinks it necessary to depend upon them. And lastly, he is a witness that, as far as Rome has cared to argue in this matter, she has rested the doctrine on *revelations*;—a true and honest account of the matter of fact, but decidedly opposed to the more accurate, though inapplicable, theory established after his death at Trent, which is this, that the revelation was concluded once for all in the Apostles, that all that the Church does is to discriminate and define their doctrine, and that he is Anathema, though an angel from heaven, who adds to it. “That alone is matter of faith,” says Bellarmine, “which is revealed by God either mediately or immediately; but divine revelations are *partly written, partly unwritten*. The decrees of Councils, and Popes, and the consent of Doctors, . . . *then only* make a doctrine an article of faith, when they *explain the Word of God or deduce* any thing from it<sup>1</sup>.”

Polydore Virgil appeals to Fisher’s statement as above given, and adds, “Moreover by the Greeks, even to this day, the doctrine is not believed.” Alphonsus de Castro says, “Concerning Purgatory there is scarcely any mention, especially among the Greek writers; for which reason, even to this day, it is not believed by the Greeks<sup>1</sup>.”

<sup>1</sup> Bellarm. de Purg. i. 15.

<sup>1</sup> These three passages are from Taylor’s Dissuasive, part 2. ii. 2.

Lastly, the following is the avowal of the Benedictine Editor of St. Ambrose's Works in his preface to the *de Bono Mortis*, on certain passages concerning the state of the dead, some of which have been above extracted in the course of these remarks.

"If we interpret the words of our author strictly and literally, we must plainly confess that in his judgment souls are kept shut up in certain dwellings, till the general resurrection, and there wait the award due to their deeds, which will not however be paid them before the last day; meanwhile that they are visited with some good or punishment, according as each of them has deserved. Lastly, the joy of the righteous is dispensed according to certain ranks.

"It is not surprising that Ambrose should have written in this way concerning the state of souls; but what might seem almost incredible, is, the uncertainty and inconsistency of the Holy Fathers on the subject from the very times of the Apostles down to the Pontificate of Gregory XI., and the Council of Florence, that is, for nearly the whole of fourteen centuries. For, not only do they differ one from the other, as commonly happens in such questions not yet defined by the Church, but they are not even consistent with themselves, sometimes appearing to grant that those souls enjoy the clear sight of the divine nature, of which at other times they deprive them."

## § 4. THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

It remains to give a brief notice of the Council of Florence by which the doctrine of Purgatory was first made an article of faith. With it I shall bring this paper to an end.

The Council of Constance, which had been summoned principally with a view to the reformation of the clergy, terminated in April 1418, without having taken any effectual measures for their object. Five years afterwards the remonstrance which the existing state of things occasioned, obliged the then Pope Martin V. to summon another, which, in consequence of his sudden death, eventually opened at Basle, 23d of July, 1431, in the pontificate of Eugenius, under the presidency of Cardinal Julian Cæsarini. Basle, as being across the Alps, was removed from the influence of the Roman see; and the Fathers assembled at once applied themselves to determine a question, which had already been agitated at Constance, the superiority, viz. of a General Council to the Pope. They passed a decree that the jurisdiction of the representatives of the Church Catholic in Council Assembled was supreme and universal, and that they could not be dissolved, prorogued or transferred without their own consent. They proceeded to summon, threaten and censure Eugenius; and at length when he resisted their proceedings, they suspended him from all his powers unless he submitted to them within 60 days. In these acts they were supported by the Emperor and other chief powers of Europe, as well as by the clergy; and the Pope was forced to submit.

They next attempted to reconcile the Greeks to the Latin Church. At this time Constantinople was much pressed by the Turkish arms; and the Emperor John Palæologus, the second of that name, after the example of his father, hoped by holding out the prospect of a union of the Churches to gain succours from the West. The Fathers of Basle invited him to attend their meeting with the Patriarch and other chief ecclesiastics of his division of Christendom; but, on his objecting to a journey across the

Alps, an opening was afforded to Eugenius, who was not slow to avail himself of it, to propose to the Greeks to transfer the seat of the Council from the Rhine to Italy. In spite of the opposition of the Fathers at Basle, Eugenius was successful in his overtures. The Greek Emperor and ecclesiastics accepted the place of meeting which he proposed, which was Ferrara, and proceeded thither, that is, besides Palæologus himself, the Patriarch, and twenty chief bishops, among whom were the metropolitans of Heraclea, Cyzicus, Nice, Nicomedia, Ephesus, and Trebizond; representatives also attended from Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; and the Primate of Russia. Such were the members of the Greek Church present at this Council, who, however, high in station as they were, evidently were too few to express the voice of the East. It is well known that on the ancient principle of Councils, decisions were made not by authority, but by the independent and concordant testimony of all the Bishops of Christendom, or what was virtually all, to the doctrines declared. On the side of the Latins there were but five archbishops, eighteen bishops, and ten abbots, the greater part of whom were subjects or countrymen of the Pope. This scanty representation however of the Latin Church received, as it happened, a considerable reinforcement from Basle; for a reaction taking place there in the Pope's favour, some chief members of the rival Council coming over to him, the whole number of subscribers which he at last obtained to the synodical decree amounted to eight cardinals, two patriarchs, eight archbishops, fifty-two bishops, and forty-five abbots. After all, however, these are at first sight scarcely to be considered representatives of the whole of Christendom; yet such was the composition of the assembly, known in history as the Council of Florence, (whither a plague had driven it from Ferrara) which established the doctrine of Purgatory.

This is a sketch of its external history: but the point to be considered is the part taken by the Greeks in its proceedings. At the first glance here is this circumstance, almost in itself decisive against its authority, that the Greeks were actuated by motives of interest and at least by the influence and the presence of a Sovereign. Were they in number fifty times as many, they

would not have appeared in Italy at all, had not the Ottomans been at the gates of Constantinople. Next they were unprotected in a strange country, depending even for their daily food on the bounty of those who were bent upon the reconciliation of the Churches; and they were detained by delays which, whether necessary or not, were sufficient to alarm them, and to make them impatient to bring their dispute to a termination. After the first session of the Council at Ferrara, the public proceedings were adjourned about six months. The Greek ecclesiastics were allowed each three or four gold florins a month; at one time there was an arrear of four months in the payment, at another of three, and at the time of their agreeing to unite with the Latins of five and a half. Besides, even had they the means, their withdrawal from the Council was absolutely forbidden: passports were required at the gates of Ferrara, the Venetian Government had engaged to intercept all fugitives, and civil punishment awaited them at Constantinople. Their condition is vividly described by Syropulus or Sguropulus, the ecclesiarch or preacher, who was present at the Council as one of the Patriarch's five attendants, and whose history of its proceedings is extant. Some extracts shall be introduced from his work; which, besides proving what I have said about the position of the Greeks, will introduce us in particular to the course taken in their discussions on the subject of Purgatory. There were four points of difference between the Churches: the use of leaven in the Eucharistic bread, the supremacy of the Pope, the nature of Purgatory, and the double procession of the Holy Ghost. Concerning the subject which alone here concerns us, Syropulus says,

“At our fourth meeting the bishop of Ephesus said, ‘In our last meeting, venerable Fathers, you laid before us four heads for discussion, out of which we might take our choice . . . Julian (the legate of Eugenius at Basle) said . . . it seems to us best, to treat first of the purgatorial fire, that our own minds may be cleared by the discussion. Let us then now dispute upon this subject. The Bishop of Ephesus answered, Be it so as you have decided; but tell us first whence has your Church her traditions about it, and when did she receive and profess it, and what is her exact doctrine on the subject. These inquiries will help us forward. This was agreed to, and we separated.

““*Meanwhile our allowance of provisions was demanded but not given us.*

*Though we made frequent demands on account of our need, it was not given, until we came into the proposed conditions. When we had come round, we received the second monthly allowance on the 12th of May.*

“While we were so circumstanced, serious news kept coming that Amurath was preparing an attack upon Constantinople. The Venetians sent the despatches to our Emperor and the Patriarch; afterwards came letters from the City itself, intimating the same, and begging them to do their utmost to gain succours. On hearing this we were sadly afflicted, were sick of life, prayed to God for help, took it to heart, and with groans and tears begged for some escape from so great a calamity. . . . The Emperor had much talk with the Cardinals on this subject, and made representations through them to the Pope. We, indignant at their unbecoming conduct, betook ourselves to such private friends as we might have among them. When some of us had intreated in this way brother Ambrose, he said to them, ‘Be not out of heart, *but do your utmost to bring about a union*, and then we shall make great preparations, and will send a formidable force to Constantinople.’

“Meanwhile some of our company said, that if a subscription for raising forces was proposed to our Archbishops, they would be ready according to their power. The Emperor catching at this, immediately went to the Patriarch, and called us all together, and made us a speech concerning contribution, saying that he himself had set the pattern by borrowing money to fit out a vessel of his own, that he felt confident the Pope would send some also, and that it was a duty in the case of those who had the means to be liberal in the service of their country. To this the principal Archbishops made answer, that were they in Constantinople, they would contribute even more than they could well afford; but, being at present in a foreign land, and not knowing what was coming upon them, they felt it necessary to keep what they had, even supposing some among them had any thing left; . . . however, under the necessity, they would each give something. Accordingly four of them promised 50 aspers apiece.

“The Bishop of Nicea (the celebrated Bessarion) said, ‘I have no ducats, but I have three urns, of which I will contribute two.’ The Bishop also who came next said, ‘I have no ducats, but I have two woollen cloaks, and I give one of them.’ The Emperor on hearing as far as this, gave up the attempt as vain, for he had reckoned that the Archbishops together might have almost fitted out one vessel. . . .’

“In the fifth meeting, Julian began to discuss the subject of Purgatory, and said that the Roman Church, even from the very first had received and held this doctrine, from the time of the Holy Apostles, receiving it from St. Peter and St. Paul, . . . and then from the Doctors of the Church who succeeded them.”

To complete the imbecility of the Greek party, they were at variance with each other, Bessarion of Nicea inclining to the Latins, Gregory the Penitentiary taking either side as it hap-



pened, and both opposing Mark of Ephesus, the resolute defender of the Greek doctrines. The Latins having put their argument on paper, the Greeks had to do the same, and the Emperor commanded Mark to draw it up, who declined the office, unless it was understood that what he should present would be accepted. The following childish scene ensued, which is here introduced merely to show that the Greek cause was not fairly represented in that Council, since it was in the hands, as will be seen, of two rival Bishops and an Emperor as umpire, and not as if to imply that a Council must be composed of none but superior men in order to come to a right conclusion.

“It appeared proper that some among ourselves should stay with the Bishop of Ephesus, and that the paper should be drawn in our presence and hearing, and with our assistance, if it happened to be needed. Accordingly the Bishop of Nicea, the great Ecclesiarch” (the writer) “Gregory the Penitentiary, the Secretary of the Holy Consistory, met him. The Bishop of Nicea began to converse carelessly, and to digress into a variety of subjects. The Penitentiary followed, and rivalled him in the irrelevancy of his discourse. They took up each other, and emulated each other in wasting time on trifles and impertinences. I at intervals begged them to spare words and attend to the writing, but they persisted; when good part of the day was thus wasted, the Bishop of Ephesus said, ‘At this rate I shall not be able to write a word: leave me with the Secretary of the Consistory and I will draw up something. Afterwards you shall look over it, and correct any thing that is amiss?’ On this we left the room. Then the Bishop of Ephesus began to write; but the Bishop of Nicea did the same, at the suggestion of the Penitentiary, who praised what he drew up to the Emperor, and wished him to send it to the Latins, as more striking in style, and more eloquent. At his command both compositions were brought to him and read in the presence of select judges. Then the Emperor said to the Bishop of Ephesus, ‘Your composition is good; it has many strong points. But it has some things too which will give advantage to the Latins, such as the story of St. Macarius asking the skull (of an idolator) and receiving an answer; for you can bring no unexceptionable testimony to this, and they will at once put it aside, and some other arguments also. Better let alone what can be easily met, and urge a little and strong than a parade of arguments, some of which may be easily upset, for your opponent will fix on your weak points, and if he masters you on one or two, he will appear to the many, or rather he will be heralded forth as having defeated you altogether. Therefore put out these passages.’ . . . Then turning to the Bishop of Nicea, he remarked, ‘You too have your own faults, you begin by saying, ‘O men of Latium;’ this is unsuitable. It is more becoming to say, ‘Venerable Fathers,’ or something of the

same respectful and acceptable nature; you have other mistakes too.' He ended by saying that the proem and previous statements of the Bishop of Nicea were the better, but the course of the argument, the proofs, and collateral remarks stronger in the paper of the Bishop of Ephesus; and that it seemed advisable to take the commencement of the former, and any other serviceable passages, and the body of the latter." . . .

The reply thus compounded by two men of discordant sentiments was submitted to the Latins, and an answer drawn up to it in due form. A reply followed, and the discussion became animated.

"Meanwhile in private conversations the Latins begged the Bishop of Ephesus to propound plainly the doctrine which our Church holds concerning souls departed hence. *But he did not state it, being hindered by the Emperor.* And in proportion as they perceived him resisting, and not wishing to set forth our Church doctrine on the matter, so much the more did they press him, and intreat him, and remonstrate with him, and asked what he meant by his reserve, saying that every regular member of any Church was bound, when asked what was the Church's view on any question, at once to give it without hesitation or ambiguity. But the Bishop had his mouth stopped by the royal command."

John, a Spanish Bishop, then entered into a discussion with the Bishop of Ephesus with great dialectic skill, and Bessarion deserted to the Latins; at length, however the Emperor consented to Mark's speaking out, and he put the Latins into full possession of the Greek notions on the subject of Purgatory. The next sentences run as follows:—

"Our allowance was expended, and nothing more was given us in spite of our frequent demands: but, when we yielded to their demand and told them our Church's opinion on the question in discussion, then they gave us three months' allowance on the 30th of June, 689 florins." 5. §. 18.

This was all that passed on the subject of Purgatory, before the final decree, which, as in other points, so in this, was overruled by the determination of the Latins and the need of the Emperor. But here let me instance another hardship inflicted on the Greeks, for which I have already prepared the reader.

"We sat down in sorrow, not only because of existing and expected perils, but for the loss of our liberty, for we were shut up as slaves. And when three months and more were passed, and all were indignant at our dependence upon

strangers, the straits we were in, and our want of provision, . . . . three clerics, under the spur of necessity, found an escape. . . . . But the Patriarch learning it, and being indignant at it, wrote at once to the Doge of Venice, who found out the men and sent them to him."

After many months discomfort from the causes that have been enumerated, the Greeks came to an understanding with the Latins: indeed, from the first, they had very little trust or attachment to their view. Their doctrine is said to have been, that the souls of imperfect Christians went to a place of darkness and sadness, where they were for some time in affliction and deprived of the light of God's countenance, in which state they were benefited by Eucharistic offerings and by alms; to this the Latins wished to add, that souls without stain enter at once into heavenly glory, while those who have repented of sin but have not had time to complete the necessary penance, are consigned for a longer or shorter time to purgatorial fire. This was the difference between the Churches, and they compromised the matter thus: the Latins did not press the doctrine of *fire*, and the Greeks gave up—not a word, but a truth,—they allowed, contrary to the belief with which they had come to the Council, that those who are not in Purgatory are immediately beatified, and enjoy the sight of God.

It may be objected, and readily admitted, that the narrative of which the above are extracts, is drawn up by a writer unfriendly and unfair to the Latins. But it would seem to prove as much as this, viz. what was the popular view in Greece on the subject of these discussions and their termination, immediately upon it.

A high ecclesiastic, as Syropulus was, would hardly have ventured to have set himself against a recent and solemn act of his own Church sanctioned by the Court, unless he had had a strong feeling with him. The very fact of his opposition proves that the conduct of the Greeks at Florence was but the act of a party at most in the Church; while the line of the history, their sufferings and compelled decision, is too clearly guaranteed to us as true by the known circumstances of the case. But we need not thus painfully deduce the real dissatisfaction of the Greek Church with the articles imposed upon its delegates at Florence. On their return home, they had to encounter so general an indignation and

resentment at their conduct, that they were obliged at once to recant and confess their weakness, and throw themselves on the mercy of their brethren. Mark of Ephesus had not signed the decree, and became a rallying point for all who held by the popular religion; while the successor of the Patriarch was deserted even by his cross-bearers, and presided in an empty Cathedral. The feeling spread north and south; the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem assembled a numerous Council, and disowned the acts of their representatives in Italy; and Isidore, the Primate of Russia, on returning to his country, was synodically condemned and imprisoned in a monastery.

Again, it may be objected that the great article of difference between Greeks and Latins was the question of the procession, not that of Purgatory, and after all, that the real point of repulsion between them lay in national jealousies; whereas they agreed together, as the Council shows, or at least with the slightest difference, on the question in which we are concerned, while the subsequent resentment of the Greeks at home had little or no reference to it; and that their agreement under such circumstances was only the more remarkable. It may be replied, that the object of the foregoing account has been to shew that the Greeks at Florence were not trustworthy, that they had neither the ease of circumstances, the learning, or the composure of mind to be witnesses of the traditionary and universal doctrine of their Churches. If this is proved by after circumstances, by the popular indignation as regards one doctrine, it takes all credit from their testimony as regards another. Moreover as regards the doctrine of Purgatory, they did not agree with the Latins in an important point, yet that point they gave up to them; most unfaithfully, considering them as stewards of Gospel truth; and, had they discerned the bearings of the Latin doctrine, which doubtless they did not, most treacherously. They admitted, against the national belief, the beatification of souls under specific circumstances, before the judgment, and in so doing they admitted practically almost as much, as if they had subscribed to the doctrine of purgatorial fire. For, as the mention of fire on the one hand is definite, and ascertains Purgatory to be strictly a

place of punishment, which the general expressions of the Greeks did not strictly imply, so in like manner to separate off from it all the perfected saints, and transfer them to a better and heavenly state, does in effect sink it, by the contrast, to a place of privation and suffering. The presence of the souls of all saints, (to speak in general terms, that is, not to include the Martyrs whom the early Church has excepted) in Hades, Paradise, or Abraham's bosom, or by whatever other name we designate the Intermediate State, is our guarantee for the substantial blessedness of that State. We cannot spare the higher Saints from Paradise, in that they are our pledges for its heavenly character in the case of all believers. Thus as regards their own doctrine, the Greeks made most important admissions to the Latins, for making which they had no warrant, and therefore cannot be considered of authority in witnessing a Purgatory at all, any more than in the account they gave of it.

And with these remarks shall terminate a discussion, which has extended far beyond the limits which were originally proposed by the writer.

OXFORD.

*The Feast of the Annunciation.*

---

*These Tracts are sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.*

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,  
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.  
1837.

---

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

*The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts :—*

- Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons.*  
Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake and Varty.*  
Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford.*  
Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons.*  
Newman's Sermons, 3 vols.—*Rivingtons.*  
Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons.*  
The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons.*  
Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie.*  
Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan.*  
Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns.*  
Carey on the Apostolical Succession.—*Rivingtons.*  
Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons.*  
Keble's Sermon on National Apostacy.—*Rivingtons.*  
Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons.*  
Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons.*  
Law's first and second Letters to Hoadley.—*Rivingtons.*  
Bp. Andrews's Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering.*  
Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons.*  
Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.  
Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons.*  
Le Bas's Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons.*  
Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.  
Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons.*

*Larger Works which may be profitably studied.*

Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford.*

Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press.*

Waterland's Works.—*Do.*

Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do.*

Pearson on the Creed.—*Do.*

Leslie's Works.—*Do.*

Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London.*

Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press.*

Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Do.*

*Shortly will be published,*

Bishop Cosin's Devotions for the Seven Canonical Hours.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

---

ON RESERVE IN COMMUNICATING RELIGIOUS  
KNOWLEDGE.

---

PART I.

FROM THE EXAMPLE OF OUR LORD.

1. Some general allusions to this mode of concealment.
2. The general historic narrative of our Saviour's life and resurrection.
3. Some particular expressions of this kind.
4. The teaching by Parables.
5. The manner of our Lord's miracles, their concealment, &c.
6. Some incidents which seem to imply the same reserve.
7. Our Lord spoken of by others,—and speaking of Himself.
8. His instructions to His disciples, and their conduct illustrating the same.
9. The same system in the Epistles.
10. Passage from Scripture on the other side explained.
11. Confirmed by the analogy of God's present dealings with mankind.
12. Manifestations of Christ's presence subsequent to the gospel narrative in His Church.

PART II.

THE EXAMPLE OF OUR LORD CONFIRMED BY HIS MORAL GOVERN-  
MENT.

1. That all moralists consider vice and virtue as states of darkness and light.
2. That Scripture attributes these effects to the immediate agency of God.
3. This knowledge is considered as something infinite and divine.



4. It is of a moral and not of an intellectual nature.
5. That we may perceive intimations of what it may be.
6. That God punishes with blindness those who approach sacred truths with a speculative mind.
7. That Christ, as seen in the conduct of good men, thus conceals Himself.
8. That the whole subject contains something analogous in each particular to the circumstances noticed in our Lord's life.

### PART III.

#### SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FOREGOING OBSERVATIONS.

1. That the principle was fully recognized by the Ancient Church.
2. That the present aspect of the world is much opposed to it.
3. A practical rule afforded by it in the investigation of truth.
4. This principle of reserve applied to prevailing opinions on the modes of promoting religion.
5. On the supposed necessity of bringing forward the doctrine of the Atonement.
6. On reserve in speaking of sacred subjects.
7. The important practical conclusion.

## PART I.

FROM THE EXAMPLE OF OUR LORD.

### 1. *General allusions to this mode of concealment.*

THE object of the present inquiry is to ascertain, whether there is not in God's dealings with mankind, a very remarkable holding back of sacred and important truths, as if the knowledge of them were injurious to persons unworthy of them. And if this be the case, it will lead to some important practical reflections.

It is not intended to speak of it as a mark of judicial punishment, nor as denoting the anger of the Almighty, nor as connected in any way with intellectual acuteness: but, if I may so speak with reverence, I would say, that there appears in God's manifestations of Himself to mankind, in conjunction with an exceeding desire to communicate that knowledge, a tendency to conceal, and throw a veil over it, as if it were injurious to us unless we were of a certain disposition to receive it.

And though this cannot explain the speculative difficulty, why the truth is not set before mankind so strongly and clearly that they cannot fall; yet it may tend to satisfy a fair mind, to see that we have symptoms of such a thing being not good, or perhaps possible in morals; and such we may assuredly gather from what we see of God's dealing with us in all His moral government, both natural and Scriptural, so as to show us, that as we are to be thankful for what is revealed, we have also to be thankful for what is not revealed.

At the first view, we have the remarkable fact of the many generations of the heathen world, in a state of great ignorance of many things which we know to be of the very highest importance to our well being. In the next place, we may notice the silence

observed, respecting a future and eternal life in the books of Moses, as one of "the secret things which belonged unto God." The fact that the Patriarchs were supported by an indefinite, but full assurance of God's unfailing goodness, which could not cease with this life, will be a confirmation of this point; for it shows that it was in some measure revealed unto them, as they could bear it. In the next place, the numerous rites and types, are instances of a veil thrown remarkably over moral and spiritual truth; for it is very evident that to David and others, they conveyed all the "secrets of wisdom," and spoke of "the hands washed in innocency," and "the sacrifice of a broken heart, and the circumcision of the heart"—but it was through a veil. The expression "I am a stranger upon earth, hide not thy commandments from me," seems to imply, that the commandments being hid from him was the thing which the Psalmist apprehended from unworthiness; and the verse preceding, "open thou mine eyes, that I may behold the wondrous things of thy law," and indeed the whole of the 119th Psalm, indicates something great and wonderful, contained in the commandments beyond the letter. Origen says (contr. Cels. p. 197.) 'if the law of Moses had not any thing of a more latent meaning the prophet would not have said "open mine eyes, that I may behold the wonderful things of thy law." The descriptions of the Messiah's kingdom in the prophets were exactly of this kind, such as a carnal mind would take literally; a good man would see that God had something better for those that waited for Him.'

2. *The general Historic Narrative of our Saviour's Life and Resurrection.*

The whole of the Gospel History, may be seen to be remarkably in harmony with this view of God's dealings in the Old Testament. The circumstances attending our Lord's birth, and the important transactions at the early period of His life, we might have expected beforehand would have been more known to the Jewish nation<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Chrysostom mentions it as the opinion of the Fathers that our SAVIOUR'S being born of a virgin, was perhaps one of the secret things, not at first made known to the Jews.

instead of being concealed, like the actions of apparently obscure persons, (as for instance the LORD's appearing in His temple as foretold by Malachi.) The account of all these things is so familiar to us, that we are perhaps scarce able to judge clearly of the wonderful and mysterious economy of GOD, in these circumstances. There is something in the thought of our SAVIOUR's being for thirty years among men, not known and not believed on, even by those about Him, and the witnesses of His early life, very remarkable and awful. And the great pledge and seal of the truth of the Gospel, the Resurrection itself, seems in such a striking manner to have been kept back, if I may so speak, from the gaze of the multitude, from the broad light of the common day. Its great manifestations break forth, as if indistinctly, and according to the great need of certain persons, the watchful and weeping Mary, then the penitent Peter, then (the perhaps aged) Cleopas. And we find the obscure Galilee, marked out so repeatedly<sup>1</sup> and pointedly to be the chosen scene of these manifestations more than the crowded Jerusalem. Surely in all this there is something of mysterious wisdom, which it is good for us humbly to consider.

*3. Some particular expressions of this kind.*

We may reasonably expect some more distinct intimations of this, in our blessed LORD's own teaching and mode of disclosing Himself. And do we not find the same Spirit, "who spake by the Prophets" with type and figure, in things of this kind?

In the use, for instance, of figurative expressions to persons who did not understand the meaning of them. To this we cannot but apply the remark of Bishop Butler, where he observes the vast difference between Holy Scripture, and any human composition in this respect, that in the latter our object is by words to convey most fitly our meaning to others; we cannot say this of GOD's

<sup>1</sup> Galilee, the marked place of our SAVIOUR's manifestation, foretold by Himself Matt. xxvi. 32, by the Angels xxviii. 7, by our SAVIOUR Himself, v. 10. and in v. 16. it is mentioned that our SAVIOUR had appointed the spot, a solitary mountain in the obscure Galilee; this is very observable.

written word. It may have other objects quite of another kind, which its very obscurity serves, better than its distinct meaning would do.

Thus, when our Saviour told His disciples, that it was now time that he who had not a sword should sell his garment and buy one, it is evident that they took the meaning literally, nor does our LORD appear to have done away with their misconception; although their erroneous impression was of a practical nature, and perhaps led to a subsequent action, wrong in itself, but overruled by His mercy for good. The expression of "the living Water" to the Samaritan woman, "the leaven of the Pharisees," and "the Bread from Heaven," with perhaps many others, seem not to have been understood, and were spoken in such a manner as to bear a striking analogy to the figurative expressions of the Old Testament and their reception.

Such, it may be added, is the expression of rebuilding the Temple in three days, which was not comprehended. And at twelve years of age, it is said, His parents understood not the saying that He spake unto them, but Mary "kept all these sayings in her heart." (Luke ii. 51.)

And are not the numerous expressions in the New Testament, which are taken from the Old, and are either brought forward in a new meaning, or in a light which opens and expands their fuller meaning, of the same kind? for they are made to convey a lesson different from what is at first sight perceptible to a careless hearer, such as that of taking the lowest place in order that we may gain honor in the presence of those who sit at meat; and that of the Apostle's, to do good to our enemy in order to "heap coals of fire on his head?" And in the Old Testament itself are there not passages that refer to this reserve of wisdom? what is the meaning of that expression, (in Proverbs xxv. 2.) "It is the glory of God to conceal a matter?" Does it not allude to this?

But what is much to be observed with regard to those expressions of our LORD is, that the not understanding of them was considered as matter of reproof, as implying something morally deficient, not intellectually. This would, I think, appear to be the case, as for instance, as in the expression of the "leaven of

the Pharisees," "He saith unto them, Why reason ye because ye have no bread? perceive ye not yet, neither understand? have ye your heart yet hardened?" (Mark viii. 17.)

In St. Matthew the same expression of complaint or rebuke is repeated, "do ye not yet understand?" ch. xvi. ver. 9. and "how is it ye do not understand?" Mark viii. 21. And in the explanation of the parable of the sower, "the understanding" or "not understanding" is spoken of in some higher sense, evidently, than that of the mere reception or barren acknowledgment of a Truth; "when any one heareth the word and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart," where of course it cannot be the mere intellectual apprehension, for without that it could not be received at all. And again, "but he that received the seed into the good ground, is he that heareth the word and understandeth it." (St. Matt. xiii. 23.)

And in chap. vi. of St. John, when the Jews murmured at the literal expression, and said it was "a hard saying," it seems to be implied that it was the teaching of God only that could bring them to a better mind, so as that they should understand the full meaning of such typical expressions, "Jesus answered and said, Murmur not among yourselves, no man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." "It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God; every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me."

Again, of the coming of Elijah in the person of John, our Saviour says, "If ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come." "He that hath ears to ear let him hear." From which it is evident that it was a certain state of the heart which could alone receive it in the sense implied. The Baptist had before declared that he was not Elias in the manner that the Jews conceived.

Add to this that the Disciples are reproved, for not understanding the parables (Matt. xv. 15.) "Then answered Peter and said unto Him, Declare unto us this parable. And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without understanding? Do not ye yet understand?"

Again, does not the expression of the Disciples in St. John, (xvi. 29.) "Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no

proverb," seem to imply that in our LORD's usual discourse there had been proverbs which they did not understand ?

All of which instances are examples in various degrees of persons "who hear the word of the kingdom and understand it not;" and which I would adduce as showing that the want of comprehension was indeed a fault in the moral understanding of the hearer ; on which supposition alone is grounded the argument of the Truth not being fully manifested by our LORD.

There is another circumstance that will bear upon this subject, that which must be observed on many occasions, and perhaps it would lead us to a better comprehension of other points, if it was observed in more, viz, our LORD's custom of answering not the words of the inquirer, but the thoughts in his mind, which had prevented his discerning the truth, or of directing His answer to the sentiments which the circumstance suggested to others. This must necessarily have rendered His expressions difficult of comprehension to some, while at the same time they were beneficial to all, according to the need of each Like the rains from Heaven, or the seasons, in His natural providence, which are not as each wishes, or prays for, but as is best for each and for all. This may be perceived in the observations made at the feast in Levi's house, where the company was composed of such different kinds of persons; and expressions so pregnant and full of meaning to one, must have been dark sayings to another.

#### 4. *The teaching by Parables.*

I cannot but conceive that there must have been this intention of veiling the truth in the Parables. It has been said indeed that they render moral truths more plain and easy, as well as more engaging ; and that this was their purpose. But is this the case ? They are easy to us, as all such things seem to be when explained ; but were they so at the time ? Was not the Crucifixion foretold nine times to the Apostles, and yet it was said distinctly that they did not understand it, although it does not appear to us who know the circumstances so difficult ? Does not the place where the word parable occurs often imply that this was its meaning or effect ?

Twice in the Psalms it occurs with "dark sayings," Psalm xlix. 4., "I will incline mine ear to a parable, I will open my dark sayings upon the harp," and Ps. lxxviii. 2. quoted expressly to this purpose by St. Matt. ch. xiii. verse 35. "I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter dark sayings of old."—And in the prophet Ezekiel in the same sense, "They say of me, Doth he not speak parables?" And does not our LORD's answer to his Disciples, when they asked Him why He taught the people in Parables, prove this? "He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given." The whole of which passage at length seems to me to explain this view of the subject. And seems, with regard to the Disciples, the same as is said of Moses in Numbers xii. "If there be a Prophet among you, I the LORD will make myself known to him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches."

The passage just now referred to in the Gospels is the following, "And He said to His disciples privately<sup>1</sup>, But blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see, for I say unto you that many prophets and kings have desired to see the things

<sup>1</sup> St. Matt. xiii. 10. Chrysostom says, "It is worthy of admiration, how the disciples, though desirous to learn, yet know the right point of time when to ask. And this Matthew hath signified by saying, and 'having come to Him.' And that this that I say is not a mere assumption, Mark hath more clearly set forth, by saying that they came to Him 'privately.'" And speaking on the same subject he says, "Let us also thus act, when we see one hearing carelessly and cannot persuade him by all our exhortations to attend, let us desist, for if we continue, his carelessness is increased. But when we perceive one in earnest to learn, let us draw him on and pour in much." Origen remarks this coming privately, and typically expounds "in the house," as the secret wisdom of God; he also observes, "That it is not said merely to the Disciples that He expounded these things, but to the Disciples, 'who came to Him.'" (Comment. on St. Matt.) He likewise draws the same typical allusions, as expressive of this mode of teaching, from our LORD's withdrawing to the mountain, and descending to the plain; in the former, to those who could ascend with Him, He explained the mysteries of the kingdom. (Contra Celsum.)



which ye see and have not seen them." Those glorious promises therefore of the Old Testament were now already thrown upon the world, but only seen by certain persons who had "eyes to see." So that those glowing prophetic descriptions of CHRIST's kingdom may not imply any great change in the external appearance of the world, as is sometimes supposed, but only those high and heavenly privileges which some may value and receive. And the blessings of CHRIST's kingdom as contained in the Beatitudes would indicate the same, as confined to persons of a certain description and character.

I think we cannot but be struck at the little direct information that our Blessed Saviour gives to the Pharisee and such inquirers, the moving and striking discourses, as they appear to us, are all more or less private, such as the prophecies and parables respecting the end of the world and the like, (Matt. xxiv. xxv.) and the discourses towards the end of St. John's Gospel. It is in the retired Galilee, that the Gospel seems to open with blessings, couched in the half secret though simple forms of the Beatitudes; and it is in the crowded Temple at Jerusalem that our LORD's public ministry ends with the opposites throughout to those Beatitudes, the woes pronounced on the Jews at Jerusalem<sup>1</sup>.

In speaking of a Parable as a veil, I would be cautious against mentioning anything as the end proposed in the operations of GOD: which, of course, to confine to one end and purpose, we may perceive would be quite impossible, as in the works of Nature; I would only say that the Parable did serve this purpose among others. Might it not be that the most spiritual and heavenly precepts were thus left to the rude and rough world, so that the veil of the figure might still be over them, though disclosing its import to any attentive and thoughtful person; performing thus by themselves through the wonderful wisdom of GOD, that which He has commanded us to observe, in not "giving that which is holy to the dogs," and not "casting pearls before swine."

This view of a Parable as a veil of the truth seems generally

<sup>1</sup> And this it is to be observed was after He had said, that the things which belonged unto their peace were now hid from their eyes.

confirmed by the Fathers. A Parable is explained by Theophylact (see Schleusner) as "a dark saying." Cyril (in the Catechesis vi.) says, "Is it only the God of the Old Testament who hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not? Hath not Jesus Himself said, 'therefore I speak unto them in Parables, that seeing they might not perceive.' Was it from hating them that He wished them not to see? Or was it not that they were unworthy to do so, since they had closed their eyes?" And again, the same writer says, "To those who could not hear He spoke in parables, and privately expounded them to His disciples. The brightness of glory was for these; and blindness for unbelievers."

Clement of Alexandria says (Stromata, B. vi. p. 676.) "Neither Prophecy nor our Saviour Himself promulgated the divine mysteries in such a manner that they might easily be apprehended by all persons, but discoursed in parables. Certainly the Apostles say concerning the Lord, 'that He spake all things in Parables, and without a parable spake He not unto them.'" "And even in the law and prophets," he adds, "it was He that spake to them in Parables."

And Chrysostom in like manner. "Had He not wished them to hear and to be saved, He would have been silent, and not have spoken in Parables. But by this means He moveth them, by speaking things overshadowed and darkened." (Homil. on St. Matt. xiii.)

5. *The manner of our Lord's Miracles,—their concealment, &c.*

The miracles of our blessed LORD were the other mode of His teaching mankind and disclosing His Divinity—and will not all that has been said forcibly apply to them also? Would it not appear (if I may so express myself with reverence) that He walked about, infinitely desirous to communicate good, without any limit or measure of His own goodness or power, but yet bound, as it were, in some very wonderful manner, by the unfitness of mankind to receive Him? For as He is revealed to us as more than willing to forgive, but as it were unable to do so unless we repent; in like manner is He also as desirous

to manifest Himself to us, but as it were unable to do so unless we are fitly disposed for it. Is it not very observable that the miracles recorded were to the very utmost of the faith of the person seeking relief, but as it were unable to go beyond? By a word, and at a distance, if so asked, as in the case of the Centurion: by laying on His hand, if the request went to this, as in Jairus's daughter: by a more speedy cure of another intervening by touching the hem of His garment, if such the belief<sup>1</sup>; and He is spoken of as unable to work miracles (except a few) because they believed not: A very memorable expression, which incidentally occurs as marking the sole bounds of His power and will.

I think it may be considered without doubt as a general rule, that the benefits conferred in the Gospel are in a sort of measured proportion according to the faith of the recipient or person engaged, as shown by the words of St. Mark, "JESUS said to them that word of His, *If thou canst believe,*" (*τὸ εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι.*) and there are many like sayings. There may be some instances which *appear* to be exceptions to this, and in the manifold and incomprehensible ways of God's wisdom, there may of course be these exceptions, and some mode of accounting for them, but this would not affect the general rule. But in the second place I doubt whether any of these exceptions can be made out to be so. Take for instance the case of the healing of Malchus; we are perfectly in the dark respecting this individual and the state of his mind, excepting so far as the service he was engaged in proves he could not have had the highest degree of faith and knowledge. The case of the ten lepers might appear an exception, but cannot be proved to be so; it was said to the one in some especial sense probably, "thy faith hath saved thee." It would seem from this that he had in his case some benefit conferred which the others had not; and though the nine had not the gratitude to return thanks, they might have had under the pressure of disease the faith to trust for help, which would only make it an ordinary case in human nature, of good thoughts departing

<sup>1</sup> Thus also the leper's prayer is, "If thou wilt," the answer, as given by three Evangelists, "I will."

with restored health. And that this faith required was the result of a certain state of the heart, and not a mere effort of the feelings or imagination, would be evident from the place where the means of acquiring it are spoken of, viz. by prayer and fasting.

The frequent instances of our Lord forbidding them to mention His miracles, is usually accounted for by His not wishing to call the attention of the Jews, and provoke persecution on the one hand, and that the people might not make Him a King on the other, for which on more than one occasion we have an Evangelist's authority. But may we not see more in it than this? forbearing to work miracles before some persons seems to be like that of keeping from them what was already done. For might it not have been that if such persecution on the part of the Jews were thus brought on prematurely, it would prove their more hardened state; He would therefore first of all deal with them more gently, by not showing them His full power? This will, I think, appear from the instance in St. Matt. xii. 16, where it is said, that "He charged them that they should not make him known," and that in His thus doing, was fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, in part of which it is said, "He shall not strive nor cry, neither shall any one hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench, until he shall send forth judgment unto victory." The application of which passage to our Lord, introduced with reference to His having charged them<sup>1</sup> not to make Him known, would seem to imply, that it was from great tenderness<sup>2</sup> towards them, that our Lord would not disclose Himself. And this will appear also from a circumstance that occurs immediately afterwards in the narration, when on our Lord's casting out a devil, and

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Luke viii. I think one's first feeling on reading the request of the poor man from whom the devils were cast, is that of surprise at its not being granted. To speak humanly, was it not the reasonable wish of the poor creature that he should be allowed to continue with his Deliverer? and would one not have thought how good must it have been for him that such a wish should be granted? But somehow it is clear that a nearer view of our Lord's person and Divinity was not good for him, as we might have supposed; he was not perhaps able to bear it.

the people being greatly astonished, the Pharisees on "*hearing*" of it attributed it to the prince of the devils. And upon this, we know, follows that most awful and earnest admonition, as if by this circumstance they had come to the edge of the precipice from which He had been endeavouring to save them, the sin against the Holy Ghost. For they might have doubted the reality of God's revelation, and have seen only the Son of *Man*, and still have repented; but if they allowed the miracles, which must be divine, and still continued in unbelief, they were in a state of heart that could neither repent nor be forgiven. If the manifestation of Divinity is made to them, and they still disbelieve, nothing more can be done. All sin is forgiven which is repented of: to deny the Son of Man may be from ignorance and repented of, but to see God Himself revealed and to deny Him, is a state in which all principle is gone; there can therefore, perhaps, be no repentance; we are sure there is no forgiveness. Might it not be to prevent their falling into this sin against the Holy Ghost, that so much was done to keep the knowledge from them, till all means might be tried gently to lead them? It may be remarked, that this twice takes place: that after our Lord charged them not to declare the miracle, on the next occasion the Pharisees bring this charge of casting out devils by the prince of the devils; the one alluded to in the xiith of St. Matt. another in the ixth.

And if we take the instance of those miracles which appear to have been the most public, those, for instance, of the loaves and fishes, with 5000 persons on one occasion, and 4000 on the other partaking of them; even here it would appear as if there was somehow a sort of secret character about the miracle, for the multitudes were afterwards following our Saviour, because they ate of the bread, but not considering the miracle; and of the disciples themselves, of whom it is said, (by some doubtless very important coincidence of expression by the four Evangelists on both occasions,) that they distributed the bread as it grew in their hands, it is said immediately after on the sea, that they considered not the miracle. It was not, therefore, even on this public occasion like an overpowering sign from heaven, but

the divine agency even here retiring in some degree from view, as in His natural providence.

One must be cautious not to appear to limit the intention of Divine Wisdom by any interpretation, and, indeed, Chrysostom on St. Matt. viii. gives another purpose to the words ὄρα μηδενὶ εἰπῆς, "see that thou tell no man," (and so also, I think, does he on another occasion), which he considers as a lesson to us in all our good works to avoid the praise and even the knowledge of men. But thankfully acknowledging this lesson does not prevent our seeing other purposes also. For it is evident that another, a deeper and a higher meaning, was sometimes (if not always) contained in it, as when our Lord told His disciples not to declare who He was. And at another time, when the devils were commanded not to make Him known. And on these occasions it is much to be observed, that it is the Divinity of our Lord, or any thing that would indicate Divine power, such as the Transfiguration, which they were commanded not to divulge<sup>1</sup>.

All these things tend to confirm the supposition that our Lord's manifesting Himself was accompanied with very great and singular danger, and this is borne out by expressions such as these, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin," and, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin<sup>2</sup>;" and we know that the places of our Lord's peculiar abode, and the scene of His mighty works, Capernaum and Bethsaida, were brought into a condition so fearful, that as to the former it will be more tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment. If, therefore, such great guilt was incurred by witnessing our Saviour's miracles and preaching, may we not reasonably suppose that the withholding the full evidence of His power was in mercy intended to keep them back from so awful a state? It may also be observed, that

<sup>1</sup> All accounts seem to concur in the supposition that it was the Divinity of our Lord, which could not be disclosed without so much danger; and indeed this or the doctrine of the Trinity was the subject of the Christian mysteries of the early Church. May it not be the case, therefore, that this was in some way connected with the sin against the Holy Ghost?

<sup>2</sup> St. John ix. 46.

persons who come before us as most accepted, are those who have had least advantages, the Centurion, the Canaanitish woman, the good Samaritan, the returning leper, (also a Samaritan,) the thief on the cross; on the contrary, the Levite in the parable, is only not so bad as the priest; out of those admitted nearest to our Lord the Judas is found.

In accordance to all this, viz., that withholding the sign or greater manifestation was out of great tenderness to them, is that circumstance which is mentioned, when they asked a sign of Him, "He sighed deeply in spirit." And on another occasion our Saviour pointed out the manner in which they should have arrived at the truth, in the same way of probable evidence by which they judged of things in Nature, that they knew the signs of the weather, whether it would be fine or cloudy. And, indeed their continual asking for a sign, when such wonderful miracles were being abundantly performed, seems extraordinary, for it cannot but occur to one, What greater sign could they have? And the circumstance of their thus asking seems to prove that the miracles or the greatness of them was rather out of their sight. And what is much to be noticed is, that although our Lord's divinity was thus, as it were, concealed from the indifferent and careless observer, yet from any serious attention to the miracles, even in the accounts we have, the fulness of divine power is clearly discernible, as in the expression, *Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι*, "I will, be thou clean," and many others, and in that power which is the attribute of God alone, so frequently exerted, reading the thoughts, *ἅτε ἔχων ὀφθαλμοὺς καρδίας διαλογισμοὺς βλέποντας*, "as having eyes which behold the thoughts of the heart," as Origen says of the words, *ἰδὼν διαλογισμοὺς*, "seeing their thoughts." Indeed, it has been well shown in some cases<sup>1</sup>, and in many others it may clearly be noticed, so as to carry the fullest conviction to any one desirous to know the truth, that by an attention to our Lord's actions and the manner of His speaking, we may perceive strong and lively indications of His divinity. Observe, for instance, the sermon on the Mount. "Think not

<sup>1</sup> See the Bampton Lectures for the year 1836.

that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy ;” and that expression frequently repeated, “ For I say unto you,” which considering they were spoken with reference to the law of Moses, it seems almost blasphemous to suppose could be spoken by one less than Divine.

On the occasion of their requiring a sign, though they are told with such sorrow and earnestness, that no sign should be given to that generation, yet St. Matthew twice inserts an exception, “ excepting the sign of the prophet Jonas.”

The only sign which they should receive, namely, “ the sign of Jonas,” which was thus promised them, cannot but convey to us, who know to what it applied, something very awful ; for it was, that they should have no sign such as they wanted, but should have one which they themselves would bring about in condemning Him, a sign which would show the enormity of their guilt, that they had done no less than put to death the Son of God.

And will not the solemn answer of Abraham to the rich man bear much on this point ? We are inclined to say they will repent if they have this or that warning ; but this mournful prophecy has declared otherwise, for one can scarce help thinking of it as conveying a prophetic intimation of the Resurrection and its reception. It was a mercy, therefore, that no one was sent to them from the dead, for otherwise they would have been worse. May not this be said also of the Jews, to whom the manifestation of the Resurrection publicly was not vouchsafed ? And it is to be observed, that the very commencement of the plot against our ΣΑΥΙΟΥΡ's life, was the report of his raising Lazarus from the dead. (St. John xi. 45.) “ But some of them went their way to the Pharisees, and told them what things JESUS had done. Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council ;” and the object of this council was to put Him to death. Certainly a most astonishing fact, as leading to the development of this fearful phenomena in the human mind, that the circumstance, which of all conceivable should have been most to their wealth, was to them an occasion of falling. I would speak with caution on such a subject, but if, on other occasions, our LORD's being troubled was from causes of this kind, may not this explain our LORD's



personal deportment (so to speak,) on that occasion, as proceeding from the very fearful nature of such a miracle to those who should witness it. (v. 38.) "JESUS therefore again groaning in himself cometh to the grave." We naturally watch for some expression to give us some clue to the cause of this distress, and in the next verse but one, we read, "JESUS saith unto her, (Martha) Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of GOD?" And, indeed, one cannot but remark, that the preparation, as it were, for this miracle, was a gentle leading or drawing on of Martha, the weaker sister, to this fulness of belief which was necessary: first of all a confession of our Saviour's power is elicited from her, great indeed, but inadequate, "I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of GOD, GOD will give it thee." But our LORD proceeds afterwards to declare to her His own inherent Divinity, "I am the Resurrection and the Life," and a full confession is required, "Believest thou this?"

In addition to these two circumstances, viz. the performing of miracles, only in proportion to men's faith, and the withholding the knowledge of them, there is another point, which requires to be considered, that of certain persons only being admitted on some occasions, and others excluded. We do not of course suppose that it was from any partiality to the three disciples thus favoured, but in divine love and wisdom, alike for their good and that of all. We are reasonably led to inquire, why, in one instance recorded, that of Jairus's daughter, he put them all out but those three disciples, and the father, (who had asked and worshipped Him) and the mother? We shall find one thing, mentioned in all these accounts, that may explain it, viz. it is said, "they laughed Him to scorn." It seems probable from this, that our LORD knew they were not of a temper of heart fitted to witness such a miracle without injury to themselves<sup>1</sup>.

On the other occasion, that of the Transfiguration, we are naturally inclined to ask, why it is stated in all three accounts

<sup>1</sup> And St. Mark mentions that He instantly supported the faith of the father on the news of her death, saying, "Be not afraid, only believe."

so particularly in connexion with a certain conversation, which took place about a week before? The "six days" of St. Matthew and St. Mark, and the "eight days" of St. Luke, perhaps imply that it was on the same day in the following week: whether it was on our Sunday<sup>1</sup>, or there was any other circumstance that rendered the day, on which these two great events occurred, remarkable. That discourse, so noticed as preceding this event, was the confession of St. Peter; from which it would appear that it was this testimony, so blessed of our Lord, that rendered them now meet to be, as St. Peter expresses it in his second Epistle, "eye witnesses of His majesty."

And may there not be something more in it, than what we should call a mere accidental circumstance, that, on our Lord's appearing to the assembled disciples on the evening of the Resurrection, that one of them who was most slow of belief was not present? I trust also it will not be considered fanciful, to apply to this view of the subject the remarkable difference in the tone (if I may so speak reverently) of our Lord's conversation, after the departure of Judas at the last supper: and also the high and divine subjects of the discourse which ensues, independently of its free and affectionate character. Again, in that most interesting narrative of the circumstances which occurred to two of them as they were going to Emmaus, (which St. Luke records) we shall be supplied with another instance of this caution, in not revealing the truth, excepting so far as there was a heart disposed to seek out and embrace it: "And they approached to the village whither they went, and He made as though He would have gone farther, and they constrained Him," on which, we read, He went in to abide with them, and revealed Himself to them. From which it would appear, that He would have gone away, and left them, if they had not evinced this desire to retain Him.

There is another incident, in which there might be something of the same kind; it is in one of those interesting incidental ob-

<sup>1</sup> Origen, speaking of our Lord's transfiguration, says, "Such shall He appear to those who watch with Him after the six days, the days of work;" perhaps, therefore he considered it the Sunday when this occurred.

servations in which St. Mark abounds, where, in describing the account of our ΣΑΥΙΟΥΡ's walking on the sea, and their alarm at seeing Him, he adds, *καὶ ἤθελε παρελθεῖν αὐτοὺς*, "and he would have passed by them," but when in their fear they cried out, then He immediately talked with them.

To which may be applied the remark of St. Chrysostom on another occasion, when they besought Him to depart from their coasts: we read, "He entered into a ship and passed over;" to which St. Chrysostom adds, *ἄκοιτας γὰρ οὐ σωφρονίζει*, "for the unwilling he does not instruct;" and *ἐκβληθεὶς οὐκ ἀντέτεινε, ἀλλ' ἀνεχώρησε*, and "when cast out he resisted not, but retired." There are examples, or perhaps typical intimations of the same mode of acting, which might be pointed out in the Old Testament, in which it would appear that God was "waiting to be gracious," but waiting till something should be done on the part of man, to accept his deliverance. Thus, when the angel appeared unto Moses in the bush, we read, "and Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt. And *when the Lord saw that he turned aside*, God called unto him." (Exod. iii. 3, 4.) It is also to be observed, that even those miracles in the Old Testament, which we might suppose most public and open, were not entirely of this character; thus in the striking of the rock it is said, "The Lord said unto Moses, Go on before the people, and take with thee of the elders of Israel," (Exod. xvii. 5.) which might be compared with the miracle of the loaves dispensed by the disciples, as referred to above.

6. *The same secret mode of teaching, observable in some actions and incidents.*

In addition to the parables, and miracles, are there not events in the Gospel, which are similar in their effect to those difficult expressions before alluded to, such as convey a high and heavenly meaning beyond the letter? I do not allude to any mere fanciful interpretations, but to events such as to a plain attentive reader would suggest immediate moral and spiritual intentions and instructions; as perhaps that of St. Peter walking on the sea, which seems in many points typical or prophetic of his fall; and the miraculous draught of fishes, recorded in the 5th of St. Luke, when

the disciples, as it appears, had been previously called, and were now again at their worldly employments, by which action they seem to be significantly taught, that, though they had to relinquish their means of livelihood to follow our SAVIOUR, they need not fear to do so, and that, as fishers of men, they need not despair, though their efforts might long seem unavailing. Such also was the withering of the fig tree, and the bearing of the cross after Him. These evidently contained hidden wisdom, not palpable, nor seen or acknowledged at the time, if at all. They seem to be quite of the nature and character of dark and difficult sayings, conveying instruction by a kind of metaphor, or similitude, in the same way. And in both, the full meaning was a secret to those to whom it was first spoken. Such are remarkably in unison with events in the Old Testament, as, e. g., the offering up of Isaac. The instances mentioned appear obvious ones—they may be but glimpses, which we perceive, of a great system. Add to these the Sabbath day being selected by our LORD for His miracles of mercy. How much is signified in this, to a thoughtful observer? Indeed no less than all the Gospel, as contained within, and rising out of the law, and the latter departing away<sup>1</sup>.

*7. Our Lord spoken of by others, and speaking of Himself.*

May we not also, from the expressions of others respecting our SAVIOUR, see allusions to this awful and mysterious wisdom, and which indicate that He was in the habit of concealing, in a remarkable manner, His divine power and majesty, excepting so far as persons might be found capable of receiving it? Such is the expostulation of His brethren: "No man doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly; if thou do these things, shew thyself to the world." And not his unbelieving brethren only, but the unbelieving Jews at Jerusalem also say, "How long makest thou us to doubt? if thou be the Christ tell us plainly." All of which cannot but forcibly remind us of passages in the Old Testament, such as where the angel (or, as it would appear, more than an angel) says to Manoah, "Why askest thou

<sup>1</sup> That the miracles of healing contained deep spiritual teaching appears from the reproof of the Scribes (St. Matt. ix. 5.) on account of their not seeing that the bodily cure implied a power of forgiving sins.

my name, seeing it is secret?" (or wonderful :) and to Israel, "Why askest thou my name?" and in Isaiah, (xlv. 15.) "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the SAVIOUR." And, though God hath appeared out of Sion in perfect beauty, yet "clouds and darkness are round about Him." So that, although the beloved disciple could say, "we have seen His glory," yet to the world He hath "no form nor comeliness." (Origen.)

Origen has, I think, observed, that, although false Christs should arise, saying, "I am CHRIST, and, I am CHRIST," yet that our LORD does not openly profess, or proclaim Himself as such. And the constant open designation of Himself as "the Son of Man," is to be noticed, for it might be thought, here is the common admission which those, who wish to deny the Godhead of CHRIST, might most desire. And will it not be seen, by examining the passages where our LORD most fully declared His Divinity, that it was, as it were, (so to speak) forced from Him by others, and followed by violence? And when indeed the most full declaration was at last extorted from Him, by the adjuration of the high priest, the consequences which ensued were, we know, dreadful beyond example, for it was the beginning of the great crime. But on the other hand, any thing approaching to an acknowledgment of divine power in our SAVIOUR seems to be followed by some signal blessing, as in the case of the Centurion, &c. and the full confession still more so in the case of St. Peter; no one else seems to have made this, others acknowledged our SAVIOUR as the Son of David, or as the CHRIST, not knowing what it imported. It is worthy of attentive observation, that the acknowledgment is from the de-ils, (see Mark iii.) when He strictly charged them not to divulge it. As if to see, and acknowledge, without suitable reverence, was a state utterly hopeless.

From all which it may be gathered, that it was indeed of infinite importance, that they should see and believe that He was the CHRIST; but, that it was of no less infinite importance, that He should not Himself declare it to them. If, when they required the sign, the stronger miraculous attestation, He groaned deeply in spirit; so, on the contrary, when Peter acknowledged Him to be the CHRIST, the SON of GOD, (from which conversation it would appear that He had never Himself told them that He was,) then came

down that blessing, which ceases not, and never shall cease. And it has been observed, (by Origen) that, as St. Matthew is the only one of the three Evangelists, who records the expression, "Thou art the SON of GOD," in addition to "Thou art the CHRIST," so he is the only one of the three who records the blessing, and that this was revealed to Peter "not of flesh and blood, but of GOD," as if this latter expression of our SAVIOUR'S, had a reference to that declaration of His Divinity on the part of St. Peter.

The only mode, therefore, of arriving at the truth was by means of that moral inference, under the influence of GOD'S good Spirit, which arises from that probable evidence, which He has given us as the guide of life: in the same way that we gain natural truths. This was the mode pointed out to the Jews<sup>1</sup>, and such appears to have been the case with the Virgin herself, of whom it is said, *Μαριάμ συνετήρει ταῦτα συμβάλλουσα τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς*, "Mary kept to herself these things, pondering them together in her heart," and on another occasion, *ἡ μήτηρ διετήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς*, "His mother kept throughout all these words in her heart;" the same which St. Paul has pointed out as the way to heavenly wisdom, "comparing things spiritual with spiritual," and thus arriving at what is sometimes called the *πληροφορία*, the full accumulation gathered from probable evidence to the full assurance of faith.

As if in the same manner as in natural events or worldly matters we gather this fulness of assurance from the recurrence or repetition of many single circumstances, so also a divinely illuminated mind, in the course of practical obedience, necessarily must accumulate numerous facts which necessarily lead to certain conclusions, or convictions of divine truth, so as to be open to the hearty, and full reception of higher knowledge, when presented to it; the numerous circumstances, on which such evidence is built, being perfectly unknown to the careless, and disobedient; which of course would explain how such conviction is entirely moral.

This view of the subject seems to explain, and itself to be ex-

<sup>1</sup> See St. Matt. xvi. 3, "Ye can discern the face of the sky," &c.

plained by, the Baptist's sending his disciples when he was in prison, to our SAVIOUR, and our LORD's reply to them. As John came to bear testimony to our LORD, and some of his disciples had already followed our SAVIOUR on that testimony, the Baptist must naturally have desired, that the others should do the same, particularly now on his approaching death; and, according to this mode of divine teaching, would have been desirous to leave it to them to see and believe according to the strong moral evidence set before them. For if John expresses no belief in His being the CHRIST, nor does our SAVIOUR on the other hand declare Himself to be so; the Baptist tells them not it is the CHRIST, but sends them to see: and our LORD declares not that He is the CHRIST, but points to His works<sup>1</sup>.

For we can hardly suppose, I think, that the Baptist, to whose testimony our LORD himself so strongly appealed, could have had any doubts himself. That John the Baptist's sending in that manner might have naturally occasioned such a supposition on the part of the persons present, and that our LORD intended to correct that erroneous impression, appears to me to be the meaning of what our blessed LORD says on the occasion; as if (Matt. xi.) in that passage which commences with the words "what went ye out for to see," something of this kind was implied, "Think not the Baptist's faith is shaken; you yourselves went to see him, you well know his character, that it was not liable to wavering, like the reed of his own desert. But, perhaps, you think his own sufferings, or my lowly appearance, have shaken his belief. He was not, you well know, (for you have seen him) a person like this, one who looked on personal exterior, whom a king's court could have dazzled, or subsequent misfortune shake. Such a man as that you would not have to seek in the desert; was he not a prophet, yea, indeed, and more? Do not think, therefore, that he himself has any doubt or wavering."

And at the same time they are told that, if they could receive it, this was the foretold Elijah; which seems to prove two things, first, that, if he was that great prophet, he could be no doubtful

<sup>1</sup> Pascal says, "Jesus Christ, to leave the impious in their blindness, never expressly told them, that He was not of Nazareth, or that He was not the son of Joseph."

testimony, and secondly, that it required a certain disposition of the heart to receive him as such.

And our blessed LORD Himself describes this peculiarity in His own mode of teaching, as in the parable of the new cloth added to the old, and the new wine received into the old bottles, which appears to indicate the exceeding danger of the Gospel being received into the unregenerate heart of the old man, and such fatal consequences as our LORD's manner of teaching was calculated to avert. And even to the disciples themselves at the last, He thus speaks, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." In all which our LORD appears as morally dealing with mankind in the same way as He supplies the necessities of all His creatures in His natural providence, ministering to all their wants in due season, and also according to the wants of each, and as they were able to bear it.

There is a tradition (mentioned I think by Origen) highly interesting from the moral reflections it suggests, that our LORD was in the habit of appearing to different beholders in a different personal form. Whether there is any evidence for the truth of such a statement or not, it is clear, that the very different feelings with which He would be looked upon, from those of the deepest adoration and love, to those of Pharisaical contempt, would, in fact, in the eyes of mankind have invested him with the greatest imaginable difference of exterior, which might have given rise to such a report. Indeed the same writer makes this application of it, "The Word," he says, "hath different forms, appearing unto each beholder in the way beneficial to him, and being manifested unto no one, beyond what he that beholdeth Him can receive." (Origen, Comment. St. Matt. tom. xii. 36.)

8. *The instructions to the Disciples, and their conduct illustrating the same.*

Again, do not our LORD's instructions to His disciples, when they were sent forth to preach, convey throughout something of the same impression, that they were not to press the truth beyond what men were willing to receive, and imply the awful state of those, to whom it had been spoken, as may be seen at length in the 10th chapter of St. Luke? Again, the word *μαθητεύσατε*



*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες* is to be remarked, as of course it implies something different from "teach all nations," as if it was not to be the mere communicating of knowledge, but rather, the training them, and making them disciples; and it is observable, that the same expression is also applied to the apostles in the Acts, xiv. 21, *μαθητεύσαντες*, "having made disciples." And these remarks derive an additional force from something of this kind being observable in their conduct, as when St. Peter in raising Tabitha first "*put them all forth.*" Athanasius speaks of them as observing the same reserve which is here noticed in our LORD respecting His Divinity. In his answer to the Arians, who urge that the apostles spoke of our SAVIOUR, as of a man, as when St. Paul says at Athens, "by the Man whom He hath ordained," and St. Stephen, "I see the Son of Man standing." To this says Athanasius, "Because the apostles used these words did they consider that CHRIST was only a man and nothing more? God forbid! Let such a thought never enter the mind. But this they did as wise master-builders and dispensers of the mysteries of GOD; not without a good reason for doing so."—"With much wisdom the blessed apostles first declared to the Jews what concerned the human nature only of our LORD: in order that, when they had thoroughly persuaded them from the manifest miracles that had taken place that CHRIST had come, they might afterwards lead them on to faith in His divine nature, shewing that the works which had taken place were not those of a man, but of GOD." [Athanasius de Senten. Dionys. 8.]

9. *The same system in the Epistles.*

And now, if this view of the subject be correct with respect to the Old Testament, and the Gospels, may we not reasonably expect to find the same Spirit dealing with us in the same manner in the Epistles? And if we find what we might consider obscurities in the former, which had the effect of misleading the unwary and inconsiderate, as the prophecy of Elijah, those of the supposed temporal kingdom, and perhaps the expression of the sword, misunderstood by St. Peter: we know also from the authority of an apostle that there are things hard to be understood in the Epistles of St. Paul, which are "wrested to their

own destruction by the unwary." May we not suppose that the difficulties in the Epistles were intended to answer the same purpose as the figures of the Old Testament, and the parables of the New? Such was the opinion of Origen, who on the Epistle to the Romans thus writes :

"It must be observed, as a general truth, that, where it is the purpose to throw a veil over, and not openly to set forth the sentiments of truth, whether it be by the Spirit of CHRIST speaking in the prophets, or by His word in the apostles, there is often a confusion (or obscurity) in the diction, and the order of the sentiments is not clear and unbroken, to prevent those who are unworthy from discovering, to the condemnation of their souls, things which it is for their good should be concealed from them. And hence it is oftentimes the case that there appears a want of order and connexion in different parts of Scripture, especially, as we said before, in the Prophetical and Apostolical parts. And in the latter, especially in the Epistle to the Romans, in which things concerning the law are spoken of, and in such different ways, and under such different circumstances, that it might have appeared as if St. Paul had not the object of that Epistle distinctly before his mind in writing it."

But with regard to the Epistles, as confirming these opinions, the subject would be too long to enter upon further than just to notice the many passages in them, in which the Apostle speaks of his care not to impart divine knowledge to those, who are not worthy to receive it.

A full and adequate reason for this withdrawing, and withholding of divine truth, might be shown in passages which speak of the great danger of a revelation of God to man, as a savour of death, as well as a savour unto life. If fire is the figure under which the Holy Ghost is spoken of, it is alluded to under both its properties, to cheer and give life, and also to consume. The Baptist, who foretold our SAVIOUR'S manifestation as baptizing with fire, spoke also of the fire unquenchable, which should burn the chaff; and the pillar of fire, which was the strength of the Israelite, was the destruction of the Egyptian. Is it not said of Tophet, "the breath of the LORD like a stream of brimstone doth kindle it?" In all His moral dealings, therefore, it is the same

mercy which said to Moses, "Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto the LORD to gaze, and many of them perish." (Exod. xix. 21.) "For our GOD is a consuming fire." (Heb. xii. 29.)

10. *Passages in Scripture on the other side explained.*

There is one passage in Holy Scripture, which has occurred to me as at first sight appearing contrary to the whole of this argument, where in the Book of Proverbs it is said, "Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets, she crieth in the chief place of concourse, in the openings of the gates, in the city she uttereth her words, saying." But, on a little consideration, it will be seen to fall in with, and confirm the view we have taken. For of this whole description in the Book of Proverbs, Bishop Butler<sup>1</sup> has remarked, that it may be questioned, whether it was most intended as applicable to prudence in our temporal affairs, or to that wisdom, which is purely religious and heavenly. To him, therefore, who was a beginner, or who had not yet entered into the school of CHRIST, it would speak of this temporal wisdom; the higher sense would be to him a secret, concealed under the other, as by the veil; but to the heavenly minded it would open the higher meaning, the deeper treasures of divine Wisdom. So that it would really appear the same as that Wisdom, of which it is said in another place, that she walks at first in difficult and trying ways, and not shewing her secrets, but to those whom she hath proved and found worthy. "She goeth about seeking such as are worthy of her, shewing herself favourably unto them in the ways, and meeting them in every thought." (Wisdom xi.) And of course the passage from the Book of Proverbs means that there is no one living but to whom Wisdom speaks, a voice that tells him of something better, which he ought to do, than what he does, which the very nature of probation implies; but until he follows this first voice, the higher and better Wisdom is hid from him. But, however this may be, we know it was said of Him who was Wisdom itself, and "the light that lighteth every one that cometh into the world," "that He should not cry nor lift up His voice in the street."

<sup>1</sup> Law, in his *Serious Call*, quotes this from the Book of Proverbs in the same way; viz. as the call of Wisdom to those that are without.

Another passage has been suggested to the writer, as appearing to militate against some of the foregoing inferences,—the expression of our LORD'S, "compel them to come in, that my house may be full." But the meaning of that parable seems to be that, on the Jews refusing the Gospel, the Gentiles would be forced to enter, that the Church throughout the world might be full. And it rather therefore seems to imply the mode of GOD'S dealing with the world at present (which will be noticed afterwards), contrary to all His former dispensations, when all men are as it were forced to come in. While, at the same time, of the spiritual kingdom, it may be always "that the violent take it by force."

Another expression is also to be explained; the Jews say, (John vii. 27.) "We know this man whence he is, but when CHRIST cometh, no man knoweth whence He is. Then cried JESUS in the Temple, as He taught, saying, Ye know me, and ye know whence I am." This might seem at first contrary to the view here taken. But in reconciling this passage with that in the following chapter, where our LORD says, (chap. viii. 19.) "Ye neither know me, nor my Father; if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father," Origen shews in his Commentary, that the former alludes to our LORD'S human nature, to which the Jews were referring, but the latter to His Divinity.

11. *Confirmed by the analogy of God's present dealings with mankind.*

The whole history of this, the Almighty's mode of revealing Himself, is the circumstance which has been matter of offence to the unbeliever, asking for a sign. And perhaps it is different to preconceived expectations, such as we might have been led to form of ourselves: for instance, we might have thought, that the evidence of the Resurrection would have been more public, and the like. It is therefore, as in solving all other difficulties in the history of revelation, very satisfactory to shew, how remarkably consistent all this is with what we see in the analogy of GOD'S Providence, in our own experience of His dealing with us in His moral government, which we discern, as now going on.

A good man, however illiterate, has his faith established by a daily accumulating weight of evidence, which may perhaps be considered as equivalent to the testimony of the senses in the case of any of our Lord's miracles. A weight of evidence which is perfectly unknown to the infidel, and thoughtless, however intellectually superior : it is the path of the just, brightening in the clearness of his faith to the perfect day.

It seems as if this kind of evidence might be considered as joined on to the former (as being in our case the substitution for it, and yet acting in a similar manner upon this point,) by that singular fact, which Origen mentions, (against Celsus, p. 5.) that the traces (or steps) of those miracles were still remaining in his day among those, who lived according to the precepts of the word of God. So that the moral evidence, which a good man ordinarily has, arose at that time to the more sensible evidence of miracles, in the same manner as good persons were admitted to a closer and more intimate knowledge of our Lord's works, and the manifestation of Himself.

At the same time we must not speak as if we considered that a *sensible* manifestation of the Divine Presence, or Power, appeared to be the highest reward, or crown and end of a good and obedient faith ; but rather, perhaps, it may be a help vouchsafed to those, who are desirous to be led on to something better, and require such assistance. Indeed, where St. Peter speaks of the manifestation of our Lord's person, and the hearing of His voice, with both of which he had been so singularly honoured, he speaks of such testimony of the senses, as something less sure than the word of Prophecy, and this latter but as the "light shining in a dark place," compared with "the day-star arising in the heart," whatever this may be explained to be. Add to which, we know that St. John himself had not the earliest sensible and direct evidence of our Lord's Resurrection ; and that he needed not this assurance, but had the more especial blessing of having believed, though he had not seen, perhaps a blessing, which was no other than that, which belongs to the pure in heart, that they shall see God ; for, surely, if this blessing of seeing God be one, which, in the manifold application of Scripture, refers to this life, as well

as to the next, we have abundant evidence in the writings of St. John, of its having been singularly fulfilled in him, as well in the habitual turn of his own mind, as in those higher and more divine revelations, to which he was admitted.

It may well be supposed that the disciple, who lay upon His LORD's breast, had the fulness of His divinity (so to speak) disclosed to him in a signal, and singular degree. This is obvious throughout his Gospel and Epistles. As Chrysostom says at the commencement of the former, "He beginneth not, like the rest, from below, but from above," so may it be said does he continue throughout. We may suppose him to have remembered, and dwelt upon, in a way to have almost absorbed every other thought, those of his Master's words, which fully showed him to be the *Son of God*. And this might be traced, with much interest, to some little particulars, perhaps, in his Gospel, some manifest, but as it were incidental indications, which were such as this Evangelist might alone have noticed; and with these we might compare or contrast some observations respecting St. Peter. It gives a very peculiar interest to the Gospel of St. Mark (which is supposed to have been St. Peter's,) that the very minute, and apparently unimportant remarks, with which it abounds, are many of them respecting our LORD's own personal demeanour. Such as, twice that "He was *angry*;" that he was *moved with pity*; that "He *marvelled*;" that "He *groaned*" on two occasions; that "He *loved*" the young man; twice that *He took children into His arms*; that he was *asleep on a pillow*. Several observations of this kind occur in a few chapters, where the substance of the account seems often taken from another Gospel; many of them such as, humanly speaking, none but one admitted to a very intimate approach to our LORD's person, as St. Peter was, could have observed. And all this is exactly what we should have supposed of St. Peter during this period, a most earnest watchfulness respecting every shade of expression, which might have appeared on our LORD's countenance, and the most apparently trivial of His actions observed, and remembered. For, when he speaks, in his second Epistle, of their "having been eye witnesses of His majesty," and "having heard the voice of God bearing

testimony to Him," he speaks like one, who had felt at the time the need of such confirmation, or at all events was much supported by such Divine attestation. And these casual remarks, which have been mentioned, are indications of a state of mind, in which his eyes were intensely bent on "the *Son of Man*," while God the Father was gradually revealing to him that, which "flesh and blood had not told." A blessed and high state of faith and acceptance; but we are supposing it to have been something less than that of St. John. The faith of the latter, needing no manifestation, may be compared to that of Abraham, who, requiring no proof of God's favour, as it is more than once recorded, at the place of his sojourn "builded an altar unto the LORD, and called on His name." Whereas the faith of Jacob required some attestation of the Divine Presence with him: "If God will keep me, and I come again to my father's house, then shall the LORD be my God." To acknowledge the indications of God's presence in the proofs he gives us of His favour is acceptable to Him, but not to need such sensible proofs would appear to be more so.

But to return from this digression. In addition to all that has been said, it must be remarked, that, when our LORD was most exposed to the view of the unbelieving multitude, it was, by the Providence of God, at a time when His Divinity was most shrouded, as it were, by the veil of human suffering; if it be true (as I think Origen says) that His Divinity was the last truth the perfect man came to know, and CHRIST crucified the first taught. And this is according to the whole analogy of the gospel narrative, wherein he is drawing first of all "by the cords of a man, with the bands of love," until able to disclose His Godhead. Therefore they were capable of being forgiven, because "they did it ignorantly," as St. Peter says, and our LORD could pray for them, as "not knowing what they did." Would it otherwise have been the sin against the Holy Ghost? (I ask not curiously, but for our profit.) Certainly we cannot but be struck with the effects which ensued, when the Divine power was more manifested and acknowledged, as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, and in that of the sorcerer.

12. *Subsequent manifestations of Christ's Presence in His Church.*

One ought to pursue such a subject with caution, but if we consider the manifestations which God has subsequently been pleased to make to mankind, it may be observed that, as a right holding of the sacraments, and the acknowledgment of God's presence in them, is the mark and sign of a healthful Church, which the history of the Church will warrant us in supposing; so it appears that, when religion has been decaying in the minds of men, God has either allowed His divine presence to be hid from them, by the errors of the Roman Catholics on the one side, which would have the effect of a veil, like a type and figure, in concealing His presence under a low and carnal notion; or has left men to deny that presence altogether; (as Protestants are inclined to do,) so that a sacrament would be to them no sacrament, as far as the Divine power is displayed in it—but merely like a picture, or representation of our SAVIOUR'S sufferings—no more. Nor in this view are we at all considering it, as if God was the author of evil, but rather as seeing His hand controlling the errors of men, and judicially present, as so often represented, even in their wickedness. At all events it would seem to be an instance of the same kind as those enumerated, "He did not miracles because of their unbelief;"—it is precisely the same in effect. He is among us, and our eyes are holden, and we know it not, or, as St. John says, (ch. xii. 36) "These things spake JESUS, and departed, and did hide himself from them<sup>1</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above, I find that these two opinions, which have been stated, of the manhood of our Lord formerly, and of a Sacrament now serving for a veil of the Godhead, are confirmed by Pascal, who says,

"Before the Incarnation God remained hidden in the recesses of His divinity; and after it he became, in some respects, more hidden, by putting on the veil of our humanity. It had been easier to have known him while invisible, than when he conversed in a visible shape: and at length, designing to accomplish the promise which he made to his apostles of continuing with His Church till his second coming, He chose a concealment more strange and obscure than either of the former, under the species of the Eucharist." Dr. Kennet's translation, p. 265.



## PART II.

### THE EXAMPLE OF OUR LORD'S LIFE CONFIRMED BY HIS MORAL GOVERNMENT.

1. *That all Moralists consider vice and virtue as states of  
Darkness and Light.*

THE object of the former inquiry was, to ascertain whether, in the history of our SAVIOUR'S life, there does not appear a very remarkable reserve in the communication of Divine Truth. It is now intended to carry on the same inquiry, and to show that there are strong indications of something extremely analogous to this in His moral government.

This is so much the case, that, if it may be said of our LORD in the days of His humiliation, that He went about exceedingly desirous to disclose Himself; but that, nevertheless, He did, in a very remarkable manner, hide and conceal Himself from the view of those who were not desirous to know Him. So may it, in like manner, be stated in the same words respecting our moral nature, that there are clear indications that He is therein going about, exceedingly desirous to disclose Himself; but that, nevertheless, He does, in a very remarkable manner, hide and conceal Himself from the view of those who are not desirous to retain Him in their knowledge.

In proof of this, the first point which I would adduce is the fact,—that all the best moral writers, whether sacred or profane, speak of a state of probation, as being one of increasing moral light, or of increasing darkness; that a good life is, in some especial sense, one of advancement in knowledge, and an evil life, of growing and progressive ignorance.

Aristotle's system is a sufficient instance of this. In the state of ignorance which is considered wrong and blameable, there are

two degrees ; one, the ignorance of a general principle, such, perhaps, as may be instanced in that action of the disciples, when they were blamed in that they knew not of what spirit they were of; the other the very proof of viciousness in character, by which men become utterly depraved, as was, perhaps, the case of the Jews. The first, like a spot on the organ of vision, increasing in the latter to a loss of sight. Whereas, on the contrary, the whole of moral improvement, in the heathen philosopher seems to be an increase in knowledge ; and a preparation of the heart to a discernment, ever clearer, and more clear of the highest wisdom, and a cordial embracing of, and resting in, the contemplation of truths which are thus at length disclosed to it. For he not only considers goodness to lead to, and consist in, improved moral and practical discernment, (*φρόνησις*) but this discernment as subservient to the attainment of some higher wisdom (*σοφία*).

Now these acknowledgments of moral writers seem glimpses, and guesses, and sometimes distinct shadows and outlines, of great and divine truths ; for it is to be observed how this description of our moral nature is confirmed by Holy Scripture, where sin is frequently spoken of by expressions which imply "the light within being darkened ;" and progressive holiness is continually alluded to as progress in knowledge, and to know God as the end of all Christian obedience. The strength of un-governed passion, ending in a total want of control, is emphatically called "adding drunkenness to thirst," and the want of spiritual discernment is termed "a book that is sealed." And, in like manner with the Divine Scriptures, Clement of Rome says, "On this account Righteousness and Peace is far from you, because each of you has left the fear of God, and in His Faith has become blind, or dull of seeing." (c. iii.)

*2. That Scripture attributes these effects to the immediate agency of God.*

Thus far Scripture may only seem to confirm this moral account of our nature. But now it is to be noticed, that

although this principle is often alluded to by heathen moralists, yet in Scripture there is to be observed a mode of expression very remarkably distinguished from theirs. In the first place, Scripture speaks of this Divine knowledge as, in some especial manner, the gift of GOD. As in the instance of the blessing on St. Peter, on account of his acknowledging the SON of GOD, it is said expressly, because "flesh and blood had not revealed it unto him, but GOD the FATHER, who is in heaven;" and in the thanksgiving of our SAVIOUR to His Father, because He had "hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes;" and in the expression, "if any one be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you;" and, "if any one want wisdom, let him ask of God, from whom cometh every perfect gift;" and respecting religious comprehension, it seems to be said, "no one cometh unto me except the FATHER which hath sent me draw him." It is very edifying to observe this. Yet it is not so striking as in the opposite case, which is so contrary to all that we should have expected beforehand, that means are constantly taken to explain it away. The fact I allude to is, that this blindness of heart and darkness which is superinduced, as the natural consequence of an evil life, is variously, yet consistently, throughout the whole of Scripture, attributed to the agency of GOD. By Moses, as where God is spoken of as "hardening the heart of Pharaoh;" by the Prophets, as where Ezekiel says, "If the Prophet be deceived, I the LORD have deceived that Prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him and destroy him:" and Isaiah, "The LORD hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes" (see Isa. xxix.); and in the Gospels these expressions are often repeated in the same form from the Prophets; as, for instance, that they could not believe because that Esaias had said, "He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." And, after the same manner of expression, St. Paul speaks of those of the latter days, on whom God shall send a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned, who be-

lieve not the truth. And, perhaps, the same thing, which we should consider the mere natural effect of a wicked temper, is to be found, where it is said, "that an evil spirit from God was upon Saul, when the good spirit had left him." Surely such an identity of statement, under such a variety of expression, and in such variety of circumstances, ought not to be explained away, as if a mere mode of speech; but, on the contrary, we should consider, that, where the meaning is wrapt up by such difficulties on the surface, it is one of a high and sacred character. When, therefore, it is asked, why did not JESUS CHRIST disclose to them, that He was not born at Nazareth, as they supposed, nor the Son of Joseph, whom they said they knew; why did He leave them in such ignorance of His wonderful power and goodness? It must be answered, that it was He of whom it is written, "He hath blinded their eyes;" and that we have no way of coming to the full meaning of His words but by obedience. But that on the wicked He shall send, not His ultimate judgments only, but, if the expression may be allowed, snares also: "Upon the ungodly He shall rain snares, fire and brimstone." (Ps. xi. 7.) But of this circumstance thus much may be observed; that a great deal which revelation informs us of, is a bringing forward to our view the presence of God in those things in which the world is least inclined to acknowledge it; in attributing to the immediate agency, and influence, and presence of God, what was otherwise ascribed to the course of nature. Thus we see in nature the sins of fathers, in a temporal point of view, visited on children: this, revelation tells us, is the denunciation of God. We see the innocent overwhelmed with the guilty, and infants with their parents, in wars and convulsions of nature: this, scriptural history shows us, is by the command of God. So, likewise, in morals, Aristotle points out fully the effects of vice in bringing on a state of blindness. But that this is the judicial punishment of God, as clearly acting and present in this world, amid all the confusions that abound, this revelation sets before us,—"*God shall send upon them a strong delusion.*"

Instead of attempting to explain away, let us thankfully adore

and bless His holy name, for these indications of His gracious presence, even in these awful mysteries, and "give *thanks* unto Him because we are *fearfully* and wonderfully made;" for this very mysteriousness creates a feeling of awful regard, and is a subject of thanksgiving, as bringing palpably before us, that in all things "His is the kingdom and the power."

Thus far, therefore, we seem to have arrived at this point,—that there are in our moral nature indications of the same kind of concealment and disclosure, according to our various dispositions of heart, as we before observed to be the case in the history of our LORD's life. But much more than this, that such light and darkness is attributed, in a very singular manner, to the immediate agency of God.

3. *This knowledge is considered as something Infinite and Divine.*

But this analogy will carry us still further: as it was our blessed LORD's divinity, which, we have seen, He studiously concealed, but wished all men to come to the knowledge of; so the knowledge which is supposed in morals to be the result of a good life, is something which is of a nature very great and infinite. In Aristotle it is the going out of mortality, as it were, into the earnest contemplation of things that are wonderful, eternal, and divine<sup>1</sup>. Such is the shadow of that truth which Scripture

<sup>1</sup> The whole of this is illustrated with exquisite beauty in that admirable canto of the Fairy Queen (c. x. Book I.), where, after his abode in the house of Religion, the dwelling-place of Faith, Hope, and Charity, the penitent is led, by a path difficult of access, to a retired mount, which is represented as the abode of Heavenly Contemplation.

"Thence forward by that painful way they pass  
Forth to an hill, that was both steep and high,  
On top whereof a sacred chapel was,  
And eke a little hermitage thereby,  
Wherein an aged holy man did lie,  
That day and night said his devotion,  
Nor other worldly business did apply.  
His name was Heavenly Contemplation;  
Of God and goodness was his meditation."

unfolds to us. For certainly those pre-eminent saints of God, Abraham, St. John, and St. Paul, seem to stand out, as it were, from the human race, by a kind of solitude of spirit, from their minds appearing to be conversant with things above human nature. Abraham, of whom it was said, on account of his obedience, "Shall I hide from Abraham the thing which I do?" St. Paul, who saw things that it was not lawful for man to utter; and St. John, whose character is not more strongly marked by that divine love for which he is known, than for what may be termed, but very inadequately, heavenly contemplation; so as to have been found worthy, not only to have written his divine Gospel, but to whom the Book of the Revelations should have been entrusted. Add to this, that those Christians, who appear, from many circumstances, to have been the most advanced of all St. Paul's converts, the Ephesians, are especially addressed on the subject of growing in knowledge. The Apostle's unceasing prayer for them is, that "God will grant them the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him; the eyes of their understanding being enlightened, that they might know what are the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints."

This knowledge is always spoken of as something so vast, and as I said, infinite, that persons seem never to be addressed as if they had attained, so much as urged on to the greater attainment: it does not seem spoken in terms such as Peace and even Faith, but more like Divine Charity, and perhaps as co-existent and co-extensive with it, as a part only at best of what is boundless, and will be more fully developed hereafter. It is said, "in knowledge of whom standeth eternal life;" as eternal life cannot be defined by bounds, no more can this knowledge have any limits.

And indeed it is often thus spoken of as directly connected with the Divinity. It is called "the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hid in CHRIST." It is "the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." It is to "be able to comprehend what is the breadth and length and depth and height, and to know the love of CHRIST which passeth know-

ledge," and by St. Peter it is "growing in the knowledge of CHRIST." It is expressly spoken of by St. John as our SAVIOUR manifesting Himself. (John xiv.)

4. *It is of a moral, and not of an intellectual nature.*

The next point to be observed is that this hidden wisdom is entirely of a moral nature, and independent of any mere cultivation of the intellect. Indeed the latter of itself would appear to be a hindrance to it,—for such "knowledge puffeth up." Even Aristotle cautions us that knowledge in morals can only be gained by practice. And that heavenly knowledge, of which St. Paul speaks, he is cautious of disclosing to those who are carnally minded. "Add to virtue knowledge," says St. Peter; and this knowledge he considers as the very end of obedience. "If these things (i. e. these graces) abound in you, they will make that ye shall not be unfruitful in the knowledge of our LORD JESUS CHRIST." (2 Pet. i. 8.) It was seeing that he would command his family to keep the ordinances of GOD, which was the reason given, why GOD would not withhold from Abraham the thing which He did. And indeed the character of this knowledge in all its fulness, its secret and hidden,—its vast and infinite nature, and its being entirely a matter of moral attainment, is sufficiently expressed in our blessed LORD's own words—"Judas saith unto Him, (not Iscariot) LORD, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us and not unto the world? JESUS answered, and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." It might also be considered that holiness in man is, in fact, nothing else but a sense of the Divine presence; to improve in holiness, therefore, is to grow in the consciousness of GOD's presence. And would again bring us to the same point, i. e. our blessed SAVIOUR revealing himself according to the state of each man's heart.

St. John often mentions this knowledge in connexion with love, and such love as the result of obedience. And experience thus confirms it: actions of self-denial dispose the heart to prayer,

prayer to the love of God, and the love of God to the knowledge of Him. And this secret and heavenly knowledge, thus attained, seems alluded to in the expression, (Rev. xiv.) "They sang a new song, which song no man could learn, but the hundred and forty and four thousand."

Moreover, it is to such as Daniel, "the man of loves," which are divine and not earthly, that revelations are made: and it is worthy of consideration, that those who speak of the intimate connexion of CHRIST with his Church, under the type of marriage, are the Baptist, St. Paul, and St. John. As if it were to the higher, or virgin, state of life that the mysteries signified by this figure were confided.

*5. That we may perceive intimations of what it may be.*

Of the nature of this Divine knowledge, which God is pleased to reveal to His obedient children, it is of course quite impossible for us to speak adequately, "seeing that it is secret," by our very supposition. But of the manner in which this light that lighteth the path of the just may make our way clearer, and open and disclose things to us, before obscure, as we advance, may be shown in one or two instances. First of all, in morals we may see how it is that if any sincere person be otherwise minded, in any point, than what holiness of heart requires, GOD will reveal even this unto him. It may be seen that the whole system of morals is one of progressive light, as far as we can discern. Take, for example, two controverted cases in morals, and observe how the faith of Christian duty throws light upon them. First the love of praise, a subject so debated in morals, with regard to its merit or demerit. Is it not a sign of good, and therefore praiseworthy, in the worst and most indifferent characters, that they should desire the praise of their superiors in virtue? it is an endeavouring to persuade themselves that they have some merit, which their betters approve, and therefore an intimation of some wish to attain it. It is a step, as it were, in the scale of virtue, that leads us, by human means, to the footstool of God. On the other hand, in the best men it is a fault to desire praise



at all—something that sullies their best actions: it is because they ought to look to the sole infallible standard of goodness. The approbation of man was only, in the former case, a weak substitute for this—for it was a looking to the erring judgment of the creature, instead of that unerring judgment and approbation of God, in which the life of the soul consists. True goodness of heart can only acquiesce in the judgment of God; therefore, says Taylor, a good man, when praised, trembles, lest the judgment of God should be different. And our SAVIOUR has said, “How can ye believe who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour which cometh of God only.” And yet we have in this case God calling us on, through the medium of parents and superiors and good men, to whose good opinion we naturally look, to seek for some approving judgment out of ourselves, and thus to rest in Himself alone. The circumstance, which in this case appears to involve a difficulty or a self-contradiction, does, in fact, more strongly confirm the analogy; for to state, as this instance seems to imply, that the same thing should be right, and yet that it should also be wrong and blameable, may appear extraordinary. But the case would seem to be similar to that of typical rites and offerings, which were commanded in the Old Testament, and, therefore, of course *approved of*, and yet the same are strongly and repeatedly *condemned*, i. e. with a reference to a higher standard of those great moral duties and heavenly significations, which they represented and were intended to lead to.

The same may be seen in another case, considered questionable in morals, whether emulation is consistent with Christian holiness, or to be considered as distinct from envy. The fact is that wherever there is a desire after, and a resting in, finite good as an end, such a good, being finite, must be lessened by another obtaining the same from the very nature of finite good: emulation cannot exist in such a case, without envy as its shadow. For objects, which are finite, we estimate merely by comparison. But, with regard to that which is infinite, as to obtain the love of God, which love is infinite; to do His will, which is infinite; to know Him better; all this, being of an infinite nature, can

admit of no envy, because the more another may obtain in no way diminishes, but increases our own attainment of it: here is disclosed the only legitimate course for emulation, as it is the only one in which there can be no envy<sup>1</sup>.

Such instances will serve to show how, in morals, He, "who is the light that lighteth every one who cometh into the world," discloses Himself in the path of Christian duty, which looks to Himself as the only means and end; but reveals Himself in no other way<sup>2</sup>.

The same may be shown after another manner, in cases which would be more strictly considered as religious. Take the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, as the subjects of devotion. That there is, in some especial manner, an infinity of wisdom and knowledge contained in these, may be concluded from their both being in an especial manner the words of God. And our blessed SAVIOUR has taught us to look for this secret wisdom in the first in the Sermon on the Mount, where He has opened their fuller meaning and spiritual intentions, as necessary to be observed, and by which we shall be judged at the last day. And from one petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," taken in conjunction with our Lord's explana-

<sup>1</sup> A person may envy another doing good actions, which he himself practises; if so, this is an indication that he practises them himself from some inferior motive. There is a proof of this in a private journal, hereafter to be again referred to. "I was conscious that it would annoy me to think that — fasted. It proves that I do it, that I may think myself good. I must keep myself intent on the one object, strengthening and purifying my soul." Nov. 3d, 1826. Here it is implied that the feeling of envy, in a cause of religion, would immediately imply a want of purity in the end proposed.

<sup>2</sup> Indeed the very gradations, pointed out in the former treatise, in the states of an acceptable faith, and instanced in St. John, who needed no sensible manifestation, and believed, though he had not seen, and in St. Peter, who needed but readily embraced it, correspond with the two good moral states mentioned from Hesiod by Aristotle: the first of these is he who has within himself, though untaught, the principles of good; the second is he who has them not of himself but receives them on their being put before him. The third, which is an evil state, is he who is lost to principles of good, neither has them in himself, nor will receive them.

tion of the "only true bread," and with that His injunction of our not seeking the bread that perisheth, in another place, we are necessarily led on to seek for more than the letter through the whole of that Prayer. Now the manner in which the Ten Commandments open themselves to a devout mind, coming forth as a two-edged sword, and capable of discerning and trying the inmost thoughts of the heart, coming forth as "full of eyes round about them," may be seen in Bishop Andrews' devotions; where upon each occasion they are brought forth as having clear and distinct, but consistent, meanings and applications; but all such, that it would be difficult to say that one was more properly or strictly the intention of the commandment than another. The same may be seen in other practical and devotional books.

In like manner, where the LORD'S Prayer in the same book, or in Bishop Wilson's *Sacra Privata*, is made the subject of devotion, and, as such, has each petition very fully and largely paraphrased, and new and different meanings given to the words on each occasion: it cannot be said that it does not bear all those meanings, and perhaps scarcely that it bears any one of those more than another.

These are instances of a kind of mysterious language addressed to a certain state of the heart; and the same may be seen in passages of Scripture which are only understood in the day of visitation; and in the new and pregnant meanings, which the most illiterate perceive in Scripture when religiously excited, and the more devout and thoughtful at all times. This depth and infinity of comprehensiveness seems thus to disclose itself by a continual new adaptation to circumstances all in a *moral* way; and this may give us some glimpse at the meaning of the Divine knowledge which has been alluded to, and which is the especial gift of God. For here we have the Divine Word opening itself according to the need of all occasions, and adapting itself to them in a wonderful manner, like Him whose manifold gifts, when He appeared in a bodily person, whether it was to lighten the eyes, or to give feet, or health, or life, were all but varied emanations from a Presence containing infinite perfections.

6. *That God punishes with blindness those who approach sacred truths with a speculative mind.*

If in these instances our blessed SAVIOUR appears to be disclosing Himself to those who are earnestly desirous to obtain the knowledge of Him in order to obey Him, in a manner no less remarkable does He appear to be hiding Himself from those who venture to approach Him with another mind. For, in perfect harmony or analogy to all that has been before observed, we find that we are in a striking way hedged in by ignorance respecting great truths, which we endeavour to gain the knowledge of by any way but that of practical obedience. Such have been attempts to explain the doctrine of the Trinity, which have ended in Arianism; to explain CHRIST'S presence in the Holy Communion, which have led to Transubstantiation: the mode of the new birth at Baptism, which seem, in great measure, to have been the cause of denying it: the incompatibility of free will with Divine foreknowledge is the conclusion which speculations on such a subject have come to. All these topics contain great sacred truths of the very highest possible importance that we should know; but if we attempt to arrive at any knowledge of them by speculation, or any other mode but that of practical obedience, that knowledge is withheld, and we are punished for the attempt: in the same manner that it was of the highest importance that they should know our LORD; but unless they were sincerely and humbly seeking Him, He was hid from them. Thus it is in the question of our LORD to Pilate—"Askest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?" If it is of thyself that there is this desire to know, thou shalt indeed receive this life-giving knowledge: and when it is found to be merely that ensnaring cavil and false insinuation of the Jews, enough is said to do away with such a false impression, and to lead on the inquirer to further knowledge, if he had been desirous to follow that clue. With regard to the true understanding of those high truths alluded to, it seems, (so to speak with reverence,) as if our LORD admitted some chosen few to witness the secret, but shut out the others.

All this may be applied to the question of sins being admitted to pardon and remission after Baptism : however lightly and inconsiderately such a subject may be dealt with, still, in the humiliations and mortifications which mark the devotions of such as Bp. Andrews, and Wilson, and Pascal, it may be seen that they practically felt this difficulty of obtaining forgiveness. The temper evinced seems a hearty apprehension and sense of unworthiness corresponding to such a fear.

So also with respect to the great Catholic and Primitive mode of interpreting both Scripture and nature ; of seeing things the most sacred, such as the Cross and Baptism, figured and shadowed out by an infinity of types. It may be, that the coming to the knowledge of these may be, as Bp. Butler suggests respecting other things in morals, by a certain general rule according to progressive improvement in holiness of heart. For instance, it certainly is the case that all strong feelings are prone to catch at such intimations of themselves in all things, to take up circumstances the most trivial, to dwell on the derivation of names, and the like. Abundant instances of this will occur in the Greek tragedies, and on all occasions of excitement. There seems reason to believe that the Almighty has hid this vastness of analogy and type in His word and His works ; and, of course, most of all, with respect to the highest truths, such as relate to our blessed SAVIOUR's incarnation and death, and His own attributes. It seems probable that, according to some great general principle, a fervent piety is the key to all these hidden stores of God, in a natural and almost necessary manner, as it might be. A tendency thus to interpret Scripture is observable in the most illiterate persons, under the influence of an unaffected piety. So that, independently of such a mode of interpretation being Scriptural, and Apostolical, and Divine, such knowledge may be also the reward of affectionate devotion, in what we might call a natural way ; and the contrary tendency, in a cold, sceptical, and self-indulgent age, may be according to the same general principle, God hiding Himself from them. For to say that such persons as the ancient Fathers were holy, self-denying, and devout, but at the same time were weak, injudicious, and fanciful,

is to transgress the first principle in Christian morals, which is, that he who doeth the will shall know of the doctrine; for it is to say that they do the will indeed, but know not the doctrine,—that the tree is good, but not its fruits.

Now in all these cases which have been referred to, it appears as if pains were taken that, in the language of Pascal, “the understanding should not forestall the will;” as if knowledge was still the fruit of death, till the heart was prepared for it: that there is a knowledge boundless in extent and infinitely good, and, indeed, no other than that of acknowledging the Divinity of our LORD, to the attainment of which we are urged as the great end of faithful obedience; but that, unless that obedience lead us, as it were by the hand, we shall never arrive at this inner temple. And that the state of Christianity is now, and always would be such in the world, is, I think, to be gathered from the Gospel itself, more than seems usually considered. Thus, after our LORD had publicly taught the people in parables, and such modes of speaking as, it is said, they did not understand, He said to His disciples “*privately*,” (which privacy has been especially noticed) that their eyes were blessed, because they saw those glorious things which Prophets and Kings had in vain desired to see, *i. e.* the kingdom of heaven upon earth. Those glories of the kingdom described in such glowing language in the Old Testament, were already thrown upon the world; but still they were only known, seen, and received privately by persons who are there described as having eyes to see and ears to hear, *i. e.* persons of a certain disposition and character; they were things which it is said in the same passage (Luke x.), were “hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes.” And the expressions which describe that kingdom as established upon earth, still speak of it as a secret—a treasure hid in a field, which a man found, and for joy thereof sold all that he had to purchase it: as the pearl of great price, found by a certain person seeking goodly pearls, *i. e.* giving earnest heed to religious instructions. The same may be shown in the nature of the beatitudes, which may be considered as the very opening of this kingdom foretold:—the windows of heaven opened, and the pouring down

of these riches, "the heavens dropping down from above, and the skies pouring down righteousness." (Isa. xlv.)

It has been before alluded to, that these riches are all *secret*; given to certain dispositions—not cast loosely on the world. And the characters described as coming to this inheritance, such as the poor in spirit, and they that mourn, &c., may be considered as certain narrow and confined paths, leading to these riches of the kingdom. And it may be observed, that there is not only such distinctness and appropriateness in each, both in itself and when compared with the end designed, but likewise such a mutual connection, that the attainment of the one disposition implies the other also in some degree; and that the attainment of all these dispositions is the natural and necessary result of a hearty, honest, and earnest embracing of religion. And, perhaps, the great end in which there may be found an union of all these beatitudes as existing together, may be that which is more peculiarly attributed to one,—namely, that "they shall see God,"—see Him according to each of His various attributes, which their own characters most open to them. All of which implies, that they only who do the will can know the doctrine, however it may be thrown upon the world; that "the secret of the LORD is with them that fear Him, and He will show them His covenant <sup>1</sup>."

The great doctrines which of late years have divided Christians, are again of this kind very peculiarly, such as the subjects of faith and works, of the free grace of God, and obedience on the part of man. They seem to be left in Scripture in a way to give rise to all these disputations among (if I may so speak) the multitude who are without: I mean to say, among those who do not labour to obtain the knowledge of them by obedience, and in

<sup>1</sup> See John viii. 31, 32. Indeed, throughout St. John's Gospel it is constantly alluded to; *e. g.* "He that is not of God cannot hear the words of CHRIST." But we know from St. Matthew that he, who loves his enemies, and does good to them, is of God; for he will thus become the son of God. St. Matt. vi. 45. By thus *acting*, therefore, he shall be able to *understand* the words of CHRIST. So also, "if ye keep my sayings, ye shall *know* the truth."

practical seriousness of mind (*i. e.* the disciples, of whom it is written, He said, "Follow me," and "they followed Him"). For they appear to be great secrets, notwithstanding whatever may be said of them, only revealed to the faithful. What I would say is, that fully to know that we are saved by faith in CHRIST only, and not by any works of our own, and that we can do nothing, excepting by the grace of God, is a great secret,—the knowledge of which can only be obtained by obedience,—as the crown and end of great holiness of life. Thus St. Paul, who had always laboured to have a conscience void of offence, and of all the Apostles had laboured the most abundantly, yet felt himself the chief of sinners. And Abraham says of himself, that he was but "dust and ashes;" David, that he was but "a flea," and "a dead dog." May not all these difficulties be like those of the Jews, who knew that no good thing could be born of Nazareth, or like that with which they seem to have suggested to startle the Disciples, "that Elias must first come." For in *all* these things we seem to have JESUS of Nazareth going about still among us—hiding himself from the many who are engaged in factious disputations concerning Him, or busied with their worldly views; but here and there He is in secret disclosed and acknowledged.

Again, the moral government of God, in the light thrown upon it by Holy Scripture, illustrates the point in this way. Signal afflictions, and temporal calamities are spoken of in Scripture, as the comings and the visitations of CHRIST and of God. And in furtherance of this, such chastenings are spoken of as the proofs of God's love to those who are thus visited, and the withdrawing of them of His displeasure,—“Why should they be stricken any more?” implying impenitent reprobation. Now as the disclosure of our Lord's Divine person was a very signal blessing, but not without a proportionate danger, if not worthily received, so we may observe, that nothing hardens the heart more than temporal afflictions, which are spoken of as the signs of His presence; if not received and cherished with a right spirit, they leave a person at length worse, if not improved by them. And yet it seems agreeable to Scripture to consider



them as if persons were thereby drawn into a certain nearness to God—a great privilege; so great that it cannot be trifled with or neglected with impunity.

7. *That Christ, as seen in the conduct of good men, thus conceals Himself.*

There is another mode in which we may find (I would speak with reverence) the presence of JESUS CHRIST, as still in the world, and His manner of dealing with mankind,—and that is in the usual conduct of good men, especially if such conduct is at all marked by any peculiarity, and such peculiarity increasing as they advance in strictness of life. And this I think we may find to be the case: for notwithstanding that a spirit of true charity has a natural desire to communicate itself, and is, of all things, the most expansive and extending, yet, in all such cases, we may still perceive the indwelling of CHRIST in them, still seeking, as it were, to hide Himself; for, I think, they are all marked by an inclination, as far as it is possible, of retiring, and shrinking from public-view. We might have expected that it would have been otherwise, and that an increasing knowledge of God would have been accompanied with an increasing power of setting forward such knowledge to the world. In such instances, we seem to have the same impatience of feeling respecting His true Disciples, which His Brethren once expressed respecting our blessed LORD Himself; “If Thou doest these things, shew Thyself to the world.”

The circumstance I allude to is such as this; it is mentioned of James Bonnel, that he was of great “retiredness of spirit;” “solitariness of spirit,” is mentioned of George Herbert; he seems to have felt, as it were, an unseen hand pulling him back. The same is noticed of Robert Nelson, and of Thomas a Kempis, whose book is full of this spirit; a similar sacred reserve was the characteristic of Charles the Ist. Instances of this kind might probably be adduced respecting all such characters. Pascal says, “This wonderful mystery, impenetrable to any mortal eye, under which God is pleased to shade His glories, may excite us powerfully to a love of solitude and silence, and of retire-

ment from the view of the world<sup>1</sup>." p. 264, Dr. Kennet's translation.

The fact must doubtless be admitted, and several concurring causes would tend to produce this effect. In the first place that humility which must ever accompany increasing holiness of life seeks naturally to hide itself, is desirous not to be known, and would even seem to check, and draw back the strength and wisdom of the natural man. In such a case human nature is humbled under the mighty hand of God, and that self-abasement, which arises from a sense of his nearer presence, has a tendency to withdraw a person from what the world considers spheres of usefulness. Now this principle of humility is of all others the most universal in good men, and under all diversities of characters, and of gifts, and circumstances of life: there seem to be no persons held out to our imitation in Scripture, without some marks of it; and indeed degrees of acceptance and approbation are in proportion to it. We must of course conclude, that the work of God is somehow best done, and His strength perfected, under this apparent (worldly) weakness,—that His victory over the world is somehow best achieved by thus retiring from the contest. This is contrary to human calculation, in the same way that no one would have thought beforehand, that the coming on of night would open to us more glorious objects than the light of day. When the light of this world is withdrawn, the heavens open<sup>2</sup>. As God, in whom we live, is Himself unseen,

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above, a very affecting instance of the kind has come to the writer's knowledge, in the private journal of one whose memory is very dear to him, and which is now in publication; he says, "Make me to go in the path of Thy commandments, and to trust in Thy mighty arm, and to take refuge under the shadow of Thy wings. *Thou art a place to hide me in.*"—*Journal, Feb. 10, 1827. Remains of R. H. Froude.*—In another place he says, "Felt as if I was getting enthusiastic. I must be careful to check high feelings; they are certain to become offences in a day or two, and must regulate my practice by faith, and a steady imitation of great examples. In hopes that by degrees what I now have only faint and occasional glimpses of, may be settled objects on which my imagination reposes, and that I may be literally hid in the presence of the Lord." Nov. 6, 1827.

<sup>2</sup> Thus the great promises and revelations of good seem to have been made in

and His good angels, who minister to us, are unseen, so also good men, as they approach Him in any way, seem to be withdrawn from the sight of the world.

As our blessed SAVIOUR in various ways retired from the view of men, and hid His glories, so it is remarkable how little we know of the saints of God; of one of the most eminent of the disciples we know nothing, and next to nothing, of St John's private history and character. Indeed, what little we do know of them is but as it were accidental, and the exception to the general rule, as in the letters of St. Paul: and even there, casual intimations greatly tend to shew our ignorance respecting them, as of the Revelations of St. Paul, of the time he spent in Arabia, and at Tarsus. Add to these, how many things are there, which more immediately respect our LORD Himself, the account of which, as St. John says, would have been more than the world could contain, yet all lost in silence. So also the things pertaining to the kingdom which were spoken for the forty days. "Verily, thou art a God that hidest thyself, O GOD of Israel, the SAVIOUR." (Is. xlv.)

It must have occurred to every one, with some surprise at first, how much the sacred people, having the visible presence of God among them, and containing, as it were, the eternal destinies of mankind, were overlooked by, and unknown to, the more polished and powerful nations of the world. Gibbon has not failed to take hold of this circumstance. And, in like manner, how little Christianity was noticed or known to heathen writers at a time when it was secretly changing the whole face of the world,—the salt of the earth, and on which the earth depended for its existence. There may be something analogous to this in cases of unknown individuals still. And all such are examples of what Aristotle says of virtuous principle, "*εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῶ ὄγκῳ*

Scripture in times of apparent adversity, to Adam at the fall, to Noah, after the flood, by Jacob in Egypt, to Hezekiah in sickness, and the Evangelical promises more particularly come forth at the captivity and ruin of the two kingdoms that contained the promises. For the strength of this world all flows from its most extreme humiliation, that is from the cross. Therefore the meek inherit the earth, and the obedient have length of days.

*μικρόν ἐστι, δυνάμει καὶ τιμιότητι πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑπερέχει πάντων,*  
“though in external appearance it be but small, yet, in power and worth, it is very far indeed superior to all things.” (Ethics, b. x. c. vii. ad finem.)

In the second place, there is another circumstance, which would tend to produce the same effect, viz. that reserve, or retiring delicacy, which exists naturally in a good man, unless injured by external motives, and which is of course the teaching of God through him. Something of this kind always accompanies all strong and deep feeling, so much so that indications of it have been considered the characteristic of genuine poetry, as distinguishing it from that which is only fictitious of poetic feeling. It is the very protection of all sacred and virtuous principle, and which, like the bloom which indicates life and freshness, when once lost cannot be restored. Which is thus expressed in a Latin hymn ;

“Se sub serenis vultibus  
Austera virtus occultit :  
Timet videri ; ne suum,  
Dum prodit, amittat decus.”

Paris. Brev. Comm. Mul.

Such a reserve on other subjects of sublime or delicate feeling is only a type of the same in religion ; where, of course, from the very nature of the subject, it must be much greater, inasmuch as it comprehends all feelings and all conduct which are directed to Him who is invisible, and who reads the language of the heart, and to whom silence may often best speak. Every thing which has God for its end gives rise to feelings which do not admit of expression. This seems to be implied in the difference which Aristotle speaks of, when he says there are objects which are worthy of higher feelings than praise can express, and such we look upon with honour and veneration.<sup>1</sup> We do, indeed, often

<sup>1</sup> Not ἐπαινετά, but τίμια. Arist. Ethics, B. i. c. 12. Add to which, a circumstance not usually observed, that, though Aristotle refers to the universal consent of mankind, as indicating the moral sense on any subject, yet he gene-

speak of such with words of praise, as we do of the Supreme Being, but in so doing we stand upon lower ground, and rather turn to each other than to Him, and introduce relation and comparison, which necessarily must be drawn from human and inferior objects: but we then descend from the higher, but silent, impressions of awe, veneration, and wonder. Such, for instance, are those with which we first contemplate a vast religious edifice, or some grand object in nature. When these first feelings subside, we express ourselves in praise, and, necessarily, have recourse to comparison or contrast. Hence it was the case in the primitive times of Christianity, that the feelings of devotion were expressed by significant actions, which spoke, as it were, a secret language: such was the custom of turning to the East, and the use of the sign of the Cross. For "*Curæ leves loquuntur, ingentes stupent,*" those who feel deeply are pained by the lighter expressions of others.

When that reserve is cast aside, there is a want of true and deep feeling; and this may be seen in the rejection of strong, typical, and figurative, and, therefore, half-secret expressions with which deep feeling is apt to clothe itself. Thus, in early periods of a nation, when their sense of the great and marvellous is strongest, they make use of those terms or modes of speech, which partake more of the infinite and divine; and their language, as they become more civilized, will partake more of the character of what is earthly and human. They adopt what they think is more full of expressions of their meaning; but the fact is, that they are general expressions, and therefore more limited and finite, and such as indicate rather a straining after such strong feeling, which they have not, than an expression of it. An instance of this may be seen in the rejection of the Antient Psalms for modern paraphrases of the same. In the former an infinite meaning was opened to the eye of faith; in the latter it is tied down to one feeble human interpretation. Instances of the same

rally combines with it an appeal to the individual conscience. An action, to be virtuous, must not only be *ἐπαινετὸν*, but also *ὀρθόν*: a vicious action is not only *ψεκτὸν*, but also *ἀμαρτάνεται*.

may be seen in the New Version compared with the Old. May not one reason why Scripture, and our LORD Himself, uses figurative and proverbial expressions be on account of their comprehensiveness, and the extent of application which they bear?

In addition to such holy reserve, and the suggestions of humility, another circumstance, which tends to produce the effect here described, are the commands of Holy Scripture, which enjoin the concealment of religious actions. Now, considering that actions teach more than words, and living examples more than maxims and admonitions, this immediately removes from the sight of men the most powerful appeals of GOD, and evidences of His presence; for all the most purely religious actions are thus withdrawn from view, done from GOD only, who is in secret, and to Him only, who seeth in secret, they begin and end in Him alone, unknown to the world. These are the signs of GOD's presence among us, and of His withholding that presence from the gaze of the multitude, as too pure and holy for us to look on, and covering those that seek Him in the shadow of His hand. So that in the lives of those, in whom CHRIST dwells, there is ever something remarkably analogous to the retiring actions of His own life; and the state of such persons, while on earth, no words can express so emphatically as those of Scripture, *their "life is hid with Christ in God."*

Now, it is much to be observed, that these indications, which are found with good men, and increase with holiness of life, and by which we may learn the mode in which the Holy Spirit is dealing with mankind, are not to be found in religious enthusiasm. I would mean by enthusiasm, a state of the mind when the feelings are strongly moved by religion, but the heart is not adequately purified nor humbled. Such, therefore, would be most likely to occur when the passions have been strengthened by an irregular life, and the objects that excited them are casually removed from view, and the importance of religion is in consequence seen and felt. Such a state would partake much of the nature of earthly passion, and would be such as might be called in morals, according to the view taken above, a state of ignorance. GOD is not apprehended, as He is set forth in Scrip-

ture, as of infinite holiness, but a fiction of the imagination, as each man feigns the idea of God according to his own heart, which was shown visibly in the idols of old, and alluded to in the expression, "Thou thoughtest wickedly that God was such an one as thyself." In such a case men would have no reserve in expressing that which was not at all rightly apprehended, or feared, or loved. And the cause of this state of heart would be a not keeping the commandments which give this light to the eyes, or the not having kept them, and such transgressions not having been repented of. For this is set before us as the great cure for enthusiasm by St. John. It is the Apostle of Divine Love who seems to have been especially commissioned to warn us against this its counterfeit. Not only in his Epistles, but, in recording the parting consolations of our LORD, no less than eleven times in the course of two chapters does he stop, as it were, to insert these cautions, "If ye keep my commandments." So that it would be exactly the case with these, as with those heretics of whom Tertullian speaks, as having none of that discipline of secret reserve which the Church maintained: "All things," he says, "are with them free, and without restraint." They have no fear of God, because God is not among them; for where God is there must be the fear of Him." (Tertullian de Præscript. Hæreticorum.) And yet, of course, the effect of this would be a strong contagious influence after the usual manner of all earthly passion.

Religion does not, under such circumstances, produce its genuine effect of humbling the natural man. To have a knowledge of God, without a knowledge of our own guilt and misery, has (as Pascal mentions) the effect of puffing up. And there is a great deal in religion which the natural man may eagerly take hold of, in order to exalt himself. Here, therefore, there would not be humility drawing back into the shade, as in the former instance; nor would there be that delicacy, or modest reserve in the outward expression of feeling; because there would be rather an aiming after the persuasion, than any really deep and true sense, of religion<sup>1</sup>. On the contrary, a mind in this state

<sup>1</sup> Something of this kind has been observed to characterize attempts in poetry,

by strong expressions would be endeavouring to persuade itself, and to persuade others, in order that, through their opinion, it may again in return persuade itself, of its having that sense. And this would account for that deceit, which, as Bp. Butler observes, so often accompanies religious enthusiasm; first of all deceiving itself into a false apprehension, and then, in order to support this, deceiving others; and then others, without this self-delusion, as its end.

The third characteristic in holiness of life is also here wanting; *i. e.* a self-denying and consistent performance of religious duties in secret. For such obedience would clearly remove it; and, therefore, this would account for another circumstance which characterizes religious enthusiasm, and that is unsettledness and inconsistency,—a state of ever learning, and never coming to the knowledge of the truth; which, of course, arises from not seeking for it by obedience, which, we are told, is a sure way of arriving at it. The actions it does perform are rather the extraordinary, than the ordinary actions of religion, so as to lose that reserve before mentioned; and, for the same reason, it delights in actions of a purely religious character, more than in those, in which the religious motive is concealed in the actions of daily life.

