

---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>















THE  
WORKS  
OF  
THE REV. DANIEL WATERLAND, D. D.

FORMERLY  
MASTER OF MAGDALENE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,  
CANON OF WINDSOR,  
AND  
ARCHDEACON OF MIDDLESEX;  
NOW FIRST COLLECTED AND ARRANGED.

---

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,  
A REVIEW  
OF THE  
AUTHOR'S LIFE AND WRITINGS,  
BY  
WILLIAM VAN MILDERT, D. D.  
LORD BISHOP OF LLANDAFF.

---

VOL. VIII.

---

OXFORD,  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.  
MDCCLXXXIII.

*Clar. Press.*

*l. f. 35.*





---

**CONTENTS**  
**OF THE**  
**EIGHTH VOLUME.**

---

**CHARGES.**

THE WISDOM OF THE ANCIENTS BORROWED FROM DIVINE REVELATION, OR, CHRISTIANITY VINDI- CATED AGAINST INFIDELITY, PART I.	Page 1.
CHRISTIANITY VINDICATED AGAINST INFIDELITY, PART II.	37.
A DISCOURSE OF FUNDAMENTALS.	85.
THE DOCTRINAL USE OF THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS CONSIDERED.	127.
THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE EXPLAINED.	145.
APPENDIX TO THE SAME.	180.
THE SACRAMENTAL PART OF THE EUCHARIST EX- PLAINED.	225.
DISTINCTIONS OF SACRIFICE.	233.

**OCCASIONAL SERMONS.**

THE DUTY OF DOING GOOD.	367.
A THANKSGIVING SERMON BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.	387.
A SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE SONS OF THE CLERGY.	411.
A FAMILIAR DISCOURSE UPON THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY.	431.
A THANKSGIVING SERMON BEFORE THE LORD MAYOR, &c.	447.
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.	465.



**A C H A R G E**  
**DELIVERED TO THE**  
**CLERGY OF MIDDLESEX,**  
**AT THE**  
**PRIMARY VISITATION,**  
*Held May 19, 1731.*

**VOL. VIII.**

**B**



---

---

# A C H A R G E

DELIVERED TO THE  
CLERGY OF MIDDLESEX, &c.

---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

AS we are here met together for the honour of God, and for the service of his Church, it may be proper for me to say something of the state of religion, and the controversies depending. We live in a disputing age, and *infidelity* has been long growing upon us. It began with exploding *mysteries* in general, and from thence proceeded to a denial of our Lord's *divinity* in particular. Low notions of the person of Christ are apt to bring in low notions of his *merit* and *satisfaction*, and of the use and value of the Christian *sacraments*, which represent and apply them. And when *faith* in Christ's blood is once depreciated or frustrated, it is natural to set up *works*<sup>a</sup>, not only as the *conditional*, but as the *efficacious*, or even *meritorious* cause of salvation. The next step is to exalt *morality* in opposition to *faith*, and mere morality in opposition to *instituted* religion; which again prepares the way for looking upon all *revealed* religion as *needless* or *useless*, which comes to the same thing with denying its *truth*, because an all-wise God can do nothing *in vain*.

<sup>a</sup> Certe omnes illi qui *divinitatem* Christi in dubium vocant, non possunt non *satisfactionem* quoque, et justificationem per *fidem* solam negare, seque adeo ad *opera* legis recipere: quod vel Socinianorum exemplo patet. *Jo. Francisc. Buddai Eccles. Apostolica*, p. 130.

Such is the connection or gradation of error, when once men desert the rules of reason and sobriety, to follow their own wanderings; such the obvious and easy descent from disputing the *essentials* of revealed religion, to denying the *whole*. So now our main concern is, to defend *revelation* against *infidelity*; which, one would think, should be a very easy matter; as indeed it is, if reason and argument may prevail. But yet much may be done on the other side, by a dexterous application to the passions and weaknesses of mankind: for corrupt nature is a prevalent principle, and will always make a strong party in the world; for which reason, it concerns us, my Reverend Brethren, as watchful guardians of the flock of Christ, to be jealous over it, at this time, with a godly jealousy, and to use our best endeavours to preserve the unwary from the wiles and artifices of such as "lie in wait " to deceive." Many are the ways and means of defending Christianity, well known to this learned body, and as successfully made use of, both in preaching and writing. I shall content myself with singling out one argument from the rest, and one much made use of both by ancients and moderns. I shall explain it presently, after first taking notice of the nature of the debate now on foot between Christians and Infidels. It appears to be in substance much the same with what the ancient Jews and Christians were employed in against the infidels of their times. For the present unbelievers are setting up what they call *natural religion*, to rival *supernatural*; *human reason* in the heart of man, in opposition to *divine reason* laid down in the word of God; or to say all in short, *Pagan darkness* in opposition to *Scripture light*. When the Pagans of old presumed in like manner upon their seeming wisdom and their imaginary attainments, despising the only true wisdom from above, in comparison of their *own*; the good Jews and Christians, in their respective times, represented to them, that their boasted wisdom was, for the most part, *human folly*; and that whatever they really knew or taught, deserving any praise, they had

mostly *borrowed* it from *divine revelation*, while they meanly and ungratefully disowned it; but that it was very wrong in them to drink only of the polluted streams, instead of coming directly to the fountain-head, and madness to prefer the faint reflections of a cloud before the open sunshine. This is a famous topic among the ancient Apologists, and has been frequently made use of since, as I have already hinted. And this is what I incline to entertain you a while with at present. I rather choose it, because this topic has been disputed in part by some, and obscured by others, and seems to want a little clearing and settling: neither indeed is it to be admitted entire and in the gross, without proper qualifying and distinctions. I shall first fairly and fully represent it, as it stood among the ancient Apologists, and shall next endeavour to pass a clear and right judgment upon it, and to take off unreasonable exceptions to it.

I shall begin with the Jewish Apologists, who led the way, and who gave the first hints, which the Christians coming after laid hold of and improved.

Aristobulus, an Alexandrian Jew, as is said, and a Peripatetic philosopher, preceptor also to Ptolemy Philometor, about 160 years before Christ, affirms directly, that both Pythagoras and Plato had copied many things from Moses's Law, transferring the same into their own philosophy<sup>b</sup>. And to make it appear the more probable, he suggests that the Hebrew Scriptures, or rather some extracts of them, had been translated into Greek before the time of Alexander the Great, and even before the rise of the Persian monarchy: a fact, which learned men have been much divided upon formerly, and do not now commonly admit<sup>c</sup>. But unless he had good proof of it, it was need-

<sup>b</sup> Aristobulus apud Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 110, 111. ed. Oxon. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. cap. 6. lib. xiii. cap. 12.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Huet. Dem. Evang. Prop. iv. p. 132, 133. Nourrii Appar. ad Bibl. Max. vol. i. p. 389. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. lib. iii. cap. 12. p. 316. Prolegom. ad Grab. Septuag. tom. ii. c. 1. prop. 1. Hodii Text. Bibl. p. 570, &c. Jenkin's Reasonableness, &c. vol. i. p. 93. There is little reason to doubt,



less for him to insist upon it, since his main argument did not require it; for Pythagoras and Plato might have borrowed many things at second or at third hand from the Jewish Church, without having a sight of the Jewish Scriptures; and Aristobulus might have learned from the testimony of Megasthenes, a Pagan writer, who lived about 150 years before him, that the Greek philosophers had borrowed many of their notions from the Jews<sup>d</sup>. The same Aristobulus elsewhere intimates, that not only Pythagoras and Plato, but Socrates also, and Orpheus, and Hesiod, and Homer, and Linus had drank at the same fountains, enriching their theology from the holy Scriptures<sup>e</sup>; nay, and that Aristotle's philosophy had taken several things from the Law of Moses and from the Prophets<sup>f</sup>, or *depended* upon them.

I am aware, that a learned writer<sup>g</sup> of our own has hinted his suspicion that the writings going under the name of Aristobulus were a forgery of the second century: and another very considerable author<sup>h</sup> seems in a great measure to favour the suspicion. But other as learned writers<sup>i</sup> think, that the suspicion is not sufficiently grounded, or is far from probable: and some have professedly

but that at least part of the Bible was translated into Greek before the time of Alexander the Great. *Ibid.*

<sup>d</sup> Ἀπαντα μὲν εἰσι τὰ περὶ φύσεως ἱερῆματα παρὰ ταῖς ἀρχαίαις λίγιστα παρὰ ταῖς ἔξω τῆς Ἑλλάδος φιλοσοφίαις. τὰ μὲν παρ' Ἰνδοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν Βραχμάνων, τὰ δὲ ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν κολουμένων Ἰουδαίων. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* lib. i. p. 360. Conf. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. cap. 6. p. 410.

N. B. The same words are quoted by Cyril of Alexandria, as Aristobulus's own words, (Cyrill. contr. Jul. lib. iv. p. 134.) probably because Aristobulus had quoted them from Megasthenes; for Clemens and Eusebius both quote them as Megasthenes's, and the very manner of expression shows that they are not Aristobulus's own. See Hody de Bibl. Text. p. 54.

<sup>e</sup> Apud Euseb. Præp. Evangel. lib. xiii. cap. 12.

<sup>f</sup> Aristobulus apud Clem. Alex. Strom. v. p. 705.

<sup>g</sup> Hody de Bibl. Text. Original. lib. i. cap. 9. p. 49. et lib. iv. p. 570.

<sup>h</sup> Prideaux, Connect. p. ii. lib. i. p. 38, &c. Conf. Carpzov. Crit. Sacr. p. 490.

<sup>i</sup> Fabric. Bibl. Græc. lib. iii. cap. 11. p. 281. Wolfi Biblioth. Hebr. vol. i. p. 215.

undertaken to clear up the objected difficulties, and to assert the genuineness of the writings ascribed to Aristobulus<sup>k</sup>. I make not myself a party or a moderator in that dispute: neither is it necessary that I should, since little depends upon it as to our present argument. If Aristobulus's pieces are genuine, then he is the first man of the ancient Apologists (whom we have any remains of) that so managed the dispute in favour of revelation against the Pagans: if not, Josephus then leads the way, whom I come next to mention.

Josephus, in his two books against Apion, is very full and particular upon the same argument. He observes, that the famous Pythagoras, the father of the Pagan philosophy and theology, was well acquainted with the Jewish institutes, and was a great admirer and follower of them<sup>l</sup>: which he confirms by the testimony of the Pagan biographer Hermippus, who, in his life of Pythagoras, had observed that that philosopher had taken several of his notions from the Jews, adopting them for his own<sup>m</sup>.

Josephus himself adds, that it is said with truth, that that philosopher<sup>n</sup> transferred many of the Jewish rules into his own philosophy; thereby confirming what Aristobulus had said before. A little after, he observes from Clearchus, a disciple of Aristotle, how that philosopher

<sup>k</sup> Whiston's Appendix to the Literal Accomplishment, p. 134, &c. 141, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Πυθαγόρας τόνον ἰ Σάμιος ἀρχαῖος ἄν, σοφία δὲ καὶ τῆ περι τὸ θεῖον ἐπιτελεῖται πάντων ὑπελαμμένους διαιτηγῶν τῶν φιλοσοφῶντων, οὐ μόνον ἰσχυρῶς τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν δηλῶς ἴσταν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζηλωτῆς αὐτῶν ἐκ αὐτίστου γεννητημίνος. *Joseph. contr. Ap. lib. i. cap. xxii. p. 453.*

<sup>m</sup> Ταῦτα ὁ Ἰσραῆτι καὶ ἱλιγι, τὰς Ἰουδαίων καὶ Θρακῶν δόξας μιμούμενος, καὶ μεταφίρων ἐς ἑαυτόν. *Hermipp. ap. Joseph. ibid. p. 453.* This Hermippus lived about 250 years before Christ. See Hod. Bibl. Text. p. 11.

<sup>n</sup> Λίγηται γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὁ ἀπὸρ ἐκείνος πολλὰ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίους νομίμων ἐς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μεταιτηγῶν φιλοσοφίαν. *Ibid. p. 453.*

He seems here to allude to what had been said by Aristobulus, Πυθαγόρας πολλὰ τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν μεταίτηγας ἐς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δογματοσοφίαν. *Aristobul. ap. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 111.* This I note as a probable argument to prove that Aristobulus's pieces were then extant; only Josephus would not name him, because the testimony of one of his own side would have weighed little with the adversary.

in his travels had struck up an acquaintance with a Jew of extraordinary worth, and had learned much from him°. Which again confirms what Aristobulus reports of Aristotle's philosophy, that it derived several things from the Law and Prophets †.

From Josephus the Jew, I may now proceed to Christian Fathers and Apologists. Justin Martyr, in his first Apology, expresses himself thus. "Moses is older than any of the Greek writers: and as to what the philosophers and poets have said, either of the *immortality of the soul*, or of *punishments* after death, or of contemplation of *heavenly* things, or the like doctrines, they took their hints from the Prophets, whom they consulted and built upon; and by this means some seeds of truth seem to have been scattered amongst all: though at the same time it is evident, from their notorious disagreeing amongst themselves, that they understood not those things to any degree of exactness‡."

The same Justin, in his Parænesis, dwells upon the argument more at large; observing that Orpheus, and Homer, and Solon, and Pythagoras, and Plato had all been in Egypt, and had there learned to improve their theology by the help of Moses's writings. He first asserts it in the general', and then goes on to speak more distinctly to every particular‡: and when he comes in the close, to assign his reason for insisting so much upon this topic, he tells his readers, that it was to convince the Greeks, that there was no learning true religion from them, who had

° Joseph. contr. Apion. lib. i. cap. 22. p. 454, 455. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 358. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ix. cap. 5, 6.

† See above, p. 6.

‡ Πρεσβύτερος γὰρ Μωϋσῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι συγγραφεῖων καὶ πάντων Ἴσα πρὶν ἑθνασίας ψυχῆς, ἢ τιμωριῶν τῶν μετὰ θάνατον, ἢ διακρίσεως οὐρανόθεν, ἢ τῶν ἡμῶν δογμάτων, καὶ φιλοσοφῶν καὶ ποιητῶν ἴσασαν, ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν εἰς ἀφορμὰς λαβόντες, καὶ νοῆσαι διδόντες, καὶ ἱεργήσαντο. Ἰδὲν παρὰ πάντας ἐπίγραμμα ἀληθείας δοκεῖ εἶναι. ἐλίχθησαν δὲ μὴ ἀκριβῶς νοήσαντες, ἵναν ἰσχυρία αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοῖς λίσσων. *Just. Mart. Apol.* i. cap. 57. p. 86. edit. Oxon. p. 67. Cant.

‡ *Just. ad Græc. cohort.* cap. xv. p. 76. edit. Oxon.

‡ *Just. ibid.* cap. xv. xvi.—xxxv.

nothing considerable of their *own* to boast of; and as to what they had borrowed from Moses and the Prophets, they had so disguised and disfigured it, that they had almost spoiled it<sup>t</sup>. I speak his sense, though not his very words.

Next to Justin, follows his scholar Tatian, who expresses the same thought more distinctly, and is the best comment upon him. He observes<sup>u</sup>, that it were much more advisable for the Pagans to take Moses himself for their guide, than to follow the Greek philosophers so much younger, and who had drawn their best things from him, and not in the best manner, not like skilful men: for that many of their sophists, led by vain curiosity, had come to Moses and other Jewish sages for instruction, but had laboured to adulterate it when they had done; either to make a show of saying something of their own, or else to cover up what they did not well understand, under a mist of words, sophisticating the truth with devised fables. To proceed.

Theophilus Bishop of Antioch, about the year of our Lord 180, takes notice that the Pagan poets and philosophers coming after the sacred Prophets had stolen the doctrine of *eternal punishments* from them, in order to give the more strength and weight to their own writings<sup>x</sup>. In another place, he intimates, that they had derived the no-

<sup>t</sup> Ταῦ χρεῖν μνημονῦσαι τούτων νοτι προήχθη, ὃ ἄνθρωπος Ἕλληνας, ἵνα γινώσκει τὴν ἀληθῆ θεωρίαν οὐ δυνατὸν κατὰ τούτων μαιθάνειν τῶν μηδὲ ἰν οἱς ὑπὸ τῶν ἱεροῦ Ἰσακράδου, Ἰδίαν εἰ γράψαι δυναθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τινος ἰαίτης ἀλληγορίας ὑπὸ Μωσίου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν ἰν τοῖς ἰαυτῶν συγγράμμασι ἀσηγηγίλῃται. *Just. Pagan. cap. xxxv. p. 118.*

<sup>u</sup> Καὶ χρεῖ τῶν προφῆτων κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν πιστεύειν, ἥτις τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς παρθῆς ἀρραβῆσι Ἕλλησι, οὐ κατ' ἰσῆγῃσι, τὰ ἰαίτου δόγματα. πολλοὶ γὰρ οἱ κατ' αὐτοὺς σοφιστὰὶ πειρημένοι πειρηγῆ, τὰ ἴσα πικρὰ τῶν κατὰ Μωσῆα, καὶ τῶν ἰμοῖσι αὐτῶν φιλοσοφῶνται ἰγῃσι, ἃ καὶ παραχρησάτῃσι ἰακράδου. πρῶτον μὲν, ἵνα εἰ λίγῃ ἰδῆσι νομίζονται διότιροι δι, ἴσως τὰ ἴσα μὴ νομῆσαι, διὰ τινος ἰακράδου ἡσολογίας παρακλύπτουσι, τοῖς μυθολογίας τῆς ἀλῆθῃσι παραχρησῆναι. *Tatian. ad Græc. cap. lxi. 135. edit. Oxon.*

<sup>x</sup> Ὡν τιμωρῶν προφητῶν ὑπὸ προφῆτων μεταγινῆσιν γινῆσαι οἱ κῆται καὶ φιλόσοφοι ἰαλῆσαι ἰν τῶν ἁγῶν γραφῶν, ἰς τὰ δόγματα αὐτῶν ἀξῆσῃται γινῆσαι. *Theoph. ad Antol. l. i. c. 19. p. 62. edit. Hamb.*

tion of the *unity of God* and of a future *judgment* from the same fountain $\gamma$ . The like he says afterwards in respect of the doctrine of the general *conflagration*, that the Hea-then poets *stole* the notion from the Law and the Pro-phets $z$ .

But of all the ancient Fathers and Apologists, there is none more copious upon this argument than Clemens of Alexandria. It is very frequent with him to call the Pa-gan philosophers and poets, *thieves* or *plagiaries*, for their stealing so plentifully from the Jewish Church, to adorn their own writings; at the same time not acknowledging the obligation $a$ . He presses the charge home upon particular men by name, or bodies of men: upon Pythago-ras $b$  chiefly and Plato $c$ , as the two principal men: but upon Numa $d$  also, and Thales $e$ , and Socrates $f$ , and Clean-thes $g$ , and Antisthenes $h$ ; upon Xenophon $i$ , and Aristotle $k$ , and the whole sect of the Stoics $l$ . He makes the like charge upon the heathen poets in general $m$ ; and particularly upon Orpheus $n$ , Linus $o$ , Musæus $p$ , Homer $q$ , Hesiod $r$ , and Pindar $s$ . His proofs of the facts are not all of the same kind, nor of the same weight. What he urges from external confessions or testimonies of Pagans themselves, as from Megasthenes $t$ , Clearchus $u$ , Numeni-us $x$ , and Plato himself $y$ , must be owned to be solid and

$\gamma$  Πλὴν ἰνὸςί τινίς τῆ ψυχῆ ἐκνήψαντις ἔξ αὐτῶν, εἶπον ἀπέλουθα ταῖς προφήταις, ἵσως εἰς μαρτύριον αὐταῖς εἶ καὶ πᾶσι ἀνθρώποις περὶ εἰ Θεοῦ μοναρχίας καὶ κρεί- στως, καὶ τῶν λαμπρῶν δι' ἱερασκῶν. *Theoph.* l. ii. c. 11. p. 114. Conf. 262.

$z$  Καὶ περὶ ἰκνουρώτους κόσμου, θύλωντι, καὶ μὴ θύλωντι, ἀπέλουθα ἔξῃσιν ταῖς προφήταις, καίτις μεταγνίστημι γινόμενοι, καὶ κλίψαντις ταῦτα ἐν ἰόνου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. *Theoph.* l. ii. c. 55. p. 260.

$a$  Clem. Alex. p. 369, 377, 378, 429, 650, 663, 699, 700, 733, 737. ed. Ox.

$b$  Clem. p. 60, 355, 358, 477, 662, 663.

$c$  Ibid. p. 60, 176, 223, 224, 355, 358, 419, 662, 701, &c. 710.

$d$  Ibid. p. 358, 359.

$e$  Ibid. 704.

$f$  Ibid. p. 701.

$g$  Ibid. p. 60, 715.

$h$  Ibid. p. 60.

$i$  Ibid. p. 60.

$k$  Ibid. p. 358, 705.

$l$  Ibid. p. 699, 708.

$m$  Ibid. p. 658.

$n$  Ibid. p. 659, 692.

$o$  Ibid. p. 659.

$p$  Ibid. p. 659.

$q$  Ibid. p. 659, 707, 709.

$r$  Ibid. p. 659, 708.

$s$  Ibid. p. 295.

$t$  Ibid. p. 360.

$u$  Ibid. p. 358.

$x$  Ibid. p. 411.

$y$  Ibid. p. 355, 358, 697.

convincing, so far as it reaches. As to the artificial arguments or presumptions drawn from the *similitude* of thoughts or expressions, taking in the superior antiquity of Moses, and the certainty of the fact that many both *poets* and *philosophers* had been in Egypt, where they might have learned something at first or second hand from the Jews: these and the like considerations have their weight and credibility, but may sometimes easily be extended too far.

The particular doctrines, notions, or principles, which Clemens supposes to have been thus borrowed by the Pagans from the Jews, or from sacred Writ, are such as I shall just briefly mention: first, the main substance or best part of their *ethics* or *morality*<sup>z</sup>; next, their most considerable *laws*<sup>a</sup>, either in Minos's, or Lycurgus's, or Zaleucus's, or Solon's<sup>b</sup>; mercy towards *brute beasts*<sup>c</sup>; then the *Unity* of God<sup>d</sup>; the *Trinity* also<sup>e</sup>, and the sacredness of the *seventh day*<sup>f</sup>; the *omnipresence* or *overruling power* of the Deity<sup>g</sup>; the doctrine also of the *resurrection*<sup>h</sup>, and of *future judgment*<sup>i</sup>, and of the everlasting *punishments* in *hell*<sup>k</sup>, with the blessedness of *heaven*<sup>l</sup>: add to these the notion of good and evil *angels*<sup>m</sup>, and of the *creation* of the world<sup>n</sup>, and of the general *conflagration*<sup>o</sup>. Some obscure knowledge of all these doctrines, Clemens supposes to have been conveyed by *Scripture*, or hearsay, or tradition, from the Hebrews to the Gentile world; but that the Pagans had much depraved or disguised the doctrines so received.

Tertullian, of the same century, prosecutes the same argument in few, but in strong words. He tells the Pagans, that they borrowed their *laws*, such as were of most value, from the older laws of Moses<sup>p</sup>. In another place

<sup>z</sup> Clem. Alex. p. 469.    <sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 422.    <sup>b</sup> See p. 422. compare p. 356.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. 477.    <sup>d</sup> Ibid. p. 714, &c.    <sup>e</sup> Ibid. p. 711.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. p. 713.    <sup>g</sup> Ibid. p. 723, 724.    <sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 711.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. p. 722.    <sup>k</sup> Ibid. p. 700, 701.    <sup>l</sup> Ibid. p. 722.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. p. 701.    <sup>n</sup> Ibid. p. 701.    <sup>o</sup> Ibid. p. 711, 712.

<sup>p</sup> Dum tamen sciatis ipsas quoque leges vestras, quæ videntur ad inno-

he asks, which of their *poets* and which of their *sophists* had not drank at the fountain of the Prophets? And he further says, that from thence it was that the philosophers had quenched their learned thirst : but he intimates withal, that they had corrupted and mangled what they had so taken, and had endeavoured to wrest and warp it to their own hypotheses<sup>r</sup>, not sufficiently considering that a *Divine* writing is privileged from ill usage, and ought not be so profaned.

Minutius Felix expresses the same thought, observing, that the philosophers had taken several things from sacred Writ, but had adulterated what they took, and delivered it but by halves<sup>s</sup>.

Origen discovers the same sentiments, in more places than one of his treatise against Celsus. He refers to Hermippus, which Josephus had before done, as a voucher, that Pythagoras had borrowed his philosophy in part from the Jews<sup>t</sup>. In another place he intimates that Plato probably might have learned some things from the Jews in Egypt, which he afterwards disguised for fear of giving offence to the Greeks<sup>u</sup>. He elsewhere speaks more positively of Plato's borrowing some of his expressions or notions, either directly from *Scripture*, or at second hand

centiam pergere, de *divina* lege ut antiquiore, formam mutuatas: diximus jam de Mosis ætate. *Tertull. Apol.* c. xlv. p. 372. edit. Haverc.

<sup>r</sup> Quis poetarum, quis sophistarum, qui non de prophetarum fonte potaverit? Inde igitur et philosophi sitim ingenii surriggerunt. *Tertull. Apol.* c. xlvii. p. 396. Conf. ad Nation. l. ii. c. 2.

<sup>s</sup> Si quid in sanctis offenderunt digestis, exinde regeſtum pro instituto curiositatis ad propria verterunt, neque satis credentes *divina* esse quo minus interpolarent, neque, &c. *Ibid.* p. 396.

<sup>t</sup> Animadvertis philosophos eadem disputare quæ nos dicimus: non quod nos simus eorum vestigia subsecuti, sed quod illi de *divinis* prædicationibus *prophetarum*, umbram interpolatæ veritatis imitati sunt. Sic etiam conditionem renascendi sapientium clariores, Pythagoras, et præcipuus Plato, corrupta et dimidiata fide tradiderunt, &c. *Minuc. F.* c. xxxiii. p. 189, 190. edit. Cant.

<sup>u</sup> Λίγιστα δὲ καὶ Ἐρμιπποῦ ἐς τῆς πρώτης περιῆ νεμαδιεῶν ἰσραηλῖται, Παιδαγωγὸς τὴν λαοῦ φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἕλληνας ἀγαγὺν. *Origen. contr. Cels.* l. i. p. 13.

<sup>v</sup> Origen. cont. Cels. lib. iv. p. 190.

from his converse with the Hebrews <sup>x</sup>. And he takes notice also of Numenius (a Pythagorean of the second century) his speaking respectfully of the Jews <sup>y</sup>, and of his borrowing several things from Moses and the Prophets <sup>z</sup>.

Our next author is Lactantius, who, though he agrees with the other Fathers and Apologists in the main thing, that the Pagans did borrow from the Hebrews several of their best notions, yet he seems to differ from them in some considerable circumstances. For his opinion appears to be, that they did not receive those doctrines at first hand, by reading the *Scriptures* themselves, neither yet at the second hand, by conversing with the Hebrews, but by a more remote and obscure channel of conveyance, by uncertain hearsay, or blind and very corrupt tradition <sup>a</sup>; so that the Pagan philosophers did not themselves deprave what they had so taken, but they received it depraved, and could not make it better than they found it. This appears to be Lactantius's real sense of the matter. Accordingly he denies that ever Pythagoras or Plato resorted directly to the Jews, or (as his argument seems to imply) that they conversed at all with them <sup>b</sup>:

<sup>x</sup> Origen. cont. Cels. l. vi. p. 288. conf. lib. vii. p. 351, 352.

<sup>y</sup> Origen. ibid. l. i. p. 13.

<sup>z</sup> Origen. ibid. p. 198.

<sup>a</sup> Nullas enim literas veritatis attigerant; sed quæ prophetarum vaticinio tradita in sacrario Dei continebantur, ea de *fabulis et obscura opinione* collecta, et depravata, (ut veritas a vulgo solet variis sermonibus dissipata corrumpi, nullo non addente aliquid ad id quod audierant) carminibus suis comprehenderunt. *Lactant. Instit.* l. ii. c. 10. p. 95. edit. Cant.

Quia mysterium divini sacramenti nesciebant, et ad eos mentio *resurrectionis futuræ obscurorum ore* pervenerat, eam vero temere ac leviter auditam, in modum commentitiæ fabulæ prodiderunt. Et tamen iidem testati sunt, non auctorem se certum sequi; ut Maro qui ait: *Sit mihi fas audita loqui*. Quamvis igitur veritatis arcana, in parte, corruperint, tamen ipsa res eo verior invenitur, quod cum *prophetis* in parte consentiunt; quod nobis ad probationem rei satis est. *Id.* l. vii. c. 22. p. 397.

<sup>b</sup> Unde equidem soleo mirari, quod cum Pythagoras, et postea Plato, amore indagandæ veritatis accensi ad *Ægyptios*, et Magos, et Persas usque penetrassent,—ad Judæos tamen non accesserint, penes quos tunc solos [religio] erat, et quo facilius ire potuissent. Sed aversos esse arbitror Divina provi-



Some have gladly laid hold on this passage of Lactantius, disliking the hypothesis of the other Fathers, and looking upon this single opinion of Lactantius, as weighty in itself, and sufficient to counterbalance all the rest<sup>c</sup>. Others, on the contrary, think that Lactantius has betrayed great ignorance<sup>d</sup> in what he has said, and that his single opinion is of small weight against many more valuable writers. Some have endeavoured to excuse him in this affair, and to reconcile him with the other Fathers, by saying, that he might mean only that Pythagoras and Plato did not go into Judæa, however they might have conversed with Jews in Egypt or elsewhere<sup>e</sup>. But Lactantius probably meant, that they never conversed with the Jews at all; and his argument seems to require that he should mean so. In short then, we must either give up Lactantius, as to those particular facts relating to Pythagoras and Plato, or else set aside a number of other more considerable authorities. But as to his main notion, that the Pagans, many of them, borrowed their best principles from revelation *remotely*, and by obscure *tradition*, rather than by reading of sacred Writ, or conversing directly with Jews; there appears to be both sense and truth in it; of which I shall say more when I come to pass a judgment upon the general argument.

I may next mention the learned Eusebius, who, in his

dentia, quia nondum fas erat alienigenis hominibus religionem Dei veri, justitiamque cognoscere. *Lactant.* lib. iv. cap. 2. p. 176.

<sup>c</sup> See Marsham Can. Chron. sect. xix. p. 152. Franæq. edit. Clerici Epist. Crit. vii. p. 228. Hodii Text. Bibl. lib. iv. p. 571.

<sup>d</sup> Nec enim satis didicerat Lactantius sive Pythagoræ, sive Platonis res, cum eos minime Judæos accessisse scripsit. Id quod ex sequentibus fiet manifestum. *Selden. de Jur. N. et Gent.* lib. i. cap. 2. p. 14.

Splendide ergo halucinatur Lactantius, cum *mirari* se ait, &c. Conceptis enim verbis tradit Porphyrius, in vita Pythagoræ, Ægyptios, Arabes, Chaldæos et Ebræos ipsum adlisse, &c. *Huet. Dem. Evang. Prop.* iv. p. 45.

Splendide enim, quum id scriberet, erravisse Lactantium, non modo ea quæ produximus testimonia arguunt, sed et res ipsa loquitur, &c. *Witsii Ægyptiaca*, lib. iii. cap. 13. p. 276.

<sup>e</sup> See Baltus, Defense des SS. Peres accusés de Platonisme, l. iv. p. 612, *Nourrii Apparat. ad Bibl. Max.* vol. i. p. 386, 387.

celebrated treatise of Evangelical Preparation, takes in almost every thing that others had said before him, relating to our present topic. His tenth book in particular is very diffuse and copious, in showing that Plato and other philosophers had borrowed much the greatest and best part of their *theology* and *ethics* from the holy Scriptures. His eleventh book is taken up in specifying the particulars wherein Plato's doctrine agrees with sacred Writ; and his twelfth and thirteenth books carry on the comparison.

I pass over Athanasius and Philastrius, whom I shall have occasion again to mention: I omit Ambrose<sup>f</sup> also, and Austin<sup>g</sup>, and Cyril<sup>h</sup>, who have some things to our purpose, that I may come the sooner to Theodoret, who has treated this argument as closely, as learnedly, and as judiciously as any of the ancients, in his Therapeuticks. He observes, that the most celebrated Pagan sages, Phercydes, Pythagoras, Thales, Solon, and Plato, had all travelled, in their times, into Egypt, and had there been instructed about the true God and true religion; not by the Egyptians only at second hand, but at first hand also by the Hebrews themselves. And for proof thereof, he appeals to the testimonies or confessions of Pagans, such as Plutarch, Porphyry, and Numenius<sup>i</sup>. He makes mention also of Pythagoras's having been *circumcised*<sup>k</sup> during his stay in Egypt, a rite which the Egyptians (he says) must have taken from the Hebrews. As to Plato in particular, Theodoret frequently takes notice, how much that philosopher had improved his own sentiments and enriched his works by what he had learned of the Jews<sup>l</sup>. And he sometimes hints the like of Anaxagoras also, and So-

<sup>f</sup> Ambros. Serm. ii. in Psalm. 118. Epist. l. i. Ep. 6.

<sup>g</sup> Austin. de Doctr. Christian. lib. ii. cap. 43. Retract. lib. ii. cap. 4. De Civit. Dei, lib. viii. cap. 11.

<sup>h</sup> Cyrill. Alexand. contr. Jul. lib. i. p. 29—34. Lib. ii. p. 47. edit. Lips.

<sup>i</sup> Theodoret. Therapeut. Serm. i. p. 466, 467. edit. Paris.

<sup>k</sup> Theodor. *ibid.* p. 467. Conf. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. c. 15. p. 354.

<sup>l</sup> Theod. *ibid.* p. 489, 490, 495, 498, 505, 506, 567.

ocrates, and Orpheus<sup>m</sup>. He takes notice farther, that the philosophers which lived after Christ, namely, Plutarch, Numenius, Plotinus, Amelius, and Atticus, had not only been instructed by the *Old Testament*, (as Plato before them had been,) but by the *New Testament* also, improving their philosophy with what they had stolen from both<sup>n</sup>. So much for Theodoret.

I need not descend lower, to writers of the sixth, seventh, or later centuries. Enough has been produced from the earliest Apologists, (Jews and Christians,) to give us a just idea of the argument, and of what they intended by it. It is now proper I should come to perform what I have promised; namely, to examine strictly what real truth or force there is in it.

This inquiry is the more necessary, because there may be an extreme either way, either by extending the argument too far, laying more stress upon it than it can justly bear; or not allowing enough to it, but throwing a kind of slight and contempt upon it. Two very considerable writers, Sir John Marsham<sup>o</sup> and Dr. Spencer<sup>p</sup>, appear to have slighted it too much. They have not only called in question the prevailing opinion of the ancient Apologists, but they have run directly counter to it; pretending that the Pagans did not borrow from the Jews, but that the Jews rather copied after the Egyptians or other Pagans, in such instances as both agree in: a strange way of turning the tables, confounding history, and inverting the real order of things. But their pleas and pretences have been distinctly and solidly confuted by the learned Witsius<sup>q</sup>. The celebrated Le Clerc<sup>r</sup> has in a great measure fallen in with the two gentlemen before

<sup>m</sup> Theodoret. Therapeut. Serm. i. p. 490, 491, 492, 495.

<sup>n</sup> Theodoret. *ibid.* p. 499, 500, 505, 573, &c.

<sup>o</sup> Marsham. *Can. Chron.* sect. ix. p. 152.

<sup>p</sup> Spencer de *Leg. Hebr.* p. 285, 650. edit. Cant. 1727.

<sup>q</sup> Witsii *Ægyptiaca*, p. 277, &c. *Conf. Carpzov. Introd. ad Libr. Bibl.* par. i. p. 45, 105, &c. 483.

<sup>r</sup> Clerici *Epist. Crit.* vii. p. 216, &c.

mentioned, having a favourite hypothesis of his own to serve, as they also had theirs. But a learned Frenchman<sup>a</sup> took the pains to examine his reasonings, and to unravel his fallacies. The most specious and plausible pretence, which those three learned moderns have gone upon, is, that the Jews were a small and a contemptible people<sup>t</sup>, and that therefore it is much more likely that they should take rules from the other great and flourishing states, than the contrary. But it is not a fair account of the Jews, to call them a contemptible people, from the testimony only of a few prejudiced writers, their bitterest adversaries, and too much given to romancing; such as Tacitus, for instance, whom Tertullian wittily styles *mendaciorum loquacissimus*<sup>u</sup>, and justly too, so far as concerns our present argument. Josephus has well vindicated his nation (in his two books against Apion and elsewhere<sup>x</sup>) from such unworthy reproaches, and has abundantly shown how much the Jews were respected and honoured, even in the decline of their state, among the heathen countries of greatest figure and fame: and Scripture itself bears testimony to the times going before. Certainly God's design was, that that nation should be honoured above all nations in the sight of the heathen, for the excellency of their laws, and the dignity of their constitution. So thought Moses, when he said, "Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments;—keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people<sup>y</sup>." If this be truth and fact, (and no one can question it that believes the holy Scriptures,) then undoubtedly the nations all around Judæa might be ambitious to learn from those, whose wisdom they should

<sup>a</sup> Baltus *Defense des SS. Peres*, &c. l. iv. 608, &c.

<sup>t</sup> See Spencer, 285, 286, 650.

<sup>u</sup> Tertullian. *Apol.* cap. xvi. p. 157.

<sup>x</sup> Joseph. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. xiii. cap. 3, 4.

<sup>y</sup> Deut. iv. 5, 6.

so much admire: and it might be strongly argued from this single text, that the thing would be so of course. However, this and the other considerations before mentioned may at least be sufficient to take off the first and principal objection against the thing in general. There are other slighter objections, not so much affecting the main cause, as the management of it, or the excesses some have run into, which may all be avoided by proper cautions and distinctions, and a just stating of the case, which is what I am now coming to.

It may be admitted, that both ancients and moderns have sometimes extended the comparison between Scripture and Pagan philosophy too far, have imagined several parallelisms, where there really were none; as there is a great deal of room for fancy in such cases, and it is very easy to exceed.

It may be allowed also, that some moderns especially, otherwise great and learned men, have often strained a point too far, in endeavouring to deduce all the heathen *mythology* from Scripture history. Huetius, for instance, to name no more, has undoubtedly exceeded in that way, and has been justly censured for it by the more judicious <sup>z</sup>.

It may further be admitted, that such as have treated this argument (whether ancients or moderns) have not always been careful to distinguish the several channels by which revealed light was conveyed to the Gentile world; or have not been content to rest in generals, when they might most safely and prudently have done it. That *supernatural* notices and *revealed* light were communicated, more or less, to the bulk of mankind, in every age, is most certain and uncontestable: but whether directly by *Scripture*, or by other more *oblique* or more *remote* means, may often admit of a dispute. The Pagans might be instructed in divine things, either by reading the *Scriptures*, or by conversing with Jews, or by conversing with other nations

<sup>z</sup> See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Antiquar.* p. 29. *Buddæus, Analecta*, p. 12, 13, 57, 71.

that had been acquainted with Jews, or by means of public edicts of several great *princes* that had favoured the Jews ; or lastly, by *tradition* handed down to them from Abraham, or from Noah, or from the *first parents* of mankind. Now since revealed light, more or less, might break out upon the Pagan world all these several ways ; it is not necessary, in every case, to determine which way it came ; much less can it be necessary to believe that every Pagan *philosopher* or *poet* had seen the holy Scripture, only because he had hit upon some things consonant to Scripture, and such as probably were not owing to mere natural light.

But to be a little more particular, give me leave to say something distinctly of the several channels of conveyance before mentioned.

I. The first of them is undoubtedly the best and surest, *viz.* the reading of the *Scriptures*. It is reasonable to believe, that such philosophers as lived after Christianity became generally known, did improve their philosophy, both religious and moral, from the Old and New Testament, or at least from what they had, some way or other, learned of Jews or Christians. Many of the junior Platonists, as Numenius, Apuleius, Maximus Tyrius, Plotinus, Amelius, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Hierocles, and Proclus, thus refined and improved their theology from Christian principles, in order to combat Christianity the more successfully, turning against her her own artillery<sup>a</sup>. We may observe also, (as has been often observed,) that the Pagan *moral*ity was much improved after Christianity appeared ; as may be seen by the writings of Seneca, Epictetus, Plutarch, and Marcus Antoninus : which may be justly attributed either to their having had a sight of the holy Scriptures, or to their having learned something of the principles and manners of Christians, by conversation with them, or from common fame. There is a remarkable letter of

<sup>a</sup> See Baltus, *Defense des SS. Peres*, I. iv. c. 6. p. 475, &c. Gale's *Court of the Gentiles*, part ii. b. 3. c. 4.

Julian's, which may give us a just idea of this matter, and of the emulation raised among the Pagans, by the excellency of the Christian morals <sup>b</sup>.

II. To go a step farther backwards, it is reasonable to think, that from the time that the Hebrew Scriptures had been translated into Greek, either in *whole* or in *part*, (277 years, at least, before Christ,) I say, from that time it is reasonable to think, that the Pagans improved their theology and morality, more or less, by them <sup>c</sup>. It has indeed been suggested by a learned writer, that even the Greek version of the Seventy was altogether unknown to the learned Pagans for many years after, or entirely neglected by them <sup>d</sup>. But his reasonings on that head are short of proof, and have been, in a great measure, confuted <sup>e</sup>; so that I need not say more of them.

III. I am next to observe, that though it were supposed that the Pagans never read the Scriptures, yet they might become acquainted, in some degree, with the Jewish doctrines, by conversing with Jews dispersed into distant quarters. And if Pythagoras, or Plato, or Aristotle, or others, learned something of the Jewish theology or morality this way, it comes to the same thing in the main; for then they owed such knowledge, in the last resort, to Divine revelation.

IV. But supposing that those or other Pagans had neither read the Jewish Scriptures, nor conversed directly

<sup>b</sup> Julian. ad Arsacium Pontif. Galat. Epist. xlix. p. 429. edit. Lips.

<sup>c</sup> Ptolemæus Rex Ægypti—jussit conscribi, atque poni in templum, ut venientibus de Achaia, atque aliis provinciis, philosophis, poetis, et historiographis cupientibus, legendi copia non negaretur. Unde et maxime argumenta sumentes philosophi, poetæ, atque historiographi, sicuti voluerunt, ad sua Paganitatis mendacia transtulerunt, aliisque nominibus rudes puerorum animos edocentes, legem Dei divinam irritam seculo facere properarunt, impietatisque semina in sono verborum, in periculosis sententiis confirmarunt; quorum causa dicebat et Dominus, *fures atque latrones eos fuisse* in omnibus, atque ab omnibus cognoscendos. *Philastr. de Hæres.* cap. cxxxviii. p. 305. Conf. Clem. Alex. 366, 368.

<sup>d</sup> Hody de Bibl. Text. p. 101.

<sup>e</sup> See Basnage's Hist. of the Jews, lib. v. cap. 6. sect. 16. p. 417. lib. vi. cap. 5. sect. 9. p. 490.

with Jews; yet if they had conversed with Egyptians, or Persians, or Phœnicians, or Chaldæans, or others that had been before instructed by the Hebrews, they might in that way come at the knowledge of revealed truths. The Egyptians had many opportunities, at various times, of imbibing the Jewish principles, and adopting their rites<sup>f</sup>. The Persians also, especially from the time of Cyrus, (536 years before Christ,) had, or might have had a competent knowledge of the true God, and the true religion from the Jews, and might communicate the same to others. Accordingly, some learned men have thought that Pythagoras fetched his knowledge of Divine things from thence, taking them from the Magians, and particularly from Zoroastres<sup>g</sup>, that is, at second hand from the Jews. The Phœnicians likewise, being near neighbours to the Hebrews, might learn many things of them, and convey the same to the Greeks or other nations. And thus some learned men account for what Orpheus and Linus may have written consonant to Scripture doctrine<sup>h</sup>.

Add to this, that it has been generally the method of Divine providence, from the time that the Jews grew up to be a people, to notify the true God, and the true religion by them, to the princes and potentates of the world, either in the very capital of their empire, as at Nineveh, Babylon, &c. or in such place and manner as should render the thing most notorious. It cannot be doubted, but that the fame of the true God and true religion must have spread, that way, over a great part of the Gentile world. The several public edicts of Artaxerxes<sup>i</sup>, Darius<sup>k</sup>, Cyrus<sup>l</sup>, the elder Darius<sup>m</sup>, and of Nebuchadnezzar<sup>n</sup>, makes the

<sup>f</sup> See Witsii *Ægyptiaca*, lib. iii. cap. 12. p. 261,—&c.

<sup>g</sup> See Prideaux, *Connect.* part i. b. iv. p. 228, 229.

<sup>h</sup> Cum Phœnicibus vetus Atticæ incolis, Ionum antiquissimis, intercessisse commercium Grotius docuit. Linum a Phœnice venisse tradunt veteres: et Orpheus sua a Phœnicibus hausit; Phœnices ab Hebræis. *Wits. Ægypt.* p. 174. Vid. Grot. de Verit. Rel. Christian. lib. i. cap. 16. p. 32.

<sup>i</sup> Ezra vii. 12, 13.

<sup>k</sup> Ezra vi. 10.

<sup>l</sup> Ezra i. 1, 2. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23.

<sup>m</sup> Dan. vi. 25, 26.

<sup>n</sup> Dan. iv. 1, 2. iii. 29.



supposition unquestionable<sup>o</sup>; to say nothing of other princes before and after them.

V. Another channel of conveyance was *tradition* down from Abraham, who was the grand restorer of true religion, before sunk in Chaldæa, (and perhaps in several other places,) and father of many and great nations. He has this testimony given him by God himself, in Genesis. “I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment<sup>p</sup>.” We want ancient history to inform us more particularly how religion was scattered about the world by this means; only we may be certain in the general, that so it was. If the whole nation of the Assyrians were the posterity of Abraham, so called from Ashurim<sup>q</sup>, descended from Abraham by Keturah, (as an ancient writer in Josephus<sup>r</sup> asserts, and a learned modern<sup>s</sup> now lately has undertaken to maintain,) we may then the more easily account for the quick repentance of the Ninevites, upon the warning given them by a *single* prophet of Israel, as well for their manner of expressing their repentance; not like *idolaters*, but true worshippers: they had not altogether forgot the religion of their fathers. This, I say, may be a probable account of that remarkable affair; unless we choose rather, as some do<sup>u</sup>, to resolve it all into the acquaintance they before had with the nation of the Jews, and the awful sense they were under of the

<sup>o</sup> See Postscript to second part of Scripture Vindicated, vol. vi. p. 171, &c.

<sup>p</sup> Gen. xviii. 19.

<sup>q</sup> Gen. xxv. 3.

<sup>r</sup> Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. i. cap. xv. p. 44. edit. Havercamp.

<sup>s</sup> Joh. Frider. Schroerus. Imperium Babylonis et Nini, sect. ii. p. 105, &c.

<sup>t</sup> See Jonah iii. 5, 8, 9. Matt. xii. 41.

<sup>u</sup> Etenim cum Nineve emporium fuerit per totum orientem celeberrimum, et cum ipsis Judæis quoque incolis ejus commercia intercesserint, religionis Judaicæ profecto ignari esse non poterant. — Atque istud sane eo mihi fit verisimilius, quod Jonæ divinam iram annuntianti statim habuerint fidem, et ad ejus præscriptum mores suos composuerint. Credisne, si religionem Judaicam, aut pro *inepta* habuissent, aut *falsa*, aut nulla ejus imbuti fuissent noticia, eos virum Judæum mandata numinis ad eos perferentem tam facile fuisse admissuros? Næ, qui istud asseruerit, indolem hominum parum exploratam habet. *Budd. Parerga*. p. 426. Compare Lowth on Jon. iii. 3.

many wonderful works God had wrought for that people. But I proceed.

VI. There is yet another more general way by which revealed religion, in some of the principal heads or articles of it, has been diffused through the world; I mean *tradition* delivered down from Noah, or from the *first parents* of the whole race, who received it immediately from God. The doctrine of *one true God supreme* might probably come this way, and be so diffused to all mankind<sup>x</sup>. The like may be said of the doctrine of an overruling *providence*, and of the *immortality of the soul*, and a future state of *rewards and punishments*. These general principles, so universally believed and taught in all ages and countries, are much better referred to *Patriarchal tradition*, than to any later and narrower source<sup>y</sup>. I know not whether the same observation might not be as justly made of some other doctrines; as of the *creation of the world*<sup>z</sup>, and *corruption of human nature*<sup>a</sup>, and perhaps of several more of slighter consideration.

Besides *doctrines*, there have been common *rites* and customs derived very probably from the same general

<sup>x</sup> *Discat ergo Faustus, vel potius illi qui ejus literis delectantur, monarchiæ opinionem non ex gentibus nos habere; sed gentes non usque adeo ad falsos Deos esse delapsas, ut opinionem amitterent unius veri Dei, ex quo est omnis qualiacunque natura. Augustin. cont. Manich. lib. xx. cap. 19. p. 345.*

<sup>y</sup> *Certum est multos ritus et traditiones Ethnicorum longe antiquiores esse ecclesiæ Judaicæ, ideoque a Judæis eos hæc non desumpsisse, sed potius a communi fonte, nempe a patriarchis; quorum multi, ut Terachus Abrahami pater, in idololatriam degenerarunt. Nihilominus multas retinuerunt traditiones laudabiles: ut de uno Deo cæteris omnibus superiore, de immortalitate animarum, et de judicio post mortem secuturo, ac de virtute heroica. Has traditiones multo probabilius esse videtur eos ab antiquissimis patriarchis, Japheti, Chami, imo et Semi posteris idololatricis accepisse, quam a Judæis. Antiquissima Ægyptiorum et Romanorum templa sine imaginibus fuere: decimas Cabiris datas fuisse constat ex Dion. Halicarnassensi. Cumberland. Origin. Antiq. p. 451. Conf. Witsii Ægyptiaca, lib. ii. cap. 15.*

<sup>z</sup> *Vid. Witsii Ægyptiaca, p. 170—174. Grotius de Verit. R. Ch. lib. i. cap. 16.*

<sup>a</sup> *Vid. Buddæi Selecta Juris N. et Gent. p. 242—244. Huetii Quæst. Alnet. lib. ii. cap. ix. p. 165.*

source, because widely (or in a manner universally) spread among mankind; such as the custom of *sacrifices*, and of some regard paid to one day in *seven*, and of dedicating a *tenth* or *tithe* to God.

That *sacrifices* were a part of the Patriarchal religion, not owing to *human* invention, but to *Divine* appointment, has been so often and so strongly argued, and the pretences to the contrary so fully and so justly exploded<sup>b</sup>, that there remains but little room for dispute upon that head.

As to the sacredness of the *seventh* day, there appear footsteps of it among the earliest nations; though the reason of the thing was not sufficiently understood by the Gentiles in later times. Aristobulus<sup>c</sup>, Philo<sup>d</sup>, Josephus<sup>e</sup>, take notice of the *universality* of the notion and practice, and it is by them made use of as an argument to show, how the Pagans had borrowed from the Hebrews. They might better have said, how *both* had borrowed from the same common fountain of *Patriarchal* tradition. And this will be the best way of compromising the dispute between such moderns as pretend that the Hebrews borrowed the custom of reckoning time by *weeks* from the Egyptians<sup>f</sup>, and those, on the other hand, who say, with more probability, that the Egyptians borrowed it from the Hebrews<sup>g</sup>. The truth seems to be, that neither borrowed from each other, in this particular, but that both of them drew

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Johann. Meyer. Diatribe de Festis, cap. i. per tot. Sam. Basnag. Exercit. Historico-crit. p. 676. Buddmi Select. Juris Nat. p. 231, &c. Eccles. Apostol. p. 141. Carpzovii Introduct. ad Libr. Bibl. par. i. p. 111, &c. Frid. Bucheri Antiq. Bibl. p. 388. Shuckford's Sacred and Profane Hist. vol. i. p. 79, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Aristobulus apud Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. xiii. cap. 12. p. 667.

<sup>d</sup> Philo de Vit. Mos. lib. ii. p. 656, 657. De Mund. Opif. p. 20.

<sup>e</sup> Οὐδ' ἴσταν οὐ πάλις Ἑλλήνων οὐδενισοῦν, οὐδὲ βάρβαρος, οὐδὲ ἰσθῆες, ἴσθῆα μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἰσθῆμας, ἢ ἀργούμεν ἡμῶς, ἐν ἰσθῆς οὐ διακρίνομεν. Joseph. contr. Apion. lib. ii. cap. 39. p. 494. Conf. Theoph. Antioch. ad Autol. lib. ii. cap. 17. p. 134. Clem. Alex. Strom. v. p. 713.

<sup>f</sup> Marsham. Can. Chron. sect. ix. Spencer de Leg. Hebr. lib. i. cap. v. p. 73, 74.

<sup>g</sup> Joh. Meyer de Festis, cap. v. p. 105. Witsii Ægyptiaca, 241, 242.

from the same common original, Patriarchal tradition <sup>b</sup>.

I mentioned a third article, near akin to the other, and probably coeval with it, namely, that of paying a *tithe* to God. I shall account for it in the words of the learned Dean Prideaux, who had well considered it, and was very able to judge of it. He says thus :

“ A *seventh* part of our time having, from the beginning of the world, been consecrated by God himself to his public worship ; from that time there was a necessity of consecrating also a part of our substance for the support thereof<sup>i</sup>.—I doubt not, from the beginning such a certain part was, by the first parents of mankind, consecrated to this purpose<sup>k</sup>.—And if we consider of how general a practice the payment of tithes anciently was, amongst most nations of the earth, for the support of the worship of those gods they adored, and the many instances we have of this usage among the Syrians, Phœnicians, Arabians, Ethiopians, Greeks, Romans, and other nations ; there is no other rational account to be given how so many different people of various languages, and various customs from each other, and who also worshipped various deities, should all come to agree so exactly in this one matter ; but that it had been an ancient institution, *sacredly* observed by the *first fathers* of mankind, and after the flood transmitted by them in a lasting *tradition* to the nations de-

<sup>b</sup> Re accuratius pensitata, haud difficulter intelligimus, non quidem ab Ægyptiis, ut Herodotus asserit, sed ab Ebræis illorumque *majoribus*, quin *primis parentibus* quibus hanc legem positivam promulgaverat Deus, notitiam ejus ad omnes dimanasse gentes. Illis enim suffragari nequeo, qui antiquorum quæ afferri solent testimonia de *septimo die* post lunæ ortum, aut *die Apollini* in fastis sacro, capiunt. *Budd. Select.* p. 235.

Such as would see more of this matter, may consult Grotius de Verit. Rel. Chr. lib. i. cap. 16. p. 41. Selden. de Jur. Nat. et Gent. lib. iii. cap. 15—23. Huert. Dem. Evang. Prop. iv. cap. xi. p. 126.

<sup>i</sup> Prideaux's Original and Right of Tithes, p. 1.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. p. 7.

“scended from them<sup>1</sup>.” Thus far that judicious writer, who further intimates, that the Patriarchs, probably, had a *Divine* direction for fixing upon that proportion of their substance, and for settling the rule.

What has been observed of the *theology* and *rituals* derived down by tradition, may in a great measure be applied to *morals* also: for there can be no reasonable doubt made, but that the soundest and best part of the Pagan Ethics came down to them in the same way, and so were remotely owing to *Divine revelation*, as hath been sufficiently argued both by *ancients*<sup>m</sup> and *moderns*<sup>n</sup>, and I need not repeat.

The sum then of all is this; that the Gentile world, before Christ came, had, at sundry times, and in divers manners, some beams of Divine light sent them from above, to help the dimness of the light of nature. And what through *Scripture*, or *tradition*, what by direct or indirect conveyances, they were never entirely destitute of supernatural notices, never left to the mere *light of nature*, either for forming a knowledge of God and religion; or for directing their life and manners. It remains now only to draw a few corollaries from what has been here advanced.

I. From hence may be observed, upon how precarious a bottom the unbelievers of our times have built their notion of the *sufficiency* of natural light. They plead that it is sufficient, because the bulk of mankind, for many ages formerly, had *nothing else*: a manifest error in point of *fact*, and for which they have not so much as the appearance of *proof*.

<sup>1</sup> Prideaux's *Original and Right of Tithes*, p. 10. As to the universality of the practice, see Selden of *Tithes*, chap. iii. Spencer de *Leg. Hebr.* lib. iii. cap. 10. p. 720, &c. Huet. *Quæst. Alnet.* lib. iii. cap. 3. p. 322, &c.

<sup>m</sup> Clem. Alex. Eusebius.

<sup>n</sup> Jenkin's *Reasonableness*, vol. i. p. 376. Nicolls *Confer. par.* ii. p. 164. Gale's *Court of the Gentiles*, book i. p. 15. book ii. p. 88, &c. *Postscript to second part of Scripture Vindicated*, vol. vi. p. 171.

If it be said, (though it is saying wrong,) that we ought to prove the *affirmative*, I have endeavoured to show how far we can go towards it. But the truth is, they ought to prove the *negative*, since they rest their cause upon it, and have little else to support it. If it appears but probable or possible that the bulk of mankind should have been instructed in such a way as I have been mentioning, that is enough for us: but they that build the *sufficiency* of natural light upon this supposition, that mankind from the creation, for the most part, had *no other light* but that, must either prove that they *had not*, or they do nothing. They must either make good their *premises*, or give up their *conclusion*. If they build upon a *negative*, they must *prove* the *negative*, or they will be found to build upon the sand.

II. It may next be observed, that the infidels of our days, in setting up *natural* light to rival *supernatural*, commit the same error as the Pagans of old did. All that they have to boast of, as demonstrable now by natural light, was, very probably, discovered first by *revelation*: and it is both ungrateful and unreasonable to oppose revelation with what has been *borrowed* from it. But that is not the worst of the case: for revelation once set aside, the result will be (as it ever used to be) the taking up with a *part* of religion, and a part of morality, instead of the *whole*, and then corrupting even that *part* with *adulterous* mixtures. Natural light cannot *demonstrate* all that revealed light has discovered, either of *religion* itself, or the *sanctions* of it: besides, natural reason, left to itself, will undoubtedly bring in many corruptions, as past experience sufficiently testifies: and it is certain, that the wisdom of *man* will never come up to the purity or perfection of the wisdom of *God*. Men will not, if they could, neither can they, if they would, carve out so pure a religion for themselves, as God, in the holy Scriptures, has carved out for them.

III. But I must further observe, that our modern un-

believers are in one point very singular, and come far short in that article, of the sagacity and good sense of their Pagan predecessors. None of the ancient unbelievers ever pretended to set up the mere wisdom of man, as such, to the wisdom of God; never thought that *revelations* were either not desirable, or that they were altogether *needless*, or *useless*. They generally pretended to revelation, of one kind or other, and were not so weak as to imagine that their *natural* parts or endowments were sufficient to supersede all use of *supernatural* notices, if such might be had. The common reason of mankind would have strongly remonstrated against such a plea; and it would have been thought betraying any cause, to make use of it. For to pretend to believe that there is a *God*, and a *providence*, and a *future state*, and at the same time to desire no external revelation from God, no instructions from heaven, (as needing none, and being wise enough without any,) is so wild and so extravagant a thought, that nothing can match it, or compare with it. But such will commonly be the fate of attempting any *new ways* of *opposing* Divine revelation, as well as of *defending* it; because indeed the best in each kind have been long since anticipated: and both *believers* and *unbelievers* must now be content with traversing over again the same *beaten* tracks, or they will take into worse, and will but expose their cause, instead of serving it.

IV. I shall conclude therefore with recommending to you, my Reverend Brethren, the old and well tried principles of the *ancient* Apologists. They never had a thought that all revealed religion had been confined, for so many ages past, to the Jews only: but they looked upon the Jews as the proclaimers and publishers of true religion to the rest of the world. The Israelites were a *kingdom of priests*, an *holy nation*<sup>o</sup>. They were made the preachers of righteousness to other nations, in order to convey

<sup>o</sup> Exod. xix. 6.

the main substantial of religion all over the world; as is more than once intimated in Scripture itself<sup>p</sup>. It is in this view that the ancient Apologists, both Jews and Christians, considered this matter. Josephus therefore observes, that “like as the Divine Being pervades the whole universe, so “the Divine law (given by Moses) passes through all “mankind<sup>q</sup>.”

Of the same mind was Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, of the second century; who says, “Moses, the servant of “God, was the proclaimer (minister) of the Divine law to “all the world, but principally to the Hebrews, otherwise “called Jews<sup>r</sup>.”

To the same purpose speaks Origen, of the next century: “Moses’s writings have brought many to the faith, “even among those that were aliens from the common- “wealth of Israel: because indeed the original lawgiver, “who delivered his laws to Moses, was no other than “God himself, the Creator of the universe, as the same “writings testify. And it was meet, that the Maker of “all the world, giving laws to all the world, should send “such efficacy along with them, as should work its way “among all nations<sup>s</sup>.”

Athanasius, of the following century, expresses the same thought, in terms still clearer, and, if possible, stronger.

“The law was not intended for the Jews only, neither

<sup>p</sup> See the texts to this purpose, cited in Jenkin's Reasonableness, &c. vol. i. and in the Postscript to Scripture Vindicated, vol. vi. part ii. p. 171, 174.

<sup>q</sup> Καὶ ὅσπερ ὁ Θεὸς διὰ παντὸς τῷ κόσμῳ πιστοῖται, οὕτως ὁ νόμος διὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων βιβλάται. Joseph. contr. Apion. lib. ii. cap. 39. p. 494. Conf. Phil. de Vit. Mos. lib. i. p. 603.

<sup>r</sup> Τύτου μὲν οὖν τῷ Θεῷ νόμου διάκονος γίνεσθαι Μωσῆς, ὁ καὶ θεράπων τοῦ Θεοῦ, παντὶ μὲν τῷ κόσμῳ, παντελῶς δὲ τοῖς Ἰσραηλῖταις, τοῖς καὶ Ἰουδαίοις καλουμένοις. Theophyl. lib. iii. cap. 8. p. 308. conf. cap. x. p. 312.

<sup>s</sup> Τῷ δὲ Μωσείῳ τὰ γράμματα πολλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀλλοτρῶν οὕς παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἀπιστοφῆς κινήσει πιστιῶσαι, ἵτι, κατὰ τὴν ἰσαγγλίαν τῶν γραμμάτων, ὁ πρῶτος αὐτὰ νομοθετήσας, καὶ Μωσῆϊ παραδοὺς, Θεὸς ὁ κτίσας τὸν κόσμον ἦν. Καὶ γὰρ ἴστανται τὸν ἔλου τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργὸν, νόμους τιθεμένον ἕνα τῷ κόσμῳ, δύναμιν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν λόγων, κρατῆσαι τῶν πανταχοῦ δυναμίτων. Orig. contr. Cels. lib. i. p. 15.



“ were the prophets sent only for their sakes : but the  
 “ prophets were sent to the Jews, and were persecuted  
 “ also by the Jews, while they were in reality a kind of  
 “ sacred school to all the world, as to what relates to  
 “ the knowledge of God, and the concerns of the  
 “ soul t.”

I shall add but one writer more, the judicious Theodoret, of the fifth century, who, speaking of the Jews, says, “ God ordained this nation, to be a guide to all nations in Divine knowledge. For like as he appointed  
 “ sometimes Moses, and at other times Joshua, and then  
 “ Samuel, and afterwards one or other of the prophets, to  
 “ take the charge of this people, and by a single man, of  
 “ approved wisdom, benefited the whole brotherhood : so  
 “ by the single nation of Israel did God vouchsafe to call  
 “ all nations, partakers of one common nature, to become  
 “ partners also in the same common religion u.”