There would, also, from a secret misgiving, or sense of insecurity, be a tendency to feel after sensible signs, as in Balaam, when he sought for God's voice and warrant. Such would be seen in a craving after palpably felt evidences, in doing extraordinary and remarkable actions; in strong party affection, as taken for self-denying charity; in a looking out for miracles. (I mention this looking out for them, in distinction from a kind of credulity, and readiness to receive miracles, which is observ-

which are written without the genuine poetic impulse. The thing alluded to in religion may be seen, in some measure, in the following instance. An English translation of the "*De Imitatione Christi*," (of Thos. a Kempis,) seems to have passed into a rather different tone and spirit, though closely rendered. On coming to analyse and compare it with the original, we find the modest words of the latter, in most instances, substituted, as it were unconsciously, by stronger and higher expressions.



able in the best men, when they come before them in the line of duty; for the former seems forbidden by our SAVIOUR,—for many shall arise, saying, “here is CHRIST, and there,” but the practical rule is given, “Go not after them<sup>1</sup>.”)

As every thing in nature seems to decline and die away when it has done its work—such as the bodily faculties, natural gifts, and the like—so do animal feelings gradually subside when they have done their part in the probation of the soul, which may be seen in the circumstance of passive impressions becoming weaker by repetition. And perhaps this may be the case, as men advance in holiness of life; that a calm equability of soul is produced, (as in St. John,) and such sensible feelings exist less, as having done their part in the state of trial.

*S. That the whole subject contains something analogous in each particular to the circumstances of our Lord's life.*

Now, the inference from the whole of this view of the subject is, that the HOLY SPIRIT, in every way in which His dealings with mankind may be ascertained, is ever wont to throw a veil over His presence from the eyes of the world. That, as our LORD avoided the more public places for the manifestation of His Divine power and goodness, and went into the retired and despised Galilee, and hid His Divinity under the garb of humble and common life, so does He in the persons of His disciples, producing in them a tendency to withdraw themselves from the eyes of men; so that of each of them it may be said, as it was of Him, “He doth not strive nor cry, neither is his voice heard in the streets.”

That, as our LORD wrapt up the most sacred and divine truths in parables and mysterious sayings, so we find, that in good men there is a natural reserve of expression, which is apt to veil from the world holy sentiments; in both cases the end is observed,

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps all persons may be, more or less, liable to this religious enthusiasm, as here described, according to their different constitutions, circumstances, and habits; and, of course, it is not to be expected to be thus always fully developed, or to be such as to mark the character of a person.

of keeping "that which is holy from dogs." And that such reserve is apt to give vent to its own feelings, especially in such similitudes and dark sayings, as partake of the nature of what is infinite, and, therefore, to the world mysterious.

That, as our LORD concealed His divine miracles, and could not perform them because of men's unbelief, and commanded others not to mention them, so does He now, in that He makes known to a good man a daily increasing weight of evidence, similar to the attestation of miracles, in disclosing to him those confirmations of his faith, which are opened to an obedient life, and by the harmonious language of all nature, all of which testimony He reveals not to others because of their unbelief. And, in addition to this, He has commanded His disciples not to promulgate to the world those good works which He Himself still works in, and through, and by them.

That, as our LORD left the curious and worldly-minded Jew to his own delusions, and answered him not, but left him to the difficulties which Scripture had thrown before him, in the solving of which alone, with a serious mind, could he find the truth; and did not explain to him his misconceptions concerning Himself: so is it also now with those who speculatively consider religious truth (the knowledge of which is the gift of God alone); they are beset with insurmountable difficulties, suggesting to them that "this is not the CHRIST," or leading to other practical errors.

That, as our LORD disclosed the greatness of His divine power and person to a chosen few obedient and teachable spirits, limiting even that disclosure more and more; first to twelve, then to four, then, still further, to three (as in the Garden of Gethsemane, and at the transfiguration, &c.): so does it appear that in morals, both when considered as separate from, and also when considered as including religion, there is something, which is called knowledge, which is infinitely great and good, which is concealed from all others, who are universally represented as being in a state of darkness and ignorance, and is thus disclosed to these alone.

That, as He, who spake by the law and the prophets, veiled

the gospel therein in type and figure ; and because of men's disobedience, "gave them statutes which were not good, and judgments by which men should not live," but led them on, by laws which satisfied not, to a secret wisdom, which good men perceived beyond: so also are there in morals, things which have led to much difficulty with speculative moralists, which are good and right to the natural man, but wrong in a Christian, on account of a further knowledge disclosed to the eye of faith: these are circumstances in which all that can be said is, "this is He, if ye can receive it." For, to the natural man, it is his boast "to covet honour" of men, but to the Christian his shame. Thus also the Fifth Commandment contains the germ of all piety; and yet to the Christian it is said, he must hate father and mother.

Lastly, that as the manifestation of our LORD was seen to imply some very great and peculiar danger, when the heart was not prepared to receive it; so do we find that whenever these feelings, which are natural to a good man under the protection of the Spirit, are violated, as by enthusiasm, it is accompanied with dangerous consequences. Not to adduce other proofs of this, we have the memorable one in this country, when there broke in upon us an age, which has been well called one of "Light, but not of Love;" when the knowledge of divine truths was forced upon men of corrupt lives, and put forward without this sacred reserve. The consequence of this indelicate exposure of religion was, the perpetration of crimes almost unequalled in the annals of the world.

## PART III.

### SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FOREGOING OBSERVATIONS.

#### 1. *That the principle was fully recognised by the Ancient Church.*

It is well known that the general principle upon which the foregoing remarks are founded, pervades the whole religious system of the Ancient Church, and appears so much in various shapes throughout the works of the Fathers, that it would of itself form an entire subject of discussion to trace and exemplify it. Origen often alludes to it, as appearing in the conduct of our LORD; and his expositions of Scripture are founded upon it. Others do the same. Clement of Alexandria had before Origen, philosophically discussed the subject at great length. Cyril of Jerusalem says, that not to men only, but from the highest archangel to the lowest created being, it is CHRIST that reveals the FATHER, to each as they are found worthy and capable of receiving Him. St. Basil speaks of the traditions they had received being of this character, which, says he, our Fathers have preserved in inobtrusive silence, and alludes to the secrecy and sacredness of the Holy Place in the Mosaic Law, as representing the same spirit of reserve. And there are some interesting circumstances that seem to connect it with our LORD Himself and His disciples. Such may be seen in the early Epistle to Diognetus, attributed to Justin Martyr, where the writer speaks of himself, as carrying on that sacred reserve, which they had derived from CHRIST and His Apostles, for, says he, "knowledge is not safe without a true life." There is a remarkable instance of similar testimony in that passage of Hippolytus, quoted by Mr. Keble in his Sermon on Tradition. (p. 19, 1st Edit.) This principle of Reserve was developed into a regular system, known under the name of the

62 *That the present aspect of the world is much opposed to it.*

Disciplina Arcani<sup>1</sup>. In another form it may be observed among the Ancients in their, almost universal, mode of interpreting Scripture, every part of which they consider replete with mysterious knowledge, revealed only to the faithful Christian. And although individuals among them may be wrong in any particular explanation, the general principle of interpretation, so Catholic and Apostolic, it cannot be doubted, is the right one. St. Augustin speaks not only of the Word of God, but of his works also in nature, and of the Heavens themselves, serving for a covering to hide God from us, by this means to lead us on to the gradual knowledge of Him. Here, therefore, again, the conduct of our blessed LORD might be traced, as illustrating this subject, viz. in His Church, in which we know He is present always; and if where two or three are gathered together in His name, He is in the midst of them, where shall we find Him, who is Truth itself, more assuredly than in the Catholic consent of His Church.

2. *That the present aspect of the world is much opposed to it.*

When, after being engaged in such contemplations, we lift up our eyes upon the present state of the world, an extraordinary aspect of things meets our view. The *knowledge* of God, hastening to cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea; and a remarkable combination of circumstances at work, to produce effects, the opposite to what has been hitherto witnessed in the world. The art of printing, bringing home this knowledge to all; the means which Providence has formerly allowed to hide it, not only from the Heathen, and the Jew, but also from the Christian, (by a mysterious economy, which has been long permitted in the Church of Rome,) we see now removed; men of various creeds, opposed in principles and opposed in discipline, one might almost say Christians and Unbelievers, combining together in the circulation of the Scriptures. Add to this, preachers and teachers of various parties and from various motives, all busily engaged in imparting religious instruction. Schools more-

<sup>1</sup> For an account of this system, see Mr. Faber "on the Apostolicity of Trinitarianism;" B. 1st, c. viii. and the passages there referred to. See also Mr. Newman's Arians, c. 1, sect. iii.

over, and many on an extensive national system. Churches and altars thrown open to all, from the loss of church discipline : and, what is worthy of notice, Christianity acknowledged as true, by persons of the worst principles. Discoveries of science too, opening to us the boundless extent of the material world, which we cannot but suppose may have some bearing on the religious condition of mankind, as manifestations of God. Add moreover a new principle, unknown to former ages, prevailing throughout the world, in the shape, not only of an Article of Faith, but as the one and only Article, indeed as one so important, and requiring to be received with such authority, as to supersede the very fabric of the Church : dispensing with her Sacraments, her Creeds, her Liturgies, her Discipline ; and this principle is, that the highest and most sacred of all Christian doctrines, is to be brought before, and pressed home to, all persons indiscriminately and most especially to those who are leading unchristian lives.

Such are some of the most prominent features of the case. And so much does the opinion prevail of the value of religious knowledge merely and *of itself*, that when public attention was lately called to the commemoration of the familiar use of the Scriptures for these last 300 years, we heard no expressions on the subject which implied any thing like that feeling of apprehension, which the foregoing remarks would have led us to attach to it. Nor was it at all looked upon as that trying dispensation which the Baptist spoke of, as of the axe laid unto the root of the tree, and the coming wrath, and the sifting of the wheat. Nor was the awful import of those words considered, " be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke x. 11), and " for judgment I am come into this world" (John ix. 39). Nor was our case at all alluded to in conjunction with that of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, or of them to whom our Lord said, " if I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin." There seems also an impatience at any book being held back from any person, as too high and sacred for them ; it is a thing not understood. And so far from it being considered necessary to keep persons from church on account of irreligious lives, it is usually thought that every thing is done, if they can be brought

to it. There is also an inclination to put aside the Old Testament for the more exclusive use of the gospel itself, which is contained in it. And indeed full statements of religious truth have been thought so necessary, as to have produced ways of thinking often unnatural, of which this is an instance. A writer, investigating the existence of Christian truth in the Church, has thought it necessary to find explicit declarations of the acceptance of the atonement by the individual as the only proof of the preservation of the faith. The effect of which becomes equivalent to this, that an affectionate and dutiful child might be condemned for undutifulness, unless it could be proved, that he had made use of expressions of strong filial attachment.

This general tendency of things cannot, I think, be considered in connexion with the former observations, without some serious thought in every reflecting mind, "waiting to see what God will do;" and not without some distrust of popular views, and superficial appearances, and an anxious desire for some anchor of the soul, in this new trial which seems coming upon the world. And cautious as we ought to be in speculations respecting the future, yet there is a thought which occurs, which one is almost afraid to mention, lest it should not be with sufficient seriousness. Whether when noticed in conjunction with the dangerous consequences which have been observed to follow our LORD's disclosures of Himself, and the fact of those having been pronounced the worst to whom most knowledge was vouchsafed, and that so frequently as to mark a kind of mysterious and perhaps prophetic tendency of things which seem to point that way; whether, I say, all these circumstances may not indicate the coming of a time when "knowledge may indeed cover" the world, but "the love of the many shall have waxed cold," and faith be scarce found. There is something of prophetic admonition in the advice which St. Paul gives to persons under a similar apprehension, in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, where the stay against Anti-CHRIST is this: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or by our epistle." In looking to that epistle for some practical guidance, the general principle on which this steadfastness must be founded

is here given, namely, an adherence to the Catholic truth written and unwritten<sup>1</sup>.

*3. Practical rules afforded by it in the investigation of Truth.*

And now the observations which have been made respecting God's mode of revealing Himself to mankind will furnish us with some important general rules for the attainment of religious truth. If in the sacraments we have in some especial sense the present power of God among us, and the episcopal and priestly succession have in them something divine, as channels which convey, as it were, such His Presence to us; according to the analogy of what has been said, we must expect to find in them something *that hideth itself*, something like the personal presence of our Lord in His incarnation, surrounded with difficulties to the carnal mind, withdrawing itself, and leaving excuses for the Divine Power being denied; for did they come to us in a strong, unquestionable shape, with the palpable evidence by some required, they would come to us in a manner unlike all other Divine manifestations. These would lead us to expect, that they should be left in so delicate a manner, that he who wishes to ascertain the truth may find a sufficient and satisfactory evidence, so as by a fine clue to lead him into all the treasures of the Divine blessings, but yet of such a kind that he who will not afford them such affectionate attention will lose all those high privileges<sup>2</sup>. The secret of such enquiries is given us in the Book of Proverbs (xxiii. 26), "My son, give me thine heart, and let thine eyes observe my ways." For the whole case, in the

<sup>1</sup> It is to be observed that where separatists hold the Catholic truth, they hold it not from Scripture only, for others on the plea of Scriptural authority deny the same, but from tradition supplied by the Church, which has been to them the key to the Scriptures.

<sup>2</sup> The blessings attendant on the reception of this truth seems to be promised when the commission is first given to the apostles, when it was said, that he who would "receive a prophet in *the name of* a prophet shall receive" the proportionate reward of that commission (St. Matt. x. 41); and the word "the sent" (apostles) instead of the preachers, or the teachers, immediately sets before us the value of such being in the commission, leading us to look back by faith, and not to apparent fruits.



search after God, is a trial of the affections, and whatever that knowledge may be, of which such great things are spoken, it implies affection combined with, and giving life to the understanding, otherwise dead, and after some heavenly manner illuminating and spiritualizing it. To require, therefore, that such subjects should come to us in a more sensible and palpable way, before we will accept them, betrays the same temper of mind as that of requiring a sign; or at best, it is but that weak belief which says, "unless I handle and feel I will not believe," and which therefore loses the highest blessing, "blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed."

If the Divine presence is among us in these things, unbelief must be met as our LORD met that of the Jews. The obstacles to their belief were, first, low conceptions of GOD'S Messiah and His promises. To obviate these our SAVIOUR drew their attention to that prophecy where David himself called Him LORD; and, secondly, their looking out for a sign, which called from our LORD such visible indications of grief. And the remedy which He pointed out for this latter was this, that they should judge of heavenly matters as they did of earthly, such as indications of the weather, by affording them such attention as a person pays to any object respecting which he is solicitous. They who best know those signs of the weather are they whose interest it is to know them.

The outset, therefore, of such enquiries is, first, that we should form high conceptions of the Divine promises and expressions, such, for instance, as "this is my body" (the only expression, I believe, in the whole of Scripture used, on one single occasion, which has been recorded four distinct times in precisely the same words); and the second requisite is such an interest as would open our minds to acquiesce in the proofs of probable evidence. Both of these would make the reception of the truth to depend upon natural piety. It appears that that temper of mind which is produced by obedience to the fifth commandment, as extending through the various relations of life, is the foundation of that in the character in which piety or devotion consists, producing, as it were, that habitual attitude of the soul. And this piety to

God gives life again in return to that piety which embraces all those lower relations, considering such superiors as invested in various ways with something of a Divine prerogative, as faint emblems or substitutes of the Supreme Father and Governor. Now, this highest temper of mind in natural religion, becoming spiritualized and exalted in the Christian, is rendered immediately in him the channel by which are conveyed to him all those gifts in which the kingdom of heaven consists. For first of all, by this temper of mind the Christian's affections are carried up through all these inferior relations (by which the knowledge and power of Christianity is brought down to him) to Jesus Christ Himself, as the fountain of all good. And then, again, it is impossible to have a high sense of reverence for our LORD's person, without investing all who approach Him with some portion of the same. This Nature itself shows us in the case of any strong attachment: and this would exist in all degrees according to the nearness of such persons. At first it would extend to apostles, then to apostolical men and fathers, and then to those commissioned of the same. This is so necessarily the result of affection, that it is impossible to do violence to it without impairing that affection itself. For instance, we cannot allow ourselves to think slightly of apostolical fathers, without thinking so, in some degree, of apostles: and we cannot think slightly of apostles, without lowering our veneration for our LORD Himself.

The question, therefore, never need be, whether an ordinance, such as that of Episcopacy, can be *proved* to be of Divine command, for it has been observed, that our LORD never said that He was the CHRIST. But He was not on that account the less so, nor was it the less necessary that He should be received as such. All the external evidence required would be, whether there are indications of a Divine preference given to it, for if this can be proved, it is sufficient for a dutiful spirit. In such considerations, all that can be said is, "he that can receive it, let him receive it," and that "the poor in spirit" occupy "the kingdom."

It follows, that, although such knowledge be the result of "senses exercised in the discernment of good and evil," yet that it depends not on intellectual acuteness, or subtle reasonings.

Religion being a practical matter, a disposition to argument should be discouraged, and the thoughts directed to something practically good ; as GOD does not reveal Himself excepting to a certain disposition, the question is one of natural piety.

As our SAVIOUR pointed to His works, instead of declaring Himself, after the same manner, when, in the times of Origen, the secret discipline was practised in the Church, which seems to correspond to our SAVIOUR'S concealing Himself, he pointed to the lives of Christians, *i. e.* to the works of CHRIST shown in them, as the strongest evidence which he could offer to the world. The truth must ever be propagated by some way of this kind, and not by argument. It is perceived whether certain principles are seriously held with that consistency and constancy of endurance which attends the conviction of truth. It is to this evidence that the eye of mankind looks, and from which flow its strong persuasions, otherwise they are not held so as to become a part of the character in those that hear of them, and therefore not in reality held as *moral principles* of truth.

4. *This principle of Reserve applied to prevailing opinions on promoting Religion.*

The subject under discussion may in the next place be wisely applied as a test to the popular modes of extending Christianity, which partake of the spirit of the age. And these may be considered under three heads, that of bringing churches near to the houses of every body, cheap publications, and national schools.

With regard to the building of churches, our LORD'S testimony to the widow's mite, and the costly ointment, and to the intention of the man after His own heart, prove such works to be in the highest degree acceptable to Him, and therefore necessarily productive of good. And the sacrifices they require are greatly beneficial to the individual, merely as religious sacrifices. It is also very important as setting up a witness, of which character alone many of the best actions must be. It is indeed one of the most natural expressions of a heart rightly disposed, as offerings made to GOD, arising in Him, and resting in Him as their end ; and therefore there can be no means of promoting the cause of

religion higher and better than such. Merely, I repeat, as oblations to God, and having reference to Him alone; and which of course cannot be too costly and expensive in proportion to our own habits of life, which natural piety itself would teach. It were painful to think we should bestow ornaments on our own houses, and leave the house of God without.

But when the utilitarian view of the subject is taken, are we not thinking that we may do by human means, and such as partake of this world, that which is the work of God alone, as if the mammon of the world could promote the cause of God? For if the erection of churches, which from commodiousness and easiness of access are to invite, and from their little cost partake more of a low contriving expediency than of a generous love of God, is to do the work of religion, then is it more easy to win souls than Scripture will warrant us in supposing. On the contrary, if the maxim be true, that "men venerate that which resisteth them, and that which courteth their favour they despise<sup>1</sup>," then have we to fear lest, rather than doing good, we be breaking that holy law, which hath commanded, that we give not that which is holy to the dogs; the Church's best gifts be trod under foot, and her enemies turn and rend her. For if churches are to be brought home to all, then are all persons to be brought into churches, and this by human means. Thus immediately connected with that view alluded to is that of eloquence and pleasing delivery, a powerful worldly engine, unlike that weak instrument which St. Paul calls "the foolishness of preaching<sup>2</sup>;" and liturgies made suitable to the taste of the generality, and canonical hours relinquished for those which are more popular, and sacred things brought out of their chaste reserve, and put forth to attract. We

<sup>1</sup> Thucydides.

<sup>2</sup> It is worthy of notice, that in the Parisian Breviary, in its long services for the Feast of Dedication, composed of passages from Scripture, hymns and homilies, there appears no allusion to this end as the object of building churches, viz. the converting of persons by preaching. It abounds with allusions to building up the spiritual temple, and to the awful presence of God in His sacraments. Whatever objections may be made to this testimony, it serves at all events to prove what the religion of a former age was.

have not so learned of Him who is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. Of Him it is said, that "He spake the word unto them as they were able to hear it<sup>1</sup>;" and that our LORD's own mode of teaching was the one prescribed to His Apostles is evident from the instructions, "unto whatsoever city ye enter, enquire who in it is worthy, and there abide<sup>2</sup>."

All acceptance of divine truth, and all religious worship must be the spontaneous act of the individual, and the more inconvenience or self-denial such an act is accompanied with, the more does it partake of the nature of such spontaneous action. The dealings of our LORD seem intended to call out this self-denial, but in no way to force it, or to supersede the necessity of it; on the contrary, He appears to withdraw to avoid such an effect, "when cast out He resisted not, but retired," as Chrysostom says. The Church system is founded on this principle; the daily service actually requires such a devotional habit formed by self-discipline, which no attraction or external motive can supply the place of. The writer has heard it well remarked, that the tendency of the Church has ever been to prefer earlier hours of the day, the present system of the world the later hours, for religious services. The same may be applied also to the morning of life, to which the Church looks more than to a late repentance. This arises from the former requiring an effort on the part of the individual, the latter meeting him in his indolence. However this may be, all the good that can be done to others must be by calling out by some means their self-denial. "The kingdom of heaven is preached," but the "violent" alone "press into the possession of it." Παθήματα μαθήματα was an ancient proverb, and is universally extensive; there is no strength but in the Cross. It will always be true of human nature, that it *cannot approach God without a sacrifice*.

Much of what is here said may be applied to an indiscriminate distribution of Bibles and religious publications. We must not expect that the work, which occasioned our SAVIOUR and His disciples so much pains, can be done by such means. We have

<sup>1</sup> St. Mark iv. 33.

<sup>2</sup> St. Matt. x. 11.

rather to look with awe on these new dealings of Providence with mankind. It might perhaps be thought that, if it is a state of the heart alone which can receive the truth, to bring it forward before persons unprepared to acknowledge it does not signify. Such persons cannot receive it, and therefore the effect is merely nugatory and unavailing. But this does not follow: that they cannot receive it is the appointment of God, but our attempting to act contrary to His mode of acting may be productive of evil. It may arise from a want of real seriousness on the subject of religion, and it may be that for this reason we are not acting under the teaching of God, and that, in consequence, these effects are prevailing. Are we rightly estimating the consequence of a bare knowledge of the Gospel? As a proof that religious knowledge has been otherwise considered may be mentioned one of the short practical rules attributed to St. Basil: the question is asked "whether it be advantageous to learn many things out of Scripture?" the answer implies, that, though it be necessary for those whose office it is to instruct, yet that all should be cautious that, according to the Apostle's injunction, "they think soberly<sup>1</sup>," earnestly learn their own duty, and do it, only caring for and bent on attaining that blessing, "well done, good servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee rule over many<sup>2</sup>." The next question and answer is the following:

"Q. How ought they to receive the gift, who have been deemed worthy to learn the four Gospels?"

"A. Since the Lord hath declared that 'to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more<sup>3</sup>,' they ought to be more exceedingly afraid, and give earnest heed, as the Apostle hath taught us, saying, 'as workers together with Him, we beseech you that ye receive not the grace of God in vain<sup>4</sup>.' And this will be the case if we be persuaded by the Lord when He saith, 'if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them<sup>5</sup>.'"

Here he evidently seems to think that the knowledge of the Gospels was a matter for the most serious apprehension, not to

<sup>1</sup> Rom. xii. 3.    <sup>2</sup> Matt. xxv. 21.    <sup>3</sup> Luke xii. 48.    <sup>4</sup> 2 Cor. vi. 1.  
<sup>5</sup> John xiii. 17.

be lightly coveted, but received with fear. And these occur among religious rules most sensible and practical.

Thirdly, with regard to national schools. I would be careful not to say any thing that might appear to depreciate the value of religious knowledge, but to say that such knowledge is a treasure of so transcendent a nature, that it must be handled with sacred care, is not to depreciate, but to exalt its value. As our LORD led persons gradually to the knowledge of the truth by quiet teaching, by leading them to observe His works; by drawing out their self-denial and engaging their confidence, so, in obedience to His command "to make *disciples* of all nations," the system of the Church is that of parental and pastoral training, and building up by practical instruction, such as catechising and the use of a constant devotional form. These not having been sufficiently carried on has given rise to two effects: the one is an undue preponderance given to preaching, in order to supply the want, as if it were able powerfully to bring to the heart that knowledge which has not been received into the character by gradual inculcation and discipline; the other effect has been the system of large national schools, the object of which is contrary to the spirit of the Church, to impart sacred knowledge without any of this training as coinciding with it, except in a very limited way, and to inculcate knowledge without adequately instilling a sense of its practical importance.

With regard to preaching, that it cannot of itself supply the want of the other requisites, is evident. George Herbert, indeed, speaks highly of it as an instrument of good, but only as subsidiary. And what are his preacher's qualifications? "The character of his sermons," he says, "is holiness; he is not witty, or learned, or eloquent, but holy." In another place, he says, his library, from which, of course, his stores are drawn, is "a divine life." Speech, therefore, with him is chiefly efficacious, as the means by which the all-prevailing force of example passes from one to another; and this brings the subject again to the point this treatise would inculcate, that the only way to promote good in others is to begin by self-discipline.

In addition to all this it must be observed, that the effect of

the Church as a witness, though in a manner silent and out of sight, is something very great and incalculable, of which I would adduce the following instance. Before the Reformation the Church recognized the seven hours of prayer. However these may have been practically neglected, or hidden in an unknown tongue, there is no estimating what influence this may have had on common people's minds secretly, but we find strong traces of it in these circumstances; that not only were numerous books of devotion written by persons of a Catholic spirit, recognizing these appointed hours, but many others were evidently attempting to realize to their own minds some influence or feeling of want which this system had left on their thoughts. Thus we have Nicholas Ferrar supporting in his family an unceasing round of worship, night and day, and reading the whole of the Psalms in the twenty-four hours. We have William Law recommending every independent Christian to appoint with himself these frequent hours of prayer, making the object of each a distinct grace or virtue; and Robert Nelson advises us thus to realize each day some Christian duty. Dr. Sherlock of Winwick, in his *Practical Christian*, is another instance; and many others might be adduced to prove the effect which this system had produced in their minds; though the Breviary itself does not appear to have been in their thoughts. Since the former system has worn out of people's recollections, and the two daily services have been forgotten, practical books of devotion have been of rare occurrence, and such as have appeared have been from persons who have been comparatively more alive to the existence of such an obligation in the Church. And yet any form of religion that does not support devotional habits must be essentially wrong.

These means are of a more unobtrusive and retiring character than the Age approves of, but still this is the temper of the Church, as it always has been. Indeed, the great occasions of difference on which many Separatists have left, or would leave, her bosom, have been this very temper of reserve, which she has inherited from the beginning. It may be observed, that they have in many cases taken some single doctrine; which they have put forward in a bold and prominent way, and made the centre of a self-formed system, which the Church holds as well as them-



selves, but after a certain manner of reserve, in a certain proportion and in combination with others.

5. *On the necessity of bringing forward the Doctrine of the Atonement.*

WE now proceed to the consideration of a subject most important in this point of view,—the prevailing notion of bringing forward the Atonement *explicitly* and *prominently* on all occasions. It is evidently quite opposed to what we consider the teaching of Scripture, nor do we find any sanction for it in the Gospels. *If* the Epistles of St. Paul *appear* to favour it, it is only at first sight. The singular characteristic of St. Paul, as shown in all his Epistles and speeches, seems to have been a going out of himself to enter into the feelings and put himself in the circumstances of others. This will account for the occasions on which he brings forward this doctrine ; as in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. In both of these cases, the prejudices which closed up their ears against the reception of the truth were such as were essentially opposed to the Atonement. So much in the writings of St. Paul does the Holy Spirit adapt His teaching to the wants of each, as our LORD did in His Incarnation, a principle which is opposed to this opinion.

There is another point which might seem to countenance it, that St. Paul speaks of himself as at all times preaching “CHRIST crucified ;” and it being said by Origen that CHRIST crucified was the first doctrine taught, and that of our LORD’s divinity the last which men come to know. But this, in fact, so far from contradicting, strongly confirms the view here taken ; it will be evident, on a little attention, that when St. Paul thus speaks, it is not the Atonement and Divinity of our LORD which he brings forward, although it is implied in that saying. The whole of St. Paul’s life and actions, after his conversion, and the whole of his teaching, as appears from the Epistles, may be said to have been nothing else but a setting forth of CHRIST crucified, as the one great principle which absorbed all his heart, and actuated all his conduct. It was the wood cast into the waters which entirely changed them into its own nature, and impregnated them with itself. This is intimated by expressions of this kind which are

of continual occurrence, such as, "God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ;" "I was determined not to know any thing among you but Christ crucified;" "But we preach Christ crucified." Now these words of course imply "the Atonement" as a life-giving principle contained in them; but it is a great mistake to suppose that they contain nothing more, or that, by preaching the Atonement, we are preaching what St. Paul meant by CHRIST crucified. It may be seen by an attention to the context in all the passages where these expressions occur, that it is a very different view, and in fact, the opposite to the modern notion, which St. Paul always intends by it. It is the necessity of our being crucified to the world, it is our humiliation together with Him, mortification of the flesh, being made conformable to His sufferings and His death. It was a doctrine which was "foolishness to the wise and an offence to the Jew," on account of the abasement of the natural man which it implied. Whereas, the notion now prevailing is attractive to the world, in the naked way in which it is put forth, so as rather to diminish, than increase, a sense of responsibility and consequent humiliation. If the doctrine of the Atonement is conveyed in the expression of CHRIST crucified, as used by St. Paul, it is by teaching, at the same time, the necessity of our mortification, which is repugnant to opinions now received. It is expressing, in other words, our SAVIOUR'S declaration, "he that cometh after me must take up his cross daily and follow me." They both imply that we cannot approach God without a sacrifice,—a sacrifice on the part of human nature in union with that of our SAVIOUR. Both of which seem to be taught in the legal sacrifices.

The Cross of CHRIST which St. Paul preached was that by which "the world was crucified to him and he was crucified to the world," "bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus." And precisely the same was the teaching of our blessed LORD also. His own humiliation, and the necessity of our humiliation together with Him, was the doctrine signified by the Cross which He put forth and inculcated on the multitude, in distinction from that of His own divinity, and our salvation through the same, which He rather kept secret. This is remarkably shown in the 8th chapter of St. Mark; after the confession

of St. Peter it is added, and "He charged them *that they should tell no man concerning Him.*" And He began to teach them, as the account continues, concerning His sufferings, to which it is immediately added, "and he spake *that saying openly,*" and the account proceeds, and "when He had called the people unto Him with His disciples also, He said unto them, "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." We cannot but contrast the full declarations, so often repeated, concerning His sufferings, with the mysterious silence respecting His divinity; and we must observe that the mention of those sufferings is introduced in conjunction with that of the necessity of His disciples drinking of the same cup.

In all things it would appear that this doctrine, so far from its being what is supposed, is in fact the very "secret of the Lord," which Solomon says "is with the righteous," and "the covenant" not to be lightly spoken of by man, but which "*He will show to them that fear Him:*" That knowledge which is blessed, because flesh and blood cannot reveal it, but the Father only. The "hidden manna" which He will give to those who overcome the world: the white stone, with "a new name" written thereon, "which no man knoweth, saving he that receiveth it."

The cause of the extraordinary prevalence of this modern opinion, of the necessity of preaching the Atonement thus explicitly, seems to be this: The doctrine of the Atonement is secretly implied in the whole of Scripture, in the Law and the Prophets, and the New Testament. In the Gospel it is in most of the precepts, in the blessings, in most of the parables, so much so, that they would have no meaning without it as the foundation: for how is the mourner to be comforted without it, or the poor in spirit to have a kingdom? how is the prodigal to be received with such welcome, or what is the pearl of great price, and the hidden treasure? In like manner ought it to pervade the teaching of the Church under the same Spirit, as doubtless it does its Liturgies, especially the Baptismal Service. And as a more and more full reception of this truth will accompany all growth in grace in a good man, proceeding from CHRIST crucified, to a broader, and deeper, and higher sense of that Atonement and our LORD's divinity, so will it pervade all his reaching under the same

Spirit. Since the great loss of Christian principle, which our Church sustained at the Rebellion of 1688 ; when she threw as it were out of her pale the doctrine of CHRIST crucified, (together with Ken and Kettlewell) a low tone of morals has pervaded her teaching, and not founded on the great Christian principle, and that Baptism, which implied it, has been much forgotten. The reaction which usually attends popular feeling, has brought in the present opinions, which, as might be expected, has rather caught at the shadow, than attained to the substance, of that truth, which is as much above our nature, as heaven is above earth.

The apparent paradox which we witness, of Christianity having become publicly acceptable to the world, contrary to our LORD's express declarations, can only be accounted for by its having been put forward without its distinguishing characteristic, the humiliation of the natural man : the doctrine of the Cross having been in some manner hidden : or those truths connected with it which are most agreeable to mankind being brought forward alone. "Had the design of our LORD's coming," says Pascal, "been the work of Justification only, it had been then the easiest task in the world to convince an unbeliever. But since he came, as Isaiah prophetically speaks, *in sanctificationem et in scandalum*, perverse Infidelity is above our strength to conquer, and our art to cure." (page 179.) The teaching alluded to has practically made a separation between these doctrines, or, at least, has led the world to do so.

Every great doctrine in Scripture secretly pervades the whole of it under different forms, and in different degrees, and we cannot calculate on the danger that may ensue, when we not only give an undue and exclusive prominence to any one truth, but bring forward that one singly and nakedly, without all that which accompanies it in Scripture. This may be seen in another instance ; take the doctrine of eternal punishment : it is surrounded with speculative difficulties which might pronounce it incompatible with the goodness of God. The natural man is averse to receive it. But it comes to us in Scripture accompanied with so many circumstances equally mysterious and apparently connected with it, that a devout mind becomes prepared to receive it, in conjunction with many others, which it acquiesces in,

though it cannot explain. As, for instance, the imprecations on the wicked, which abound in the Psalms, in which there is something incompatible with Christian feeling and the feebleness of our knowledge. But a good man, instead of explaining them away, learns from them a sense of awful acquiescence in the divine judgments; which prepares his mind to receive the other great doctrine, in a way that he would not otherwise have done. For we cannot but conceive these expressions to be bound up in some secret manner with that incomprehensible mystery, that, at the consummation of the world, the righteous shall be so entirely resigned to the Divine will, as somehow, we know not how, to acquiesce in the destruction of the wicked. As if the Almighty, in these passages of Scripture, were taking us into his own councils, and making us, in some mysterious manner, partakers of them. This instance may serve to show how persons may be led practically to reject the most important doctrines, on account of their impatience at other parts of Holy Scripture.

And not only is the exclusive and naked exposure of so very sacred a truth unscriptural and dangerous, but, as Bishop Wilson says, the comforts of Religion ought to be applied with great caution. And moreover to require, as is sometimes done, from both grown persons and children, an explicit declaration of a belief in the Atonement, and the full assurance of its power, appears equally untenable. For if, in the case of Abraham, and many others of the most approved faith in CHRIST, there was no such explicit knowledge, it may be the case now. If a poor woman, ignorant and superstitious, as might be supposed, was received of our LORD by so instant a blessing for touching the border of His clothes, may it not have been the case that in times, which are now considered dark and lost to Gospel truth, there might have been many such? That there might have been many a helpless person, who knelt to a crucifix in a village churchyard, who might have done so under a more true sense of that faith which is unto life, than those who are able to express the most enlightened knowledge. And, therefore, though such as would be now considered in a state of darkness, had more fully arrived at those treasures of wisdom which are hid in CHRIST.

Now all these unhallowed approaches to our blessed SAVIOUR

which these principles indicate, will, from what has been said, in some manner lead to a disbelief in His divinity, the knowledge of which, it has been observed, was that which He kept from the unworthy. Not that we are to expect a declaration of Socinianism as its immediate consequence; but there are two ways in which the effect may be perceived; first, when the system develops itself in any course of time adequate for producing its legitimate results; and, secondly, it may be seen in a subtle shape in the tendency it produces in individuals to apply familiar and irreverent expressions to our blessed LORD. For such is, in fact, a disguised shape of Socinianism. It may also be seen in a disposition to deny His Divine Presence and Power in His Sacraments,—the regenerating grace of one, and the Spiritual presence in the other. And this view of the subject derives confirmation from the Prophecies, which indicate that all corruptions tend to that apostacy which shall deny the SON. It may be that these are but accidental developments of a great necessary and essential principle, ending in the denial of “the LORD that bought them.”

But these general tendencies must not of course be applied to individuals, who may acquiesce in, or not see the danger of the system they espouse; for we know there is often a great deal in the character to counteract one admitted principle; and it is often the case, by God’s mercy, that in particular instances wrong principles are not received into the heart and conduct, no more than in other cases good ones, which are professed.

We must observe, that in the Old Testament, all approaches to God were accompanied with sacrifices and ablutions; in the Gospel with the denunciation of our SAVIOUR’S, that none are to follow Him without taking up the cross daily,—and the fuller manifestation at the last is seen through the extreme humiliation of human nature in CHRIST crucified. Afterwards, it is preached by St. Paul, while bearing about in the body the marks of the LORD JESUS; and received by his converts in a participation of the same sufferings. By St. John, our LORD’S Divinity is put forth with the repeated and unceasing exhortations of keeping the Commandments. All of these are varied expositions of the expression, “now mine eye seeth Thee, wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes” (Job xlii. 6). Perhaps there

is no giving glory to God without this humiliation of the creature, as David to the reproaches of his wife expresses his holy determination, "I will yet be more vile than thus, and will be base in mine own sight." For "no flesh shall glory in His presence." But what is remarkable in this late moral phenomenon, is the reverse to all this,—it is accompanied with a great impatience, not only of any holding back of this Divine truth, but of the inculcation of it being accompanied with that of the necessity of mortification and obedience on the part of man.

And here it may be asked, if this necessary tendency to some subtle form of Socinianism accompanies all practical disregard to Religion when professed: how is this proved in the case of the Roman Church, which, notwithstanding its extensive corruption, has served, by God's protection, as a safeguard for the Catholic truth? It will explain a circumstance that seems otherwise unaccountable, the extraordinary, yet powerfully prevailing, tendency to substitute the Virgin as the object of religious worship. The great Catholic doctrine of the Trinity being so strongly established among them by entering into all their devotional forms and Creeds, that it could not be shaken, human depravity has sought out an opening for itself under another shape. It is by this means the natural heart lowers the object of its worship to its own frailty, so as to approach that object in Prayer without Holiness of life. Which is in fact the object of every false or perverted religion.

#### 6. *On Reserve in speaking of Sacred Things.*

In immediate connection with these topics, is that of not observing any Reserve on sacred subjects, or rather of casting aside that Reserve which is natural both in conversation and in writing.

It seems to arise from causes not unsimilar to those which have been at the bottom of most of the things alluded to, viz., an attempt to remedy certain effects and symptoms which indicate a want of Religion, instead of the want itself.

A simple and unaffected piety will fulfil the injunctions of Scripture, which says prophetically of our blessed SAVIOUR, and doubtless in Him of all His members, "I have not hid Thy righteousness within my heart, my talk hath been of Thy truth

and of Thy salvation ;” and “ the mouth of the righteous speaketh wisdom and his tongue talketh of judgment ;” his endeavours will be to fulfil the Apostolical injunction, “ that his conversation be good for the use of edifying,” “ seasoned with salt ” of Scripture principle, and “ ministering grace.” Add to which that bearing testimony to God’s truth in common discourse is a duty of the very highest importance.

Agreeable to these commands are the practical remarks of Bishop Wilson, that “ hearts truly touched with the love of God will minister light and warmth to each other in ordinary conversation.” It is a distinct subject of his prayers that he may do so ; and he observes that it was the constant practice of our blessed SAVIOUR to leave all persons better with whom he conversed.

But the force of all this arises from this, that in all these cases it is “ from the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.” Bishop Wilson himself gives the caution, that we should never talk of religion without thinking seriously ; that such conversation should be affectionate, seasonable, and “ not casting pearls before swine.” And surely our blessed LORD’s example was entirely of this kind, what we might be allowed to call perfectly natural ; drawing out from every passing event treasures of wisdom, and also from the secret thoughts of His hearers. But the great sacred lesson was often only implied, and which might occur afterwards on attentive recollection.

The injury produced by the habit here condemned is from what Bishop Butler mentions on the formation of moral habits, that going over the theories of religion has the effect of hardening the heart. And Aristotle had long before observed that the reason why persons did not improve in virtue was, that they have recourse to theory and words to persuade themselves that they are good, and so do not labour after internal habits. To this it may be added, that strong right feeling may find a vent in talking, which it would otherwise seek for in action<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> On this subject see some valuable remarks in the journal before referred to on October 29th, on the verse Proverbs xii. 23, “ a prudent man concealeth knowledge.”



The same may be said of bringing forward the name of the ever-blessed spirit of God without serious attention: the effect of this is to take away the sense of reality, and to habituate the mind to irreverence. "Whenever you happen to hear the name of God mentioned," says Norris, in his advice to his children, "accustom yourself to make a reverential pause, and form within yourselves an inward act of adoration; whereby you will be less apt to profane that great and venerable name in your more solemn addresses."

*7. The important practical conclusion.*

But the one great practical consideration, and which contains in it all others, which is to be gained from a due regard to the whole of the subject which has been investigated, is one which is full of awe, indeed, but also full of consolation, as tending to keep the mind quiet in times of universal movement and excitement. That JESUS CHRIST is now, and has been at all times, hiding Himself from us, but at the same time exceedingly desirous to communicate Himself, and that exactly in proportion as we show ourselves worthy He will disclose Himself to us; that if we constrain Him He will come in and abide with us; that unsatisfactory as human knowledge is, and the increase of which is the increase of care, a knowledge which puffeth up; yet that there is a knowledge which humbleth, which is infinite in its nature, and is nothing else than deeper, and higher, and broader views of the mystery which is hid in CHRIST.

That although Scripture does not set before us any sensible joy or satisfaction to be sought for, as the end of holiness, yet it does this knowledge; which is attainable by nothing else but by making the study of Divinity to consist in a Divine life.

That with regard to any ways of doing good to the world, it is far too great a work for any thing of human device, or any plans that partake of this world to perform; but if in the prescribed path of duty we shall be enabled to obtain this light, it will from us be communicated to others, but perhaps only in some secret way which is known to God, and which the world esteems foolishness, but a power which is of God, and therefore must overcome the world.

That all the means of grace faithfully cherished will lead us, as it were, step by step, into all these treasures, inexhaustible in their nature, limitless in their duration, and exceeding all conception of man, the blessing of the pure in heart, that they shall see God.

And to see God implies, even in this world, in all apparent imperfections, to discern something which is harmonious and life-giving; for even earthly passion, after the similitude of this affection, which is heavenly, invests all things with itself, and makes them to speak eloquently its own language.

It is to be observed, that Holy Scripture not only speaks of it as the light within, and its being darkened as a great darkness, but introduces the natural senses as being in some manner the seats or partakers of it. The loss of it is not only the heart being hardened, but the eyes being blinded, and the ears made dull of hearing. As if, when quickened by this internal light, all the senses were made to communicate with and to convey from things without this heavenly wisdom. Such expressions are not made use of merely as figures.

Such a knowledge must include a power of setting a right value on all objects, which occupy the imagination and affections of the natural man, such as power, and wealth, and reputation, and beauty, and learning, and genius; such a light in the mind must show the right proportions of these things after some heavenly manner.

But the whole of this subject, so truly divine and holy, it is perhaps better not to dwell on, from all that has been said; not only that we may not, as we necessarily must do, speak unworthily of it, but also lest, making it a matter of words, we should please ourselves, and not be earnest enough to attain it.

---

*These Tracts are sold at the price of 2d. for each sheet, or 7s. for 50 copies.*

LONDON: PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,  
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1838.

---

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

*The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts:—*

- Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons.*  
Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake and Varty.*  
Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford.*  
Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons.*  
Newman's Sermons, 3 vols.—*Rivingtons.*  
Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons.*  
The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons.*  
Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie.*  
Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan.*  
Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns.*  
Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons.*  
Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons.*  
Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons.*  
Law's first and second Letters to Hoadly.—*Rivingtons.*  
Bp. Andrews' Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering.*  
Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons.*  
Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.  
Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons.*  
Le Bas' Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons.*  
Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.  
Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons.*  
Bp. Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Bp. Jolly on the Eucharist.  
Fulford's Sermons on the Ministry, &c.—*Rivingtons.*  
Rose's Sermons on the Ministry.—*Rivingtons.*  
A Catechism on the Church.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Russell's Judgment of the Anglican Church.—*Baily.*  
Poole's Sermons on the Creed.—*Grant, Edinburgh.*

*Larger Works which may be profitably studied.*

- Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford.*  
Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press.*  
Waterland's Works.—*Do.*  
Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do.*  
Pearson on the Creed.—*Do.*  
Leslie's Works.—*Do.*  
Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London.*  
Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press.*  
Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Do.*

## TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

## CATENA PATRUM.

## No. IV.

TESTIMONY OF WRITERS OF THE LATER ENGLISH CHURCH TO THE  
DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE, WITH AN HISTORICAL  
ACCOUNT OF THE CHANGES MADE IN THE LITURGY AS TO THE  
EXPRESSION OF THAT DOCTRINE.

---

THE general character and object of these Catenæ is the same : viz. to exhibit the practical working of the system and peculiar temper and principles of our Church upon the minds of the more faithful of her sons, whether acting upon them through the channel of reflection or learning, or through the deference of a single-hearted simplicity. The extent and character of this influence will, however, necessarily vary, according to the nature of the several doctrines, and the degree in which they enter into that system. Doctrines, for instance, are impressed more or less prominently, and in different ways, in her Creeds, or her Prayers, or her Catechism, or her selection of Holy Scripture : some definitely and tangibly, some conveyed in a general tone, which runs throughout, and which may be called the  $\pi\theta\omicron\varsigma$ , or spirit of the Church : some again have been retained by oral tradition, and maintained by her uniform spirit of deference to the early Church, whose hallowed lamp she carries on, and whose handmaid she is. Such, for instance, is her view of the spiritual benefits of absolution and confirmation, or the spiritual gifts in ordination, which are assumed to be great and real, where these ordinances are duly and worthily received ; but what they are, is not dogmatically enunciated, being presupposed as already known, through the

successive teaching of her Ministers. So in other points, wherein they, who at the time had the deposit of her faith committed to them, were persuaded to withdraw from common use, or to leave but slight indications of, doctrine, which had recently and might again be abused. This might, by a sort of analogy, as far as relates to the *object*, be called the “*disciplina arcani*” of the Anglican Church; only, it was so far a hazardous experiment, in that no provision was made (as in the antient Church) for authoritatively inculcating upon those fit to receive it, the doctrine thus withheld from the unworthy or uninstructed. It was left to tradition, but that tradition was not guarded. One must, also, herein not speak of the wisdom or foresight of individuals, but of the good Providence of God, controlling and guiding the genius of the Church. “Not through our merit but His mercy; not through our foresight but His Providence; not through our own arm but His right hand and His arm were we rescued and delivered.” Yet since He “saw some good thing in us,” He so directed our Church’s reverence for the “good old Fathers of the primitive Church” as not indeed to exempt us from “suffering loss” but still with safety of our “lives” as a Church. For “loss” He has ordained all to suffer, who in any way tamper, whether by adding to or taking away from, the Apostolic deposit of sound words; yet since we had in most things been faithful, He chastened us only, and gave us not over unto death.

Of this latter kind — a doctrine, namely, which our Church retains, but one of the most withdrawn from sight, lest it should, at one time, perchance have been misapplied or profaned, is the doctrine of a Sacrifice in the Blessed Eucharist. It is not here intended to speak disparagingly of those of the revisers of our Liturgy, who furthered or consented to the suppression of doctrine visible in the 2d book of Edward VI. They listened or yielded to foreign advisers, who had their minds fixed solely on the “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,” which the Church of Rome had connected with the true doctrine, and who had themselves lost it. Happy, if while guarding against the errors of Rome, they had escaped the opposite danger of fomenting profane indifference or unbelief, which have left their own

homes desolate! And the revisers of our own Liturgy, in the latter part of the reign of Edward VI, would have acted with greater wisdom and a firmer faith, had they continued to retain the explicit statements of the Catholic doctrine, and sought other means of averting its abuse, or left the correction to Almighty God, who gave that doctrine. Nor can one doubt that if they could have foreseen, whither this half-suppression of true doctrine would lead, they would have guarded in some other way against any temporary danger which might arise from the association of past errors therewith. There is evidence, as will appear hereafter, that those of the revisers, who were most yielding, themselves held, and were prepared to maintain, the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; one cannot indeed suppose that they felt altogether, even as men might, its great value and privilege: they had been engaged in controverting errors connected with a high view of sacred doctrine; and such errors cannot be controverted without great peril to the delicacy of our own faith, and our refined and affectionate apprehension of it; the office of assault makes the mind rough and rude, and associates jarring thoughts with the doctrine thus approached, (so that the Spirit of love cannot dwell there,) and, again, it almost forces the mind to speak familiarly on high mysteries, thereby injuring the reverence by which they must be apprehended. Then also, the very notion of disguising the expression of any doctrine implies a diminished estimation of it; the debating about it, preparing for it, at last, the overt act of doing it, are so many acts of forfeiture. For "he that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath." Whoso watches not jealously over the deposit committed to him shall lose it. Still the revisers in question had the doctrine, and wished, in their way, to keep it, and so would be grieved to find that their mode of acting had nearly forfeited it to the Church. But, further, no doctrine can be lost, or injured singly. We may not indeed maintain any doctrine, or rest its principal importance, upon its connection with or bearings upon some other doctrine, lest we arrogate too much to ourselves, and lose sight of the *intrinsic* value of the doctrine, which we presume to make thus dependent on another; still it is allowable to point out any *additional* evils,

4 *Evils involved in withdrawing the doctrine of the Sacrifice.*

which departure from that doctrine may have. We know not then how great may be the loss of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in itself; undoubtedly much greater than they are aware of, who, while in the flesh, think it the greatest; the loss of this, as a devotional act, may be an unspeakable evil to the whole Church, and intercept much of the favour of the FATHER from us, and of the fulness of His blessings in His SON. And so, on the other hand, we may perhaps look upon the "chain of witnesses" here adduced, not only as having attested and perpetuated the truth, but also, each in their generation (with a multitude of others whom they represent, and who more or less consciously and distinctly performed the same act of devotion and held the same truth) obtaining a measure of favour of GOD for His Church here by pleading thus the merits of their LORD. But apart from this, the highest and most mysterious part of the subject, it may be noticed as a fact, that the way wherein the doctrine of the Communication of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Holy Eucharist has been received, has always been proportioned to this of the "commemorative sacrifice." Both were held in high and awful honour in the Primitive Church, both perverted in the later Church of Rome, both depreciated by Ultra-Protestants; and among ourselves, the reverence felt towards the one Mystery has been generally heightened or depressed, according to the several degrees in which the other was received; and not these only, but (since every portion of our faith is indissolubly although invisibly linked with every other portion,) other truths also which people do not readily suspect. It was easy for those, free from the errors of Rome, to see that *her* doctrine of the sacrifice interfered with that of the one Sacrifice on the Cross; but many overlooked that the belief in that Sacrifice *might* then only be altogether sound, when the Eucharistic Sacrifice was also revered.

It may be well, however, in these days, before going further, to state briefly what that doctrine is, and what the Romanist corruption of it. The doctrine then of the early Church was this; that "in the Eucharist, an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to GOD, under the form of His creatures of bread and wine, " according to our Blessed LORD's holy institution, in memory of

“His Cross and Passion ;” and this they believed to be the “pure offering” or sacrifice which the Prophet Malachi foretold that the Gentiles should offer ; and that it was enjoined by our LORD in the words “Do this for a memorial of Me ;” that it was alluded to when our LORD or St. Paul speak of a Christian “altar” (St. Matt. v. 23. Heb. xiii. 10.), and was typified by the Passover, which was both a sacrifice and a feast upon a sacrifice. For the first passover had been a vicarious sacrifice, the appointed means of saving life, when the first-born of the Egyptians were slain ; and like all other vicarious sacrifices, it shadowed out that of our LORD on the Cross ; the subsequent Passovers were sacrifices, commemorative of that first sacrifice, and so typical of the Eucharist, as commemorating and shewing forth our LORD’s sacrifice on the Cross. Not that they reasoned so, but they knew it to be thus, because they had been taught it, and incidentally mentioned these circumstances, which people would now call evidence or grounds and reasons. This commemorative oblation or sacrifice they doubted not to be acceptable to God, who had appointed it ; and so to be also a means of bringing down God’s favour upon the whole Church. And, if we were to analyze their feelings in our way, how should it be otherwise, when they presented to the ALMIGHTY FATHER the symbols and memorials of the meritorious Death and Passion of His Only Begotten and Well-beloved Son, and besought Him by that precious sacrifice to look graciously upon the Church which He had purchased with His own blood—offering the memorials of that same sacrifice which He, our great High-Priest, made once for all, and now being entered within the veil, unceasingly presents before the FATHER, and the representation of which He has commanded us to make ? It is, then, to use our technical phraseology, “a commemorative, *impetratory* sacrifice,” which is all one with saying that it is well-pleasing to GOD ; for what is well-pleasing to Him, how should it not bring down blessings upon us ? They preferred to speak of it in language which, while it guarded against the errors of their days, the confusion with the sacrifices of Jew or Pagan, expressed their reverence for the memorials of their SAVIOUR’s Body and Blood, and named it “the awful and un-



“bloody sacrifice,” or the like, as men would, with a sense of the unfathomable mystery of God’s goodness connected therewith. This pleading of our SAVIOUR’S merits, by a sacrifice instituted by Himself, was (they doubted not) regarded graciously by God, for the remission of sins ; as indeed our LORD had said, “This is My Blood which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins.” The Eucharist then, according to them, consisted of two parts, a “commemorative sacrifice” and a “Communion” or Communication ; the former obtaining remission of sins for the Church ; the Communion “the strengthening and refreshing of the soul,” although, inasmuch as it united the believer with CHRIST, it indirectly conveyed remission of sins too. The Communion was (to use a modern phrase) the feast upon the sacrifice thus offered. They first offered to God His gifts, in commemoration of that His inestimable gift, and placed them upon His altar here, to be received and presented on the Heavenly Altar by Him, our High-Priest ; and then, trusted to receive them back, conveying to them the life-giving Body and Blood. As being, moreover, appointed by their LORD, they believed that the continual oblation of this sacrifice (like the daily sacrifice appointed in the elder Church) was a benefit to the whole Church, independently and over and above the benefit to the individual communicants—that the sacrifices in each branch of the Christian Church were mutually of benefit to every other branch, each to all and all to each : and so also this common interest in the sacrifice of the memorials of their SAVIOUR’S Passion was one visible, yea, and (since GOD for its sake diffused unseen and inestimable blessings through the whole mystical body of His SON) an invisible spiritual bond of the Communion of Saints throughout the whole Body. “There is one JESUS CHRIST,” says St. Ignatius<sup>1</sup>, “who is above all : haste ye then all together, as to one Temple of God, as to one Altar, as to one CHRIST JESUS, who came forth from One FATHER, and is in One, and to One returned.” Lastly, since they knew not of our chill separation between those who, being dead in CHRIST, live to CHRIST and with CHRIST, and those who are yet in the flesh, they felt assured

<sup>1</sup> Ep. ad Magnes. §. 7.

that this sacrifice offered by the Church on earth, for the whole Church, conveyed to that portion of the Church, which had passed into the unseen world, such benefits of CHRIST's death as (their conflicts over, and they in rest) were still applicable to them. For their state, although higher far and purified, was yet necessarily imperfect, since the consummation of all things was not yet; and so, they thought, was capable of increased spiritual joys, and fuller disclosures of the Beatific Vision. At all events, it had ever been the received practice of every branch of the Church Catholic, then to remember the "dead in CHRIST," and so whatever might become of their own individual surmises as to the mode, or extent of its efficacy, they comforted themselves, that being according to the will of God, it must in some way be of benefit to them. The merits of CHRIST's death it is, which still keeps in subsistence a sinful world, and retains God's love for the Church; it is in His Son, that the whole Church, notwithstanding her manifold deficiencies and unfaithfulnesses, is still acceptable to Him, and, "in the unity of the Church" and so in CHRIST, all the several members of the one Body: and they who sleep in CHRIST, are in CHRIST. Why then should we take upon ourselves to say that they, who are His members, as well as we, have no interest in this, which is offered as a memorial for all? or why should men think it an unhappiness or imperfection, that they should obtain additional joys and satisfactions thereby?

The Romish Church corrupted and marred the Apostolic doctrine in two ways. 1st. By the error of transubstantiation. 2nd. By that of purgatory. And in both there occurs that peculiar corruption of the administrators of the Romish Church, that they countenance so much more of profitable error, than in their abstract system they acknowledge. Thus by combining the doctrine of Transubstantiation with that of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, the laity were persuaded that not only a commemorative sacrifice, but that CHRIST Himself was again offered; as indeed one of their own writers<sup>1</sup> confesses; "It is true, and impossible

<sup>1</sup> Courayer, Réponse au P. Le Quien, c. xvii. p. 469. Even the excellent Nicole frequently repeats: "The sacrifice of the Mass is the *same* as that of the Cross; it is substantially the same sacrifice, because it is the same Victim, the

“ to deny, that many theologians of the Romish Church took occasion of the name of sacrifice given to the Eucharist, to tell us of a fresh immolation and death ; to attach to it an efficacy of its own [*i. e.* independent of the one meritorious Sacrifice on the Cross], and an independent merit ; to make us place therein a confidence which cannot but be superstitious, whenever it refers not to the Sacrificē of the Cross.” These false notions, in themselves, aggrandized the character of the priesthood, and as such, it was part of the unhappy policy of Rome to countenance them ; and while (to take the mildest view) she narrowly observed the erroneous tendencies which were almost unavoidably mixed up in the minds of individuals with the reformed doctrine, she had no sense for her own ; she thought no deeds cruel which would remove the motes that threatened to darken her sister’s eye, but perceived not the beam in her own. While repressing even by the shedding of blood the slightest approximation to the Reformed doctrine, she rebuked not errors which entrenched on the authority of our LORD. Joined, however, with the doctrine of purgatory, the sacrifice of the Mass gained for them another accession of power, the extent whereof, and of the abuses therewith connected, is not now easily appreciated. For the souls of almost all, if not all, who passed out of this life, were supposed to go into purgatory ; its pains were regarded as intolerable, equal, except in duration, to those of Hell. From these torments the sacrifice of the Mass came to be *practically* regarded as the only means of deliverance. For when it was believed that CHRIST was “ truly<sup>1</sup> and indeed, in respect of His very Body and Blood, offered up to His FATHER under the form of bread and wine, in the daily sacrifice of the Church,” nothing else, however

“ same JESUS CHRIST who offers to His FATHER the same Body and Blood upon our altars, as He offered in Calvary.” *Esprit de M. Nicole*, p. 533. M. Nicole a little softens this, but still keeps the main position, “ that the sacrifices on the Cross and the Altar were the same, because it is the same JESUS CHRIST who offers Himself in the one as in the other.” These writers make the Sacrifice both the same and distinct ; through Transubstantiation, the same, and yet, in act, distinct. But for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, Nicole might have a right meaning.

<sup>1</sup> Harding ap. Jewel, Reply, c. xvii. init.

abstractedly it might be allowed to be of use, could in comparison be of any moment<sup>1</sup>. The corruptions, occasions of avarice, superstition, and profaneness thence ensuing, exceed all bounds. Even the Council of Trent was obliged to address itself to the remedy of them<sup>2</sup>. The connection then of the doctrine of the sacrifice with the two errors of Transubstantiation and Purgatory, at the Reformation, was of much moment; and of these, the fun-

<sup>1</sup> One illustration of the practical combination of these doctrines may suffice, viz. the way in which even Sir Thomas More writes in a practical and popular work. A book, namely, "the Supplication of Beggars," had been put out, complaining that the charity destined for their relief had been turned aside to pay the priests for saying masses. Against this, Sir Thomas More, "Counsellor to our Sovereign Lord the King, and Chancellor of his duchy of Lancaster," wrote "The Supplication of Soules against the Supplication of Beggars." It thus begins: "In most piteous wise continually calleth and crieth upon your devout charity and most tender pity, for help, comfort, and relief, *your late acquaintance, kindred, spouses, companions, play-fellows, and friends*, and now your humble and unacquainted and half-forgotten suppliants, poor prisoners of God, the silly souls in purgatory, here abiding and *enduring the grievous pains and hot cleansing fire*, that fretteth and burneth out the rust and filthy spots of our sin, till the mercy of ALMIGHTY GOD, the rather by your good and charitable means, vouchsafe to deliver us hence. From whence, if ye marvel why we more now molest and trouble you with our writing than ever we were wont before, it may like you to wit and understand, that hitherto, tho' we have been with many folk much forgotten of negligence, yet hath alway good folk remembered us, and we have been recommended unto GOD, and eased and holpen, and relieved, both by the priests' prayers, of good virtuous people, and *specially by the daily masses*, and other ghostly suffrages *of priests, religious, and folk of holy Church*. But now sith that of late, there are sprung up certain seditious persons, which not only travail and labour to destroy them by whom we be much holpen, but also to sow and set forth such a pestilent opinion against our self, as once received and believed among the people, must need take from us the relief and comfort that ever should come to us by the charitable alms, prayers, and good works of the world; ye may take it for no wonder, tho' we silly souls that have long lien and cried so far from you, that we seldom break your sleep, do now, in this our great fear of our utter loss for ever of your loving remembrance and relief, not yet importunately bereave you of your rest with crying at your ears, at unseasonable time, when ye would (*which we do never*) repose yourself and take ease," &c. (Works p. 288). In p. 316 they speak of the "pains which will else hold them here with us *in fire* and torments intolerable, only God knoweth how long."

<sup>2</sup> In the decree on Purgatory.

damental error was that of Transubstantiation. “St. Cyprian saith,” says Bishop Jewell to Harding<sup>1</sup>, “we offer our LORD’s cup mixed with wine. But he saith not as you say, ‘we offer up *the Son of God substantially and really* unto the FATHER.’ Take away *only this blasphemy*, wherewith you have deceived the world, and then talk of mingling the cup and of the sacrifice while ye list.” “Do ye take away from the Mass your Transubstantiation,” says Bishop Andrews<sup>2</sup> to Cardinal Bellarmine, “and we shall not long have any question about the sacrifice.” “This kind of oblation,” [the Romish] “*standeth upon Transubstantiation*, his cousin-german,” says Bishop Ridley<sup>3</sup>, “and they do both grow upon one ground.” And at the beginning of his book<sup>4</sup>, “As in a man diseased in divers parts, commonly the original cause of such divers diseases, which is spreading abroad in the body, do come from one chief member,—even so all five points aforesaid do chiefly hang upon this one question: What is the matter of the sacrament? Whether is it the natural substance of bread, or the natural substance of CHRIST’s own body?—For if it be CHRIST’s own natural body, born of the Virgin,—then assuredly they must needs grant Transubstantiation, that is, a change of the substance of bread into the substance of CHRIST’s body. Then also they must needs grant the carnal and corporal presence of CHRIST’s body. Then must the sacrament be adored with the honour due to CHRIST Himself, for the unity of the two natures in one person. Then if the priest do offer the Sacrament, he doth offer indeed CHRIST Himself.” And again<sup>5</sup>, “Transubstantiation is the very foundation, whereon all their erroneous doctrine doth stand.”

How then did those who revised our Liturgy separate the true doctrine from the false? The doctrine of Purgatory was entirely connected with the private masses, *i. e.* such as the priest celebrated alone, when there was the sacrifice, but no communion; for these, as being said especially for the deceased, were more

<sup>1</sup> Defence of Apology, P. 2. c. 5. v. fin. p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> Respons. ad Card. Bellarm. c. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Brief declaration of the Lord’s Supper p. 16.   <sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid p. 17. See also p. 57, quoted below, p. 50.

costly, and it was profitable to multiply them<sup>1</sup>. These our Church laid aside, as contrary to primitive practice; and there-with a main blow was struck at the belief that the sacrifice of the Eucharist benefited souls in purgatory; for the rite, with which this error was associated, was gone. Transubstantiation (as is well known) was not expressed or implied in any of the Liturgies used anywhere in the Church, down to this very period; on the contrary, the very Church of Rome preserved, as a witness against her, her ancient Liturgy in this respect uncorrupted. The Canon of the Mass, or the ancient, peculiar service of the Communion, is, as is well known, thus far wholly pure and catholic, although some other prayers, incidentally blended with it, are not always so.

The revisers of our Liturgy, however, anxious to remove all occasion of stumbling, in the very first instance went further than this. They dropped all which spoke of any benefit of this commemorative sacrifice; they retained the act, as a duty, but omitted all mention of its privileges. Again, they retained the practice of the Church Universal, to “commend to the mercy of God all His servants which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace;” but they transposed this prayer, placing it *before* the oblation, perhaps for fear that it should give any countenance to the Romish error, “that CHRIST was offered for the quick and dead;” and

<sup>1</sup> “These monstrous things (that the Mass is a sacrifice for the remission of sins, and that it is applied by the priest to them for whom he saith or singeth, &c.) were never seen or known of the old and primitive Church, nor was there not then in one church many masses every day; but there were then no daily private masses, where every priest received alone, like as until this day there is none in the Greek churches *but one common mass in a day*. Nor the holy fathers of the old Church would not have suffered such ungodly and wicked abuses of the Lord’s Supper. But these private masses sprung up of late years, partly through the ignorance and superstition of unlearned monks and friars, which knew not what a sacrifice was, but made of the mass a sacrifice propitiatory, to remit both sin and the pain due for the same; but chiefly they spring of lucre and gain, when priests found the means to sell masses to the people; which caused masses so to increase, that every day was sold an infinite number,” &c.—*Cranmer, Defence of the Catholic Doctrine*, &c. b. 5. c. 16.

they confined the *verbal* act of the sacrifice to the single prayer which followed after the consecration. Then also they introduced the mention of another sacrifice, comprehended in that sacrifice, as the "sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies,"—not to lower the character of that commemorative sacrifice, but still to remove men's wrong conceptions of it, as if the sacrifice were something quite independent of the faith and devotion of those who offered it, in like way as the communication of the Body and Blood of our LORD is *indeed* independent of any intention of the priest.

The form of words which accompanied the oblation, was as follows. After the prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church," there followed a prayer as well of consecration as of oblation, of which part was subsequently omitted, part retained as the prayer of the consecration, part placed after the actual communion. The prayer began, "O GOD, heavenly Father, which "of Thy tender mercy," &c. to "His coming again," hear us, "O merciful Father, we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy "Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bl<sup>✠</sup>ess and sanc<sup>✠</sup>tify these "Thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be "unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most Dearly Beloved SON, "JESUS CHRIST, who in the same night," &c. to "in remembrance "of Me." "Wherefore, O LORD, and heavenly Father, according "to the institution of Thy Dearly Beloved SON, our Saviour JESUS "CHRIST, we Thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here "before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy SON hath willed us to make; having in remembrance His blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious "Ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks, for the "innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely "desiring Thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," &c. to "sacrifice unto "Thee;" "humbly beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be "partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the "most precious Body and Blood of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, and "be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one "body with Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, that He may dwell in them

“ and they in Him. And although we be unworthy, through our  
“ manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice ; yet we beseech  
“ Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command  
“ these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of Thy holy  
“ Angels to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle before the  
“ sight of Thy Divine Majesty ; not weighing our merits, but,” &c.

In the subsequent part of the service, as an additional safeguard, is added (in a brief address now omitted,) a Confession, which bears the character of antiquity. “ CHRIST our Paschal  
“ Lamb is offered up for us, once for all, when He bare our sins  
“ on His Body upon the Cross, for He is the only LAMB of GOD,  
“ that taketh away the sins of the world ; wherefore, let us keep  
“ a joyful feast with the LORD.”

The remainder of the Service differed not from our present ; save that possibly the doctrine of the connection of the actual participation of our LORD in the Communion, with the reception of the Holy Elements, was more distinctly enounced in the prayer, “ We do not presume,” &c.—in that they prayed that they might “ drink His blood in these holy Mysteries ;” and again, in the thanksgiving after the Communion (now in consequence of these changes universally omitted,) in like manner, “ for that Thou  
“ hast vouchsafed to feed us [in these holy Mysteries] with the  
“ spiritual food,” &c. “ and hast assured us [duly receiving the  
“ same] of Thy favour and goodness towards us,” instead of “ for  
“ that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received  
“ these holy Mysteries, with,” &c.

Such was the modified form in which the doctrine was expressed ; so that one should rather question whether the revisers had not already gone further than they need, and if so, further than they ought, in altering the ancient liturgy of the Church. For, of course, it would be a maxim that, especially in high doctrines, which we do but dimly see, as little change should be made as possible, lest we inadvertently part with that, whose value we do not at the time appreciate. The false doctrine was that ordinary persuasion that “ in the Mass, the Priest did offer  
“ CHRIST for the quick and dead.” The danger to be apprehended, lest it should interfere with “ that perfect redemption,



14 *First Liturgy well received by the whole Anglican Church.*

“ propitiation, and satisfaction made by the one oblation of CHRIST  
“ upon the cross, for all the sins of the whole world.” Of this, in  
the revised liturgy, there was not the remotest trace. It would  
be difficult to imagine what ground of exception could be taken  
against what remained, unless one had known whence those  
exceptions came. There is not the slightest intimation that the  
English Church dreaded any practical evils from the revised  
form,—as indeed how should they, when every expression which  
could, in the remotest way, favour the Romish corruption, was  
removed? On the contrary, the Act which enforced it “ gave  
“ offence (only) we are told<sup>1</sup>, to the Romish party; not that  
“ they could except against it, in regard either of the manner or  
“ matter of it (*which they acknowledged to be consonant to the ancient*  
“ *forms,*) but because it was communicated to the people in the  
“ Vulgar Tongue.” The general feelings of the Lay portion of  
the Church might, in *those* days, be tolerably estimated by those  
expressed in the two Houses of Parliament; and these<sup>2</sup> “ gave  
“ to the king most hearty and lowly thanks for it, and for his  
“ godly travail, in collecting and gathering together the said  
“ Archbishop, Bishops, and learned men, and for the godly  
“ prayers, orders, rites and ceremonies in the said book; and  
“ considered the honour of God, and the great goodness which,  
“ by the grace of God, would ensue upon it; and finally, con-  
“ cluded the book such, that it would give occasion to every  
“ honest man most willingly to embrace it.” It was also not  
only confirmed by the two Houses, but “ the<sup>3</sup> more material  
“ points were disputed and debated in the Convocation, by men  
“ of both parties, and might further have been discussed, so long  
“ as any Popish Divine had anything reasonably to say.”

Indeed, persons of the most different views agree in praising

<sup>1</sup> Heylyn, Hist of the Ref. p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> ap. Strype, Eccl. Mem. of Edw. 6, b. 1. c. 11. p. 86. fol.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. G. Abbot against Hill, p. 104. ap. Strype, ib. p. 87. “ The religion—  
“ drawn out of the fountains of the word of God, and from the purest oracles of  
“ the primitive Church, was, for the ordinary exercise thereof, collected into  
“ the book of Common Prayer, by the pains and labour of many learned men,  
“ and of mature judgment.” Id. lb.

the wonderful wisdom of these first revisers of our Common Prayer Book ; and, at the time, it was unhesitatingly affirmed to have been done " by aid of the Holy Ghost ;" without Whom so blessed a work could not have been accomplished. There seems, then, to have been good hope that all the Romanist Laity would have continued to conform to it, inasmuch as in the Upper House only four of the Laity protested against it <sup>1</sup>.

This hope, however, of retaining the Romanist Laity within our Communion, was soon dissipated. The feelings of the Church do not appear to have been altered. When some Bishops had been induced, by the representations of Calvin and the rest, to open the question about the " words used at the giving of the " elements, and the different manner of administering the holy " sacrament," the lower House of Convocation <sup>2</sup>, to whom the matter was proposed, put off the question until the succeeding session, nor does it appear that they ever acceded to the plan.

The objections came entirely from without. When this, our genuine English Liturgy, was framed, one foreign reformer only, of any note, (P. Martyr) had arrived in England ; à Lasco, whose influence was subsequently most pernicious, and Bucer, came not until the Liturgy was completed. But the kindness wherewith England has made itself the refuge of the oppressed, was in this case also abused. Immediately after the completion of the Liturgy, we find the poor Archbishop unhappily surrounded by foreigners, who had in their own countries rejected Episcopacy, some, the doctrines of the Sacraments also, and left their own countries because they went beyond the foreign reformation. Others were generally unsound.

Of these, the highly-gifted B. Ochinus died an apostate to a low Socinianism ; à Lasco, a Polish emigrant nobleman, carried even further than their author, the anti-sacramental doctrines of Calvin <sup>3</sup>. Yet he was highly trusted by Cranmer, was, although

<sup>1</sup> Strype, *ib.* p. 86.

<sup>2</sup> Heylyn, p. 107.

<sup>3</sup> See Scriptural views of Holy Baptism (Tracts) Note M. p. 245 seq. The following account is from Strype, principally his " Cranmer," b. 2, c. 22.

a Preacher only<sup>1</sup>, invested with a sort of Episcopal authority over the several congregations of foreigners, Germans, Italians, and French, and perhaps Spanish, settled in or near London; and so much wealth was, out of a dissolved Church, settled upon him, that he was enabled to become a patron to all foreigners who should resort thither. His having fled from his own country, his position in London, reputation for learning, and strictness of life, gave him considerable influence; and in those unsettled days, the existence of a regular form of doctrine, worship, and government different from that of the Church, was calculated in unstable minds to produce a like desire of novelty. À Lasco himself was of an active, meddling temper; he took upon himself to interfere in the question of episcopal habits, (which was indeed a question between the spirit of the English Church and Geneva,)<sup>2</sup> and from the Arians<sup>3</sup> in his own country also, ultimately from Geneva, had brought in the custom of sitting at the Holy Eucharist, and the antipathy to the scriptural and primitive name of "Altar."

With these and the like men Cranmer was surrounded; and paid much deference to them<sup>4</sup>, as a man of no decision is wont to do to those who are bent upon carrying a point. It was probably a fruit of this influence, that there came out from the Council in 1550 an ill-omened letter, signed by seven laymen, but by one Bishop only (Ely) besides the Archbishop, commanding the altars to be taken down, and tables to be placed in their room. Some of the reasons assigned<sup>5</sup> are the more remarkable, in that the good ground of Christian antiquity was necessa-

<sup>1</sup> He had become a preacher to a Protestant congregation at Embden, Strype, l. c.

<sup>2</sup> It is characteristic that Peter Martyr, although he accepted a Canonry in our Church, boasts that he never would wear the surplice. Epist. ej. ap. Heylyn, p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> Heylyn, p. 92.

<sup>4</sup> "A Swiss Reformer, resident at Oxford, informed Bullinger, in Nov. 1548, that Cranmer had been brought to *sunder* views of the Lord's Supper by John "à Lasco!" Jenkyns's pref. to Cranmer's Works, p. lxxix.

<sup>5</sup> Heylyn, p. 96, 97.

rily abandoned, and arguments are drawn from the partial silence of Holy Scripture; in that "it is not to be found that any of the Apostles did ever use an altar in the ministration;"—the selfsame argument by which the name of the Blessed "Trinity" is proscribed by the Socinian, and the blessing of Infant-baptism by the Anabaptist. It was forgotten that as little is it said that they ever used a table; that in the first three centuries the name "table" but *once* occurs, that of altar, as sanctioned by Holy Scripture, is the ordinary title<sup>1</sup>. The edict, however, was executed; "the people flew upon the spoil," jewels, hangings, plate, candlesticks, were transferred from the temple of God to the houses, tables, or persons of the rich; and sacrilege was an ill augury of what should follow.

The change in doctrine was now actually introduced, and recommended by the authority of Bishop Hooper, who had unhappily, during Henry VIII's reign, taken refuge in Zurich<sup>2</sup>, and become acquainted with Bullinger a friend of Zuingli. Of the change itself, the less need be said, since the whole doctrine of the Eucharist was then altered. The service indeed was rendered inconsistent; for some of the antient doctrine was retained, although all the alterations went one way, to introduce the Zuinglian view of a simple commemoration for the Catholic doctrine of actual communion. It suffices to characterize and condemn this change, that words, some whereof were ever used by the whole Church, "The Body of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life," were expunged, and instead thereof was invented and substituted the mere exhortation, "Take and eat this, in remembrance," &c.

But it is instructive to observe how this change of doctrine affected (as it must) the value felt for the Holy Eucharist, as appears incidentally in the two liturgies of Edward VI. In the first, we find it said,

<sup>1</sup> Johnson, *Unbloody Sacrifice*, p. 308.

<sup>2</sup> Heylyn, p. 90. The interest which Calvin took in Hooper's success, is instructive. During the demur about the "habits," Calvin wrote to the Protector "to give him a helping hand." Ep. Calv. ap. Heylyn, p. 91.

“ In Cathedral churches or other places, *where there is daily Communion*, it shall be sufficient to read this exhortation, once in a month. And *in parish churches, upon the week-days*, it may be left unsaid. And if, *upon the Sunday or holy day*, the people be negligent to come to the Communion, then shall the Priest earnestly exhort his parishioners, to dispose themselves to the receiving of the holy Communion more diligently.”

And, “ If in the sermon or homily, the people be not exhorted to the worthy receiving of the holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour CHRIST; then shall the curate give this exhortation to those that be minded to receive the same, “ Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind, &c.” and

“ When the *holy Communion is celebrated on the week-day*, then may be omitted the Gloria in excelsis, the creed, the homily<sup>1</sup>, and the exhortation.”

Another regulation implied that it might very probably be celebrated every Wednesday and Friday, and other days; and it is provided that “ the priest *on the week-day* shall forbear to celebrate the Communion, except he have *some* that will communicate with him;” and provision was made (as far as might be) that “ the Minister, having always some to communicate with him, may accordingly celebrate so high and holy Mysteries with all the suffrages and due order appointed for the same.”

In the second book, all these notices and this urgent desire of frequent Communion disappear; we find only, “ there shall follow this exhortation *at certain times*, when the curate shall see the people negligent to come to the holy Communion” [the 2d exhortation, now in use, only altered].

Daily communion was altogether dropped; it is implied only that there *may be* communion on holy days; and that in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, there should be *weekly* communion; but, on the other hand, it is provided that “ there shall be no celebration of the Lord’s supper,” not as before, “ unless there be *some*,” but “ *except there be a good number* to communicate with the priest, according to his discretion,” (a regulation for which

<sup>1</sup> The Communion was then thought of more moment than the sermon.

now has been substituted, "a *convenient* number,") as also another still retained, "if there be not above twenty persons in the parish of discretion to receive the Communion; yet there shall be no Communion, except four (or three at the least) communicate with the priest." They were more anxious to rescue the priest from communicating with a few, than the flock from rare communions or losing them well-nigh altogether.

And thus the devout (as is ever the case in these changes) were sacrificed to the undevout; and *we* have followed out *this* reformation, thus brought about through the agency of foreign reformers, and have brought down our celebrations of the Communion from weekly to monthly, or quarterly, or three times in the year; (whereby those of our people who can receive it oftenest, receive it only so often as our Church, even in those bad times, thought necessary, at the very least, to retain the spiritual health of any member of CHRIST'S body, and the most cannot receive it even on all these rare occasions;) and we have dropped the Communions of Holy Days, and should oftentimes not think it worth while to administer it (in church) to three or four communicants, and have lost (for the most part) the very sense and feeling, that more frequent communion would be a blessing. It makes, in truth, a man's "eyes gush out with water," to see in these notices, how the glory of our church, the days of her youth, and her first love are departed: and to think what she might have been, had she stood in the old paths. "The virgin daughter of my people is broken with a great breach, with a very grievous blow."

On the accession of Q. Elizabeth, the worst alteration, that of the words used at the delivery of the holy elements, was modified, so as to restore the old doctrine of a real Communion, for those who were willing to receive it; and with regard to her doctrine of the Sacrifice, the restoration of the Communion table to the place which the altar had formerly occupied, shewed that the Church recognized the doctrine, which some of her heads had before shrunk from avowing in the presence of the foreign reformers, and their disciples.

These restorations were, however, inadequate to replace men's minds in their former state; the confession of the true doctrine

had been once half suppressed, and was now not more than half avowed: and it seems annexed as a penalty to all unfaithfulness in guarding the deposit committed to us, that we cannot replace things as they were. The snow which descends from Heaven, cannot, if once polluted, recover its former purity. The purity which God gave, He can restore; yet He does not so to any Church, for any half-efforts, nor unless it be "zealous and repent." (Rev. iii. 19.)

Men's minds also had received a severe shock through the profanations which had been carried on in the name of this second reformation; in taking away the tares, they had uprooted the wheat also; in endeavouring, with a rude hand, to eradicate Romish misbelief, they went hard to introduce unbelief; they had effectually effaced the association between the altar and the Romish sacrifice, but they had loosened men's reverence altogether. "When their table was constituted, (was the well-merited mockery of a Romanist divine<sup>1</sup>) "they could never be contented "with placing the same, now East, now North; now one way, "now another: until it pleased God of His goodness to place it "quite out of the Church:" "this difference and diversity, (says Heylyn very truly) "although in circumstance only, might draw "contempt upon the Sacrament itself, and give great scandal "unto many moderate and well-meaning men." Then followed the scenes of plunder, each labouring to outdo the other; the

<sup>1</sup> White, Bp. of Lincoln ap. Heylyn, p. 107. Heylyn quotes other mockery, which is very instructive as to the mischief which was done by these vacillations: "The like did Western (Prolocutor of Convocation, 1 Queen Mary) in a disputation held with Latimer, telling him, with reproach and contempt enough, that "the Protestants having turned their table, were like a company of apes, that "knew not which way to turn their tails; looking one day East, and another "day West; one this way, and another that way, as their fancies led them. "Thus, finally, one Miles Hubbard, in a book called 'The Display of Protestants,' "doth report the business, 'How long were they learning to set their tables "to minister the Communion upon? First, they placed it aloft, where the "High Altar stood; then must it be removed from the wall, that one might go "between; the ministers being in contention, whither part to turn their faces, "either toward the West, the North, or South; some would stand Westward, "some Northward, some Southward.' "

king issuing a Commission to restrain the "plundering of the Churches," and to recover what had been stolen, in order—to appropriate it to himself; and this Commission, with all intended expedition, was left behind in the race of sacrilege, and powerful private plunderers, or secret thieves, had got much of the treasure into their own hands, and could not be discovered, or would not disgorge it: "Insomuch<sup>1</sup> that many private men's parlours were "hung with altar cloths; their tables and beds covered with "copes instead of carpets and coverlids; and many made carousing cups of the sacred chalices, as once Belshazzar celebrated "his drunken feast in the sanctified vessels of the temple. It "was a sorry house, and not worth the naming, which had not "somewhat of this furniture in it, though it were only a fair large "cushion made of a cope or altar cloth, to adorn their windows, "or make their chairs appear to have somewhat in them of a "chair of state. Yet how contemptible were these trappings in "comparison of those vast sums of money, which were made "of jewels, plate, and cloth of tyssue, either conveyed beyond "the seas, or sold at home, and good lands purchased with the "money; nothing the more blessed to the posterity of them that "bought them, for being purchased with the consecrated treasures of so many temples."—"Thou that abhorrest idols, dost "THOU commit sacrilege?"

One would gladly have turned from these sickening scenes, whereby and by the like, religion was, for the time, made "a gainful occupation," (1 Tim. vi. 5) and God's holy name was blasphemed; bad men supplanting one another, and Bishops scarcely lifting up one warning voice against the sacrilege, but submitting to enforce it<sup>2</sup>; (so that the days of Q. Mary come as a

<sup>1</sup> Heylyn, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> Ridley, although we have no doubt unwillingly, as Bishop of London, enforced the mandate addressed to him, for pulling down the altars, which was accompanied with so much profaneness and sacrilege. (Heylyn, p. 96, seq.) Day, Bp. of Chichester, was deposed for not pulling down the altars in his diocese. (Strype, Cranmer, b. 2, c. 20.) A specimen of what then passed in men's minds is the report of the times (whether true or mistaken, matters not) "what "Cheke told him (P. Martyr) did not a little *refresh him*, viz. That if they themselves (the Revisers of the Liturgy) would not change what ought to be



relief, wherein those of our reformation suffered, not sinned) but that through the profaneness which these acts entailed, they must have had much effect in changing religious doctrine, and preventing its restoration.

After these scenes of rapid legislation and confusion, decree following decree, spoliation upon spoliation, liturgy upon liturgy, (men's minds unsettled by the frequent changes, by the consultations with men of a different reformation, and by the state's violent interference and lawless deeds) a large body of our clergy fled abroad, mistrusted by the Lutherans on account of their consultations with à Lasco, and settling in the birth-place of the unsoundest part of the reformation, Zurich, Geneva, and other cities connected with them.

Here such as were left (Ridley, the great upholder of Catholic truth, having received his martyr's crown) divided into two parties; only, as is ordinarily the case, evil principles are more rapidly developed than good, and so we find what was subsequently the Puritan party most developed, and engaged in turbulent, ambitious, schismatic measures. They also had the Zuingli-Calvinist reformation close at hand, to which they joined themselves without scruple, and so they were already arrived at the first stage of that Reformation, opposed to the Church, but not as yet opposed to the Scriptures; the other was gradually recovering from the influences, under which it had been brought during the reign of Edward VI; but we find this difference, that, while the principles of the Puritans or Nonconformists were already developed, that of the genius of the English Church did not unfold itself altogether, until some years afterwards, in the seventeenth century, and then was again cast out. At the accession of Queen Elizabeth, they either did not see their way clearly (as was natural) or "the sons of Zeruiah were too hard for them;" the body of the English Church, not having been infected with foreign notions, was yet sound, and desired no foreign inventions; but when an inno-

"changed, the king would do it himself; and when they came to a Parliament, the king would interpose His Majesty's own authority." Strype, Cranmer, b. 2, c. 18.

vating party is decided, and the sound party engaged on the defensive only, the innovators will ever have the advantage, and the quiet body of the Church is sacrificed. Concessions, involving the sacrifice of principle, are made, if only to avoid the imputation of obstinacy or stiffness in refusing. As an instance, some idea there was of restoring (as the Queen herself wished) the genuine English service book (Edward VI's first book): how this was prevented, we know not; the Church generally desired it: perhaps the hope of conciliating those who afterwards overturned our Church and nation, prevailed; mediating measures were adopted; and the Church lost the distinct and tranquil enunciation of doctrine, which was the best and only antidote to further evil.

The amalgamating measures of Queen Elizabeth's divines produced just their natural effect, viz. an amalgamation of doctrine; of which, however, unhappily, the lower doctrine naturally dragged down the higher (since men will always in the end subside into the lower of two views proposed to them), and was, from its own nature, the more conspicuous.

Should this sketch to any appear distressing, let him rather contemplate the immense fermentation, which was likely to arise in the endeavour to separate off the impurities of the Church of Rome; the influence which, in any such troubled times, bad men and bad passions must naturally obtain; and instead of wondering that the lees did not settle down until the next century, rather let him thank God (and he has abundant reason to thank Him) that, while He allowed them to float up and down in the vast ferment, He did not yet permit them to spoil the "good wine," but has "kept it until now." Even our Articles, as well as our Liturgy and Catechism (blessed be His Holy Name), were preserved free from the errors into which the foreign Reformers fell, and expressed the truth fully on all points necessary to salvation, and, in the case in question, though maimed, and not with the simple unreservedness of primitive days, still, sufficiently to preserve the agreement with the primitive Church. Besides, she not only did not exclude, but directed her true sons to, the teaching of the Church Catholic; she did not form a system of faith, which

should exclude whatever lay beyond it, but only secured (as far as she could) certain prominent points, on which error had existed. But these, as a particular church, she laid down only in dependence upon, and subordination to, not to supersede the Church Catholic.

Cranmer himself shared, in a great degree, the difficulty which men of those days must have had, in arriving at any definite or ascertained results at all : one who has been even compelled to part with a portion of his belief, has shaken the hold of the remainder : and even though the needle should be endued with a power, not its own, to fix at last on the centre where it should rest, yet, should it have been necessary once violently to shake it, it will not be until after much vehement vibration to the right and to the left, that it will at last tremblingly fix itself. It is not in the midst of conflict, while men are struggling for their footing and for life, that we are to expect a calm survey of the nature of the ground whereon they stand. All the Reformers (as was to be expected) vacillated, English and foreign (save, perhaps, Ridley, who was most imbued with the doctrines of the early Church, and had therein a firm resting place) ; and they who ventured to systematize most, as Calvin, went most astray ; others, as Luther, in whatever proportion they did so. *Their* province was, to clear the building of its untempered mortar ; it was to be the task of others to point the edges, which, in this rough handling, were of necessity injured, and to restore the fair harmony and finish of the goodly building. It is difficult, at any time, to oppose even an error broadly, without impairing some neighbouring truth out of which it was corrupted, or to which it is akin ; this has been miserably evidenced again and again in individual controversy with heretics ; the insulated defender of truth against heresy, himself steps on the other side beyond the Catholic verities, and becomes a heretic : every error, almost, in these latter divided times, is the depository of some kindred truth, and rough censures of what is untrue fail not to include what is true also ; thus, in refuting men who depreciated the ordained sacraments, men, in their turn, came to depreciate or deny unquestionable (although mis-stated) Divine agency, and explain God's miraculous work-

ings in the conversion of a single soul, or the refreshing of His Church, by mere secondary causes : on the other hand, in correcting false notions of the Sacraments, they lost the true ; in refuting Transsubstantiation, they fell short of the truth of the real mystical, spiritual presence of CHRIST in the Eucharist ; the mind, intent upon the one side of removing injurious error, misses or forgets to establish, or does not discriminate, the positive truth.

The Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had different offices ; in the sixteenth, we are to look for strong broad statements of truths, which had been obscured by Popery, but often without the modifications which they require and receive from other portions of the Gospel ; in the seventeenth, we have the calmer, deeper statements of men, to whom God had given peace from the first conflict, yet suffered not their arms to rust, having "left" certain of "the nations to prove Israel by them, even as many of Israel as had not known the wars of Canaan" (Judges iii. 1). Yet their office was to maintain, not to win, and so was a calmer duty ; and they, however exercised by troubles, still breathed freely amid the "arva serena," which their fathers had won with their own blood. They had not to rise and take possession of the land, while

"blood and fire ran in mingled stream<sup>1</sup>,"

but "to keep the watch of the LORD by His holy temple and by the altar, every man with his weapon in his hand." (2 Chron. xxiii.) There is then no occasion to institute any comparison between the relative value of these several "vessels meet for the Master's use" in the House of God ; between those who here first laboured, and those who, when these were at rest, entered into their labours. Each had their several offices, and were severally qualified for them ; and they only risk disparaging the Reformers of the sixteenth century who would look to them for that which was not their office, viz. a well-proportioned and equable exhibition of the several parts of the Catholic faith, which was, in the appointed order of things, rather reserved for the seventeenth.

<sup>1</sup> Christian Year.

It was, then, natural that Cranmer should vacillate, and that, the more as to the doctrine of the Eucharist, since he had arrived at the Catholic views, through the aid of Ridley, and contrary perhaps to his own bias. We blame him then not for this, rather should one abstain from rudely blaming those, who vacillated most, and even for a while, or altogether, returned to Rome. It was not necessarily for interest that men so vacillated; the excesses of many foreign Protestants must needs have startled many of the gentler sort, who yet wished to be freed from the grosser corruptions of Rome, as they do at this day: and if Cranmer, pledged as he was, could recant, and retract not, while there was yet hope, one need not impute worse motives than undue fear of man to others. God, for His own name's sake, rescued His servant Cranmer, and gave him the crown of martyrdom; Jewel's recantation was blotted out only by bitter tears, and a life of fasting and humiliation: why then ascribe sordid motives to others, who, halting between two opinions, were dissatisfied perhaps both with the corruptions of Rome and those of the Reformation under Edward VI., and so took part with neither, but held a middle course, leaning first on the one side, then on the other? Such persons are not to be hastily blamed: unless indeed they put themselves in the office of leaders of the Lord's host, for which they are not fitted; to the *people*, it was wont to be proclaimed in the wars of the Lord, "What man is fearful and faint hearted? let him go and return unto his house!" (Deut. xx. 8.) Stirring times must be times of fear.

What, however, is to be blamed in Cranmer, is that one, from his own yieldingness unfitted for the task, should have undertaken so mighty a work as that of uniting the discordant elements of Protestantism in one Episcopal body. A splendid conception truly; but not to be encompassed by such an instrument! No great principles put forward; private and discordant opinions not repressed by an appeal to the agreement of Catholic antiquity, which had been the Anglican touchstone in Romish controversy; the peculiar advantages of the Anglican reformation abandoned; and instead thereof, a mere attempt at comprehension by the use of vague and indistinct terms, "which might be taken in a larger

acceptation," but which, as Melanchthon saw, were but a source of increased contention to posterity<sup>1</sup>. Cranmer thus aggravated the difficulties of his own waveringness; and entailed upon himself trials, which God had not annexed to his office, fell into a snare and brought the elements of confusion into our Church. As also he began the design, not in unison with the Church, but in concert with foreigners or the state alone, so it seems to have continued it single-handed; the body of the clergy do not appear even

<sup>1</sup> Cranmer wished to unite the reformations of England, Germany, France, Geneva, and Zurich, i. e. the Fathers, Luther, Beza, Calvin, and Zuingli, in one. Melanchthon approved Cranmer's plan generally, "to publish a true and clear confession of the whole body of Christian doctrine, according to the judgment of learned men, whose names should be subscribed thereto. He thought this confession should be much of the nature of their confession at Augsburg; *only that some few points in controversy might be in plainer words delivered, than was in that*" (Ep. 66. L. 1. ap. Strype Cranmer, b. 3. c. 24). This last admission is the more remarkable, in that it was the policy of his followers in Germany to render that Confession more ambiguous, so that it might comprehend persons yet more at variance with one another, instead of guiding them in one way. They went on, veiling differences of opinion under ambiguity of expression, until it proved their destruction. As people came to look upon Articles as a *test*, instead of a guide, they first sacrificed their primary use as "a confession of faith," and then dreaded their effects, for the very purpose to which they had turned them, and wished to relax them and make them more indefinite (thus destroying their use in teaching), for fear that, as tests, they should be too restricted. P. Martyr agreed with Melanchthon, but on the opposite, the Zuinglian, side; so that here, for this plan of union, there were already two opposed parties, wishing their own views to be fully and precisely expressed. This was impossible; but Bucer and Cranmer took a line equally impracticable, to conciliate parties by "using more dark and ambiguous forms of speech, that might be taken in a larger acceptation" (Strype, ib. p. 408). This was in 1548. Edward VIth's Articles (1552) which seem to have been carried through by the Archbishop in connection with the State, in conjunction perhaps with some selected Commission, but which were never submitted to the Church at large (Strype's Cranmer, 11, 27, 34. Heylyn, p. 121)—these Articles are a fruit of this policy, and have two faces, one to be presented to those abroad, who could not as yet come up to the high doctrine; the other to be followed out at home, with reference to the teaching of the Church Catholic. Unhappily, but as was natural, they have been too often followed out into Zuinglianism, which they were intended to bring over to the Church. (On this negotiation with Melanchthon and Calvin, see Strype's Cranmer, b. 3, c. 24 and 25. Of Calvin's strong interference with our reformation, Heylyn speaks, p. 80, 107.)

to have been consulted about it; the other Commissioners were (although nothing is known certainly) very probably joined in this office of revision, but the majority unquestionably disliked it: as the scheme of comprehension was Cranmer's only, so the responsibility of veiling or lowering the doctrine is only his. And again, in the articles of Edward VI, of which he acknowledged himself the writer, and which were composed about the same time, there is, in those relating to the Sacraments, the like tendency to Zuinglianism, and the like use of ambiguous or inadequate expressions.

Cranmer's views on the Sacrifice of the Eucharist must, of course, have been lowered by his intimacy with reformers, who had imbibed the Zuinglian errors. Yet even in the book, which betrays much Zuinglian language and illustration, and contains passages scarcely reconcileable with any sound doctrine on the *Sacraments*, (his "Defence of the true and Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour CHRIST, 1550") on the doctrine of the *Sacrifice*, he directs himself against statements either wholly Romish and erroneous, or which could most obviously be understood in a Romish sense, as though the priest sacrificed CHRIST, or the sacrifice benefited those who partook not of it, or as if there could be priest or sacrifice *distinct* from the priesthood or sacrifice of CHRIST, or (and that mainly) as if the sacrifice could be applied by the priest to whom he willed; on the other hand, there occur passages, which express so far at least the true doctrine, that the author could hardly have needed any further alteration of the Liturgy for his own sake.

It is remarkable in this and many other instances how the respect for the old Fathers, which was characteristic of our Anglican church, upheld those, who had otherwise, in all likelihood, lapsed into Ultra-Protestantism. On the principles of our Church, they could not but defer to the authority of the "old primitive and apostolick Church," and so were checked, even after they had half adopted views at variance with them. An Ultra-Protestant would consistently reject the doctrine of the sacrifice, (as he would the rite of Infant Baptism) because there is no *explicit* authority for it in Holy Scripture, no statement of it *totidem verbis*; the

Anglican Divine must receive it, as the doctrine of the Church Catholic, coinciding with hints of Holy Scripture. It is just in this way, through reference to the Fathers, that Cranmer retains his statement of the doctrine. "Therefore when the old fathers called the mass or supper of the Lord, a sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving, and so as well the people as the priest do sacrifice, or else that it was a remembrance [memorial] of the very true sacrifice propitiatory of Christ; but they meant in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin, and applicable by the priest [at his pleasure] to the quick and dead. For the priest may well minister CHRIST'S words and sacraments to all men both good and bad, but he can apply the benefit of CHRIST'S passion to no man, being of age and discretion, but only to such as do, by their own faith, apply it to themselves<sup>1</sup>," &c.

This was but two years before the unhappy change of the service in compliance with the Zuinglian view; and after this time it is not even supposed that Cranmer's views were further changed; and yet even thus late Cranmer thus speaks of the first service-book; "Thanks be to the eternal God, the manner of the Holy Communion, which is now set forth within this realm, is agreeable with the institution of Christ, with St. Paul, and the old primitive and Apostolic Church, with the right faith of the sacrifice of CHRIST upon the cross for our redemption, and with the true doctrine of our salvation, justification, and remission of all our sins by that only sacrifice<sup>2</sup>."

Cranmer's views then were unchanged, even while with a false scheme of comprehension, he suppressed such as were too high for the foreign reformers; it was partial suppression, not falsification, which the English Church suffered. Even the Articles, although they naturally suffered most from this policy of Cranmer (in that they were to be the media of comprehension) and retain in parts the character so impressed upon them, still have sufficient indications of the true doctrine, and are upheld by the li-

<sup>1</sup> Defence of the Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. B. v. c. 16. t. 2. p. 461. ed. Jenkyns.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. c. ult. p. 463.



turgy, which, as being mostly antient, could be less affected by the expedients of the times.

In the liturgy, the most serious alterations affected, not the doctrine of the sacrifice, but the privileges of the communion, although, in order to understand the spirit in which they were made, it has been necessary to speak of the whole subject. For the abolition of words, which had expressed the doctrine of the whole Church, "The Body of our Lord JESUS CHRIST," &c. and the substitution of a lower formula, expressing only modern notions, went nigh to an apostacy and betrayal of the trust reposed in us as a Church.

The suppressions in the article of the "sacrifice" were not entire; only it must be borne in mind, that much had been already suppressed, other parts expressed, according to Cranmer's policy, with perhaps a studied ambiguity, so that the land-marks of true doctrine were both diminished and obscured.

The actual omissions were, 1st, That of the direction of the Rubric, that "the minister should take so much Bread and Wine, "as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion, laying the Bread upon the corporas, or else in the "paten, or in some other comely thing, prepared for that purpose: and putting the Wine into the chalice or else into some "fair or convenient cup, prepared for that use (if the chalice will "not serve), putting thereto a little pure and clean water; and *setting both the bread and wine upon the Altar.*" This was the *act* of oblation. The very circumstantiality of these directions betokens men's reverence. The reformed liturgy gives directions how "the devotion (i. e. in their sense, alms) of the people should "be collected, and that the due and accustomed offering should "be paid to the Curate on offering days," but leaves the bread and wine to be placed on the Altar any how, (as too many do now,) studiously omitting all mention of it. In the prayer for the Church militant, it is there inserted for the first time "to accept our alms" as if to exclude any other oblation. 2dly, The omission, throughout, of the word "Altar." This title is, in our first reformation, used as unhesitatingly as any other, and has its appropriate place: that, whereon the "commemorative sacrifice"

is offered, is an "Altar" in respect of that sacrifice; but, in respect to those who communicate, it is "God's table" or God's board, in that God invites us to feast on that sacrifice, to a heavenly feast at a table which He prepares for us in the wilderness; and accordingly, wherever, in our own reformation, the words "Lord's table" were used, it was in reference to our "coming thither;" "we do not presume to come to this Thy table," &c. but the bread and wine were said to be "set upon the Altar:" twice only it is said, "the priest standing at God's board," the most frequent<sup>1</sup> name is the "Altar." 3dly, All the beginning of the form of oblation was omitted, viz. "Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour JESUS CHRIST, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Sox hath willed us to make; having in remembrance His blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits promised unto us by the same." The remainder, "entirely desiring," &c. was placed (*mutatis mutandis*) after the delivery of the elements, and consequently when their presence could no longer sanction in any mind the idea of the actual offering up of CHRIST.

Of these alterations, Bucer's criticism extends only to the words, "And command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy Angels, to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, not weighing our merits," &c. On which he says<sup>2</sup>, "It is clear enough that the authors of the book wished here somewhat to defer to the language received of old, wherein frequent mention is made of oblations and sacrifices."—"We know to what the Papists have distorted these words; so on that account only, they are to be avoided rather than imitated."

Here, then, as in other parts of these criticisms by Bucer, we have the general principle avowed, (which Hooker so blessedly withstood,) that whatever has been abused by the Church of

<sup>1</sup> It is used five times.

<sup>2</sup> *Opp. Anglic.* p. 473.

Rome should be avoided. It is not a little remarkable, that the very passage of the Roman Liturgy from which this prayer is taken, is an actual difficulty to the Romanists<sup>1</sup>. In the original the words are "jube *hæc* preferri." The difficulty to the Romanist is, "What is meant by these things;" for, since this prayer is subsequent to the consecration, according to their error, the bread and wine must be then the essential Body and Blood of CHRIST; yet, "how shall the Body of CHRIST be conveyed to heaven, since it is always there?" asks St. Thomas. Yet if that which is on the altar, be not then the Body and Blood of CHRIST, Transsubstantiation is overthrown. The Romanists, then, fell on the gloss, which the revisers of the Prayer Book adopted, that under "*hæc*" were meant "prayers and supplications." But this, though less distinctly opposed to the Romish doctrine, than if the plain words of the ancient Liturgy had been retained, still in no degree countenanced it. The consideration, however, of the objection of Bucer and his fellows, was part of Cranmer's plan; and so, whatever this criticism applied to, was altered.

Once more, then, it must be observed, that there was no change of doctrine as to the Christian sacrifice, involved in the alterations and omissions made in Edward the Sixth's second book, but only a suppression and timidity as to their statement. This is expressly stated in the name of the English Church, in the Preamble to the Act of Parliament, which confirmed the altered form. It was there set forth, that, 1st, "There was nothing contained in the said first book, but *what was agreeable to the Word of God, and the primitive Church*, very comfortable to all good people, desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm." 2dly. "That *such doubts as had been raised, in the use and exercise thereof*, proceeded rather from the curiosity of the minister and mis-takers, than of any other worthy cause<sup>2</sup>."

There is no speech here, about what moderns have been so fond of upholding, viz. the gradualness of the reformation; how

<sup>1</sup> See Assem. Cod. Liturg. t. 4. p. 164. n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Ap. Heylin, p. 107, 8.

the light burst not at once upon men, but was gradually restored to them; or rather, that they (for so it is spoken of) saw more clearly into the genius of Christianity, or into the errors of the faith in which they had been educated; and so that our first reformation was not enough reformed;—the very theory upon which Rationalism justified itself. Doubtless, persons who made *their own insight into Holy Scripture* the rule of their faith, would be exposed to this temptation of gradually unravelling the articles of their belief, dropping them one by one, until they had brought them down to what *they* thought a scriptural standard. For such persons, having no definite rule to go by, but their own frail judgment, must be exposed to the constant unsteadiness and waveringness to which private judgment must necessarily be subject. Such, blessed be God! was not the case with our Anglican Church. For, having seized hold of a fixed standard for scriptural interpretation and for doctrine, in this agreement of Catholic antiquity, she had no longer need to toss up and down in the fluctuations of human opinion, but was at once arrived in her haven. *Felices nimium, sua si bona norint!* Thrice happy, had she never, by compromise or foreign alliances, risked the blessings which the Lord her God had given her above all people!

These and other changes, then, although happily without effect, were intended to unite us with bodies, from which the miserable history of the last eighty years more especially, has shewn it to be our privilege to be separate,—the foreign Protestants, with whom and whose theology we have never had any large commerce, without injuring our own, overlooking how the peculiarity of our reformation corresponded with the place assigned to us by God's Providence, as an island-people, and both with God's blessing; "This people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

This character of the change, whereof Cranmer was the instrument and furtherer, has much influence on the subsequent history of the doctrine. For when a change is introduced by one individual, or by a few, not in compliance with, but rather against the feelings of the body of the Church, it will work but

slowly through the body. People, for a time, will continue their old habits of thought, and their doctrines and devotions, under the new form, as long, at least, as any witnesses of the old doctrine remain; as "Israel served the LORD all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua," (Josh. xxiv. 31,) until perhaps that generation or the next have passed away; and then, perhaps, the tradition having nothing or but little outward to lean to, becomes gradually weaker, and at last lurks only here and there, in the caves of the earth, which are less exposed to the variations of the external atmosphere. They "hid themselves in caves, and in thickets, " and in rocks, and in high places, and in pits," (1 Sam. xiii. 6,) where the Philistines, who overspread the open land, could not reach them.

Thus, even after the alterations now introduced, as far as the old prayers and rites remained, they who had been accustomed to them before, would attach the same meaning to them now as then. Even Edward the Sixth's second service book would be a very different book, and bear very different meanings, in the hands and hearts of those who had been accustomed to the ancient worship, and to one who should take it up now, with ultra-Protestant notions. For instance, although all *directions* about placing the bread and wine upon the altar, or the *act* of oblation, were now omitted, they who had been accustomed so to regard it, would not cease at once to do as they had been wont; they would lay the elements upon the place appointed, with the same reverence as before; they would not at once (at least the right-minded among them) leave it to sextons or clerks; and, placing them there, they would do it with the same feelings as before, mentally offering them to Almighty God, on whose altar and before whom they placed them, and from whom they looked again to receive them. So again, a king's edict ordering the altars to be pulled down, and tables to be placed in their room, and their goodly decorations and vessels of silver and gold to be melted down or turned to common use, would not prevent those of constant mind from looking on the new board, (since it was still God's board, and in God's house,) and the single cha-

lice which they were allowed to retain, as the altar of their God and its furniture. It was but as the "single ewe lamb" left, but still on that account, at first, prized the more. They would look on the lessened glories of this house with a reverent and respectful sorrow. 3. Then also, in the prayer of consecration, the preamble, which *implied* the sacrifice, still remained; for (as it was said) Cranmer's object was not to efface the doctrine, but to remove captious offence; this, then, was left as now; our LORD (it was said in prayer to God) "did institute and in His holy Gospel command us to continue *a perpetual memory* of that His precious Death, until His coming again." What followed upon this preface was now omitted; but they who had been accustomed to the antient form must have supplied it, viz. that we did as we were enjoined; as indeed even now, those who have well nigh lost the Church's doctrine, must, of course, (even if half unconsciously) mentally supply something of this kind; since we cannot rehearse our LORD's direction "to make this memorial of Him," and not do what He bade us. Then also, for a time, the word "memory" would help to perpetuate the doctrine, as being the received word,—not, as many now use it, for "our own remembrance of His death," but—for the "making a public memorial<sup>1</sup> or commemoration," which the Church, by the Priest, is directed to make: "Do this for a memorial of ME." Still more, at the time, the recent omission of the latter part of the prayer of consecration, manifestly could not affect the sense of the former which was retained; although when deprived of the light thrown upon it by the explicit statement in the latter part, the force of the preamble might gradually be obscured. 4. The same may be said with regard to the remaining indication of the doctrine of the sacrifice, that portion, namely, of the prayer of consecration, which has been transposed and placed after the actual communion: the sense must remain the same, although its meaning is less visible, on account of its being disconnected from the actual visible elements, (except so far as a portion of the consecrated elements still remains upon the altar) whence it is recorded, that Bishop Overall used it before the parti-

<sup>1</sup> Ἀνάμνησις.

cupation, as it was at first. And perhaps his so doing implies that it had always been so done in that portion of the Church, and the rubric not received in that Church as yet. However, whether before or after, the same prayer must have the same meaning; and so it still remained a portion of the oblation or sacrifice to God. It is also, probably, a remnant of the antient tradition, that the prayer of oblation, thus transposed, is even now universally used, although the ancient thanksgiving after the Communion, "Almighty and ever-living God, we most heartily thank Thee," &c. is thus lost; our second reformation having only given us the choice which of the two we should use, not permitting both. In this state things remained during the reign of Queen Elizabeth; the revisers of the Service being then contented with the most essential restoration, that of the words accompanying the delivery of the Bread and Wine,—“The Body of our Lord JESUS CHRIST,” &c. The doctrine of the Commemorative Sacrifice was committed rather to the faithfulness of individual Ministers, than to the explicit teaching of the Church. A decided step towards the recovery of the avowal of this truth, was gained after the Hampton Court Conference, at the beginning of the reign of James I. For then, there being no hope of gaining the Puritans, the Church avowed more fully some of her doctrines, in the Appendix to the Catechism on the Sacraments. Here, namely, was introduced, for this express purpose, the question, “Why was the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper ordained?” A person who should examine this Catechism with modern notions, would be surprised at the occurrence of this question at all, and especially at this place, in the Catechism. For the Catechism, he would observe, proceeds regularly, stating the number of the Sacraments, the meaning of the word, the parts therein, (first, the outward, then the inward,) then the requisites for partakers; and that this order is observed as to each Sacrament. Whence then is it, that before the mention of these two parts of the Lord’s Supper, and the requisites thereto, there is intercalated, as it were, this question? The benefits of our own actual communion are mentioned afterwards, as in the case

of Baptism, in a distinct answer, viz. "the strengthening and "refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of CHRIST." They who confound the public act of the holy Eucharist with its benefits to the souls of individual believers,—the Sacrifice with the Communion,—must needs think this question out of place; and so, by their very perplexity, shew that the construction which they put upon the words is wrong. Besides this, the opinion of the writer of this part of our Catechism, Bishop Overall, is well known. The meaning of the answer, "For a continual remembrance," (*i. e.* continually to make a memorial, ἀνάμνησις) "of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST, and of the "benefits which we receive thereby," was then obvious. It was herein declared that the holy Eucharist, besides being a *sacrament*, was for the continual setting forth of the *Sacrifice* of the Death of CHRIST; or, in the language of the old Church, "a sacrifice commemorative of *the* Sacrifice." The Catechism and the prayer of Consecration throw mutual light upon each other, and belong to the same system; and Convocation, by sanctioning this part of the Catechism, restored to our Church the *formal* recognition of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

After the close of the great rebellion, this recognition was again brought into the Liturgy itself, although with a gentle hand. The Savoy Conference had shown the hopelessness of gaining the Ultra-Protestant party by any concession which could be made. The Church, therefore, seemed the freer to act with reference only to herself. Accordingly a rubric, which had remained expunged since the adoption of Edward the Sixth's second book, was restored; and it was enjoined that "when "there is a communion, the Priest shall *then*" (*i. e.* after he has placed the alms upon the holy table) "place upon the Table so "much Bread and Wine as he shall think convenient." Thus the antient *act* of the προσφορά or oblation was formally directed to be made. And to mark the meaning of the *act* the rather, then, for the first time, after the words "to receive these our alms" was added, "and oblations," in the same order as each had been presented on the altar; first, "the alms," then "the oblations." And these are distinguished from each other in the



marginal rubric, which says, "if there be no alms or oblations," &c. *i. e.* if there be neither collections for the poor, nor elements offered to ALMIGHTY GOD (for the collections were made each Lord's day, adhering so far to the Apostolic custom even when there was no Communion, and consequently no *oblations* or offerings). Moreover, the word *oblation* is the received word for this peculiar offering or sacrifice to ALMIGHTY GOD.

This was the last restoration, and such as our branch of the Anglican Church was then fixed, it still in theory remains. The chain of witnesses was kept up in the Church; and we at this day have sufficient evidence both to maintain the character of our whole Church, as not having altogether in this respect departed from the primitive model, and for our own guidance in following that model in this most awful part of our devotions. Two other changes, however, ought to be mentioned, which took place in other branches of the Anglican Church, the Scotch and American; the one as having been designed ultimately to influence our own Church, had the miserable violence of the times permitted, and doubtless having tacitly done so; that of the American (as a daughter Church) indicating the then state of doctrine among us. The revisers of the Scotch Liturgy (for they were Scottish Divines, and it may be called a revision, since the first Reformers of Scotland adopted the English Liturgy<sup>1</sup>) went back in most things to that their first Liturgy, and so restored the doctrine of the Communion and Sacrifice according to our genuine English Reformation. The invocation of the Blessed Trinity to sanctify the elements, was restored, verbatim, out of Edward the Sixth's Liturgy, as was the subsequent prayer, now called distinctly the "memorial or prayer of oblation;" except that the words, "and sacrifice," were added after "a perpetual memory of that His precious death," and those "command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy Angels," &c. were omitted. The prayer of oblation was of course restored to its original place before the Communion, whereby the thanksgiving after the Communion came again into use. The antient words used at the delivery of the Elements were also restored,

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Scotch Common Prayer-book. 1637.

to the exclusion of the later addition of the Zuinglian school. Other lesser alterations were made tending to the same end. Sentences from Holy Scripture were introduced into the offertory, having reference to oblations made to GOD under the old law, and to the sacrifice of Abel (referred to in some antient liturgies); the Presbyter was directed to "*offer up* and place the bread and wine prepared for the sacrament upon the LORD's table;" the table itself was (besides "a carpet and fine white linen cloth") to have "other decent furniture meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated," and the Collect for the inspiration of GOD's Holy Spirit was said to be "for due preparation;" things slight in themselves, but still tending to inspire more reverence into men's minds, or to obtain it from GOD.

We find, accordingly, that both the Puritan party and the Church in England, had their eyes turned to this restored service-book, although it was to Scotland that it was restored. The feelings of the Puritans may be judged of from the title of a work written by a Scotchman, but published in England, wherein the reformed Liturgy was paralleled with the Mass-book, and it was contended that no abomination of the Romish mass could be refused by those who embraced it<sup>1</sup>. The writer was one of those who held that "the<sup>2</sup> far most part, if not simply all, the godly of

<sup>1</sup> The title is "A parallel or brief comparison of the Liturgy with the Mass-Book, the Breviary, the Ceremonial, and other Romish Rituals. Wherein is clearly and shortly demonstrated, not only that the Liturgy is taken for the most part word by word out of these Anti-Christian writs; but also that not one of the most abominable passages of the Mass can in reason be refused by any who cordially embrace the Liturgy as now it stands and is commented by the *prime of our Clergy*. All made good from the testimonies of the most famous and learned Liturgic writers both Romish and English." By R. B. K. [Robert Bailie, a well-known controversialist of the day.] London. 1641. The work is done with care and pains. "Had not that Hydra of the Scottish Liturgy," say the authors of the [English] "*Common Prayer-Book unmasked*," "lost all the heads and had the brains dashed against the stones, they made no question but that all the power of head and tail should have room enough to domineer in England. But, blessed be GOD, who brake the head of that young Dragon in our neighbour nation, and we hope will by you [the Parliament] crush out all the blood of the old one here [the English Liturgy], *who was the mother of that*, and the Mass-book the mother of both." p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Preface to Parallel, p. 7.

“ the Isle, are longing with great expectation, and greater desires to see that instrument (the English Liturgy), after all the “ evil they have suffered by it, to be broken in pieces,” and to whom it sufficed for its condemnation that any of the sentences, yea, that the very prayer of our LORD, should occupy the same position as in the antient, though corrupted, Liturgy of Rome. These are not the excesses of an individual, but the characteristics of a body, and of a portion of the age. And so, in like way, one may look upon the Scotch Liturgy as expressing the sentiments of the Church in that age, although not as yet ventured upon the nation which shortly after fell into hands which persecuted the Church, and proscribed the Liturgy. It was in truth the English Liturgy which was thus attacked under the name of the Scotch. It is meantime a singular confession, which herein occurs (such as is now made for the baptismal service), that it was only by “ a benign interpretation that many passages “ could be drawn to a Protestant [an ultra-Protestant] sense.” The Scotch Liturgy fixed that sense ; and it was a decided gain for primitive doctrine, that that sense was somewhere, even though for one branch only of the Anglican Church, now authoritatively determined. The sense of the English Church was carried out, where it might be ; and so her sons might the more take courage that that exposition was the right one. The Church in Scotland, although soon cast out, and in later times hunted up and down on the mountains, was still a standing memorial of the meaning of that in England, and had its influence even in times when one should have little expected it, as in those of Bishop Horsley. The Liturgy “ drawn up by Bishop Taylor for the English Royalists, when Parliament forbade the use of that provided by the Church,” that of the Non-Jurors, and finally that of our daughter-Church in America, may be regarded as the result of the same spirit, which produced this courageous, although ill-received avowal of the truth ; and this facilitated doubtless the partial restoration, which, though less fully expressed, still fixed the meaning of the English Liturgy.

The effects of the restoration in the American Liturgy are mostly perhaps yet future ; but no fearless avowal of truth by

any Church can be without its effect on that Church, and others related to it. For the time, the parent has delivered over to her daughter, to bring out into open day, the treasure which she was obliged as yet to keep half-concealed. The American Liturgy embodied, it may be concluded, the doctrine of the whole Anglican Church (had she been at liberty to express it) in her form of oblation taken from the then Scotch Liturgy. "We Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here, before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now offer before Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make, having in remembrance," &c.

A doctrine, however, left so long to tradition and sustained by mere hints in the service itself, could not but lose ground in the mass of the Church, especially in the remarkable circumstances of our Church, placed as the single guardian of Catholic truth of the West, and so deriving no support from without, but the contrary; and *it may be*, that it lost much in the very period which preceded its formal restoration, the unhappy confusion of the Rebellion, in which so much besides of instructive traditionary rite perished; as, on the other hand, no formal restoration can be of any avail, if the vividness of the belief be waxing fainter. The violent convulsion of 1688, and the subsequent ingratitude of the State, casting out some of our best bishops, who had most resisted Popish tyranny, and 400 of our Clergy, introduced a new character into the Church. During the following age, the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice mostly found refuge among the Non-Jurors and our brethren of the Scotch Church. Bad however as were the times which followed for the English Church, in which she had to contend "*pro aris et focis*," for the holiest truths of the faith, and was corrupted from high places, lest she should be too powerful, and those who would defend her, again lost sight of the source of her great strength, and grasped to the right hand and to the left, again to foreign help, to the Calvinistic or Arminian divines of Holland, Witsius, or Grotius, or Episcopius—they could not probably have been so much affected by external circumstances, had not the evil times of the Great Rebellion, while they purified the few, injured the many. So

far, however, from looking to any fuller restoration of doctrine of any sort, in the track of the Restorers of the 17th century, it was by the great mercy of GOD that they who stood in the breach, preserved any doctrine at all.

The history of the doctrine of the "Commemorative Sacrifice" is however in this way a warning. Satisfactory as is the "chain of witnesses" in the Church, still it must be admitted, that the number of those who retained this doctrine, over the whole face of the Church, was very possibly by no means so great as in the case of doctrines more definitely announced.

The chain of witnesses for the doctrine of the "Eucharistic sacrifice" is as large and venerable as that *e. g.* for "baptismal regeneration<sup>1</sup>." Still it is certain that it had not such deep root as those doctrines more prominently expressed in our Liturgy; as one may judge from the relative degree in which the two doctrines are apparently held in this day. They both had the same opponents—those educated in the Zuingli-Calvinist school, but the one has been uniformly the recognized doctrine of our Church, and held, until these latter days, by almost all her members, and is still probably the prevailing belief; and they who hold it not, are necessarily to a degree uncomfortable about their departure from the plain meaning of the Church services, and are obliged to feel about for excuses to themselves for so doing; and the very contradictoriness of their explanations, and their necessary unsatisfactoriness, opens the way of return to the more candid of them, whenever Catholic truth is set in its fulness before them. The other is held probably by far more than we deem, but still out of sight as it were, in the secret sanctuary of men's hearts, and is not handed down in any very distinct and authoritative way. People are under no uneasiness for not holding *it*; it is enough for them that it is not sufficiently explained, for them without pains to understand it; and so those who will not be at any pains, think they may the more readily dispense with thinking about it, or deny its existence. It is as a stranger and wayfarer in the Church, which was once its home, and brings with it indeed the blessing of receiving strangers, "whereby some

<sup>1</sup> See *Catena*, No. 2—*Tracts for the Times*, No. 76.

have entertained angels unawares." The mere holding of a doctrine may suffice for the existence of a Church, but not for the well-being, whether of a Church or an individual, unless, when occasion requires, it be avowed distinctly and courageously. Suppression of the truth may become equivalent to, and in a favoured Church, involve the penalty of disavowal or apostasy. Had *e. g.* the proposals in the last century to remove the Athanasian Creed been acceded to, our Church might now very probably have become Sabellian or Socinian. While then we gather up thankfully the "fragments which remain," and praise God that He so restrained the minds of the Bishops and Pastors of His flock, that while abandoning the public expression of this doctrine, they still hid, as it were in the temple, this good deposit, where they who seek might find it, the history of this doctrine may be a warning to us. Had, for instance, as was proposed, those parts of the Baptismal service, which most distinctly confess the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration, been, on some plea of charity, erased, we may, in the fate of the one doctrine, read what would have been that of the other—cherished by the few, who trod faithfully in the old paths, declaimed against by the more vehement, and forgotten by the many.

With regard to the writers, whose belief on this subject has been preserved, not a little perplexity may be caused to a superficial observer by the ambiguity of the language, and the variety of senses in which the terms are used. Thus, the words "sacrifice," "proper sacrifice," "real and true sacrifice," and even "propitiatory or expiatory sacrifice," will be severally used in a good or a bad sense by the several writers, the one understanding thereby the Romish error, the other, the Catholic truth; and so, meaning the same thing, they will yet maintain or censure, as it may be, the same words. Thus the writer of one of our Homilies uses the simple word "sacrifice" in the Popish sense, and employs that of "the memory" for what antiently was designated by "sacrifice." He says in popular language, alluding throughout to Romish errors, "we must then take heed lest of *the memory*, it be made a sacrifice; lest of a communion it be made a "private eating; lest of two parts we have but one; lest apply-  
"ing it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive<sup>1</sup>." And yet a

<sup>1</sup> Homily concerning the Sacrament, pt. 1.

French writer quotes<sup>1</sup> this very homily, as an instance in which the writers of our Church maintain the old Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice. And rightly; since this author separates "the memory," or commemoration, from the "Communion," and so means thereby something distinct from this; then his "memory" is the *ἀνάμνησις* of antiquity. Again, the same French writer observes, that "Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury, is, of the first writers "of the Reformation, one of the most opposed to the [Roman] Catholics, and who has spoken as much and as loudly as any one, "both against the mass and the sacrifice. But when he explains "himself, he admits all which we [the Gallican Church?] admit "ourselves. He throughout holds a mystical offering and sacrifice "of JESUS CHRIST. 'As<sup>2</sup> CHRIST was slain at the Table, so was "He sacrificed at the Table. But He was not slain at the Table "verily and indeed, but only in a mystery: therefore he was not "sacrificed at the Table really and indeed, but only in a mystery.' 'The sacrifice<sup>3</sup> [after the order of Melchisedek] which "is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, is only "JESUS CHRIST the Son of GOD upon the Cross. And the ministrations of the holy Mysteries, in a phrase or manner of "speech, is also the same sacrifice, because it layeth forth "the death and blood of CHRIST so plainly and so evidently "before our eyes.' 'We offer<sup>4</sup> up CHRIST, *i. e.* an example, a

<sup>1</sup> Courayer, *Défense de la Dissert. sur la Validité des Ordinations Anglaises*, L. 4, c. 6. He quotes a free translation, which brings out the meaning of the passage, "cavendum, ne sacrificium commemorationis convertat in sacrificium proprium et materiale."

<sup>2</sup> [Reply to Harding, Art. 17. div. 6. p. 417. Bishop Jewell is here answering Harding's proof of the real, substantial, sacrifice of CHRIST in the Eucharist, drawn from His own sacrifice of Himself at His Supper. The preceding words in Bishop Jewell are, "We deny not but it may well be said, *Christ at His last supper offered up Himself unto His Father*; albeit, not really and indeed, but, according to M. Harding's own distinction, in a figure or in a mystery; in such sort, "as we say, CHRIST was offered in the sacrifices of the old law: and as St. John "says, *The Lamb was slain from the beginning of the world*. As CHRIST was "slain," &c. The meaning is the same, for as that first "offering of Himself to His Father" is understood, so will be the oblation of the Eucharist.]

<sup>3</sup> [Ib. div. 10. p. 422.]

<sup>4</sup> [Ib. div. 12, p. 424. This is Bishop Jewell's comment on the passage of St. Chrysostom in Ep. ad Hebr. Hom. 17. adduced by Harding.]

“ commemoration, a remembrance of the Death of CHRIST. *This kind of sacrifice was never denied* <sup>1</sup>.’ What then does he deny?  
 “ That JESUS CHRIST was *really* sacrificed, that he offers anew  
 “ His own life, and again sheds His own blood, as Harding very ill  
 “ expresses himself, that ‘CHRIST sacrificed Himself at two sundry  
 “ times, and that He twice really shed His blood, first at the Table,  
 “ and afterwards upon the Cross.’ This it was which Jewell com-  
 “ bated, this the doctrine which he attributed to the [Roman] Ca-  
 “ tholics, and which the inaccuracy of Harding gave him occasion  
 “ to attack. In truth, all his answers to the arguments and author-  
 “ ities adduced by his opponent, come to this; viz. that they do not  
 “ prove that JESUS CHRIST was really sacrificed, and that conse-  
 “ quently there is no sacrifice (doubtless in the sense in which he  
 “ supposed the [Roman] Catholics to hold it). ‘M. Harding’s  
 “ real sacrifice was never yet proved.’”

“ It is thus that he answers the passage of St. Cyprian, that of  
 “ the supposed Areopagite, those of St. Irenæus and St. Ambrose  
 “ and others; which Harding had paraded in his work. ‘The  
 “ place of St. Cyprian <sup>2</sup> [as it] not once toucheth the *real* sacrificing  
 “ of CHRIST unto His Father,’ &c.—‘Here Dionysius <sup>4</sup> calleth not  
 “ the ministration of the holy Mysteries the sacrificing of CHRIST  
 “ unto His Father, [as M. Harding would force us to believe, but  
 “ a figurative sacrifice, that is, a figure or a sign of that great sacri-  
 “ fice]’—‘That Irenæus <sup>5</sup> meant not any such *real* sacrifice of the

<sup>1</sup> [Bishop Jewell, to the words, “This kind of sacrifice was never denied,” sub-joins, “but M. Harding’s *real* sacrifice was never yet proved.”]

<sup>2</sup> Ap. Jewell, 146 [l. c. p. 417.]

<sup>3</sup> P. 149 [422.]

<sup>4</sup> P. 147 [419. Bishop Jewell had just before said, “Dionysius hath no token or inkling of any sacrificing of the Son of GOD unto His Father. But clearly and in most plain wise, he sheweth the difference that is between the sacrifice of the Cross, and *the sacrifice of the Holy Communion*.” Such a sacrifice then Bishop Jewell believed.]

<sup>5</sup> P. 148 [424. Bishop Jewell begins the paragraph, “Here, at last, M. Harding has found out the name of a sacrifice, *that was not denied him*. But the sacrifice, that he hath so long sought for, and hath so assuredly promised to find, hitherto he hath not found. For Irenæus not once nameth the Mass, nor this *real* oblation of the Son of GOD unto His Father.”]



“ Son of God, nor may not in any wise so be taken, it is evident by  
 “ the plain words that follow, touching the same.’—‘ Even so, St.  
 “ Ambrose saith, CHRIST is offered here in the earth (not *really and*  
 “ *indeed*, as M. Harding saith, but) in like sort and sense as St.  
 “ John saith, ‘The Lamb was slain from the beginning of the world,  
 “ that is, *not substantially or in real manner, but in signification in*  
 “ *mystery and in a figure.*’ Read through all that this author says  
 “ on the subject, and you will find that it comes back to these two  
 “ points, 1st, That JESUS CHRIST does not really offer Himself in the  
 “ Eucharist. 2d, That there is no ‘ proper sacrifice <sup>1</sup> where there is  
 “ no real immolation. On the first of these, which is that which  
 “ Jewell attacks, we are agreed. The second comes to a mere ques-  
 “ tion of names, *i. e.* whether one ought to give the name of “ pro-  
 “ per sacrifice ” to an action wherein there is no real immolation.  
 “ All antiquity decides in favour of the [Roman] Catholic Church.  
 “ But of what use to the acknowledgment of the doctrine is a dis-  
 “ pute about the word sacrifice, which these authors will only give  
 “ to a real and actual immolation, when they confess that the death  
 “ of JESUS CHRIST is represented in the Eucharist, that a continual  
 “ memorial is there made of Him, and that there is therein a mysti-  
 “ cal oblation of His sacrifice, which applies its benefits to us. ‘We  
 “ offer up CHRIST, *i. e.* an example, a commemoration, a remem-  
 “ brance of the death of CHRIST.’ It is not then our doctrine which  
 “ he attacks, but an imaginary sacrifice which we do not admit, and  
 “ which yet is the only one that he imputes to us. ‘ Therefore <sup>2</sup>  
 “ this new article of faith, of the *real* sacrificing and shedding of  
 “ CHRIST’S Blood at the Table, neither being true in itself, nor  
 “ hitherto by M. Harding, nor any way proved—to say, that  
 “ any mortal man hath power and authority, *really and indeed*  
 “ to sacrifice the Son of God, it is a manifest and wicked blas-  
 “ phemy.”

With Courayer’s endeavours to extricate himself and his  
 Church from the decrees of the Council of Trent, which fixed  
 this language, we have nothing to do: certainly, the language of

<sup>1</sup> [The term of the Council of Trent.]

<sup>2</sup> P. 144 [p. 414, 5.]

the Council on the Sacrifice, is in itself capable of a good interpretation, were it not that terms employed in it must be explained with reference to that Church's acknowledged doctrines of Transsubstantiation and Purgatory. And THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRIFICE CANNOT BE THE SAME, WHERE TRANSSUBSTANTIATION IS HELD AND WHERE IT IS NOT. This long extract, however, may be of much use in setting vividly before the mind, not merely the opinions of Bishop Jewell, but whereon the controversy really turned, viz. on the doctrine of Transsubstantiation. And it is the difficulty of fixing language, with regard to this or any point, which creates the difficulty; if *e. g.* by "true and proper sacrifice" the Tridentine decree means "an actual immolation of the real and substantial Body and Blood of CHRIST," an Anglican must reject it; if, on the other hand, it could have meant only "a real oblation, commemorative of the One Sacrifice of our LORD, and pleading and applying its merits," the phrase in itself would have nothing objectionable: in a word, if "true and proper" means "physical, corporeal, substantial," *i. e.* implies "Transsubstantiation," we reject it; if it were opposed only to any ultra-Protestant notion of "figurative" (as opposed to "true"), "unreal," "in a figure of speech," and the like, it may have a good sense, and serve to uphold sound doctrine.

In like manner, Cranmer, although he did not come up to the old Catholic Fathers in his statement of the truth, yet addressed his mind to the word "propitiatory," in itself objectionable, as probably conveying popularly the notion of an *intrinsic* merit and value in propitiating the Father. "The greatest blasphemy and injury that can be against CHRIST, and yet universally used through the Popish kingdom, is this, that the Priests make their mass a service propitiatory, to remit the sins as well of themselves as of others, both quick and dead, to whom they list to apply the same. Thus, under pretence of holiness, the papistical priests have taken upon them to be CHRIST's successors, and to make such an oblation and sacrifice as never creature made but CHRIST alone, neither He made the same any

<sup>1</sup> Defence, &c. b. 5. c. 1. t. 2. p. 447. ed. Jenkyns.

“ more times than once, and that was by His death upon the “ Cross.” Yet, as we saw above <sup>1</sup>, he held in some sense the doctrine, and in one place, even in a later work, he parallels <sup>2</sup> the sacraments with the sacrifices of the old Law, which implies altogether the high view, and is the language of the Fathers. “ The “ true reconciliation and forgiveness of sin before God neither the “ fathers of the old Law, nor we yet have, but only in the “ sacrifice of CHRIST, made in the mount of Calvary. And the “ *sacrifices of the old Law were prognostications and figures of* “ the same then to come, *as our sacraments be figures and de-* “ *monstrations of the same now passed.*” He contends throughout against the *Romish* sacrifice, and though (as happens to people in controversy, especially when under the influence of the class to whom he listened) he even appears to lower the true view for fear of approximating to the *Romish* error, still it is apparent to the attentive, that even in his controversy he has regard to this only. Thus in answer to Gardiner, who quoted the phrase, ἀθύρωσ θύεσθαι, as applied to the sacrifice of the Eucharist, he says <sup>3</sup>, “ In saying that CHRIST is sacrificed of the priest “ not like a sacrifice, or after the manner of a sacrifice, the “ Council in these words signified a difference between the “ sacrifice of the priest and the sacrifice of CHRIST, Which upon “ the Cross offered Himself to be sacrificed after the manner of “ a very sacrifice, that is to say, unto death, for the sins of the “ world. CHRIST made a bloody sacrifice, which took away sin; “ *the priests with the Church make a commemoration* thereof with “ lauds and thanksgiving, offering *also* themselves obedient to “ God unto death. And yet this our sacrifice taketh not away “ our sins, nor is not accepted but by His sacrifice.” Wherein Cranmer expresses himself as strongly as need be wished, especially in that he distinguishes the “ sacrifice” as a “ memorial,” from the “ oblation of ourselves.” And again <sup>4</sup>, upon the very word “ propitiatory.” “ You speak according to the “ Papists, that the priests in their masses make a sacrifice pro-

<sup>1</sup> P. 29.<sup>2</sup> Defence, &c. b. 5. c. 5. p. 451.<sup>3</sup> Answer, &c. b. 5. t. 3. p. 534.<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 544.

“ pitiatory. I call a sacrifice propitiatory, according to the Scripture, such a sacrifice as pacifieth God’s indignation against us, obtaining mercy and forgiveness of all our sins, and is our ransom and redemption from everlasting damnation. And, on the other side, I call a sacrifice ‘gratificatory,’ or the sacrifice of the Church, such a sacrifice as doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled, to testify their duties, and to show themselves thankful unto Him. And these sacrifices in Scripture be not called propitiatory, but sacrifices of justice [righteousness], of laud, praise, and thanksgiving. But you confound the words, and call one by another’s name, calling that propitiatory which the Scripture calleth but of justice, laud, and thanking. And all is nothing else but to defend your propitiatory sacrifice of the priests in their masses, whereby they may remit sin, and redeem souls out of purgatory.”

In like manner, Ridley, in answering the Romish corruption of the doctrine, sets himself entirely to oppose such statements of the doctrine as would any way interfere with the one sacrifice of the Cross, or ascribe to the commemorative sacrifice any intrinsic merit, and objects to the word “propitiable,” only if it involved that meaning. The proposition which he opposed was: “*In the mass is the lively sacrifice of the Church, propitiable and available for the sins as well of quick as of the dead.*” “I answer,” he says<sup>1</sup>, “that being taken in such sense as the words seem to import, it is not only erroneous, but withal so much to the derogation and defacing of the Death and Passion of CHRIST, that I judge it may and ought most worthily to be counted wicked and blasphemous against the most precious blood of our Saviour CHRIST. Concerning the Romish Mass which is used at this day, or the lively sacrifice thereof propitiatory and available for the sins of the quick and the dead, the Holy Scripture hath not so much as one syllable.—Touching these words, ‘the lively Sacrifice of CHRIST,’ there is doubt whether they are to be understood figuratively and sacramentally for the Sacrament of the lively Sacrifice (after

<sup>1</sup> Answer to the three propositions proposed to him in the disputation at Oxford, April 12, 1554. Prop. 3.

“ which sort we deny it not to be in the Lord’s Supper), or pro-  
 “ perly and without any figure; of the which manner there was but  
 “ one only sacrifice, and that once offered, namely, on the Cross.  
 “ There is also a doubt in the word ‘propitiabile,’ whether it signify  
 “ here that which taketh away sin, or *that which may be made avail-*  
 “ *able for the taking away of sin*; that is to say, whether it is to be  
 “ taken in the active or in the passive signification. Now the false-  
 “ ness of the Proposition, after the meaning of the Schoolmen and  
 “ the *Romish Church*, and impiety in that sense, which the words  
 “ seem to import, is this; that they, leaning to the foundation of  
 “ their fond Transubstantiation, would make the quick and lively  
 “ body of CHRIST’s flesh (united and knit to the Divinity) to lie hid  
 “ under the accidents and outward show of Bread and Wine.  
 “ Which is very false, as I have said before; and they, building  
 “ upon this foundation, do hold that the same body is offered unto  
 “ God, by the priest in his daily massings, to put away the sins of  
 “ the quick and the dead; whereas by the Apostle to the Hebrews  
 “ it is evident that there is but one Oblation, and one true and  
 “ lively Sacrifice of the Church offered upon the Altar of the Cross,  
 “ which was, is, and shall be for ever, the propitiation for the sins  
 “ of the whole world, and where there is remission of the same,  
 “ there is, saith the Apostle, no more offering for sin.—In the  
 “ Mass the Passion of CHRIST is not in verity, but in a mystery re-  
 “ presenting the same; yea even there when the Lord’s Supper is  
 “ duly ministered. But where CHRIST suffereth not, there is He  
 “ not offered in verity; for the Apostle saith, *Not that He might*  
 “ *offer up Himself oftentimes (for then must He have suffered often-*  
 “ *times since the beginning of the world)*. Now when CHRIST is  
 “ not offered, there is no propitiatory sacrifice. *Ergo*. In the  
 “ Mass there is no Propitiatory Sacrifice. For CHRIST, &c. Heb.  
 “ ix. 28.—I know that all these places of the Scripture are avoided  
 “ by two manner of subtle shifts; the one is, by the distinction of  
 “ the bloody and unbloody Sacrifice; as though our unbloody  
 “ Sacrifice of the Church were any other than the *Sacrifice of*  
 “ *Praise and Thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a showing*  
 “ *forth, and a Sacramental Representation of that one only bloody*  
 “ *Sacrifice, offered up once for all*. The other is, by depraving and

“wresting the sayings of the ancient Fathers unto such a strange  
 “kind of sense, as the Fathers themselves indeed never meant.  
 “For what the meaning of the Fathers was, is evident by that  
 “which St. Augustine writeth in his Epistle to Boniface, and in the  
 “83rd Chapter of his Ninth Book against Faustus the Manichee,  
 “besides many other places; likewise by Eusebius Emisenus,  
 “Cyprian, Chrysostom, Fulgentius, Bertram, and others who do  
 “wholly concord and agree together in this unity in the LORD,  
 “that the Redemption, once made in Verity for the Salvation of  
 “Man, continueth in full effect for ever, and worketh without  
 “ceasing unto the end of the world; that the Sacrifice once of-  
 “fered cannot be consumed; that the LORD’S Death and Passion  
 “is as effectual, the virtue of that Blood once shed, as fresh at  
 “this day, for the washing away of sins, as it was, even the same  
 “day that it flowed out of the blessed side of our SAVIOUR: and  
 “finally, that the whole substance of our Sacrifice, which is fre-  
 “quented of the Church in the Lord’s Supper, consisteth in  
 “Prayers, Praise, and giving of Thanks, and in remembering,  
 “and in showing forth of that Sacrifice once offered upon the  
 “Altar of the Cross; that the same might continually be had in  
 “reverence by Mystery, which once only and no more, was of-  
 “fered for the Price of our Redemption.”

The doctrine itself the Romanists certainly did confound, but  
 the word “propitiatory” was afterwards adopted in no other  
 sense than Cranmer above calls “gratificatory” (a word *as* foreign  
 to Scripture as “propitiatory”) *sc.* “such a sacrifice as doth not  
 reconcile us to God, but is made of them as be reconciled.” And  
 they adopted it as expressing more accurately that we approach  
 God herein, not simply with something of our own, our “prayers  
 and thanksgivings,” but with something altogether out of our-  
 selves, and which “He has provided” for us, even the memorials  
 of the Blessed Death and Passion of His Son. So that a learned  
 man<sup>1</sup>, not from his own habits of mind or those of his day dis-  
 posed to any high doctrine of the Sacrifice, yet says (on this very  
 word) speaking of a moderate and learned Lutheran Divine<sup>2</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Waterland, *Doctrine of the Eucharist*, c. xii. t. 7. p. 344. 5. Ed. Van Mildert.

<sup>2</sup> Pfaffius, *Diss. de Oblatione Vet. Eucharistica*, Irenæi Fragm. Anecd. sub-

“ He allows that the antients, by *oblation* and *sacrifice* meant more than *prayer*, and that it is even ludicrous to pretend the contrary. He acknowledges that they speak of an oblation of Bread and Wine, and that the Eucharist is a *sacrifice of praise*, and *propitiatory* also in a sober qualified sense.” “ In short, he seems,” adds Waterland, “ almost to yield up every thing which Dr. Grabe had contended for, except only the point of a *proper* or *material* sacrifice ; and he looked upon that as resolving at length into a kind of logomachy, a difference in words or names arising chiefly from the difficulty of determining what a ‘ sacrifice’ properly means, and from the almost insuperable perplexities among learned men, about the ascertaining any precise definition of it.” “ I am persuaded,” he lastly sums up, “ there is a good deal of truth in what that learned gentleman has said, and that a great part of the debate, so warmly carried on a few years ago, was more about names than things.”

So now we have, in these few instances, the words “ sacrifice,” “ proper,” or “ propitiatory sacrifice,” taken in a good or bad sense, or the question looked upon as a mere question of

jecta, p. 211. He says, “ The Council of Trent maintains that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is propitiatory, and that this is to be believed under pain of anathema, which yet is not said in the Service, which does not call the Holy Supper a ‘ sacrifice,’ much less ‘ a propitiatory’ one. Still the Tridentine Fathers, while they call the sacrifice of the Mass ‘ propitiatory,’ distinguish it from the sacrifice of the Body of CHRIST upon the Cross. For through the sacrifice of the Cross, propitiation was so perfectly *obtained* for man, that nothing can be added to the price of our redemption, as being infinite (Heb. ix. 11, seq. x. 1, seq. 1 John i. 2). If then the propitiation has been acquired by the sacrifice of the Cross, it is not *acquired* or *obtained* afresh by the Eucharistic sacrifice, unless you take *obtained* in the sense of *applied*. Whence it appears, how ambiguous that word ‘ propitiatory’ is, in that it may be taken as well for the ‘ acquiring and obtaining’ as for the ‘ applying’ of the one and the same thing, and so opens the door to numberless strifes of words. For if you say that the Eucharist *applies* to the faithful the propitiation made by the sacrifice of the Cross, no Protestant will dispute this. But if you believe that the devotion of the Eucharist *acquires and obtains* propitiation, you may be saying what is perhaps at variance from the opinion of the Romish Church. For the Council of Trent (sess. 6. c. 1.) calls the Mass ‘ a peculiar sacrifice, whereby CHRIST in the Last Supper presented to GOD the Father His own Body and Blood under the forms

words; so necessary is it to regard, not what words a person uses, but in what sense he uses them, else even the same person might be looked upon as a Papist and an Ultra-Protestant, which were absurd. In our perplexity on this subject, we may be the more thankful that God guided the Church Catholic to fix the language on the most essential articles of faith.

There is yet another opinion, which must be mentioned, as being a modification or a portion of the old doctrine, and bearing witness to that, for which it has been substituted. This is what has, since Cudworth's time, been commonly received, viz. that the Eucharist is "a feast upon a sacrifice." This, like so many other modern theories, takes up one half of the ancient doctrine, and then appears as new. It has, however, been valuable, as keeping up a portion of the truth among such as would not, perhaps, have received the whole. But the "feast upon a sacrifice" implies, first, the offering of a sacrifice; and so, as Archdeacon Daubeny<sup>1</sup> has well said, "The Episcopal Church in Scotland keeps close to the original pattern of the primitive Church; and with the Church of England,—considering the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a feast upon a sacrifice, to constitute it such, makes that which is feasted upon first a sacrifice, by having it offered up by a priest."

In conclusion, one word of caution. It is not without some natural sense of shrinking, that one casts thus upon the troubled waters of our rude days, the testimonies to a doctrine which is not meant for "doubtful disputations," but for reverence and devotion. The choice, however, is not with us: the ardent longing, which God has in so many minds awakened, to know and practise the faith of the Church, such as it was in the days when she kept her first love, is a warning which may not be passed unheeded; and they who know that Church's way have a duty

"of bread and wine, and whereby that bloody sacrifice finished upon the Cross is represented, and *its salutary efficacy is applied* to the remission of our daily trespasses." But if this be their meaning, they seem to have anathematized the Protestants, on account of an ambiguous term, which these do not admit. "For these hold the substance while they reject the word."

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in the Brit. Mag. Sept. 1834, p. 238.



laid upon them to declare it. Yet, since this doctrine especially has been cast into the shade, it seems to us a blessed circumstance that we were led by events, (which, since they are not of our own arranging, are commonly God's ordering and direction,) to set forth this doctrine in this way. For we trust that they who are apt to look upon these subjects with a sort of jealous impatience, because differing from the system in which they have been educated, and what they think the religion of the Bible, will, (at least some of them,) be restrained from giving vent to that impatience, by the presence of so many witnesses, some of whom, even they have been accustomed to respect; and so the injury which they might do to their own spirit or to the Church, by such profane opposition to the truth, may be avoided. On the other hand, we would warn those who may be tempted over hastily to take up, with all the interest of novelty, an old doctrine, which, in its extent, may to them appear to be new, that they too must restrain themselves. These are not subjects for discussion, for speculation, for display of recently acquired knowledge; they are high, mysterious, awful Christian *privileges*, to be felt, revered, embraced, realized, acted. Let them not speak of them until they have practised them, but rather pray God to deepen their own sense of them. They will then speak of them, if they speak at all, more chastenedly and in the ear,—not in mixed society or in the market-place; and, we may trust, not so as to injure themselves or others, or make the mysteries of God a common thing. What St. Augustine saith of God, is true also of all His mysteries:—"The soul<sup>1</sup> may more readily attain to speak of Him than to see Him, and she will so much the less speak of Him, the more purely she is enabled to see Him." "What do we?" says he again<sup>2</sup>; "shall we be silent? Would we might! For it might be that through silence some thing might be conceived worthy of that which is unutterable."

To further these ends, to obviate the embarrassment which may naturally result to individuals, from feeling themselves in possession of a doctrine greater than they have hitherto had, or

<sup>1</sup> Serm. 117, sect. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cont. Ep. Manich. c. 19.

than, from the contrariety of their previous habits, they can readily associate with an action, outwardly so simple as that of placing upon the altar the elements of bread and wine,—as also for the sake of the blessing of the prayers themselves, we subjoin a form wherewith the oblation was of old accompanied. This the priest may say *silently*<sup>1</sup>, (for the Church places no restraint upon silent prayer,) while he is reverently placing the bread and wine upon the altar, as directed. The prayer is in substance that which St. Irenæus doubtless derived, through St. Polycarp, from the blessed St. John, and was probably in use in this Church, before, for the first time, it suffered from foreign influence, then that of Rome. Clergymen, whether they place (as they are bidden) or even remove from one part of the altar to another, the Bread and Wine, which is to be made so mysteriously holy, cannot but offer some prayer, or at least think thoughts which are prayers. It is here only proposed as *a* form, which may be used by such as desire it; others may be found elsewhere<sup>2</sup>, or have been already given.

In the old Gallican Liturgy, then, the prayers of oblation and invocation of the HOLY GHOST to sanctify the elements, which form part of every known Liturgy, are thus combined :—

<sup>1</sup> The Apostolic Bishop Wilson gives this direction after the prayer of consecration : “ Say *secretly*, ‘ Most merciful God, the Father of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, look graciously upon the gifts now lying before Thee, and send down Thy Holy Spirit on this sacrifice, that He may make this bread and this wine the Body and Blood of Thy CHRIST, that all they who partake of them may be confirmed in godliness,—may receive remission of their sins,—may be delivered from the devil and his wiles,—may be filled with the Holy Ghost,—may be worthy of Thy CHRIST, and obtain everlasting life;—Thou, O LORD ALMIGHTY, being reconciled unto them, through the same JESUS CHRIST our LORD. Amen.’—*Intro. to the Lord’s Supper, Works* t. i. p. 51. 4to. 1781, quoted in part in *Brit. Mag.* l. c. p. 408.

<sup>2</sup> See Tract, No. 63—“ The Antiquity of the existing Liturgies,” whence (p. 15.) the following passages from the Gallican Liturgy are transcribed. They occur in Brett’s *Liturgies*, p. 114. 120. Mabillon, p. 227, 228. 457. In an interesting paper in the *British Mag.* Sept. and Oct. 1834, p. 402, sqq. portions of thirteen ancient forms are given, and those of our own Liturgy, as used in England, Scotland, and America.

“ We, O LORD, observing these Thy gifts and precepts, lay  
“ upon Thine Altar the sacrifices of Bread and Wine, beseeching  
“ the deep goodness of Thy mercy, that the Holy and Undivided  
“ Trinity may sanctify these Sacrifices, by the same SPIRIT through  
“ which uncorrupt virginity conceived Thee in the flesh ; that  
“ when it has been received by us with fear and veneration,  
“ whatever dwells in us contrary to the good of the soul may die,  
“ and whatever dies, may never rise again.”

Or in the Christmas office of the same Liturgy.

“ We therefore, observing these His commandments, offer  
“ unto Thee the holy gift of our salvation, beseeching Thee  
“ that Thou wouldst vouchsafe to send THY HOLY SPIRIT upon  
“ these solemn mysteries, that they may become to us a true  
“ Eucharist, in the Name of THEE, and Thy SON, and of the  
“ HOLY SPIRIT, that they may confer eternal life and an ever-  
“ lasting kingdom on us who are going to eat and drink of them,  
“ in the transformation of the Body and Blood of our LORD  
“ JESUS CHRIST, Thine Only Begotten SON. Amen.”

OXFORD.

*Feast of All Saints.*

In order to exhibit more clearly the character of Edward VIth's first book, which has been above commented upon, as well as a sort of introduction to the following list of witnesses, to whom it was a link, as it were, connecting them and their Church with the Fathers and the Primitive Catholic Church, it seemed advisable to give here, as a whole, the prayer of Consecration and Oblation as it stood in that book ; and, to explain the mind of its principal revisers, there have been appended the official answers, given by them a little previously, to the question on the doctrine here contained. Only it must be remembered that the language, being that of the ancient Church, is not dependent for its interpretation on the views of its revisers ; whether they saw what they delivered, more or less clearly, is an object of interest solely as relates to them ; they transmitted to us not their own interpretations, or their own thoughts, nor cast our devotions into the model of their

own minds, but, as far as they thought safe for their times, gave us the devotions of Primitive ages; and these must be obviously understood in the sense of those ages, *i. e.* of the Old Catholic Fathers, to whom also themselves appeal. They would not stamp their own image or superscription, lest they should seem more like forgers of a new religion, than refiners of corruptions. In like manner, it will be observed, they who come after depend not upon them, but derive their doctrine mainly from Catholic Antiquity, the common stay of both.

“O God, heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine Only Son JESUS CHRIST to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His holy gospel command us to celebrate a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again; hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son JESUS CHRIST. Who in

Here the Priest must take the bread into his hands. the same night that He was betrayed, took bread, and, when He had blessed and given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, ‘Take, eat, this is My Body, which is given for you. Do this

Here the Priest shall take the cup into his hands. in remembrance of Me.’ Likewise, after supper, He took the cup, and, when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, ‘Drink ye all of this, for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for remission of sins. Do this as oft as you shall drink it, in remembrance of me.’

“*These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation or shewing the Sacrament to the people.*

“Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour JESUS CHRIST,

we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here, before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; entirely desiring Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy dear Son JESUS CHRIST, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee, humbly beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Thy Son JESUS CHRIST, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him. And although we be unworthy (through our manifold sins) to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy Angels to be brought up into Thy holy tabernacle, before the sight of Thy divine Majesty, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through CHRIST our LORD; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen."

## QUESTION III.

*What is the Oblation and Sacrifice of Christ in the Mass?*

Answers.

CANTUARIEN. (*Cranmer.*)

The Oblation and Sacrifice of CHRIST in the Mass is not so called, because CHRIST indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people, (for that was done but once by Himself upon the Cross,) but it is so called, because it is a Memory and Representation of that very true Sacrifice and Immolation which before was made upon the Cross.

ROFFEN. (*Ridley.*)

The Representation and Commemoration of CHRIST's Death and Passion, said and done in the Mass is called the Sacrifice, Oblation, or Immolation of CHRIST; *Non rei veritate*, (as learned men do write) *sed significandi mysterio*.

*List of Authors cited.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Jewell.                                  | 33. Towerson.                                 |
| 2. Bilson.                                  | 34. Bull.                                     |
| 3. Hooker.                                  | 35. Stillingfleet.                            |
| 4. Overall.                                 | 36. Smith.                                    |
| 5. Field.                                   | 37. Beveridge.                                |
| 6. Buckeridge.                              | 38. Hooper.                                   |
| 7. Morton.                                  | 39. Dodwell.                                  |
| 8. Andrews.                                 | 40. Hickes.                                   |
| 9. Mason.                                   | 41. Comber.                                   |
| 10. White.                                  | 42. Collier.                                  |
| 11. Laud.                                   | 43. Nelson.                                   |
| 12. Hall.                                   | 44. Wake.                                     |
| 13. Montagu.                                | 45. Johnson.                                  |
| 14. Forbes.                                 | 46. Wilson.                                   |
| 15. Mede.                                   | 47. Sherlock.                                 |
| 16. Duppa.                                  | 48. Grabe.                                    |
| 17. Compilers of the Scotch<br>Prayer Book. | 49. Leslie.                                   |
| 18. Nicholson.                              | 50. Brett.                                    |
| 19. Bramhall.                               | 51. Bennet.                                   |
| 20. Cosin.                                  | 52. Potter.                                   |
| 21. Heylyn.                                 | 53. Hughes.                                   |
| 22. Sparrow.                                | 54. Laurence.                                 |
| 23. Ferne.                                  | 55. Law.                                      |
| 24. Hammond.                                | 56. Wheatly.                                  |
| 25. Barlow.                                 | 57. Ridley.                                   |
| 26. Thorndike.                              | 58. Compilers of the American<br>Prayer Book. |
| 27. Taylor.                                 | 59. Jones.                                    |
| 28. Brevint.                                | 60. Horsley.                                  |
| 29. Sancroft.                               | 61. Daubeny.                                  |
| 30. Scrivener.                              | 62. Jolly.                                    |
| 31. Fell.                                   | 63. Philpotts.                                |
| 32. Patrick.                                |   |

The above list, although enlarged beyond what was thought necessary in the other catenæ, is by no means intended to comprise all who might be adduced. On the contrary, such are omitted (although of repute in their generation,) as belonged to the one

or other school, *e. g.* that of Archbishop Land, and so were hardly independent witnesses. There is also a set of writers who, perhaps, can scarcely be brought under one head, who appear to have held *implicitly* the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, although the circumstances of the age in which they lived, or their own habits of mind, may have prevented their declaring it so *explicitly* as to enable one to place them in the primary list of witnesses. Of some (as Archbishop Sharpe, Bishop Cleaver, Dr. John Scott, Pelling, and others,) the language seemed almost definite enough to entitle them to be ranked in that list; yet it seemed best to omit them, in order to avoid all appearance of anxiety to press their words beyond their true meaning, or to make our Anglican Church look more primitive than she has really been. The real point of difference between the primitive Church and modern views, is whether there be in this oblation a mystery or no; and this, doubtless, many have believed, who, from the unfavourable circumstances of their times, had scarcely developed that belief even to themselves. All however, even those who held the doctrine in its lowest degree, are witnesses thus far, that they who held it most deeply would not have held it thus deeply, or have been formed in that depth, in a Church which had not held the doctrine, or so referred her sons to primitive antiquity, and they whose tenure of it seems almost questionable, obviously would not have held it at all. A mere Protestant body could not have given rise even to the lowest statements of this last set. The doctrine must exist; otherwise they would never have been compelled to receive it into their mind, in whatever degree they did entertain it. Their having to weigh it, prove it, even their labouring to adjust it to their own minds, in as far as they did not conform their own minds to it, is a fact and a testimony, independent of the conclusions, often very undecided, floating between the higher and the lower view of the doctrine, to which they ultimately arrived. It bears witness to the real substantial existence of the doctrine, offering and proposing itself and seeking entrance, even though, by many, it may, at last, have been inadequately admitted.

JEWELL, BISHOP.—*Defence of the Apology*. Part II.

But you Protestants (ye say) have no external Sacrifice, and therefore ye have no Church at all. It pitieth me, M. Harding, to see the vanity of your dealing. Have we no external Sacrifice, say you? I beseech you, what Sacrifice did Christ or His Apostles ever command that we have refused? Leave your misty clouds, and generalities of words, and speak it plainly, that ye may seem to say some truth.

We have the Sacrifice of Prayer, the Sacrifice of Alms deeds, the Sacrifice of Praise, the Sacrifice of Thanksgiving, and the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST. We are taught to present our own bodies, as a pure, and a holy, and a well pleasing Sacrifice unto God, and to offer up unto Him the burning oblation of our lips. These (saith St. Paul) are the Sacrifices wherewith God is pleased. These be the Sacrifices of the Church of God. Whosoever hath these, we cannot say he is void of Sacrifice. Howbeit, if we speak of a Sacrifice propitiatory for the satisfaction of sins, we have none other but only CHRIST JESUS, the Son of God upon His Cross. "He is that sacrificed Lamb of God, that hath taken away the sins of the world."

You will say, ye offer not up Christ really unto God His Father. No, M. Harding, neither we nor you can so offer Him: nor did CHRIST ever give you commission to make such Sacrifice. And this is it, wherewith you so foully beguile the simple. CHRIST offereth and presenteth us unto His Father. "For by Him we have access to the throne of grace." But no creature is able to offer Him. CHRIST JESUS upon His cross was a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedeck. "As for our part," St. Augustine saith, "Christ hath given us to celebrate in His Church, an image or token of that Sacrifice for the remembrance of His Passion." Again he saith, "After CHRIST's ascension into heaven, the Flesh and Blood of this Sacrifice is continued by a Sacrament of remembrance." Eusebius saith, "We burn a Sacrifice unto God, the remembrance of that great Sacrifice upon the cross, and CHRIST commanded us to offer up a remembrance of His death, instead of a Sacrifice." It were an



infinite labour to report all that may be said. To be short, St. Hierome saith, turning himself unto CHRIST: "Then shalt Thou, O CHRIST, receive Sacrifice, either when Thou offerest up Thyself for us unto Thy Father," (which was only upon the cross,) "or else, when Thou receivest of us praises and thanksgiving."

All these things are true, M. Harding: you cannot deny them. . . . God's name be blessed for ever, we want neither Church nor Priesthood, nor any kind of Sacrifice, that CHRIST hath left unto His faithful.—pp. 130, 1.

St. Cyprian saith, "We offer our LORD's cup mixed with wine." But he saith not as you say, "We offer up the Son of God substantially and really unto His Father." Take away only that blasphemy wherewith you have deceived the world: and then talk of mingling the cup, and of the Sacrifice, while ye list. St. Cyprian saith, "We offer the LORD's cup," meaning thereby, the wine contained in the cup. So likewise St. Augustine saith: "The Church offereth up the Sacrifice of bread and wine." If there be any darkness in this manner of speech, both St. Cyprian and St. Augustine have plainly expounded their meaning. St. Cyprian, in the same Epistle before alleged, saith thus: "The cup is offered in remembrance of CHRIST: by the wine CHRIST's Blood is shewed, or signified: therefore wine is used, that by wine we may understand the LORD's Blood: water only without wine, cannot express the Blood of CHRIST: in the water we understand the people: in the wine CHRIST's Blood is represented: in all our Sacrifices, we work the memory of CHRIST's passion: the Sacrifice that we offer, is the Passion of our LORD." Thus much St. Cyprian in the same epistle. St. Augustine saith, "In this Sacrifice is a Thanksgiving, and a remembrance of the Flesh of CHRIST, that He hath offered for us, and of the Blood of CHRIST that He shed for us." Thus saith St. Cyprian: thus saith St. Augustine: thus say the old godly learned fathers of the Church of Christ.—p. 140.

*Id.—Replie unto M. Harding's Answer.*

But M. Harding saith: "The Sacrifice of the Church is not thanksgiving, as our new masters teach us." Certainly our Sacri-

fice is the very Body of CHRIST, and that for ever, according to the order of Melchizedeck, evermore standing in God's presence, and evermore obtaining pardon for us: not offered up by us, but offering us up unto God the Father. For the same, it is our part to offer unto God our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. And this is the doctrine, not only of them whom it liketh M. Harding to call new masters, but also of the oldest and most Catholic Doctors of the Church. And to allege one instead of many, St. Augustine hereof writeth thus: "In these fleshly Sacrifices (of the Jews) there was a figure of the Flesh, that CHRIST afterward would offer: but in this Sacrifice of the Church, there is a thanksgiving, and a remembrance of that Flesh, which CHRIST hath already offered for us." If M. Harding will happily refuse St. Augustine, as mistrusted for one of these new masters; yet he may not well refuse his own Mass Book. There he himself even at his Mass is taught to say: "We that do offer up to Thee this Sacrifice of praise."—p. 267.

True it is, the ministration of the holy Communion is oftentimes of the old learned fathers called a Sacrifice: not for that they thought the Priest had authority to sacrifice the Son of God, but for that therein we offer up unto God thanks and praises for that great Sacrifice once made upon the cross. So saith St. Augustine: "In this Sacrifice is a thanksgiving, and a remembrance of the flesh of Christ, which He hath offered for us." So Nazianzenus calleth the holy Communion, "A Figure of that great mystery of the death of CHRIST." This it is that Eusebius calleth, "The Sacrifice of the LORD's table:" which also he calleth: "The Sacrifice of praise."—pp. 415, 6.

Chrysostom showeth in what sense other ancient fathers used this word, Sacrifice, and also utterly overthroweth M. Harding's whole purpose touching the same. For, as he saith, "we offer up the same Sacrifice that CHRIST offered," so in most plain wise, and by sundry words, he removeth all doubt, and declareth in what sort and meaning we offer it. He saith not, as M. Harding saith, "We offer up the Son of GOD unto His Father, and that verily and indeed:" but contrariwise thus he saith, "We offer indeed, but in remembrance of His death This Sacrifice is an

example of that Sacrifice. This that we do, is done in remembrance of that, that was done. We offer up the same that CHRIST offered : or rather we work the remembrance of that Sacrifice." Thus we offer up Christ, that is to say, an example, a commemoration, a remembrance of the death of CHRIST. This kind of Sacrifice was never denied : but M. Harding's real Sacrifice was never yet proved.—pp. 424.

BILSON, BISHOP.—*Of Subjection and Rebellion.*

Philander (Romanist). All the fathers with one consent stand on our side for the Sacrifice.

Theophilus (Anglican). You be now where you would be ; and where the Fathers seem to fit your feet. But if your Sacrifice be convinced to be nothing less than Catholic or consequent to the Prophets', Apostles', or Fathers' doctrine, what say you then to your vanity in alleging, if not impiety, in abusing so many Fathers and Scriptures to prop up your follies ? . . . Let it therefore first appear what they teach touching the Sacrifice of the LORD's table, and what we admit : and then it will soon be seen which of us twain hath departed from them. The Fathers with one consent call not your private Mass, that they never knew, but the LORD's Supper a Sacrifice, which we both willingly grant and openly teach : so their text, not your gloze may prevail. For there, besides the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which we must then offer to GOD for our redemption and other His graces bestowed on us in CHRIST His Son : besides the dedication of our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, quick, and holy Sacrifice to serve and please Him : besides the contributions and alms there given in the Primitive Church for the relief of the poor and other good uses : a Sacrifice no doubt very acceptable to God : I say besides these three sundry sorts of offerings incident to the LORD's table, the very Supper itself is a public memorial of that great and dreadful Sacrifice, I mean, of the death and blood-shedding of our SAVIOUR. . . . The visible Sacrifice of bread and wine, representing the LORD's death, St. Augustine enforceth in these words : . . . (vid. sup. Jewell, p. 61). With him agreeth Irenæus : " Christ, willing his disciples to offer

unto God the firstfruits of His creatures, . . . took the creature of bread and gave thanks, saying, This is my body. And likewise He confessed the cup which is a creature amongst us, to be His Blood, teaching the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offereth to God throughout the world." . . .

This oblation of bread and wine for a thanksgiving to God, and a memorial of His Son's death, was so confessed and undoubted a truth in the Church of CHRIST, till your Schoolmen began to wrest both Scriptures and Fathers to serve their quiddities, that not only the Liturgies under the names of Clemens, Basil, and Chrysostom do mention it: ("We offer to Thee our KING and God this bread and this cup, according to Thy Son's institution: *tua ex tuis offerimus tibi, Domine*, we offer Thee, O LORD, these Thy gifts of Thine own creatures") . . . ; but also the very Missals used in your own Churches at this day do confirm the same. These be the words of your own Offertory: "Receive, Holy Father, God Everlasting, this undefiled Host; which I, Thine unworthy servant, offer to Thee my KING and true God. . . . We offer to Thee, O LORD, this cup of salvation, intreating Thy goodness that it may be taken up into Thy sight, as a sweet smell for the saving of us and the whole world. Receive, blessed Trinity, this oblation, which we offer to Thee, in remembrance of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of CHRIST JESUS our LORD. We humbly beseech Thee, most merciful Father, through JESUS CHRIST Thy Son our LORD, that Thou accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy undefiled Sacrifices, which we offer to Thee first for Thy Church, holy and Catholic," &c. . . .

Certainly you speak these words long before you repeat CHRIST's institution. . . . What then offer you in this place? CHRIST, or the creatures of bread and wine? By your own doctrine CHRIST is not present, neither any change made till these words, "This is my body," "this is my blood," be pronounced: ergo, before consecration, the creatures of bread and wine keep their proper and earthly substance, when notwithstanding yourselves offer them to God in your masses for the remission of your sins,

redemption of your souls, and to profit the quick and the dead by that oblation. You teach the people that nothing is offered by the priest to God the Father for remission of sins, but CHRIST His Son: your mass, where this should be done, convinceth that you sacrifice not CHRIST, but the creatures of bread and wine. Be you not more than blind which see not that the prayers which you daily frequent refute that Sacrifice which you falsely pretend?

PHIL. As though the ancient Fathers did not also say that CHRIST himself is daily offered in the Church.

THEOPH. Not in the substance, which is your error, but in signification, which is their doctrine and ours. Take their interpretation with their words, and they make nothing for your local and external offering of CHRIST. "Was not CHRIST," saith Austin, "once sacrificed in Himself? and yet in a Sacrament is He offered for the benefit of the people, not every Paschal feast only, but every day." . . . Mark well the words of Cyprian, "The passion of the LORD is the Sacrifice which we offer:"—of Ambrose, "Our High Priest is He that offered (on the cross) a Sacrifice to cleanse us; the very same we offer now; which being then offered cannot be consumed, this sacrifice is a sampler of that, we offer that very Sacrifice for ever:"—of Eusebius, "CHRIST after all things (ended), offered a wonderful oblation, and most excellent Sacrifice (on the cross) for the salvation of us all, and gave us a memory thereof instead of a Sacrifice. We therefore offer the remembrance of that great Sacrifice in the mysteries which He delivered us:"—of Chrysostom, "Bringing these mysteries we stop the mouths of those that ask, how we prove that CHRIST was sacrificed (on the cross). For if JESUS were not slain, whose sign and token is this sacrifice?"—of Austin, "We sacrifice to God in that only manner in which He commanded we should offer to Him at the revealing of the New Testament: the flesh and blood of this Sacrifice was yielded in very truth when CHRIST was put to death: after His ascension it is now solemnized by a sacrament of memory."—pp. 687—691.

In this very sense CHRIST is offered daily. Chrysostom: "Do we not offer every day? we do: but a memorial of His death. We do not offer another sacrifice, but ever the same or rather

we continue the remembrance of that Sacrifice." Ambrose: . . . "It is a memorial of our redemption." Eusebius: "CHRIST offered a wonderful sacrifice for the salvation of us all, and we have received a memorial of that most sacred oblation to be performed at the LORD's table according to the rule of the New Testament." Augustine: "CHRIST is our High Priest after the order of Melchisedec, which yielded Himself a slain sacrifice for our sins, and gave us a similitude and image of that oblation to be celebrated for a remembrance of His passion, insomuch that we may see that, which Melchisedec offered to God, now sacrificed in the Church of CHRIST throughout the world." . . . Theophylact: "Do we then offer unbloody sacrifices? No doubt we do, by being a remembrance of the LORD's death. He was once offered, and yet we offer Him always, or rather we celebrate the memorial of that oblation, when He sacrificed Himself (on the cross)."

Receive this addition which they make; and we grant you that oblation, which they teach. "CHRIST is offered, or rather a memorial of His death and oblation is celebrated." This later correction doth expound and interpret their former assertion. You can require no plainer, nor sounder doctrine. . . . They did offer an "unbloody sacrifice, not of flesh but of spirit and mind," "the selfsame which Melchisedec did" two thousand years before CHRIST took flesh, and therefore not the flesh of CHRIST: "a figurative sacrifice," to wit, "signs, samples, similitudes, and memorials of His death and bloodshedding." So that "CHRIST is offered daily but mystically," not covered with qualities and quantities of bread and wine; for those be neither mysteries nor resemblances to the death of CHRIST: but by the bread which is broken, by the wine which is drunk, in substance, creatures; in signification, sacraments; the LORD's death is figured, and proposed to the communicants, and they, for their parts, no less people than priests, do present CHRIST hanging on the cross to God the Father, with a lively faith, inward devotion, and humble prayer, as a most sufficient and everlasting Sacrifice for the full remission of their sins, and assured fruition of His mercies. Other actual and propitiatory Sacrifice than this the Church of CHRIST never had, never taught.

You believe not me. Well, what if your own fellows and friends teach the same? What if the Master of your Sentences, what if the glosser of your Decrees, what if the ringleader of your Schoolmen, make with us in this question, and evince that, for twelve hundred years after CHRIST, your Sacrifice was not known to the world: will you give the people leave to bethink themselves better, before they call you or account you Catholics? Then hear what they say: Peter Lombard, in his 4th Book and 12th Distinction, "I demand whether that which the priest doth be properly called a Sacrifice or an oblation, and whether CHRIST be daily offered, or else were offered only once. To this our answer is brief: that which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a Sacrifice and oblation, because it is a memory and representation of the true Sacrifice and holy oblation made on the altar of the cross. Also CHRIST died once on the cross, and there was He offered Himself, but He is offered daily in a sacrament, because in the sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was done once." Now what this meaneth, CHRIST is offered in a sacrament, we need no fairer interpretation than that which your own gloss often repeateth; "CHRIST is offered in a sacrament;" that is, His offering is represented, and a memory of His passion celebrated. "It is the same oblation which He made;" that is, a representation of the same passion. "CHRIST is offered every day mystically;" that is, the oblation which CHRIST made for us is represented in the sacrament of His Body and Blood.

With this concurreth Thomas of Aquine. "Because the celebration of this sacrament is a certain image of CHRIST's passion, it may conveniently be called the sacrificing of CHRIST. The celebration of this sacrament is termed the immolating of CHRIST in two respects; first for that, as Austin saith, resemblances are wont to be called by the names of those things whose resemblances they are; next, for that by this sacrament we be made partakers of the fruit of the LORD's Passion." Here find you no real, local, nor external offering of CHRIST to GOD His Father by the priest for the sins of the people; which is your opinion at this day; you find that the celebration of the LORD's Supper may be called an oblation; first, for that it is a representation of CHRIST's

death, and sacraments have the names of the things which they signify; next, because the merits and fruits of CHRIST'S Passion are by the power of His Spirit, divided and bestowed on the faithful receivers of these mysteries.—pp. 692—694.

PHIL. You grant the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, which your fellows will be angry with you for.

THEOPH. Neither they, nor I, ever denied the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice. The very name informeth it to be "the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," which is the true and lively Sacrifice of the New Testament.—p. 699.

PHIL. Why then refuse you the Fathers expressing their opinion of this Sacrifice?

THEOPH. Nay, why do you abuse their words, to support your errors: and wheresoever you find the names of Sacrifice and oblation in them referred to the LORD'S Supper, why allege you the places with such confidence as if the Fathers were at your commandment: to mean nothing but your real sacrificing the Son of GOD under the forms of bread and wine?

PHIL. What other meaning could they have?

THEOPH. I have already showed you by their own writings what other meaning they had.—p. 700.

HOOKE, PRESBYTER AND DOCTOR.—*Ecclesiastical Polity*,  
book v. § 67.

The disciples, when CHRIST appeared to them in a far more strange and miraculous manner, moved no questions, but rejoiced greatly in what they saw. . . . If then the presence of CHRIST with them did so much move, judge what their thoughts and affections were at the time of this new presentation of CHRIST, not before their eyes, but within their souls. They had learned before that His flesh and blood are the true cause of eternal life; that this they are not by the bare force of their own substance, but through the dignity and worth of His person, which offered them up by way of Sacrifice for the life of the whole world, and doth make them still effectual thereunto: finally, that to us they are life in particular, by being particularly received. Thus much



they knew, although as yet they understood not perfectly to what effect or issue the same would come, till at the length being assembled for no other cause which they would imagine but to have eaten the Passover only, that Moses appointed, when they saw their LORD and MASTER, with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, first bless and consecrate, for the endless good of all generations till the world's end, the chosen elements of bread and wine; which elements, made for ever the instruments of life by virtue of His Divine benediction, they being the first that were commanded to receive from Him, the first which were warranted by His promise, that not only unto them at the present time, but to whomsoever they and their successors after them did duly administer the same, those mysteries should serve as conducts of life, and conveyances of His Body and Blood unto them; was it possible they should hear that voice, *Take, eat, this is My body: drink ye all of this, this is My blood*; possible, that doing what was required, and believing what was promised, the same should have present effect in them, and not fill them with a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which they saw in themselves? . . . These things considered, how should a virtuously disposed mind better resolve with itself than thus? . . . . *they are things wonderfull which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb, and made joyfull in the strength of this new wine: this bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold; this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body; in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins, as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving. . . .*

OVERALL, BISHOP<sup>1</sup>.

“ Sufficient Sacrifice—of that His precious Blood.”] This word refers to the Sacrifice mentioned before, for we still con-

<sup>1</sup> “ MS. Notes written in an interleaved Common Prayer Book, printed in the year 1619, supposed to be made from the Collections of Bishop Overall, by a friend or chaplain of his.”—*Additional Notes on the Common Prayer in Nicholls's Commentary.*

tinue and commemorate that Sacrifice which CHRIST once made upon the Cross : and this Sacrifice which the Church makes, as a Sacrifice is taken *pro maculatione et occisione victimæ*, is only Commemorative and Sacramental ; for in that sense CHRIST only offered it really upon the Cross by His own death : and so likewise, as it is taken for a visible Sacrifice, CHRIST only offered it ; for here it is invisible : but as it is taken for a sufficient Sacrifice to take away the sins of the world, so indeed it was offered upon the Cross, as having power in itself to abolish all sin whatsoever ; but it does not abolish any man's sins for all that, unless it be applied.

And the ways to apply it are divers, by Faith, by good Works, by the unbloody offering up of the same Sacrifice, by the receiving of His most precious Body and Blood.

For if we compare the Eucharist with the Sacrifice once made upon the Cross, with reference to the killing or destroying of the Sacrifice, or with reference to the visibility of it, in that sense we call it only a Commemorative Sacrifice, as the Fathers do. *Chrys. Hom. contr. Jud. part 2. Sentent. lib. 4. dist. 12.* But if we compare the Eucharist with CHRIST'S Sacrifice made once upon the Cross, as concerning the effect of it, we say that that was a *sufficient* Sacrifice ; but withal that it is a true, real, and *Efficient* Sacrifice, and both of them propitiatory for the sins of the whole world. And therefore in the Oblation following, we pray that it may prevail so with GOD, as that we and all the whole Church of CHRIST (which consists of more than those that are upon the earth) may receive the benefit of it. Neither do we call this Sacrifice of the Eucharist an *Efficient* Sacrifice, as if that upon the Cross wanted efficacy ; but because the force and virtue of that Sacrifice would not be profitable unto us, unless it were applied and brought into effect by this Eucharistical Sacrifice, and other the holy Sacraments, and means appointed by GOD for that end : but we call it propitiatory both this and that, because they have both force and virtue in them to appease GOD'S wrath against this sinful world.—Read *Mald. de Sac. p. 323.* Therefore this is no new Sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every day offered to GOD by CHRIST in heaven, and continueth here still on earth, by a mystical repre-

sentation of it in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new propitiation, or new remission of sins obtained, but to make that effectual, and in act applied unto us, which was once obtained by the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross. Neither is the Sacrifice of the Cross, as it was once offered up there, *modo cruento*, so much remembered in the Eucharist, though it be commemorated, as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering of it by CHRIST now in Heaven in His everlasting Priesthood, and thereupon was, and should be still the *juge Sacrificium* observed here on earth as it is in Heaven, the reason which the ancient Fathers had for their daily Sacrifice. *S. Chrysost. in 10 Heb. . . S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. 10. cap. 20. . . —p. 46.*

“O LORD and heavenly FATHER.”] In King Edward’s first Service-book, this Prayer was set before the delivery of the Sacrament to the people, and followed immediately after the Consecration; and certainly, it was the better and more natural order of the two; neither do I know whether it were the printer’s negligence, or no, thus to displace it: for the Consecration of the Sacrament being ever the first, it was always the use in all Liturgies, to have the Oblation follow (which is this), and then the Participation which goes before, and after all the Thanksgiving, which is here set before the *Gloria in Excelsis*; in regard whereof, I have always observed my lord and master Dr. Overall, to use this Oblation in its right place, when he had consecrated the Sacrament to make an offering of it (as being the true public Sacrifice of the Church) unto GOD, that by the merits of CHRIST’s death, which was now commemorated, all the Church of GOD might receive mercy, &c. as in this Prayer; and when that was done, he did communicate the people, and so end with the Thanksgiving following hereafter. If men would consider the nature of this Sacrament, how it is the Christian’s Sacrifice also, they could not choose but use it so too; for as it stands here it is out of its place. We ought first to send up CHRIST unto GOD, and then He will send Him down unto us.

“This our Sacrifice of praise,” &c.] So the ancient Fathers were wont to call this Sacrifice, *Sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis*; not exclusively, as if it were no other Sacrifice but that; for they called it also, *Sacrificium commemorationis*, and

*Sacrificium Spiritus*, and *Sacrificium obsequii*, &c.; and which is more, *Sacrificium verum et propitiatorium*: all other ways but this the Eucharist, or any other Sacrifice we make, are improperly, and *secundum quandam similitudinem*, called Sacrifices. The true and proper nature of a Sacrifice is, to be an oblation of some real and sensible thing made only to GOD, for the acknowledging of man's subjection to GOD, and of His supreme dominion over man, made by a lawful minister, and performed by certain mysterious rites and ceremonies, which CHRIST and His Church have ordained. . . . Therefore as there never was, nor could be any religion without a GOD; so there never was, nor could be any without a Sacrifice, being one of the chiefest acts whereby we profess our religion to Him that we serve. . . .

Therefore because the chief end of every Sacrifice was to acknowledge GOD's majesty and dominion over the world; hence it is, that every act almost which did but show *that*, was called in Scripture a Sacrifice in analogy to the other. As I. &c. . . Now the Eucharist, though by way of analogy it may be called a Sacrifice many of these ways, yet the true and real nature of it in the Offertory, is to acknowledge GOD's Majesty and our misery, and to appease His wrath towards us, to get blessings from Him, to make CHRIST's bloody Sacrifice effectual unto us. . . .

The people may offer it up all the improper ways, none but the Priest can offer it as a proper Sacrifice.

So that though it may analogically be called a Sacrifice most of the seven ways, yet formally and truly it may be called a Sacrifice also, in the very natural signification of a Sacrifice, for aught I know any harm should come on't: not in strictness and rigour of speech, for so was there never a Sacrifice, nor never shall be any, but CHRIST's alone.—See the Exposition of the place in Malachi *apud Maldon. de Euch.* p. 326. and of Psal. 110. *Tu es Sacerdos*, &c. both which the ancient Fathers with one consent understand of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, and the Priests of the Gospel.

“That by the merits and death of Thy Son JESUS CHRIST, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church,” &c.] This is a plain Oblation of CHRIST's death once offered, and a re-

presentative Sacrifice of it, for the sins, and for the benefit of the whole world, of the whole Church; that both those which are here on earth, and those that rest in the sleep of peace, being departed in the faith of CHRIST, may find the effect and virtue of it. And if the authority of the ancient Church may prevail with us, as it ought to do, there is nothing more manifest than that it always taught as much: and it is no absurdity to say, here is an oblation made for all, when it is not only commemorated to have been once offered, but solemn prayers are here also added, and a request made, that it may be effectual to all. *S. Chrys. 18 Matt. . . Hom. 72 in Joh. . .* And in this sense it is not only an Eucharistical, but a Propitiatory Sacrifice: and to prove it a Sacrifice propitiatory, always so acknowledged by the ancient Church, there can be no better argument than that it was offered up, not only for the living but for the dead, and for those that were absent, for them that travelled, for Jews, for heretics, &c. who could have no other benefit of it, but as it was a propitiatory Sacrifice: and that thus they did offer it, read a whole army of Fathers, *apud Mald. de Sac. p. 342. Nos autem ita comparati sumus, ut cum tam nullis et magnis auctoribus errare malimus quam cum Puritanis verum dicere.* Not that it makes any propitiation as that of the Cross did, but only that it obtains and brings into act that propitiation which was once made by CHRIST; and so we may speak of prayer, for that is propitiatory too. Why should we then make any controversy about this? . . .—pp. 49, 50.

“ Upon the Holidays, if there be no Communion, shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion until,” &c.] By all that follows it appears, that the mind of the Church of England was and is to have a Communion and Commemorative Sacrifice of CHRIST’s death, every day that the people will but come to it, and make up a sufficient number.

“ And there shall be no Celebration, &c. except there be a great number.”] This was made against the *Solitariae Missæ*, that the Papists are now-a-days content withal. It was an abuse springing up about Charlemain’s time (it seems) to have the Priest communicate and say mass, though there were none to celebrate with him. Therefore the Council of Nice then made a Canon

against it. *Nullus Presbyter solus Missam cantare valet rectè, ut nobis videtur. Quomodo enim dicet, Dominus vobiscum? &c.* They say yet, *ut nobis videtur*; fain would they have had the abuse amended, and yet the Communion not neglected for all that. They knew not well whether they should forbid it absolutely and simply, if there were no company; as indeed better were it to endure the absence of the people, than for the Minister to neglect the usual and daily Sacrifice of the Church, by which all people, whether they be there or no, reap so much benefit.

And this was the opinion of my lord and master Dr. Overall.  
—p. 53.

FIELD, PRESBYTER.—*Of the Church. Appendix to Book iii.*

Amongst all the Sacraments of this Church, that is the principal, saith Durandus, that is celebrated upon the table of the most holy Altar. . . . These mysteries, and this holy Sacrament Christ then instituted, when He made His new and last testament, disposing to His heirs a kingdom, as His Father had disposed to Him, that upon His table they might eat and drink in His kingdom, that which the Church hath consecrated, for as they were at supper, JESUS took bread, &c. . . . The Apostles, following this institution, began to celebrate these mysteries for the same end that Christ had expressed, keeping the same form in words, and using the same matter of bread and wine that He did, as the Apostle witnesseth to the Corinthians, when he saith, What I have received of the LORD I have delivered unto you, Who the same night, &c. . . and added to the form of words used by CHRIST, the LORD's Prayer. And St. Peter is said, in this sort, to have celebrated first of all in the East parts. Wherefore, in the beginnings of the Church, these mysteries were celebrated in another sort than since they have been. . . . And it is not to be doubted, but that the ancient forms as different from the latter, were more pure and sincere than they that are now used.—pp. 188, 9.

. . . For otherwise the very form and words of the Liturgy condemn the abuse of private masses and half communion, and make nothing for that propitiatory sacrifice, whereof the Papists fable,

which are those greatest mysteries of Romish religion, that they insist upon in their Mass.

“Touching the first of these parts of Romish religion, which is that of their private masses, wherein the Priest receiveth alone without any communicants; making the people believe, that that which he doth is a propitiatory sacrifice, and that he can apply the benefit of it to whom he will, and that it is enough for them to be present, or to give something for the procuring of it; their error is clearly refuted by the form of prayers that are used in the Mass. . . . Whatsoever the neglect or abuses were, it is evident by the composition of the Canon, that the mystical action, in which the Canon was used, was public, and that there were always some present that offered the sacrifice of praise together with the Priest, and participated of the sacrament, as the words do plainly show.—pp. 190—192.

Wherefore, from this point of Romish religion. . . . let us come to the next, which is the propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. . . . First, therefore, I will make it appear, that the Canon of the Mass importeth no such sacrifice: and, secondly, I will show at large, that neither before nor after Luther’s appearing, the Church believed, or knew any such new real sacrificing of CHRIST, as is now imagined.

Touching the Canon of the Mass, it is true that therein there is often mention of sacrifice and oblation: but Luther professeth, that the words may be understood in such a sense, as is not to be disliked. . . . That the form of words used in the Canon are obscure in sundry parts of it, and hard to be understood even by the learned, Cassander confesseth. . . . The obscurity that is in it groweth, as he rightly observeth, partly out of the disuse and discontinuing of certain old observations, to which the words of the Canon, composed long since, have a reference, and partly from the using of the word Sacrifice in divers and different senses, though all connected: and the sudden passing from the using of it in one sense, to the using of it in another. It is not unknown to them that are learned, that in the primitive Church the people were wont to offer bread and wine, and that out of that which they offered, a part was consecrated, to become unto them the sacrament of the

Lord's body and blood, and other parts converted to other good and holy uses. Respectively to this ancient custom are those prayers concerned, that are named *Secretæ*; and the first part of the Canon, wherein we desire that God will accept those gifts, presents, offerings, and sacrifices which we bring unto Him, and that He will make them to become unto us the Body and Blood of His Son CHRIST, which only are that Sacrifice that procureth the remission of our sins, and our reconciliation and acceptation with God. So that to take away this obscurity, and that the words may have a true sense, the ancient custom must be brought back again, or at least it must be conceived that the elements of bread and wine, that are set upon the mystical table and are to be consecrated, are brought thither and offered in the name of the people, and that, as being their presents, they are symbols of that inward Sacrifice, whereby they dedicate and give themselves and all that they have unto God. Touching the second cause of the obscurity of the words of the Canon, which is the using of the word Sacrifice, and Offering in so manifold and different senses, and the sudden passing from the one of them to the other; we must observe, that by the name of Sacrifice, gift, or present, first, the oblation of the people is meant, that consisteth in bread and wine, brought and set upon the Lord's table. In which, again, two things are to be considered, the outward action, and that which is signified thereby, to wit, the people dedicating of themselves, and all that they have, to God by faith and devotion, and offering to Him the Sacrifice of praise. In this sense is the word Sacrifice used, in the former part of the Canon, as I have already showed. In respect of this is that prayer poured out to God, that He will be mindful of His servants, that do offer unto Him this Sacrifice of praise, that is, these outward things, in acknowledgment that all is of Him, that they had perished if He had not sent His Son to redeem them; that unless they eat the flesh and drink the blood of CHRIST, they have no life; that He hath instituted holy sacraments of His Body and Blood, under the forms of bread and wine, in which He will not only represent, but exhibit the same unto all such as hunger and thirst after righteousness; and, therefore, they desire Him



so to accept and sanctify these their oblations, of bread and wine, which in this sort they offer unto Him, that they may become unto them the Body and Blood of CHRIST, that so, partaking in them, they may be made partakers of CHRIST, and all the benefits of redemption and salvation, that He hath wrought. Secondly, by the name of Sacrifice is understood, the Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Body; wherein we must first consider the thing offered, and, secondly, the manner of offering. The thing that is offered is the Body of CHRIST, which is an eternal and perpetual propitiatory Sacrifice, in that it was once offered by death upon the cross, and hath an everlasting, never-failing force and efficacy. Touching the manner of offering CHRIST'S Body and Blood, we must consider that there is a double offering of a thing to GOD. First, so as men are wont to do that give something to GOD out of that they possess, professing that they will no longer be owners of it, but that it shall be His, and serve for such uses and employments as He shall convert it to. Secondly, a man may be said to offer a thing unto GOD, in that he bringeth it to His presence, setteth it before His eyes, and offereth it to His view, to incline Him to do something by the sight of it, and respect had to it. In this sort CHRIST offereth Himself and His Body once crucified daily in heaven: who intercedeth for us, not as giving it in the nature of a gift, or present, for He gave Himself to GOD once, to be holy unto Him for ever; not in the nature of a Sacrifice, for He died once for sin, and rose again, never to die any more; but in that He setteth it before the eyes of GOD His FATHER, representing it unto Him, and so offering it to His view, to obtain grace and mercy for us. And in this sort we also offer Him daily on the altar, in that, commemorating His death, and lively representing His bitter Passion, endured in His body upon the cross, we offer Him that was once crucified, and sacrificed for us on the cross, and all His sufferings, to the view and gracious consideration of the ALMIGHTY, earnestly desiring, and assuredly hoping, that He will incline to pity us, and show mercy unto us, for this His dearest Son's sake, who, in our nature for us, to satisfy His displeasure, and to procure us acceptation, endured such and so grievous things. This kind of

offering, or sacrificing CHRIST commemoratively, is twofold, inward and outward. Outward, as the taking, breaking, and distributing this mystical bread, and pouring out the cup of blessing, which is the communion of the blood of CHRIST. The inward consisteth in the faith and devotion of the Church and people of God, so commemorating the Death and Passion of CHRIST, their crucified SAVIOUR, and representing and setting it before the eyes of the ALMIGHTY, that they fly unto it as their only stay and refuge, and beseech Him to be merciful unto them for His sake that endured all these things, to satisfy His wrath, and work their peace and good. And in this sense, and answerable hereunto that is, which we find in the Canon, where the Church desireth ALMIGHTY GOD to accept those oblations of bread and wine which she presenteth unto Him; and to make them to become unto the faithful communicants the Body and Blood of CHRIST, Who the night before He was betrayed took bread, &c. . . . And then proceedeth and speaketh unto ALMIGHTY GOD in this sort: Wherefore, O LORD, we Thy servants, and Thy holy people, mindful of that most blessed Passion of the same CHRIST Thy Son our LORD, as also of His resurrection from the dead: and His glorious ascension into heaven, do offer to Thy divine Majesty, out of Thine own gifts consecrated, and by mystical blessing made unto us the Body and Blood of Thy Son CHRIST, a pure Sacrifice, a holy Sacrifice, and an undefiled Sacrifice; the holy bread of eternal life, and the cup of everlasting salvation;" that is, we offer to Thy view, and set before Thine eyes, the crucified body of CHRIST Thy Son, which is here present in mystery and Sacrament, and the Blood which He once shed for our sakes, which we know to be that pure, holy, undefiled, and eternal Sacrifice, wherewith only Thou art pleased; desiring Thee to be merciful unto us for the merit and worthiness thereof, and so to look upon the same Sacrifice, which representatively we offer to Thy view, as to accept it for a full discharge of us from our sins, and a perfect propitiation; that so Thou mayest behold us with a pleased, cheerful, and gracious countenance. This is the meaning of that prayer in the Canon; *supra quæ propitio et sereno*

*vultu respicere digneris, &c.* as the best interpreters of the Canon do tell us. . . .

There is nothing therefore found in the Canon of the Mass, rightly understood, that maketh anything for the new real offering of CHRIST to GOD His Father, as a propitiatory sacrifice to take away sins; neither did the Church of GOD at and before Luther's time, know or believe any such thing, though there were some in the midst of her, that so conceived of this mystery as the Romanists now do.—pp. 203—206.

This is the present doctrine of the Roman Church: but this was not the doctrine of the Church at the time of Luther's appearing: for the best and principal men then living, taught peremptorily that CHRIST is not newly offered any otherwise, than that He is offered to the view of GOD; nor any otherwise sacrificed, than in that His Sacrifice on the cross is commemorated and represented. "The things that are offered in the Sacrament are two, (saith the author of the *Enchiridion of Christian Religion*, published in the provincial Council of Cologne,) the true Body of CHRIST with all His merits, and His mystical Body, with all the gifts which it hath received of GOD. In that, therefore, the Church doth offer the true Body and Blood of CHRIST to GOD the FATHER, it is merely a representative Sacrifice, and all that is done is but the commemorating and representing of that Sacrifice which was once offered on the cross. But in that it dedicateth itself, which is the mystical body of CHRIST unto GOD, it is a true, but a spiritual Sacrifice, that is, an Eucharistical Sacrifice of praise, thanksgiving, and of obedience due unto GOD. CHRIST, therefore, is offered and sacrificed on the Altar, but sacramentally and mystically; in that in the Sacrament there is a commemoration and remembrance of that which was once done. . . ." The most reverend Canons of the Metropolitan Church of Cologne agree with the author of the *Enchiridion*. . . . In the book proposed by Charles V., written by certain learned and godly men, much commended to him by men worthy to be credited, as opening a way for the composing of the controversies in religion, we shall find the same explication of this point,

touching the Sacrifice that I have already delivered out of the former authors. . . . Hosius was of the same opinion with those before recited : . . . Michael, Bishop of Werspurge, a man learned, godly, and truly catholic. . . and with him agreeth another learned Bishop (Thomas Watson), sometime Bishop of Lincoln, in his Sermons upon the Seven Sacraments. . . . With these Gregorius Wicelius, a man much honoured by the Emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian, fully agreeth, defining the Mass to be a Sacrifice rememorative, and of praise and thanksgiving: and in another place he saith, the Mass is a commemoration of the passion of CHRIST celebrated in the public assembly of Christians, where many give thanks for the price of redemption. With these agreeth the Interim, published by Charles V. in the assembly of the States of the Empire, at Augusta, March 15th, 1548, and there accepted by the same States. But some man happily will say, here are many authorities alleged, to prove that sundry worthy Divines in the Roman Church, in Luther's time, denied the new real offering or sacrificing of CHRIST, and made the Sacrifice of the Altar to be only representative and commemorative, but before his time there were none found so to teach. Wherefore I will show the consent of the Church to have been clear for us, touching this point, before his time, and against the Tridentine doctrine now prevailing. . . . Wherefore that which Bellarmine hath, that Aquinas and the other Schoolmen, for the most part, do no otherwise say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is an immolation of CHRIST, but in that it is a representation of CHRIST's immolation on the cross, or because it hath like effect with that true and real sacrificing of CHRIST that implied His death, is most true; his evasion is found too silly, and it is made clear and evident that the best and worthiest amongst the guides of God's Church, before Luther's time, taught as we do, that the Sacrifice of the Altar is only the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and a mere representation and commemoration of the Sacrifice once offered on the cross, and, consequently, are all put under the curse, and anathematized by the Tridentine Council. . . .

Wherefore, to conclude this point, it appeareth by that which

hath been said, that neither the Canon of the Mass, rightly understood, includeth in it any such points of Romish religion, as some imagine, but in sundry, yea, in all the capital differences, between us and them of the Roman faction, witnesseth for us, and against them; and that the Prelates and guides of the Church formerly made no such construction of it, as now is made. . . . For the Canon of the Mass, rightly understood, is found to contain nothing in it contrary to the rule of faith, and the profession of the Protestant Churches; . . . and the construction that they now make of the word *sacrifice*, so often used in it, appeareth to be a mere perverting of the meaning of the Canon to a sinister sense, never intended by the authors of it, nor ever allowed by the best men in the Church. This Canon, notwithstanding, is found to have some passages, that, in the judgment of men rightly learned, cannot well have any true meaning, unless the old custom of offering bread and wine on the Lord's table, out of which the Sacrament may be consecrated, be restored; so that those parts, that custom being discontinued, may well be omitted. Some other parts are obscure, and need explication, which being added or inserted, it will differ little or nothing from those forms of consecration of those holy mysteries, that now are in use in the Reformed Churches of England, and some other places, therefore brought in because in later ages many things were added to the Canon anciently in use, which the best and gravest in the Church thought fit to be taken away, and a new form of divine service to be composed. So that the Church that formerly was having no different judgment touching matters dogmatical, no liking of those abuses in practice, which some had brought in, and wishing things to be brought to such a course as Protestants now have brought them, it may well be said to have been a Protestant Church, in such sort as I have formerly shewed.—pp. 210—221.

Yet let us see what it is that this grave censurer reprehendeth. for first, as he saith. . . we have no altar. . . we admit no sacrifice. . . . For answer whereunto, I say briefly, (for he deserveth no large answer) that we have altars in the same sort the Fathers had, though we have thrown down Popish altars: that we

admit the Eucharist to be rightly named a Sacrifice, though we detest the blasphemous construction the Papists make of it.— p. 761.

BUCKERIDGE, BISHOP.—*Discourse concerning Kneeling at the Communion*<sup>1</sup>.

The first reason then is this: It is *Pars cultus Dei*, a part of divine worship; in which sense I understand not the worship of GOD in a large sense, for every act that concurrerth in the worship of GOD; but in a more near and proper sense, as it doth exhibit and offer up somewhat to GOD. . . Now the Sacrament is a part of GOD's worship. . . in which, as GOD offereth to us His Son in His Death and Passion, and the graces of the Holy Spirit, so we offer to Him ourselves.

In Baptism . . . we offer up ourselves and our children to be sons of GOD by grace. . . The like is done in the Eucharist . . . we there give and offer up our whole selves a holy and living Sacrifice acceptable to GOD, which is our reasonable service of Him. . . In which respect the Fathers call this Sacrament *Latreiam*, divine worship.—“ While we do show the death of the Only Begotten Son of GOD, that is, JESUS CHRIST, and His resurrection from the dead, and His assumption into heaven, we profess to perform the unbloody worship of GOD in the Church” . . . so saith St. Cyril. And St. Augustine saith:—“ We do owe to GOD that service, which in Greek is called divine worship, either in certain sacraments or in ourselves.” Again, “ The oblation of Sacrifice pertaineth *ad cultum latreie*, to divine worship.” And again; “ Sacrifice is divine worship.” And again; “ Infants know not that which is set upon the altar, and performed in the celebration of piety:” where this Sacrament is called “ piety.”

As, in the law, circumcision did consecrate and seal the seed of Abraham to GOD; and the Passover did prepare them to the sacrifice of GOD in the wilderness; yea, and this Passover is called *Religio*, Religion; “ what is this service?” Exod. xii. 26. and *Victima transitus Domini*, ver. 27. “ the Sacrifice of the LORD's

<sup>1</sup> Subjoined to a Sermon preached before his Majesty at Whitehall, March 22nd, 1617, touching prostration and kneeling in the worship of GOD. 1618.

Passover." And Exod. xiii. 10. *Custodies hujusmodi cultum*, " thou shalt observe this ordinance, or form of worship : " so in the Gospel, Baptism doth regenerate and consecrate us to GOD ; and the Eucharist doth offer us up in sacrifice to Him. And this Sacrament may better be called an act of religion or piety, and the Sacrifice of the LORD'S Passover, since that was *typus agni Paschalis*, a type of the Paschal lamb, and here are offered *membra agni Paschalis*, the members of the Paschal lamb.

And this offering up of ourselves to Him, is indeed the true and daily Sacrifice of the Christian Church, which being the mystical body of CHRIST, cannot offer CHRIST'S natural Body, which CHRIST offered once for all upon the Cross ; but offereth His mystical body, that is herself, by CHRIST her High Priest and Head, unto GOD, as St. Peter saith (1 Peter ii. 5.), of which I shall speak more in the next reason.—pp. 38—44.

The second reason, it is *Sacrificium*, or *congeries Sacrificiorum*, a Sacrifice, or rather a collection and gathering together, a sum or epitome of all the Sacrifices of Christianity. And Sacrifice was ever to be offered with all humility of soul and body, and therefore with kneeling, the true gesture and representation of humility.

I would not be mistaken, as if I spake in favour of any external daily Sacrifice of the Church, such as the Jews had in time of the law ; for the one Sacrifice of CHRIST, once offered upon the Cross, hath made a full and perfect redemption, and needs no new Sacrifice, nor reiteration of the old to perfect it. . . .

The Church, according to CHRIST'S commandment, keeps the memory of this offering in this Sacrament : " Do this in remembrance of Me : " but she doth not reiterate the action, or take upon her to offer the body of CHRIST : . . . In which respect I cannot sufficiently marvel at Bellarmine's subtilty, that will have this Sacrament to be an external proper Sacrifice, not only as the name Sacrifice doth signify *rem sacrificatam*, the thing sacrificed, that is, CHRIST crucified, which is there truly given and received ; but also as it doth signify *actionem sacrificii*, or *sacrificandi*, the action of sacrifice : so that the action of CHRIST'S Sacrifice on the Cross, and of the Priest's in the Host, must be one and the same action. . . .

And as absurd is his other conceit, that one and the same action should be *res et repræsentatio rei*, the thing and the representation of the thing. . . . Surely in this conceit Bellarmine is a plain sophister, and no logician ; for he doth instance only in this particular of this Sacrament, that it is the representation of CHRIST'S Sacrifice upon the Cross, as CHRIST and all antiquity call it ; and the very Sacrifice itself or action of the Sacrifice ; . . . so that, if the Sacrament be the representation of the true, proper, and external Sacrifice of the Church, then it cannot be the Sacrifice itself.

And the truth is, that the Church hath ever offered true sacrifices, and that in this Sacrament ; but, as St. Peter speaketh, they be *hostiæ spirituales*, " spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable unto GOD, *per Jesum Christum*, by JESUS CHRIST : " so the Church offereth her daily spiritual Sacrifice, not *Jesum*, but *per Jesum Christum*, not JESUS CHRIST, (He only hath power to offer Himself,) but by JESUS CHRIST her High Priest, by whom they are presented unto, and accepted of GOD. But although this Sacrifice be not an external proper Sacrifice, as our adversaries would make it, yet it hath in it spiritual Sacrifices of divers sorts, all which require all humility of soul and body in the offerers. For to say nothing of the elements, that were in all times and ages brought by the people *in sportulis*, in little baskets, and so in a sort offered up to be consecrated for the uses of the congregation, which is now done by public charge ; there are besides divers other spiritual Sacrifices in the whole action of the ministration of this Sacrament.

First then, as the sacrifices of the law had a double respect ; first, as they were offered up to GOD ; secondly, as they were communicated and eaten by those men that offered them : so this Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper, which contains a commemoration of CHRIST'S one and only all-sufficient Sacrifice, consummated upon the Cross, and never more to be reiterated by any man, hath the same double respect in it ; and therefore as it is represented to GOD by our consecration, so it may well be called *Sacrificium repræsentativum*, or *commemorative*, a representative, or commemorative Sacrifice. And that is warranted in the words of our SAVIOUR. " Do this, *in Mei commemorationem*,



in remembrance of Me, or of My death ;" and so expounded by the Apostle, "so often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, *annunciatis mortem Domini*, ye show forth, or represent and commemorate the LORD's death till He come." And as it is received by us, it may be called *Sacrificium communicativum*, a communicative Sacrifice, or the communication or application of that Sacrifice that was offered for us on the Cross, and that is most plain in the Apostle ; "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of CHRIST? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of CHRIST?" So that though there be not *idem Sacrificium*, the same Sacrifice, as it denoteth the action of sacrificing or offering, which is here done only by way of representation, yet it is *idem sacrificatum*, the same thing sacrificed ; CHRIST crucified, that is, represented to GOD, and communicated to us.

And surely every one that doth desire to be heard, and therefore concludes his prayers with these words, *per Jesum Christum, Dominum nostrum*, "through JESUS CHRIST our LORD," doth represent and offer CHRIST crucified to GOD, and entreats remission and grace, through His Death and Passion. And CHRIST our High Priest that sitteth at the right hand of GOD, doth at that instant execute His office, and make intercession for us, by representing His wounds and scars to His FATHER. In Baptism, in like manner, when we do consecrate and dedicate ourselves to GOD's service, we do as it were offer up CHRIST crucified by way of representation, as if we did explicate and unfold the Passion of CHRIST at that time, desiring to be accepted for His sake. And that made St. Augustine to say,—“at that time every one offereth the Sacrifice of CHRIST's Passion for his sins, when he is dedicated in the faith of that Passion :” and the manner he explicateth with *quodam modo offert* ; “he offers in a sort,” not properly but by way of representation and application. . . . But this Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, as a more ample and perfect image, doth more fully represent CHRIST's Death, and by way of memorial offer it to GOD, as being instituted and commanded for a representation and commemoration thereof. And this is generally received of antiquity, and so allowed by the Romish sacrificers, though they proceed further without ground or reason.

For why? St. Augustine said well, *Ipse cui offert, qui offert, quique offertur* : these be proper to CHRIST, to be the Godhead to whom He offereth, to be the Priest that offereth, and the Sacrifice that is offered up to God. . . . As for Christians “they celebrate the memory of this Sacrifice, performed on the Cross, by the sacred oblation and participation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST? So CHRIST’s Sacrifice is the truth, and ours the representation of that truth.” And in his twenty-third Epistle—“He was once offered in Himself, and yet in the Sacrament He is not only offered yearly at the solemnity of the Passover, but also every day.” . . .

These and many other sentences of the Fathers made the Master of the Sentences to rest in this ; that this Sacrament is a representation, or memory of that Sacrifice performed on the altar of the Cross ; and further went not the divinity of his time. And Thomas, that lived long after him, knew no other doctrine. And he giveth only two reasons why it is called *Immolatio Christi*, the sacrificing or immolation of CHRIST. First, because it is *Imago quædam passionis Christi*. It is a certain image or representation of CHRIST’s passion . . . The second reason is, *Quia participes efficitur fructus Dominicæ passionis* ; because by this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit and benefit of CHRIST’s Passion, therefore it is called the Sacrifice of CHRIST ; so Thomas goeth no further than representation and participation. I descend no further : for by this it is plain who are *veteratores* and *novatores*, the corrupters of antiquity, that removed the ancient bounds, and the authors of novelty, that not only speak old divinity *novè* in new words and forms, but also bring in *nova*, new and strange doctrines, and articles never heard of. That this Sacrament is the only proper external daily Sacrifice of the Church, without which the other two relatives cannot stand ; *viz.* that there is no religion without priesthood, nor priesthood without Sacrifice ; here it is manifest where the house began to run to decay, and where the enemy sowed tares : for, as Thomas saith, the Altar is the representation of CHRIST’s Cross, and the Priest bears the image of CHRIST our High Priest ; and so his Sacrifice is but a representation of CHRIST’s Sacrifice, *exemplum illius*, as before. . . .—pp. 47—57.

This was the received doctrine of the Fathers, and ancient School . . . So then, it is manifest that this Sacrament is no proper external Sacrifice, but only commemorative, and communicative of the all-sufficient Sacrifice of CHRIST . . .

This Sacrament is called a Sacrifice, because in it we offer and present unto God "ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a living Sacrifice unto God, which is our reasonable service and worship of Him," as the Apostle calleth it . . . And this, indeed, is the daily Sacrifice of the Church; for CHRIST, the Head, offered Himself as the only propitiatory Sacrifice for sin; . . . "Of which (His Sacrifice) He would have the daily Sacrifice of the Church to be a Sacrament," &c. (*August. lib. x. De Civ. Dei, cap. 20.*) . . . Again (*cap. 19.*) . . . But the clearest and fullest place is in the sixth chapter: . . . "This is the Sacrifice of Christians; many are one body in CHRIST; which Sacrifice the Church doth frequent in the Sacrament of the Altar, known to the faithful, when it is demonstrated to her (the Church) that in that oblation which she offereth, herself (that is, the Church) is offered . . . And this place of St. Augustine may serve as an interpretation of the Fathers' authorities, that speak of the offering of the body of CHRIST, which are to be understood of the offering of His natural Body, by way of representation or commemoration, or else of His mystical body (the Church) which offereth herself as a daily Sacrifice to God.—pp. 57—63.

I have been too long in setting down these places of St. Augustine, who is the most doctrinal among the ancient Fathers; and, therefore, I content myself with him, and some few more; only I add Eusebius, who joineth both these; that is, the commemorative Sacrifice, and the Sacrifice of ourselves together, with other Sacrifices, concurring in that action:—"We sacrifice after a new manner, according to the New Testament; a pure Sacrifice; . . . And now, also, we burn that prophetic sweet odour in every place, . . . *alias celebrantes memoriam*, sometimes celebrating the memory of that great Sacrifice, according to those things which are delivered by Him . . . and sometimes consecrating our whole selves to Him . . . to His High Priest, even to the Word Himself." Here is both the commemorative Sacrifice, and the Sacrifice or offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies, besides the Sacrifice of prayer and praise, and contrition, which I am

now to speak of, all joined in this one sentence of Eusebius.—  
pp. 65—7.

To proceed then with this collection of Sacrifices in this one Sacrifice, the third is *Sacrificium non pecoris trucidati*, and as St. Augustine calleth it, The Sacrifice not of slain beasts, but of broken and contrite hearts, by repentance and sorrow for sin. . . .  
—p. 67.

I proceed to the fourth, for I shall have occasion to speak of this again . . . and that is *Sacrificium orationis et laudis*, the Sacrifice of prayer and praise. . . .

As for prayer . . . I ever thought that our SAVIOUR, before He offered His all-sufficient Sacrifice on the Cross, did offer up supplications with strong cries and tears, and He was heard for His reverence. And His action being our institution, we should follow His steps, and offer our prayers and supplications with strong cries and tears before we did presume to present CHRIST sacrificed to His FATHER, or receive Him ourselves, or offer up the sacrifice of our souls and bodies, and the whole Church, which is the daily Sacrifice of the Church. I ever took it, that the Apostles knew best how this Sacrament was to be received; . . . And in the 13<sup>th</sup> of the Acts, the Church at Antioch, before they sent out Paul and Barnabas, they ministered, fasted, and prayed: here is fasting and prayer, and it is likely it was not without the LORD'S Supper; for that which we read *ministering*, is translated by Erasmus to be sacrificing, *Sacrificantibus illis*, and sacrificing did surely imply the representation of CHRIST'S Sacrifice; and the word is *λειτουργούντων*, "offering of divine worship:" and so there was then a Liturgy, and all Liturgies had this Sacrament in them: so prayer went through with this Sacrament . . . —p. 72.

I come to the fifth Sacrifice that I find in the LORD'S Supper, and that is *Sacrificium Eleemosynarum*, the Sacrifice of Alms. . . —p. 73.

This is then plain, that, in the ministration and receiving of the Sacrament, there are these five kinds of Sacrifices: 1. The Sacrifice commemorative to Godward, and communicative to us. 2. The Sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, in which the

Church offers the mystical body of CHRIST, that is, itself, the Church, to God, by her High Priest, CHRIST, &c.—And in the offering of all these solemn Sacrifices, humility, both of soul and body, is necessarily required; and, therefore, this Sacrament ought to be received with kneeling.—p. 84.

I come now to the reasons for sitting, for the authorities are for standing.—p. 214.

The third reason is *prærogativa mensæ et convivarum*: the prerogatives and liberties of a table and a guest . . . .

But this man might have remembered, that the Eucharist is as well called *Sacrificium*, and *Cultus Dei*, as *Cœna*: and then kneeling and prostration, and adoration, are more fitting gestures for sacrificers and worshippers, than sitting is for guests at the table of the LORD of all power and majesty.

And, therefore, as in St. Paul there is *mensa Domini*, “the table of the Lord;” so there is *habemus altare*, “we have an altar,” &c.; and the word altar, in the Fathers, is more common than the word table; so that, as the name of table may plead for sitting, so the name of altar enforceth worship, and Sacrifice, and that implied adoration and kneeling.—pp. 227—9.

The fourth reason is, it is *contra jus naturæ*, contrary to the law of nature, kneeling at a feast or banquet: therefore it is unlawful to kneel at the feast or Supper of the LORD.

Here I would be glad to know where this law of nature is written, or to be found. If by the law of nature be understood the moral law, I find bowing down, or kneeling, commanded there in the worship of GOD. . . . And this Sacrament is a principal part of GOD's worship. . . . If he mean the law of nature, that is, the nature of the thing or action . . . . then kneeling is most agreeable to the nature of the action, or thing done, that is the Eucharist: for it is altogether an action of subjection, and humility, and therefore kneeling is most suitable to it. It is *Cultus Dei*, the worship of God, and a most eminent and principal part of it. It is a Sacrifice commemorative: it is a Sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies: it is a Sacrifice of contrition offered by penitentiaries: a Sacrifice of prayer, offered by suppliants; and kneeling is most fit for Sacrificers: it is the

Eucharist or Sacrifice of praise : and in the Revelation, where it is often said, that the elders did fall down and worship, there is seldom or never any prayer made for want, but honour, and glory, and praise for that which was received. So kneeling is most suitable to thanksgiving.—pp. 232, 3.

LD.—*Funeral Sermon for Bishop Andrews.*

In the tenth verse (Heb. xiii.) the Apostle saith, "We have an altar," &c. . . *Habemus altare.* We have ; that is, Christians . . . And yet it is *commune altare*, a common altar to all Christians. And so it is *externum altare*, not only a spiritual altar in the heart of every Christian ; then St. Paul should have said *habeo*, or *habet unusquisque* : I have, and every Christian hath in private to himself : but "We have an altar," that is, all Christians have ; and it must be external, else all Christians cannot have it.

Our Head CHRIST offered His Sacrifice of Himself upon the Cross ; and the Cross of CHRIST was the "altar" of our Head, where He offered the *unicum, verum, et proprium Sacrificium*, the only, true, proper Sacrifice, propitiatory for the sins of mankind ; in which all other Sacrifices are accepted, and applicatory of this propitiation. . . .

NOW as CHRIST'S cross was His altar, where He offered Himself for us, so the Church hath an altar also, where it offereth itself : not *Christum in capite*, but *Christum in membris* ; not CHRIST the Head properly (but only by commemoration), but CHRIST the members. For, CHRIST cannot be offered truly, and properly, no more but once upon the cross. . . .

Therefore St. Paul proceeds in the 15th verse : "By Him, therefore, let us offer the Sacrifice of praise to GOD continually ; that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name." "Let us offer up to GOD : " Christians then have an offering : and "let us offer up to GOD continually ;" this is the ground of the daily Sacrifice of Christians, that answereth to the daily Sacrifice of the Jews. And this Sacrifice of praise and thanks may well be understood the Eucharist, in which we chiefly praise and thank GOD for this His chief and great blessing of our redemption.

And this, and all other Sacrifices of the Church, external and spiritual, must be offered up and accepted *per Ipsum*, in, by, and through CHRIST. St. Paul saith not, *Ipsum offeramus*, let us offer Him (that is), CHRIST; but let us offer and sacrifice *per Ipsum*, by Him, in whom only we and our Sacrifices are accepted. . . .

So, likewise, the Church, which is CHRIST's mystical body, offers not CHRIST's natural body, it hath no power to offer the natural body. . . . And there is no such thing in Scripture, nor I presume can easily be shewed out of any of the probable and undoubted Fathers, but the Church offers *corpus mysticum*, CHRIST's mystical body (that is, itself) to GOD in her daily Sacrifice.—pp. 1—3.

MORTON, BISHOP.—*Catholic Appeal*, ii. 7.

May not all these sufficiently justify the objected exception? yes verily, especially seeing it is . . . only a large extension of the text, to signify a Sacrifice in the Eucharist, although in a sense orthodoxal, and (if they shall permit us so to speak,) plainly protestantial, signifying, (according unto St. Augustine's exposition,) “the commemorative representation of the sacrifice of CHRIST's body crucified upon the Cross.” . . .—p. 166.

After the contention about the word Sacrifice, which, in respect of the superstitious apprehension of corruptive times, hath been judged dangerous and incommodious, we descend to the question of doctrine, concerning the true nature of a Sacrifice; which is by the Romanists, in their Council of Trent, propounded as a doctrine of faith, and is by them defined to be “the same Sacrifice, truly propitiatory, now offered by the ministry of the Priest, which was offered by CHRIST Himself on the cross:” “so fully the same (saith their Cardinal,) that as the substance of CHRIST, which is really in the Host, differeth not from the substance of His Body in heaven, so the immolation and sacrificing of Him in the forms of bread, and His sacrificing upon the cross, is the very same.” But “Protestants, (saith the same, our greatest adversary) although they allow this to be a Sacrifice of thanksgiving, and of divine worship to GOD, yet do they not esteem it to have the

proper nature of a Sacrifice, but to be so called after a large and improper manner of speech :” in the which large acceptation Protestants may account it “propitiatory” also. So that the controversy is only concerning the proper and improper signification of terms, and compriseth two questions : first, whether the Eucharist be a true essential Sacrifice ; secondly, whether it be properly propitiatory, and available in itself for remission of sins, or no. Both which, we wish, may be decided by the verdict of ancient Fathers, by the tenor of CHRIST’s institution, and by the principles of the Romish Church, and in every of these by the confessions of our learned adversaries.—pp. 168, 9.

As for the Protestants, they, in their divine and public service, do profess CHRIST the Son of GOD, to be the only true Priest of the New Testament ; who, being GOD and man, was only able to work in Himself propitiation with GOD for man ; and His Sacrifice once offered upon the cross, to be the all and only sufficient Sacrifice for the remission of sins ; which, by an Eucharistical and thankful commemoration, (according unto the acknowledged tenor of ancient Liturgies, “ for all the faithful, whether Martyrs, Patriarchs, Prophets, or Apostles,” and all Saints) they present unto GOD, as an effectual propitiation both for the quick and the dead ; by the which prayers they apply the same propitiatory Sacrifice unto the good of all that are capable :—but what ? not the Body as it is glorified, but as then freshly bleeding on the cross ; which doth, not by a casual or deceivable intention of the Priest, but according unto the faith of the believer, nor by a finite virtue of that sacrifice, but by an infinite, work a full remission, not only of venial, but also of mortal sins, according unto the tenor of holy writ [“ If any”]<sup>1</sup>, excluding no penitent and sinner, and [“ from all”]<sup>2</sup> excepting no sin ; and by the same virtue doth redeem us not so much from temporal punishment, as from eternal :—building this their doctrine not upon uncertain conjectures, but as it becometh the heirs of truth, upon the written will of our testator JESUS : and finally defend the same not with the inconstancy of innumerable contradictions, but with the strength of an universal consent. All which do perfect

<sup>1</sup> 1 Joh. ii. If any man sin, &c.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Joh. i. The Blood of CHRIST doth purge from all our sins.



this our appeal, and we conclude in the sentence of St. Augustine, "A Sacrifice (saith he, using the word in a large sense), when it is offered unto GOD, according to His inspiration and doctrine, it is true religion; but if it want that direction, it is a pestilent and contagious superstition."—pp. 188, 9.

ANDREWS, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*Sermon of the worshipping of Imaginations.*

Imaginations touching the "breaking of bread:" . . . Concerning which, as the Church of Rome hath her imaginations: first, in that she many times celebrateth this mystery *sine fractione*, without any "breaking" at all. Whereas (as heretofore hath been shewed out of 1 Cor. x. 18.), it is of the nature of an Eucharist or Peace-offering: which was never offered but it was eaten, that both these might be a representation of the memory of that Sacrifice, and together an application to each person by partaking it. And secondly, in that she hath indeed no "breaking of bread" at all. . . . As these are their imaginations, so we want not ours. For many among us fancy only a Sacrament in this action, and look strange at the mention of a Sacrifice: whereas, we not only use it as a nourishment spiritual (as that it is too), but a mean also to renew a covenant with God, by virtue of that Sacrifice, as the Psalmist speaketh, (Psalm l. 5.) So our Saviour CHRIST in the institution telleth us, (Luke xxii. 10.) And the Apostle, (Heb. xiii. 10.) And the old writers use no less the word "Sacrifice," than "Sacrament;" "altar," than "table;" "offer," than "eat;" but both indifferently, to shew there is both.—*Sermons, Appendix, p. 35.*

ID.—*Responsio ad Apologiam Card. Bellarmini, cap. viii.*

And this it is whereat they of our side do "marvel," not that whereat the Cardinal there feigneth that they marvel. For they "believe that the Eucharist was instituted by our LORD" for the commemoration of Him; even of His Sacrifice; or, if we may so speak, (*si ita loqui liceat*) for a commemorative Sacrifice: and not only for a "Sacrament," or "spiritual food." This, however, though

they admit, yet they deny that these two uses, (thus instituted by the LORD at the same time and conjointly,) can be rent asunder by man, or be broken off the one from the other, either by reason of the negligence of the people, or the avarice of the priests. (They hold) that the Sacrifice which is there, is eucharistic: of which Sacrifice it is the law that he who offereth it partake of it: and partake of it by taking and eating (as our SAVIOUR commanded.) For "to partake *impetrando*" is a modern and novel kind of partaking: even much more than the private mass itself.

And from what I have now said (concerning the *commemoration* there made of the Sacrifice, or the *commemorative Sacrifice*), it may be seen that that is all to no purpose which the Cardinal (without any occasion, however,) putteth in touching the "antiquity" of this word. For the King said nothing touching that word . . . . But do ye take away from the Mass your Transubstantiation, and there will not be long any controversy with us concerning the Sacrifice. That a memory is there made of the Sacrifice, we grant willingly. That your CHRIST made of bread is sacrificed there, we will never grant. The word "Sacrifice" the King knoweth is used by the Fathers, nor doth he "put it amongst novelties:" but that of your "Sacrifice in the Mass" he both "dareth" and doth so "put."—pp. 183, 4.

LD.—*Sermons Of the Resurrection.* No. 7.

Thus CHRIST is a passover . . . . But, above all, His death, His offering was it . . . there, our sins passed from us to Him. Then and there passed the destroyer over us . . . . Of which passing our sins to Him, and GOD's wrath over us, this day, and the action of this day, is a memorial. . . . "Therefore let us keep a feast."

'Εορτάζωμεν, the word is one, but two ways it is turned. Some read *Celebremus*, some other *Epulemur*. But well: for first, it is kindly, when we keep a feast, we make a feast. But this, this feast is not celebrated *sine hoc epulo*. If CHRIST be a propitiatory sacrifice, a Peace-offering, I see not how we can avoid but the flesh of our peace-offering must be eaten in this feast by us, or else we evacuate the offering utterly, and lose the

fruit of it: and was there a Passover heard of and the lamb not eaten? . . . No *Celebremus* without *Epulemur* in it.

*Celebremus* and *epulemur*. There be, that refer *celebremus* to the day: *epulemur* to the action: and so it may, well: both day and action have interest in this text. . . .

But the Fathers usually refer both to the action. Their reason: because (in truth) the Eucharist now, in the Gospel, is that the Passover was under the Law: the antitype answering to their type of the Paschal Lamb. It is plain, by the immediate passage of it from the one to the other: that no sooner done, than this began. Look how soon the Paschal Lamb eaten, presently the holy Eucharist instituted, to succeed in the place of it for ever. And yet more plain, that this very Scripture of my text was thought so pertinent, and so proper to this action, as it was always said or sung at it. And I know no cause, but it might be so still. Two things CHRIST there gave us in charge *ἀνάμνησις* (chap. xi. 25.) "remembering," and *λήψις* (chap. xi. 29.) "receiving:" the same two, St. Paul (but, in other terms) *καταγγελία* "shewing forth;" *κοινωνία* "communicating." Of which, "remembering" and "showing forth" refer to *celebremus*; "receiving" and "communicating," to *epulemur* here.

The first in remembrance of Him, CHRIST: what of Him? *mortem Domini*, His death, (saith St. Paul:) to "show forth the LORD's death." Remember Him, that we will, and stay at home; think of Him there: nay, shew Him forth ye must. That we will, by a Sermon of Him: nay, it must be *Hoc facite*. It is not mental thinking, or verbal speaking: there must be actually somewhat done to celebrate this memory. That done to the holy symbols, that was done to Him, to His body, and His blood, in the Passover: break the one, pour out the other; to represent *κλάμενον*, how His sacred Body was broken; and *ἐκχυνόμενον*, how His precious Blood was shed. And in *corpus fractum*, and *sanguis fusus* there is *immolatus*. This is it, in the Eucharist, that answereth to the Sacrifice in the Passover: the memorial, to the figure. To them it was, *hoc facite in Mei præfigurationem*, Do this in prefiguration of Me: to us it is, Do this, in commemoration of Me. To them, *prænuntiare*: to us, *annuntiare*: there is the difference. By the same rules that theirs was, by the same

may ours be termed a Sacrifice. In rigour of speech, neither of them: for (to speak after the exact manner of Divinity) there is but one only Sacrifice, *veri nominis*, properly so called: that is, Christ's death. And that Sacrifice but once actually performed, at His death: but ever before represented, in figure, from the beginning; and ever since repeated, in memory, to the world's end. That only absolute; all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it. The Lamb, but once actually slain, in the fulness of time: but virtually, was from the beginning, is, and shall be, to the end of the world. That, the centre, in which their lines and ours, their types and our antitypes do meet. While yet this offering was not, the hope of it was kept alive, by the prefiguration of it, in theirs. And after it is past, the memory of it still kept fresh in mind, by the commemoration of it, in ours. So it was the will of GOD; that so, there might be with them a continual foreshowing, and with us a continual showing forth the LORD's death till He come again. Hence it is, that what names their's carried, our's do the like, and the Fathers make no scruple at it; no more need we. The Apostle (in the tenth chapter) compareth this of our's to the *immolata* of the Heathen: and (to the Hebrews) *Habemus aram*, matcheth it with the sacrifice of the Jews. And we know the rule of comparisons: they must be *ejusdem generis*.

Neither do we stay here, but proceed to the other [*Epulemur*]. For, there is another thing yet to be done, which doth present to us that which *celebremus* doth represent. From the Sacrament, is the applying the Sacrifice. The Sacrifice, in general, *pro omnibus*. The Sacrament, in particular, to each several receiver, *pro singulis*. Wherein, that is offered to us, that was offered for us; that which is common to all, made proper to each one, while each taketh his part of it; and made proper by a communion, and union, like that of meat and drink, which is most nearly and inwardly made ours, and is inseparable for ever. . . .

Will ye mark one thing more: that *epulemur* doth here refer to *immolatus*. To CHRIST, not every way considered, but as when He was offered. CHRIST's body that now is; true: but not CHRIST's body as now it is, but as then it was, which was offered,

rent, and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not as now He is glorified; for so, He is not, so He cannot be *immolatus*; for He is immortal, and impassible. But as then He was, when He suffered death (that is) passible and mortal. Then, in His passible estate, did He institute this of ours, to be a memorial of His *passibile*, and *passio*, both. And we are, in this action, not only carried up to CHRIST (*sursum corda*) but, we are also carried back to CHRIST; as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach. So, and no otherwise, do we represent Him.—pp. 451—454.

Now then, this is our conclusion: come we must, and *Itaque celebremus*. . . . The Apostle binds us to do it: the time to do it, now. For, if this follow, CHRIST is offered, therefore we are to come to His feast: this will follow as strongly, CHRIST is now offered, therefore let us now come. . . . And indeed, if at any time we will do it, *Quando Pascha, nisi in Pascha*, what time is the Passover so proper as at the Feast of the Passover? . . . . When the day cometh, to remember what was done on the day; and so, what we to do, on that day. *Pascha quod celebramus*, to put us in mind of *Pascha quod epulamur*. For, tell me, will the Sacrifice commemorative, or the Sacrament communicative, ever fall more fit than when that was offered, which we are to commemorate, and to communicate withal.—p. 457.

II.—*Answer to Cardinal Perron.*

*The Eucharist a Sacrifice.*

1. The Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered, both as a Sacrament and as a Sacrifice. 2. A Sacrifice is proper and applicable only to divine worship. 3. The Sacrifice of CHRIST's death did succeed to the Sacrifices of the Old Testament. 4. The Sacrifice of CHRIST's death is available for present, absent, living, dead (yea, for them that are yet unborn). 5. When we say the dead, we mean it is available for the Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors, and all (because we are all members of one body): these no man will deny.