From hence may be clearly seen what the current notion was among the ancient most judicious advocates for Divine revelation ; namely, that though the Law of Moses was in a peculiar manner designed for one people, (because the select preachers of righteousness, the ministers or publishers of religion, were to be kept a distinct order of men from the rest,) yet the most necessary points of revealed religion, which concerned mankind in general, were to be communicated, more or less, to all the world, and that by means of the Jews, after they grew up to be considerable. Other nations or persons, ordinarily, were not obliged to become Jews : and therefore Moses did not

<sup>t</sup> Οὐδὲ γὰρ διὰ Ἰουδαίους μόνους ὁ νόμος ἦν, οὐδὲ δι' αὐτοὺς μόνους οἱ προφῆται ἐπέμπεστο, ἀλλὰ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους μὲν ἐπέμπεστο, καὶ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἰδιώκοντο πάσης δὲ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἦσαν διδασκαλῶν ἱερῶν τῆς περὶ Θεοῦ γνώσεως, καὶ τῆς κατὰ ψυχὴν σωτηρίας. *Athen. contr. Gent. cap. xii. p. 57. ed. Bened.*

<sup>u</sup> Τῶν γὰρ Ἰσθῶν ἀπάντων τοῦτο τὸ Ἰσθὺς Διευγνωσίας ἰχυροτάτη διδάσκαλος. Καὶ καθάπερ εἰς τοῦτο τοῦ Ἰσθῶς ἰσμήλιμα, ὡς μὲν ἐξελίχαστο τὸν Μωϋσῆν, ὡς δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πάλιν τὸν Σαμουὴλ, ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλοι τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ δι' ἰσθῶν ἀιδρόπου φιλοσοφίας ἀπεκόντες, ἅπαντας ἐνεργίτω τοὺς ἀμφύλους ὄντα δι' ἰσθῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, πάντα τὰ Ἰσθὰ τὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἴχοντα φύσει, εἰς τὴν ἐπιβίβας κοινῶν ἰσθῶν. *Theodor. de Provid. Serm. x. p. 454. Conf. p. 456.*

insist upon it with his father-in-law Jethro; neither did Elisha expect it of Naaman the Syrian, nor Jonas of the Ninevites, nor Daniel of Nebuchadnezzar; neither did the prophets insist upon it with the Chaldæans, Egyptians, Sidonians, Tyrians, Edomites, or Moabites; as Grotius has well observed<sup>x</sup>: but though they were not obliged to become Jews, they were obliged to admit the *true* God, and the most *substantial* parts of true religion; the knowledge of which had been handed down by *tradition*, and was often renewed and revived by means of the Jews, who were the standing witnesses and memorials of it.

The consideration of these things may, I conceive, be of good use for the preserving just and worthy ideas of the Divine wisdom and goodness in his dispensations

<sup>x</sup> Grotius de Jur. N. et G. lib. i. cap. 1. sect. 16. Grot. de Verit. R. Chr. lib. v. cap. 7.

The words of Clemens of Rome (an apostolical man) are so just, and so moderate, and so proper to compose all contests on this head, that they are well worth the quoting in this place.

Ἀντίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἴδωμεν ὅς ἔστι τίμιον τῷ Θεῷ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ, τι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῇ πίστει μετανοίας χάριν ἐπέργηκεν. Ἀνίσταμεν εἰς τὰς ἡμετέρας πάσας, καὶ καταμάθωμεν, ὅτι ἐν ἡμετέρῃ καὶ ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας ἵκετο Ἰησοῦς ὁ θεοκύριος τοῖς βουλομένοις πιστεῦσαι ἐν αὐτῷ. Νῦν ἐκέρξιν μετανοίας, καὶ οἱ ὀπακούσαντες ἐσώθησαν. Ἰανῶς Νουίταις καταστροφὴν ἐπέργηκεν, οἱ δὲ μετανοήσαντες ἐπὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν, ἐλάσαντο τὸν Θεὸν ἰσιτεύσαντες, καὶ ἔλαβον σωτηρίαν, καί σιμ' ἄλλοι τῷ Θεῷ ἔστις. *Clem. Rom. Epist. i. cap. vii. p. 32.*

Which may be Englished thus: "Let us look up steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and let us consider how precious in God's sight his blood is, which, being shed for our *salvation*, hath obtained the privilege of repentance for all the world. Run we back to all past ages, and there we may learn, that in every age the Lord gave place for repentance to as many as would turn to him. Noah preached up repentance, and they that hearkened unto him were saved. Jonah denounced destruction against the Ninevites, and they, repenting of their sins, and praying, appeased God, and were saved, though aliens from God."

I may hereupon remark as follows: I. That as many as are saved upon their *repentance*, are yet saved by and through the *blood of Christ*. Repentance is the *conditional* cause of it, Christ's death the *efficacious* and *meritorious*.

II. That such privilege of being saved, upon true repentance, through Christ, was not confined to the Jews only, but was extended to all mankind, in all ages, according to Clemens.

towards mankind, and for the more effectual silencing the ignorant or malicious cavils of unbelievers.

To be short : our adversaries can never prove that revelation was *needless*, unless they could first prove that there has been no *revelation* ; because they cannot know what natural light could have done without it, unless they could first show that it ever was without it. Revelation might, for any thing they can tell, have been absolutely necessary to *discover*, even that *natural religion* which they plead for, and which appears so easy and obvious to the understanding, now it has been discovered. But if revelation was ever *needful* for that purpose, then, by the tacit confession even of our adversaries, it must be *true* ; and if it be *true*, then we are obliged to embrace the *whole* of it as God has given it us, and not a *part* only, according to every man's judgment or fancy ; which is what these gentlemen seem to be aiming at under all their disguises.

However that be, they have certainly taken the wrong way to come at their point, have committed an ἵστερον πρότερον in their main argument ; pretending to disprove a fact, by arguing that the thing was *needless*, when there is no possible way of proving the thing *needless*, but by first disproving the fact.

*An additional Illustration to Note* <sup>h</sup> p. 25, from Archbishop Sharpe, vol. iv. Sermon. 12. p. 272, 273. relating to the traditional *Computation of Time by Weeks*.

“ WHAT account can be given of *all the world's* computing their time by *weeks*; that is, counting *seven days*, and then beginning again: I say, what possible account can be given of this, but that original distribution of time that God had observed in the works of the creation, and had delivered to the *first parents* of mankind, and they to their children. For men to reckon time by *days* and *nights*, is obvious to sense; nay, and to compute time by *months* and *years*, hath a sufficient foundation in it from nature; for mankind cannot avoid the observing the course of the *moon* and of the *sun*, which makes *months* and *years*: but why they should count *seven days*, and then begin again, that hath no foundation in nature, but must be taught them from the *tradition* of their fathers, which could have no other original than that which I am now insisting on. And yet this way of computing time by a *weekly* revolution, obtained throughout all the world, as far as we can judge, from the very beginning of time. That the *Patriarchs* did so some hundreds of years before the law of the *Sabbath* was given to the children of Israel, we have sufficient evidence from sundry texts of Scripture. That all the ancient nations of which we have any history, Egyptians, Chaldeans, Greeks, Romans, nay, and the barbarous nations too; I say, that they did so likewise, is proved to us from the ancientest records that are extant about them. This practice now, that had no foundation in nature, obtaining thus universally throughout the whole world, and that from time immemorial, is to me a demonstration that they had it from the *first parents* of mankind, and that it was founded in God's institution of the *seventh* day being set apart for his service.

“ I do grant indeed, they did not know the true reason  
 “ why they thus counted their days by *sevens* : for the  
 “ tradition of the *creation* of the world, and the institution  
 “ of the *Sabbath*, was in time and by degrees lost among  
 “ them. But yet thus still they computed their time :  
 “ and we that have the holy Scriptures know upon what  
 “ grounds that computation was begun.”

*What Dr. Williams also has, upon the same argument, in his Second Sermon of his first year's course of Boyle's Lectures, is well worth the perusing, p. 23, &c.*

---

*An additional Note to p. 31. from Dr. Sherlock's Discourse on the Knowledge of Christ, p. 19, 20, 21.*

“ GOD chose the posterity of Abraham to be a *public*  
 “ and constant demonstration of his power, and provi-  
 “ dence, and care of good men. For when God chose the  
 “ posterity of Abraham to be his peculiar people, he did  
 “ not design to *exclude* the rest of the world from his  
 “ care and providence, and all possible means of salvation ;  
 “ as the Apostle argues in Rom. iii. 29. *Is he the God of*  
 “ *the Jews only ? Is he not also of the Gentiles ? Yes, of the*  
 “ *Gentiles also.* Which argument, if it have any force in  
 “ it, must prove God's respecting the Gentiles before the  
 “ preaching of the Gospel, as well as since ; because it is  
 “ founded on that *natural relation* which God owns to all  
 “ mankind, as their merciful Creator and Governor ; which  
 “ gives the Gentiles as well as Jews an interest in his  
 “ care and providence.

“ This plainly evinces, that all those particular favours  
 “ which God bestowed on Israel, were not owing to any  
 “ *partial* fondness and respect to that people : but the de-  
 “ sign of all was, to encourage the *whole world* to worship

“ the *God of Israel*, who gave so many demonstrations of  
 “ his power and providence. For this reason God brought  
 “ Israel out of Egypt, with *great signs and wonders*, and  
 “ a *mighty hand*, (when he could have done it with less  
 “ noise and observation,) that he might the more glori-  
 “ ously triumph over the numerous *gods* of Egypt, and all  
 “ their *enchantments and divinations*, and that he might  
 “ be honoured on Pharaoh and all his host. For this rea-  
 “ son he maintained them in the wilderness at the constant  
 “ expense of *miracles*, fought all their battles for them ;  
 “ and many times by weak and contemptible means over-  
 “ threw great and puissant armies, drove out the inha-  
 “ bitants of Canaan, and gave them possession of that  
 “ good land. I say, one great and principal design of all  
 “ this was, to convince *the world* of the majesty and  
 “ power of the *God of Israel*, that they might renounce  
 “ their foolish *idolatries* and country *gods*, and consent in  
 “ the worship of that *one God*, who alone doth won-  
 “ drous things. This account the Psalmist gives of it, that  
 “ God wrought such visible and miraculous deliverances  
 “ for Israel, to make his glory and his power known  
 “ among the Heathen: *The Lord hath made known his*  
 “ *salvation, his righteousness hath he openly showed in the*  
 “ *sight of the heathen.* Psal. xcvi. 2. *That the heathen*  
 “ *might fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the*  
 “ *earth his glory :* i. e. That all nations might worship  
 “ God, and all kings submit their crowns and scepters to  
 “ him. Psal. cii. 15. That by this means they might be  
 “ instructed in that important truth: *That the Lord is*  
 “ *great, and greatly to be praised, that he is to be feared*  
 “ *above all gods : for all the gods of the nations are idols,*  
 “ *but he made the heavens.* Psal. xcvi. And as God set up  
 “ the people of Israel, as a visible demonstration to all the  
 “ world of his power and providence, so he committed his  
 “ *laws and oracles* to them ; from whence *the rest of the*  
 “ *world*, when they pleased, might fetch the best rules of  
 “ life, and the most certain notices of the Divine will. In

“ such ways God instructed *the world*, in former ages,  
“ by the *light of nature*, and the *examples of good men*,  
“ and the *sermons of the prophets*, and the public ex-  
“ ample of a *whole nation*, which God chose for that  
“ purpose.”

**CHRISTIANITY VINDICATED**

**AGAINST**

**INFIDELITY:**

**A**

**SECOND CHARGE**

**DELIVERED TO**

**THE CLERGY**

**OF THE**

**ARCHDEACONRY OF MIDDLESEX.**

**D 3**





---

---

A  
SECOND CHARGE

DELIVERED TO  
THE CLERGY  
OF THE  
ARCHDEACONRY OF MIDDLESEX, &c.

---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

THE growth of *infidelity* has for two or three years last past been more talked of than ever; and I am afraid there has been too much occasion for it. Yet I am willing to believe, that the advances supposed to have been lately made on that side, carry a great deal more of noise and show in them, than of real strength. *Deism* may perhaps have become fiercer or bolder than formerly; and it may be owing, not so much to any additional advantages it has really gained, as to the disappointments it has met with.

If we look between thirty and forty years backwards, we shall find that the complaints of good men then ran in very high and strong terms. "It is dreadful to think" (says a noted author of that time<sup>a</sup>) what numbers of "men are poisoned by infidel principles. For—they be-

<sup>a</sup> Nicholls's Conference with a Theist, Pref. p. 5.

“gin to talk them in shops and stalls; and the cavils of Spinosa and Hobbes are grown common even to the rabble.” What more deplorable could be said of us at this day? The like complaints were made some time after, about twenty years ago: “That *infidelity* had taken deep root, had been cultivated with care, had spread its branches wide, shot up to an amazing height, and brought forth fruits in great abundance. The Mosaic account of the creation was represented as mere *allegory* and *fable*: the *inspiration* of holy Writ so explained as to amount to a denial of it; the authority of the present *Canon* of Scripture disputed; the spuriousness of several passages, and some books of it, more than insinuated; *priests*, without distinction, traduced as imposters on the credulity of mankind; and those religious ordinances which they were appointed to dispense, even the chief of them, *Baptism* and the *Supper of the Lord*, spoken of with such a degree of ungodly mockery and insolent scorn, as filled the hearts of good Christians with horror and astonishment: nay, *religion* itself was, in some of the loose writings, so described, as if it were nothing but a melancholy *frenzy* and pious *enthusiasm*.<sup>b</sup>” Such were the representations made in those days. Yet Christianity (God be thanked) has still kept up its head, has reigned triumphant all the time; and I trust will reign, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

I know not whether these licentious principles were the proper produce of our own soil, or may not be rather said to have been transplanted hither from abroad<sup>c</sup>; where, it is certain, they had taken root and spread for a hundred years or more, before they met with any favourable recep-

<sup>b</sup> Representation of the present State of Religion by a Committee of Convocation, A. D. 1711. Compare An Inquiry into the Causes of the late Growth of Infidelity, written in 1705.

<sup>c</sup> “It seems to have been brought over hither from some of our neighbouring countries, together with the rest of our fashions.” *Inquiry into the Causes, &c.* p. 3.

tion, or made any public figure in this grave and serious, and for the most part well disposed kingdom. Mr. Hobbes has been reputed the first or principal man that introduced them here, or however that openly and glaringly espoused them<sup>d</sup>. And it is not unlikely that he imbibed his loose principles in France and Italy, as he also composed his famed pieces while residing in *foreign* parts. *Deism* seems to have sprung up abroad about the middle of the sixteenth century. A learned foreigner takes notice of the rise of the sect in his time; and he wrote in 1563. His account of them is as follows: "There are several who profess to believe, that there is a certain *Deity*, or *God*, as the Turks and Jews do: but as for *Jesus Christ*, and all the doctrine testified by the Evangelists and Apostles, they take them for fables and dreams.—They have entertained some opinions concerning religion, which are more extravagant than those of the Turks, or any other *infidels*. I hear that some of this band call themselves *Deists*, a *new* word in opposition to that of *Atheists*.—These *Deists* of which we speak ridicule all religion; though they accommodate themselves to the religion of those with whom they are obliged to live, out of *complaisance* or *fear*. Some amongst them have a sort of notion of the *immortality* of the soul: others agree with the *Epicureans* in that, as well as on the *Divine providence* with regard to mankind. I am struck with horror, when I think that there are such monsters among those that bear the name of Christians<sup>e</sup>." Thus far Peter Viret: for he is the man that gives this account of the

<sup>d</sup> Anglorum primus est (faxit Deus, sit ultimus) qui impietatem palam ostentare ausus est. *Parker, Disputat. de Deo*, p. 219.

In the account of the Growth of Deism, written in 1696, it is said, "It is now three years since you and I had a serious discourse concerning the rise and progress of Deism, which is an opinion of *late years* crept into England, though not so widely spread here as in other parts of Europe," p. 1.

The Inquiry dates the growth of them from about the year 1660. *Inquiry*, &c. p. 7.

<sup>e</sup> See Bayle's Dictionary in Peter Viret, p. 2973.

modern Deists: and notwithstanding their complimenting themselves with a new plausible name, he scruples not to call their system of doctrine an *execrable Atheism*. Not intending, I presume, that they directly disowned the being of a God, (for he intimates the contrary,) but that they did it *consequentially*, or that they did as effectually undermine and destroy all the *influences* of religion, as if they had been professed Atheists: and so, in effect, their doctrine amounted to the same thing, but gave less offence. What *Atheism* chiefly aims at, is to sit loose from *present* restraints and *future* reckonings: and those two purposes may be competently served by *Deism* <sup>f</sup>, which is but a more refined kind of *Atheism*. For when a man presumes to take God's business out of his hands, and under the name of *reason* prescribes both the *laws* and the *sanc-tions*, as his own fancy or inclination shall suggest; it is obvious to perceive, that God is as much excluded this way from being *Lord over us*, as if his existence were denied. And therefore, in this view, *Atheism* and *Deism*

<sup>f</sup> "It is certain that *infidelity*, as it is at present countenanced and maintained by those that would be called the Freethinkers of the age, does give " as much encouragement to immorality as most *libertines* either need or " desire. *Atheism* indeed makes shorter work of it, and at one blow cuts " asunder all the ties of religion and duty. But that is too bold a step: it " thwarts not only the common principles of *reason*, but even the general " bent and inclination of human nature. It is an affront to *good breeding* " and *civility*, as well as to *good sense*, and common *morality*: whereas *in-* " *fidelity* will answer the ends and designs of *libertinism* as well, but does it " in a softer and a gentler way. For there being no *authentic* body or sys- " tem of the laws of *natural religion*, every man may believe as much or as " little of it as he thinks fit; he is left to judge for himself how far the obli- " gation of its duties extends, and no doubt will find out some favourable " exceptions for his own darling lusts and vices." *Inquiry into the Cause*, &c. p. 4.

" These loose notions—first appeared abroad without any *disguise*, " among those that set up for wits of the age, who declared themselves " avowed Atheists. This was too gross to become popular, though it appear- " ed too open and barefaced: but being not long after deserted as an inde- " fensible cause, by some of its greatest advocates, it daily lost ground, and " by degrees was modelled and new licked into that shape wherein it now ap- " pears, and passes current for *Deism*, though little differing, in reality, from " what it was before." *Ibid.* p. 7.

amount very nearly to the same thing, having the same effect in application and practice; for which reason, some conclude both under the same name<sup>s</sup>. The good man, before mentioned, was struck with horror at the thought of there being such *monsters* as he had described; men bred up to *Christianity*, and acquainted also with *pure* and *reformed* Christianity. An infidel under *Paganism* might have something to plead from the *impurities* allowed of in the Pagan worship, and from the mass of *superstition* and *imposture* under which the remains of *true religion* lay buried: but what colourable excuse can any person invent for his *infidelity*, under the brightest sunshine of the Gospel? None certainly. For, to use the words of a famous writer, and no bigot in the cause, "Unless the *reigning passion* of his soul, or some prodigious *stupidity* obstruct, he must see, that embracing the Gospel profession is infinitely a more reasonable choice than *the way he is in*." I know not how far an affectation of *singularity*, or an ambition to be thought *wiser* than the rest of the world, may have carried some persons. A few shining characters in history, of any kind, have often drawn after them a considerable number of very unequal imitators. There have been some extraordinary geniuses, who, by correcting *vulgar errors*, have acquired immense reputation. This perhaps may have stirred up others to aim at the same glory, by rejecting any thing *vulgar*, though ever so *true* and *right*: as if it were any commendation to be singularly *injudicious*; or as if, because it is honourable to *exceed* the common standard, it were honourable likewise only to *differ* from it, or *not to come up to it*; which is manifestly the case of our modern Deists, however highly they may please to think of themselves. For they have not so *clear* a discernment, nor so *true* a taste, nor so *correct* a judgment (whatever the reason be) as common Christians have. They have *proved* nothing

<sup>s</sup> See Gastrell's Boyle's Lecture Sermons, vol. i. p. 251, 252.

<sup>h</sup> Bayle's Miscellaneous Reflections on a Comet, vol. ii. p. 392.

of what they boast of, nor ever will : they have frequently discovered warm inclinations to maintain their principles, but have been as frequently disappointed. Take but away their rhetorications and equivocal expressions, their misrepresentations and misreports, their ostentation and their scurrilities, and their cause will be left in a manner destitute. One *advantage* indeed they have over us, that they run the same way with corrupt nature, and it is easy to drive down a precipice, while it is hard to climb up an ascent : on which account they can never fail to have their disciples, such as they are ; for Epicurus also before them had his<sup>i</sup>. But then they have their *disadvantages* also, in other respects, and those many and great ; so that, upon the whole, they will have the less reason to triumph.

1. For, in the first place, notwithstanding the *depravity* of human nature, prone to listen to bad counsels, there are yet (God be thanked) great numbers of honest and conscientious Christians, who fear God, and reverence his holy Word, and upon whom these new teachers can make no impressions at all, excepting only of horror and detestation. 2. Besides those, there may be other knowing and sensible men, who, if they have less affection for religion, (being taken up with the world,) will yet give no countenance to *infidelity* ; either for fear of risking the reputation of their *judgment*, or for the regard they bear to the interests of *society*, which can never subsist upon infidel principles. 3. Add to this, that there may be a great many more, who, though viciously given, will yet never be mad enough to run those desperate lengths, so as to throw off all regards to *revealed* religion, and all prospects of *heaven* ; but will rather choose, for a time, to “ hold the truth in unrighteousness,” reconciling themselves to it by the hopes of *repentance*, or by *self flattery*,

<sup>i</sup> Epicuri disciplina multo celebrior semper fuit, quam cæterorum : non quia *veri* aliquid afferat, sed quia multos popolare nomen *voluptatis* invitat : nemo enim non in vitia pronus est. Propterea, ut ad se multitudinem contrahat, apposita singulis quibusque moribus loquitur. *Lactant.* lib. iii. cap. 17. p. 145.

or other delusive expedients: it is as difficult almost, in a country so enlightened as ours is, to be superlatively wicked, (which a man, generally speaking, must be to turn Atheist<sup>k</sup>, or apostate,) as it is to be superlatively good. 4. Farther still, there may be several more, who, though delighted with loose and profane pamphlets, may yet have no real value or esteem for the writers; as men may love the treason, while they dislike the traitor. Many will despise the man that shall undertake to defend in cold blood, what they, with a kind of conscious guilt and shame, commit only in the heat of appetite or passion. The patronizing *infidelity* and *irreligion*, which is patronizing all that is bad, will for ever be disreputable and odious employment in the general opinion of mankind<sup>l</sup>; while religion and virtue, for their own intrinsic worth, must always have crowds of *admirers*, though perhaps few *followers*.

For this reason, the patrons of irreligion and infidelity in every age, down from Epicurus to the present times, have been forced in a great measure to conceal their sentiments, and to put on disguises to the world; well knowing, that they can never hope to overturn religion and virtue, without pretending a zeal for them all the time. Epicurus himself could write as devoutly in favour of *sanctity* and *Divine worship*, and of *virtue* also, as any believer could do, while he was really destroying them<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>k</sup> “ When a man is come to that pass as to wish himself an Atheist, and “ make the last efforts on conscience, he is at the very *crisis* of malice; a “ higher degree is not incident to the human soul: and unless God works “ miracles to convert him, he sticks at no kind of iniquity, although possi- “ bly he may not obtain his full wish: so that such a one is incomparably “ farther removed from the way of salvation, than an Atheist bred and born, “ or a simple unbeliever.” *Bayle’s Miscellan. Reflect. on a Comet*, p. 364, 365.

<sup>l</sup> Hence it was that the wiser and better sort even of Pagans detested the Epicureans, as debauchers of manners, and the bane of youth, and a scandal to the very name of *philosophy*. See Suidas in *Ἐπίκουρος*, and Athenæus, lib. xii. 547.

<sup>m</sup> At etiam de *sanctitate*, de *pietate* adversus Deos, libros scripsit Epicurus. At quomodo in his loquitur? Ut Coruncanium, aut Scævolum, Ponti-



In like manner, our modern *Deists* plead vehemently for *morality*, that one might be tempted almost to think, that they were really in good earnest: but their rejecting the best and only complete system of *morality* that ever the world was blessed with, and their taking *morality* out of *God's* hands into their *own*, in order to curtail and mutilate it; and above all, their sapping the *authority* which it properly stands upon, and their undermining the *sanctions* which alone can ever keep it alive in the world<sup>a</sup>; all these circumstances too plainly show, that their encomiums upon morality are only magnificent professions, like Epicurus's devotions, pompous appearances, solemn show, or, at the best, sound without sense. For the amount of all is, to *compliment* virtue or morality very highly, but to *starve* it at the same time, leaving it little or nothing to subsist upon. But without some such colourings as these, they could never set up for writers in a knowing age, nor bear a part in debate: the readers would be shocked<sup>o</sup> at once, upon the first sight of what they are doing; and the exposing their principles to open view, would save their adversaries the labour of a confutation. So it is not merely for the sake of guarding against legal censure, that these gentlemen so studiously

fices Maximos, te audire dicas; non eam qui sustulerit omnem funditus religionem.—At etiam liber est Epicuri, de *Sanctitate*. Ludimar ab homine non tam faceto, quam ad scribendi licentiam libero. Quæ enim potest esse *sanctitas*, si Di humana non curant? *Cicero. de Natur. Deor.* c. xlii. p. 100, 107. edit. Davies.

<sup>a</sup> See *Scripture Vindicated*, vol. vi. part ii. p. 65.

<sup>o</sup> This is as good as owned by some of them in their private letters. "More detriment than advantage has been done to the cause of *Deism* by an *open* profession of it.—One rule, I think indeed, ought always to be observed, that we should keep the persons we have a design upon, as long as possibly we can, from knowing that we ourselves are of those sentiments to which we would bring them.—L——t has often talked to him against *Christianity*, but he was only *shocked* at the discourse: which confirms what I was saying before, that the way to convince a prejudiced man, is not to let him know your own sentiments, but draw him in first, before he knows where he is, till it is too late to step back." *Two Letters from a Deist to his Friend*, p. 2, 18, 20.

affect *disguises*; but it is to prevent, if possible, the *exposing* a bad cause, which cannot bear the *light*; and to lay in for evasions and subterfuges, for the carrying on a dispute about their *meaning*, when all besides is at an end. This however is no small difficulty in their way, to be thus constrained to act a part; to write just plain enough to be understood, (for without that they do nothing,) and yet not so plain as either fully to discover the whole scene, or to foreclose all retreat, or to leave no colour for declaiming against hard censures, when they come to be pressed. But by frequent trials and long experience, they have learned to manage with competent dexterity.

They set out commonly, or conclude, with pompous declarations of their more than ordinary concern for *reason* and *truth*; full of *truth* in their professions, to supply their want of it elsewhere: that now *seeking the truth*, is almost become as much a phrase amongst these gentlemen, as *seeking the Lord* once was among another set of refiners. There is undoubtedly some advantage to be gained in this way; otherwise it would never have been the common pretext of all *detractors* <sup>p</sup> and *deceivers* whatsoever: neither would such men as Celsus and Hierocles <sup>q</sup> (sharp and subtle disputants) have made use of it; neither could the sect of the Manichees have ever imposed upon so *acute* a man as St. Austin, though in his younger days, by it<sup>r</sup>. Nevertheless, it must be said, that

<sup>p</sup> Prætexit quidem vir acutissimus præcipuum *veritatis* studium, cui nihil præferat, cui omnia submittat: sed ignoscat mihi, si dixerò, etiam *maledicentissimum* quemque illud præ se ferre, nec ullo alio unquam nomine suam velare obtreactionem: quid enim aliud dixerit Zoilus olim, quid Socratis accusatores, quid infames illi *delatores* sub tyrannis, Tiberio, Nerone, Domitiano, quam solo se *veritatis* et utilitatis publicæ studio duci ad alios ita palam increpandos et accusandos? *Perizon. contra Cleric. in Quint. Curt. Vindicat.* p. 13, 14.

<sup>q</sup> The pompous titles they gave to their invectives against the Christians are well known, both pretending a very particular zeal for *truth*.

<sup>r</sup> Quid enim me aliud cogebat annos fere novem, spreta religione quam mihi puerulo a parentibus insita erat, homines illos sequi ac diligenter audire, nisi quod nos *superstitione* terreri, et *fidem* nobis ante *rationem* impe-

*boasting* is no argument of *sincerity*, but is itself a *suspicious* circumstance. *Honest* men have no need to boast of their integrity, while their dealings abundantly declare it: neither need *faithful* writers tell of their uncommon zeal for *truth*, because an author is proved by his work, and it is good manners to suppose, that a reader has some discernment.

Another very common artifice which those gentlemen make use of is, to usher in their crudities under the name and umbrage of the *men of sense*. I cannot blame them for affecting to appear in good company: but as they have no commission for making so free with persons of that character, and as the whole amounts only to proclaiming *themselves* considerable, which their readers should be left to judge of; it seems to me, that such an offence against modesty and manners is a stronger argument against them, than any self commendations can ever be for them.

The same gentlemen who take so much pains to recommend themselves as abounding in *sense*, and *reason*, and *truth*, are as solicitous, on the other hand, to invent some *odious* names for what they dislike. They never acquaint their readers (though the more ancient Epicureans were sometimes frank enough to do it\*) that their aim is to destroy *religion* and *conscience*, and the *fear of God*; but they give it out, their whole quarrel is against *credulity* or *bigotry*, against *superstition* or *enthusiasm*, against *statecraft*, *priestcraft*, or *imposture*; names which they are pleased to affix, for the most part, to true religion and godliness. And when they have thus shifted off the blame to others which belongs only to themselves, in

rari dicerent; se autem nullum premere ad *fidem*, nisi prius discussa et enodata *veritate*. Quis non his pollicitationibus illiceretur, præsertim adolescentis animus cupidus *veri*, etiam nonnullorum in schola doctorum hominum disputationibus superbus et garrulus; qualem me tunc illi invenerunt, spernentem scilicet quasi aniles fabulas, et ab eis promissum *apertum* et *sincerum verum* tenere atque haurire cupientem? *Augustin. de Util. credendi*, tom. viii. p. 46. edit. Bened.

\* Lucretius, lib. i. 63, &c. with Creech's notes.

order to blacken their opposers, and to wash themselves white; they then begin to play their machinery upon the ignorant unguarded readers. Now since their main strength lies in their frequent repetition of these ill sounding names, upon a presumption that the world is more governed by *names* than by *things*, and that it is the easiest thing in nature to carry on an imposture of *words*; I shall entreat your patience while I endeavour to unravel the mystery of those affected names, considering them one by one, in the same order as I have mentioned them. And I hope to make it appear, that the guilt which those gentlemen would load us with, is not *ours*, but *theirs*; and that it ought therefore to be thrown back upon the proprietors. This certainly is a very fair and equitable method of defence on our side, to retort the blame, which belongs not to us, upon the accusers themselves, with whom it should rest.

1. I begin with *credulity*, a kind of cant word, (as they use it,) and made to stand for a serious belief of what Moses and the Prophets, of what Christ and his Apostles have taught us. It has been no new thing for the most *credulous* men imaginable to anticipate the charge of *credulity*, fixing it upon others, in order to throw it off from themselves. It was remarkable in the Pagans, who were themselves all over *credulity*, that they assumed a bold air, and fell foul upon the Christians as *credulous* men. Arnobius (besides many other of the Fathers) takes notice of it, and handsomely retorts it<sup>t</sup>. The Manichees also, who were silly enough to *believe* that *God* and *matter* were two *coeternal* principles, that *souls*

<sup>t</sup> Et quoniam ridere nostram *fidem* consuestis, atque ipsam *credulitatem* facetiis jocularibus lancinare; dicite, O festivi, et meraco sapientiæ tincti, et saturi potu,—nonne vestrum quicumque est, huic vel illi *credit* auctoribus? Non quod sibi persuaserit quis verum dici ab altero, velut quadam fidei ad stipulatione tutatur?—Cum igitur *comperti* nihil habeatis et *cogniti*, omniaque illa quæ scribitis et librorum comprehenditis millibus, *credulitate* asseveretis duce, quænam hæc est judicatio tam injusta, ut nostram derideatis *fidem*, quam vos habere conspicitis nostra in credulitate communem? *Arnob.* lib. ii. p. 47, 48. edit. Lugd.

were part of the Divine substance, and that *sun* and *moon* were to be adored, (besides many other points of doctrine too ridiculous to bear the mentioning <sup>u</sup>;) even they had the confidence to charge the churches of *Christ* with *credulity*, the better to cover their own dotages. And now what shall we say to the same charge revived against us by modern *infidels*? As to the word *credulity*, it denotes, according to its just and proper acceptation, any *rash* or *wrong* belief, taken up *against* reason or *without* reason. If this be a true explication of the name, (as it undoubtedly is,) then I humbly conceive that we stand clear of the indictment; and that our impeachers are themselves the men whom they would feign us to be. I do not know any more *credulous* men living, than they generally are. Indeed, we call them *unbelievers*, because they believe not what they ought to believe; otherwise they are great *believers* in their way, and, for the most part, men of a very large faith. It cannot be pretended that they believe *less* than we, since our creeds *reversed* (which usually makes theirs) are as long creeds as before; like as traversing the same ground backwards measures the same number of paces. He that believes, for instance, that there is *no heaven, no hell, no future state, no Providence, no God*, is as much a *believer*, in his way, as the most religious men can be in theirs. Infidels have their *articles* of belief as well as we, and perhaps more than we: so the difference seems not to lie so much in the *quantity* of faith, theirs or ours, as in the *quality*.

Bring we therefore this matter to a fair issue, that it may be clearly seen which of the contending parties are the *credulous* believers. Let the adversaries produce Epicurus's creed, or Hobbes's <sup>x</sup>, or Spinoza's <sup>y</sup>, or any other,

<sup>u</sup> The English reader may see the monstrous creed of the Manichees briefly summed up in Nye's Defence of the Canon of the New Testament, p. 88, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Hobbes's Creed of Paradoxes and palpable Absurdities has been collected into one summary view by several writers. See, among others, Kortholtus de Tribus Impostoribus, p. 93 ad p. 139; Reimman. Histor. Atheismi, p. 444.

fairly and fully drawn out, and let us compare. I am verily persuaded that such their creeds, represented at full length, will be found to contain more, and more frightful articles, than the Trent Creed itself, or even the Mahometan. A learned foreigner has taken the pains to digest one of the infidel creeds into three and twenty articles<sup>z</sup>, eight of them *negative*, and fifteen *affirmative*: there is scarce an article amongst them but what is big with many and shocking absurdities. By which it may appear, that those over censorious gentlemen do not want *faith*, where they have *inclination*; but while they strain out *gnats*, can swallow *camels*. They can readily assent

<sup>z</sup> Spinoza's marvellous creed may be seen, in a good measure, collected in Kortboltus de Trib. Impostoribus, p. 139 ad p. 208; Bayle's Dictionary, in the article *Spinoza*.

\* Symbolum Fidei Tolandicæ.

*Articuli Negantes.*

1. *Nego* spiritus incorporeos. 2. Mentem æternam et præstantissimam. 3. Providentiam numinis divini. 4. Immortalitatem animæ humanæ. 5. Pœnas et præmia in vita futura. 6. Authentiam et divinæ Scripturæ originem. 7. Miracula Mosis et Christi. 8. Mosem fuisse autorem Pentateuchi.

*Articuli Affirmantes.*

1. *Affirmo* mundum aut naturam rerum esse solum numen, neque genitum neque interiturum. 2. Religionem esse pulchrum politicorum commentum. 3. Atheismum esse naturalem notitiam et sapientissimorum virorum religionem. 4. Religionem vulgi esse superstitionem. 5. Religionis institutores et sacrarum legum latres esse vafra et subdola ingenia. 6. Omnium religionum sacerdotes, et sacrorum mysteriorum interpretes esse simulatæ pietatis vanos ostentatores, qui ex errore alieno quæstum faciunt. 7. Religionis cultores et numinis cœlestis veneratores, esse ignavum et imbecille hominum genus. 8. Quæcunque pro supernaturalibus habentur et in Deum vertuntur, esse res mere naturales. 9. Quæ pro miraculis venditantur et creduntur, esse fraudes impostorum, vel effecta morbi melancholici in testibus qui ea viderunt vel audierunt. 10. Autographa Veteris et Novi Testamenti intercidisse. 11. Mosem et Scriptorem Pentateuchi fuisse Pantheistas; aut, ut recentiores loqui amant, Spinozistas. 12. Mosis scripta explicanda et corrigenda esse ex exoticorum libris, 13. Certiorem fidem adhibendam esse Strabonis diligentia, quam Mosis, uti pie creditur, autoritati. 14. Atheum esse meliorem civem quam Theistam. 15. Religionem reipublicæ nocere. *Fayi Defens. Religionis contra Joh. Toland*, p. 248, 249, 250.

to things more incredible or impossible than any to be met with in *romance* or *legend*: indeed nothing is too absurd for their belief, when they have a mind to it. They can believe, for instance, that Moses (a wise man by all accounts) could be weak enough to attempt the imposing a *forgery* and *lying* history upon a whole nation, endeavouring to persuade them out of their senses at once; and that he did not only attempt it, but succeeded in it too, and palmed his imposture upon all the people, none gainsaying it, nor discovering it; that the same imposture had the good fortune to pass unsuspected upon the people of the Jews for many ages, and came at length to be received even by Christ himself, who entirely confided in it, and staked all his character upon it, where he says; "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words<sup>a</sup>?"

But because the same gentlemen, who make Moses an impostor, must of consequence make Christ and his Apostles impostors also, let us next observe, how *credulous* they appear to be in this point too, as well as in the former. Not to mention a multitude of other absurdities, they must believe "that a despicable company of wilful impostors and deceivers, men of a hated nation and religion, without learning and discipline, without skill and experience, without any of the arts of pleasing and recommending themselves to mankind, should run down all the wit and power and policy of the world; and preaching a most despised and incredible and seemingly ridiculous doctrine, directly contrary to all the worldly interests and humours of men, to their religion and customs, and to their reason and philosophy too, should propagate the belief of it far and wide through the earth, so that there was scarce a nation in the whole compass of the globe, but what, in whole or in part,

<sup>a</sup> John v. 46, 47.

“received this *fiction* as the most sacred truth of God, and laid all the stress of their salvation upon it<sup>b</sup>.”

I borrow this representation from a very judicious writer and close reasoner, who pursues the same turn of thought a great way farther<sup>c</sup>, setting forth in the strongest and most lively colours the numerous and intolerable absurdities which *infidels* must admit of; thereupon observing, very justly and pertinently, that “their so much boasted aversion to all kind of *bigotry* and *credulity* is mere jest and scene, and that they are either some of the most fondly credulous persons in the world<sup>d</sup>,” or worse; “credulous to a prodigy,” and might as well “go on to the fictions of a Popish legend, or a Turkish Alcoran<sup>e</sup>.” These are the men who are pleased to reproach the Church of Christ with *easiness* of belief, for believing *mysteries* and *miracles*. It is true, we do believe *mysteries*, few and well attested; while they believe many and palpable absurdities<sup>f</sup>. We admit *miracles* also, assigning

<sup>b</sup> Ditton on the Resurrection of Christ, p. 363.

<sup>c</sup> Ditton, *ibid.* p. 364—371.

<sup>d</sup> Ditton, *ibid.* p. 374.

<sup>e</sup> Ditton, *ibid.* p. 375.

<sup>f</sup> Mr. Bayle, speaking of Spinoza, has some just reflections, apposite to our present purpose, and worth the inserting.

“The most disdainful censurers of other men’s thoughts are very indulgent to themselves. Doubtless he (Spinoza) derided the *mystery* of the *Trinity*, and wondered that so many people could speak of a *nature* terminated by *three hypostases*: and yet, properly speaking, he ascribed as *many persons* to the *Divine nature*, as there are *men* upon earth.—Spinoza could not bear the least obscurity of *Peripatism*, *Judaism*, or *Christianity*; and yet he heartily embraced an *hypothesis* which reconciles two things so contrary to one another, as the *square* and *circular* figures, and whereby an infinite number of *inconsistent* attributes, and all the *variety* and *antipathy* of the thoughts of mankind are true at the same time of *one* and the *same* most simple and indivisible substance.” Bayle in Spinoza, 2791, 2792.

A celebrated author has a reflection of like kind, in the words here following:

“It must certainly be something else than *incredulity* which fashions the taste and judgment of many gentlemen, whom we hear censured as *Atheists*, for attempting to philosophize after a newer manner than has been known of late. For my own part, I have ever thought this sort of men to



a cause more than equal to the effect; while they are forced to admit the same effects, or things more marvellous, independent of their proper or adequate causes; which is admitting *contradictions*. In short then, we believe what we can prove by good authority, and no more: they believe what they please. Let them therefore first clear their own accounts, and then proceed, if they see proper, to charge the churches of Christ, as such, with *credulity*.

2. Another party word and term of reproach, near akin to the former, is *bigotry*: a calumny thrown upon us for our steadfast adherence to Moses and the Prophets, to Christ and his Apostles, to God blessed for ever. In the mean while, to whom or to what do our accusers adhere, that we should be *bigots*, and not they? *Bigotry* means, in common acceptation, a warm or obstinate adherence to things or persons, to principles or party, *against* reason or *without* reason. By this definition we desire to be tried, and to join issue with our adversaries: and let the indifferent world judge whether Christians or infidels are most properly *bigots*.

The lower class of *unbelievers* appear to have as tame and as implicit a faith in their new instructors, as it is possible for men to have; that is, they are *bigoted* to them, and led blindfold by them. They believe every *tale* that is but confidently told them against religion, or the ministers of it: they accept of any *sophistry* that is offered them, and submit to any delusion or imposition upon their judgment and understanding. They often take dictates for arguments, mere assertions for proofs, equivocating for reasoning, and sound for sense. While they are afraid of being *guided* by priests, they consent to be *governed* by anti-priests; who demand a much greater

“ be in general more *credulous*, though after another manner, than the mere *vulgar*. Besides what I have observed in conversation merely, with the “ men of this character, I can produce many *anathematized* authors, who, if “ they want a true Israelitish faith, can make amends by a Chinese or Indian one.” *Characteristics*, vol. i. p. 345.

submission from them than we can pretend to: for we are content and thankful, if our people will but observe us in what is evidently true and right, while they expect to be believed and followed in what is palpably false and wrong. From hence may appear the bigotry of the inferior sort among the Deists.

As to the leading men themselves, they generally follow the track of their predecessors, and appear to be zealous *bigots* to their *systems*, to their *creeds*, to their *paradoxes*, to their *party*; all which they adhere to as pertinaciously as we can do to our Bible. They have Pagan historians to rest their faith upon, instead of Moses and the Evangelists; they have Pagan morals to answer to the Divine Sermon on the Mount, and Pagan or Jewish calumnies to set against our Christian evidences. They have Epicurus and Celsus, Porphyry and Julian, for their guides and leaders in many things, as we have the *sacred* writers in all. Hobbes and Spinoza seem to be their chief instructors among the moderns; and it has been observed by knowing judges, that Hobbes himself was little more than a disciple of Epicurus<sup>s</sup> in his system of religion, or irreligion. The like may be shown, and has been shown<sup>h</sup> in some measure, of the present advocates for infidelity. Now, indeed, if they have reason for preferring those their guides and teachers to ours, then we are the *bigots*: but if it has been manifested a thousand times over, as I presume it has, that the *proofs* are on our side, and that it is impossible to come at any, as to the main things, on theirs; then we humbly conceive that the *bigotry* lies at their door, and we appeal from the seat of calumny to the truth and reason of things. Let them show that they

<sup>s</sup> Hoc probe scio, ipsum nihil nobis obtulisse nisi quod apud veteres in Epicuro reprehensum inveniamus. Ut enim Epicurus omnia a Democrito surripuisse dicitur, ita Hobbins omnia Epicuri flagitia ingenti fastu tanquam sua recudit; atque ut nova videantur, novis nominibus (quorum ille, ut sunt novatores omnes, egregius artifex) appellare affectavit. *Parker, Disputat. de Deo*, p. 86.

<sup>h</sup> Scripture Vindicated, vol. vi. part 2. p. 166, &c.

have as good grounds for following the doctrines of Epicurus, or any other ancient or modern infidel, as we have for following Christ. Such was the challenge which Arnobius long ago made to the Pagans, who presumed to oppose their philosophers to Christ and his Apostles<sup>i</sup>: and such we make to every unbeliever at this day. Perhaps they will say, that they follow no one's authority implicitly or absolutely, but collect from all what they like best. This might show they are no bigots to mere *human* authority; neither are we: but then they may be bigots to their own *passions*, or *prejudices*, or *party*, in rejecting *Divine* authority sufficiently attested; while there is no *bigotry* in submitting to the *highest reason*, and in adhering to God. Balance reasons with reasons, evidences with evidences, facts with facts, and thereupon judge where truth and credibility, where error and bigotry lie. It is easy to raise *objections* to any thing; as it is easy to be ignorant, or unattentive, or humoursome, or perverse: but the great point is, whether those objections, surmises, or suspicions, *comparatively*, have any weight, or how much, when put into the scale against solid arguments. There then rests the whole thing: let our accusers show that the *reasons* are all on their side, and then we shall readily admit, that all the *bigotry* is on ours: but till this be done, (and it is impossible it ever should,) the charge which they bring against us is as easily retorted as made, and with much more truth and justice; which will always be the case, as often as Christianity is impeached upon this article.

3. Another famous term of reproach, which *unbelievers*

<sup>i</sup> Et quid est quod in hac parte, aut vos plurimum habeatis, aut nos minus? Vos Platoni, vos Cronio, vos Numenio, vel cui liberit creditis: nos credimus et acquiescimus *Christo*. Iniquitas hæc quanta est, ut cum utrique auctoribus stemus, sitque nobis et vobis unum et socium *credere*, vobis velit dari, quod ita ab illis dicatur accipere, vos ea quæ proferuntur a *Christo*, audire et spectare nolitis. Atqui si causas causas, partes partibus voluerimus æquare, magis nos valemus ostendere quid in *Christo* fuerimus secuti, quam in *philosophis* quid vos. Ac nos quidem in illo secuti hæc sumus: opera illa magnifica, &c. *Arnob. adv. Gent.* lib. ii. p. 49.

asperse us with, is *superstition*; a name which often stands for *Christianity*, or for all *revealed* religion, in their nomenclature. But the word properly imports any *religious excesses*<sup>k</sup>, either as to matter, manner, or degree. There may be a *superstitious awe*, when it is wrong placed, or is of a wrong kind, or exceeds in measure: and whenever we speak of a *superstitious belief*, or *worship*, or *practice*, we always intend some kind of *religious excess*. Any *false* religion, or false part of a true one, is a species of *superstition*, because it is *more* than should be, and betokens *excess*. Hence it has been usual for persons of some religion, to style all but their own, *superstition*, as being *false* in their account: and they that admit no religion as true, make *superstition* the common name for all. The contrary extreme to *excess* is *defect*, or want of religion, and is called *irreligion*, *profaneness*, *impiety*, *apostasy*, *atheism*, according to its respective circumstances and degrees. The due mean between the two extremes is true and sound religion. Now since the Christian religion is most evidently *true*, (if any ancient facts whatever can be proved to be true,) we do insist upon it, that it is properly *religion*, and not *superstition*: and that a disbelief of it, where it is sufficiently promulgated, is *irreligion*, *profaneness*, *madness*. This then is a short and a clear answer to our adversaries upon the present head; that they can never maintain the charge of *superstition* against Christian believers, as such; but we can easily make good the charge of *profaneness* or *irreligion* against them. But besides that, I may venture perhaps to add, that they are not so clear even of *superstition* itself, as is commonly imagined: for *infidelity* and *superstition* are, for the most part, near allied, as proceeding from the same weakness of judgment, or same corruption of heart. Those guilty fears and apprehensions of an avenging Deity, which drive some persons into *superstition*, do as naturally drive others of a more hard and stubborn

<sup>k</sup> See Vossii Etymologicum, in *Superstitio*.

temper into *infidelity*, or *atheism*<sup>l</sup>. The same causes working differently in different persons, or in the same persons at different times, produce both<sup>m</sup>: and it has been a common observation, justifiable by some noted instances, that no men whatever have been more apt to exceed in *superstition*, at the sight of danger, than those who at other times have been most highly *profane*.

But I may farther observe, that *superstition* (*practical* superstition at least) may be more directly charged upon *many* or *most* of our accusers, as it is their avowed principle to comply *outwardly* with any public and authorized *superstitions* whatever. Epicurus and his followers conformed readily to the popular superstitions<sup>n</sup>, being willing enough to compound at that rate to save themselves harmless. I have before observed of the leaders of the modern Deists abroad, that they accommodated themselves to the prevailing religions wheresoever they lived. Hobbes and Spinoza are known to have advised and inculcated the same doctrine, making the *magistrate's* religion the sovereign rule for outward practice<sup>o</sup>. Mr. Toland observes of Atheists, (and he knew them well,) that their principle is, to stand up for all *established* religions, by all means, right or wrong<sup>p</sup>. The author of the Oracles of

<sup>l</sup> See Smith's Select Discourses, p. 25. and p. 41, &c.

<sup>m</sup> A late ingenious author has well expressed and illustrated the observation, as follows:

“*Atheism* and *superstition* are of the same origin: they both have their rise from the same cause, the same defect in the mind of man, our want of capacity in discerning truth, and natural ignorance of the Divine essence. Men that from their most early youth have not been imbued with the principles of the true religion, or have not afterwards continued to be strictly educated in the same, are all in great danger of falling either into the *one* or the *other*, according to the *difference* there is in the *temperament* and *complexion* they are of, the *circumstances* they are in, and the *company* they converse with.” *Second Part of the Fable of the Bees*, p. 374.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Plutarch. contr. Epicur. Opp. tom. ii. p. 1102. Origen. contr. Cels. lib. vii. p. 375.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Kortholtus de Tribus Impostoribus, p. 208, &c.

<sup>p</sup> Atheus, commodo suo intentus, nunquam a *stabilita* religione dissen-

Reason and his friends profess the same principle of conformity to the religion of one's country, whatever it be <sup>9</sup>. Some have openly, and with great immodesty, even boasted of it <sup>r</sup>; interpreting it to such a monstrous latitude, that the same person might indifferently go to a Popish chapel, or a Turkish mosque, or to an Indian pagod. Among the noted *characteristics of atheistical men*, this commonly makes one, that they follow the religion of the *magistrate*, value it not as *true*, but as *established*, and regard it only as an instrument of *state policy*<sup>s</sup>.

tiet; cui omnes alios, ne suspectus evadat, per fas et nefas velit conformes. Toland. *Adeisidemon*, p. 78.

<sup>r</sup> See Blount's *Miscellanies*, p. 202, 203. Compare Nicholls's *Conference*, part ii. p. 193.

<sup>s</sup> Colo Deum talem qualem princeps vel respublica me jubet. Si Turca, Alcoranum; si Judæus, Vetus Testamentum; si Christianus, Novum Testamentum veneror pro lege et religionis meæ norma. Papa si imperans, Deum credo *transubstantiatum*; si Lutherus, Deus mihi particulis *in, cum*, et *sub* circumvallatur; si Calvinus, signum pro Deo sumo. Sicque cujus regio, in qua vivo, ejus me regit opinio, &c. *Autor Meditation. Philosoph. &c. apud Budd. Isagog.* p. 1390.

<sup>t</sup> Those *characteristics* are numbered up in twelve articles, by a learned foreigner.

1. Omni occasione data, negare aut in dubium vocare *supernaturalia*; miracula, &c.

2. Sacræ Scripturæ autoritatem imminuere, aliisque suspectam et contemptam reddere; Scripturam cum Scriptura et cum ratione committere, et inde elicere contradictiones.

3. Metam omnem et justam sollicitudinem omnibus excutere, nil nisi hilaritatem et securitatem commendare.

4. Immortalitatem animæ rationalis negare.

5. Providentiam Dei accusare, vel vocare in dubium.

6. Mysteria religionis Christianæ exagitare, et scurriliter traducere.

7. Ab Ecclesiæ Ministris abhorrere, et eorum colloquia declinare.

8. Atheismos aliorum cupide enarrare, et argumenta pro Atheismo tanquam indissolubiles subtilitates admirari.

9. *Religionem aliquam strenue simulare, et gravissime contra eos qui Atheismi ipsos insimulant, contestari.*

10. *Religionem non alio nomine urgere, quam quatenus ad rationem statui facit.*

11. Atheismi impugnationes et increpationes ægre ferre.

12. Libros gentilium libentius quam Christianorum legere, et sacræ Scripturæ lectionem aversari.

*Adjiciunt plerique, non seorsim esse spectanda hæc criteria, sed conjunc-*

Now one might have expected of those gallant gentlemen, who had undertaken to assert the dignity of human nature, and to rescue mankind from the slavery of *superstition*, that they more especially should have abhorred the practice, or even the appearance of it. For what is the use of their superior wisdom, and their elevation of thought above the *vulgar*, if it be not to inform practice and conduct life? The strongest objection against *superstition*, and the worst circumstance of it, is, that it leads men to ridiculous and absurd *practices*, such as dishonour God, and debase the dignity of man, and do mischief to the world. *Speculative* superstition is an innocent, harmless thing, in comparison of *practical*: and therefore what glory is there in discarding the former only? They that reject superstition in *theory*, and yet retain it in *life*, and that upon *principle* too, do but expose their own *folly* and *falseness* both in one. There can scarce be conceived a more contemptible figure in nature, than a man railing at all *superstitions*, and at the same time practising, and persuading others to practise, all that come. Might he not much more decently forbear censuring the public *religions*, or *superstitions*, than thus fall to *censuring* first, and then to *practising* what he condemns, and last of all, to instructing *others* to do the same thing? Such persons have no reason to value themselves upon any supposed superiority in *notion* or *sentiment*, because there cannot be a more abject or pusillanimous *principle* than what they espouse: and why should they condemn others for being *superstitious*, and that but in *part*, while their own practice is *totally* such? I do not charge all the Deists with such practices or principles; I know they are divided upon that article: but so many at least as do espouse them, may prudently be silent on this head. Such unsincere and inconsistent conduct cannot be the conduct of good *moral* men, or men of *probity*<sup>t</sup>. But I pass on.

*tim, si velimus sincerum ex iis ferre judicium. Reimman. Histor. Atheismi, p. 17, 18.*

<sup>t</sup> An odd sort of apology the Pantheisticon makes for such kind of dissi-

4. Next to the charge of *superstition* follows *enthusiasm*, another term of reproach, and often made a name for the *true religion* of *Christ*, by men disposed to defame and to destroy it. There have been unhappy persons, whose heads have been disturbed with religious *melancholy* or devout *phrensies*; the flights and sallies of an overheated imagination and a distempered mind. From hence weak or wicked men have taken the handle to ascribe all religion to *enthusiasm* or *fanaticism*; that is, to a kind of phrensy, or dotage. But to such a suggestion, so far as concerns Moses and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, we answer, that those excellent personages, by their whole *conduct*, gave sufficient proofs that they were *no enthusiasts*, never disordered in mind. Besides, we insist upon it, that sallies of imagination never did, never could produce any such sound and consistent doctrines as they taught, never wrought such *miracles*, never uttered such *prophecies*: neither can the *facts* which we appeal to be contested, without shaking the faith of all history, and retiring to universal *scepticism*, which would be madness indeed. There cannot be a wilder thought than for a man to imagine that the world was converted by lunatics and madmen; “ that men hurried by the impetus of a “ wild extravagant fancy, were masters of all that *conduct* “ and *management*, that *argument* and *address*, which was “ requisite to bring those astonishing effects about. Or “ if he finds it too hard to suppose that a company of dis- “ tracted men should ever be able to argue with so much “ art and force, as to overpower all the wisdom and learn- “ ing of the world; then he must think the rest of man-

mulation. The sum of it is, that religious men are *mad*, or *fools*, and therefore infidels may humour them, and comply with them *outwardly*, as nurses do with froward *children*. Pantheistæ, quæ eorum est moderatio, non aliter cum hominibus *deliris* et *pertinacibus* agunt, ac *nutricula* cum balbutientibus suis *alumnis*.—Qui *infantulis*, in hisce nugis non *adblandiuntur*, iis *injacundi* sunt et *exosi*.—Hinc necessario evenit, ut *aliud sit in pectore* et *privato consensu*, *aliud in foro* et *publica concione*. *Pantheisticon*, p. 79, 80. How decently may such persons exclaim against *pious frauds*, or *religious cheats*!



“ kind, who believed them, to be *mad*, as well as they ;  
 “ that they were convinced and persuaded by mere *enthusiasm*, that they mistook downright raving for the  
 “ strongest reason, and a chain of absurd incoherent falsi-  
 “ ties, for bright and evident demonstrations of truth ;  
 “ that all the sages, statesmen, and philosophers, who  
 “ embraced Christianity in great numbers, as well as the  
 “ poor and illiterate, believed they had proofs which they  
 “ had not ; thought things were plain and clear to them  
 “ which were not ; fancied irresistible strength, majesty,  
 “ and eloquence, in an empty noise and sound of words,  
 “ made by a company of poor distempered men, who  
 “ neither knew nor cared what they said .”

But if any persons notwithstanding can have confidence enough to charge the Founder of our religion, or the sacred writers, with *enthusiasm*, that is, with *madness*, may it not be proper to ask, what kind of complexion the men are of, who make such a groundless charge ; and whether they are not the *visionaries*, rather than the other. There may be an *irreligious* phrensy, as well as a *religious* one ; and the imagination may be as soon heated with a spirit of *profaneness*, as with the fervours of *piety*. A very learned and judicious writer has said, that there are enthusiastical, or fanatical Atheists, and that “ all manner  
 “ of Atheists whatsoever, and those of them who most  
 “ pretend to reason and philosophy, may in some sense  
 “ be justly styled both *enthusiasts* and *fanatics* : foras-  
 “ much as they are not led or carried on into this way of  
 “ atheizing by any clear dictates of their reason or under-  
 “ standing ; but only by an *ὄρμη ἀλογος*, a certain *blind*  
 “ and *irrational impetus*, they being, as it were, *inspired*  
 “ to it by that lower *earthly life* and *nature*, or the *spirit*  
 “ of the world, or *mundane spirit*.—The mundane spirit,  
 “ or earthy life, is *irrational* sottishness ; and they who

▪ Ditton on the Resurrection of Christ, p. 364. compare p. 310, &c. See also Nicholls's Conference, part ii. p. 230, &c. Fayi Defens. Relig. cont. Toland, c. xiii. p. 71. Campbell's Discourse proving that the Apostles were not enthusiasts.

“are atheistically inspired by it (how abhorrent soever they may otherwise seem to be from *enthusiasm* and *revelations*) are notwithstanding really no better than a kind of bewitched *enthusiasts* and blind *spiritati*, that are wholly ridden and acted by a dark, narrow, and captivated principle of life.—Nay, they are *fanatics* too, however that word seem to have a more peculiar respect to something of a *Deity*; all Atheists being that blind goddess Nature’s fanatics <sup>x</sup>.”

The observation is cited and approved by a *noble* writer, who has been thought not partial on the side of religion. He says, that *Atheism* itself is *not exempt* from *enthusiasm*, but there have been *enthusiastical* Atheists <sup>y</sup>. He repeats it elsewhere <sup>z</sup>, and confirms it more at large. The same noble author scruples not to say, that “to deny the magistræ a *worship*, or take away a *national* Church, is as mere *enthusiasm* as the notion which sets up persecution <sup>a</sup>.”

To confirm what has been hinted of the *enthusiasm* of these men, who charge us with it, let but any one seriously consider the Pantheistic system, (which is reported by those that should know, to be a favourite system amongst them, and as fashionable as any <sup>b</sup>,) whether it be not as wild *enthusiasm* as ever was invented and published to the world. It supposes God and nature, or God and the whole universe, to be one and the same substance, one *universal being*; insomuch that men’s souls are only *modifications* of the Divine substance: from whence it follows, that what men will, God wills also; and what they say, God says; and what they do, God does <sup>c</sup>. Was there ever any raving

<sup>x</sup> Cudworth, *Intellect. Syst.* p. 134.

<sup>y</sup> *Characteristics*, vol. i. p. 52.

<sup>z</sup> *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 63, 64.

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 17.

<sup>b</sup> *Parisiis plurimum versantur [Pantheistæ] itidem Venetiis; in omnibus Hollandiæ urbibus, maxime certe Amstelodami; et nonnulli, quod mireris, in ipsa curia Romana: sed præcipue, et præ aliis locis omnibus, Londini abundant, ibique sedem, et quasi arcem suæ sectæ collocant. Pantheisticon, p. 42.*

<sup>c</sup> See the *Pantheistic* principles drawn out more at large by Mr. Bayle in the article *Spinoza*, and well confuted, p. 2792.

enthusiast that discovered greater extravagance? This doctrine first owed its birth to Pagan darkness<sup>d</sup>, and revived afterwards among the Jewish cabalists<sup>f</sup>: from thence it was handed down to Spinoza, who was originally a Jew, and from him it descended to the author or authors of the *Pantheisticon*; who, while they are themselves the greatest *visionaries* in nature, yet scruple not to charge the Christian world with *enthusiasm*.

There is another, though a more pardonable instance of *fanaticism*, or *enthusiasm*, among some modern Deists, relating to *virtue*, considered as subsisting, and in an eminent degree too, independent on hopes and fears, or on future rewards and penalties<sup>f</sup>: a chimerical notion, and betraying the greatest ignorance both of men and things. What but some egregious warmth of imagination could ever induce any man to conceive, that he might be capable of practising a nobler kind of virtue than Abel, or Enoch, or Noah, or Abraham, or even Christ himself, considered in his human nature? All these owed their brightest instances of virtue to *faith*<sup>e</sup>, to the respect they had to the "recompence of reward<sup>h</sup>," to the "joy that was set before them<sup>i</sup>;" which is a *just* and *rational* principle, suited most certainly to the circumstances of this life. Possibly in a life to come, virtue and pleasure may constantly coincide, where we suppose all to be uniformly virtuous, and where there will be no clashing, no interfering, no trials, no conflicts: but in this life, undoubtedly, virtue, in any high degree of perfection, is present *self-denial*, and cannot be made *rational*, that is, cannot be *virtue*, (for *virtue* and *folly* are not the same thing,) with-

<sup>d</sup> See Buddæus's *Analecta Histor. Philosoph. in exercitat. de Spinozismo ante Spinozam*, p. 317, &c. Cudworth's *Intellect. Syst.* p. 306, 344. Bayle's *Dictionary* in Spinoza, p. 2782.

<sup>e</sup> See Buddæus, *ibid.* p. 346, &c. Reimman. *Hist. Atheismi*, p. 45, 46, 47.

<sup>f</sup> *Ad beate vivendum sola sufficit virtus; sœaque sibi est satis ampla merces.* *Pantheisticon*, p. 57. *Comp. Christianity as old as the Creation*, p. 25, 367.

<sup>g</sup> See Hebr. xi. 4, &c.

<sup>h</sup> Hebr. xi. 26.