In a word, we hold with St. Augustine, in the very same chapter which the Cardinal citeth, *Quod hujus Sacrificii caro et*

*sanguis, ante adventum CHRISTI, per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione CHRISTI per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adventum CHRISTI, per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.*

*Altars.*

If we agree about the matter of Sacrifice, there will be no difference about the Altar. The holy Eucharist being considered as a Sacrifice (in the representation of the breaking the bread, and pouring forth the cup), the same is fitly called an Altar: which again is as fitly called a Table, the Eucharist being considered as a Sacrament, which is nothing else but a distribution and an application of the Sacrifice to the several receivers. The same St. Augustine that, in the place alleged, doth term it an altar, saith in another place, *CHRISTUS quotidie pascit. Mensa Ipsius est illa in medio constituta. Quid causâ est, O audientes, ut mensam videatis, et ad epulas non accedatis?* The same Nyssen, in the place cited, with one breath calleth it *θυσιαστήριον*, that is, an Altar; and *ἱερὰ τραπέζα*, that is, the holy Table.

Which is agreeable also to the Scriptures. For the Altar, in the Old Testament, is, by Malachi, called *Mensa Domini* (Mal. i. 7.) And of the Table, in the New Testament, by the Apostle it is said, *Habemus Altare* (Heb. xiii.). Which, of what matter it be, whether of stone, as Nyssen; or of wood, as Optatus, it skills not. So that the matter of altars makes no difference in the face of our Church.—pp. 6, 7.

*Id.—MS. Notes upon the Common Prayer*<sup>1</sup>.

“After the Creed.”] *Lecta confessione Nicena*, the Priest adores, then he removes the bason from the back of the Altar to the forepart. The Bishop ascends with treble adoration, and, lastly, kneels down at the Altar.

Into his hands the Priest, from a by-standing table on the south side, reaches first the wafer-bread, in a canister close covered and lined with linen. 2dly. The wine in a barrel on a cradle with four feet. These the Bishop offers in the name of the whole congregation upon the Altar.

<sup>1</sup> Additional Notes, in Nicholls's Commentary on the Common Prayer, p. 40.

ID.—*Preces Privatæ.*

Ὁ ἄνω τῷ Πατρὶ συγκαθήμενος,  
 Καὶ ἄδε ἡμῖν ἀοράτως συνῶν,  
 Ἐλθέ εἰς τὸ ἁγιάσαι τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα  
 Καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν, καὶ δι' ὧν, καὶ ἐφ' οἷς προσκομίζονται.

Qui sursum cum Patre sedes,  
 Et invisibilis hic præsens nobiscum es,  
 Veni ut sanctifices dona proposita,  
 Pro quibus, et a quibus, et quibus de causis offeruntur <sup>1</sup>.

MASON, PRESBYTER.—*Vindication of the Church of England.*  
 book v.

ORTHODOX.—So often as we celebrate the Eucharist, so often do we offer CHRIST in a mystery, and sacrifice Him, by way of commemoration or representation.—p. 470.

Our question is concerning the English Ministry, which you attack professedly, because it is not exercised in sacrificing. And this you contend for as necessary, by an argument drawn from the type of Melchizedeck; whom you endeavour to prove out of the Fathers, to have sacrificed bread and wine, and that too in figure of CHRIST's celebrating the Eucharist; that from thence you might prove that CHRIST sacrificed at His last supper, and consequently enjoined the Ministers of the Gospel to do the same, because CHRIST commanded the Apostles and their successors to do the same as He did. Here I answer, that, though (some of) the Fathers might think that Melchizedeck did sacrifice, yet nevertheless they were not of your side. For the Sacrifice which ye contend for, is transubstantiated; which none of the Fathers knew any thing of. Wherefore, when the Fathers understood

<sup>1</sup> From the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. "Thou that sittest on high with the Father, and art here invisibly present with us, come Thou to sanctify the gifts lying before Thee, for whom, and by whom, and for what reason soever they are offered up."—Compare Hickes's Two Treatises, Prefatory Discourse, p. xl. (ed. 1711.) Second Collection of Controversial Letters, p. xxxix.

the Eucharist, according to CHRIST'S institution (that is, sacramentally, not transubstantially, and of a remembrance, representation, or commemoration, not of a Sacrifice properly so called, as will appear in its proper place) certainly they do by no means fortify your Sacrifice, but rather overthrow it.—p. 492.

For, first, though the LORD'S Supper be called a Sacrifice, by St. Cyprian, as well as the rest of the Fathers, yet it is not so called properly, but only because it is a memorial and representation of that one Sacrifice which was made upon the altar of the Cross.—p. 493.

The representative was made in the Eucharist, the real upon the Cross. In the first celebration, the representative was before the real: in all the rest, the real is before the representative. Neither can you conclude, that there is a real Sacrifice properly in the Eucharist, because there was a representative one.—p. 531.

PHИЛОДОХ. The true meaning of the Scriptures was well known to the ancient Fathers; who all, with one voice, acknowledged both Priest, Altar, Oblation, and Sacrifice.

ОРТНОДОХ. They do so indeed; but not such as you mean. For the Sacrifice which they defend in the Eucharist, is not properly propitiatory, nor properly a Sacrifice, but only a commemoration, and representation of the sovereign Sacrifice of the Cross. . . And whatsoever is a commemoration or representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross, is different from it (for nothing is a commemoration or representation of itself).—pp. 538, 9.

WHITE, BISHOP.—*Reply to Fisher.*

And the Fathers term the holy Eucharist, an unbloody Sacrifice, not because CHRIST is properly, and in His substance offered therein, but because His bloody Sacrifice upon the Cross is, by this unbloody commemoration represented, called to remembrance, and applied<sup>1</sup>.—Read the Sentences of Fathers<sup>1</sup> placed in the margin. Read also Peter Lombard and the Enchiridion of Cologne.—pp. 463, 4.

<sup>1</sup> St. Cyprian, ep. 63. Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact. (cf. sup. cit. pp. 61—64. 66, 7.)



LAUD, ARCHBISHOP AND MARTYR.—*Conference with Fisher.* § 35.  
*Punct.* 3.

And since here's mention happened of Sacrifice, my third instance shall be in the Sacrifice which is offered up to God, in that great and high mystery of our redemption by the death of CHRIST. For as CHRIST offered up <sup>1</sup> Himself once for all, a full and all sufficient Sacrifice for the sin of the whole world. So did He institute and command a <sup>2</sup> memory of this Sacrifice in a Sacrament, even till His coming again. For at, and in the Eucharist, we offer up to God three Sacrifices. One by the Priest only; that's the <sup>3</sup> commemorative Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Death

<sup>1</sup> "CHRIST by His own blood entered once into the holy place, and obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. ix. 12. And this was done by way of Sacrifice. "By the offering of the body of JESUS CHRIST once made." Heb. x. 10. "CHRIST gave Himself for us, to be an offering, and a Sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour unto God." Eph. v. 2. Out of which place the School infers, *Passionem Christi verum Sacrificium fuisse.* Thom. p. 3, qu. 48, art. 3. c. "CHRIST did suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, and made there by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." *Eccles. Angl. ? in Canone Consecrationis Eucharist.*

<sup>2</sup> And CHRIST "did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again." *Eccles. Angl. ? ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> "Sacramentum hoc est Commemorative Dominicæ Passionis, quæ fuit verum Sacrificium; et sic nominatur Sacrificium." Thom. p. 3, qu. 73, art. 4. c. "CHRIST being offered up once for all in His own proper person, is yet said to be offered up, &c., in the celebration of the Sacrament; because His oblation, once for ever made, is thereby represented." Lambert in *Fox's Martyrology*, Vol. ii. Edit. Lond. 1597, p. 1053, et postea. "'Tis a memorial, or representation thereof." *Ibid.* "The Master of the Sentences judged truly in this point, saying: That which is offered and consecrated of the priest, is called a Sacrifice and oblation, because it is a Memory and Representation of the true Sacrifice, and holy oblation made on the altar of the cross." Archbishop Cranmer, in his Answer to Bishop Gardiner, concerning the most holy Sacrament.—Lib. v. p. 377. And, again, "This shortly is the mind of Lombardus, that the thing which is done at GOD'S Board is a Sacrifice, and so is that also which was made upon the cross, but not after one manner of understanding, for this was the thing indeed, and that is the commemoration of the thing."—*Ibid.* So, likewise, Bishop Jewell acknowledgeth *incruentum et rationale Sacrificium*, spoken of by Eusebius, *de Demonstrat. Evang.* lib. i. *Jewell's Reply against Harding*, Art. vii. Divis. 9. Again, "The ministration of the holy Communion is sometimes of the ancient Fathers called an

represented in bread broken, and wine poured out. Another by the <sup>4</sup> Priest and the people, jointly; and that is the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, for all the benefits and graces we received by the precious Death of CHRIST. The third <sup>5</sup>, by every particular man for himself only; and that is the Sacrifice of every man's body, and soul, to serve Him in both, all the rest of his life, for this blessing thus bestowed on him. Now thus far these dissenting Churches agree, that in the Eucharist there is a Sacrifice of duty, and a Sacrifice of praise, and a Sacrifice of commemoration of CHRIST. Therefore, according to the former rule, (and here in truth too) it is safest for a man to believe the commemorative, the praising, and the performing Sacrifice, and to offer them duly to God, and to leave the Church of Rome in this particular to her superstitions, that I may say no more.

unbloody Sacrifice, not in respect of any corporal or fleshly presence, that is imagined to be there without bloodshedding, but for that it representeth and reporteth to our minds that one and everlasting Sacrifice that CHRIST made in His Body upon the cross." This Bishop Jewell disliketh not, in his Answer to Harding. Art. xvii. Divis. 14. " Patres Cœnam Dominicam duplici de causa vocarunt *Sacrificium incurventum*. Tum quod sit imago et solennis representatio illius Sacrificii quod Christus cum sanguinis effusione obtulit in cruce: tum quod sit etiam *Eucharisticum Sacrificium*, id est, Sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis, cum pro beneficiis omnibus, tum pro redemptione imprimis per Christi mortem peracta."—*Zanch. in 2. Præcept. Decal. t. iv. p. 459.* And Dr. Fulke also acknowledges a sacrifice in the Eucharist. In S. Matt. xxvi. 26. " Non dissimulaverint Christiani in cœna Domini, sive ut ipsi loquebantur, in Sacrificio Altaris peculiari quodam modo præsentem se venerari Deum Christianorum, sed quæ esset forma ejus Sacrificii quod per symbola panis et vini peragitur, hoc Veteres præ se non ferebant."—*Isa. Casaub. Exercit. 16. ad Annal. Baron. § 43. p. 560.*

<sup>4</sup> In the Liturgy of the Church of England, we pray to GOD, immediately after the reception of the Sacrament, that He would be pleased to accept this " our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," &c. And Heb. xiii. 15. " The Sacrifice propitiatory was made by CHRIST Himself only, but the Sacrifice commemorative and gratulatory is made by the Priest and the people."—*Archbishop Cranmer in his Answer to Bishop Gardiner, l. v. p. 377.*

<sup>5</sup> " I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you give up your bodies a living Sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto GOD." Rom. xii. 1. " We offer, and present unto Thee, O LORD, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living Sacrifice unto Thee," &c. So the Church of England in the Prayer after the receiving of the blessed Sacrament.

ID.—*MS. Introduction to the Liturgy*<sup>1</sup>.

It is objected by the Romanists, that to the very being of a Bishop, the order of Priesthood is essentially required, which they say is not to be found in the Church of England, neither in the one function of the power of sacrificing, nor in the other of absolution.

To which is answered, that by the Book of Common Prayer and ordinations, they are called and made Presbyters, Priests, as appears thereby. And as touching the function of sacrificing, whereby, they say, a true and proper Sacrifice is to be made for the sins of the quick and the dead, and an oblation of the very Body and Blood of Christ;

We say, that forasmuch as our Priests have authority to minister the Sacraments, and, consequently, the Eucharist, which is a representation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST; therefore they may be said to offer CHRIST in a mystery, and to sacrifice Him by way of commemoration.

And our Church by the Articles of 1562, Art. xxxi. teacheth, that the offering of CHRIST once made is sufficient and perfect, and that there needs no other satisfaction for sins, and consequently condemns the Mass for the quick and the dead as blasphemous. And by the place of Acts xiii. 2, there cannot be anything thence inferred, to prove that their ministering at that time, may warrant the Popish massing, in these times, as now it is used.

ID.—*Daily Office.*

O Thou that sittest on high with the Father, and art here invisibly present with us<sup>2</sup>, &c. . . .

<sup>1</sup> From "An Introduction to the Liturgy of the Church of England, written by way of preface before Archbishop Laud's collection of various readings out of the several ancient Common Prayer Books, &c. . . Printed by a copy exactly compared with the original MS., in his Grace of Canterbury's library at Lambeth."—See *Supplement to Nicholl's Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, where reasons are given for attributing these MS. notes to Abp. Laud.

<sup>2</sup> Vide sup. cit. p. 100.

Id.—*History of his Troubles and Trial.*

Now we are come to the arraignment of the [Scotch] Liturgy, and the Book of Common Prayer; . . . for they say:—

“1. This book inverteth the order of the Communion in the Book of England. . . Of the divers secret reasons of this change we mention one only, enjoining the spiritual sacrifice and thanksgiving, which is in the book of England pertinently after the Communion, with the Prayer of Consecration, before the Communion; and that under the name of Memorial, or Oblation; for no other end, but that the Memorial and Sacrifice of praise mentioned in it, may be understood according to the Popish meaning: (*Bellarmin. de Missa*, l. 2. c. 21,) not the spiritual sacrifice, but of the oblation of the Body of the LORD.” . . .

As for the only reason given of this change, it is in my judgment a strange one. 'Tis, forsooth, for no other end (they say) but that the memorial and sacrifice of praise mentioned in it, may be understood according to the Popish meaning, not of the Spiritual Sacrifice, but of the Oblation of the Body of the LORD. Now, ignorance, and jealousy, whither will you? For the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, no man doubts but that it is to be offered up. Nor doth any man of learning question it, that I know, but that, according to our SAVIOUR'S own command, we are to do whatsoever is done in this Office, as a memorial of His Body and Blood offered up, and shed for us. (*Luke xxii.*) Now 'tis one thing to offer up His Body, and another to offer up the memorial of His Body, with our praise and thanks for that infinite blessing; so that, were that change of order made for this end, (which is more than I know,) I do not yet see how any Popish meaning, so much feared, can be fastened upon it. And the words in that Prayer are plain, (as they are also in the Book of England,) that we offer and present unto GOD ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively Sacrifice unto Him. What is there here that can be drawn to a Popish meaning, unless it be, with the cords of these men's vanity?—pp. 109. 114—116.

Yet the charge goes on—

“4. The Book of England abolishes all that may import the oblation of an unbloody Sacrifice: but here we have, besides the preparatory oblation of the elements, which is neither to be found in the Book of England now, nor in King Edward's Book of old, the oblation of the body and the blood of CHRIST, which Bellarmine calls, *Sacrificium laudis, quia Deus per illud magno-pere laudatur*. This also agrees well with their late doctrine.”

First, I think no man doubts, but that there is, and ought to be offered up to GOD, at the consecration and reception of this Sacrament, *Sacrificium laudis*, the Sacrifice of praise; and that this ought to be expressed in the Liturgy, for the instruction of the people. And these words, “We entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,” &c. are both in the Book of England, and in that which was prepared for Scotland. And if Bellarmine do call the oblation of the Body and the Blood of CHRIST a Sacrifice for praise, sure he doth well in it; (for so it is) if Bellarmine mean no more, by the oblation of the Body and the Blood of CHRIST, than a commemoration and a representation of that great Sacrifice offered up by CHRIST Himself: as Bishop Jewell very learnedly and fully acknowledges. But if Bellarmine go farther than this; and by the oblation of the body and the blood of CHRIST, mean, that the Priest offers up that which CHRIST Himself did, and not a commemoration of it only, he is erroneous in that, and can never make it good.—pp. 123, 4.

HALL, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*No Peace with Rome*, § xix.

The priestly office of CHRIST is not a little impeached by the daily oblation of the Missal Sacrifice, and the number of mediators. For the first: that in the sacred Supper there is a Sacrifice (in that sense wherein the Fathers spoke) none of us ever doubted; but that is there, either Latrieutical (as Bellarmine distinguishes it not ill) or Eucharistical: that is here (as Chrysostom speaks) a remembrance of a Sacrifice; that is, as Augustine interprets it, a memorial of CHRIST's passion, celebrated in the Church; and from this sweet commemoration of our

redemption there arises another Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of praise ; and from thence a true Peace-offering of the Christian soul : these three Sacrifices offer themselves to us here ; but for any propitiatory Sacrifice, unless it be (as the gloss interprets it) representatively, I find none, none essential ; none (as the Tridentines labour to persuade) true and proper ; neither, indeed, can there be. For what ? Doth the priest offer the same that CHRIST hath offered, or another ? If another, then not propitiatory, for only CHRIST is our propitiation, if the same, then not an unbloody Sacrifice (for CHRIST'S Sacrifice was a bloody one) : then, the natural being of CHRIST should again be destroyed ; then, the blood of the Mediator (which I abhor to imagine) must be of a finite value and power : yea, CHRIST Himself did not sacrifice on the table, but on the cross ; for if the Sacrifice, which He offered in His supper, were perfect, and fully propitiatory, what needed He to die afterward ? Wherefore was His blood shed upon the cross, which by His transubstantiated blood (not yet shed) had formerly redeemed the world ? But if it be unbloody, then it is not propitiatory ; for without shedding of blood (saith the Apostle) is no remission.

MOUNTAGU, BISHOP.—*An Answer to a late Gagger of Protestants.*

For why ? who can alter CHRIST'S institution ? who dare change that which He hath ordained ? *Sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesia Deo Patri, &c.* [“ He (the priest) doth then offer in the Church to GOD the Father a true and full Sacrifice, if he begin so to offer, even as he seeth CHRIST Himself did offer,”] saith St. Cyprian. “ But,” saith he again, and we know it is true, *Constat, &c.* [“ It is acknowledged that the LORD offered the cup for the commemoration of the Passion. And because we make mention of His Passion at every Sacrifice, we ought to do nothing else than what He did.”] Why ? because otherwise we offer not the Sacrifice as we should. *Nec, &c.* [“ Neither do we celebrate the LORD'S Sacrifice with a lawful hallowing, except our oblation and Sacrifice answer to the Passion :”] and that cannot be without pouring out of wine, that representeth the shedding of His

blood. But your Church hath altered it; presumptuously done. Who gave your Church such authority? Hear St. Cyprian again: *Quare, &c.* ["Wherefore if CHRIST alone is to be heard, we ought not to attend to what any other before us hath thought should be done, but what He who is before all, even CHRIST, first did. For we ought not to follow the custom of men, but the truth of God. For if JESUS CHRIST, our LORD and GOD, be Himself the High Priest of God the Father, and first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and commanded that this should be done for the commemoration of Him, then verily that priest doth truly fulfil his office in CHRIST's stead, who copieth that which CHRIST did; and doth then offer in the Church to GOD the Father a true and full Sacrifice, if he so begin to offer, even as he seeth CHRIST Himself did offer."] You do not this; therefore, in St. Cyprian's judgment, your Sacrifice is neither full nor true.—pp. 262, 3.

*Id.—Appeale to Cæsar.*

I hope you will not overthrow the Sacrifice. You well confess the blessed Sacrament of the altar, or communion table, whether you please, to be a Sacrifice. Not propitiatory, as they call it (I will use this word "call it," lest you challenge me upon Popery, for using "propitiatory") for the living and dead. Not an external, visible, true, and proper Sacrifice, but only representative, rememorative, and spiritual Sacrifice.—p. 287.

FORBES (WILLIAM), BISHOP<sup>1</sup>.—*Considerationes Modestæ*, lib. iii. c. 1.

The Eucharistic bread is consecrated to God, inasmuch, as from being profane, or not sacred, it is made sacred: it is also specially dedicated to God, as is plain by the actions that are performed, and the words that are said concerning it. It cannot, therefore, be denied, but that it is specially offered to God: moreover, when offered to Him, there is the benediction, and there

<sup>1</sup> Consecrated First Bishop of Edinburgh.

is the eating ; yea, it is offered and blessed to this end, that it may be eaten. There is made, therefore, there, in a certain manner, a Sacrifice of bread, which is offered to GOD, and concerning which, by CHRIST's institution, so many words of mystery are said, and sacred rites performed, as Casalius rightly observes, *De Sacrificio Missæ*, lib. i. cap. 20.

The holy Fathers, also, very often say that the very Body of CHRIST is offered, and sacrificed in the Eucharist, as is clear from almost innumerable passages, but not properly and really, with all the properties of a Sacrifice preserved, but by a commemoration and representation of that which was once accomplished in that one Sacrifice of the cross, whereby CHRIST, our High Priest, consummated all other Sacrifices ; and by pious supplication, whereby the ministers of the Church, for the sake of the eternal Victim of that one Sacrifice, which sitteth in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is present in the holy table in an unspeakable manner, humbly beseech GOD the Father that He would grant that the virtue and grace of this eternal Victim may be effectual and salutary to His Church, for all the necessities of body and soul —p. 451.

MEDE, PRESBYTER.—*The Christian Sacrifice*<sup>1</sup>. Mal. i. 11.

“ From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My name shall be great among the Gentiles ; and in every place incense shall be offered in My name, and a pure offering : for My name shall be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of Hosts.”

This place of Scripture, howsoever now in a manner silenced and forgotten, was once, and that in the oldest and purest time of the Church, a text of eminent note, and familiarly known to every Christian, being alleged by their pastors and teachers, as an express and undoubted prophecy of the Christian Sacrifice or solemn worship in the Eucharist, taught by our blessed

<sup>1</sup> Compare Discourse “ Of the name Altar,” &c. pp. 383—392. Also Discourse li. pp. 284—295.



SAVIOR unto His disciples, to be observed of all that should believe in His name : and this so generally and grantedly, as could never have been, at least so early, unless they had learned thus to apply it by tradition from the Apostles. . . .

For in the age immediately succeeding them, it being the second hundred of years after ΧΡΗΣΤ, we find it alleged to this purpose by Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the pillars of that age; the former of them flourishing within little more than thirty years after the death of St. John; and the latter, a disciple of Polycarp, St. John's scholar. In the age following, or third *seculum*, it is alleged by Tertullian, Zeno Veronensis, and Cyprian: in the fourth *seculum*, by Eusebius, Chrysostom, Hierome, and Augustine: and in the after ages, by whom not? Nor is it alleged by them as some singular opinion or private conceit of their own, but as the received tradition of the Church; whence in some Liturgies (as that of the Church of Alexandria, commonly called the Liturgy of St. Mark) it is inserted into the Hymn, or Preface, which begins, Ἀληθῶς ἀξιόν ἐστι καὶ δίκαιον—"It is truly meet and right;" the conclusion of the hymn or laud there being, "Giving thanks we offer unto Thee, O LORD, this reasonable and unbloody service, even that which all nations from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, offer unto Thee; for Thy Name shall be great among all nations; and in every place incense is offered unto Thy holy Name, and sacrifice and oblation."

Thus you see the antiquity of tradition for the meaning and application of this prophecy.

But for the Christian Sacrifice itself, whereunto it is applied, what the ancient Church understood thereby, what and wherein the nature of this Sacrifice consisted, is a point, though most needful to be known, yet beyond belief obscure, intricate, and perplexed.

I will chalk out my discourse in this order.

First, I shall premise, as the ground thereof, a definition of the Christian Sacrifice, as the ancient Church meant it.

Secondly, explain the meaning of my text, by application thereto.

Thirdly, prove each part of the definition I shall give, by the

testimonies of the Fathers, Councils, and Liturgies of the first and best ages.—pp. 355, 6.

To begin with the first, the definition of the Christian Sacrifice. Under which name first know, that the ancient Church understood not, as many suppose, the mere Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, but the whole sacred action or solemn service of the Church assembled, whereof this sacred mystery was then a prime and principal part, and, as it were, the pearl or jewel of that ring, no public service of the Church being without it. This observed and remembered, I define the Christian Sacrifice, *ex mente antiquæ Ecclesiæ*, according to the meaning of the ancient Church, in this manner ;

“An oblation of thanksgiving and prayer to GOD the Father, through JESUS CHRIST, and His Sacrifice commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine, wherewith GOD had been first agnized.” So that this Sacrifice, as you see, hath a double object or matter : first, praise and prayer, which you may call *Sacrificium quod* ; secondly, the commemoration of CHRIST's Sacrifice upon the Cross, which is *Sacrificium quo*, the Sacrifice whereby the other is accepted. For all the prayers, thanksgivings, and devotions of a Christian, are tendered up unto GOD in the name of JESUS CHRIST crucified. According whereunto we are wont to conclude our prayers with “through JESUS CHRIST our LORD.” And this is the specification whereby the worship of a Christian is distinguished from that of the Jew. Now that which we in all our prayers and thanksgivings do vocally, when we say, “through JESUS CHRIST our LORD,” the ancient Church, in her public and solemn service, did visibly, by representing Him, according as He commanded, in the symbols of His body and blood : for there He is commemorated and received by us for the same end for which He was given and suffered for us ; that through Him we receiving forgiveness of our sins, GOD our FATHER might accept our service, and hear our prayers we make unto Him. What time then so fit and seasonable to commend our devotions unto GOD, as when the LAMB of GOD is slain upon the Holy Table ; and we receive visibly, though mystically, those gracious pledges of His blessed Body and Blood ? This was that Sacrifice of the ancient

Church the Fathers so much ring in our ears ; “ the Sacrifice of praise and prayer, through JESUS CHRIST mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine.”

But yet we have not all, there is one thing more my definition intimates, when I say, “ through the Sacrifice of JESUS CHRIST commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine, wherewith God had first been agnized.” The Body and Blood of CHRIST were not made of common bread and common wine, but of bread and wine first sanctified, by being offered and set before God as a present to agnize Him the LORD and giver of all : according to that, “ The earth is the LORD’s, and the fulness thereof;” (Psal. xxiv. 1.) and, “ Let no man appear before the LORD empty.” (Deut. xvi. 16.) Therefore as this Sacrifice consisted of two parts, as I told you, of praise and prayer, (which in respect of the other I call *Sacrificium quod*), and of the commemoration of CHRIST crucified (which I call *Sacrificium quo*), so the symbols of bread and wine traversed both ; being first presented as symbols of praise and thanksgiving to agnize God the LORD of the creatures in the *Sacrificium quod*, then, by invocation of the Holy Ghost, made the symbols of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, in the *Sacrificium quo*. So that the whole service throughout consisted of a reasonable part, and of a material part, as of a soul and a body : of which I shall speak more fully hereafter, when I come to prove this I have said by the testimonies of the ancients.—p. 356, 7.

And this is that Sacrifice which Malachi foretold the Gentiles should one day offer unto God ; “ in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure Mincha : for My name shall be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of Hosts.” Which words I am now, according to the order I propounded, to explicate, and apply to my definition. Now to apply them. . . . “ Incense ” (as the Scripture itself tells) notes the “ prayers of the saints.” It was also that wherewith the remembrance was made in the sacrifices, or God put in mind. *Mincha*, which we turn *munus*, a “ gift ” or “ offering,” is *oblatio farrea*, an offering made of meal or flour, baked or fried, or dried or parched corn. We, in our English, when we make distinction, call it a “ meat-offering ; ” but might call it a “ bread offering,” of which the *libamen*, or the

drink-offering, being an indivisible concomitant, both are implied under the name *mincha*, where it alone is named.

The application then is easy: "incense" here notes the rational part of our Christian Sacrifice, which is prayer, thanksgiving, and commemoration; *mincha*, the material part thereof, which is *oblatio farrea*, a present of bread and wine.—pp. 357, 8.

I come now to the third and longest part of my task, to prove each particular contained in my definition by the testimonies and authorities of the ancient Fathers and writers of the first and purest ages of the Church. The particulars I am to prove are in number six.

1. That this Christian service is an oblation, and expressed under that notion by the utmost antiquity.

2. That it is an oblation of thanksgiving and prayer.

3. An oblation through JESUS CHRIST commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine.

4. That this commemoration of CHRIST, according to the style of the ancient Church, is also a Sacrifice.

5. That the Body and Blood of CHRIST, in this mystical service, was made of bread and wine, which had first been offered unto GOD, to agnize Him the LORD of the creature.

6. That this Sacrifice was placed in commemoration only of CHRIST'S Sacrifice upon the Cross, and not in a real offering of His Body and Blood anew. . . .

Let us then begin with the first, That this Christian service is an oblation, and under that notion expressed by all antiquity. The names whereby the ancient Church called this service are Προσφορὰ, Θυσία, "oblation," "Sacrifice;" Εὐχαριστία, "Eucharist," (a word, if rightly understood, of equipollent sense;) Θυσία αἰνέσεως, Θυσία λογικῆ καὶ ἀναίμακτος, "a Sacrifice of praise," "a reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice;" *Sacrificium Mediatoris*, *Sacrificium Altaris*, *Sacrificium pretii nostri*, *Sacrificium corporis et sanguinis Christi*, "the Sacrifice of our Mediator," "the Sacrifice of the Altar," "the Sacrifice of our Ransom," "the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST." It would be infinite to note all the places and authors where and by whom it is thus called.—p. 360.

But what if one of them, namely Θυσία, were used sooner, even

in St. Paul's and St. Peter's time? In the first Epistle of Peter, chap. ii. 5. "You are (saith he, speaking of the body of the Church) an holy priesthood, to offer πνευματικὰς Θυσίας spiritual sacrifices to God by JESUS CHRIST." In the Epistle to the Hebrews, xiii. 15. "By Him (that is, through CHRIST our Altar) let us offer Θυσίαν αἰνέσεως διαπαντός τῷ Θεῷ the sacrifice of praise to God continually." Why should I not think St. Paul and St. Peter speak here of the solemn and public service of Christians, wherein the Passion of CHRIST was commemorated? I am sure the Fathers frequently call this Sacrifice Θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, "the Sacrifice of praise." And in some ancient Liturgies, immediately before the Consecration, the Church gives thanks unto God for choosing them to be an holy priesthood to offer Sacrifices unto Him, as it were alluding to St. Peter. Thus you see, first or last or both, the words Προσφορά and Θυσία were no strangers to the Apostles' age.

I will now make but one quere, and answer it, and so conclude this point: whether these words or names were used (seeing they were used) properly, or improperly (καταχρηστικῶς) of the subject we speak of. I answer briefly; this Christian service, as we have defined it, is an oblation properly: for wheresoever any thing is tendered or presented unto God, there is truly and properly an oblation; (Heb. v. 7. xiii. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 5.) be it spiritual or visible, it matters not; for *oblatio* is the *genus*: and Irenæus (lib. iv. c. 34.) tells me here,—“For offerings in the general are not reprobated; there were offerings there (*viz.* in the Old Testament), there are also offerings here (*viz.* in the New Testament); there were Sacrifices among the people (that is, the Jews), there are Sacrifices also in the Church: but the specification only is changed.” But as for Θυσία, or Sacrifice, according to its prime signification, it signifies a “slaughter-offering,” as in Hebrew, so in Greek of θύω, *mactō*, “to slay;” as the angel, Acts x. 13. says to St. Peter, Πέτρε, Θύσον καὶ φάγε, “Peter, kill and eat.” Now we, in our Christian service, slay no offering, but commemorate Him only that was slain and offered upon the Cross; therefore our service is called Θυσία, improperly and metaphorically. But if Θυσία be synecdochically taken for an offer-

ing in general, as it is both in the New Testament and elsewhere, then the Christian Sacrifice is as truly called *Θυσία*, as *Προσφορά*, or *Εὐχαριστία*.—p. 361.

Now I come to the second particular contained in my definition; to prove that the Christian Sacrifice, according to the meaning of the ancient Church, is an oblation of thanksgiving and prayer.

My first author shall be Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Tryphon the Jew; where, to the evasion of the Jews, labouring to bereave the Christians of this text. . Justin replies,—“That prayers and thanksgivings, made by those that are worthy, are the only Sacrifices that are perfect and acceptable unto God, I do also affirm; for these are the only Sacrifices which Christians have been taught they should perform.” If you ask where, and how; he tells you, “in that thankful remembrance of their food both dry and liquid, wherein also is commemorated the Passion which the Son of God suffered by Himself.” . . . My next author shall be Tertullian. . . Thirdly, Clemens Alexandrinus. . . Cyprian. . . These authorities are all within the first three hundred years, to which I will add one of the fourth; Optatus Milevitanus . . .

Furthermore, that the Christian Sacrifice was an oblation of prayer, and consisted in invocation, is also another way to be evinced; namely, because the Fathers, when they speak thereof, use the terms of “prayer,” “oblation,” and “Sacrifice” promiscuously, and interchangeably one for the other, as words importing the same thing. Tertullian. . . Augustine. . .

For this reason the Christian Sacrifice is among the Fathers, by way of distinction, called *Θυσία αἰνεσέως*, *Sacrificium laudis*, that is, of confession and invocation of God; namely, to difference it from those of blood and incense. Augustine. . . —pp. 363, 4.

The second particular thus proved, the third comes next in place, which is, That this oblation of thanksgiving and prayer was made through JESUS CHRIST commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine; namely, they believed that our blessed SAVIOUR ordained this Sacrament of His Body and Blood as a rite to bless and invoke His FATHER by, instead of the manifold and bloody Sacrifices of the Law. . .

Instead, therefore, of the slaying of beasts and burning of incense, whereby they called upon the name of GOD in the Old Testament; the Fathers, I say, believed our SAVIOUR ordained this Sacrament of bread and wine as a rite whereby to give thanks and make supplication to HIS FATHER in His name.

The mystery of which rite they took to be this; that as CHRIST, by presenting His Death and Satisfaction to His Father, continually intercedes for us in heaven; so the Church on earth semblably approaches the throne of Grace, by representing CHRIST unto His Father in these holy mysteries of His Death and Passion. "*Veteres enim* (saith Cassander) *in hoc mystico Sacrificio,*" &c. . . . "The ancients did not, in this mystical Sacrifice, so much consider and respect the oblation once made upon the cross, (the memory whereof is here celebrated,) as the everlasting Priesthood of CHRIST, and the perpetual Sacrifice which He, our High Priest for ever, doth continually offer in heaven; the resemblance whereof is here on earth expressed by the solemn prayers of God's Ministers."

This a Reverend and famous Divine<sup>1</sup> of blessed memory, once of this society, and interred in this place, saw more clearly, or expressed more plainly, than any other Reformed writer I have yet seen, in his *Demonstratio Problematis*, and Title *de Sacrificio Missæ*<sup>2</sup>; where he speaks thus: "*Veteres,*" &c. . . . "The ancient Fathers used to call the Supper of the LORD, or the whole action of the Supper, a Sacrifice; and that for divers reasons. Because it is a commemoration, and also a representation unto GOD the FATHER, of the Sacrifice of CHRIST offered upon the cross." He goes on, "*Hoc modo fideles,*" &c. "In this sense the faithful in their prayers do offer CHRIST, as a Sacrifice unto GOD the Father for their sins, in being wholly carried away in their minds and affections unto that only and true Sacrifice, thereby to procure and obtain God's favour to them." That which every Christian doth mentally and vocally, when he commends his prayers to GOD the FATHER through JESUS CHRIST, making

<sup>1</sup> [Perkins.]

<sup>2</sup> [Vide *Workes*, vol. ii. pp. 550—554. Compare "Reformed Catholike," vol. i. pp. 593, 4.]

mention of His death and satisfaction; that, in the publick service of the Church, was done by that rite which our SAVIOUR commanded to be used in commemoration of Him.

These things thus explained, let us now see by what testimonies and authorities it may be proved the ancient Church had this meaning. I will begin with S. Ambrose. . . Eusebius. . . Cyril of Jerusalem, (or more likely John, his successor). . . Tertullian. . . S. Austin. . .

Lastly, that the representation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in this Christian service, was intended and used as a rite whereby to find grace and favour with God, when the Church addressed herself unto Him, (which is that I undertook to prove) is apparent by a saying of Origen, Hom. 13 in Levit., where, treating of the Shewbread, which was continually set before the LORD with incense, for a memorial of the children of Israel, that is, to put God in mind of them, he makes it in this respect to have been a lively figure of the Christians' Eucharist; "For," saith he, "that is the only commemoration which renders God propitious to men."

All these testimonies have been express for our purpose, that the thanksgivings and prayers of the Church in the Christian Sacrifice were offered unto the Divine Majesty, through CHRIST commemorated in the symbols of bread and wine, as by a medium whereby to find acceptance.

There is, besides these, an usual expression of the Fathers, when they speak of the Eucharist; which, though it be not direct and punctual, as the former, yet, I verily believe, it aimed at the same mystery: namely, when they say that in this Sacrifice, they offer praise and prayer to God the Father, through JESUS CHRIST the great High Priest. . . Clemens. . . Justin Martyr. . . Irenæus. . . Origen. . . the third Council of Carthage and Hippo. . . —pp. 365—368.

The fourth particular propounded was this, that the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, or LORD'S Supper, or the commemoration of CHRIST in the creatures of bread and wine, is also a Sacrifice, according to the style of the ancient Church.

It is one thing to say, that the LORD'S Supper is a Sacrifice, and another to say, that CHRIST is properly sacrificed therein.



These are not the same : for there may be a sacrifice which is a representation of another sacrifice, and yet a sacrifice too. And such a Sacrifice is this of the New Testament; a Sacrifice wherein another Sacrifice, that of CHRIST's death upon the cross, is commemorated. Thus the Papists gain nothing by this notion of antiquity, and our asserting the same : for their tenet is, that CHRIST in this Sacrifice is really and properly sacrificed ; which we shall show in due time that the ancients never meant.

To begin with this, that the LORD's Supper, or mystical rite of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, is a Sacrifice: as, in the Old Testament, the name of Sacrifice was otherwhile given to the whole action in which the rite was used, sometimes to the rite alone, so, in the notion and language of the ancient Church, sometimes the whole action or Christian service, (wherein the LORD's Supper was a part,) is comprehended under that name ; sometimes the rite of the sacred Supper itself is so termed, and truly, as ye shall now hear.

The resolution of this point depends altogether upon the true definition of a Sacrifice, as it is distinguished from all other offerings. Which, though it be so necessary that all disputation without it is vain ; yet shall we not find that either party interested in this question hath been so exact therein as were to be wished. This appears by the differing definitions given and confuted by Divines on both sides : the reason of which defect is, because neither are deduced from the notion of Scripture, but built upon other conceptions. Let us see, therefore, if it may be learned out of Scripture, what that is, which Scripture, in a strict and special sense, calls a Sacrifice.

Every Sacrifice is an oblation or offering : but every offering is not a Sacrifice, in that strict and proper acceptation which we seek. For tithes, first-fruits, and all other called heave-offerings in the Law, and whatsoever, indeed, is consecrated unto God, are oblations or offerings ; but none of them Sacrifices, nor ever so called in the Old Testament. What offerings are then called Sacrifices ? I answer, burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and peace-offerings. These, and no other, are called by that name. Out of these, therefore, must we pick the true and proper *ratio* and nature of a Sacrifice. . . .

A Sacrifice, I think, should be defined thus; an offering whereby the offerer is made partaker of God's table, in token of covenant and friendship with Him, &c. or more explicately thus; an offering unto the Divine Majesty of that which is given for the food of man; that the offerer, partaking thereof, might, as by way of pledge, be certified of his acceptation into covenant and fellowship with his God, by eating and drinking at His table. . . .

In a word, a Sacrifice is *oblatio fœderalis*. For the true and right understanding thereof, we must know, that it was the universal custom of mankind, and still remains in use, to contract covenants, and make leagues and friendship by eating and drinking together. . . .

Such, now, as were these covenant-feastings, and eatings and drinkings, in token of league and amity between man and man, such are Sacrifices between man and his God; *epulæ fœderales*, federal feasts, wherein God deigneth to entertain man to eat and drink with or before Him, in token of favour and reconciliation. For so it becomes the condition of the parties, that he which hath offended the other, and seeks for favour and forgiveness, should be entertained by Him to whom he is obnoxious; and not *è contra*: that is, that God should be the *convivator*, the entertainer or maker of the feast, and man the *conviva*, or guest. To which end, the viands for this sacred *epulum* were first to be offered unto God, and so made His; that He might entertain the offerer, and not the offerer Him. For we are to observe, that what the fire consumed was accounted God's own mess, and called by Himself the meat of His fire-offerings: (Levit. iii. 11. 16. Numb. xxviii. 2. 24.) the rest was for His guests, which they were partakers of, either by themselves, as in all the peace-offerings; or by their proxies, the Priests, as in all the rest, to wit, the holocausts, the sin and trespass-offerings.—pp. 369, 370.

Having thus seen what is the nature of a Sacrifice, and wherein the *ratio* or essential form thereof consisteth, it will not be hard to judge, whether the ancient Christians did rightly in giving the Eucharist that name, or not. For that the Lord's Supper is—"a federal feast," we all grant, and our SAVIOUR expressly affirms it of the cup in the institution, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ

ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,  
 “This cup is the rite of the new Covenant in My blood, which is  
 poured out for many for the remission of sins;” evidently imply-  
 ing that the bloody Sacrifices of the Law, with their meat and  
 drink-offerings, were rites of an Old Covenant, and that this suc-  
 ceeded them as the rite of the New : that that was contracted  
 with the blood of beeves, sheep, and goats ; but this founded in  
 the Blood of CHRIST. This parallel is so plain, as I think none  
 will deny it. There is nothing then remains to make this sacred  
*epulum* a full sacrifice, but that the viands thereof should be first  
 offered unto GOD, that He may be the *convivator*, we the *con-*  
*vivæ*, or the guests.—p. 372.

And this the ancient Church was wont to do ; this they be-  
 lieved our Blessed SAVIOUR Himself did, when, at the institution  
 of this sacred rite, He took the bread and the cup into His sa-  
 cred hands, and, looking up to heaven, gave thanks and blessed.  
 And after His example, they first offered the bread and wine  
 unto God, to agnize Him the LORD of the creature ; and then  
 received them from Him again in a banquet, as the symbols of  
 the Body and Blood of His Son. This is that I am now to prove  
 out of the testimonies of antiquity, not long after, but next unto  
 the Apostles’ times, when it is not likely the Church had altered  
 the form they left her for the celebration of this mystery.

I will begin with Irenæus. . . Justin Martyr. . . Origen. . .

Thus much out of Fathers ; all of them within less than two  
 hundred and fifty years after CHRIST, and less than one hundred  
 and fifty after the death of St. John.

The same appears in the forms of the ancient Liturgies. As  
 in that of Clemens, where the Priest, in the name of the whole  
 Church assembled, speaks thus ;—“ We offer unto Thee our King  
 and GOD, according to His (that is CHRIST’s) appointment, this  
 bread and this cup ; . . . and we beseech Thee, Thou GOD that  
 wantest nothing, that Thou wouldest look favourably upon these  
 gifts here set before Thee, and accept them to the honour of  
 Thy CHRIST,” &c. . . .

Yea, in the Canon of the Roman Church, though the rite be  
 not used, yet the words remain still ; as when the Priest, long

before the consecration of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, prays ; —“ We humbly beseech and entreat Thee, most merciful Father, through JESUS CHRIST Thy Son, our LORD, to accept and bless these gifts, these presents :” and other like passages, which now they wrest to a new-found oblation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which the ancient Church knew not of.—p. 374.

Lastly, this oblation of the bread and wine is implied in St. Paul’s parallel of the LORD’s Supper and the sacrifice of the Gentiles : (1 Cor. x. 21.) “ Ye cannot, (saith he) be partakers of the table of the LORD, and the table of devils ;” namely, because they imply contrary covenants, incompatible one with the other ; a Sacrifice (as I told you) being *epulum fœderale*, a federal feast. Now here it is manifest that the table of devils is so called, because it consisted of viands offered to devils, (for so St. Paul expressly tells us,) whereby those that eat thereof, eat of the devil’s meat ; *ergo*, the table of the LORD is likewise called His table, not because He ordained it, but because it consisted of viands offered unto Him.

Having thus, as I think, sufficiently proved what I took in hand, I think it not amiss to answer two questions which this discourse may beget. The first is, how the ancients could gather out of the institution, that our SAVIOUR did as hath been shewed. I answer, They believed He did as the Jews were wont to do : but they did thus. How, will you say, doth this appear ? I answer, it may appear thus. The passover was a Sacrifice, and, therefore, the viands here, as in all other holy feasts, were first offered unto GOD. Now the bread and wine, which our SAVIOUR took when He blessed and gave thanks, was the *Mincha* or meat-offering of the Passover. If, then, He did as the Jews used to do, He agnized His Father, and blessed Him, by oblation of these His creatures unto Him, using the like or the same form of words—“Blessed be Thou, O LORD our GOD, the King of the world, Which bringest forth bread out of the earth :” and over the wine—“Blessed be Thou, O LORD our GOD, the King of the world, Which createst the fruit of the vine.” Moreover, the Church, *ab initio*, applied that precept of our SAVIOUR, Matt. v. 23. “If thou bring thy gift to the altar,” &c. to the Eucharist ; for they believed that He would not enact a new law

concerning legal Sacrifices, which He was presently to abolish, but that it had reference to that oblation which was to continue under the Gospel.

The other question is, If all this be so, how is not our celebration of the Eucharist defective, where no such oblation is used? I answer, This concerns not us alone, but all the Churches of the West, of the Roman Communion, who, as in other things they have depraved this mystery, and swerved from the primitive pattern thereof, so have they, for many ages, disused this oblation of bread and wine, and brought in, in lieu thereof, a real and hypostatical oblation of CHRIST Himself. This blasphemous oblation we have taken away, and justly; but not reduced again that express and formal use of the other. Howsoever, though we do it not with a set ceremony and form of words, yet, in deed and effect we do it, so often as we set the bread and wine upon the holy table: for whatsoever we set upon GOD's table, is *ipso facto* dedicated and offered unto Him; according to that of our SAVIOUR, (Matt. xxiii. 19.)—"The altar sanctifies the gift," that is, consecrates it unto GOD, and appropriates it to His use. In which respect it were much to be wished that this were more solemnly done than is usual; namely, not until the time of the administration, and by the hand of the Minister, in the name and sight of the whole congregation, standing up and showing some sign of due and lowly reverence; according as the deacon was wont to admonish the people in ancient Liturgies . . . "Let us stand in an upright posture before GOD to offer with fear and trembling."—pp. 375, 6.

The sixth and last thing to be proved was, that CHRIST is offered in this Sacrifice commemoratively only, and not otherwise.

Though the Eucharist be a Sacrifice, (that is, an oblation wherein the offerer banquets with his GOD,) yet is CHRIST in this Sacrifice no otherwise offered, than by way of commemoration only of His Sacrifice once offered upon the cross, as a learned Prelate of ours<sup>1</sup> hath lately written, *objectivè* only, not *subjectivè*. And this is that which our SAVIOUR Himself said, when He ordained this sacred rite, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, "This do in commemoration of Me."

<sup>1</sup> [Bishop Morton.]

But this commemoration is to be made to GOD His Father, and is not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind only, (as is commonly supposed), but a putting of GOD in mind : for every Sacrifice is directed unto GOD, and the oblation therein, whatsoever it be, hath Him for its object, and not man. If, therefore, the Eucharist be *Sacrificium Christi commemorativum*, a commemorative Sacrifice of Christ, as ours grant, then must the commemoration therein be made unto GOD : and if CHRIST therein be offered *objectivè*, that is, as the object of the commemoration there made, (as that learned Bishop speaks,) the commemoration of Him be an oblation of Him, to whom is this oblation, that is, commemoration, made but unto GOD ?

Well then, CHRIST is offered in this sacred Supper, not hypostatically, as the papists would have Him, (for so He was but once offered,) but commemoratively only : that is, by this sacred rite of bread and wine we present and inculcate His blessed Passion to His Father ; we put Him in mind thereof, by setting the monuments thereof before Him ; we testify our own mindfulness thereof unto His sacred Majesty ; that so He would, for His sake, according to the tenour of His covenant, in Him be favourable and propitious unto us, miserable sinners.

That this, and no other offering of CHRIST in the blessed Eucharist, the ancient Church ever meant or intended, I am now to show by authentical testimonies. First, by the constant form of all the Liturgies ; in which, after the reciting of the words of institution, is subjoined, *Μεμνημένοι προσφέρομεν*, *commemorantes*, or *commemorando*, *offerimus*, “commemorating,” or by “commemorating, we offer.”

Clemens, *Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν προσφέρομέν σοι* . . . “Therefore commemorating His Passion, and Death, and Resurrection from the dead, and Ascension into heaven. . . we offer to Thee our KING and GOD this bread and this cup.” Mark here, “commemorating we offer,” that is, we offer by commemorating. But this commemoration is made unto GOD to whom we offer. This is the tenour of all the Greek Liturgies, save that some, instead of “We offer unto Thee this bread and this cup,” have “We offer unto Thee this dreadful and unbloody Sacrifice ;” as that of Jerusalem (called

St. James's Liturgy :) others, "this reasonable and unbloody Service;" as that of St. Chrysostom: others, τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν "Thine own of Thine own;" as that of Basil and of Alexandria, (called St. Mark's :) but all Μεμνημένοι προσφέρομεν, *Commemorantes offerimus*, "commemorating, we offer."

In the same form runs the *Ordo Romanus*, "*Memores, Domine*," &c. . . . "We, O LORD, Thy servants, as also Thy holy people, being mindful both of the Blessed Passion and Resurrection from the dead, as also of the glorious Ascension into heaven, of the same CHRIST Thy SON our LORD, offer unto Thy excellent Majesty, of Thy own gifts, a pure Sacrifice, a holy Sacrifice, an immaculate Sacrifice, the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation." Note here also *Memores offerimus*, "being mindful of," or "commemorating, we offer."

*Memores* therefore in the Latin Canon is "commemorantes," which the Greek expresses better, Μεμνημένοι: of the sense whereof that we may not doubt, hear the explication of that great council of Ephesus in this manner: Καταγγέλλοντες. . . . "Showing forth the Death of the Only Begotten Son of GOD, that is, of JESUS CHRIST, as also confessing His Resurrection and Ascension into heaven, we celebrate in our Churches the unbloody Sacrifice" or "service." . . .

I shall need allege no more of the Latin Liturgies; there is no material difference amongst them; so that, if you know the form of one, you know of all. . . .

This may suffice for Liturgies. Now let us hear the Fathers speak.

I quoted heretofore a passage of Justin Martyr affirming a twofold commemoration to be made in the Eucharist; the one of our "food dry and liquid," (as he speaks) that is, of our meat and drink, by agnizing and recording Him the LORD and Giver of the same; the other an ἀνάμνησις in the same food,—of the Passion of the Son of GOD. The first of these commemorations is made unto GOD; for to whom else should we tender our thankfulness for the creature? Ergo, the second, the commemoration of the Passion of the Son of GOD, is made to Him likewise.

My next Father is Origen, Hom. 13. in Lev. cap. 24, where

comparing the Eucharist to the shewbread which was every Sabbath set for a memorial before the LORD, *Ista est*, (saith he, meaning the Eucharist,)—"that's the only commemoration which renders GOD propitious to men." Where note that both this commemoration is made unto GOD, as that of the shewbread was; and that the end thereof is to make Him propitious to men. . . .

My next witness is Eusebius, *Demonst. Evang. lib. 1. cap. 10.*—"After all these things done," saith he, speaking of Christ, "He made that so wonderful an oblation and excellent Sacrifice to God for the salvation of us all, appointing us to offer continually a Remembrance thereof instead of a Sacrifice." And again, toward the end of that chapter, having cited this place of Malachi, which I have chosen for my text, and alluding thereunto, "We offer the incense spoken of by the Prophet;" "we offer Sacrifice and incense, while we celebrate the remembrance of the Great Sacrifice according to the mysteries given to us by Him, and offer the Eucharist with holy hymns and prayers to God for the salvation of our souls; as also in that we consecrate ourselves wholly unto Him, and dedicate ourselves both soul and body to His High Priest the Word."

But above all other, St. Chrysostom speaks so full and home to the point as nothing can be more; to wit, *Hom. xvii. in Epist. ad Hebræos. . .* What then? (saith he). "Do not we offer every day?" He answers—"We offer indeed, but it is by making a commemoration of his death," &c. . . [*Vid. sup. cit. pp. 63. 66.*] What can be more express than this is?

Primasius is short, but no less to the purpose. "Our priests indeed offer," saith he, "but it is in remembrance of His death." St. Augustine calls it "*Memoriale Sacrificium*," a Sacrifice by way of remembrance," in his Book against Faustus.

In a word, the Sacrifice of Christians is nothing but that one Sacrifice of CHRIST once offered upon the cross, again and again commemorated.

Which is elegantly expressed by those words of St. Andrew, recorded in the history of his passion, written by the Presbyters of Achaia: where, Ægeas the proconsul requiring of him to sacrifice to idols, he is said to have answered thus;—"I sacri-



rice daily to ALMIGHTY GOD, but what? not the smoke of frankincense, nor the flesh of bellowing bulls, nor the blood of goats: no, but I offer daily the unspotted Lamb of GOD on the Altar of the Cross; whose Flesh and Blood though all the faithful eat and drink of, yet after all this notwithstanding, the Lamb that was sacrificed remains entire and alive still." This riddle, though Ægeas the proconsul were not able to unfold, I make no question but you are. And here I conclude.—pp. 376—379.

#### DUPPA, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR<sup>1</sup>.

In the primitive Church, the Offertory was a considerable part in the administering and receiving the Sacrament, and was for a double end, the one in relation to the Sacrament in the offering of bread and wine, the other for the use of the poor. And these oblations were called a Sacrifice.

#### COMPILERS OF THE SCOTCH PRAYER BOOK<sup>2</sup>.

##### *Sentences for the Offertory<sup>3</sup>.*

Gen. iv. 3. And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto

<sup>1</sup> Note inserted just before the Prayer for the Church Militant, in a copy of the Book of Common Prayer, which belonged to Bp. Duppa, with marginal notes in his handwriting, written during the rebellion. The book is preserved in the Bodleian Library, Arch. D. 59.

<sup>2</sup> The following passage from Laud's "History of his Troubles and Trial," (pp. 113—115.) shows, among others, that the Scotch Common Prayer Book, was indeed compiled by the Bishops of that Church, and not (as was afterwards alleged) by Laud.

"The Large Declaration professeth, that all the variation of our Book from the Book of England, that ever the king understood, was in such things as the Scottish humours would better comply with, than with that which stood in the English Service."

"That which the 'Large Declaration' professeth, I leave the author of it to make good. Yet, whosoever was the author, thus much I can say, and truly, that the Scottish Bishops (some of them) did often say to me, that the people would be better satisfied by much, to have a Liturgy composed by their own Bishops, (as this was,) than to have the Service Book of England put upon them. . . . This I remember well, that when a deliberation was held, whether it were better to keep close to the English Liturgy, or venture upon some additions, some of your

the LORD: and Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel, and to his offering: but unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect.

Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring Exod. xxv. 2. me an offering: of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart, ye shall take my offering.

Ye shall not appear before the LORD empty: Deut. xvi. 16. every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the LORD your God, which he hath given you.

Scottish Bishops were very earnest to have some alterations and some additions. And they gave this for their reason; because, if they did not then make that Book as perfect as they could, they should never be able to get it perfected after. 'Canterbury,' therefore, was not the man 'that added this fuel to your fire.'

"But they say; 'there are divers secret reasons of this change' in the order [of the Communion]. Surely there was reason for it, else why a change? But that there was any hidden secret reason for it (more than that the Scottish Prelates thought fit that Book should differ in some things from ours in England; and yet that no difference could be more safe than those which were in the order of the Prayers; especially, since both they and we were of opinion, that of the two, this order came nearest to the Primitive Church,) truly, I neither know nor believe."

<sup>3</sup> In the present Scotch Communion Office, the Offertory stands thus:—

*Then the Deacon or Presbyter shall say,*

Let us present our offerings unto the Lord with reverence and godly fear.

*Then the Presbyter shall begin the Offertory, saying one or more of these sentences.*

[“The sentences are the same as those in the old Scotch Prayer Book, with this single exception, that 1 Chron. xxix. 10, is not inserted in its order, being reserved for a particular place, where it is introduced with peculiar propriety; for when the Presbyter places the bason containing the offering on the holy table, then he repeats 1 Chron. xxix. 10.”]

*And the Presbyter shall then offer up, and place the Bread and Wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table, and shall say,*

The Lord be with you, &c.

See Bp. Horsley's "Collation of Offices," in Skinner's "Office for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, according to the use of the Episcopal Church in Scotland."—p. 173, sqq.

1 Chron. xxix. 10. David blessed the Lord before all the congregation: and said, Blessed be Thou, O LORD GOD, for ever and ever. Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven, and in the earth, is Thine: Thine is the kingdom, O LORD, and Thou art exalted as head above all: both riches and honour come of Thee, and of Thine own do we give unto Thee. I know also, my GOD, that Thou triest the heart, and hast pleasure in uprightness. As for me, in the uprightness of my heart, I have willingly offered all these things. And now have I seen with joy Thy people which are present here, to offer willingly unto Thee.

Psal. xcvi. 8. Give unto the LORD the glory due unto His name: bring an offering, and come into His courts.

Matt. vi. 19, 20. Lay not up for yourselves, &c.

¶ *While the Presbyter distinctly pronounceth some or all of these sentences for the Offertory, the Deacon, or (if no such be present) one of the Churchwardens, shall receive the Devotions of the people then present, in a Bason provided for that purpose. And when all have offered, he shall reverently bring the said Bason, with the oblations therein, and deliver it to the Presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the holy Table. And the Presbyter shall then offer up, and place the Bread and Wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table, that it may be ready for that service: And then he shall say,—*

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church, &c.

ALMIGHTY and everliving GOD, who by Thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men, &c. . . truly serving Thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. And we commend especially unto Thy merciful goodness, the congregation which is here assembled in Thy Name, to celebrate the commemoration of

the most precious death and sacrifice of Thy Son and our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. And we most humbly beseech Thee, of Thy goodness, O LORD, &c. . . .

[*Prayer of Consecration.*]

ALMIGHTY GOD, our heavenly Father, which <sup>1</sup> of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thine only Son JESUS CHRIST to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who <sup>2</sup> made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered,) &c. . . . and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory <sup>3</sup> of that His precious death and sacrifice, until His coming again; <sup>4</sup> . . . Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with Thy word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son: so that we, receiving them according to Thy Son our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST's holy institution, may be partakers of His most precious Body and Blood; who, in the night that He was betrayed, &c. . . . in remembrance of Me.

¶ *Immediately after shall be said this Memorial, or Prayer of Oblation, as followeth:—*

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts <sup>5</sup>, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed passion <sup>6</sup>, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for

<sup>1</sup> In the present Scotch Communion Office, the Form of Consecration stands thus; "All glory be to Thee, Almighty God, for that Thou, of Thy tender mercy, &c."

<sup>2</sup> "Who (by His own oblation of Himself once offered) made."

<sup>3</sup> "Memorial."

<sup>4</sup> "For, in the night, &c."

<sup>5</sup> "Which we now offer unto Thee."

<sup>6</sup> "And precious death, His mighty resurrection."

the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same<sup>1</sup>. And we entirely desire, &c.

NICHOLSON, BISHOP.—*Exposition of the Catechism.*

A "remembrance" of it: the Sacrament was "ordained for" that end. On all hands it is agreed, that it is a Sacrifice of commemoration.—p. 209.

A command there is, that upon the first day of the week (a day appointed for the Sacrifice), every man should set apart somewhat for the use of the poor.—p. 210.

BRAMHALL, ARCHBISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Answer to M. de la Miltière's Epistle to the King*<sup>2</sup>.

First, you say, we have renounced your Sacrifice of the Mass. If the Sacrifice of the Mass be the same with the Sacrifice of the Cross, we attribute more unto it than yourselves: we place our whole hope of salvation in it. If you understand another propitiatory Sacrifice, distinct from that (as this of the Mass seems to be, for confessedly the priest is not the same, the altar is not the same, the temple is not the same); if you think of any new meritorious satisfaction to God for the sins of the world, or of any new supplement to the merits of CHRIST'S Passion, you must give us leave to renounce your Sacrifice indeed, and to adhere to the Apostle: "by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Heb. x. 14.

<sup>1</sup> In the present office, here follows, out of the Prayer of Consecration, "And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son. And we earnestly desire, &c. And here we humbly present...unto Thee, beseeching Thee," &c. . . . [as in the old Scotch Prayer Book, except that the word "filled" is used instead of "fulfilled."]

After the Prayer of Oblation and Invocation, follows the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church.—See Bp. Horsley's "Collation."

<sup>2</sup> Epistle to the King of Great Britain, wherein he inviteth his majesty to forsake the Church of England, and to embrace the Roman Catholic Religion.

Surely you cannot think that CHRIST did actually sacrifice Himself at His last supper; (for then He had redeemed the world at His last supper, then His subsequent Sacrifice upon the cross had been superfluous); nor that the priest now doth more than CHRIST did then. We do readily acknowledge an Eucharistical Sacrifice of prayers and praises; we profess a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the cross; and, in the language of holy Church, things commemorated are related as if they were then acted: as "ALMIGHTY GOD, who hast given us Thy Son [as this day] to be born of a pure virgin;" and, "whose praise the younger innocents have [this day] set forth;" and, between the Ascension and Pentecost, "which hast exalted Thy Son JESUS CHRIST with great triumph into Heaven, we beseech Thee leave us not comfortless, but send unto us thy Holy Spirit." We acknowledge a representation of that Sacrifice to GOD the Father; we acknowledge an imputation of the benefit of it; we maintain an application of its virtue: so here is a commemorative, impetrative, applicative Sacrifice. Speak distinctly, and I cannot understand what you can desire more. To make it a suppletory Sacrifice, to supply the defects of the only true Sacrifice of the cross, I hope both you and I abhor.—*Works*, pp. 35, 6.

Id.—*Protestants' Ordination defended.*

His third argument is contained in the sixth section. "The English superintendents, after their fall from the Roman Church, neither intended to give those holy orders instituted by CHRIST, neither did the ordained intend to receive them. For the priesthood instituted by CHRIST comprehended two functions, the one appertaining to the real Body of CHRIST, to complete it and offer it to GOD; the other, over the mystical Body of CHRIST, to remit sins. But, with the Protestants, the consecrating bishops do not intend to give, nor the consecrated ministers to receive either of these two functions, but on the contrary, do deny them, and disdain them. Therefore, notwithstanding their character, they have not those sacred orders which were instituted by CHRIST. But

their ordination is a mere personation of that Sacrament. . . To his argument then I answer . . .

Thirdly, to his two functions of consecrating and remitting sin, Protestants do intend to confer them both, so far as either CHRIST did confer them, or the blessed Apostles execute them. Doubtless they know their own intentions better than S. N. He who saith, "Take thou authority to exercise the office of a priest in the Church of God," (as the Protestant consecrators do,) doth intend all things requisite to the priestly function, and among the rest, to offer a representative Sacrifice, to commemorate and to apply the Sacrifice which CHRIST made upon the Cross. But for any other Sacrifice, distinct from that which is propitiatory, meritorious, and satisfactory by its proper virtue and power, the Scriptures do not authorize, the Fathers did not believe, the Protestants do not receive any such. This is a certain truth, that the Passion of CHRIST is the only ransom and propitiation for sin.—pp. 992, 3.

In the next place he goes about to refute Mr. Mason, a Protestant writer who saith, that we have purged that holy priesthood which CHRIST ordained, from the corruptions of sacrificing and shrift, which the Romanists had added. So saith he, "The whole question is brought to this issue, whether our SAVIOUR instituted a sacrificing priesthood, to which authority is given to remit sins in the Sacrament of penance." And concludes, "that if the Protestants have pared away these priestly functions, they have rejected the whole substance, and pared off the pith of CHRIST's heavenly priesthood." In the name of God, what have we to do with CHRIST's heavenly priesthood in this question, which is to make intercession and atonement for us to His FATHER, in respect whereof, He is called our Passover, our Propitiation, our Advocate, our Mediator; as St. Austin saith, "the same is the Priest, and the Sacrifice, and the Temple; the Priest by whom we are reconciled, the Sacrifice wherewith we are reconciled, the Temple wherein we are reconciled; but Priest, Sacrifice, Temple, and all, is GOD in the form of a servant." They are not the Protestants then, but the Romanists, who pare off the pith of CHRIST's heavenly priesthood, who daily

make as many distinct propitiatory Sacrifices as there are masses in the world, who mix the sufferings of the saints with the blood of CHRIST, to make up the treasury of the Church, who multiply their mediators, as the heathens did their tutelary gods, begging at their hands to receive them at the hour of death, to reconcile them to GOD, to be their advocates, their mediators, their propitiation, and briefly to do all those offices which belong to the heavenly priesthood of CHRIST. . . .

Thus he mistakes CHRIST's heavenly priesthood for man's earthly priesthood; he mistakes the power or actions of the presbyterate for the essence of it. And lastly, he mistakes the tenet of his adversaries. Mr. Mason does not say, that the Protestants have pared away all manner of Sacrifices. First, they acknowledge spiritual and eucharistical Sacrifices, as prayers, praises, a contrite heart, alms, and the like. Secondly, they acknowledge a commemoration, or a representative Sacrifice, in the holy Eucharist. Thirdly, they teach that this is not *nuda commemoratio*, a bare commemoration without efficacy, but that the blessed Sacrament is a means ordained by CHRIST, to render us capable, and to apply unto us the virtue of that all-sufficient Sacrifice of infinite value, which CHRIST made upon the Cross; which is as far as the moderate Romanists dare go, in distinct and particular expressions. But the Protestants dare not say, that the holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice propitiatory in itself, by its own proper virtue and expiatory efficacy. Whatsoever power it hath, is in relation to the Sacrifice of CHRIST, as a means ordained to apply that to true believers. In sum, the essence of the Roman Sacrifice doth consist, according to the doctrine of their own schools, either in the consecration alone, or in the manducation alone, or both in the consecration and participation, but not at all either in the oblation before consecration, or in the oblation after consecration, or in the fraction or mixture. Seeing therefore the Protestants do retain both the consecration and consumption or communication, without all contradiction, under the name of a Sacrament, they have the very thing which the Romanists call a Sacrifice. How is the world amused with a show of empty names to no purpose!—pp. 996, 7.



COSIN, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Collection of Private Devotions.*

*Prayers before the Sacrament.*

I. ALMIGHTY LORD, who hast of Thine infinite mercy vouchsafed to ordain this dreadful Sacrament for a perpetual memory of that blessed Sacrifice which once Thou madest for us upon the cross ; grant me, with such diligent remembrance, and such due reverence, to assist the holy celebration of so heavenly and wonderful a mystery, that I may be made worthy by Thy grace to obtain the virtue and fruits of the same, with all the benefits of Thy precious death and passion, even the remission of all my sins, and the fulness of all Thy graces ; which I beg for Thy only merits, who art my only SAVIOUR, God from everlasting, and world without end. Amen.

II. O LORD, our heavenly Father, Almighty and everlasting God, regard, we beseech Thee, the devotion of Thy humble servants, who do now celebrate the memorial which Thy Son our SAVIOUR hath commanded to be made in remembrance of His most blessed Passion and Sacrifice, that by the merits and power thereof, now represented before Thy divine Majesty, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and be made partakers of all other the benefits of His most precious death and passion, together with His mighty resurrection from the earth, and His glorious ascension into heaven, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost ever one God, world without end. Amen.

III. Be pleased, O GOD, to accept of this our bounden duty and service, and command that the prayers and supplications, together with the remembrance of CHRIST'S Passion, which we now offer up unto Thee, may be received into Thy heavenly tabernacle ; and that Thou not weighing our own merits, but looking upon the blessed Sacrifice of our SAVIOUR, which was once fully and perfectly made for us all, mayst pardon our offences, and replenish us with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, through the same JESUS CHRIST our LORD.

ID.—Notes on the Common Prayer <sup>1</sup>.

“ A perpetual memory.”] . . . It is peculiar to this celebration, that the death of our LORD is commemorated therein, not by bare words, as in other prayers, but also by certain sacred symbols, signs and sacraments, which, according to St. Austin, are a sort of “*verba visibilia*.” “*Nam dum frangitur hostia*,” &c. (Lib. 19. cont. Faust. cap. 16.)

There is indeed a remembrance and a prayer, both within and without this most holy Sacrament; because the body of CHRIST, which was delivered to death, is exhibited therein; and besides, by symbolical or sacramental actions, the delivery of His Body, and the effusion of His Blood, are figured out; therefore the ancients love to call the commemoration peculiar to this Sacrament, a “*Commemorative Sacrifice*,” and the prayer, an “*Oblation* :” both these words being taken properly, but in an improper and large or metaphorical signification. It is a known passage, that of St. Austin in his Epistle to Boniface, “*Die Dominico dicimus*.” “*Now by the same figure as CHRIST is said to have risen that day by which the remembrance of his resurrection is celebrated, so is He said to be sacrificed in the Eucharist, because therein the memory of His Sacrifice is performed* :” and likewise that place in Fulgentius is remarkable, *de Fid. ad Pet.* cap. 19. *Firmissimè tene*, &c. . . . Euseb. *Demonstr. Evang.* lib. 2. *sub fin. Ejus Sacrificii memoriam*, &c.

It pleased the Synod at Trent (not long after this Liturgy of ours was published) to lay their curse (their “*Anathema*”) upon all them that held the “*celebration of this Sacrament to be made a commemoration only of CHRIST’S Sacrifice upon the cross; or that said, it was not a true propitiatory Sacrifice, but a Sacrifice only of praise and thanksgiving; or that taught any more, that this Sacrifice profited none but those who communicate of it, and was not truly offered up for the sins, pains, and satisfactions of the living and the dead*.” Sess. 22. For thus

<sup>1</sup> MS. Notes collected by Bishop Cosin, and written in an interleaved Common Prayer Book, in the Bishop of Durham’s Library, printed 1636. See Additional Notes, in Nicholls on the Common Prayer.

they declared themselves in ambiguous words, which, as they may have a right and true sense put upon them, so are they capable of a wrong and a false, if they intended them (as they did) against us. For we do not hold this celebration to be so naked a commemoration of CHRIST's Body given to death, and of His Blood there shed for us; but that the same Body and Blood is present there in this commemoration (made by the Sacrament of bread and wine) to all that faithfully receive it: nor do we say, it is so made a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but that, by our prayers also added, we offer and present the death of CHRIST to God, that for His death's sake we may find mercy; in which respect we deny not this commemorative Sacrifice to be propitiatory. The receiving of which Sacrament, or participating of which Sacrifice exhibited to us, we say is profitable only to them that receive it, and participate of it; but the prayers that we add thereunto, in presenting the death and merits of our SAVIOUR to God, is [are] not only beneficial to them that are present, but to them that are absent also, to the dead and living both, to all true members of the Catholic Church of CHRIST: but a true real presence and propitiatory Sacrifice of CHRIST, *toties quoties*, as this Sacrament is celebrated, which is the Popish doctrine, and which cannot be done without killing of CHRIST so often again, we hold not; believing it to be a false and blasphemous doctrine, founding ourselves upon the Apostle's doctrine, that CHRIST was sacrificed but once, and that now He dieth no more.—p. 46.

“Do this in remembrance”—“Drink this in remembrance.”] That is, of CHRIST put to death, and sacrificed for us upon the cross, which is the Sacrifice which He truly and properly once made, and whereof we only make a commemoration or representation, *toties quoties*, as often as we celebrate this His Sacrament, and observe the precept which He gave us about it.

But as much as the breaking of bread, or the pouring out of wine, or the mystical taking of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, is far different from being the true suffering and death of our LORD, and the separation of the Soul from our LORD's Body, so is the Sacrifice of the Eucharist far from being a Sacrifice of a proper strict nomination; and this denominated from that only extrinsically as the image of its prototype.—p. 48.

“This our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,"] *i. e.* this Sacrifice of our Eucharist. In which regard, and in divers other besides, the Eucharist may, by allusion, analogy, and extrinsical denomination, be fitly called a Sacrifice, and the LORD's table an Altar ; the one relating to the other ; though neither of them can be strictly and properly so termed.

It is the custom of Scripture, to describe the service of GOD under the New Testament, be it either internal or external, by the terms which otherways most properly belonged to the Old ; as “immolation,” “offering,” “sacrifice,” and “altar.” And, indeed, the Sacrament of the Eucharist carries the name of a Sacrifice ; and the table, whereon it is celebrated, an altar of oblation, in a far higher sense, than any of their former Sacrifices did, which were but the types and figures of those services, that are performed in recognition and memory of CHRIST's one Sacrifice, once offered upon the altar of His cross. The prophecy of Malachi, concerning the Church under the New Testament (“My name is great among the Gentiles, and they shall offer a sacrifice unto me, a pure oblation.” Mal. i. 10.), applied by the Doctors of the Roman Church to their proper Sacrifice (as they call it) of the Mass, is interpreted and applied by the ancient Fathers, sometimes in general to all the acts of our Christian religion, and sometimes in particular to the Eucharist ; that is, the act of our prayers and thanksgiving for the Sacrifice of CHRIST once made for us upon the cross, (as here we use in the Church of England) Hieron. *in hunc locum*, &c. . . . The Church of England herein followeth the Holy Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers. Psal. l. 14. Hos. xiv. 3. Heb. xiii. 15, &c. . . .

“That by the merits and death,” &c.] “*Insigne admodum Sacrificii genus*,” &c. A very excellent kind of Sacrifice is this : for to beseech and pray to GOD the Father by CHRIST's death and merits, is nothing else, but to offer CHRIST and CHRIST's death and merits to GOD the Father ; therefore, in the celebration of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, GOD's Son and His Son's death (which is the most true Sacrifice) is represented by us to GOD the Father, and by the same representation, commemoration, and obtestation, is “offered ;” and that (as will appear from what will be afterwards said) for the living and for the dead,

*i. e.* for the whole Church : for, as CHRIST Himself, now He is in heaven, does appear in the presence of GOD for us, making intercession for us, (Heb. ix. 20. Rom. viii. 34.) and does present and offer Himself and His death to GOD ; so also the Church upon earth, which is His body, when it beseeches GOD for His sake and His death, does also represent and offer Him, and His death, and consequently that Sacrifice which was performed on the cross : for no one is so blind, as not to see the difference between a " proper offering," which was once performed by His death on the cross, and between an " improper offering," which is now made either in heaven, by that His appearance on our behalf, or here on earth, by prayers and representation, or obtestation, or commemoration, there being only the same common name for these, but a very wide difference in the things themselves. But if any one does consider the true nature of a Sacrifice, he will find, that to have a live thing which is offered to GOD destroyed, is not a Sacrifice properly so called, but improperly only, and by external denomination.

It appears therefore how this may be called a Sacrifice, and how it may not ; which is to be observed ; for if we take a Sacrifice properly and formally, whether for the action of sacrificing (as it is at this day taken by the Roman priests), then truly, although, by the commemoration and representation, it be the same numerical Sacrifice with that which was offered on the Cross, yet the action itself, or the oblation which is now made by us in the Eucharist, agrees neither in species nor genus with the oblation or immolation which was on the Cross. For there is no form or reason of the oblation given, which can be univocally predicated of that ; for upon the Cross the oblation was made by a true destruction and death of the live thing, without which no Sacrifice properly so called can be ; but in our Eucharist there is a Sacrifice made by prayers, a commemoration, and a representation, which is not properly a Sacrifice. But nothing binders, but that the Eucharist may be accounted and called the commemorative Sacrifice of the proper Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST, which our LORD Himself hath taught us, when He said, " This do in remembrance of Me."

' That we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of

our sins, and all other benefits of His passion.”] Whereby all “the whole Church” is to be understood, as well those who have been heretofore, and those who shall be hereafter, as those that are now the present members of it. And hereupon my Lord of Winchester, Bishop Andrews, propounded his answer to Cardinal Perron, when he said, “We have and offer this Sacrifice both for the living and for the dead: as well for them that are absent, as those that be present;” or words to this purpose, for I have not the book now by me. . . .

So that the virtue of this Sacrifice (which is here in this Prayer of Oblation commemorated and represented) doth not only extend itself to the living, and those that are present, but likewise to them that are absent, and them that are already departed, or shall in time to come live and die in the faith of CHRIST: Which thing being observed, several expressions of the ancients, concerning the Sacrifice and Oblation of the Church for the living and the dead, (which otherways at first view may seem difficult) may be cleared up and easily explained; for they thought of nothing less than of the “*opus operatum*” of the popish mass, and a Sacrifice so called, which the Romish priests (not the reformed) pretend and boast, though without ground, “*toties quoties*,” to offer up. But we, with the ancient Fathers, assert and teach, that in the Sacrament of the LORD’S Supper, among the ancients, there was no other oblation made for the living and the dead, but only that the priest or presbyter, standing before the holy table, prayed to GOD for them for the sake of CHRIST, and CHRIST’S Passion and death.

Therefore we do not depart from the tradition of antiquity, and the custom of the universal Church in this matter.

“To offer unto Thee any Sacrifice.”] The celebration of this Sacrament may for divers reasons be called a Sacrifice; and we do acknowledge, that by the ancient Church it was so called; but yet we deny that there is any reason why it should be called a “true Sacrifice,” and “properly so called,” or ought to be so; for when we call any thing a true Sacrifice, we have regard to the *formal* reason of a Sacrifice, and not the *final*. For the end is to pay worship and obedience to GOD, and to do what GOD ap-

proves and accounts acceptable to Him. For whatsoever work is of this kind, is by S. Austin called a true Sacrifice. . . .

So that by the ancients and us, the celebration of this Sacrament is called a Sacrifice, yea a true Sacrifice in the manner we have explained it in. First, because it is a sensible rite, supplying the place of sensible things. Secondly, because, when it is celebrated, those things are wont to be offered, which were used in Sacrifices, or at least went to the use of the ministers of the Church, or the poor, which in scriptural phrase are called "Sacrifices acceptable to God." Thirdly, because therein thanks are given to God, and prayers are poured out, which in Scripture are styled by the name of "Sacrifice." Fourthly, because by these prayers the Passion, Death and Merits of CHRIST, are offered up to God the FATHER by commemoration and representation. As we showed before that S. Austin spoke.—pp. 49—51.

Id.—*Paper concerning the Differences, &c.*<sup>1</sup>

The Differences.

5. That the priests offer up our SAVIOUR in the mass, as a real, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead; and that whosoever believes it not is eternally damned.

Our Agreements.

7. In commemorating at the Eucharist the Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Body and Blood once truly offered for us.

HEYLYN, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Antidotum Lincolnense.*

For when our blessed LORD and SAVIOUR had, by that one offering of Himself once for all, "perfected for ever all them that are sanctified," and "by His own blood entered into the holy place" and "obtained eternal redemption for us," there was forthwith an end of all those sacrifices in the law, by which this one of His had been prefigured. . . . Yet did not CHRIST deprive His Church for ever of all manner of Sacrifices, but only abrogated

<sup>1</sup> A Paper concerning the Differences in the chief points of Religion betwixt the Church of Rome and the Church of England, written to the late Countess of Peterborough.—*Hicks's Controversial Letters*, vol. i. *Appendix*, Paper i.

those which had been before ; which, if continued, might have been a strong presumption of His not coming in the flesh ; in which respect, those, and all other ceremonies of the Jews, are by the Fathers said to be, not only dangerous, but deadly, to us Christian men. The Passion of our SAVIOUR, as, by the LORD'S own ordinance, it was prefigured to the Jews in the legal Sacrifices, *à parte ante* ; so by CHRIST'S institution, it is to be commemorated by us Christians in the holy Supper, *à parte post*. A Sacrifice it was in figure, a Sacrifice in fact, and so, by consequence, a Sacrifice in the commemorations, or upon the post-fact. A Sacrifice there was among the Jews, shewing forth CHRIST'S death unto them, before His coming in the flesh : a Sacrifice there must be amongst the Christians, to show forth the Lord's death till He come in judgment. And if a Sacrifice there must be, there must be also Priests to do, and Altars whereupon to do it ; because, without a Priest and Altar, there can be no Sacrifice : yet so that the precedent Sacrifice was of a different nature from the subsequent ; and so are also both the Priest and Altar from those before : a bloody Sacrifice then, an unbloody now ; a Priest derived from Aaron then, from Melchisedec now ; an Altar for Mosaical Sacrifices then, for Evangelical now ;—the Sacrifice prescribed by CHRIST, *qui novi testamenti*, &c. [“ who taught the new oblation of the New Testament,”] saith Irenæus, l. iv. c. 32. “ Who the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, &c. . . . Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.” Which words, if they express not plain enough the nature of the Sacrifice to be commemorative, we may take those that follow by way of commentary ; “ for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the LORD'S death till He come.”—pp. 137—139.

Of any expiatory Sacrifice, of any offering up of CHRIST for the quick and dead, more than had been done by Him once, and once for all, those blessed ages never dreamt. And howsoever some of the ancient Fathers did amplify, with the choicest of their rhetoric, the dignity and nature of this holy Sacrament, the better to influence the people with a lively zeal, at their partaking of the same ; yet they meant nothing less, than to give any



opportunity to the future ages, of making that an expiatory Sacrifice, which they did only teach to be commemorative, or representative of our SAVIOUR'S Passion. A Sacrifice they did confess it, Altars and Priests they did allow of, as necessary thereunto; not thinking fit to change those terms, which had been recommended to them from pure antiquity. Those blessed spirits were not *λογομάχοι*, contentious about words and forms of speech, in which there was not manifest impiety. The Supper of the LORD they called sometimes a Sacrifice, and sometimes a memorial of the Sacrifice,—and so St. Chrysostom on the 9th chapter to the Hebrews, sometimes a Sacrifice, and sometimes a Sacrament, and so St. Austin for example; for, in his book *de Civitate Dei*, he calleth it a Sacrifice; and saith, that it succeeded in the place of those legal Sacrifices, mentioned in the Old Testament. The same St. Austin, as you tell us, doth in the same book call it a Sacrament of memory; . . . and I am sure, that in the very same book it is called “the Sacrament of the Altar:” which was a very common appellation among the Fathers, as was acknowledged by the Martyrs in queen Mary's time. So for the Minister thereof, they called him sometimes Presbyter, and sometimes *Sacerdos*, Elder, or Priest, indifferently, without doubt or scruple. . . The Table, or the Altar, were to them such indifferent words, that they used them both equally. . . . So that, in all this search into antiquity, we find a general consent in the Church of GOD, touching the business now in hand: the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper being confessed to be a Sacrifice; the Minister therein, entitled by the name of Priest; that on which the Priest did consecrate, being as usually called by the name of Altar, as by that of Table. . . . Not an improper Altar, and an improper Sacrifice, as you idly dream of: for Sacrifices, Priests, and Altars being relatives, as yourself confesseth, the Sacrifice and the Altar being improper, must needs infer that even our Priesthood is improper also; and we may speak in proper and significant terms, as the Fathers did, without approving either the Popish mass, or the Jewish sacrifices.—pp. 155—8.

It were an infinite labour to sum up all places of and in the Rubrics, wherein the Minister is called by the name of Priest;

which being so, as so it is, and that your own self hath told us that Altar, Priest, and Sacrifice are relatives, the Church of England, keeping still as well the office of Priesthood, as the name of Priest, must needs admit of Altars, and of Sacrifices, as things peculiar to the Priesthood. But, not to trust so great a matter to your rules of logic, we will next see, what is the judgment of the Church in the point of Sacrifice. Two ways there are by which the Church declares herself in the present business : first, positively, in the Book of Articles and that of Homilies ; and practically, in the Book of Common Prayer. First, in the Articles ; (Art. xxxi.) “ The offering of CHRIST once made,” &c. . . This Sacrifice or oblation, once for ever made, and never more to be repeated, was, by our SAVIOUR’S own appointment, to be commemorated and represented to us, for the better quickening of our faith : whereof, if there be nothing said in the Book of Articles, it is because the Articles related chiefly unto points in controversy ; but in the Book of Homilies, which do relate unto the Articles, as confirmed in them, and are (though not dogmatical, but rather popular discourses,) a comment, as it were, on those points of doctrine, which are determined of elsewhere. we find it thus : (*Hom. of the Sacrament*, Part ii. p. 197.) “ That the great love of our SAVIOUR CHRIST to mankind doth not only appear, in that dear bought benefit of our redemption, and satisfaction by His death and Passion, but also in that He hath so kindly provided that the same most merciful work might be had in continual remembrance. Amongst the which means is the public celebration of the memory of His precious death at the LORD’S table :—our SAVIOUR having ordained and established the remembrance of His great mercy expressed in His Passion, in the institution of His heavenly Supper.” Here is a commemoration of that blessed Sacrifice which CHRIST once offered, a public celebration of the memory thereof, and a continual remembrance of it by Himself ordained. Which, if it seem not full enough for the commemorative Sacrifice, in the Church observed, the Homily will tell us further ; “ that this LORD’S Supper is in such wise to be done and ministered, as our LORD and SAVIOUR did, and commanded it to be done ; as His holy Apostles used it ; and

the good Fathers in the primitive Church frequented it." So that whatever hath been proved to be the purpose of the institution, the practice of the holy Apostles, and usage of the ancient Fathers, will fall within the meaning and intention of the Church of England.

For better manifesting of the which intention, we will next look into the *Agenda*, the public Liturgy of this Church. Where first we find it granted, that "CHRIST our SAVIOUR is the very Paschal Lamb that was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world;" (Preface on Easter Day.) that suffering "death upon the cross for our redemption," He "made there by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;" (Prayer of Consecration.) "and, to the end that we should always remember, &c. . . He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love and continual remembrance of His death;" (Exhortation before the Communion.) "instituting, and in His holy Gospel commanding us to continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death till His coming again." (Prayer of Consecration.) Then followeth the consecration of the creatures of bread and wine, for a remembrance of His death and Passion, in the same words and phrases which CHRIST our SAVIOUR recommended unto His Apostles, and the Apostles to the Fathers of the primitive times: which now, as then, is to be done only by the Priest, ("then the Priest standing up, shall say as followeth,") to whom it properly belongeth, and upon whom his ordination doth confer a power of ministering the Sacraments, not given to any other order in the holy Ministry. The memory or commemoration of CHRIST's death thus celebrated, is called (Prayer after the Communion) a Sacrifice, a "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" a Sacrifice, representative of that one and only expiatory Sacrifice, which CHRIST once offered for us all: the whole communicants "beseeching God to grant, that," &c. . . . Nor stay they there, but forthwith "offer and present unto the LORD themselves, their souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively Sacrifice unto Him:" and, howsoever, as they most humbly do acknowledge, they are "unworthy through their manifold sins, to offer to Him

any Sacrifice, yet they beseech Him to accept that their bounden duty and service." In which last words, that present service which they do to ALMIGHTY GOD, according to their "bounden duties," in celebrating the "perpetual memory of CHRIST's precious death," and the oblation of themselves, and, with themselves "the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," in due acknowledgment of the benefits and comforts by His death received, is humbly offered unto GOD, for and as a Sacrifice, and publicly avowed for such, as from the tenour and coherence of the words doth appear most plainly. Put all together which hath been here delivered from the Book of Articles, the Homilies, and public Liturgy, and tell me if you ever found a more excellent concord, than this between Eusebius <sup>1</sup> and the Church of England, in the present business: our SAVIOUR's Sacrifice upon the cross, called there, τὸ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου καθάρσιον, and here acknowledged to be the "perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world." . . . The memory or commemoration of this His death, called there, τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος ὑπόμνησιν, and here, (Hom.) the public "celebration of the memory" of His precious death, at the LORD's table; there, μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος, here, (Hom.) the remembrance of His great mercy expressed in His Passion; there, for the offering of this Sacrifice to ALMIGHTY GOD, πάντως καὶ ἱερωσύνης &c. there was a Priesthood thought to be very necessary, and, here, the Priest alone hath power to consecrate the creatures of bread and wine, for a remembrance of His death and Passion; there, the whole action, as it relates to Priest and people, is called θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, and here, the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; there, τὰς λογικὰς θυσίας καὶ ἱεροπρεπεῖς θῦμα, here, in the selfsame words, a "reasonable and holy Sacrifice:" there, the communicants do offer to the LORD σφᾶς αὐτοῦς, σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ, and here they do present unto Him themselves, souls, and bodies; finally, there it is said, θύομεν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος, that they do sacrifice unto the LORD the memory of that great oblation; *i. e.* as he expounds himself, they offer to Him the commemoration of the same, ἀντὶ τῆς θυσίας, for, and as a Sacrifice; and here, we do

<sup>1</sup> Vid. sup. cit. p. 125.

beseech the LORD to accept this our "bounden duty and service," for, and as a Sacrifice, which, notwithstanding, we confess ourselves "unworthy to offer" to Him. Never did Church agree more perfectly with the ancient patterns.—pp. 159—164.

*Id.—Life and Death of Archbishop Laud. Necessary Introduction.*

The Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper they (the first Reformers) called the Sacrament of the Altar, as appears plainly by the statute 1st Edward VI., entituled, "An Act against such as speak unreverently against the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, commonly called the Sacrament of the altar." For which consult the body of the Act itself. Or, secondly, by Bishop Ridley, (one of the chief Compilers of the Common Prayer Book,) who doth not only call it the "Sacrament of the Altar," affirming thus, "that in the Sacrament of the altar is the natural Body and Blood of CHRIST," &c. but, in his reply to an argument of the Bishop of Lincoln's, taken out of St. Cyril, he doth resolve it thus, *viz.* "The word 'Altar' in the Scripture signifieth as well the altar whereon the Jews were wont to offer their burnt Sacrifice, as the Table of the LORD'S Supper: and that St. Cyril meaneth by this word Altar, not the Jewish altar, but the Table of the LORD," &c. (Acts and Mon. part iii. p. 492. 497.) Thirdly, by Bishop Latimer, his fellow martyr, who plainly grants, "That the LORD'S Table may be called an Altar, and that the Doctors called it so in many places, though there be no propitiatory Sacrifice, but only CHRIST." (Part ii. p. 85.) Fourthly, by the several affirmations of John Lambert, and John Philpot, two learned and religious men, whereof the one suffered death for religion under Henry VIII., the other in the fiery time of Queen Mary,—this Sacrament being called by both, "the Sacrament of the altar" in their several times: for which consult the Acts and Monuments, commonly called the Book of Martyrs.—p. 21.

Here, then, we have the word, the "altar," *sed ubi est victima holocausti*; (as Isaac said unto his father,) "but where is the lamb for the burnt-offering?" (Gen. xxii. 7.) Assuredly, if the Priest and Altar be so near, the lamb for the burnt-offering

cannot be far off, even the most blessed "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world," as the Scripture styles Him, whose Passion we find commemorated in the Sacrament of the Altar, as before is said; called for the same reason by St. Augustine, in his Enchiridion, *Sacrificium altaris*, "the Sacrifice of the altar;" by the English Liturgy, in the Prayer next after the participation, the "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" (*Sacrificium laudis*); by Chrysostom, Ἀνάμνησις τῆς θυσίας, "the remembrance of a Sacrifice;" by many learned writers amongst ourselves, a "commemorative Sacrifice." For thus saith Bishop Andrews in his answer to Cardinal Bellarmine, (c. 8.) "*Tollite*," &c.<sup>1</sup> . . . . The like we find in Bishop Morton. . . But what need any thing have been said for the proof hereof, when the most Rev. Archbishop Cranmer, one (and the chief) of the compilers of the public Liturgy, and one who suffered death for opposing the Sacrifice of the Mass, distinguisheth most plainly between the Sacrifice propitiatory, made by CHRIST Himself only, and the Sacrifice commemorative and gratulatory, made by Priests and people: for which consult his Defence against Bishop Gardiner, lib. v. p. 439. And, finally, the testimony of John Lambert, who suffered for his conscience in the time of Henry VIII., whose words are these: "CHRIST (saith he) being offered up once for all in His own proper person, is yet said to be offered up, not only every year at Easter, but also every day in the celebration of the Sacrament; because His oblation, once for all made, is thereby represented." (Act. Mon. p. ii. 35.) So uniform is the consent of our Liturgy, our Martyrs, and our learned writers in the name of Sacrifice: so that we may behold the Eucharist or the Lord's Supper, first, as it is a Sacrifice, or the commemoration of that Sacrifice offered unto God; by which both we and the whole Church do obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of CHRIST's Passion; And, secondly, as it is a Sacrament, participated by men, by which we hope that, being made partakers of that holy Communion, we may be fulfilled with His grace and heavenly benediction. Both which occur in the next Prayer after the Communion. Look on it as a

<sup>1</sup> Vid. sup. p. 95.

Sacrifice, and then the LORD's board not improperly may be called an altar, as it is properly called the table in respect of the Sacrament.—pp. 22, 3.

SPARROW, BISHOP.—*Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer.*

The reason why this Creed [the Nicene] follows immediately after the Epistle and Gospel, is the same that was given for the Apostles' Creed following next after the Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer. To which the canon of Toledo, last cited, hath added another reason of the saying it here before the people draw near to the holy Communion. . . .

A third reason is given by Dionys. *Eccl. Hierarch.* It will not be amiss to set down some passages of his at large; because they will both give us a third reason of using the Creed in this place, and discover to us, as I conceive, much of the ancient beautiful order of the Communion service.

The Bishop or Priest, standing at the altar, begins the melody of psalms, all the degrees of ecclesiastics singing with him. . . . Then is read by some of the ministers, first a lesson out of the Old Testament, then one out of the New, in their order. . . . After this the catechumens, the possessed, and the penitents are dismissed, and they only allowed to stay, who are deemed worthy to receive the holy Sacrament. . . . Then the ministers and devout people, reverently beholding the holy signs, not yet consecrated, but blest and offered up to God on a by-standing table, called "the table of proposition," (τράπεζα προθέσεως) praise and bless the FATHER of lights, from whom, as all good gifts, so this great blessing of the Communion does come, with the Catholic hymn of praise, which some call the Creed, others, more divinely, the pontifical Thanksgiving, as containing in it all the spiritual gifts which flow from heaven upon us, the whole mystery of our salvation. When this hymn of praise is finished, the Deacons, with the Priests, set the holy bread and cup of blessing upon the altar; after which, the Priest or Bishop says the most sacred, that is, the LORD's prayer, and gives the blessing to the people. Then they (in token of perfect charity, a most necessary virtue at this

time of offering at the altar, St. Matt. v. 23.) salute each other. After which, the names of holy men, that have lived and died in the faith of CHRIST, are read out of the diptychs, and their memories celebrated, to persuade others to a diligent imitation of their virtues, and a stedfast expectation of their heavenly rewards. This commemoration of the saints, presently upon the setting of the holy signs upon the altar, is not without some mystery; to show the inseparable sacred union of the saints with CHRIST, who is represented by those sacred signs.—pp. 215—218.

The Offertory follows, which are certain sentences out of holy Scripture, which are sung and said while the people offered.  
*Durant.*

Offerings or oblations are an high part of God's service and worship, taught by the light of nature and right reason, which bids us to "honour God with our substance" as well as with our bodies and souls; to give a part of our goods to God as an homage or acknowledgment of His dominion over us, and that all that we have comes from God. 1 Chron. xxix. 14. "Who am I, and what is my people," &c. to "bring presents to Him that ought to be feared." Psalm lxxvi. 11. This duty of offering was practised by the fathers before the law, with a gracious acceptance; witness Abel, Gen. iv. 4; was commanded in the Law, Exod. xxv. 2. "Speak to the children of Israel," &c. so, Deut. xvi. 16; and confirmed by our SAVIOUR in the Gospel, St. Matt. v. 23. "Therefore, if thou bring thy gift," &c.

If any man conceives that this offering here mentioned was a Jewish perishing rite, not a duty of the Gospel to continue, let him consider,

First, that there is the same reason for this duty under the Gospel, as there was under or before the Law; God being LORD of us and ours as well as of them, and, therefore, to be acknowledged for such by us, as well as by them.

Secondly, That all the rest of our SAVIOUR'S Sermon upon the Mount was Gospel, and concerning duties obliging us Christians: and it is not likely that our SAVIOUR should intermix, one only Judaical rite amongst them.



Thirdly, That our SAVIOUR, before all these precepts mentioned in this His Sermon, whereof this of oblations is one, prefaces this severe sanction, St. Matt. v. 19. "Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments," &c. ; which could not be truly said concerning the breach of a Jewish outworn rite.

4. That our SAVIOUR hath carefully taught us there the due manner of the performance of this duty of oblations, like as He did concerning alms and prayers: and no man can show that ever He did any where else, nor is it probable that he should here, carefully direct us, how to do that which was presently to be left, and was already out of force, as this was, supposing it to be a Jewish rite. We may then, I conceive, suppose it for a truth, that oblations are here commanded by our SAVIOUR.—pp. 224—226.

[*Of Chancels, Altars, and the fashion of Churches.*]

"*The Chancels shall remain as they have done in times past.*"

That we may the better understand the intent of this rubric, it will not be amiss to examine, how CHANCELS were in time past, both for the fashion and necessary furniture; for as they were then, so they are to continue still, in the same fashion, and with the same necessary appendices, utensils, and furniture. All this may be, and, for ought appears to me, must be meant in these words, "The Chancels shall remain as they have done in times past." . . .

The Church of old was parted into two principal parts; *Navis*, the NAVE or body of the Church; and *Sacrarium*, the CHANCEL. The first, the Nave, was common to all the people that were accounted worthy to join in the church's service: the Chancel was proper and peculiar to the priests and sacred persons. . . .

The Chancel was divided from the body of the Church, *cancellis*, whence it is called the *Chancel*. This was, as was said, peculiar to the priests and sacred persons. In it were, at least in some principal churches, these divisions: *Chorus cantorum*, the Choir; where was an high seat for the Bishop, and other stalls or seats for the rest of the Choir; yet, perhaps, this *Chorus*, as

also the next, called *Soleas*, might be more properly reckoned a part of the Nave, and the Chancel properly that which of old was called *ἄγιον βῆμα*, the Sanctuary. . . . The Bishop, sitting in this seat by the Altar, having his assistant priests sitting with him, resembles CHRIST, with His Apostles by Him, instituting the holy Sacrament, and blessing the prayers offered up at the Altar by the priest. Right under this seat stood the "Altar" or "holy Table," the propitiatory, CHRIST'S monument, the tabernacle of His glory, and the seat of the great Sacrifice. *Sym. Thessal.*

Now that no man take offence at the word "Altar," let him know that anciently both these names, "Altar," or "holy Table," were used for the same things, though most frequently the Fathers and councils use the word "Altar." And both are fit names for that holy thing: for, the holy Eucharist being considered as a Sacrifice, in the representation of the breaking of the bread, and pouring forth the cup, doing that to the holy symbols which was done to CHRIST'S Body and Blood, and so shewing forth and commemorating the LORD'S death, and offering upon it the same Sacrifice that was offered upon the Cross, or rather the commemoration of that Sacrifice, (S. Chrysostom in Heb. x. 9,) it may fitly be called an "Altar;" which again is as fitly called an "holy Table," the Eucharist being considered as a Sacrament, which is nothing else but a distribution and application of the Sacrifice to the several receivers.

To put all out of doubt; it is questionless lawful and safe to speak the language of the New Testament, and to give this holy thing the name which is given it there. Now there it is called an Altar, (Heb. xiii. 10.) "We have an altar," &c. St. Paul, in the verse before, had persuaded that they should not be carried away with strange doctrines of Jewish and carnal observances, which are grown unprofitable to those that walk in them. For "we have an altar" now, "whereof they that serve at the Tabernacle," the Jewish Priests, "have no right to eat," unless they will receive the faith of CHRIST; our altar is better than theirs, and theirs was but a shadow of ours; the Sacrifices of their altar, but types of ours; theirs are vanished, and ours only continue. And for

this reason, do you leave strange doctrines of legal observances, and Jewish altars, and continue in the grace of the Gospel, whose altar is to continue; for "we have an altar." Again, St. Matt. v. 23, "When thou bringest thy gift to the altar." That precept and direction for offerings is Evangelical, as is proved at large on the Office for the Communion; and if the duty there mentioned be Evangelical, then altars are to be under the Gospel; for those gifts are to be offered upon the altar. So that I hope we may go on and call it "Altar" without offence. —pp. 327—329.

To return then to the appendices of the Chancel. On each side or wing of the Altar, in the transverse line, which makes the figure of the cross, stand two side tables; the one, *mensa propositionis*, τράπεζα προθέσεως, a by-standing table, appointed for the people's offerings, which the Bishop or Priest, there standing, received from the people, offered upon that Table, in their names, and blessed; and though the oblations there offered were not yet consecrated, yet were they there fitted and prepared for consecration, and were types of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, says *Symeon Thessal.* The other was σκευοφύλακειον, *Sacristæ mensa*, the Vestiary. . . . These several places and this furniture some principal and cathedral Chancels had; which I have named, not that I think this rubric does require them all in every chancel, but because I conceive the knowledge of them may serve to help us in the understanding of some ancient canons and ecclesiastical story.

But though all chancels of old had not all these, yet every chancel had, even in rural churches, "an Altar" for the consecrating of the holy Eucharist, which they always had in high estimation. . . . placing it aloft in all their churches, at the upper end, the east. . . . And so they stood at the east in the Church of England, till Q. Elizabeth's time, when some of them were taken down indeed; upon what grounds I dispute not; but where-soever the altars were taken down, the holy Tables, which is all one, were set up in the place where the Altars stood, by the Queen's Injunctions, and so they continued in most cathedral Churches; and so ought to have continued in all; for they were

enjoined by Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, forbidden by no after law, that I know, but rather confirmed by this rubrick: "The Chancels are to remain as in times past."—pp. 322—332.

[Of the word "Priest."]

The Greek and Latin words which we translate "Priest," are derived from words which signify "holy:" and so the word Priest, according to the etymology, signifies him whose mere charge and function is about holy things; and therefore seems to be a most proper word for him, who is set apart to the holy public service and worship of God; especially when he is in the actual ministrations of holy things. . . .

If it be objected that, according to the usual acception of the word, it signifies him that offers up a Sacrifice, and, therefore, cannot be allowed to a Minister of the Gospel, who hath no Sacrifice to offer; it is answered that the Ministers of the Gospel have Sacrifices to offer; St. Peter, 1 Ep. ii. 5, "Ye are built up a spiritual house, a holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual Sacrifices" of prayer, praises, thanksgivings, &c. In respect of these, the Ministers of the Gospel may be safely in a metaphorical sense called Priests; and in a more eminent manner than other Christians are, because they are taken from among men to offer up these Sacrifices for others. But, besides these spiritual Sacrifices mentioned, the Ministers of the Gospel have another Sacrifice to offer, *viz.* the unbloody Sacrifice, as it was anciently called, the commemorative Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST, which does as really and truly "show forth the death of CHRIST," as those Sacrifices under the Law did foreshow it; and in respect of this Sacrifice of the Eucharist, the ancients have usually called those that offer it up, Priests. And if Melchisedec was called a Priest, (as he is often by St. Paul to the Hebrews,) who yet had no other offering or Sacrifice, that we read of, but that of bread and wine, Gen. xiv. "He brought forth bread and wine, and," or "for (the Hebrew word bears both,) He was a Priest," that is, this act of his was an act of Priesthood; (for so must it be referred, "he brought forth bread and wine; for he

was a Priest ;” and not thus, “and he was a Priest, and blessed Abraham ;” for, both in the Hebrew and Greek, there is a full point after these words, “and,” or, “for he was a Priest ;”) if, I say, Melchisedec be frequently and truly called a Priest, who had no other offering, that we read of, but “bread and wine,” why may not they, whose office is to bless the people as Melchisedec did, and, besides that, to offer that holy bread and wine, the Body and Blood of CHRIST, of which, his bread and wine, at the most, was but a type, be as truly and without offence called “Priests” also?—pp. 337—339.

FERNE, BISHOP.—*Certain Considerations, &c.*

His last exception against the calling of our Bishops, ever since the beginning of the Queen's time, is, because they were not *veri Sacerdotes*, truly made Priests ; which, saith he, is such an essential defect, that it renders their episcopal ordination altogether invalid. *cap.* 17. We grant it of *veri Presbyteri* ; those that are not truly-made Presbyters first, cannot be true and complete Bishops. But for his *veri Sacerdotes*, we say, as there are no such Priests under the Gospel, so is there no need that Bishops should first be made such ; for Priests, in the Romish sense, are such as, in their ordination, “receive a power of sacrificing for the quick and the dead,” *i. e.* a real offering up again the Son of God to His Father. . . .

I do not mean to follow Champny here step by step, for he runs into the controversy of the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, heaping up the sayings of the Fathers, usually alleged by their writers, and as often answered and cleared by ours. I shall not examine those sayings particularly, but stay upon some generals, which may in brief show the meaning of that manner of speech the Fathers commonly used in and about the celebration of the Eucharist, the high presumption of the Romanists in taking to themselves such a power of sacrificing, and their vanity in reproaching us for not assuming it.

First, it is true that some Fathers seem to say, CHRIST offered Himself up in His last supper ; but it is evident they meant it not really and properly, (for how could it be so, when there was

no real effusion of His Blood, no real occision or death?) but mystically, or, as Saint Augustine sometimes expresseth it, *significante mysterio*, in a mystery or Sacrament, signifying or representing His Sacrifice, or offering on the cross, presently to follow; that *Sacramentum Dominici Sacrificii*, Sacrament of the LORD'S Sacrifice, as St. Cyprian calls it, Ep. 63. *ad Cæcil.* . . .

Champny, endeavouring to clear the relation which the Sacrifice of the Eucharist hath to that of the Cross, is forced to make a wide difference between them, and indeed to come to that which we allow in the Eucharist as it is a Sacrament, without placing such a Sacrifice in it as they vainly contend for. "The Sacrifice of the Cross (saith he, p. 704), is absolute and independent, which hath his effect, *ex propria sua efficacia, valore, et virtute*, "from his own efficacy, value, and virtue: but the Sacrifice of Eucharist" is *respectivum, dependens, et applicativum*, "relative" to that Sacrifice on the Cross, "depending" on it, and borrowing *totam suam propitiandi vim a Sacrificio Crucis*, all the propitiatory force it hath from that on the Cross; lastly, it is "applicative" of the Sacrifice of the Cross, *applicando nobis Crucis merita et valorem*; "it applies," saith he, "unto us the merits of that Sacrifice." . . .

Now, in all this, we may observe what a wide difference is made between the Sacrifice in the Eucharist and on the Cross; and, thereupon, how impossible it is to make them one and the same; also . . . we may further observe, how the Romanists, after all their contending for a real, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, are fain to make it but "applicative;" and that is it which we ascribe to the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrament appointed for this end and purpose, that by it the Sacrifice of the Cross may be applied to us.

Secondly, it is true that the Fathers often speak of the Eucharist as of a Sacrifice. . . .

Thirdly. However the Fathers used, for the most part, to speak of this mystery of the Eucharist mystically and obscurely, under the properties of the things signified, rather than of the external symbols, and therefore seeming to imply a real conversion, or transubstantiation of the symbols into the Body and Blood of CHRIST, and a real Sacrifice, or offering up of that Body and Blood again in the Eucharist, yet do they sometimes punctually and positively express their meaning by the "memorial," "repre-

sentation," and "showing" in the Sacrament what was done upon the Cross; and this they learnt from St. Paul, who tells us (1 Cor. xi. 26) to "do this" is to "remember" and "to show" the LORD's death . . . . Now for this explication of this manner of speech used by the Fathers, I shall instance only in three of them. First, in Chrysostom. . . . Hom. 17 in Heb. . . . Next, St. Augustine, Ep. 23. . . . lib. 20. *contra Faustum*, cap. 21. . . . Lastly, let Eusebius (sub. cit.) speak, who, in his first book, *de Demonstr. Evang.* cap. 10, accurately sets down and clears this whole business of the Eucharist<sup>1</sup>. . . .

All that the Romanists have to reply unto the evidence of these and other Fathers, speaking properly of that respect and relation the Eucharist hath to the Sacrifice on the Cross, comes to this: that the placing of a remembrance or representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross in the Eucharist, doth not hinder it to be a true and proper Sacrifice also: no more, saith Champny, page 699, than the respect which the sacrifices of the law had to CHRIST'S Sacrifice, hindered them to be true and real sacrifices. But all this is very impertinent; for if the Fathers had barely said, there was a remembrance in the Eucharist of CHRIST'S Sacrifice, it had not excluded a real Sacrifice; but when, in explaining themselves (why they call the Eucharist a Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, and why they say CHRIST is there offered up) they give it for the reason of their so speaking, because that Sacrifice once offered by our SAVIOUR is there remembered, shown, and represented, it is most plain they did not think that which is done in the Eucharist to be a real sacrificing of CHRIST. Their instance also of the legal sacrifices is as impertinent, for they were real sacrifices in regard of the beasts really slain and offered. Now if the Romanists will have the bread and wine (which represent the Body and Blood which was really offered) to be the real Sacrifice in the Eucharist, then indeed the remembrance or representation of CHRIST'S Sacrifice there doth not hinder, but there may be also an external oblation (and so many Fathers accounted the bread and wine to be, as they were brought and offered to that holy use and service). But the Romanists will not say the bread and wine is the Sacrifice they

<sup>1</sup> Vid. sup. cit. pp. 63, 66, 7, 88, &c.

contend for, but that it is the very Body and Blood which is offered up; which Body and Blood being the same which was offered up upon the Cross, their real Sacrifice cannot have help by their instance of the legal sacrifices of the bodies and blood of beasts, but stands excluded by the Fathers saying, CHRIST is offered up in the Eucharist by a "mystical signification," by a "remembrance," by "representation," as above said. It is very remarkable what Peter Lombard saith to this purpose<sup>1</sup>. . . . The sum of all is this. The Fathers usually expressed the celebration or work of the Eucharist, by the words of Sacrifice, or offering up the Body of CHRIST, for themselves and others, because there was a representing of the real Sacrifice of the Cross, and a presenting (as we may say) of it again to GOD, for the impetration or obtaining of the benefits thereof for themselves, and for all those, they remembered in the celebration of the Eucharist.

Fourthly, it is true that the ancient Fathers speak of offering this Sacrifice for the dead, but far from the popish sense, according to which Romish Priests, in their ordination, are said to receive "power to offer Sacrifice for the quick and dead:" for that offering for the dead, which the ancients speak of, in the celebration of the Eucharist, had the same extent, purpose, and meaning, that their prayers there for the dead had; and these anciently were made for those whom they judged to be in bliss, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Holy Bishops, &c. . . . . And it is plain, by the writers of those times, that this remembering of the dead, thus in the celebration of the Eucharist (which was the representation of CHRIST's Sacrifice), was that which the ancients called "offering for them," or, as in St. Augustine's time, "offering the Sacrifice of the Altar," or the "Sacrifice of our SAVIOUR" for them; *i. e.* an acknowledging of, and thanksgiving for their sleeping (*pro dormitione*, as St. Cyprian and others,) in the LORD, and their saving by the merits of His death; and an impetration (by His Sacrifice then represented) of all that mercy, redemption, and glory, which was yet behind. Thus St. Augustine, in his Confessions, speaks of offering for his mother

<sup>1</sup> Vid. sup. cit. p. 68.



Monica (whom he doubted not to be in bliss); *i. e.* remembering her upon the like respects.

The Romanists have applied all prayers and offering for the dead to the souls in purgatory . . . . . so contrary doth the Church of Rome now run to antiquity, which offered for and prayed for the saints, and both in the honour of CHRIST and His Sacrifice. Now the offering of their mass, and the prayers for the dead, are made for the souls in purgatory; and in regard of them only, it is that the Romish Priests “receive power to offer Sacrifice for the dead.” . . .

Now to conclude. By all that hath been said, it appears how groundless, unwarrantable, and presumptuous this power is which the Romish Priests pretend to; and how that power which our Priests or Presbyters receive in ordination, and use in celebrating the Eucharist, is warranted by the express word, and doth the whole work of the Sacraments sufficiently, according to all purposes that our SAVIOUR intended it for, when He said “Do this,” and according to the true and proper meaning of the Fathers, speaking usually of a Sacrifice in it . . . . . Bellarm. lib. 3. *de Pontif. Rom.* c. 19. writing of Antichrist, and answering to this as a piece of Antichristianism charged upon the Church of Rome, dare not simply affirm that the Priest offers up CHRIST, but that CHRIST offers up Himself, *per manus Sacerdotis*, by the hands of the Priest. Whether Bellarmine mend or mar his business here, it is hard to say; this we know, that CHRIST, our High Priest (according to the Apostle, Heb. vii. 25. and ix. 24), is in heaven, at God’s right hand, executing His eternal Priesthood, by interceding for us, and in that representing still what He hath done and suffered for us. And we know, and we have warrant and His appointment to do the like sacramentally here below, *i. e.* in the celebration of the Eucharist, to remember His death and passion, and represent His own oblation upon the Cross, and by it to beg and impetrate what we or the Church stand in need of . . . . . Yea, the Priest saith directly, in order of their Mass: *Suscipe, Pater, hanc hostiam, quam ego indignus servus tuus offero tibi* “Receive, O Father, this Sacrifice, which I, thine unworthy servant, do offer unto Thee.” They that composed this

prayer knew not that CHRIST (as the Cardinal contrives it) offered up Himself there, by the hands of the Priest; or, rather, knew not that CHRIST was there really offered; but by the *hanc hostiam* "this Sacrifice," meant as the ancient Fathers did, as shown above. . . .

All this considered, we see how needless, unwarrantable, and presumptuous a thing this, their Sacrifice of the Mass; and that such also is the power of sacrificing given to their Priests, and how vainly they reproach us for not assuming, and as vainly question the lawful calling of our Bishops.—pp. 320—356.

HAMMOND, PRESBYTER, CONFESSOR, AND DOCTOR.—*Practical Catechism.*

S. Is there any third observation of this kind?

C. There is this, that CHRIST instituted this after a peculiar Supper, to wit, the Passover, which being a sacrificial feast (of which notion there were many among the Jews and Gentiles, it being common to both those to annex to their Sacrifices to God, a feeding with mirth and festivity upon some parts of the Sacrifice) and peculiarly commemorative of God's mercy of deliverance to the Israelites out of Egypt, and so, very fit to signify the crucifixion of CHRIST,—that Lamb slain by the Jews, and fed on by us with bitter herbs, a mixture of sourness in this world (whereupon CHRIST is called our Passover, or Paschal Lamb, slain for us).—this Sacrament (which was after the commemorative Passover) is to be conceived a confederation of all Christians one with another, to live piously and charitably, both by commemorating the death of CHRIST, and by making His Blood (as it was the fashion in the Eastern nations) a ceremony of this covenant, mutual betwixt God and us. . . .