<sup>i</sup> Hebr. xii. 2.

out taking into consideration *future* prospects †. It is romantic to talk of a new kind of virtue never yet practised, nor practicable: or if it were, *caprice*, or *convenience*, or *vain-glory*, not *virtue*, is the name for it. For if it be founded on *worldly* considerations, it is *convenience* only, or *vain-glory*; and if it be founded on no considerations, it is *caprice*: and between these two there is no medium, in this case, but *faith* in a world to come. The ancient Stoics, having but dark and fluctuating views of another life, were, in a manner, driven into that dry doctrine of *virtue being constantly its own reward*, in order to solve the difficulties concerning *Providence*. The Epicureans, absolutely rejecting both *Divine Providence* and a *future state*, made *pleasure*, worldly pleasure, the reward of virtue, that they might not seem altogether to desert the cause; and their virtue proved accordingly. The Sadducees, among the Jews, came nearer to the Stoical principles, having fallen into them, as it seems, unawares, through a kind of *enthusiastic* affectation of soaring above common sense. The Mystics followed, and deviated in like manner with the former, by over-refining and subtilizing plain things. After them came a set of *enthusiasts* amongst us, in the ill times, who revived the same principles, and were solidly con-

† Hæc causa est, cur præceptis eorum nullus obtemperet; quoniam aut ad *vitia* erudiunt si voluptatem defendunt; aut si *virtutem* asserunt, neque *pœnam* minantur nisi solius turpitudinis, neque virtuti ullum præmium pollicentur, nisi solius honestatis et laudis, cum dicant, non propter aliud, sed propter *seipsam* expetendam esse virtutem.—Non enim tantum *religionem* asserere noluerunt, verum etiam sustulerunt, dum specie *virtutis falsæ* inducti, conantur animos omni metu liberare. *Lactant.* lib. iii. cap. 26. p. 165, 166.

“ Although it be true, that as things now stand, and as the nature of men “ is framed, good men do find a strange kind of inward pleasure and secret “ satisfaction of mind in the discharge of their duty, and in doing what is “ virtuous; yet every man that looks into himself, and consults his own “ breast, will find, that this delight and contentment springs chiefly from the “ hopes which good men conceive that an holy and virtuous life will not be “ unrewarded; and without these hopes, *virtue* is but a *dead* and *empty* “ name.” *Tillotson*, Sermon. cxxi. p. 121.

futed by several of our able and learned Divines<sup>1</sup>. The Deists seem to fall in sometimes with the Stoics and sometimes with the Epicureans, following virtue (as they say) either for its *beauty*, or for the *present pleasure* attending it, abstracted from the consideration of *future* rewards; that so they may carry on a *show* of supporting morality, while they are paring away the ground upon which it stands. If they are sincere and honest in their doctrine, it is a spice of *enthusiasm*; and if they are not, it is worse.

I may farther observe, that there appears besides, in the present advocates for Deism, a very particular turn of mind, such as seems not to differ, in any thing material, from a spirit of *enthusiasm*; if it is not grave banter or solemn grimace. Their way is, to sanctify their flights of fancy, their own roving inventions, under the sacred name of *reason*, which they style also, in part, *Divine inspiration*<sup>m</sup>, and in the whole, *internal revelation*<sup>n</sup>. Hereupon they presume to talk as familiarly of God's mind and laws, and with as warm an assurance, as if they had been rapt up into the third heaven, or had sate in council with the Almighty. They prescribe, according as their fancies dictate, where they know nothing what services God ought to expect<sup>o</sup>, what indulgences he should make to *warm desires*<sup>p</sup>, what *penalties* he may appoint here or hereafter<sup>q</sup>. They enter caveats against his being *arbitrary*<sup>r</sup>, so as to enact any thing which they see not the

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Bull's Posth. Sermons, vol. ii. p. 593. Wilkins's Sermon on Heb. xi. 26. Sharrock de Fin. &c. p. 70, &c. Boyle's Seraph. Love, p. 118. South's Serm. vol. iv. p. 178. Tillotson's Posth. Serm. cxxi. p. 121.

"Though a man were never so much in love with virtue, for the native *beauty* and *comeliness* of it; yet it would strangely cool his affection to *it*, to consider, that he should be *undone* by the match; that when he had *it*, he must go a *begging* with it, and be in danger of *death* for the sake of *that* which he had chosen for the felicity of his life." *Tillotson, ibid.*

<sup>m</sup> Christianity as old, &c. p. 182, 194, 330.

<sup>n</sup> *Ibid.* p. 3, 8, 67, 70, 369.

<sup>o</sup> *Ibid.* p. 3, 105, 115, 116, 124, 125.

<sup>p</sup> *Ibid.* p. 345.

<sup>q</sup> *Ibid.* p. 38, &c.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* p. 30, 35, 61, 65, 114, 116, 125, 130, 370.

reason for ; and against his playing the *tyrant* <sup>s</sup>, either by imposing *positive* laws without their *consent* <sup>t</sup>, or by abridging them of their *natural* right <sup>u</sup>, (that is, of what they might otherwise enjoy upon the *permissive* law of nature,) or by interposing in matters *indifferent* <sup>x</sup>, (which every petty prince or state may do,) or by *punishing* the incorrigible for sins *past* <sup>y</sup>. This is taking great lengths of freedom with the high and tremendous Deity, such as one would not expect from any but the wildest *enthusiasts*. Indeed, all claims to any *internal* notices exclusive of God's *written* word, whether they be entitled *inspiration*, or *internal revelation*, or *inward light*, or *reason*, or *infallibility*, or what else soever ; I say, all such claims brought to exclude Scripture, are *enthusiastic* and *fanatical*, false and vain.

But some perhaps may ask, can those then be *enthusiasts*, who profess to follow *reason*? Yes, undoubtedly, if by *reason* they mean only *conceits*. Therefore such persons are now commonly called *reasonists* and *rationalists*, to distinguish them from true *reasoners* or *rational* inquirers. For their great fault is, that they will not suffer *reason* to have its *free* course or *full* exercise, nor allow it sufficient *light*. *Reason* desires and requires all useful *notices*, and all the friendly *intimations* that can be procured : but these her most insidious adversaries, under a false plea of *sufficiency* <sup>z</sup>, confine her to short measures, and shut up

<sup>s</sup> Christianity as old, &c. p. 29, 30, 32, 38, 70, 122, 176, 188.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. p. 113. Compare Script. Vindicat. vol. vi. part 2. p. 137. and Pnfendorf, book iii. ch. 4. sect. 4. p. 254.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. p. 113, 134.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. p. 132, 135, 171, 370.

<sup>y</sup> See Second Address, p. 7.

<sup>z</sup> The common pretences about the *sufficiency* of reason, for furnishing out a complete system of *religion* and *morality*, seem to have just as much sense in them, as if a man should pretend to draw out a complete system of *optics*, setting aside all the instructions brought in by facts and observations ; or a complete system of *philosophy* or *medicine*, throwing out the informations of *history* and *experiments*. The Scripture accounts are as necessary to be superadded to *abstract reason*, in order to form a *complete* system of *religion* and *morality*, as those other accounts are to complete the respective *arts* and *sciences* : and if *reason* requires that these should be taken in, it is

the avenues of improvement : by which it plainly appears, that they are just such friends to *reason* as they are to *morality* ; friends to the *name*, and that is all. They follow *reason*, as they profess : but we maintain, that *reason* itself directs us to take in *Scripture*, when we have it before us, for our *light* and our *guide*. Who then is the friend to *reason* ? he that flatters her with empty *compliments*, or he that follows her *rules* ?

5. From the article of *enthusiasm*, I proceed next to two other terms of reproach, namely, *state-craft* and *priest-craft*, nearly allied to each other, (for which reason I mention them together,) and frequently made use of by unbelievers, in order to render true religion odious or suspected. It has often been suggested, that religion owed its birth and progress to the subtle contrivances of *politicians* and *priests*. Indeed *priests* seem to have come in the later, to bear their share in the scandal. Formerly, *princes* only, or *lawgivers*, were marked out as the most likely persons to have wrought those marvellous effects upon mankind. In the very nature of the thing, *religion* should be conceived prior to *priesthood* appointed to serve in it : unless we were to suppose some previous and special designation of the persons by Almighty God. In the natural course of things, if religion was all of human invention, it must have been invented before *priests* were appointed or made. For example : Evander, suppose, and Numa, invented and formed several religions, or superstitions, and then appointed the Luperci, Potitii, Pinarii, Sallii, &c. to administer. I say then, that religion, in such a case, must naturally go before *priesthood* : which is true, though the *inventor* should *appoint* himself. And therefore Critias was so far in the right, when he thought of fathering religion upon human policy, to ascribe the invention of it to *lawgivers*<sup>a</sup> or *politicians*, not to *priests*. Critias was one of the thirty

running counter to *reason*, and destroying the *use* of it, to leave them out. Therefore the pretences of these gentlemen to *reason* are mere fallacies and impositions upon their readers.

<sup>a</sup> Sextus Empiricus, adv. Physic. lib. ix. p. 562. edit. Fabric.

tyrants of Athens, (in the days of Socrates, whose most unworthy pupil he had once been,) a wicked and profligate man, by all accounts<sup>b</sup>, a perfect Atheist<sup>c</sup>. There could not be a fitter person to set on foot the conceit, that all religion was a trick of state. Euripides, in one of his plays, introduces Sisyphus, an ungodly wretch, as saying the same thing<sup>d</sup>, agreeably to his character: for there is no reason to suspect with Plutarch<sup>e</sup>, (or whoever is the author,) that Euripides there expressed his own sentiments under disguise<sup>f</sup>. I shall not here waste your time in confuting that chimerical notion of Critias and his atheistical companions. It was exploded by all sober men as soon as started: it is sufficiently answered, even by Sextus Empiricus<sup>g</sup>, a Pagan sceptic; but has been since more abundantly confuted and exposed by several learned moderns<sup>h</sup>. The Academic, in Cicero, occasionally makes mention of it, as an impious suggestion, contrived to overturn all religion<sup>i</sup>. Now, as to our particular case, there needs no further answer more than to observe, that it would be infinitely absurd to resolve *Christianity* into *state-craft*, when it is certain and unquestionable fact, that Christianity subsisted for 300 years together, independent of the secular powers, and in defiance to the united *state-craft* of all the

<sup>b</sup> See Bayle's Dictionary in *Critias*.

<sup>c</sup> Plutarch. de Superstitione, Opp. tom. ii. p. 171. Sext. Empiric. p. 182, 562. Theoph. Antioch. lib. iii. p. 292. edit. Hamb.

<sup>d</sup> Euripides in Sisyphus, p. 492. edit. Barnes.

<sup>e</sup> Plutarch. de Placit. Philosoph. tom. ii. p. 880.

<sup>f</sup> Euripides has been well defended by Barnes, in Notis ad Euripid. p. 492, 493; Fabricius, in Not. ad Sext. Empiric. p. 562; Bayle, in *Euripides and Critias*; Stillingfleet, Origin. Sacr. part ii. p. 49; Reimman. Hist. Atheism, p. 123.

<sup>g</sup> Sext. Empiric. p. 556.

<sup>h</sup> Stillingfleet, Origin. Sacr. part ii. ch. 1. Cudworth, Intellect. Syst. p. 691, &c. Tillotson, Serm. i. p. 16. fol. edit. Fabricius de Veritat. Relig. Christianæ, c. ix. p. 317. Fayl Defens. Relig. contr. Toland, p. 51, 52.

<sup>i</sup> Quid? ii qui dixerunt totam de diis immortalibus opinionem fictam esse ab hominibus sapientibus reipublicæ causa, ut quos *ratio* non posset, eos ad officium *religio* duceret; nonne omnem religionem funditus sustulerunt? Ciccr. de Natura Deor. cap. xlii. p. 102. edit. Davis.



world. I shall just take notice, that those *atheistical* objectors, in their blind zeal against religion, happened to lay their indictment wrong. It is true, that many tricks have been played with religion, by princes, states, and people; and many superstitions, false worships, and impostures have owed their birth to those causes: so it was not *religion*, but the *corruptions* of religion, which came in by *state-craft*. Jeroboam, for instance, among the Jews, and Numa among the Romans, served up some *impostures* of their own, superadding them to the old foundation, grafting their own superstitions upon the ancient religion. For the fault has been, (and it resolves into the *depravity* of human nature,) that men generally have not been content with religion, as it came at first *pure* out of the hands of God, but they would have the correcting and refining of it (as they fancied) to themselves; either to accommodate it to their own particular taste, or to serve some other sinister and secular ends. It is the same thing, in the main, with what *infidels* are now doing, and have been doing all along; only with this difference, that *politicians* carried the humour not quite so far: for they were content with *corrupting* religion, while nothing will serve these other gentlemen, but *discarding* it all but the *name*, under pretence still of improving and refining it. There is the same *secular craft* in both cases, only exerting itself in a different way: for both agree in the main leading principle; which is, to take religion into their *own* hands, and to deal with it as they please, abandoning the guidance of *God*, to follow their own *inventions*.

6. But it is time for me now to pass on from *state-craft* to the other more famous article of the two, entitled *priestcraft*. It is a favourite word amongst our modern *unbelievers*, and has been thought to make no small figure in their writings. The *ends* proposed by haranguing upon this abusive topic seem to be, first, to wound *religion* through the sides of its ministers; next, to give vent to some uneasy *passions*; and lastly, if possible, to draw in the unsuspecting, unguarded *laity*, as parties to the quar-

rel against their *guides*. Now as to this compound word *priestcraft*, (since there is a necessity of condescending to these minutenesses,) I take it to mean some *fraud* of priests, in imposing *false facts*, or *false doctrines*, or *false claims* upon the world, under the name of *religion*, for their own humour, ambition, or advantage. The charge of such *sacerdotal* craft hath often been unjustly laid by *anti-sacerdotal* pride or resentment: thus Korah and his company charged Aaron, God's high priest, very injuriously, with *taking too much upon him*<sup>k</sup>; that is to say, with *ambition* or *priestcraft*. Nevertheless, there are instances of *priestcraft* *justly* charged, and in the same Scriptures: there were many *false* priests, such as the priests of Baal, and such as Jeroboam by his wicked policy set up; in both which there was undoubtedly *guile* and *priestcraft*. There were also *true* priests, but very ill men, who misbehaved in their office, and made an infamous merchandise of their holy function: such were Hophni and Phinehas, the two sons of Eli; who are therefore justly chargeable with *priestcraft*, and are perhaps the first examples of it on record. But as the charge is of a very high and heinous nature, it ought never to be made upon mere surmises or suspicions, nor without plain and full proof. It cannot, I presume, be proved that either Christ or his Apostles craftily imposed any *false facts*, or *false doctrines*, or *false claims* upon the world. They were persons as far removed as possible from *craft* and *guile*, in their whole conduct and character: neither could any human device or subtlety, without direct assistance from above, have ever converted the world as they did. *Christianity* therefore in itself is certainly no *priestcraft*; and this is sufficient for us to insist upon, in opposition to Deists. For could they prove ever so much *priestcraft* upon the Christian Clergy, it is all foreign and impertinent to their cause, while *Christianity* itself stands clear of the imputation. A dissenting *Christian*, who should desire a farther reformation, might *pertinently* ex-

<sup>k</sup> Numb. xvi. 3.

claim against the priestcraft of the Christian Clergy, if there were occasion for it: but in a *Deist*, the complaint is beside the purpose; because his quarrel, primarily and properly, is not with the *modern Clergy*, but with *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and with *Christianity* itself. As soon as ever a man discovers himself to be an *infidel*, his complaints against the modern Clergy become *bruta fulmina*, frivolous remonstrances, such as answer themselves. For when it is observed, that those who complain so tragically of the *tyranny* of the Christian and Protestant Clergy, complain also as heavily of the *tyranny* of all *positive* institutions, and of all *revealed* religion, and deal as rudely almost with the *sacred* writers themselves, and even with *God* most high, as they had before done with Christian *priests*; this is clearing up the whole affair to the meanest capacity, and is a more sensible argument in favour of the Clergy, abused with so much better company, than any other apology whatsoever: because now it appears that the principal ground of the displeasure against them is, that they are *Christians*.

We deny not however, that *priests* may be corrupt, as well as *laicks*, for both are *men*. What profession is there which may not, or has not, or will not frequently be abused? *Kings* have often debased the throne of majesty; *senators* have betrayed their most weighty trusts; *judges* have defiled the bench of justice: even *prophets* have misused their prophetic dignity; and one *apostle*, of twelve, disgraced the apostolate itself. How then can it be expected, that *priests* should never shame their order; unless they could plead exemption from human infirmities, or had the privilege to be impeccable? But supposing them ever so corrupt, what argument does it carry with it for the purposes of *Deism*? What if lawyers should be found to pervert both law and justice? does it follow that our legal privileges are all so many *nullities*, that *Magna Charta* is a *fiction*, and the *Statute-book* an *imposture*? I presume, such logic is too light to bear in that case: and I see no reason why it should be of more force in

the other. The faults of Christian *priests*, or of *Christians*, are no argument against the *profession*, but against the *professors* only, as every one knows, and as has been said a thousand times over : and therefore complaints on that head are foreign and impertinent (were they otherwise ever so just) in the mouths of Deists ; though few besides themselves are observed to exaggerate as they do.

There are indeed those who would persuade us, that there is scarce such a thing as a Deist in the kingdom, but that they who are suspected to impugn Christianity, “only write against priestcraft<sup>1</sup>.” It seems they are at length sensible how incompetent the plea is, and how foreign to the cause of infidelity.

We might be heartily glad, my Reverend Brethren, to find the report true : for then how amicably might we unite together, our accusers and we, in condemning and exploding that odious thing, *priestcraft*, to end all disputes. I have no inclination to magnify the number of Deists : I am willing rather to hope they will appear but as an handful of men in comparison. Yet some there certainly are who write against both Testaments, and in such an unfriendly manner, that if they were the most avowed infidels, they could not do more. These men we call Deists, a name of their own choosing to avoid a worse. Some would have us add the epithet of *Christian* to it, and to style them *Christian Deists*<sup>m</sup> : a phrase which it will be hard to make sense of, as here applied, more than of *Christian Pagans*, *Christian Mahometans*, or *Christian Infidels*. Indeed the word *Deist* or *Theist*, in its original signification, implies merely the belief of a *God*, being opposed to *Atheist* : and so there may be *Deists* of various kinds, according to the respective religions which they receive, over and above that prime article. There may be *Pagan Deists*, and *Jewish Deists*, and *Mahometan Deists*, and *Christian Deists* ; meaning such persons as respectively embrace those several religions, above the belief of a *God*.

<sup>1</sup> Examination of the Facts, &c. in the Bishop of Chichester's Sermon, p. 58.

<sup>m</sup> Christianity as old as the Creation, p. 361, 371.

But those that reject all traditional religions, and yet profess to believe in God, are merely *Deists*, or emphatically such, without any additional epithet to distinguish them : or if an epithet must be added, they should be styled *Epicurean Deists*, or *infidel Deists*, or something of like kind. To call them *Christian Deists* is a great abuse of language ; unless Christians were to be distributed into two sorts, *Christians* and *No-christians*, or *Christians* and *Anti-christians*.

It is very true, what a late writer says, that these gentlemen do “ profess to be Christians<sup>n</sup> :” and it were strange if they should not in a *Christian* country, where the very name is venerable ; especially considering that even Hobbes and Spinoza, and others of like principles, did so before them. They understood the policy of introducing *new* doctrines, gradually and imperceptibly, under the cover of the *old* names : so they retained the *terms*, but shifted the *ideas* as they pleased. They retained the name, but laboured to destroy the *thing* under affected and foreign names, viz. *credulity*, *superstition*, *priestcraft*, and the like, as I have been showing.

As to *priestcraft*, which we are now upon, if these gentlemen have any where observed it, they may bear the more patiently with it, because it is much the same thing with what themselves are deeply engaged in ; as they are labouring to impose *false facts*, *false doctrines*, and *false claims* upon the world, under the name of *religion*, for their own humour, ambition, or advantage. Neither is it to the purpose to plead, that “ nobody is paid to maintain Deism,” or that “ no interest attends it<sup>o</sup> ;” for be that ever so true or certain, in the sense intended, (which might bear some dispute,) yet if the maintainers of *Deism* may be supposed to gratify either their *vices*, or their *vanity*, or their *resentments*, they have then an *interest* to serve in doing it ; they are *paid* in such a way as most pleases them ; and none can be paid higher. When any man indulges his predominant passions to the utmost, be the instance what it

<sup>n</sup> Examination of the Bishop of Chichester's Sermon, p. 58.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. p. 60.

will, he thinks himself well *paid* in doing it, and he is a *gainer* so far, in his own account, because he gains his end P.

But perhaps there may be some reflection insinuated against the maintainers of *Christianity*, as they are *paid* for doing it. The fact is true, and it is an honour to them, that they are paid by the *public*. It is an argument that what they teach is conformable, in the main, to the general sentiments of the *wisest* and *best* men amongst us, is the sense of the *legislature*, and voice of the *whole nation*; not *private persuasions*: a circumstance, as I conceive, very much in their favour, and, other things supposed equal, a presumption that *truth* is with them, rather than the contrary. Besides such public allotments are so many

▷ A fine writer turns the argument upon them another way: "There is something so ridiculous and perverse in this kind of zealots, that one does not know how to set them out in their proper colours. They are a sort of *gamesters*, who are eternally upon the fret, though they *play for nothing*. They are perpetually teasing their friends to come over to them, though at the same time they allow that neither of them shall get any thing by the bargain. In short, the *zeal of spreading Atheism* is, if possible, more absurd than *Atheism* itself." *Addison's Evidences*, &c. p. 223. Another very ingenious writer hints the same thing more briefly thus: "One would think that libertines, of all men, should be unconcerned in making *prose-bytes*; since they expect no *future* reward for their labour, and to succeed in it, would be only to spoil their *present* market." *Inquiry after Wit*, p. 90.

The turn of the thought in both appears to be very just, as to any real or lasting interest here or hereafter: but yet those gentlemen have an interest to serve in what they do, and they know what they *play for*, so long as they run no great risks in a temporal account, and are regardless of the future. It is a pleasure to some, merely to be *talked of*, as men of uncommon sentiments. Most have a fondness for their own conceptions, though never so much out of the way; and they expect to be highly *admired* for them: some affect to *surprise* the public with *paradoxes*, and they are sure to gratify some of the looser sort, and to obtain their *applauses*. Add to this, that it is a *relief* to many, to fence as much as possible against their inward fears, doubts, and misgivings, by any strained declamations: and as they are *uneasy* to find that religion is held in honour, or priests in esteem, they may be inclinable to try how far it may be practicable to turn the current of *public repute*, or however to bear up against it, for a time. These things considered, I do not think it so hard to account for some men's *zeal in spreading Atheism* or *Deism*, as for their being *Atheists* or *Deists*.

testimonies given to the dignity and usefulness of their ministry, like as in other useful and honourable employments, *civil* and *military*. And what can be the reason that *Deism*, which has subsisted now for 2000 years, or more, (reckoning from the days of Epicurus,) should never yet meet with any kingdom or state, among Pagans, Jews, Mahometans, or Christians, that should judge it a thing proper to be supported at the public charge, or *worth* the *rewarding*? I forbear to say more. Let those gentlemen then go and tell it abroad, as much or as often as they please, that the ministers of Christ are *paid* for defending Christianity, or *hired* to do it, (for so they love to express it;) it is all very well, so long as the *labourers* are *worthy* of their *hire*. And when those other gentlemen shall please to produce any thing as useful to society as *Christianity* is, and as beneficial to mankind, here and hereafter, then may they also reasonably hope for the like *honour* of being *paid* by the public for it. It is neither mean nor blameworthy in the general, to take rewards for *good* services; but it is always a fault to serve as volunteers in *bad* ones. Those that defend Christianity do the thing that is *right*, (whatever their motives be;) while those that either corrupt it, mutilate it, or discard it, do *wrong*, which makes a sensible difference. As to *motives*, here or there, the favourable presumption will always lie on the side of the *religious*, that their motives are not merely *secular*, because they believe in a judgment to come, which their accusers despise. Christians *may* act purely upon secular motives, but infidels of course *will*: therefore let them not reproach us on this head.

I have but one thing farther to add upon the subject of *priestcraft*, namely, that after all the clamours which have been raised about it in this *Protestant* kingdom, I cannot

¶ Christianity as old as the Creation, p. 165, 233, 234, 305.

¶ Luke x. 7.

¶ The words of a learned Protestant abroad may here be properly inserted.

An est religio *reformata* politis in totum adaptata? An in verbi divini præconum emolumentum concinnata, quorum stipendia plerisque in locis ad

yet perceive any great danger there is of it; except it be from that very quarter from whence all the clamour comes. Indeed if *Deism* should once spread among the *laity*, it may in time insinuate itself farther; and then probably *priestcraft* may be the consequence: for the most noted masters of that *craft* (such for instance as Pope Leo the Tenth) have been shrewdly suspected to have been *Deists* or *Infidels* in masquerade, by some loose sayings which they dropped. The sons of Eli before mentioned, as infamous for *priestcraft*, “were sons of Belial; they knew not “the Lord’;” they were practical infidels, if not more. Wherever there is most *infidelity*, there in all likelihood will be the most craft and guile of every kind. Men that seriously *fear God* and reverence *sacred Writ*, will of course abhor both *priestcraft* and *anti-priestcraft*: but *infidels*, in a sacerdotal capacity, or out of it, may be prepared for any *cunning craftiness* whatever. Therefore, I say, the introducing and propagating of *infidelity* is the likeliest means to bring in *priestcraft*. The same thing is further evident in another view: *indifference* to all religions saps the principles of the Reformation, and tends to prepare men equally, either for *no religion*, or for any *corrupt* religion that may offer. Besides, all *confusion* and *distraction* in religion amongst us weakens the *Protestant* interest; and whatever that loses, another interest gains. So that *infidelity* in this light can serve only to pave the way for the

assem usque definita sunt? An est horum pietas ars et purus putus questus? An vendunt sacra? An falsis miraculis et fabulis anilibus vulgus imperitum decipiunt, nisi pias conciones de Deo et Christo, de nostri Salvatoris ejusque Apostolorum miraculis, de pœnis et præmiis post mortem, commenta esse velit *Adeisdæmon*, qui, nisi me fallit mens, id non distitebitur? An fraudes et mendacia aucupantur ii qui populo nudam veritatem ex sacris literis exponunt?—Ubinam igitur sunt tot et tantæ fraudes et nundinationes omnium religionum sacerdotum, et eorum qui sacris præsent, et unquam aut usquam præfuerunt, ne quidem exceptis Judæis, Christianis, et Reformatis (qui rediivi sunt Christiani) ab *Adeisdæmone* tam confidenter decantatæ, et tam audacter exprobratæ? Nullibi, ut puto, extant, nisi in deliris Atheorum cerebellis, et in religionis hostium scommatibus et convitiis. *Fayi Defens. Relig. cont. Toland.* p. 60, 61.

1 Sam. ii. 12.



return of antiquated *superstitions*, and to bring *priestcraft* in again at a back door. Consistent men these all the while! to be perpetually declaiming against *priestcraft*, and at the same time labouring to the utmost (knowingly or ignorantly) to introduce it. To be short, the only sure way to keep out *priestcraft* is to exclude *infidelity*; to reverence the *Bible*; to support a *Protestant* government and a *Protestant* Clergy; to esteem those of the Clergy that honour God, and deserve well of their function; and when any of them misbehave, either to cover their faults, or to prosecute them in legal form, that so all *scandals* may be put away from us.

7. The seventh and last article of impeachment against the Christian religion is that of *imposture*: an odious charge, a compendious calumny, all reproaches in one. I need not be long in answering it, having in a great measure anticipated myself already under the former heads. That there is an *imposture* somewhere is very certain: and the only question is, who are the *impostors*? Reckon up the *marks* and *characters* of an imposture<sup>u</sup>: apply them, first, to Christ and his doctrine and followers, and see whether they will fit; and next apply them to Hobbes, Spinoza, &c. and their doctrines and followers, and see whether they will not fit. What can we think of men who set themselves up, in the name of God, *uncalled*, and as *rival teachers* to Moses and the Prophets, to Christ

<sup>u</sup> They are reckoned up by Dr. Prideaux, as follows:

1. That it must always have for its *end* some carnal interest.
  2. That it can have none but *wicked* men for the authors of it.
  3. That both these must appear in the very *texture* of the imposture itself.
  4. That it can never be so framed, but that it must contain some palpable *falsities*, which shall discover the falsity of the rest.
  5. That wherever it is first propagated, it must be done by *craft* and *fraud*.
  6. That when intrusted with many conspirators, it can never be long concealed.
  7. That it can never be established, unless backed with force and violence.
- Prideaux, Letter to Deists, p. 7.*

and his Apostles : who recommend their own loose systems in the room of *God's word*, and substitute their reveries in the place of the *Bible* : whose *religion* is nobody knows what, because it is to be what every man shall carve out for himself by his own *internal light* ; and likely to be as *various* as men's capacities, tempers, circumstances, or faces : whose *morality*, short and superficial at the best, is further defective as wanting a proper *authority* to support it, and *sanctions* <sup>x</sup> to bind it, and so is next to no *morality* ; and whose *virtue* is little more than an *idea*, or a dead and empty name<sup>y</sup>. Whose *God* is either *universal nature*, (no God at all, in any proper sense <sup>z</sup>,) or else a kind of Epicurean Deity, tied up from interposing at all by *miracles*, and from issuing out any *positive* laws, and from making any rule or order in things *indifferent* here, and from doing *exemplary* justice upon sinners hereafter : for such his vindictive *justice* is profanely miscalled or misconstrued *spite*, *wrath*, *malice*, *revenge*, *tyranny* <sup>a</sup>, and the like. As Epicurus's principal aim, after courteously acknowledging a *Deity*, was to divest him of his rule and governance, and to *disarm* him of his *terrors*<sup>b</sup> ; so modern

<sup>x</sup> It is doubtful whether those gentlemen, many of them, admit any *future* state at all. To say nothing of Acosta, or other single writers that absolutely rejected it, the Pantheists (who are thought to make the most considerable body) plainly discard it, if we may judge from their own systems. " Ut omnium rerum nobis initium ortus attulit, sic adferet mors exitum : ut horum nihil ad nos ante ortum pertinuit, sic nihil post mortem pertinebit." *Pantheisticon*, p. 71. Some that seem to admit a future state, yet plainly reject future *penalties*. See two Letters from a Deist to his Friend, p. 2, 17, 19. The author of *Christianity as old*, &c. declares against all future penalties, but such as shall be for the *amendment* of the party, (ch. iv.) which may amount to declaring against all, unless he admits a *purgatory* : which he has not yet mentioned. He declares also against punishment having any *retrospect*, because " what is past cannot be helped," (Second Address, p. 7.) which, in effect, is declaring against all proper *punishment* for sins ; and is exempting the *obstinate* and *incorrigible*, who most deserve punishment, from being punished at all.

<sup>y</sup> See *Scripture Vindicated*, vol. vi. part 2. p. 168, &c.

<sup>z</sup> See *Wollaston's Religion of Nature delineated*, p. 76.

<sup>a</sup> See *Christianity as old*, &c. p. 38, 42.

<sup>b</sup> Tu denique, Epicure, Deum *inermem* facis, omnia illi *tela*, omnem de-

*Deism* evidently centers in the same design, and differs only in a few slight circumstances, as to the manner of pursuing it.

Now what is all this wild doctrine, this compound of profaneness and absurdities, (so solemnly delivered out in the face of the world,) but a *fraud* and imposition upon the public, a *cheat* upon the populace, a formal *imposture*? And if I be not very much mistaken, it is an imposture of a more *pernicious* nature, and of a more *fatal* tendency, (were it possible it should ever prevail,) than any other noted imposture whatsoever, ancient or modern. *Mahometism*, *Paganism*, and *paganized Christianity*, amidst a great deal of rubbish, have yet retained the prime fundamentals of *virtue* and *godliness*; viz. the belief of a *God* and a *providence*, the *immortality* of the *soul*, and a *future judgment*, together with *eternal* rewards and punishments: but *infidelity*, or modern *Deism*, (which is little else but revived *Epicureism*, *Sadducism*, and *Zendichism*,) is so exceeding loose upon the heads aforementioned, that one knows not what solid foundation it leaves, or whether any, for *virtue* and *godliness* to rest upon. In this view, therefore, it must appear the most *pernicious* imposture that the world has yet known.

Then as to the *method* of promoting it, it is such as threatens the destruction of all *sincerity* and common *probity*. The strength of it lies wholly in falsification, stratagem, and wile. It cannot be *pleaded for* decently, without *disowning* it, verbally, at the same time, and without

traxisti *potentiam*; et ne cuiquam metnendus esset, projecisti illum extra motum. Hunc igitur inseptum ingenti quodam et inexplicabili muro, divisumque a contactu, et a conspectu mortalium, non habes quare verearis: nulla illi nec tribuendi, nec nocendi materia est. *Seneca de Benef.* lib. iv. cap. 19. p. 436.

• Cæterum, ut olim obtrectatoribus ethnicis *imposturas* Christianismo objicientibus, reponerat Origenes (lib. vi. contr. Celsum) ipsos *impostores* esse omnium maximos; ad eundem modum et nos in novos illos philosophos [Hobbium, Spinosam, &c.] hanc faciem retorquemus, *fraudumque* eos et *imposturarum* postulamus. *Kortholt. de tribus Impostoribus magnis*, p. 3, 4.

making it pass for the very reverse of what it really is. Never was there such an abuse of *good words*, or such a misapplication of *bad ones*, in any other cause, nor ever will be. *Truth, reason, morality, virtue, natural religion, internal revelation, Christianity*, are all of them made names or titles for *libertinism* and *irreligion*; while *credulity, bigotry, &c.* are made the names for true *religion* and *godliness*: which is miscalling evil *good*, and good *evil*, in a detestable manner, and to a degree beyond example. These things considered, I scruple not to repeat, that there never was a greater or a more unnatural *imposture* offered to the world, than what is seen in modern *deism, or infidelity*.

I do not hereby intend to deny all *degrees* in infidelity, or to condemn all equally: the infidel schemes are various, and some worse than others. *Pantheism*, for instance, and *Hobbism* are scandalously bad, scarce differing from the broadest *Atheism*: and *Fatalism*, in effect, is but little better. There may be modester schemes than these. But yet take the best and most refined system of *Deism*, that either has been or can be invented, and what is it (in our present circumstances) but the *folly of man*, set up in opposition to the *wisdom of Heaven*? a confused medley of jarring sentiments, huddled up together blindly and presumptuously, *without God* and *against God*? I mean no reflection here upon *natural religion*; which (*abstracted* from revealed, after borrowing much from it) is an excellent thing<sup>d</sup>, and worthy of all acceptance so far as it goes.

<sup>d</sup> There are several good systems of *natural religion*, but three more particularly, drawn up by three able men, Cumberland, Wilkins, and Wollaston; who all took a rational and consistent way, and such as must inevitably terminate, when properly pursued, in a serious belief of Divine revelation. On the other hand, *Deism*, which rejects all Divine revelation, must as inevitably terminate, if *consistently* pursued, in downright *Atheism*; as Dr. Clarke has well shown in his *Evidences of natural and revealed Religion*, p. 19—33. fourth edit.

One might be apt to expect, since the *Deists* talk so much of the *perfection* of natural religion, that they should be willing at least to adopt the most *perfect* systems of it, such as I have mentioned; rather than leave it to

*Natural religion* and modern *Deism* are not the same thing, but widely different. It were much to be wished, that *Deists* were *sincerely* in the interests of *natural religion*: they could not long be *Deists*, if they were. For, not to mention several other considerations, I shall only observe here, that it is a clear and self-evident dictate of *natural religion*, to believe and embrace whatever God has *revealed* or shall *reveal*, as soon as sufficient proof shall be made of its being so. "Whatever is immediately *revealed* from God, must, as well as any thing else, be treated as *what it is*; which it cannot be, if it is not treated with the *highest regard, believed, and obeyed*."\*

I have now, my Reverend Brethren, run through the

every day-labourer to draw one out for himself. But they have reasons perhaps for not doing it. For,

1. The *morality* in those systems is so extensive, strict, and pure, that they might almost as well be *Christians*, (in point of *restraint*), as be obliged to submit to all the rules there prescribed.

2. If they were once to admit such a thread of clear and close reasoning, and resolve to pursue it as far as it would carry them, they could not avoid being *Christians*. For the proofs of Christianity stand upon as clear a foot as *natural religion* itself does, especially in its remoter branches: besides that, the law of *nature*, or *reason*, will now of course take in *revelation*, and make it one of its own dictates.

3. The principal aim and design of the *Deists* would be defeated and frustrated, as it seems, were they to espouse any such *certain* scheme, that should be admitted, as a *common* rule for all men. The three excellent writers before named, intended one *common* invariable rule, such as none should swerve from; but infidelity appears to admit of no common and invariable system, but to affect an *independent, personal, various* religion, according as every man may fancy: [see *Literal Scheme*, p. 435.]—and the result will be, that every one shall be left to do *what seemeth him good in his own eyes*. Which, perhaps, is the true reason, why every man is to have the forming of the rule to *himself*, by his own *internal light*, without the help of external revelation from God, or instruction from men. See *Christianity* as old, &c. p. 277, 279, 280, 281, 295, 296, 305, 309, 379.

Upon the whole, *Deists* are neither for a *revealed* religion, nor for a *natural* one, justly so called, but for as many *natural religions*, as there are men of different circumstances and abilities. They are for a *personal* religion of their *own* carving, or none: which is not espousing *natural religion*, in any proper sense, but *libertinism* only and *irreligion*, under the name of the religion of nature.

\* Wollaston, p. 211.

several opprobrious aspersions and odious imputations cast upon *Christianity*, endeavouring all the way to show, not only that they are wrongfully charged upon Christians, but that they are, for the most part, *justly* chargeable upon the accusers themselves; who have been sending their readers upon a false pursuit after *credulity*, *bigotry*, &c. where they are not, only to turn their eyes off from observing where they really are. True religion will ever shine, whether considered in itself, or compared with the misshapen schemes set up against it: and those who are not yet duly apprised of its *absolute* value may yet perceive enough of its *comparative* excellency over *infidelity*; as a man that doubts even of true coin may know a plain counterfeit when he sees it, and may be certain of thus much at least, that one is no way comparable to the other.

I shall only add, that if we take a survey of mankind in former ages, we shall find, that though they had the same inclinations to *ease* and *pleasure* as we may now have, and the same aversion to *restraints*; and though they were as willing to get rid of the terrible apprehensions of *God* and a *world to come*, as any of us now can be; yet so strong were the impressions of religion every where, that *infidelity* could not maintain its ground, even in the darkest times of *Paganism*; much less can it be able to do it now. Or supposing it might, yet what could its patrons expect to gain by it in conclusion, after once the wanton humour should go round, but to fall, with others, in the universal ruin? In the mean while, it is observable, that they are themselves, in some measure, sensible of the *use* of *religion*, as often as their own liberty, property, or reputation is concerned, and they then claim with some earnestness the *benefits* of it; condemning others as profane, wicked, or impious, (words without *sense*, or however without *force*, upon their principles,) who are but suspected to treat them wrongfully. It is only when they consider themselves as *actors*, that religion appears so grievous a *restraint*; for when they look upon themselves as *sufferers*, it is as great a *relief*: and then

that religion, which at other times is ill thought of, as an enemy to *liberty*, is found to be the best and surest friend to it. To conclude, since their *licentious* principles are condemned absolutely by all mankind but themselves, and by themselves also at times, and in particular circumstances; more needs not be said to show how erroneous and pernicious they are, and how justly odious in the sight both of God and man.

A  
DISCOURSE  
OF  
FUNDAMENTALS,  
BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF  
TWO CHARGES  
DELIVERED TO THE  
MIDDLESEX CLERGY,  
*AT THE EASTER VISITATIONS OF 1734 AND 1735.*





---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

UPON a serious and attentive review of the general state of religion amongst us, and of the particular controversies now depending, I could not think of any subject more useful, or at this time more seasonable, than the subject of *fundamentals*. The name is a noted name, frequently occurring in religious debates: but the notion is often left obscure, and the application is so various among contending parties, that it may be difficult to fix any certain rule for it, though it is allowed, on all hands, that much depends upon it.

Lord Verulam, at the beginning of the last century, expressed his judgment of the great *importance* of distinguishing rightly between points *fundamental* and points of *further perfection*; so he worded the distinction, though, I think, not accurately. At the same time he complimented the Divines of that age, as having done their parts to entire satisfaction upon that article<sup>a</sup>. But upon more mature consideration, twenty years after, or nearly, he apprehended that some further improvement was still wanting, and so he recommended it, among the *desiderata* in theology, to the care and diligence of succeeding Divines<sup>b</sup>.

The subject has since passed through many learned and judicious hands<sup>c</sup>, most of them complaining of the per-

- \* See *Advancement of Learning*, p. 320, 321. first ed. A. D. 1605.
- † *Augmentum Scientiarum*, lib. ix. p. 532, 533. ed. Paris. A. D. 1624.
- 1635. *Mede's Letters*, Opp. vol. ii. p. 1064—1074.
- 1638. Chillingworth, part i. chap. 3d. p. 115.
- 1650. Johann. Hoornebeck, *Socin. Confut.* tom. i. lib. 1. cap. 9. p. 181. *Exercitat. Theolog.* p. 712, &c.
- 1654. Dr. Hammond, Opp. vol. i. p. 275.
- 1665. Bp. Stillingfleet, *Rat. Account*, part i. cap. 2, 3, 4.
- 1680. Lambert. Velthuysius, Opp. vol. i. p. 693.
- 1682. Dean Sherlock, *Vindic. of Stillingfleet*, chap. 5.

plexities appearing in it, but all bearing testimony to the great weight and importance of it<sup>d</sup>.

The very name of *fundamental* carries in it some confuse general idea of *weight* and *significancy*; which again rises in proportion to the dignity of the subject whereunto it belongs. Every *art* or *science*, every *society*, *system*, or *constitution*, has its *fundamental* rules, laws, principles, or constituents, which it rests upon, and whereby it subsists. The word *fundamental*, in such cases, seems to mean the same thing with *essential*, and to denote that wherein the very *essence* or *subsistence* of the subject spoken of is contained. And as there is a just distinction to be made between *essentials* and *circumstantials*, so is there the like just distinction to be made between *fundamentals* and *extra-fundamentals*, or *non-fundamentals*. When we apply the epithet *fundamental* either to religion in general or to Christianity in particular, we are supposed to mean something *essential* to religion or Christianity; so necessary to its being, or at least to its well-being, that it could not subsist, or not maintain itself tolerably without it.

There is in Scripture itself, as well as in the reason of the thing, ground sufficient for distinguishing between points fundamental to Christianity and points of smaller

1693. Dr. Clagett, vol. ii. Serm. second and third.

1694. Frid. Spanheim. Fil. Opp. tom. iii. p. 1289, &c.

1696. Puffendorf. Jus feciale Divinum: sive de Consensu et Dissensu Protestantium.

1697. Witsius. In Symbolum Apostol. p. 9, &c.

1719. Alphons. Turretin de Articulis Fundamentalibus.

<sup>d</sup> *Ardua* satis et tamen *necessaria* est disquisitio de dogmatibus et erroribus *fundamentalibus*. Hinc enim pendent disputationes et deliberationes de *libertate prophetandi*, de *tolerantia et moderatione*, de *hæresi*, de *secessione*, de *scismate*, de *unione et syncretismo* ecclesiarum, de *excommunicatione*, &c. Voetius, Disp. 5. Conf. Spanheim. p. 1289.

Res sane *difficilis*, sed cujus difficultas *incredibili* quadam utilitate compensatur. Nam, primo, Te dogmatum *fundamentalium* a cæteris distinctio, in *praxi* magnopere adjuvabit. Secundo, Ea res ad Christianorum *concordiam* munitam viam parabit: quomodo enim pacis iniri consilia, antequam illud in genere decernatur, *quid sit dogma fundamentale*, nec intelligi quidem potest. Steph. Gausen. Dissert. Theolog. p. 104. edit. Halæ.

moment. There are the *weightier* matters, and the matters *less weighty*; some things deserving our most *earnest heed*, others requiring no more than ordinary or common care. I shall not take up your time in commenting upon the several *texts* which appear to have intimated the distinction, or to have expressed it in terms<sup>e</sup>. The whole tenor of the New Testament abundantly authorizes the distinction, while it lays a very particular stress upon some doctrines more than upon others, and while it condemns the contrary tenets as *subversive* of the Gospel, or as *frustrating* the *grace* of God, or as rendering the false teachers altogether unworthy of Christian communion. The whole conduct of our Lord's Apostles sufficiently declares the same thing: but I shall instance only in St. Paul, that I may not be tedious in a plain case. There were in the days of the Apostles, Judaizers of two several kinds; some thinking themselves obliged, as Jews, to retain their Judaism along with Christianity, others conceiving that the Mosaical law was so necessary, that it ought to be received, under pain of damnation, by all, whether Jews or Gentiles. Both the opinions were wrong; but the one was *tolerable*, and the other was *intolerable*. Wherefore St. Paul complied in some measure with the Judaizers of the first sort, being willing, in such cases, "to become all things to all men<sup>f</sup>:" and he exhorted his new converts of the Gentiles to bear with them, and to receive them as brethren<sup>g</sup>. But as to the Judaizers of the second sort, he would not "give place to them by subjection, no not for an hour, lest the truth of the Gospel" should fatally suffer by it<sup>h</sup>. He anathematized them as subverters of the faith of Christ, and as a reproach to the Christian name<sup>i</sup>. This single instance may suffice to point

<sup>e</sup> See the texts brought together and descanted upon in Hoornbeek, Socin. Confut. lib. i. cap. 9. p. 188, &c. Velthuysius, Tract. de Fundament. p. 705. Frid. Spanheim. tom. iii. 1058. 1305. Turretin. de Fundam. p. 7, 8.

<sup>f</sup> See 1 Cor. ix. 19—23. Acts xvi. 3. Acts xxi. 21—26.

<sup>g</sup> See Rom. xiv. xv. Coloss. ii. 16, 17.

<sup>h</sup> Gal. ii. 5, 21.

<sup>i</sup> Gal. i. 7, 8, 9. v. 12.

out the distinction between *fundamentals* and *non-fundamentals*; and to illustrate the use of it in practice.

The primitive churches afterwards had the same distinction all along in their eye, as might be made appear from numerous and plain testimonies<sup>k</sup>. But their ordinary conduct in admitting persons to communion, or rejecting them from it, according to that rule<sup>l</sup>, is a plain and sensible argument drawn from certain fact, which supersedes all further inquiries. Unity in the *fundamental* articles of faith was always strictly insisted upon as one necessary condition of church membership: and if any man openly and resolutely opposed those articles, or any of them, he was rejected as a deserter of the *common faith*, and treated as an *alien*.

From hence then it may appear, that the *distinction* which we are now upon is *ancient* and *well grounded*: and of what *moment* it is may be collected from hence, that the previous question, in almost every dispute concerning *church communion*, depends upon it. Nor need we wonder if much pains has been taken by many to perplex and entangle it: for they who are most afraid of being condemned by the rule will declare against it, or will warp and pervert it, to make it serve their own purposes. Hence it is that we have almost as many different rules for determining *fundamentals*, as there are different sects or parties; and that which might otherwise serve (if all men were reasonable) to end all differences, has itself been too often made one principal bone of contention.

But though perverse disputers may at any time raise clouds and darkness, and there is no rule so clear, but a wrangler may contrive a thousand ways to perplex and entangle it; yet if the point can but be once settled upon a *rational* foot, the clearing it so far will suffice among the *honest* and *reasonable* part of mankind; and it is an

<sup>k</sup> See many of those testimonies collected in Frid. Spanheim. tom. iii. 1059, 1306. Hoorabeeck. Socin. Confut. lib. i. cap. 9. p. 210. Turretin. p. 9.

<sup>l</sup> See Bingham, Christian Antiquities, b. xvi. cap. 1.

end worthy of our thoughts and care<sup>m</sup>. It is morally certain that all schemes or projects for any *perfect union* of Christians, however well intended or wisely laid, will at length fail in the issue, (through the almost infinite variety of capacities, tempers, interests, passions, prejudices,) just as all schemes for an *universal peace* throughout the world (or only over all Europe) will of course fail of effect: nevertheless, we ought evermore seriously to seek after *peace*, whether religious or secular, and to promote the same by instruction, counsel, and endeavour, as far as *possible*, or *reasonable*, leaving the event to God. And therefore there is no reason for throwing aside any *useful* means of making peace, though some persons will not admit of them, and others may turn them into a matter of more strife.

As the distinction between doctrines *fundamental* and *non-fundamental* is undoubtedly just in the general, and is confessed, in a manner, by all parties to be a good *previous* rule for settling the terms of *Christian communion*, there is certainly a way of clearing it from all *reasonable* exceptions, however difficult it may be to come at that way. *Error* may run men into inextricable mazes, and commonly does so: but *true* and *right* principles, regularly and aptly pursued, will always find a clear exit. I proceed then to the business in hand.

It will be needless here to distinguish between the fundamentals of *natural* and *revealed* religion, because revealed takes in both, and both, so considered, fall into one. It will be equally needless to distinguish nicely between the several fundamentals of *faith*, *worship*, and *morality*, because all of them indifferently are *essential* to Christianity, and ought equally to be insisted upon, as terms of *Christian communion*. But it may be highly needful to distin-

<sup>m</sup> *Optari id magis potest quam sperari inter Christianos ut conveniatur vel in iudicio de necessariis et fundamentalibus religionis, vel ut in iis ab omnibus unanimiter stetur—Adeo aliud est, quid hic alibique fieri debeat videre et monere; aliud, quid fieri possit, vel eventurum videatur, indicare. Hoornbeek, lib. i. cap. 9. p. 199.*

guish fundamentals considered in an *abstract* view, as essentials of the Christian *fabric* or *system*, (in which view it is, that they are most properly called *essentials* and *fundamentals*,) and fundamentals considered in a *relative* view to particular persons, in which respect they are frequently called *necessaries*, as being ordinarily necessary to salvation. For though the *fundamentals* and the *necessaries* do really coincide, and are indeed the same thing, (*equal capacities and opportunities supposed*,) yet so great is the variety of capacities and opportunities in different persons, that one rule and measure of *necessaries* will not equally serve for all. The want of observing this very useful distinction between *fundamentals* as such in an *abstract* view, and *necessaries* as such in a *relative* view, has unhappily occasioned much confusion in our present subject: and therefore the surest and readiest way to clear it up to satisfaction will be to attend carefully to the distinction now mentioned<sup>n</sup>. Fundamentals in their *abstract* view are of a fixed determined nature as much as Christianity itself is, and may be ascertained by plain and unalterable rules: but fundamentals in their *relative* view to persons will always vary with the *capacities* and *opportunities* of the persons. There is no certain judgment to be made as to particular men, either with respect to their *heads* or their *hearts*: neither can we presume to determine in special how far the Divine mercies may extend<sup>o</sup> towards

<sup>n</sup> Bp. Stillingfleet means the same thing in the main, though he words it differently, where he distinguishes between what things are *necessary* to the salvation of men *as such*, or considered in their *single* or *private* capacities; and what things are *necessary* to be owned in order to salvation by *Christian societies*, or as the *bonds* and *conditions* of *ecclesiastical communion*. Whereupon he further adds: "The want of understanding this *distinction* of the "necessity of things has caused most of the perplexities and confusion in "this controversy of fundamentals." *Stillingfleet, Rat. Account*, part i. cap. 2. p. 49.

<sup>o</sup> Ad salutem quæ præcise exigantur, ita ut sine iis et explicite et huc vel eo usque agnitis, nemo a Deo salvetur vel salvari possit, ecquis determinabit? sc. *minimum quod sic*. Neque *Dei consiliarius* aliquis existit, vel *Judex salutis aut damnationis* ab ipso est constitutus, ut non modo doceat necessaria ad salutem creditu factuque, (quod omnium doctorum est,) sed de-

*idiots*, or men next to *idiots*; toward *enthusiasts*, or others not far from *enthusiasts*; towards even sensible and learned men erring *fundamentally*, but under some *unconquerable* prejudice or disorder of mind P. In this view, there is no fixed measure of *fundamentals*: or to speak more properly, though *fundamentals* as such are fixed and established in the very nature or reason of things, yet *necessaries* as such are not so; neither need they be. The way then is, to abstract from *persons*, and to consider *fundamentals* under a distinct view, as referring to the *fabric* of Christianity. All parties almost one way or other, one time or another, do admit of the like distinction, making the *terms* of *communion* somewhat stricter than the *necessary terms* of *salvation*: that is to say, they exclude many from communion as erring *fundamentally*, whom notwithstanding they do not, they dare not condemn absolutely to everlasting perdition.

The reason is, because they can make no certain estimate of the *infirmities* or *incapacities* which the men may unhappily lie under, nor of the *allowances* which an all-seeing God may please to make to them upon that score. The Romanists, who are commonly the most severe in

*finiat cum quo et quanto sive vitio sive errore, aliquis non possit ad salutem admitti, vel possit.*

Ad salutem quæ requirat Deus, et quæ nobis velit esse cordi, verbum ejus copiose tradit: at quid *ipse velit facere*, et quomodo aut quousque vel pro *misericordia* cum hominibus agere aut *justitia*, ipsi relinquendum duco. Loquor de *precisa* ultimi termini in peccato vel errore ad salutem vel damnationem *definitione*: mihi quidem, quicquid alii aliter censeant, visum semper inscrutabile. *Hoornbeeck. Exercit. Theolog. p. 713.*

P It may be noted, that though the Scripture says absolutely, "He that believeth not shall be damned," and the Athanasian and other creeds have followed the like absolute form of expression, yet from other places of Scripture, and from the nature of the thing, it is plain that such forms of expression are always to be understood with grains of allowance for *invincible ignorance* or *unavoidable infirmity*, as all the Divine *laws* concerning either matters of *faith* or matters of *practice* are to be understood: they bind according to what a man *hath*, or *might have* if he would; and not according to what he *hath not* and *could not have*. This exception is so just and evident, that it was sufficient for *Scripture* or *creeds* to *suppose* it generally, rather than to *mention it*: for every one's common sense will readily supply it.



their censures of any men whatever, yet sometimes do make a distinction between excluding men absolutely from *Christian communion*, and peremptorily sentencing the same men to *eternal damnation*<sup>q</sup>. The Remonstrants, who in debate, and to serve a cause, love to confound *fundamentals* with *necessaries*, or *fundamentals* of *communion* with *fundamentals* of *salvation*, are yet observed to distinguish them in practice: for they receive not Jews, Turks, Pagans, or wild sectaries professing Christianity, as friends or brethren, and yet they presume not to exclude them absolutely from all possibility of being saved<sup>r</sup>. All which shows, that a distinction ought to be made between *fundamentals* considered in their *abstract* nature, as *essential* parts of the Christian system, and *fundamentals* considered in a *relative* view to the salvation of particular persons.

Having thus far cleared the way, by separating from the subject what belongs not to it, (but has been unwarily or insidiously brought in, to perplex and confound it,) I may now proceed to the explaining the *ratio* of a *fundamental* truth or error, and to the fixing some certain *rule* whereby to discover or determine what kind of doctrines or positions properly fall under such denomination.

<sup>q</sup> Non esse æqualiter definitos aut definiendos *terminos communionis cum ecclesia invisibili* atque adeo cum Christo et gratia Dei; et *terminos communionis cum ecclesia externa visibili*, docet disputatio nostrorum cum pontificiis, quod excommunicati possint esse in ecclesia; et altera, de salute majorum nostrorum sub papatu. Quin et ipsi *pontificii* moderatores, Græcos aliosque Orientales extra communionem ecclesiæ positos, ab omni salute non excludunt: immo ne *reformatos* quidem, ex sensu Cassandri, Renati Benedicti et qui illos sequuntur. *Voetius*, Disput. 5.

<sup>r</sup> Hactenus non vidimus tales Judæos a societate Remonstrantium gehennæ adjudicatos. Idem dicendum est de Gentilibus, Mahumetistis, Samaritis, Henric-Nicolaitis, David-Joristis, Franckistis, Stephelianis, Weigelianis, Pontificiis moderatoribus, Anabaptistis, Torrentianis, &c. Aut omnes illos a Deo et cælo necessario exclusissimos pronuntient, aut communionem et fraternitate sua dignos judicent; et consequenter dilectionem illam suam ac moderationem Remonstranticam ilico exerçant, invitando et recipiendo illos in communionem suam. *Voetius*, *ibid.*

“ A *fundamental doctrine* is such a doctrine as is in strict sense of the *essence* of Christianity, without which the whole building and superstructure must fall; the belief of which is necessary to the very being of Christianity, like the *first principles* of any art or science<sup>s</sup>.” So says a learned and judicious writer: and this may serve for a good general description of what *fundamental* means, as likewise for a first principle or *postulatum*, to proceed upon in our farther inquiries.

The next step we advance to, and which bears an immediate connection with the former, is, that such doctrines as are found to be *intrinsic* or *essential* to the *Christian covenant* are *fundamental truths*, and such as are plainly and directly *subversive* of it are *fundamental errors*.

To be more particular, the *Christian covenant* may be considered as containing or including the several articles here following. 1. A Founder and principal Covenanter. 2. A subject capable of being covenanted with. 3. A charter of foundation. 4. A Mediator. 5. Conditions to be performed. 6. Aids or means to enable to performance. 7. Sanctions also, to bind the covenant, and to secure obedience.

I. The first article to be considered is, the *Founder* and principal Covenanter: for without this, there could be no such *covenant* as is here supposed; a covenant of grace and salvation made with mankind by God the Father, in and by Christ Jesus<sup>t</sup>. Hence it is evident, that the *existence* of a *Deity* is a *fundamental* article of doctrine; and to deny or to disbelieve it is to err *fundamentally*. In

<sup>s</sup> Sherlock, Vindicat. of the Def. of Stillingfleet, p. 256.

Articuli *fundamentales* ea sunt religionis capita quæ ad ejus *essentiam* seu *fundamentum* ita pertinent, tantique sunt in ea *momenti*, ut iis demptis stare nequeat religio, vel saltem *præcipua* quadam planeque *necessaria* sui parte destitatur. *Turretin*. p. 2, 3.

<sup>t</sup> How the Christian religion carries in it a *covenant* of this kind, see explained at large by Baron Puffendorf, *Jus feiale Divinum*, sect. xx. p. 92, &c. sect. xxxvii. p. 134, &c. English translation, entitled, an *Essay towards the Uniting of Protestants*, p. 87, &c. 129, &c.

the belief of a Deity is included the belief of all such *perfections* or *attributes* as without which God cannot be understood to be *God*: and therefore to disown such perfections as are necessarily and plainly contained in the idea of a *Divine Being*, is the same in effect with disowning the *existence*, and so is erring fundamentally. To this head belongs the belief of God's being our *Creator*, *Preserver*, and likewise *Inspector* over our thoughts, words, and actions<sup>u</sup>: and consequently, the denial of any one or more of these articles must be numbered among the errors *fundamental*.

But besides the *existence* and *providence* of some Divine Being thus considered in the general, (which even the soberer kind of Pagans made part of their creed,) it is further *fundamental* in the *Christian system* to acknowledge a Deity *in special*; namely, *Jehovah*, God both of the Old and New Testament, and *Father of Christ*, in opposition to the false Gods, either of *heathens* or *heretics*. For it is not sufficient for a *Christian* barely to know or believe that there is a God, but to understand also *who* is *God*. Faith in *Jehovah* as being both *God of Israel* and *Father of Christ Jesus*, is an *essential* in Christian theology, and *fundamental* to the Christian covenant: from whence also it is evident, that the Simonians, Cerinthians, Marcionites, Manichees, and as many others as presumed to contest this article, erred *fundamentally*.

II. A covenant between God and man supposes and implies that man is a party *capable of being covenanted with*, has *freedom of will* sufficient to denominate him a *moral agent*, apt to discern between *good* and *evil*, and *choosing* which he pleases. Therefore the doctrines of *free-will* (thus understood) and of the *essential* differences between *moral good* and *evil* are *fundamental* verities; and to

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Velthuysius, p. 747, 748, 756.

<sup>x</sup> Velthuysius, p. 749.

<sup>y</sup> Vid. Hoornbeeck, Socin. Confut. lib. i. cap. 9. p. 217.

disown them, or either of them, is to err *fundamentally* <sup>a</sup>.

III. The *charter of foundation* is undoubtedly an *essential* of the covenant: and therefore, of course, the admittance of the *sacred oracles*, which are the *charter* itself, (or at least the only *authentic* instrument of conveyance,) is essential to the covenant: consequently, to reject, or disbelieve the *Divine authority* of sacred Writ, is to err *fundamentally*.

IV. The belief of a *Mediator* of the Christian covenant is manifestly an *essential*, and needs no proof. The acknowledging of the blessed *Jesus* as *Messiah* and *Mediator* is plainly *fundamental*, according to the whole tenor both of the Old and New Testament; and to deny it is to throw up Christianity at once.

But further, the acknowledging *such* a Mediator as the Scripture very clearly describes, a *Divine* Mediator, a Mediator who is *very God* and *very man*, while one Christ, is *fundamental* also in the Christian system. "We must know and believe of this Mediator, that he is *true God* and the second Person in the sacred Trinity, and that he is also true man, and that the same, who is both God and man, is yet but one Person. The places of Scripture are numberless which prove that the Mediator of the new covenant is *God*, which give to him that name in the *proper sense* of it, and ascribe to him such *works* as can be ascribed to none but God. And this indeed is what the very nature of the *covenant* required, for as much as no *creature* whatever could be of so great dignity as to be worthy and fit to bear the person of all mankind with an effect so great as even to equal the creation of them <sup>b</sup>."

To deny the real and proper *Divinity* is of consequence to err *fundamentally*. It is in effect "rejecting the chief Person of the covenant upon whom our salvation de-

<sup>a</sup> See Clagett, vol. ii. Sermon 2. p. 56, 57, 58. Velthuyusius, p. 75.

<sup>b</sup> Puffendorf. sect. xli. p. 145. Lat. edit. 138. Engl. edit. Compare Sherlock, Vindicat. &c. p. 261—270.

“ pends, and does therein overthrow the whole covenant <sup>c</sup>.”

To this head belongs the doctrine of *expiation, atonement, or satisfaction*, made by Christ in his blood: a *fundamental* article of Christianity, fully expressed, frequently and earnestly inculcated quite through the New Testament. To advance one’s *own* righteousness in *opposition* to justification by the *meritorious* sacrifice of Christ, or as *sufficient* without it, is plainly altering the *terms of acceptance*, and *frustrating* the covenant in Christ’s blood, as it is making him to have “died in vain <sup>d</sup>,” which is subverting the whole Gospel.

“ A religion *with a sacrifice*, and a religion *without a sacrifice*, differ in the whole kind. The first respects the *atonement* of our past sins and our daily infirmities; it respects God as the *judge* and *avenger* of wickedness, as well as the rewarder of those who diligently seek him: the other is a kind of *philosophical* institution, to train men up in the practice of piety and virtue. A religion *without a sacrifice* is at most but half as much as a religion *with a sacrifice*: and that *half* wherein they agree are of a quite different nature from each other.—The *practical* part of religion is vastly altered by the *belief* or *denial* of the sacrifice and expiation of Christ’s death <sup>e</sup>.”

In a word, to deny the *expiation, or satisfaction*, is to renounce the Christian covenant, and is refusing to be saved upon the Gospel terms; which undoubtedly must be *erring fundamentally*.

V. The *conditions* of the covenant on our part are very plainly *essential* to the covenant itself. Consequently, the doctrines of *repentance* and a *holy life* are fundamental doctrines <sup>f</sup>. Whatever tenets or principles do directly and

<sup>c</sup> Puffendorf. *ibid.* p. 143. Lat. p. 135. Engl.

<sup>d</sup> Gal. ii. 21. Compare Gal. i. 6, 7, 8, 9.

<sup>e</sup> Sherlock, *Vindicat.* p. 282, 283. Conf. Hoornbeeck, *Socin. Confut.* p. 253. Velthuysius. p. 756, 758, 769. Puffendorf, *sect. li.* p. 171. Lat. p. 160. Engl.

<sup>f</sup> See Puffendorf, *sect. i.* 54, 55, 56. Velthuys. p. 790.

evidently overthrow the necessity of *holiness*, or of *evangelical obedience*, do at the same time subvert the Gospel covenant, and are therefore grievous and fatal errors, errors in the *foundation*.

VI. The *aids*, or enabling *means*, without which the covenanter cannot perform the conditions, must of course be looked upon as *essential* to the covenant. The *two Sacraments* in this view, considered as enabling *means* of *grace*, are essential to the covenant: therefore the discarding the *two Sacraments*, or either of them, and the denying their *use* or *necessity*, is erring fundamentally<sup>g</sup>. I might perhaps come at the same conclusion more directly, by considering the *Sacraments* as *seals of the covenant*, and so bearing in that view an immediate relation to it and connection with it. But I know not whether the premises might not admit of some dispute; besides that a *metaphorical* expression is not so clear a ground to build an argument upon: though at the same time I make no question but that the *two Sacraments* are very justly styled, and really are, *seals of the covenant*.

Among the necessary *aids* must be reckoned the assistance or guidance of God's *Holy Spirit*, as the chief of all aids, and what contains all other: this therefore is a *fundamental* principle. And because this cannot be rightly understood without admitting that the Holy Spirit is *omnipresent*, *all sufficient*, and, in a word, strictly *Divine*, therefore the *Divinity* of the Holy Ghost is a *fundamental* article of the Christian covenant, and to disown it is to err *fundamentally*<sup>h</sup>.

And since it is manifest from the whole tenor of Scripture, that there is but *one God*, one Lord *Jehovah*, it is evident that the doctrine of *three* real Persons in *one* eternal Godhead is a *fundamental* doctrine of Christianity. Of

<sup>g</sup> Of Baptism in particular, see Puffendorf. *Jus fecial.* sect. lii. liii. and Clarke's Sermons, vol. ix. p. 86. Of the Eucharist as essential, see Puffendorf. *ibid.* sect. lvii. and Velthuysen, p. 800.

<sup>h</sup> See Sherlock, *Vindicat.* p. 271, 294. Velthuysins, p. 783, 789, 794.

this I have largely treated elsewhere<sup>i</sup>; but I may here take leave to add the excellent words of Baron Puffendorf, a person of exquisite judgment, and very far from being a bigot to any churchmen: "In this article of *three Persons* "in *one Divine essence* lies the *foundation* of genuine "Christian religion; which being taken away this falls to "the ground, and nothing will remain but somewhat of an "exact *moral philosophy*. For if there are not more Per- "sons than one in the Divine essence, there is *no Saviour*, "no *redemption*, *no faith*, *no justification*<sup>k</sup>." Good reason there is why the Christian churches would never communicate either with the Samosatensians and Arians of old time, or with the Socinians of later date: a noble writer of our own has very justly observed, "That by this very "thing, that they disbelieve the article of the *Holy* "Trinity, they make themselves incapable of the *commu-* "nion of other Christian people of the Nicene faith: and "we cannot so much as join with them in good prayers, "because we are not agreed concerning the Persons to "whom our devotions must be addressed. And Christen- "dom never did so lightly esteem the article of the *Holy* "Trinity, as not to glory in it, and confess it publicly, "and express it in all our Offices. The *Holy Ghost*, toge- "ther with the *Father* and the *Son*, must be worshipped "and glorified<sup>l</sup>." But I proceed.

VII. In the seventh and last place, I am to observe, that the *sanctions* proper to bind the covenant, and to give it its due force and efficacy, must needs be looked upon as *essential* to the covenant. Accordingly, the doctrine of a *future state* must be a fundamental doctrine, as it is the principle of all religion: for without it there can be no sufficient inducement to the *constant* and *conscientious* practice of virtue and piety. The doctrines also of a *resurrection*, and final *judgment* by Christ our Lord, together

<sup>i</sup> Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, vol. v.

<sup>k</sup> Puffendorf, sect. lii. p. 174. Lat. p. 162. Engl.

<sup>l</sup> Lord Viscount Hatton. In the Preface to his Psalter, p. 17.

with the doctrines of a *heaven* for the righteous, and a *hell* for the ungodly, are *fundamental* points of Christian theology. To deny or disbelieve these doctrines is to overturn the *covenant*, because it directly tends to defeat and frustrate the *end* and *use* of it, undermining its binding force, and sapping its influences, depriving it of its life, strength, and energy.

Thus far I have proceeded in pointing out some of the *fundamental verities*, together with the *fundamental errors* opposite thereto, and known by their contraries. By the same rule, and upon the same general principles, it may be easy to draw out more, as often as occasion shall require. It is not necessary to exhibit any complete *catalogue*<sup>m</sup> either of fundamental truths or errors: it is sufficient that we have a *certain* rule to conduct by, whenever any question arises about church communion, heresy, schism, or the like. The ablest physicians would not perhaps undertake to give us an exact catalogue or determinate number of all the *essentials* of human life<sup>n</sup>, or of all the *fatal* distempers or *mortal* wounds incident to the animal frame: but they could easily give in a competent list of either kind; and when any particular case comes before them, they can for the most part judge, by the rules of their art, what means may be necessary to preserve life, and what will as naturally tend to destroy it. In like manner, though Divines take not upon them to number up with exactness all the verities *essential* to the life of Christianity, or all the errors *subversive* and *destructive* of it, yet they can specify several in each kind with unerring certainty, and have certain rules whereby to

<sup>m</sup> See Chillingworth, part i. cap. 3. sect. 13, 53. Frid. Spanheim. p. 1312, &c. Turretin. p. 21, &c.

<sup>n</sup> Quis dixerit, quid præcise alimentorum ad vitam sustinendam requiratur? Neque tamen ob illam ignorantiam periculum est ne nos fame consumi sinamus. Sed et quis dixerit quot *ciborum* genera, et quot *venenorum* species in orbe reperiuntur? Quod tamen non impedit quo minus et *cibis* uti et *venenis* abstinere optime possimus. Quid mirum ergo, si de cibis animi salutaribus erroribusque exitiis idem dicatur? Turretin. p. 23, 24.



judge, as occasion offers, of any other; and this suffices in the essentials of *faith*, as well as in the essentials of *practice*.

There may be some difficulty in marking out the exact partitions which divide *fundamentals* from *non-fundamentals*, as they differ only in the degree of *more* and *less* weighty: but then there is also the like difficulty in settling the precise boundaries between *lawful* and *unlawful*, *right* and *wrong*, *virtue* and *vice*, in many particular instances; which yet is no just objection to the undertaking, nor accompanied with such difficulties as need make any considerate casuist despair.

Besides, whatever perplexities may sometimes arise in *theory*, there will be few or none in *practice*, since in case of just and reasonable *doubt*, whether such or such an article be *fundamental* or otherwise, the known rule is, to choose the *safer* side. If it be further asked, which is the *safer* side, that of *truth* or of *peace*; I scruple not to give it on the side of *peace*, which ordinarily is of greater value (as more depends upon it) than the supporting or securing the outward profession of a *non-fundamental* truth, or which does not certainly *appear* to be fundamental<sup>o</sup>. When I speak of *doubtful* cases, I would not be understood of *doubtful doctrines*, (for such are not fundamental,) but of such cases where the *truth* of the doctrine is at least *morally certain*, and the *importance* of it only *doubtful*. In such cases and instances, reasons of *peace* and *charity* (as I humbly conceive) ought to prevail, rather than break communion for the sake of such truth as cannot be clearly proved a *fundamental* one<sup>p</sup>. Till good proof

<sup>o</sup> Est lic prudenter procedendum, ne *fidei* in non-necessariis et sæpe dubiis ac incertioribus dogmatibus ita consulamus, ut lædamus *charitatem*, et eos forte damnemus quos Christus summus iudex absolvit. *Vitringa, Observ. Sacr.* lib. v. cap. 9. p. 140.

<sup>p</sup> Placuit et theologis distinctio in necessaria ad *salutis consecutionem* et quæ insuper talis ad *communione[m] ecclesie*: quandoque enim, retento fundamento, non excludi iudicio humano a *salute*—quos tamen recipi in *externam* cum ecclesia *communione[m]*, unionis, ordinis, disciplinæ, ædificati-

can be made of its being *fundamental*, it may reasonably pass for a *non-fundamental*: and they who reject it, or refuse to accept it, may notwithstanding be received as *Christian brethren*, yea and ought to be received as such, if there be no other greater reason for excluding them. For I may note by the way, that though a disagreement in *fundamentals* is one bar to communion, and a very just one, yet it is not the only one which may be supposed. If any *non-fundamental* error should be rigorously insisted upon, so far as to *require* us to deny any certain truth, or if any *sinful* terms whatever be imposed; a breach of communion must follow of course, (since it is necessary to avoid a *lie*, and to obey *God* rather than *man*,) and the *imposers* in such cases are the *dividers*. So likewise in case of *impure* worship, or *flagrant immoralities*, (though all the *essentials* of *faith* might remain secure,) it may be necessary to refuse communion with such and such men, or bodies of men. But I have no occasion to consider those or the like cases, which lie out of the compass of our present inquiry. The subject of *fundamentals* was all that I undertook to state and clear as briefly as might be, and to observe how far *Church communion* hangs upon that single article, waving the consideration of other articles, as foreign to the point in hand. I am willing to hope that what has been said may be found sufficient with persons of discernment, for determining the *formal reason* of a fundamental truth or error; and for the settling a safe and easy rule to distinguish the same from what is not fundamental, I have not room to consider particular cases and instances, wherein some difficulties may occur: but if the *general* rule laid down be right and clear, that suffices; neither is the rule to be rejected on account of *accidental* difficulties which

onis ratio prohibeat. In quo, si unquam alias, observandam esse, ut moderate prudentiæ, sic Christianæ charitatis, ac mutæ tolerantie legem,— prudens quisque theologus facile largitur; satiusque peccari in charitatis excessu. (nisi intercedat totius ecclesiæ salus) quam in defectu. *Spanheim. Opp.* tom. iii. p. 1311.

may sometimes happen to arise about the application of it.

But for the farther illustrating or confirming the rule laid down, it may be now proper to compare it with *other rules*, some differing in *words* only, (being the same in *substance* with it,) others differing in the main thing, and some of them very widely. As to those other rules which appear to coincide with what I have offered, or scarcely to differ from it, it will be sufficient barely to mention them in passing.

Some learned and judicious writers resolve the *ratio* of a fundamental article into its *essential* connection with the general and comprehensive article of *salvation by Christ* 9: which in reality amounts to the same with resolving it, as I have done, into the nature of the *Christian covenant*. Others characterize fundamental doctrines as being “ necessary to the love of God towards us, or to that love of ours towards him, which consists in keeping his commandments<sup>r</sup>.” Which again comes to the same with resolving the *ratio* of a fundamental into the *covenant* of grace: for maintaining that *covenant* in all its *essential* parts or branches, is most effectually maintaining the principles of consummate *amity* between *God* and *man*. Our very judicious Mr. Mede resolves the *formal reason* of a fundamental into the necessary connection which it has with the acts and functions of *Christian life*<sup>s</sup>: but he owns at the same time, that if it be resolved into the necessary connection it has with the *Christian covenant*, it is all one with the other, differing only in the manner of expression. Baron Puffendorf, in his excellent treatise upon the subject of Union among Protestants, every where resolves the *ratio* of a fundamental, just as I have, into the doctrine of the *Christian covenant*. But I proceed to consider several

<sup>9</sup> Dean Sherlock, *Vindicat.* p. 259, 302.

<sup>r</sup> Whitby, *Comment.* on 1 John ii. 5.

<sup>s</sup> See Mede to Hartlib. Letter lxxxviii. p. 1072. Compare Dr. Clagett, vol. ii. Sermon. 2. p. 37.

other *rules* or *ratios* which have been offered by learned men, and which are more or less widely differing from what I have laid down. It will be proper not only to mention them, but to confute them likewise, by pointing out their faults or defects.

I. Some, to make short work, and to cut off all disputes at once, have been pleased to refer us to the *definition of the Church*, as the surest or the only rule for determining what is *fundamental*, and what not. But it is certain that the *definition* even of the *primitive churches*, after the Apostles, is merely *declarative*, not *effective*; makes no fundamental article, but declares only what was supposed to be so previously to that declaration: and therefore we must look higher for the *formal reason* of a fundamental. The judgment of the *primitive churches* is, no doubt, of great use and weight, as they drew from the fountain head, and well understood the true and genuine principles of the Christian system: and it is of great moment to observe what doctrines they *received* as fundamental truths, and what they *rejected* as fundamental errors; because there is good reason to believe, all circumstances considered, that they judged very rightly in both cases. But still since their judgment must finally be submitted to the test of *Scripture* and *right reason*, and cannot be admitted but as consonant thereto, it is very plain that the *ratio* of a fundamental rests not ultimately in their *judgment* or *definition*, but in the nature of the doctrine itself, and the credentials which it brings with it, by which all the rest must be tried. The *definition* therefore even of the *primitive churches* can never be justly looked upon as the proper or adequate rule.

As to the *definition* of any modern church, (the Roman for instance,) the pretences urged in favour of it are altogether frivolous and vain. To boast of *infallibility* against a thousand demonstrations that such church *may err*, and in fact *has erred*, and yet *does err*, is a ridiculous *vanity* at the best, not to call it by a worse name. And it is very odd to imagine that their *definitions* are an unerring rule,

when they cannot be more certain, on one hand, that any such definitions were ever made, or are now extant, than we are, on the other hand, that they are *false* and wrong, and some of them even palpably *absurd* <sup>t</sup>.

II. There are those who take *Scripture truths* and *fundamental truths* to be tantamount and reciprocal, conceiving that every thing asserted in *sacred Writ* is *fundamental*, because the whole Scripture *was written for our learning* <sup>u</sup>, and cannot be *contradicted* in any part, without giving the lie to the *Holy Spirit* of God. But this opinion, however pious in appearance, is none of the most solid or judicious. It confounds the *truth* or *usefulness* of what is said with the *importance* or *necessity* of it; as if there were no difference between the *weightier* matters and the matters *less weighty*. Scripture contains points of an *inferior* moment, as well as those of an *high nature*: and all the truths contained in it are neither equally *clear* nor equally *important* <sup>x</sup>. There are many incidental verities, *historical, geographical, genealogical, chronological, &c.* which common Christians are obliged rather implicitly to admit, or not to deny, than explicitly to know, or treasure up in their minds. There may be thousands or millions of these *inferior* truths <sup>y</sup> in sacred Writ, which it

<sup>t</sup> If the reader would see more in answer to this first pretence, he may please to consult Bishop Stillingfleet, *Rat. Ac.* part i. c. 2. p. 47, &c. Frid. Spanheim. *Opp.* tom. iii. p. 1330. Alphons. Turretin. *de Fundament.* c. iii. p. 10, 11.

<sup>u</sup> Rom. xv. 4.

<sup>x</sup> Omnia quæ in Scripturis occurrunt non sunt æque ad salutarem fidem, aut ad unionem ac communionem Ecclesiasticam necessaria; nec omnia pari necessitate fidelibus discenda et inculcanda: quod colligimus ex 1 Cor. iii. 10, 12, 15. Phil. iii. 15, 16. 2 Tim. i. 13. 1 Tim. vi. 3. Tit. i. 1. Accedit hæc ratio, quod uti in omnibus disciplinis, sic etiam in Scripturis *essentialia* et *essentia* religionis, sive axiomata sive præcepta, a commentariis sint distinguenda. Multa enim ibi tractantur occasionaliter, non ex professo, per cognitionem, ut vocant, *divisivam*, in ordine ad Deum et *spiritualia*. Voetius, *Disput.* 5. Conf. Hoornbeeck. lib. i. c. 9. p. 188. Puffendorf. *sect.* 60. Spanheim. tom. iii. p. 1330. Turretin. p. 7, 11.

<sup>y</sup> “Accidental, circumstantial, occasional objects of faith, millions whereof  
“there are in holy Scripture: such as are to be believed not *for themselves*,  
“but because they are *joined with others* that are necessary to be believed,

may suffice to believe in the gross, under this one general proposition, *Whatsoever Scripture declares, or teaches, is infallibly true and right.* If any person, without any ill meaning, should dispute or deny many of those occasional *inferior* points, (misinterpreting the texts, and retaining all the while a just veneration for the *authority* of holy Scripture,) he might be thought a bad critic or commentator, rather than a bad Christian: but were the same person to dispute or deny the *necessity of holiness*, or the doctrine of a *resurrection*, or of a *future judgment*, (misinterpreting the texts whereon those doctrines are built,) he might be, and would be justly suspected as guilty of *profane levity* and *heretical pravity*, notwithstanding any pretended veneration for Scripture he might presume to boast of. And what is the reason of the difference in the two cases now mentioned? plainly this: that in one case, the *main substance* of the Christian faith, worship, morality would suffer little or no detriment, but in the other case would suffer very much. Some truths are valuable for the sake only of *greater*, which they may accidentally be joined with, or resolve into; while those *greater* are valuable for their own intrinsic weight and worth. Hence it is, that *creeds, catechisms, confessions*, and other *summaries* of true religion, take in only the principal *agenda* and *credenda*, leaving out the truths of an inferior class; though *scriptural*, and *infallibly* certain, and of the same *Divine authority* with the other. Those inferior points may by *accident* become fundamental<sup>2</sup>, if

“and are delivered by the *same authority* which delivered these.” *Chillingworth*, chap. iv. sect. 3. p. 172.

“Such as pastors are not bound to teach their flocks, nor their flocks bound to know and remember; no nor the pastors themselves to know them or believe them, or not to disbelieve them, *absolutely* and *always*, but *then only* when they do see and know them to be delivered in Scripture as Divine revelations.” *Chillingworth*, *ibid.* p. 173.

“To acknowledge any proposition to be of *Divine* revelation and authority, and yet to *deny* or *disbelieve* it, is to offend against this *fundamental* article and ground of faith, that *God is true*. But yet a great many of the *truths* revealed in the Gospel—a man may be *ignorant* of,

the denying them, in some certain circumstances, should inevitably carry with it a denial of the *Divine authority* of sacred Writ: but that, and the like *accidental* circumstances excepted, they are of slight moment in comparison, neither would it be justifiable to break communion with any man for differing from us in things only of that kind<sup>a</sup>.

I may farther add, that the rule which I have been here considering appears to be faulty in *defect*, as well as in *excess*: for as every Scripture tenet is not fundamental, so neither does Scripture, strictly speaking, contain *all* fundamental truths. The *certainty* of the *canon* in general, and the *authenticity* of the sacred code, are *fundamental* articles, and are *previous* to those which Scripture itself contains: and our obligation to receive them resolves into this *fundamental* principle of *natural* religion, that we are bound to receive with reverence whatever God shall *sufficiently* make known to us as his law, word, and will. But I proceed.

III. A third pretended rule for determining *fundamentals* is to admit every thing *expressly* taught in Scripture, and nothing but what is so: which differs from the former, as there is a difference between saying *every thing* taught, and every thing *expressly* taught. However this rule also is faulty, and that both in *excess* and *defect*. It is faulty in *excess*, as making many more fundamentals than there really are: for there may be thousands of very *express* verities in holy Scripture which in themselves are not fundamental, having no *immediate* connection with the

“ nay *disbelieve*, without danger to his salvation; as is evident in those who, “ allowing the *authority*, differ in the *interpretation* and meaning of several texts of Scripture not thought fundamental.” *Locke, Reas. of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 540. fol. Compare p. 580.

<sup>a</sup> In loco Rom. xv. 4. et toto capite xiv. fuse docet Paulus infirmos in fide tolerandos, neque alium in finem additur, *nam quæcunque scripta sunt* &c. quam ut documentis in Scriptura contentis, ad mansuetudinem et tolerantiam Christianam erudiamur. Quod ipsam ostendit dissensum aliquem in capitibus *non momentosis*, quanquam *Scripturæ* traditis, haudquaquam capitale esse. *Turretin*. p. 12.

Christian covenant, no direct concern with or influence upon faith, worship, or morality. It is faulty likewise in the other extreme, of *defect*, as not taking in *all* that is really fundamental. The *sense* of Scripture is *Scripture*; and such sense may be *certain* and *indubitable*, when it is not *express*: and if the point of doctrine contained in it be of the *important* kind, nearly affecting the *vitals* of Christianity, it is a *fundamental* article. Some *consequences* are so direct, plain, and immediate, that they even force their way into every attentive and well disposed mind. It has been frequently manifested<sup>b</sup>, and ought now to be acknowledged as a *ruled* case, that clear *consequential* proof is very little short of *express* text, (if it be at all so,) either as to value, or certainty: not to mention that *express* text, (or what some may call so,) may often mislead us, if we make not use of *reason* and *argument*, that is to say, of *consequences*, to draw out and ascertain the true and just meaning. It may indeed be allowed, that *fundamental* doctrines ought not to be rested upon consequences really *obscure*, or very *remote*: neither ought persons to be charged with *capital* errors for holding some tenets, which *obscurely*, or at a *distance* only, appear to strike at the foundation. Therefore Divines have distinguished fundamental errors into two sorts, as being either *in the foundation*, or *near the foundation*<sup>c</sup>; while those which are more remote, being *besides* the *founda-*

<sup>b</sup> Dallæus de Fidei ex Scripturis Demonstratione, par. i. c. v—xiii. p. 31—91. Hoornbeeck. Socin. Confut. p. 210, &c. Voetius, Disput. 5. Frid. Spanheim. tom. iii. p. 1337. Cumming, Dissertation of Scripture Consequences. Turretin. de Fundament. p. 17.

<sup>c</sup> Error *in fundamento* ille est, qui *directe* aut plures, aut unam thesin *fundamentalem* negat atque oppugnat.

Error *circa fundamentum* est, qui non negat *directe* thesin, illam tamen antithesin tenet qua stante et defensa, *indirecte*, et per *primam consequentiam* thesis illa evertitur.

Error *super fundamento*, vel *præter fundamentum* est, quo aliquid statuitur quod per *remotior*em aut *obscurior*em consequentiam, et *eminus*, pugnat cum thesi fundamentali, eamque plus aut minus lædit aut concutit, aut saltem radit ac tangit. Voetius, de Artic. et Error. fundam. sect. 5. Conf. Hoornbeeck. Socin. Confut. p. 210.



tion, or *distant* from it, are reckoned among the *non-fundamental* errors, as not affecting the *vitals*, or *essentials* of Christianity, except it be in so *distant* or *obscure* a manner, that a person may reasonably be supposed *not to see* such consequence, or seriously to *abhor* it. But if any person holds a tenet which plainly, directly, and at *first consequence*, destroys a *fundamental* article, he is altogether as blameable as if he erred against the *express* text, in a point of like *importance*<sup>d</sup>. But I pass on.

IV. Another pretended rule is, that whatever Scripture has expressly declared *necessary*, or commanded us to believe under pain of *damnation*, or of *exclusion* from Christian communion, that is *fundamental*, and nothing else is. Now as to the first part, it is certain, that whatever Scripture has thus strongly bound upon us is *fundamental*: but it is not true, on the other hand, that whatever Scripture has not so bound upon us is *not fundamental*. So then this rule is faulty in *defect*, as narrowing the foundation more than is just or proper. God's plainly revealing any doctrine carries in it the force of a strict *command* to assent to it as true, whenever we think of it as revealed: and if such doctrine be found to bear an *intrinsecal* or *essential* connection with the doctrine of the *Christian covenant*, that single consideration, added to the former, is sufficient to make out its *importance*, and to signify to every man of common discernment the *fundamental* nature of such article, without any additional declaration from sacred Writ. However it may perhaps be justly said, that, in a general way, all the *essentials* of the Gospel are declared to be *necessary to salvation* in one single text, which declares the belief of the Gospel necessary: "He "that believeth *it* not, shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16. What are the essential articles must be learned from other places, or from the nature of the thing itself; but whatever they are, they are here declared to be *necessary*. But of this matter I have professedly treated elsewhere<sup>e</sup>,

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Turretin. p. 17.

<sup>e</sup> Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, vol. v. c. 3. p. 62—67.

and need not repeat; except you will give me leave, thus far, to say, what I there prove, that “the *importance* of any doctrine is not to be judged of merely from the *declarations* of Scripture concerning its *necessity*, but from the *nature* and *quality* of the doctrine itself, and the *relation* it bears to the *other parts* of revealed religion, and from the mischiefs likely to ensue upon the opposing of it.”

V. Some very considerable Protestant writers<sup>f</sup>, in their disputes with the Romanists, have often referred to the Creed called the Apostles', both for the *rule* and the *sample* of fundamentals. But then it ought to be observed, in the first place, that the most which those excellent persons intended by it is, that the Creed contains all *necessary* matters of *simple belief*: which if admitted, does not sufficiently answer our present purpose with respect to the question of *church communion*: for fundamentals of *worship* and of *Christian morality* must be considered in this case, as well as fundamentals of *mere faith*. Add to this, that the Apostles' Creed rather *supposes* than *contains* the article of the *Divine* authority and inspiration of Scripture, and therefore is no complete catalogue or summary of fundamentals. Besides, it may be justly questioned whether it really contains or includes all the fundamentals of *simple belief* which are to be found in holy Scripture<sup>g</sup>: or if it does now, it did not always; for it

<sup>f</sup> Such as Petit, Usher, Davenant, Calixtus, Chillingworth, Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Whitby, &c.

<sup>g</sup> Ad questionem propositam respondemus, non omnes articulos necessarios, si id solum quod expressum est consideres, *symbolo* contineri. Nihil enim hic est de *verbo Dei* quod fidei nostræ proximum objectum, norma, et fons est; quodque præterea *fundamentum* Apostolorum et Prophetarum dicitur, Ephes. ii. 20. Nihil de *peccato* et *miseria* nostra, cujus cognitio tamen ut unice *necessaria* inculcatur. Jerem. iii. 13. Nihil de *justificatione per fidem*, sine operibus legis, cujus tamen notitiam tanti faciebat *Apostolus*, ut præ ea, reliqua omnia ut damnum et stercorea reputaret, (Phil. iii. 8, 9.) et Christi exsortes esse, et a gratia excidisse declaret, quicumque per legem justificari volunt. Gal. v. 4. Nihil etiam de *Dei adoratione et cultu*, et *præxi novæ vitæ*, quæ exerceri rite non possunt, nisi et cognoscantur, et *necessaria* esse credantur. *Witius in Symb. Apostol.* p. 17.

was once much *shorter*. And creeds never were intended as perfect *catalogues* of *fundamentals*, but were compiled with other views and for other purposes<sup>h</sup>. I may add further, that were the Roman Creed ever so complete a catalogue of fundamentals, when *rightly* understood, yet since that creed is *verbally* admitted by all parties and denominations of Christians, and by some that err *fundamentally* even in point of *simple belief*, (as by Arians, Socinians, Sabellians, &c. who warp the general expressions of the Creed, as they do Scripture texts also, to their respective persuasions,) the Creed so misinterpreted and misapplied will be of very little service to us, for the distinguishing *fundamental* articles from *non-fundamental*. Those learned Divines, who have spoken the most highly of its perfection and use, have always supposed that it ought however to be *rightly* understood, according to the true meaning and intent of the compilers that drew it up, and of the churches which made use of it: otherwise the design of it is in a great measure lost or frustrated<sup>i</sup>.

From what hath been observed, we may certainly conclude that the *rule* which refers us to the Apostles' Creed is a wrong rule, as it is faulty in *defect*, shortening the number of *fundamentals* more than is meet: at the same time it appears also, in some other respects, to be peccant in *excess*, taking in some articles which seem not to merit a place among *fundamentals*. Such for instance are the articles of Christ's suffering under Pontius Pilate, and of his *descent into hell*, whatever it means: for though they are *Scriptural truths*, *theological verities*, or *articles of religion*, yet that they are properly *articles of faith*, of the essential and fundamental kind, (more than several other

<sup>h</sup> See my Sermons, vol. ii. p. 193. Crit. Hist. of the Athanas. Creed, vol. iv. p. 309. Remarks on Clarke's Catechism, vol. v. p. 417. Importance, vol. v. p. 173.

<sup>i</sup> Si qui ex nostris dixerint *omnes fundamentales articulos in symbolo contineri*, id non eo dixerunt sensu, quasi *verborum* symboli recitationem mox pro sufficienti Christianismi signo haberent: nam fides nostra non in *verbis*, sed in *sensu* sita est, non in *superficie* sed in *medulla*, non in sermonum *foliis*, sed in *radice* rationis. *Witsius ubi supra*, p. 17.

Scripture truths left out of the creeds,) does not appear<sup>k</sup>; neither does their *perspicuity*, or intrinsic *dignity*, or *use*, give them a clear preference above many less noted articles of religion which might be named<sup>l</sup>.

VI. Some have been of opinion, that the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the two first verses, gives us a complete list of fundamentals, under four or five articles, viz. *repentance*, *faith in God*, *baptism with confirmation*, *resurrection*, and *judgment*<sup>m</sup>. But this opinion appears to be founded only in the *equivocal* sense of the name *fundamental*, and the want of distinguishing between the *elementaries* and the *essentials* of Christianity. The Apostle is there speaking of *milk* as opposed to *strong meat*, of doctrines proper to *babes* in Christ, as opposed to doctrines fit for *grown men*: he is not speaking of points *essential* to the Christian system, as opposed to points *not essential*. The first *elements* of Christianity are not the same with *fundamentals*, in the sense we here take the word, as signifying *essentials*: therefore that passage out of the Hebrews is wide of our present pur-

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Turretin. de Fundam. p. 14.

<sup>l</sup> See more upon this argument in Voetius, de Artic. et Error. fundam. sect. 5. Hoorbeeck. Socin. Confut. tom. i. lib. 1. cap. 9. p. 256. tom. ii. Prolegom. p. 65.

<sup>m</sup> "The doctrine of *fundamentals* (about which learned and contentious men have raised great disputes) is really from this passage of the Apostle exceedingly clear and manifest. For the *only* fundamental doctrines of Christianity (*viz.* those covenanted about at Baptism) are plainly these: that we have *faith towards God*, that we *repent from dead works*; that we have the acceptableness of this repentance assured to us through Christ in the ministration of the *Word and Sacraments*, styled here by the Apostle the doctrine of *Baptisms* and of *laying on of hands*; and, lastly, that we live as becomes such persons as are in continual expectation of a *resurrection from the dead*, and of *eternal judgment*: these, I say, are plainly the *only* fundamentals of Christianity: about these there can be no controversy; in these there can be no ignorance, no not among persons of the *meanest* capacity. And besides these, whatever other doctrines are *occasionally* taught, or *eagerly disputed* about, they cannot be of the *foundation* of religion, but men may *differ* concerning them with *peace* and *charity*, and yet every one hold fast the *root* of their *confidence*, the *assurance* of their *salvation* in these undisputed doctrines of faith and obedience." Clarke's Posthum., Sermons, vol. ix. serm. iv. p. 90.

pose, and mostly foreign to the business in hand. It may indeed be allowed, that the *elementary* doctrines there specified are so many *essentials* likewise: but there are other *essentials* besides those; neither was it the Apostle's design to number them up in that place. In that short summary of *elementary* principles, no express mention is made of the doctrine of Christ *crucified*, which the Apostle elsewhere lays a very particular stress upon<sup>n</sup>; no mention of *justification* by the merits and death of Christ, in opposition to justification by mere works, though an *essential* of the Gospel in St. Paul's account<sup>o</sup>; no express mention of any thing more than what some *heretics* condemned by St. Paul as such<sup>p</sup>, and others in like manner condemned by St. John, might have owned, or probably did own. Therefore the Apostle's list of *elementaries* in that place is no list of *fundamentals* properly so called, no catalogue of *essentials*. And whereas it is suggested, that those were the *only* fundamental doctrines stipulated in *Baptism*, that cannot be true, since it is acknowledged that what concerns the *dignity of the person of Christ* is omitted in that catalogue<sup>r</sup>: for who can imagine, that *Baptism* in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, does not carry in it a plain intimation of the *dignity of the person of Christ*, and a stipulation to pay him the like honour, worship, and service, as we pay to the *Father*; or that such doctrine and such worship are not *essentials* in the Christian system? And whereas it is further suggested, that those four or five articles there mentioned by the Apostle are such as admit of *no controversy*, and that in these there *can be no ignorance*, no not among persons of the *meanest capacity*; it may pertinently be replied, that there was *great controversy*, even in the Apostles' days, about one of them, namely, about the doctrine of the *resurrection*, which some *heretics* of that time interpreted to a *metaphorical sense*, and in effect vacated and

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 2.

<sup>o</sup> Gal. i. 7, '8; 9. Gal. v. 4. Phil. iii. 8, 9.

<sup>p</sup> Gal. i. 7, 8, 9.

<sup>q</sup> 2 John 19.

<sup>r</sup> Clarke's Sermons, vol. ix. p. 71, 94.

frustrated it: and it is notorious at this day, that some *Christians*, so called, do very *ignorantly* (for it were hard to say that they do it *maliciously*) reject *water-baptism*, and throw off the *use* or *necessity* of both *Sacraments*. So that it is in vain to offer any catalogue of *fundamentals* which may not or has not been *controverted*, in whole or in part, by some that call themselves *Christians*; or to think of settling the rule of fundamentals by considering what may be called the *undisputed* doctrines of faith and obedience. But this by the way only; we shall have more of that matter presently, in its proper place. All I shall observe farther here is, that if the articles in Hebr. viii are to be understood in the *inclusive* way, and with all that they may be supposed to comprehend, or contain, then indeed they may be said to include all the fundamentals, and more; for even the single article of *faith towards God*, in the reductive way, contains every thing: but if they are to be taken in the *exclusive* way, (as is plainly intended by those who refer to them as a rule for fixing *fundamentals*;) then it is certain, that they come vastly short of a complete catalogue. But I proceed.

VII. Some persons observing, that converts in the apostolical times were admitted to Baptism upon the confession of a single article, namely, that *Jesus is the Messiah*, with two or three concomitant articles, have concluded from thence, that such a *general* belief is sufficient to *make* a man a *Christian*, and therefore also to *keep* him so: from whence also it is further insinuated, that such a confession gives a man a claim to *Christian communion*, and that nothing beyond that ought to be absolutely insisted on as *fundamental*, or made a *term* of *communion*<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>s</sup> "The belief of *Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah*, together with "these concomitant articles of his *resurrection*, *rule*, and coming again to "judge the world, are all the faith required as *necessary* to justification." *Locke*, vol. ii. p. 538. Compare p. 540. 566. 578.

"Nothing can be absolutely *necessary* to be believed, but what by this "new law of faith God of his good pleasure hath made to be so: and this, "it is plain by the preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles to all that

But this reasoning is faulty in many respects. 1. It proves too much to prove any thing: for, by the same argument, there would be no absolute need of any belief or confession at all: *Baptism* alone (as in *infants*) is sufficient to *make* one a Christian, yea, and to *keep* him such, even to his life's end, since it imprints an *indelible* character in such a sense as never to need repeating. 2. Admitting that a very short creed might suffice for *Baptism*, it does not follow that the same may suffice all along to give a man a right to *Christian fellowship*; especially when he is found to hold such principles as tend to *overthrow* that very confession. The whole of Christianity may be virtually implied or included in that single article; of admitting *Jesus* to be *the true Messiah*; and therefore the denying any *important* point of the Christian faith is in effect revoking or recanting that very article. 3. The *forms* of admission into any society, (though they commonly draw after them an obligation to submit to all the *fundamental* laws, rules, or maxims of such society,) are not properly the *fundamentals* themselves: and though a man may have a right to be *received* as a member upon his passing through such forms, it does not follow that he has a right to *continue* a member, and to participate of the privileges thereto belonging, while he refuses to submit to the *essential* rules or maxims of the society, or makes it his endeavour to subvert or destroy them. It is one thing to say what may be barely necessary at *admission*, and another to say what may be necessary *afterwards*. General professions may suffice at first, as a pledge and earnest of more *particular* acknowledgments to come after: and if those do not follow, it amounts to a kind of retracting even that *general* security. 4. It may be further observed, that neither Simon Magus, nor the ancient Judaizers whom St. Paul anathematized<sup>t</sup>; neither

"believed not already in him, was only the believing the *only true God*,  
"and *Jesus to be the Messiah* whom he hath sent." *Locke*, vol. ii. p. 581.  
Compare p. 615.

<sup>t</sup> See Importance, vol. v. p. 8.

Alexander, nor Hymenæus, nor Philetus, (who denied the general *resurrection* and were delivered over to Satan for it<sup>u</sup>;) neither the Docetæ of the apostolical age, who denied Christ's *humanity* and were rejected by St. John<sup>x</sup>; nor even the impious Nicolaitans whom our Lord himself proscribed as unfit for Christian communion: none of those (so far as appears) ever directly threw up their baptismal profession, or denied, in such a sense, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, or ceased to be *Christians* in the large import of the name, so as to want to be *rebaptized*: and yet certainly they had forfeited all right to *Christian communion*, and were justly rejected as deserters and aliens, for teaching doctrines *subversive* of the Christian religion. Therefore again, that short creed, or single article, however sufficient it might be to *make* a nominal Christian, or to *keep* him so, was yet never allowed sufficient to entitle a subverter of the faith to the right hand of fellowship, or to supersede an explicit acknowledgment of other Gospel doctrines, as *fundamental* verities. 5. Lastly, I observe, that to deny *Jesus to be the Messiah*, is in effect to renounce Christianity, and to revert to *Judaism*, or *Paganism*, or worse: and therefore the insisting upon that confession only without any thing more, as a *term of communion*, is as much as to say, that all but downright *apostates* are to be received as *Christian brethren*, so far as *faith* is concerned: a consequence too absurd for any sober and considering man to admit; and so I need not say more of it, but may pass on to a new article.

VIII. Another pretended rule or criterion for determining fundamentals, is *universality of agreement* among *Christians* so called: to throw out what is *disputed*, and to retain only what *all agree in*. A rule as *uncertain* in its application and use, as it is *false* in its main ground: for how shall any one know what all sects and denominations of *Christians* agree in, or how long they shall do

<sup>u</sup> See Importance, &c. vol. v. p. 9, 79.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. p. 9, 187.



so? Or if that could be known, are we to be guided by the floating humours, fancies, follies of *men*, or by the unerring wisdom of *God*? What article of faith is there which has not heretofore, or may not again be disputed? Or what *creed* can there be pitched upon, be it ever so short, that can please all, or that some perverse sect or other may not controvert? The Romanists allow the *Church governors* to augment the number of *fundamentals* at discretion by their *definitions*: on the other hand, these Universalists, still worse, seem to allow any the wildest sectaries to *abridge* the number as they please, (by disputations,) and not for themselves only, but for all Christendom: for whatever is *disputed* by any of them, is by the supposition to be thrown out as *unnecessary* or *non-fundamental*. A strange expedient for healing differences: a remedy much worse than the disease<sup>z</sup>. It must be owned that a *comprehension* or *coalition* of religious parties is a thing very desirable in itself; and so far as it can be effected by throwing out *circumstantials* and retaining only *essentials*, it is well worthy of every good man's

‡ Quidam toto theologiæ systemate, ac notorie fundamentalibus articulis dissentiunt.—Ad (quam) classem referimus Socinianos, et qui hisce proxime accedunt; tum plerasque Anabaptistarum familias, Tremulos, seu Quackeros, et qui Fanaticorum nomen merentur: qui articulos quos Protestantæ *palmarios* habent, negant, aut detorquent, et velut evacuant; ut amoto nucleo, inania tantum putamina remaneant. Sic ut theologiæ systema ab istis formatum a nostro plane abeat, et *vir* circa alia *inter eos conveniat* quam quæ ex ipso *naturalis rationis lumine* cognita sunt.—Circa quos, quamdiu hypothesis suis innitantur, nobiscum *conciliandos* satagere, *vesanie proximum*, ac plane *inutile* duco &c.—

Ex quo et illud consequitur, rationem istos valde fugiase, qui *conciliationem* harum quoque sectarum quas tetigimus, cum Protestantibus moliti sunt, eoque fine vel *symbolum Apostolicum*, vel aliam *laxissimam formulam* proposuerunt.—Nam si formula concordiæ ita *laxe* concipiatur, ut *eadem quibusvis sectariis ad palatum sit*, theologia emerget oppido quam *jejunam ac mutilam*, et quam parum e solido Christianismo retineat. *Puffendorf, Jus fe-ciale Divin.* sect. xvi. p. 82.

\* Præstat *salutiferam* veritatem vel inter *pugnas et contradictiones* retinere, quam *mendacio*, altam inter quietem, *indormire*. Sed nec ejusmodi concordie ratio est ineunda quæ vel *Christianæ religionis indoli* repugnet, vel *plures calamitates* generet quam illæ ipsæ dissensiones, non lacessitæ et irritatæ, prodicebant. *Puffendorf, ibid.* sect. 3.

thoughts and care: but to attempt the doing it by relaxing the *rule* for *essentials*, or leaving us no rule at all, or what is next to none, is a wild undertaking. If it may be called *uniting*, it is uniting in nothing but a *cold indifference* towards the *weighty* concerns of God and a world to come, which of course will be accompanied with so much the *warmer* pursuit of *secular* emoluments; for, in the same proportion as *religious* fervours abate, *secular* will succeed in their room. I forbear to be more particular in answer to this so popular pretence, because the learned Spanheim is beforehand with me, and has in a manner exhausted the argument under nine several articles<sup>a</sup>. To recite what he says, at length, would be trespassing too far upon your patience, and to abridge what is so close and so well written would be doing it an injury, and much impairing its force. So I pass on to another head.

IX. There is another pretence, which proceeds upon a like bottom with what I last mentioned, but is looser still, and much more extravagant. For as that pitched upon the *universal agreement* of *Christians* so called, for its mark or rule to steer by, so this still fetching a wider compass, pitches upon the *universal agreement* of the whole race of *mankind* (or of the soberer part at least) in all ages, for its measure of *fundamentals*. Throw out all that has been *disputed*, not only between Christian and Christian, but between *Christians* and *Pagans*, or between *Christians* and *Jews*, or *Mahometans*, and make a short creed of the remainder, and there is your list of *fundamentals*, your *terms of communion*, reducible to *five* articles of *natural* religion<sup>b</sup>, as is pretended. 1. The exist-

<sup>a</sup> Frid. Spanheim. tom. iii. 1332, 1333, 1334. Compare Hoornbeeck, Socin. Confut. p. 193, 206, &c. Buddæus, Miscellan. Sacr. tom. i. p. 320, &c. Turretin. de Fundam. p. 13.

<sup>b</sup> Herbert de Religione Gentilium. c. i. sect. 15. de Veritate, p. 268, &c. de Causis Errorum, p. 31.

Longe processit E. Herbertus, vir illustris, in suis de *veritate*, et *causis errorum* scriptis: in quibus e *necessariorum* censu *fidem Christianam* dispuavit, eaque solummodo capita quæ prudentiores Gentilium admiservant, in

ence of a *Deity*. 2. Some kind of *worship* to be paid him. 3. The practice of *moral virtue*. 4. *Repentance* for sins past. 5. Belief of a *future* state of rewards and punishments.

I shall not here waste your time in confuting a notion which confutes itself, and which ought rather to be exploded at once with abhorrence, than seriously answered. If *infidelity* in the worst sense, carried up to *apostasy*<sup>c</sup>, is not a *fatal* delusion, or if *Christianity* itself is not a *necessary* term of communion, it is in vain to attempt to prove any thing, or to say any thing upon the subject of *fundamentals*. But from hence we may observe what mazes of error the minds of men (and sometimes men of excellent sense otherwise) are exposed to, when once they recede from true and sound principles, and are set afloat to follow their own wanderings. The effect is natural, as error is infinite, and knows no bounds: and when vain presumption once gets the ascendant, and makes men full of themselves, God leaves them to themselves, and to their own inventions.

X. There is one pretence more which I have reserved for the last place, being as loose as any, and yet carrying so fair a face with it, that it may be most apt to deceive. It is to throw off all concern for a *right faith*, as insignificant, and to comprise all *fundamentals* in the single article of a *good life*, as they call it; to which some are pleased to add *faith* in the *Divine promises*<sup>d</sup>. Well: but can we

*fundamentalibus* habuit, qualia videlicet; 1. Esse Deum. 2. Colendum eundem. 3. Virtuti operam dandam. 4. A peccatis respiscendum. 5. Denique præmia et pœnas post hanc vitam expectandas. *Frid. Spanheim.* vol. iii. p. 1294. Conf. Kortholt de Trib. Impost. magn. p. 11.

<sup>c</sup> *Infidelitatis* species quatuor.

1. *Gentilismus*, materialiter maxima infidelitas, sed formaliter levior quam *Judaismus*.

2. *Judaismus* est gravior infidelitas, quia acceperunt figuram evangelii, quæ erat quasi aurora respectu diei evangelicæ.

3. *Hæresis*, gravissima infidelitas, quæ renititur fidei claræ.

4. *Apostasia* est fastigium hæreseos; scilicet generalis defectio a fide. *Rog. Boyle, Summ. Theolog. Christian.* p. 204.

<sup>d</sup> Nonnulli eo usque restringunt *fundamenta* religionis, ut dicant, præter

say any thing too much, or too high, in commendation of a *good life*, the flower and perfection of all religion, and the brightest ornament of every rational mind? I do not say that we can ever think or speak too highly of it, provided only that it be *rightly understood*: but the more valuable a thing it is, the greater care should be taken to *understand* what it means, and not to repose ourselves on an *empty name*, instead of a *real* thing. There is not a more equivocal or ambiguous phrase than this of a *good life*: every different sect almost has its own peculiar *idea* of it: and though they may perhaps agree in some *few generals*, yet none of them agree in all the *particulars* that should go in to make up the one collective notion or definition of it. *Jews, Turks, Pagans, and Infidels*, as well as *Christians*, all talk of a *good life*, and each in their *own* sense: and the several denominations of Christians, as *Papists* and *Protestants, believers* and *half believers*, the soberest *churchmen* and the wildest *sectaries*, all equally claim a title to what they call a *good life*<sup>e</sup>. But do they all mean the same thing by it? No certainly: and there lies the fallacy. To be a little more particular, it is observable, that the infamous *Apelles*, of the Marcionite tribe, in the second century, (a man that discarded the

*obedientiam mandatis divinis, et positam in promissis evangelicis fiduciam, fundamentale nihil esse. Turretin. p. 13, 14. Conf. Hoornbeek, tom. i. p. 176.*

Minus recte assertum aliis hoc criterium fierit; ea sola censi debere *necessaria*, vel *fundamentalia*, quæ *practica*, quæ ad *vitam et mores* faciunt, quæ accommodata ad *studium pietatis* excitandum. Unde quosdam, nostra ætate, *fiducia* promissionum, et præceptorum *obedientia* totum Christianismum circumscripsisse constat. *Frid. Spanh. tom. iii. p. 1334.*

“ *Salmeron, Costerus, Acosta*, are so ingenuous as to confess expressly, “ that a *life* apparently good and *honest* is not proper to any one sect, but “ common to *Jews, Turks, and Heretics*: and *St. Chrysostom* is as plain “ and large to my purpose as any of them. It is too plain, that arguing “ from the pretended *holiness* of men’s lives to the goodness of their cause “ or opinion, is a paralogism which hath advanced *Arianism, Pelagianism,* “ and other *heresies* of old, *Mahometanism, Familism, and Anabaptism* of “ late; and, unless God of his infinite mercy prevent, may ruin Christen- “ dom now.” *Thomas Smith, Preface to his Translation of Daillé’s Apology, p. 31.*

*prophecies* of the Old Testament, and who denied the *real* humanity, or incarnation, of our blessed Lord, yet,) pleaded this for a *salvo*, or cover for all his execrable doctrines, that a *good life*, together with a reliance upon *Christ crucified*, was *sufficient* for every thing<sup>f</sup>. It is certain that he left out of his idea of a *good life* one essential ingredient of it, *viz.* a *sincere* love of *truth*, accompanied with an *humble submission* of his own conceits to the plain and salutary doctrine of the Gospel. So again, professed Deists have put in their claims, along with others, to the title of a *good life*, and have valued themselves upon it<sup>g</sup>, under a total contempt of all *revealed* religion. It is manifest, they must have left out of their idea of a *good life*, the best ingredient of it; namely, the *obedience of faith*. No doubt but *moral probity* is in itself an excellent quality, and I should be apt to value even a *Turk*, a *Jew*, or a *Pagan*, who enjoys it in any competent degree, more than the most orthodox *Christian* who is a stranger to it: but still it is but a *part* (though an essential part) of a *good life*, in the proper *Christian* sense; for nothing comes up to the true and full notion of a *good life*, but *universal righteousness* both in *faith* and manners<sup>h</sup>. A *right belief* (in *fundamentals* at least) is implied and included in *true obedience*, as *believing* is submitting to Divine authority, and is *obeying* the commands of God<sup>i</sup>. It is a vain thing therefore to speak of a *good life*, as separate from *saving* belief, or knowledge, where such knowledge may be had<sup>k</sup>. The pretence to it carries this twofold *absurdity*

<sup>f</sup> Euseb. Eccl. Histor. v. c. 13. p. 226.

<sup>g</sup> Haud crucient animum quæ circa religionem vexantur lites; sit modo *vita proba*. Baro. Herbert. apud Kartholt. p. 20.

<sup>h</sup> See Importance &c. vol. v. p. 103, &c. 210.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. p. 48, &c.

<sup>k</sup> A late ingenious writer well expresses this matter as follows: "It is in vain to pretend to real *purity of heart*, or *life*, without a *belief* of the *truth*.—How is it possible that the man can be really *good*, who is constantly offering the *highest affronts* to his *Maker*, and by a disbelief of the *plain* and *important* articles of faith, is loudly proclaiming him a liar? "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not

along with it: it supposes the *end* already attained without the previous *necessary* means, and makes the *whole* to subsist without the *essential* parts. In short, there is no judging of a *good life*, but by considering first what it contains, and whether it answers its *true idea* or *definition*, or means only a *partial obedience*. A belief of *fundamentals* ought to make *part* of the *idea*, ordinarily at least: which therefore must be determined before we can form a just estimate of a *good life*. To deny or disbelieve the *fundamental* articles of Christianity, is a contradiction to the very nature and notion of true *Christian obedience*, and will always be a stronger argument against the supposition of a *good life*, than any other circumstances can be for it<sup>1</sup>. Or if we may sometimes charitably hope or believe that such and such persons, erring fundamentally, and propagating their errors, are yet strictly *honest* men, and accepted by the great Searcher of hearts, as holding what is *sufficient* for *them*, and as doing the best *they can*; yet this can be no rule for the Church to proceed by, which must judge by the nature and tendency of the doctrines, what is *fundamental* in an *abstract* view to the *Christian fabric*, as before intimated. As to what is so in a *relative* view to particular persons, God only is judge, and not we; and therefore to him we should leave it.

Having thus, my Reverend Brethren, recited, and competently examined the several *improper* or *erroneous* rules suggested by some learned writers for determining *fundamentals*, and having pointed out (in as clear a manner, and in as short a compass as I well could) their principal *defects*; I may now return with the greater advantage to the rule before laid down, and there abide. Whatever verities are found to be plainly and directly *essential* to the doctrine of the *Gospel covenant*, they are *fundamental*

“the record that God gave of his Son. 1 Joh. v. 10.” *Dunlop's Preface to Westminster Confession*, p. 168.

<sup>1</sup> See more in reference to this head, in Frid. Spanheim, tom. iii. 1336. Velthuyusius, 698, 703, 742. Turretin, p. 14. Hoornbeeck, p. 177—187.

*verities*: and whatever errors are plainly and directly *subversive* of it, they are *fundamental errors*. By this rule, as I humbly conceive, we may with sufficient *certainty* fix the *terms of communion* with the several denominations of Christians. As to the precise *terms of salvation*, they may admit of greater variety and latitude, on account of particular circumstances of diverse kinds: and there is no necessity of absolutely excluding all from *uncovenanted* or even *covenanted mercies*<sup>m</sup>, whom we may be obliged to exclude from *brotherly communion*. God will have regard in judgment to *invincible* ignorance, incapacity, infirmity: but *men* ought to have no regard to them, in settling the *terms of communion*; because they ought never to look upon any ignorance &c. as *invincible*, while it is in their power to apply any *probable* or *possible* remedies; and among the possible or probable remedies, *Church censures* may be justly reckoned, as carrying both *instruction* and *admonition* along with them. Whether the errors be *vincible* or *invincible*, whether the parties erring be *curable* or *incurable*, in many cases, God alone can know; Church governors do not, and cannot; and therefore they are to proceed in the same way, and to make use of the same expedients, (under direction of Scripture,) as if they were *certain* that the error is *conquerable*, and the party *capable of cure*.

But besides the consideration of the *offending party*, there are several more things of moment to be looked to in this business, *viz.* the preserving *others* from going astray, and the keeping ourselves *pure* and *undefiled*, and

<sup>m</sup> Persons *unbaptized* and without the pale of the Church, doing all that humanly speaking could be expected in their circumstances, we exclude not from *uncovenanted mercies*.

Persons admitted into *covenant* by *Baptism*, and erring *fundamentally*, but with an *honest* mind, and under some *unavoidable* infirmity or incapacity, we exclude not even from *covenanted mercies*: for they that are unavoidably, unaffectedly *blind*, are not chargeable with *sin* so far; and a man shall be accepted (as I observed above, p. 93.) according to what he *hath* or *might have*, not according to what he *hath not* and could not have. This rule is a *Gospel rule*, and so makes a part of the *Christian covenant*.

the maintaining *truth* and *godliness* in the face of the world, every man according to his abilities, and according to the station wherein God has placed him: for “ since “ the conservation of such things as are *united* is the end “ of *union*, it is evident that we are not to entertain any “ *union* but only with them who may help it forward. If “ therefore there be any, who, under colour of the blessed “ name of Christ, *subvert* his *doctrine*, *annihilate* his *authority* and our *salvation*; it is so far from being our “ duty to *unite* ourselves to them, that, on the contrary, “ we are obliged to *part* with them: because, to *unite* “ with them, were in effect to *disunite* from Christ, and “ from his *body*; and instead of coming to *salvation*, to “ fall into *eternal ruin*.—Both the *discipline* of Jesus “ Christ, and the laws of *civil societies*, and even those of “ *nature* itself, permit us to *avoid* the *communion* of such “ as, under any pretence, name, or colour whatever, go “ about to *destroy* and *ruin* Christianity<sup>n</sup>.”

<sup>n</sup> Daillé, *Apology for the Reformed Churches*, p. 4, 5.





THE  
DOCTRINAL USE  
OF THE  
CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS  
CONSIDERED;  
IN  
A CHARGE  
DELIVERED TO THE  
MIDDLESEX CLERGY,  
*May 12th, 1736.*



---

# A · C H A R G E

DELIVERED TO THE

MIDDLESEX CLERGY, &c.

---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

AS it hath been customary, upon these occasions, to commend some important point of Christianity; so I take the liberty to offer to your thoughts, at this juncture, the consideration of the *Christian Sacraments*. Not that I can have room, in a short discourse, to enter into the heart of the subject: but the time perhaps may permit me to single out some collateral article, of moderate compass, and to throw in a few incidental reflections, tending to illustrate the value and dignity of those Divine ordinances, and to preserve in our minds a just regard and veneration for them.

When we duly consider the many excellent ends and purposes for which these holy Sacraments were ordained, or have been found in fact to serve, through a long succession of ages, we shall see great reason to adore the Divine wisdom and goodness in the appointment of them. They are of admirable use many ways; either for confirming our *faith* in the *Christian religion* at large, and the *prime articles* of it; or for promoting *Christian practice* in this world; or for procuring *eternal happiness* in a world to come.

I shall confine my present views to the first particular, the subserviency of the Sacraments to *true and sound*

faith : which, though it may be looked upon as a bye-point, and for that reason hath not been so commonly insisted upon ; may yet be of weight sufficient to deserve some consideration at this time.

I. Give me leave then to take notice, in the first place, that the *Sacraments* of the Church have all along been, and are to this day, standing monuments of the *truth* of Christianity against Atheists, Deists, Jews, Turks, Pagans, and all kinds of infidels. They bear date as early as the Gospel itself ; and have continued, without interruption, from the days of their Founder. They proclaim to the world, that there once was such a person as Christ Jesus ; that he *lived*, and *died*, and was *buried*, and *rose again* ; and that he erected a Church, and drew the world after him, maugre all opposition ; (which could never have been effected without many and great *miracles* ; ) and that he appointed these ordinances for the preserving and perpetuating the same Church, till his coming again. The two *Sacraments*, in this view, are abiding *memorials* of Christ and of his religion, and are of impregnable force against *unbelievers*, who presume either to call in question such plain *facts*, or to charge our most holy religion, as an invention of men.

II. But besides this *general* use of the *Sacraments* against *unbelievers*, they have been farther of great service all along, for the supporting of *particular* doctrines of prime value, against *misbelievers* of various kinds ; as may appear by an historical deduction all the way down from the earliest ages of the Church to the present times.

No sooner did some misbelieving Christians<sup>a</sup> of the apostolical age endeavour to deprave the true Gospel doc-

<sup>a</sup> The Docetæ, or Phantasiastæ, whom in English we may call Visionaries ; men that would not admit that our Lord assumed *real* flesh and blood, but in *appearance* only ; considering him as a walking *phantom* or *apparition*, in order to take off the *scandal* of the *cross*, or for other as weak reasons. Some short account of them may be seen in my *Importance*, vol. v. p. 9, 187. or a larger and more distinct one in Buddeus's *Eccles. Apostol.* p. 550 —570.

trine of *God* made *man*, rejecting our Lord's *humanity*, but the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, carrying in it so indisputable a reference to our Lord's *real* flesh and blood, bore testimony against them with a force irresistible. They were so sensible of it, that within a while they forbore coming either to the *holy Communion*, or to the *prayers* that belonged to it<sup>b</sup>, merely for the sake of avoiding a practice *contradictory* to their principles. However, this was sufficient intimation to every honest Christian, of the meanest capacity, that their *principles* must be false, which obliged them in consequence to vilify and reject the plain and certain *institutions* of Christ. There was no need of entering into the *subtilities* of argument; for the thing declared itself, and left no room for dispute. Such was the valuable use of this Sacrament, at that time, for supporting *truth* and detecting *error*, for the confirming the *faithful* in the right way, and for confounding *seducers*.

III. In the century next following, the Valentinian Gnostics corrupted the faith of Christ more ways than one, but particularly in pretending that this *lower* or *visible* world was not made by *God most high*, but by some inferior *power* or *æon*. Here again the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* was of signal service for the confuting such wild doctrine, and for the guarding sincere Christians against the smooth insinuations of artful disputers. It was very plain, that the bread and wine in that Sacrament were presented before God, as *his creatures* and *his gifts*; which amounted, in just construction, to a recognizing him as their *true* Creator: and it was absurd to imagine that God should *accept of*, and *sanctify* to heavenly pur-

<sup>b</sup> Ἐὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχουσαι, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἠμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σῶμα ἴσθαι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, &c. *Ignat. ad Smyrn.* c. vii. p. 4. Le Clerc well comments upon this passage: Quod quidem convenienter ceteræ suæ doctrinæ faciebant: cum enim *Eucharistia* sit instituta ad celebrandum memoriam *corporis* Christi pro nobis *fracti*, et *sanguinis effusi*, non poterat celebrari, ex instituto Christi, ab hominibus qui *mortuum* non esse *Christum* putabant, nisi sibi ipsi contradicerent. *Ecccl. Hist.* p. 568, 569.

poses, creatures *not his own*<sup>c</sup>. Besides, our Lord had chosen these creatures of the *lower world* to represent his own *body* and *blood*, and called them his *body* and *blood*, as being indeed such in Divine *construction* and *beneficial effect* to all *worthy* receivers: a plain argument that he looked upon them as his *own* and his Father's creatures, and not belonging to any *strange* creator, with whom neither he nor his Father had any thing to do.

These arguments, drawn from the holy *Eucharist*, were triumphantly urged against those false teachers, by an eminent Father of that time<sup>d</sup>: who, no doubt, made choice of them as the most affecting and sensible of any; being more entertaining than dry criticisms upon texts, or abstracted reasonings, and more likely to leave strong and lively impressions upon the minds of common Christians. At the same time they served to expose the adversaries to public shame, as *appearing* along with others at the *holy Communion*, while they taught things directly contrary to the known language of that Sacrament.

IV. The same *deceivers*, upon some specious pretences, (but such as no cause can want, that does not want artful pleaders,) took upon them to reject the doctrine of the *resurrection* of the *body*; conceiving that the unbodied *soul* only had any concern in a life to come<sup>e</sup>. Here again, the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* was a kind of armour of proof against the seducers. For as the consecrated bread and wine were the authentic symbols of Christ's body and

<sup>c</sup> Tertullian afterwards makes use of the same argument, against the same error, as espoused by the Marcionites: and he strengthens it farther, by taking in the other *Sacrament* also. Sed ille quidem (*Deus noster*) usque nunc nec *aquam* reprobavit *Creatoris*, qua suos abluit — nec *panem* quo ipsum corpus suum representat. *Contra Marcion*. lib. i. cap. 14.

<sup>d</sup> Nostra autem consonans est sententia *Eucharistie*, et *Eucharistia* rursus confirmat sententiam nostram: *offerimus* enim ei quæ sunt *ejus*. *Iren.* lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251. edit. Bened. Conf. cap. xxxiii. p. 270. Conf. Tertull. *contra Marcion*. lib. i. cap. 14.

<sup>e</sup> Basilides, probably of the first century, taught this doctrine. *Iren.* lib. i. cap. 24. p. 102. Afterwards, Cerdo also, and Marcion, lib. i. cap. 27. p. 106. The Valentinian Gnostics also taught the same, lib. v. cap. 1. p. 292.

blood, and were, in *construction* and certain *effect*, (though not in *substance*,) the same with what they stood for, to all worthy receivers; it was manifest, that *bodies* so incorporated with the *body* of Christ must of course be partners with it in a glorious *resurrection*. Thus was the *Eucharist* considered as a sure and certain *pledge* to all good men, of the future resurrection of their *bodies*, symbolically fed with the *body* of Christ. For like as the *branches* partake of the *vine*, and the *members* of the *head*, so the bodies of the faithful, being by the Eucharist incorporate with Christ's *glorified* body, must of consequence appertain to it, and be *glorified* with it. This is the argument which the Christian Fathers<sup>f</sup> of those times insisted upon, and with this they prevailed; as it was an argument easily understood<sup>ε</sup> and sensibly felt, (by as many as had any tender regard for the *Sacraments* of the Church,) and as it expressed to the life the *inconsistent* conduct of the *new* teachers, proclaiming them to be *self-condemned*. Wherefore they were put in mind over and over, to correct either their *practice* or their *principles*; and either to come no more to the *holy Communion*, or to espouse no more such doctrines as were contrary to it<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>f</sup> Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. cap. xx. p. 19. Irenæus, lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251. lib. v. cap. 2. p. 294. Tertull. de Resurr. Carnis, cap. viii. p. 330. Rigalt. Conf. Athanas. Epist. iv. ad Serap. p. 710. edit. Bened.