S. Is there any fifth observation of this kind?

C. Yes; the manner of CHRIST's instituting this supper, by way of blessing or praising God, or giving thanks over it, from whence it is called the Eucharist.

S. What doth this import to us?

C. The offering up somewhat unto God in imitation of the first fruits under the Law. To which purpose you may please

to observe the manner of the Sacrament in the first apostolical and ancient Church. The Christians, all that were present, brought some of the good fruits of the earth along with them, and offered them at God's Altar or Table ; and there the prefect or bishop, or, if he were not there, the presbyter, receiving them as an Abel's offering, blessed God for all His mercies, the fruits of the season, but above all for the death of CHRIST, signified by and commemorated in the breaking of the bread and pouring out of the wine ; and, all the people saying Amen, the officer or attendant, called the deacon, delivered portions of these, to wit, bread and wine, to all that were present. . . .

S. Is there yet any more behind ?

C. Yes ; to enquire what is the full importance of those words, added in St. Luke xxii. 19. and repeated by St. Paul 1 Cor. xi. 24. though not mentioned in the other Gospels " Do this in remembrance of Me."

S. What is the full importance of them ?

C. It is, first, a commission given to His Apostles to continue this ceremony (now used by Him) as an holy ceremony or Sacrament in the Church for ever. Secondly, a direction that (for the manner of observing it) they should do to other Christians as He had now done to them, *i. e.* take, bless, break this bread, take and bless this cup, and then give and distribute it to others. . . . Thirdly, a specifying of the end to which this was designed, a commemoration of the death of CHRIST, a representing His Passion to God, and a coming before Him in His name, first, to offer our Sacrifices of supplications and praises, in the name of the crucified JESUS, (as of old, both among Jews and heathens, all their Sacrifices were rites in and by which they supplicated God, see 1 Sam. xiii. 12.); and secondly, to commemorate that His daily continual Sacrifice, or intercession for us at the right hand of His FATHER now in heaven.

S. Will you now proceed to the fourth part of your proposed method, and see what is to be found to this purpose in that special place, 1 Cor. x. 16 ?

C. I shall ; and for a right understanding of it, and collecting that which the context was meant to afford us, you must mark that the practice of the Israelites first in their Sacrifices, and then

of the heathens in theirs, are there brought to convince the truth of what is there said of this Christian Sacrament, and therefore it will be useful to observe first, what it is that is there said of the Israelites, then of the Gentiles, and then to apply or bring it home to this business.

S. What then is it that is said of the Israelites ?

C. It is this observation concerning their sacrificial feasts, ver. 18. that they that eat any part of them (as, when the priest offered up a Sacrifice, some parts of the beasts were eaten together by the people) are conceived to have joined in the service performed by the priest or sacrificer, and to have right together with him in all the benefits of the Sacrifice ; his eating is called " eating before the LORD," and is by God counted as an acceptable service ; and whatever flows from God in this case by way of benefit or advantage, comes to them as really as to the priest, it being the priest's part to sacrifice, the people's to eat : and so, in those two things, there is a mutual, reciprocal action betwixt God and them ; they serve God, and God blesses them ; and that is called communicating or being partakers of the Altar.

S. What is it that is said of the heathens ?

C. First, that they sacrifice to their false gods, when only the true one ought to have that worship from them, vers. 20 and 22. and (as by the 22nd it appears) that this is a breach of the second Commandment. . . . Secondly, that they which have this mutual conjunction with those false gods, are supposed to have received influxes from them, and to disclaim expecting any thing from the true one, ver. 20, 21. . . .

S. What then is the result of both these instances together ?

C. That they that eat of the sacrificial feast, either of the true or false gods, have a mutual conjunction with them, a kind of confederation, perform services to, and receive influences, benefits, and advantages from them, do so really from the true God, and are supposed to do so from the false.

S. How then will you bring this home to our business in hand, to the Sacrament ?

C. You shall see, verse 16. For there the Sacrament is set down, and the nature and use of it, thus: " the cup of blessing which

we bless," or (as the Syriac) "the cup of praise," *i. e.* the chalice of wine, which is, in the name of the people, offered up by the bishop or presbyter to GOD with lauds and thanksgivings, *i. e.* that whole Eucharistical action (and that expressed to be the action of the people, as well as the presbyter, by their drinking of it) is "the communication of the Blood of CHRIST,"—a service of theirs to CHRIST, a Sacrifice of thanksgiving, commemorative of that great mercy and bounty of CHRIST in pouring out His Blood for them, and a making them for a means ordained by CHRIST to make them partakers of the Blood of CHRIST, not of the guilt of shedding it, but (if they come worthily thither) of the benefits that are purchased by it, *viz.* the washing away of sin in His Blood: so in like manner, the breaking and eating of the bread is a communication of the Body of CHRIST,—a Sacrifice commemorative of CHRIST's offering up His Body for us, and a making us partakers, or communicating to us the benefits of that bread of life, strengthening and giving us grace. . . .

I will now give you a compendium or brief of the main substantial part of this Sacrament. And that consists only of two branches, one on our parts performed to GOD, the other on GOD's part performed to us. That on our part is commemorating the goodness of GOD in all, but especially that His great bounty of giving His SON to die for us: and this commemoration hath two branches, one of praise and thanksgiving to Him for this mercy, the other of annunciation or showing forth, not only first to men, but secondly, and especially, to GOD, this Sacrifice of Christ's offering up His Body upon the Cross for us. That which respecteth or looks towards men, is a professing of our faith in the death of CHRIST; that which looks towards GOD, is our pleading before Him that Sacrifice of His own SON, and, through that, humbly and with affiance requiring the benefits thereof, grace and pardon, to be bestowed upon us. And then GOD's part is the accepting of this our bounden duty, bestowing that Body and Blood of CHRIST upon us, not by sending it down locally for our bodies to feed on, but really for our souls to be strengthened and refreshed by it. . . .

S. There is then only a fifth behind, to apply all this by way

of illustration and confirmation to what is said of this matter in the Catechism.

C. This will be easily done ; you would be able to do it yourself ; yet I shall go before you in this also.

S. The first question then is, Why the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper was ordained ? and the answer, "For the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST, and of the benefits which we receive thereby : " What is the meaning of that answer ?

C. Dissolve the words, and you shall see most clearly. First, CHRIST died. Secondly, this death of His was a Sacrifice for us, an oblation once for all offered to His FATHER for us weak sinful men. Thirdly, by this Sacrifice we that are true Christians receive unspeakable benefits ; as, strength to repair our weakness, and enable us to do what GOD in His SOU will accept ; and reconciliation, or pardon for us miserable sinners. And, fourthly, the end of CHRIST'S instituting this Sacrament was on purpose that we might, at set times, frequently and constantly returning, (for that is the meaning of "continual," parallel to the use of "without ceasing" applied to the Sacrifice among the Jews, and the duty of prayer among Christians) remember and commemorate before GOD and man this Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST.—*Works*, vol. i. pp. 124—130.

Id.—*View of the New Directory*, sect. 39.

For the order of the Offertory, it must first be observed that, in the primitive Apostolic Church, the Offertory was a considerable part of the action, in the administering and receiving the Sacrament ; the manner of it was thus. At their meetings for divine service, every man, as he was able, brought something along with him, bread, or wine, the fruits of the season, &c. : of this, part was used for the Sacrament, the rest kept to furnish a common table for all the brethren . . . Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 2. p. 97. sets down the manner of it clearly in his time. . . . This clearly distinguisheth two parts of the Offertory, one designed for the use of all the faithful in the Sacrament, another reserved for

the use of the poor ; the former called *προσφοραι*, “ oblations,” in the Council of Laodicea, the other, *καρποφορῖαι*, in that of Gangra ; and proportionably, the repository for the first called *Sacrarium*, in the fourth Council of Carthage, can. 93. (and by Possidonius, in the life of Saint Augustine, *Secretarium unde altari necessaria inferuntur*, “ where those things are laid, and from whence fetched, which are necessary to the altar,”) the other *gazophylacium*, or treasury :—the first St. Cyprian calls *Sacrificia*, “ Sacrifices ;” the second, *Eleemosynæ*, “ Alms,” parallel to those, which we find both together mentioned, Acts xxiv. 17.—“ I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings.” This, saith Justin Martyr, is our Christian Sacrifice ; which will more appear to him that considers, that the feasting of the people, their partaking of the Sacrifice, having their *τόμας* and *μερίδας*, was always annexed to Sacrifices, both among Jews and Heathens, which the Apostle calls “ partaking of the Altar ;” and, consequently, that the Sacrifice and the feast together, the Sacrifice in the Offertory, the Feast in the eating and drinking there, do complete and make up the whole business of this Sacrament, as far as the people are concerned in it ; and all this blessed by the Priest, and God blessed and praised by Priest and people, and so the title of Eucharist belongs to it. Thus after Justin, Irenæus . . . So Tertullian . . . Much more might be said of this out of ancient Constitutions and Canons, if ’twere not for my desire of brevity.—pp. 374, 5.

Id.—*Preface to “ Dispatcher dispatched.”*

As for his other way of charging the schism upon us, from a supposed “ separation betwixt us in necessary points of Divine worship, *viz.* in Sacrifice and Sacrament,” if he and I, being both Englishmen, speak the same language, and there lie not some undiscovered ambiguity in the words “ Sacrifice” and “ Sacrament,” I should hope, when the Universal Pastorship by Divine right were discarded, and only the Primacy of Order taken in its stead, the issue would be brief. . . .

What controversies are now risen, and waged among us on these heads, he hath in part truly enumerated ; though, as

he omits the two principal, concerning their private masses, and denying the cup, their no-communication and their half-communication, . . . so I must confess, I should not have begun the list as he doth, that "all Roman Catholics believe and reverence the Sacrifice of the Mass, as the most substantial and essential act of their religion, all Protestants condemn and abhor it." When 'tis visible that the Protestants of the Church of England believe and reverence, as much as any, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, as the most substantial and essential act of our religion; and doubt not, but the word *Missa*, "Mass," has fitly been used by the Western Church to signify it; and herein abhor and condemn nothing, but the corruptions and mutilations which the Church of Rome, without care of conforming themselves to the Universal, have admitted in the celebration.—Vol. ii. p. 164.

BARLOW, BISHOP<sup>1</sup>.

"Almighty GOD, our heavenly FATHER," &c. Hear us, O merciful FATHER, we most humbly beseech Thee, (through the operation of the HOLY GHOST sanctifying both us and these (*c e*<sup>2</sup>) gifts, and exalting them above their ordinary use, importance, and conception, &c.

THORNDIKE, PRESBYTER.—*Epilogue*, book iii. chap. v.

I come now to the question of the Sacrifice, the resolution whereof must needs proceed according to that which hath been determined in the point now despatched. For, having showed the presence of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Eucharist, because it is appointed that in it the faithful may feast upon the Sacrifice of the Cross, we have already showed, by the Scrip-

<sup>1</sup> Addition to the Prayer of Consecration, in a copy of the Book of Common Prayer, habitually used by Bishop Barlow, with very copious extracts from the Fathers and ancient Liturgies on the doctrine of the Oblation. This volume is preserved in the Bodleian Library, Arch. C. 9.

<sup>2</sup> The letters *c e* refer to the two marginal directions to the Priest to "lay his hand upon all the Bread," and "upon every vessel in which there is any Wine to be consecrated."



tures, that it is the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, in the same sense, and to the same effect, as it containeth the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which it representeth, that is, mystically and spiritually, and sacramentally, (that is, as in and by a Sacrament) tendereth and exhibiteth. For, seeing the Eucharist not only tendereth the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, but separated one from the other, under and by several elements, as His Blood was parted from His Body by the violence of the Cross; it must of necessity be as well the Sacrifice, as the Sacrament of CHRIST upon the Cross.—p. 38.

But, for the same reason, and, by the same correspondence between the Sacrifices of the Law and that of CHRIST'S Cross, it may be evident, that it is not, nor can be any disparagement to the Sacrifice of our LORD CHRIST upon the Cross, to the full and perfect satisfaction and propitiation for the sins of the world which it hath made, that the Eucharist should be counted the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified, mystically, and, as in a Sacrament, represented to, and feasted upon by His people. The Apostle saith, that "CHRIST is gone into no holy place made with hands," &c. Heb. ix. 24—28. But have I said anything to cause any man to imagine, that I suppose CHRIST to be crucified again, as often as the Eucharist is celebrated? . . . Certainly, I will speak freely, neither can they that hold Transubstantiation be truly said to stand obliged to any such consequence, so long as they acknowledge, with all Christians, that the Covenant of Grace is for once settled by the one Sacrifice of our LORD upon the Cross. Why? because, though they believe the natural Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, as crucified, to be there, yet not naturally but sacramentally, (that is, in their sense, under the accidents of bread and wine, which is, indeed, and in the sense of the Church, under the *species* or kinds); which difference is so great an abatement of that common and usual sense, in which all Christians understand that CHRIST was sacrificed upon the Cross, that all that know it to be their profession (which all must know, that will not speak of they know not what) must acknowledge that the repeating of the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified by the Eucharist, is not the repeating of that Sacrifice by which mankind was redeemed, otherwise

than as a Sacrament is said to be that whereof it is a Sacrament. What ground and advantage this gives me, and any man of my opinion, to argue from those things which themselves acknowledge, that there is no cause why they should insist upon the abolishing of the substance of the elements in the Eucharist, I leave to them that shall think fit to consider the premises, to judge. But for me, who demand no more than this, that, inasmuch as the Body and Blood of CHRIST is in the Eucharist, inasmuch it is the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, I cannot foresee what occasion slander can have to pick any such consequence out of my sayings. Certainly, the Sacrifices of the old Law ceased not to be Sacrifices, because they were figures and prophecies of that one Sacrifice upon the Cross, which mankind was redeemed with. And why should the commemoration and representation (in that sense of this word representation which I determined afore) of that one Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, which mankind was redeemed with, be less properly a Sacrifice, in dependence upon and denomination from that one which the name of Sacrifice upon the Cross was first used to signify? For all conceit of legal Sacrifice is quite shut out, by supposing the Sacrifice past, which the Sacrifice of the Eucharist represents and commemorates; whereas, all Sacrifices of the Old Law are essentially (at least to Christians) figurative of the one Sacrifice of CHRIST to come.

Indeed, by that which I have said, concerning the nature of a Sacrifice in the Eucharist, as it is intended for Christians to feast upon, it is evident that this commemorative and representative Sacrifice is of the nature and kind of Peace-offerings, which, by the Law, those that offered were to feast upon. "I will take the cup of salvation," &c. . . . saith the Psalm cxvi. 12, 13. And that, in answer to the question made, "What reward shall I give unto the LORD for all the benefits that He hath done unto me?" At feasting upon the parts, or remains of peace-offerings, the master of the Sacrifice began the cup of thanksgiving for deliverance received, in consideration whereof he pays his vows; and the Sacrifices which he pays are called *συνθήματα*, or "Sacrifices of thanksgiving for deliverance received." Is not this the same that

Christians do, in celebrating the Eucharist, setting aside the difference between Jews and Christians? Wherefore I have showed, that it is celebrated, and is to be celebrated, with commemoration of, and thanksgiving for the benefits of God, especially that of CHRIST crucified. Which thanksgiving, as it tends to the consecrating thereof, so, inasmuch as the consecration tends to the receiving of it, another thanksgiving, at the receiving of it, becomes also due, as at feasting upon peace-offerings. And here-upon I have showed, that it is called by the Apostle "the Sacrifice of praise, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to God:" and that, having showed that Jews have no right to it as a propitiatory Sacrifice, that is, not to it because not to the propitiatory Sacrifice which it representeth; but therefore, that Christians have right to feast upon it, as the Jews upon their peace-offerings. But if it be true, as I have showed, that the celebration of the Eucharist is the renewing of the Covenant of Grace, which supposeth propitiation made for the sin of mankind, by that one Sacrifice which it commemorateth and representeth; the celebration thereof being commanded, as a condition to be performed on our part, to qualify us for the promise, which it tendereth to those that are qualified as it requireth; shall it be a breach on Christianity, to say also, that it is such a Sacrifice whereby we make God propitious to us, and obtain at His hands the blessings of Grace, which the Covenant of Grace tendereth?—pp. 39—41.

In as much, then, as I have showed that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, in so much, and for that very reason, that which Christians offer to God for the celebration of the Eucharist, is no otherwise a Sacrifice than those things which were appropriated to the Altar under the Law were Sacrifices, from the time that they were dedicated to that purpose; saving always the difference between Sacrifices figurative of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, (such as Christianity supposeth all the Sacrifices of the Old Law to be) and the commemoration and representation of the same past, which I have showed that the Eucharist pretendeth. And truly, having showed that this representative and commemorative Sacrifice is of the nature and kind of peace-offerings, in as much as it is celebrated on purpose to commu-

nicate with the Altar, in feasting upon it; and knowing that every beast that was sacrificed for a peace-offering was attended with a meat-offering of flour, and a drink-offering of wine, which are the kinds in which the Eucharist is appointed to be celebrated; I must needs say, that those *species*, set apart for the celebration of the Eucharist, are as properly to be called Sacrifices of that nature which the Eucharist is of, (to wit, commemorative and representative,) as the same are to be counted figurative under the Law, from the time that they were deputed to that use. This is then the first act of oblation by the Church, that is, by any Christian that consecrates his goods, not at large, to the service of God, but peculiarly to the service of God by Sacrifice in regard whereof the elements of the Eucharist, before they be consecrated, are truly counted Oblations or Sacrifices.

After the consecration is past, having showed you that St. Paul hath appointed that, at the celebration of the Eucharist, prayers, supplications, and intercessions be made for all estates of the world, and of the Church; and that the Jews have no right to the Eucharist, (according to the Epistle to the Hebrews) because, though Eucharistical, yet it is of that kind the blood whereof is offered to God within the veil, with prayers for all estates of the world, as Philo and Josephus inform us; seeing the same Apostle hath so plainly expounded us the accomplishment of that figure, in the offering of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross to the FATHER in the highest heavens, to obtain the benefits of His passion for us; and that the Eucharist is nothing else but the representation here upon earth of that which is done there; these things, I say, considered, necessarily it follows, that whoso believes the prayers of the Church, made in our Lord's name, do render God propitious to them for whom they are made, and obtain for them the benefits of CHRIST's death, (which he that believes not is no Christian,) cannot question that those which are made, by St. Paul's appointment, at the celebration of the Eucharist, offering up unto God the merits and sufferings of CHRIST there represented, must be peculiarly and especially effectual to the same purposes. And, that the Eucharist may very properly be accounted a Sacrifice propitiatory and

impetratory both, in this regard, because the offering of it up to God, with and by the said prayers, doth render God propitious and obtain at His hands the benefits of CHRIST's death which it representeth, there can be no cause to refuse, being no more than the simplicity of plain Christianity enforceth.

But whether the Eucharist, as in regard of this oblation, so, in regard of the consecration may be called a propitiatory Sacrifice, this, I perceive, is yet a question even among those of the Church of Rome. For it is acknowledged, that there is yet among them a party, even since the decree of the Council of Trent, who, acknowledging the nature of a Sacrifice propitiatory in the Eucharist, in regard of the offering of it, already consecrated, (according to the order of the Latin Mass,) to God, for the necessities of the Church, utterly deny any nature of such a Sacrifice in it, by virtue of the consecration otherwise. True it is, these men are looked upon as bordering upon heretics, in regard they acknowledge no other nature of a Sacrifice but that which those who acknowledge no Transubstantiation may grant, without prejudice to their positions. And, if my aim were only to hold a mean opinion between two extremes, and not freely to declare what may be affirmed with truth, it might seem very convenient to take up that position, for which I may allege a party at present extant, in the communion of the Church of Rome. But, having resolved to set all regard of faction behind the consideration of truth manifested by the Scriptures, I stick not to yield and maintain, that the consecration of the Eucharist, in order to the participation of it, is indeed a Sacrifice, whereby God is rendered propitious to, and the benefits of CHRIST's death obtained for, them that worthily receive it; but this, perhaps, neither in the sense nor to the interest of them who make it their business to maintain the present abuses of the Church of Rome, by disguising the true intentions and expressions of the Catholic Church.—pp. 41—43.

For having maintained that the elements are really changed from ordinary bread and wine into the Body and Blood of CHRIST, mystically present, as in a Sacrament; and that, in virtue of the consecration, not by the faith of him that receives; I am to admit

and maintain whatsoever appears duly consequent to this truth, namely, that the elements so consecrated are *truly* the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, in as much as the Body and Blood of CHRIST crucified are contained in them,—not as in a bare sign, which a man may take up at his pleasure, but as in the means by which GOD hath promised His Spirit,—but not *properly* the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, because that is a thing that consists in action, and motion, and succession, and therefore, once done, can never be done again, because it is a contradiction, that that which is done should ever be undone. It is therefore enough, that the Eucharist is the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, as the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross is represented, renewed, revived, and restored by it, and as every representation is said to be the same thing with that which it representeth; taking “representing” here not for barely signifying, but for tendering and exhibiting thereby that which it signifieth.—p. 44.

For though there be only a general reason of offering, no particular consideration of destroying, seen in the act of the Church offering either the elements to be consecrated, or the consideration of CHRIST's Cross represented, to render GOD propitious to His Church; yet are the consecrated elements no less the Sacrifice of CHRIST's Cross, than the presence of CHRIST's Body and Blood in them will allow, though in order to that Evangelical banquet upon them, at which, and by which the Covenant of Grace is renewed. For, the Apostles having made the Eucharist a Sacrifice in this regard, I must not count the making of it one offensive. I say; then, that having proved the consecration of the Eucharist to be the production of the Body and Blood of CHRIST crucified, or the causing them to be mystically present in the elements thereof, as in a Sacrament representing them separated by the crucifying of CHRIST; and the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross being necessarily propitiatory and impetratory both; it cannot be denied that the Sacrament of the Eucharist, in as much as it is the same Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, (as that which representeth is truly said to be the thing which it representeth,) is also both propitiatory and impetratory by virtue of the consecration of it, whereby it becometh the Sacrifice of CHRIST

upon the Cross. For is it not all the reason in the world that, if the Eucharist be the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified, the consecration of the Eucharist, that is, the causing of the elements to become this Sacrifice, should be, and be accounted, and called the sacrificing of CHRIST? And, if the participation of the Eucharist be, as I have showed it to be, the renewing of the Covenant of Grace, (by virtue whereof the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross becomes propitiatory and impetratory in behalf of Christians,) shall not the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, whereof they participate, be counted propitiatory and impetratory, by virtue of the consecration indeed, though in order to the participation of it? For if the profession of Christianity be the condition that renders God propitious to us, and obtains for us the benefits of CHRIST'S Passion; and that the receiving of the Eucharist is the renewing of that profession, by virtue whereof the faults whereby we have failed of that profession, for that which is past, are blotted out, and we, for the future, are qualified for the blessings which CHRIST'S Passion tendereth; then is the Eucharist a Sacrifice propitiatory and impetratory, by virtue of the consecration, though in order to the participation of it. Which, whether those that are so much for the Sacrifice, in the Church of Rome, rest content with it or not, seemeth to me so natively proper to the simplicity and holiness of Christianity, that nothing can be held forth more pertinent to advance the zeal of frequenting, together with the devotion and reverence of communicating in this most precious of GOD'S ordinances to Christians. For what can more oblige a Christian to the frequent and worthy communion of this Sacrament than to consider that, by receiving it, he is reinstated in his right to those promises which the Gospel tendereth; provided that he, on his part, reestablish in his own heart that resolution to Christianity by professing which he was at the first estated in GOD'S kingdom? Hereupon arises a fourth reason, why this Sacrament is a Sacrifice; to wit, of the bodies and souls of men, who, having consecrated their goods to GOD, for the celebration of it, do, by receiving it, profess to renew that consecration of themselves to the service of GOD, according to the Law of CHRIST, which their baptism originally pretendeth.—pp. 45, 6.

And now I confess, that all they who do not believe the promises of the Gospel to depend upon any condition to be performed by our free will, qualifying us with a right title to them, may very well say by consequence, that it is a disparagement to the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, to make the Eucharist a propitiatory and impetratory Sacrifice in behalf of the Church, in that sense and to that effect as I have said. But, supposing that condition, I challenge all the world to say wherein any such disparagement lies. For let any man think either me or the doctors of the Church of Rome so mad, as to ascribe that propitiation, which is once made for the whole world, by the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, to the representation and commemoration of it by the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. But, in regard the Gospel requires a certain condition at thine hands, which being not performed, to thee CHRIST is neither born nor crucified, nor risen again, as St. Prosper saith ; and that the communion of the Eucharist professeth the performance thereof ; and that truly, if it be worthy, so that the propitiation wrought by the Cross thereby becomes effectually thine ;) in that regard the Eucharist becomes to thee a propitiatory Sacrifice, by virtue of the consecration indeed, (which makes the elements to become the Body and Blood of CHRIST mystically, as in a Sacrament,) but yet in order to the participation of it. And is not this the applying of the propitiation wrought by the Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Cross, when as by the Sacrament of the Eucharist a man becomes entitled to the benefit of it? Nor let any man tell me, that this application is wrought by living faith, as if that were evidence enough that not by the Sacrament of the Eucharist : for if, notwithstanding this faith, the Sacrament of Baptism is necessary to estate us in this right, because there is no living faith without being baptized into God's Church, by the same reason, (supposing the frequentation of the Eucharist commanded for the daily redressing and maintenance of the same title,) of necessity it follows, that the application of that propitiation is to be ascribed to the Eucharist, which is not applicable without it. Again, if St. Paul enjoins the Church to offer up their prayers, supplications, and intercessions for all estates in the world, at the cele-



bration of the Eucharist, as recommending them in the Name of CHRIST, there mystically present, in the commemoration of His death upon the Cross; can it seem strange, that the prayers which are so powerfully presented, by alleging an intercession of such esteem, should have a special virtue, and take a special effect, in making GOD propitious to His Church and all estates of the same, and obtaining for them those benefits which CHRIST's Passion tenders? And if so, is not the Sacrament of the Eucharist a propitiatory and impetratory Sacrifice, by virtue of the consecration, though in order to the oblation and presentation of it, by the prayers of the Church, for the obtaining of their necessities? What is there in all this, that the tongue of slander can asperse with the imputation of Popery, unless they will have Popery to be that Christianity which we have received from our LORD CHRIST and His Apostles?—p. 47.

As for the sayings of the Fathers, whereby the Eucharist is declared to be a Sacrifice, in regard of the consecration, I do no way doubt that they are utterly innumerable. For wheresoever the whole action, including the propitiation which the Church intends to procure by it, is called a Sacrifice, (which is most ordinary in the language of the Fathers,) there the consecration cannot be excluded, though referring it to the communion, not the communion to it, as some would have: for if it be considered, on the other side, that they were all said at such time as the communion was no less usual than the consecration thereof, (that is to say, when it was a strange thing to hear of the Eucharist celebrated, and none but the Priest to receive,) it will not be strange, that I demand it to be understood, in order to the communion of the same.—p. 49.

Now that, in the sense of the Catholic Church, the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a Sacrifice propitiatory for the Church, and impetratory of the necessities thereof, in regard of those prayers wherewith it is offered and presented to GOD, in virtue of the Sacrifice of the Cross, which it is mystically, (that is, representeth and commemorateth,) a few words will serve to persuade him that knows the practice and custom of the Church in all ages, at the solemn and regular times and occasions of celebrating

the Eucharist, to make mention of all states and qualities belonging to the Church ; and not only so, but, upon occasions incident, of going to God for the necessities, either of the Church or of particular Christians, to celebrate the Eucharist, with an intent of presenting and offering the Cross of CHRIST, there present, for their necessities. . . . For in all the Liturgies, there is a place where mention is to be made of all states of the Church, for whom the oblations, out of which the Eucharist is consecrated, are offered. And, likewise, a place, where, the Eucharist being consecrated, prayer is made in behalf of all states in the Church; that is to say, the Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Cross, there present, is offered up, to move God to grant them all that is desired, by the regular and continual prayers of the Church. And among them, there is a special place for those that offer at present.

If any man be moved to imagine, that any part hereof is prejudicial to that Reformation which the Church of England professeth, (for I profess from the beginning, not to be scrupulous of offending those that offend it,) I remit him to that learned Appendix of Dr. Field to his third book of the Church; the purpose whereof, (in answer to the question, Where the Reformed Church was before Luther?) is, to show that, in this point, as in others there handled, the sense of the whole Church of Christ, even to the time of Luther and to the Council of Trent, was no other than that which the Church of England embraceth and cherisheth: thereby to show, that the Reformation thereof never pretended to found a new Church, but to preserve that which was, by taking away those corruptions which time and the enemies of Christianity had sown in the laws and customs of it. Which he doth so evidently perform, in this point, that I must needs challenge any man, that hath a mind to blast anything here said with the stale calumny of popery, to consider first, whether he can prove those things, which the authors, past exception, there quoted, declare to be the sense of the Catholic Church at that time, to contain any thing prejudicial to the Gospel of CHRIST, and that purity thereof which the Reformation pretendeth.—pp. 49—51.

In fine, it is not that consideration of a Sacrifice in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which the sense and practice of the Ca-

tholic Church enforceth, but the violent interpretations of it, which are made on both sides, to both extremities, that can give the least pretence for division in the Church. For while, on the one side, the sacrificing of Christ anew is so construed, as if to doubt of the virtue of it in behalf of all that assist in it, whether they communicate in it or not, whether their devotions concur to it or not, were to doubt of the virtue of CHRIST'S Cross; it is no marvel if this create so great offence, that the receiving of the Eucharist, nay, the assisting of it with the devotions of Christian people, comes to be a matter of indifference. On the other side, while the renewing of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, by that representation thereof which the Eucharist tendereth, for the redressing of the Covenant of Grace between GOD and those which receive, is construed as prejudicial to that one Sacrifice, whereby our LORD for ever hath perfected those whom He sanctifieth, no marvel if the very celebrating of it come to be a matter of indifference, the effect whereof, by believing that a man is predestinate or justified, is had before and without it. The matter of the Sacrifice, then, being so great a subject for the division, upon so little cause, it is time for good Christians to awake and look about them, and see that the less cause there is, the greater good-will the parties have to continue at distance. In the meantime, it is the common interest of Christianity, even the means of their salvation, by the worthy frequenting of this holy Sacrament, that suffers. As for the Church of England, I refer myself to the very form of those laws, according to which, as many as have received orders in it, have promised to exercise the ministry to which they were appointed by the same, and that before GOD and His Church, at so solemn an occasion, that nothing can be thought obligatory to him that would transgress it. For the Offertory which the Church of England prescribeth, if it signify anything, signifieth the dedication of that which is offered, as at large to the necessities of the Church, so in particular to the celebration of the Eucharist then and there. At the consecration the Church prayeth, "that we, receiving," &c. . . And after communion, "We, Thy humble servants," &c. . . all this, having premised prayer for all states of CHRIST'S Church. Which, whether it make not the Sacrament of the Eucharist, by virtue of

the consecration, the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, propitiatory and impetratory for them who communicate in it by receiving the elements ; (whether or no by virtue of this oblation, propitiatory and impetratory, for the necessities of the rest of the Church, as well as the congregation present;) I leave to men of reason, but not to puritans, to judge. This, I am sure, the condition of the Gospel, (which is the fourth reason, for which, I have showed that the Eucharist is counted a Sacrifice in the sense of the Church,) is exactly expressed in the words that follow, to the confusion of all puritans, that would have us expect the blessings promised, from such a kind of faith which supposeth it not, neither implies it ; “ And here we offer and present unto Thee, O LORD, ourselves, our souls,” &c. For, the reason which obliges us to profess this at receiving the Eucharist, (which is the New Testament in the Blood of CHRIST,) is, because the promises which the Gospel covenanteth for, depend upon it, as the condition which renders them due. And, upon these premises, I may well conclude, that all the reasons, for which I have showed that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice in the sense of the Church, are recapitulated and comprised in that which followeth : “ And though we be unworthy, through our manifold sins,” &c.—pp. 52, 3.

II.—*Just Weights and Measures.*

This is further seen by the words of St. Paul, when, inferring his purpose, to wit, that Christians ought not to communicate in things sacrificed to idols, upon that which he had premised, “ The cup,” &c., he addeth, 1 Cor. x. 18—21, “ Behold, Israel after the flesh,” &c. These words manifestly suppose the Eucharist to be the communion of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross. So that, as those who ate of the Sacrifices of the altar, (whether by the priests or by themselves) did feast with GOD, whose altar had received and consumed a part of those Sacrifices, so, those that communicate in the Eucharist, do feast upon the Sacrifice of our LORD CHRIST on the Cross, which GOD is so well-pleased with as to grant the covenant of grace, and the publication thereof, in consideration of it. This, being evidently

that correspondence, which the discourse of St. Paul requires, remains manifestly proved by the same.—p. 9.

The same sense is contained in St. Paul's words, 1 Cor. v. 8, 9. "CHRIST our Passover," &c. For, if we consider the circumstance of time and place, which our LORD took to institute the Sacrament of the Eucharist, just when the Paschal Lamb was eaten, how shall we deny the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross to have been as presently received there as the Sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb was the subject and occasion of the feast, at which he ordained it? But the discourse by which the Apostle persuades Christians to separate themselves from the Jews, Heb. xiii. 10—16. is most pertinent to this purpose, as that which is not to be understood otherwise. . . . And surely, if we consider but the name of Eucharist, we cannot think it could have been more properly signified, than by calling it "the Sacrifice of praise, the fruit of the lips that confess the name of God;" for, when he proceeds to exhort, not to forget communicating their goods, do we not know, and have we not made it to appear, that this must be by their oblations to the altar, the first fruits of their goods, whereof the Eucharist being first consecrated, the rest served the necessities of the Church? . . . If, therefore, the eating of the Sacrifice of the Cross, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, mean no more but the signifying and the figuring of that eating of the Sacrifice of the Cross, which is done by a lively faith, (that is, by every one that considers the death of CHRIST with that faith, which, supposing all that the Gospel says of it to be true, resolves faithfully to profess Christianity,) the question is, why the Sacrament of the Eucharist was instituted by God? why, in those elements, and to what purpose, seeing, without God's appointment, men could have done it of themselves, to the same effect? But, if it be manifest, that, by the Sacrament of the Eucharist, God pretends to tender us the communion of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, then is there another presence of the Body and Blood of our LORD in the Sacrament, beside that spiritual presence in the soul, which that living faith effecteth without the Sacrament, as well as in the receiving of it.—pp. 9, 10.

If the consecrated elements be the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, then are they the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified upon the Cross. For they are not the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST as in His Body, while it was whole, but as separated by the Passion of His Cross. Not that CHRIST can be sacrificed again; for a Sacrifice being an action done in succession of time, cannot be done the second time, being once done because then it should not have been done before; but, because the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified is represented, commemorated, and applied, by celebrating and receiving the Sacrament, which is that Sacrifice. They of the Church of Rome, that would make the breach wider than it is, do but justify the Reformation, by forcing any other reason of a Sacrifice out of the Scripture, expounded by the consent of GOD'S Church. And they which stumble at the Altar, and the Priesthood, which the Sacrifice inferreth, plainly they invite us to renounce the whole Church of GOD, with the Church of Rome, for their sakes. And how much Christianity they will leave us, when that is done, who will undertake?—pp. 95, 6.

The common prayers of the Church, that is, of those who were admitted to communion with the Church, were always made at the altar, or communion table, in the action of the Sacrament. Reason good. How can Christians think their prayers so effectual with GOD, as when they are presented at the commemoration of the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified, the representation whereof to GOD, in heaven, makes His intercession there so acceptable?—p. 102.

However, the ancient Church manifestly signifieth, that they did offer their oblations, out of which the Eucharist was consecrated, with an intent to intercede with GOD for public or private necessities; and that, out of an opinion that they would be effectual, alleging the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified then present, which renders CHRIST'S intercession effectual for us. And this is the true ground, why they attributed so much to this commemoration of the Sacrifice; which makes nothing for the effect of it in private Masses, but more than will be valued, for the frequenting of the holy Eucharist.—p. 103.

Id.—*Judgment of the Church of Rome*<sup>1</sup>.

The council of Trent enjoineth to believe that CHRIST instituted a new passover to be sacrificed as well as represented, commemorated, and offered in the Eucharist, *de Sacrificio Missæ*, cap. i. which is false.

For the Sacrifice of CHRIST'S CROSS is commemorated, represented, and offered, as ready to be slain, in and by the Eucharist; but not slain, and therefore not sacrificed in it and celebrating it.

And therefore, when it is said there, cap. 11. *Quod in Missa Christus incruentè immolatur*, if it be meant properly, it is a contradiction; for that which hath blood is not sacrificed but by shedding the blood of it; if figuratively, it signifies no more than that which I have said, that it is represented, commemorated, and offered as slain.

TAYLOR, BISHOP, CONFESSOR AND DOCTOR.—*Life of Christ*,  
Disc. xix.—*On the Institution and Reception of the Sacrament*.

Upon the strength of the premises, we may sooner take an estimate of the graces which are conveyed to us, in the reception and celebration of this holy Sacrament and Sacrifice. For, as it is a commemoration and representment of CHRIST'S death, so it is a commemorative Sacrifice: as we receive the symbols and the mystery, so it is a Sacrament. In both capacities, the benefit is next to infinite. First: for whatsoever CHRIST did at the institution, the same He commanded the Church to do, in remembrance and repeated rites; and Himself also does the same thing in heaven for us, making perpetual intercession for His Church, the body of His redeemed ones, by representing to the FATHER His death and Sacrifice. There He sits, a High Priest continually, and offers still the same one perfect Sacrifice; that is, still represents it as having been once finished and consummate in order to perpetual and never-failing events. And this also His ministers do on earth; they offer up the same Sacrifice to GOD,

<sup>1</sup> "As it was delivered by him, in a Paper to a Lady, a little before his death."  
See *Hickes's Controversial Letters*, Appendix, Paper 1.

the Sacrifice of the Cross, by prayers, and a commemorating rite and representment, according to His holy institution. And as all the effects of grace and the titles of glory were purchased for us on the Cross, and the actual mysteries of redemption perfected on earth, but are applied to us, and made effectual to single persons and communities of men, by CHRIST's intercession in heaven; so also they are promoted by acts of duty and religion here on earth, that we may be "workers together with GOD," (as St. Paul expresses it,) and, in virtue of the eternal and all-sufficient Sacrifice, may offer up our prayers and our duty; and, by representing that Sacrifice, may send up, together with our prayers, an instrument of their graciousness and acceptation. The funerals of a deceased friend are not only performed at his first interring, but in the monthly minds and anniversary commemorations; and our grief returns upon the sight of a picture, or upon any instance which our dead friend desired us to preserve as his memorial: we "celebrate and exhibit the LORD's death," in Sacrament and symbol; and this is that great express, which when the Church offers to GOD the FATHER, it obtains all those blessings which that Sacrifice purchased. Themistocles snatched up the son of King Admetus, and held him between himself and death, to mitigate the rage of the king, and prevailed accordingly. Our very holding up the SON of GOD, and representing Him to His FATHER, is the doing an act of mediation and advantage to ourselves, in the virtue and efficacy of the Mediator. As CHRIST is a Priest in heaven for ever, and yet does not sacrifice Himself afresh,—nor yet without a Sacrifice could He be a Priest,—but, by a daily ministration and intercession, represents His Sacrifice to GOD, and offers Himself as sacrificed; so He does upon earth, by the ministry of His servants: He is offered to GOD, that is, He is, by prayers and the Sacrament, represented or "offered up to GOD, as sacrificed;" which, in effect, is a celebration of His death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church, as we are capable, by a ministry like to His in heaven. It follows, then, that the celebration of this Sacrifice be, in its proportion, an instrument of applying the proper Sacrifice to all the purposes which it first designed. It



is ministerially, and by application, an instrument propitiatory ; it is eucharistical, it is an homage, and an act of adoration ; and it is impetratory, and obtains for us, and for the whole Church, all the benefits of the Sacrifice which is now celebrated and applied ; that is, as this rite is the remembrance and ministerial celebration of CHRIST'S Sacrifice, so it is destined to do honour to God, to express the homage and duty of His servants, to acknowledge His supreme dominion, to give Him thanks and worship, to beg pardon, blessings, and a supply of all our needs. And its profit is enlarged, not only to the persons celebrating, but to all to whom they design it, according to the nature of sacrifices and prayers, and all such solemn actions of religion.—*Works*, vol. iii. pp. 296—298.

This only remember, that we are, by the mystery of "one bread," confederated into one body and the communion of saints, and that the Sacrifice which we then commemorate, was designed by our LORD for the benefit of all His Church ; let us be sure to draw all faithful people into the society of the present blessing, joining, with the holy man that ministers, in prayers and offerings of that mystery, for the benefit of all sorts of men, of CHRIST'S Catholic Church. . . . And the celebration of the holy Sacrament is, in itself and its own formality, a sacred, solemn, and ritual prayer, in which we invoke God by the merits of CHRIST, expressing the adjuration, not only in words, but in actual representment and commemoration of His Passion. And if the necessities of the Church were well considered, we should find that a daily Sacrifice of prayer, and a daily prayer of Sacrifice, were no more but what her condition requires : and I would to God the governors of Churches would take care, that the necessities of kings and kingdoms, of Churches and states, were represented to God by the most solemn and efficacious intercessions ; and CHRIST hath taught us none greater than the praying in the virtue and celebration of His Sacrifice. And this is the counsel that the Church received from Ignatius : "Hasten frequently to approach the Eucharist, the glory of God. For when this is daily celebrated, we break the powers of Satan, who turns all his actions into hostilities and darts of fire." But this con-

cerns the ministers of religion, who, living in communities and colleges, must make religion the business of their lives, and support kingdoms, and serve the interest of kings, by the prayer of a daily Sacrifice.—pp. 310—312.

Id.—*Holy Living*, sect. x. chap. iv.

The celebration of the holy Sacrament is the great mysteriousness of the Christian religion, and succeeds to the most solemn rite of natural and Judaical religion, the law of sacrificing. For God spared mankind, and took the Sacrifice of beasts, together with our solemn prayers, for an instrument of expiation. But these could not purify the soul from sin, but were typical of the Sacrifice of something that could. But nothing could do this, but either the offering of all that sinned, that every man should be the *anathema* or devoted thing; or else by some one of the same capacity, who, by some superadded excellency, might in his own personal sufferings have a value great enough to satisfy for all the whole kind of sinning persons. This the SON of GOD, JESUS CHRIST, GOD and Man, undertook, and finished by a Sacrifice of Himself upon the altar of the Cross.

2. This Sacrifice, because it was perfect, could be but one, and that once; but because the needs of the world should last as long as the world itself, it was necessary that there should be a perpetual ministry established, whereby this one sufficient Sacrifice should be made eternally effectual to the several new arising needs of all the world who should desire it, or in any sense be capable of it.

3. To this end CHRIST was made a Priest for ever; He was initiated or consecrated on the Cross, and there began His Priesthood, which was to last till His coming to judgment. It began on earth, but was to last and be officiated in heaven, where He sits perpetually representing and exhibiting to the FATHER that great effective Sacrifice which He offered on the Cross, to eternal and never-failing purposes.

4. As CHRIST is pleased to represent to His FATHER that great Sacrifice as a means of atonement and expiation for all mankind,

and with special purposes and intendment for all the elect, all that serve Him in holiness ; so He hath appointed, that the same ministry shall be done upon earth too, in our manner, and according to our proportion ; and therefore hath constituted and separated an order of men, who, by “ showing forth the LORD’s death ” by Sacramental representation, may pray unto GOD after the same manner that our LORD and High Priest does ; that is, offer to GOD and represent, in this solemn prayer and Sacrament, CHRIST, as already offered ; so sending up a gracious instrument, whereby our prayers may, for His sake and in the same manner of intercession, be offered up to GOD in our behalf, and for all them for whom we pray, to all those purposes for which CHRIST died.

5. As the ministers of the Sacrament do, in a sacramental manner, present to GOD the Sacrifice of the Cross, by being imitators of CHRIST’s intercession ; so the people are sacrificers too in their manner: for, besides that, by saying Amen, they join in the act of him that ministers, and make it also to be their own, so, when they eat and drink the consecrated and blessed elements worthily, they receive CHRIST within them, and therefore may also offer Him to GOD, while, in their Sacrifice of obedience and thanksgiving, they present themselves to GOD with CHRIST, whom they have spiritually received, that is, themselves with that, which will make them gracious and acceptable. The offering their bodies and souls and services to GOD in Him, and by Him, and with Him, who is His FATHER’S Well-beloved, and in whom He is well-pleased, cannot but be accepted to all the purposes of blessing, grace, and glory.

6. This is the sum of the greatest mystery of our religion ; it is the copy of the Passion, and the ministration of the great mystery of our redemption : and, therefore, whatsoever entitles us to the general privileges of CHRIST’s Passion, all that is necessary by way of disposition to the celebration of the Sacrament of His Passion ; because this celebration is our manner of applying or using it.—vol. iv. pp. 265, 6.

When you have received, pray and give thanks. Pray for all estates of men ; for they also have an interest in the body of

Christ, whereof they are members: and you, in conjunction with CHRIST (whom then you have received) are more fit to pray for them in that advantage, and in the celebration of that holy Sacrifice, which then is sacramentally represented to God.—p. 272.

When I said that the Sacrifice of the Cross, which CHRIST offered for all the sins and all the needs of the world, is represented to GOD by the minister in the Sacrament, and offered up in prayer and sacramental memory, after the manner that CHRIST Himself intercedes for us in heaven, (so far as His glorious Priesthood is imitable by His ministers on earth,) I must of necessity also mean, that all the benefits of that Sacrifice are then conveyed to all that communicate worthily. . . . And if we desire anything else and need it, here it is to be prayed for, here to be hoped for, here to be received.—p. 273.

*After the receiving the Cup of Blessing.*

It is finished. Blessed be the mercies of God revealed to us in JESUS CHRIST. O blessed and Eternal High Priest, let the Sacrifice of the Cross, which Thou didst once offer for the sins of the whole world, and which Thou dost now and always represent in heaven to Thy FATHER, by Thy never-ceasing intercession, and which this day hath been exhibited on Thy holy table sacramentally, obtain mercy and peace, faith and charity, safety and establishment, to Thy holy Church, which Thou hast founded upon a rock, the rock of a holy faith; and let not the gates of hell prevail against her, nor the enemy of mankind take any soul out of Thy hand, whom Thou hast purchased with Thy Blood, and sanctified by Thy Spirit.—p. 312.

Id.—*Collection of Offices.—Office for the Holy Communion*<sup>1</sup>.

*Prayer of Preparation.*

O LORD GOD, who, in mercy and great compassion, dost consider Thy people, and hast given unto us, Thy unworthy servants,

<sup>1</sup> "An office or order, for the administration of the Holy Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper, according to the way of the Apostolical Churches, and the doctrine of the Church of England."

miserable sinners, confidence and commandment to present ourselves before Thee, at Thy holy table, to represent a holy, venerable, and unbloody Sacrifice for our sins, and for the errors and ignorances of all Thy people, look upon me, the meanest and most polluted of all them that approach to Thy sacred presence. Pity me, O GOD, and wash away all my sins . . . and, by the power of the HOLY GHOST, make me worthy for this ministry, accepting this service for His sake whose Sacrifice I represent, and by whose commandment I minister, even our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. AMEN.—vol. xv. p. 291.

Let us Pray.

O LORD GOD, our Creator, who hast given us life and being, and hast shown unto us the way of salvation, vouchsafing to us the revelation of heavenly mysteries, and hast commanded to us this service in the power of the Holy Ghost, and obedience of the LORD JESUS, be Thou well-pleased, O LORD, with this our service and duty, and grant that with a holy fear, and a pure conscience, we may finish this service, presenting a holy Sacrifice holily unto Thee, that Thou mayest receive it in heaven, and smell a sweet odour in the union of the eternal Sacrifice which our Blessed LORD perpetually offers; and accept us graciously as thou didst entertain the gifts of Abel, the Sacrifice of Noah, the services of Moses and Aaron, the peace-offering of Samuel, the repentance of David, and the incense of Zacharias; and as from the hands of Thy holy Apostles Thou didst accept this ministry; so vouchsafe by the hands of us miserable sinners to finish and perfect this oblation, that it may be sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and be accepted in the LORD JESUS . . . —pp. 292, 3.

*Prayer of Consecration.*

Have mercy upon us, O Heavenly FATHER, according to Thy glorious mercies and promises, send Thy Holy Ghost upon our hearts, and let Him also descend upon these gifts, that by His good, His holy, His glorious presence, He may sanctify and enlighten our hearts, and He may bless and sanctify these gifts. . . . pp. 299, 300.

*Prayer of Oblation.*

We sinners, Thy unworthy servants, in remembrance of Thy life-giving passion, Thy Cross and Thy pains, Thy death and Thy burial, Thy resurrection from the dead, and Thy ascension into heaven, Thy sitting at the right hand of God, making intercession for us; and expecting, with fear and trembling, Thy formidable and glorious return to judge the quick and dead, when Thou shalt render to every man according to his works, do humbly present to Thee, O LORD, this present Sacrifice of remembrance and thanksgiving, humbly and passionately praying Thee not to deal with us according to our sins, nor recompense us after our transgressions . . . —p. 301.

*Prayer for the Catholic Church.*

Receive, O eternal God, this Sacrifice for and in behalf of all Christian people whom Thou hast redeemed with the blood of Thy SON, and purchased as Thine own inheritance . . . —p. 303.

ID.—*Worthy Communicant*, chap. i. sect. iv.

It is the greatest solemnity of prayer, the most powerful liturgy, and means of impetration, in this world. For when CHRIST was consecrated on the Cross, and became our High Priest, having reconciled us to God by the death of the Cross, He became infinitely gracious in the eyes of God, and was admitted to the celestial and eternal priesthood in heaven, where, in the virtue of the Cross, He intercedes for us, and represents an eternal Sacrifice in the heavens on our behalf. That He is a Priest in heaven, appears in the large discourses and direct affirmatives of St. Paul. That there is no other Sacrifice to be offered, but that on the Cross, it is evident, because "He hath but once appeared, in the end of the world, to put away sin by the Sacrifice of Himself;" and, therefore, since it is necessary, that He hath something to offer, so long as He is a Priest, and there is no other Sacrifice but that of Himself, offered upon the Cross,—it follows, that CHRIST, in heaven, perpetually offers and represents that Sacrifice to His Heavenly FATHER, and, in virtue of that, obtains all good things for His Church.

(2.) Now what CHRIST does in heaven, He hath commanded us to do on earth; that is, to represent His death, to commemorate His Sacrifice, by humble prayer and thankful record; and, by faithful manifestation and joyful Eucharist, to lay it before the eyes of our heavenly Father, so ministering in His priesthood, and doing according to His commandment and example; the Church being the image of heaven; the priest, the minister of CHRIST; the holy table being a copy of the celestial altar; and the eternal sacrifice of the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world, being always the same: it bleeds no more after the finishing of it on the Cross; but it is wonderfully represented in heaven, and graciously represented here; by CHRIST's action there, by His commandment here. And the event of it is plainly this,—that as CHRIST, in virtue of His Sacrifice on the Cross, intercedes for us with His FATHER, so does the minister of CHRIST's priesthood here; that the virtue of the eternal Sacrifice may be salutary and effectual to all the needs of the Church, both for things temporal and eternal. And, therefore, it was not without great mystery and clear signification, that our blessed LORD was pleased to command the representation of his Death and Sacrifice on the Cross should be made, by breaking bread and effusion of wine; to signify to us the nature and sacredness of the liturgy we are about, and that we minister in the priesthood of CHRIST, who is a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec; that is, we are ministers in that unchangeable priesthood, imitating, in the external ministry, the prototype Melchisedec: of whom it was said, “He brought forth bread and wine, and was the priest of the Most High God;” and, in the internal, imitating the antitype, or the substance, CHRIST Himself; who offered up his Body and Blood for atonement for us, and, by the Sacraments of bread and wine, and the prayers of oblation and intercession, commands us to officiate in His priesthood, in the external, ministering like Melchisedec, in the internal, after the manner of CHRIST Himself.

(3.) This is a great and a mysterious truth, which, as it is plainly manifested in the Epistle to the Hebrews, so it is understood by the ancient and holy doctors of the Church. . . .

(4.) The effect of this I represent in the words of Lyra; “That

which does purge and cleanse our sins, must be celestial and spiritual; and that which is such, hath a perpetual efficacy, and needs not to be done again; but that which is daily offered in the Church, is a daily commemoration of that one Sacrifice, which was offered on the Cross, according to the command of CHRIST, 'Do this in commemoration of me.'

(5.) Now this holy ministry and Sacrament of His death, being, according to CHRIST's commandment, and, in our manner, a representation of that eternal Sacrifice,—an imitation of CHRIST's intercession in heaven in virtue of that Sacrifice, must be after the pattern in the Mount: it must be as that is, by *purâ prece*, as Tertullian's phrase is, "by pure prayer;" it is an intercession for the whole Church, present and absent, in the virtue of that Sacrifice. I need add no more, but leave it to the meditation, to the joy and admiration of all Christian people, to think and to enumerate the blessings of this Sacrament, which is so excellent a representation of CHRIST's death, by CHRIST's commandment; and so glorious an imitation of that intercession, which CHRIST makes in heaven for us all; it is all but the representation of His death, in the way of prayer and interpellation; CHRIST as Head, and we as members; He as High Priest, and we as servants, His ministers. And, therefore, I shall stop here, and leave the rest for wonder and Eucharist; we may pray here with all the solemnity and advantages imaginable; we may, with hope and comfort, use the words of David, "I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the LORD." We are here very likely to prevail for all blessings, for this is, by way of eminency, glory, and singularity, *calix benedictionis*, "the cup of blessing," which we bless, and by which God will bless us, and for which He is to be blessed for evermore.—vol. xv. pp. 437—440.

For what CHRIST did once upon the Cross in real Sacrifice, that He always does in heaven, by perpetual representment and intercession; what CHRIST does by His supreme priesthood, that the Church doth by her ministerial; what He does in heaven, we do upon earth; what is performed at the right hand of God, is also represented, and, in one manner, exhibited upon the holy



table of the LORD: and what is done on altars upon solemn days, is done in our closets in our daily offices; that is, GOD is invocated, and GOD is appeased, and GOD is reconciled, and GOD gives us blessings and the fruits of CHRIST'S Passion, in the virtue of the Sacrificed Lamb; that is, we, believing, and praying, are blessed, and sanctified, and saved, through JESUS CHRIST.—pp. 481, 482.

*A Prayer, to be said after the Communion, in behalf of our souls and all Christian people.*

O most merciful and gracious GOD, FATHER of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the LORD of glory; . . . relying upon Thy goodness, trusting in Thy promises, and having received my dearest LORD into my soul, I humbly represent to Thy divine majesty the glorious Sacrifice, which our dearest JESUS made of Himself upon the Cross, and, by a never-ceasing intercession, now exhibits to Thee in Heaven, in the office of an eternal priesthood; in behalf of all that have communicated this day in the divine mysteries, in all the congregations of the Christian world, and in behalf of all them that desire to communicate, and are hindered by sickness or necessity, by fear or scruple, by censures ecclesiastical, or the sentences of their own consciences. . .

I humbly present to Thy Divine Majesty this glorious Sacrifice, which thy servants, this day, have represented upon earth, in behalf of my dearest relations, *wife, children, husband, parents, friends, &c.* . . .

For all mankind whom I have, and whom I have not remembered, I humbly represent the Sacrifice of Thy eternal SON, His merits and obedience, His life and death, His resurrection and ascension, His charity and intercession. . . —pp. 686, 688.

BREVINT, PRESBYTER.—*Christian Sacrifice and Sacrament.*

For this must be granted, that the holy Communion is not only a Sacrament, that the worshipper is to come to for no other purpose, than to receive; nor a Sacrifice only, where he

should have nothing else to do, but to give: but it is as the great solemnity of the ancient Passover was, whereof it hath taken place; a great mystery, consisting both of Sacrament and Sacrifice, that is, of the religious service which the people owe to God, and of the full salvation which God is pleased to promise to His people.—p. 2.

It is a certain truth, that there never was on earth a true religion without some kind of Sacrifices: and it is a very great lie to say that now the Christian should want them. . . .

Of all the carnal Sacrifices, which the Jews do reduce to six kinds, (besides many more oblations,) none ever had any saving reality, as to the washing away of sins, but in dependence on JESUS CHRIST our LORD; and as to our service and duty towards God, which they were also to represent, none had this second end so fully performed under the Law as it must be under the Gospel. The blessed Communion alone, when whole and not mutilated, concentrates and brings together these two great ends (full expiation of sins, and acceptable duty to God,) towards which all the old Sacrifices never looked, but as either simple engagements, or weak shadows. As for the first, which is expiation of sins, it is most certain that the Sacrifice of JESUS CHRIST alone hath been sufficient for it: . . . And the reiteration of it were not only superfluous as to its real effect, but also most injurious to CHRIST in the very thought and attempt.

Nevertheless, this Sacrifice, which by a real oblation was not to be offered more than once, is, by an Eucharistical and devout commemoration, to be offered up every day. This is what the Apostle calls, to "set forth the death of the LORD",—to set it forth, I say, as well before the eyes of God His Father, as before the eyes of all men,—and St. Augustine did explain, when he said that the holy Flesh of JESUS CHRIST was offered up in three manners; by prefiguring Sacrifices under the Law, before His coming into the world; in real deed upon the Cross; and by a commemorative Sacrament, after He is ascended into heaven. All comes to this—First, that the Sacrifice, as it is itself and in itself, it can never be reiterated; yet, by way of devout celebration and remembrance, it may nevertheless be reiterated every day.

Secondly, that whereas the holy Eucharist is by itself a Sacrament, wherein God offers unto all men the blessings merited by the oblation of His Son, it likewise becomes, by our remembrance, a kind of Sacrifice also; whereby, to obtain at His hands the same blessings, we present and expose before His eyes that same holy and precious oblation once offered. Thus the ancient Israelites did continually represent, in their solemn prayers to God, that covenant which He had made once with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, their forefathers. Thus did the Jews, in their captivity, turn their faces towards either the country or to the Temple, where the Mercy-seat and the Ark were, which were the memorials of His promises, and the Sacramental engagement of His blessings. And thus the Christians in their prayers do every day insist upon, and represent to God the Father the meritorious passion of their SAVIOUR, as the only sure ground, whereon both God may give, and they obtain the blessings which they do pray for. Now, neither the Israelites had ever Temple, or Ark, or Mercy-seat, nor the Christians have any ordinance, devotion, or mystery, that may prove to be such a blessed and effectual instrument to reach this everlasting Sacrifice, and to set it out so solemnly before the eyes of GOD ALMIGHTY, as the holy Eucharist is. To men it is a sacred Table, where God's Minister is ordered to represent from God his Master the passion of His dear Son, as still fresh and still powerful for their eternal salvation: and to God it is an Altar, whereon men mystically represent to Him the same Sacrifice, as still bleeding and sueing for expiation and mercy. And because it is the High Priest Himself, the true Anointed of the LORD, who hath set up most expressly both this Table and this Altar for these two ends, namely, for the communication of His Body and Blood to men, and for the representation and memorial of both to God; it cannot be doubted, but that the one must be most advantageous to the penitent sinner, and the other most acceptable to that good and gracious Father, who is always pleased in His Son, and who loves of Himself the repenting and the sincere returning of His children. Luke xv. 22. Hence one may see both the great use and advantage of more frequent communion; and how much it concerns us,

whenever we go to receive it, to lay out all our wants, and pour out all our grief, our prayers, and our praises, before the LORD, in so happy a conjuncture. The primitive Christians did it so, who did as seldom meet to preach or pray, without a Communion, as did the old Israelites to worship, without a Sacrifice. On solemn days especially, or upon great exigencies, they ever used this help of sacramental oblation, as the most powerful means the Church had to strengthen their supplications, to open the gates of heaven, and to force in a manner God and His CHRIST, to have compassion on them. The people of Israel, for the better performance of prayer and devotion, went up to the Tabernacle and the Temple, because (besides other motives) both these were figures of that Body which was to be sacrificed. Wherefore CHRIST calls His body "this temple." John ii. 19; and the first Christians went up to their Churches, there to meet with these mysteries, which do represent Him both as already sacrificed, and yet as in some sort offering and giving up Himself. Those, in worshipping, ever turned their eyes, their hearts, their hopes towards that Altar and Sacrifice, whence the High Priest was to carry the Blood into the sanctuary; and these, looking towards the Cross and their crucified SAVIOUR there, through His sufferings hope for a way towards heaven; being encouraged to this hope by the very memorial which they both take to themselves and show to God of these sufferings. Lastly, JESUS, our eternal Priest, being from the Cross, where He suffered without the gate, gone up into the true sanctuary which is in heaven, there above doth continually present both His Body in true reality, and us as Aaron did the twelve tribes of Israel, in a memorial. Exod. xxviii. 29. and, on the other side, we, beneath in the Church, present to GOD His Body and Blood in a memorial, that, under this shadow of His Cross, and image of His Sacrifice, we may present ourselves before Him in very deed and reality.

"O LORD, who seest nothing in me, that is truly mine, but dust and ashes, and, which is worse, sinful flesh and blood. . . . Turn Thine eyes, O merciful Father, to the satisfaction and intercession of Thy Son, who now sits at Thy right hand; to the seals of Thy covenant, which lie before Thee upon this Table; and to all the

wants and distresses, which also Thou seest in my heart." . . .  
—pp. 71—78.

It is either the error, or the incogitancy of too many Christians, which makes them sometimes believe, and oftener live as if, under the Gospel, there were no other Sacrifice but that of CHRIST upon the Cross. It is very true, indeed, there is no other, nor can there be any other sufficient, and proper for this end, of satisfying God's justice, and expiating our sins. "I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me; I looked, and there was none to help." Isai. lxiii. 3. 5. In this respect, though the whole Church should, in a body, offer up herself as a burnt Sacrifice to God, yet could she not contribute more towards the bearing up or bearing away "the wrath to come," than all those innocent souls, who stood near JESUS CHRIST when He gave up the ghost, did towards the darkening of the sun, or the shaking of the whole earth. But that which is not so much as useful, much less necessary to this eternal Sacrifice which alone could redeem mankind, is indispensably both necessary and useful, that we may have a share in this redemption. So that if the sacrifice of ourselves, which we ought to offer up to God, cannot procure salvation, it is absolutely necessary to receive it.—pp. 80, 81.

And this act of the Church consecrating herself to God, and joining herself so to CHRIST as to make but one oblation with Him, is the mystery represented by the daily Sacrifice. Exod. xxix. 38. Numb. xxviii. 3.

This Sacrifice did consist of two parts. The first and chiefest was the lamb, that did foreshow the Lamb of God; and the second was the meat and drink offering, made of flour mingled with oil and wine: all which, being but an additional thrown on the lamb, morning and evening, was counted but for one and the same Sacrifice. Those secondary oblations, so thrown and burnt upon the main Sacrifice, signified properly these offerings which Christians must present to God, of themselves, of their goods, and of their praises. From this meat and drink offering, which was added to more substantial Sacrifices, came the bread and wine to be used at the celebration of CHRIST's death. Which

bread in the Communion considered as Sacrament, signifies the natural, but considered as Sacrifice, it represents the mystical Body of CHRIST, that is His Church. "For we that are many," saith the Apostle, 1 Cor. x. 17, "are one bread." . . . Soon after, the Church added oil and frankincense to bread and wine, to make up the whole meat-offering, which consisted of four things. The truth is, all that we can offer upon our own account, is but such an oblation as this meat and drink offering of Moses was, that cannot be presented but by the virtue and merits of JESUS CHRIST, who supports it: and that can never ascend up to heaven but along with the sacred smoke of that great Burnt Sacrifice, which is to carry it up thither. For, on the one side, our own persons, our works, or any thing else that may be ours, are by themselves but weak, unsubstantial kinds of offerings, which cannot be presented unto GOD, otherwise but as these additional oblations, which of themselves fall to the ground, unless a more solid Sacrifice do sustain them: and on the other side, this solid and fundamental Sacrifice upholds, saves, and sanctifies but those persons and things, that, according to the Law of Moses his meat-offerings, are thrown into this His fire, are allowed upon His altar, and are together with Him consecrated to GOD by Him.—pp. 88, 9.

Now, though all men be called to this conformity and communion in the sufferings of CHRIST, from the time of those sufferings until there be no times at all; and although the days of our present life have all the privilege which those seven feast days once had, when every one might gird his loins, eat his unleavened bread, and kill his own bullock, as the Priest did sacrifice the Paschal Lamb; (which bullock was superadded to the Paschal Lamb, that both might better suffice for the seven festival days, besides its other ritual and figurative importance as a Sacrifice;) it is certain, nevertheless, that there are two more special and extraordinary days, wherein Christians are invited by more urgent and proper circumstances, to present their souls and bodies, by way of second offering, upon the Sacrifice of their SAVIOUR. The first is past, and that was when the SAVIOUR offered Himself to death; when heaven and earth, temple and graves, shook at the blow that killed Him; when pious souls

either stood immovable, as the blessed Virgin, hard by His Cross, or, in a manner, crucified themselves, beating their breasts, as the daughters of Jerusalem; and when every disciple might, by the very conjunction of all the things he saw, be moved to say as Thomas, "Let us go and let us die with Him." John xi. 16. The other time most favourable and proper, next to that of His real Passion, is that of the holy Communion; which, as it hath been explained, is a Sacramental Passion, where, though the Body be broken, and the Blood shed but by way of representative mystery, yet both are as effectually, and as truly offered for our own use, if we go to it worthily, as when that Holy and Divine Lamb did offer Himself the first time.

Therefore, whensoever Christians approach to this dreadful mystery, and to the Lamb of God "lying and sacrificed" (as some say that the holy Nicene Council speaks,) "upon the holy Table," it concerns their main interest, in point of salvation, as well as other duties, to take a special care not to lame and deprive the grand Sacrifice of its own due attendance: but to behave themselves in that manner that, as both the principal and additional sacrifices were consumed by the same fire, and went up towards heaven in the same flame, so JESUS CHRIST and all His members may jointly appear before GOD: this in a Sacramental mystery, these, with their real bodies and souls, offering themselves at the same time, in the same place, and by the same oblation.—pp. 92—94.

"O Father of mercies, I beseech Thee, both by the merits of Thy Son, who now intercedes in heaven, and by that bloody Sacrifice which He hath offered on the Cross, (whereof Thou seest the Sacrament upon this table,) this day be pleased to receive me into the communion of His sufferings, and hereafter into the communion of His glory."—p. 102.

It is an express and often repeated law of GOD by Moses, and no where repealed by CHRIST, that no worshipper shall presume to appear before Him with empty hands. Sincere Christians must have them full at the receiving of the holy communion, with four distinct sorts of sacrifices, 1. The sacramental and

commemorative Sacrifice of CHRIST. 2. The real and actual sacrifice of themselves. 3. The freewill offering of their goods. 4. The peace offering of their praises.

The first as representing the Sacrifice offered on the Cross, is the ground of the three others, especially of the second; which must no more be separated from it, than parts are from the whole, or the body from its head.—p. 106.

Now, though CHRIST our blessed SAVIOUR, by that everlasting and ever same Sacrifice of Himself, offer Himself virtually up on all occasions; and we, on our side, also, offer ourselves, and what is ours, with Him several other ways, besides that of the Holy Communion: . . . nevertheless, because CHRIST offers Himself for us at the holy communion in a more solemn and public sacramental way,—(thence it comes, that the memorial of the Sacrifice of CHRIST thereby celebrated, takes commonly the name of the Sacrifice itself, as St. Austin explains it often),—we are then obliged, in a more special manner, to renew all our Sacrifices, all the vows of our baptism, all the first fruits of our conversion, and all the particular promises which, it may be, we have made. . . .

So shall the new Israel tread on the pious steps of the old, who ever from time to time reiterated, either in Mispah or in Gilgal, &c., that covenant which the LORD had made with him in Sinai. It is true, the Lord did not then again repeat the thunder, that once made the mountains tremble; as, in our Churches, He doth not reiterate that very Passion that made the powers of heaven mourn and shake: nevertheless, as Joshua, Asa, Josias, Jehoiadah, and other such holy men, could from their Master assure the people, that the covenant which they did renew,—for example, in Shechem, Josh. xxiv. 25. 2 Chron. xv. 12. and xxiii. 16.—was not less powerful, either to bless the observers, or to destroy the offenders thereof, than it was when Moses and the holy angels published it at the first upon Sinai: so now the ministers of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, having in their hands the Sacraments of the Gospel, (true seals and tables of the new law,) may both produce and give them out as evidences, that the Sacrifice of their Master



is not less able to save men's souls, when it is offered to men, and sacramentally offered again to God, at the Holy Communion, than when it was new offered upon the Cross. . . .

By this it is easy to see, that our holy eucharistical Communion is much correspondent to those feasts, that did call the people of Israel together, first to appear and prostrate themselves before the LORD with Sacrifices for their sin; and then to lay upon the altar that other kind of Sacrifices which they used to call "peace offerings," and which were ordained to express both their thankfulness to God, and their charity to men.—pp. 113—115.

This is the reason why, because primitive Christians never received those holy mysteries but after they had made their offerings, and because those very mysteries which they received were commonly taken, as to the matter, from that bread and wine which they had before offered; the holy fathers, (for instance, St. Irenæus,) who thus had no occasion to be so exact or cautious as to distinguish precisely the nature of two sacred offices, which went constantly together, do not scruple to speak of the blessed communion, promiscuously as Sacrament or Sacrifice.—pp. 119, 20.

I dare appear before the LORD with all my sins and my sorrows; it is very just also, that I should appear with these few blessings which are mine; they are mine by Thy favour, and, having received them of Thy hand, now do I offer them to Thee<sup>1</sup>. Forgive, I beseech Thee, sins, deliver me from my sorrows, and accept of this my small blessing. Accept of this my Sacrifice, as Thou didst of that of Abel, of Abraham, and of Noah; or rather, look in behalf on that only true Sacrifice, whereof here is the Sacrament,—the Sacrifice of the only unspotted Lamb, the Sacrifice of Thine own SON, of Thine only Begotten SON, of Thy SON proceeding from Thee, to die for me. O let Him again come from Thee to me; let Him come now as the Only Begotten of the FATHER, full of grace and of truth, to bless me. Amen, Amen.—pp. 128, 9.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Chron. xxix. 14.

*Id.—Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass.*

The main intention of the Mass is, first, to offer up to GOD the FATHER the Body and Blood of His SON. . . . This is the grand object of Rome's Catholic religion; and whosoever every morning goes to that Church, it is in order to have some share in this unreasonable service.

For, both in reason and Scripture, we are to offer ourselves to GOD; which St. Paul calls our "reasonable service." Rom. xii. 1. We must, likewise, offer our prayers, praises, elevation of hearts, tears of contrition, virtuous thoughts, just and charitable vows and works, &c., which, in opposition to the flesh and blood of Levitical Sacrifices, the ancient fathers use to call "Sacrifices without blood." We must also celebrate, and in a manner offer to GOD, and expose and lay before him the holy memorials of that great Sacrifice on the Cross, the only foundation of GOD's mercies and of our hopes, in like manner as faithful Israelites did, at every occasion, represent unto GOD that covenant of His with Abraham their father, as the original conveyance of blessings settled on his posterity. And this is the "sacramental priestly office" in the Areopagite, the "commemorative Sacrifice" in St. Chrysostom, and the "Sacrifice after the order of Melchisedek" in St. Theodoret, which we solemnly do offer in the celebration of holy mysteries. All these things, I say, and whatsoever else depends on them, it is our duty to offer to GOD and to CHRIST, or rather to GOD by CHRIST. But that we should offer also CHRIST Himself, our LORD and our GOD, to whom we must offer ourselves;—it is a piece of devotion never heard of among men, till the Mass came in to bring such news.—pp. 28—30.

Because it was the general custom of primitive Christians, never to receive the holy Sacrament but after they had made their offerings, out of which the two elements of bread and wine, being set apart and consecrated, and then, by an ordinary manner of speech, called the Body and Blood of Christ; the word, as well as the act of offering, got so large and common a use in two distinct offices, as to signify the whole service; which St. Augustine

more distinctly calls "offering" and "receiving;" that is, offering the bread and wine before, and receiving part of it after it was consecrated. And really the whole service was little more than a continued oblation. For Christians, before the Sacrament, offered their gifts; and, after it, offered their prayers, their praises, and themselves. And this was the constant and solemn oblation of the Church, until dark and stupid ages, which by degrees have hatched Transubstantiation in the bosom of the Roman Church, have at last improved it to this horrid direful service, which mainly aims at this, to offer upon an altar, not the bread and wine as before, but the very Body and Blood of CHRIST.

And because these public offices about the holy Sacrament are, in antiquity, commonly called Sacrifices, as being standing memorials of the true Sacrifice of CHRIST, the Church of Rome is now pleased to mistake these "antitypes" and "representations," as the ancient Church calls them, of the sufferings of CHRIST, for CHRIST Himself, represented by the antitypes; and upon this mistake she now builds up altars in every corner of her temples, thereon not only to offer, but also to sacrifice the SON of GOD.—pp. 57, 8.

SANCROFT, ARCHBISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*MS. Corrections of the Common Prayer.*

[*Rubrick before the Prayer for the Church Militant*<sup>1</sup>.]

*And if there be a Communion, the Priest shall then offer up, and place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient.*

<sup>1</sup> From a copy of the Book of Common Prayer, in the Bodleian Library, (Arch. D. Bodl. 28.) prepared, as it would seem, by Sancroft for the consideration of the Commissioners in 1661; containing also minute directions to the printer. Before the Prayer "We do not presume," &c. there is a marginal note, "What follows from hence to the end of the distribution is somewhat otherwise methodized in page B, and both left to censure. See after the next leaf". Page B is headed, "Another method of the Consecration, Oblation, Address, and Distribution." This book, together with those of Bishops Barlow and Duppa, above quoted, was obligingly pointed out by the Rev. Bulkeley Bandinel, D.D., Bodley's Librarian.

[“The

[*Prayer of Consecration and Oblation.*]

ALMIGHTY GOD, our heavenly FATHER, who of Thy tender mercy, &c. . . and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious death

“ The Convocation assembled on the 8th of May, 1661, and, after due deliberation, made considerable additions and alterations. . . .

“ It is well known, that Mr. Sancroft was eminently useful in assisting in the alterations, although it is not easy to ascertain on what particular parts of the work, or to what extent his services were employed. As he was not a member of Convocation at the time, for he then held no preferments, his name does not appear among those to whom the preparation of any portion of the work was committed; and it seems that he was only privately employed, probably by the recommendation of Bishop Cosin, who bore a considerable share in this business, and in consequence of the confidence reposed in his talents, learning, and judgment.

“ However, it is specially recorded that he assisted in rectifying the calendar and the rubrics, and that, after the work was completed, he was one of those appointed by an order of the upper house of Convocation for the supervision of the press.”—*D' Oyley's Life of Sancroft*, vol. i. pp. 111-114.

The alterations proposed in the Prayer of Consecration remarkably agree with those suggested by Bishop Cosin, in a paper of “ Particulars to be considered, explained, and corrected in the Book of Common Prayer,” printed in Nicholls, Appendix, pp. 67—71<sup>1</sup>.

“ In the Prayer of Consecration, where the Priest saith, ‘ to continue a perpetual memory of His precious death,’ here seems to want ‘ and Sacrifice’—‘ until His coming again;’ which, if added, would be more consonant to the nature of that holy action, and the words of the Catechism following, made and set forth for that purpose.

“ The Prayer of Oblation is here placed after the participation and distribution of the Sacrament made to the people, which in King Edward's First Service Book, and in all other ancient Liturgies, is set before it, and next after the Prayer of Consecration.

“ If it were ordered here, and the Prayer of Thanksgiving (‘ Almighty and everlasting GOD, we most heartily thank Thee,’ &c.) appointed to follow for the Post Communion, it would be more consonant, both to former precedents, and the nature of this holy action.’

---

<sup>1</sup> “ Whether or no these following observations were drawn up by Dr. Cosin before the Restoration of King Charles, or afterwards, upon the last Review of the Common Prayer, I cannot say; but this is plain, that those reviewers had very

and Sacrifice, until His coming again; Hear us, O merciful FATHER, we most humbly beseech Thee, and by the power of Thy holy Word and Spirit, vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that we receiving them according to Thy SON our Saviour JESUS CHRIST's holy institution, in remembrance of Him, and to show forth His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood.

Who, in the same night, &c.

*Immediately after shall follow this Memorial, or Prayer of Oblation.*

Wherefore, O LORD and heavenly FATHER, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved SON, our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here, before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy SON hath willed and commanded us to make; having in remembrance His most blessed Passion and Sacrifice, His mighty Resurrection, and His glorious Ascension into heaven, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks; for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same. And we entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy SON JESUS CHRIST, now represented unto Thee, and through faith in His Blood, who maketh intercession for us at Thy right hand, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and be made partakers of all other benefits of His passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O LORD, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively Sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, and be fulfilled, &c. . . .

great regard to these remarks, they having altered most things according as was therein desired; and it is probable, that they were laid before the Board, Bishop Cosin being one of the principal commissioners."—*Note in Nicholls*, p. 67.

SCRIVENER, PRESBYTER.—*Course of Divinity. Book i. chap. 44.*

Great contention has been about the Sacrifice of the altar; and, perhaps, though with just cause, yet not so great as is generally believed. For these two terms do much illustrate one the other. For neither is the altar upon which Christians offer, properly an altar, any more than (as is said before) the LORD's day now observed is properly a Sabbath; nor is the Sacrifice thereon performed properly a Sacrifice. Some will have that only truly called a Sacrifice which consisted of living creatures slain and offered to GOD, and to this sense do I most incline. . . .

Now, for brevity sake, to omit many things incident to this dispute, and to apply the notion of Sacrifice to the actions in the Eucharist; if we take Sacrifice in Melanchthon's sense, from which Calvin doth not much vary, for "every act and thing devoted to God, whereby we give Him honour," there are Sacrifices enough to be found in the Eucharist; and there are many known senses of Sacrifice given to GOD, admitted by Protestants. But, passing all them over, the question here must be stated concerning this Sacrifice, as it was concerning the Body of CHRIST, not whether there really it is, but whether it really and properly be predicated of the matter of the Sacrament; and that in as proper a sense as CHRIST's Body was offered upon the Cross: this we deny, acknowledging only these three things, which fully satisfy the expressions of the ancient, calling the Host an "incruent Sacrifice." First, because here we call to remembrance CHRIST's Sacrifice upon the Cross, according as He instituted and required that at our hands, saying, "Do this in remembrance of Me." Secondly, as it is a Sacrifice rememorative, so it is a Sacrifice representative, insinuating and signifying unto us the death and passion of CHRIST; and not as common signs and advertencies only to bring to mind, or, as Gulielmus Parisiensis hath it, "like a string tied about the finger," to put a man in remembrance, and no more; but also to inform the judgment, and confirm and increase the faith of the receiver. Thirdly, it is a Sacrifice representative to GOD as well as to man, for, though nothing can lie hid from Him, or be forgotten by Him, yet, taking things as He

hath been pleased to express them unto us, after the manner of men, He, by the offering of this Sacrifice, and the devout worship there performed to God, is moved to behold, consider, and accept the true Sacrifice which Christ made for us in offering Himself for us; as it was by God's own appointment in the rainbow, put for a sign between Him and man, of the covenant for not drowning the earth. "And the bow (saith the Scripture) shall be in the cloud, and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh, that is upon the earth." Gen. ix. 16. In like manner, and much more effectually, may we say, that the action of the Eucharist presents to God the Sacrifice of CHRIST's death, and mediation made by Him for mankind, especially those that are immediately concerned in that Sacrament; from which metonymical Sacrifice what great and rich benefits may we not expect? Thus is the Host a Sacrifice, but not essentially, as the Sacrifices of the law, or CHRIST's offering Himself; but analogically and metonymically, by virtue of the Sacrifice of CHRIST; and through whose virtue the benefits of CHRIST's death and passion are made over unto the worthy communicants agreeably to CHRIST's institution, and the title given to it by the ancient and holy fathers.—pp. 218, 219.

FELL, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Paraphrase and Annotations*<sup>1</sup>.

*On Heb. v. 10.*

His Melchisedeckial or eternal Priesthood, joined with Kingship, was consummated in His resurrection; and is now continued in His service in the heavenly sanctuary. In which heavenly sanctuary, He perpetually offers His Blood and Passion to God; and, as Man, makes perpetual prayers and intercessions for us. . . As also He hath instituted the same oblation of His holy Body and Blood, and commemoration of His Passion, to be made in the holy Eucharist to God the FATHER by His ministers

<sup>1</sup> "Done by several eminent men at Oxford, corrected and improved by the late Right Rev. and learned Bishop Fell."—Third edit. 1702.

here on earth, for the same ends, viz. the application of all the benefits of His sole meritorious death and Sacrifice on the Cross, till His second return out of this heavenly sanctuary.

Id.—*On* Heb. xiii. 9.

The Apostle here exhorts the Christians to withdraw themselves from all communion with the Jews, and partaking of their sacrifices; (see v. 13.) and to make oblation to God of their goods, (v. 16.) and of their praise, and thanksgiving, (v. 15.) in the celebration of the Eucharist, the Christian Sacrifice. At which time, solemn thanksgivings, prayers, and intercessions have, from the beginning of the Gospel, been presented unto God; (see 1 Tim. ii. 1. *εὐχαριστία*, understood anciently of the Eucharist joined with *προσευχαι*, &c.) and a feast of charity made among Christians, as was amongst the Jews at their peace offerings.

(v. 9.)

. . . “Which have not profited them,”]—Likely, some of the Christian Jews, who believed in CHRIST’s expiatory Sacrifice, yet ceased not to feast on the Mosaical peace offerings, as formerly, which were shared between God or the altar, the priest, and the people; who, inviting their friends, the Levites, the poor, feasted thereon in the court of the temple; to which are opposed [v. 15.] our spiritual peace offerings.

(v. 15.)

“By him, therefore,”]—This verse relates to the tenth, (where the Apostle mentions the Christians’ altar,) and, together with the next verse, specifies the duties which were more solemnly performed in the Eucharist, corresponding to former peace offerings.

“Let us offer the [spiritual] sacrifice of praise to God continually.”]—1 Pet. ii. 5. As, in the law, after atonement followed peace offerings of thanksgiving, &c. which were never laid upon the altar, but upon a sin offering underneath. Lev. iii. 5.



PATRICK, BISHOP.—*Mensa Mystica.*

First, then, this holy rite of eating bread broken, and drinking wine poured out, is a solemn commemoration of CHRIST, according as He Himself saith to all His Apostles, Luke xxii. 19, and particularly to St. Paul, who twice makes mention of this command, "Do this in remembrance (or for a remembrance) of Me." His meaning is not, that we should hereby call Him to mind (for we are never to forget Him), but rather that we should keep Him in mind, and endeavour to perpetuate His name in the world, and propagate the memory of Him and His benefits, to the latest posterity. Now this is done by making a solemn rehearsal of His famous acts, and declaring the inestimable greatness of His royal love. For *ἀνάμνησις* doth not barely signify *recordatio*, recording or registering of His favours in our mind; but *commemoratio*, a solemn declaration that we do well bear them in our hearts, and will continue the memory, and spread the fame of Him, as far and as long as ever we are able.—pp. 3, 4.

Now, for the fuller understanding of this matter, you must know that the Paschal supper (which is called by Gregory Nazianzen, very elegantly, *τύπος τύπου ἀμυδρότερος*, "a more obscure type of this type") was instituted for a remembrance and was a feast of commemoration.— p. 7.

Now, of two things it is a remembrance; and two ways we commemorate or remember them:—

I. It is instituted for a remembrance that He was embodied for those that believe on Him, and became passible for their sakes. . .

II. It was instituted in commemoration of His passion and sufferings for us. As the bread and wine do commemorate the truth of His Body, so do bread broken, and wine poured out, commemorate the truth of His sufferings for us. . . .

But, as I said before, there are two parts of this commemoration; and it cannot be contained within the bounds of this world, but we must make it reach as high as heaven.

I. We do show it forth, and declare it unto men, which is sufficiently clear by all that has been said. . .

II. We do show forth the LORD's death unto God, and commemorate before Him the great things He hath done for us. We keep it (as it were) in His memory, and plead before Him the Sacrifice of His Son, which we show unto Him, humbly requiring that grace and pardon, with all other benefits of it, may be bestowed on us. And, as the minister doth most powerfully pray in the virtue of CHRIST's Sacrifice, when he represents it unto God, so do the people also, when they show unto Him what His Son hath suffered. Every man may say, "Behold, O LORD, the bleeding wounds of Thy own Son; remember how His Body was broken for us; think upon His precious Blood, which was shed in our behalf. Let us die, if He have not made a full satisfaction. We desire not to be pardoned, if He have not paid our debt. But canst Thou behold Him, and not be well pleased with us? Canst Thou look on His Body and Blood, which we represent to Thee, and turn Thy face from us? Hast Thou not set Him forth to be a propitiation, through faith in His Blood? O LORD, then suffer us sinful creatures to plead with Thee. Let us prevail in the virtue of His Sacrifice, for the graces and blessings which we need; and hide not Thyself from us, unless Thou canst hide Thyself from Thy Son too, whom we bring with us unto Thee." In this sort may we take the boldness to speak to God, and, together with a representation of CHRIST, we may represent our own wants; and we may be confident that, when God sees His Son, when we hold Him up (as it were) between His anger and our souls, He will take some pity, and have mercy upon us.—pp. 10—15.

We can hope to prevail for nothing, but through the name of our LORD, whom we can never mention with so much advantage, as when we solemnly commemorate His sufferings and deservings; for then we pray, and do something else also, which God hath commanded; so that there is the united force of many acceptable things to make us prevalent. And hence I suppose it is, that Isidore Pelusiota calls the sacramental bread, *ἄρτον προθέσεως*, "the shewbread," which we set before God, as that stood alway before His face in the time of the law, that God, looking upon it, might remember His people Israel for good.

It will not be unprofitable to add, that this was one reason why the ancients called this action a Sacrifice (which the Romanists now so much urge), because it doth represent the Sacrifice which CHRIST once offered. It is a figure of His death which we commemorate, unto which the Apostle St. Paul (as a learned man conceives), hath a reference, when he saith to the Galatians, that JESUS CHRIST was, set forth evidently before their eyes, crucified among them, They saw (as it were) His Sacrifice on the Cross; it was so lively figured in this Sacrament. And it is very plain, that St. Chrysostom understood no more, when as he thus speaks, upon the Epistle to the Hebrews: "What, then, do we not offer every day?" &c. Such an unbloody Sacrifice, which is only rememorative, and in representation, we all acknowledge. And, if that would content them, we make no scruple to use Eusebius' words, who saith "it is a remembrance instead of a Sacrifice;" and, in another place, "we sacrifice a remembrance of the great Sacrifice." And so every Christian is a Priest or a Sacrifice, when he comes to the table of the LORD; for, as our LORD saith to His Apostles, Luke xxii. 19, "Do this in remembrance of Me," so He saith to every private Christian the same words, 1 Cor. xi. 24. Only there is this difference, that "Do this," &c. in St. Luke, doth manifestly refer to those words before, to take bread, give thanks, and give to others (which is only the minister's work); but in St. Paul, "Do this," &c. refers to "take, eat," which immediately precedes, and this is to be done by all. So that both the one and the other, in their several kinds, do commemorate CHRIST, and represent Him to the Father.

And that it is only a memorial of a Sacrifice, and not a propitiatory Sacrifice, the arguments of a divine, in the Council of Trent, will prove, in spite of all opposers.—pp. 15—17.

This holy action is to be next of all considered as a remembrance, or commemoration, with thanksgiving;—and thence it is called by the name of Eucharist, *i. e.* "thanksgiving," according to the phrase of ancient times. For as the bread and wine, the breaking and pouring out, are representations, so our taking, eating, and drinking, express our hearty resentments. . . .

The Jewish feasts upon their Sacrifices do more plainly instruct us in this matter. They that offered peace-offerings unto God, were admitted to eat some part of them, after they were presented to Him and some pieces of them burnt upon His altar. And this is called "partaking of the altar" (which was God's table, Ezek. xli. 22. Mal. i. 7), where they did rejoice before Him, as those that were suffered to eat and drink with Him. . . . But the Psalmist's words are most to be observed to this purpose, Ps. cxvi. 12, 13, where to the question, "What shall I return to the LORD for all His benefits towards me?" he returns this answer, "I will take the cup of salvation," &c. i. e. when I offer *σωτήρια* Sacrifices for salvation, or deliverance that God hath granted me out of trouble, I will remember the mercy of God with all thankfulness, as I feast upon the remains of that Sacrifice. For it was the manner, that the Master of the Sacrifice should begin a cup of thanksgiving to all the guests that he invited, that they might all praise God together for that salvation, in consideration of which he paid these vows unto Him; and in those words the ancients thought they tasted the cup of salvation, which we now drink in the supper of the LORD; expounding them, in the analogical sense, to signify *τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν* (Chrysost. in Ps. cxvi.) the participation of the Christian mysteries.—pp. 20, 21. 26, 27.

It may further be observed, that all Churches in the world have always used divine praises in this commemoration, and (if we may believe ancient records) such as are very conformable to the Jewish benedictions at the Passover<sup>1</sup> . . . for so we read in Justin Martyr and others, that in their times the Church used to praise God for all things, and particularly for those gifts of bread and wine; and so for JESUS CHRIST, His death, passion, resurrection, and ascension, beseeching the Father of the whole world to accept of the offering they made to Him. And, in after ages, Cyril of Jerusalem saith, "We make mention of the heaven, the earth, the sea, and all the creatures, reasonable and unreasonable; of the Angels, Archangels, and powers of heaven; praising God,

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. cit. p. 121.]

and saying, Holy, holy, holy, LORD GOD of Sabaoth," &c. These do very much correspond with those Hebrew forms, which perhaps they were willing in part to imitate, for the greater satisfaction of the Jewish Christians, who constituted part of their assemblies. . . .

From all which we may discern a further reason why they called this Sacrament by the name of a Sacrifice; because they did "offer unto God thanksgiving" (as the Psalmist speaks, Ps. l. 14), which is one of the spiritual Sacrifices which every Christian is consecrated to bring unto Him. . . . Christians, therefore, are not without their Sacrifice also, when they keep this feast, and such an one as is very befitting God, and which no rational man can deny to deserve the name.—pp. 33—35.

But . . . there are Eucharistical *actions* also whereby we perform a most delightful Sacrifice unto God.

We must not, when we come to God, appear before Him empty; but we are to consecrate and offer unto Him some of our temporal goods, for the relief of those that are in want, which may cause many thanksgivings to be sent up by them to God. It hath been said before, that our whole selves ought to be offered as an holocaust to God . . . so that the spiritual Sacrifice of ourselves, and the corporal Sacrifice of our goods to Him, may teach the Papists that we are sacrificers as well as they, and are made kings and priests unto God. Yea, they may know, that the bread and the wine of the Eucharist, is an offering (out of the stock of the whole congregation) to this service, according as it was in the primitive times. . . . We pray Him, therefore, in our Communion Service, to accept our OBLATIONS (meaning those of bread and wine), as well as our ALMS. We still make, as Origen's phrase is,—“a rational and unsmoky Sacrifice,” for we offer ourselves, and our prayers, and our praises, and our goods: so that, if you please, we may call the table of the LORD (in Theodoret's style)—“a rational table;” where, as God provides for us, so we provide for Him, in those that are His members, and offer upon it those Sacrifices which are most befitting either Him or rational creatures. And that you may see we are engaged to this kind of offering, it is to be observed, that

the eating of the Lamb was not all the solemnity of the Pass-over; but they sacrificed, likewise, offerings of thanksgivings in abundance, that there might be provision for the poor.—pp. 36—38.

Now this bread and wine in the Sacrament is God's, both as it is offered by us unto Him, and as it is consecrated to represent His SON CHRIST unto us; and therefore we, by partaking of it, do solemnly engage ourselves unto, and promise our fidelity in His service. . . .

And that you may see it more fully verified, that this eating and drinking is a federal rite between God and us, let it be considered as a feast upon a Sacrifice (in which notion it is most rarely explained by an excellent doctor of our own<sup>1</sup>), from which it will evidently appear to be intended as a solemn profession of CHRIST's religion, and a renewal of our covenant with God.

For the understanding of this, you must know that, Jerusalem being the holy city in God's land, and the temple being the house of God, where He dwelt, and the priests God's servants, and the altar His table (as was said before), there was a constant provision brought in for the keeping of God's house, and maintaining of His servants. And besides those of the morning and evening, there were a great number of occasional Sacrifices (which were His flesh), together with their meat and drink offerings (which were His bread and wine), that came in to be His food, as the expression is, Lev. iii. 11. These common Sacrifices were of three sorts: the first were holocausts, or burnt offerings . . . . The second we may call expiatory, because they were to make atonement and reconcile, which were of two sorts, sin offerings and trespass offerings; . . . The third sort were peace offerings, which were made to God for some benefits received (which go among the Hebrews under the name of "peace") to testify their gratitude unto Him. The fat of these offerings being burnt upon the altar to God (Lev. iii. 3, 4), and one breast with a shoulder being given to the priest, for his portion (Lev. vii. 34), the remainders were the owner's share, that he might eat of God's

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Cudworth.

meat, and so feast with Him (if he was not in any legal uncleanness), as you may see, Lev. vii. 20.

The examples of such Sacrifices are numerous in the Scripture...

Now that this eating and drinking was intended as a rite of covenanting with that Deity to whom the Sacrifices were offered, or else as a profession that they were in the covenant, and did remain God's friends (if they were already of the religion), you may discern from these two places, which will lead me to that for which all this is said. When Moses had rehearsed to the people God's laws (Exod. xx. 21—23), which he gave on Mount Sinai, and then came to strike the covenant between God and Israel, it is said (Exod. xxiv. 5), that Moses sent young men (*i. e.* some of the first-born, who were the Priests hitherto) to offer burnt offerings and peace offerings of oxen, and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar, which represented God, and the other half he sprinkled on the people, (ver. 6—8) as a token of the covenant between them; but for the completing of the compact, the chief of the people went up nearer to God, and saw that bright appearance, and did eat and drink, (ver. 11) which sure must be understood of their feasting upon the peace offerings which had been sacrificed unto God, whereby they professed to own that covenant He had given to them.

Not long after, this people made to themselves other gods, and offered not only burnt offerings, but also peace offerings to them, (Exod. xxxii. 6) and then "sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play," *i. e.* to be wanton, and commit uncleanness with each other. Now that this was an associating of themselves with the Egyptian gods, we may learn from the Apostle, who, reciting of this passage, and speaking of their idolatry, makes no mention at all of their sacrificing to these new gods, but only of this eating, &c. which did conclude the ceremony; as if the idolatry did formally consist in this, and that hereby they did devote themselves to that strange worship. "Neither be you idolaters, (saith he, 1 Cor. x. 8) as were some of them, as it is written, the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play." By which words you may see the Apostle makes account,

that this eating and drinking of the Sacrifices, was a renouncing of the covenant of their God, and joining of themselves to idols. . . . For just as Israel, by eating of the Sacrifices partake of (or have communion with) the altar, ver. 18, *i. e.* profess to be of that religion, and adhere to that way of worship, so it is with Christians, when they eat of the Body and Blood of the crucified Saviour, which was offered for us. . . .

From all which discourse we may thus reason, that this holy Sacrament is a feast upon the Sacrifice which CHRIST offered, as the Jewish feasts were made with the flesh of those Sacrifices which they offered to God.—pp. 50—57.

This eating and drinking is a feast upon a sin offering, and therefore, is a greater pledge of remission of sin. That you may conceive of this aright, it must be remembered, that, though the people of Israel used to feast upon their peace offerings which were made at the altar, (as hath been said already) yet they were not admitted to eat of any else. . . . Now CHRIST made His soul an offering for sin, and such an offering, that with His Blood He entered into the holy place, and suffered without the camp, and therefore was most illustriously set forth by that Sacrifice, which was for the whole congregation. According, then, to the law, none was to feed upon the Sacrifice; and yet our LORD hath indulged unto us the privilege of feasting upon this great Sacrifice of propitiation; according as the very words of the institution of this Sacrament do intimate, when our SAVIOUR saith, "This is the Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many;" (Mark xiv. 24) *i. e.* which is like to the Sacrifice on the great day of atonement, which was not made for one person, but for the whole congregation; and of this I give you leave to drink. This was a favour never granted to the world before. . . . This difference, therefore, is remarkable between the legal Sacrifices and the representation of CHRIST'S Sacrifice. In them was made *ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν*, (Heb. x. 3) a commemoration of sin every year; they were a plain confession of sin that it remained still in force, and that they could not take it away, else they needed not to have been repeated. . . . But this Sacrifice of



which we now take, is an *ἀνάμνησις*, a “commemoration” of the remission of sins; a remembrance that it is quite taken away, and hath lost all its strength; and so, seeing CHRIST hath made a perfect satisfaction, though they might not eat, yet we may of the Sacrifice of expiation. . . .

To shut up this, then, you may thus take a very brief sum of it. Before the flood, they only offered holocausts, or whole burnt offerings, (for then they ate no flesh). After the flood, they sacrificed peace offerings also for mercies which they received; and these they all ate of. But we read of no sin offering till the law was given; and those the priests only ate of, but not of all. Till the Gospel came, never did any eat of a sin offering that was carried within the vail to reconcile withal; but now both priest and people partake of it. We are all made “priests unto God, in this regard, that” as the priests of old had the favour to eat of the sin offering, so have the people of GOD now, by communicating of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, who offered up Himself unto God for us.—pp. 75—80.

When we take the bread into our hands, it is a seasonable time to do that act which I told you was one end of this Sacrament, viz. “commemorate, and show forth, or declare the death of CHRIST unto GOD the FATHER.” Let us represent before Him the Sacrifice of atonement that CHRIST hath made; let us commemorate the pains which He endured, let us entreat Him that we may enjoy all the purchase of His Blood, that all people may reap the fruit of His Passion; and that, for the sake of His bloody Sacrifice, He will turn away all His anger and displeasure, and be reconciled unto us. . . . Themistocles, (they say) not knowing how to mitigate and atone the wrath of king Admetus, and avert his fury from him, snatched up the King's son, and held him up in his arms between himself and death, and so prevailed for a pardon, and quenched the fire that was breaking out against him. And this the Molossians (of whom he was king) held to be “the most effectual way of supplication,” and which, of all others, “could not be resisted or denied.” Of far greater prevalency is this act, the holding up (as it were) the SON of GOD in our hands, and representing to the FATHER, the broken

Body and the Blood of His only begotten. Let us set this between the heat of God's anger and our souls; let us desire He would have regard to His Dearly Beloved; and the LORD cannot turn back our prayers that press and importune Him with such a mighty argument. Say, therefore, to Him, "Behold, O LORD, the Sacrifice of the everlasting covenant; behold, we lay before Thee the Lamb that takes away the sins of the world. Is not Thy soul in Him well pleased? Is not His body as really in the heavens, as the signs of it are here in our hands? Hear, good LORD, the cry of His wounds. Let us prevail with Thee through the virtue of His Sacrifice. Let us feel, yea, let all the world feel the power of His intercession. Deny us not, O LORD, seeing we bring Thy SON with us. Hear Thy SON, O LORD, though Thou wilt not hear us, and let us and all others know that He lives, and was dead, and that He is alive for evermore. Amen."—pp. 265, 6.

*Id.—Christian Sacrifice.*

In such meditations as these, when we show forth the inestimable value of CHRIST'S Sacrifice, we do, as it were, offer it unto God; or rather, make before Him a commemoration of this offering. And in this sense the ancient Christians did call this Sacrament a Sacrifice; and every Christian they looked upon as a priest and a sacrificer, when he came to the table of the LORD. Because CHRIST not only bade His Apostles "do this in remembrance of" Him; but St. Paul requires every one of us to do the same, and to "show forth His death till He come."—p. 20.

As we are partakers of a better Sacrifice, which is of greater efficacy and virtue than any of theirs (the Jews) were; so God receives us into a nearer familiarity with Himself, and, by setting before us not only the body of that Sacrifice which was offered to Him, but the blood also (which was His own proper food), plainly tells us that He intends to make us partakers of the highest blessings, even of His own joy and happiness. Of which He gives us strong assurance, in that He lets us partake

not only of the blood of the Sacrifice, in this figure and representation, but of the blood of that Sacrifice which was offered for the sins of the world. This bids us rest assured of His abundant grace; and not doubt of our acceptance with Him, to a participation of His highest favour. There is nothing now to hinder it, nor to make us call in question His merciful kindness towards us. For we have such a token and pledge of forgiveness of our sins by this Sacrifice, as the ancient people of God had not of the forgiveness of their offences, by the blood that was offered at God's altar. They were not admitted to taste of that blood, as we are of the blood of Jesus; and so, could not have that boldness and access with confidence to God, which we have through the faith of Him.

This seems to be one great secret of this Sacrament, as appears from the words of St. Luke and St. Paul, (Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xii. 25. compared with Matt. xxvi. 28) who tells, that this cup which we drink of, is "the new covenant in CHRIST'S Blood, which was shed for the remission of sins." . . . Which is the import also of the word "communion," used by St. Paul to express the effect of this Sacrament. (1 Cor. x. 16.) "The cup of blessing which we bless," &c. In its full signification, that phrase denotes not merely our being made of His society, but our having a communication of His Body and His Blood unto us, (so the word *κοινωνέω* is rendered in other places, Gal. vi. 6; Phil. iv. 15) of which we partake by eating this bread and drinking this cup, in remembrance of His death for the remission of sins. And so we beseech our merciful FATHER, (in the Prayer of Consecration which our Church prescribes) that we receiving these, His creatures of bread and wine, according to His SON our SAVIOUR'S holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood. For, after the bread and wine are deputed by holy prayer to God, to be used for a commemoration of CHRIST'S death, though they do not cease to be what they were before, yet they begin to be something which they were not before this consecration. . . All the effects and benefits of His Passion are imparted to us by these

which in themselves are but God's creatures of bread and wine, yet by His appointment become to us the Body and Blood of His SON. In short, there is nothing which the Body and Blood of CHRIST can be to the spirits of men, but by these tokens He exhibits it to us, and gives us an interest in it. This is spiritually to eat His flesh and drink His Blood; as both our Church and the ancient speak. Our souls entertain and feast themselves upon His Sacrifice; being really made partakers of whatsoever His Body and Blood can do for them. Which St. Gregory Nazianzen meant, I should think, when he saith, that "these oblations are the communication of the incarnation of God, and of the sufferings of God."—pp. 45—48.

It is certain that it was not common bread and wine which the ancient Christians prayed might become the Body and Blood of CHRIST to them; but bread and wine first sanctified, by being offered to God with thanksgiving, and presented to Him with due acknowledgments that He was the LORD and giver of all things. After which followed a thankful mention of the great love of God, in sending His SON to redeem mankind by His death, represented by that holy bread and wine broken and poured out, in commemoration of His Passion. This was the principal thing of all, which our Church therefore expressly puts us in mind of, in the words now recited; and distinctly acknowledges in the Prayer of Consecration. As for the other, that also is to be understood when you see the bread and wine set upon God's table by him that ministers in this divine service. Then it is offered to God; for whatsoever is solemnly placed there, becomes by that means a thing dedicated and appropriated to Him.

And if you observe the time when this bread and wine is ordered to be placed there, which is immediately after the alms of the people have been received for the poor, you will see it is intended by our Church to be a thankful oblation to God of the fruits of the earth. And, accordingly, all that are there present, when they behold the priest thus preparing the bread and wine for consecration to an higher mystery, should secretly lift up their souls to God in hearty thanksgiving, and offer Him the

Sacrifice of praise for these and all other such like benefits ; desiring Him to accept of these gifts, as a small token of their grateful sense that they hold all they have of Him, as the great LORD of the world. And so we are taught to do in that prayer which immediately follows in our Liturgy, “for the whole state of CHRIST’s Church,” and wherein we humbly beseech Him to “accept” not only “our alms,” but also our “oblations.” These are things distinct, and, the former “alms” signifying that which was given for the relief of the poor, the latter “oblations” can signify nothing else but (according to the style of the ancient Church) this bread and wine presented to GOD, in a thankful remembrance of our food both dry and liquid (as Justin Martyr speaks), which He, the Creator of the world, hath made and given unto us. But, above all, we must be sure to offer our devoutest acknowledgments for that gift of gifts, the SON of GOD dying for us ; without which thanksgiving, to speak the truth, we do not do that which CHRIST commanded, and so cannot hope for the blessing He hath promised. Hear St. Chrysostom (instead of all that treat of this matter) who excellently declares the manner and reason of thanksgiving, in a sermon of his upon the eighth chapter of St. Matthew. “A perpetual memory,” saith he, “and thanksgiving for a good turn, is the best way that can be found to secure and preserve it to us. And, therefore, the dreadful mysteries and full of salvation, which we celebrate in every assembly, are called the Eucharist ; because they are a commemoration of many benefits, and show forth the principal piece of Divine providence, and dispose us always to give Him thanks. For if to be born of a virgin was a great wonder, what was it to be crucified, to shed His blood for us, and to give Himself to us for a feast and a spiritual banquet ? What shall we call this ? Where shall we place it ? We can do no less than give Him thanks perpetually. . . . And, therefore, the priest, when this Sacrifice is in hand, bids us ‘thank GOD for the whole world ; for what is past, and what is present, and for those things that are to come.’ This sets us free from the earth, and translates us to heaven ; and of men makes us angels. . . . For that Only Begotten SON of His, who was more

“ precious to Him than all things besides, hath He given for us  
 “ enemies ;—and not only given Him, but, after that gift, set  
 “ Him before us on our table ; doing all things Himself for us,  
 “ both to give, and then to make us thankful for His gifts. For,  
 “ mankind being generally ungrateful, He undertakes through-  
 “ out, and doth all things for us Himself. And what He did for  
 “ the Jews, putting them in mind of His benefits, from places,  
 “ and times, and feasts, that He hath done here ; from a kind of  
 “ Sacrifice, casting us into a perpetual remembrance of the good  
 “ He hath wrought for us.”—pp. 68—71.

TOWERSON, PRESBYTER.—*Explication of the Catechism*, Part iv.

But because the fore-mentioned Baronius tells us that the Sacrament, whereof we speak, had also the name of an “ oblation,” or “ Sacrifice,” as that too because of the “ offering” there made for sin, or an expiatory one ; therefore it will be necessary for us to go on to inquire into that name, and so much the rather, because the same author is so copious in his quotations concerning it. And I readily grant that this Sacrament is frequently so called by the ancients, but that it was called so for the reason alleged is utterly denied, neither can there be produced any convincing proof of it. The utmost that can be said by those who are the most ancient, is, that it is an eucharistical oblation, as that too for the blessings of this world, and particularly for the fruits of the earth, as well as for the blessings of our redemption. And to that purpose, and no other, are the sayings before quoted out of Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, and Origen. Which, how they agree with their designs who represent this Sacrament as an expiatory oblation or Sacrifice, I shall leave to all indifferent men to judge. And though it be true, that some of those who followed, spake in another strain, and represented it also as an oblation “ for the benefit of the offerers” and others, as well as an eucharistical oblation for benefits received, yet it is evident, from Mr Mede, that the ancients meant no more by that oblation or Sacrifice, than a commemorative one, by that sacred rite of bread and wine representing to GOD and the FATHER the expiatory Sacrifice of His SON upon the Cross, and, as it were,

putting Him in mind of it, that so be He would, for the sake of that Son, and the valuableness of His Sacrifice, be propitious to them, and to all those whom they recommended to His grace and favour. And, indeed, as it is not difficult to conceive, that they who meant no more, when they called the Eucharist the Body of CHRIST, than its being a figure, and a memorial, and a means of its conveyance, meant no more, when they entituled it a Sacrifice, than a commemoration of that great one, which CHRIST made of Himself upon the Cross; so it is evident, that St. Cyprian (with whose authority Baronius begins his proofs) meant no more than such a commemorative Sacrifice. . . . And if they who insist so much upon its having been entituled a Sacrifice, will content themselves with this, and the former sense, we will allow that they have the Fathers on their side, but otherwise to have no title to them in this affair.—pp. 168, 9.

Let us go on to inquire, because a question of far greater moment, whether he who administers this Sacrament is obliged by the words of the institution, or otherwise, to make an “ offering to God of CHRIST’s Body and Blood,” as well as to make a tender of the Sacrament thereof to men; the Council of Trent, as is well known, avowing that to be the importance of the words, “ Do this in remembrance of Me ;” and that the Apostles were, by the same words, appointed priests to offer them.—p. 274.

Yet will not the words *τοῦτο ποιῆτε* reach that Sacrifice which is intended to be superstructed upon them; because he who commands men to sacrifice, or offer, in remembrance of himself, doth rather enjoin a commemorative than expiatory one, and, consequently, not that Sacrifice which is intended. So little is there in the words themselves, how favourably soever considered, to oblige us to understand them of such an offering as the Church of Rome advanceth. And we shall find them to signify as little, though we take in the sense of the Catholic Church upon them, how conformably soever the Council of Trent affirms it to be unto its own; because, though the ancients did all agree upon a Sacrifice, and, which is more, looked upon those words as either directly or indirectly obliging to the offering of it, yet, (as hath been elsewhere shown) they advanced other kinds of

Sacrifices than what the Church of Rome now doth, and, consequently, cannot be supposed to give any countenance to it. And I shall only add, that though Justin Martyr represented that offering of fine flour, which was offered for those that were cleansed from the leprosy, as a type of the bread of the Eucharist; though he moreover applied the word ποιῆν to that bread, and (if any of the fathers, therefore, did,) affirmed CHRIST to command us to “make,” or “offer” that bread to God; yet he adds, that “He commanded us to do so in remembrance of that Passion which He suffered for those that were cleansed in their souls;” and again, “that we might at the same time give thanks to God for His having made the world, and all things in it for the sake of man, and for His having delivered us, by CHRIST, from that wickedness, in which we sometimes were, and dissolved all noxious principalities and powers,” which shows him not to have thought in the least of our being commanded to offer CHRIST’s Body and Blood, under the species of bread, or indeed of any other Sacrifice, than a commemorative or eucharistical one.—pp. 276, 7.

BULL, BISHOP AND DOCTOR.—*Sermon xiii. Common Prayers, ancient, useful, and necessary.*

St. Paul the Apostle had, in the foregoing chapter, (1 Tim. i.) given instructions to bishop (or rather archbishop) Timothy, concerning the regulation of preaching and preachers within his province, which was the proconsular Asia, of which Ephesus was the metropolis. . . .

To this public person, to this great bishop of the Church, is this charge given by St. Paul, in my text; “I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men,” &c. He was to take care that such prayers should be made in all Churches and congregations under his inspection and jurisdiction. And how could he do this, but by providing by his authority, that there should be set forms of prayer, framed according to this rule given him by the Apostle, to be used in those Churches? Sure I am, the primi-



tive Catholic Church understood this to be the meaning of the Apostle. Hence, in all the Churches of CHRIST over the world, however distant from each other, we find set forms of public prayers, suited and conform to this direction of the Apostle. . . .

And indeed, if we consult all the ancient Liturgies extant at this day, we shall find this observation to be most true ; they are all framed and composed according to this rule of the Apostle.

And it is observable, that, however those ancient Liturgies have been altered and corrupted in after-times by many additions and interpolations, yet there are in all of them still remaining many excellent and divine forms of prayer and thanksgiving, wherein they do all perfectly agree, and which, therefore, cannot reasonably be thought to have any other original than apostolical order and appointment, delivered to the several nations and people, together with the first preaching and plantation of Christianity among them. Such, for example, is the *Sursum corda* in the Office of the Communion, the priest saying, "Lift up your hearts ;" and the people answering, "We lift them up unto the LORD." There is no liturgy in any Church of CHRIST to this day, but hath this form. Such is the excellent form of thanksgiving in the same Office of the Communion, to be performed by the priest and people ; the priest saying, "Let us give thanks unto our LORD God ;" and the people answering, "It is meet and right so to do." This form also is to be found in all the most ancient Liturgies. . . .

I add, to what hath been already observed, the consent of all the Christian Churches in the world, however distant from each other, in the Prayer of Oblation of the Christian Sacrifice in the holy Eucharist, or Sacrament of the LORD's supper ; which consent is indeed wonderful. All the ancient Liturgies agree in this form of prayer, almost in the same words, but fully and exactly in the same sense, order, and method : which, whosoever attentively considers, must be convinced that this order of prayer was delivered to the several Churches in the very first plantation and settlement of them. Nay, it is observable, that this form of prayer is still retained in the very canon of the Mass, at this day used in the Church of Rome, though the form doth manifestly

contradict and overthrow some of the principal articles of their new faith. For from this very form of prayer, still extant in their canon, a man may effectually refute those two main doctrines of their Church, the doctrine of purgatory and that of transubstantiation, as I could clearly show you, if I had time, and this were a proper place for it. Thus, by a singular providence of God, that ancient, primitive, and apostolic form of prayer still remains in the Liturgy of that Church, as a convincing testimony against the latter innovations and corruptions of the Christian doctrine. But this by the way. . . .

Other instances of the like nature I could give you, if the time would permit. But these, I think, are sufficient to show that there were set, prescribed offices, and forms of prayer and praise, and profession of faith, delivered to all the Churches of CHRIST by the Apostles or their immediate successors; many of those forms (notwithstanding the manifold corruptions and depravations of the primitive Liturgies in after-times) being still retained, and unanimously used in all the Churches of Christ to this day. . . .

What we have said concerning prescribed forms of prayer as always, from the days of the Apostles, used in all settled Churches of CHRIST, may administer abundant satisfaction and confirmation to all that adhere to the communion of the Church of England, and consequently to the Liturgy and form of prayer prescribed in that Church.

This may be our comfort, that we serve and worship God in the same way that the primitive confessors and martyrs, and all good Christians in the succeeding ages did.

We have a Liturgy conform to this law and rule of prayer laid down by the Apostle in my text, and observed by the Catholic Church. We have good and wholesome supplication, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgiving, not only for ourselves, but for all men.

Those excellent men, our first reformers, took care to retain and preserve what was primitive and good in the Liturgies of other Churches, and to pare off all excrescences and adventitious corruptions of after-times. . . . We have an entire Sacrament,

the cup of blessing in the holy Eucharist, which was sacrilegiously taken from us by the Church of Rome, being happily restored to us. The ridiculous pageantry and fopperies of that Church are laid aside, and we have the holy Sacrament purely, reverently, and decently administered<sup>1</sup>.

Let us bless and praise God for these His great mercies, and make a good use of them. Let us constantly resort to the prayers of our Church, and neglect no opportunity of receiving the holy Sacrament.—*Works*, vol. i. pp. 323—334. 343, 4.