<sup>ε</sup> Notwithstanding the plainness of the argument, a very learned and ingenious Lutheran declares, that he does not understand it, can make no *sense* or *consequence* of it. (Pfaff. Notæ in Iren. Fragm. 84, 85.) I suppose the reason is, because it agrees not with the Lutheran notion of the *presence*: for indeed, as such *corporal* or *local* presence supposes Christ's *body* and *blood* to be received by *all* communicants, both *good* and *bad*, Irenæus's arguments will by no means favour that *hypothesis*, nor consist with it. His reasoning will extend only to *good* men, *real* members of Christ's body, men whose *bodies*, by the Eucharist *worthily* received, (perseverance supposed,) are made *abiding members* of Christ's *body*, *flesh*, and *bones*. The argument, so stated, proves the *resurrection* of such persons; and it is all that it directly proves: which however was sufficient against those who admitted no resurrection of the *body*, but denied all.—N. B. The argument is of as little force on the hypothesis of *transubstantiation*; as is plain from what has been hinted of the other.

<sup>h</sup> Ἡ εὐχὰν γινώσκον ἀλλαξάντων, ἢ τὸ προσφίγειν τὰ ἱερῆματα παρατείνωσαν.



V. In the same century, or beginning of the next, when the Marcionites revived the old pretences of the Visionaries, rejecting our Lord's *humanity*; the *Eucharist* still served, as before, to confound the adversaries: for it was impossible to invent any just reply to this plain argument, that our Lord's appointing a memorial to be observed, of his *body broken* and of his *blood shed*, must imply, that he *really* took part of *flesh* and *blood*, and was in *substance* and in *truth* what the Sacrament sets forth in *symbols* and *figures*<sup>i</sup>.

VI. When the Encratitæ, or Continents, of the second century, (so called from their overscrupulous abstemiousness,) had contracted odd prejudices against the use of *wine*, as absolutely unlawful; the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* was justly pleaded, as alone sufficient to correct their groundless surmises<sup>k</sup>: but rather than part with a favourite principle, they chose to celebrate the Communion in *water* only, rejecting *wine*; and were from thence styled Aquarians<sup>l</sup>. Which practice of theirs served however to detect their *hypocrisy*, and to take off the *sheep's clothing*: for nobody could now make it any question, whether those so seemingly *conscientious* and *self-denying* teachers were really *deceivers*, when they were found to make no scruple of violating a holy Sacrament, and running directly counter to the express commands and known practice of Christ their Lord.

VII. When the Praxeans, Noetians, and Sabellians, of the second and third centuries, presumed to innovate in the doctrine of the *Trinity*, by reducing the *three* Persons

ἁμῶν δὲ σύμφωνος ἡ γνώμη τῆ εὐχαριστίᾳ, καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία . . . βιβλαῖο τῆς γνώμης. *Iren.* lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251.

<sup>i</sup> Acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, *corpus* illum *suum* fecit, *Hoc est corpus meum*, dicendo; id est *figura* corporis mei. *Figura* autem non fuisset, nisi *veritatis* esset corpus: ceterum *vacua res*, quod est phantasma, *figuram* capere non posset. *Tertull. adv. Marc.* lib. iv. c. 40. p. 458. *Conf. Pseud. Origen. Dialog. contr. Marcion.* lib. iv. p. 853. edit. Bened.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* lib. ii. cap. 2. p. 186. *Strom.* lib. i. p. 359.

<sup>l</sup> Epiphanius. *Hæres.* xvii. 3. Theodorit. *Hæret. Fab.* lib. i. cap. 21. Philastrius. *Hæres.* lxxvii. p. 146. Augustinus. *Hæres.* cap. lxxv.

of the Godhead to *one*; then the Sacrament of *Baptism* remarkably manifested its *doctrinal* force, to the confusion of those *misbelievers*. There was no resisting the pointed language of the sacramental *form*, which ran distinctly in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*<sup>m</sup>. It seems, that those men being conscious of it, did therefore change our Lord's *form*, and baptized in a *new* one of their own<sup>n</sup>; not considering, that that was plunging deeper than before, and adding iniquitous practice to ungodly principles. But the case was desperate, and they had no other way left to make themselves appear *consistent* men. In the mean while, their carrying matters to such lengths could not but make their *false* doctrine the more *notorious* to all men, and prevent its stealing upon honest and well disposed Christians, by ignorance or surprise. Such was the seasonable use of the Sacrament of *Baptism* in that instance; detecting *error*, and obstructing its progress, and strongly supporting the *true faith*.

VIII. When the Arians, of the fourth century, took upon them to deprave the doctrine of the *Trinity* in an opposite extreme, by rejecting the *Deity* of our Saviour Christ, "who is over all God blessed for ever<sup>o</sup>;" then again the same Sacrament of *Baptism* reclaimed against *novelty*, and convicted the *misbelievers* in the face of the world. It was obvious to every impartial and considering man, that the *form* of *Baptism* ran equally in the name of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, and that it could never be intended to initiate Christ's disciples in the belief and worship of *God* and *two creatures*<sup>p</sup>. The new teachers however, in prudence, thought proper to continue the old form

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Tertull. adv. Prax. cap. 26, 27. Hippol. contra Noet. cap. xiv. p. 16.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Bevereg. Vindic. Can. lib. ii. cap. 6. p. 252. Bingham, Eccles. Antiq. lib. xi. cap. 3. p. 7.

<sup>o</sup> Rom. ix. 6.

<sup>p</sup> A full account of this argument may be seen in Bishop Stillingfleet on the Trinity, ch. ix. or in my eighth sermon per tot. vol. ii. or in Athanasius, p. 510, 633. edit. Bened.

of baptizing, till the Eunomians, their successors, being plainer men, or being weary of a practice contradictory to their principles, resolved at length to set aside the Scripture form, and to substitute others more agreeable to their sentiments<sup>9</sup>. This was intimation sufficient to every well disposed Christian, to be upon his guard against the new doctrines, which were found to drive men to such desperate extremities. For now no man of ordinary discernment, who had any remains of godliness left in him, could make it matter of dispute, whether he ought to follow Eunomius or Christ.

There was a farther use made of both Sacraments, by way of argument, in the Arian controversy. For when the Arians pleaded, that the words *I and my Father are one*, meant no more than an *unity of will or consent*, inasmuch as all the faithful were said to be *one* with Christ and with *each other*, on account of such *unity of consent*; the argument was retorted upon them in this manner: that as Christ had made himself really *one with us*, by taking our *flesh and blood* upon him in the incarnation; so again he had reciprocally made us really *one with himself* by the *two Sacraments*. For in Baptism we *put on* Christ, and in the Eucharist we are made partakers of his *flesh and blood*: and therefore the *union* of Christ's disciples with the *Head*, and with *each other*, (though far short of the essential *union* between Father and Son,) was more than a bare *unity of will or consent*; being a *real*, and *vital*, and *substantial* union, though withal *mystical* and *spiritual*. Thus Hilary of Poitiers (an eminent Father of that time) retorted the argument of the adversaries; throwing off their refined subtilties, by one plain and affecting consideration, drawn from the known doctrine of the *Christian Sacraments*<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Epiphani. Hær. lxxvi. Greg. Nyssen. contr. Eunom. lib. x. p. 278. Theodorit. Hæret. Fab. lib. iv. cap. 3. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. lib. v. cap. 24. Theodorus, Lect. lib. xi. p. 576. edit. Cant.

<sup>r</sup> Hilarius de Trinit. lib. viii. p. 951, &c. Conf. Cyrill. Alexandr. de Trin. Dial. i. p. 407.

IX. About the year 360 rose up the sect of Macedonians, otherwise called Pneumatomachi, impugners of the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghost*. They were a kind of Semi-Arians, admitting the *Divinity* of the *second* Person, but rejecting the *Divinity* of the *third*, and in broader terms than the Arians before them had done. However, the Sacrament of *Baptism* stood full in their way, being a lasting monument of the true *Divinity* of the *third* Person as well as of the *second*: and by that chiefly were the generality of Christians confirmed in the ancient faith, and preserved from falling into the snares of seducers<sup>s</sup>.

X. About the year 370, or a little sooner, the sect of Apollinarians began to spread new doctrines, and to make some noise in the world. Among sundry other wrong tenets, they had this conceit, that the *manhood* of our Saviour Christ was converted into or absorbed in his *Godhead*. For they imagined, that by thus resolving *two* distinct *natures* into *one*, they should the more easily account for the *one Person* of Christ; not considering that the whole economy of man's redemption was founded in the plain Scripture doctrine of a Saviour both *God* and *man*. In opposition to those dangerous tenets, the learned and eloquent Chrysostom (A. D. 405. circ.) made use of an argument drawn from the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, to this effect; that the *representative* body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist (sanctified by *Divine grace*, but not converted into *Divine substance*) plainly implied, that the *natural* body of Christ, though joined with the *Godhead*, was not *converted* into Godhead: for like as the consecrated bread, though called Christ's body on account of its sanctification, did not cease to be *bread*; so the *human nature* of Christ, though dignified with the *Divine*, did not cease to be the same *human nature*, which it always was<sup>t</sup>. We may call this either an argument or an

<sup>s</sup> See St. Basil on this argument, De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 10, 12, 27, 29.

<sup>t</sup> Sicut enim, antequam sanctificetur panis, *panem* nominamus, *Divina* autem sanctificante *gratia*, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem appella-

illustration; for indeed it is both under different views. Considered as a *similitude*, it is an *illustration* of a case: but at the same time is an argument to show, that the Apollinarians were widely mistaken in imagining that a change of *qualities, circumstances, or names*, inferred a change of *nature and substance*. Bread was still bread, though for good reasons dignified with the name of the *Lord's body*: and the man Christ was still *man*, though for good reasons (that is, on account of a *personal union*) dignified with the title of *God*. Thus the Sacrament of the Eucharist, being a *memorial* of the *incarnation*, and a kind of *emblem* of it <sup>u</sup>, was made use of to explain it, and to confirm the faithful in the ancient belief of that important article. But I proceed.

XI. About the year 410, Pelagius opened the prejudices which he had for some time privately entertained against the Church's doctrine of *original sin*: but the Sacrament of *Baptism* looked him full in the face, and proved one of

tione *panis*, dignus autem habitus est *Dominici corporis* appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit; et non duo corpora, sed unum corpus Filii predicatur: sic et hic Divina *injurians*, id est, inundante corpori *natura, unum Filium, unam Personam*, utraque hæc fecerunt; agnoscendum tamen inconfusam et indivisibilem rationem, non in *una* solum *natura*, sed in *duabus* perfectis. *Chrysost. Epist. ad Cesar. Monach.* p. 7, 8. edit. Harduin.

As to what concerns this Epistle, and our debates with the Romanists upon it, the reader may consult, if he pleases, besides Harduin, Frid. Spanheim. *Opp.* tom. i. p. 844. Le Moynes, *Varia Sacra*, tom. i. p. 530. Wake's *Defence ag. M. de Meaux*, printed 1686. Fabricii *Bibl. Græc.* tom. i. p. 433. Le Quien, *Dissert. Damascen.* p. 48. et in *Notis*, p. 270. Zornii *Opusc. Sacr.* tom. i. p. 727.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Justin. *Mart. Dial.* p. 290. *Apol.* i. p. 96. edit. Thirlby.

N. B. The Eucharist was anciently considered as a kind of *emblem* of the *incarnation*, but in a loose general way: for like as there is an *heavenly* part and an *earthly* part here, so it is also there; and like as *Divine grace* together with the *elements* make the Eucharist, so the *Divine Logos* with the *manhood* make *God incarnate*. But then the analogy or resemblance ought not to be strained beyond the intention of it: for there is this observable *difference* in the two cases; that in one case there is barely a *conjunction* or *concomitance* of the two natures, and that to the *worthy* receivers only: in the other, there is an *absolute, permanent, and personal* union. So then the Eucharist is but a faint, imperfect *emblem* of the other.

the most considerable obstacles to his progress. The prevailing practice had all along been to baptize *infants*: and the Church had understood it to be baptizing them for *remission of sin*. The inference was clear and certain, and level to the capacity of every common Christian. Wherefore this single argument had weight sufficient to bear down all the abstracted subtilties and laboured refinements of Pelagius and his associates, and proved one of the strongest securities to the Christian faith so far, during that momentous controversy\*.

XII. About the year 430 appeared the Nestorian heresy: which, dividing the *manhood* of our Lord from the *Godhead*, made in effect *two Persons*, or *two Christs*. Here the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* was again called in, to compose the difference, and to settle the point in question. For since the *virtue* and *efficacy* of the *representative* body was principally founded in the supposed *personal* union of the *real* body with the *Divine* nature of our Lord, it would be frustrating or evacuating all the *efficacy* of the *Eucharist*, to divide the *manhood*, in such a sense, from the *Godhead*†. The argument was just and weighty, and could not fail of its due effect among as many as had any tender regard for so divine and comfortable a Sacrament.

XIII. Within twenty years after, came up the Euty-chian heresy; which, in the contrary extreme, so blended the *Godhead* and *manhood* together, as to make but *one nature* of both, after the example of the Apollinarians, whom I before mentioned. The Sacrament of the *Eucharist* was of eminent service in this cause also: for if the bread and wine in that Sacrament are what they have been called, (and as constantly believed to be,) *symbols* and *figures* of Christ's *body* and *blood*, then it is certain

\* A full and distinct account of this whole matter may be seen either in Vossius, *Hist. Pelagian.* lib. ii. par. 1. *Thess.* v. *Opp.* tom. vi. p. 603, &c. or in Dr. Wall's *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, part i. ch. 19.

† Vid. Cyrill. Alex. *Epist. ad Nestor.* p. 1290. *Anathem.* xi. p. 1294. cum Cyrill. *Explan. apud Harduin. Concil. Conf. Albertin. de Eucharist.* p. 754.

that our Lord really put on *flesh* and *blood*, and that his *human* nature was and is distinct from his *Divine*. To say, that “the Word was made flesh,” or that the *flesh* was converted into the *Word*, in such a sense as to leave no distinct *humanity*, was as much as to say, that the *Sacraments* now make us not “members of his body, of his “flesh, and of his bones<sup>z</sup> ;” and that the *Eucharist* in particular is an *insignificant* show, or *worse*, either not representing the *truth* of things, or representing a *falsehood*. Such was the argument made use of in the Eutychiean controversy<sup>a</sup> : a plainer or stronger there could not be ; nor any wherein the generality of Christians could think themselves more deeply concerned.

XIV. Long after this, in the eighth century, endeavours were employed by many to bring in the *worship*, or at least the *use*, of *images* into churches. In this case also, the Sacrament of the Eucharist was seasonably pleaded, for the giving some check to the growing corruption. The good Fathers of Constantinople, in the year 754, meeting in council to the number of 338, argued against *images* to this effect : that as our Lord had appointed no visible *image* of himself, his incarnation, or passion, but the *eucharistical* one, and probably intended that for a most effectual bar, to preclude all appearances of idolatry ; it would be high presumption in men, without *warrant*, without *occasion*, and against the very *design* of our Lord in that Sacrament, to introduce any other kind of *images* of their own devising<sup>b</sup>. The opposite party, some time after, (A. D. 787.) in the second Council of Nice, eluded this plain reasoning, by pretending, falsely, that the sacred symbols are not the *image* of Christ’s body and blood, but the *very* body and blood<sup>c</sup> : and thus they laid

<sup>z</sup> Ephes. v. 30.

<sup>a</sup> The reader may see the ancient testimonies collected and commented upon in Albertinus, p. 802, 835, 836, 867, 868, 874, 886.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Acta Concil. Nicæni. secundi, tom. iii. vers. finem.

<sup>c</sup> N. B. They might justly have said, that the sacred symbols are *more* than a mere *image*, *more* than mere *signs* and *figures* : but they should not

the seeds of that error, which grew up at length by degrees into the monstrous doctrine of *transubstantiation*. For the true notion of the Eucharist lying cross to their darling schemes, they chose rather to deprave the *Sacrament* itself, than to stand corrected by it. However, all this tends to confirm the main point, which I have been insisting upon, that the Sacraments, among other very valuable uses, have for many ages upwards been the standing *barriers* against corruptions: though there are no fences so strong, nor any ramparts so high, but daring and desultorious wits may either break through them or leap over them.

XV. I shall add but one example more; and it shall be of Faustus Socinus, of the sixteenth century: a person of pregnant wit and teeming invention; of moderate learning, but a very large share of sufficiency. His great ambition was, to strike out a new system of religion from his own conceits; though he happened only to revive (and perhaps very ignorantly) the ancient Sabellianism, Photinianism, and Pelagianism, with other exploded heresies. He began with subverting (as far as in him lay) the true and ancient doctrine of the *Trinity*, rejecting the *Deity* of the second Person, and even the *being* of the third. After a thousand subtilties brought to elude plain Scripture, and after infinite pains taken in so unnatural a war against Heaven, he was yet sensible, that he should prevail nothing, unless, together with the doctrine of the Trinity, he could discard the *two Sacraments* also, or render them *contemptible*. Baptism was a standing monument of the *personality* and *equal* Divinity of *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: and the other Sacrament was an abiding memorial of the *merits* (though no *creature* can *merit*) of our Lord's obedience and sufferings: and both together

have denied their being *images* at all. And they might justly have said, that the sacred symbols are, in *construction* and *beneficial effect*, to worthy receivers, the very body and blood: but they ought not to have asserted what they did, in that *absolute* manner, or in such *crude* terms, left without the proper qualifying explanations.



were lasting attestations, all the way down from the very infancy of the Church, of the *secret* workings, the heavenly *graces* and influences of the *Holy Spirit* upon the faithful receivers. Therefore to let the *Sacraments* stand, as aforetime, was leaving the ancient faith to grow up again in the Christian world, much faster than Socinus, with all his subtile explications of Scripture texts, could bear it down. Being well aware how this matter was, he fell next upon the *Sacraments*; discarding one of them, in a manner, under pretence that it was *needless*; and castrating the other, with respect to what was most valuable in it, to render it *despicable*. It was thought somewhat odd, by some of his own friends <sup>d</sup>, that he should labour to throw off *Baptism*, and at the same time retain the *Eucharist*, which appeared to be *comparatively* of slighter moment, and less insisted upon in Scripture. But he well knew what he did; for the *form* of *Baptism* stood most directly in his way. As to the *Eucharist*, if he could but reduce it to a bare *commemoration* of an absent friend, there would be nothing left in it to create him much trouble; but it might look sincere and ingenuous, in that instance at least, to abide by the *letter* of the text, and to plead for the *perpetuity* of an ancient and venerable (now by him made a *nominal*) Sacrament. This appears to be the most natural account of his conduct in the whole affair. For otherwise it is a very plain case, that a lively imagination like his might have invented as fair or fairer pretexts for laying aside the *Eucharist* <sup>d</sup>, than for discarding *Baptism*; and it might have been easier to elude some *few* places of Scripture than *many*. But I return.

From the induction of particulars here drawn together, and laid before you, may be understood, by the way, the true and right notion of the Christian *Eucharist*, such as obtained from the beginning, and continued till the dark

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Ruari Epistolæ, vol. ii. p. 251.

\* Indeed, the same pretences, some of them, equally affect both Sacraments, and tend to the discarding of *both*, or *neither*; as Vossius justly remarks, De Baptismo.

ages came on, and longer: but the point which I aimed at was, to illustrate the use of both the Sacraments considered as *fences* or *barriers*, ordained by Christ, to secure the *true faith*, and to preclude *false doctrines*. Few have ever attempted to corrupt Christianity in any of its considerable branches, but, first or last, they have found themselves embarrassed by one or both Sacraments; and have been thereby obliged either to desist presently, or to expose themselves farther, by quarrelling with those sacred institutions, which all wise and good men have ever most highly revered.

I have taken notice, how the most essential articles of the Christian religion have, in their several turns, (as they happened to be attacked,) been supported and strengthened by these auxiliary means. The doctrine of the *visible creation* by God most high: the doctrine of our *redemption* by Christ, both *God* and *man*: the doctrine of sanctifying *grace* by the *Holy Spirit* of God, a *real Person*, and also *Divine*: the doctrines of *original sin*, and of our Lord's *meritorious sacrifice*, and of a *future resurrection* of the body: these, and as many others as are contained in *these*, have all been eminently preserved and held up by the Christian Sacraments. The Sacraments therefore are full of excellent instruction and admonition: they carry *creeds* and *commandments*, as it were, in the bowels of them: they speak even to the *eyes* in silent *imagery*, and often teach more in *dumb show*, with less expence of time and much greater efficacy, than any the most eloquent discourses could do. The Romanists have sometimes boasted, that *images* are the *laymen's books*, wherein the unlearned may read what it concerns them to know, without knowing *letters*. And indeed, if images had been *authorized*, or had they not been *prohibited* books, they might have been admitted with a better grace. But our *Sacraments* are the true books, (or serving as books,) both to learned and unlearned; full of lively imagery and instructive emblem; drawn by Christ himself, and left as his legacies, for the use of all the churches.

Let us then, my Reverend Brethren, be careful to preserve these *sacred deposits* with all due reverence and watchfulness ; inasmuch as they contain treasures of infinite value ; and Christianity itself appears to be so entirely wrapped up in them, that, humanly speaking, it must unavoidably stand or fall with them.

THE  
**CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE**

EXPLAINED,

IN

**A CHARGE**

DELIVERED IN PART TO

**THE MIDDLESEX CLERGY**

AT

**ST. CLEMENT-DANES,**

*April the 20th, 1738.*

---

TO WHICH IS ADDED

**AN APPENDIX.**

**VOL. VIII.**

**L**



---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

THE Sacrament of the *Eucharist* has for some time been the subject of debate amongst us, and appears to be so still, in some measure; particularly with regard to the *sacrificial* part of it. As it is a *federal* rite between God and man, so it must be supposed to carry in it something that *God gives to us*, and something also that *we give*, or present, *to God*. These are, as it were, the two *integral* parts of that holy ceremony: the former may properly be called the *sacramental* part, and the latter, the *sacrificial*. Any great mistake concerning either may be of very ill consequence to the main thing: for if we either mistake the nature of God's *engagements* towards us, or the nature of our *engagements* towards God, in that sacred solemnity, we so far defeat the great ends and uses of it, and prejudice ourselves in so doing.

A question was unhappily raised amongst us, about an hundred years ago, whether the *material elements* of the *Eucharist* were properly the *Christian sacrifice*. From thence arose some debate; which however lasted not long, nor spread very far. But at the beginning of this present century, the same question was again brought up, and the debate revived, with some warmth; and it is not altogether extinct even at this day.

Those who shall look narrowly into the heart of that dispute may see reason to judge, that a great part of it was owing to some *confusion* of ideas, or *ambiguity* of terms; more particularly, from the want of settling the *definitions* of *sacrifice* by certain rules, such as might satisfy reasonable men on both sides.

How that *confusion* at first arose may perhaps be learned by looking back as far as to Bellarmine, about 1590, or however as far as to the Council of Trent, about thirty

years higher. Before that time things were much clearer, so far as concerned this article. No body almost doubted but that the old *definitions* of *sacrifice* were right, and that *spiritual* sacrifice was *true* and *proper* sacrifice, yea the *most proper* of any.

*Spiritual sacrifice* is St. Peter's phrase <sup>a</sup>: and it agrees with St. Paul's phrase of *reasonable service* <sup>b</sup>: and both of them fall in with our Lord's own phrase, of *worshipping* God in *spirit* and in *truth* <sup>c</sup>. It is serving God in *newness* of *spirit*, not in the *oldness* of the *letter* <sup>d</sup>. It is offering him *true* sacrifice and *direct* homage, as opposed to *legal* and *typical*, in order to come at *true* and *direct* expiation, without the previous covers or shadows of *legal* and *typical* expiations, which reached only to the *purifying* of the *flesh*, not to the *purging* of the *conscience* <sup>e</sup>. This kind of sacrifice called *spiritual* does not mean *mental* service only, but takes in *mental*, *vocal*, and *manual*, the service of the *heart*, *mouth*, and *hand*; all *true* and *direct* service, *bodily* <sup>f</sup> service, as well as any other, since we ought to serve God with our *bodies*, as well as our *souls*. Such is the nature and quality of what *Scripture* and the *ancients* call *spiritual* sacrifice, as opposed to the outward *letter*. Such services have obtained the name of *sacrifice* ever since David's time <sup>g</sup>, warranted by God himself, under the *Old Testament* and *New*. The Jews, before Christ and since <sup>h</sup>, have frequently used the name of *sacrifice* in the same *spiritual* sense. The very Pagans were proud to borrow the same way of speaking <sup>i</sup> from Jews and Chris-

<sup>a</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 5.

<sup>b</sup> Rom. xii. 1.

<sup>c</sup> John iv. 23. See Dodwell on Instrum. Music, p. 31. Stillingfleet, Serm. xxxix. p. 602. Scot, vol. iv. Serm. iv.

<sup>d</sup> Rom. vii. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. ix. 13, 14, 9.

<sup>f</sup> Rom. xii. 1. 1 Cor. vi. 20.

<sup>g</sup> They are emphatically styled *sacrifices of God*, (Psal. li. 17.) as being the fittest *presents* or *gifts* to him, the most acceptable *offerings*.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Vitringa de vet. Synag. in Proleg. p. 40, 41. Philo passim. Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 387.

<sup>i</sup> Porphyrius de Abstin. lib. ii. sect. 34. Conf. Enseb. Præp. Evangel. lib. iv. cap. 9—14. xiii. cap. 13. Clem. Alex. Strom. v. p. 686. edit. Ox. Even

tians : so that *custom of language* has not run altogether on the side of *material* sacrifice. It may rather be said, that the custom of *Christian language*, not only in the *New Testament*, but also in the Church writers, has run on the side of *spiritual* sacrifice, without giving the least hint that it was not *true* sacrifice, or not sacrifice *properly so called*.

St. Austin's definition of true and Christian *sacrifice*<sup>k</sup> is well known, and need not here be repeated. He spoke the sense of the churches before him : and the Schools, after him, followed him in the same. Aquinas, at the head of the Schoolmen, may here speak for the rest : he determines, that a sacrifice, *properly*, is any thing performed for God's sole and due honour, in order to *appease* him<sup>l</sup>. He plainly makes it a *work*, or *service*, not a *material thing* : and by that very rule he determined, that the *sacrifice of the cross* was a *true sacrifice* ; which expression implies both *proper* and *acceptable*. This notion of sacrifice prevailed in that century and in the centuries following, and was admitted by the early Reformers<sup>m</sup> ; and even by Romanists also, as low as the year 1556, or yet lower. Alphonsus a Castro, of that time, a zealous Romanist, in a famous book (which between 1534 and 1556 had gone

Plato, long before Christianity, had defined *sacrifice* to mean a *present* to the Divine Majesty ; not confining it, so far as appears, to *material*, but leaving it *at large*, so as to comprehend either *material* or *spiritual*. See my Review, vol. vii. p. 347.

<sup>k</sup> Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhaeramus Deo, relatum scilicet ad illum finem boni quo veraciter beati esse possumus. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 242. tom. 7. ed. Bened. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 345.

<sup>l</sup> Dicendum, quod sacrificium *proprie* dicitur : *aliquid factum in honorem proprie Deo debitum ad eum placandum*. Et inde est quod Augustinus dicit, *verum sacrificium est*, &c. Christus autem, ut ibidem subditur, seipsum obtulit in passione pro nobis. Et *hoc ipsum opus*, quod voluntarie passionem sustinuit, Deo maxime acceptum fuit, utpote ex *charitate* maxime proveniens : unde manifestum est, quod *passio Christi fuerit verum sacrificium*. *Aquin. Summ.* par. iii. q. 48.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Melancthon. de Missa, p. 195. In Malachi, p. 545. tom. ii. Chemnit. Examen. part. ii. p. 137.



through ten or more editions) declared his full agreement with Calvin, so far as concerned the definition of *true sacrifice*, conformable to St. Austin's<sup>n</sup>. Even Bellarmine acknowledged, above thirty years after, that some noted Doctor of the Roman Church still adhered to the same definition<sup>o</sup>. So that *spiritual* sacrifice was not yet entirely excluded as *improper, metaphorical, and nominal*, among the Romanists themselves; neither was it hitherto a *ruled* point amongst them, that *material thing* was essential to the nature, notion, or definition of *true and proper sacrifice*. How that came about afterwards, we shall see presently.

The Romanists, wanting arguments to support their *mass sacrifice*, thought of this pretence, among others, that either their *mass* must be the *sacrifice of the Church*, or the Church had really *none*: and so if the Protestants resolved to throw off the *mass*, they would be left without a *sacrifice*, without an *altar*, without a *priesthood*, and be no longer a *church*<sup>p</sup>. The Protestants had *two* very just answers to make, which were much the same with what the *primitive Christians* had before made to the Pagans, when the like had been objected to them. The first was, that *Christ himself* was the *Church's sacrifice*<sup>q</sup>, considered in a *passive* sense, as commemorated, applied, and participated in the Eucharist. The second was, that they had sacrifices besides, in the *active* sense, sacrifices of their *own* to *offer*, visibly, publicly, and by sacerdotal hands, in the Eucharist: which sacrifices were their *prayers*, and *praises*,

<sup>n</sup> After reciting Austin's definition, he proceeds; Hæc Augustinus, ex quibus verbis aperte colligitur *omne opus bonum quod Deo offertur, esse verum sacrificium*, et hanc definitionem ipsemet Calvinus admittit—ex cujus verbis constat, inter nos et illum de *veri sacrificiû* definitione convenire. *Alphons. a Castro, adv. Heres.* lib. x. p. 75. edit. 1565.

<sup>o</sup> Bellarmin. de Miss. lib. i. cap. 2. p. 710.

<sup>p</sup> Alphons. a Castro, lib. x. p. 74. Conf. Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. 1. cap. 20.

<sup>q</sup> Vid. Clem. Alex. p. 688, 836. ed. Ox. Euseb. Demonstr. Evan. p. 38. Augustin. tom. iv. p. 1462. ed. Bened. Gregorius M. tom. ii. p. 472. ed. Bened. Cyrill. Alex. contr. Jul. lib. ix.

and *commemorations*<sup>t</sup>; *eucharistic* sacrifices, properly, though *propitiatory* also in a qualified sense. The Council of Trent, in 1562, endeavoured to obviate both those answers<sup>s</sup>: and Bellarmine afterwards undertook formally to confute them. The Romanists had no way left but to affirm stoutly, and to endeavour weakly to prove, that the *two* things which the Protestants insisted upon did neither singly, nor both together, amount to *true* and *proper* sacrifice. Here began all the subtilities and thorny perplexities which have darkened the subject ever since; and which must, I conceive, be thrown off, (together with the *new* and *false* definitions, which came in with them,) if ever we hope to *clear* the subject effectually, and to set it upon its true and ancient basis.

I shall pass over Bellarmine's trifling exceptions to the Protestant *sacrifice*, (meaning the *grand sacrifice*,) considered in the *passive* sense. It is self-evident, that while we have *Christ*, we want neither *sacrifice*, *altar*, nor *priest*; for in him we have all: and if he is the *head*, and we the *body*, there is *the Church*. Had we no *active* sacrifice at all, yet so long as we are empowered, by Divine commission, to convey the *blessings*<sup>t</sup> of the *great sacrifice* to as many as are *worthy*, we therein exercise an honour-

<sup>r</sup> Justin Martyr, p. 14, 19, 387, 389. ed. Thirib. Clem. Alex. 686, 836, 848, 849, 850, 860. edit. Ox. Origen. tom. ii. p. 210, 311, 191, 205, 243, 363, 418, 563. ed. Bened. Euseb. Dem. Evang. p. 20, 21, 23. Tertullian, p. 69, 188, 330. Rigalt. Cyprian, Ep. lxxvii. p. 159. ed. Bened. Hilarius, Pictav. p. 154, 228, 535. Basil. tom. iii. p. 52. ed. Bened. Chrysostom, tom. v. p. 231, 316, 503. ed. Bened. Hieronym. tom. ii. p. 186, 250, 254. tom. iii. p. 15, 1122, 1420. ed. Bened. Augustin. tom. ii. p. 439. iv. p. 14, 473, 455, 527, 498, 1026, 1113. vii. p. 240. Bened. and compare my Review, vol. vii. cap. 12.

<sup>s</sup> Si quis dixerit in missa non offerri Deo *verum et proprium* sacrificium, aut quod *offerri* non sit aliud quam nobis *Christum ad manducandum dari*, anathema sit.—Si quis dixerit missæ sacrificium tantum esse *laudis et gratiarum actionis*, aut nudam *commemorationem* sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem *propitiatorium*, anathema sit. *Concil. Trid. sess. xxii. can. 1, 3.*

<sup>t</sup> *Blessing* was a considerable part of the sacerdotal office in the Aaronical priesthood. Numb. vi. 23—27. Deut. x. 8. xxi. 5.

able *priesthood*<sup>u</sup>, and may be said to *magnify our office*. But waving that consideration at present, for the sake of brevity, I shall proceed to examine what Bellarmine has objected to our *sacrifices* considered in the *active* sense, and to inquire by what kind of logic he attempted to discard all *spiritual* sacrifices, under the notion of *improper, metaphorical, nominal* sacrifices, or, in short, *no sacrifices*.

1. He pleads, that Scripture *opposes* good works to sacrifice; as particularly in Hosea vi. 6. "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice:" therefore *good works* are not sacrifice properly so called<sup>x</sup>. But St. Austin long before had sufficiently obviated that pretence, by observing, that Scripture, in such instances, had only *opposed* one kind of sacrifice to another kind, *symbolical* to *real*, *typical* to *true*, *shadow* to *substance*<sup>y</sup>. God rejected the *sign*, which had almost engrossed the *name*, and pointed out the *thing signified*; which more justly deserved to be called *sacrifice*. So it was not opposing *sacrifice* to *no sacrifice*, but *legal* sacrifice to *evangelical*. Such was St. Austin's solution of the objected difficulty: and it appears to be very just and solid, sufficiently confirmed both by the Old Testament and New.

<sup>u</sup> Some of the elder Romanists acknowledged this to be *sufficient*. Satis est, ut *vere et proprie* sit sacrificium, quod mors Christi ita nunc ad peccati remissionem applicetur, ac si nunc ipse Christus moreretur. *Cunus, Loc. Theol.* lib. xii. cap. 12.

<sup>x</sup> Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 2. p. 710.

<sup>y</sup> Per hoc ubi scriptum est, *Misericordiam volo quam sacrificium*, nihil aliud quam *sacrificio sacrificium* prelatum oportet intelligi: quoniam illud quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium *signum* est *veri sacrificii*. Porro autem *miseriordia* est *verum sacrificium*. *Augustin. de Civ. Dei*, lib. x. cap. 5.

N. B. In explication of what Austin says, *quod ab omnibus*, &c. it may be noted, that he did not take the *vulgar language* for the *best*, or the *only* rule of *propriety*: he observes elsewhere (de Verb. Dom. Serm. liii.) that almost all call the *Sacrament*, (that is, *sign* of the body,) the *body*. *Pene quidem sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt*. And yet he did not think that the *sign* was more *properly* the body, than the *body* itself, but quite otherwise.

2. Bellarmine's next pretence is, that in every sacrifice, *properly* so called, there must be some *sensible thing* offered; because St. Paul has intimated, that a priest must have *somewhat* to offer. Heb. viii. 3<sup>z</sup>. But St. Paul says *somewhat*, not some *sensible thing*. And certainly, if a man offers prayers, lauds, good works, &c. he offers *somewhat*, yea and somewhat *sensible* too: for *public* prayers, especially, are open to the *sense* of hearing, and *public* performances to more *senses* than one. Therefore the *service* may be the sacrifice, not the *material things*: and such service being *evangelical*, (not *legal* or *typical*,) is *spiritual* sacrifice.

3. The Cardinal has a third argument about *elicit acts*; which being highly metaphysical and fanciful, I choose rather to pass it off without further answer, than to offend your ears with it.

4. A fourth pretence is, that the sacrifice of the Church being but *one*, the *spiritual* sacrifices, which are *many*, cannot be that *one* sacrifice. Here he quotes Austin, Pope Leo, and Chrysostom, to prove that the Church's sacrifice is but *one*, and *that one* the Eucharist<sup>a</sup>. He might have spared the labour, because the same Fathers assert the sacrifice of the Eucharist to be both *one* and *many*, diversly considered: one *complicated sacrifice*, taking in the *whole* action; *many* sacrifices, if distinctly viewed under the several particulars. And though the Eucharist might by common use come to be called emphatically, *the sacrifice*, as being most *observable*, or most *excellent*, or as comprehending *more* sacrifices in one, than any other service did, yet it does not from thence follow that the other less observable or less considerable sacrifices were not properly sacrifices. For has not the same Eucharist, in vulgar speech, and by custom, come to be *emphatically* called, *the Sacrament*, as if there were no other Sacrament? And yet certain it is, that Baptism is as *properly* a Sacrament as the other. *Emphatical* appellations therefore are rather marks of the

<sup>a</sup> Bellarmiu. *ibid.* p. 711.

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.* p. 712.

*excellency* or *notoriety* of a thing, than of strict *propriety* of speech. But I return to Bellarmine.

5. A fifth pretence is, that *spiritual* sacrifices, being common both to clergy and laity, require no *proper priesthood*, and therefore cannot be justly esteemed *proper sacrifices*: for *proper sacrifice* and *proper priesthood*, being relatives, must stand or fall together<sup>b</sup>. To which it may be answered, that even *lay Christians*, considered as *offering* spiritual sacrifices, are so far *priests*, according to the doctrine of the New Testament, confirmed by Catholic antiquity<sup>c</sup>. But waving that nicety, (as some may call it,) yet certainly when spiritual sacrifices are offered up by *priests*, divinely commissioned, and in the face of a Christian congregation, they are then as *proper sacrifices* as any other are, or can be: and this is sufficient to our purpose. Let the *Eucharist* therefore, duly administered by *sacerdotal* officers, be admitted as a sacrifice *properly* so called, but of the *spiritual* kind, and we desire nothing further. If a *sacerdotal* oblation of the people's *loaf* and *wine*, can be thought sufficient to convert them into *proper sacrifices*, though they had nothing at all of a *sacrificial* nature in them before such oblation; surely the like sacerdotal oblation may much more convert the people's *prayers*, *praises*, and devout *services* (which previously had something of a *sacrificial* nature in them) into *real* and *proper sacrifices*, yea the *properest* of any<sup>d</sup>. Why then must our *spiritual* offerings be set aside as of no account in respect of *proper sacrifice*, only to take in other things of much *lower* account than they? Why should we take in those *meaner*

<sup>b</sup> Bellarmin. *ibid.* p. 712.

<sup>c</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 390.

<sup>d</sup> This matter is briefly and accurately expressed by our very learned and judicious Bp. Montague.

In lege Christi sunt *sacerdotes*, non tantum illa *laxa* significatione, qua quotquot Jesu Christi sumus *κρίστυμοι*, (*Christiani nominati*), sumus etiam et dicimur *sacerdotes*, sed et illa magis *stricta*, qua qui populo acquisitionis *presunt* *ἐν νόμῳ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐν Θεῷ*, Dei sunt et populi *μεινται*.—Habemus autem et *altare*, ad quod *offerimus* oblationes et sacrificia *commemorationis*, *laudationis*, *orationis*, *nos, nostra* Deo, per sacerdotem. *Montacut. Orig.* tom. ii. p. 313.

things at all, as *sacrifices*, into our *pure offerings*, which are much better without them, and can only be defiled by such an heterogeneous mixture of *legal* and *evangelical*? Let the elements be *signs* (as they really are) of the sacrifice which we *offer*, as they are also *signs* of the sacrifice whereof we *participate*: that appears to be the *end* and *use* of them, (and *great* use it is,) and seems to be all the honour which God ever intended them. To be plainer, we ourselves are the *sacrifice offered* by those <sup>c</sup> symbols; and the victim of the cross is the *sacrifice participated* by the same symbols. But I proceed.

6. It is further argued against *spiritual* sacrifices, that they require no *proper* altar, as all *proper* sacrifices do: therefore they are not *proper* sacrifices <sup>f</sup>. This argument is faulty, more ways than one. For, 1. It can never be proved, that *sacrifices* and *altars* are such inseparable *relatives*, that one may not subsist without the other. An *altar* seems to be rather a *circumstance* of convenience, or decency, than *essential* to sacrifice. It was accidental to the Jewish sacrifices, that they needed *altars*: and the reason was not because *all* sacrifices must have *altars*, but because sacrifices of *such a kind* could not be performed without them; otherwise, an *altar* appears no more necessary to a *sacrifice*, considered at large, than a case or a plate, a *pix* or a *patin*, is to a *gift*, or *present*. 2. Besides, how will it be made appear that the *table* on which our Lord consecrated the Eucharist, or the *cross* on which he suffered, was *properly* and *previously* an altar? The Cardinal's argument proves too much to prove any thing: for it does not only strike at the *spiritual* sacrifices, but at the *mass sacrifice* too, and even at the *sacrifice of the cross*,

\* The sacrifice of the cross, or Christ himself, may also be said to be *offered* in the Eucharist. But then it means only offered *to view*, or offered to *Divine consideration*: that is, *represented* before God, angels, and men, and *pleaded* before God as what we claim to; not offered again in *sacrifice*. See Field on the Church, p. 204, 205. and my Review, vol. vii. p. 384.

<sup>f</sup> Bellarmin. *ibid.* p. 712, 713.

which had no *proper* altar. But if it be said, that both the *table* and the *cross* were *proper altars*, as being the *seats* of *proper sacrifices*, then whatever is the *seat* of a spiritual sacrifice (which we now suppose to be *proper*) will, by parity of reason, be a spiritual *altar* also, and *proper* in its kind: so then, take the thing either way, the argument is frivolous, and concludes nothing<sup>h</sup>. I have now run through the Cardinal's subtilities on this head; excepting that some notice remains to be taken of his artful contrivance to elude St. Austin's definition of sacrifice, and therewith all the old definitions which had obtained in the Church for fifteen hundred years before.

7. He pretends, that that Father defined only *true sacrifice*, not *proper sacrifice*; and that therefore his definition comes not up to the point in hand: *good works* may be *true sacrifices*, in St. Austin's sense, but they will be *improper, metaphorical, or nominal* only, notwithstanding<sup>i</sup>. This is the substance of the pretext, laid down in its full force, and it will require a clear and distinct answer. First, I may take notice, that it is very odd, in this case especially, to make a distinction between *true* and *proper*, and to *oppose* one to the other. St. Austin, most undoubtedly, intended, under the word *true*, to take in all *Christian*, all

<sup>h</sup> Some make the *cross* itself the *altar*, which has been the current way of speaking from Origen of the third century. Others say, the *Divine nature* of our Lord was the *altar*, grounding it upon Hebr. ix. 14. Others take in *both*, in different respects: but neither of them seems to have been an *altar* in strict *propriety* of speech, but rather in the way of *analogy*, or *resemblance*. This article has been minutely discussed by Cloppenburg. Opp. vol. i. p. 82, &c. Witsius, Miscellan. tom. i. p. 509. In Symb. Apostol. p. 146. Vitringa, Obs. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. 13. lib. iv. cap. 15. Deylingius, Obs. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 393. Miscellan. 559, 567.

<sup>i</sup> The Lord's table is by the ancients frequently called an *altar*, as being the *seat* of the elements, and so an *altar* in the same *metonymical* meaning, as the elements were *body* and *blood*, or the *grand sacrifice* itself. The Lord's table might also more *properly* be called an *altar*, as being that from which, or at which, prayers and praises and commemorations (*spiritual sacrifices*) were offered. See my Review, vol. vii. p. 372.

<sup>j</sup> Bellarmine. *ibid.* p. 713. conf. Vasquez, tom. iii. p. 507. Suarez, tom. iii. p. 886. Bapt. Scortia, p. 18.

*evangelical*, all *salutary* or *acceptable*, yea all *allowable* sacrifices: and what can it signify to talk of any *proper* sacrifice (Jewish, suppose, or Pagan) as opposed to *true*, so long as such *proper* sacrifice is no sacrifice at all in Christian account, but a *sacrilege* rather, or a *profanation*? But I answer farther, that there is no reason to imagine that St. Austin did not intend to include *proper* under the word *true*. It would not have been sufficient to his purpose to have said *proper* sacrifice, because Jewish and Pagan sacrifices might come under the same appellation: but he chose the word *true*, as carrying in it more than *proper*, and as expressing *proper* and *salutary*, or *authorized*, both in one. As *true religion* implies both *proper* and *authorized* religion, and as *true worship* implies the like; so *true sacrifice* implies both *propriety* as to the *name*, and *truth* as to the thing<sup>k</sup>.

The point may be farther argued from hence, that the ancient Fathers did not only call spiritual sacrifices *real* and *true*<sup>l</sup>, but they looked upon them as the *best*, the *noblest*, the most *perfect* sacrifices, the most *suitable* and *proper* gifts or presents that could be offered to the Divine Majesty<sup>m</sup>: and they never dropped any hints of their being either *improper* or *metaphorical*. The Romanists knew this very well; and it may be useful to observe

<sup>k</sup> In this sense St. Austin called our Lord's sacrifice *true*. Contr. Faust. lib. xx. cap. 18. xxii. 17. Contr. advers. Leg. &c. lib. i. cap. 18.

<sup>l</sup> Justin. Dial. p. 389. ed. Thirlb. Irenæus, lib. iv. cap. 17. p. 248. ed. Bened. Origen. tom. ii. p. 362. ed. Bened. Clem. Alex. p. 686. ed. Ox. Lactant. Epit. 169, 204, 205. edit. Dav. Philastrius, Hær. cap. cix. p. 221. ed. Fabr. Hieronym. in Amos, cap. v. p. 1420. ed. Bened. Augustin. tom. x. p. 94, 242, 243, 256. ed. Bened. Gregor. Magn. Dial. lib. iv. cap. 59. p. 472. ed. Bened.

<sup>m</sup> Justin. Dial. p. 387. Athenagoras, p. 48, 49. ed. Ox. Clem. Alex. p. 836, 848, 849, 860. Tertullian, Apol. cap. xxx. De Orat. cap. 27, 28. Minuc. Felix, sect. xxxii. p. 183. Cyprian, Ep. lxxvii. p. 159. ed. Bened. Lactantius, Epit. cap. lviii. de vero Cultu, lib. vi. cap. 24, 25. Eusebius, Demonstr. p. 40. Hilarius, Pictav. p. 154. ed. Bened. Basil, tom. iii. p. 207. ed. Bened. Nazianzen. tom. i. p. 38, 484. Chrysostom. tom. v. p. 20, 231, 316, 503. vii. 216. ed. Bened. Augustin. tom. v. p. 268. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 20. lib. xix. cap. 23. Isidorus Pelus. lib. iii. Ep. 75.



their exquisite subtilty in this argument. For after they have exploded, with a kind of popular clamour, all that the Fathers ever called *true* sacrifice, under the opprobrious name of *improper* and *metaphorical*<sup>n</sup>, and have raised an odium against Protestants for admitting no other, then, (as if they had forgot all that they had been before doing,) they fetch a round, and come upon us with the *high* and *emphatical* expressions of the *Fathers*, asking, how we can be so dull as to understand them of *metaphorical*, *nominal* sacrifices<sup>o</sup>? Yet we are very certain, that all those *high* expressions of the *Fathers* belonged only to *spiritual* sacrifices; the very same that Bellarmine and the rest discard as *improper* and *metaphorical*.

But they here play fast and loose with us: first, pretending that the *true* and *noble* sacrifices of the ancients did not mean *proper* ones, in order to discard the *old* definitions; and then again, (to serve another turn,) pretending that those very sacrifices must have been *proper*, (not *metaphorical*), because the Fathers so highly esteemed them, and spake so honourably of them. In short, the whole artifice terminates in this, that the self-same sacrifices as admitted by Protestants shall be called *metaphorical*, in order to disgrace the Protestant cause, but shall be called *proper* and *true* as admitted by the *Fathers*, in order to keep up some show of agreement in this article with *antiquity*. But I return to the Cardinal, whom I left disabling all the *old* definitions, in order to introduce a *new* one of his own, a very strange one<sup>p</sup>; fitted indeed to throw out *spiritual sacrifice* most effectually, (which was what he chiefly aimed at,) but at the same time also overthrowing, undesignedly, both the *sacrifice of the mass* and the *sacrifice of the cross*.

<sup>n</sup> Vide Suarez, tom. iii. p. 886, 891, 892, 893, 896.

<sup>o</sup> Vide Petavius, Eccl. Dogm. tom. iii. p. 130.

<sup>p</sup> A definition of *one kind* of sacrifice, (*Jewish*, as it seems,) rather than of *sacrifice* in general, or of *Christian* in particular. It is giving us a *species* for the *genus*, like the making a definition of *man*, and then calling it a definition of *animal*.

1. As to the *sacrifice* of the *mass*, the subject of it is supposed to be our Lord's *natural* body, *invisible* in the Eucharist; and yet, by the *definition*, the sacrifice should be *res sensibilis*<sup>9</sup>, something *visible*, obvious to one or more of the *senses*. Again, our Lord's body is not liable any more to *destruction*; and yet, by the *definition*, the sacrifice should be *destroyed*. But I shall insist no longer upon the Cardinal's inconsistencies in that article, because he has often been called to account for them by learned Protestants<sup>r</sup>.

2. The second article, relating to the *sacrifice of the cross*, has been less taken notice of: but it is certain, that Bellarmine's definition is no more friendly to that, than to the other.

If our Lord's *soul* was any part of his *offering*, (as Scripture seems to intimate<sup>s</sup>, and as the *Fathers* plainly teach<sup>t</sup>, and the reason of the thing persuades,) or if his *life* was an offering, which Scripture plainly, and more than once testifies<sup>u</sup>; then *res aliqua sensibilis*, some *sensible thing* is not the true notion of *proper* sacrifice, neither is it essential to the *definition* of it; unless the *life* which our Lord gave upon the cross was no *proper* sacrifice. Perhaps, in strictness of notion, his "obedience unto death<sup>v</sup>," his amazing act of *philanthropy*, (so highly extolled in the New Testament,) was properly the acceptable *sacrifice*. So Aquinas states that matter, as I before noted: and Bel-

<sup>9</sup> *Sacrificium est oblatio externa, facta soli Deo, qua ad agnitionem humanæ infirmitatis, et professionem Divinæ majestatis, a legitimo ministro res aliqua sensibilis et permanens, in ritu mystico, consecratur, et transmutatur, ita ut plane destruat. Bellarm. p. 715, 717.*

<sup>r</sup> Johann. Forbesius, p. 615. Montacutius, Orig. tom. ii. p. 302, 357. Bishop Morton, b. vi. cap. 6. p. 467, 468, &c. Hakewill, p. 8. Brevint. Depth and Mystery, &c. p. 133, 144. Payne on the Sacrifice of the Mass, p. 70. Bishop Kidder, p. 316, 415.

<sup>s</sup> Isa. liii. 10, 11, 12. Psalm xvi. 10. Luke xxiii. 46.

<sup>t</sup> Clem. Roman. cap. xlix. Irenæus, p. 292. ed. Bened. Hieronym. tom. ii. part. 2. p. 167, 173. ed. Bened. Fulgentius ad Thrasimund. lib. iii. Compare Bishop Bilson, Full Redemption, &c. p. 83, &c.

<sup>u</sup> Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. John x. 11, 15, 17. xv. 13. 1 John iii. 16.

<sup>v</sup> Phil. ii. 8. Hebr. v. 8.

larmine was aware of it, in another chapter, wherein he undertakes to prove, that our Lord's death was a *proper sacrifice* <sup>w</sup>. There he was obliged to say, though he says it coldly, that acts of charity are *quoddam sacrificium*, a kind of sacrifice. But the question was about *proper sacrifice*, and about our Lord's *philanthropy*: was that only *quoddam sacrificium*, or was it not *proper*? Here the Cardinal was nonplused, and had no way to extricate himself, but by admitting (faintly however and tacitly, as conscious of self-contradiction) that *spiritual sacrifice* may be *proper sacrifice*, and is not always *metaphorical*: otherwise, the very brightest part of our Lord's own sacrifice, the very flower and perfection of it, his most stupendous work of *philanthropy*, must have been thrown off, under the low and disparaging names of *metaphorical*, *improper*, *nominal sacrifice*.

Having seen how the ablest champion of the Romish cause failed in his attempts against *spiritual sacrifices*, failed in *not proving* his point, failed also in *over proving*, we may now with the greater assurance maintain, that the *old definitions*, which took in *spiritual sacrifice*, were true and just, and that the *new ones*, arbitrarily introduced, in the decline of the sixteenth century, are false and wrong; such as one would expect from men *zealous* for a *party cause*, and disposed to support manifest *errors* and *absurdities*, at any rate whatsoever.

After pointing out the *rise* of the *new definitions*, I am next to observe what their *progress* was, and what the result or issue of them. It must, I am afraid, be owned, that our Romish adversaries were but too successful in spreading mists and darkness all over the subject, in opening a new and wide field of dispute, thereby drawing the Protestants, more or less, out of their safe intrenchments; dividing them also, if not as to their main *sentiments*, yet at least as to their *modes of expression* and their *methods of defence*.

<sup>w</sup> Bellarm. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 3. p. 718.

How this affair had been fixed amongst us, but a few years before, may be collected from Archbishop Sandys's judicious *definition* of *sacrifice*<sup>1</sup>, published in 1585, and contrived to take in sacrifices both of the *material* and *spiritual* kind. Dr. Bilson also (afterwards Bishop) published his book of Christian Subjection, the same year; wherein he took occasion to assert, that the Eucharist is a *sacrifice*, yea, and a *true* sacrifice; but understanding it to be of the *spiritual* kind<sup>2</sup>. This kind of language (the uniform language of *antiquity*, and of the *whole reformation*<sup>3</sup> for sixty or seventy years,) began to vary in some measure, from Bellarmine's time, and more and more so, both here and abroad. Some indeed stood by the *old definitions* and *ancient language* concerning the Eucharist: more went off from it; and so Protestants became divided, in *sounds* at least, while they differed not much in *sense*. Many finding that they were sufficiently able to maintain their ground

<sup>1</sup> "Sacrificing is a voluntary action whereby we worship God, offering him *somewhat*, in token that we acknowledge him to be the Lord, and ourselves his servants." *Sandys*, Sermon. xxi. p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> "Malachi speaketh of the *true* sacrifice, which, from the beginning, and so to the end, was and shall be more acceptable to God, than the bloody and external sacrifices of the Jews." *Bilson*, p. 696.

<sup>3</sup> "Neither they nor I ever denied the Eucharist to be a *sacrifice*. The very name enforceth it to be the sacrifice of *praise* and *thanksgiving*; which is the *true* and *lively* sacrifice of the New Testament. The Lord's table, in respect of his *graces* and *mercies* there proposed to us, is an heavenly banquet, which we must *eat*, and not sacrifice: but the *duties* which he requireth at our hands, when we approach his table, are *sacrifices*, not *sacraments*. As namely, to offer him *thanks* and *praises*, *faith* and *obedience*, yea our *bodies* and *souls*, to be living, holy, and acceptable *sacrifices* unto him, which is our *reasonable* service." *Bilson*, p. 699.

<sup>4</sup> Beza's account (in 1577) may serve for a *specimen*.

Cena Domini *sacrificii rationem habet*, idque triplici respectu. 1. Quatenus in ea *aliquid Deo offerimus*, solennem videlicet *gratiarum actionem*, ex illo Christi præcepto. 1 Cor. xi. 26.

2. Deinde, quod in ea conferrentur *eleemosynæ*, ex instituto fortassis Apostoli, 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Quæ eleemosynæ vocantur *ελεησίναι*, ex illo Christi sermone. Matt. xxv. 40.

3. Quod mortis Domini *sacrificium*, ob *oculos* quodammodo in illis mysteriis *positum*, veluti renovetur. *Beza*, *Quæst. et Respons.* p. 105.

against the Romanists, even upon the foot of the *Romish definitions*, never troubled themselves farther to examine how *just* they were: it was enough, they thought, that the Romanists could not prove the Eucharist a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice, in their own way of defining; and the rest seemed to be only contending about *words* and *names*. Nevertheless the more thoughtful and considerate men saw what advantage the adversaries might make by aspersing the Protestants as having *no sacrifice, properly so called*, nor pretending to *any*: besides that the *dignity* of a venerable Sacrament would probably suffer much by it; and the ancient Fathers, who were very wise men, had never consented (though as much provoked to it by the Pagan objectors) to lessen the dignity of their *true* and *real* sacrifices by the low and diminutive names of *improper* or *metaphorical*. They always stood to it, that they had *sacrifices, yea and true sacrifices*, (of the spiritual <sup>a</sup> kind,) the *noblest* and *divinest* that could be offered; while all other pretended sacrifices, all *material* sacrifices <sup>b</sup>, were

<sup>a</sup> See the testimonies in my Review, vol. vii. ch. 12. To which abundance more may be added. And note, that though the epithet *spiritual*, joined, suppose, with *meat*, or *drink*, or the like, may denote some *material thing* bearing a *mystical* signification, yet it has not been shown, neither can it be shown, that the phrase *spiritual sacrifice* anciently denoted a *material substance* offered as a sacrifice. A sacred regard was had to St. Peter's use of that phrase, to denote *evangelical services*: besides that the Fathers constantly *explained* what they meant by *spiritual sacrifices*, and so *specified* the particulars, as to leave no room for scruple or evasion, among persons of any reasonable discernment. So that the putting a *new* construction upon the phrase, in order to make some show of agreement with antiquity, is a transparent fallacy. It is keeping their terms, but eluding their meaning. It is teaching *novel* doctrine under *ancient* phrases.

<sup>b</sup> Express testimonies against *material* sacrifice may be seen in Justin Martyr, Apol. p. 14. Tertullian, p. 188. Rigalt. Origen. in Psalm. p. 563, 722. ed. Bened. Lactantius, Epit. cap. lviii. p. 169. Eusebius, Præp. Evang. lib. iv. cap. 10. p. 148, 149. Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. p. 39, 222, 223. Basil. tom. ii. p. 402, 403. ed. Bened. Chrysostom, tom. i. p. 664. ed. Bened. Cyrill. Alex. contr. Jul. lib. x. p. 345. Procopius in Isa. p. 22, 493.

N. B. It is not *possible* to reconcile those testimonies to the *material* scheme: but it is very easy to make the Fathers *consistent* throughout, with themselves, and with each other, on the *spiritual* foot, as making the *work*,

mean, poor, contemptible things, in comparison. Such, I humbly conceive, ought to have been our constant, standing reply to the Romanists, with respect to this article: for we have certainly as just a plea for it in our case, as the ancient Fathers had in theirs. However, as I before hinted, Protestant Divines varied in their *language* on this head, some abiding by the *old definitions*, upon good consideration, others too unwarily departing from them. So now we are to consider them as divided into *two* sorts: and in process of time, as shall be related, sprang up a *third* sort, growing, as it were, out of the other two: I shall say something of each in their order and place, for the farther clearing of the subject.

1. Among those that adhered to the *old language*, and still continued to call the Eucharist a *true* or a *proper* sacrifice, but of the spiritual kind, I may first mention Aman-  
 dus Polanus<sup>c</sup>, a learned Calvinist, who died in 1610. Our very judicious Dean Field, (who finished his book of the Church in 1610, and died in 1616.) he also adhered to the *old language*, disregarding the *new* definitions. He asserted the Eucharist to be, with regard to the sacrifices of our *selves*, our *praises*, &c. a *true* but *spiritual* sacrifice<sup>d</sup>.

Scharpius, a learned Calvinist, who published his *Cur-  
 sus Theologicus* in 1617, scrupled not to reckon the Eu-  
 charist among the *sacrifices strictly and properly so called*,  
 but still of the *eucharistical* and *spiritual* kind. He had

or *service*, the sacrifice. The single question then is, whether the Fathers ought to be so interpreted as to make them *consistent* upon the *whole*; or whether some *detached* passages, capable of a *consistent* meaning, ought to be understood in a sense *repugnant* to the uniform tenor of their writings. The *passive* sense is the true key to those passages.

<sup>c</sup> *Cœna Domini est sacrificium, tum eucharisticum, tum propitiatorium: eucharisticum quidem proprium, quatenus in ejus usu gratias Deo agimus quod nos ex servitute, &c.—propitiatorium vero aliquo modo, quatenus unici illius sacrificii vere propitiatorii memoriam in eo serio frequentare jubemur. Amand. Polan. Symphon. Cathol. cap. xvii. p. 275. Conf. p. 855.*

<sup>d</sup> Field, of the Church, p. 210, 220.

seen Bellarmine's affected subtilities on that head, despised them, and in part confuted them<sup>e</sup>.

Bishop Andrews appears to have been a Divine of the same *ancient* stamp, in this article. In the year 1592, he discovered some uneasiness, that many would not allow the Eucharist to be a *sacrifice* at all, but a mere *sacrament*<sup>f</sup>. Afterwards, in 1610, he asserted the Lord's Supper to be a *sacrifice*, of the *eucharistical* kind<sup>g</sup>. In 1612, he went so far as to say, that the Apostle (1 Cor. x.) *matcheth* the Eucharist with the *sacrifice of the Jews*, and that, by the "rule of comparisons, they must be *ejusdem generis*<sup>h</sup>." By which he did not mean, as some have widely mistaken him, that both must be the *same kind of sacrifice*, but that both must be of the *sacrificial kind*, agreeing in the same *common genus* of sacrifice: for he said it in opposition to those who pretended that the Eucharist was an ordinance merely of the *sacramental kind*, and not at all of the *sacrificial*<sup>i</sup>.

Dr. Buckeridge wrote in 1614. His notion of the eucharistic sacrifice seems to resolve into a *real* and *proper* sacrifice of Christ's *mystical body*, the Church, and a *metonymical, improper* offering of Christ himself; offering him in *some sort*, or in the way of *representation*, like as is done in *Baptism*<sup>k</sup>. He does not indeed use the word *pro-*

<sup>e</sup> Scharpius, Curs. Theolog. p. 1522, 1525, 1539. edit. 2. Genevæ.

<sup>f</sup> Bp. Andrews's Sermons, part ii. p. 35.

<sup>g</sup> Andrews ad Bellarmin. Apolog. Responsa. p. 184.

<sup>h</sup> Bp. Andrews's Sermons, p. 453: Compare his Posthumous Answer to Card. Perron, p. 6, 7.

<sup>i</sup> Besides the argument here drawn from the consideration of what principles he was then *opposing*, (which is a good rule of construction,) it may farther be considered that the approved Divines of his time, Mason and Spalatensis, rejected with indignation the thought of any *material* sacrifice, (vid. Mason de Ministerio Anglican. p. 575, 599, 618, 551, 595. Spalatensis, lib. v. p. 149, 265, 267.) condemned it as *absurdity, madness, and impiety*. So also Bp. Morton, (b. vi. cap. 5. p. 438, 439.) approving what the wiser Romanists had said, condemning the notion in the like strong terms.

<sup>k</sup> De sacrificio cordis contriti—de sacrificiis item corporis Christi mystici (non naturalis) in quo nosmetipsos Deo offerimus, satis convenit.—De

per, following the style of the *ancients* before ever that word came in : but he apparently *means* it, where he speaks of the sacrifice of Christ's *mystical body*, that is, of *self-sacrifice*.

Archbishop Laud speaks of three sacrifices : 1. Christ's own sacrifice, *commemorated* before God, by the *priest alone*, in his *breaking* the bread, and *pouring out* the wine. 2. The sacrifice made by priest and people *jointly*, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. 3. *Self-sacrifice* by every communicant<sup>1</sup>. I will not defend all those distinctions. I think all the *three* sacrifices are properly the sacrifices of the *Church*, or of all the *worthy* communicants, recommended or offered up by their *priests* in that holy solemnity : the priest is their *mouth* in doing it, their conductor, or principal, authorized by God so to be. This great man said nothing of *proper* or *improper* : all the three sacrifices may be understood to be *proper*, but *spiritual*. What he believed, as to each, is not easy to say. If we explain his *commemorative* sacrifice by Bp. Buckeridge's account of the same thing, it could be no more than figurative, in that *relative* view ; for we cannot *properly* sacrifice *Christ* himself : but the *commemorative service*, being of the same nature with hymns and praises, may be considered in the *absolute* view, as a *proper* sacrifice of *ours*, of the *eucharistical* and *spiritual* kind ; and

sacrificio item *commemorativo*, sive *representativo*, quo *Christus* ipse, qui in cruce pro nobis immolatus est, per viam *representationis* et *commemorationis* a nobis etiam *quodammodo offerri* dicitur, his non magna est : in *Baptismo* enim offertur sacrificium *Christi*, uti *Augustinus*, &c. Buckeridge de *Potest. Papæ* in præfat.

<sup>1</sup> In the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices : " *One*, by the *priest only*, that is, the *commemorative* sacrifice of Christ's death, represented in " bread *broken* and wine *poured out* : another, by the priest and people " *jointly* ; and that is the sacrifice of *praise* and *thanksgiving* for all the benefits and graces we receive by the precious death of Christ : the *third*, " 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 upon him." *Laud's Conference*, sect. xxxv. p. 305, 306.



that perhaps was what that great Prelate might have in his thoughts.

It is certain that Bp. Montague, of that time, understood the whole *action*, or *memorial service*, to be a *true* and *real* sacrifice of praise<sup>m</sup>. And as he was a great admirer of *antiquity*, he had no regard to the *new* definitions, but referred the novellists to St. Austin for correction and better instruction<sup>n</sup>. The very learned Dr. Hammond was, undoubtedly, in the same way of thinking: the *whole eucharistical action* both of *priest* and *people*, the *memorial service* jointly performed, that was *the sacrifice* in his account<sup>o</sup>. Bishop Taylor<sup>p</sup>, Archbishop Bramhall<sup>q</sup>, Hamon l'Estrange<sup>r</sup>, appear to have been in the like sentiments. Dr. Patrick, who wrote in 1659, more plainly followed the ancient way of thinking and speaking, such as had been in use before the *new* definitions came in. *Duties* and *services* were his sacrifice, a *spiritual* sacrifice<sup>s</sup>. He pleads, that such services justly deserve the *name*<sup>t</sup>; that even the Pagan Platonists (as well as Scripture and Fathers) had so used the name of *sacrifice*; and that the appellation was very *proper*<sup>u</sup>, taking in not only *mental*, or *vocal* praises, but *manual* also; that is, as he expresses it, the *eucharistical actions*<sup>w</sup>. Upon these principles, he tells the Papists, that "we are sacrificers as well as they<sup>x</sup>:"

<sup>m</sup> Montacut. Origin. tom. ii. p. 301—304. Compare his Antidiatribē, p. 143, 144. where he takes in our *self-sacrifice*, calling it the sacrifice of Christ's *mystical body*.

<sup>n</sup> Montacut. *ibid.* p. 358.

<sup>o</sup> Hammond, Practical Catech. lib. vi. sect. 4. vol. i. p. 174. Compare View of New Direct. p. 154. and vol. ii. Dispatch, p. 164. vol. iii. p. 769. The notion of the *whole action* being the sacrifice, was not *new*: it appears in the *Fathers* of old; and Mr. Perkins, who died in 1602, had taught the same. Problem. p. 137, or English Works, vol. ii. p. 550.

<sup>p</sup> Taylor, Holy Living, &c. chap. iv. sect. 10. Worthy Commun. p. 54.

<sup>q</sup> Bramhall's Works, p. 35, 36, 996.

<sup>r</sup> L'Estrange's Alliance, &c. p. 187, 221.

<sup>s</sup> Patrick's Mens. Mystica, p. 16, 18, 19. ed. 4.

<sup>t</sup> *Ibid.* p. 35.

<sup>u</sup> *Ibid.* p. 35, 36.

<sup>w</sup> *Ibid.* p. 36. compare p. 19.

<sup>x</sup> *Ibid.* p. 37. compare p. 38, 40. N. B. I have omitted Mr. Thorndike, because his notion plainly resolves into the *passive* sense, *viz.* into the *grand*

which was the right turn, copied from what the ancient *Fathers* had said in answer to the like charge of having *no sacrifice*, and as justly pleaded by Protestants now, as by Christians then, against their injurious accusers.

Bishop Lany, after the Restoration, (A. D. 1663.) a very learned Divine, and of great acumen, scrupled not to call the whole eucharistical service *true* and *proper* sacrifice, proper without a *metaphor*, as being the fittest *gift* or *present* that could be offered to the Divine Majesty. So little did he regard the frivolous *distinctions* of the Trent Council, or the *new definitions* invented to support them.

Nine years after appeared Dr. Brevint<sup>2</sup>. He was well read in the *eucharistic* sacrifice: no man understood it better; which may appear sufficiently from *two tracts* of his upon the subject, small ones both, but extremely fine. He stood upon the *ancient* ground, looked upon evangelical *duties* as the *true* oblations and *sacrifices*<sup>a</sup>, resolved the *sacrifice* of the Eucharist, *actively* considered, solely into them<sup>b</sup>; and he explained the *practical* uses of that doctrine in so *clear*, so *lively*, and so *affecting* a way, that one shall scarce meet with any thing on the subject that can be justly thought to exceed it, or even to come up to it<sup>c</sup>. So that I could heartily join my wishes with a late

*sacrifice* itself, as contained in the Eucharist, because *represented*, *applied*, and *participated* in it. The Lutherans, generally, resolve it the same way, only differing as to the point of *real* or *local* presence. Vide Brochmand, tom. iii. p. 2072, 3052.

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Lany's Sermon on Hebr. xiii. 15. p. 16, 32. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 354, 355.

<sup>a</sup> In 1672, Dr. Brevint wrote the Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass: reprinted 1673. In 1673, he published the Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice. He was made Dean of Lincoln in 1681, and died in 1695.

<sup>b</sup> Brevint, Depth and Myst. p. 16.

<sup>c</sup> "Sincere Christians must have their hands full, at the receiving 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 *free-will offering* of their goods. 4. The *peace-offering* of their praises." Brevint, *Christian Sacrifice*, 110, 111.

<sup>c</sup> Brevint, Sacram. and Sacrif. sect. vi. vii. viii. p. 74—134.

learned writer, that that “excellent little book, entitled, “The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, might be re-  
 “printed, for the honour of God, and the benefit of the  
 “Church<sup>d</sup>.” It is worth the noting, how acutely Dr.  
 Brevint distinguished between the *sacramental* sacrifice of  
*Christ*, and the *real* or *actual* sacrifice of *ourselves*. We  
 cannot *properly* sacrifice *Christ*: we can only do it in  
*signs* and *figures*, that is, *improperly*, or *commemoratively*:  
 but we may *properly* offer up *ourselves* to God; and that  
 is, in strict propriety of speech, our *sacrifice*, our *spiritual*  
 sacrifice. Dr. Brevint rejected, with disdain, any thought  
 of a *material* sacrifice, a *bread offering*, or a *wine offering*;  
 tartly ridiculing the pretences commonly made for it<sup>e</sup>.  
 But I have dwelt long enough upon the Divines of the  
*first* class; who standing upon the *old* principles, and  
 disregarding the *new* definitions, continued to call the Eu-  
 charist a *true* sacrifice, or a *proper* sacrifice, (meaning eu-  
 charistical and *spiritual*,) or forbore, at least, to call it  
*improper*, or *metaphorical*.

2. I may now look back to other Divines, who used a  
 different *language* in this article.

At the head of them<sup>f</sup> stands the celebrated Mr. Hooker,  
 who wrote in 1597, and who feared not to say, that “sa-  
 “crifice is now no part of the Church ministry,” and

<sup>d</sup> Dr. Hickee's Christian Priesthood, vol. i. Prefat. Disc. p. 39, 40.

<sup>e</sup> “Now among these magnificent wonders of Christ's law, *bread* and  
 “*wine* can be reputed but of *little importance*; which you may find as well  
 “or better among the *oblations* of Aaron, and thus far belonging better to  
 “his *order*; because he is often commanded to *offer bread*, which Priest  
 “Melchizedek is not. Therefore, if *offering bread* and *wine* makes an  
 “*order*, Aaron will be more certainly a priest *after the order of Melchize-*  
 “*dek*, than was either *Melchizedek* or *Christ* himself.” *Brevint, Depth*  
*and Mystery*, p. 116. See p. 117.

<sup>f</sup> Dr. Rainoldes, in 1584, had in the way of arguing *ad hominem* shown,  
 that the Fathers were no friends to the *mass-sacrifice*, considered as *true*  
 and *proper*, inasmuch as they allowed only of *spiritual* sacrifices, which, in  
 the Romish account, were not *true* or *proper* sacrifices. See Rainoldes  
 against Harte, p. 472, 535, 536, 539. That kind of arguing first led the  
 way to such sort of language as Mr. Hooker made use of; but was not pre-  
 cisely the same with it, not running in the like *absolute* terms.

that we have, "properly, now no sacrifice  $\xi$ ." I presume he meant by *proper* sacrifice, *propitiatory*, according to the *sense* of the Trent Council, or of the *new* definitions. In such a *sense* as that, he might justly say, that *sacrifice* is no part of the *Church ministry*, or that the Christian Church has *no sacrifice*. But I commend not the use of such *new language*, be the meaning ever so right: the *Fathers* never used it <sup>h</sup>.

Dr. Francis White, in the year 1617, (he was afterwards Bishop of Ely,) observed, that the *name* of sacrifice doth not in a *proper* and *univocal* sense belong to the Eucharist, but in a *large* *acceptation* of the word, and in a *figurative* meaning; because it is a *representation* of the *real* sacrifice of Christ once offered upon the cross <sup>i</sup>. He was so far right, in making a *representation* of Christ's sacrifice to be but figuratively *that* sacrifice: but he forgot, that the *Eucharist* contains many *spiritual* services, which are truly *sacrifices* in the Scripture language, and that even the *memorial service*, though it is but *metonymically* *Christ's* sacrifice, is yet *really* *our* sacrifice, our *spiritual* sacrifice. From hence, however, may be seen how and by what degrees Protestant Divines came to leave off calling the Eucharist a *sacrifice*, or called it so with the epithet of *improper*, or *figurative*. It was chiefly owing to a *partial* conception of it: they considered it barely in its *representative* or *relative* view, and too hastily concluded, that since it was not the *sacrifice represented*, (as the Romanists pretended it was,) it was *no sacrifice* at all in propriety of speech.

Spalatensis, of that time, made no scruple of saying, over and over, that the Eucharist is "not a true sacrifice <sup>k</sup>."

<sup>ξ</sup> Hooker, Eccl. Polity, vol. ii. lib. 5. sect. 78. p. 439. Oxf. edit.

<sup>h</sup> Once Clemens Alexandrinus, (Str. vii. p. 836.) and once Arnobius, (lib. vii.) has said, that the Christians had *no sacrifices*; meaning such as the Pagans had boasted of: but that did not amount to saying, that the Church had no *proper* sacrifices, or *properly* *no sacrifice*.

<sup>i</sup> White, Orthodox Faith and Way, p. 339.

<sup>k</sup> Antonius de Dominis, lib. v. c. 6. p. 82, 265, 269, 271, 278.

In a certain place, he expressed himself in such a manner as might be apt to surprise a man at the first reading: he says, that the name of *true sacrifice* was never given to the Eucharist, never thought on, before the very *latest* and the most *corrupt* ages<sup>1</sup>. But he meant it, I suppose, according to that *sense of true sacrifice*, which the Trent Council and the Popish writers had lately affixed to the name.

The Divinity chairs in both Universities, about that time, concurred in denying the Eucharist to be a *true, real, or proper* sacrifice: which appears from Dr. Abbot<sup>m</sup>, afterwards Bishop of Sarum; and from Dr. Davenant<sup>n</sup>, afterwards Bishop of the same see. Both of them seemed to take their estimate of *true* and *proper* sacrifice from the *new* definitions; allowing them for argument sake, and joining issue with the Romanists upon their own terms. The like may be said of Mr. Mason, who frequently allows, or declares, that the Eucharist is not a sacrifice *properly so called*<sup>o</sup>. But Dr. Crakanthorp (about A. D. 1624.) may serve for a good comment upon all the rest: for when he denied the Eucharist to be either a *true* sacrifice, or a *sacrifice properly so called*, he cautiously guarded what he had said, by restraining it to *such a sense* as the Trent Council and Romish divines had affixed to the phrases of *true sacrifice*, and *sacrifice properly so*

<sup>1</sup> *Esse verum sacrificium, nunquam ad postrema corrupta secula invenio, aut dictum, aut cogitatum, aut traditum, aut practicum in Ecclesia. Antonius de Dominis, ibid. p. 281.*

▪ “The *passion* of Christ is the sacrifice which we offer: and because the “*passion* of Christ is not now really acted, therefore the sacrifice which we “offer is no *true* and *real* sacrifice.” *Abbot, Counterproof against Dr. Bishop*, chap. xiv. p. 364. N. B. Here was the like *partial* conception of the thing as I before noted in Dr. White.

▪ Nos asserimus, in *missa* nihil posse nominari aut ostendi quod sit *sacrificabile*, aut quod *rationem et essentiam* habeat *realis, externi et proprie dicti sacrificii*: quamvis quae adhiberi in eadem solent *preces, eleemosynae, gratiarum actiones, spiritualium sacrificiorum nomen* sortiantur; quamvis etiam *ipsa representatio fracti corporis Christi et fusi sanguinis, figurate sacrificium* a veteribus saepenumero vocetur. *Davenant. Determinat. q. 13.*

° *Mason. de Minist. Anglic. p. 549, 550, 551, 555, 627, 628.*

called P. That restriction, or salvo, was often forgot, and came, by degrees, to be more and more omitted; and so the most prevailing doctrine ran in absolute terms, that the Eucharist is *no true sacrifice*, or *no proper sacrifice*, or in short, *no sacrifice*. Bishop Morton, being sensible how much it tended to disparage the holy Eucharist, and how contradictory it was to *ancient* language, to say that the Eucharist is not a *true* or not a *proper* sacrifice, endeavoured to help the matter by a distinction between *truth of excellency* and *truth of propriety* †; allowing the Eucharist to be *true* sacrifice, as to *excellency* of nature, but not as to *propriety* of speech: as if the new definitions were a better rule of *propriety*, than all that had prevailed for fifteen hundred years before. His distinction was a good one, in the main, but was not justly applied in this particular, where truth of *excellency* and truth of *propriety* are really *coincident*, and resolve both into one. However, so the vogue ran, as I have before said, and so has it been transmitted, through many hands, down to this day †.

‡ Sacrificium missæ non est vere sacrificium propitiatorium, ut concilium Tridentinum definit, vestrique docent; sed Eucharisticum tantummodo et commemorativum.—Sed nec omnino verum et proprie dictum sacrificium in missa ullum est; non quale Tridentinum concilium definivit, et vestri uno ore profitentur. *Orakanthorp. contr. Spalatens.* c. lxxiv. p. 574.

† Morton's Institut. of the Sacram. book vi. chap. 3. p. 415. chap. 7. sect. 1. p. 470.

How much the *old notion* of sacrifice was now *wearing* out may be judged from Dr. George Hakewill, who wrote in 1641, and was otherwise a learned and judicious writer, particularly as to this very argument. He says, "Commemoration being an *action*, cannot, in *propriety* of speech, be the *thing sacrificed*, which must of necessity be a *substance*," &c. *Hakewill, Dissertat.* p. 25.

He rejects Austin's definition, p. 4. And it is too plain from several places of his work, that the *mists* first raised by Bellarmine, and other Romish divines, hung before his eyes.

‡ The Lutheran way of speaking, in this matter, may be seen in Deylingius, *Observat. Miscellan.* p. 291. and in Zeltner. *Breviar. Controvers. cum Eccl. Græc.* p. 231, 251.

The Calvinistical way, in Dallæus, *de Cult. Religiosis*, p. 1122, 1126. L'Arroque, *Hist. of the Eucharist*, 275, &c. Basnage, *Annal. tom. i.* p. 373. all declare it, absolutely, *no true sacrifice*: which, though well meant, is

3. Such being the case, there is the less reason to wonder that a *third* set of Divines, in process of time, sprang up, as it were, out of the two former. For some serious men perceiving how much the *ancient* and *modern* language differed in this article, and that by means of the now prevailing *definitions* they were likely to *lose* their *sacrifice*; they thought of reconciling the *eucharistic sacrifice* with the *new* definitions, by making it a *material* sacrifice. Our excellent Mr. Mede, in the year 1635, was *chief* in this scheme. The aim was good, to retrieve the *Christian sacrifice*, which seemed to be almost sinking; but the measures were ill laid: for the only right way, as I conceive, of compassing what he intended, would have been to have restored the *old definitions* of sacrifice, and so to have set the Eucharist upon its *true*, and *ancient*, that is, *spiritual* foundation. The endeavouring to fix it on a *material* foot, and to make the *elements* themselves a *sacrifice*, was no more than what had been attempted, about fourscore years before, by the Romanists<sup>s</sup>, and, after mature deliberation, had been justly exploded by the *shrewder* men<sup>t</sup>, as *Jewish*, or *meaner* than Jewish, and

too *unguarded*, and is different *language* from that of the *Fathers* of the *Reformation*.

One of our *late Divines* (a person of great learning) speaks thus:

“ We deny that there is *any reason* why the Eucharist 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 to the *final*.” *Nichols's Additional Notes*, p. 51. printed A. D. 1710.

But what did he make the *formal reason* of a sacrifice? Did he take it from the *new definitions*? Where there is *properly* a *gift* to God, by way of *worship*, to *honour*, or to *please* him, there is the *formal reason* of a sacrifice. *Gratulatory* sacrifice is as *properly sacrifice*, as the *propitiatory*, or *expiatory*: they are different *species* under the same genus.

<sup>s</sup> Ruardus Tapper. contr. Luther. art. 18. Gaspar. Casalius. De Sacrif. lib. i. c. 20. Jansenius, Concord. Evang. p. 905. Gordon. Huntlaeus, lib. ix. c. 3. n. 1.

<sup>t</sup> Salmeron. tom. ix. tract. 29. p. 224. Maldonate, de Sacram. tom. i. par. 3. p. 334. Bellarmine, p. 788, 792, 793. Vasquez, tom. iii. p. 527. Suarez, tom. iii. p. 886, 905, 906, 910. Gregor. de Valentia, tom. iv. p. 1274. Baptista Scortia. de Missa, 34, 36, 38. Arcudius, p. 187, 189.

altogether repugnant to *Christian* principles. Neither could Mr. Mede escape the censures of many of that time for what he was doing; as appears by a letter of Dr. Twisse, written in 1636, and since printed in Mede's Works <sup>u</sup>. Mr. Mede forbore however to print his *Christian Sacrifice*; though he published the appendage to it, concerning the *altar*, which might give least offence: the rest appeared not till ten years after his decease, in the year 1648. There are many good things in it, for which reason it has generally been mentioned with respect by our best Divines: but in the point of a *material* sacrifice, (a sacrifice of the *elements*;) he had not many followers. Dr. Heylin, who in 1636 and 1637 had some scheme or schemes of his own <sup>w</sup>, seems to have taken into Mr. Mede's in or before 1654, when he published his exposition of the Apostles' Creed <sup>x</sup>.

There are two fundamental flaws in Mr. Mede's system: 1. One in his endeavouring to fix the notion or definition of a *Christian sacrifice* by the rules of the *Levitical*; as if *typical* and *true* were the same thing. 2. The other, in not being able to make out the *sacrifice* he aimed at, by the very *rules* which himself had fixed for it. He observed very justly, that in the *Levitical* peace offerings, God had, as it were, his *part*, *portion*, or *mess*, assigned in the *sacrifice*, or *feast*: (for God was considered in those feasts, not merely as *Convivator*, but as *Conviva* also; a necessary circumstance to complete the *federal* oblation and *federal* feast.) But when he came to make out the *analogy* between the *Jewish* and *Christian* feast, he could find no *part* or *portion* for God in the Eucharist;

<sup>u</sup> "I perceive, the main thing you reached after, was a certain *mystery* concerning a *sacrifice*; which the Papists have miserably transformed; but, in your sense, is now-a-days become a *mystery* to all the Christian world." Twisse, Ep. 70. Compare Mede's Answer, Ep. 71.

<sup>w</sup> In his *Coal from the Altar*, and in his *Antidotum*.

<sup>x</sup> Heylin on the Creed, p. 240, &c.

<sup>y</sup> Mede's *Christian Sacrifice*, book ii. c. 7. p. 370, 371.



where we take all to ourselves<sup>2</sup>. There the parallel failed; the rule would not answer: therefore the rule was wrong. It would be trifling here to reply, that a *Christian sacrifice* is no *Jewish* one, and is therefore not to be measured by *Jewish* rules: for why then should a *Christian* sacrifice be made *material* by *Jewish* rules? or why is the *definition* of sacrifice measured by the same? Either uniformly hold to the rule assigned, or else give it up as *no rule*; and then the *Christian sacrifice* may be a *true* and *proper* sacrifice, (though *spiritual* only,) being of a different kind from the *Jewish* ones. If, indeed, the Eucharist could be proved to be a *material* sacrifice by any *clear* text of Old Testament or New, then there would remain no further room for dispute: but since the point is chiefly argued from its supposed *analogy* to other *material* sacrifices, (*Jewish* or *Pagan*,) and that *analogy* does not answer, but fails in the *main thing* belonging to all *material sacrifices*, and which alone should make them appear *gifts to God*; it is plain that the argument has an *essential* flaw in it, which no art can cure.

One thing may be pertinently observed of Mr. Mede, that he confined the sacrifice to the *ante-oblation*. His was a sacrifice of the *unconsecrated* bread and wine<sup>2</sup>, not

<sup>2</sup> Luther first took notice of the *self-contradiction* contained in the making the *elements* a *proper sacrifice* to God in the Eucharist.

*Totum ergo cur nos panem, et vinum totum comedimus et bibimus, nihil relinquentes Deo?—Dum corpora nostra et laudes sacrificamus, nihil nobis, sed omnia Deo soli exhibemus, ut stet ratio sacrificii etiam spiritualis. Totum nos voramus, et totum offerimus: hoc est tantum dicere; neque voramus si offerimus, neque offerimus si voramus: et ita dum utrumque facimus, neutrum facimus. Quis audivit unquam talia? Omnia sibi pugnantisime contradicunt, et invicem sese consumunt: aut necessario et infallibiliter concludunt Eucharistiam sacrificium esse non posse. Diluant hæc, rogo, Lovanienses et Parisienses. Luth. de abrogand. Missa privata, tom. ii. par. 2. fol. 255. Several answers have been thought on, to elude this argument, by Romanists and others: but it is impossible to invent any that will bear.*

<sup>2</sup> “ Thus was there, as it were, a mutual commerce between God and the “ people; the people *giving* unto God, and God again unto his people: the “ people giving a *small thanksgiving*, but receiving a *great blessing*; offering *bread*, but receiving the *body*; offering *wine*, but receiving the *mys-*

of the *consecrated*; not of the *body and blood*. He supposed no new *sacrificing act* in the post-oblation, but the *representation* only of Christ's sacrifice, made by what had been *sacrificed* before. So that some late notions of the *eucharistic sacrifice* can claim but very little countenance from Mr. Mede. What we call *offering* the elements for *consecration*, (like as we *offer* the *waters* of Baptism,) he called *sacrificing*; which was indeed calling it by a *wrong name*, and upon wrong principles: but, in other things, his notion of the Eucharist was much the same with the common one; and he went not those strange lengths, those unwarrantable excesses, which, I am sorry to say, some late schemes manifestly abound with. But I proceed.

The doctrine of a *material* sacrifice, first brought hither about 1635, barely subsisted till the Restoration, and afterwards slept, as it were, for thirty or forty years. But in 1697, two queries being sent to a learned man<sup>c</sup>, in these terms, "Whether there ought to be a true and real sacrifice in the Church; and, Whether there is any such thing in the Church of England," (both which might very safely have been answered in the *affirmative*, keeping to the *terms* wherein they were stated,) that learned person chose to alter the terms, *true and real*, into *material*, and still answered in the *affirmative*: which was going too far. Nevertheless, in his answer to the queries, he admitted of some *spiritual sacrifices*, as being *true*, and *real*, and *proper* sacrifices; which makes it the more surprising that he should think of any other sacrifice. For since it is self-evident that *truth of excellency* goes along with the *spiritual* sacrifices, and since he himself had allowed *truth of propriety* to go along with the same, or with some of them at least; to what purpose could it be to seek out for another sacrifice, not *more proper*, but certainly *less excellent*, than what we had before? It is an

"*tical blood of Christ Jesus.*" *Mede's Disc.* li. p. 293. *Comp. Christian Sacrif.* chap. viii.

<sup>b</sup> Dr. Hickes, in *Two Discourses*, p. 51, &c. 61. printed 1732.

uncontestable maxim, that the *value* of a *sacrifice* can never rise higher than the value of the *sacrificers*<sup>d</sup>; and therefore if they sacrifice *themselves*, it is not possible that they should do *more*, because in the *giving* themselves, they *give* all that they have to *give*. What *dignity* then, or *value*, could it add to an *evangelical* priesthood, or sacrifice, to present the Divine Majesty with a loaf of bread, or a chalice of wine? or what *practical* ends or uses could be served by it? I shall only observe farther, that the same learned writer, afterwards, took *material thing* into the very *definition* of sacrifice<sup>e</sup>: but upon the latest correction, he struck it out again, putting *gift* instead of it<sup>f</sup>; thereby leaving room for *spiritual* sacrifice (which undoubtedly is a *gift*) to be as *proper* a sacrifice as any. So that his *first* and his *last* thoughts upon the subject appear to have been conformable so far, in a *critical* point, upon which much depends.

Another learned writer (a zealous *materialist*, if ever there was one) laid it down for his groundwork, that nothing can properly be called a sacrifice except some *material thing*: but to save himself the trouble of *proving* it, he was pleased to aver, that it was *given for granted*<sup>g</sup>. It might reasonably be asked, when *given*, or by whom? Not by the penmen of the *Old* or *New* Testament; not by the Christian Fathers, or Pagan Platonists, in their times: not by the Schoolmen down to the Reformation, nor by the Papists themselves, generally, before the Council of Trent: not by any considerable number of Protest-

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Peter Martyr. loc. commun. p. 753, 895. Field on the Church, p. 209. Cornel. a Lapide, in Heb. vii. 7. seems to allow this maxim, when he says, *In omni sacrificio sacerdos major est sua victima quam offert.*

<sup>e</sup> Hickee's Christian Priesthood, p. 74. ed. 2. A. D. 1707. "A sacrifice is "a *material thing* solemnly brought, or presented, and offered to any God, "according to the rites of any religion," &c.

<sup>f</sup> Hickee's Christian Priesthood, vol. i. p. 159. A. D. 1711. "A sacrifice "is a *gift* brought, and solemnly offered by a *priest*, ordinary or extraor- "dinary, according to the rites and observances of any religion, in, before, "at, or upon any place, unto any God, to honour and worship him, and "thereby to acknowledge him to be God and Lord."

<sup>g</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 5. ed. 1714, or p. 6. ed. 1724.

395  
READING ROOM  
OF RESERVE  
H. M. S.  
HOLLER

PLACED IN THIS TOP  
POSITION AND ITEMS  
LEFT BELOW

ants, till fifty years after, or more; never by the *Divines* of our Church, without contradiction and opposition from other *Divines* as wise and as learned as any we have had: not *given* for *granted*, even by Dr. Hickes, of the *material* side, in 1697<sup>b</sup>; no, nor in 1711, as hath been already hinted. To be short then, that important point was rather *taken* than *given* for *granted*, by one writer who wanted a *foundation* to build a *new* system upon: and as the *foundation* itself was weak, the *superstructure*, of course, must fall, however curiously wrought, or aptly compacted, had it really been so.

But it is time for me now, my Reverend Brethren, to relieve your patience, by drawing to a conclusion. I have pointed out (so far as I have been able to judge, upon very serious and diligent inquiry) the original ground and source of all the *confusion* which has arisen in this argument. The changing the *old* definitions for *new* ones has perplexed us: and now again, the changing the *new* ones for the *old* may set us right. Return we but to the *ancient* ideas of *spiritual* sacrifice, and then all will be *clear*, *just*, and *uniform*. We need not then be vainly searching for a *sacrifice* (as the Romanists have been before us) among *texts* that speak nothing of one, from Melchizedek in Genesis down to Hebrews the thirteenth. Our proofs will be found to lie where the *spiritual* services lie, and where they are called *sacrifices*. The *Eucharist* contains *many* of them, and must therefore be a *proper sacrifice*, in the strength of those texts, and cannot be other-

<sup>b</sup> His words are: "Vocal sacrifices are commonly called *spiritual*.— These are *true*, *real* sacrifices—and therefore our Saviour is said to have offered them up, Heb. v. 7. and they are expressly called *sacrifices*, Heb. xiii. 15. and 1 Pet. ii. 5. Two Disc. p. 53. The sacrifice of *praises* and "prayers unto God—is a *proper*, but *spiritual* sacrifice," p. 61.

*N. B.* It appears to me, that Dr. Hickes's original scheme of the *Christian sacrifice* (though he called it *material*) really meant no more than an *oblation* of the material elements for *consecration*, (which *certainly* is no *sacrifice*), and a *commemorative service* performed by the *material* elements, an *external*, *manual* service, as opposed to mere *mental* or *vocal*: both which points might have been granted him, as not amounting to the *sacrifice* of any *material substance*, the point in question.

wise. Here the primitive *Fathers* rested that matter; and here may we rest it, as upon firm ground. Let us not presume to offer the Almighty any *dead sacrifice* in the Eucharist; he does not offer us *empty signs*: but as he conveys to us the *choicest* of his *blessings* by those *signs*, so by the same *signs* (not *sacrifices*) ought we to convey our *choicest gifts*, the *Gospel services*, the *true sacrifices*, which he has commanded. So will the *federal* league of amity be mutually kept up and perfected. Our *sacrifices* will then be magnificent, and our *priesthood* glorious; our *altar* high and heavenly, and our *Eucharist* a constant *lesson of good life*; every way fitted to draw down from above those inestimable blessings which we so justly expect from it. Let but the *work* or *service* be esteemed the sacrifice, rather than the *material elements*, and then there will be no pretence or colour left for absurdly supposing, that any sacrifice of ours can be *expiatory*, or more valuable than *ourselves*; or that our hopes of pardon, grace, and salvation can depend upon any sacrifice *extrinsic*, save only the *all-sufficient* sacrifice of Christ. When once those foreign fictions, or fancies, of other *extrinsic* sin offerings or expiations are removed, there will be no error in asserting a proper *eucharistic sacrifice*; but many good *practical* uses will be served by it.

Under the legal economy, *bulls* and *goats*, *sheep* and *turtle-doves*, *bread offerings* and *wine offerings*, were really *sacrifices*: they had *legal* expiations (*shadows of true*) annexed to them; to intimate, that *true expiation* then, and always, must depend *solely* on the *true* sacrifice of atonement, the sacrifice of the cross. The *shadows* have since disappeared; and now it is our great *Gospel privilege*, to have *immediate* access to the *true sacrifice*, and to the *true* expiations, without the intervention of any *legal* expiation or *legal* sacrifice. To imagine any expiatory sacrifice now to stand between us and the great sacrifice, is to keep us still *at a distance*, when we are allowed to *draw near*: it is dishonouring the *grace* of the Gospel; and, in short, is

a flat contradiction to both Testaments. For the rule of *both* is, and the very nature of things shows that so it must be, that all *true expiation* must resolve solely, directly, and *immediately*, into the one true sacrifice of expiation, namely, the *grand sacrifice*. If, indeed, we had now any *legal* or *typical* offences to expiate, then might *bread* and *wine* be to us an expiatory typical sacrifice, as before to the Jews; and that would be all. If we look for any thing *higher*, they have it not in them, neither by their own virtue, nor by any they can borrow: for it is no more possible that the blood of the grape, representing Christ's blood, should *purge the conscience*, and *take away sins* now, than that the blood of bulls or of goats, representing the same blood of Christ, could do it aforetime. The utmost that any *material sacrifices*, by *virtue* of the grand sacrifice, could ever do, was only to make some *legal* or *temporal* atonement: they cannot do so much now, because the *legal* economy is out of doors, and all things are become *new*. In a word, our *expiations* now are either *spiritual* or *none*: and therefore such of course must our *sacrifices* also be, either *spiritual* or *none at all*.

---

## THE APPENDIX.

---

AS I have hinted something above<sup>a</sup> of the *strange lengths* which have been run, and of the *unwarrantable excesses* which some late systems of the eucharistic sacrifice *manifestly abound with*; it may reasonably be expected that I should here give some account of what I there intimated. I must own, it is the most unwelcome part of my employ, and what I least wished to be concerned in. It can never be any pleasure to a good mind to be *exposing* failings, even when there is a necessity for it; but it is rather an *abatement* of the *solid satisfaction* arising from the *maintaining* of the *truth*, that it cannot ordinarily be done without some kind of rebuke, open or tacit, upon every *gainsayer*. When I first engaged in the subject of the Eucharist, I saw what *necessity* there was for throwing off the *material hypothesis*, (being *unscriptural*, and *uncatholic*, and many ways *unreasonable*,) lest it should hang like a millstone upon the neck of the main cause. Nevertheless, I endeavoured to remove that *weight* with all imaginable tenderness towards persons, living or dead; designing only to rectify mistakes, in a manner the most respectful, so as not to *betray* the *cause of truth*. What I could not approve of, in a late learned *writer*, I expressed my dislike of, where necessary, in the *softest* terms; scarce noting the *deformities* of his system in any *explicit* way, but wrapping them up in *generals*, and throwing the kindest shade over them. But by what has appeared since, I find, that every degree of tenderness, and every token of re-

<sup>a</sup> See above, p. 175.

spect must be looked upon as nothing, unless I could have commended the same writer, as a person of *sound judgment*<sup>b</sup>, in the very things wherein he certainly judged amiss, and much to the prejudice of those *important truths* which I had undertaken to defend. A very particular stress is laid upon that gentleman's *solid learning* and *judgment* in this very question: he was, it seems, *visibly superior in learning and argument* to all opposers<sup>c</sup>; insomuch that a *most eminent* person, in 1716, *had not the courage* to contradict him, however disposed to it, in the article of the *sacrifice*<sup>d</sup>. I have no inclination to detract from that gentleman's *talents*: though the proper glory of a man lies not in the *possession*, but in the *right use* of them. *Admiration of persons* has often been found a *false guide* in our searches after *truth*. *Very great men* have frequently been observed to run into *great excesses*: and I doubt not but to make it appear that *he did so* in the article now before us. *Men* must, at last, be tried by *truth*, (which is above every thing,) and not truth by *men*, or by *names*<sup>e</sup>. That I may observe some method, I shall point out the *excesses* which that learned writer appears to have run into, under the heads here following:

<sup>b</sup> See Dr. Brett's Remarks on Review, p. 97. and compare p. 1, 121, 123, 156.

<sup>c</sup> "Mr. Johnson's books had given *great offence* to many in the highest stations in this Church. Dr. Hancock, Dr. Wise, and Dr. Turner, and *some others* were encouraged to answer him; but they were all found to be too weak to be *any of them, or all together*, a match for a man of his *solid learning and judgment*: he was visibly their *superior in learning and argument*, and their faint essays served but to raise his reputation." Brett, *ibid.* p. 122.

<sup>d</sup> "This eminent person, whoever he was, (for Mr. Johnson does not name him,) and who was least expected to favour the doctrine of the sacrifice, had not the courage to deny it to be one." Brett, *ibid.*

The design, I suppose, of that *eminent person*, was not to enter into the debate at all, but only to suggest an healing thought, viz. that since every thing of *moment* was perfectly *secure* without the *material hypothesis*, there could be no good reason left for the *warmth* that was shown in it. A wise reflection: which ought to have been thankfully received, and seriously attended to.

<sup>e</sup> See my Importance &c vol. v. p. 334.



1. In depreciating *spiritual* sacrifices beyond what was decent or just.
2. In overvaluing *material* sacrifices.
3. In overstraining many things relating to our Lord's *supposed* sacrifice in the Eucharist.
4. In overturning or undermining the *sacrifice of the cross*.
5. In the wrong stating *our sacrifice* in the Eucharist.
6. In giving erroneous accounts of the *Evangelical or Christian* priesthood.

These several heads may furnish out so many distinct chapters: I shall take them in the order as they lie, and shall proceed as far in them as necessity may seem to require, or my present leisure may permit; reserving the rest for any future occasion, according as circumstances may appear.

#### CHAP. I.

*Showing some Excesses of the new Scheme, in depreciating spiritual Sacrifices.*

I. I MADE mention before of Mr. Johnson's *taking it for granted*, that *spiritual* sacrifice cannot be sacrifice *properly so called*<sup>f</sup>: which was throwing off a very important question too negligently, and forbidding it a fair hearing.

II. Elsewhere he maintains, that "it is impossible in the nature of things, that prayer and praise without sacrifice" (he meant *material* sacrifice) "can be better than with it &c." I pass by the pretence offered in support of this paradox; because it is an old one, borrowed from the Romanists: and it was solidly confuted long

<sup>f</sup> See above, p. 176. I forgot to take Grotius into my list above; who says, *Elemosynæ et jejunia et res similes sunt sacræ actiones, et quidem externæ; ideoque cum fiunt ex fide in Christum, sunt sacrificia novi fœderis, etiam talia per quæ Deus nobis redditur propitiis. Grot. Vol. pro Pace, p. 670. Conf. 715.*

<sup>g</sup> Johnson, *Unbloody Sacrifice*, part ii. p. 123.

ago, by our very learned and judicious Mr. Mason<sup>h</sup>. I shall only note farther, that the author might as justly have said, that it is impossible for *uncircumcision* to be better than *circumcision*, because he who receives *circumcision as he ought*, must of course have the true *circumcision of the heart*, and *both* must needs be better than one.

III. Another the like paradox is, that “prayer and praise are absurdly preferred to material sacrifices<sup>i</sup>.” Much might be said in confutation of this assertion, both from *Scripture* and *antiquity*: but I consult *brevery*; besides that the bare mentioning such things is sufficient to expose them. I shall only ask, how came *material incense* to be laid aside, and *naked prayer* to be preferred before it, as proper to the *saints*, under the Gospel<sup>k</sup>? Incense was *symbolical* prayer; prayer is the *evangelical* incense, and as much preferable to the other, as *truth* is to *shadow*, or *thing signified* to the *sign* or *figure* of it.

IV. To disparage *spiritual* sacrifice yet farther, he says, “A *contrite spirit* is called a sacrifice by David, though “it be no more than a disposition of mind fitting us for “devotion and humiliation, and may prevail with God “when no real [viz. material] sacrifice is to be had<sup>l</sup>.” An unseemly reflection upon what are emphatically called *the sacrifices of God*, in that very place<sup>m</sup>, as vastly preferable to *material* sacrifices. The Psalmist did not mean, when *material sacrifice was not to be had*: for in the verse immediately preceding he says, “Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: thou delightest not in “burnt offering<sup>n</sup>.” What could be said plainer, to show the *preference* of the *spiritual* sacrifices above all other?

<sup>h</sup> Mason de Minister. Anglic. p. 585.

<sup>i</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 127.

<sup>k</sup> Revel. v. 8. Conf. Irenæus, lib. iv. c. 17. p. 249.

<sup>l</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 128.

<sup>m</sup> Psalm li. 17.

<sup>n</sup> The pretences made for changing the *translation*, in order to elude the sense, (p. 131.) appear so forced and unnatural, as not to deserve a serious confutation.

V. The author goes on in the same strain: "Whatever " is now said of prayer without sacrifice, it is certain, " that it is but mere synagogue worship<sup>o</sup>." It is certain that such prayer is the worship of the *saints*, under the Gospel, as I before noted. But, I presume, this ingenious turn was thought on to anticipate or to retort the charge of *Judaism*; which may justly be objected to *material* sacrifices, and frequently has been. It is odd to speak of public prayer *without sacrifice*, when such prayer is itself a *Christian sacrifice*: but he meant prayer without a *material* sacrifice; that, in his account, is mere *synagogue worship*. He forgot, that it runs in *Christ's* name.

VI. Another position is, that " a sacrifice of righteousness signifies a noble or rich sacrifice, such as it was " proper for King David to offer<sup>p</sup>." But learned men have well shown, that it signifies *true* and *spiritual* sacrifice<sup>q</sup>, as opposed to *material, typical, symbolical*: and such *spiritual* sacrifice is really *richer* and *nobler* than an *hecatomb*. I am aware that something may be speciously pleaded from Psalm li. 19: and Mr. Johnson makes his use of it<sup>r</sup>. But the learned Vitringa seems to me to have given a just account of that whole matter<sup>s</sup>.

VII. To disparage *spiritual* sacrifices yet more, and to give the reader as *low* and *contemptible* an idea of them as possible, they are compared with the *wood offerings*<sup>t</sup> mentioned in Nehemiah<sup>u</sup>; the *fuel* brought for the use of the sacrifices: and it is thereupon observed, that " the " Jews of old hoped, as well as other people, by their " *sweet-scented cane* and *wood*, to render their sacrifice a

<sup>o</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 128.

<sup>p</sup> Johnson, *ibid.* p. 130.

<sup>q</sup> See Vitringa, de Vet. Synagog. p. 65. Observat. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 499. in Isa. tom. ii. p. 56, 733, 829.

<sup>r</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 130.

<sup>s</sup> Vitringa in Isa. tom. ii. p. 733.

<sup>t</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 225.

<sup>u</sup> Nehem. x. 34. xiii. 31.

“ more agreeable service.” A coarse comparison! Had not the author otherwise bore the character of a grave and serious writer, one could not have taken this extraordinary thought to proceed from any reverent regard towards *spiritual* sacrifices, the *sacrifices of God*. However, we may perceive from hence, that as often as any one should have objected the *meanness* of a *loaf offering*, or a *wine offering*, he was provided with an answer, and prepared to retort.

VIII. I shall take notice but of one article more, under this head. It was a famous topic among the *Christian Fathers*, when arguing for *spiritual* sacrifices, that *spiritual* offerings were most agreeable to *spiritual beings*<sup>z</sup>, such as *God*, and the *souls* of men: the same argument has been as justly urged by learned moderns. But in order to break the force of it, it is observed, that Porphyry of old, and the Quakers of late days, have carried those reasonings too far, in the *spiritualizing way*<sup>y</sup>. Be it so: may not wise men know where to stop? Has not *external* religion been oftener and more grievously perverted, and carried into extremes? We know what *superstitions* and *dangerous* deceits arose from the use of *material incense* in the Eucharist<sup>z</sup>, by the making it an *offering for sin*<sup>a</sup>: neither have we reason to expect any thing better from the bringing in a *material mincha*, for the like purposes, into the Christian Church.

However, this way of depreciating *internal* religion and *spiritual* sacrifice is not the way to promote the *prime* uses, the *practical* ends and purposes of the holy Communion. It is indeed said on the other hand, in the

<sup>w</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 225.

<sup>x</sup> Tertullian. de Orat. c. xxviii. See Review, vol. vii. p. 369. Lactantius, Epit. c. lviii. p. 169. De ver. Cult. lib. vi. c. 24, 25.

<sup>y</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 127.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Renaudotius, Collect. Liturg. tom. i. 201.

<sup>a</sup> Jacob. Liturg. p. 38, 53. ed. Fabric. Marci Liturg. 261, 273. Ordo Commun. Renand. tom. ii. p. 4, 6, 18, 19. Mozarab. Miss. in Martene. tom. i. p. 470, 498. Dionys. Missal. ibid. p. 519. Prudent. Pontif. ibid. 528. Maysacens. Missal. ibid. 538. conf. 591, 601.

way of apology, that they “do not at all lessen the value “of any internal grace, or the necessity of a pious life,” but the contrary<sup>b</sup>. They do not *mean* it, I easily believe: but in *fact* they do it. For every cool, considering man must see, that those *low* notions of *spiritual* sacrifice (very different from the elevated *ideas* which *Scripture* and Catholic *antiquity* every where inculcate) can have no good aspect upon *practical* religion. As to the pretence of “raising the dignity of the Sacrament<sup>c</sup>,” by a *material* sacrifice, it is marvellous that any man of moderate discernment can entertain such a thought: for the *reverse* is the certain truth. The *dignity* of the holy Sacrament must infallibly *suffer*, if so *mean*, so *unprimitive* a sacrifice should ever be admitted into it. The *ancients* constantly preserved the *dignity* of the Eucharist, by supporting the *dignity* of *spiritual* sacrifices: if *moderns* will submit to learn of them, they will use the same *effectual* methods, often proved and tried.

## CHAP. II.

*Showing the EXCESSES of the new Scheme, in OVERVALUING material Sacrifices.*

I. It is alleged, that “there is more *intrinsic* value in “a loaf of bread and a flagon of wine, than in all the gold “and silver in the Indies; because the former will for “some time support our lives, the other cannot do it of itself, but only as by the consent of men, it has a value “set upon it<sup>d</sup>.” Upon which I observe, 1. That the argument proves too much: for, by the same argument, a flask of *air* would have more *intrinsic* value than all the rest put together; since *air* is absolutely *necessary* to support *life*, which none of the rest are. 2. The author observes elsewhere, that bloody sacrifices, *in themselves*,

<sup>b</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 283. alias p. 288. Brett's Remarks on Review, p. 139.

<sup>c</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 283.

<sup>d</sup> Johnson, *ibid.* part ii. p. 62.

are of the *nobler sort*<sup>e</sup>; that is, have more *intrinsic* value: and yet David (a very wise and good man) disdained to offer *even such* to God, if they were to *cost him nothing*<sup>f</sup>. He measured the *value* of the *sacrifice* by the *self-denial*, the *respect*, and the *affection* of the *offerer*, shown in part by the *costliness* of the offering. And indeed, when God did require *material* sacrifices at all, he required *costly* ones, of as many as could afford it. But what do our bread and wine cost a *whole* congregation? What the *communicants*, who, perhaps, are not one half of the whole? What does the *quota* of any single communicant amount to? Besides that, in reality, we *give* God nothing: we take all to *ourselves*, though not all of it provided at our own proper cost or charge. Was there ever such a *sacrifice* known or thought on, either among Jews or Gentiles, since the world stood? Or were the *primitive* Christians ever charged with any thing of this kind?

II. It is pretended farther, that this material oblation is of "greater value than ourselves." Impossible, if we ourselves are the *offerers*<sup>h</sup>: for it is a clear and uncontested maxim, (as I have hinted above,) that the value of a *sacrifice* can never rise higher than the value of the *sacrificers*. Upon the strength of which maxim our very learned and judicious Deaa Field did not scruple to intimate, that if a man could be supposed to sacrifice even

<sup>e</sup> Johnson, Propit. Oblat. p. 10.

<sup>f</sup> 2 Sam. xxiv. 24.

<sup>g</sup> Johnson, Propit. Oblat. p. 107.

<sup>h</sup> That *we* are the *offerers* (and not *Christ*, as the Romanists absurdly pretend) is allowed by Dr. Hickee, who says, "As the *congregation* offered, so it *consecrated* and *performed* the whole eucharistical service, by the *ministration* of the *priest*; who therefore always administered in the *plural* number—*ἡμεῖς φερούμεν σοι, we offer*," &c. *Christian Priesth.* vol. i. pref. Account, p. 22, 23.

The Romanists themselves allowed it, a few years before the Council of Trent; as appears from Alphonsus a Castro. *Hærea.* lib. x. fol. 214. edit. A. D. 1549.

*Sacerdos, in persona Ecclesie, præsentat Deo Patri oblationem factam per Filium in ara crucis.* Compare Field, p. 210. and Spalatensis, lib. v. c. 6. p. 282.

*Christ* our Lord, it would not be so valuable as the sacrifice of *himself*<sup>i</sup>. The same principle is confirmed by the united voices of the *ancients*, who always looked upon *self-sacrifice* as the most *valuable* of any<sup>k</sup>. They had good reason to think so, if either our Lord's *example*, or St. Paul's authority<sup>l</sup>, or the nature of the thing itself can be of any weight.

III. It is pretended, that the bread and wine are the most *excellent* and *valuable* sacrifice, because "they are "in mystery and inward power, though not in substance, "the body and blood of Christ, and therefore the most "sublime and divine sacrifice that men or angels can "offer<sup>m</sup>:" they are *enriched*, *replenished*, *overshadowed* by the Holy Spirit, and by such *Divine influence* rendered the *body* and *blood* in *efficacy* and *virtue*, receiving by the Spirit a *life-giving power*<sup>n</sup>.

To which I answer, 1. That it is certainly a valuable *Sacrament*: and what the author here enumerates may show the value of what *God gives to us*, not the value of what *we give to him* in it. The *Spirit*, which is supposed to make all the *value*, is what *God gives* to us in the Eucharist, not what *we give* to God: for it cannot be supposed that we *sacrifice* the *Holy Spirit*. So that all that

<sup>i</sup> Field on the Church, p. 209.

<sup>k</sup> Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 836, 848, 849, 860. Origen, tom. ii. p. 364. ed. Bened. Cyprian, Ep. 76. p. 232. alias Ep. 77. p. 159. Euseb. Demonst. p. 40. Basil, tom. iii. p. 207. ed. Bened. Nazianzen, tom. i. p. 38. Hilarius, p. 154. ed. Bened. Chrysostom, tom. v. p. 20, 231, 316, 503. tom. vii. p. 216. ed. Bened. Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xix. c. 23. lib. x. c. 20. ed. Bened. Procopius, in Isa. p. 22. Gregor. M. Dial. iv. c. 59.

<sup>l</sup> Rom. xii. 1. Phil. ii. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 6.

<sup>m</sup> Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 60. compare 67, 141.

<sup>n</sup> Johnson, *ibid.* p. 171. Note, That *overshadowing* is peculiar to *Baptism*: for because it is said, that a man must be *born of water and of the Spirit*, the Fathers sometimes followed the *figure*, in describing the *new birth*. The Spirit is *quasi maritus*; the water is *marita*, and *secundata*, and therefore styled *unda genitilis*. The Holy Ghost *overshadows*; the water *brings forth*; and the *holy thing* born is the *new Christian*. How to adapt the same *figure* to the Eucharist, I see not; nor how to apply it to the purpose of *sacrifice*.

the author has here said, however pertinent to the *sacramental* part of the Eucharist, is foreign to the *sacrificial*, and can add little to the *value* of it. It is but consecrated *bread* and *wine* still that we are supposed to *sacrifice*; unless we take in Christ's *natural body* to enrich the sacrifice, which would be *Popery*; or else the *Divine Spirit*, which is worse. 2. Besides, it is certain, that the baptismal *waters* are as much *enriched, replenished, overshadowed* by the Holy Spirit, and have the same (if not greater) *life-giving* power, and yet they are no *sacrifice* at all. 3. I have before hinted, that no sacrifice, which *we* can offer, can be more *valuable* than *ourselves*: and therefore all this pompous train of words must come to nothing. 4. The notion of the *Spirit's* coming upon the elements, to make them *absolutely* the body, is a *gross* notion; arising only from a *popular* form of speech<sup>o</sup>, and not consistent with the *true* and *ancient* doctrine, that the *unworthy* eat not the *body*, nor drink the *blood* of Christ in the Eucharist<sup>p</sup>: neither have they the communion or fellowship of the *Holy Spirit*. It is not sufficient here to say, that they *do receive* the Spirit, but receive *no benefit*, because they *resist*, or *quench* the Spirit: for being "guilty of the "body and blood of the Lord," in the very act, (1 Cor. xi. 27.) there is no room to suppose that in that very act they receive *motions of grace*: and if they receive none, there are none to be *quenched*. Or if, on the contrary, they were certain to receive the *kindly motions* of the Spirit in the very act, who should forbid the *unworthy* coming to receive *motions of grace*? This *evasion* therefore will not answer the purpose. The Spirit *deserts* ill men in their *sinful* acts: therefore the *unworthy* do not receive the *Spirit*, but the *elements* only: therefore again, they receive not the *body*; because without the *Spirit*,

<sup>o</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 94, 185, 194, 284, 827, 295.

<sup>p</sup> Review, vol. vii. p. 157. Ostensum est Dominum recedere cum negatur, nec immerentibus ad salutem prodesse quod sumitur, quando gratia salutaris in cinerem, sanctitate fugiente, mutetur. Cyprian. de Laps. p. 214. ed. Bened.



the elements, *ex hypothesi*, are not the *body* and *blood*, but bare elements, having a *relative* holiness, because before *consecrated*, and that is all. 5. If the bread and wine once *consecrated* were *absolutely* the *body* and *blood*, by means of the *Spirit*, there is no reason why the baptismal waters should not be thought Christ's blood *absolutely*, by means of the same *Spirit*. It is certain, from the nature of the thing, and it is confirmed by the concurring verdict of antiquity<sup>q</sup>, that we are as properly *dipped* in the *blood* of Christ in Baptism, as we *eat* the *body* and *blood* of Christ in the Eucharist. Therefore the baptismal *water* is as *valuable* as the eucharistical *wine*, and as fit to make a *sacrifice* of; and it is also *commemorative* of the *death* and *passion*: consequently the *elements* in either Sacrament, being blessed with like *privileges*, and having the like *dignity*, have all of them, in that view, the same title, and ought *all of them* to be *sacrifices*, as much as *any*.

IV. It is further pretended, that the consecrated bread and wine are *changed*, if not in their substance, yet in their *inward qualities*<sup>r</sup>: which appears to be *sound* only, without *meaning*; or *words* without *ideas*. When *water* is said to have been miraculously *changed* into *wine*, the words carry some idea of an *internal* change of qualities: but when *wine* remains *wine* still, not changed as to *colour*, or *taste*, or *smell*, or any other *perceivable* quality, it is hard to say what that *inward* change means, or what *idea* it carries with it. *Outward* relations, *adventitious* uses or offices, are easily understood; and *relative* holiness carries some sense in it<sup>s</sup>: but the *inward* change, the *inhering*, *intrinsic* holiness, supposed in this case, will not comport either with true *philosophy* or *sound theology*. Whatever it means, or whatever it is conceived to be, certain it is,

<sup>q</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 302. and to the references in the margin add, Salmasius contr. Grot. p. 186, 191, 394. and Patrick's Full View of the Eucharist, p. 82.

<sup>r</sup> Grabe, Defens. Eccl. p. 75, 87, 20, 85, 91. Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. part i. p. 254, 255. alias p. 258, 259, 163, 181, 183, 244. first edit.

<sup>s</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 91.

that it belongs as much to the *consecrated* waters of *Baptism* †, as to the *consecrated* elements of the Eucharist : and so let it pass.

V. The most important paradox of all, relating to this head, is, that the consecrated elements are the *substitutes* of the body and blood ; are *sacrificed* first, and afterwards *taken* by the communicants *in lieu* of the *natural* body and blood, or of the *sacrifice of the cross* †. “ The eucharistical bread and wine are made the most perfect and consummate *representatives* of the body and blood.— They are not only *substituted*, but they are, by the *power* of the *Spirit* which is communicated *to them*,—made the *lively, efficacious* Sacrament of his body and blood.— The *visible* material *substitutes*—are the bread and wine: and when the Holy Spirit, which is his *invisible representative*, communicates its *power* and *presence* to the symbols, which are his *visible representatives*, they do thereby become as full and *authentic substitutes*, as it is possible for them to be †. The sacramental body and blood of Christ are *substituted* instead of the natural, and are therefore first to be *presented* to the most worthy party in the covenant, the infinite *grantor* of all mercies, and then, in the next place, to the least worthy persons, or the *grantees*, the whole body of Christian people †.” How to make any clear sense or consistency of these or the like *positions*, I know not ; but they seem to be embarrassed with insuperable perplexities. 1. The notion of *substitute*, as here applied, appears unaccountable. The *sacramental* body is supposed to be *substituted* for the *natural*, so as to be exclusively an *equivalent* for it, made such consummate *proxy, substitute, representative*, by the *power* and *presence* of the Holy Spirit *with it* and *in it*. This is the notion, if I can understand it. And if this be

† See my Review, vol. vii. p. 300, 301, 302.

‡ Johnson, Propit. Oblat. p. 29, 30, 44, 76.

§ Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. part i. p. 183. alias p. 186. Compare p. 344. alias 349. and p. 176. alias 179.

¶ Johnson, Unbloody Sacrif. part i. Pref. to second edit.

the notion, it is very different from the *old notion* of *instruments of investiture*, or *deeds of conveyance*, supposed to convey instrumentally some other thing<sup>a</sup>, but not to be so given *in lieu* of it, as to *exclude* it, or *supersede* it, or to supply the *want* of it<sup>a</sup>. The rights, privileges, honours, offices, so conveyed, are supposed to go *with* the pledges, and not to be made up to the grantee by an *equivalent*. The *pledges* (a *ring*, suppose, or *book*, or *parchment*, or *staff*) are worthless things *in themselves*, and are valuable only for what *accompanies* them, not for what they really *inclose* or *contain*. In a word, such pledges are not *exclusively* given *in lieu* of the *things* which they are pledges of, (for then the party would be no richer for them than the bare *pledges* amount to,) but such a *manner* of delivery is made *in lieu* of another *manner*; and the *pledge* and *thing* go together<sup>b</sup>. In the Eucharist, for example, Christ's crucified body and blood shed (that is, his *atonement* and *sacrifice*) are spiritually *eaten* and *drank*, under the *pledges*

<sup>a</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 146, 147, 148.

<sup>a</sup> For were it so, then the *inward part*, or *thing signified*, would not be our *Lord's body*, but a *fictitious body* given in its room: and if made such body *absolutely*, by an *union* with the Spirit, it would be more properly the *body* of the *Spirit*, than our *Lord's body*, from which it is supposed distinct: and in this way, the *very* idea of our *mystical union* with Christ's *glorified body* would be obscured or lost, and we should be but as *aliens* from his *proper body*; unless *two bodies* of Christ (not *sign* and *thing*, but *absolutely* two bodies, for the *sacramental* is said to be *absolutely* the body) were given at once in the Eucharist.

<sup>b</sup> See Review, vol. vii. p. 148. N. B. A thing may be said to be given *in lieu*, or *instead* of another thing, two ways: 1. In a sense *exclusive*; as when a *stone*, suppose, is given instead of *bread*, or a *serpent* instead of *fish*: where neither the *fish* nor the *bread* are supposed to be given, nor any thing *equivalent*. To the same *exclusive* sense belongs the giving *value* for *kind*: as *money*, suppose, instead of *house* or *land*: where again neither the *house* nor the *land* is supposed to be given, but an *equivalent* in *money*. 2. But one thing is also said to be given *in lieu* of another thing, in an *inclusive* or *accumulative* sense; as when *deeds* are delivered *instead* of an *estate*, which is given *with* them and *by* them. Here, in strictness, the deeds are not *substitutes* or *equivalents* for the *estate*: but one *form of delivery*, which is practicable and easy, is substituted and accepted, instead of *another form*, which the principal thing given is not capable of. In this *latter inclusive* sense, the symbols of the Eucharist may be called *substitutes*, but not in the *former*.

of corporal refreshment : and even the *glorified* body is *received* into real, but *mystical* union, under the same symbols. Those symbols, with what they contain, are not *substitutes*, in the sense of *equivalents* for the things, to *supersede* them ; but they are *instruments* to *convey* them, and to bring them in effect to us. 2. It is not easy to explain how the supposed *substitutes* can be any *sacrifice* at all to God. The elements are not conceived *substitutes* of the *body* and *blood*, any otherwise than by the *power* and *presence* of the Spirit. The elements, *with* the Spirit, (not *separate* from the *Spirit*, which alone renders them so *valuable*,) are supposed the *substitutes*. Is the *Spirit* then *sacrificed* along with the elements ? That is *absurd*. But if the *Spirit* makes no part of the thing sacrificed, the *value* departs from it, yea, and the *essence* of the substitutes ; for the *body* and *blood*, that is, the *substitutes*, are not sacrificed, but the *elements* only. If it be said, that *grace* or *virtue* accompanies the elements, in the *presenting* them to *God*, like as in the presenting the same elements to *man* ; this again is perfectly *unintelligible*. We can understand that *pardon* and *sanctification* are presented to the communicants along with the symbols : but how *pardon* and *sanctification* should be presented, in the way of *sacrifice*, to *God*, is not easy to explain. 3. I must here also observe, that whatever those *substitutes* mean, the baptismal *waters* have as clear a claim, in that case, as the eucharistical *elements* can have : they are as certainly *substituted* in the sense of *pledges*, and in a *sacramental* way, as the other can be supposed to be. But it never was the intention of either *Sacrament*, that we should, in a *sacrificial* way, present to *God* *as much* or *the same* that *God* gives to us<sup>c</sup>. I see not the *sense* or the *modesty* of pretending to it. *Spirit*, *pardon*, *grace*, we may be glad to

<sup>c</sup> Some such *confuse* notion appears more than once in the Propitiatory Oblation, p. 27, 43. Comp. Preface to second edit. of Unbl. Sacrif. and Advertisment, p. 498. Brevint takes notice of the like *confusion* in the conception of some Romanists upon this article. Depth and Myst. p. 20.

*receive*; but we have no right, no pretence, no power to *offer* the same in sacrifice. It is neither practicable nor conceivable; it is mere confusion: which confusion arises, partly, from the want of distinguishing between what is *in* the elements, from what comes *with* them; and partly, from the not distinguishing between the *sacramental* view of the Eucharist and the *sacrificial*; or between the *gifts of God* to man, and the *gifts of man* to God. The elements are in effect the body *to us*, because God gives us the body *by* and *with* the elements: but they are not in effect the body *to God*; because we do not give to God the *fruits* of the body *crucified*, or the *privileges* of the body *glorified*. A man must have very *confused* sentiments, who can argue from what we *receive*, in this case, to what we *give* as a *sacrifice*.

### CHAP. III.

*Pointing out some EXCESSES in relation to our Lord's supposed Sacrifice in the Eucharist.*

I. IT is pretended, that our blessed Lord offered up his *sacramental body*, that is, the *consecrated elements*, as a material sacrifice in the Eucharist<sup>d</sup>. Now, in the first place, I find no *Scripture proof* of this position. The Romanists, in support of the *general* point of a *material* or *sensible* sacrifice, have often taken their tour from Melchizedek in Genesis down to Hebrews the xiii<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>. And they have as often been pursued, in like order, by the best-learned Protestants<sup>e</sup>, and forced out of all their intrenchments.

The plea from *hoc facite*, when first set up, was abundantly answered by a very learned Romanist: I mean the

<sup>d</sup> Johnson, Unbl. Sacrifice, part i. p. 85, 90, 92. edit. 2d. part ii. p. 1, 3, 6, 7, 178, 246, 242, et passim.