*Id.—Corruptions of the Church of Rome.*

But, alas! these superadded articles of the Trent creed are so far from being certain truth, that they are most of them manifest untruths, yea, gross and dangerous errors. To make this appear, I shall not refuse the pains of examining some of the chief of them.

The first article I shall take notice of is this; “I profess, that in the Mass is offered to God, a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, and really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divi-

<sup>1</sup> Compare Nelson's *Life of Bishop Bull*. “He administered the Sacraments of our holy religion with great reverence and solemnity. The holy Eucharist, the mysterious rite and perfection of Christian worship, was not performed so often in his parish, as he earnestly desired, and yet oftener than is usual in little villages; for he brought it to seven times in a year. But whenever he officiated at the altar, it was exactly agreeable to the directions of the rubric, and with the gravity and seriousness of a primitive priest. . . .

“He always placed the elements of bread and wine upon the altar himself, after he had received them either from the churchwarden or clerk, or had taken them from some convenient place, where they were laid for that purpose. His constant practice was, to offer them upon the holy table, in the first place, in conformity to the practice of the ancient Church, before he began the communion service; and this the rubric, after the offertory, seemeth to require of all her priests, by declaring, ‘That when there is a Communion, the priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient.’”—pp. 52, 53. (ed. Burton.)

nity of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; and that there is wrought a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation." Where this proposition, ("That in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead,") having that other of the "substantial presence of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Eucharist," immediately annexed to it, the meaning of it must necessarily be this, that in the Eucharist the very Body and Blood of CHRIST are again offered up to God as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of men. Which is an impious proposition, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of CHRIST made by His death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture, Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12. 25, 26. 28. and x. 12. 14. It is true the Eucharist is frequently called by the ancient fathers *προσφορά*, *θυσία*, an "oblation," a "sacrifice." But it is to be remembered, that they say also it is *θυσία λογική και ἀναίμακτος*, a "reasonable Sacrifice," a "Sacrifice without blood"; which, how can it be said to be, if therein the very Blood of CHRIST were offered up to God?

They held the Eucharist to be a commemorative Sacrifice, and so do we. This is the constant language of the ancient Liturgies, "We offer by way of commemoration;" according to our SAVIOUR's words when He ordained this holy rite, "Do this in commemoration of me." In the Eucharist, then, CHRIST is offered, not hypostatically, as the Trent fathers have determined, (for so He was but once offered,) but commemoratively only; and this commemoration is made to God the FATHER, and is not a bare remembering, or putting ourselves in mind of Him. For every Sacrifice is directed to God, and the oblations therein made, whatsoever it be, hath Him for its object and not man. In the holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the bread and wine, as "figures or images of the precious Blood of CHRIST shed for us, and of His precious Body," (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy,) and plead to God the merit of His SON'S Sacrifice once offered on the Cross for us sinners, and in this

Sacrament represented, beseeching Him for the sake thereof to bestow His heavenly blessings on us.

To conclude this matter : the ancients held the oblation of the Eucharist to be answerable in some respects to the legal Sacrifices ; that is, they believed that our blessed SAVIOUR ordained the Sacrament of the Eucharist as a rite of prayer and praise to God, instead of the manifold and bloody Sacrifices of the law. That the legal Sacrifices were rites to invoke God by, is evident from many texts of Scripture, see especially 1 Sam. vii. 9; and xiii. 12; Ezra vi. 10; Prov. xv. 8. And that they were also rites for praising God for His mercies, appears from 2 Chron. xxix. 27. Instead, therefore, of slaying of beasts, and burning of incense, whereby they praised God, and called upon His name, under the Old Testament; the Fathers, I say, believed our SAVIOUR appointed this Sacrament of bread and wine, as a rite whereby to give thanks and make supplication to His FATHER in His name. This you may see fully cleared and proved by the learned Mr. Mede, in his treatise entitled, "The Christian Sacrifice." The Eucharistical Sacrifice, thus explained, is indeed λογική θυσία, a "reasonable Sacrifice," widely different from that monstrous Sacrifice of the Mass taught in the Church of Rome.

The other branch of the article is concerning transubstantiation, wherein the ecclesiastic professeth upon his solemn oath his belief, that in the Eucharist "there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood of CHRIST:" a proposition that bids defiance to all the reason and sense of mankind; nor (God be praised) hath it any ground or foundation in divine revelation. Nay, the text of Scripture, on which the Church of Rome builds this article, duly considered, utterly subverts and overthrows it. She grounds it upon the words of the institution of the holy Sacrament by our SAVIOUR, the same night wherein He was betrayed; when He took bread and brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, "This is my body," τὸ διδόμενον, saith St. Luke, [xxii. 19.] τὸ κλάμενον, saith St. Paul, [1 Cor. xi. 24.] "which is given and broken for you." After the same manner

He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Now whatsoever our SAVIOUR said was undoubtedly true : but these words could not be true in a proper sense ; for our SAVIOUR's body was not then given or broken, but whole and inviolate ; nor was there one drop of His blood yet shed. The words, therefore, must necessarily be understood in a figurative sense ; and then, what becomes of the doctrine of transubstantiation ? The meaning of our SAVIOUR is plainly this : What I now do, is a representation of My death and passion near approaching ; and what I now do, do ye hereafter ;—"do this in remembrance of Me ;"—let this be a standing, perpetual ordinance in My Church, to the end of the world ; let My death be thus communicated and shown forth till I come to judgment. See 1 Cor. xi. 26.

As little foundation hath this doctrine of transubstantiation in the ancient Church, as appears sufficiently from what hath been already said, concerning the notion then universally received of the Eucharistical Sacrifice. It was then believed to be an ἀνάμνησις, or "commemoration," by the symbols of bread and wine, of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, once offered up to GOD on the Cross for our redemption ; it could not, therefore, be then thought an offering up again to GOD of the very Body and Blood of CHRIST, substantially present under the appearance of bread and wine ; for these two notions are inconsistent, and cannot stand together. The ancient doctors, yea, and Liturgies of the Church, affirm the Eucharist to be *incruentum sacrificium*, "a Sacrifice without blood ;" which it cannot be said to be, if the very blood of CHRIST were therein present and offered up to GOD. In the Clementine Liturgy, the bread and wine in the Eucharist are said to be *antitypa*, "correspondent types," figures, and images of the precious Body and Blood of CHRIST. And divers others of the fathers speak in the same plain language. *Vid. Greg. Naz. Apol. Orat. 1. tom. 1. Cyril. Hierosol. 5. Cat. Myst. Ambros. de Sacrament. lib. iv. cap. 4.—Vol. ii. p. 250—255.*

STILLINGFLEET, BISHOP.—*Conferences concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.*

P. D. . . . We have all the reason in the world to commemorate, with great thankfulness and devotion, that invaluable Sacrifice of the Cross; and if you will call the whole Eucharistical office a commemorative Sacrifice, as the ancients did, I shall never quarrel with you about it. But how the Sacrifice of the Mass comes to be propitiatory as the Sacrifice on the Cross was, I understand not. . . .

R. P. But what makes Dr. Stillingfleet so bitter against the Sacrifice of the Altar, since the most true and genuine sons of the Church of England do allow it? as Mr. Thorndike, Dr. Heylin, and Bishop Andrews? And doth not this rather look like betraying the Church of England than defending it?

P. D. 1. Mr. Thorndike, as I have showed already, declares against the "true proper Sacrifice" defined by the Council of Trent, as an innovation and contradiction. And that which he pleads for is, "that the Eucharist is a commemorative and representative Sacrifice," about which Dr. Stillingfleet would never contend with him or any one else; and immediately after the words cited by T. G. he adds these; "It is therefore, enough, that the Eucharist is the Sacrifice of CHRIST on the Cross, as the Sacrifice of CHRIST on the Cross is represented, renewed, revived, and restored by it, and as every representation is said to be the same thing with that which it representeth."

2. Peter Heylin's words are expressly only for a "commemorative Sacrifice," as T. G. himself produces them, and, therefore, I wonder what T. G. meant in citing them at large; for he quotes the English Liturgy for the "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" and St. Chrysostom calling it "the remembrance of a Sacrifice;" and many of our learned writers, "a commemorative Sacrifice." What is there in all this in the least repugnant to what Dr. Stillingfleet had delivered?

R. P. But he quotes Bishop Andrews, saying, "Take from the

Mass your transubstantiation, and we will have no difference with you about the Sacrifice."

P. D. Bishop Andrews calls the Eucharist a "commemorative Sacrifice," and he saith, "it was properly Eucharistical, or of the nature of peace-offerings, concerning which the law was, that he that offered should partake of them;" and a little after follow those words you mention; to which he adds, "We yield you that there is a remembrance of CHRIST'S Sacrifice; but we shall never yield that your CHRIST being made of bread is there sacrificed." Which is the very thing that T. G. is so angry with Dr. Stillingfleet about. And have not you bravely proved that Dr. Stillingfleet hath herein gone against the sense of the genuine sons of the Church of England?—*Works*, vol. vi. pp. 176. 179.

SMITH, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Sermon on frequent Communion.*

They [the Fathers] did not, under a pretence of exalting the mystery, destroy the nature of a Sacrament, as now is done in the Roman Church. It must now, no longer, be a representative, but a "real propitiatory Sacrifice, for the living and for the dead." And CHRIST'S natural Body must be brought down from heaven upon a thousand altars at once, and there really broken and offered up again to GOD the FATHER, and His blood actually spilt a thousand times every day, and mixing itself with ours.—p. 19.

BEVERIDGE, BISHOP.—*Private Thoughts upon Religion.*

And, as Baptism thus comes in the place of the Jews' Circumcision, so doth our LORD'S Supper answer to their Passover. Their Paschal Lamb represented our SAVIOUR CHRIST, and the sacrificing of it, the shedding of His Blood upon the Cross, and as the Passover was the memorial of the Israelites' redemption from Egypt's bondage, Ex. xii. 14. so is the LORD'S Supper the memorial of our redemption from the slavery of sin, and assertion



into Christian liberty ; or, rather, it is a solemn and lively representation of the death of CHRIST, and offering it again to GOD, as an atonement for sin, and reconciliation to His favour.

So that I believe this Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper, under the Gospel, succeeds to the rite of sacrificing under the law, and is properly called the Christian Sacrifice, as representing the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross.—p. 124.

*Id.—Great Necessity and Advantage of frequent Communion.*

“For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the LORD'S death till He come.”—1 Cor. xi. 26.

In which words we may first observe, that every time that the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper is administered, His death is thereby shown and declared to all that are there present. As, when the Jews ate the Paschal Lamb, the master of the family declared the reasons why they ate it with bitter herbs, and why with unleavened bread, and the like ; so here, when we eat the bread, and drink the cup, according to CHRIST'S institution, we thereby declare the reasons of it, though not by words, yet by the very act itself, and the several circumstances of it. By the breaking of the bread, we declare CHRIST'S Body to be broken and wounded to death ; by the cup we declare His Blood to be shed, or poured out for the sins of the world : and by distributing both the bread and cup to each communicant apart, we declare to every one, particularly, that CHRIST died for his sins, and that he may be saved by CHRIST'S death, if he will but receive and apply it to himself, as he ought, by a quick and lively faith.

In the next place we may here observe, that the Apostle doth not say, that CHRIST'S death is repeated, or that He is offered up again every time this Sacrament is administered, but only that the LORD'S death is shown by it. And, therefore, that this is not, as the Papists absurdly imagine, a “propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead,” but only commemorative and declarative of that one Sacrifice, which CHRIST once offered to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world.—pp. 3, 4.

Again, we may from hence observe, that this was no temporary institution, which was to continue only for some time, but to the end of the world; or, as the Apostle here expresses it, "till He," our LORD and SAVIOUR, "come." As, from the beginning of the world, as often as they offered, according to its first institution, any bloody Sacrifice to GOD, they thereby foreshewed the death of CHRIST, typified by it, until His first coming into the world to save it; so, since that time, "as often as we eat this bread, and drink this cup," according to CHRIST's own institution, "we shew forth His death" all along, until His second coming into the world to judge it.—pp. 5, 6.

And, verily, to remember CHRIST and His death, is a thing of far greater consequence than people are commonly aware of. The people of GOD, under the law, by His own appointment, had it typified and represented to them every day in the year, by having two lambs offered up for a burnt offering, the one in the morning, and the other in the evening, as a type of that "Lamb of GOD which taketh away the sin of the world," Exod. xxix. 38. Numb. xxviii. 3. John i. 29. These were offered every day, besides the sin-offerings, peace-offerings, trespass-offerings, and such like as were offered up on particular occasions. Wherefore, these two lambs were called the "continual burnt-offering," as being continually offered every day in the week. And upon the Sabbath-day there were two more added, Numb. xxviii. 9; so that, upon every Sabbath-day in the year, there were four lambs offered, that they might be sure, at least upon that day, to think upon that grand Sacrifice which was to be offered up for them. And it may not be amiss to observe, that every one of those lambs had a meat and a drink offering to attend it; a meat-offering made of flour, and a drink-offering of wine: which are both the same elements which CHRIST Himself instituted, to signify His Body and Blood. And besides the burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and drink-offerings, every Sabbath-day, the high priest was to set the shewbread upon the holy table, and to put frankincense thereon; which was to continue there before the LORD till the next Sabbath, when the Priests had eat the bread, and burnt the frankincense לַאֲזִכָּרָה "for a memorial, even an

offering made by fire unto the LORD," Lev. ii. 4, 5, 9, &c. Exod. xxv. 30. All which, as most things in the Levitical law, had, doubtless, some respect or other to CHRIST, as is intimated in the law itself, where it is said, that this shall be done by an "everlasting covenant," Lev. xxiv. 8, even that which is founded in CHRIST. The bread, consisting of twelve loaves or cakes (according to the number of the tribes of Israel, and of CHRIST'S Apostles), was set upon the table in two rows; which might put us in mind of the two natures in CHRIST, "the bread of life which came down from heaven," John vi. 33, 35. In Hebrew this is called לחם פנים "the bread of the face," because it was to be set before the face of GOD continually, Exod. xxv. 30, as CHRIST "continually appeareth in the presence of GOD for us," Heb. ix. 24. Upon this bread was laid pure frankincense, called in Hebrew לבונה, *olibanum*, from its whiteness; by reason whereof it was used in Sacrifices, as a symbol of GOD'S pardoning sin, as it was likewise of His acceptance of what was done, by the sweet scent it made when burnt. This was laid upon the bread, to be to it for a memorial, as the Hebrew words signify, to call to remembrance the offering made by fire unto the LORD; that is, the death of CHRIST, typified by all such offerings. The bread was to be eaten, not burnt; but the pure frankincense that was laid upon it, was to be burnt, and by its sweet smell call to mind the death of CHRIST, by virtue whereof GOD smells a sweet savour, and accepts of the Sacrifices and services we offer and perform to Him, 1 Pet. ii. 5. And all this was to be done, the bread to be eaten, the frankincense burnt, and new put in their places every Sabbath-day throughout the year: that upon *that* day especially men might be put in mind of their SAVIOUR, and accordingly act their faith on Him, for their pardon and acceptance with GOD.

There were many such ways, whereby the people of GOD, in those days, were constantly put in mind of what the SAVIOUR of the world was to do, and suffer for them. All which are now laid aside, and only this one Sacrament of His last supper, instituted by Himself, in the room of them. This is now our Christian shewbread, whereby we "shew the LORD'S death till

He come." This is our burnt-offering, our sin-offering, our trespass-offering, our thank-offering, our meat-offering, our drink-offering, and all the offerings required of us, whereby to commemorate our blessed SAVIOUR, and what He hath done for us; and, therefore, as the Jews were punctual and constant in observing all things prescribed to them, for the same end we certainly ought to do this as often as we can; this one thing, which answers the end of all their offerings, and yet hath neither the trouble, nor the charges, nor the difficulty of any one of them. —pp. 19—23.

ID.—*Church Catechism explained.*

When our ever blessed Redeemer instituted the Sacrament of His last Supper, He said, "This do in remembrance of Me." Luke xxiii. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24. Whereby He laid His command upon His Apostles there present, and, in them, upon His Church in all ages, that they should continue this His holy institution in remembrance of Him, or of that death which He was the next day to suffer for the sins of the world; and that they should do it all along until His coming again. As we learn also from His Apostle, saying, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the LORD's death till He come," 1 Cor. xi. 26.

This, therefore, is to be always done, for the continual remembrance of His death, as it was a Sacrifice for the sins of the world; therefore called here, "the Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST." . . .

And therefore His death was not only a true and proper Sacrifice, but the only true and proper Sacrifice for sin, that was ever offered up in the world. For, His being offered up for the sins of the whole world, there was no sin for which any other need or could be offered up. Or if there had been, no other could have taken it away: "for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins," Heb. x. 4. Yet such only were all the "Sacrifices," as they were called, under the Law. Which, therefore, were not real expiatory Sacrifices in themselves, but only types and shadows, appointed by God to foreshow, typify,

and represent "the Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST" then to come.

And in like manner, the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper is now ordained by Him, to set forth and commemorate the same Sacrifice as now already offered up for the sins of mankind. Which, therefore, is necessary to be continued to the end, as the typical sacrifices were from the beginning of the world.—pp. 138, 9.

ID.—*Sermon VIII. Christianity an holy Priesthood.*

But in every temple of the LORD, it is necessary that there be likewise a priesthood to offer Sacrifices suitable to such a temple. And so there is here : for the Apostle having said [1 Pet. ii. 5.] that the Saints are a "spiritual house," or temple, he adds, that they are also an "holy priesthood," . . . ordained to "offer up spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable to GOD by JESUS CHRIST."

For the understanding of which words, it will be necessary to consider what Sacrifices they are which the Saints offer up to GOD ; wherefore they are called spiritual Sacrifices ; and that these spiritual Sacrifices are acceptable to GOD by JESUS CHRIST.

First, therefore, a Sacrifice in general is properly something that we give or offer to GOD for our own. For though we have nothing but what He first gives to us, yet when He hath given it to us, we have a civil right to it ; it is our own in respect of all other men : but when we give it back again to GOD, divesting ourselves of our own right to it, and transferring it wholly to Him, then He looks upon it as a Sacrifice offered up to Him, and is pleased to accept of it as such. Under the law, GOD commanded that oxen, and sheep, and lambs, and such like living creatures, should be offered up in Sacrifice to Him ; which, being killed by a priest, were consumed, either by fire upon the altar, or else by those who waited at it and so were fed as it were at GOD'S table, of such things as were offered to Him. But these Sacrifices being ordained only to foreshow and typify the "Lamb of GOD that taketh away the sins of the world," they ceased in course, when He had offered up Himself a Sacrifice for our sins upon the Cross. But now under the Gospel other kinds of Sacrifices are required of us : we are now commanded to

“present our bodies as a living Sacrifice,” Rom. xii. 1. not to kill them, but to offer them up alive, as a “living Sacrifice,” by devoting ourselves wholly to the service of God.

Hence all manner of good, pious, and charitable works, that are done in obedience to God, and for His service and honour, are now called “Sacrifices” . . . But sacrificing in general, being a public owning of God and His sovereignty over the world, whereby we openly testify our acknowledgment and belief, that He is the Almighty Creator, Possessor, and Governor of all things, and that we are obliged to Him for all the blessings we enjoy; therefore, by the Sacrifices which are here said to be offered by the holy priesthood here spoken of in my text, such duties seem to be more especially understood, whereby we now set forth the glory of God, by joining together, in making our public profession of our dependance upon Him, and our manifold obligations to Him.

Particularly our open or public praying to Him, and to Him alone, for all the good things that we want. For hereby we plainly discover, that we believe Him to be the Author and Giver of “every good and perfect gift.” . . . And therefore, under the law itself, their public prayers always went along with their daily Sacrifices both morning and evening, and were performed at the same time, even while the lamb was roasting upon the altar: and this was itself also reckoned as a Sacrifice offered up to God. “Let my prayer,” saith David, “be set forth before Thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as an evening Sacrifice,” Psal. cxli. 2.

Especially considering that prayer always was, and ought to be accompanied with praise and thanksgiving to God, which is so properly a Sacrifice, that it is often called by that name. “I will offer,” saith David, “to Thee the Sacrifice of thanksgiving,” Psal. cxvi. 17. “And let them sacrifice the Sacrifices of thanksgiving, and declare His works with rejoicing or singing,” Psal. cvii. 22.

But the Sacrifice that is most proper and peculiar to the Gospel is the Sacrament of our LORD's Supper, instituted by our

LORD HIMSELF to succeed all the bloody Sacrifices in the Mosaic law.

For though we cannot say, as some absurdly do, that this is such a Sacrifice whereby Christ is again offered up to God, both for the living and the dead; yet it may as properly be called a Sacrifice as any that was ever offered, except that which was offered by CHRIST Himself: for His, indeed, was the only true expiatory Sacrifice that was ever offered. Those under the law were only types of His, and were called Sacrifices only upon that account, because they typified and represented that which He was to offer for the sins of the world. And therefore the Sacrament of CHRIST's Body and Blood may as well be called by that name as they were. They were typical, and this is a commemorative Sacrifice. They foreshowed the death of CHRIST to come; this shows forth His death already past. "For as often," saith the Apostle, "as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the LORD's death till He come," 1 Cor. xi. 26. This is properly our Christian Sacrifice, which neither Jews nor Gentiles can have any share in, as the Apostle observes; "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the tabernacle;" Heb. xiii. 10. an altar, where we partake of the great Sacrifice, which the eternal Son of God offered up for the sins of the whole world, and ours among the rest; that ALMIGHTY God may be reconciled to us, and receive us again into His love and favour, and make us happy in the enjoyment of it for ever. Which is so great a blessing, that they who really mind their own good and welfare can no more forbear to partake of this Sacrament, when they may, than they can forbear to eat when they are hungry and have meat before them.

These are those spiritual Sacrifices which the holy Priesthood, or whole body of Saints, offer up to God. The Apostle calls them "spiritual," in opposition to those carnal Sacrifices that were offered by the Levitical priesthood; and because they are of a spiritual nature, and performed in a spiritual manner, being offered up in the spirits of the Saints as well as bodies; and by the Spirit of God Himself, dwelling in them, and so consecrating

them "a spiritual house, an holy priesthood," and enabling them to offer up these Sacrifices in the name of CHRIST; and through the merits of that Sacrifice which He hath offered up for them; according to that of the Apostle in the place before quoted, "By Him, therefore, let us offer up the Sacrifice of praise to God continually."

Id.—*Codex Canonum Eccles. Prim. vindicatus ac illustratus.*

Lib. ii. cap. x. §§ 3, 4.

But greater difficulty, perchance, will arise in regard to the words *θυσιαστήριον*, "altar," for the table of the LORD, Can. Apost. iii. iv. xxi. *θυσία*, "Sacrifice," and *προσφορά*, "oblation," for the celebration of the Eucharist, Can. iii. viii. xlvii. It may indeed, perhaps, appear so to others, but not to us, who continually find these and such like names used concerning these things, in the most ancient monuments of the Church. St. Cyprian is wont to designate the table of the LORD by no other name, so far as I recollect, save that of "altar;" but by that, very often . . . . Before him, Tertullian called both the celebration of the Eucharist a "Sacrifice," and the LORD's table "the altar of God." . . . Before Tertullian, Ignatius himself, in his genuine and uncorrupted epistles, used *θυσιαστήριον* in the same sense—"If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God." Ignat. *Ep. ad Ephes.* and elsewhere: "For there is one flesh of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and one cup, in the unity of His Blood; one Altar, as there is one Bishop, together with the Presbytery and Deacons, my fellow-servants." Id. *Ep. ad Philadelph.*

It is plain, therefore, that the mystical table was, from the very times of the Apostles, called *θυσιαστήριον*, but not *βωμόν*. For this word is peculiar to Gentiles and idolaters, exclusively; that, to ecclesiastical writers; nor is it ever used except of an altar which is raised to the true God. Hence it is that Origen, Minutius Felix, Arnobius, and others, often asserted that Christians had no *βωμόν*, no altars of idols; as also no temples, that is to say, no shrines of deities, such as all the temples of the heathen were, or were thought to be. But they nowhere assert



that they have not *θυσιαστήρια*, that is to say, "altars" of that kind which served for the mystical offering of the Body and Blood of ΧΡΗΙΣΤ. For that "altars" of this kind were always in use among Christians, is clear from what has been said above. And, indeed, that word *θυσιαστήριον*, or "altar," in a proper sense, is nothing else than *ἀγία τράπεζα*, "a table consecrated to God," or a "holy table," unto which God invites His faithful people, and makes them partakers of that great Sacrifice, which His Only Begotten Son offered for the human race. Whence also this same holy action or celebration of the Eucharist is often called *θυσία* and *προσφορά*, a "Sacrifice" and "oblation," as is clear not only from Tertullian above quoted, but also from other commentaries of the same century and that preceding. For so Irenæus. "But ΧΡΗΙΣΤ, giving direction to His disciples to offer unto God the first fruits of His creatures," &c. <sup>1</sup> . . . Iren. *adv. Hæreses*, lib. iv. cap. 32. and elsewhere. . . . In truth, the holy Eucharist is a kind of fœderal feast, (such as were also the ancient Sacrifices) between God and men. For men first offer to God bread and wine, which creatures, offered to Him and consecrated to be symbols of the great Sacrifice accomplished by ΧΡΗΙΣΤ, God imparts again to men: by which means they by faith in very deed partake of the great Sacrifice of ΧΡΗΙΣΤ. And, therefore, this great mystery can be expressed by no other word more fitly and fully than by those *θυσία*, *προσφορά*, "Sacrifice," "oblation," and the like. By which words, accordingly, it is called by Justin Martyr also . . . *Dial. cum Tryph.* In which book the words *θυσία* and *προσφορά* are often used in this sense, namely, for the Eucharist. And, before him, Clement of Rome:—"We ought," saith he, "to do all things in order, whatsoever the Lord commanded us to perform, performing the oblations and liturgies at the appointed times;" and a little after,—"they, therefore, who make their oblations at the appointed times, are acceptable and blessed." Clem. *Ep. i. ad Corinth.* Whence it is clear that the celebration of the holy Eucharist is called *θυσία* and *προσφορά*, and the mystic table, accordingly, whereon it was celebrated, *θυσιαστήριον*, from the very infancy of the Church. And therefore it need not seem

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. cit. p. 64.]

wonderful to any, that these words are used in that sense in these Canons, which were put forth some years later.

HOOPER, (GEORGE) BISHOP.—*Christian Ordinances derived from the Jews.*

I come next to the other Sacrament of our LORD'S Supper, which He was pleased to institute at a Paschal Supper; and to borrow thence its provisions, the bread and wine.

The Paschal Lamb was a Sacrifice of a peculiar compounded nature. As it was to be roasted with fire, it had something of a burnt-offering, and might seem to be expiatory; as it was then, when the blood of it was sprinkled upon their doors at the first institution. By the same blood it was federal also, the children of Israel entering by it into a New Covenant. And as it was to be eaten all that night, or burnt with fire, and none left to the morning; so it seemed to be as an offering for thanksgiving. Now answerable to the kind of the Sacrifice, was the Supper for which it was prepared. It was a festival entertainment for joy of the great deliverance: but it was to be eaten with unleavened bread and with bitter herbs, as memorials of their former afflictions.—p. 204.

Now to this account the history of our SAVIOUR'S Paschal Supper agrees. . . . These are the particular correspondencies between the Paschal and the LORD'S Supper: and there was, too, another general one in their nature; as they were both of them to be memorials of a former bloody Atonement; feasts of present joy and thanks, but not without some afflictive remembrance for the past.

Here, therefore, it appears, and from the relation of the Scripture, that our LORD thought fit to raise his other Sacrament likewise out of festival commemoration, which the Jews were commanded to keep for their old deliverance. And hereafter it will appear further, by the construction the primitive Church made, that our SAVIOUR, in the institution of His feast, did not consider only that single annual solemnity of theirs, but their other more frequent sacrificial entertainments of praise and thanksgiving.—pp. 206, 7.

The Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper has plainly appeared to be raised by our SAVIOUR from a Paschal supper.—p. 240.

The sacramental action, as hath been said, was celebrated after the morning prayer, beginning with the oblation of bread and wine. . . . For those creatures they blessed GOD the FATHER through JESUS CHRIST, and then, after some prayers and hymns, He is invoked to send down His Holy Spirit on the offered bread and wine, to sanctify it, and that it may become to the worthy receivers the Body and Blood of His Son: after which, it was distributed by the Deacons to the people, and sent also to the absent.

This was the Christian practice undoubtedly in the primitive Church; nor does it want a Jewish pattern. Our SAVIOUR, as it hath been premised, took occasion, from the Paschal memorial of the redemption of Israel out of their Egyptian slavery, to institute a commemoration of a new and far greater deliverance of all mankind from the eternal bondage of Satan and hell. And, whereas it has been observed that the first Paschal Lamb of the Jews was a Sacrifice of a mixed, extraordinary nature, being in part propitiatory, in part federal, and partly Eucharistical; it is likewise manifest, that the Sacrifice of our SAVIOUR was also of an eminent extraordinary kind. It was a Sacrifice for sin, taken in the most strict acception, being perfectly expiatory: it was also federal; for in that Blood the New Testament or Covenant was made; and, in that same respect, it was in some sort an offering of peace; obtaining not only pardon, but favour for men. And further, as the succeeding Paschal Sacrifices, though commemorative of the first, yet varied something from it; being chiefly of an Eucharistical nature, and not performed with the same ceremony; (for neither was the blood sprinkled upon the doors of the offerers, neither was the Lamb eaten with their staves in their hands, and in a travelling posture;) so it is not to be wondered if the succeeding commemorations of our LORD'S Sacrifice, though it was chiefly expiatory, were Eucharistical, and differing also from the manner in which the first was celebrated by our LORD Himself.—pp. 241, 2.

This, therefore, seems to have been the construction of the

primitive Christians, that the Sacrament of our LORD'S Body and Blood answered to the Jewish Sacrifices of thanks.—p. 243.

For, 1st, The name which the ancients gave this Sacrament, seems to speak them of the same opinion. For they not only speak of it as of a "Sacrifice" and "oblation" at large; but call it determinately and expressly the Eucharist, that is, the "thanks" or "praise-offering," as by its proper name; the sacramental bread and wine being as much known by that style with Christians, as the "bread of the Eucharist" or "praise" was with the Jews. 2ndly, The leavened bread they always chose to use, as it evidently declares that there was no further regard to the Paschal Sacrifice, so it seems to import a just correspondence with those of the Eucharistical kind, in which leavened bread was singularly required. And, lastly, the bread, which was to represent, and in some manner to become, the Body of our LORD, did not unfitly succeed in the place of that "bread of thanks," which had been made use of before to stand for the flesh of an Eucharistical Sacrifice, and to make up the whole. . . .—p. 246.

Now, as this feast of our LORD was Eucharistical, so we suppose it was celebrated in a suitable manner. . . .

And so, when afterwards the Sacrament and Supper were divided, (about the time, I presume, when the legal Sacrifices were going to cease,) the Christian Eucharistical oblation, as the primitive Church speaks, began then more distinctly to appear, and was made after morning prayer, just as extraordinary Sacrifices, with the Jews, were offered after the morning daily Sacrifice: and as, under the law, what of the Eucharistical Sacrifice was offered at the Altar, the *Muram*, belonged to the Priest, so that part which had been offered by the Christian Priest, being more especially sacred, and his portion, was eaten in the morning sacramentally from his hands; the congregation being, as it were, his family; while the other residual part was kept for the provision of the Love-feast, to be held in the evening, its accustomed time.—p. 247.

It sufficiently appears, I presume, that the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our LORD was understood by the ancient Christians to be in the nature of an Eucharistical (not of a propitiatory) Sa-

crifice with the Jews. But, further, that this kind of Sacrifice only should remain, when all the rest should cease; this also is consonant to the tradition of the Jews, as Kimchi tells us. For, upon this saying of the Prophet, (Jer. xxxiii. 11.) that there should be "heard again in Jerusalem the voice of joy, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride, the voice of them that shall say, Praise the LORD of Hosts, for the LORD is good, for His mercy endureth for ever, [and] of them that shall bring [the Sacrifice of] praise [or thanks] into the house of the LORD:" he comments on the last words in this manner; "The Prophet says not that they shall bring sin-offerings, or trespass-offerings; because in that day there would be no wicked nor sinners among them: for (as he before told them) they should all know the LORD. And so have our Masters of blessed memory told us, that in the time to come all Sacrifices should cease, except the Sacrifice of thanksgiving."

This saying of the Masters of Israel is a great truth, and better understood by Christians, who . . . know that the Sacrifices for sin are not ceased by the ceasing of sin, but superseded by the Sacrifice made for them by their LORD and High Priest; and that the "Sacrifice of thanksgiving," they are thenceforth to make, is the commemoration their LORD has instituted, for that their most gracious redemption. This is the Sacrifice of that New Covenant of which the Prophet there speaks, and which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews from him alleges. And to this Sacrifice the same author, I suppose, refers, when he says, "We have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat, who serve the tabernacle;" for they eat not of the oblation made for their sins, as we do of our blessed SAVIOUR; "by whom [by whose Body, and in whose Name] we offer the Sacrifice of praise [thanksgiving] to God continually, that is, the fruit [or oblation] of our lips, [or, which our lips have vowed to return, as well as what we do return with our lips,] ceasing not to do good, and to distribute, [both out of our oblations, and the rest of our substance,] for with such sacrifices [such offerings of our praise and goods in the general, and at the Eucharist in particular] God is well pleased."—pp. 248, 9.

DODWELL, CONFESSOR.—*Discourse concerning the one Altar,  
and one Priesthood.*

The unity of the Catholic Church, in opposition to the separate conventicles of schismatics, is (in the language of the most ancient and accurate writers against schism, especially Ignatius and St. Cyprian, from whom later antiquity has received the same terms) expressed as grounded on the unity of the priest and the altar. In which way of reasoning they conclude, that they who partake at the same altar, and of the same mystical Sacrifices offered thereon, and receive their portions of this sacrificial feast from the ministry of the same priest, whose office it is to offer those mystical Sacrifices on that same altar, that they, and they alone, are to be judged to belong to the same society, confederated by those Sacrifices.—pp. 1, 2.

First, therefore, I observe, that this way of reasoning for unity from one altar and one priest, was not first taken up in the later ages of the Church, but deduced from the nearest and freshest memory of the Apostles.—p. 14.

Even these very terms are mystically applied to Christianity by authors of Ignatius's age, who, notwithstanding, wrote before him; and particularly so applied when they had occasion to reason from the Levitical patterns to deduce obligations under the Christian religion. Thus Clemens Romanus reasons to the Corinthians. . . .

Yet not St. Clemens only . . . but the Apostle himself allows and observes the same reasoning, and in the very same instances for which I am at present concerned of priest and altar. So he argues for the right of maintenance, that "they who minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple; and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar:" that "even so hath the LORD ordained, that they which preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel." Plainly supposing that our clergy answers the Levitical priesthood, our Churches their temple, our Communion table their altar: and that what was

thought equal in their case in the provisions of the Old Testament, is for that very reason to be taken for ordained in the case of the Gospel ministry. . . . But . . . the Apostle . . . allows a higher obligation to this way of arguing from the precedent of the Levitical priesthood. He reasons from the Aaronical to the Melchizedechian priesthood, from the priesthood of mortal men to the immortal priesthood of the Son of God. "No man took the honour" of the Levitical priesthood "unto himself, but he that was called of God, as was Aaron. So also CHRIST glorified not Himself to be made an High Priest," &c. And "every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and Sacrifices. Wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer." And as none had right to eat of the Jewish altar but Israelites, so when he is to prove that literal Israelitism is not the Israelitism that can challenge privileges, he does it by this argument, that "we have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."

Thus customary it was, in those earlier times, to reason from Levitical precedents in these very instances.—pp. 21—24.

Thirdly, therefore, as this way of reasoning from Jewish precedents is solid in general, and solid in these very instances of priest and altar; so it holds particularly in such inferences as these are, for which they are produced by the ancients concerning unity;—That, as the one priest and the one altar were the characteristics of unity in the Jewish constitution, so that priesthood and altar among the Christians, which was shadowed by the Jewish priesthood and altar, ought now also, by the same parity of reason, to be taken for the characters of Christian unity.—pp. 28, 9.

For as it was not to be doubted, that God designed unity for the mystical as well as the literal Israel, so He would, certainly, have been more express in the signification of His mind, if He had intended any change in the principles of this unity. But seeing there appears not the least intimation of such a design, seeing He was pleased to continue a mystical priesthood, and a mystical altar, in the mystical as well as the literal Israel, who would not thence conclude, that He intended the mystical priest-

hood and altar should still be the principles of unity to the mystical Israel, as the literal priesthood and altar had formerly been to the literal? And seeing the very terms of "priest" and "altar" were not the proper language of the New Testament, why should they be used at all, but only to signify that they were equivalent, under the New Testament, with those things which had properly borne their names under the Old, and were to perform the same office?—pp. 35, 6.

But that which more nearly concerns the design of this present way of reasoning is, that these Sacrifices and this high priesthood of the Gospel were mystical; and so mystical as not only to signify, but also to perform what was, according to the sense of those times, to be expected from mysteries. . . . And this also they did believe, and had not reason to believe themselves mistaken in believing so, that the Eucharist was the mystical Sacrifice, performing the same thing under the Gospel as the external bloody Sacrifices under the law; . . . And therefore, the public Sacrifices being . . . designed as ceremonies of admission to a league and covenant and intimate union with God, such a kind of Sacrifice was requisite to be asserted to our mystical Israelitism, as might engage God in covenant with us, and admit us to a mystical union with Him.

This therefore being granted, it was also further plain that this mystical Sacrifice was to be expected by positive prescription of God Himself, and therefore must be found among the positive prescriptions of the Gospel. For no external rites could either oblige God, or unite the worshippers to Him by any natural efficacy of the things themselves, and therefore what efficacy soever they were conceived to have, must wholly be derived from the divine pleasure and appointment, which it is withal impossible for us to know without positive and express revelation.—pp. 296—299.

If, therefore, we can only expect these mystical evangelical Sacrifices among the positive institutions of the Gospel, the inquiry then cannot be difficult. There are but two institutions of this kind pretended, and whether of these was more probably intended to supply the office of Sacrifices will easily be known



by the analogy they bear to the Sacrifices then received. That which came nearest them was, in all likelihood, intended by God Himself to supply their use in this new institution. And this will then be best known, if we first remember what kind of Sacrifices were granted by the Christians to be really useful, and, therefore, of eternal obligation, even under the state of mystical Israelitism. It is certain they thought some Sacrifices designed by God Himself as temporary; and what they thought so, they could not think themselves obliged to continue. Now, what they thought so, will best appear by these reasonings against the Jews on this very subject concerning Sacrifices. Therein they show, that it was "impossible that the blood of bulls and goats" could be available for "the expiation of sin;" which reasoning does indeed proceed against expiatory Sacrifices, such of them especially as were to be of the blood of brutes, and needed repetition; which the Apostle makes an argument of the imperfection, not only of such Sacrifices themselves, but of the dispensation also which was provided of no better Sacrifices; and for that reason concludes them not agreeable to the dignity of the Gospel. But in Eucharistical Sacrifices no expiation was pretended to be made, but only a return of acknowledgments for favours received, and among them was the *Liba*, the meat offering and the drink offering, which indeed seems to have been most proper to such Sacrifices, almost exactly answering our Eucharist. These are the Sacrifices which are there approved where the other Sacrifices are rejected, the *θυσία αινέσεως* in Psalm l. 14. In these, no sins were commemorated, and therefore they must needs have been thought most agreeable with a state of perfect expiation. These are common to a perfect as well as an imperfect condition, and, therefore, more likely to be of eternal use, and not antiquated with the temporary shadows of the law. And, which comes more exactly home to my design, these were, according to the customs of all nations who admitted any Sacrifices, used on such occasions, when good news were brought them, they did *θύειν τὰ εὐαγγέλια*, and therefore extremely suitable to the very title of the Gospel as an *εὐαγγέλιον*, the very word taken up by the Christians from the Hellenistical version of the Old Testament,

and thence derived by the Apostle himself, in the Epistle to the Romans.—pp. 302—304.

Accordingly I am very apt to think that this is indeed the true original of the name of Eucharist as applied by the primitive Christians to this very Sacrament, that they intended thereby to signify, that this was, among them, to perform the office of a "Sacrifice of thanksgiving." The very name was thus commonly applied to the bread itself in the time of S. Justin Martyr. So he tells us expressly—*καὶ ἡ τροφή αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῶν εὐχαριστία*. And this is indeed a more natural account than that which is there alluded to by that blessed person, as if it were called so from the *εὐχαριστία*, the thanksgiving and blessing that was used over it in the Office of Consecration.—pp. 305, 6.

Thus far the Christians might have been led into the substitution of the Eucharist as the proper evangelical Sacrifice, even from the popular received notions of the Hellenists concerning Sacrifices. But yet, in this reasoning from the Old Testament prefigurations even of evangelical Sacrifices, they might yet justify a further change from the common usages as designed by God Himself in that sacrifice which He intended should last for ever. Thus, having shown that CHRIST'S priesthood was not after the order of Aaron, but a new order, that of Melchisedec, to which perpetuity was expressly appointed by the Psalmist, the same reasoning would then hold for an alteration in the Sacrifice which is used expressly by the Apostle himself to prove an alteration of the Covenant. If there be any difference, it would rather be here that the reasoning proceeds more strongly in the former case. For the notion of Sacrifice is more intrinsically involved in the very notion of a priest, who has no other relation to a covenant than that of a Mediator, nor mediates any otherwise than as the Covenant itself was entered into by such Sacrifices wherein it was his office to preside. As, therefore, his concernment in Sacrifice is fundamental to his concernment in the covenant, so also the change of the covenant must necessarily suppose a change in the Sacrifice as antecedent to it. And this would bring the reasoning yet more close to the materials of our Christian Sacrifice, as consisting of the very elements of bread and wine. For if our SAVIOUR'S Priesthood was to be of the

order of Melchisedec, then His Sacrifice must also be of the same kind as those of Melchisedec. And if we may again reason concerning the Sacrifice of Melchisedec from what is mentioned concerning it in the story, as the Apostle concludes his being without father, or mother, or genealogy, or beginning of days, or end of life, because the history of Genesis mentions neither his father, nor mother, nor genealogy, &c. then, for the same reason, we may conclude that he had no other Sacrifice but that of bread and wine, because no other is mentioned in that place. Which inference will the rather hold, because of the connexion of that action with the mention of his priesthood. So it is in the text, "Melchisedec, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God." The vulgar reads it, *erat enim*, with a causal particle. And unless some such thing be understood, it will not be easy to give any tolerable account of the pertinency and connexion of the former part of the verse with the latter. For what relation could his bringing forth bread and wine have with his priesthood, if not as the proper Sacrifice which concerned him as a priest? Why should this mystical priesthood be mentioned as a precedent of a future priesthood, (as it was supposed to be by those who used this reasoning,) unless it were also known what Sacrifice was to be proper to him, seeing that, in the same reasoning, it was also granted that every priest ought to have something to offer?—pp. 307—309.

It hence appears, how naturally this reasoning, so agreeable to the principles then granted by the Christians, does proceed on this supposition, that the Eucharist was their mystical Sacrifice. I might now proceed to show, that not only the reasoning, but the conclusion itself, was also owned by them, that they did own the continuance of sacrifices under the times of Christianity, and particularly that they took the Eucharist for the Sacrifice proper to those times, if this had not been a common place usually debated between us and the Romanists, where our writers, and our Church too, do usually grant as much as I am concerned for, that it is indeed an Eucharistical Sacrifice, and that this is the true sense of those passages of antiquity which are produced for this purpose. And I have shown that their principles of reason-

ing were against the repetition of propitiatory Sacrifices, which is that which is denied by our writers. I am unwilling to enlarge on things already commonly observed, especially when what I am concerned for is already granted me on all hands, as it is here. I only observe now that this particular reasoning is the reasoning of St. Cyprian. . . . I mention this the more particularly, because St. Cyprian is our principal author in the whole argument from one priesthood and one altar, that the reader may see how accurately what is said concerning it, is agreeable to his mind. Now these things being put together, that this whole reasoning, both premises and conclusion too, were owned by them, and that they were withal taken up from such originals as could not fail them, it plainly follows, that the whole reasoning was solid, as urged against the ancient schismatics, at least as to this particular, that the Eucharist is a mystical Sacrifice.—pp. 311—313.

HICKES, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*The Christian Priesthood asserted.*

The new Covenant is better than the old, and the house of CHRIST much more excellent than that of Moses, in as much as the Christian is the full improvement and perfection of the Mosaic religion and worship; and therefore it would be strange if either the Liturgical ministrations of the Christian worship for men should be less holy, or pertain less to God for them, than those of the Jewish Church; or the Christian Liturgies, or ministers, should either not at all be priests, or priests in a less proper sense than those of the Levitical order and institution, who were ministers by fire and immolation under the first Testament. . . . For as there have been different churches and religions, so there have been different rites and services in them; and yet the ministers of those different holy rites and services for the people to their God, have all been counted priests, as agreeing in the common notion of priesthood, which is the function or office of a person separated or taken from men, and ordained *πρὸς τὸ ἱεροουργεῖν* or *θεουργεῖν*, as human authors speak, to minister for the people in holy services pertaining to God.—pp. 25, 26.

And therefore . . . it is far from being true that Bishops and Presbyters are not proper priests, upon supposition that the Christian religion hath neither altar nor Sacrifice of any sort, as the Jewish neither now hath, nor formerly in the captivity had.

I say, "upon supposition," which, for argument sake, I am willing to grant your "late writer," though in reality it hath both, as I now proceed to show, from the writings of the New Testament; and thereby prove that the ministers of CHRIST are so far from not being proper priests, that they are proper altar ministers, or sacrificing priests, τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι, as the Apostle calls the Jewish priests.—pp. 41, 2.

I will begin with the twenty-third and twenty-fourth verses of the fifth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel: "If thou bring thy gift," &c. The original word for "gift," is a sacrificial term of a general signification, and denotes a material Sacrifice, or offering of any sort, as may be seen in the margin, [Lev. i. 2, 3; ii. 17, &c.] and therefore it is to be taken here in that sense in which it is to be understood in Matt. viii. 4. "Show thyself to the priest, and offer the GIFT (or oblation) that Moses commanded." So in chap. xxiii. 18. "Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing, but whosoever sweareth by the GIFT that is upon it, he is guilty." . . . And as the primitive Church conceived this precept of reconciliation to be intended for a Gospel precept, so they always applied it to the Eucharist, as the Gospel Sacrifice, or oblation, not thinking (as Mr. Mede well observes) that our LORD would make a new law, or, let me add, enforce an old one concerning legal Sacrifices, which he was presently to abolish, but that it had reference to that oblation which was to be instituted by Him for the Gospel dispensation, and to continue with and under it for ever. Thus, in the Apost. Const. . . St. Clement. . . Irenæus. . . Tertullian. . . St. Cyprian. . . Eusebius. . . Cyril of Jerusalem. . . St. Chrysostom. . . Jerome. . . and Augustine. . . —pp. 42, 4—53.

The next Scriptural proof which I shall produce in order, for the Eucharistical oblation of the bread and wine, is taken from the words of the institution, Matt. xxvi. 26. Mark xiv. 22. Luke xxii. 19. recited by the Apostle in these words: "The

LORD JESUS, in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is my Body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my Blood; this do ye, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of Me." That the ancients believed that our LORD made an oblation of the bread and wine at His institution of this Sacrament, and commanded His disciples so to do, is past all doubt, from the 63. Epist. of St. Cyprian to Cecilius. . . So in the Eucharistical Office, Const. Apost. . . The same may be proved from the testimony of Irenæus. . .—pp. 53—56.

It is plain from these testimonies, how the primitive Church understood the words of the institution of the LORD's Supper, and what was their sense of them, which is very agreeable to the signification of the word *ποιεῖν*, which, in profane as well as sacred writers, signifies to "offer." . . But more especially, it is so used in the Septuagint translation, which, all learned men know, is followed by the writers of the New Testament, even where they recite the words and speeches of our blessed SAVIOUR. In that translation of the Old Testament, *ποιεῖν* signifies the same as *ιεροποιεῖν* or *ιερουργεῖν* to "offer" or "sacrifice," as *פָּעַל* does in the Hebrew, and *FACERE* in the Vulgar translation. So Exod. xxix. 36. *καὶ τὸ μυσχάριον ΠΟΙΗΣΕΙΣ*, &c. . .—p. 58.

To these testimonies out of the Old Testament, to show that "do" signifies "offer," I think fit to add one more out of a Jewish Hellenistical writer, Baruch i. 10. . . . The verb *ποιεῖν*, as I have elsewhere observed, is used for to "offer," in the New Testament, as Heb. xi. 28. *Πίστει πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα*. . . So 1 Tim. ii. . *ποιεῖσθαι* may very well be rendered "offered." "I exhort, therefore, that first of all prayers, &c. be offered for all men," as it is in the Syriac version.

The verb *ποιεῖν* is also used in the Hellenistical sense, to signify "offer," in the Greek writers of the Church, particularly where they have occasion to speak of the holy Eucharist. We find it so used in St. Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians, §. xi. . . In the same sense Justin Martyr useth the word. . . So in the Epistle which Cornelius, Bishop of

Rome, wrote to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch. . . So St. Chrysostom upon the words of the institution, Matt. xxvi. . .—pp. 62, 3—65.

According to this sacrificial signification of the verb *ποιεῖν*, *facere*, and in particular from the signification of it “to offer” in the Paschal Sacrifice, we may justly observe, that the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, *hoc facite*, either relate to the whole action and ministration of the holy Eucharist, as *סדר*, in the Hebrew, and *τοῦτο*, in the Greek, relate to the whole service of the Passover, Exod. xii. 27; and then it proves the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, (in which the oblation of the bread and cup to God the FATHER was a principal part,) to be *ἱεροποιία* or *ἱεροουργία*, a sacrificial service:—or else they relate more especially to the bread and wine; and then, by a natural and easy interpretation, they may be translated thus: “Take, eat, this is my body, *offer* this in remembrance of Me;” and “This is my blood, *offer* this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.” Either of these senses of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, *hoc facite*, give us a good account of the reason why the ancient fathers, treating of this mystery, affirm it to be the “oblation of the Church, which CHRIST appointed to be offered.”—pp. 67, 8.

The next places of the New Testament from which I shall prove, that the Christian religion hath a Sacrifice, are those which imply, or express that it hath an altar. For if it hath a Sacrifice or oblation, as I have showed, then it must have an altar, at which to offer that oblation; and if it have an altar, as I am going to show, then it must have an oblation to be offered at, or upon it; and then by consequence, the ministers of the Gospel must be altar ministers, as well as offering priests. I will begin with that text, 1 Cor. ix. “Do ye not know, that they who minister about holy things live of the things of the temple, and they who wait at the *altar* are partakers with the *altar*.” . .—p. 68.

I should from hence return to Matt. v. 23. “When thou bringest thy gift to the altar,” &c. But having said enough upon that place, I proceed to Heb. xiii. 10. where the Apostle saith expressly, “We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle.” In the original whereof is *ἘΞ ΟΥ*, which may be rendered in a literal and proper sense, *ex quo*

OR DE QUO,—“ of which,” or “ from which, they have no right to eat.” . . . But because the generality of learned men have taken ALTAR here in the metonymical sense, for the altar-offering, as the Latin translation and ours take “ temple” (1 Cor. ix. 13.) for the holy provision of the temple, I am therefore content to take it in the same sense ; which will not in the least abate the force of my argument from the place ; because, if altar there be put for the Sacrifice, or oblation of the altar, that metonymical use of the word proves the first and proper sense of it, as much as the use of *τράπεζα* in Greek, and *mensa* in the Latin tongue, for the meat or entertainment upon the table, proves it to be a “ table” the primary, proper, literal sense.

But, perhaps, sir, your “ late writer” will say, the apostle doth not mean a proper material altar, upon which offerings were made, and then eaten, but an improper metaphorical altar, by way of allusion and similitude ; and so, sir, if he pleases, he may say the Apostle meant only an improper metaphorical High Priest, where he says in the same epistle, “ We have a great High Priest,” &c. . . The phrase is the same, *ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον*, and *τοιούτων ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα* and *οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι*. . . And since the High Priest we have is a more proper High Priest than the Jewish high priest, who was but His shadow, it would be very arbitrary in him to assert that the altar we are said to have is not a proper altar, especially considering that the Jerusalem altar, for the reason hereafter given, is several times called “ the table of the Lord ;” in Malachi i. 7. 12. and Ezekiel xli. 22 ; xlv. 16. as the offerings upon it are called His “ food,” which He consumed by fire. And that the altar we are said to have is such an altar, of which, that is, of the Sacrifices of which, neither the priests who were ministers of the tabernacle, nor their people had any right to eat, but the Christian ministers and people have, the Apostle proves, by an argument taken from their own law. For if they could not eat of the Sacrifices of atonement and expiation, which prefigured the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, how could they partake at the Christian altar, of the Christian Sacrifice, which was the mystical Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, by which the Sacrifice of



Himself upon the Cross,' was represented according to His own institution, under the new law, as it was under the old, by the Sacrifices of Expiation, whose bodies were burnt without the camp? . . . Here is altar answering to altar, and Sacrifice to Sacrifice; the Sacrifice, which was a figure of CHRIST'S Sacrifice upon the Cross, before His suffering, to that which is the figure of it after. . . . For the farther explication of which, it is to be observed, that, as the great altar at the temple of Jerusalem was so called, with respect to the Sacrifices which were offered there, but, with respect to the consumption of them upon it by fire, was called also the LORD'S table; so the LORD'S table, in Christian Churches, was considered in a double respect, first, with relation to the offering of the bread and wine upon it; and secondly, with relation to the consumption, or participation of them in the sacrificial feast at it; and as, in the latter respect, the Apostle called it the LORD'S table, so, in the former, it is an altar; and therefore the Apostle, by a usual metonymy of the "altar" for the Sacrifice of the altar, said, "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve at the tabernacle."—pp. 70—75.

I hope I have now made it appear in this paragraph, that the Communion table, in respect of its different uses, is an "altar" as well as a "table;" an altar upon which the elements are presented, and offered up by the minister to GOD the FATHER, and a table at which, after they are consecrated into the symbols of CHRIST'S dead Body and Blood, they are consumed by the offerers in the holy sacrificial banquet.—p. 79.

Having showed, from one place of the New Testament, that the ministers of CHRIST are proper altar ministers, because they minister at a proper altar, I now proceed to show, from another place, 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. that they offer Sacrifice, and by consequence that they are proper offering, or sacrificing priests. These are the words, "But the things which the Gentiles sacrifice," &c. For the devils had their tables for their sacrificial feasts as well as the true God. . . . And, I need not observe, that to "drink the cup of the LORD, and the cup of demons" or "devils," and to "be partakers of the LORD'S table and the table of devils," are metonymical expressions, which properly signify to drink of the wine

offered to the LORD, and of the wine offered to devils, and to be partakers of the Sacrifices of the LORD's table, or altar, and of the Sacrifices of the tables, or of the altars of devils. . . . For first, oblations or Sacrifices were offered to both; to the former, only upon the holy table altar, but to the latter both upon their altars and their tables. Secondly, it is plain those oblations to both were eaten by the offerers at tables. And thirdly, that the cup was offered at the LORD's table, as well as at the table of devils; and by consequence, in the fourth place, that they were *ἑύται* or sacrificing Ministers, as Pollux calls Priests, who offered upon the LORD's table, as idolatrous Priests did upon the altars or tables of the devils, and thence and there feasted their people in the name of their false gods. I say, the whole parallel between eating and drinking at the table of the LORD and the table of devils supposes, that they ate and drank of things which had been offered, and by consequence, that the Ministers of the LORD's table, upon which the bread and wine were first solemnly offered, and then consumed in the sacrificial banquet, are sacrificing Priests; such as, in the ninth chap. 13th ver. of this Epistle, the Apostle, speaking of the Jewish Priests, calls τὰ ἁγία ἐργαζόμενοι, τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσεδρεύοντες, *sacra operantes*, or *sacra procurantes*, *altari deservientes*, or *altari operam dantes*, "ministers about holy things" pertaining to GOD, "waiters at the altar;" without whom there could have been no Sacrifices or offerings, or any partaking of the offerings at the holy table, in which the act of communion doth consist.—pp. 80. 85—87.

From this I proceed to another place of the New Testament, to show that it is a Sacrifice, viz. Rom. xv. 15, 16. where, alluding to the ministration of the Christian Sacrifice. . . he said, ver. 15, 16, "Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly to you in some sort, as putting you in mind of the grace that is given to me of GOD, that I should be the Minister of JESUS CHRIST to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of GOD, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." The words in the original for "the offering up of the Gentiles" are προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν, "the offering of the Gentiles,"

as the Eucharist is called by Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho. . . So Irenæus. . . St. Cyprian. . . Const. Apost. . . Now if, according to this primitive notion of the Eucharist being the "Sacrifice of the Gentiles" in all places, *προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν* signified their offering or Sacrifice, not as offered, but as offerers, this text would be a direct and express proof. But although the ancients always spoke of the Eucharist as the Sacrifice, or oblation of the Gentiles, in opposition to those of the Jews, when they argued against them from the prophecy of Malachi, yet, because they understood the words of the Apostle for "the offering up of the Gentiles," I think we ought to take them in that sense. But then, I think that in mentioning that offering of his, as "being sanctified by the Holy Ghost," he plainly alludes to the ministration of the Christian Sacrifice, in which they solemnly prayed unto God "to send down His Holy Spirit upon the oblations." . . . In the ancient Liturgies nothing is more common than the prayers of the Priest to God, to send down His Holy Spirit upon himself, and the communicants, and the oblations. . . I cannot, from considering all this, but think it very probable that the Apostle alluded to the common notion the Christians had of the Eucharistical oblations being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, in saying that the oblation he made of the Gentiles, was "acceptable to God, being [like the Eucharistical bread and wine] sanctified by the Holy Ghost."—pp. 92—97.

I believe no man in the world, that was of any religion where Sacrifice was used, and that by chance should see the Sacrament of the <sup>1</sup> holy Eucharist administered among Christians, as it was administered in the primitive times, or as it is administered according to the order and usage of the Church of England, but would take the bread and wine for an offering or Sacrifice, and the whole action for a sacrificial ministration; and the eating and drinking of the holy elements for a sacrificial entertainment of the congregation at the table of their God. To see bread <sup>2</sup>, and wine mixed with water, so solemnly brought to the table, and then a loaf of that bread and a cup of that wine brought by the Deacon

<sup>1</sup> Justin Mart. Apol. I.

<sup>2</sup> Id. *ibid.*

in manner of an offering to the Liturg, or Minister, which he also taking in his hands, as an offering, sets them with all reverence on the table; and, then, after solemn prayers of oblation and consecration, to see him take up the bread, and say, in a most solemn manner, "This is my Body," &c. and then the cup, saying as solemnly, "This is my Blood," &c. and then to hear him, with all the powers of his soul, offer up praises, and glory, and thanksgiving, and prayers to God, the FATHER of all things, through the name of the Son, and Holy Spirit, which they beseech Him to send down upon the bread and cup, and the people with the greatest harmony and acclamation, saying aloud, "Amen;" after which also to see the Liturg first eat of the bread, and drink of the cup, and then the Deacon to carry about the blessed bread and wine, to be eaten and drunk by the people, as in a sacrificial feast; and lastly, to see and hear all concluded with psalms and hymns of praise, and prayers of intercession to God, with the highest "pomp-like celebrity" of words;—I say, to see and hear all this, would make an uninitiated heathen conclude that the bread and wine were an offering, the whole Eucharistical action a sacrificial mystery, the eating and drinking the sanctified elements a sacrificial banquet, and the Liturg who administered, a Priest. I have here used the term "sacrificial mystery," because there was no federal Sacrifice but what was a religious mystery, exhibiting one thing to the sense, and another to the understanding of the votist, or what was not an outward sign of an invisible inward grace of the God, true or believed to be true, to whom the Sacrifice was offered;—I say, every federal Sacrifice is an outward sign of an invisible grace, and by consequence is a mystery, or Sacrament; for "Sacrament" in the Latin Church, from which we borrowed the word, signifies the same, as "mystery" in the Greek; and, therefore, the Eucharistical Sacrifice is also a Sacrament, or, to speak more properly of it, it is a Christian Sacrament or mystery, as a federal commemorative Sacrifice, in which as CHRIST represents unto God His Passion and the merits of it, as our High Priest in heaven, so, in this Sacrifice, the Priests upon earth, in conjunction with it, present and commemorate the same

unto Him, by setting before Him the symbols of His dead Body and Blood effused for our sins.

I speak this to let the reformed world see, that they need not be afraid of believing the holy Eucharist to be a proper Sacrifice, or offering, in which the bread and wine are offered in a proper and literal sense; and that by consequence the ministers of it are, properly and literally speaking, "offering Priests," as the primitive Christians, and all Churches before the Reformation taught and believed. . . . For the holy Eucharist is so very like a Sacrifice, or sacrificial mystery, in all its rites and manner of ministration, that if it be not a Sacrifice, no man can well tell what the common notion of a Sacrifice is, or easily distinguish it from the nature of any Sacrifice, upon which the votists used to feast in the temple, and at the altar of their God. The primitive Christians, who were as afraid of idolatry as any of the Protestants, were so far from not having this notion of it, or being afraid to own it as such, that, as they believed Melchisedec was a type of CHRIST, so they believed the bread and wine, which he brought to Abraham, when he blessed him, to have been a type of this commemorative Sacrifice by bread and wine, which CHRIST instituted for His Church. They believed it to be that *mincha purum*, that "pure offering" foretold by the Prophet Malachi, which should be offered in every place, and not in one, as among the Jews, unto the name of God among the Gentiles, from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same.—pp. 103—109.

But to return to the Christian oblation, or Sacrifice in the holy Eucharist, I cannot but observe, that the "offering" of the bread and wine was of old esteemed so special a part of that most holy service, that the administration of the holy Communion, and the Communion itself, was signified by *προσφέρειν*, and *προσφορά* in the Greek, and by *offerre*, and *oblatio* in the Latin Church.—p. 113.

In the second place, I cannot but observe, that the ancient Church made a plain and accurate distinction between the oblation of bread and wine upon the altar in the Eucharist, and the oblation of other things thereupon—p. 115.

But thirdly, it is evident from one argument, which the ortho-

dox Fathers used in the second Council of Nice, against the worship of images, that the bread and wine were solemnly offered in the Eucharist, and that the oblation of them was esteemed a Sacrifice of Divine institution. That argument was to this purpose, viz. that the Catholic Church of us Christians agreed with the Jewish and Gentile religion, being a medium between both, as having a new mystical Sacrifice instituted by God, but without the rites and ceremonies of either, not admitting the bloody Sacrifices and burnt-offerings of Judaism, and abhorring the idols and idol-worship in the Sacrifices of Gentilism, which was the author and inventor of that abominable art (of making and worshipping idols). . . . From this way of reasoning against the use of images in divine worship, it is plain, that these holy Fathers thought the Christians had a Sacrifice of Divine institution, though not a bloody Sacrifice, as the Jews had, nor polluted with image-worship, after the manner of the Gentiles, but a pure unbloody Sacrifice in the holy Eucharist, which was a medium of negation from both, as being neither a bloody nor an idololatrical oblation.

In the fourth place, the ancients asserted that Melchisedec, who was the type of CHRIST, offered bread and wine; and that the bread and wine which he offered, prefigured the oblation of it in the Eucharist. . . . And as they believed that Melchisedec first offered the bread and wine, with which he entertained Abraham; so they taught, as I have already showed from many authorities, that CHRIST, the antitypal Melchisedec, as really offered bread and wine to the Father at the institution of the holy Eucharist. From those and other authorities cited in this letter, it is plain, that the bread and wine were really offered in the Eucharist, and were, in the opinion of the ancient Church, as properly an external material oblation in that pure unbloody Sacrifice, as any other thing could be that was offered by any priest upon the altar of any god.

Indeed there were two oblations of the elements in the Eucharist; one before the consecration, in which they were presented to God the FATHER upon the altar, as the first-fruits of His creatures, to acknowledge Him for our sovereign LORD and

Benefactor ; the other at the consecration, when they were offered to Him as the symbols of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, or as the mystical Body and Blood of CHRIST, to represent that oblation He made of both upon the Cross, and to obtain the benefits of His death and passion ; who, by the oblation of Himself once so offered, made a full and perfect satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.

These two oblations are distinguishable in Justin Martyr's short account of the celebration of the Eucharist: the first at the offering of the bread, and the cup of water and wine, " which," saith he, " the Bishop (or Priest) receiving, offers up (*αἶνον καὶ δόξαν*) praise and glory to God the Father of all things, through the name of His Son and the Holy Spirit ; and also offers up thanksgiving for deeming us worthy of these His creatures". . . . This long action of praise and thanksgiving may be seen at large in Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 12. . . . Then after a short introduction, in which are the words of the institution, follows the second oblation of the elements, beginning at *Μεμνημένοι οὖν ὧν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν*, &c. which I shall hereafter transcribe. This second Eucharistical oblation, in which the elements were offered as the mystical Body and Blood of CHRIST, and wherein they prayed God the FATHER graciously to accept them, is implied by Justin in the word *εὐχὰς*, in the sentence next to that which I have cited,—“ when the Bishop (or Priest) hath finished the prayers, all the people present conclude with an audible voice, saying, Amen.” These two forms of oblation of the bread and wine, though then in one continued prayer, are plainly distinguished by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechis. Mystag. V. where the first is described § iv. v., and the latter in § vi., and the description of them in both places exactly agrees with the large account of ministering the holy Sacrament in the Apost. Const. cited above : and they are also to be found in all the ancient Liturgies. In our present Liturgy, the first oblation is made in the beginning of the Prayer for the whole state of CHRIST'S Church, immediately after the Priest hath placed the bread and wine upon the table, in these words, “ Almighty and everliving GOD . . . we humbly beseech Thee to accept our

alms and oblations." And the latter is made, in substance, and according to the intention of the Church, in the Prayer of Consecration to God the Father, where, after the commemoration of CHRIST'S offering Himself upon the Cross, and His institution of the perpetual memorial of His precious death, GOD the FATHER is implored to hear us, while, according to the same institution, we receive His creatures of bread and wine, in remembrance of His Son our SAVIOUR'S death and passion: and then, while the Priest recites the words of the institution, he is to take the bread into his hands and break it; and at the words, "This is My Body," to lay his hand upon all the bread: and at the words, "He took the cup," he is to take the chalice into his hands; and at the words, "This is My Blood of the New Testament," &c. he is to lay his hand upon every vessel, in which there is wine to be consecrated. These are the solemn rites which attend "our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," (as it is truly called in the Prayer of the Post-Communion,) at the consecration, as the placing the bread and wine upon the table by the priest in order to be consecrated by him is also to be observed. And, therefore, those Bishops and Priests who can satisfy their consciences in the total neglect of this rite, may as well satisfy them in the total omission of the other; and then take upon them to say, as some lately have done, that "the general neglect of the clergy to observe them, vacates them;" a way of arguing, which were it true, might vacate all the other rules and rubrics of the Church.

But to return to the Christian oblation or Sacrifice; the next argument I shall produce to prove that the bread and wine were really offered in the holy Communion, is taken from the primitive manner of the administration of it, as set forth in the viiith Book of the Apost. Const. cited in the last paragraph. In this liturgical account of the holy Sacrament we read, that the catechumens and audients, &c. being gone out of the Church, the Deacon began the office of the holy Eucharist, with that general admonition,—“Let none that is not in charity, let no hypocrite come hither.” After pronouncing these admonitions, he said,—“In sincerity towards our LORD, let us, standing, offer, with



fear and trembling<sup>1</sup> ;” which being done, (saith the rubric, for so I call the direction,)—“ let the Deacons bring the offerings unto the altar to the Bishop.” Then the Bishop, standing in his priestly robes before the altar, began the Sacramental Office with this blessing : “ The grace of ALMIGHTY GOD, and the love of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and the communication of the Holy Spirit, be with you all.” To which the people answered, “ And with thy spirit.” Then the Bishop, “ Lift up your hearts :” to which the people : “ We lift them up unto the LORD.” Then the Bishop, “ Let us give thanks unto our LORD :” to which the people, “ Ἀξιὸν καὶ ἔκτατον, “ It is meet and right,” &c. Then the Bishop, “ It is truly meet and right,” &c. And then after a long and noble hymn of praise and glory to GOD the FATHER, and the SON, abbreviated in after-ages, in which is the hymn *Ter Sanctus*, and after an introduction, in which the words of the institution are recited, he proceeds to the Consecration, the most special part of the sacrificial action, beginning with the Prayer of Oblation, in the words which follow ; *Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν*. . . . “ Wherefore, remembering His passion, and death, and resurrection from the dead, and His return (ascension) into heaven, and His second appearance, in which He will come in glory and power, to judge the living and the dead, and to reward every one according to their works : We offer this bread, and this cup to Thee, (our) King and God<sup>2</sup>, according to His institution ; giving thanks to Thee through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand in Thy presence, and execute the priest’s office to Thee ; and we beseech Thee, that Thou wouldest look with complacency on these offerings lying before Thee, O GOD, who standest in need of nothing, that Thou wouldest accept them for the honour of Thy CHRIST, and send Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, upon this Sacrifice, that He may (make) show forth this bread to be the Body of Thy CHRIST, and this cup to be Thy CHRIST’s Blood, that the partakers thereof may be confirmed in godliness, &c. . . . Thou, O LORD ALMIGHTY, being reconciled to them<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, we pray unto

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. p. 122.]<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 65. 123.]<sup>3</sup> [Vid. sup. p. 54. note.]

Thee for Thy holy Church, dispersed from one end of the world to the other, which thou hast purchased with the precious Blood of Thy CHRIST, that Thou wouldest preserve it unshaken and unmolested, to the end of the world. (We pray) likewise for the whole episcopate, rightly dividing the word of truth. We pray also for my worthless self, who am making this oblation, and for all the Presbyters, for the Deacons, and the Clergy, that Thou wouldest instruct them, and fill them with the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, O LORD, we offer unto Thee for the Emperor," &c.

This is as plain a description of a Sacrifice, and a sacrificial action, as is in any author sacred or profane; and *mutatis mutandis* may be said of any Sacrifice offered upon any altar, or to any god. And we find the Bishop, in the xiiiith chapter, saying, "Let us also pray unto GOD, through His CHRIST, for the offering which has been offered to the LORD GOD, that our merciful GOD, through the mediation of His CHRIST, would receive it up unto His holy, heavenly altar, for a sweet smelling savour." In the same chapter, the rubric calls the consecrated bread to be distributed, "the offering." Answerably to all which, in the lviith chapter of the 2d book, in a short account of the manner of administering the holy Sacrament, the administration of it is called "the oblation of the Eucharist." "Let some of the Deacons attend to the oblation of the Eucharist, ministering to the Body of the LORD with fear, and let others look after the congregation, and enjoin them silence. . . . After this, let the Deacon pray for the universal Church, &c. Then let the Bishop, having given the peace of God to the people, bless them, as Moses commanded the priests, and praying, say: 'The LORD bless thee and keep thee.' After this, let the Sacrifice be done (offered) all the people standing and praying in silence; and when it is offered up, let every order by itself orderly partake of the LORD's Body, and precious Blood with reverence and fear."

This account of the Eucharistical service is, as I have before observed, most agreeable to the accounts we have of it, and of the administration thereof, both in the first apology of Justin Martyr, and also, to the doctrine of it in his dialogue with Trypho, and I do not doubt, but it is most conformable to the primitive

and apostolical form. And now let any candid reader judge, whether the bread and wine are not the [ΔΩΠΑ] "offerings," in a proper literal sense, which were brought by the Deacons to the altar unto the Bishop, that he might place them on the holy table, to be consecrated in the service of the holy Eucharist; the [ΠΡΟΚΕΙΜΕΝΑ ΔΩΠΑ] proper material "offerings," that lay upon the altar, and upon which the Bishop prayed God to look down in mercy; the "offerings," of which the Bishop or priest only was the "offerer;" the "offerings," which he took in his hands, and offered in the name of the people; the "offerings," of which God has no need, the "offerings," or the [ΘΥΣΙΑΝ] "Sacrifice," upon which he prays God to send down His Holy Spirit, that it might show forth the bread to be the Body, and the cup, the Blood, to the receivers: lastly, the "offerings," of which the Oblation and Consecration was called the "Sacrifice," and of which they said in the ancient Offices, *Sancta sanctis*, and *Tibi ex tuis offerimus*. And if all this be true, then let the reader also judge, whether the celebration of the holy Eucharist was not a sacrificial action or administration, and the bread and wine, the materials of that Sacrifice, which were first presented, and then by solemn consecration offered up unto God, and, last of all, distributed to the faithful, for the favour of God, the remission of their sins, the benefit both of their bodies and souls, the confirmation and increase of their faith, and preserving of them in all godliness, and unto the life of the world to come. In a word, it is evident, that according to the ancient Church, the bread and wine were the matter which the people brought, and the Bishop received, to be spent or consumed in the celebration of the Eucharist; the matter which the Bishop solemnly offered up to God by consecration, for the heavenly banquet of the Lord's Supper; and which, as they were, in the literal sense, a proper, external, material offering or Sacrifice, which succeeded in the place of the legal Sacrifices, so, in the Sacramental or mystical, they were the Body and Blood of CHRIST, of which they were the representatives, and whereof the one was broken with wounds, and the other shed upon the Cross. To this Liturgical testimony in the Apost. Const. I shall . . . produce the testimonies of the

ancient Liturgies, which suppose the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, in which the bread and wine were solemnly offered in a proper literal sense, by prayer and thanksgiving to God.

I begin with the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom<sup>1</sup>, of which there are two editions . . . both which begin with this secret prayer of the priests, in the beginning of the ministration ; " Send down, O LORD, Thy assistance from Thy holy habitation, and strengthen me in Thy service, which I am going to perform, that I may stand, without blame, before Thy tremendous altar, and minister the unbloody Sacrifice," &c. So in the prayer at the *πρόθεσις*, or table where the people's oblations of bread and wine were set, before they were brought to the altar ; " of Thy goodness and love for mankind, remember those who have offered, and those for whom they have offered." . . . So in the prayer after the oblations are placed upon the altar ; " O LORD GOD ALMIGHTY, who only art holy, and who receivest the Sacrifice of praise from those who call upon Thee with their whole heart, receive the prayer of us sinners, and bring it to Thy holy altar, and make us worthy to offer up these gifts and spiritual Sacrifices for our sins and the errors of the people, and grant we may find grace in Thy sight, to have this our Sacrifice made acceptable to Thee." Then after the *Sursum corda*, and the " Prayer of thanksgiving," mentioned by Justin Martyr, and the words of the institution, the priest saith, as in the Consecration before cited, out of the Apost. Const. " Wherefore, remembering this salutary commandment, and all the things that are done for us, His death, burial, resurrection on the third day, His ascension into heaven, His sitting at thy right hand, and His second and glorious coming, we offer Thy own [gifts or creatures] unto Thee. We also offer up unto Thee this reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice, and we pray and beseech Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts. Amen." . . .

So in the Liturgy of St. Basil<sup>2</sup>, in the prayer at the Prothesis, upon which the oblations were set ; " Bless this table, and the oblations thereupon, and receive them up unto Thy altar in the highest heavens ; and, of Thy goodness and love towards men,

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 65. 124.]

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. *ibid.*]

remember the offerers, and those for whom they have offered". . . So in the prayer of the priest, after the offerings are set on the holy table or altar; "May it please Thee, O LORD, as we are ministers of the New Testament and Liturgs of Thy holy mysteries, according to the multitude of Thy mercies, to receive us, who are approaching to Thy holy altar; that we may be worthy to offer unto Thee this reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice for our sins, and the errors of the people, which Thou having received up for a sweet savour to Thy holy and intellectual altar, send down for it the grace of Thy Holy Spirit upon us. Look upon us, O LORD, and upon this our Sacrifice, and receive it, as Thou didst receive the oblations of Abel; the Sacrifices of Noah; the holocausts of Abraham; the consecration-offerings of Moses and Aaron; the peace-offerings of Samuel; even as Thou didst receive this Eucharistical oblation, the verity of them, from thy holy Apostles:—let us stand as becomes us, with reverence, and take heed that we offer this holy offering in peace. Wherefore, most holy LORD, . . . we approach to Thy holy altar, and having set [thereupon] the figures [or symbols] of the holy Body, and Blood of Thy CHRIST, we pray and beseech Thee, O Most Holy, by the pleasure of Thy goodness, that Thy Holy Spirit may come upon us, and upon these gifts lying before Thee, to bless them, and sanctify them, and make them the Body and Blood of CHRIST." . . .

I could add more such passages out of this Eucharistical Office, but because they are the same with those in that of St. Chrysostom, or almost the same, I thought fit to pass over them, and proceed to the other Greek Liturgies. . . . I shall begin with the Liturgy of St. James<sup>1</sup>, *i. e.* of the Church of Jerusalem, of which he was the first Bishop. There, in the beginning of the Sacramental Office, the priest prays, "O ALMIGHTY GOD, who gives us access to the holy of holies; . . . fearing and trembling to approach Thy holy altar, we implore Thy goodness: Send down Thy grace upon us, and sanctify our souls, bodies, and spirits, . . . that we may offer these gifts, presents, and Sacrifices, with a pure conscience,"

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. *ibid.*]

&c. Ὁ ἱερεὺς εἰσάγων τὰ ἅγια δῶρα, &c. "The priest who brings in the holy gifts shall say this prayer : Ὁ ἐπισκεψάμενος, &c. O LORD, who hast visited us in mercy and pity, and given us poor sinners, and Thine unworthy servants, leave to come unto thy holy altar, and offer this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice for our sins, &c. . . . And of Thy goodness receive me, who approach to Thy altar, and grant that these gifts, offered by my hands, may be made acceptable to Thee," &c. And then in the Prayer of Consecration, Μεμνημένοι οὖν, &c. "We sinners, therefore, being mindful of His sufferings, offer unto Thee, O LORD, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice; Have mercy upon us, O LORD, and send down Thy most Holy Spirit upon these gifts which are set before Thee, that, descending upon them," &c.

So in the Liturgy of St. Mark, or the Church of Alexandria, at the beginning of the Oblation : "O LORD our GOD, who art our Sovereign LORD, . . . who hast made all things by Thy Wisdom, the true Light, Thy Only Begotten Son, our LORD and GOD and only SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, through whom, giving thanks to Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit, we offer this reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice, which all nations offer up unto Thee from the rising of the sun unto the setting thereof, from the North to the South, because great is Thy name among all people, and incense, and Sacrifice, and oblation, is offered unto Thee in every place. Καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν μερίδα, &c. And grant that we may have our part and lot with all Thy Saints, who bring unto Thee sacrificial oblations. And, O God, receive up these Eucharistical gifts into Thy heavenly and intellectual altar, Κύριε, &c. . . . O LORD our GOD, we have set what are Thine of Thy own gifts before Thee; and we pray," &c. . . .

So in the Liturgy of St. Peter, that is, of the Latin Liturgy of the Church of Rome, translated into Greek; Θυσίαν, Κύριε, Σοὶ, &c. "O LORD, sanctify this Sacrifice, which is to be offered to Thee, and receive us graciously, &c. Σὲ τάλιν, &c. We therefore pray, and beseech Thee most merciful FATHER, through our LORD JESUS CHRIST, that Thou wouldest please to accept and bless these gifts, this oblation, this holy and pure Sacrifice, which we offer up to Thee in the first place for Thy holy Catholic Apos-

tolie Church. Ταύτην τοίνυν τήν προσφοράν, &c. O LORD, we beseech Thee, mercifully to receive this offering of our [bounden duty and] service which we offer to Thee. . . . Thy own of Thy own; this pure Sacrifice, this holy Sacrifice, this spotless Sacrifice, this holy bread of eternal life and cup of everlasting salvation, we offer of Thy gifts and benefits unto Thee, upon which we beseech Thee that Thou wouldest look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept as Thou wast pleased to accept the gifts of Thy righteous child Abel. And command," &c. . . .

So in the Lent Office of administering the Eucharist, *ex præ-sanctificatis*, translated by Genebrard. . . .

I might, sir, from the Greek Liturgies as now extant, return to the ancient Greek writers, and cite many more authorities out of them for the Eucharistical oblation, especially that in the margin<sup>1</sup>, to which I refer my reader; but from the Liturgies of the Greek Churches it is time to lead you to those of the Latin, among whom I shall begin with the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, where the Canon of the mass, (for "mass" of old . . . was a word of good and harmless signification) . . . begins with this prayer: "Wherefore, O most merciful FATHER, we humbly pray, and beseech Thee through JESUS CHRIST Thy Son our LORD, that Thou wouldest accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy pure Sacrifices, which we offer up to Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church." . . . in the present Canon of the Roman Mass, . . . "Wherefore, O LORD, we Thy servants, and Thy holy people," &c.<sup>2</sup>

So in the *Codices Sacramentorum*. . . which are ancient Offices written about the latter end of the eighth century. . . . To this I might add the canon of the Eucharistical action in the ancient Gallican Liturgy, published by Mabillon, but because it is almost of the same with the former, I omit it. Many collections and observations of the same kind might also be extracted out of the elaborate and useful volumes of the learned Benedictine, Edmund Martene, *de Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*. But having produced enough out of the ancient Liturgies, to prove the Sacrifice of the holy Eucharist, from the harmonious agreement of them

<sup>1</sup> In the Prayer of Consecration of a Bishop, Apost. Const. lib. viii. cap. 5.

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 79. 124.]

all in that point, I forbear to collect any more. Sir, I say "the harmonious agreement" of them all, to prevent cavil from such men as your "late writer:" for in whatsoever they all agree among themselves, and every one of them with the account we have of the Eucharist, in Justin Martyr's Apology, and in the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters of the Apostolic Constitutions, (which answer so exactly to the celebration of it, as described by Justin.) that must needs be primitive and apostolical, and the consenting suffrage, *i. e.* the consentient doctrine and practice of the ancient Catholic Church.—pp. 116—140.

Thus, sir, I have gone through the Fathers and Councils, and ancient Liturgies, to prove the Eucharist to be a real oblation or Sacrifice, and by consequence, that the ministers of it are proper Priests, as the Bishops and Presbyters of the ancient Catholic Church thought, and taught themselves to be, according to that of St. Cyprian de Orat. Dom. *Quando in unum cum fratribus convenimus, et sacrificia divina cum Dei sacerdote celebramus.* But, as men biassed by preconceptions are apt to object, so such men as your "late writer," taking the notion of a Sacrifice from Dr. Outram, who is a great author with them, object his definition of a Sacrifice to the sacrificial notion of the holy Eucharist, which they truly say do not agree together. And therefore I must acknowledge, that either he is mistaken in his definition, or that the ancient Church hath erred in the sacrificial conception they had of the holy Eucharist, which must be false if the Doctor's definition or description of a Sacrifice be strictly true.—p. 146.

But, sir, there yet remains another objection to be answered, taken also from the opinion of another of our learned divines, Dr. Cudworth, who, in a discourse concerning "the true notion of the LORD's Supper," asserts, that it is not a Sacrifice, but *epulum ex oblatis*, a "feast upon a Sacrifice;" or in other words, not *oblatio Sacrificii*, but, as Tertullian excellently speaks, (saith he) *participatio Sacrificii*; not "the offering of something up to God upon an altar, but the eating of something which comes from God's altar," and is set upon our tables. And then, in contradiction to all antiquity, he asserts, that the notion of a Sacrament's



being a Sacrifice is a mistake for what is the true notion of its being "a feast upon a Sacrifice," and that it grew up by a degeneration of this truth, as he expresseth himself. . . . In a word, from analogy to this ancient rite of feasting upon things sacrificed, and eating of those things in person, or proxy, which they had offered up to GOD, he takes this new notion of the LORD'S Supper being a feast upon a Sacrifice, and not a Sacrifice itself.—pp. 165, 6.

Now, sir, in answer to the objection taken from this learned man's new notion of the LORD'S Supper, it will be convenient to distinguish, in this Sacrificial feast of Christians, between the matter or entertainment of it, and the eating and participation thereof in the holy feast; that it may appear in what this opinion agrees, and how it differs from the ancient and common notion of it which the Church had of it in the primitive and purest times. First, then, as to the matter of it, the bread and wine; it must be granted, that by CHRIST'S own institution, they are symbols of His natural Body and Blood, and by His appointment are to be deemed, reputed, and received as His natural Flesh and Blood, in the holy feast. And secondly, it must be granted, that the participation of them is a federal rite, and hath all the moral effects between GOD and the faithful communicants, as if they did eat and drink of His natural Body and Blood, which was sacrificed for us upon the Cross. Those moral effects are the solemn and comfortable commemoration of His all sufficient Sacrifice upon the Cross, and representing it before GOD on earth as He represents it before Him in heaven; together with a confirmation and ratification of the covenant between GOD and the communicants; and the signification and assurance of GOD'S pardon, and of peace, reconciliation, and fellowship between GOD and the worthy partakers, who eat and drink the mystical and vicarious Body and Blood of CHRIST. . . . Thirdly, it must be acknowledged, that the one great Sacrifice upon the Cross is the only true and proper Sacrifice of the Christian religion, as by "one" true Sacrifice is understood the one great Sacrifice of propitiation for sin, which was the truth and completion of all typical Sacrifices: but then his opinion, that there is no other "external

material oblation" in the Christian religion, no "offering at God's altar, but only eating something that comes from it;" and that the mystical or sacramental Body and Blood of CHRIST, of which we partake at the LORD's table, "are not there offered up unto God," if there were no other reason, is to be rejected, as of no authority, because it is new, and contrary to the consentient belief and practice of all Churches for above fifteen hundred years.—pp. 167—169.

I could say more to refute this learned man's opinion, were it needful or convenient to enter into a theory of the Jewish Sacrifices, but I think it is time to dismiss this cause, and therefore to conclude, as this notion of the LORD's Supper being only a feast upon a Sacrifice, is new and singular, and as I have showed, contrary to Catholic traditions, both in belief and practice; so it is a nice notion, and of no use or service, that I know of, to religion. First, It is a very nice notion, and vain imagination, thus to separate the table from the altar, the Sacrament from the Sacrifice, and the outward offering of the one from the federal feast of the other, in the LORD's Supper. This is to put asunder what God hath joined together, and in effect to declare that if the bread and wine be first made an oblation to God, they cannot become the mystical Flesh and Blood of His Son. Secondly, As this is a nice and new notion, so it is of no use or service to the Church. On the contrary, it dis-serves religion, and is of dangerous consequence to this holy Sacrament itself; for by the same liberty, this author, I am sure, without any ill intention, hath taken away this solemn offering of the bread and wine from the holy mystery, others, after his example, have presumed to take away the solemn consecration of them. . . . So dangerous it is for learned, though never so good men, to remove the old landmarks. and advance new notions destructive, or tending to the destruction of the old. I believe this author might really intend by this notion to sever the holy Eucharist from the Popish notion of it; but if it is not a real Sacrifice at all, most certainly it cannot be such a Sacrifice, as the Papal Church defines it to be. . . . But this is running from one extreme to the other without any reason, because the ancient notion of

this holy Sacrament's being a commemorative Sacrifice, in which we represent before GOD the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, perfectly secures the holy mystery from that corrupt and absurd notion, it being impossible that a solemn commemoration of a fact or thing, should be the fact or thing itself; or to speak otherwise, with respect to the holy symbols by which we make the commemoration, that what represents should be the thing represented,—the figure, the verity itself, or the sign, that which is signified thereby.

Sir, I have said all this in defence of the old, against the Doctor's new notion of the holy Eucharist, much more out of love to that old truth, than to prove Christian ministers to be proper priests.—pp. 174, 5.

To the modern testimonies I have cited for this doctrine in my first letter, I beg leave to add two or three more out of the writings of our learned divines, who have wrote of the holy Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper as of a Sacrifice, altogether as plainly as I have done. Dr.<sup>d</sup> Dan. Brevint, late dean of Lincoln, in his excellent little book entitled, “The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice<sup>1</sup>,” to use his own words, hath endeavoured, as he speaks, “to set this holy Sacrament at liberty, without regard to Papists or Protestants, and rescue it out of the hands of such as have not treated rightly of it, and to restore it to the full meaning and institution of CHRIST.” . . . . I forbear to transcribe any more, referring the reader to the discourse itself, which I wish were reprinted\*for the honour of GOD, and the benefit of the Church. Dr. Taylor plainly asserts this holy Sacrament to be a Sacrifice<sup>2</sup>. The bishop of Sarum<sup>3</sup> on Article XXXI., writes of the holy Eucharist in these words:—

“In two other respects it may also more strictly be called a Sacrifice. One is because there is an oblation of bread and wine made in it, which, being sacrificed, are consumed in an act of religion. To this many passages in the writings of the Fathers relate. This was the oblation which was made at the altar by the people. And though at first the Christians were reproached,

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 190—200.]

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 183, 4. 186, 7.]

<sup>3</sup> [Burnet.]

as having a strange sort of religion in which they had neither temples, altars, nor sacrifices, because they had not those things in so gross a manner as the heathens had, yet both Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and all the succeeding writers of the Church, do frequently mention the oblations that they made; and in the ancient Liturgies they did with particular prayers offer the bread and wine to God, as the Creator of all things. These were called the gifts and offerings, which were offered to God in imitation of Abel, who offered the fruits of the earth in a sacrifice to God. Both Justin Martyr, Irenæus, the Constitutions, and all the ancient Liturgies, have express words relating to this. Another respect in which the Eucharist is called a Sacrifice, is because it is a commemoration, and representation to God, of the Sacrifice that CHRIST offered for us upon the Cross. Upon these accounts we do not deny but that the Eucharist may be well called a Sacrifice. But still it is a commemorative Sacrifice, and not propitiatory<sup>1</sup>. . . . I wish his lordship had been pleased to add expressly, what is implied, that the Eucharist was also called a Sacrifice by the ancients, because the oblation of bread and wine, which they compared to other external Sacrifices, was always brought to the priest, to be presented by him as Sacrificial gifts to God upon the holy table or altar, and after the prayer of thanksgiving, to be consecrated by him in a second solemn oblation. . . .

It is plain that Bishop Andrews thought the holy Eucharist to be the Christian Sacrifice, by this prayer in his Greek and Latin devotions 'Ο ἄνω κ. τ. λ.<sup>2</sup>. . . .

Dr. Heylin . . . . cites a noble testimony out of Eusebius, *De Demonstratione Evangelica*, about the priesthood, altar, and Sacrifice of the Christians. . . .

Bishop Stillingfleet saith, "It is the peculiar honour of the Christian religion, to have an order of men set apart, not merely as Priests to offer Sacrifices (for that all religions have had) but as preachers of righteousness, to set good and evil before

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop means, not propitiatory in itself or by its own virtue, as the Papists assert their Sacrifice of the Mass to be.

[<sup>2</sup> Vid. sup. p. 100.]

the people committed to their charge." . . . Those who desire more authorities may consult the Appendix<sup>1</sup>, to which I refer the reader.

And to these authorities of learned men in print I shall add others of no less moment out of an interleaved Book of Common Prayer, with notes, which I happened to meet with, and value very much<sup>2</sup>. . . .

And now I hope, by these additional authorities, and those cited in my book, and in the Appendix to it, I shall convince the "late writer" I have spoken of in the beginning of my first letter, that the Eucharist is a proper Sacrifice, and that we, who offer it, are proper Priests, and that there can be no danger in this doctrine, which was taught and practised by all the ancient Catholic Church. I hope also what I have said here, and in that letter, will sufficiently refute and expose the incomparable presumption of the author of the "Rights," who represents the whole notion of the Lord's Supper, as I have shewed it was taught in the primitive times, for priestcraft, saying that "they made it a mystery in the heathenish sense of the word." . . . All serious Christians among us believe it to be a mystery, though not to be a "Sacrifice," a sacrificial mystery, as the Passover to which it answers, and in whose place it did succeed, by our Saviour's institution, was. —*Prefatory Discourse*, pp. xxxvii—lii. lxiii.

It hath been my endeavour, especially in the first of the following letters, to revive this ancient, true, Catholic doctrine, which hath accidentally grown into disuse, and almost utter oblivion in this Church, by the alterations that were made in the Office, or order of administering the Lord's Supper in the first Liturgy of the Church of England, which in the Appendix I have presented to the view of the world.

In the changes made in that Office, the word "Altar," which had been used in all ages of the Church before, even in the purest as well as the most corrupt, was left out of the rubrics. And the Prayer of Oblation, which had been ever used before the delivering of the Sacrament, in which we pray God "mercifully to

<sup>1</sup> In which are cited Laud, Hammond, Dodwell, Patrick, Wake, Bull, &c.

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 70—73.]

accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," was put in the Post-Communion after the Lord's Prayer; of which I read thus in my interleaved Common Prayer Book: "This prayer," &c.<sup>1</sup>

In the alterations made in the Office for administering the Lord's Supper, in king Edward the Sixth's Service Book, that Rubric was also left out which commanded the minister to "set the bread and wine upon the altar," as an offering. But this Rubric was restored, in the Office for the Church of Scotland, and likewise in the Office of the Holy Communion of our present Liturgy, established by the Act of Uniformity after the Restoration, with an intention undoubtedly to oblige the Priest to place the elements, as an offering, with reverence upon the Lord's Table. But as the disuse of this practice had taken deep root from the fifth year of king Edward VI., when the first Service Book was altered, to that time, and helped to obliterate the notion of the Christian Sacrifice in the minds both of priests and people; so this restored Rubric, to the great reproach of the Clergy, was almost never since observed in cathedral or parochial churches. I say almost never, because I never knew or heard but of two or three persons, which is a very small number, who observed it; but the bread and wine was still placed upon the table before the office of the Communion began, without any solemnity, it may be by the clerk or sexton, or any other, perhaps, unfitter person, to the great derogation of the reverence due to the holy mystery; and I hope, for the sake of my good intentions, no worthy clergyman will be displeased at me for taking notice thereof.

This practice of the officiating priests setting the bread and wine in the sight of the people with reverence upon the holy table, was so inviolably observed in ancient times, that they had in their churches a buffet, or side table, on the right or left hand of the altar, upon which a priest or deacon set the bread and wine, from whence they were carried by the deacon, or other priest, when there were two, to the officiating priest, who reverently placed them as an offering on the Lord's table. This

[<sup>1</sup> Vid. sup. p. 72.]

side-table, for the elements and holy vessels, was called in the Greek Church *Πρόθεσις*, because they were first set in public view upon it; and in the Latin Church *Paratorium*, because they were prepared, and made ready upon it, for the Holy Communion; and in Italy it is called *Credenza*, in France *Credence*. . .

I have made these remarks for three reasons; first, to move the clergy of cathedral and parochial Churches to put the aforesaid rubric in practice, which in the Communion enjoins the priest to place the bread and wine upon the LORD's table. Secondly, To persuade them to restore the ancient use of the *Paratorium*, or table of preparation, which that rubric plainly implies; for the priest is supposed, either to fetch them from some place, or else to have them brought from some place to him, that he may set them on the altar; and I cannot tell why that should not be another table in some part of the Church or chancel, to set the bread and wine, and holy vessels upon, especially where there is no sacristy or vestry, where they may be conveniently set till they are brought unto the priest.

In cathedrals it seems to be most proper for the deacon, or another priest, as the sacrist commonly is, to bring the elements to the Bishop, or officiating priest; but in parish Churches, where there is neither deacon nor second priest, the churchwarden, or other fit person, might reverently bring them from the *Credence*, wheresoever placed, to the rail, where the minister might receive them of him, to place them upon the altar. This practice would conciliate a greater measure of reverence than is often seen, to the holy Sacrament, and help the people to conceive how the bread and wine is *their* oblation, and how it is made a Sacrifice by the ministry of the priest.—pp. lxiii—lxviii.

II.—*Second Collection of Controversial Letters.*

In this the reader will find the Holy Eucharist asserted to be a commemorative Sacrifice . . . that doctrine which so many of our greatest men have asserted to be the doctrine of the purest ages of Christianity, without seeing any danger in it, or any consequence from the old commemorative representative Sacrifice to the new Popish Sacrifice of the Mass.

Wherefore, to the eminent writers, which I formerly cited for that doctrine, . . . I beg leave to add the authority of others. . . . p. 277.

I shall begin with a book entituled, "A Discourse concerning the worship of God towards the holy table, or altar." Printed at London, 1682. But as I understand it was printed from a MS. copy, which a learned clergyman, since deceased, somewhere met with, so is it plain from the book that it was written about the year 1637. . . . Who was the author of this little book, I cannot tell, but thus he writes . . . "Having proved an altar by your own consequence we must have a Sacrifice too, and a priesthood, for these you say infer one another, as correlates. But I will not be beholden to you to make this my argument, but will prove it out of Scripture the word "Sacrifice" to be applied to our Sacrament. God by His prophet foretels the Jews, that whereas they had polluted His altars, He had also rejected them and their Sacrifices, and would appoint Himself a new people and a new Sacrifice. In every place (that is, not in Jerusalem only, and in one place) incense should be offered unto His name, and *Sacrificium purum*, a pure Sacrifice, or offering, for so the word signifies in the Hebrew. Now what other incense have we but prayer? What other Sacrifice but the Lord's Supper? which he calls a pure Sacrifice or offering; which God hath appointed to commemorate the death and Sacrifice of His Son, instead of the Jewish Sacrifices, which only typified it. This is the interpretation of the most ancient fathers; for among all the ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin, there is nothing more frequent than the use of the words Sacrifice, priest, altar, when they speak of the Sacrament, holy table, and ministers of the Gospel. No man can deny this, that hath but cast his eyes upon their writings, which are every where full of these expressions." . . .

The next authority shall be that of Archbishop Bramhall<sup>1</sup>. . .

To the Archbishop's authority let me add that of Dr. Brough, in his tract<sup>2</sup>, printed in the appendix: "In the Sacrament of the

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 131, 2.]

<sup>2</sup> "Sacred Principles, Services, and Soliloquies, or a Manual of Devotion made up of three parts, &c. The third edition, with some additions. London, printed



Eucharist, a Sacrifice commemorative both grant, but a propitiatory we disclaim."

In the next place let me produce the testimony of Mr. Thorn-dike<sup>1</sup>. . . that of Dr. Beveridge, late Bishop of St. Asaph<sup>2</sup>. . . &c. . .<sup>3</sup>

Reflecting upon what I have now written, did I not consider the power of prejudice in men, I should wonder how "Sacrament" came to jostle "Sacrifice," not only out of so many Reformed Offices of the LORD'S Supper, but out of the writings of divines who have treated on that subject; as if now we were to know the holy institution but by halves, which the ancient apostolic Churches knew in whole and so taught and learned it, though we teach and learn but half of it, as the papists administer and receive it but in one kind. This, perhaps, was the pious reason why Mr. Nelson endeavoured to retrieve this primitive word and notion, by bringing the one into the title page, and the other into the devotions of his book. For he that knew *Id verum quod prius*, might think he could not more honour GOD, or better serve His Church, or more benefit his readers in writing on that subject than by restoring the Sacrifice to the Sacrament, which had kept possession in the Churches of GOD for fifteen hundred years, and was a notion so proper to explain the special nature of that mystery, as also to inflame the devotion of the faithful, and increase their veneration for the Sacrament and the whole ministration thereof. . . . And if I should ever write a book of it, as I think I now never shall, I would first treat of it as a Sacrifice, and then, as it is a Sacrament; and, with all due regard to many learned men, who have written of the LORD'S Supper only as a Sacrament, I take the freedom to say, that, how useful and excellent soever their books may otherwise be, yet, excluding the doctrine by T. S. for John Clark, 1656.<sup>1</sup> The worthy author, who then only styled himself Philo-Christianus, was Dr. William Brough, who, for his piety and learning, as well as great sufferings and loyalty, was promoted by King Charles I. to the deanery of Gloucester, and, after the restoration of king Charles II., had other preferments conferred upon him, which upon many accounts he deserved."—pp. xiii, xiv.

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 167—170.]

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 229—236.]

<sup>3</sup> [Citing Johnson, Potter, (vid. inf.) Biigham, &c.]

of the Sacrifice from their subject, I think they are deficient and imperfect works.

I have hitherto been showing, that it is no fault, but, on the contrary, what becomes a Christian writer, to bring this primitive, common, and consentient doctrine of the Catholic Church into books of devotion, and but that I foresee it would swell my preface beyond its bounds, I should show the same from the admirable prayers in the ancient Offices, which relate to the Lord's Supper as a Sacrifice. But this, I hope, may be done by another hand. I shall, therefore, only proceed to show, that the notion of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist is no stranger to the Communion devotions of the Church of England; for, as it was in the first Common Prayer Book of Edward the VIth. so is it now in her present liturgy . . . the old rubrick for the priest to set the bread and wine upon the holy table is restored, and the order of doing it is directed in this manner: "While the sentences" &c. . . This is one sort of offering, which may be made when there is no Communion. But, "when there is a Communion (saith the rubric) the priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient;" which is the other offering proper for the Communion, as being offered to be consecrated, and consumed in the celebration thereof. These two offerings being set in order upon the holy table, the priest is directed to say, "ALMIGHTY and ever living GOD . . . we humbly beseech Thee, most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations." I have already observed the difference that is, and is accordingly made by the Church, between these two material offerings, whereof the one is given, and presented upon the altar for pious and charitable uses, especially for the maintenance of the poor, but the other are dedicated and offered for the service of GOD in the holy Eucharist, and to that end to be consecrated into a memorial of the sufferings and Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, in remembrance of His death and Passion, and thereby become in the mystery, or Sacrament, the Body and Blood of CHRIST to the faithful receivers. This consecration of the OBLATIONS for the use of GOD's table and to be made His entertainment, is performed by solemn prayer<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Called in the Rubric the "Prayer of Consecration."

and rehearsing the words of the institution, at which the priest first takes the patin into his hands, and breaks the bread, and then lays his hand upon all the consecrated bread, which by consecration, as St. Ignatius calls it, becomes "the bread of God." Then, in like manner, he takes the cup into his hand, and lays his hand upon every vessel in which there is wine to be consecrated for the heavenly entertainment; and then receiving in both kinds himself, proceeds to deliver the same in order to the Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and the people, who are all entertained as guests at the LORD's table with the consecrated oblations, and, in partaking of them, are made partakers of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which they represent. In the Post-Communion, after the LORD's Prayer, the priest desires GOD of His fatherly goodness, "mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving:" which hath the same signification it had before when it was the Prayer of Oblation, out of which that Prayer is taken; I mean, the same special, and I may say technical signification it hath in the ancient Eucharistical Offices, to denote the Sacrifice of the bread and wine offered to be spent in that divine service. After this I need not say more in defence of the Eucharistical Sacrifice of bread and wine, nor of Mr. Nelson, or any other person for bringing the notion thereof into books of devotion, as I find Bishop Beveridge hath done in his Devotions at the end of his treatise of the "Necessity and Advantage of the Holy Communion." Where, after having declared the holy Eucharist not to be a "propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead," but only a Sacrifice "commemorative" and "declarative" of the Sacrifice which CHRIST once offered upon the Cross, and that it succeeded in the room of all the Jewish types, and representations of the death of CHRIST, and is our shew bread, our burnt offering, our sin offering, &c. . . . and all the offerings required of us, whereby to commemorate our LORD, and what he hath done for us<sup>1</sup>; I say, after all this, among the private Devotions there is this prayer: "Be pleased, O GOD, to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command that the prayers and supplications<sup>2</sup>;" &c.

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 230. 232. 3.]

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. p. 134.]

I must also take notice, that the Bishop, in these Devotions, calls the holy table the "altar," as in these inscriptions for his several Prayers: "Before going to the Altar;" "At going to the Altar;" "At prostrating before the Altar."—pp. lvii—lxiii.

Before I conclude, I cannot but observe how disingenuous those writers are, who misrepresent this doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice as dangerous; and as such endeavour to render it scandalous and odious to the people, as if it were the ready way, and so intended by the teachers of it, to introduce the Popish Sacrifice of the Mass, and bring the Church back to it again. Those, who have read "Canterbury's Doom," and the Charge of the Scottish Commissioners, will know very well, that I have just cause to make this reflection, and particular reason to put my adversaries in remembrance of it. But this is a most uncharitable and unjust charge, and where it is not the effect of ignorance, or insuperable preconception, it is the pure effect of malice: for there is no more alliance between the ancient doctrine of the "commemorative," or "representative Sacrifice" of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, and that of the "expiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead" in the Mass, than betwixt "reward" and "merit," or between the superiority of one Bishop over many Presbyters, and the supremacy of one chief universal Pontiff over all the Bishops of the Christian world. On the contrary, it is so far from being true that there is any consequence of this from that, that of the two, *that* is a bar to *this*, and neither is, nor can be, any more the same Sacrifice which CHRIST offered upon the Cross, than an ambassador is the king he represents, or a picture its prototype, or the representation of things, and persons, and actions, upon a stage, the things, and persons, and actions themselves. Wherefore the right understanding of the commemorative and representative Sacrifice in the Eucharist, is so far from reducing us to the Sacrifice of the Mass, that it secures us like a bulwark against it, and it is as impossible for men rightly instructed in it, to misconceive or mistake the one for the other, as it is for any donatory to imagine the deed of gift is the land which the donor gave him, or for a spectator of any dramatic action to think it the very history or reality which

it represents. The Church, then, can receive no damage or prejudice by this doctrine, as some men, and in particular my adversaries, seem to fear: on the contrary, it is a great benefit and advantage to her to be thought so primitive as to teach and practise it. For it is one of the objections which the Papists bring against us, that we have no Sacrifice, as may be observed from what I have before cited out of Archbishop Bramhall. And I can assure my adversaries, from good authority, that there is now a person of great quality in France, who is kept back by no other cause from coming to the Church of England, but that he is told "she hath no Sacrifice:" to which his learned correspondent here, who is one of the French ministers, in answer hath assured him, that the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England freely teach the doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, as it was taught and practised in the purest ages of the Catholic Church, which, I may presume, from the gentleman's objection, he understands very well.—pp. lxxi—lxxiii.

I must here say . . . that there is no reason why the Reformed should be afraid of believing the holy Eucharist to be a Sacrificial service, or the bread and wine to be the proper oblations of it, forasmuch as, according to the ancients before the eighth century, we teach them to be not the "real," but only the "mystical," or "sacramental" Body and Blood of CHRIST. There is, therefore, a very plain and intelligible difference between the Eucharist's being the Sacrifice of the real Body and Blood of CHRIST, and its being a real Sacrifice of His mystical Body and Blood. They are inconsistent and impossible one with the other, because mystical and real differ as much as the substance and its shadow, the verity and its type, or a thing of any sort or kind from the thing that is its image. All this is comprehended in the distinction betwixt "mystical" and "real;" the one as I have said is a contradiction and bar to the other, and therefore great must be their ignorance or prejudice who cannot distinguish the pure Primitive from the Popish doctrine of the Eucharist, and where ignorance or prejudice is not in the case, it must be evil designs and passions that make divines especially inveigh against their brethren, who teach the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper to be

the representative Sacrifice of CHRIST'S mystical Body and Blood. Whether or no my adversaries be men of the latter sort, I leave it to their readers to judge . . . In the mean time, I shall believe the holy Eucharist to be an unbloody Sacrifice, and of a sacrificial nature for the seal and sanction of the new Covenant, in the whole ministration, and all the parts and rites of it, from presenting the bread and wine to GOD upon the Altar, to the consumption of them in the holy, federal, and sacrificial feast; and that this notion of it is most suitable to the Evangelical Covenant, as a seal and sanction thereof, and altogether worthy of the New and royal Law, and of its one Lawgiver, the antitypal Moses, our LORD JESUS CHRIST. And as I believe it to be a doctrine and institution most agreeable to Christianity, as the mystical Judaism, to have one Sacrifice succeed in the room of all the Jewish Sacrifices, so I think it very proper not only to illustrate the nature of the holy Eucharist as a Sacrament, but to render the mystery more tremendous and adorable, and the Christian priesthood more venerable, and the devotion of the faithful more flaming both before, at, and after the holy Communion, as furnishing them with special and proper matter not only for holy and comfortable meditations, but for prayers and praises to the FATHER, and intercessions with Him in the name of His SON JESUS CHRIST, and of the Holy Ghost, to whom with the FATHER in the unity of the Trinity, be all honour, worship, and glory, now and ever. Amen.—pp. lxxx—lxxxiii.

I hope I have now said enough to make it appear, that all the ancient Churches believed the bread and wine to be the proper subject matter of the Christian oblation in the holy Eucharist, or the sensible things which they really offered and believed, ought to be really offered to GOD in that holy service, for the sacrificial feast, and by consequence, that they thought it to be an outward Sacrifice properly so called.—“*Account*” *prefatory to the third edit.* pp. iv, v.

It hath the honour above all the Sacrifices that ever were, to be the representative of the Sacrifice of the Cross; and the value and dignity of it above all other Sacrifices, consists in being the representative of that propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of the

whole world. It was instituted by our LORD for that noble and adorable purpose; and, therefore, were I to define the Eucharistical Sacrifice, it should be in these forms: The Eucharistical Sacrifice is an oblation of bread and wine, instituted by JESUS CHRIST, to represent and commemorate His Sacrifice upon the Cross. Wherefore, to represent and commemorate the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, being the great end of its institution, and the special part of its definition, by which it differs from, and is dignified above all other Sacrifices, it may be said of it in this respect, "We offer a Sacrifice, or rather the remembrance of a Sacrifice;" without meaning that it is not a proper Sacrifice, but only intending to set forth its super-eminent dignity above all other Sacrifices, in being instituted for a remembrance of the Sacrifice of CHRIST.—pp. xxxiii. xxxiv.

I have been necessitated to write all this upon mentioning the additions which I have made in this edition of my book, to what I had said, in the former, of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, but now I have done for ever with that subject, and with all others that will require such labour and study as, through age and infirmities, I am no longer able to endure. If it meets with any more opposition, I leave the further defence of it to those learned younger divines, or students of Divinity, who are conversant in the ancient writers of the Church. God, of His mercy to it, increase the number of them.—p. xxxv.

COMBER, PRESBYTER.—*Companion to the Altar.*

Whatsoever benefits we now enjoy, or hope hereafter to receive from ALMIGHTY GOD, they were all purchased by the death, and must be obtained through the intercession of the Holy JESUS. And for a perpetual memorial thereof, we are not only taught to mention His Name in our daily prayers, John xiv. 13. and xv. 16. but are also commanded by visible signs to commemorate and set forth His Passion in the LORD'S Supper, 1 Cor. xi. 26. wherein, by a more forcible rite of intercession, we beg the divine acceptance. That which is more compendiously expressed in the conclusion of our prayers, "through JESUS CHRIST our LORD," is more fully and more vigorously set out in this most holy

Sacrament ; wherein we intercede on earth in imitation of, and conjunction with the great intercession of our High Priest in heaven ; pleading here in the virtue and merits of the same Sacrifice which He doth urge there for us. And because of this sympathy and near alliance between these two offices of praying and communicating, we find the Eucharist in the purest ages of the Church, was a daily companion of their Common Prayer.—*Introd.*

As the people of Israel were wont to bring their gifts and sacrifices to the Temple, and by the hands of the priest to present them to ALMIGHTY GOD, so are we appointed to give our oblations into the hands of the Minister of CHRIST, who by virtue of his office may best recommend them with prayers and praises to the Majesty of Heaven ; and yet we must not neglect to join with him in these supplications, both to beg the acceptance of our offering, and to shew that our charity extendeth farther than our alms can reach, for the benefit of these is received only by a few of our neighbours, but we ought to love all the world, especially our Christian brethren, even those who do not need, or cannot have profit by our gifts. And how can we express this better, than by recommending them all to the mercies of God, who is able to relieve them all, and of whose bounty all have need ? Which excellent duty, though it be to be done daily, yet at this holy Sacrament it is most proper, because we here behold the universal love of JESUS, and are declared lively members of His mystical body, and conjoined in the strictest bonds of union with all our fellow Christians. Besides, when can we more effectually intercede with God for the whole Church, than when we represent and shew forth that most meritorious Passion on earth, by the virtue whereof our great High Priest did once redeem, and doth ever plead for His whole Church even now that He is in heaven ? This Sacrament, therefore, hath been accounted the “great intercession ;” and accordingly all the ancient Liturgies did use such universal intercessions and supplications while this mystery was in hand, and in the time of St. Cyril there was a prayer used, exactly agreeing with this <sup>1</sup> of our Church. St. Chrysostom also saith, that the priest standing at the altar, did

<sup>1</sup> [The Prayer for the Church Militant.]



“offer prayers and praises for all the world, for those that are absent, and those that are present, for those that were before us, and those that shall be after us, while that Sacrifice is set forth.” Hom. 26. in Matt. For which cause our Communion Office in the Rubric before this Prayer, appoints the bread and wine to be set upon the table first, and then stirs us all up with that solemn “Let us pray for the whole estate of CHRIST’s Church,” &c. And if, as we are worshipping without, we remember Him that is praying within the veil, and, by imitating His general charity, do unite our supplications to His all powerful intercession, we may no doubt obtain the largest and the choicest blessings in the treasures of heaven.—pp. 78, 9.

Let us then, with all possible devotion, offer up this Sacrifice, and delight in this pious and prudent intercession, which is enjoined by Him that purposes to grant it, and presented by charitable souls, who will infinitely rejoice in the success thereof, viz. the prosperity of the whole Church.—p. 83.

“Beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord :”] Among the several prayers which were made at the holy table, it was particularly enjoined that they should pray for “the holy Catholic Church, extended from one end of the earth to the other, which the LORD had redeemed with the precious Blood of Christ,” saith the author of the Apostolical Constitutions; for the Sacrifice here commemorated was offered for the Church, Acts xx. 28. which is called the body of Christ, Eph. v. 23. Col. i. 24.—p. 85.

“Grant this, O FATHER, for JESUS CHRIST’s sake, our only Mediator and Advocate; Amen.”] This general conclusion of all our prayers we should not remark particularly here, but that the Mass hath thrust in the names of the Blessed Virgin, and other Saints into this supplication, through whose merits and prayers they intercede, even in this place, where there is a lively commemoration of the death of CHRIST our only Mediator, which is not only the holding a candle to the sun, but seems to intimate, that to plead in the virtue of our LORD’s Passion is not sufficient; and that His intercession, by which the Holy Virgin, and all other Saints, became accepted by GOD, was not alone forcible

enough. But we desire no other Mediator, nor need no other Advocate (1 Tim. ii. 5) but our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who is here represented; nor do we doubt to ask all these mercies for all these persons, since we approach our heavenly FATHER with His dear and only beloved SON in our arms. Wherefore let us bless the Name of GOD, who hath chosen such a Master of Requests to present our prayers, and put such an argument in our mouths, when we approach unto Him. Let us look to the holy symbols, and remember our great High Priest, while we offer up the intercessions with a great humility, and a sprightly devotion, because our GOD will not, nay, cannot deny those that thus come unto Him.—p. 100.

The nearer we approach to these mysteries, the greater reverence we must express. The very heathen could say, men should be always best when they came to the gods, and therefore so much better, by how much they come nearer; our late rejoicing might savour of too much confidence, if it were not allayed with this act of humility, which is the immediate address to this holy Feast: ["We do not presume," &c.] There is somewhat agreeable to this, some apology, or acknowledgment, in all ancient Liturgies, but that of St. James comes the nearest to this of ours. "I come to this divine and super-celestial mystery, unworthy, indeed, but relying on thy goodness." And afterwards: "Turn not away from us sinners, who are celebrating this dreadful and unbloody Sacrifice, for we trust not in our own righteousness, but in Thy bountiful mercy," &c.—p. 243.

After all this preparation, we need not ask with Isaac, Gen. xxii. 7. "where is the lamb for the burnt offering?" for GOD hath provided his own dear SON, whose Blood, being already spilt, is so efficacious and all-sufficient that there is now no need of any other but this unbloody Sacrifice to be offered, and that in memorial of that great sin-offering which taketh away the sins of the world, 1 Pet. ii. 5. And for this purpose CHRIST Himself hath appointed these creatures of bread and wine, ordaining that, because they are designed to express so great a mystery, they shall have a peculiar consecration. . . . The Jews would not eat of the Sacrifice till Samuel came to bless it, 1 Sam. ix. 13.

How much more then ought we to expect the prayers of the priest over this mysterious food of our souls, before we eat thereof! especially since JESUS Himself did not deliver this bread and wine until He had consecrated it by giving thanks.—pp. 252, 3.

“And thus by thine own appointment, dearest JESUS, we do shew our thankfulness for Thy Passion, our faith in Thy resurrection, and our hope of Thy second coming. We will commemorate Thy all-sufficient Sacrifice before the ALMIGHTY to pacify His anger against us; before the world, to testify our hope in a crucified SAVIOUR; and before ourselves, to renew our sense of Thy inexpressible love.”—p. 274.

COLLIER, BISHOP AND CONFESSOR.—*Reasons, &c.*

The oblatory prayer goes upon this ground, that the holy Eucharist is a proper Sacrifice; and that our blessed SAVIOUR, at His last Supper, offered the bread and wine to GOD the FATHER, as the symbols of His Body and Blood, and commanded His Apostles to do the same. And since this truth is not contested amongst us, since 'tis plainly proved from Scripture, by Dr. Hickes, since the subject is exhausted to the utmost satisfaction by the learned Mr. Johnson<sup>1</sup>, we need only touch upon this argument.—p. 27.

NELSON, CONFESSOR.—*The great duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice.*

First, I shall inquire into those obligations that lie upon all Christians to receive the holy Communion, and to frequent the Christian Sacrifice.

The first argument for the performance of this Christian duty arises from the positive command of our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, the Author of our Religion. . . . Now that our SAVIOUR has made it the duty of all Christians to frequent this commemora-

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. inf.]

tive Sacrifice, is plain from the history of its institution, in the close of which our SAVIOUR adds this positive injunction, "Do this in remembrance of Me;" by which, as the holy Apostles were obliged to do to others as our SAVIOUR had done to them, *viz.* to bless, break, and give the bread to all that joined with them in these holy Services; so were all Christians hereby engaged to receive from them and their successors, these symbols of CHRIST'S Body and Blood. By this precept, therefore, the Communion of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, as represented by bread and wine in the holy Sacrament, is made the standing memorial of His death and sufferings in all Christian assemblies to the end of the world.—pp. 4—6.

The second argument for the performance of this Christian duty arises from the nature of the duty itself. It is a piece of worship appropriated to the Christian religion, by which in a peculiar manner we profess ourselves followers of the Blessed JESUS. The Heathens and Mahometans offer up prayers and praises to GOD, and by the light of nature apply themselves to infinite Power for the relief of their necessities, and return their thanks to infinite Goodness, as the source from whence they receive all their blessings. The Jews, by slaying of beasts, and by burning incense, invocated GOD, and praised and blessed Him for those mercies of which they partook. But Christians only set before GOD bread and wine in the Eucharist, "as figures or images of the precious Blood of CHRIST shed for us, and of His precious Body," as it is expressed in the Clementine Liturgy. And, therefore, we cannot be said so properly to worship as Christians, as when we join in those sacred mysteries that CHRIST has made peculiar to His own religion; and it cannot be imagined, that it should be at our own disposal, whether we would perform it or no, when it was ordained as the peculiar service of Christians, to distinguish them from all other worshippers of the Deity; and as the principal act whereby we partake of the Sacrifice of CHRIST made upon the Cross, and without which our public service wants its due perfection. Upon which account the primitive Christians (at least for a time in some places) on

no day held their public assemblies without this Christian Sacrifice.—pp. 7, 8.

The third argument for the frequent performance of this Christian duty arises from the great benefits that are annexed to the worthy participation of this holy Ordinance. By the nature of our circumstances in this world, we are surrounded with variety of temptations, no condition of life being free from the assaults of our spiritual enemies; so that it but too frequently happens, that we become a prey to their attempts, and are prevailed upon to transgress our duty. Now when we are brought to a sense of our follies, and our souls are pierced with an unfeigned sorrow for having committed them; what surer method have we to procure our pardon from God, than by showing forth the Lord's death, by representing His bitter Passion to the FATHER, that so He would, for His sake, according to the tenour of His Covenant in Him, be favourable and propitious to us miserable sinners?—pp. 10, 11.

Secondly, I shall show what preparation is necessary to perform this duty after an acceptable manner. . . .

The first part of preparation consists in the informing ourselves carefully in the nature and end of this sacred institution, enquiring what is meant by this holy action, and to what purpose this blessed Sacrament was ordained. This necessary knowledge, once attained, is a standing qualification in all our future Communion; and, therefore, we ought to take the pains to settle right notions in our minds concerning this matter, because they will be serviceable to us in all the remaining part of our lives. In order to this purpose it will be necessary to read over the history of the institution of this Christian Sacrifice, as recorded by the Evangelists, and by St. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians, who received what he taught in this matter by a divine revelation. [Matt. xxvi. 17. 26. Mark xiv. 12. 22. Luke xxii. 7. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24.] . . . . From which places it will appear, that when our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST celebrated the Jewish Sacrifice of the Passover, with His disciples, a little before His sufferings, He substituted the Sacrament of His Body and

Blood, as the true Christian Sacrifice, in the room of the Pass-over; and ordained it as a rite to invoke His FATHER by instead of the manifold and bloody Sacrifices of the Law, and to be a means of supplication and address to God in the New Testament, as they were in the Old. To which end our SAVIOUR first offers up the creatures of bread and wine to God, as an acknowledgment of His sovereignty, by taking the bread and wine into His sacred hands, by looking up to heaven, and giving thanks, and then by blessing the elements, He makes them the symbols of His Body and Blood, and distributed them to His disciples, to eat and drink them in commemoration of Him. So that the design of instituting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, was to constitute a Christian Sacrifice, wherein God mystically entertains man at His own table, in token of amity and friendship with Him; which that He might do, the bread and the wine are offered to God, to acknowledge Him Lord of the creatures; and accordingly, in the ancient Church, they were laid on the table by the priest (as they are still ordered to be done by the Rubric in the Church of England) and tendered to God by this short prayer, "Lord, we offer Thy own out of what Thou hast bountifully given us;" which by consecration being made symbols of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, we thereby represent to God the FATHER the Passion of His SON, to the end that He may, for His sake, according to the tenour of His Covenant in Him, be favourable and propitious to us miserable sinners; that, as CHRIST intercedes continually for us in heaven, by presenting His death and satisfaction to His FATHER, so the Church on earth, in like manner, may approach the throne of grace, by representing CHRIST unto His FATHER in these holy mysteries of His death and Passion; that what every Christian does mentally and vocally, when he recommends his prayers to God the FATHER through JESUS CHRIST, making mention of His death and satisfaction, that, in the public service of the Church, is done by this rite, which our SAVIOUR commanded in commemoration of Him.—pp. 14—19.

The second part of preparation consists in those pious disposi-

tions of mind, which qualify us to receive this Sacrament after a worthy manner, and make us fit guests at the LORD's table. And therefore when we plead the merits of CHRIST's death and Passion before GOD the FATHER in this Christian Sacrifice, it ought to be accompanied with a most thankful acknowledgment of those great blessings our SAVIOUR has purchased for us by His sufferings, and with a public proclaiming to all the world the great sense we have of such invaluable kindness. . . with a readiness of mind to be reconciled to all those that have offended us, because "when we were enemies we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON." Rom. v. 19;—with hearty and sincere love and charity to our brethren. . . . Indeed charity, and good will towards all men, was always thought so necessary a qualification for the celebration of this Christian Sacrifice, that, in the ancient Church, at the very entrance thereunto, the Deacon was wont to proclaim, "Let no man have ought against his brother:" and this practice was founded upon our SAVIOUR's ordinance, in His divine Sermon upon the mount, "If thou bringest thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Which Scripture, in the sense of the primitive Church, was taken to be an evangelical constitution, implied by way of anticipation, that our SAVIOUR would leave some rite to His Church, instead and after the manner of the Law, which should begin with an oblation, as they did; and that, to require this proper and peculiar qualification in the offerer, to be at peace, and without enmity with his brother; insomuch that Irenæus seems to place that purity of the evangelical oblation, prophesied of by Malachi, principally in this requisite.—pp. 31—35.

They that are acquainted with Ecclesiastical history, know very well that the Eucharist, in the purest ages of the Church, made a part of their public service; and when the devotion of Christians began to decline, they yet always upon the LORD's day celebrated the Christian Sacrifice. Our Second Service at the altar seems defective without a conformable practice to anti-

quity in this point, and the holy exercises of the LORD's day appear to want their due perfection without these Eucharistical devotions. . . .

To this holy end and purpose I have endeavoured by proper arguments to press the duty of frequent communion upon the consciences of men; for all those motives that persuade us to communicate at all, ought to prevail upon us to do it often; and it appears to me very plain, that no sincere Christian, not otherwise lawfully hindered, can justify going out of the Church when the Christian Sacrifice is celebrated; nor is there any pretence or excuse sufficiently valid for a man that is in earnest with religion, to turn his back upon the holy table, when the heavenly banquet is there prepared. . . .

I have particularly taken care to show that this Christian institution was ordained not only to put us in mind of those great blessings which our SAVIOUR purchased for us by His death,—for what man, that reflects upon his Christianity, can easily forget them?—but that it was also established as a sacred rite to supplicate GOD the FATHER by the merits of our SAVIOUR's Passion, representing to Him the images of His Body and Blood, that thereby He may become favourable and propitious to us. This sense of it is agreeable to Scripture, as it was understood by those who lived nearest to the times of the Apostles; and has been evidently proved by the learned, judicious, and pious Mr. Mede. *Preface.*

*A Prayer to prepare our minds for the devout celebration of the Holy Mysteries.*

Almighty GOD, by whose great bounty and infinite goodness I have now an opportunity offered me of approaching Thy altar, and of pleading before Thee the prevailing merits of the death and Passion of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST; I am sensible, O LORD, of my great unworthiness to partake of this Christian Sacrifice; but the positive command of my blessed SAVIOUR, when He was about to lay down His life for my sake, has made it absolutely necessary; and the many spiritual wants I labour



under, oblige me to apply to this sovereign remedy to repair those breaches my sinful follies have made in my soul.

Assist me, therefore, O LORD, with Thy Holy Spirit, in the duty and service I am about to perform. . . .

That I may have . . . such a faith in that full perfect oblation and satisfaction made upon the Cross for the sins of the world, that I may so importunately plead the merit of it in this commemoration of that Sacrifice, as to render Thee gracious and propitious to me a miserable sinner. . . .—pp. 74—76.

When the offertory is finished, the priest desires GOD to accept of our alms, and of those oblations of bread and wine which he is now about to consecrate, whereby they may become to us the Body and Blood of CHRIST; in which we are to join with the greater fervour, because we are so particularly concerned in the acceptance of the holy gifts. And at this time it is that we exercise another sort of charity, by offering up our intercessions for the Church militant, for all estates and conditions of men, that GOD would be pleased to hear us for them, by virtue of the Sacrifice of HIS SON, which we are about to commemorate. And we now thank GOD for all His servants departed this life in His faith and fear, because it is by virtue of the same Sacrifice they will obtain their perfect consummation and bliss. How conformable this is to the practice of the ancient Church, is well known to those who are skilled in Ecclesiastical history.—pp. 91, 92.

—After this comes the Prayer of Consecration, the most ancient and essential part of this Eucharistical worship, because it is by the prayer and authority of GOD's lawful minister, that the offerings of bread and wine become to us symbols of the Body and Blood of CHRIST. . . .

*A Prayer immediately after Consecration.*

Accept, O Eternal GOD, of that representation we make before Thee, of that all-sufficient Sacrifice which Thy SON our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST made upon the Cross; let the merit of it plead

effectually for the pardon and forgiveness of all my sins, and render Thee favourable and propitious to me, a miserable sinner. . .  
—pp. 97—99.

Having finished those devotions that relate to ourselves, this is a proper season to be mindful of the wants and necessities of our brethren, and we cannot better exercise our charity, than by recommending the whole state of mankind to the mercy and goodness of God, and by interceding with Him, by the virtue of this Christian Sacrifice, for a supply of whatever they shall stand in need of. Such intercessions always made a part of the public Liturgies of the ancient Church, as is well known to those that are conversant in antiquity, and no part of the prayers exceeded more in length than that which related to this subject; so that we cannot do better, than to follow the ancient model for our direction in this particular.

*A Prayer for the whole State of Mankind.*

Accept, O LORD, of my prayers and intercessions, as a testimony of my charity for the whole race of mankind, and let the virtue and efficacy of this Christian Sacrifice, procure for them comfort and relief in all those wants and necessities they labour under. . . .

That thus commemorating His all-sufficient Sacrifice upon earth, we may receive the benefit of it in Thy heavenly kingdom, and bless and praise Thee for it to all eternity. Amen.—pp. 128, 129. 133.

WAKE, ARCHBISHOP.—*Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England.*

When GOD delivered the children of Israel out of Egypt, He instituted the Passover to be a continual remembrance of that great deliverance. In like manner, our blessed SAVIOUR being now about to work out a much greater deliverance for us, by offering up Himself upon the Cross for our redemption, He designed by this Sacrament to continue the memory of this blessing; that, "as often as we eat of this bread and drink

of this cup, we might show forth the LORD's death till His coming."

That this Sacrament, instituted for the like end which the Passover had been, and now for ever to succeed in its place, might be both the better understood, and the easier received by them, it pleased our blessed LORD to accommodate Himself, as near as was possible, to the ceremonies and phrases they had before been used to. He retained the symbols, and even the expressions they had so long been acquainted with ; only He changed the application of them to a new and more excellent remembrance.

—p. 49.

And, 1, We desire it may be observed, that the peace offerings under the law, were designed as an acknowledgment on the people's part for those temporal blessings which it pleased God to bestow upon them. And because, after the sacrifice of Isaac, God first entered into the covenant with Abraham, and promised him His blessing, and to be his God, and the God of his seed after him ; it seems to have been further their intention, in all these Sacrifices, to call to remembrance that offering of Isaac, as a foundation of all those blessings for which these sacrifices were appointed, as a testimony of their gratitude.

2. That though the Passover, like the Sacrifice of the Cross, was offered as a sin-offering for the delivery of the first-born in the land of Egypt, yet that yearly remembrance of it, which God afterwards established, was always esteemed a peace offering ; and indeed the perpetual order of their Sacrifices clearly demonstrates that it could be no other.

So that the parallel, therefore, for the explaining the nature of the holy Eucharist, must be this :—

1. That as the Jews ate of their peace-offerings in general, to call to mind the Sacrifice of Isaac, and give God thanks for those blessings they received by it, and of that of the Passover in particular, in memory of God's delivering them out of Egypt ; so the Christians partake of this blessed Sacrament, in memory of that deliverance which the Sacrifice of the Cross of CHRIST, whom both Isaac and the Paschal lamb typified, has purchased for them.

2. That as the peace offering which the Jews ate, was not changed into the substance of that first Sacrifice whereof it was the remembrance, but was eaten as a figure or commemoration of it; so the Christians in their Sacrament are not to think the bread and wine, which CHRIST has appointed to be our peace offering, should be changed into the very substance of that Body which was offered for us upon the Cross, but to be received only as types of it. For thus was the peace offering in general a type of Isaac, and the Passover in particular the type of that first lamb which was slain for their deliverance in the land of Egypt.

When, therefore, Monsieur de Meaux tells us, that the Jews ate the proper flesh of their peace offering, we answer, that so do we the proper substance of ours; we eat the bread which CHRIST appointed to be the remembrance of that deliverance which He has purchased for us, as the body of the Lamb was commanded by God to be the remembrance of theirs.—pp. 51, 52.

A third consequence of the corporeal presence of CHRIST in the holy Eucharist, is the Sacrifice of the Mass; in which we ought to proceed with all the caution such a point requires as both makes up the chiefest part of the Popish worship, and is justly esteemed one of the greatest and most dangerous errors that offends us.

Monsieur de Meaux has represented it to us with so much tenderness, that, except perhaps it be his foundation of the corporeal presence, on which he builds, and his consequence, that this service is a true and real propitiatory Sacrifice, which his manner of expounding it we are persuaded will never bear, there is little in it besides, but what we could readily assent to.

We distinguish the two acts which he mentions, from one another. By the consecration, we apply the elements, before common, to a sacred use; by the manducation, we fulfil our SAVIOUR'S command; "we take, and eat, and do this in remembrance of Him."

This consecration, being separately made, of His Body broken, His Blood spilt for our redemption, we suppose represents to us our blessed Lord in the figure of His death, which these holy

symbols were instituted to continue the memory of. And whilst thus with faith we represent to God the death of His Son, for the pardon of our sins; we are persuaded, that we incline His mercy the more readily to forgive them.

We do not, therefore, doubt, but that this presenting to God ALMIGHTY this Sacrifice of our blessed LORD, is a most effectual manner of applying His merits to us. Were this all the Church of Rome meant by her propitiatory Sacrifice, there is not certainly any Protestant that would oppose her in it.

Where is that Christian, that does not by faith unite himself to his SAVIOUR in this holy Communion?—that does not present Him to God as his only Sacrifice and propitiation?—that does not protest that he has nothing to offer Him but JESUS CHRIST, and the merits of His death?—that consecrates not all his prayers by this divine offering? and, whilst he thus presents to God the Sacrifice of His Son, does not learn thereby to present also himself a lively Sacrifice, holy, and acceptable in His sight?

This is, no doubt, a Sacrifice worthy a Christian, infinitely exceeding all the Sacrifices of the law; where the knife is the wood, the blood not shed but in a figure, nor is there any death but in representation; a Sacrifice so far from taking us off from that of the Cross, that it unites us the more closely to it, represents it to us, and derives all its virtue and efficacy from it.

This is, if any other, truly the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and such as the Church of England has never refused; and except it be our doubt of the corporeal presence, Monsieur de Meaux had certainly reason to expect that there was nothing in this we could justly except against.—pp. 62—64.

JOHNSON, PRESBYTER.—*Propitiatory Oblation in the Holy Eucharist*<sup>1</sup>.

The impartial reader will not entertain any prejudice against

<sup>1</sup> Published anonymously.

this treatise for coming abroad without a name, if he do but consider how dangerous it is for any man openly to plead on that side of the cause, for which I have declared in my title-page. A very learned divine <sup>1</sup> has been sometimes slyly pointed at, sometimes in words at length reproached, for being inclined to Popery, because he had freely declared his mind to this purpose. His adversary is not content to hint his suspicion once, or twice, but repeats it almost twenty times in one book, consisting of little more than two hundred pages; and I do not think it necessary to give opportunity to such men, to mark me out for destruction, by branding me with that infamous character.—p. 1.

But the judicious reader will give me leave to observe, that the learned Bishop Taylor and the incomparable Mr. Mede could see no Popery in this doctrine, and those books of theirs wherein they expressly assert it, have maintained their reputation to as high a degree as most others written in that age. . . . And that this opinion is consistent with a very extraordinary degree of zeal against the Church of Rome, appears by the example of Mr. Mede, who was not more remarkable for his industry in asserting the Christian sacrifice, than in his laborious proofs that the Church of Rome is the Anti-Christian Church. And I think no divine has more distinguished himself on this subject, than this admirable man.

But that I may clear not only these great men, but the doctrine itself from all just imputation of Popery, I shall first show the erroneous judgment of the Church of Rome as to this particular, and then lay before the reader that doctrine concerning the oblation in the Eucharist, which I think deserves to be embraced and defended by all that have any regard to antiquity, or even the institution of CHRIST JESUS himself.

1. The Papists hold, That, in the sacrifice of the Mass, the whole CHRIST, God and Man, is offered up hypostatically to the FATHER in the Eucharist, and is to be worshipped there by men under the species of bread and wine. This doctrine is utterly

<sup>1</sup> [Dr. Hicques.]

renounced by all Protestants ; by those who assert the Eucharistical oblation, as well as those who deny it.

2. The Papists assert the substantial presence of CHRIST's body and blood, under the species of bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist ; and that the Sacrifice of the Cross and Altar are substantially the same. But this is peremptorily denied by those who declare for the oblation of the Eucharist in the Church of England.

3. The Papists do maintain, That the sacrifice of the Mass is available for remission of sins to the dead, as well as to the living. And as this is not asserted by any of our Church, so it is heartily detested by the Author of this Treatise.

4. The Papists have private masses, in which the Priest pretends to make the oblation without distributing either the Body or Blood to the people ; nay, without any people attending : and they have many hundred such masses to one communion, and all this is expressly justified by the Council of Trent, Sess. xxii. c. vi., though it be contrary to Scripture, and the practice of the primitive Church, and to several expressions even in their own Mass Book, which suppose the people to be present. All this is condemned by those who defend the Eucharistical Oblation here in England.

I need not tell the learned reader, that the opinions here renounced, are they which make the Mass a Sacrifice so odious in the sight of God, and of all well-informed Christians. On the other side it will appear by the following discourse,

1. That not the divinity and human soul of CHRIST JESUS, but his Body and Blood only, are offered in the Eucharist.

2. That not his substantial, but sacramental Body and Blood are there offered.

3. That the oblation of the Eucharist is a representer of that of the Cross, and therefore can be only for the sins of the living ; for the representer cannot have a greater efficacy than the principal.

4. That the Eucharist is a Feast as well as a Sacrifice, and that the symbols are to be eaten and drunk, as well as offered to God ;

and this is what needs no other proof, but the words of institution, "Take, eat, this is my body," and "Drink ye all of this."

As what is here laid down makes a wide difference between the sacrifice of the Mass, and the primitive Oblation, which I am now defending; so I cannot but say, that the approbation of this doctrine is so far from being for the interest or service of Popery, that it may be a very proper means to bring over the more sensible and judicious part of the Papists to the Communion of our Church. For the Eucharistical oblation is so clearly to be demonstrated from the most primitive antiquity, and so well grounded on Scripture, that men who have senses exercised, and are capable of perusing the ancient records of Christianity, cannot but discern it, and are therefore averse from communion with that church, which is by some unwarily represented as an enemy to this doctrine.—pp. 4—6.

I shall explain and defend this notion,

I. By showing, that propitiation was of old made by offering other material things besides animals.

II. I shall give some proofs from Scripture, that the Eucharist was intended to be such a propitiatory oblation.

III. That the primitive Church did understand the Eucharist to be a propitiatory oblation.

IV. And that our Church may very aptly be understood to mean the same.

V. I shall answer the objections against this doctrine.

I. Propitiation was of old made by other material things, as well as animals. By propitiation, I do not only mean pardon of sin; but in general, rendering the Divine Majesty more propitious to us. . . .

1. That sin might be expiated by other material things, under the law, besides animals, appears from Numb. xvi. 46, 47, where Aaron at Moses's command makes an atonement for the sins of the people with incense only; and the table for incense is always called an altar, Exod. xl. 5. and all the parallel texts. Philo (*De Victim. offerend.*) does not only prefer the altar of incense to the altar of burnt-offering, but even the oblation of incense before that of bloody sacrifices. . . .



2. Oblations were made, not only for the expiation of sin, but in general, to make the Divine Majesty more propitious. . . . The shew-bread was a continual *mincha*, though renewed every week. It was to "be set in order before the LORD continually by an everlasting covenant, by a perpetual statute." Lev. xxiv. 8, 9. . . . They were to be placed before the LORD, and not before the Israelites. And further, the memorial was made by burning the frankincense, which was put upon them "for an offering made by fire unto the LORD." Lev. xxiv. 7. And it would be strange indeed, if the priests should burn incense, and make offerings to the people. And here I may very seasonably desire the reader to observe the use and nature of a "memorial." The Greeks render it here *Ἀνάμνησις*, which is the very same word that our SAVIOUR was pleased to use in the institution of His Supper. Whenever a *mincha* was offered, some part of it was burnt, and this part was called the "memorial," as Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16. . . .—pp. 11—13.

I proceed to show,

II. That the Eucharist is such a propitiatory oblation; and this will appear probable in the highest degree from the Scriptures of the New Testament. And here, to take away all just occasion of dispute, I declare, that I mean not, that the offered bread and wine have any propitiatory virtue of themselves to take away sin, or to confer grace. 'Tis true, all gifts and offerings are designed in a larger sense to procure the divine favour, to be an *εὐωδία*, an oblation of a sweet smelling savour to GOD; not only those offered under the law, but those Sacrifices offered by Noah, Gen. viii. 20. But the bread and wine, in the Sacrament, are not only a *mincha*, but by consecration made a representation of the great Sacrifice on the Cross, and on that account propitiatory in the most proper sense, and may therefore be called a Sacrifice, as a representative may justly be called by the name of its principal.

1. The bread and wine in the Sacrament are an oblation. Now the solemn placing them on the holy table, and in vessels set apart for that only use, doth sufficiently show, that they are separated for divine service. Further, to "eat and drink," in a religious manner and with solemn rites, "before the LORD," is a

phrase equivalent to the making an oblation. Thus Deut. xv. 19, 20. the Israelites are commanded "to eat the firstlings of the flocks and of the herds before the LORD;" and this is called, "giving," or "offering them to God," Exod. xxii. 29, 30. And perhaps no better account can be given of the elders "eating and drinking," when they "saw the God of Israel," Exod. xxiv. 10, 11. than that they did solemnly eat of those oblations, which they had brought with them to present by Moses to their King and their God. . . . And when 'tis said of the idolatrous Israelites, that they "eat upon the mountains," Ezek. xviii. 11. no one doubts but the meaning of it is, that they there made their oblations to their false gods. And since it is, I think, allowed on all hands, that the Eucharist is a service performed to, or before God, and is of right attended with a solemn eating and drinking in the Divine Presence, this, according to the notions of those countries in which the Eucharist was instituted, does imply it to be an oblation made to God. And further, 'tis most likely, that the bread and wine in which CHRIST first celebrated the Eucharist, had been actually offered in the Temple. For it has already been proved, that the Passover which our SAVIOUR and his Apostles had just before been eating, was a Sacrifice; and it is clear, that every sort of Sacrifice had a meat and drink-offering of course attending it.—pp. 14—16.

2. Another proof, that the Eucharist is a proper oblation, we have from the prophet Malachi. . . . Mal. i. 11. and there is no prophecy more unanimously applied to the times of the Messiah by the primitive teachers of Christianity.—p. 16.

2. A third argument to prove the Eucharistical oblation, is taken from the words of our SAVIOUR, Matt. v. 23, 24. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar," &c.

Confiding in the strength of Mr. Mede's reasons for proving that this is an evangelical precept, I need not use many words to show, that our Christian oblation, or *mincha*, may from hence be fairly concluded to be intended by CHRIST JESUS himself.

1. Our SAVIOUR supposes His disciple's bringing some material gift, or something to be offered on the altar, and which he could leave behind him, while he went to be reconciled to his brother.

2. It must denote a gift to be presented to Almighty God, and thereby dedicated to His service in a special manner ;

3. And therefore unquestionably the oblations made by Christians at the holy table ; except our adversaries can show us any other material oblation any where else made in the primitive Christian Church.

The learned reader need not be told, that Christians, in the Apostolical times, made their oblations for public uses every time they met for worship, and that out of these oblations the bread and wine for the sacrament were taken. . . . . and this is a clear demonstration that the bread and wine, among the rest of the gifts, were offered up to GOD, before they were consecrated for symbols of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, and that the practice of the primitive Church is the best gloss on these words of our blessed SAVIOUR.

Nay, further, we have here a clear account why the Christian oblation is by Malachi styled "a pure mincha," viz. because, as Mr. Mede has long ago observed, it is to be offered with purity of conscience, and freedom from malice, which is that singular purity, by which the Christian oblation differs from that of the Jews, who, as has been observed, were not prohibited to offer Sacrifices, and other gifts, though they were at enmity with one another.—pp. 18—23.

II. Having proved that the Eucharistical bread and wine are an oblation to be offered upon the Christian altar, I proceed to show that they are a propitiatory oblation. And

1. This will, I think, evidently follow from the very nature of an oblation presented upon the altar ; unless our adversaries can make it appear that there ever was any Sacrifice or oblation so offered, which was not propitiatory. I do not say, that every Sacrifice and oblation so offered was expiatory, and had a power of atoning for sin ; but that it was intended to procure the Divine favour, to avert evil and punishment, and to move the Divine Majesty to bestow such blessings as the worshipper stood in need of, and was therefore in all respects propitiatory, excepting that it was not expiatory ; for this last quality was peculiar to the Sacrifices and offerings for sin, and the trespass offerings. . . . . We

have the propitiatory nature of all Sacrifices and oblations at the altar represented to us, Ezek. xlv. 13—17. "This is the oblation (Heb. heave-offering) that ye shall offer. . . and ye shall give the sixth part of an ephah of an homer of barley. . . . And one lamb out of the flock, out of two hundred. . . . for a meat offering, (Heb. a *mincha*) and for a burnt-offering, and for peace offerings, to make reconciliation (propitiation, or atonement, Heb. *kapper*) for them, saith the LORD God. All the people of the land shall give this oblation for the prince in Israel. . . . he shall prepare the sin-offering, and the meat-offering (Heb. *mincha*), and the burnt-offering, and the peace-offerings, to make reconciliation (Heb. *kapper*) for the house of Israel." More need not be said to show, that all sacrifices and oblations on the altar had a propitiatory nature.

2. Further, If the Eucharistical elements be considered not only as an oblation, but as symbols and figures of CHRIST's crucified Body and effused Blood, it will from thence appear, that they are a propitiatory offering. That by them "we show forth CHRIST's death," (1 Cor. xi. 26.) the Apostle affirms; and if they are an oblation, as has been proved, then this oblation is directed to God, and shows forth CHRIST's death to Him, as well as to the communicants; and if the holy Eucharist be an oblation, in which we show forth CHRIST's death to God, then, I think, no more need be said to show, that it is a propitiatory oblation.

Hitherto I have been showing, that the holy Eucharist is an oblation, whereby we do in general render God propitious to us; but I have before hinted, that there is a more ancient sense of this word ("propitiation") whereby it especially denotes "expiation," or "atonement for sin." Now I proceed to shew,

3. That if the holy Eucharist, as it is an oblation of bread and wine, and as that bread and wine are types and symbols of CHRIST's death, do not expiate, and atone [for] sin; yet that it does this as it is a full and perfect representation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST's Body and Blood.

I here think it necessary to declare, what I mean by its being a representative; and I persuade myself that they of the ancients and moderns, who have called it a "commemorative Sacrifice," did really intend the same thing with me; but they have not, I sup-

pose, been rightly understood by those who have been of a contrary judgment. Now I rather choose the word "representative," as being known to denote, in our language, not only that which resembles, and puts us in mind of something else; but what is deputed or substituted in the stead of another, and is to us what the principal would be if it were present. And such a representative of CHRIST's Body and Blood are the consecrated bread and wine in the Sacrament. They were instituted by CHRIST, not only to call Him and His sufferings to remembrance, but to be to us all that His natural Body and Blood, crucified and poured out for us, could be, if we had them actually lying on our altars. Nor can I conceive how the words of St. Paul can otherwise be understood, in their full scope and latitude, when he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion," &c. 1 Cor. x. 16. He supposes that the Body and Blood of CHRIST are communicated to us by the bread and wine in the holy Eucharist. He tells us, what was sacrificed is communicated to us—and not the effects of that Sacrifice only. And when St. Paul saith, that ignorant and profane communicants "do not discern the LORD's Body" in the holy Eucharist, (1 Cor. xi. 29.) and that "they are guilty of" (an indignity toward) the Body and Blood of our LORD," v. 27, he surely takes it for granted, that the Body and Blood are actually there, whether they discern it or not.—pp. 25—28.

'Tis universally acknowledged, that the Sacrament is a "representative" of CHRIST's Body and Blood; but then, some seem to understand by that word no more than a type, a figure, or "shadow," such as the Passover and all the Sacrifices were, and not "the very image of the things." By the "very image," I understand, "true representative," by which are meant the Sacraments of the New Testament, if we may believe Gregory Nazianzen and Theophylact. (See Theoph. on Heb. x. 1.) Such a representative is every rainbow we now see of that which God "set in the clouds," in the time of Noah. Gen. ix. 13. . . . And though the Covenant was ratified, and unalterably established by the appearance of the first rainbow, yet God thought fit to renew this covenant frequently every year, by causing this bow to be seen in the clouds.

So, though the evangelical covenant was effectually confirmed by CHRIST's death on the Cross, yet GOD has thought fit, for the supporting our faith and hope, to have the representative Sacrifice of His Body and Blood often repeated, and the Gospel Covenant by this means renewed. . . . I have already declared against the personal presence or Sacrifice of CHRIST in the Eucharistical elements. Nor do I suppose that the bread and wine represent His whole Person, as He is GOD and Man, but only His sacrificed Body and His effused Blood. His Soul was separated from the Body before the Sacrifice was consummated. We have in the Sacrament His Body and Blood consecrated and administered apart, which is a demonstration that we have not there His entire living Person. . . .

Now since it appears, that the Eucharistical elements are not only types, but representatives, and that not only to man, but to GOD; and since they are representatives of the only truly propitiatory and expiatory Sacrifice of the Cross; I suppose it clearly follows, that they also are a propitiatory and expiatory Sacrifice; for, otherwise, they are no true and perfect representation. But that this may more distinctly appear to the reader's view, I will particularly consider those texts of the New Testament wherein, I suppose, we have this truth clearly proved to us.

1. I shall make use of the words of institution; because I think that an argument drawn from them will be of the greatest weight; and I am persuaded that the propitiatory nature of the holy Eucharist is as plainly contained in those words, as any rational man can desire. When our SAVIOUR says, "This is My Body given for you," He must mean, given to GOD. For, to whom did CHRIST give His natural, crucified Body? Not to us, but for us: "He gave Himself, for us an offering, and a Sacrifice to GOD." Eph. v. 2. And if the bread in the Sacrament be His Body given, offered, sacrificed for us by a true and proper representation, then I cannot see how the consequence can be avoided; namely, that the consecrated bread and wine are a representative oblation, or Sacrifice of His Body and Blood; for it would be a poor representative indeed, if it fell short of its principal or

original in the main point of all ; if it represented CHRIST only as dead, not as sacrificed ; only as crucified, not as offered to GOD for us. As sure as it is His Body, so sure it is, that it is His Body sacrificed for us. St. Paul, instead of "given," says, "broken for you;" 1 Cor. xi. 24. which can scarce, in propriety, be understood of His natural Body, "one bone of which was not broken:" not His natural, but His sacramental Body is broken for us ; and the same body which is broken is also given for us ; which is to me an unanswerable proof, that His representative, sacramental Body is also His Body offered for us. And the very same may, and must, in justice, be said of the Eucharistical wine, viz. that it is His blood poured out, offered for us.

Further, it is justly observed by some, that when our SAVIOUR says, "Do this," &c. the true meaning most probably is, "Offer this". . .

Further, our SAVIOUR's words are, "Do," or, "offer this" εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, "for a memorial of Me," as I should rather choose to render it than "in remembrance of Me." I have before observed, that ἀνάμνησις is a sacrificial term, and denotes that part of the bread offering which was burnt in the fire, where-with the atonement, or propitiation was made under the law. And therefore, what can be more congruous than to suppose, that our SAVIOUR, when He was going to yield Himself a Sacrifice for us, should by these words design this institution to be a perpetual representation of this Sacrifice to His FATHER? For to Him all these memorials under the law were offered, and by them the oblation itself was rendered beneficial to the offerers.—pp. 30—35.

Thus I have showed from the words of institution, that it is in the highest degree probable, that our SAVIOUR intended the holy Eucharist to be a perfect representation of His own Sacrifice to His FATHER.—p. 39.

. . . The bread and wine are divinely authorised substitutes for the Body and Blood of CHRIST JESUS, and therefore may justly have the names and titles of their principals ; and by being presented apart, they are clear proofs, that the Sacrifice by them represented is just now ready to be offered, and the propitiation to be made; CHRIST cannot be represented as actually dead, but He must be represented as actually sacrificed. He was not sacrificed whilst

alive; that is inconsistent; but when His Blood was poured out, then the Sacrifice was offered; for it was the blood of Sacrifices with which the atonement was made; . . . Therefore, the bread and wine represented Christ as just now dead, and fit to be offered. And it is scarce to be conceived how our SAVIOUR could have expressed Himself more clearly, when He says, "This is My Body given," *διδόμενον*, just now given, "for you." By this representation, our SAVIOUR offered Himself in effigy, as I may say, before He offered Himself on the Cross; and by this representation, what passed near one thousand seven hundred years ago, is set forth, and exhibited to us, as if it were but now done.

There never was anything so memorable as the death of the SON of GOD. If we turn over all history, both sacred and profane, we shall find nothing that can justly be compared to it; there never was anything done so acceptable to GOD, and so beneficial to mankind; nothing that deserves so much to be remembered both by GOD and man. This death of His was but short; He remained in that state not above thirty-eight hours: but, the effects of it being so very great, the benefits so lasting, the merits so infinite, no wonder if He who was pleased to suffer so much for our sakes, thought fit to have the memory of it recorded in the most indelible manner. And how could this be better done, than by providing, that it should be frequently and solemnly commemorated; nor only commemorated, but represented; not only to man, but to GOD; not only that it might be done in the most serious and affecting manner, but that, by the benefits to be received from GOD by this representation, we might be the more encouraged still to repent, and perpetuate this representation, and to live like a people that have received such blessings from this Sacrifice, and expect much greater still?

And having thus at large explained the propitiatory nature of the oblation in the holy Eucharist, I need not any more than hint to my reader, that this shows the purity and excellence of the Eucharistical oblation beyond all other whatsoever; and that this therefore is the "pure Mincha" foretold by the prophet



Malachi, as being the most perfect representation of the Sacrifice of that "Lamb of God without spot and blemish, that takes away the sins of the world."—pp. 44, 45.

II. I now proceed to the second argument from Scripture, whereby I shall prove, as I have in my last, that the holy Eucharist is a full representation of the Sacrifice on the Cross, and therefore propitiatory.

The Apostle expressly says, "We have an altar, from which they have no right to eat, who serve the tabernacle," Heb. xiii. 10. From which words, with those going before and after, I shall prove these three things :

1. That it is an oral eating that the Apostle here speaks of.
2. That the oblation here understood, is, that of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Eucharist.
3. And that consequently, by the "altar," he means the Communion table.

1. That it is an oral eating that the Apostle here speaks of, will appear, both from what goes before, and what follows. In the foregoing verse the Apostle had said, "It is a good thing that the heart be strengthened," or, "refreshed with grace," that is, with evangelical mercies and blessings, "not with" such "meats" as the Jews used to eat in their festivals, and their peace offerings, which had "not profited them that had been occupied therein," so as to purge their consciences from dead works. These meats were without question orally eaten ; to these meats he opposes what Christians receive from their altar ; for the Apostle seems to speak, as if he would not have the Jews think that they were the only people whom God feeds from His altar. "We also," says he, "have an altar," and what we receive from thence is such as cannot be eaten "by those who serve the tabernacle." The least that can be said of this sense, is, that the Apostle's connexion will by this means be most apparent, and his arguing most apposite. But the following words make this more clear still, in which he proves what he had here laid down, *viz.* that neither priest nor people, so long as they served the Jewish tabernacle or temple, had any right to eat from the Christian altar. "For," says he, "the bodies of those beasts, whose blood

is brought into the sanctuary, are burnt without the camp," and, therefore, could not possibly be eaten orally by those who were in the temple or tabernacle; and he proves that our SAVIOUR'S was such a Sacrifice, because He "suffered without the gate." v. 12. Now this does apparently prove, that the Jewish priests and people could not orally eat from off the Christian altar, upon supposition we have there a Sacrifice for sin, "whose blood has been carried into the sanctuary;" but it does not prove that they might not eat of the Christian Sacrifice in a spiritual manner; for they might by faith eat even of those sin-offerings whose bodies were burnt; that is, they might sincerely believe, that the blood of the Sacrifice made an atonement for their sin: so that I think it very evident that the Apostle here cannot be understood of spiritual manducation; and he that is of that opinion, let him reduce the Apostle's argument into mood and figure, and he will see his own error; nay, let him but put "cross" for "altar," and see what sense he makes of the Apostle's words; "We have a cross from which they have no right to eat," &c. . .

2. And if the Apostle speak of eating orally, then it will easily be granted, that the Sacrifice here understood must be the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Eucharist; for we have no other which can be so eaten. . . .

3. That by the "altar" here mentioned, the Apostle means the Communion Table. . . . The preposition ἐξ or ἐκ may signify "at" or "off from." . . . When the Apostle says, "They who eat the Sacrifices, are partakers of the altar," by "altar" he cannot mean the Sacrifice, for then the sense of those words must be, He that eats the Sacrifice, eats the Sacrifice. But the plain meaning is, that "he who religiously eats the Sacrifice, is a guest of the altar;" though he do not sit or stand at the altar, as at a table. By parity of reason, in this place, "to eat of," or "from the altar," is "to be a guest at the altar." . . . . The Sacrifice of the Cross cannot be meant in this place; because that was a Sacrifice without an altar, and therefore could not in all probability be intended by the word "altar." In a word, I think one of the best rules for understanding Scripture, is never to depart from the common literal sense of the words, unless for some violent reason

indeed; but here I can see no reason at all. The question is, What is the common meaning of the word "altar," when used by Christians in relation to the Christian Church? And here all antiquity, from CHRIST JESUS Himself down to the present age, does unanimously affirm, that the most usual and received signification of that word in relation to the Christian Church, is that of a Communion Table; this, therefore, must be the meaning of it here as well as elsewhere, unless some inconsistency, or absurdity do from thence follow; but when that sense fits this place better than any other, as has been showed, we cannot depart from it but that we must, at the same time, take the liberty of fixing such signification to words as best fits our present terms, without any regard to truth, or the intention of the writer. And since all do and must agree, that either the oblation of CHRIST on the Cross, or of His Body and Blood in the holy Eucharist, must be here alluded to; 'tis left to the reader to determine, whether it be not most reasonable to understand it of the latter, since 'tis an oral manducation is here spoken of, and consequently the oblation must be such an one as is capable of being orally eaten; especially, since 'tis an oblation, or Sacrifice on an altar, and the most received signification of the word "altar," determines us to take it for the holy Table, on which this mystery is performed; and if the representative Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Body and Blood be here meant, there is, I suppose, no occasion for me to repeat my former arguments, whereby to prove that it is propitiatory.—pp. 45—50.

But before I pass to my third argument, I shall endeavour to wipe off those exceptions of our doctor against giving the name "altar" to the Communion table,—I mean, in a strict and proper sense. If it could not be proved that the holy Table on which we perform our mysteries, was ever called an Altar in Scripture, or antiquity, yet the holy Eucharist might be a proper oblation; for the board on which the shew-bread was placed, is never called an altar, always a "table;" yet it is certain, the "memorial" of the shew-bread offered upon that table, was as proper an oblation as any other; 'tis expressly called "an offering made by fire unto the LORD," Lev. xxiv. 7. But the Communion board

is never called simply a "table," or "holy table" in the Scripture; but "the LORD's table," or (which is the same thing) an "altar." —p. 51.

... The books of Ezekiel and Malachi are the only books in which we meet with this expression, "the table of the LORD," "the table of God;" and they, by this phrase, do, beyond all reasonable doubt, mean an altar. And from hence I form my

3rd Argument for the propitiatory oblation in the holy Eucharist, which proceeds thus. If the holy Board, on which the sacred mysteries are performed, be on that account an altar, then the Body and Blood of CHRIST there represented are an oblation; but the holy board on which these mysteries are performed is an altar, and therefore the representative Body and Blood of CHRIST must be an oblation; and if an oblation, then certainly propitiatory and expiatory, because the principal was so in the most perfect manner. Now that the holy board is an altar on account of the representation there made, appears from those words of St. Paul, "Ye cannot be partakers of the table of the LORD, and the table of devils," 1 Cor. x. 21. For it has already been shewed that by "the LORD's table," or "God's table," we are always to understand an altar; for no other utensil, or thing, has that name given it in the holy Scripture; and we are to take the meaning of words in the Bible, not from our fancies, or from vulgar prejudices, but from the Bible itself; and since we find it has no other signification in any other place in the Old Testament, we must be extremely partial indeed, if we allow it any other in the New.—p. 56.

III. I proceed to show, That the primitive church did thus understand the Scriptures, and believe the holy Eucharist to be a propitiatory oblation.—p. 57.

1. The citations from antiquity which Mr. Mede gives us, do to a demonstration prove, that the primitive Church believed the bread and wine to be an oblation made to ALMIGHTY GOD.—p. 59.

2. I proceed to show, That they thought the Eucharist a propitiatory oblation; and to show that the ancient Liturgies give their evidence to this truth, I shall mention the Clementine,

in which after the last words before cited, *viz.* "We beseech Thee look graciously on these gifts laid before Thee," it presently adds "and be Thou well pleased with them for the honour of Thy CHRIST, . . . that so they who are partakers hereof, may be established in piety," &c. This is a form of full propitiation in behalf of the receivers: the remainder of the prayer is a propitiation for the Church, and all orders of men. . . . And it is owned, that all the ancient Liturgies have forms to this effect, though not in the same words; and it was for this reason, that the ancient Church used the Eucharist upon all extraordinary occasions, upon a marriage, or a death, I mean, just on the decease of any Christian, and upon any great calamity or affliction, it being supposed to be a proper means to avert the wrath of God, and conciliate His favour; and indeed to what other intent or purpose should it be offered to the Divine Majesty?—pp. 67, 8.

IV. I proceed to show, that our Church may very aptly be understood to mean the same. And,

1. I can see no reason to doubt, but that as the Bread and Wine are by the Rubric ordered to be placed on the table, just before the Prayer "for the whole state of CHRIST'S Church," so those words, "accept our oblations," are to be referred to the Bread and Wine just before placed on the table. And what confirms me in this opinion, is, that the Rubric and those words were inserted at the same time, and by the same hands; there was no Rubric ordering the Bread and Wine to be so placed, before the Restoration, and before that time there was no such word as "oblation" in the following Prayer; before that time the words were only these, "to accept our alms, and to receive our prayers." And lest any one should apply the word "oblations" to the offerings due to the minister, the Rubric relating to these offerings, which formerly stood just before this Prayer, is now put after the whole Communion Office. It is well known that the writings of Mr. Mede were greatly admired by most of our Clergy at the time of the Restoration; and he had publicly declared his judgment, that our Liturgy was defective in this particular, and many great men had shown themselves of the same

mind, and therefore we might justly wonder if, upon a review of the Liturgy, nothing had been done to supply this defect. All this considered, I think it is in the highest degree probable, that by "oblations" there, we are to understand the bread and wine. And I think no one can reasonably doubt, but that they who added "oblations" in the Prayer 'for the whole state of CHRIST'S Church," and the Rubric immediately going before, had the very words of Mr. Mede in their eye.—pp. 82, 3.

Some think that the oblation of the Eucharistical Bread is lessened by being placed after that of the alms-money; whereas, if they be looked upon as several oblations, I rather suppose that the climax rises than falls; I mean, that we proceed upwards, first offer the alms, next the Eucharistical elements, and last of all exhibit them to God, as representatives of the great Sacrifice; and indeed the thing speaks for itself, we must begin with the lowest, because we end with the highest.—pp. 84, 5.

There are two considerable points determined by this Rubric, which before were uncertain, *viz.*

1. Who shall place the Bread and Wine on the holy Table? And this office is assigned to the Priest; and why to the Priest, unless it were to show that the placing them there was a very solemn action, not to be performed by any common person? And I suppose there can no reason be given, why this should be done by the priest, rather than any one else, but only this, that he is the only person authorized to tender an oblation to the ALMIGHTY.

2. The other point determined by this Rubric, is, when the elements shall be there placed? And that is, when he "humbly presents the alms;" and, therefore, to be offered together with them. . . . The Bread and Wine were ordered to be provided by an old Rubric, and sure neither Priest nor clerk need be told, that when there is a communion, Bread and Wine must be placed on the Holy Table: but the question was, when, and by whom? and upon this much depended; and these questions are answered by this Rubric in favour of the Christian oblation.

And after all, if this Rubric be not so express, in words at length, as some honest men might desire, yet it is sufficient

that there is enough said, as to the first oblation, to justify any man that doth take these words as an actual tendering and presenting the elements to GOD. They who reviewed the Liturgy had reason to be on the reserve, considering how many they had to please, how many severe critical eyes were to censure it, before it could be established by a national authority. And for this reason they did not go so far as Mr. Mede desired; for he, after the words just before cited, would have "the congregation stand up, and show some sign of due and lowly reverence," while the minister offered the elements. The adding of a new ceremony, in which the people were to be concerned, was not thought advisable at that season.

2. Afterwards, all, or part of this Bread and Wine, thus offered, is by the Priest, in the words, and by the authority of CHRIST JESUS, declared to be His Body given or sacrificed, His Blood shed for our sins.

And here we have another question of moment determined in favour of the "propitiatory oblation." For one main matter of dispute under this head, is whether the Sacrifice of CHRIST's death is represented to GOD, or whether only to the people? and the Consecration Prayer clearly decides this dispute; for no one can doubt whether that Prayer be directed to GOD: and the words of institution are by our Church made a part of that Prayer, and therefore, to a demonstration, directed to GOD, as well as the rest of that Prayer: and to what end do we represent the Sacrifice of CHRIST to GOD, if not in order to procure from GOD the effects and purchase of that Sacrifice? And if this representation of a Sacrifice be made to GOD, and in order to obtain these blessings, then I need add no more words to prove it a "propitiatory oblation."

3. Another argument may be drawn from those solemn words of propitiation, in behalf of every single communicant, "The Body of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul to eternal life;" and the same is said *mutatis mutandis*, at the delivery of the cup: and how can this Body and Blood preserve us to eternal life, but by preserving us from sin and punishment, from guilt, and from falling under

temptations? So that no words can be more propitiatory; and it is to be observed, that, while they are spoken, the Minister is holding the consecrated elements in his hand, tendering them at the same time to God, and to the communicants.—pp. 86—88.

After all have communicated, it is presumed by the Rubric that some of the consecrated “elements remain,” which the priest is commanded “reverently” to “place” on the table, and, after the Lord’s Prayer, to say that which in the Scotch Liturgy is placed between the consecration and administration, and I think may properly be called the Prayer of Oblation; in which God is desired “mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;” which words, as they may be understood of the whole service, so they may likewise be referred to the Eucharistical elements, part of which, as was observed, are supposed still to remain and stand on the table. As for my part, I cannot but take “this Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” in its most proper sense, in congruity with ancient Liturgies, to denote the symbols of CHRIST’S Body and Blood. . . . . And it is by virtue, and in confidence of this Sacrifice, that we proceed to intercede, that not only we, but the “whole Church may receive remission of sins, and all other benefits of His Passion,” “by the merits and death” of CHRIST JESUS, “and through faith in His Blood” represented by the consecrated cup. . . .

On the other side, I dare not say that every one of these expressions must of necessity be taken in the sense here suggested, or that it was the intention of the Church to make the belief of the material Sacrifice in the holy Eucharist, a necessary term of communion: it is not absolutely required, that the prayer last mentioned should be used by any; for the following, in which there are no such expressions, may be used in its stead. All that I plead for is, that the doctrine here laid down, is agreeable enough to our present forms of celebrating the holy Eucharist, and that they ought the rather so to be understood, in conformity to the primitive church, and, as I truly think, to the Scripture itself; and if we thus understand our Liturgy, there will be no occasion for any of our people to run to the Church of Rome to have this defect supplied. . . . . The doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice had been so horribly abused by the



Papists, that our Church chose to be very sparing and cautious in inserting anything into her Liturgy, that might be improved to any superstitious notions or practices, and only left so much as to show, that she did not renounce the primitive, pious notion of the Christian Sacrifice. It is true she has wholly laid aside those words, to be met with in all the ancient Offices, “commemorating we offer;” but the Church, (if I understand her rightly,) offers the bread and wine in express terms; and though the word “offer” is not expressly applied to the Bread and Wine after consecration; yet I suppose none will dispute but that an oblation may be made by implication, without using the words, “offer” and “oblation.”—pp. 89—91.

And now the old question, *cui bono*, may be justly asked; to what end or purpose is so much zeal and warmth shown on both sides to persuade the world, that the holy Eucharist is, or is not, a real oblation, or, as others choose to speak, a Sacrifice? And,

1. It cannot in justice be said, that the only end, which the assertors of the Eucharistical oblation propose to themselves, is to make the superior officers of CHRIST’S Church “priests” in the common acceptance of the word. It does not appear that Mr. Mede, who is, after all, the greatest patron of that doctrine, had any such design in his view; nor was there any great occasion for him to labour in that point, in the age when he wrote, the distinction between Clergy and Laity, or, at least, of ministers and people, being a thing then not disputed: nay, it is evident, that not only Bishop Bull had printed his answer to Monsieur Meaux, but Dr. Hickes had wrote, though not published, his letter on this subject, before ever the Christian priesthood had been assaulted in that furious manner it has since been.

2. But I shall show, that this consideration of the Sacrament’s being an oblation, or representative Sacrifice, does give more life and lustre to it in relation to the people. And,

1. Let the reader judge, whether that be a more lively commemoration of CHRIST’S death, which is supposed to be a bare type and resemblance of it, as the Passover, and other Sacrifices, under the Law, were; or that which is not only so, but a perfect representation of His Sacrifice, and, to all intents and purposes, as effectual to our good, as if JESUS CHRIST had been crucified

before our eyes, and as if we had His very Body and Blood to present to the FATHER, in order to avert His indignation against our sins, and to atone for them. Mere types and shadows are cold, lifeless things ; whereas perfect representatives do more raise our affections, and leave deeper impressions on our memories, and a perfect representative it cannot be, except it be an oblation ; therefore, says Theophylact on Heb. x. 1. " We make a memorial of this oblation, as if it were now performed."

2. I suppose it will not bear a dispute, whether our faith and confidence in the merits of CHRIST's death be more invigorated and confirmed by a bare remembrance, a solemn calling it to mind, or by having the oblation, by which He purchased these blessings, put into our hands and mouths. . .

3. And I believe there is nothing that can more inflame and exalt the devotion of a sincere Christian, than to think and believe, that when he is praying at God's altar, and receiving the holy Eucharist, he has the price of his redemption in his hand, or lying before his eyes. He is emboldened to do somewhat more than pray, even humbly to claim those spiritual blessings he stands in need of ; for the soul of every pious and judicious communicant, is hereby not only assured of pardon and grace, and a happy resurrection, and of whatever CHRIST has purchased for us, but is delighted to see and perceive by what means these blessings are obtained and conveyed to us ; when the Sacrifice with which those blessings were purchased, is now representatively renewed, and when he can plead for all necessary supplies for his soul by that Sacrifice now visibly exhibited, to which nothing can be denied. And I believe, all that have experienced how the improvement of this truth of the oblation of the holy Eucharist does encourage and provoke their faith, hope, and devotion, will never permit themselves to be rifled of such a treasure, by the vain disputers of this world.—pp. 98—101.

But from the whole the reader may see what reason we have to express and publish our zeal for the Eucharistical oblation ; because it does so much illustate the beneficial nature of the ordinance itself. Nay, it is a great honour done to CHRIST,

frequently to represent to GOD, as well as man, what we believe to be the most wonderful and engaging favour that ever was, or could be performed for us. It is further the greatest honour we can do to GOD the FATHER, to present to Him the most valuable oblation that we can give, or He receive, . . . an oblation which can be offered no where but in the Church of CHRIST; the benefits whereof no people are capable of but His disciples; which can be offered by none, but by the officers commissioned by Him: it is the only oblation, which is of greater value than ourselves; of which, therefore, to deprive the Church of GOD, would be the greatest sacrilege; and for men, by false glosses on the Scripture, to rob themselves of it, is a great injury done to their own souls; and I pray GOD give the reader such a sense of this truth as I am under, while I defend it; and GOD grant us all clear understandings, impartial judgments, and a truly primitive spirit, that we may follow the old apostolical paths.—pp. 107, 8.

*Id.—Unbloody Sacrifice.*

Sacrifice is, 1, some material thing, either animate or inanimate, offered to GOD; 2, for the acknowledging the dominion, and other attributes of GOD, or for procuring divine blessings, especially remission of sin; 3, upon a proper altar, (which yet is rather necessary for the external decorum, than the internal perfection of the Sacrifice); 4, by a proper officer, and with agreeable rites; 5, and consumed in such a manner, as the author of the Sacrifice has appointed.—pp. 4, 5.

In order to prove the Eucharist a proper Sacrifice, I am . . . first to show, that material things were actually offered to GOD in the Eucharist by the primitive Church, and by CHRIST JESUS Himself. But before I undertake this, I shall first, by way of prevention, dispute one pass with our adversaries; and it is the main evasion they have, when they feel themselves closely pressed with our arguments; I mean, that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is frequently called by the ancients an “unbloody,” “rational,” “spiritual” Sacrifice. And when they find any of these epithets given to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, they from thence

conclude that it was by the ancients meant to be a mere mental, figurative Sacrifice. Now once for all to silence this pretence, . . . I shall beforehand show, that the ancients were so far from thinking it was inconsistent with a true material Sacrifice, to be "unbloody," "rational," or "spiritual," that they do often in the same sentence express, or imply, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist to be material, and yet unbloody, rational, or spiritual.—p. 19.

1. As to the word "unbloody," it generally denotes some material thing, according to the best of my judgment and information. However, that it does so, when applied to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, take these following instances. St. Cyril of Alexandria says—"The table which had the shew-bread denotes the unbloody Sacrifice of the bread or loaves." . . . St. Chrysostom. . . . St. Gregory Nazianzen. . . . St. Athanasius. . . . Eusebius. . . . So that I take for granted, that by the "unbloody Sacrifice" is always meant the Sacrifice of the sacramental bread and wine, in all ancient monuments of Christianity; and, consequently, that when "rational" or "spiritual" go along with "unbloody," the same materials are thereby meant; and indeed, in some particular places, there are other concomitant words, which shew that bread and wine are meant; as, in the Apostolical Constitutions, "Instead of bloody Sacrifices, CHRIST enjoined the rational, unbloody Sacrifice of His Body and Blood;" for where is CHRIST's Blood sacrificed in an unbloody way, but in the Eucharistical chalice?—pp. 20—22.

2. As for the word "rational," when applied to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, that it does not only denote some act of our reason or understanding, sufficiently appears by this, that the Sacramentary of Gregory and other Latin Liturgies instruct the priest to pray to GOD, that he would "render it a rational acceptable Sacrifice, and make it the Body and Blood of CHRIST;" which can be understood of nothing, but the material bread and wine; for of nothing else can it be said or expected, that it should become the Body and Blood.—pp. 24.

3. It may seem very strange to some moderns, to be told, that the ancients looked upon the oblation of a material thing, when performed according to the laws of CHRIST and the Church, to be

a "spiritual" oblation; yet certainly such were their thoughts, such were their words. St. James's Liturgy, in the Prothesis, teaches the priest to say, "I am not worthy to hold up my eyes toward this spiritual table." . . . The priest, when he presents the elements on the altar, is by the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom directed to say, "Enable us to offer the gifts and spiritual Sacrifices for our own sins, and for the errors of the people." . . .

Nay, it is further observable, that the ancients did not only assert the bread and wine in the Eucharist to have been rational and spiritual Sacrifices; but Theodoret expressly says, "We find Melchisedek offering to God not irrational Sacrifice, but bread and wine;" and St. Hierom says, "Irrational Sacrifices are no longer to be offered, but bread and wine, that is, the Body and Blood of CHRIST." Eusebius Cæsariensis, "Melchisedek never appears to have offered corporeal Sacrifices, but blessed Abraham with bread and wine." Eusebius, and St. Hierom, and Theodoret, certainly understood the language of the Primitive Church, equally at least to any now living; and they were so far from thinking that a Sacrifice of bread and wine might not be a spiritual Sacrifice, that they do very clearly and roundly deny, that such Sacrifices are irrational and corporeal.

It is evident, that St. Paul uses the same language; for he speaks of a "spiritual body," 1 Cor. xv. and in the same chapter calls the entire Person of CHRIST JESUS, "a quickening spirit," ver. 45.—pp. 24—26.

I suppose there is no occasion for me particularly to prove, that the Fathers believed, that Melchisedec offered bread and wine, and that in so doing he was a type of CHRIST, by producing the several passages wherein they express these sentiments. . . . And what I am chiefly concerned to prove is, that they who believed that Melchisedek offered bread and wine, and that in so doing he was a type of CHRIST, must believe that CHRIST also did offer those materials, nay, that they who believed that such an oblation was, and ought to be made in the Christian Church, must believe also, that CHRIST in the institution did

make this oblation : for it cannot, in common sense and charity, be believed, that they thought any thing was, or ought to be done in the Eucharist by the Church, but what our SAVIOUR did when He founded it ; and, indeed, several of them do express their sentiments to this purpose. . . . . But, to put the point beyond dispute, I shall further lay before my reader the express affirmations of the ancients to this purpose ; namely, that our SAVIOUR did, in the original Eucharist, offer His Body and Blood in the symbols of bread and wine. Theodoret . . . . St. Chrysostom . . . . St. Austin. . . . St. Hierom. . . . St. Gregory Nyssen. . . . Eusebius.—pp. 51. 62—65.

The sense of what these Fathers teach us is, that CHRIST entered upon His priestly office in the Eucharist ; that there He began the one oblation ; there He offered Himself in a spiritual mystical manner, as He afterwards did corporally upon the Cross. . . . These two parts of the oblation were but one continued solemnity ; nay, we add, that the Ascension of CHRIST into heaven many days after, was but the finishing of this one oblation. The distinguishing the oblation in the Eucharist from that on the Cross, and that afterwards performed in heaven, is really a confounding or obscuring the whole mystery, and rendering it perplexed and intricate. We ought no more to reckon them two or three several oblations, than we would say an animal was three several Sacrifices, because it was first immolated, then slain, afterwards burned, and the blood of it ritually sprinkled. Any one of these actions may be called an oblation ; and the animal, by having any one of these actions passed upon it, was rightly called a Sacrifice ; and yet the whole process was really but one and the same Sacrifice.—pp. 71, 2.

We have the express words of CHRIST JESUS Himself, recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, fully attesting this great truth ; namely, that He did in the institution of this Sacrament, actually offer bread and wine to GOD, as His mysterious Body and Blood ; and that He commanded His Apostles to do the same.

(1.) I will shew that these words, “ This is my Body given for you, this is my Blood shed for you,” do prove, that CHRIST gave

or offered the bread and wine to God, as His mysterious Body and Blood. And (2.) that He commanded His Apostles to do the same.

Now, in order to prove the first point, I take it for granted that when our SAVIOUR says, "This is my Body given," by "given" He means "offered," or sacrificed to God. This is a thing very plain in itself, and is, nay, must be, acknowledged by all; when He said, "Take, eat," He gave His sacramental Body to His disciples; when He adds, "given for you," He must mean given, or offered in Sacrifice to God for them. The giving His Body to His Apostles, and giving it *for* them, are two things perfectly distinct; His putting it into their hands or mouths, was not giving His Body for them; this was an action performed to the Apostles; His giving, or offering it for them, was an action directed to God: which, as it is very plain in itself, so is it expressly taught us by St. Paul; "for CHRIST," says he, "has given Himself for us, an offering and Sacrifice to God," Eph. v. 2. And if we duly consider this particular, which can be denied by none that do not want common sense and judgment, the rest inevitably follows.

I take it for certain and indisputable, that the Body here spoken of, was now actually given, yielded, offered to God by our SAVIOUR, as a priest according to the order of Melchisedek. The three Evangelists before mentioned, and St. Paul, do every one of them speak in the present tense, *διδόμενον*, Luke xxii. 19. *κλάμενον*, 1 Cor. xi. 24. *έκχυνόμενον*, Matt. xxvi. 28. Mark xiv. 24. Luke xxii. 20. The Spirit by which they wrote, directed them all with an unanimous harmony to represent our SAVIOUR as now performing the most solemn act of His Melchisedechian priesthood; and, therefore, as offering His Body and Blood to God, under the symbols of bread and wine. It is well known by all that are not perfect strangers to the Hebrew and Hellenistic diction, that the strongest and most strict way they have of expressing the time present, is by a participle of that tense; this way of expressing Himself our SAVIOUR uses, and all the four holy writers who give us the history of the institution, do agree in using this present participle; and do, therefore, most

gloriously conspire to teach us this truth, that our SAVIOUR did now actually offer Himself to GOD, under the representations of bread broken, and wine poured out. . . 'Tis therefore preposterous to tell us, that by "is" we are to understand "shall be." Nor have our adversaries any pretence for giving so unnatural a sense to these words: they tell you, it is the present tense for the future; and if you ask upon what grounds this is said, they have nothing to reply but this; viz. that CHRIST'S Body was not in any sense given or offered to GOD, till it was crucified, which is to take that for granted, which, my reader sees, was denied by the ancient fathers. What if some few MSS. and the old Italic translation, and St. Cyprian, and the translator of Irenæus, and the canon of the Mass in the Church of Rome say, "shall be given," "shall be shed?" Those can be of no weight when laid in the scale against the concurrent authority of most and the best of the Greek books. Nor does the Scripture give any countenance to our adversaries, while they would persuade us that CHRIST'S oblation was performed on the Cross only.

It seems clear to me, that the one personal oblation performed by our SAVIOUR Himself, is not to be confined to any one instant of time; but commenced with the Paschal solemnity, and was finished at His Ascension into Heaven there to appear in the presence of GOD for us. And if our adversaries will restrain the oblation to the Cross alone, then they must exclude CHRIST'S sacerdotal entry into Heaven, as the holy of holies, and say that the oblation was finished before the blood of the Sacrifice was brought into the most holy place and there offered; contrary to what the Apostle teaches us, Heb. ix. 7; and, therefore, few, I suppose, will presume thus far. And if it was consistent with the one oblation to be made in the holy of holies, as well as on the altar; in Heaven, as well as on the Cross; then I cannot conceive, why the oblation made in the Eucharist should make the oblation cease to be one, any more than the double offering it, on the Cross and in the holy of holies, already mentioned. . . .

If it could be proved, that our SAVIOUR offered Himself on the Cross only, it would from thence follow, that, in this one oblation, He did not at all act as a priest according to the order



of Melchisedec. For Melchisedec, as the ancients observe, is never reported to have offered a bloody Sacrifice; if he offered any, (which will not admit of a dispute,) it was a Sacrifice of bread and wine, as a prefiguration of the grand Sacrifice. And if, therefore, our SAVIOUR did ever make an oblation according to the order of Melchisedec, He must have done it in the same materials, and, therefore, in the Eucharist. And from this my reader will observe, how much more agreeable the notions of the Fathers were, who believed that CHRIST blessed the spiritual progeny of Abraham, as Melchisedec did the Father of the faithful, by an oblation of bread and wine, than the notions of those who must assert, if they will discourse consistently with their own hypothesis, that, though our SAVIOUR was a priest according to the order of Melchisedec, yet in the main point of the priestly office, that is, Sacrifice, there was no correspondence between them. In a word, it is agreed, that Melchisedec typified the priesthood of CHRIST in blessing Abraham, and that the foundation of all the blessings conferred on Abraham, and his spiritual posterity, was the mactation of CHRIST's natural Body. It is evident, that the way of deriving the merits of CHRIST to particular persons, or imparting benedictions to them, has always been by Sacrifice. It is clear that Melchisedec's priesthood was a sacrificing priesthood; but there is no probability, that he offered bloody Sacrifices, but bread and wine only; and that, therefore, in such a Sacrifice he imparted a benediction to Abraham; and by consequence, that our SAVIOUR, as a priest of the same order, did intend to confer benedictions to the people, as Melchisedec did to Abraham; and, therefore, performed the sacerdotal oblation in bread and wine. And here, as has been proved, we have the judgment of the ancients with us; who do generally assert, that CHRIST did offer bread and wine in the Eucharist, and offered them as a Melchisedechian priest, and as symbols of His Body and Blood; and that in, and by these symbols, He did mysteriously devote His natural Body to suffer according to the will of GOD; and this is a certain proof, that the Fathers took "given," not only as expressing, but as meaning and intending the time then present. Let the Papists then

go on with their *dabitur* and *effundetur*, "shall be given," "shall be shed"; and it fits their notion well enough, who believe that the same Body and Blood was substantially offered in the Eucharist and on the Cross; but let Protestants stick close to the Primitive Church, and to the Evangelists, and to CHRIST JESUS Himself; who undoubtedly declared, that, in that very instant of time in which He celebrated the original Eucharist, He did at once offer, or give to GOD bread and wine, and gave them as a pledge and earnest of the natural Body and Blood, which was soon after yielded to GOD on the Cross.—pp. 85—90.

Thus the reader may see, that the main stress of the dispute lies in effect in this single question, whether our SAVIOUR did offer His Body and Blood in the Eucharist; to which our SAVIOUR'S express answer is, "This bread is My Body now given for you"—"This wine is My Blood now shed for you." Our adversaries, to shift off this, tell us our SAVIOUR used one tense, but meant another; He said "is given," He meant, "shall be given:" and further, they will not allow the word "given" to be applied to His sacramental Body, though every word in the sentence, excepting that, is by them acknowledged to belong to that Body. Now this is perfectly precarious and evasive; and because our adversaries will not be convinced with the most plain, natural, obvious construction of the words, we have no means left us but to refer our cause to the arbitration of the most competent, disinterested, and uncorrupted judges, the primitive Fathers and Councils, and the earliest Liturgies that are now in being; and they do unanimously, whenever they have occasion to speak of this matter, pronounce in favour of us; and I am bold to say, that none of them ever said the contrary. They say, indeed, that they have no such Sacrifices as the Jews and Heathen had, offered by blood and fire; but those very Fathers do upon occasion assert the unbloody Sacrifice; and if this be not sufficient to establish this doctrine in the opinion of all equal judges, we know not what will.—pp. 93, 4.

Whatever CHRIST did Himself, the same He commanded us to do. If, therefore, He offered His own Sacramental Body and Blood in the Eucharist, He has positively commanded us to do the same; and we are without excuse, if we do wilfully and de-

signedly omit it. Having, therefore, before showed, that CHRIST did here make an oblation, it inevitably follows, that we must do so too; taking these words, "Do this in remembrance of Me," in the sense which our adversaries themselves put upon them: but we affirm further, that the word ποιῆν, when joined with a noun that signifies any thing proper to be offered to GOD, does very often signify to "offer," or present to the Divine Majesty, by way of Sacrifice. Dr. Hickes, in his "Christian Priesthood," has produced a very great number of proofs to this purpose, . . . and when our SAVIOUR says of the cup, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε ὡς ἅκις ἂν πίνητε, it cannot in strictness be otherwise rendered than, "Offer this as oft as ye drink it."—p. 94.

Thus, I conceive, I have fully established the doctrine of the Sacrifice, not only from the monuments of the Primitive Church, but from the words of CHRIST JESUS Himself. . . . And I must continue of this opinion, till I am convinced by some direct evidence from Scripture, that CHRIST did at any other time or place here on earth, perform any sacerdotal act of oblation. That CHRIST'S Body was substantially sacrificed on the Cross, must be acknowledged by all; but by "sacrificed on the Cross," we must then mean, that He was slain as an expiatory victim, and not that He offered Himself as a Melchisedechian Priest: for He declares, that He did this in the Eucharist, "For this," says He, "is My Body given" to GOD "for you."

And though we ought in every Eucharist to do what CHRIST did, yet we are not to do it in all respects, with the same ends and designs that He did. The chief end, or primary intention, which CHRIST seems to have had in the celebration of the first Eucharist, was to devote and resign Himself up to GOD, as a Sacrifice for the life of the world, and to institute a perpetual commemoration of it; but we do neither the one nor the other. We do not offer the Body of CHRIST in order to its being crucified; but as a memorial of its having been thus devoted to crucifixion or mactation, now long since past. We do not institute either a Sacrament or a Sacrifice; but put in practice the institution made so many hundred years since by CHRIST Himself.—p. 328.

And thus I have beyond all just contradiction proved, that

JESUS performed the office of a Sacrificing Priest, when He first instituted the holy Communion, and that He, at the same time, ordained His Apostles and their successors to succeed Him in that sacred office; and, whether Melchisedek's priesthood were a type of CHRIST's, in offering bread and wine, or not, (of which, I believe, few impartial readers will doubt) yet that, in thus offering a real Sacrifice, He fulfilled the prefiguration of the pontifical Sacrifice<sup>1</sup> offered under the law, and that He intended the latter, as well as the former, to be a perpetual daily Sacrifice, will be granted me by all that are not very hard to be convinced.—pp. 98—100.

Having fully showed what is offered in the Eucharist, I now proceed to consider the ends for which it is to be offered. . . . I proceed therefore.

First, to show, that one and the primary end of the Eucharistical Christian Sacrifice, is the acknowledgment of God's dominion and other attributes; and I must add, what is most especially implied, of His goodness, in redeeming the world by CHRIST JESUS, which is the foundation of all other spiritual mercies. And I apprehend our adversaries themselves do so far consent to this, as to own that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice of thanksgiving, and a recognition of all the blessings and favours we receive from GOD, and more particularly of His sending His SON to die for us, and of all the inestimable mercies, accruing to ourselves and others, by this means: they only deny, that the bread and wine, or Eucharistical Body and Blood, are this Sacrifice; and would have it believed, that the verbal and mental praises are the only thing meant by this Sacrifice; and, therefore, the authorities produced under this head, shall chiefly be such as do effectually prove, that the Sacrifice of thanksgiving in the Christian Church, was, in the judgment of the ancients, an oblation, not only of words and thoughts, but of the material bread and wine. And first St. Chrysostom . . . . St. Austin . . . Paulinus . . . Eusebius . . . Origen . . . Irenæus. . . Justin Martyr . . . Gregory Nazianzen.—pp. 266, 7, &c.

<sup>1</sup> See Lev. vi. 20—22.

If from single Fathers we turn our eyes to the ancient Liturgies, we shall find them filled with long recitals of God's power, dominion, providence, and attributes, with Psalms of David, and other hymns from canonical and apocryphal Scripture, or of a private and more late composure: and these were commonly introductory to the *Trisagium*, and, in all Liturgies, ended with those angelical words; soon after which, the priest proceeds to the Institution, and then to the Commemorative Oblation, and then to the finishing Consecration. Now these particular and very large enumerations of God's mercy and care over the whole race of mankind and especially the Church, were intended to be express declarations of the meaning and intentions of CHRIST JESUS, and His priest and people, in instituting and celebrating the Eucharist: that it was designed, in an especial manner, to be a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the creation, and preservation, and wise government of the world, and especially for our redemption by CHRIST JESUS; and that these recitals were very ample and very ancient, is to be seen in Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharist.— I apprehend that the ancient way of introducing the Oblation in the Eucharist, was no more than an express and most solemn profession of the Church's intention, in the Sacrifice now to be offered, to do glory to God, to agnize His dominion and other attributes, and to acknowledge all His mercies and favours, especially that which was the principal and the foundation of the rest, His sending CHRIST JESUS into the world to die for our sins; and that this was the first and primary design of the Eucharist they knew, not only from the nature of Sacrifice, but because CHRIST had instituted this to be offered for a memorial of Him.—pp. 281—283.

2. That the other end of this Sacrifice is to procure divine blessings, and especially pardon of sin. In the first respect, it is propitiatory; in the second, expiatory, by virtue of its principal, the grand Sacrifice. . . . St. Chrysostom . . . . St. Austin . . . . Cyril of Jerusalem . . . . Eusebius . . . . St. Cyprian . . . . Origen . . . . St. Clement of Rome. . . .

The Liturgies are very full of proof to this purpose; the Gregorian . . . . that of St. Peter . . . . St. Chrysostom's Li-

turgy . . . the Liturgy of St. Basil . . . and the Liturgy of St. James . . . But the Clementine Liturgy best deserves our notice; and in that the Bishop beseeches God, "to look favourably on the gifts, and to send down His Holy Spirit on them; that they who partake of them, may be confirmed in godliness, obtain remission of sins," &c. and then goes on to "pray" or "offer" (these words are indifferently used) for all sort and degrees of men, and for blessings of all kinds. . . .

There is one proof of the propitiatory nature of the Eucharist, according to the sentiments of the ancient Church, which will be thought but only too great; and that is the devotions used in the Liturgies, and so often spoken of by the Fathers, in behalf of deceased souls. There is, I suppose, no Liturgy without them, and the Fathers frequently speak of them. . . . I shall say nothing of this doctrine but

That the ancients did not use these prayers, as if they thought of a Purgatory; it is certain this last is a modern invention, in comparison of the oblations and prayers offered by the primitive Church, in behalf of their deceased brethren.

They did not allow prayers to be made for such as they thought ill men, either as to principles or practice. They prayed for the Virgin Mary, Apostles, Patriarchs, &c. and such as they believed to be like them.

They seem to have learned this practice from the synagogue; for it is probable the Jews in and before our Saviour's time did use it. . . .

The only use I make of it is to prove, that the ancients believed the Eucharist a propitiatory Sacrifice; and therefore put up these prayers for their deceased friends, in the most solemn part of the Eucharistic office, after the symbols had received the finishing consecration; for, as no desires are more sincere or affectionate than those which we conceive in behalf of our deceased friends, so certainly the ancients addressed these desires to God in such a manner as they thought most prevalent, that is, by virtue of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, then lying in open view.

Upon whatever grounds it was, that the Primitive Church

received this custom of praying for the dead, which I am not now at leisure to consider so much at large as it deserves, it is certain they had this notion of the propitiatory nature of the Eucharist from the Scripture, and even from CHRIST JESUS Himself. For if the Eucharistical bread and wine be CHRIST'S Body and Blood, given and poured out for us; if our SAVIOUR did in the institution give the one, and shed the other for us; and if He commanded His Apostles, and their successors for ever after, to do the same, as a memorial of Him; then I think it is already sufficiently proved, that the Eucharist is a propitiatory Sacrifice.—pp. 289—293.

And thus having finished my proof of the Eucharistical and propitiatory nature of the Christian Sacrifice, I think it seasonable, before I close this chapter, to consider such exceptions as have, or may be made against it, as here asserted to be propitiatory and expiatory. I have already, in the first section, answered, or prevented those objections, which may be raised against it, as if it were a repetition of the Grand Sacrifice; and have showed, that it is not the repetition of the satisfaction made on the Cross, but only of that oblation made by CHRIST in instituting this memorial: yet still it may be thought by some, that in pretending to offer an expiatory Sacrifice, after the all-sufficient and most satisfactory Sacrifice offered by CHRIST, we lessen and depress the value and merits of it.

But I must confess I do not perceive any force in this argument, against the expiatory nature of the Eucharist, any more than against the expiatory nature of the Sacrifices offered by God's direction before, or under the Law. If God had seen it necessary, in order to preserve the honour and esteem due to the grand Sacrifice, that no other oblation offered to Him, should be looked upon to be an expiation for sin, He would surely never have expressly told the Israelites, that "by the blood" of their Sacrifices "an atonement was made." Lev. xvii. 11. He would rather have told them, that instead of sacrificing, they ought to believe in that grand Sacrifice, which was hereafter to come; which was the only method, upon the supposition of our adversaries, to have secured the value and esteem

which men ought to have for the personal Sacrifice of CHRIST JESUS. And then to suppose, that the faint, shady types and figures of the Law, should be of greater force and efficacy than what the ancients thought to be a completive Sacrifice under the Gospel, than a Sacrifice instituted with the mouth and hands of the Son of GOD Himself, is a doctrine very hard to be digested by those, that have a hearty esteem for the Gospel Sacraments, and the Founder of them. . . .

It may further be said, that since so perfect a satisfaction has been made by the one oblation of CHRIST, all further propitiations and expiations must, to say the least, be perfectly unnecessary. To which I humbly reply, that,

If, by calling the Eucharist a propitiatory or expiatory Sacrifice, I am understood to mean, that we add to the merits of our SAVIOUR'S death and sufferings; I must disclaim, and protest against all such thoughts and notions. It is the natural Blood of CHRIST which is the inexhaustible treasure of all those blessings, that can be derived to us by the Eucharist, or by any other means. Whatever power or efficacy is ascribed to the Eucharist, flows wholly from the original Sacrifice: and yet we cannot think the Eucharistical Sacrifice needless, because . . . all Christians, with whom I am now arguing, will grant, that CHRIST purchased forgiveness and other blessings by His death, conditionally only; and that till we have complied with these conditions, we have no reason to expect these blessings.

In order therefore to procure pardon of sin, or any other mercy, which we hope to receive by the shedding of His Blood, these two things are necessary.

1. That we apply ourselves to GOD in a proper manner: and if He have directed us in what manner to do it, we are to seek for no other. GOD decreed from the beginning, that the death of CHRIST should be the means of all that pardon and other graces and favours, which He intended for His Church and people: yet this did not hinder Him from instituting Sacrifices, whereby men should apply themselves to Him, in order to have these graces and favours imparted to them; and though He hath now abolished all other Sacrifices, yet I have showed, that He has en-



joined a new one in their stead. And since the sins of Christians are more exceeding sinful than those of other men, as being committed against a more clear and full light than was ever enjoyed by others; therefore it seems reasonable, that they should make this application to God for pardon, by more valuable and powerful Sacrifices than others did, or could: and since the mercies we expect are more great and weighty, than any men, before CHRIST's coming had any reason with confidence to ask of God; therefore the Sacrifice offered by us ought in reason to be of greater price, and more full of persuasion than theirs were; and CHRIST hath accordingly furnished us with such a Sacrifice, even that of His spiritual Body and Blood. The Apostle excellently well teaches us this truth, when he tells us, that "God hath set forth" CHRIST "to be a propitiation," or rather, a "propitiatory," Rom. iii. 25; that is, CHRIST is to us what the mercy-seat was to the Jews. Now the Jews were never the better for the mercy-seat, if they did not apply themselves to it in the method which God by His law had prescribed: and the method of making approach to the mercy-seat was by offering Sacrifice, and sprinkling the blood thereof upon the veil, which was drawn before His throne, where the Divine Majesty did in so peculiar a manner reside, Levit. iv. 6, 17; and our SAVIOUR has directed us, where, and how, we are to make our addresses to Him, as our mercy-seat; and that is, by offering the memorial, which He Himself hath appointed: and 'tis strange, that Christians can think of making application to their mercy-seat in a less solemn manner than the Jews did to theirs. . . . 'Tis agreed on all hands, that the merit and satisfaction, whereby our sins are forgiven, flow freely from the Grand Sacrifice; but I am now speaking of the actual application of these merits and this satisfaction, which was the end for which all Sacrifices under the Law, and the Eucharistical Sacrifice under the Gospel, were appointed by God: and it is, I suppose, very evident, that none was ever allowed to make expiation for himself by any thing that he was capable of doing as a private person. The High Priest, when he had sinned, was indeed to expiate his own fact; but it was by virtue of an Eternal Sacrifice instituted by God for this purpose: not by any prayer, or faith, or

internal act of religion. He was to apply himself to God, "by the blood of other" creatures, to show, that nothing which proceeds *ab intus*, from within ourselves, can either make satisfaction for our sins, or make application of the satisfaction made by another . . . . I conclude, that neither prayer, nor faith, nor any other act or deed of ours, can be expiatory in any sense; by them no satisfaction can be made; nor did God ever intend them to be the ordinary means of applying the merits of the Grand Sacrifice; if He had, sacraments would have been needless things, as well as Sacrifices; and this brings me to speak of,

2. The other thing necessary for the receiving pardon of our sin, or any other benefit of CHRIST'S Passion; and this must be some divine act, passed by God the FATHER, SON, or HOLY GHOST towards us . . . . And 'tis extremely vain and groundless to suppose, that any particular man can perform this divine act of applying the merits of CHRIST'S death to himself: it is an act of God, who has the sole power of pardoning or conferring any special grace upon his creatures; and since God does it not by express revelations made from time to time to his creatures, 'tis very evident he performs it to Jews and Heathens upon their conversion, in and by baptism; to those that are already members of His Church in and by the Eucharist. . . .

Our adversaries agree, that the sacramental Body and Blood of CHRIST do convey pardon, and all the benefits of CHRIST'S death, to the souls of the receivers; and if they allow that these mercies are bestowed by the Sacrament, they must allow, that there we must apply ourselves to God for them. . . . They may say, that this application may be made by God in the Eucharist, considered as a sacrament only, not as a Sacrifice; but then they must suppose, that God makes this application to us without any application made by us to Him. For we cannot apply ourselves to God otherwise than by Sacrifice. Our adversaries grant this; but they assert this to be only a mental Sacrifice of prayer, faith, and such like inward devotions; and granting this, yet 'tis evident, that the Sacrament without some sort of Sacrifice, is not sufficient for the application of CHRIST'S merits; and whether this Sacrifice consist only of such internal actions of the

mind, or of the Body and Blood of CHRIST there represented, I leave to be determined by Scripture and antiquity, which I have proved to be with us in this particular. It is therefore sufficiently clear, that GOD does apply the effects of the Great Sacrifice to us in the Eucharist; and that in order to obtain this application, we must first apply to Him by Sacrifice, even the Sacrifice of the CHRIST'S Body and Blood. It is evident that, before the death of CHRIST, pardon was imparted to the Jews by the oblation of the Sacrifice for sin, no part of which was returned to the lay-offerer; but CHRIST hath provided, that our offering for sin should be shared out among all that attend this Sacrifice, as a token of GOD'S acceptance of it.

But in some cases it seems pretty clear, that the ancients were of opinion, that the application of the merits of CHRIST'S death might be made by virtue of the oblation only, without eating and drinking the Eucharistical Body and Blood; as for instance, to those who by banishment, imprisonment for CHRIST'S sake, or other violent means, were debarred from the privilege of actual communion. As the case of such was always particularly recommended to GOD in the Eucharistical Service, so no doubt it was done upon an apprehension, that by virtue of this propitiation, they had the benefits of CHRIST'S sufferings imparted to them. . . . And let not any man suspect, that by saying this I intend to say any thing in behalf of the private, solitary masses of the Church of Rome; for I own them to be a modern corruption. . . . I only speak of the efficacy of the oblation in behalf of such, as were detained from the communion by some involuntary and invincible obstacle; and am so far from having any good opinion of the solitary masses among the Papists, that I am fully satisfied, that in the primitive Church the oblation and communion were inseparable.—pp. 296—305.

There is no occasion for me now to prove, either that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, or that it is to be consumed by manducation: the first I have sufficiently proved already, the last is what all will grant, except the divines of the Church of Rome, who make the consumption of the Sacrifice consist in the miraculous change, as I suppose, according to Bellarmine's notion of it. . . . I have

already showed . . . that much the greatest part of the Jewish Sacrifices were consumed in this manner ; . . . and therefore under the Law it must be owned, that either manducation was a proper way of consumption, or that the greatest part of their Sacrifices were not rightly consumed.

'Tis true, that what was burnt in the fire on the altar was more directly offered to God, because this action of burning was then a rite of oblation ; but from hence the grosser part of the Jews were apt to conclude, that God stood in need of Sacrifice, and was refreshed with the *nidor*, or steam of the altar, as we may learn from Psalm 1. Therefore God, to take off this objection against Sacrifice, has commanded it to be consumed, as His own Sacrifice the Passover was, wholly by manducation. . . .

And certainly this *modus* of consuming the Sacrifice was not only intended for the removing of that grand objection against consumption by fire, namely, that it gave occasion to men to think that the indigence of the Deity was by that means supplied, but likewise for the honour of the Sacrifice itself. For it is not easy to imagine, how any creature can be disposed of in a more honourable manner, than by being consumed in an act of the most solemn devotion, as the Eucharistical symbols are by the institution of CHRIST JESUS. The Jewish Sacrifices were in part to be reduced to ashes, and the remainder to be eaten in such a place, and by such persons, and with such circumstances as God had appointed ; but it does not appear, that they who eat them were obliged, during that action, to employ their minds in the service of God ; only in the Passover they were to call to mind their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage : but on the other side, the manducation of the Christian Sacrifice is to be performed, as the most solemn and religious action, that private Christians ever do in their own persons. For the oblation, and consecration, have been showed to be the acts of the Priest, in which the people are only accessories. . . .

That the receiving of the bread and wine in the Communion, is the consumption of a Sacrifice ; or that the Eucharist is a feast upon a Sacrifice, has been asserted by several learned men in the

last, and by some in this age : . . . and so, it seems, Christians feast upon something that is a Sacrifice, but not offered. . . .

And this brings me to reflect on the singular and honourable mark of distinction, by which God has dignified the Christian people, above and beyond his old *peculium*, the Jews : and that is, that whereas the Christian Church has but one Sacrifice, instead of that multitude and variety of Sacrifices under the law, and whereas the Jewish laity were not permitted to eat of any other Sacrifices but the peace-offerings, the rest being wholly burnt in the fire, or reserved to be eaten by the Priests and their families ; on the other side, now under the Gospel, our one Sacrifice is wholly to be consumed by Priest, Clergy, and people jointly : and this I take to be a most signal mark of favour to the Christian laity, that they are admitted to a participation of the Sacrifice equally with the Priests themselves.

And it is very evident that our SAVIOUR did intend the Eucharist to be not only a Sacrifice, but a feast upon a Sacrifice ; and, therefore, when He was before-hand showing to His disciples the nature of His sacramental flesh, He calls it " the bread of God," John vi. 33 ; for, as Dr. Whitby justly observes, " The oblations made to God are styled in the Old Testament the 'bread of God,' Levit. xxi. 6. 8. 22. and accordingly CHRIST styles His peculiar victim by the same name." And I must add, that nothing but what had been sacrificed is ever in Scripture called " the bread of God ;" and therefore, when our SAVIOUR gives this character of what we receive in the Sacrament, that it is the " bread of God," we may safely from thence infer, that it was by Him designed as a feast on a Sacrifice. And when, in the narrative of the institution, He says, " Take, eat, this is my Body given," i. e. sacrificed " for you," He does not more plainly say, that the Body which He reached out to them, was now made an oblation for them, than He says that they were to eat of it as such. In the tenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul draws a parallel between the heathen feasts upon the Sacrifices, and the Christian Eucharist, or between " drinking the cup of the LORD, and the "cup of devils" being partakers of " the LORD's table," or altar,

“and the table,” or altar, “of devils,” ver. 21. So that in all the most observable contexts which treat of this Sacrament, it is represented to us as a Sacrifice consumed by manducation.

The true and full notion of the Eucharist is, that it is a religious feast upon bread and wine, that have first been offered in Sacrifice to АЛМІЕНУ God, and are become the mysterious Body and Blood of СХРИСТ. The Papists, both in their notions and practice, represent it more like a bare Sacrifice, than as a feast on a Sacrifice; for the generality of their masses are nothing else but a mere offering of the Sacrament to God, in their superstitious manner, without any distribution of the holy symbols to the people. Others endeavour to have it thought nothing more than a religious feast. These are two faulty extremes. The truth is that the holy Eucharist, according to the institution of СХРИСТ, and the judgment of the ancient Church, is a feast upon a Sacrifice. That it is a Sacrifice, I have already showed; that it is a feast, I need not take any pains in proving, since it is the universal opinion of all Protestants. The truth is, this Sacrament has so long been discoursed of, and used as a feast only, that too many think these two notions contrary to each other, and imagine, that if it be a feast, it cannot be a Sacrifice; therefore, I shall here make it my business to show, that these two notions are not only fairly consistent, but that, in truth, sacrificing and religious feasting are things which God hath in all ages joined together, and that, therefore, they ought by no means to be put asunder.

We know not the laws of divine worship given to the ancients before the law of Moses. . . . Yet it is certain, that “Jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread, and they did eat bread.” “Eating bread,” is a phrase used in Scripture for feasting; and here it is evident, that Jacob made a feast to his relation of the cattle which he had offered in sacrifice. Jethro was no Israelite, and therefore the sacrifices offered by him may safely be affirmed to have been in all respects agreeable to the primitive laws of divine worship, and of him we are informed, that he “took a burnt-offering and sacrifices for God, and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel,

and ate bread with him before God." And that this was the practice of the Israelites long before the giving of the Law, appears sufficiently from this, that Moses and Aaron, in their address to Pharaoh, use these two phrases, of "holding a feast to God," and "sacrificing to the Lord," as expressing the very same sense. (Exod. v. 1. 3.)

Though feasting upon Sacrifice was more ancient than the Law, yet it pleased God to give more particular rules and precise directions, concerning the distribution and eating of the things offered at the altar, in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, than had been ever given before. The sin-offering, and trespass-offering, the first-born, and the meat-offerings, were divided between God and the priests; in the peace-offerings only the priests had their share; the burnt-offerings were wholly consumed in the fire, so that neither the priests nor people had any portion reserved for them. But then it is observed by them, who are best versed in the Jewish learning, that burnt-offerings were usually attended with peace-offerings, only some except such burnt-offerings as were offered for the whole congregation. . . . We may therefore safely conclude that the generality of Sacrifices among the Jews were accompanied with a feast. And their very language speaks this, for the same word *אָהַל*, signifies both feast and Sacrifice.

And what comes nearer to our purpose still, is this, that the Passover, which was the most solemn Sacrifice among the Jews, and which God gave in charge to that people before the Law or even the Ten Commandments, was to be wholly eaten; and this was a Sacrifice which, as it was a special type of the Eucharist, so it exactly agreed with it in this particular, namely, that God took no portion to Himself, nor assigned any precise share to the priest, but it became wholly a feast to the owners, whether priests or laymen.—vol. ii. pp. 17—19.

It will be very proper to consider the practice of the Gentiles, as well as of the Jews, under this head: for He who is the God of both, may reasonably be presumed to have had a regard to the notions and ancient usages of the former, as well as of the latter, in the whole frame of the Gospel dispensation. And the

Scripture affords us sufficient proof, that the heathen, even in the age of Moses, did make feasts on their Sacrifices.—p. 21.

Upon the whole, it is evident, that a Sacrifice and a religious feast are very near akin to each other; or rather, they are but two parts of the same worship, which, both among Jews and Gentiles, used to go hand in hand together. . . . I do not say, that there never was any religious feast made upon meats and drinks, which had not been first offered to God in Sacrifice; and I may safely affirm, that the most solemn religious feasts were always of this sort; such were the Passover, and the two other annual feasts of weeks and tabernacles, among the Jews. And, therefore, if the Eucharist be not a feast of a very inferior rank, and in its nature entirely different from the most solemn religious feasts of former ages, it must be confessed to be a Sacrifice too.—pp. 25, 6.

The Eucharist agrees in the main with the most solemn Sacrifices of the ancients, in the ends for which it is offered.

The ends or designs of men in sacrificing, have always been the same in all ages and nations; these are of two sorts, viz.

First, particular. Secondly, general.

I. There are particular ends and designs, which men have always proposed to themselves in offering every Sacrifice; these ends are various, but may be reduced to these following heads:

1. One particular end of Sacrifice, is to render prayers or petitions for some special mercy, more effectual.
2. Another end, is to express a grateful sense of some mercies or favours received.
3. A third end, is the expiating the guilt of sin, or obtaining pardon.

II. The general end of Sacrifice is,

1. To acknowledge the power and dominion of that God to whom it is offered.
2. To render Him gracious and favourable to the worshippers.
3. To preserve covenant and communion with Him.—p. 30.

And it is evident that all these ends are served by the Sacrifice of the Eucharist; and

1. All the particular ends of Sacrifice. For, 1st, and 2dly,



All prayers and praises for special mercies are most properly offered to God in, and by the Eucharist; because the Eucharist is the peculiar worship of the Christian Church, as will appear in the next chapter; and the primitive Christians practised it as such, and therefore used it in order to procure any singular blessing from God: as for instance, when a Bishop, or Priest was ordained, or when any of them, or of the faithful died, or were married, the Eucharist was offered to God in hopes of obtaining proper blessings and mercies on the persons concerned. The Eucharist was most probably that "ministry" in which "the prophets at Antioch" were engaged, when "the Spirit said unto them, Separate me Paul and Barnabas," and when they laid hands on these two eminent ministers of CHRIST. St. Paul exhorts, "that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and EUCHARIST" should be made for kings and all that were in authority. It can scarce be thought reasonable, that St. Paul should charge Christians to give thanks for such prodigies of vice and tyranny, as then swayed the Roman Empire; much less that "thanks" should be given "for all men" without distinction, for the enemies and persecutors of Christianity; but it was indeed proper to offer the Eucharist, the Christian Sacrifice, even for their most bitter enemies, that God might convert them, or bring them to a better mind, that so Christians "might lead quiet and peaceable lives." The very name Eucharist implies it to be a Sacrifice of thanks for all real blessings. It is also, by virtue of the personal Sacrifice of CHRIST, a means of averting all evil. And as to the third particular end, viz. forgiveness of sin, our SAVIOUR hath taught us, that this is one special end of the Eucharist, where He calls the consecrated bread and wine, "My body given" (to God) and "My blood shed for the remission of sins."

3. The general ends of Sacrifice are all obtained by the Eucharist. For 1st, All gifts brought to God's altar are an acknowledgment of His dominion; and CHRIST expects, that His disciples should bring gifts to the altar: and those too, material gifts, such as may be left behind them, while they go to be reconciled to their brethren: and Irenæus justly explains this, as a gift given to our great King, and by which we honour Him. And

2dly and 3dly, That the Christian Eucharist is a service by which we render God propitious to us, and by which we do covenant, and communicate with Him, is what, I suppose, will be denied by none.

And the excellency of the Christian Sacrifice, above and beyond all others, does appear from this consideration, that though it be but one, and always offered in the same manner, yet it does at once serve all the ends of all the Levitical Sacrifices : and we are actually to propose all these ends to ourselves, whenever we offer it. But there is one end in offering of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, in which it differs from the generality of the ancient Sacrifices. What this is, I am to show in the next section.—pp. 40, 1.

The first and principal design which our SAVIOUR proposed to Himself in the institution of the Eucharist, was, that it might be a standing perpetual memorial of the Sacrifice offered by Him for the sins of the world. He clearly teaches us this truth, in those words, “Do,” or “offer this, in remembrance of Me.” . . .

It is a mistake to think, that we are only to call this to remembrance in our own minds, or before men : we are certainly to show forth CHRIST’s death in the Sacrament, not only to one another, but to GOD . . . . We offer the sacramental Body and Blood of CHRIST to GOD, not only as a Sacrifice of praise for the merits of our SAVIOUR’s Passion, but in order to render all our prayers and petitions more acceptable at the throne of grace, especially our prayers for the pardon of our sins, for grace to amend our lives, and thereby to obtain a happy resurrection to eternal life : so that indeed the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, as it is a commemoration of CHRIST’s offering Himself in Person, does answer all the ends of the ancient Sacrifices ; forasmuch as the merits of His death are the most prevailing motive we can use with GOD, to render all our services acceptable to Him, to procure forgiveness of our sins, and the continuance of all spiritual favours, especially those of our covenanting, and communicating with GOD. . . . .

It cannot be said of the generality of the Sacrifices of the ancients, that they were commemorations, or representations of some other more ancient and excellent Sacrifices : however, they were not so in the intentions of those who offered them . . . . .

There was indeed one very singular providence, and the greatest, I think, that ever happened, except our redemption by CHRIST JESUS; and that was, the deliverance of the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt, with the miracles which went before, and followed it. This providence GOD was pleased to have yearly commemorated by slaying a lamb for every family, and offering it as a Sacrifice to GOD, and consuming it in a religious feast: and this was indeed a commemorative Sacrifice both in the design of GOD and of the Israelites, by whom it was offered. Nay, and it seems, that the lambs slain every year in after-ages, were representations of the lambs slain at first, the evening before they went out of the land of Egypt: for GOD commands the people, when they were in future ages asked by their children, "What mean you by this service?" to answer, "It is the LORD's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt." By which, it appears, that all the lambs that were sacrificed on this festival, though many hundred years after the first institution, were commemorations and representations of the Sacrifice of the Passover, which was first offered in Egypt; and it does not appear, that they had any other Sacrifice of this nature. . . .

I am entirely in the sentiment of all divines, both ancient and modern, Protestants and Papists, who agree in this, to the best of my observation, that all the Sacrifices before and under the law, received the atoning virtue they had, from the will of GOD, who instituted and accepted them, not in regard to their own value or virtue, but in consideration of the great and most meritorious Sacrifice, which was to be offered by CHRIST in the fulness of time; and that therefore these Sacrifices were types of CHRIST in the purpose and intention of GOD, though not revealed to all that offered these Sacrifices; and that, therefore, all acceptable Sacrifices agree in this, that they are representations of the grand one which was offered by CHRIST in His own Person.

And of all representative Sacrifices, the Eucharist is certainly the most excellent.

1. Because the bread and wine in the Sacrament are, or ought to be known by all who use them, to be representations of the great Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST; whereas the

Sacrifices under the law, and before it, were not generally known and discerned by those who offered them, to be types of CHRIST.

2. The first and main design of the Eucharist, is to be a remembrance of the personal Sacrifice of CHRIST, whereas the beasts offered under the law were first and chiefly intended by God to be services performed to Him by His people, whereby to express their wants and desires, and procure a supply and relief of them; and they were types of CHRIST only by a second and more remote intention of Almighty God.

3. The Eucharist is the only Sacrifice in which that of CHRIST is represented since it was offered, and to them who live under the Gospel, and is therefore clearly discerned by those who offer it. If the Jews had been informed that their Sacrifices represented a more excellent one to come; yet this apprehension of its signification and efficacy must have been more obscure than ours now is, because their notions of the Messiah Himself were but imperfect, in comparison of that plain view of Him which the Gospel gives us.

4. This is the only representation of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, which is that Body and Blood in power and effect; for the bread and wine in the Eucharist are such types, as that he who eats and drinks them unworthily, is "guilty of the Body and Blood of CHRIST," which can be said of none of the other ancient Sacrifices.—pp. 41—47.

*A Prayer to be used by one that is going to communicate. . . .*

O most merciful God and FATHER, I acknowledge, and adore Thine infinite love in sending Thy SON JESUS CHRIST to take upon Him our nature, and to suffer death upon the Cross, as a Sacrifice for the sins of men. I bless the divine goodness and wisdom of Thy Son, in offering His Body and Blood to Thee, and in commanding His Church to continue the memorial of it until His coming again to judge the quick and dead.

Grant, O gracious God, that all Christian men may have a just sense of the riches of Thy love and mercy in CHRIST JESUS, and may be duly affected with His holy life, heavenly sermons,

meritorious death and passion, glorious resurrection, and ascension; that we may all delight ourselves in doing Thy will, and His, in offering the good oblation, in showing forth His death according to His appointment: and, LORD, let the offering made by Thy Church be pleasant to Thee, as in the days of old, and come up with acceptance on Thine altar; let Thy gracious Presence be with Thy people assembled together, and praying in the Name of Thy Son: turn not away Thy face from the priests, and the congregations that join with them in pleading the merits of Thy SON'S death and passion, in the manner that He Himself ordained. Let the fire of Thy Holy Spirit always descend on the Christian Sacrifice, and on those who offer it; that their iniquity may be taken away, and their sins purged.—p. 250.

*When the Priest places the Alms, and the Bread and Wine on the altar, say,*

The LORD accept thine oblations, and perform all thy petitions in behalf of thyself and us.

*After the Prayer of Consecration, say,*

O most merciful LORD GOD, as we do believe Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, the High Priest of our oblation, to be now and always appearing at the right hand of glory, and always presenting His crucified and now glorified Body in our behalf; so we beseech Thee, let His intercession prevail with Thee for the acceptance of the services performed by Thy Church here on earth, according to His appointment. Reject not us, nor our oblations, while we wholly depend upon Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, as our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.—p. 256.

*A Prayer to be said after the Communion, in behalf of all Men, but especially Christians.*

O most merciful and gracious LORD GOD, that art the SAVIOUR of all men, especially of them that believe; Having now humbly represented to Thy divine Majesty the glorious Sacrifice which Thy dearest SON JESUS CHRIST offered, of His own Body and Blood; relying on Thy goodness, and trusting in Thy promises, and in the never-ceasing intercession made by our eternal High-

Priest in Heaven, I put up my prayers to Thee in behalf of all that call on Thy Name and have communicated to-day in the one Sacrifice, throughout the whole Christian world; and also in behalf of all them, that desire to communicate, but are hindered by any just necessity, whatsoever it be.

Give unto me, O LORD, and give unto them a portion of all the good prayers made by CHRIST in Heaven, and by Thy Church on earth . . .

I humbly beseech Thy Divine Majesty to accept the Sacrifice this day offered to Thee in behalf of my dearest friends and relations. . . .

Accept of this Sacrifice in behalf of all that suffer wrongfully, or that are under Thy correcting hand. . .—pp. 258—260.

*An Act of Spiritual Communion<sup>1</sup>, to be used after the Prayer above written<sup>2</sup>, when the person is destitute of an opportunity of external Communion.*

My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the courts of the LORD . . .

I rely upon the Sacrifice offered by CHRIST JESUS . . . LORD, thou knowest the desire of my heart to be to this bread and this cup; and that whenever Thou, in Thy good Providence, shalt remove this obstacle under which I at present lie, my heart is ready to join with any true Christian Priest and people, in offering this Sacrifice and partaking of this spiritual feast . . .

Accept, O Lord, of my will and desire, while I cannot actually communicate . . . Lord, reject not my prayer, nor turn Thy mercy from me; while, though absent from all true Christian congregations in body, but present with them all in spirit and desire, I join with them in pleading the merits of the all-sufficient Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Thy Son, for the pardon of my own sins and of all sincere penitents; for the obtaining of all necessary graces, and of a happy resurrection to eternal life.—pp. 262, 3.

<sup>1</sup> [Compare Bp. Taylor's Worthy Communicant, p. 386, as quoted by Johnson.]

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. p. 345.]

ID.—*Primitive Communicant.**A recognition of the Priesthood of Christ.*

O Infinite and Almighty God the FATHER, who hadst from the beginning Thy Word and Son dwelling with Thee, and in Thee, who was the light of men, by shedding on the ancient Patriarchs and Prophets, and all holy people before and under the Law, whatever knowledge they had of Thee, and of spiritual things . . . . I desire to acknowledge and glorify Thee, and Thy divine Son, for these early dawns of Thy grace and good will toward mankind; especially I confess and adore Thy immense goodness and mercy, for that Thou didst, in the fulness of time, send this Thy Word, and Son, to take upon Him our nature, and, as a priest according to the order of Melchisedek, to fulfil and abolish all the types of the Aaronical Priesthood and Sacrifices, and to bless the spiritual posterity of Abraham, in and by the Sacrifice of His Body and Blood, represented in bread and wine. Praise the Lord, O my Soul, all the days of Thy life, for such a priest and Sacrifice, by which the Gospel ministry, and Church, have been once for ever consecrated and perfected, and their services established, and a perpetual availment given to them; and all the defects and blemishes of them that attend Thine altars supplied by the abundant merits of this great High Priest, and His most efficacious oblation. Praise the Lord, O my soul, all the days of thy life, for such a Priest, and for the oblation of His body and Blood, which He commanded for ever to be continued in remembrance of Him; for the mysterious Bread given for the life of the world, for the cup poured out for the remission of the sins of men. . . . . Praise the Lord, O my soul, all the days of thy life, for this High Priest according to the order of Melchisedek, and for this pure oblation of bread and wine, by which we serve all the ends, and obtain all, and more than all the benefits procured by the manifold Sacrifices under, and before the law: of that bread and wine in the offering whereof CHRIST consigned Himself to the Cross, there to suffer death and make a full sa-

tisfaction for the sins of all, who should with true penitent hearts apply themselves to Thee through His all-sufficient death and Sacrifice. Praise the LORD, O my soul, all the days of thy life, for this High-Priest of our oblation; who, after He had finished the works and sufferings which Thou hadst assigned Him here on earth, did visibly ascend into Heaven, and sit down on Thy right hand; and now with His crucified and glorified Body appears in Thy presence, to give force and effect to the devotions of His Church, and especially to the ordinances of His own institution. May all Christian Priests and people for evermore rejoice in this most prevailing Mediator, and never seek for any other. May they with diligence and constancy employ themselves in those duties of religion, in which they may most safely depend on the intercession of this High Priest; especially in the commemorative oblation of His Body and Blood. May we make it our chief care and study to imitate His example in all the virtues of a holy life; that so we may at last receive the reward of faithful servants, and follow Him into the Holy of Holies, for His merits, and for Thy mercies' sake. Amen.—pp. 188—190.

*An Exercise of Communion with God and His Church, in the Holy Eucharist.*

O GOD of peace and love, who didst send Thy Son into the world to gather a holy nation, a peculiar people, an universal Church, from among all kingdoms, tongues, and countries, and to unite them together in the same faith and worship, and to bring them all at last to the same blessed place of eternal rest and joy. . . . Thou didst purchase this Church to Thyself, by the precious Body and Blood of Thine own Son offered in Sacrifice to Thee; and madest the commemoration of that Sacrifice the centre and ligament of that worship we owe Thee, and of that communion, which Thou didst intend to continue between Thee and Thy Church. The many loaves offered to Thee in all the congregations of Christians throughout the world, are but one and the same Sacrifice to the same GOD and Father of all, and are sanctified by the same Holy Spirit, and are made the one myste-



rious flesh of our one Mediator. . . . And do Thou, LORD GOD, send out Thy lively and powerful Spirit, to unite all Christians in the sincere belief and practice of these sacred truths, that they, with one heart and one voice, may offer this one Sacrifice, that Thy Church and the services of it may be perfectly one.—pp. 198—200.

*An Eucharistic Prayer to be said just before the receiving of  
the Sacramental Body and Blood.*

The highest praises, honours, and thanksgivings be to GOD the Father, who sent His Son into the world to make an atonement for the sins of men ; and to His Son, for willingly offering Himself as a ransom for our souls ; and to the eternal Spirit, with whose concurrence this inestimable offering was made, and this glorious work of our redemption was accomplished. The whole Church was first founded, and raised to be a holy nation and peculiar people, for the setting forth the praises of GOD, and offering spiritual Sacrifices for the salvation purchased by the Blood of CHRIST. At the same time that the Holy JESUS declared His Body to be given, His Blood to be shed for us, He did command that this remembrance should be continued, till His coming again. And this is that Sacrifice of thanksgiving in which we see the salvation of GOD ; and in and by which we receive and enjoy all the benefits of CHRIST's death and passion, if we come with hearts prepared for such great blessings . . . May I never want a heart to value, and rejoice over them ; or an opportunity of joining with the priests and people of Thy Church, in presenting this Sacrifice of praise to Thee, the God of all our mercies . . . The favourable acceptance of the Sacrifices offered to Thee of old, did much depend on the eating them in a due and just manner. And it was declared that he who eat of them without observing the rules prescribed by the Law, should bear his iniquity and be cut off from Thy people : and Thou hast declared by Thy Apostle, that he who eateth and drinketh the Body and Blood of the LORD unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself. LORD GOD, do Thou be pleased so to dispose my heart, while I am approaching Thy mysteries with joy and praise, at

the same time to be assisted with such awe and reverence, such a judicious fear and trembling, as befits those who are employed in so solemn and concerning an ordinance . . . . . As no Christian ought to doubt but that the Christian Sacrifice is accepted on the heavenly Altar, and that the sacramental Body and Blood of CHRIST are replenished with His merits, and enriched with the special presence of the Holy Spirit ; so it is the sincere desire of my heart, that I myself, and all who communicate in this holy Sacrament, may perceive, and lay hold, and possess themselves of these rich treasures . . . . . and that, looking to CHRIST JESUS as the Author and Finisher of our faith and good services, and on His all-sufficient Sacrifice as the foundation of all our hopes and devotions, we may at last obtain the reward of faithful servants, for the sake of the same JESUS CHRIST our LORD. Amen.—pp. 201—204.

WILSON, BISHOP, CONFESSOR & DOCTOR.—*Short Introduction to the Lord's Supper.*

Sect. ii.

The holy Apostles of CHRIST, who were present when He first administered this Sacrament, give us the following account of its end and institution.

They signify to us, in the first place, that this Sacrament was ordained by CHRIST the same night in which He was betrayed, and after they had observed the Passover. . . . .

Now, after the Paschal Supper, as the Apostles relate it, "JESUS CHRIST took bread," &c.

In obedience, therefore, to this command of JESUS CHRIST, who has delivered us from a greater bondage than that of Egypt, the Christian Church keeps up the memory of His love, His Sacrifice, and His sufferings and death, after this solemn manner.

First, as an acknowledgment that our lives, and all that we eat or drink to preserve them, are owing to the bounty of GOD, we present upon His table, by the hands of His own minister, a portion of His creatures, the best we have for the support and comfort of our natural life, namely, bread and wine. After this,

the bread and wine are consecrated, the bread is broken, and the wine poured out, to represent the death of CHRIST, whose Body was broken, and whose Blood was shed for us.

Then the Minister of GOD, as the Steward of CHRIST's household, applies these blessings to every person who receives the Sacrament, in this devout prayer:—"The Body and Blood of CHRIST, which were given and shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."—*Works* (8vo. edit.), vol. ii. pp. 21 — 23.

*The Order for Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion,*

*With suitable Directions, Observations, and Devotions.*

[*Note.*] The following prayer was used by the pious author, before receiving and administering the Sacrament:—

"Give me grace, O merciful God, now I am going to Thine altar, that I may in some measure answer the work appointed me, in offering sacrifice unto Thee, in order to communicate the bread of life to Thy people." . . .