<sup>e</sup> Chemnitius, Rainoldes, Bilson, Hospinian, Duplessis, Mason, Spaltenensis, Montague, Morton, Albertinus, Johan. Forbesius, Brevint, Towerson, Kidder, Payne.

excellent Picherell<sup>f</sup>, who wrote about 1562, and died in 1590. Protestants also <sup>g</sup> have often confuted it; and the Papists themselves, several of them, have long ago given it up. The other boasted plea, drawn from the use of the *present tense*, in the words of the institution, has been so often refuted and exposed<sup>h</sup>, that I cannot think it needful to call that matter over again, in an age of so much light and learning. The fairest pretences from *antiquity* have likewise been again and again fully answered, mostly by the same hands. Wherefore, let that be my apology for not taking distinct notice of every particular advanced by the late learned Mr. Johnson; who has but little of *moment*, which had not been completely *obviated* on one side (as it had been *anticipated* on the other side) long before he wrote in this cause. He was indeed a stranger to what had been done; because he had resolved and determined from the first so to be, and held to his resolution all along; as he frankly declared in 1714, and again in 1724<sup>i</sup>. I commend not his *rule* nor his *conduct* in that particular. *Wise* men will be always glad to see what *wise* men have said before them, in any point of controversy, and will not think themselves so *perfectly secure* against mistaking the sense either of *Scripture* or *Fathers*, as to need no *counsellors* to assist them, nor any *eyes* but their *own*<sup>k</sup>. It

<sup>f</sup> Picherellus, p. 63, 136.

<sup>g</sup> Johan. Forbesius, p. 616. Mornæus, p. 212. Salmasius contr. Grot. p. 444. Albertinus, p. 498, 509. Morton, b. vi. ch. 1. p. 390. Towerson, p. 276. Brevint, *Depth and Myst.* p. 128. Payne, p. 9, &c. Pfaffius, p. 186, 220, 259, 269.

<sup>h</sup> Picherellus, p. 62, 138. Spalatensis, p. 278. Mason, p. 614. Morton, b. vi. ch. 1. p. 394. Albertinus, p. 74, 76, 78, 119. Johan. Forbesius, p. 617. Brevint, p. 128. Kidder and Payne. Pfaffius, p. 232, 233.

<sup>i</sup> "It was my resolution from the beginning, to take my measures and information from *antiquity* only, and therefore not to look into any of those books that had been written, either by those of the Church of Rome for their corrupted sacrifice, or by the Protestants against it: and I can truly say, I have most firmly and religiously observed this rule, which I at first proposed to myself." *Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif.* pref. epist. p. 39. first and second edit.

<sup>k</sup> Of the use and necessity of consulting *moderns*, (as well as *ancients*),

was not right to imagine, that in 200 years time, or nearly, (in a question very frequently canvassed by the best-learned men,) nothing had been thought on, nothing done, towards *clearing* the point; more than what a single writer might do at once, with a *Bible* only and some *Fathers* before him. I should not wonder if the strongest genius, walking by such a *rule*, should commit abundance of mistakes in the management of a controversy of any considerable *compass* or *delicacy*, such as this is. But I pass on.

It is certainly of some moment, that so learned and judicious a man as Picherellus (critically skilled in *Scripture* and *Fathers*, and under no bias, except it were to the Romish Church, in which he lived and died,) should so expressly and fully declare against our Lord's offering any *expiatory* sacrifice in the Eucharist<sup>l</sup>. It is also of some moment, that the *current* opinion before the Council of Trent was against the *first* Eucharist's being an *expiatory* sacrifice; and that the Divines of Trent were almost *equally* divided upon that question; and that it was chiefly *fear* of the *consequences*, obvious to Protestants, which obliged the Council to controvert the then *current* persuasion<sup>m</sup>. It is not without its weight, that Jansenius, Bishop of Ghent, who died fourteen years after, was content to take in *spiritual* sacrifice, in order to make out some *sacrifice* in the *first* Eucharist<sup>n</sup>: as to which he judged

see Review, vol. vii. p. 6—9. To neglect *moderns*, in such cases, is really nothing else but preferring *one modern* to all the rest, and claiming to be *heard* as an *interpreter* of *Scripture* and *Fathers*, at the same time *refusing* the favour of an *hearing* to every interpreter besides.

<sup>l</sup> Picherell, p. 134.

<sup>m</sup> See Jurieu, Hist. of the Council of Trent, p. 380.

<sup>n</sup> Dicendum est, quod, Christum in Cœna et Eucharistiæ institutione *sacrificium obtulisse*, primum quidem satis est significatum, cum dicitur *gratias egisse*. Gratiarum actio enim est *quoddam sacrificium*: a qua Christi actione Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini habuit nomen illud ab initio Ecclesiæ, ut diceretur *Eucharistia*. Igitur cum gratiarum actio est *sacrificium*, et Sacramentum hoc dicatur et sit *Eucharistia*, (quod est *gratiarum actio*.) consequitur ex Christi *actione*, et nomine a Christi actione imposito, Sacramentum hoc esse *sacrificium*. Unde in canone dicitur *sacri-*

very right; for undoubtedly our Lord so *sacrificed* in the Eucharist, and we do it now. But no proof has been given, nor ever can be given, of our Lord's *sacrificing the elements*. He might, yea, and did *offer* the elements for *consecration*, (which is very different from *sacrificing*, being done also in *Baptism*,) or he might present them as *signs* and *figures* of a *real* sacrifice, being also signs and figures of *real* body and blood: but as they were not the *real* body and blood which they represented, so neither were they the *real* sacrifice: neither can it be made appear that they were *any* sacrifice at all.

As the point now in question has not been *proved*, there is the less occasion to *disprove* it. *Want* of proof is sufficient reason for *rejecting* a position, according to the old rule, that the proof lies upon him that *affirms*. However, I may, *ex abundanti*, throw in one reason against it, which may be as good as a thousand, because it is *decisive*. If the elements were a *sacrifice* in the *first* Eucharist, as upon the principles lately advanced, then they were *given for remission of sins*; consequently were a *sin offering* and an *expiatory* sacrifice: which is directly repugnant to the whole tenor of the New Testament, every where ascribing *true* expiation solely to the death of Christ. It is in vain to plead, that this other sacrifice expiated *in virtue* of what it represented. The *blood* of *bulls* and of *goats* represented Christ's sacrifice, and expiated, so far as they did expiate, *in virtue* of it: yet St. Paul plainly teaches, that it was *not possible*, in the very nature of the thing, for those *secondary* sacrifices to "take away sins<sup>o</sup>," that is, to make *true* and *spiritual* expiation. They might *atone* (and that *in virtue* of the grand atonement) for *legal* offences, or *typical* sins, and might sanctify to the "purifying of the flesh<sup>p</sup>," procuring some *temporal* blessings, which were figures and shadows of *eternal*: but more

*ficium laudis*: de quo Psalmista, *immola sacrificium laudis*, &c. *Jan- senius, Comm. in Concord. Evang.* p. 904.

<sup>o</sup> Heb. x. 4.

<sup>p</sup> Heb. ix. 13.



than that they could not do. *True* expiation always rested *immediately* and *solely* in the *prime* sacrifice. And the *secondary* sacrifices could avail no farther, by any *virtue* whatever, than to *secondary*, that is, *typical* and *temporal* expiation. Now, as we have no *typical* expiation at all under the Gospel, nor look for any remission but what is *spiritual*, and “pertaining to the conscience<sup>q</sup> ;” it is exceeding plain, that the remission of the Eucharist resolves *immediately* and *entirely* into the *prime* and *grand* sacrifice, and not into any supposed *elemental* sin offering. Neither indeed is there any such thing under the Gospel; it being one of the great Gospel privileges to have *immediate* access to the *true* expiation, and not to be kept, as it were, at a *distance* from it, by the intervention of secondary sacrifices, or secondary expiations<sup>r</sup>.

Such most certainly is the doctrine of *Scripture* and of all *antiquity*: and our own excellent Liturgy was altogether formed upon it. Accordingly we never ask remission on account of any expiatory sacrifice but *Christ's* alone; never conclude our prayers (no, not even in the *Communion service*) *through the sin offering of the Eucharist*, but *through Jesus Christ our Lord*: that is, through his *merits*, solely and immediately, and his *sacrifice*, not through any sacrifice of our *own*: which would be both *superstitious* and *profane*.

If the reader would see the sense of the *ancients*, with respect to the words of institution, “body given and blood shed for remission of sins,” he may turn to Albertinus<sup>s</sup>, who produces a long list of ancients<sup>t</sup>, (besides a multitude of moderns, Schoolmen and Romanists<sup>u</sup>.) all interpreting

<sup>q</sup> Heb. ix. 9.

<sup>r</sup> See above, p. 178, 179.

<sup>s</sup> Albertinus, p. 78. Compare 74, 119. And Bishop Morton, b. i. part 3. p. 112. b. vi. ch. 1. p. 394, &c. ch. viii. p. 475, &c.

<sup>t</sup> Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Jerome, Pelagius, Theodorit, Fulgentius, Ferrandus, Primasius, Pseud-Ambrose, Hesychius, Remigius, Sedulius, Bede, Isidorus, Claudius Taurinensis, Haymo, Euthymius, Theophylactus, Anselm.

<sup>u</sup> Aquinas, Hugo Cardinalis, Carthusianus, Titelmannus, Valentia, Sal-

the words, not of the *sacramental* body and blood given in the Eucharist, but of the *real* body and blood which were to be given upon the *cross*. I may add one more, older than any of them, namely, Tertullian; who does not only so interpret the words, but occasionally mentions it as a very great *absurdity*, to interpret the "body given for you," of the "bread given:" inasmuch as it would amount to saying, that the *bread* was to be *crucified* for us<sup>x</sup>. These things considered, we may take leave to conclude, that the notion of Christ's offering the *consecrated* elements as a *sacrifice*, may justly be numbered among the unwarrantable *excesses* of some few moderns, who did not well consider what they were doing.

II. It is pretended farther, that such sacrifice of the *consecrated* elements, or *sacramental* body and blood, was our Lord's *most solemn act of his Melchizedekian priesthood*. Indeed, to make out this Melchizedekian offering, sometimes our Lord's sacrificing *himself* along with the symbols is taken in<sup>y</sup>: but I wave the consideration of that *additional* part at present, designing to treat of it separately in the next article. The sacrifice of the *consecrated* symbols by itself, must, upon the foot of the *new* scheme, be reckoned Melchizedekian; as well because *our* eucharistical sacrifice (which is not of the *natural* body, but of the *sacramental* only) is reputed Melchizedekian<sup>z</sup>, as also because it is self-evident, that Melchizedek did not sacrifice the *natural* body of Christ, which was not then in being, but the *sacramental* only, if either. If therefore .

meron, Sà, Jansenius, Cajetan, Vasquez, Maldonate, Barradas, Suarez, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Si propterea panem *corpus* sibi finxit, quia corporis carebat veritate; ergo panem debuit tradere *pro nobis*: faciebat ad vanitatem Marcionis, ut panis crucifigeretur. *Tertull. contr. Marc.* lib. iv. cap. 40. p. 571.

<sup>y</sup> "The Spirit by which they wrote directed them—to represent our Saviour, as now performing the most solemn act of his Melchizedekian priesthood, and therefore as offering *his body and blood* to God, under the *symbols of bread and wine.*" *Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif.* part i. p. 83. alias 86.

<sup>z</sup> *Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif.* part i. p. 317. alias 322.

our Lord's sacrifice of *himself* in the *first* Eucharist be taken in to complete the *most solemn act*, then it must be said, that he offered *two* sacrifices in the Eucharist, and both of them Melchizedekian; of which I shall say more below, in the place proper for it. Our present concern is only with the sacrifice of the *consecrated elements*, considered as a Melchizedekian sacrifice, by itself.

I apprehend that it *has not*, and that it *cannot* be proved, that Melchizedek (so far as his priesthood, or the acts of it are recorded in Scripture) made any *expiatory*, or any *material* sacrifice at all. His *sacerdotal* function was described but *in part*, to make it the fitter type of *part* of our Lord's priesthood. Other parts of our Lord's priesthood were sufficiently *typified* by the Aaronical priesthood: but some further *type* was still wanting, to *typify* what Aaron's priesthood could not do. Aaron's typified the *transient* part, the *atonement* part; which was to be performed *once for all* by our Lord: but the *abiding* or *everlasting* part (*viz.* the distributing the *subsequent* and *permanent* benefits of that atonement) was not provided for in Aaron's priesthood, considered as *typical* of our Lord's, but was to be *typified* another way; namely, by the priesthood of Melchizedek, represented no further in Scripture than the reason of such type required. Melchizedek therefore was introduced, not as offering any *sacrifice of atonement*, (that was to be considered as *previously* executed,) but as conveying or applying, instrumentally, the subsequent *blessings* of that atonement. This was part of the *sacerdotal* office: and in respect of this part only, Melchizedek was introduced as a *priest*; to *typify*, as I said, the *permanent* part of our Lord's priesthood. *Types*, at the best, are but imperfect resemblances of their *antitypes* or *archetypes*: and therefore it is no wonder, if our Lord's priesthood (a complicated office) could not sufficiently be represented, whole and entire, by any single *type*, but might require *several*, and of different kinds, to represent it *distinctly*, as branched out into its *several* distinct particulars.

Whoever well considers in what manner Melchizedek is introduced in Genesis <sup>a</sup>, and what is further said of him by the Psalmist <sup>b</sup> and by St. Paul <sup>c</sup>, will easily perceive the truth of what I say. Melchizedek, therefore, so far as he is brought in for a *type*, did not *sacrifice* at all, (except it were in the *spiritual way of lauds*,) but he instrumentally conveyed to Abraham the *blessings* of the *grand sacrifice*; like as Christian ministers now do to the children of Abraham, that is, to all the *faithful*.

The ancient *Fathers*, who have often been wrongfully appealed to in this matter, by Papists in general, and by some Protestants, meant no more than what I have here said: though it would be tedious to enter into a detail of them <sup>d</sup>. They meant, that Melchizedek, by a *divine instinct* <sup>e</sup>, foreseeing the *sacrifice of the cross*, offered to God, by way of *thanksgiving*, a mental, vocal, manual *representation* or *figuration* of it, by the *symbols* of bread and wine; and by the same *symbols*, instrumentally, conveyed to Abraham the *spiritual blessings* of it. This I observe of those *Fathers* who make the most of what Melchizedek did: but the *Fathers* of the first two centuries and a half say nothing expressly of his *offering to God* any thing, (whether in a *spiritual way* or otherwise,) but only of his *feasting* Abraham and his family. As to the *later Fathers*, some of them speak with the same reserve as the more *ancient Fathers* did; others are more explicit: but none of them, I conceive, went farther than what I

<sup>a</sup> Gen. xiv. 18.

<sup>b</sup> Psalm cx. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Heb. v. 6, 10, 11. vi. 20. vii. 1—24.

<sup>d</sup> The ancients referred to on this article are, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, Julius Firmicus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Ambrosius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Pelagius, Austin, Isidorus Pelusiota, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodorit, Leo Magnus, Arnobius junior, Cassarius of Arles, Cassiodorus, Primasius, Isidorus Hispalensis, Damascene, Pseudo-Athanasius, Pseudo-Cyprianus, Pseudo-Ambrosius, Paschasius Radbertus, Ecumenius, Theophylact, Euthymius, Potho Prumiensis; and perhaps more.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. v. cap. 3. p. 243.

have mentioned. Upon the whole therefore, their testimonies are altogether foreign to the point of *sacrificing the elements*, being that they were not considered as *sacrifices*, but as *figures* of a sacrifice, and *instruments* of a thanksgiving service.

What Mr. Johnson has pleaded in favour of his notion had been sufficiently *obviated* by Picherell<sup>f</sup>, among the Romanists, long before; and by many judicious Protestants<sup>g</sup> after him. The same has been confuted by the learned Pfaffius<sup>h</sup> since; as also by the reverend and learned Mr. Lewis, in a small tract<sup>i</sup>, containing much in a little; close, clear, and judicious, published in 1714.

The sum then is, that if our Lord's performances in the *first* Eucharist were such as Melchizedek performed, (by the accounts which *Scripture* and *antiquity* give of them,) they amounted only to a *spiritual* sacrifice of *lauds*, a *representation* of the sacrifice to be made *upon the cross*, and a *distribution* of the *benefits* and *blessings* of that sacrifice to his disciples.

III. It is pretended, that our Lord did not only sacrifice his *sacramental* body in the Eucharist, but his *natural* body besides, sacrificed *both* in the same act<sup>k</sup>. This refinement of the *material* scheme was not thought on (so far as appears) before 1714, and then hardly submitted to, after much reluctance, by the learned Dr. Hickes; and not well relished by *others* on the material side, whom Mr. Johnson complained of in 1720<sup>l</sup>. However, the "strength of the cause" was now made to "depend in a great

<sup>f</sup> Picherell, p. 116, 135, 333, &c.

<sup>g</sup> Jewell, Answ. to Harding, p. 425. Peter Martyr, Loc. Comm. p. 895. Bilson, p. 702. Spalatensis, p. 272. Mason, p. 557. Gul. Forbesius, p. 672. second edit. Jackson, vol. ii. p. 955. vol. iii. p. 305. Morton, b. vi. Brevint, Depth and Myst. p. 107, &c. 135. Outram, p. 228. Kidder and Payne. Albertinus, p. 199, 200.

<sup>h</sup> Pfaffius, p. 196, 278, 321, 323.

<sup>i</sup> Lewis, Answ. to Unbl. Sacrif. p. 18—23.

<sup>k</sup> Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. part i. p. 49, 83, 118. first edit. alias 51, 86, 122. second edit. part ii. p. 6—10.

<sup>l</sup> Johnson, Saxon Laws, pref. p. 56.

measure," upon that "matter of fact," (as it is called<sup>m</sup>), advanced without *proof*, or so much as *appearance* of proof; excepting the precarious argument drawn from the *present tense*, mentioned above; and except another as slight an argument drawn from John xvii. 20. taken with some obscure testimonies of Fathers; which at most prove only that our Lord *devoted* himself in the Eucharist or elsewhere, *before* his passion, to be an *expiatory sacrifice* on the cross: not that he *sacrificed himself*, in the expiatory sense, before. A person's *devoting* himself in order to be such a sacrifice, is not *performing* the sacrifice, any more than *engaging* to do a thing is *actually* doing it<sup>n</sup>. So slender are the proofs of this *new* notion. But let us see what *self-contradictions* and other *absurdities* it contains in it, or carries with it.

1. It is supposed to be the most solemn act of the Melchizedekian priesthood; though it is certain, that Melchizedek neither so sacrificed *himself*, nor our Lord's *natural* body or blood, not then existing.

2. It supposes *two* expiatory sacrifices made by our Lord in the Eucharist; one of the *sacramental* body, and the other of the *real*: this the author seems to own, thinking he has some colour for it in Hebrews ix. 23. where St. Paul (he says) calls the offering made by Christ *sacrifices*, in the *plural* number<sup>o</sup>. As to the construction of that text, I am content to refer to *commentators*, not suspecting that so forced and strange a sense is at all likely to gain many followers: the *hypothesis* itself must

<sup>m</sup> Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. part ii. p. 272.

<sup>n</sup> Of this see Dr. Turner's Christian Eucharist no proper Sacrifice, p. 19, &c. Field's words in the like case are very applicable here: "This proveth not a *real* sacrifice of Christ.—For his blood is not *poured* out, neither is he *slain* indeed. As in the time of the old Law, if the priest reaching forth his hand to slay the beast that was brought to be sacrificed, had been so hindered by something interposing itself, that he could not *slay* the same, he had *offered* no sacrifice, but *endeavoured* only so to do, so is it here." Field, p. 207.

Put *engaged* for *endeavoured*, and the argument is much the same.

<sup>o</sup> Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. part ii. pref. p. 5.

be better supported, before any such odd meaning of that text can be admitted. But what shall we do with those *two* sacrifices of our Lord's in the Eucharist? They agree not with the words of institution, "This is my body:" which should rather have run, This is my *two bodies*, my *sacramental* one, and my *natural*: and so likewise the words, "This is my blood." Then again, those *two* sacrifices, being both *expiatory*, both given for the "life of the world," there would be two *propitiations*, two *expiations*; and we shall want to know what was the precise *value* of this, and what of *that*, and whether they differed in value as *finite* and *infinite*; or whether they were of *equal* worth.

It is pleaded, that they were both but *one oblation*: which is resembled to a *deed of gift*, where, by delivery of a *parchment*, lands or houses are conveyed; and it is farther likened to a man's *presenting* to God *houses*, &c. by a piece of *money*, or a pair of *gloves*<sup>p</sup>. But this account will not tally. 1. Because the *sacramental* body is supposed to be a complete *substitute*<sup>q</sup>, made so by the *Holy Spirit*; which therefore must be a great deal more than a *pledge* or *earnest* of the *natural*, being itself absolutely *Christ's body*, and invested with the like *power* and *efficacy*. So here were *two* sacrifices of *like* power and efficacy, and therefore of *like value*, as it seems: there were *principal* and *proxy*, the *thing* itself and the *equivalent*, both together, though they mutually *superseded* each other<sup>r</sup>. The first of them seems to be advanced, in order to make our Lord's two sacrifices look like *one sacrifice*; and the second, to the end that *ours*, which is but *one* of the *two*, and *infinitely* slighter, may yet look as considerable to us now, as *both* his then were to his disciples<sup>s</sup>. But if the *elemental* sacrifice be considered only

<sup>p</sup> Johnson, *Saxon Laws*, Pref. 57.

<sup>q</sup> See above, p. 191.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>s</sup> N. B. As there are two *inconsistent* accounts here tacked together, in order to serve two *different* purposes, so it is observable, that *different* rea-

as *gloves* or *parchment* in comparison, notwithstanding all its *inherent* virtues and *enrichings* of the Spirit, then it is not a *substitute* in the sense contended for, nor of any considerable *value*; so that instead of calling it a *substitute* or a *sacrifice*, we may better call it a *sign* or *figure* of our Lord's sacrifice, or at most a *pledge*, *earnest*, or *token* of our *own*. I here take it for granted, that our Lord's *elemental* sacrifice was at least as good as *ours* can be supposed to be: and if even *his* was but as *gloves* or *parchment*, (comparatively speaking,) *ours*, at this day, can be no more; and if so, it does not appear worth the contending for, while we have an *infinitely better* sacrifice to trust to, and to rest our *expiation* upon.

3. There is no more proof made that our Lord in the Eucharist *consigned* his *natural* body to be *broken*, and his *natural* blood to be *shed*, than that he consigned the same to be *then* and *there* eaten and drank. It is allowed, that *what was given for them* in the Eucharist, *was also given to them*; and *what was given to them*, that *they received*<sup>t</sup>. If therefore our Lord *then* and *there* gave his *natural* body and blood for them, they *then* and *there* received the same *natural* body and blood: but if he *gave* them not, no *transfer*, no *sacrifice* was yet made of them. It is argued, "if the bread and wine were" [in the Eucharist] "given to God, so were Christ's natural body and blood too"<sup>u</sup>:"

sons, in different places, have been assigned for calling the elements the *body*: for when they are to be made *substitutes*, then the reason given for the *name* of body is, that they are in *power* and *effect*, by the *Spirit*, the *same* with the *archetypes*, the very *body* and *blood* which they represent. Part i. p. 177—212. But when it is to be proved, that Christ offered his *natural* body besides, then the reason why the elements are called *his body*, is quite another reason, *viz.* because he offered his *natural* body a sacrifice by and under the elements, as *symbols* or *pledges*. See part ii. Pref. p. 2. I may note, that if the *last* reason were a true one, we could have no pretence now for calling the elements *his body*; because it is not our intention to *offer*, under the *symbols*, our Lord's *natural* body as a sacrifice for the sins of men: we cannot *sacrifice* Christ our Lord.

<sup>t</sup> Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. p. 87. alias 91. part ii. p. 11.

<sup>u</sup> Johnson, Saxon Laws, pref. 57.



by the same way of reasoning, if the bread and wine were in the Eucharist given to the disciples, so were Christ's natural body and blood too.

I know it is *denied* that Christ gave his *natural* body, in such a sense, to the Disciples, because of the glaring absurdity; and it is pleaded in that case, that our Saviour, in the institution, "said not one word of his natural body x." But why then is it pretended, from the same institution, that he *consigned* his *natural* body to God as a *sacrifice*? If our Lord's *silence*, as to his *natural* body, is an argument that it was not then *given* to the Disciples, the same *silence* is as good an argument to prove that it was not then *given for them* to God: or if any words of the institution prove that the *natural* body was then *given for them*, the same words will equally prove, that it was also then *given to them* and *received* by them; and *orally* too, according to the *hypothesis* which I am here examining. To be short, upon the principles advanced to support the *material* sacrifice, it most evidently follows, either that the *natural* body was not *given to God* in the *first* Eucharist; or if it was, that it was *literally* given to the Disciples also, and *orally* received by them.

IV. Another paradox relating to this head is, "that our Saviour *laid down his life*, when, by a free act of his will, he did give his body and blood to God, in the Eucharist z." It might as *justly* and with as much *propriety* be said, that he was *crucified* at the table, or *died* at his last Supper. But the author, I presume, being sensible, that where our Lord "laid down his life," there he *sacrificed himself*, and having conceived that the *sacrifice of himself* should be performed in the *Eucharist*, and there only; he was under a kind of necessity of maintaining, (pursuant to his other principles,) that our Lord "laid down

x See Brett's Discourse on the Eucharist, pref. p. 16. Answer to Plain Account, p. 41. Johnson, Propit. Oblat. p. 33.

y See Johnson, part i. p. 64, 83. part ii. p. 4, 6, 7, 9, 272, 273.

z Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. part ii. p. 69.

“his life” in the Eucharist. The love of Christ towards us is sometimes expressed by his “laying down his life” for us<sup>a</sup>; and oftener by his “dying<sup>b</sup>” for us: which (besides the *general* use of the phrase of *laying down one’s life*) is a more special argument with respect to this case, that the phrases are here *equivalent*. Let it be said then, that Christ was *crucified, slain, gave up the ghost, or resigned his spirit* in the Eucharist: indeed, they may any of them be as reasonably asserted, as that he literally *sacrificed himself* in the Eucharist.

Another learned writer, on the same side, chooses rather to say, that our Lord “laid down his life,” when he *surrendered* himself to the band of soldiers<sup>c</sup>; which was after his last Supper: but if any person would undertake to justify such *new* construction of the phrase, he should produce some example to show, that any one has ever been said to have “laid down his life” without *dying, or before he died*. And yet if any such example could be produced, it would not fully come up to this particular case, because our blessed Lord, at the very last moment, when he resigned his soul, had it in his power to rescue himself from death, as well as he had power to *raise the dead*. His life *no man could wrest from him* at any time: neither was it taken till the very instant when he “laid it “down of himself<sup>d</sup>,” condescending to suspend his *Divine* power, or the exercise of it. But I shall have another occasion to say more of this matter under the following chapter.

#### CHAP. IV.

*Pointing out some EXCESSES in relation to the SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS.*

THE *sacrifice of the cross* is so momentous an article of

<sup>a</sup> John x. 15, 17, 18. 1 John iii. 16.

<sup>b</sup> Rom. v. 6, 8. xiv. 9. 1 Cor. viii. 11. xv. 3. 2 Cor. v. 15. 1 Thess. v. 10.

<sup>c</sup> Brett’s Answ. to Plain Acc. p. 62, 75.

<sup>d</sup> John x. 18.

the Christian religion, that we have great reason to be jealous of any attempt either to overturn it, or to undermine it. No such thing was ever formally attempted, that I know of, by any Divines of our Church, before 1718, when the *second* part of Unbloody Sacrifice appeared. The author himself, in his *first part*, had owned the *sacrifice* of the cross more than once<sup>e</sup>, in *words* at least; though he then seems to have *scrupled*, in some measure, the use of the *phrase*, and to have been looking out for some *evasive* construction to put upon it. Afterwards, in some places, he ordered *mactation* to be read for *sacrifice*<sup>f</sup>, or for *oblation*: and *mactation* at length became his usual expression for what we call the *sacrifice* of the cross. Let us examine his reasons or motives for this so important a *change* in Christian theology.

1. His first scruple seems to have been what he had hinted in the *first* edition of his *first part*, where he says, "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 Melchizedekian *priest*; for he declares "that he did this in the *Eucharist*. For *this*, says he, is "my *body given* to God for you<sup>g</sup>." He adds afterwards, "It cannot be proved," that the Melchizedek in Genesis did offer *bloody sacrifice*<sup>h</sup>. This pretence is very slight; because it cannot be proved, by any thing said in Genesis, or any other part of Scripture, or by *antiquity*, *universality*, and *consent*, that Melchizedek *sacrificed* bread at all, or that he did any thing more (so far as he is brought in for a *type*) than what amounted to the *prefiguration* of the

<sup>e</sup> Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. part i. p. 12, 66, 68, 95. first edit. Propit. Oblat. p. 106.

N. B. Dr. Hickes all along owned the *sacrifice of the cross*. (Christ. Priesth. vol. i. p. 165.) So likewise Mr. Leslie, and Mr. Scandret, p. 4, 8, 157. Dr. Brett also, as late as 1713, which appears by his Sermon on the Christian Altar, &c. p. 18, 19. Though he adopted Mr. Johnson's new notions in or before 1720. Discourse, &c. p. 39.

<sup>f</sup> See Johnson, second part, p. 267.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. p. 95.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 472.

grand sacrifice, and an instrumental conveyance of the blessings of it <sup>i</sup>. However, as it is certain from *Scripture*, confirmed by *antiquity*, *universality*, and *consent*, that our Lord did offer himself a sacrifice *on the cross*, and that our Lord was not a priest of any *other* order but the order of Melchizedek, it most evidently follows, that such his sacrifice was so far Melchizedekian, was an act of that *priesthood* which was altogether Melchizedekian, and not Aaronical <sup>k</sup>. In the *strictest* sense, no *material* sacrifice, bloody or unbloody, no *active* sacrifice at all, (excepting the sacrifice of *lauds*,) can be Melchizedekian; for Melchizedek, as a *type*, offered nothing but *lauds* to God, and *blessings* to Abraham under visible *signs*: but as our Lord's priesthood was entirely Melchizedekian, and contained the *atoning* as well as *benedictory* part, it is manifest, that even the *atonement*, so considered, was Melchizedekian, as opposed to Aaronical. In short then, it must not be said that our Lord's sacrifice was *bloody*, and therefore not Melchizedekian; but it was Melchizedekian, though *bloody* <sup>l</sup>, because it was our Lord's, who was of no other priestly order but the order of Melchizedek. It is a poor thought of the Romanists, and it is well exposed by Dean Brevint <sup>m</sup>, that *bread* and *wine* are necessary to every act or exercise of the Melchizedekian priesthood: for as the notion is founded in *error*, so it terminates in *absurdity*. Our Lord had no *bread* to offer on the cross; neither has he any *bread* or *wine* to offer in heaven, where he *intercedes* as a priest in virtue of his sacrifice once offered, and *blesses* as a priest, and "abideth a priest continually <sup>n</sup>." But I proceed.

<sup>i</sup> See above, App. p. 200, &c.

<sup>k</sup> Heb. vii. 11, 13, 14, 16, 17.

<sup>l</sup> N. B. It cannot be reasonably doubted but that Melchizedek offered *bloody* sacrifices, after the way of the ancient Patriarchs: only, that *part* of his *priesthood* was not mentioned; as there was no need to mention it, since the *benedictory* part of his priesthood was all that the type intended was concerned in, as I before intimated.

<sup>m</sup> Brevint, *Depth and Mystery*, &c. p. 116, 117, 118.

<sup>n</sup> Hebr. vii. 3.

2. The first and main scruple against the sacrifice of the cross being thus considered and confuted, there will be less difficulty with the rest, which are slighter, and which appear to have been invented purely to wait upon the other. A second scruple is, that our Lord could not, while alive, offer (unless it were under symbols) his body and blood, as *substantially separated*; because it appears not that *any blood* flowed from him till the *soldier* pierced him; but it is probable, that the "nails so filled the orifices," that "no blood could issue thence<sup>o</sup>." I shall venture to leave this ingenious speculation with the reader.

3. Against the *sacrifice of the cross*, it is pleaded, that to suppose it, "is to render the sacrifice of Christ a *bloody* one indeed; so bloody, as that it cannot be reconciled to *purity* of any sort, till *killing one's self* be esteemed a *virtue*<sup>p</sup>." The same argument, as lately revived by another gentleman, runs thus: "He could not offer himself a sacrifice in any other manner than by *symbols* or *representatives*: for had he in any manner put himself to death, he might have been too justly accused of *self-murder*<sup>q</sup>." Sorry I am, that any thing of this kind, though only in the way of argument, should drop from serious and religious persons: and I was in some doubt with myself, whether I could *prudently* or *reverently* repeat it, though in order only to *confute* it. But who can any longer bear to have that *most precious sacrifice*, upon which all our hopes and all our comforts depend, treated in a manner far from becoming it? Why must Christ's laying down his life be so invidiously, so injuriously called *putting himself to death*? To resign his

<sup>o</sup> Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. pref. p. 4, 5.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. part ii. p. 70.

<sup>q</sup> Brett's Answ. to plain Acc. p. 66. One might here make use of Tertulian's argument against Marcion, (cited above, p. 199.) with a very little change. "If our Lord made for himself a *body of bread*, to be sacrificed, "because he could not offer himself in any other manner than by *symbols*, "then was bread given for the life of the world, and bread should have been "crucified for us."

*life*, or voluntarily *to submit to death*, is one thing : to *put himself to death* is quite another, differing as *active* disobedience from *passive* obedience. But though he was *passively* obedient, in submitting to *suffer, bleed, and die* for us, it does not therefore follow, that he exercised no *act of offering*, or that he made no *active* sacrifice on the cross. It was his *own choice* to submit to the will of his enemies, and his *choosing* so to *suffer*, so to be *passive*, for the honour of God and the salvation of men, was the *divinest* act and exercise of true *piety* and *philanthropy*. It was *active* virtue, as all *choice* (whether to do or to suffer) is equally *active*, an *act* of the will, and a *work*<sup>r</sup>. He thus *actively* offered on the cross his *body*, his *blood*, his *soul*, his *life* to God ; choosing not to *kill*, but to be *kill-ed* ; not to *slay*, but to be *slain* : and by such *act* of submission and resignation to the will of God, he made himself a voluntary *sacrifice*, in his death, for the sins of mankind. This is the plain doctrine of the Gospel, which every one that runs may read : and it is confirmed by as *early*, as *universal*, and as *constant* a tradition for fifteen centuries or more, as any point of Christian doctrine whatsoever ; from Barnabas, Clemens, and Ignatius<sup>s</sup>, down even to Socinus of the sixteenth century. It would be tedious to enter into the detail of *authorities* ; neither can it, I presume, be necessary. I shall only hint farther, that from the third century and downwards, *altar of the cross*<sup>t</sup>

<sup>r</sup> Aquinas understood *active* and *passive* as well as most can pretend to : and he scrupled not to call our Lord's passive obedience, a *work* : *Hoc ipsum opus, quod voluntarie passionem sustinuit*, &c. See above, p. 183. The arguing from the word *patient*, or *passive*, in this case, is only playing upon an *equivocal* name, and committing a *fallacy*.

<sup>s</sup> Barnabas, Ep. ch. vii. p. 21. Coteler. Clem. Rom. Epist. i. c. 49. Ignatius ad Ephes. c. ii.

<sup>t</sup> Origen, tom. ii. p. 220. conf. 187, 83, 362. Bened. edit. Eusebius de Laud. constant. 765. ed. Cant. Hieronym. tom. ii. part. 2. 167. tom. iii. 384. Bened. Ambrosius, tom. i. 995, 1002. tom. ii. 1054. ed. Bened. Chrysostom, tom. ii. 403, 404. Bened. edit. in Heb. 839. Augustinus, tom. iv. 211, 1565. tom. v. Append. 273. tom. viii. 820. Leo Magn. tom. i. 251, 261, 264, 267, 276, 293. Quen. Venant. Fortunat. Hymn de Pass. Christi, p. 695.

has been the current language: one certain argument, among many, that the *sacrifice* was supposed to be made *upon the cross*. And such also is the language of the Greek and Oriental liturgies<sup>v</sup>.

It is very wrong to suggest that our Lord was merely *passive* in laying down his life, because *nature was spent*, and because he had been *half dead before*, and the like<sup>x</sup>; as if any *violence* of death could have *wrested* his soul from *him*, the Lord of life, as it may *ours*. Our *older* and *better* divinity may be seen in the learned and judicious Bp. Bilson, who confirmed the same both by *Scripture* and *Fathers*. It ran thus: "The conjunction of the *human* nature with the *Divine*, in the Person of Christ, " was so fast and sure, that neither *sin*, *death*, nor *hell*, " assaulting our Saviour, could make any *separation*, no " not of his *body*: but he himself, of his *own accord*, must " put off his earthly tabernacle, that dying for a season, " he might conquer death for ever. And so the *laying* " *down his life* was no imposed punishment, nor *forcible* " invasion of death upon him, but a *voluntary sacrifice* for " *sin*, rendered unto God for our sakes<sup>y</sup>." This doctrine Bishop Bilson defended against some rigid Calvinists of his time, who maintained the *contrary*<sup>z</sup> for the support of some other *false* principles. But I return.

The author of Unbloody Sacrifice, though he had argued before, several ways, against the *sacrifice of the cross*, yet retreated at length to this: "I do not, nor ever did " *deny*, that Christ *offered himself on the cross*; but I declare, I cannot prove it from Scripture; so that if it be " true; I leave it to be proved by *tradition*<sup>a</sup>." How hard of belief in this high article, when it is *undeniable* that

<sup>x</sup> Jacob. Liturg. p. 35. Fabric. Basil. Liturg. Copt. p. 24. Renaud. Gregorii Liturg. Copt. 36, 37. conf. 46. Basilii Liturg. Alex. p. 83. Gregorii Liturg. p. 120, 121, 123. Ordo Commun. Syr. Jacob. p. 22.

<sup>y</sup> Johnson, part ii. p. 69, 70.

<sup>z</sup> Bishop Bilson, Full Redemption, &c. p. 8.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 229.

<sup>b</sup> Johnson, Sax. Laws, vol. i. pref. p. 58.

Scripture (taken in the sense of the *Fathers* of the *first*, *second*, and *following* centuries) *does prove* it; and when, in other cases, he conceived, that “that man ought to suspect his own judgment and orthodoxy, whose opinions sink below the standard of the second age after Christ<sup>b</sup>.” But we need not *Fathers* in this point, nor indeed any thing but *Scripture texts*, and *unprejudiced reason*.

The prophet Isaiah represents our Lord as “wounded for our transgressions,” and “bruised for our iniquities,” and making “his soul an offering for sin<sup>c</sup>.” Where but on the cross? Not at his last supper, where he was neither *wounded* nor *bruised*, except it were *in effigy*, nor offered his *soul*, so much as *in effigy*, whether we interpret it of *soul* or of *life*. His “pouring out his soul unto death,” (not his *pouring out wine*, or *pouring out promises* or *engagements*;) is by the same prophet made the one thing considerable<sup>d</sup>.

Where our Lord *bare our sins*, (a *sacrificial* phrase,) there most certainly he made his *sacrifice*: now St. Peter expressly tells us, that “he bare our sins in his own body on the tree<sup>e</sup>;” not in his *sacramental* body, or at the *Communion table*. Besides that it is manifest from the same text, that he had not made the *expiatory sacrifice* in the Eucharist: for if he had, he could have had none of our sins to *bear* in his body on the cross; neither indeed would his *death* have been *necessary* to our redemption, being *superseded* by the eucharistical *remission*, and by the *atonement* then made.

Where *peace* was purchased, where *redemption* and *reconciliation* were perfected, there may we look for the *sacrifice* of peace, redemption, and reconciliation. Now St. Paul says plainly, that he “made peace through the blood of his cross,” (not through the blood of his *holy*

<sup>b</sup> Johnson, Unbl. Sacrif. part i. p. 212. alias 215.

<sup>c</sup> Isa. liii. 5, 10.

<sup>d</sup> Isa. liii. 12.

<sup>e</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 24. Compare Isa. liii. 4, 6, 11, 12.



table, whether sacramental or natural,) “to reconcile all “things<sup>f</sup>,” &c. Again, “we were reconciled to God by “the death of his Son<sup>g</sup>,” and reconciled “unto God by “the cross<sup>h</sup>,” not by the *Eucharist* of his Son, not by the *Communion table*. We were “redeemed by his blood<sup>i</sup>,” and “made nigh by the blood of Christ<sup>k</sup>,” and “sanctified “also by his blood<sup>l</sup>,” not in the Eucharist, where no blood was *shed*, except it were in *effigy*; neither will such *sacramental* shedding answer St. Paul’s meaning, where he says, that “without shedding of blood there is no remission<sup>m</sup>.” Again, it is said, Christ “appeared to put “away sin by the SACRIFICE OF HIMSELF: and as it is “appointed unto men ONCE TO DIE—so Christ was ONCE “OFFERED to bear the sins of many<sup>n</sup>,” &c. Where it is plain, that he was to put away sin by *sacrificing himself*, and that, *by dying*; as appears by the similitude immediately following; “As it is appointed unto men once “to die, *so Christ was once offered*,” *viz.* in his *death*: otherwise the parallel will not answer. It is in vain to say, that the *offering* was *previous* to his *bearing* our sins: for the prophet Isaiah expounds his “making his soul an “offering for sin,” by his “pouring out his soul unto “death<sup>o</sup>.” So that his being *offered to bear*, must mean, that he was offered *on the cross*, where he was to pour out his soul, that upon the *same cross* he might *bear* our sins, &c.

More might be added, but I forbear to proceed farther in so plain a point, so firmly grounded on Scripture, and so fully established by *antiquity, universality, and consent*; consent of the Christian churches from the beginning down to this day.

4. It was going great lengths, to say, “I must humbly “declare my opinion, that it is impossible to establish the “doctrine of Christ’s body and blood being a *real sacri-*

<sup>f</sup> Coloss. i. 20.

<sup>g</sup> Rom. v. 10.

<sup>h</sup> Eph. ii. 16.

<sup>i</sup> Revel. v. 9.

<sup>k</sup> Eph. ii. 13.

<sup>l</sup> Heb. xiii. 12. x. 29. ix. 12, 13, 14.

<sup>m</sup> Heb. ix. 22.

<sup>n</sup> Heb. ix. 27, 28.

<sup>o</sup> Isa. liii. 10, 12.

“*fice*, by any *other* arguments but those by which we “prove the *Eucharist* to have been instituted a *sacrifice* by “our blessed Saviour<sup>p</sup>.” Whatever might be the fate of this *particular*, much *disputed* notion of the eucharistic sacrifice, one thing is certain, and will be readily allowed by every considerate man, that the *general* and *unquestionable* doctrine of the *real sacrifice* ought never to be put upon a level with it: neither ought it to have been so much as suggested, that there is any ground for so strange a comparison. It was obliging Socinians too far, to raise any doubt or question about the certainty of the *sacrifice of the cross*: but to throw out broad innuendos besides, that it stands upon *no better*, or *no other* foundation, than the *material* sacrifice, the material and *expiatory* sacrifice of the Eucharist; what is it but betraying the Christian cause into the hands of the adversaries? For if they may reasonably urge, (or cannot reasonably be confuted, if they do urge,) that such *material* and *expiatory* sacrifice is a *novelty* of yesterday, scarce thought on before the *dark* ages of superstition, which made use of *material* incense for like purposes; scarce ever seriously maintained by any of the West before the sixteenth century, and then only by the Romanists; never admitted, in either part, by Protestants before the seventeenth century, nor then by many of them; never taught (as now taught) before the eighteenth century, and then by a single writer only, for some time: I say, if the Socinians may reasonably urge the *premises*, the conclusion which they aim at is *given* them into their hands: and so at length this indiscreet zeal for an *imaginary*-sacrifice of the Eucharist (not capable of *support*) can serve only to perplex, darken, or destroy, the *real* one of the cross <sup>q</sup>.

<sup>p</sup> Johnson, *Sax. Laws*, pref. p. 54. *Unbl. Sacrif.* part ii. pref. p. 1, 2.

<sup>q</sup> The chief advocate for the *new system* says, “It is no small *satisfaction* to me, that the sacrifice of the *Eucharist*, and the *personal* sacrifice “of Christ, do rest upon the same foundation, and stand or fall together.” *Johnson’s Unbl. Sacr.* part ii. pref. p. 1, 2. To which it is sufficient to say,

I thought to go on to *two chapters* further, pointing out more *excesses* and *inconsistencies* of the new scheme. There is one which particularly deserved to be mentioned; the precarious consequence drawn from our Lord's supposed sacrifice in the *first* Eucharist, to *our* sacrifice in the rest, built only upon this, that *we are to do what Christ did*: an argument, which, if it proves any thing, proves that we are to do *all that Christ is supposed to have done* by way of sacrifice; that is, to sacrifice his *sacramental* body and his *natural* also, (which is *absurd*,) or else to sacrifice *ourselves* under symbols, as our Lord sacrificed *himself*, which will not serve the purpose of the *material* scheme. One way the argument proves *too much*, and the other way *too little*; and so neither way will it answer the end designed. I am aware, that some will tell us what the argument *shall prove*, and what it *shall not prove*<sup>s</sup>. But who will give a disputant leave to draw consequences *arbitrarily*, not regulated by the *premises*, but by an *hypothesis*, which itself wants to be regulated by *reason* and *truth*?

I have not here room to enter farther into this matter: these papers are already drawn out into a length beyond

*God forbid!* The *personal* sacrifice of Christ stands upon the *rock of ages*: the other (in his sense of it) is built upon the *sand*.

<sup>r</sup> Johnson's Unbl. Sacr. part i. p. 50, 91. alias 51, 94. Johnson, part ii. p. 10.

<sup>s</sup> Johnson, part i. p. 96, 122. alias 99, 126.

Dr. Brett on Liturgies, p. 135. N. B. The sum of what is pleaded on that side, when carefully examined, will be found to amount only to this: we are to *do what Christ did*, so far as *serves* the *new system*: but we are *not to do what Christ did*, so far as *disserves* it. *Do this*, shall be an *argument*, when and where it makes for it: *do this*, shall be *no argument*, when or where it makes against it. It is observable, that the words *this do*, in the institution, come after the words, *take, eat, this is my body*, and therefore manifestly relate, not merely to the *sacerdotal* ministrations, but to the *whole action* or *actions* both of priest and people. The  *blessing*, the *breaking*, the *pouring out*, the *distributing*, the *receiving*, the *eating*, and the *drinking*, are all comprehended in the words, *this do*. All those actions are *showing forth the Lord's death*, (1 Cor. xi. 26.) for a *remembrance* or *memorial* of him.

what I at first suspected. I hope my readers will excuse my stopping short in this fourth chapter, and saving both myself and them the trouble (perhaps *unnecessary* trouble) of two more. It is of use in any controverted points, to observe what *exit* they are found to have, when pursued to the utmost. There were sufficient reasons before against a *material* sacrifice, considered in its best light, as purely *gratulatory*, or *eucharistical*: and there were more and stronger against the same considered as *expiatory*, or *propitiatory*; reasons, I mean, from *Scripture* and *antiquity*, and from the *nature of things*: but the managers for the *material* cause have now lately furnished us with a *new* argument against it, by showing us, that, after all that can be done for it, it has really *no exit*, or such as is *worse* than *none*; while it terminates in various *inconsistencies* and *incongruities*; and not only so, but is contradictory also to *sound doctrine*, particularly to the *momentous* doctrine of the *sacrifice* of the *cross*.

*A brief Analysis of Mr. Johnson's System, showing what it is, and by what Steps he might be led into it.*

1. **T**HE first thing in *intention*, last in *execution*, was to prove, that the Gospel ministers are *proper priests*.

2. *Proper priests* must have a *proper sacrifice*: therefore some *medium* was to be thought on, to prove a *proper sacrifice*, particularly in the *Eucharist*.

3. A prevailing notion, or vulgar prejudice, had spread among many, for a century or more, that no sacrifice could be *proper*, but a *material* one: therefore pains were to be taken to prove the Eucharist a *material sacrifice*.

4. But as material sacrifice carried no appearance of *dignity* in it, looking too *low* and *mean* for an *evangelical* priesthood to stand upon; therefore ways and means were to be used to raise some esteem of it: *spiritual* sacrifice was to be *depreciated*, and *material* to be *magnified*. Hence, as it seems, arose the thought of enriching the *elements* with the *Spirit*; borrowing from the *sacramental* part of the Eucharist, to augment and advance the *sacrisficial*. And now the scheme appeared with a better face.

5. Nevertheless, if our Lord in the *original* Eucharist did not sacrifice the *elements*, it could not reasonably be supposed that we do it now, and so things would not tally: therefore it was found necessary to assert, that he also *sacrificed* the *elements*, as his *sacramental body*; and thereupon *reasons* and *authorities* were to be searched out for that purpose.

6. Still there was a weighty objection remaining, *viz.* that Scripture speaks often of Christ's offering *himself*, but never once of his offering in sacrifice the *symbols*: to remove which difficulty, it was thought best to say, that he offered *himself* in the Eucharist, but by and with the symbols. An after-thought, and not well comports with former parts of the scheme.

7. But there was still another difficulty, a very great one; namely, that our Lord, according to the accounts of the New Testament, sacrificed himself but *once*<sup>a</sup>: therefore, either he did it not *in the Eucharist*, or not *upon the cross*. To remove this difficulty, it seems to have been resolved to give up the *sacrifice of the cross*, and to retain only the *sacrifice of the Eucharist*: and so the scheme was complete.

Having thus given a sketch of the system in the *analytical* way, it may now be easy to throw it into the *synthetic*, thus:

1. Christ our Lord made a *personal* sacrifice of himself *once*; either in the Eucharist, or on the cross.

2. It cannot be proved to have been *on the cross*, but there are divers reasons against the supposition; therefore it must have been *in the Eucharist*.

3. He sacrificed himself in the Eucharist, under *symbols*, sacrificing the *symbols* together with *himself*: otherwise we could have no pretence now for sacrificing the same symbols.

4. The Christian Church, after his example, sacrifices the *symbols*, but not *him*.

5. Therefore the Church has a *material* sacrifice.

6. Therefore the Church offers a *proper* sacrifice.

7. Therefore the Gospel ministers are *proper* priests, *sacrificing* priests: which was to be proved.

Now my humble opinion upon the whole is, that if the learned author had taken *spiritual* sacrifice for his *medium*, instead of *material*, he might not only have avoided many perplexities, and no small number of mistakes, but might also have come at his *main point* justly and regularly, in conformity with *Scripture* and *antiquity*. He might have proved that Christian ministers are *priests* in as high and as proper a sense as any before them have been, (*Christ* only excepted,) authorized to stand and *minister between God and his people*, and to *bless in God's name*, and to

<sup>a</sup> Propit. Oblat. p. 97.

execute all other *sacerdotal* functions, but in a more *spiritual* and *heavenly* way than other priests had done : which detracts not at all from the *propriety* of the Christian priesthood, but adds very much to its *value* and *excellency*, and shows it to be of *superior* dignity to any real or pretended priesthood, either of Jews or Pagans.

*A distinct summary View of the several OBLATIONS in the Eucharist, previous to CONSECRATION, or subsequent.*

What is *previous*, goes under the name of *Ante-oblation*: what is *subsequent*, falls under the name of *Post-oblation*.

### I. Of the *Ante-oblation*.

THE *ante-oblation* has three parts, or three views, as here follows:

1. There is a presenting to God *alms* for the poor, and *oblations* for the use of the Church. The *material* things are gifts to men: the benevolent *act*, or *work*, is a *gift*, or *sacrifice* unto God. St. Paul points out this distinction where he teaches, "To do good and to communicate" are "such sacrifices" as "God is well pleased with<sup>a</sup>." The benevolent *services* are the sacrifice; not the *material* money, or goods. This distinction is further confirmed by the common *custom of speech*; which shows what the common *ideas* are. *Alms* (that is, alms-deeds) *make an atonement for sin*: a true and a proper expression, understanding *atonement* in a qualified sense. But who would say, that *money* makes an atonement? *By bounty and charity God is appeased*: the proposition is *true*, and the expression *proper*. But can we say, that by *silver* and *gold* God is appeased? No, certainly. And why cannot we? Because it would be *confounding* ideas: for, even in common language, expressive of the common ideas, the *service* is the gift to God, not the *material* thing.

2. There is in the Eucharist a presenting to God (*virtually* at least) an *acknowledgment* of God's being *Creator*

<sup>a</sup> Hebr. xiii. 16. The like distinction is clearly laid down in Justin Martyr. Apol. ii. p. 60. ed. Paris. 1636. Τὰ ὑπ' ἑαυτῶν εἰς διατροφὴν γινόμενα, οὐ πρὸς δαπανᾶν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς διωκτικοῖς προσφέρειν, ἑαυτῶν δὲ εὐχαρίστους ὄντας, διὰ λόγου παντὸς καὶ ὕμνου ἀίματι.



and *Giver* of all good things; as Irenæus intimates<sup>b</sup>. Tertullian extends it to *both* Sacraments<sup>c</sup>: inasmuch as the religious use of *water* in Baptism carries in it a *tacit* acknowledgment that water is a *creature* of God.

3. There is also a presenting of the elements to God for *consecration*: which is common to *both* Sacraments. For in *Baptism* the waters are so *presented*, and for the same or like *spiritual* purposes.

## II. Of the *Post-Oblation*.

The *post-oblation*, otherwise called *commemoration*, may likewise be considered under *three views*, or as containing *three parts*.

1. The first is, the *offering to view*, viz. of God, angels, and men, under certain *symbols*, the *death*, *passion*, or *sacrifice* of Christ. We do the *like* (not precisely the *same*) in Baptism also: for there we *represent* and *commemorate* mentally, vocally, and manually, (in *mind*, and by *mouth*, and by significant *actions*,) the death and burial of Christ our Lord.

2. The second is, the *offering*, as it were, to *Divine consideration*, with our *praises* and *thanksgivings*, Christ and his sacrifice, pleading the *merit* of it, in behalf of ourselves and others. We do something near akin to this in *Baptism* likewise, pleading the same *sacrifice* of atonement, with the *merits* thereof, in behalf of the persons baptized; offering the same to *Divine* consideration.

3. The third is, the offering up Christ's *mystical body*, the Church, or *ourselves* a part of it<sup>d</sup>, as an holy, lively,

<sup>b</sup> Iren. lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251.

<sup>c</sup> Tertull. contr. Marc. lib. i. cap. 14. 23.

<sup>d</sup> Fulgentius's doctrine on this head is well worth the noting, as making the *Church* to be the *sacrifice* offered, and likewise as interpreting the *illapse* of the *Spirit*, conformably, of the Spirit's sanctifying that *mystical body*, viz. the *Church*. He flourished about 510, and is of greater antiquity and authority than most of the Greek, Latin, or Oriental *liturgies* now extant.

Cum ergo sancti *Spiritus* ad sanctificandum totius *Ecclesie sacrificium* postulatur *adventus*, nihil aliud postulari mihi videtur, nisi ut per gratiam salutarem in *corpore Christi* (quod est *Ecclesia*) caritatis unitas jugiter indisrupta

reasonable *sacrifice* unto God: a sacrifice represented by the outward *signs*, and conveyed, as it were, under the *symbols* of bread and wine.

This third article of the *post-oblation* is seen also in *Baptism*: for we are therein supposed to be *dedicated*, *consecrated*, *devoted*, through Christ, to God. On which account Baptism has been looked upon as a kind of *sacrifice* among the ancients<sup>e</sup>.

Nevertheless, the Sacrament of the Eucharist has more particularly obtained the name of *sacrifice*: partly, on account of the *offerings* to church and poor in the *ante-oblation*, which are *peculiar* to that Sacrament; and partly, on account of the commemorated *sacrifice* in the *post-oblation*. For though Baptism commemorates the *death* and *burial*, and indirectly the *grand sacrifice*; yet it does not so precisely, formally, and directly represent or commemorate the *sacrifice of the cross*, as the Eucharist does.

servetur.—Dum itaque Ecclesia Spiritum sanctum sibi cœlitus postulat *mitti*, donum sibi caritatis et unanimitatis postulat a Deo conferri. Quando autem congruentius quam ad consecrandum sacrificium *corporis Christi* sancta Ecclesia (quæ *corpus est Christi*) Spiritus sancti deposcat adventum? quæ ipsum *caput suum* secundum carnem de Spiritu sancto noverit natum. —Hoc ergo factum est caritate divina, ut ex ipso Spiritu *corpus illius* capitis esset renatum, de quo *ipsum caput* est natum.—Hæc itaque spiritualis ædificatio *corporis Christi*, quæ fit in caritate, (cum scilicet secundum B. Petri sermonem, *lapides vivi ædificantur* in domum spiritalem, in sacerdotium sanctum, offerentes *spirituales hostias*, acceptabiles Deo per Jesum Christum) nunquam opportunius petitur, quam cum ab ipso *Christi corpore* (quod est *Ecclesia*) in *sacramento* panis et calicis ipsum *Christi corpus et sanguis* offeratur. *Calix enim quem bibimus*, &c. 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. *Fulgent. ad Monim.* lib. ii. p. 34—37. edit. Paris. Conf. Fragment. p. 641.

<sup>e</sup> Cum venis ad gratiam Baptismi, vitulum obtulisti, quia in mortem Christi baptizaris. *Origen. in Levit.* Hom. ii. p. 191. ed. Bened.

Holocausto dominicæ passionis, quod eo tempore offert quisque pro peccatis suis, quo ejusdem passionis fide *dedicatur*, et Christianorum fidelium nomine *baptizatus* imbuitur. *Augustin. ad Rom. Expos.* cap. xix. p. 937. ed. Bened.

Ipse homo, Dei nomini consecratus, et Deo devotus, in quantum mundo moritur ut Deo vivat, *sacrificium* est. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 242.



THE  
SACRAMENTAL PART  
OF  
THE EUCHARIST  
EXPLAINED,  
IN  
A CHARGE  
DELIVERED IN PART TO  
THE CLERGY OF MIDDLESEX,  
*At the Easter Visitation, 1739.*

VOL. VIII.

Q



---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

IN a former discourse<sup>a</sup>, upon the like occasion, I endeavoured to explain the *sacrificial* part of the Eucharist more minutely than I had before done, for the removing of scruples and the obviating mistakes. I would now do something of like kind with respect to the *sacramental* part of the same, so far as it appears to be affected by the *sacrificial*; that so both parts may aptly suit with each other, and hang naturally together. As truth is uniform, so just notions of one part will of course tend to preserve just ideas of the other part also: and as error is apt to lead to error, so any erroneous tenets there, will naturally bring in erroneous positions here.

It is matter of fact, that for the sake of advancing a *new* kind of sacrifice, *new* doctrines have been offered, time after time, with regard even to the *sacramental* part of the Eucharist: which in truth is as much *superior* to the *sacrificial*, as *God's* part in that holy rite is superior to *man's*; and which therefore calls for our more especial caution and circumspection.

Great stress has, by some amongst us since 1702, been laid upon the *invocation* and *illapse* of the *Holy Ghost* upon the elements; not barely to make them *sacred* signs and pledges, or *exhibitive* symbols of Christ's body and blood to every *faithful* communicant, (which might reasonably be admitted,) but even to make them the *very body*, or *verily* the *body* of Christ: not the *natural* body, but another true body, called a *spiritual body*, consisting, as is presumed, of elements changed in their *inward* qualities, and *replenished* either with the Holy Spirit himself,

<sup>a</sup> The Christian Sacrifice explained, in the preceding Charge.

or with the *graces*, or *virtues*, or *energies* of the Spirit<sup>b</sup>; supposed to be *intrinsic* to them, *inherent* in them, permanent with them, and *received* both by *worthy* and *unworthy* communicants. It is said, that the “Holy Spirit being invited and called down by the prayer of the priest, (according to the ancients,) descended upon the bread and wine on the altar, and *enriched* them with all the *virtues* and *graces* with which the *personal* body and blood of Christ did abound, and so made them in this, and perhaps in a yet more mysterious and incomprehensible manner, to be *verily the body and blood* of Christ; as the Holy Ghost did formerly come upon the blessed Virgin, and *formed* in her womb the *personal* body and blood of Christ<sup>c</sup>. That the consecrated symbols are sanctified, and *altered*, if not in their *substance*, yet in their *internal* qualities,—and that the eucharistical symbols *themselves* are *verily* made, in a mysterious manner, the *body* and *blood* of our crucified Saviour<sup>d</sup>. That this sacramental flesh and blood of Christ is taken by a *corporeal* eating and drinking of the *unworthy*, as well as *worthy* communicants: of these, namely, to their justification and eternal salvation both of flesh and spirit; but of *those*

<sup>b</sup> Spiritu Sancto, qui ad invocationem sacerdotis descendens, panem sanctificat, et omni *divina* ac *vivifica* virtute corporis et sanguinis Christi eundem replet.—Ita ut Eucharistia duabus constet rebus, *terrena*, quæ est materia panis, et *caelesti*, quæ est *gratia* ac *virtus* Spiritus Sancti *pani indita*.—Divina illius virtus et gratia *pani communicata* ac *inherens*, uti jam paucis probabo. *Grabe. Ad Iren.* lib. iv. cap. 34. p. 327, 328.

In the same year, Dr. Allix, who saw deeper, condemned those notions, in very plain terms, while speaking of the modern Greeks, whose tenets those are.

Ad tales autem *miraculosos* effectus, quos jactant tam Græci quam Latini, credendos, aliquid nobis videtur deesse, *scil.* Christi promissio, aut mandatum. De his miraculis fama orta videtur ex *absurda* quadam *credulitate*, Spiritum Sanctum in elementorum naturam, *supernaturalem* quandam *vim* infundere. *Allix. in notis ad Nectarium*, p. 429. N. B. The question of *inherent virtues* had been thoroughly discussed by the best-learned Protestants, and the notion generally exploded, here and abroad, long before Dr. Grabe undertook (inadvertently perhaps, or however unadvisedly) to revive it.

<sup>c</sup> Grabe's Defence of the Greek Church, p. 88.

<sup>d</sup> Grabe, *ibid.* p. 75, 87. *Conf.* p. 20, 35, 90, 91.

“ to their condemnation and destruction of soul and “ body e.”

Whoever looks into *Scripture*, or genuine *antiquity*, will there find but very little ground or colour for these or the like speculations; which appear rather to have been borrowed from Damascen of the eighth century, or from the more *modern* Greeks, or the Pseudo-primitive liturgies. There was indeed, as early as the *second* century, some mention made of the *descent* of the *Holy Ghost* in Baptism f: and there was also a prevailing notion of some *concurrence* of the Holy Spirit with *water*, to the *conception* and *birth* of a Christian; which *concurrence*, by way of illustration, or to render the idea of it more lively and affecting, was sometimes compared to a *conjugal union* g. But it was never understood, that such *similitudes* were to be scanned with a scrupulous exactness; or that every affecting or popular expression should be strained with the utmost rigour: for that would be using the ancient writers in much such a way as the Anthropomorphites and others have interpreted *Scripture*, contrary to the true meaning and intent of it. The *Fathers* very well knew how to distinguish between a power *adsistant* to, or *concurrent* with the element h, and a power *infused* into it, or *lodged* in it: and they were well aware of the difference between the *virtue* of *Baptism* (meaning the *whole* solemnity, in which

e Grabe, *ibid.* p. 87.