[*On the Rubric, "And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table," &c.*]

[*Note.*] If this rubric is not strictly observed, as in many places it is not, the intent of the Church is defeated, and a very instructive circumstance is omitted.

[*After the Prayer of Consecration.*]

*Say secretly*,—Send down Thy Spirit and blessing upon this means of grace and salvation, which Thou Thyself, O JESUS, hast ordained.

Most merciful GOD, the Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, look graciously upon the gifts now lying before Thee, and send down Thy Holy Spirit on this Sacrifice, that He may make this bread and this wine the Body and Blood of Thy CHRIST, that all they who partake of them may be conformed in godliness,—may receive remission of their sins,—may be delivered from the devil and his wiles,—may be filled with the HOLY GHOST,—may be worthy of Thy CHRIST, and obtain everlasting life; Thou, O

LORD ALMIGHTY, being reconciled unto them, through the same  
JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD. Amen.

[*Concerning Spiritual Communion.*]

The Church<sup>1</sup>, for the comfort and advantage of such Christians as, through any just impediment, be hindered from receiving the LORD's Supper in the manner which she has appointed, (that is, from the hands of CHRIST's own minister,) has given us this instruction:—"That if we do truly repent," &c. . . . They that composed this Rubric had, it is very probable, an eye to the daily Sacrifice, which, under the law of Moses, was offered for the whole people of Israel; at which all such pious persons who could not possibly be present, yet offered their daily prayers to GOD in union of spirit, and in virtue of that Sacrifice offered in the temple; and which, no doubt of it, were accepted of GOD.

Now, forasmuch as very many pious souls do labour under this sad impediment, especially in many country churches, where the Sacrament is but too seldom administered,—to supply this defect, some such help as the following may be made use of, on the LORD's day, or on any other Holy-Day. . . .

ST. LUKE xxii. 19. "Do this in remembrance of Me."

O good SAVIOUR, I will, through Thy grace, "do this in remembrance of Thee," and in obedience to Thy command, as well as I am able.

I do, therefore, this good day join, in desire and spirit, with every Christian congregation in the world, which truly celebrates this holy mystery.

With them I join in giving my devoutest thanks to Thy ALMIGHTY FATHER, and our gracious GOD, who did not overlook lost mankind, but sent Thee, His only SON, to redeem us. With them I call to remembrance what Thou hast done and suffered for us;—Thine incarnation,—Thy laborious life,—Thy bitter passion,—Thy death and resurrection,—the great deliverance Thou hast thereby wrought for all mankind,—and the obligations Thou hast laid upon us.

<sup>1</sup> See the second Rubrick after the Office of the Communion of the Sick.

I join with Thy Church, and plead the merits of Thy Sacrifice for all estates and conditions of men; that none may deprive themselves of that happiness which Thou hast purchased by Thy death:—for all Christian Kings and Governors;—for all Bishops and Pastors; . . . for all persons and places in distress by the sword, pestilence, and famine<sup>1</sup>; &c. . . .

Id.—*The Lord's Supper practically explained.*—(Sermon lxxvi.)

May not one therefore conclude, without any great uncharitableness, that such as do lightly turn their backs upon this ordinance, do not indeed love the LORD JESUS; and that, according to St. Paul's direction, they ought to be "anathema," that is, separated from the communion of the faithful.

And though this would be called great severity at this time, yet this was the practice of the primitive Church, and it was agreeable to the law of the Passover, the great figure of CHRIST'S death, and by GOD'S express command; that is, that whoever did neglect to observe the Passover, in remembrance of their deliverance out of Egypt, "that soul should be cut off" from among the people of Israel.

. . . . For, as the most unlearned Israelite under the Law, when he was commanded to bring his Sacrifice to the altar, to lay his hand upon the head of the beast, confessing his sins over him;—as he did very easily understand, that this was to put him in mind, that death was the punishment due to sin,—that he himself deserved the death that that creature was going to suffer,—that it was great mercy in GOD that He would accept such a Sacrifice for his sin, which yet he had good hopes He would do, since He Himself had ordained it;—as he would very easily perceive, that all this was designed as a very powerful motive to humble him before God; to give him an abhorrence of sin, which could not be forgiven without the loss of the life of an innocent creature; and lastly, that it was intended to lead him

<sup>1</sup> 1 Macc. xii. "We remember you in our Sacrifices, and in our prayers, as reason is, and as it becomes us to think upon our brethren."

to the love of God, who would be reconciled to him upon such gracious terms ;—I say, the most ignorant Israelite could understand this end of Sacrifices, and perform the duty required of him, as well as the most learned master in Israel :—

Even so every Christian, even the most unlearned, is capable of understanding, (if it be not plainly his own fault,) and of performing all the duties of a worthy communicant.

For when he is informed, that this is the true Christian Sacrifice,—the only means of rendering our persons and all our prayers acceptable to God,—of obtaining the pardon of our sins, the assistance of God's grace, and everlasting happiness after death :—when he sees that done before his eyes that JESUS CHRIST Himself did ; who the same night in which He was betrayed, having devoted Himself an offering and a Sacrifice to God for the sins of the whole world, did institute this holy Sacrament, by taking bread and wine, and blessing them, and making them, by that blessing, the true representatives of His Body and Blood, in virtue and power, as well as in name :—

When he is made sensible that this service was ordained by CHRIST Himself, not only as a testimony of His great love for His poor creatures, but as a means whereby He would communicate all the benefits of that death which He was then going to suffer ; and by which He would apply the merits of His death to all people and ages of the world :—

Lastly, when he is assured, even from CHRIST Himself, that whoso eateth and drinketh this His Flesh and Blood after this holy manner, dwelleth in CHRIST, and CHRIST in Him ; that such a one has a right to eternal life, and that God will raise him up at the last day :—

Let a man, I say, be never so unlearned, yet he will easily understand, that he is not to look upon and receive this bread and wine as common food, but as holy representatives of CHRIST's Body and Blood, made such by an especial blessing of God ; that he is to receive it in remembrance of the death of CHRIST, and to believe assuredly that the blessing of God will attend his doing so ; for it being God's own ordinance, He cannot but bless it, and him who observes it.

Id.—*Holy Bible, with Notes.*

*On St. Matt. v. 23.*

“If thou bring thy gift,” &c.] This was always understood to have respect to the Christian Sacrifice, to the bread and wine there offered to God: for the legal Sacrifice being soon to be abolished, it is not likely that CHRIST would give precepts concerning them. “Thy gift.” Thy Sacrifice.

*On Chap. xxvi. 28.*

“Which is shed”—*i. e.* He then, at that instant, gave His Body and Blood a Sacrifice for the sins of the world. He then offered, as a priest, Himself under the symbols of bread and wine, and this is the Sacrifice which His priests do still offer. And let it be observed, that JESUS CHRIST did this before He was apprehended, when He was at His own disposal; it was then He offered Himself a Sacrifice to God.

Id.—*Parochialia, or Instructions to the Clergy.*

Now, as JESUS CHRIST did by His death make our peace with God, and “obtain eternal redemption for all them that obey Him,” we Christians, in obedience to His command, do keep up the remembrance of His death until His coming again, after this solemn manner.

First, As God is the King of all the earth, we offer unto Him the best things that the earth affords for the life of man, namely, bread and wine, as an acknowledgment that all we have, whether for the support or comfort of our lives, is owing entirely to His bounty.

The bread and wine being placed upon the altar, (by which they are sanctified, that is, set apart for holy uses,) we then proceed to give God thanks for His SON, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who is the life of our souls, after this manner:

The priest, by doing what CHRIST did, by prayer and thanksgiving, by breaking the bread and pouring out the wine, obtaineth of God, that these creatures become, after a spiritual manner, the Body and Blood of CHRIST, by receiving of which

our souls shall be strengthened and refreshed, as our bodies are by bread and wine.

For all this is done to represent the death of JESUS CHRIST, and the mercies which He has obtained for us; to represent it not only to ourselves, but unto GOD the FATHER, that, as the prayers and alms of Cornelius are said to have "gone up for a memorial before GOD," so this service may be an argument with His Divine Majesty to remember His SON's death in heaven, as we do on earth, and for His sake to blot out our sins, and to give us all an interest in His merits.

After this, we all receive the bread and wine (being thus made the Body and Blood of CHRIST,) in token of communion with CHRIST our Head, and with all His members.

And, that we may have a more lively sense imprinted upon our minds of the love of GOD, of the kindness of our Redeemer, and of the benefits He has, by the shedding of His Blood, obtained for us, the Minister of GOD applieth the merits of CHRIST's death to the soul of every faithful receiver in these words: "Eat and drink this in remembrance that CHRIST died for thee, and that He may preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

By explaining the meaning of this ordinance after some such familiar way as this, a young Christian will see,

That, by joining in this Sacrament, we keep up the remembrance of CHRIST's death, which is our salvation:

We plead with GOD for pardon, for His SON's sake, after a way which His SON Himself appointed:

We are hereby more firmly united to CHRIST our Head, and to the Church, which is His body:

And lastly, we do hereby express our faith and hope of His coming again to reward His faithful servants.

LD.—*Sacra Privata.*

LORD'S SUPPER.

*Before Service begins.*

May it please Thee, O GOD, who hast called us to this ministry, to make us worthy to offer unto Thee this Sacrifice for our own sins, and for the sins of Thy people.



Accept our service and our persons, through our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who liveth and reigneth, with Thee and the HOLY GHOST, one GOD, world without end. Amen.

O reject not this people for me, and for my sins.

*Upon placing the Alms upon the Altar.*

All that we possess is the effect of Thy bounty, O GOD; and of Thy own do we give Thee. Pardon all our vain expences; and accept of this testimony of our gratitude to Thee, our Benefactor, for the LORD JESUS' sake.

*Upon placing the Elements upon the Altar.*

Vouchsafe to receive these Thy creatures from the hands of us sinners, O Thou self-sufficient God.

*Immediately after the Consecration.*

We offer unto Thee, our King and our God, this bread and this cup.

We give Thee thanks for these, and for all Thy mercies; beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this Sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy CHRIST, and this cup the Blood of Thy CHRIST; and that all we who are partakers thereof, may thereby obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion.

And, together with us, remember, O GOD, for good the whole mystical Body of Thy SON; that such as are yet alive may finish their course with joy; and that we, with all such as are dead in the LORD, may rest in hope, and rise in glory, for Thy SON's sake, whose death we now commemorate. Amen.

May I atone Thee, O GOD, by offering to Thee the pure and unbloody Sacrifice, which Thou hast ordained by JESUS CHRIST. Amen.

But how shall I dare to offer Thee this Sacrifice, if I had not first offered myself a Sacrifice to Thee, my GOD?

May I never offer the prayers of the faithful with polluted lips, nor distribute the Bread of life with unclean hands.

I acknowledge and receive Thee, O JESUS, as sent of GOD, a Prophet, to make His will known to us, and His merciful pur-

pose to save us ;—as our Priest, who offered Himself an acceptable Sacrifice for us, to satisfy the Divine Justice, and to make intercession for us ;—and as our King, to rule and defend us against all our enemies.

May I always receive the Holy Sacrament in the same meaning, intention, and blessed effect, with which JESUS CHRIST administered it to His Apostles in His last Supper.—Vol. ii. pp. 226—228.

#### LENT.

##### *Meditations proper for a Clergyman at that season.*

Give me such holy dispositions of soul, whenever I approach Thine Altar, as may in some measure be proportionable to the holiness of the work I am about,—of presenting the prayers of the faithful,—of offering a spiritual Sacrifice to God, in order to convey the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST, the true Bread of life, to all His members. Give me, when I commemorate the same Sacrifice that JESUS CHRIST once offered, give me the same intentions that He had, to satisfy the justice of GOD,—to acknowledge His mercies,—and to pay all that debt which a creature owes to his Creator. None can do this effectually but JESUS CHRIST. Him, therefore, we present to GOD, in this holy Sacrament.—pp. 288, 9.

##### SHERLOCK, (WILLIAM,) PRESBYTER.—*Practical Discourse of Religious Assemblies.*

For we may consider further, that as CHRIST has instituted this Holy Supper, so He has instituted it as an act of religious worship. It is a Sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving to GOD, and to our SAVIOUR. It is a commemoration of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, “ a showing forth the LORD’S death until He come ” ; and therefore is a mysterious rite of worship, as all Sacrifices were under the law. But to explain this more particularly, though briefly, I shall consider this holy feast, both as it respects GOD, and as it respects our SAVIOUR.

1. With respect to GOD; and so we may consider it as a thanksgiving, or as a prayer.

As a thanksgiving to GOD for His great and inexpressible goodness in sending His SON JESUS CHRIST into the world, and offering Him up as an expiation and atonement for our sins. . . . and what more proper Sacrament of thanksgiving and praise can we use than to present Him with the memorials of His stupendous love? You cannot more effectually praise any man, than to show the visible remains and monuments of his bounty and charity; as the widows, weeping, "showed the coats and garments which Dorcas made while she was with them." Thus, when we offer up to GOD the memorials of CHRIST'S Death and Passion, it is a visible Sacrifice of praise, and speaks such kind of language as this; "Behold, Lord, here is the token of Thy love to us, Thy own Son bleeding and dying for our sins; Thy eternal Son, the Son of Thy love, in whom Thy soul is well pleased, dying upon the Cross, a shameful, accursed, lingering, tormenting death; scorned and reproached of men, and forsaken of GOD. We will never forget such love as this; we will perpetually celebrate this holy feast, and offer up the memorials of a crucified JESUS, as a Sacrifice of praise to His FATHER, to His GOD, and to our GOD."

2. The LORD'S Supper may be considered as a Sacrament of prayer; for so the Sacrifices under the law were always offered with prayers, which were accepted in virtue of the Sacrifice. . . . offered by the priests who were GOD'S ministers; and now under the Gospel, GOD has sent His own Son into the world, to be both our Priest and our Sacrifice; the acceptation of our prayers depends upon the power of His intercession; and the power of His intercession upon the merit of His Blood: for "with His own Blood He entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." We must now go to GOD in His name, and plead the merits of His Blood, if we expect a gracious answer to our prayers.

Now, for this end was the LORD'S Supper instituted, to be a "remembrance" of CHRIST, or of the Sacrifice of the Cross, to "show forth the LORD'S death till He come;" which, as it respects

GOD, is to put Him in remembrance of CHRIST's death, and to plead the virtue and merit of it for our pardon and acceptance. It is a visible prayer to GOD, to remember the sufferings of His Son, and to be propitious to His Church, His body, and every member of it, which He has purchased with His own Blood. And therefore, the ancient Church constantly at His holy Supper, offered up their prayers to GOD, in virtue of the Sacrifice of CHRIST, there represented, for the whole Church, and all ranks and conditions of men. For this reason, the LORD's Supper was called a commemorative Sacrifice, because we therein offer up to GOD the remembrance of CHRIST's Sacrifice; and therefore, in the ancient Church, the altar, or the place where they consecrated the elements, was the place also where they offered up their prayers to signify that they offered their prayers only in virtue of the Sacrifice of CHRIST, and that the very remembrance of this Sacrifice in the LORD's Supper by virtue of its institution, did render their prayers prevalent and acceptable to GOD, and therefore, in the very first account we have of the exercise of Christian worship, we find "breaking of bread and prayers" joined together. The efficacy of our prayers depends on the merit of CHRIST's Sacrifice; and the way CHRIST hath appointed to give our prayers an interest in His Sacrifice, is to offer them in the holy Supper, with the sacramental remembrance of His Death and Passion.—pp. 316—322.

GRABE, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*MS. Adversaria* <sup>1</sup>.

*Is the Eucharist a Sacrifice of the New Testament?*

It is agreed amongst divines, even those who differ concerning

<sup>1</sup> Translated from papers "deposited, among the rest of his valuable remains, in the Bodleian Library, to which, after the deaths of Bp. Hicke and Bp. Smalridge, he had himself bequeathed them." See Preface to "De Formâ Consecrationis Eucharistiæ, &c. or a Defence of the Greek Church against the Roman, in the article of the Consecration of the Eucharistical Elements, &c. London, 1721." This paper, together with those from which extracts are given above, is contained in Dr. Grabe's *Adversaria*, of which there are three and twenty volumes preserved in the Bodleian Library. The seventh volume is headed, "Testimonia Veterum de Controversiis ad Theologiam Mystagogicam pertinentibus."

"I. De

the question proposed, that "Sacrifice is a religious rite, whereby a sacred person offers some creature, on the altar or holy table, to God in the way of a gift, to testify his own subjection, and that of those in whose behalf he offers, to Him as the Creator and Supreme God." The *genus* of Sacrifice, therefore, is oblation, and consequently whatever is properly called a Sacrifice must be offered by a priest upon an altar, as a sacred gift to God; and that which is not so offered, is not truly a Sacrifice. The general end of Sacrifices is the testifying of our inward devoted subjection to God, as the supreme LORD, in like manner as tributes or gifts are given to kings for the acknowledgment of their supreme outward dominion. Which comparison St. Irenæus uses, book iv. chap. 34. writing thus, "Therefore the oblation of the Church, which the LORD hath taught to be offered in the whole world, is esteemed by God a pure Sacrifice, and is accepted by Him; not that He wants a Sacrifice from us, but because he who offers is

"I. De modis diversis quibus panis et vinum possint esse in S. Eucharistiâ corpus et sanguis Christi.

"II. De mutatione quæ in S. Eucharistiâ fit, contra Transubstantiationem Pontificiam.

"III. De Sacrificio Eucharistico, juxta sensum ejus genuinum vereque Catholicum."

These papers are marked No. 116, and they begin with the fragment of a translation of Mede's "Christian Sacrifice," containing the first chapter of the Discourse. There is a rough draft of this translation in Vol. xx. No. 29. together with a translation of part of the third chapter. It is there headed, "Sacrificium Christianum ex Malach. i. 11. descriptum et expositum a viro pio ac profunde docto, Josepho Medo, Theologo Anglicano."

The paper, No. 117, (in vol. vii.) from which extracts are given above, is headed "Qu. An S. Eucharistia sit Sacrificium Novi Testamenti?"

On the opposite page is pasted a paper containing a rough draft, less fully expanded, of the first few sentences, down to the quotation from St. Irenæus. On the margin of this paper stands a list of names of English divines in alphabetical order, written wide, as though for further insertions. "Burnet, Brevint, Beveridge, Fell, Forbesius, Hammond, Hooperus, Laud, Medus, Montacut., Sherlock, Taylor, Thorndike, White." "Burnet" has been added afterwards, and perhaps "Hooperus." This list, accidentally discovered, was, it may be mentioned, the groundwork of the present Catena.

No 118, in the same volume, is the tract published, with a translation, in the volume referred to above. "De formâ Consecrationis," &c.

himself honoured in what he offers, if his gifts be accepted. For our honour and affection toward a king is declared by our gifts." And so all nations by means of Sacrifices showed themselves devoted to the service of those gods to whom they offered; so the Jews testified their devotion to the true God. But, in truth, in the Sacrifices of these [Christians] there was yet another general end regarded, namely a representation of the oblation of CHRIST upon the Cross, through which all other oblations are accepted of God, whereas, without respect to that, they are hateful, or at all events useless. There were indeed besides, many and divers special reasons of Sacrifices, whence also the Sacrifices themselves were divers, being either Eucharistic, or propitiatory, or impetratory; but the two afore-mentioned ends were in common regarded in all the Sacrifices whether of all nations or of the people of God. And that which hath thus far been said is placed beyond all hazard of controversy, so that he would be losing his labour who should go about to prove it at length; and he who would deny it, would be introducing a new signification of the word "Sacrifice," and removing landmarks that have been fixed. It was, however, in the last century, a point strongly affirmed on the one side, and denied on the other, that the mystery of the holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice as described in the manner aforesaid. This point, namely, (to pass by the refinements of others,) was disputed; whether, in the Eucharist, the bread and wine, and, after the mystical consecration, the Flesh and Blood of the LORD, are offered upon the holy table, as upon an altar, to God, for the testifying of His supreme dominion, and the commemoration or representation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST finished on the Cross. For there were, and yet are, many who believe that the holy Eucharist is a bare Sacrament, or sacred feast, not a Sacrifice, and who will have the afore-said sacred symbols to be signs, indeed, whereby God doth declare and communicate His grace to the faithful, and represent the death of the LORD to their eyes, that they may not be taken with forgetfulness of it: but they deny them to be signs whereby the faithful testify their subjection to the Deity, and represent the Sacrifice

of the Cross to God the FATHER, in order that by this memorial they may find favour in His eyes. This, I say, in the last century almost all the Protestants denied; it is still denied by many: it hath been affirmed, however, in this century, and is still affirmed, by not a few prelates and divines of the English Church, Laud, Abp. and Martyr, Mountagu, White, Fell, and others<sup>1</sup>, bishops, and, of presbyters, Mede, Hammond, Thorndike, Beveridge, Sherlock, Hooper, &c., to whom may be added, from Scotland and Ireland, two most eminent Prelates, William Forbes and Jeremy Taylor; all, men illustrious for learning and piety, who would not have asserted it in their writings, unless they had seen firm grounds for this opinion, which it will be worth our while briefly to go over.

To begin from what is the better known, there is in behalf of this opinion such a consent of the most ancient Fathers and successors of the Apostles, as is seen in scarcely any mystery of the Christian faith. St. Clement of Rome, in his epistle to the Corinthians, written while many of the Apostles were yet alive, § 40. "We ought to do all things in order, whatsoever our Lord hath commanded us to observe; to celebrate the oblations and liturgies at the appointed times," &c. . . . and §. 44. "It will be no small crime if we eject those from the episcopal function, who offer the gifts in an unblameable and holy manner." Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, p. 259. sq. "The oblation of fine flour which was ordered to be offered for those that were cleansed from the leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which the LORD JESUS CHRIST ordered to be offered for the remembrance of the suffering which He underwent for those who are cleansed as to their souls from all wickedness; in order that we may give thanks to God for having created the world, and all things in it for the sake of man, and for having delivered us from the wickedness in which we lived, and for having finally dissolved powers and principalities through CHRIST, who, according to His will, became subject to suffer-

<sup>1</sup> In the margin is added, "Burnet forte;" or possibly the text is—"Whiteus, Fellus, episcopi," and the note, "Burnet aliiq̄ forte."

ing<sup>1</sup>. . . . I prove it by other words which Justin Martyr has used, in that Dialogue with Trypho, p. 344. "We who, by the name of Jesus, believe, as one man, in God the Maker of all things, are indeed a priestly race unto God; as God also Himself testifies, declaring that we offer in every place among the Gentiles, victims pleasing to Him and pure. Verily, God accepts Sacrifices from no one save from His priests. All those, therefore, who, by His name, offer the Sacrifices which JESUS CHRIST delivered to be performed, namely, in the Eucharist of the bread and the cup, which are offered in every place by Christians, God beforehand testifies to be acceptable to Him. But He rejects those made by you, and those priests of yours, saying, 'I will accept none of your Sacrifices at your hands, for, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, My name is glorified among the Gentiles, &c.' " But concerning this passage of Malachi, I shall, in what follows, adduce other expressions of Justin and other Fathers. I now go on to testimonies of Irenæus concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice<sup>2</sup>. \* \* \*

I proceed to the second oblation, whereby the bread and wine, or symbols and sacraments of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, are offered by the priest to GOD the FATHER, and not only thanks are given to Him, for that He hath delivered His beloved Son to death for the redemption of the human race, but He is also entreated that, looking from heaven upon these holy signs of the New Covenant, He will become propitious to us, and not disdain to bestow upon us remission of sins, and other good things obtained to us through Christ. Such an oblation there is in the first Liturgy of Edward VI. [and also in the Scotch<sup>3</sup>,] in the following form, immediately after the words of institution, the consecrated symbols being present, "Wherefore, O LORD," &c. . . . There is rightly there made, and said to be made, that Eucharistic oblation, in observance of the

<sup>1</sup> Here follows a discussion of the right reading of the original text.

<sup>2</sup> On the back of this leaf is a discussion of the question of Apostolical tradition, in regard to the Eucharist. What follows is on the next leaf.

<sup>3</sup> Added in the margin.



sacred institution of CHRIST, who, pointing to the leading character of this sacrament, saith, "Do this for the commemoration of Me." Which words the Apostle reciting, (1 Cor. xi. 25.) subjoins these words of his own, v. 26. "Wherefore as often as ye eat this bread," &c. From which it is plain, that the memory of the LORD's Passion is to be celebrated not only by the mind inwardly, but also outwardly with the voice; and not by words only, but also in act. But is it in discourse to the people, or in prayer to God? That it is the latter that is to be done, rather than the former, is both pointed out by the very nature of a commemorative Sacrifice, in that therein we have to do with GOD, not with man; and also our SAVIOUR hath taught us by His pattern, inasmuch as, in the institution of this mystery, He discoursed not with His Apostles concerning the redemption of men, but blessed GOD His FATHER for it, and commanded the Apostles and their successors, all priests whatsoever, unto the end of the world, to do the same which He then did. Now, that our SAVIOUR gave thanks to GOD the FATHER for the redemption of the human race, now shortly to be accomplished by the offering of His Body and the shedding of His Blood, is most rightly gathered from the rites as well of the Jews as of the Christians, although the holy Evangelists have not expressed the matter or the form of the praise and prayer uttered by CHRIST. For the Jews, on festival days, not only praised GOD, as the LORD of all the creatures, in the ordinary form, for the creation of bread and wine, but made likewise especial mention of that benefit of which the festive memory was then celebrated. And CHRIST accordingly, in the first Eucharist, gave thanks to GOD the FATHER, not only for creation but chiefly for redemption, the memorial Sacrament whereof He was then instituting, and, by His example and precept, appointed the same to be done now also by priests. Whence Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, p. 250, having before made mention of the Eucharistic bread says, "which we offer for the remembrance of the suffering," &c. . . . and Eusebius de Dem. Evang. lib. i. cap. 10. . . . And that the primitive Christians strictly observed this institution of CHRIST,

as well Eusebius bears witness as Justin Martyr, in the dialogue above cited. . . . In which passage of Justin, and that above cited, thanksgivings are spoken of as being appointed by CHRIST, and made by the primitive Christians, both for the creation of food and of the creatures necessary, and also for redemption by the Passion. And this their practice is most clearly seen from the ancient liturgies. Of which I will quote one, and that of the greatest antiquity, and undoubtedly genuine, extant in the 8th book of the Apostolical Constitutions<sup>1</sup>. . . . Compare other forms, prescribed, as appears, for sacred services, lib. vii. c. 26. But that CHRIST not only gave thanks to GOD for the redemption of man, but also prayed GOD HIS FATHER that He would make His Apostles, and them that should believe on Him through their word, partakers of that benefit; and that He prayed also for His Church; is further gathered from the constant practice as well of the Jews before Him as of Christians after Him. For, among the Jews, on feast days, the master of the family, holding a cup of wine, joined with the giving of thanks a long prayer, cited by Fagius, on Deut. viii. 10; which runs thus: "Have mercy, O LORD our GOD, upon our Israel, even Thy people, and Thy city Jerusalem, and Sion the tabernacle of Thy glory," &c. . . . With regard to the Christians, in the Liturgies of St. James and of St. Clement, immediately after the words above recited, the priest goes on, "And we pray Thee," &c.<sup>2</sup> which correspond remarkably to those forms of the Jews above mentioned, where they pray for the temple, and for Sion, the tabernacle of the glory of GOD. And this selfsame prayer, in which, through the Body and Blood of CHRIST represented on the altar, GOD is entreated to be propitious to us, and bestow upon men all good things, is that "propitiatory Sacrifice," or "unbloody immolation and propitiatory Sacrifice" of CHRIST, of which very frequent mention occurs in the writings of the holy Fathers. We have already above recited the words of Justin Martyr, where

\* \* \* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> [Vid. sup. cit. pp. 260, 261—263.]

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. cit. pp. 262, 266.]

[*Distinctions of the English Church above other Congregations of Protestants, in practice and doctrine especially*<sup>1</sup>.]

In the Ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the continued succession of Bishops from the Apostles, and the lawful ordination of priests.—chap. 1.

In the celebration of the Eucharist, wherein is treated of the oblation of bread and wine, and the bread leavened, of the blessing, of the giving of thanks and prayers, of the breaking the bread, and of the priest himself taking the first portion of the oblations.—chap. 2.

In the administration of Confirmation, &c. . . .

---

The English divines teach that in the holy Eucharist the Body

<sup>1</sup> “Amongst his plans there is one in Latin, entitled *ANGLICANÆ ECCLESIÆ Prærogativæ, præ aliis Protestantium Cœtibus, in Praxi et Doctrina speciatim*. The titles of the chapters of this intended treatise are those which follow, in his own words, ‘In Hierarchiâ,’ &c. I have set down these titles to show what a singular esteem he had for the Church of England above all other reformed Churches, and to take occasion to tell the world, that, upon his deathbed, he desired it might be known that he died in her faith and communion, which he thought a pure and a sound part of the Catholic Church. But then, after these heads, he hath written in capitals *DESIDERATA*. . . . For it cannot be denied that he was for restoring the pure primitive practices and discipline of the Catholic Churches, which continued more or less corrected in all Churches, till the Reformation. . . . And as he used to speak of the want of these things, as defects in the reformed Churches, so it was not without sorrow and indignation that he used to lament the corruption and depravation of them in the Church of Rome, to which his great love and zeal for pure ancient Christianity would no more let him be reconciled than any of those Martyrs who, for bearing their testimonies against her intolerable errors, have, here or elsewhere, resisted unto blood.” See “Some account of Dr. Grabe, and of his Manuscripts,” by Dr. Hickes, prefixed to “Some instances of the defects and omissions in Mr. Whiston’s Collection of Testimonies,” &c.—pp. vi—x.

Among the “*Desiderata*,” enumerated in the page following of the MS., is “6. *Circa Eucharistiam a Negatio Sacrificii*,” &c.

The paper above quoted is in Vol. xx. of the *Adversaria*, No. 21. In the same Volume, No. 19, is a dissertation entitled, “*Sacrificium Christianum ab Apostolis traditum*,” in which the authorities referred to in the last cited paper are quoted at greater length.

and Blood of CHRIST, under the species, that is, the signs, of bread and wine, are offered to GOD, and become a representation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST once made upon the Cross, whereby GOD may be rendered propitious. Daniel Brevint, &c. . . . Jeremy Taylor. . . .

[*Preface to Edward VI.'s First Liturgy*<sup>1</sup>.]

Of the occasion of publishing by itself this form of Liturgy with annotations. Of the use of it, namely, to show how near the first reformers of the Church of England kept to the primitive institution of JESUS CHRIST, and the practice of His immediate followers, the holy Apostles and the ancient Christians; although they laid aside the later Popish abuses. Of the most certain and yet easy means of knowing the institution and practice of JESUS CHRIST, and of the first Christians in the Apostolical Churches, in this particular point. Of the obligation of keeping to, and complying with the said institution and practice. . . .

§ 1. When I last year perused the two very learned and most excellent treatises of Dr. Hickes, concerning the "Christian Priesthood," and the "Excellency of the Episcopal Order," and found, by the occasion of the former, added at the end the form of the Liturgy and administration of the holy Eucharist, as the same was reformed by our bishops in the first year of Edward VI. and confirmed by act of Parliament, in which

\* \* \* \* \*

I was very much pleased with it, and wished that the same might, to the more common and better use, be published by itself, and with somewhat larger annotations. In which sentiment a very pious and good friend agreed with me, and, indeed, hath since, more than once, urged me to take upon me this

<sup>1</sup> "It was with the same freedom that he used to lament the alterations that were made in the first Common Prayer Book of king Edward VI. which, as I find by a fragment among his English MSS., he designed to publish with notes." —*Hickes*, sup. cit. p. xiv. The above fragment is in Vol. xxii. of the *Adversaria*, No. 174.

small piece of work ; which, therefore, after some delay, I have now done out of hand, in hopes that it will, some time and some way or other, tend to the honour of God, and the good of men. But if it should be asked, of what use the said form, with such annotations, can be at present, when it is out of use, I answer, that it will serve at least to show, to the honour of our forefathers, the first Reformers of this Church, how near they, concerning the celebration of that most holy Sacrament, kept to the primitive institution of it by our blessed SAVIOUR, and to the practice of His holy Apostles, and the first Apostolical Churches, although they changed and threw out many abuses and corruptions of this sacred ordinance, which were crept in afterwards, and at last established by Popish decrees and Councils of later ages. Such was, in the whole, the use of an unknown tongue in this holy office. . . . And, not to mention the elevation of the consecrated elements to be worshipped by priest and all people, as JESUS CHRIST Himself, both God and Man in person, whom the Church of Rome believeth to be substantially and wholly present under the outward figures of bread and wine ; nor to speak of some other faults of less moment ; our Reformers justly redressed that grievous and grand sacrilege, as it is deservedly called by

\* \* \* \* \*

But at the same time our first Reformers laid aside the , they took not away all the substance, or beauty, and due order of the Eucharistical Office of prayers and thanksgivings, as others <sup>1</sup> then had done beyond sea, insomuch that they hardly left a Prayer of Consecration of bread and wine at the holy table, of which the Archbishop of Spalato therefore justly hath written \* \* \* \* \*

No ; our English Bishops were wiser, and, although they left the Church or Court of Rome upon the account of their intolerable abuses, yet, as they duly kept up their holy order, and episcopal dignity, so did they likewise retain the substance of the ancient Liturgy, or celebration of the holy Eucharist ;

<sup>1</sup> Luther and Calvin.

yea, they rather made the Form and Prayer of Consecration better and fuller than it is in the Canon of the Mass, used in the said Church.

For, whereas there God is entreated to sanctify the oblation of bread and wine, that they may be unto them the Body and Blood of CHRIST, in this English as also in the Scottish Liturgy, is, to the word "sanctify," added "by Thy Word and Holy Spirit;" of which both, not only the primitive Fathers make most frequent mention, when they speak of this matter, but there is also not one ancient Liturgy, except the Latin Canon, where the Holy Spirit is not expressly named, and desired to come, or to be sent down upon the propositd elements to sanctify them, as I have shown in the annotation upon the said place, and proved this Prayer of Consecration to be of Apostolical tradition<sup>1</sup>.

§. And since I mention "tradition" and Apostolical "tradition," knowing how much some [unknowing, *qu.*] people are offended at the very sound of it, I must show how little reason they have for being so, and that it is not only

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* but in some \* \* \* \*

[*The Eucharistical Sacrifice*<sup>2</sup>.]

*Of the Oblation of Bread and Wine in the Holy Eucharist.*

That action, which in the celebration of the holy Eucharist, hath ever been performed in all Christian Churches throughout the whole world by orthodox priests, even in the times of the holy Apostles, as also by heretics, which kept up that holy ordinance; and hath been observed under that notion, that our SAVIOUR did it Himself in the first institution of the blessed Sacrament; that action, I say, is doubtless of Apostolical tradition, and instituted by CHRIST, although it is not in plain terms recorded by the holy Evangelists; and ought, therefore, still devoutly to be observed in the celebration of that holy mystery.

<sup>1</sup> The beginning of the next paragraph stood originally thus—

"§ Now I think that our forementioned Reformers, for their true wisdom, as well as great prudence, in this point, are highly to be commended."

<sup>2</sup> Published in the Pamphlet above referred to, "*De Formâ Consecrationis*," &c.—pp. 73, 74.

Now the oblation of bread and wine to God the FATHER, partly to agnize Him as the CREATOR, and Supreme LORD of all the world, partly to represent before Him the oblation of CHRIST's Body and Blood on the Cross, to the intent that He might be propitious to them that offered, and for whom it was offered, and make them partakers of all the benefits of CHRIST's Passion; such action, I say, hath in all Christian Churches throughout the world, ever been performed by Catholic priests, even in the Apostles' time, as also by the heretics that had any Eucharist; and hath been observed under that notion that CHRIST did it Himself, in the first institution of that holy Sacrament.

Therefore, such an oblation is of Apostolical tradition, and instituted by CHRIST, although it is not in plain terms recorded by the holy Evangelists, and ought, therefore, still devoutly to be observed in the celebration of that holy mystery.

LESLIE, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR<sup>1</sup>.—*Case of the Regale and Pontificate.* §. xix.

The seals which the Levitical priesthood were empowered to put to the covenant, which they administered to the people in

<sup>1</sup> In the "Preliminary Dissertation on the doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice," prefixed to Skinner's "Office for the Sacrament of the LORD's Supper, or Holy Communion, according to the use of the Episcopal Church in Scotland," is an extract from a letter of Leslie's prefixed to "a valuable little tract, entitled, 'Sacrifice the Divine Service, &c. by J. Scandret, Priest of the Church of England.' This tract the compiler of the present Catena has been unable to meet with, and can, therefore, only give the extract quoted from Leslie's Letter by Skinner, which, as he observes, (p. 49,) "gives this ample testimony in favour of the subject matter" of Scandret's treatise. "Sir, I have perused with great pleasure the ensuing pious and useful treatise, committed to my hands. The subject you have undertaken vindicates the Church of England and her doctrine against the profane, the Papists, and Dissenters: and you have done it with that clearness and fulness, as was greatly desirable among us, in an age, when not only this great point of the Christian Sacrifice, but all parts of our religion, have been openly attacked;" concluding thus, "I desire your prayers, as you have those of your fellow labourer, brother, and faithful servant, CHARLES LESLIE. All Saints, 1706."

the name of GOD, were circumcision and the Sacrifices, which were appointed as types of CHRIST, for the remission of their sins.

The seals of the New Covenant are baptism and the LORD'S Supper, as commemorations and exhibitions of the Sacrifice of CHRIST already past, and a true, real conveyance of all the benefits of it to the worthy receivers, for the remission of their sins, and a pledge to assure them of heaven.

Now surely these are greater and more glorious, and at least as efficacious, as the seals of the law; and, therefore, the priests of the Gospel, to whom CHRIST has committed the administration of these, are as truly and properly priests, empowered by CHRIST, to seal covenants in his name with the people, as the priests under the law. . . .

. . . . And so, on the other hand, as we are commanded to sanctify GOD, and to esteem Him holy, the same is communicated to the priests, who represent Him, and officiate in His name, . . . (ver. 8.) "Thou shalt sanctify him, therefore, for he offereth the bread of thy GOD; he shall be holy unto thee, for I the Lord, who sanctify you, am holy." The meaning of which is, that if GOD be holy, so must His priest be esteemed by us; not upon a personal account, as GOD is holy in Himself, and none but He, and some priests, as Hophni and Phineas, are sons of Belial, and know not the LORD; and there was a Judas among the apostles; but upon account of their office, which is holy, and that they offer the bread of our GOD, which is holy.

Nor can the shewbread in the temple be called the bread of our GOD so properly, so strictly, so eminently, as the bread in the holy Sacrament, which is the body of CHRIST? And "we being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread." (1 Cor. x. 17.) And does not then holiness and honour belong as much, at least, to the evangelical priesthood, who offer this bread of our GOD, as to the priests under the law, who set the shewbread upon the holy table in the temple? And is not the one as properly the office of a priest as the other?—*Works*, Vol. i. pp. 660. 665.



BRETT, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Brief Answer, &c.*

As to what has been said to prove the Christian Sacrifice in the holy Eucharist, I need not tell the reader, that this has been so fully made out, that no further evidence is necessary in its behalf. For if so many texts of Scripture, explained by the concurrent testimony of those ancient Fathers who have cited them, if Scripture or reason, if the agreement of all the ancient Liturgies, however different in other matters, if the most strictly literal expressions to God, in His holy worship; in a word, if antiquity, universality, and consent, if any one of these, much more if all of them together be good evidence, I am sure we do not want evidence. If the doctrines and practices of the Jewish Church, in relation to their Sacrifices, be evidence, we have hence still farther evidence. If the rites and usages of the heathen in their worship, and their explications of their sacrificial terms be evidence, we have evidence in abundance. . . . The thoroughly learned and judicious Dr. Hickes, has taken such effectual pains in this argument, and confirmed his position with such variety of reading and reasoning, as may be carped at, but can never be answered to any purpose. . . .

The learned author, likewise, of the "Propitiatory Oblation in the holy Eucharist," has performed his part, very much to the satisfaction of the impartial reader. . . .

Thus convincingly have these two learned authors engaged in the present controversy; proving, by all the arguments the thing is capable of, that our blessed SAVIOUR did leave His own Supper as a commemorative, eucharistical, material Sacrifice, a Sacrifice of impetration, as well as gratulatory, showing forth our SAVIOUR'S death, presenting it before GOD as our all-sufficient propitiation, and so being an especial means of obtaining the benefits of it for us; and in a word, that it is propitiatory.—pp. 5. 8—10.

Id.—*The Christian Altar and Sacrifice. A Sermon.*

[On Heb. xiii. 10.]

Dr. Heylin long ago, and of late Dr. Hickes, and the learned author of the "Propitiatory Oblation," have proved this to be

the plain doctrine of this Church, contained in her Liturgy. And Dr. Heylin has showed that it was a doctrine freely owned by our best divines, even in their controversial writings against the Church of Rome, such as Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Andrews, and Bishop Morton, and that it was acknowledged by those blessed martyrs of this Church, Fryth, Lambert, Philpot, Latymer, and Ridley, even at the time when they were called upon to give their testimony to the truth for which they suffered.

The reverend and learned Dr. Hickes has since showed it to have been the professed and declared opinion of Bishop Overal, Bishop Taylor, Archbishop Laud, Mr. Mede, the Compilers of the Scotch Liturgy, &c. . . . and even of Mr. Baxter himself.—*Preface*, pp. x. xi.

But now the old question may be asked, *cui bono*? What signifies it to us, whether we believe the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice or not? What need any disputes about it? All parties are agreed that it is an holy ordinance, instituted by CHRIST Himself, and that every good Christian ought to partake of it.

But we may ask again, if it be not convenient, nay necessary, that all those who partake of this holy Sacrament, should understand and know what it is they do? Ought they not to be instructed in the nature and design of it, lest “they eat and drink unworthily, not discerning the LORD’s Body?” And how shall they “discern the LORD’s Body,” if they are not taught that “the LORD’s Body,” is there present? . . .

The next question then is, how is the LORD’s Body there to be discerned? It cannot be meant of the literal, natural Body of the LORD, as the Church of Rome blasphemously teaches; for St. Paul himself calls it “bread” and “wine,” even at the very time it is to be eaten and drunk. “Let a man examine himself,” says he, “and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.” How then can “the LORD’s Body” be there discerned otherwise than by representation? . . .

In the last place, then, we are to inquire how the Body and

Blood of Christ is there represented? And it is evident from the Scriptures, that it is not the whole CHRIST, body, soul, and divinity, hypostatically united, as the Papists also blasphemously teach; and from thence as blasphemously infer that it is to be worshipped. That which is represented in the Eucharist is neither the divinity nor the human soul of CHRIST, but only His Body and Blood separated from both and from one another. The Blood is not represented by the element of wine, as in the body, but as shed and separated from it; which is utterly irreconcilable with, and plainly contradictory to the Popish doctrine of the mass. Our SAVIOUR, at His institution of this Sacrament, gave the bread and wine as representing His Body broken, and His Blood shed, or poured out from it. "This is my Body which is broken for you, this is my Blood which is shed for many." And when CHRIST's real Body was broken, and His Blood shed, it was then separated, not from His divinity only, but from His human soul also, and died and was buried. The bread and wine, therefore, representing CHRIST's Body, as broken, and His Blood as shed and poured out from it, can by no means represent, much less really be, the very individual glorified Body of CHRIST now in heaven, and personally united, not only to the human soul, but also to the divine nature. But it plainly represents CHRIST's Body as given, that is, offered or sacrificed for us, for so our LORD Himself appointed it to do, saying, "This is my Body which is given," or offered "for you." It is evident, therefore, from the very institution, that the bread and wine in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, represent CHRIST's Body and Blood as given, offered, or sacrificed for us; and are so full and perfect representatives thereof, that our LORD Himself thought fit to give to the bread and wine, the name of His Body and Blood. The consequence of all this is, that the bread and wine, in the holy Eucharist, do by the very institution represent the Sacrifice of CHRIST's Body broken, and His Blood shed; and that if we do not know and understand this, we cannot rightly "discern the LORD's Body."—pp. xii—xv.

From the whole, then, we may learn,

First, If the holy Eucharist, as I trust has been sufficiently proved, be a visible material Sacrifice, representative of the one, true, and only meritorious and all-sufficient Sacrifice of CHRIST, of the same nature with, though of greater worth and dignity than the Jewish Sacrifices; it follows, that this cannot be the real and true Sacrifice of CHRIST Himself, as the Church of Rome most wickedly and absurdly teaches; to support which vain notion, she has invented the unintelligible doctrine of transubstantiation. For the representative cannot be the person represented; the thing signifying cannot be the thing signified: for the very notion of a representative implies something distinct from that which is represented by it. Those therefore who charge the doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice as savouring of Popery, either know not what Popery is, or have no right notion of the Eucharist itself; for nothing can be more directly opposite to the doctrine of transubstantiation, or to "the Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priests did offer CHRIST for the quick and the dead," than this doctrine of the representative Sacrifice of the Eucharist. . . . This doctrine, therefore, of a true and proper Sacrifice in the Eucharist, representing the one great and truly meritorious Sacrifice of CHRIST, is so far from savouring of Popery, that nothing can be more opposite to Popery than this is, nor can any other doctrine be so effectual to root out all Popish notions, relating to the blessed Sacrament of the altar, as this is. For if we deny the Eucharist to be a real and proper Sacrifice, we give the Papists a great advantage over us. Because they may easily prove from the institution of this Sacrament by CHRIST, from this and divers other texts of Scripture, and from the primitive Fathers of the Church, that it is a Sacrifice; and forasmuch as our Church declares, that "this LORD's Supper is in such wise to be done and ministered as our LORD and SAVIOUR commanded it to be done, as the holy Apostles used it, and the good Fathers in the primitive Church frequented it" (Hom. of the Sacrament); they will easily show, that if we do not believe the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, we do not hold to this rule and declaration of our Church, and confute us from our own principles.

And when they have thus confuted us, and clearly proved the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, and we have not instructed our people in the nature of this Sacrifice, what a mighty advantage do we give them to draw our people from us? For when they have thus convinced them of our error in so material a point, how easy may it be to persuade them that all our doctrines are erroneous also! But when we show our people the true nature of this Sacrifice, that it is not the very individual Sacrifice of CHRIST Himself, (for that was offered "once for all,") but only the memorial or representation of that Sacrifice, they will see clearly that the Popish Sacrifice of the Mass, wherein they pretend to offer CHRIST "for the quick and the dead," has no foundation either in the Scripture or the ancient Fathers, but is clearly opposite to them; forasmuch as the picture cannot be the man whose picture it is, nor the representative the person he represents. And therefore many of our best divines, in their controversial writings against the Church of Rome, have acknowledged it as the doctrine of our Church, that this "Sacrament is a Sacrifice which does represent the Sacrifice which CHRIST once offered; wherein we set before God the bread and wine as figures or images of the precious Blood of CHRIST shed for us, and of His precious Body; an unbloody Sacrifice instituted by God, instead of the many bloody Sacrifices of the law:" and thereby have clearly confuted the doctrine of transubstantiation and of the Mass. For how can this be an unbloody Sacrifice, or a Sacrifice without blood, if therein the very Blood of CHRIST was offered up to God? There cannot, therefore, be a better or more effectual preservative from Popery, as it has relation to the holy Sacrament of the altar, than this doctrine of the Eucharist being a true, proper, commemorative, representative and unbloody Sacrifice.—pp. 19—23.

Secondly, If the holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice which, by our Saviour's institution, fully and perfectly represents the one great and meritorious Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, then it is much more excellent than any of the old legal Sacrifices: not more excellent in its own nature, (for bread and wine have nothing in the nature of them more worthy than the blood of bulls and

of goats, than the libations of wine, or the oblations of fine flour, than shew-bread or incense,) but by virtue of the institution. For indeed there can be no natural virtue in any creature to make atonement for sin; nothing can satisfy for sin but the very Body and Blood of CHRIST Himself. And the legal Sacrifices, under the Mosaical dispensation, were propitiatory, only as they were appointed by divine institution to be so, and as they were types or shadows of that just and truly meritorious Sacrifice of CHRIST. . . . And so, by this divine appointment, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist being offered according to the institution, becomes propitiatory, that is, renders God good and gracious to us, and procures His pardon and favour.

In this respect, then, that is, by virtue of the divine institution, the Sacrifice of the holy Eucharist far exceeds all the Sacrifices of the law, and is far more excellent. For the Sacrifices of the law were, by their institution, but imperfect types of the great Sacrifice on the Cross. They were appointed to render God propitious or gracious, but in some cases and on some occasions, not in all. There was no Sacrifice that could make an atonement for murder, and some other heinous offences; but the Eucharistical Sacrifice, rightly and duly ministered and received, is an atonement for the greatest sins, and, by virtue of the divine institution, procures pardon for them, and renders God propitious and gracious to us being truly faithful and penitent, notwithstanding the foulest crimes. This Sacrifice is not an imperfect type, as the Jewish Sacrifices were, even by their institution, of the meritorious Sacrifice on the Cross; but it is, by virtue of the institution, the full and perfect representative of it, so as to convey to us all the benefits and blessings purchased by the original. Whatsoever sins CHRIST's meritorious death and Passion made satisfaction for, whatsoever sins are cleansed by His Blood; the pardon of them is conveyed to every worthy receiver, in the holy Eucharist or Sacrifice of His representative Body and Blood. Now there are no sins but what CHRIST made a satisfaction for; the Scripture expressly teaching that "the Blood of JESUS CHRIST cleanseth us from all sin." "And He is

the propitiation for our sins," whatsoever they be, "and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." And He appointed this Eucharistical Sacrifice to convey to every particular person that should receive it, all the benefits of His Death and Passion. He appointed it to be such a perfect complete representative of His very Body which was broken, and of His very Blood which was shed for us, that He thought convenient to give it the name of His Body and Blood, saying, "Take, eat, this is my Body"—"Drink ye all of it; for this is my Blood." Therefore, as St. Paul says, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of CHRIST?" That is, Are not all the blessings purchased for us by the Sacrifice of CHRIST's Body and Blood, communicated or conveyed to us by this Eucharistical Sacrifice of bread and wine? Undoubtedly they are. Since, then, by CHRIST's Body broken, and His Blood shed, there is a satisfaction made, and a pardon obtained for all sins, it is manifest that this pardon is conveyed to every penitent and faithful receiver of the Eucharist; for that, the Scripture teaches, is the communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, the means by which He has appointed that the merits of His death shall be communicated to us: that is, the pardon and remission of all sins, of all transgressions. Since, therefore, the Sacrifices of the law could procure pardon for some sins only, not for all, and the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is appointed to procure and convey the pardon of all sins, of all transgressions, the Eucharist is manifestly a more worthy and acceptable Sacrifice. by virtue of the institution, than all the Sacrifices of the law.

Thirdly, Forasmuch as the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, it is certain that none can administer it but a priest, one particularly called and appointed by GOD to that office, as was Aaron. . . .

Fourthly, Since the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, an oblation appointed by GOD Himself, to render Him propitious and gracious, and has no intrinsic virtue in itself to procure pardon and grace, but all its worth and virtue is derived only from its institution, whereby it perfectly represents and conveys to us all the

benefits purchased by the truly meritorious Sacrifice of CHRIST, let us be very careful to minister and partake of it as it was ministered by CHRIST, and received by His disciples. Let the priest, who represents CHRIST Himself on this occasion, in a more particular manner, as the steward or dispenser of His mysteries, be especially careful to perform every part of the oblation Himself as CHRIST did; not permitting the oblation to be made by any other hand, as is too commonly practised. I speak with regard to the placing the bread and wine on the altar. This is too frequently done by the clerk or sexton before the Office begins: a thing contrary to the nature of an oblation and the express directions of our Rubric, and by no means agreeable to CHRIST's institution. For He Himself took the bread and the cup, and made an oblation of them to GOD, before He consecrated them, or declared them to be His Body and Blood. For "He took bread, and when He had given thanks He brake it." By taking the bread, and giving of thanks, He plainly made an oblation of it to GOD, before He brake it, and pronounced it to be His Body. We ought, therefore, as He did, to make an oblation of the elements to GOD, before we consecrate, or pronounce them to be the Body and Blood of CHRIST. Now the placing the elements on the altar, or the LORD's table, makes them an oblation to GOD, and separates them from all common use; and to make an oblation or Sacrifice, is, as I have showed you, the proper office of the priest; and it is the highest presumption, and a great offence to GOD, for any one else to undertake it: therefore it is necessary that the priest place the elements on the table; for thereby it is that he makes them an oblation; he presents them to GOD, and having so presented or offered them, he then, as our Church also directs, blesses them, beseeching GOD to accept them, together with our alms; which are also by him placed there at the same time, saying, "We humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations." Then, after some other prayers, suitable to the occasion, he consecrates, or declares them, in our SAVIOUR's own words, to be the Body and Blood of CHRIST. But if the priest does not make an oblation of the elements before the consecration, he



does not minister this Sacrament as CHRIST ministered it, and fails in a very material part, and consecrates what he has not first offered to GOD; which CHRIST did not do.

And as the priest ought to minister this holy Sacrament, as it was ministered by CHRIST Himself, so ought the people to receive it, as it was received by His disciples; that is, they ought to receive the whole Sacrament, not a part of it only. Therefore the Church of Rome, which permits not the people to receive the Cup of the LORD, but the Bread only, is guilty of a sacrilegious sin, and a most high profanation of this Sacrifice. For when a Sacrifice or oblation is made to GOD, that which is so offered is then to be disposed of as GOD has appointed, and no otherwise; because GOD has a more particular, peculiar right in our oblations than in other things. . . . Therefore, when we have made an oblation of bread and wine at the LORD's table, if we do not dispose of that bread and wine as He has directed, we are guilty of sacrilege. Now, when CHRIST instituted this holy Sacrifice and Sacrament, He gave the wine as well as the bread to all His disciples, saying, "Drink ye all of this." For this reason, if the wine as well as the bread be not given to all the communicants, then is not this oblation entirely disposed of according as GOD has directed, consequently there is a sacrilege committed. And the Church of Rome is guilty of this great abomination, in denying the cup to all but him that ministers, when CHRIST Himself communicated it to all that were present, and gave express command that we should do as He did.

Fifthly, since the holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice perfectly representing by virtue of its institution, that great and truly meritorious Sacrifice of CHRIST Himself, so that the bread and wine which we offer is accepted in the sight of GOD, as the very Body and Blood of His only begotten Son, and as such is communicated to us; then, whensoever we rightly and duly make this oblation, we set before GOD the memorial of His SON's death, put Him in mind of that meritorious Sacrifice which has made a full, perfect, and complete satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. For though things are at all times present with GOD, and therefore He needs no memorial, nothing to put Him in mind of any thing

on His own account, as if He was forgetful, and did not always remember or know every thing; yet, in compliance with our infirmities, and to adapt Himself to our nature and capacities, He is graciously pleased to require us to put Him in mind of what He knows and sees infinitely better than we do. . . . Whenever, then, we make a memorial before God, to put Him in mind of us, by our prayers, our alms, or our oblations, it is not meant that we put Him in mind of what otherwise He might forget, but only that we thereby engage or induce Him to be mindful of us, and to remember us for good. So when we set before God the memorial of His Son's most meritorious Sacrifice, we plainly engage and induce Him to confer on us all the mercies and graces purchased for us by that all-sufficient Sacrifice; as pardon of sin, reconciliation to God, union with CHRIST, a pledge or earnest of eternal life, and grace and strength to enable us to work out our own salvation.

But if this holy Sacrament be not a Sacrifice or an oblation offered to God, (as some have of late pretended, contrary to the doctrine of the holy Scriptures, and of the pure Catholic Church in the first ages of Christianity,) but only a commemoration made among ourselves, to put us only, and not God, in mind of CHRIST's death, then there is no memorial offered to God; and if there be no memorial of CHRIST's death offered to God in this service, then cannot this service engage or induce Him to confer on us the gifts and graces purchased for us by the all-sufficient Sacrifice of CHRIST, more than any other common service of prayer and praise: and if so, then is this Sacrament of no more worth and excellency than any other service of the church; and St. Paul's precept requiring a man to examine himself before he presumes to eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, was perfectly needless. For what occasion can there be for such an examination before this Sacrament, more than before any other ordinary duty, if no memorial be offered to God of a more excellent nature than our daily prayers and praises? But if there be a particular memorial offered to God in the holy Eucharist, a memorial of CHRIST's all-sufficient and most meritorious Sacrifice, as undoubtedly there is, and that JESUS CHRIST is there

“ evidently set forth, crucified amongst us,” and if evidently set forth as crucified, then evidently set forth as offered for us ; it plainly follows, that when such a memorial is made to God, to put Him in mind of all that His SON has done or purchased for us, thereby to induce Him to confer on us all the mercies and graces obtained for us by CHRIST’s death ; that we should be in a more especial manner careful to examine ourselves before we presume to make this offering, that we may not, by our impenitence, or want of faith, draw down a curse upon us instead of a blessing, and so eat and drink our own damnation.

Sixthly and lastly, since, as the text assures, “ We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle,” but we, by the rules of opposition, must have a right to eat of it, for it is our altar ; let us not, by our own impenitence, unfaithfulness, or negligence, deprive ourselves of this right. Let us consider it as no small privilege to be admitted to partake of this altar, a privilege to which God would not admit His own chosen people the Jews, for the text plainly says, that they had no right to eat of it ; and I have shewed to you, that, by the Mosaical law, they had no right to eat even of that Sacrifice which they themselves offered, even as a type of this. Since then God has vouchsafed to us Christians, a so much greater privilege than He ever before allowed to His own chosen people, if we put a slight and contempt upon this high and extraordinary privilege, we certainly deserve not to partake of any of those benefits designed to be conveyed to us by the right and due use of it. If we will not come to the LORD’s table, there to make our oblation of bread and wine to Him, as a memorial to put Him in mind of the Sacrifice of His SON, which there by Divine institution is fully and perfectly represented, and there to receive them from Him again, as the representative Body and Blood of CHRIST, conveying to us all the benefits of His meritorious Death and Passion, we can have no good grounds to hope that ever we shall partake of any of those benefits ; and if we do not, what will become of us ? . . . Let us then never neglect this so beneficial a service, but as often as we have opportunity, let us make our oblation to God of the memorial of CHRIST’s Sacrifice, that

by receiving it from Him again, we may therewith receive the pardon of our sins, reconciliation with God, the increase of strengthening grace, and become so firmly united to CHRIST, that nothing may ever be able to dissolve the union; but being begun here in grace, it may be consummated in glory, through the merits and mediation of the same JESUS CHRIST our LORD; to whom with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST be ascribed, as most due is, all honour and glory, now, and for evermore. Amen.—pp. 25—40.

II.—*True Scripture Account, &c.*

I shall only further observe that our Church shows that she understands the words “do this,” to signify “offer this,” and therefore orders the bread and wine not to be placed on the LORD’s table by any other than the priest, and requires him to place them there as oblations; for at the time that she restored that old Rubric which orders the priest to place the bread and wine upon the table, she also ordered him, at the beginning of the Prayer immediately following, to beseech God to accept our oblations. Which word “oblations” being not in that Prayer (but the word “alms” only) before the restoration of that Rubric, shows that the Church by adding that word to the word “alms” which was before in the Prayer, at the very time that she restored that Rubric, intended the priest should solemnly offer them there, and esteemed the priest’s placing them there to be the making them “oblations,” which they cannot properly be called when placed there by any other than a priest. For Mr. Johnson in his “unbloody Sacrifice,” p. 4. Part I. having examined the several definitions which learned men have given of a Sacrifice, does from thence give this as a full description of it, viz. “Sacrifice is some material thing, either animate or inanimate, offered to God, &c. . . . [Vid. sup. p. 320.] And he observes, p. 14. that “If we inquire into these rites, which were peculiar to Sacrifice, we shall find them to be no other but the very actions of offering them. I will not,” says he, “pretend to say, that there never were any ceremonies esteemed necessary by some particular people,

for some particular Sacrifices ; but what I affirm is, that no rite is essential to Sacrifice in general, but only the very act or acts of oblation. For if it were otherwise, the Levitical Sacrifices were in reality null ; for no rites were necessary in offering them, but sprinkling the blood, and burning the whole or part of the Sacrifice." (He might have added "heaving," or "waving," part of what was offered for a heave-offering or wave-offering.) " And I suppose it needs no proof, that these were the very rites by which the sacerdotal oblation was performed : by the sprinkling the blood the whole Sacrifice was consecrated to God, and the atonement made ; and by burning a part or the whole upon the altar, God had what He required actually yielded to Him : so that these ritual actions were indeed no other but what were used as vocal signs, with which the Sacrifice was presented to God. The priest was not directed to use any words, but the actions were significant, and spake the thoughts of him that performed the office. Nor can I, upon the best inquiry I am able to make, find any (one) ceremony generally thought necessary for offering a Sacrifice, but only the actions whereby the Sacrifice was presented." And I conceive the priest's solemnly placing the bread and wine upon the altar, is as proper a rite as sprinkling the blood, or heaving or waving the Sacrifice or a part of it, or as burning it in whole or in part, or any other rite used by the Levitical priests.—pp. 84—86.

And if it be offered as our Church directs, it has all the parts requisite to a complete Sacrifice. For there is first the material thing, bread and wine ; secondly, an acknowledgment of the dominion and other attributes of God in the prayers and praises which accompany it, as likewise a desire to procure Divine blessings, especially remission of sins, which, as Christians, we expect and ask only through the merits and for the sake of JESUS CHRIST who bore our sins in His Body on the tree, and shed His Blood for the remission of them, and dignified these gifts, which we offer, with the name of His Body and Blood, and has made them truly His Body and Blood in power and effect. Thirdly, they are offered on a proper altar, the Lord's table, a table set apart entirely for this service. Fourthly, they are

offered by a proper officer, a priest regularly ordained to this office, and with an agreeable rite, a solemn placing them on the LORD's table or altar. And lastly, they are consumed by eating and drinking in such manner as our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the Author of the Sacrifice, has appointed. Thus the Church of England has taken care that the holy Eucharist may be duly celebrated as an oblation or Sacrifice, by directing the ministration of it to be performed in such manner that it may want nothing necessary to a true Sacrifice. If any of her priests wilfully maim it in a principal part, and do not himself solemnly and devoutly place them on the LORD's table or altar, the fault is wholly in them and not in the Church, whose plain rule and precept they have no regard to.—p. 88.

The essence of this Sacrament, therefore, consists, not, as he pretends it does, barely in the remembrance of CHRIST, and expressing that remembrance by partaking of bread and wine as memorials of His Body and Blood, but likewise in the doing or offering them in the same manner He did. This necessarily requires a particular person to execute this priestly office, who may do or offer as CHRIST did in the institution, and requires to be done by us till He come. A priest, therefore, is necessary and essential to the due administration of this Sacrament. He, as CHRIST did, and whose Person he on this occasion represents, must take bread and give thanks, and bless it, and break it, and give it to those that are present, as "the Body of CHRIST," before they can partake of it. "In like manner, he must take the cup, and, having" eucharistized it, "or blessed it with thanksgiving, "he must give it to them" as the "New Testament in the Blood of CHRIST, shed for many for the remission of sins," that they may "all drink of it." And if the LORD's Supper be not celebrated in this manner by a priest, then it is not celebrated in the manner CHRIST has appointed it to be done.—p. 132.

We cannot, therefore, celebrate the LORD's Supper except we have a priest standing in the place of CHRIST and representing Him, who may take the bread, and having given or offered it to God by devoutly placing it on His holy table, may then bless it

by prayer and thanksgiving, and break it and give it to the communicants as the representative Body of CHRIST, and in remembrance of Him, of all that He did for us, and more especially His dying for us. The difference between the oblation which CHRIST made at His last Supper, and what we now make when we rightly and duly celebrate the LORD'S Supper, is only this—He offered bread and wine as representatives of His Body and Blood, in order that He might suffer and bear our sins in His Body on the Cross: we offer the same in remembrance that He did suffer and bear our sins there.—p. 135.

BENNET, PRESBYTER.—*Rights of the Clergy.*

St. Clement of Rome, who wrote in the Apostles' times, plainly speaks of the Bishops presiding in the celebration of the LORD'S Supper. For nothing else can be meant by their "offering the gifts;" especially if we consider, that the Eucharistical elements are called a "gift" by St. Ignatius himself; and that this language is used by innumerable other writers, particularly those that are the most ancient; and 'tis notorious, that προσφέρειν signifies to offer a Sacrifice, such as all antiquity thought the Holy Eucharist to be; and that this word is particularly applied to the Holy Eucharist by Justin Martyr, and all antiquity.—p. 52.

I have already shewn from St. Clement of Rome, who wrote in the Apostles' own times, and knew what method ought to be taken in the celebration of this ordinance, that the elements were consecrated by the Clergy; who consequently did something more than merely receive them after the same manner as the Laity did. And 'tis notorious, that all along in the following centuries this practice was constantly observed. So that we must not now reverse an established order by new fangled notions, or pretend to a better understanding of Christian mysteries, than those very persons who learnt from the Apostles' own mouths, and were taught by them how to administer the Eucharist. The Jewish laity received the meat of their offerings, and applied it to an holy use, as much as the priest, who in some cases had his portion thereof; the laity also joined in the same ceremony of sacri-

ficing, by being publickly present as the parties concerned, and bearing a share in the solemnity. And yet no man in his wits will conclude from hence, that the Jewish laity did properly sacrifice, or that it was not necessary for the priest in particular to do his office with respect to it. Even so in the Holy Eucharist, though the people do what the Clergy do, as far as relates to the reception and use of the elements; yet the Clergy must first consecrate the elements by prayer, before they become CHRIST'S mystical Body and Blood to either the Clergy or the laity.—pp. 308, 309.

Nothing now remains, but that I consider an argument which is drawn from the practice of the Jewish Church. 'Tis pretended that the Christian Baptism succeeds the Jewish circumcision; that the Christian Lord's Supper succeeds the Jewish Passover; and that the Christian preaching succeeds the Jewish teaching in Synagogues. And consequently, since circumcision and the Passover were administered by the laity amongst the Jews, and since the Jewish laity were permitted to teach in their synagogues; there is the same reason, why the Christian laity should also administer such Gospel ordinances, as succeed in the room of those Jewish observations . . .

1. With respect to circumcision, 'tis said that the Jewish laity did perform it, and that the Christian Baptism succeeds in the room of it. These two particulars I freely grant. For as the Jews were initiated by circumcision, so are Christians initiated by baptism. And we are assured, that Zipporah circumcised her son. Exod. iv. 25. Nor is it ever said, that the Jewish Priests did circumcise the children of that nation. Nor do the Jews to this day believe, that any particular administrator is necessary. So that from the beginning any person that could dextrously perform the operation, might lawfully circumcise. But what will follow from these concessions? Does not this very plea suppose that God never appointed any administrator of circumcision under the Law? and that He always acknowledged it to be His seal, by whomsoever that mark of distinction was impressed? Was not the bare instance of Zipporah a demonstration of this?



She could not but be a lay person ; and yet she was never blamed by Moses for executing that office, even though 'tis plain, that 'tis no case of necessity ; for Moses himself, or any other proper administrator, might have been procured. But can anything like this be pleaded with respect to the ordinance of Christian Baptism ? If so, this argument from the Jewish circumcision to the Christian Baptism will be unanswerably strong. But it appears from what I have already said, that nothing of this nature can be shown. For I have proved, that, from the very first plantation of the Christian Church, God committed the administration of Baptism to the Clergy, by giving them a particular and express commission to perform it ; and that the administration of it was confined to them, not only in the Apostles' times, (which is abundantly sufficient) but also for the first three hundred years after CHRIST. And, I presume, God has not since that time made any such discovery of His divine will to our adversaries, as may warrant the alteration of that rule which He at the first was pleased to settle in His Church.

Now my argument is entirely built upon the signification of God's will. I do by no means deny, but that God might have left the administration of Baptism in common to all Christians, and made it as lawful for the Christian laity to perform it, as 'tis on both sides allowed to have been for the Jewish laity to circumcise : but I affirm, that since God has been pleased to do otherwise ; since He has from the beginning made it the business of the Clergy to baptize ; since the Clergy have undoubted authority so to do, and the laity are so far from having the like authority, that the constant and uninterrupted practice of the Church, from the first promulgation of Christianity down to the end of the three first centuries, (in which period, surely, the laity had the best opportunity of knowing what liberty God would indulge them ; nor did they want a true zeal to exercise it for as good purpose, as our adversaries can pretend to,) demonstrates that God restrained them from the administration of Baptism, and appropriated that office to the Clergy ; therefore 'tis plain, that the laity must needs be guilty of a most heinous and provoking sin, if they pre-

sume to baptize, and thereby invade the property of the Clergy, and trample upon the authority of God, who bestowed it on them.

2. With respect to the Paschal Sacrifice 'tis pleaded, that the masters of families offered it amongst the Jews, and that our LORD's Supper succeeds in the room of it. Now I grant, that our LORD's Supper succeeds in the room of the Jewish Passover; but then with respect to the oblation of the Jewish Passover, 'tis necessary for me to distinguish the times, there being a difference as to this particular between the practice before, and the practice after, the institution of the Jewish Priesthood.

First, when the Passover itself was instituted, the Jewish Priesthood was not instituted. And accordingly, in the first institution of the Passover, the masters of families did, by God's express command, sacrifice the lamb. . . .

Secondly, when the Jewish Priesthood was instituted, the sacrificing of the Passover was appropriated to the Priesthood by God Himself in a most solemn manner; and this was done before a second Passover was celebrated. For after that Aaron and his posterity had the priesthood conferred and entailed upon them, we read, that "the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron," &c. . . . Lev. xvii. 1—7. And that this law was enacted before a second Passover was celebrated, is manifest; for this law is found in Lev. xvii. whereas in Numb. ix. we have these words, "And the LORD spake unto Moses," &c. ver. 1, 2, 3. So that though the first Passover was by God's express command sacrificed by the masters of families, yet all the following Passovers were sacrificed by the Priests; nor was it lawful for the laity to celebrate the Passover, unless the Priest did his part therein.

Now 'tis certain, that the most essential and solemn part in the Sacrifice of any beast, was the sprinkling or pouring of the blood. The laity themselves, provided they were clean, did usually kill the Sacrifices; but the oblation of the blood was appropriated to the Priests. This appears from God's express institution. "If any man of you bring an offering unto the LORD, he shall put his hand upon the head," &c. Lev. i. 2, 4, 5. "And if his oblation be a Sacrifice of peace-offering," &c.

Chap. iii. 1, 2. "He shall bring his offering," &c. Chap. iv. 23, 24, 25. "He shall lay his hand," &c. ver. 29, 30. And that this was particularly required and observed at the Passover Sacrifice, appears from the following passages of Holy Writ. "Then they killed the Passover," &c. 2 Chron. xxx. 15, 16, 17. "So the service was prepared," &c. Chap. xxxv. 10. So that (not to mention what other particulars were either confined to the Priests, or permitted to the people) 'tis plain, that the Priest's action was necessary to the Sacrifice; that the strictly sacrificial part was restrained to him; and that though the people may be sometimes said to have sacrificed, yet 'tis only in a figurative sense, inasmuch as they furnished the offering, or bear a part in the solemnity, which was then only valid and acceptable to God, when the Priest discharged his office with relation to it.

Nay, so punctual an observance did God require with respect to this Passover Sacrifice, that He made it unlawful for the Jews, after they possessed the promised land, to celebrate that feast in any other place than that which He chose. Thus they are commanded; "Observe the month of Abib, and keep the Passover," &c. Deut. xvi. 1—7. And, accordingly, since their dispersion into distant countries, and the destruction of their Temple, the Jews have not pretended to sacrifice the Passover; nor indeed have they offered any of those other Sacrifices, which God required to be offered in a certain place. . . .

From what has been said, it appears, that our adversaries cannot infer the lawfulness of the laity pretending to consecrate the Lord's Supper, from the practice of the Jews touching the Sacrifice of the Passover. Because 'tis plain, that ever since the institution of the Priesthood, the oblation of that Sacrifice was always made by the Priest, and that no lay Jew could perform it. —pp. 353—363.

POTTER, ARCHBISHOP.—*Discourse of Church Government.*

Another power which our Lord has left to His Church, is that of consecrating the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper. The first Eucharist was consecrated by our Lord Himself, a little before His

Passion. At the same time He gave His Apostles commission to do as He had done: "Do this," said He, "in remembrance of Me." Yet this office was not so strictly appropriated to the Apostles, but that it might lawfully be executed by the ministers of the second order. . . .

In the primitive Church the Bishop consecrated, when he was present. Which appears from the before cited passage of Justin Martyr, where he tells us, that, sermon being ended, the elements of bread and wine mixed with water, were brought to the President of the brethren, who immediately proceeded to consecrate them by prayer and thanksgiving. . . . In the Bishop's absence, it was common for the Presbyters to consecrate; but they neither did this, nor any other act of their office, without the Bishop's direction or allowance. . . .

What part the Deacons had in this office, may be learned from the fore-mentioned passage of Justin Martyr, where he tells us, that, when the bread and wine had been consecrated by the president, it was customary for the Deacons to distribute them among the people who were present, and to carry them to such as were absent. Which power was not thought to imply any power in the Deacons to consecrate this Sacrament; but they did it as the Bishops' and the Priests' ministers, as we are expressly assured by the Apostolical Constitutions. . . .

It will here be enquired, why Deacons, who were allowed to administer Baptism, never consecrated the Lord's Supper? To which this might be a sufficient answer, that Baptism was always reckoned one of the lowest ministries, and therefore was usually committed by the Apostles to Ministers of the lower orders, as was before observed: or that Baptism, being the rite of admission into the Church, was thought more necessary than the Lord's Supper; which reason is commonly assigned by the ancient Fathers, for permitting laymen to baptize, when any person was in danger of leaving the world unbaptized. But there is yet a further reason, why none but Bishops and Presbyters here ever consecrated the Lord's Supper; viz. Because the Lord's Supper was always believed to succeed in the place of Sacrifices; consequently, as none beside the High Priest and inferior Priests, were

permitted to offer Sacrifices under the Jewish Law ; so, the LORD'S Supper was consecrated by none but Bishops and Presbyters, who alone are Priests in the Christian sense of that name. It is not my design to explain the nature and ends of the LORD'S Supper, any further than these may lead us to the proper minister of it, and therefore I shall only hint a few things necessary to this purpose.

Here, then, it may be remembered, that, in the ancient Sacrifices, both among the Jews and Heathens, one part of the victim was offered upon the altar, and another reserved to be eaten by those persons, in whose name the Sacrifice was made ; this was accounted a sort of partaking of God's Table, and was a federal rite, whereby He owned the guests to be in His favour and under His protection, as they by offering Sacrifices acknowledged Him to be their God . . . . In the Christian Church there is only one proper Sacrifice, which our LORD offered upon the Cross ; and consequently Christians cannot partake of any Sacrifice in a literal and strict sense, without allowing Transubstantiation. Lest, therefore, they should want the same pledge, to assure them of the Divine favour, which the Jews enjoyed, our LORD appointed the elements of bread and wine to signify His Body and Blood offered in Sacrifice ; whence they are expressly called His Body and Blood ; it being common for representatives to bear the name of those things or persons, which they represent : " And as they were eating, Jesus took bread," &c. The elements were not His real Body and Blood, nor understood to be so by the Apostles, or any primitive Father : but they were the symbols of His Body and Blood, the partaking whereof is all one to the receivers, and does as much assure them of the favour of God, as if they should eat and drink the real Body and Blood of CHRIST offered upon the Cross. To this purpose is the following discourse of St. Paul : (1 Cor. x. 16—21.) " The cup of blessing," &c. Where it may be observed : 1. That eating the LORD'S Supper is the same rite, in the Christian Church, with eating the things offered in Sacrifice among the Jews and Heathens. 2. That it is an act of communion or fellowship with God, at whose table we are said to be entertained ; and therefore it is declared to be inconsistent with

eating the Gentile Sacrifices, which is an act of communion with devils, to whom those Sacrifices are offered. 3. That it is an act of communion between Christians, who eat at the same table, and by that means are owned to be members of the same evangelical covenant under CHRIST. Whence the Apostle declares in another place, that the Jews, who are not within the Christian covenant, and consequently not in communion with CHRIST and His Church, have no right to partake of the Christian altar: "We have an altar," says he, "whereof they have no right to partake who serve the tabernacle." (Heb. xiii. 10.) Hence it is manifest that to eat the LORD'S Supper, is to partake of the Sacrifice of CHRIST which is there commemorated and represented. For which reason the most primitive Fathers speak of eating at the Christian altar: "He that is not within the altar," says Ignatius . . . "is deprived of the bread of GOD:" where by "the bread of GOD," he means the Sacrament, which GOD imparts to Christians from His own table, which this Father calls "the altar." And the LORD'S Supper is called an "oblation," a "Sacrifice," and a "gift." Thus, in Clemens of Rome: "It is no small crime, if we depose those from their episcopal office, who have unblameably and holily offered the gifts." Where he manifestly takes this phrase of "offering gifts" in the sense wherein the Jews and our LORD used it: "If thou bring thy gift unto the altar," says our LORD, &c. Matt. v. 23, 24. Where "gift" is put for "Sacrifice." Justin Martyr, in several places of his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, calls the Eucharist a "Sacrifice" . . . Irenæus calls the Eucharist, "the oblation of the Church," &c. In another place, where he speaks of our LORD'S instituting the Eucharist, he has these words: "He taught the new oblation of the New Testament," &c.<sup>1</sup> And in the Fathers of the next age, to consecrate the LORD'S Supper is so constantly called προσφέρειν in Greek, and offerre in Latin, that is, to "offer" it, that it is needless to cite any testimonies from them. So that it is plain, both from the design and nature of the LORD'S Supper, and from the concurrent testimony of the most primitive Fathers, who conversed with the Apostles

<sup>1</sup> [Sup. cit. p. 65.]

or their disciples, that it was reckoned through the whole world to be a commemorative Sacrifice, or a memorial of our Lord offered upon the Cross, which, being first dedicated to God by prayer and thanksgiving, and afterwards eaten by the faithful, was to all intents the same to them, as if they had really eaten the natural Body and Blood of CHRIST, which are thereby represented. The consequence whereof, as explained by the constant practice of the Church in all ages, is, that they who consecrate this Sacrament, must be Priests in the Christian sense of this name, as was before observed. But it is not to be wondered, that those of the reformed religion have either wholly abstained from the names of Sacrifice, and oblation, or mentioned them with caution and reserve, in explaining this Sacrament, which were used by the primitive Fathers in a very true and pious sense; since they have been so grossly abused by the Papists in their doctrine of Transubstantiation, which is the daily occasion of many superstitious and idolatrous practices, and has for several ages given infinite scandal both to the Jews and Gentiles, and to the Church of God.—pp. 261—274.

HUGHES, PRESBYTER.—*Dissertationes Proœmiales*<sup>1</sup>, &c.

I cannot but observe from St. Cyprian<sup>2</sup>, that the Eucharist is called a “true and full Sacrifice,” which the Priest offers to God the FATHER; and while he is offering it, acts in the stead of JESUS CHRIST Himself our great High Priest. And if the case be so, if the Eucharist is a true Sacrifice, if, as often as the Priest offers this Sacrifice, he acts in the stead of JESUS CHRIST Himself, what can be more plain and manifest, than that no man ought to offer up this venerable Sacrifice, but he who is called of God, but he who is ordained and consecrated after the lawful and ordinary manner?—p. cccclxxxvi.

But before we produce the holy Fathers, it may not be foreign to my purpose to answer an objection brought from Scripture, which our sons of Corah frequently allege, and in which they are wont egregiously to boast, as an objection of very great force.

<sup>1</sup> Prefixed to his edition of S. Chrysostom de Sacerdotio. From the translation in the Appendix to Hickeys' Two Treatises, vol. ii. pp. cccxxii. sq.

<sup>2</sup> [Vid. sup. pp. 107, 8.]

The Eucharist, say they, is instituted in the room of the observance of the Passover; and for that reason we cannot better learn who are the ministers of this Sacrament, than by well considering who were the ministers of that observance. For it cannot be doubted, but that the laics among Christians have the same power and authority in things sacred, and especially in the administration of this Sacrament, which they had among the Jews in holy functions, particularly in the celebration of the Passover. But it appears, say they, most evidently from the very institution of the Passover mentioned in the Old Testament, that the celebration of the Paschal Supper did not belong to the priests, but to the whole multitude of the Israelites, to the fathers of families. From hence they argue most strenuously, that the celebration also of the Lord's Supper (which succeeded in the room of the Passover) appertains to all the multitude of the faithful; and that all the laity have right, both of consecrating the elements, and of administering to themselves. I readily grant, that the case is this<sup>1</sup>; and that the father of the family did at his own home sacrifice a lamb, in the name of all the family; and that, in that regard, he retained the ancient right of priesthood, which belonged to the first-born, or fathers of families. But, unless I am very much mistaken, it is so far from following from hence, that our laics have a right to administer the Lord's Supper, that the contrary will be very easily proved from it.

The fathers of families did, at their own homes, slay the Paschal lamb, viz. because it was a private sacrifice, instituted of God for that end, that it should be eaten in every family. It was by no means of the number of those Sacrifices, which were brought to the temple and offered up in a public manner. The Paschal Supper did not any way belong to the public worship of the temple; but was confined within the walls of private houses, and had all the appearance of a private commemoration. If, therefore, our most blessed SAVIOUR had so instituted his Sacrament of the Eucharist, as that it should not be celebrated in public

<sup>1</sup> That what is here asserted of the Passover, is to be confined to the times before the institution of the Levitical Priesthood, see proved in the Advertisement . . . at the end of this Appendix [to Hicckes].



assemblies, but that every one should in his own private house administer it to himself and to his family; there would, indeed, be some weight in this argument. But since it evidently appears, both from Sacred Writ, and from the constant practice of the Catholic Church, that the holy Eucharist is to be accounted among the chief offices of the public worship; the contrary, in my opinion, does manifestly follow from it. It was our blessed SAVIOUR'S will, that the commemoration of His bloody Passion should have the chief place in the public offices; and that it should have the nature of a commemorative Sacrifice, far more noble than that typical and figurative one, made use of among the Jews. It was His intent, therefore, without all doubt, that this public commemoration should be celebrated by the public ministers of His Church; that this commemorative Sacrifice should be offered up by the public Priests. It was necessary that the Jews should, from their own principles, understand our SAVIOUR thus; for their public Sacrifices were slain by their Priests only. Nothing was here claimed by the laity, nothing by the Fathers of families. Therefore the argument drawn from the Paschal Supper is trivial, and of no force. For there is a very great difference between the Paschal Supper, which was a private Sacrifice, and the Supper of the LORD, which is a public Sacrifice, and claims the chief among the public offices.—pp. cccxciii—ccccxcv.

LAURENCE, BISHOP.—*The Bishop of Oxford's Charge considered.*

In this sense of a "proper Sacrifice," there never was but one proper Sacrifice in the world, my lord, and that was the Sacrifice of the real Body and Blood of CHRIST at His death. This proper Sacrifice was but once offered; and, in comparison of this, not one of the Jewish or Patriarchal Sacrifices was a proper Sacrifice; they had nothing in them of intrinsic worth or value to take away sin; and, therefore, in this exalted sense, were not proper Sacrifices, any more than that of bread and wine at the Christian altar.

And then, if by "proper Sacrifice," your lordship means some-

thing material offered to God, and, by Divine institution, appointed to represent to Him the one only proper meritorious Sacrifice of the death of His Son ;—if your lordship designs such a Sacrifice as is representative of the Sacrifice of CHRIST's death, and calls this a "proper Sacrifice," then, my lord, it is acknowledged, that such a "proper Sacrifice," in this secondary sense, has been taught, and not only warmly asserted, but firmly proved to be offered to God in the Sacrament of CHRIST's Body and Blood ; and that this Sacrifice is as proper a Sacrifice offered to God as any of the Jewish Sacrifices were. . . .

In all which it is evident at first sight, that this Article (xxxii.) asserts the offering of CHRIST once made, to be that one only self-sufficient Sacrifice which had an intrinsic value and worth in itself to take away sin ; and therefore, the Article calls it "perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction," and says, that "there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone" ; for, indeed, there never was any other : because it was "impossible that the blood of bulls, or of goats," or indeed any other, the most excellent, material offerings, under the Patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian dispensation, "should take away sins," *i. e.* by their own intrinsic worth and merit ; but yet, by Divine institution, they were made types and representations of CHRIST's Sacrifice, and, as such, the means of procuring remission. So that the Article's saying, there is "none other satisfaction for sin," does not signify, that there are no other means of remission of sin ; for there are others under the Christian dispensation, *viz.* Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and priestly absolution, by Divine appointment. But the true sense of "there is none other satisfaction," is, that there is nothing but the death of CHRIST that has any real intrinsic value in itself, adequate to the righteous demands of Infinite Justice, to take away sin ; for which reason the Church makes use of the word "satisfaction," to express the inestimable, self-sufficient merit of that price, which was of full and perfect value, and, therefore, fit and exactly proper for the Divine wisdom and justice to accept of for the redemption of sinners.

And 'tis only for this reason that the Article condemns the

Sacrifices of Masses, for "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits," because the Romanists pretend that CHRIST is again really offered to GOD in those Sacrifices; that His very Body and Blood are substantially (and not representatively) then present at their altars, and offered to GOD daily by the priests for the sins of the world; making thereby these their pretended Sacrifices of CHRIST's real Body and Blood, equal in worth and value to His own oblation of Himself, which He offered but once upon the altar of the Cross. This is blasphemy with a witness; but what has all this to do with the doctrine of that Sacrament, of real bread and wine, which has been lately revived, and convincingly taught, and proved, by the excellent writers of our Church? Do they teach that this Sacrifice is "that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world," &c. which the Article speaks of? or, do they say, that it is "another satisfaction" for sin, besides that one "perfect satisfaction" which CHRIST made once upon the Cross to Divine Justice; as the Church of Rome says their Sacrifice of the Mass is? No, my lord, our writers have taught no such doctrine, but the direct contrary, viz. that the Christian Sacrifice of bread and wine has no real intrinsic worth or excellency in itself; that it is only a Sacrifice representative of CHRIST's one meritorious Sacrifice of Himself, as the Jewish Sacrifices were only types thereof, and not proper satisfactions in themselves to propitiate the Divine nature; that its whole worth and value is owing only to Divine institution, as that of the Jewish Sacrifices was; and that it is only a Sacrifice, or offering, made to GOD to put Him in mind (as it were) of the all-sufficient Sacrifice of His SON; to beseech Him, for the sake thereof, and of that only, to be propitious and merciful to us; and to express our unfeigned thankfulness and gratitude for the infinite benefit of our redemption, purchased by the Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST. This directly overthrows the Popish pretended Sacrifice of CHRIST's real Body and Blood in the Mass; the very nature of it is such, that it highly agrees with, and constantly expresses the sense of our 31st Article, that "there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone" which was made by the death of CHRIST, once upon

the Cross ; because this Sacrifice of bread and wine is only a representation (not the reality) of that satisfaction which the Article speaks of, and, therefore, is no ways inconsistent with that Article of our Church.—pp. 13—18.

LAW, PRESBYTER AND CONFESSOR.—*Demonstration*<sup>1</sup>, &c.

The plain truth is this : the institution consists of those two essential parts just mentioned ; that is, in offering, presenting, and pleading before God, by faith, the atonement of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, and in owning Him to be a principle of life to us, by our eating His Body and Blood ; this is the entire, whole institution. . . .

And yet this poor man<sup>2</sup> (for so I must call one so miserably insensible of the greatness of the subject he is upon) can find nothing in the institution, but, first, bread and wine, not placed and offered before God, as first signifying and pleading the atonement of His SON'S Body and Blood, and then eaten and drunk in signification of having our life from Him ; but bread and wine set upon a table, to put the people that see it in mind, that by and by they are to exercise an act of the memory ;—and then, secondly, this same bread and wine afterwards brought to every one in particular, not for them to know or believe that they are receiving any thing of CHRIST, or partaking of any thing from Him ; but only to let them know, that the very instant they take the bread and wine into their mouth, is the very time for them actually to excite that act of the memory, for the exciting of which bread and wine had been set upon a table.—pp. 94, 5.

Now here it may be proper for you to observe, that whatever names or titles this institution is signified to you by, whether it be called a Sacrifice propitiatory or commemorative, whether it be called an holy oblation, the Eucharist, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper, the heavenly banquet, the food of immortality, or the Holy Com-

<sup>1</sup> Demonstration of the gross and fundamental errors of a late book, called "A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper," &c.

<sup>2</sup> [The Author of the "Plain Account."]

munion, and the like, matters not much. For all these words or names are right and good, and there is nothing wrong in them, but the striving and contention about them.

For they all express something that is true of the Sacrament, and therefore are, every one of them, in a good sense, rightly applicable to it ; but all of them are far short of expressing the whole nature of the Sacrament, and therefore the help of all of them is wanted.

He therefore that contends for one name, as the only proper one, in exclusion of the rest, is in the same mistake, as he that should contend for one name and character of our SAVIOUR, as the only proper one, in exclusion of all the rest.—pp. 122, 3.

Do you, therefore, reject this author's wisdom of words which he proposes to you, and be content to be devout without it. Be glad to know, that as the nature, office, and condition of our SAVIOUR, could not be made known to us, but by a variety of different names and titles ascribed to Him, so the nature and end, and effects of this Holy Sacrament could not be made known to us, but by a variety of different names and titles ascribed to it ; that in one respect it is a "propitiatory" Sacrifice, in another a "commemorative" Sacrifice ; in one respect it is the seal and renewal of the covenant between God and man, in another the "food of immortality," the "life of the soul," the "bread" that came down from heaven, the "tree of life ;" that in one respect it is the Holy "Eucharist," in another the Holy "Communion."

And be assured, that he who tries to set these expressions at variance with each other, and would persuade you that, if one is a true account of the Sacrament, the others cannot be so, is as vain a "disputer of this world," as he that would persuade you that, if our SAVIOUR be the "seed of the woman," He cannot be essentially "the SON of GOD ;" or that if He be the "Lamb" of GOD, He cannot be the "bread of life."

The reason why this Sacrament is said in one respect to be a "propitiatory," or "commemorative" Sacrifice, is only this : because you there offer, present, and plead before God, such things as are, by CHRIST Himself, said to be His "Body" and "Blood given for you : " but if that which is thus offered, presented, and

pleaded before God, is offered, presented, and pleaded before Him only for this reason, because it signifies and represents, both to God, and angels and men, the great Sacrifice for all the world, is there not sufficient reason to consider this service as truly a Sacrifice? Or even supposing that the calling this service a Sacrifice is no more, according to a certain literal exactness of some critics, than when our SAVIOUR says of Himself, "I am the resurrection and the life," or that a quibbler in words may be able to object as much against it, as against our SAVIOUR's saying of Himself, "I am the resurrection and the life," have you any reason to dislike it on that account, or to wish that such little critics might find more of their empty, superficial, worthless niceties, in the language of the Church, than in the language of Scripture?—pp. 126—128.

WHEATLY, PRESBYTER.—*Illustration of the Common Prayer.*

"And if there be a Communion, the Priest" is then also to "place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient." Which rubric being added to our own Liturgy at the same time with the "oblations," in the Prayer following, (*i. e.* at the last review), it is clearly evident, as Bishop Patrick has observed, that by that word are to be understood the elements of bread and wine, which the Priest is to offer solemnly to God, as an acknowledgment of His sovereignty over His creatures, and that from henceforth they might become properly and peculiarly His. For in all the Jewish Sacrifices, of which the people were partakers, the viands or materials of the feast were first made God's by a solemn oblation, and then afterwards eaten by the communicants, not as man's, but as God's provision; who, by thus entertaining them at His own table, declared Himself reconciled and again in covenant with them. And therefore our blessed SAVIOUR, when He instituted the new Sacrifice of His own Body and Blood, first "gave thanks and blessed" the elements," *i. e.* offered them up to God as LORD of the creatures, as the most ancient fathers expound that passage; who, for that reason, whenever they celebrated the holy Eucharist, always

offered the bread and wine for the Communion to GOD, upon the altar, by this, or some such short ejaculation, "LORD, we offer Thee Thy own, out of what Thou hast bountifully given us." After which they received them, as it were, from Him again, in order to convert them into the sacred banquet of the Body and Blood of His dear SON.—p. 280.

The alms, and devotions, and oblations of the people being now presented to GOD, and placed before Him upon the holy table, it is a proper time to proceed to the exercise of another branch of our charity, I mean that of intercession. Our alms perhaps are confined to a few indigent neighbours; but our prayers may extend to all mankind, by recommending them all to the mercies of GOD, who is able to supply and relieve them all. Nor can we at any time hope to intercede more effectually for the whole Church of GOD, than just when we are about to represent and show forth to the divine Majesty that meritorious Sacrifice, by virtue whereof our great High Priest did once redeem us, and for ever continues to intercede for us in heaven. For which reason we find that the ancient and primitive Christians, whenever they celebrated these holy mysteries, used a form of intercession for the whole Catholic Church. But there is this difference between our practice and theirs, that, whereas we use it immediately after the placing the elements upon the table, it is in all the ancient Liturgies, except in St. Mark's and the Ethiopian, deferred till after the Consecration.—p. 285.

[*Of the Prayer of Consecration.*]

And this [the repetition of the words of institution] is certainly a very essential part of the service. For during the repetition of these words, the priest performs to GOD the representative Sacrifice of the Death and Passion of His SON. By taking the bread into his hands, and breaking it, he makes a memorial to Him of our SAVIOUR'S Body broken upon the Cross; and by exhibiting the wine, he reminds Him of His Blood there shed for the sins of the world; and by laying his hands upon each of them, at the same time that he repeats those words, "Take eat, this is My Body," &c. and "Drink ye all of this,"

&c. he signifies and acknowledges that this commemoration of CHRIST'S Sacrifice so made to God, is a means instituted by CHRIST Himself to convey to the communicants the benefits of His Death and Passion, viz. the pardon of our sins, and God's grace and favour for the time to come. For this reason we find that it was always the practice of the ancients, in consecrating the Eucharist, to break the bread, (after our SAVIOUR'S example,) to represent his Passion and Crucifixion. The Roman Church, indeed, instead of breaking the bread for the communicants to partake of it, only breaks a single wafer into three parts, (of which no one partakes,) for the sake of retaining a shadow at least of the ancient custom. . . .

Very judiciously, therefore, did our good Reformers (though they ordered "these words to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation or showing the Sacrament to the people," yet) restore these other ceremonies to avoid superstition: and yet this very restoration of them is charged as superstitious by Bucer; who, therefore, objects to them, and prevails for the leaving them all out. . . . The taking of the bread and the cup into the hands, have indeed since been restored, viz. first to the Scotch Liturgy, and then to our own, even at the request of the Presbyterians, at the last review. . . .

But besides this, our Liturgy at that time suffered a more material alteration; the Prayer of Oblation, which by the first book of King Edward was ordered to be used after the Prayer of Consecration, (and which has since been restored to the Scotch Common Prayer,) being half laid aside, and the rest of it thrown into an improper place; as being enjoined to be said by our present rubric, in that part of the Office which is to be used after the people have communicated; whereas it was always the practice of the primitive Christians to use it during the act of Consecration. For the holy Eucharist was, from the very first institution, esteemed and received as a proper Sacrifice, and solemnly offered to God upon the altar, before it was received and partaken of by the communicants. In conformity whereunto, it was Bishop Overall's practice to use the first Prayer in the Post Communion Office between the Consecration and the



administering, even when it was otherwise ordered by the public Liturgy.—pp. 303—305.

RIDLEY (GLOUCESTER), PRESBYTER.—*The Christian Passover.*

I design in this and some subsequent discourses, to lay before you the nature of the LORD'S Supper, and shew what place it holds in the Christian oeconomy.

We learn from the institution, that it is a memorial of our blessed SAVIOUR: "This do," says our LORD Himself, "in remembrance of Me;" and St. Paul teaches us, what he received from CHRIST, that this was in remembrance of His death: "for as often as ye eat this bread," &c.; and in the same epistle, mentions the death of CHRIST, under the notion of a Sacrifice, "CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us;" where we see the particular sacrifice singled out, to which the death of CHRIST answers, as the antitype to its type.

He then proceeds to exhort his Corinthians, to keep a commemorative feast in remembrance of it, analogous to the custom of feasting upon the Paschal Lamb; and to attend it with circumstances analogous to those which were observed in the Passover, "therefore let us keep the feast," &c.—pp. 1, 2.

And as the law held forth these types, the Gospel answers them with their antitypes. Did they sacrifice their Passover? "CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us." Was theirs to them for a memorial? we also are to celebrate ours "in remembrance of" the Institutor. Was that Sacrifice a feast to them peculiar, of which the stranger and the foreigner were not to eat? "We" also "have an altar of which they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."—p. 30.

. . . From which relation the following doctrines are easily deducible:

First. That the death of CHRIST is to be remembered by us under the notion of a Sacrifice.

Secondly. That the LORD'S Supper, instituted in memory of it, is also a Sacrifice, as much as any of the Jewish sacrifices were.

Thirdly. That the LORD'S Supper is farther a covenanting rite . . . .

First, that the death of CHRIST is to be remembered by us under the notion of a sacrifice.

1. Though the death of CHRIST bore no relation to the Passover in particular, yet as the original design of sacrifices in general was to prefigure the satisfaction of CHRIST's death, and the atonement of His Blood . . . then the death of CHRIST must be looked upon as a sacrifice in the strictest sense ; nay, in comparison of which, all other sacrifices were but as shadows to the substance. This preference the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives it, when he says, "Ye are come . . . to the blood of sprinkling" (meaning the sacrificial Blood of CHRIST) "which speaketh better things than that of Abel;" *i. e.* the blood which Abel sprinkled in sacrifice, could not speak that peace to the conscience, which the Blood of CHRIST does, *that* being but a figure and shadow of *this* real atonement.

2. Though sacrifices in general had not been divinely instituted to prefigure the death of CHRIST, yet as this is the antitype of the Passover, it must be considered as a Sacrifice : for that the Passover was a Sacrifice is evident . . . It is so called expressly by GOD Himself ; "It is the Sacrifice of the LORD's Passover : " the blood of the lamb was sprinkled upon the door-posts in the first celebration, and by the Priests afterwards ; which was undoubtedly a sacrificial rite ; for we know that "the blood was given to be an atonement for the soul : " and that the death of CHRIST corresponds hereto, the Apostle directly affirms in the text, "CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us."—pp. 39—41.

. . . But, this point secured, it may be objected, that since the LORD's Supper was instituted in remembrance of the Sacrifice of CHRIST, it cannot be itself a Sacrifice, only a memorial. This leads me to shew,

Secondly, That the LORD's Supper instituted in memory of CHRIST's death, was itself a Sacrifice, as much as any of the Jewish sacrifices were.

1. It is no argument against it to say it is a memorial, and therefore no sacrifice ; for amongst the Jews we find that the most consecrated part of the Sacrifice is called a "Memorial ;"

I mean that part of the meat-offering which was burnt upon the altar, as God's appropriate share . . . . This objection rather helps us ; for it proves at least, that the LORD'S Supper is nevertheless a SACRIFICE for being a MEMORIAL.

2. The Passover itself was appointed, amongst other reasons, as a memorial ; and yet it is expressly called, " The Sacrifice of the LORD'S Passover : " the rite, therefore, which succeeds in the place of that, and is, like that, appointed for a " Memorial," is, like that, to be considered as a Sacrifice also.

3. I contend for its being a Sacrifice, as much, and no more than the Jewish Sacrifices were, because the death of CHRIST was the one, only, real Sacrifice, which could be offered but in one instant of time : and yet, as the benefits thereby procured were the greatest comfort, and only support to a burthened conscience, it was therefore necessary that they should be often present to the mind, in all ages of the world. For this reason types were instituted to prefigure the Sacrifice of CHRIST before He suffered ; and for the same reason a memorial instituted to commemorate it after He suffered ; both of them appointed for the same purpose, to represent the death of CHRIST : they are equally memorials, and equally sacrifices, differing from one another, only as the morning and evening shadow.

4. St. Paul understood the LORD'S Supper as a Sacrifice, as appears in this epistle from whence the text is taken : he exhorts the Corinthians who communicated at it, not to eat of the meats sacrificed to idols ; for, says he, " You cannot be partakers of the LORD'S table, and the table of devils ; " so that table signifies the same thing in both places, only appointed for different services. But the table of devils means the altar, and the meat upon it the sacrifices offered thereon . . . . and as the table of the LORD is opposed to these, it must be opposed under the notion of an altar, and the cup of blessing, and bread partook of there, under the notion of a Sacrifice. This passage leads me to shew

Thirdly. That the LORD'S Supper is, further, a covenanting rite ; and this appears because it is a feast upon a Sacrifice, and all such feasts were covenanting rites . . . Whence

1. Sacrifices, as religious feasts, were in testimony of friendship betwixt the Deity and the sacrificers, who had eaten their respective portions . . .

2. In the Jewish œconomy they were always accounted as such . . .

3. As sacrifices in general, so the Passover in particular, was a covenanting rite, by which the LORD engaged to be their GOD. . . . No person was permitted to partake of this Sacrifice, and thereby renew their covenant, who had not before entered into covenant by the rite of circumcision. Wherefore the LORD'S Supper succeeding in the place of the Passover, and being itself a Sacrifice, ought to be looked upon (not as the making a new and fresh covenant with GOD) but as repeating and confirming one already made, namely that at our Baptism; and accordingly "the cup" is called by our SAVIOUR, "the new covenant in His Blood."—pp. 46—52.

JONES, PRESBYTER.—*The Churchman's Catechism.*

Q. When are alms more particularly required by the Church?

A. In the Communion Service; when, with the holy oblation of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, it is right we should offer ourselves and our worldly substance to be consecrated with the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; that we, and all we have, may be acceptable and blessed."—*Works*, vol. xi. p. 419.

COMPILERS OF THE AMERICAN PRAYER-BOOK.

[*Prayer of Consecration.*]

All glory be to Thee, Almighty GOD, our heavenly FATHER, for that Thou, of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thine only SON JESUS CHRIST to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there, &c. . . and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious death and Sacrifice until His coming again: For in the night in which He was betrayed, He took bread, &c. . .

Wherefore, O LORD, and heavenly FATHER, according to the

institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our SAVIOUR  
 The Oblation. JESUS CHRIST, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate  
 and make here before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy holy  
 gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son  
 hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance His blessed  
 passion and precious death, His mighty resurrection and glo-  
 rious ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for  
 the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same. And  
 we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful FATHER, to hear  
 us, and, of Thy Almighty goodness, vouchsafe to  
 The Invocation. bless and sanctify, with Thy Word and Holy Spirit,  
 these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, re-  
 ceiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour JESUS CHRIST'S  
 holy institution, in remembrance of His Death and Passion, may  
 be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood. And we  
 earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept  
 this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly  
 beseeching Thee to grant, &c. . . . humbly beseeching Thee,  
 that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this holy  
 Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body  
 and Blood of Thy Son JESUS CHRIST, be filled with Thy grace  
 and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Him, that  
 He may dwell in them and they in Him. And although we are  
 unworthy, &c.

#### HORSLEY, BISHOP <sup>1</sup>.

With respect to the comparative merit of the two Offices for  
 England and Scotland, I have no scruple in declaring to you,  
 what, some years since, I declared to Bishop Abernethy Drum-  
 mond, that I think the Scotch Office more conformable to the

<sup>1</sup> From a Letter, dated London, June 17, 1806, to the Rev. John Skinner, printed in his "Office, &c. according to the use of the Episcopal Church in Scotland," containing in the Appendix Bishop Horsley's "Collation of Offices," &c. viz. "the several Communion Offices in the Prayer Book of Edward VI., the Scotch Prayer Book of the year 1637, the present English Prayer Book, and that used in the present Scotch Episcopal Church."—*See Skinner*, p. 157, note.

primitive models, and, in my private judgment, more edifying than that which we now use ; insomuch that, were I at liberty to follow my own private judgment, I would myself use the Scotch Office in preference. The alterations which were made in the Communion Service, as it stood in the first book of Edward VI. to humour the Calvinists, were, in my opinion, much for the worse ; nevertheless, I think our present Office is very good ; our form of consecration of the elements is sufficient ; I mean that the elements *are consecrated* by it, and made the Body and Blood of CHRIST, in the sense in which our LORD Himself said, the bread and wine were His Body and Blood.

DAUBENY, PRESBYTER.—*Discourses* <sup>1</sup>.

The holy Eucharist is a commemorative Sacrifice, offered up to God, by way of memorial, or bringing to remembrance that grand Sacrifice, once offered on the Cross, and for the purpose of applying the merits of it to the parties who, in faith, offer it up.

Id.—*Appendix to Guide to the Church* <sup>2</sup>.

The first Christians had no idea of the holy Eucharist being a proper propitiatory Sacrifice, in which the Body and Blood of CHRIST, in truth, reality, and substance, are offered up—the ideas which gave rise to the idolatry practised in the modern Church of Rome, on the subject,—but they consider it to be a commemorative Sacrifice and typical representation, by way of memorial, of the grand Sacrifice that had been offered upon the Cross by JESUS CHRIST ; an idea, which perfectly secures the possessors of it from the gross corruptions of the Church of Rome, because

<sup>1</sup> “ See Discourse IV. of a printed volume of Discourses, by the Rev. Charles Daubeny, Archdeacon of Sarum, and dedicated to the [present] Bishop of Salisbury. In which discourse, if Mr. Daubeny has expressed no other doctrine, than such as the Church of England authorises ; and, at the same time, has expressed the very doctrine which the Episcopal Church in Scotland authorises, then is the doctrine of both Churches *one and the same*.”—*Skinner's Office*, &c. p. 53, note.

<sup>2</sup> As quoted by Skinner, p. 28.

the commemoration of a fact cannot be the fact itself ; the representation cannot be the thing designed to be represented ; the sign cannot be the reality, which it is meant to signify. Such is the idea which our Church entertains upon the subject. She considers the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a feast upon a Sacrifice ; to constitute it such, that which is feasted upon must have been first made a Sacrifice, by having been offered up by a priest. Such is the idea which the episcopal Church of Scotland has upon this sacred subject ; which, . . . by forming her Communion Service upon the model of that set forth for the use of the Church of England, in the reign of Edward VI. still keeps closer to the original pattern of the primitive Church, in the celebration of this service, than the Church of England now does.—vol. ii. p. 414.

JOLLY, BISHOP.—*Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist*<sup>1</sup>.

All grace, all virtue spring from the ever full and ever flowing fountain, which was opened in His adorable side, pierced with a spear upon the Cross, whence issued blood and water—water to wash, and blood to give us life ; for His death, His atoning blood, is our life. This is the sole foundation of man's claim of pardon, grace, and glory, from Adam to the end of the world. Our resort, therefore, must ever be to the Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST, which was prefigured, for the support of man's hope, by instituted typical Sacrifices from the beginning, as we see in Adam's family ; looking forward to it before its actual accomplishment, and now perpetuating the sacrificial remembrance of it, in that divine institution, which He Himself ordained, to show it forth before God, and plead its merit, till He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead.—p. 183.

Such is the doctrine of man's redemption and salvation, by the

<sup>1</sup> The whole volume is a concise and valuable statement of the doctrine, and refers to a chain of writers in the English branch of the Church.

Sacrifice of CHRIST, and such the means of representing and applying it, from the beginning to the end of the Book of GOD. It shines more and more from its first dawn in the third chapter of Genesis, to the last of Malachi. And in the New Testament, it breaks out in its meridian light—CHRIST JESUS, Immanuel, illuminating the whole from first to final day, when He shall be the Light and Life everlasting, eternal joy taking place of momentary sorrow.

Meantime, following Him, we shall not walk in darkness, but have the light of life. As long as this lower world shall endure, and the time of trial for salvation last—until death, the last enemy be destroyed, He ever lives in His mediatorial capacity, to make intercession for us, and bring us to GOD. In the highest heavens, He presents the substance of His Body and Blood, once offered and slain upon earth, and which must in heaven remain until the times of the restitution of all things; and His Church upon earth, by the hands of those whom He commissioned, and promised to be with them, in succession from his Apostles, to the end of the world, offers the instituted representations of them, in commemorative Sacrifice, to plead the merit, and pray for all the benefits of His Death and Passion, pardon of sins, increase of grace, and pledge of glory.—p. 191.

PHILPOTTS, BISHOP.—*Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, 1836.*

And not only is the entrance into the Church by a visible sign, but that body is visible also in the appointed means of sustaining the new life, especially in that most sacred and sublime mystery of our religion, the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper, the commemorative Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST; in which the action and suffering of our great High Priest are represented and offered to GOD on earth, as they are continually by the same High Priest Himself in heaven; the Church on earth doing, after its measure, the same thing as its Head in heaven; CHRIST in heaven presenting the Sacrifice, and applying



it to its purposed end, properly and gloriously; the Church on earth commemoratively and humbly, yet really and effectually, by praying to God (with thanksgiving) in the virtue and merit of that Sacrifice which it thus exhibits.—pp. 43, 44.

---



---

#### CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA.

Page 21, *Note*. Ridley (it appears from his *Life*, p. 325) issued an injunction for the setting up of Tables in the Churches throughout his Diocese, and taking down of Altars, before the order in council, and probably obtained that order in consequence of the "great opposition and censure" this injunction met with, as "contrary to the present order of Common Prayer, and the King's proceedings." It is stated also in the "Letter from the Council," (as far as this may be taken as any authority, and not rather as asserting what they wished,) that "the Altars within the more part of the Churches were" already "taken down." It appears too that Ridley, though using the common-place ultra-Protestant statements, persuaded himself that he was acting in conformity to "primitive practice." He argued that "Christ instituted His last Supper at a Table and not upon an Altar. Nor did either the Apostles or the *Primitive Church*, as we read of, ever use an Altar in the Ministration of the Communion. Therefore a Table, as more agreeing with Christ's institution and *primitive practice*, is rather to be used than an Altar." The fact stated is indeed wholly untrue, arising, as it appears, from the confusion of the titles *θυσιαστήριον* and *βωμός*. (See Mede and Johnson, &c.) On which ground the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Ely "urged against Day, Bishop of Chichester, before the Council," (when he refused to comply with its order,) "that 'twas clear by Origen against Celsus, that the Christians had no Altars when this Father lived." Though "they owned at the same time that the Lord's Table was *called* an Altar by ancient writers." (Collier.) Origen, and other early Christians, allowed that they had no Altars whereon to offer bloody Sacrifices, as the Jews and Heathens; but continually, and indeed uniformly, spoke among themselves of their having an Altar and a Sacrifice, as the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Ely admitted. It may be recollected also, in excuse, that the Catholic doctrine of the "Communion" was obscured, or nearly effaced, by the corrupt practice of Masses without Communion, and Ridley may have thought the Altars, as they

then existed, were an impediment to its restoration, and hoped that the new "God's board" might *also* be considered as an "Altar," (though not in the Romish sense,) as, in the true Catholic view, the Altar is *also* the Table of the Lord. By taking an active part, however, with the more violent, though smaller, ultra-Protestant party, Ridley unhappily gave much occasion for immediate profaneness, and for the ultimate suspension of doctrine, which he still held. So narrow is the path of Catholic Truth, and so much danger is there in disturbing any truth, which men hold, or the way in which they hold it, or any rites or forms, in connection wherewith it has been handed down, as also in using such a wayward and ungoverned instrument as popular feeling, in things holy.

Page 83, [FIELD.] Compare Appendix to Book iii. ch. 19, p. 335.

Page 89, line 4, *dele* "and."

Page 102, *Notes* 1 and 2, bottom line, in each *dele* marks of interrogation.

Page 109, *Note*, add, Also Discourse on Ezra, vi. 10. pp. 379—382.

Page 208, line 18, for "Sacrifice" read "Sacrificer."

Page 219, [PATRICK.] Compare "Necessity and frequency of receiving the Holy Communion," pp. 71. 82. 89. 115, 116.

Page 280, *Note* 2, add, Compare Bishop Lake's Officium Eucharisticum, p. 46, where the same Prayers are inserted from Bishop Cosin.

THE END.

*The following Works, all in single volumes, or pamphlets, and recently published, will be found more or less to uphold or elucidate the general doctrines inculcated in these Tracts:—*

- Bp. Taylor on Repentance, by Hale.—*Rivingtons*.  
Bp. Taylor's Golden Grove.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, with translation.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
Pusey on Cathedrals and Clerical Education.—*Roake & Varty*.  
Hook's University Sermons.—*Talboys, Oxford*.  
Pusey on Baptism (*published separately*).—*Rivingtons*.  
Newman's Sermons, 3 vols.—*Rivingtons*.  
Newman on Romanism, &c.—*Rivingtons*.  
The Christian Year.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
Lyra Apostolica.—*Rivingtons*.  
Perceval on the Roman Schism.—*Leslie*.  
Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions.—*Duncan*.  
Dodsworth's Lectures on the Church.—*Burns*.  
Newman on Suffragan Bishops.—*Rivingtons*.  
Keble's Sermon on Tradition.—*Rivingtons*.  
Memoir of Ambrose Bonwick.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer.—*Rivingtons*.  
Law's first and second Letters to Hoadly.—*Rivingtons*.  
Bp. Andrews' Devotions. Latin and Greek.—*Pickering*.  
Hook's Family Prayers.—*Rivingtons*.  
Herbert's Poems and Country Pastor.  
Evans's Scripture Biography.—*Rivingtons*.  
Le Bas' Life of Archbishop Laud.—*Rivingtons*.  
Jones (of Nayland) on the Church.  
Bp. Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Rivingtons*.  
Bp. Beveridge's Sermons on the Ministry and Ordinances.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
Bp. Jolly on the Eucharist.  
Fulford's Sermons on the Ministry, &c.—*Rivingtons*.  
Rose's Sermons on the Ministry.—*Rivingtons*.  
A Catechism on the Church.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
Russell's Judgment of the Anglican Church.—*Baily*.  
Poole's Sermons on the Creed.—*Grant, Edinburgh*.  
Sutton on the Eucharist.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
Leslie on the Regale and Pontificate.—*Leslie*.  
Pusey, Sermon on November 5.—*Rivingtons*.

*Larger Works which may be profitably studied.*

- Bishop Bull's Sermons.—*Parker, Oxford*.  
Bishop Bull's Works.—*University Press*.  
Waterland's Works.—*Do*.  
Wall on Infant Baptism.—*Do*.  
Pearson on the Creed.—*Do*.  
Leslie's Works.—*Do*.  
Bingham's Works.—*Straker, London*.  
Palmer on the Liturgy.—*University Press*.  
Palmer on the Church.—*Rivingtons*.  
Hooker, ed. Keble.—*Do*.