N. B. The *Leipsic Acts*, in their censure upon that posthumous piece, first published in 1721, have left this note:

Ex his vero patet, quod licet in articulo de cœna, alienam a pontificiorum *transubstantiatione* sententiam habuerit Gravius, tamen in eodem ab Anglicana etiam—*Ecclēsia* haud parum discrepaverit. *Act. Lips.* p. 281. A. D. 1722.

f See my *Review*, vol. vii. p. 279, 291.

g Tertullian. de *Baptismo*. Chrysostom. in *Ephes. Hom.* xx. p. 147. Leo I. *Serm.* 23, 24. p. 155, 160. Quenell. Pseud-Ambros. de *Myst. cap.* lix. p. 243. See more testimonies in Vossius, *Opp. tom.* vi. p. 233, 274. Compare Albertinus, p. 465, 466. and my *Appendix*, p. 188, 189.

h Δις τὴ καὶ ἡ κάθαρσις, δι' ὕδατος τι, φημι, καὶ πνύματος τοῦ μὲν διορητῶς καὶ σωματικῶς λαμβανόμενου, τοῦ δὲ ἀσωμάτως καὶ ἀδιορητῶς συσχεύοντος. *Nazianz. Orat.* xl. p. 641. Compare *Review*, vol. vii. p. 286, 287, 288.



God bears a part<sup>i</sup>) and the *inherent* virtue of the consecrated *water*, which means quite another thing, and is a late invention of dark and ignorant ages<sup>k</sup>.

As to the *Eucharist*, for the three first centuries, and part of the fourth, nothing at all was said, so far as appears, of any *descent* of the *third Person* upon the elements<sup>l</sup>; nothing of his *forming* them into Christ's body; no, nor of his *forming* the *natural* body in the womb: but the ancients interpreted Luke i. 35. of our Lord's *own* Divine Spirit, namely, of the *Logos*, and supposed that the same *Logos* formed for himself a body in the womb<sup>m</sup>. So little foundation is there, within the three *first* and *purest* ages, for the pretended *similitude* between the *Holy Ghost's* forming the *natural body* in the womb, and his forming the *spiritual body* in the Eucharist. The similitude made use of anciently with respect to the Eucharist, was that of the *incarnation*<sup>n</sup>, intended only in a confuse, general way, and not for any rigorous exactness. For like as our Lord, in his incarnation, made and fitted for himself a *natural body* to dwell in; so, in regard to the Eucharist, he has appointed and fitted for himself a *symbolical body* to *concur* with, in the distributing his graces and blessings to the *faithful* receivers. As to the *third Person*, his more immediate *presence* and *energy* was by the ancients assigned to *Baptism*, correspondently to the figure of the *conjugal union*, as before hinted: while

<sup>i</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 14, &c.

<sup>k</sup> *Sacramenta continere gratiam, nunquam olim dictum: itaque Thomas, parte tertia quæstionis sexagesimæ secundæ, articulo tertio, non potuit altius arcessere quam ab Hugone de Sancto Victore. Chamier. Punstrat. tom. iv. p. 52. N. B. Hugo flourished about A. D. 1120.*

<sup>l</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 291, &c.

<sup>m</sup> *Hermas, lib. iii. Simil. 5. Justin. Apol. i. p. 54. Dial. 354. Irenæus, lib. v. cap. 1. p. 293. Clem. Alex. p. 654. Tertullian, contr. Prax. cap. xxvi. de Carn. Christi, p. 18. Hippolytus, contr. Noet. cap. iv. p. 9. cap. xvii. p. 18. Novatian, cap. xix. Cyrian, de Idol. Vanit. p. 228. Lactant. lib. iv. cap. 12. Hilarius, de Trin. 1011, 1044, 1047. Gregorius Boeticus, apud Ambros. tom. ii. p. 354, 356.*

<sup>n</sup> *Justin. Apol. xcvi. Dial. p. 290. Compare my Doctrinal Use, &c. p. 138. and Review, vol. vii. p. 161. and Albertinus, p. 296, 664.*

to the *Eucharist* was assigned the more immediate presence and energy of the *Logos*, as the figure of the *incarnation*, made use of in that case, justly required. It would be a kind of *solecism* in ancient language, to speak of the Holy Ghost in this matter, as some *late* writers have done; because it would be confounding the *analogy* which the truly *ancient* Doctors went upon in their doctrine of the two Sacraments. The very learned and judicious Bishop Bull gives a reasonable account of what was taught concerning the *Eucharist* in the early days of Justin and Irenæus.

“ By or upon the sacerdotal benediction, the *Spirit* of *Christ*, or a Divine *virtue* from Christ, descends upon the elements, and *accompanies* them to all *worthy* communicants: and therefore they are said to be, and are, the *body* and *blood* of Christ, the same *Divinity* which is *hypostatically* united to the body of Christ in heaven, being *virtually* united to the elements of bread and wine.” Here it is observable, that by *Spirit* of Christ, Bishop Bull could not mean the *third* Person, but the *Logos*, which only is *hypostatically* united to the *humanity* of Christ; and that that *Spirit* is not said to *reside* in the elements, but to *accompany* them, and to the *worthy* only: so that the *virtual union* can amount only to an union of *concurrence*, (not of *infusion* or *inherence*,) whereby Christ is conceived to *concur* with the elements, in the *due use* of them, to produce the effects in *persons* fitly disposed. All which is true and ancient doctrine.

In the fourth century, some *illapse* of the *third* Person

• Bull's Answer to the Bishop of Meaux, p. 21, 22. How different Bishop Bull's account is from Dr. Grabe's, in his notes on Irenæus, will be obvious to every one who will be at the pains to compare them: though at the same time Bishop Bull very respectfully refers to Dr. Grabe (p. 23.) for clearing the point against the Romanists.

† How common and familiar such use of the name *Spirit*, or *Holy Spirit*, anciently was, may be understood from the interpretation of Luke i. 35. as before mentioned, and from the testimonies collected to that purpose by learned men. Grotius in Marc. ii. 8. Bull. Defens. Fid. Nic. cap. ii. sect. 5. Constant. in Hilar. præfat. p. 19.

upon the elements was commonly taught, and that justly, provided it be but as justly understood. Not so as to make the sacramental body a *compound* of element and spirit, after the way of the modern Greeks; nor so as to make the *third* Person the proper *food* of the Eucharist, or the *res Sacramenti*, for the *Logos* was always considered as the *food* there spiritually given and received<sup>9</sup>: yea it was the *incarnate Logos*<sup>r</sup>, and therein stands our *mystical union* with Christ as improved and strengthened in that Sacrament. But the work of the Holy Ghost upon the elements was to translate or change them from *common* to *sacred*, from *elements* to *sacraments*, from their *natural* state and condition to *supernatural* ends and uses, that they might become holy signs, certain pledges, or exhibitivè symbols of our Lord's own natural body and blood in a mystical and spiritual way. Not that any change was presumed, either as to the *substance* or the *inward qualities* of the elements, but only as to their *outward* state, condition, uses, or offices. For like as when a *commoner* is advanced into a *peer*, or a *subject* into a *prince*, or an *house* into a *church*, or a *laic* into a *priest*, or *prelate*, there is a change of *outward* state, condition, circumstances, and there are *new* uses and offices, *new* prerogatives, *new* glories, but no change of *substance*, no, nor of *inward* qualities implied: such also is the case (only in a more eminent degree) with respect to the elements of the Eucharist; when they are *consecrated* by the priest, when they are *sanctified* by the Holy Ghost, when they are rendered *relatively holy*, when they are transferred from *common* to *sacred*<sup>s</sup>, when they are exalted from mean and low uses, in comparison, to

<sup>9</sup> Irenæus, lib. iv. cap. 38, p. 284. Clemens Alex. 123, 125, 126, 177, 178. Tertullian. de Orat. cap. 6. De Resurr. Carn. cap. 38. Origen. in Levit. Hom. xvi. p. 266. in Matt. p. 254. Novat. cap. 14, 16. Hilarius de Trin. lib. viii. p. 954. Nazianzen, Orat. iii. p. 70.

<sup>r</sup> Tertullian. de Resurr. Carn. cap. 37. Origen. in Matt. p. 254. Augustin. in Psal. xxxiii. p. 211. cxx. p. 1381. Compare Jewell's Answer to Hard. art. viii. p. 293. and Albertinus, p. 341, 758.

<sup>s</sup> Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum. Augustin. in Johann. Tract. 80.

the *highest* and *holiest* purposes that such poor things could ever be advanced to. Such a *change*, or *transmutation*, as I have now mentioned, frequently occurs in the primitive writers: more than this (I am competently assured) will not be found in any certain and undoubted monuments of Catholic writers, within the first six centuries<sup>t</sup>.

So long as *symbolical* language was well remembered and rightly understood, and men knew how to distinguish between figure and verity, between signs and things: while due care and judgment was made use of, to interpret the *literal* expressions of Scripture and Fathers *literally*, and *figurative* expressions according to the *figure*: I say, while these things were so, there could be no room for imagining any *change* in the elements, either as to *substance* or *internal* qualities, nor for supposing that our Lord's words, "This is my body," were to be otherwise interpreted than those parallel words of the Apostle, "that rock was Christ<sup>u</sup>." For as the word *Christ*, which is the *predicate* in one proposition, is to be *literally* understood, and the *trope* lies in the verb *was*, put for *signify*, or *exhibitively* signifies; so the word *body*, which is the *predicate* in the other proposition, is to be literally interpreted of the *natural* or *personul* body of Christ, and the *trope* lies in the verb *is*<sup>w</sup>, put for *represents*, or exhibitively

<sup>t</sup> Compare Jewell's Def. of Apol. part ii. p. 243, 244. Albertinus, p. 425, 509. Cosin. Histor. Transubst. p. 109, 113, 124. Covell. Account of Gr. Church, p. 47, 53, &c. 67, 68, 72.

<sup>u</sup> 1 Cor. x. 4. Solet autem res quæ *significat*, ejus rei nomine quam significat nuncupari.—Hinc est quod dictum est, *petra erat Christus*. Non enim dixit, *petra significat*, sed tanquam hoc *esset*; quod utique per *substantium* hoc non erat, sed per *significationem*. Sic et *sanguis*, quoniam animam significat in Sacramentis, *anima* dictus est. *Augustin. in Levit.* q. lvii. p. 516. tom. 3. Conf. Epist. xviii. ad Bonifac. p. 268. tom. 2. and my Review, vol. vii. chap. 8. p. 146—165.

*Sacramentorum* enim natura et *usitata* loquendi *ratio* postulare videtur, ut *symbolis* non solum *nomina*, sed et eorum *proprietas*, imo *effecta* tribuantur. *Cosin. Histor. Transubst.* p. 3.

<sup>w</sup> See this proved at large in Chamier's Panstrat. tom. iv. p. 528, 529, &c. Albertinus, p. 525, 526, 686. Jewell's Def. of Apol. p. 209. Answ. to Hard.

signifies. And as it would not be right to say that the *rock* was literally a *spiritual Christ*, distinct from the *real Christ*, making *two Christs*; so neither can it be right to say or conceive that the *bread* in the Eucharist is a *spiritual body* of Christ, making *two true bodies* of Christ. But as the *rock* was a *symbol* of the one true Christ, so is the sacramental bread a *symbol* exhibitivē of the one true body of Christ, *viz.* the *natural* or *personal* body, given and received in the Eucharist: I say, given and received *spiritually*, but *truly* and *really*; and the more *truly*, because *spiritually*, as the *spiritual* sense, and not the *literal*, is the *true* sense  $\alpha$ .

The *ancient* notion of this matter might easily be cleared from *Father* to *Father*, through the earlier centuries; and, I presume, I have competently done it elsewhere  $\gamma$ . Therefore I shall here content myself with a single passage of Macarius, of the fourth century, which very briefly, but fully expresses what all the rest mean. He observes, “that bread and wine are offered in the Church as *symbols* (or *antitypes*) of our Lord’s *body* and *blood*, and that “they who partake of the *visible* bread, do *spiritually* eat “the *flesh* of our Lord $\beta$ .” He is to be understood of *worthy* partaking; as Albertinus has shown  $\alpha$ , and as reason requires. And when he speaks of the Lord’s *flesh*, he cannot be understood of any *spiritual flesh* locally present in the Eucharist, but of the *natural* body and blood *spiritually* given and received, whereof the sacramental body and blood are the *symbols*, or *antitypes*, in his account.

p. 238, 239, 255, 267. Spalatensis, lib. v. cap. 6. n. 73. 169. Cosin. Histor. Transubstant. p. 10, 24, 30, 41, 43, 44. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 119, 120, 169, 170, 183.

$\alpha$  Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 191, 304. Jewell’s Answ. to Hard. p. 238, 241, 251, 256, 292. Bilson’s Christian Subject, p. 631.

$\gamma$  Review, vol. vii. chap. 6, and 7.

$\beta$  “Ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος ἀντίτυποι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ αἵματος, ἃ ἔστι οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τοῦ φαινομένου ἄρτου, πνευματικῶς ἐν σάρκι τοῦ Κυρίου ἰεσοῦνι. *Macar. Homil. xxvii.* p. 168. Conf. Albertin. p. 437, 438, 439.

$\alpha$  Albertinus, p. 440.

Such was the doctrine prevailing in his time, and three centuries, at least, longer.

But in the declension of the seventh century, some began to speak very oddly of the elements, as being literally made, by consecration, the *very body* and *blood* of Christ, not *images* or *antitypes* at all<sup>b</sup>, as used to be taught aforesaid. From thence we may reasonably date all the confusion and perplexity which has since so clouded and embarrassed the theory of this Sacrament.

When *learning*, *language*, and *taste* fell to decay, and men became as much strangers to the *sublime* of their forefathers, as to the symbolical *majesty* of the sacred style, then came up a lean, dry, sapless kind of *theology*, mightily degenerated from the just and elevated sentiments of former ages<sup>c</sup>. There was a branch of the Eutychians, who in consequence of their main principle of a *confusion* of the *two natures* of Christ, (making the *human* and *divine* nature *one*,) thought themselves obliged to maintain, that the *body* of Christ was, from the very moment of his conception, altogether *incorruptible*. From this error of theirs they had the Greek name of *aphthartodocetæ*<sup>d</sup>, and the Latin one of *incorrupticolæ*, and from one Gaianus, a chief leader amongst them, they had some of them the name of Gaianites. Against those Gaianites, one Anastasius (a monk of Mount Sinai about the year 680<sup>e</sup>) happened to engage: and amongst other topics of argumentation, he made choice of one drawn from the *Eucharist*. He had learned, or might have learned from Catholic teachers, that by the operation of the Holy Spirit the elements are *changed* into the *body* of

<sup>b</sup> Yet it has been thought, that while they rejected the names of *figure*, *type*, and *image*, they or their followers admitted of the names of *symbol* and *representation*. See Claude, book iv. chap. 10. p. 341, 344. Which, if true, shows only how *confused* those men were, both in language and notion.

<sup>c</sup> *Literam sequi, et signa pro rebus accipere, servilis infirmitatis est.* Augustin. *de Doctrin. Christian.* lib. iii. c. 9. p. 49.

<sup>d</sup> Ἀφθαρτοδοξίται. Vid. Damascen. *Hæres.* lxxxiv. p. 107.

<sup>e</sup> Between 677 and 686. Fabric. *Bibl. Græc.* vol. ix. p. 313.

Christ, meaning the *symbolical body*; that is, changed into *sacraments*, or *holy signs*: and he had learned also, that the worthy communicants do partake of the *natural body of Christ*, the *thing signified*; that is, *spiritually, mystically, symbolically*, partake of it. These two propositions he *confusely* remembered, or rather ignorantly *misunderstood*, and so he blended them both into this one; that the elements themselves upon consecration become, not in signification, but in reality, the *natural body of Christ*: which amounted to saying, that, instead of *exhibitive signs*, they become the very *things signified*. Under such confusion of thought, he formed his argument against the Gaianites in this manner: “The consecrated elements are no *types* or *figures*, but they are the *very body* and *blood* of our Lord; and they are *corruptible*, as will appear upon experiment: therefore our Lord’s body, before his resurrection, was also *corruptible*,” which was to be proved. To confirm his notion that the elements are no *types* or *figures*, but the *very body*, he pleaded, that our Lord, in the institution, said not, this is the *figure* [*antitype*] of my body, but “this is my body ε.” An argument by which he might as easily have proved, that the rock in the wilderness was the *very*

† Ὁ ἐρθδοξος. Εἰσὶ μὲν, παρακαλῶ—αὐτὴ ἡ κοινωνία καὶ θυσία τοῦ παναγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ ἢ προσφίρις καὶ μεταλαμβάνεις, σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ἀληθινόν ἐστι Χριστοῦ, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ ψιλὸς ἄρτος ὡς ἰ πιστευόμενος κατ’ οἶκον, καὶ ἀντίτυπος τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἡ θυσία τοῦ τραγίου ἢ Ἰουδαίου προσάγουσι;

‡ Γαϊανίτης· μὴ γίνετο ἡμᾶς εἰσὶν ἀντίτυπον τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ τὴν ἁγίαν κοινωνίαν, ἢ ψιλὸν ἄρτον, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ἀληθῆς Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ μεταλαμβάνομεν, τοῦ σαρκωθέντος καὶ γεννηθέντος ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Διοσέπου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.

§ Ὁ ἐρθδοξος. οὕτω πιστεύομεν, καὶ οὕτως ὁμολογοῦμεν, κατὰ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ—τούτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα.—οὕα εἶπτε, ταῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἀντίτυπον σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματός μου. Anastas. Hodeg. c. xxiii. p. 349, 350.

N. B. That weak way of reasoning has been since fathered upon several *older* writers; as Origen, Magnes, Theodorus Heracleotes, Theodorus Mopsuestenns, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, and others: but those and the like passages appear to be all *fictitious*, imposed upon those earlier writers by some *later* Greeks. See Albertinus, p. 367, 420, 769, 770, &c. 893.

*Christ*: for St. Paul said not that the rock *signified* Christ, or was a *symbol* of Christ; but he declared in express words, that “that rock was Christ<sup>h</sup>.” It is hard to say what precise ideas that author had of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or what he really meant; if indeed he went farther than the sound of words. Albertinus conjectures, from his occasionally mentioning the *descent* of the *Holy Spirit*, that he conceived the consecrated elements to become the *very body*, because the *same Spirit* was imparted to them as to the *natural* body of our Lord; a notion not falling in with *transubstantiation*, or *consubstantiation*, but amounting to some kind of *impanation*<sup>i</sup>. If so, he may be looked upon, according to what appears, as the first *inventor* of the spiritual *bread-body*, or first *founder* of that system. But I much question whether that notion can claim so early a date. Whatever conception the author had of the elements, as made the *very body* and *blood* of *Christ*, yet (so far as we may judge from some passages of another work of the same author, first published by Dr. Allix in 1682<sup>k</sup>;) he did not conceive that the elements were *enriched*, either with the *Spirit* himself, or with the *graces* of the Spirit: for he distinguished between the *bread from heaven*, viz. the *Logos*, given to the *worthy* only, and carrying *eternal life* with it, and the *earth-born flesh* of Christ, viz. the consecrated elements, common both to *worthy* and *unworthy*, and having no such promise of *eternal life* annexed to it<sup>l</sup>, in John vi. 51.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. x. 4.

<sup>i</sup> Mens ipsius videtur esse, panem et vinum eatenus esse *verum* Christi corpus et sanguinem, quatenus *idem Spiritus* qui proprio Domini corpori et sanguini inest, se pani et vino similiter communicat: qui certe monachi hujus conceptus nihil habet commune cum *transubstantiatione*, aut *consubstantiatione*, sed *impanationis* cujusdam, ab aliis post clarius expositæ, speciem quandam habet. *Albertin.* p. 906. Conf. *Claude*, lib. iv. c. 9. p. 331—336.

<sup>k</sup> S. Anastasii Sinaitæ Anagogicarum contemplationum in Hexæmeron, liber xii. hactenus desideratus. Lond. 1682. Conf. *Fabric.* *Bibl. Gr.* vol. ix. p. 328.

<sup>l</sup> Ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ταῦτ' ἴσται ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος· καὶ ἰάν τις φάγη ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.—ἀκούουσ' ἡμεῖς διαφορᾶς βρώσεως ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου



I will not answer for the *acuteness*, much less for the *soundness* of his distinction. He found himself entangled presently, only by reading a *few* verses farther in the same chapter, where *eternal life* is annexed to the eating of the *flesh* and drinking the *blood*, as well as before to the manducation of the *bread from heaven*, which he had interpreted of the *Divine nature* of Christ. Here he was in straits, and retired in confusion, leaving his readers in the dark; but referring them for instruction to men more knowing, and more equal to the difficulty than he pretended to be: only he seemed to aim at some blind distinction between the *earth-born visible flesh*<sup>m</sup> which the *unworthy* partake of, and the *mystical flesh*<sup>n</sup> which belonged to the *worthy* only, and which it was very difficult to make any sense or consistency of, upon his principles. He had discarded *signs* as such, and had resolved all into the *things signified*, *viz.* the *real* flesh and blood of Christ: and now he wanted a distinction, in order to explain *what* was received by the *unworthy*, and what by the *worthy*, but found none; except it were this, that the *unworthy* received the corruptible *flesh* and *blood* of Christ, separate from his *Divinity*, while the *worthy* received *both* together. This is all the sense I can make of his notion: and I pretend not to be *certain* even of this<sup>o</sup>.

τοῦ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνοντος τοῦς ἰσθίοντες ἵπαις ἔχουσιν ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἰσθίει δὲ τῆς σαρκός, οὐ τίθηται τοῦτο.—διετῶς μετιχομεν τῶν μυστηρίων. Οἱ μὲν ἄξιοι ἰσθίοντες ἀπολάβουσι τοῦ ἔρτου τοῦ καταβαίνοντος αἰεὶ ἐν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τοῦτ' ἴσθι τῆς ἰουκῆσιως καὶ ἰκλάμφσιως τοῦ παναγίου πατρὸς τῆς θιότητος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς τὰ θιῶ καὶ οὐράνια φρονοῦντες· οἱ δὲ γήϊνοι καὶ τὰ γήϊνα φρονοῦντες, τῆς γηγιούσι καὶ μόνις σαρκὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεταλαμβάνουσιν σὺλμηρῶς καὶ ἀναξίως. *Anastas. Hexaem. lib. xii. p. 18.*

<sup>m</sup> Οὐ περιὶ τῆς ἀρμῆνις αὐτῆ [fort. αὐτοῦ] σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος λίγει μετιλαβι γὰρ καὶ Ἰουδαίσι, καὶ Σίμων ὁ Μάγος τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τῆς ὑχρηριστίας, τοῦ ἔρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου. *Anastast. ibid. p. 19.*

<sup>n</sup> Τίσι δὲ ἰσθίοντες ἡ ἀληθῆς βρωσις τῆς μυστικῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τί τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ κρηπτόμενον ἀπὸρήνται αἷμα αὐτοῦ, κατακαμπάνομεν τῆσι ἰκανοστίραισι καὶ γνωστικωστίραισι, οἷσι χρεὶ μεταδιδούσιν; P. 19.

<sup>o</sup> As *errors* commonly are the *corruption of truth*, and retain some of the *original features*; so one may see in *Anastasius's* notion some resemblances of the *ancient doctrines*, miserably perverted or misunderstood.

1. He had learned that the Spirit makes the *body* of Christ: he interpret-

Neither would I have dwelt so long upon so obscure and unintelligible a writer, had he not been the *first*, or among the *first*, that threw off the old distinctions between the *symbolical* and *true* body, thereby destroying, in a great measure, the very idea of a *Sacrament*. Hitherto the *new* notion of the elements being made the *real* body, as opposed to *image* or *figure*, had been used only for the support of *true* doctrine as to other points. But it is always wrong policy (to say no worse) to endeavour to support *sound* doctrine by any thing *unsound*, or to defend *truth* by any thing but *truth*. Error, first or last, will infallibly turn on the side of error, and cannot naturally serve for any other purpose. So it proved in this case: for the next time that this *new* doctrine appeared upon the stage was in the service of *image-worship*, then creeping into the Church. They who opposed that *innovation*, kept up the ancient principle with regard to the *elements* of the Eucharist, as *symbols, figures, images*; pleading that our Lord had left no visible image of himself, his incarnation, passion, sacrifice, &c. but that of the *Eucharist*. In reply to that plea, the *innovators* remonstrated against the *symbolical* nature of the Eucharist, contending that the consecrated elements were no *images, types, or figures*, but the *very* body and blood of Christ, literally so.

Damascen, surnamed Mansur, the father of the modern Greeks, and their great oracle, was in this sentiment: a very considerable man otherwise, and worthy of better

ed it of the *natural* body, instead of *symbolical, viz. the sacrament* of the *true* body.

2. He had learned that the *natural* body is *given* and *received*: he interpreted it *literally*, instead of *mystically, or spiritually*.

3. He had learned that the *natural* body given, is considered as *corruptible, crucified* and *dead*, and not as *glorified*: that he retained, and justly.

4. He had learned, that *the flesh profiteth not*, and that the *unworthy* partake not either of the *Logos, or Holy Ghost*, but that the *worthy* partake of both: and those also he appears to have retained.

Upon the whole, he blundered only in *two* of the propositions: but those two mistakes, like the *flies* in the *ointment*, marred the composition, and corrupted his whole system of the Eucharist.

times P. He had read the *Fathers*, who were pointed against him; which however signified little to a person already embarked in a wrong cause: for it is certain, and might be proved by many instances, that men who have any *affection* stronger than their *love of truth*, will never want *evasions* against any evidence whatever. He pretended that the ancients had called the elements *types*, or *figures*, only *before* consecration, never *after*<sup>9</sup>. A plea notoriously false in fact, as all learned men know<sup>r</sup>: and had he said just the reverse, *viz.* that the *Fathers* had *never* so called them *before* consecration, but *always after*, he had come much nearer to the truth. The elements, before they are consecrated, are *common* things: and it is their *consecration* only that renders them *figures*, *signs*, *symbols*, *sacraments*. To pretend therefore that they are signs or symbols *before* consecration, is making them *sacraments* before they are *sacraments*, and carries a contradiction in the very terms. If the *Fathers* have ever so called them, which is questioned, it could amount only to some chance expression, contrary to their customary language, and to be accounted for by the *figure* called a *prolepsis*, as done by way of *anticipation*.

However, Damascen persisted in his error, that the consecrated elements are no *type*, or *figure*, but the very “deified body of our Lord<sup>s</sup>.” If you ask, who makes them so? he sometimes tells you, the *second* Person does it, like as he *formed* for himself a personal body in the womb<sup>t</sup>: and sometimes he says, that the *third* Person does it, like as he also, overshadowing the *Virgin*, *formed*

<sup>r</sup> Damascen flourished about A. D. 740. Died about A. D. 756. Vid. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. tom. viii. p. 774.

<sup>9</sup> Damascen. de Rect. Fid. lib. iv. c. 13. p. 271, 273. edit. Lequ.

<sup>r</sup> See Albertinus, p. 904, 907, 911, 912, 915. Jewell's Answ. to Hard. art. xii. p. 335. Def. of Apol. p. 243. Bilson's Christian Subject, p. 594, 595. L'Arroque's Hist. of the Euch. part ii. p. 213, &c. 368, &c.

<sup>t</sup> Οὐκ ἴσται τύπος ἢ ἄρτος καὶ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μὴ γίνωται, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου τιθεμένον. Damascen. de Rect. Fid. lib. iv. c. 13. p. 271.

<sup>t</sup> Damascen, *ibid.* p. 268.

the same body in the womb<sup>v</sup>. Thus he drew together the two constructions of Luke i. 35. one prevailing principally before the fourth century<sup>w</sup>, and the other after<sup>x</sup>: and he reconciled the two positions handsomely enough, by observing, that the *second* Person operates by the *third*.

But still he was well aware, that whatever Person should be supposed to make the *body* in the womb, yet nothing could make that body properly our *Lord's body*, but our Lord's *assuming* it into an union with himself: the forming an *human* and a *sanctified* body would not be *making* that body *Christ's body*: and, for the like reason, the Holy Ghost's so *forming* and so *sanctifying* the elements would not be *converting* them into, or *making* them, the *body and blood of Christ*, but merely a *sanctified* body. Therefore Damascen proceeded farther to *γ* affirm, that our Lord *makes* the elements *his* body and blood, by *joining* his *Divinity* with them: and it is observable, that while he thought the *grace* of the *Spirit* sufficient for the elements of *oil* and *water*, in *Chrism* and *Baptism*, yet he judged that nothing less than *Christ's own Divinity* could make the elements of the Eucharist *Christ's body and blood*. Had he thought of this in time, he might have spared his two previous considerations, about the *second* and the *third* Person's *forming* or *changing* the elements into *Christ's body*, so improperly brought in: for it is now plain, by his own account, that the elements are not *made* *Christ's body* but by *Christ's assuming* them into

<sup>v</sup> Damascen, *ibid.* p. 269. Epist. ad Zachar. Epum Duarorum, p. 656.

<sup>w</sup> See above, p. 230.

<sup>x</sup> It may be noted, that when πνεῦμα ἅγιον, in that verse, came at length to be interpreted of the *third* Person, yet δύναμις ὑψίστου continued to be interpreted of the *second*, namely of the Λόγος. Athanasius, *Orat.* iv. p. 642, 695. Basil. *contr. Eunom.* lib. v. p. 318. Ambros. *de Sp. Sancto*, lib. ii. c. 5. Ruffin. in *Symb.* p. 20. ed. Oxon. Philastrius, *cap. cl.* p. 345. Augustin. *contr. Maxim.* lib. iii. c. 15. Leo I. *Serm. xxi.* p. 147. Damascen, p. 204, 658. Theophylact in *loc.*

*γ* Συνίξις τῆ ἰλαίῃ καὶ ὕδατι τὴν χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος—ἰσχυρὴ ἰσως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἔργον ἰσχύος, ὕδαρ τι καὶ ὄσον πνεύς, συνίξις αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτοῦ θείτητα, καὶ πτωχίαν αὐτὰ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα αὐτοῦ. *Damasc.* p. 269.

some kind of *union* with his *Divinity*; and all that was supposed *previous*, could amount only to preparing them, fitting them, sanctifying them, in order to *be made* the body and blood of Christ. It could not amount to so much as *forming* them, like the body in the womb, though he had pretended that it did: for the bread and wine want no forming, (like the body in the womb,) having been *formed* before, and all along keeping their original forms. So that at length that pretended *previous change* could resolve only into a *previous sanctification* by the *Spirit*, upon his own principles: the *Logos* was to do the rest, by assuming those *sanctified* elements, and *making* them the body and blood of Christ. So confused and incoherent was this great man.

But what was worse still, after all these lengths of fancy, there was yet a difficulty remaining, which was altogether insuperable. The elements were to be made the very *deified body* of Christ, like as the *personal* body, in the womb, had been made. How could this be, without the like *personal* union of the elements with the *Divinity*? Here Damascen was plunged, and attempted not to get out, at that time, or in that work. But in another work, in the way of a private letter, he did endeavour to surmount the difficulty, by suggesting a new piece of subtlety, that like as a man's body takes in daily *additional* matter, and all becomes one and the same body; so our Lord's *personal* body takes in all the *new-made* bodies of the Eucharist; and thus, by a kind of *growth*, or *augmentation*, all become one and the same *personal* body of Christ<sup>z</sup>. A marvellous thought! But he was *wedded* to

<sup>z</sup> Damascen. Epist. ad Zachar. p. 655—659. N. B. There is something of a like thought appearing in a work ascribed to Gregory Nyssen, Orat. Catechet. magn. c. xxxvii. p. 537. But there are strong suspicions that that work has been *interpolated*. It is certain, that there is, in the close, an *addition* from Theodorus Raithu, who flourished about A. D. 646. So that there is no depending upon the *whole* work as genuine; but there may be, and probably are *interpolations* in it, perhaps of the seventh or eighth century, or later. See Albertinus, p. 487. Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. tom. viii. p. 153. But if Nyssen really held any such notions, or used any such ex-

a new scheme, and was in no disposition to return to the old principles, which might have eased him of all perplexities. The *heart* will commonly govern the *head*: and it is certain, that any strong passion, set the wrong way, will soon infatuate even the *wisest* of men: therefore the first part of wisdom is to watch the *affections*. But I pass on.

I am aware that the late learned editor of Damascen has disputed the genuineness of that epistle<sup>a</sup>. But the *external* evidences for it appear to me to outweigh the slight suspicions drawn from the *internal* characters. And I am much mistaken, if any unprejudiced examiner will find that the learned editor has *proved* any thing more than a strong desire to fetch off his author from some palpable absurdities, lest they should too much impair his credit as to other points. But, however that be, it is certain that Damascen's system wanted some such additional succour as that epistle endeavoured to supply: and whether he did the kind office himself, or some other did it for him, is of no great moment with respect to the main cause. One thing we may observe from the whole, that whosoever once embraces any great *absurdity*, and resolves to abide by it, must, if he will be consistent and uniform, proceed to *more*: and though to go on is a kind of *madness*, yet to stop short betrays more *weakness* and *self-condemnation*.

No *transubstantiation* (such as the Romanists hold) was yet invented. Damascen's doctrine was far enough from that<sup>b</sup>; excepting that it might accidentally and gradually lead to it, as indeed it did, by sapping those *ancient* principles which otherwise were sure barriers against it, and by setting men's minds afloat after new devices.

pressions, they were *affected* and *singular*, and ought to bear no weight against the *known* sentiments and *common* style of the *Fathers* in general.

<sup>a</sup> In Admonitione Prævia, p. 652.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Albertinus, p. 912, 913. L'Arroque's Hist. of Euch. p. 366, &c. Claude against Arnaud, part i. book 4. chap. 9. p. 338.

From Damascen we may pass on to the famous Council of Constantinople, which consisted of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, who assembled under Constantine the Sixth, surnamed Copronymus, A. D. 754. They, detesting all *image-worship*, reestablished the ancient doctrine of the *elements* being commemorative and exhibitivè *types, figures, symbols, or images* of the natural body and blood of Christ; alleging that the Eucharist was the only image of Christ's *incarnation* which Christ had authorized in his Church<sup>c</sup>. They speak magnificently of the *consecration*, and the *effects* of it; the elements thereby becoming an *holy image*, and *deified*, as it were, by *grace*<sup>d</sup>: by which they appear to mean no more than *divinely sanctified*, according to the ordinary use of such *phrases*, at that time, and before<sup>e</sup>: and they themselves explain it by its being *made holy*, when before it was *common*<sup>f</sup>. And though they speak of the elements being *replenished*, that is, *sanctified* by the Holy Ghost, yet they reserve the *enlivening* or *life-giving* virtue to the *true* and *proper* body and blood of Christ<sup>g</sup>; not to the elements, the *image* of them. They distinguish between the *real, natural* body, and the *relative* body, or body by *institution* and *appoint-*

<sup>c</sup> The whole passage may be seen in the Acts of the second Nicene Council, Act. vi. p. 368, 369. Harduin, tom. iv. Compare Dr. Covell's translation of it, and remarks upon it; Account of Gr. Church, p. 150, 151; and Albertinus, p. 914; and Clande, book iv. chap. 10. p. 347—355.

<sup>d</sup> Εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ ἁγία, ὡς διὰ τινος ἁγιασμοῦ, χάριτι Θεοῦ μίμη. P. 368.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Suicer's Thesaur. tom. i. 444, 1363, 1392, 1398. Jewell's Answ. to Hard. p. 247. Albertinus, p. 886. and compare Damascen, lib. iii. c. 17. p. 239.

<sup>f</sup> Τῆς ἐχαρακτικῆς ἔργου, ὡς ἀψιυθῆ ἰκὼνα τῆς φουικῆς, σαρεὺς διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἰσφιότησεως ἁγιαζέμενον, θείον εἶμα ἰδέσκειν γίνεσθαι, μισιτύπος τοῦ ἐν μιτυνίξῃ ἐκ τοῦ κοινῶ πρὸς τὸ ἅγιον, τὴν ἀναφορὰν ποιημένου ἱερώς. P. 368.

<sup>g</sup> Ζωοποιῶν θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ—ἰκανὸν τοῦ ζωοποιῶ σώματος αὐτοῦ—ἐν τῇ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ ζωοφύρου αἵματος τῆς πλιυρῆς αὐτοῦ. Note, that Mr. Johnson, inadvertently, rendered the last words, *life-giving cup of the blood which [flowed] out of his side*, (Unbl. Sacrifice, p. 195 :) he should have rendered, as Dr. Covell has done, *the cup of the enlivening blood of his side*: which is different, and gives quite another idea to the main thing. Conf. Theodoret. Dial. ii. p. 85.

ment<sup>h</sup>. The meaning of the latter must be determined by *what* it is appointed to; which the Council itself sufficiently explains: it is appointed to be a *true image*, and a most clear *memorial* of the natural body<sup>i</sup>: a *true image*, as opposed to *bare representation*, as in a *picture*, not exhibitive of, or accompanied with *true* and *spiritual* benefits: a very *clear memorial*, as opposed to the *faint shadows* and *dark intimations* of the *legal* types or figures. Some further light perhaps may be given to the true meaning of those Constantinopolitan Fathers, by a short passage of the Emperor Copronymus, preserved by Nicephorus, who was Patriarch of Constantinople from 800 to 815. The passage runs thus:

“ He commanded his holy disciples and apostles to deliver, by what thing he pleased, a *symbol* [type] for his *body*: that through the sacerdotal ministration we might receive *really* and *truly*, though it be by participation and designation, *his very body*<sup>k</sup>.” The meaning, as I apprehend, is, that we partake of the *natural* body itself, in a *true* and *reasonable* sense, (that is, *symbolically* or *spiritually*,) by receiving what God has *instituted* as a *symbol* and *instrument* to convey it. Copronymus does not say, that the elements are really and truly *that body*: no, that was the very position of the adverse party. But he affirms that we truly and really *receive* that very body, though symbolically, or by an *appointed* medium and pledge of it: which I understand to be exactly the same doctrine that our Church teaches, *viz.* that the body and

<sup>h</sup> Ὡς ἔστιν οὖν τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα ἅγιον, ὡς διατίθειν αὐτῶς ἄλλοι καὶ τὸ θεῖον — p. 368. For the phrase, εἰκὼν κατὰ θεῖον, vid. Damascen. tom. i. p. 354.

<sup>i</sup> Ἀληθῆ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα — ἦν αὐτὸς ὁ ἱεροκλιστὴς καὶ Θεὸς — εἰς τύπον καὶ ἀνάμνησιν ἱεραγιστάτην τοῖς αὐτοῦ μύσταις παραδίδωκε. P. 368.

<sup>k</sup> Ἐκίλισεν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, παραδόναι δι' οὗ ἡράσθη πρᾶγματος τύπον εἰς σῶμα αὐτοῦ. Ἴνα διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἀναγωγῆς, κἀντὶ τῆς μυστηρίου καὶ θεοῦ γίνηται, λάβωμεν αὐτὸ, ὡς κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς, σῶμα αὐτοῦ. *Constantin.* Copronym. in *Notis ad Damascen.* tom. i. p. 354. As to the ecclesiastical use and sense of the word *κυρίως*, see Albertinus, p. 461. Claude, part ii. p. 76.



blood of Christ are “verily and indeed taken and received “by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper<sup>1</sup>.” This doctrine did not happen to please the Nicene Fathers, who sate thirty-three years after, in the year 787. It was not sufficient to say, that by or with the elements we do verily and indeed *receive* Christ’s body and blood, but the *elements* themselves must *literally* be the *very body* and the *very blood* of Christ, and not types or pledges only of it<sup>m</sup>. Not indeed in the sense of Papal *transubstantiation*, (which was not then thought on<sup>n</sup>,) but in some such sense as Anastasius or Damascen had before recommended.

Seven years after (*viz.* A. D. 794.) appeared the Caroline books, moderating in the dispute between the Councils of Constantinople and Nice. The author or authors of them determine that the Sacrament of our Lord’s body and blood goes much beyond a *picture* of man’s device, in many respects; which they handsomely enumerate<sup>o</sup>: and of that no man can doubt. They determine farther, that the elements are not *types* of things *future*, nor faint *shadows*, like those under the *law*, but that they are *truth* and *substance*<sup>p</sup>; a sacrament and mystery, commemora-

<sup>1</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 191, 304.

<sup>m</sup> Οὗτοι ἡ Κύριος, οὗτοι οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, ἡ πατρίεις εἰκόνα ἴπαι—ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ αἷμα.—μὴτὰ δὲ τὸν ἁγιασμένον σῶμα κυρίου καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ λέγονται, καὶ εἰσι, καὶ πιστεύουσιν. *Concil. Nicen.* ii. Act. vi. p. 370, 371. Harduin, tom. iv.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. Albertinus, p. 915. Covel, p. 151, 152.

<sup>o</sup> Distat *Sacramentum* Dominici corporis et sanguinis ab *imaginibus* pictorum arte depictis, &c. *Carol. Magn.* lib. ii. p. 278.

<sup>p</sup> Nec nobis legis transeuntibus umbris imaginarium quoddam indicium, sed sui sanguinis et corporis contulit Sacramentum. Non enim sanguinis et corporis Dominici mysterium *imago* jam nunc dicendum est, sed *veritas*; non *umbra*, sed *corpus*; non exemplar *futurorum*, sed id quod exemplaribus præfigurabatur.—Jam verus Melchizedech, Christus videlicet, rex justus, rex pacis, non *pecudum* victimas, sed *sui* nobis corporis et sanguinis contulit Sacramentum. Nec ait, Hæc est *imago* corporis et sanguinis mei, sed Hoc est *corpus meum*—Cum ergo, ut præfati sumus, nec *artificum opus*, vera Christi possit imago dici, nec corporis et sanguinis ejus mysterium, quod *in veritate* gestum esse constat, non *in figura*, merito, &c. *Carol. Magn. de Imagin.*

tive of a thing *performed*, and not prefigurative of a thing *hoped* for only, or *promised*: a sacrament directly and plainly signifying and exhibiting the *true expiation*, and not merely under the *dark covers* or *remote innuendos* of *legal expiations*. In short, the eucharistical symbols are not *prefigurations* of things expected, but *evidences* of things done, and *memorials* of mercies and blessings in hand, not in prospect only. Their whole meaning seems to be, that though the consecrated elements are really *signs* and *symbols*, (for so much they intimate in the words *sacrament*, *mystery*, and *true image*,) and therefore not the *very body and blood*, as many then taught; yet they are more than *types*, or *prefigurations*, or *adumbrations*, or even *bare memorials*, because they *exhibit* the things signified, and that not *darkly* or *indirectly*, (which even the Jewish sacraments did,) but *directly* and *plainly*, under the strongest light, and to greatest advantage. This doctrine is sound and good, and well guarded, in the main, against both extremes. Only, it might have been wished, that they had been less scrupulous about the use of the name *figure*, or *image*, (so common and familiar in elder times,) and that they had given less countenance to the novel and affected phrases then coming into vogue: for, generally speaking, *ancient doctrine* is best kept up by adhering strictly to *ancient language*; and *new phrases* at any time, taken up without necessity, have been observed to lead the way to a *new faith*.

Hitherto, however, the *western* parts appear to have retained just ideas of the holy Eucharist. But before the end of the ninth century, the *eastern* innovations, introduced by Anastasius and Damascen, and established by the Nicene Council, spread wide and far, both among

lib. iv. p. 520. Conf. Albertin. p. 916, 917. Jewell's Answer to Hard. art. xii. p. 344, 345. Bilson's Christian Subject, p. 593. Claude, part i. book v. chap. 9. p. 96, 97. L'Arroque, p. 380, &c.

¶ Idem itaque in mysterio cibus et potus illorum qui noster, sed *significatione* idem, non *specie*: quia idem ipse Christus illis in *petra figuratus*, nobis in *carne manifestatus*. *Augustin. in Psal. lxxvii.* p. 816.

Greeks and Latins. When it was once resolved that the consecrated elements should be no longer *signs* or *figures* at all, but the *very* body and blood of Christ, the *symbolical* language of Scripture and Fathers became *neglected*, and in a while *forgotten*; and the old notion of a *sacrament*, as importing a *sign* and a *thing signified*, wore off apace: and now all the care was, how to make out that *very body and blood*, by some subtile evasions, or newly devised theories. Many are the wanderings of human invention, after men have once departed from the right way; as sufficiently appeared from the great variety of systems soon set up, instead of the only *ancient* and *true* system: and they were all but as so many different *modifications* of one and the same error, committed in sinking the idea of *symbolical* grants, and thereupon confounding *figure* and *verity*, exalting *signs* into *things signified*. But let us inquire more particularly what ways were taken, or could be taken, to make it competently appear, that the elements once consecrated are *no signs*, but the *very body and blood* of Christ. They are reducible perhaps to *five*, as follows: 1. Either the elements must literally *become* the same *personal* body. 2. Or they must literally *contain* or inclose the same *personal* body. 3. Or they must literally *become another* personal body. 4. Or they must literally *contain another* personal body. 5. Or they must literally be or contain a *true* and *proper* body of Christ, distinct and different from a *personal* body.

1. As to the first, it was undoubtedly the thing aimed at by the first *innovators*; namely, by Anastasius, and Damascen, and the Nicene Fathers. And they endeavoured to make it out in the way of *augmentation*, as has been related, joining the new-made body here to the *personal* body above, so as to make one personal body of both. Another shorter way of coming at the point was that of *transubstantiation*, which crept in later, and which the Latins generally fell into; for *relief*, as it seems, to wearied minds, fluctuating in uncertainties, and not knowing how or where to rest.

2. As to the second way, which has been called *consubstantiation*, some think that Paschasius Radbert (about A. D. 831.) took into it<sup>r</sup>: others conceive that it came in later<sup>s</sup>.

3. As to the third way, some have imagined that our Lord's *Divinity* becomes personally united with the *elements*, as well as with his own *natural* body, having in that sense *two* personal bodies. This conceit has sometimes gone under the name of *assumption*<sup>t</sup>, as it imports the Deity's *assuming* the elements into a *personal union*; and sometimes it has been called *impanation*, a name following the analogy of the word *incarnation*. Rupertus Tuitiensis (about A. D. 1111.) has been believed to espouse this notion<sup>u</sup>; and Odo Cameracensis<sup>w</sup>, who lived about the same time. It is much the same notion that St. Austin supposes *ignorant* children might be apt to conceive, in their simplicity, at the first hearing of what is said of the elements, and before they come to *know better*<sup>x</sup>. So simple were even famous Divines grown in the late and dark ages.

4. As to the fourth way, those who have supposed some *spiritual* and *personal* body from above, distinct

<sup>r</sup> Cosin. *Histor. Transubstant.* p. 86. Conf. Albertinus, p. 922. But others interpret him of *transubstantiation*. See Claude, part ii. p. 198, &c.

<sup>s</sup> Hospinian. *Histor. Rei Sacram.* p. 6.

<sup>t</sup> N. B. *Assumption* has been also a common name for Damascen's hypothesis, wherein it is supposed that the Divinity *assumes* the elements into a *personal union*, but by the *medium* of the natural and personal body. Vid. Pfaffius de *Consecrat.* p. 450. Buddæus, *Miscell. Sacr.* tom. ii. p. 80.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Hospinian. p. 7. Albertinus, p. 959, 960. Pfaffius de *Consecrat. Euch.* p. 449, 450. Buddæus, *Miscellan. Sacr.* tom. ii. p. 80.

<sup>w</sup> Fac ergo Domine, nostram oblationem adscriptam, ut pretiosum corpus Christi fiat, *Verbo Dei* adunata, et in *unitate personæ* conjuncta. Odo. *Cameracensis. in Sacr. Can. Exposit. Bibl. PP.* tom. vi. p. 360.

<sup>x</sup> Infantes—si nuquam discant experimento, vel suo vel aliorum, et nuquam illam speciem rerum videant, nisi inter celebrationes sacramentorum, cum offertur et datur, dicaturque illis autoritate gravissima, cujus corpus et sanguis sit, nihil aliud credent, nisi omnino in illa specie *Domini* oculis apparuisse mortalium, et de latere tali percusso liquorem illum omnino fluxisse. *Augustin. de Trin.* lib. iii. c. 10. p. 803. Conf. Albertin. p. 648, 649.

from the *natural*, to come upon the elements, and to abide in them and with them, have had some colour for it from two very *ancient* passages, one of Clemens Alexandrinus, and another of Jerome<sup>y</sup>. But it hath been abundantly shown, time after time, by learned and able men, that that ancient distinction ought not to be understood of two personal bodies of Christ, but of two distinct *views* or *considerations* of one and the same natural and personal body<sup>z</sup>. The celebrated Bertram, (that is, Ratramn,) of the ninth century, has been by some supposed to be of the number of those who made *two* such *bodies* of Christ. There is some appearance of it, but, I think, *appearance* only: for upon carefully weighing and considering his real sentiments, it will be found, that he supposed only a sacramental body received *orally*, and the natural body received *spiritually* in the *Eucharist*<sup>a</sup>.

5. There is yet a fifth way, which prevailed with many, as high as the ninth century; which was to imagine some kind of union of our Lord's *Divinity* with the consecrated elements, short of *personal*, but yet presumed sufficient to denominate them in a *true* and *proper* sense (as opposed to *symbolical*) the *Lord's body and blood*. Remigius<sup>b</sup>,

<sup>y</sup> Διττὸν δὲ τὸ αἷμα Κυρίου τὸ μὴ γὰρ ἴσσει αὐτοῦ σαρκινὸν, ἢ τῆς Θεότητος λαυτρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ πνευματικὸν, τούτῳσιν ἢ κηχρίμεθα. *Clem. Alex. Pædag.* lib. ii. c. 2. p. 177. Compare Review, vol. vii. p. 166.

Dupliciter vero sanguis Christi, et caro intelligitur: vel spiritualis illa et divina, de qua ipse dixit, *caro mea vere est cibus*; vel caro et sanguis, quæ crucifixa est, et qui militis effusus est lancea. *Hieron. in Ephes.* p. 327. Opp. tom. iv. edit. Bened.

<sup>z</sup> Beza de Cæna Domini, p. 93. Jewell's Answer to Harding, art. v. p. 248, 249. Albertinus, p. 315, 395. Rivet in Consult. de Relig. p. 26. Chamier, tom. iv. p. 695. Spalatensis, lib. v. c. 6. p. 103.

<sup>a</sup> Bertram de Corpore et Sanguine Domini, p. 16, 24, 36, 40, 96, 100, 114, 116. edit. Anglo-Latin. Lond. A. D. 1686.

<sup>b</sup> *Caro quam Verbum Dei Patris assumpsit in utero Virginali, in unitate suæ Personæ, et panis qui consecratur in Ecclesia, unum corpus Christi sunt. Sicut enim illa caro corpus Christi est, ita iste panis transit in corpus Christi; nec sunt duo corpora, sed unum corpus. Divinitatis enim plenitudo quæ fuit in illa, replet et istam panem, &c.—et sicut ille panis et sanguis in corpus Christi transeunt, ita omnes qui in Ecclesia digne comedunt illud, unum Christi corpus sunt.—Tamen illa caro quam assumpsit,*

who flourished about the year 890, conceived, that our Lord's *Divinity* filling the *natural* body and the *mystical*, *viz.* the Church, and the *consecrated elements*, made all the three to become *one body* of Christ. It is observable, that he admits of but one of the three to be Christ's body in the *personal* sense: but having a *confuse* notion of some *remote* union of each with the *Logos*, which was *common* to them all, he therefore called each of them singly a *true* body of Christ, and all conjunctly *one true* body. The like account may be seen in the book de *Divinis Officiis* <sup>c</sup>, falsely ascribed to Alcuinus of the eighth century, written probably in the eleventh century or later. The sum is, that because one of the three is truly Christ's body in a *symbolical* sense, and the other truly his body in a *mystical* sense, and the third in a *true* and *proper* sense; therefore all the three are severally a *true* body of Christ, and together *one true* body. Such were the rovings of men bewildered in their ways, after they had deserted the old paths. It is however worth the observing, that this author was very solicitous to avoid the suspicion of making two *true bodies* of Christ, which Christian ears could not bear: and further, that he retained so much of the *ancient* principles, under clouds of confusion, as to suppose the *Logos* to be the heavenly *food* of the Eucharist, and he resolves the *formal* reason of the name of *Lord's body* into some *immediate* relation to the *person* of Christ. I do not find that the *third* Person's filling the elements with *himself*, or with his *graces*, was hitherto supposed the *immediate ground* or *formal reason* of their having the name of *Christ's body*: or had it so been, the *element* of

et iste panis, omnisque *Ecclesia* non faciunt tria corpora Christi, sed unum corpus. Remig. Antissiodorensis (alias Haymo) in 1 *Cor.* x. p. 132.

Sicut caro Christi quam assumpsit in utero Virginali, verum corpus ejus est, et pro nostra salute occisum, ita panis quem Christus tradidit discipulis suis—et quem quotidie consecrant sacerdotes in Ecclesia, cum virtute *Divinitatis* quæ illum replet panem, verum corpus Christi est; nec sunt duo corpora illa caro quam assumpsit, et iste panis, sed unum verum corpus faciunt Christi. *Id.* in 1 *Cor.* xi. p. 137. Conf. Albertin, p. 936.

<sup>c</sup> Pseudo-Alcuinus de *Divin. Off.* cap. 40.

Baptism, upon the *analogy* observed by the *ancients*, would most certainly have had a better title to the name. For the Holy Ghost was supposed more immediately to preside, as it were, in that Sacrament, under the *figure* of a *conjugal union*, as before mentioned: and even as low as Damascen, we find, that while the *grace of the Spirit* was said to be joined with the *oil* and the *water*, the very *Divinity* of the second Person was supposed to be joined with the *elements* of the Eucharist <sup>d</sup>.

I am sensible that a great show of authorities has been produced, in order to persuade us, that, according to the *ancients*, the *third* Person was presumed to *make* the elements the *body* and *blood* of Christ <sup>e</sup>. But out of twenty-two authorities, seventeen, as I conceive, either *must* or *may* be understood of the *second* Person <sup>f</sup>, the *Λόγος*, often called *Spirit*: and the *five* remaining authorities prove only, that the *Holy Ghost* <sup>g</sup> makes the elements *sacraments*, or *sanctified* symbols, or an *holy body*, fitting them for the uses intended, and *preparing* the communicants at the same time. The Holy Ghost prepares both the *symbols* and the *guests*: but still it is the *Logos*, the *incarnate Logos*, who is properly the *spiritual food* or *feast*, according to Scripture and all Catholic antiquity; and that not as *residing*, by his Divinity, in the *elements*, but as *adjoining* only, or *concomitant*; and that to the *worthy* only: But I pass on.

I have been observing something of the various wanderings and mazes which thoughtful men fell into, after the *change* of doctrine introduced in the seventh century. For from thence came *augmentation*, *assumption*, *impanation*

<sup>d</sup> See above, p. 241, 242.

<sup>e</sup> Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 187—195.

<sup>f</sup> 1. Ignatius. 2. Justin Martyr. 3. Irenæus. 4. Clemens Alexandrinus. 5. Origen. 6. Cyprian. 7. Athanasius. 8. Julius Firmicus. 9. Nazianzen. 10. Epiphanius. 11. Gregory Nyssen. 12. Ephræm. Syrus. Vid. Albertin. 453. 13. Gaudentius. 14. Cyrill. Alex. See Albertin, 454. 15. Gelasius. 16. Theodorite. 17. Pseud-Ambrose.

<sup>g</sup> Cyril. Hierosol. Optatus, Chrysostom, Austin, and Council of Constantinople.

*tion, composition, consubstantiation, transubstantiation, local presence, and oral manducation of the res sacramenti, inherent virtues, bread-sacrifice, bread-worship, and the like; all issuing from the same source, all springing from the same root; namely, from that servilis infirmitas, which St. Austin speaks of, the mistaking signs for things, and figure for verity.*

The *Reformation*, as is well known, commenced in the sixteenth century, and then this high subject came to be reconsidered, and to be set in a proper light, upon the foundation of *Scripture* and *antiquity*. But disputes arose even among *Protestants*. For though the *later* and *grosser* corruptions of the Latin Church were soon thrown off, with general consent, yet some of the *older* and more *refined* depravations of the Greeks were not easily distinguished (in those infant days of criticism) from what was truly ancient, but had made too deep an impression upon the minds of many serious persons. The nature of *symbolical* grants and *constructional* conveyances was not so well considered as might have been wished. Many understood not what *eating* could mean, unless it were conceived to be *oral* and *literal*: neither could they suddenly bring their minds to comprehend how a thing could be said to be given and received at the supper, without being literally, locally *present* in the supper, in the very *tokens* or *pledges* of the heavenly things there made over to every faithful communicant. As if *livery* and *seisin* might not be given and taken by proper instruments: or as if a *ring*, a *book*, a *crozier*, or other tokens of investiture, might not convey lands, honours, dignities, without being inwardly *enriched* with<sup>h</sup>, or outwardly *converted* into the very things

<sup>h</sup> See Review, vol. vii. p. 146, 147. Sicut sigillum principis vere est non otiosum, sed *efficax*, nulla tamen sibi *indita virtute*, sed *authoritate* duntaxat principis quasi *comitante*: sic Sacramenta, quæ in *signis* et *signaculis* esse negare nullus potest, — etsi nulla in rebus externis *vi indita* agant in animas hominum, aut in gratiam quæ in iis quaeritur, tamen non desinunt esse instrumenta *efficacia*, tanquam *σημεία καὶ σφραγίδες*. *Chemier*, tom. iv. p. 57.



themselves which they so convey. For as any person becomes legally vested in an estate by the delivering and receiving of *deeds*, though he does not literally take the lands and tenements in his hands, nor grasp them in his arms: so may a person, in construction of *Divine law*, be vested in or possessed of the Lord's *body and blood*, and whatever depends thereupon, without literally receiving the same into his mouth. The notion is a very plain and easy notion, that one might justly wonder how it came to pass, that even Divines of good note should not hit upon it at first; or if they did, should slight it<sup>i</sup>.

Our Divines, as Cranmer, Jewell, Hooker, &c. (to do them justice,) understood this matter perfectly well. Neither do I know of any considerable person amongst our *early Reformers* who missed the right thought: unless perhaps we may except the great Bishop Poyntet, in his exile at Strasburg, where he died A. D. 1556. He drew up his *Diallacticon* abroad, with a truly pious and pacific design, hoping to contribute something towards healing the then reigning differences between Lutherans and Calvinists, upon the subject of the Eucharist. The treatise was not published till after his death<sup>k</sup>: a short preface

<sup>i</sup> It is marvellous to observe, how from the time of Paschasius Radbert, of the ninth century, down to the sixteenth, almost the whole Latin Church were imposed upon themselves, or imposed upon others, by *confounding* two very distinct propositions with each other, as if they were the *same*. They saw plainly, both in Scripture and Fathers, that *the natural body of Christ is the thing signified, and received by the faithful in the Eucharist*: that is to say, received *with* the elements, *spiritually* received. Had they rested there, all had been right. But by slipping a *false* consequence, or false comment, upon *true* premises, they inadvertently changed that *sound* proposition into this very *unsound* one: that *the elements are that very natural body, locally present, and orally received by every communicant*. They had lost the idea of a *symbolical* and *constructional* reception; which requires neither *local* presence nor *corporal* contact.

<sup>k</sup> *Diallacticon viri boni et literati, de veritate, natura, atque substantia corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia.* 1557. First edition. Strasburg. 1573. Second edition. Geneva. At the end of Beza's *Opuscula.* 1576. Third edition. At the end of Harchius. 1688. Fourth edition. London. By Dr. Pelling.

was prefixed to it by the editor, supposed to be Sturmius<sup>l</sup>. I shall give a brief account of the author's main principles, using the octavo edition of 1576.

He was a religious admirer of the *ancient* Fathers: but as their works were not at that time critically distinguished, he was often misled, even in the main lines of his *hypothesis*, by *spurious* pieces or passages; quoting several material things under the admired names of Cyprian, Ambrose, and Austin, which belonged not to them, but were some of them as late as the twelfth century. Many passages of Austin and others stand only on the credit of Gratian, an author of the eleventh or twelfth century. And it is known that the piece *De Cœna*, ascribed to Cyprian, belongs to Arnoldus, who wrote about A. D. 1140. Under these disadvantages, it is the less to be wondered at, if the excellent author did not every where hit that ancient truth which he sincerely sought for.

1. In the first place, he appears to carry the notion of *inherent* virtues or graces, as lodged in the *elements* themselves, much too far<sup>m</sup>. And he seems to make the conjunction of grace and element *absolute* and *physical*<sup>n</sup>. By which means, he found himself at length involved in insuperable perplexities upon the point of *adoration* of the elements<sup>o</sup>, and the communion of the *unworthy*<sup>p</sup>: though he endeavoured to get off from both, as handsomely as the thing would bear. Our other more cautious Divines

<sup>l</sup> See the French Supplement to Bayle's Dictionary, in the article *Poinet*.

<sup>m</sup> *Vim vitæ signis externis inditam*, p. 53. *Virtutem [veri corporis] vitalem conjunctam habet*, p. 79. *Virtus ipsius corporis efficax et vivifica—cum pane et vino conjungitur*, p. 83. *Intus additam et latentem naturalem ejusdem corporis proprietatem, hoc est, vivificam virtutem, secum trahat*, p. 83. *Virtutem veri corporis spiritualem habet*, p. 86. *Virtus autem interna, quæ vi Divini Verbi accedit*, p. 118. *Virtute benedictionis mysticæ vim insitam*, p. 119.

<sup>n</sup> *Si gratiam et virtutem veri corporis cum pane et vino conjungi credamus, nimium elementis tribuere videbimur*, p. 107. *Divina virtus abesse a signo non potest, quia Sacramentum est*, p. 112. *Sacramenta quam diu Sacramenta sint, suam retinere virtutem, nec ab ea posse separari*, p. 114.

<sup>o</sup> P. 107, &c.

<sup>p</sup> P. 112.

of that time, as Cranmer and Jewell, had no concern with those *perplexities*, any more than the ancient *Fathers* had: for they avoided the main principle from which those difficulties arose; yea, and flatly contradicted it <sup>9</sup>.

2. The very worthy author appears not to have guarded sufficiently against the notion of *two* true bodies of Christ, *natural* above, and *spiritual* below, in the Eucharist: which is what the mild and moderate Cassander, very tenderly, charged him with; intimating, that he had put the *distinction* wrong between *body* and *body*, (as if there were two *true* bodies,) instead of distinguishing between the *different manner* of exhibiting or receiving one and the same *natural* body <sup>r</sup>. And so far Cassander judged very rightly, and conformably to the ancients: only as he chose to distinguish between a *visible* and *invisible* manner, he should rather have expressed it in the terms of *literal* and *spiritual*; which is the true distinction.

<sup>9</sup> See Cranmer's Preface, cited in Review, vol. vii. p. 185. and compare Review, p. 94, 284. Bishop Jewell writes thus: "We are taught, not to seek that *grace* in the *sign*, but to assure ourselves by receiving the sign, that it is given us by the *thing signified*.—It is not the creature of *bread* or *water*, but the *soul* of man that *receiveth* the *grace* of God. These corruptible creatures need it not: we have need of God's grace. But this is a phrase of speech. For the *power* of God, the *grace* of God, the *presence* of the Trinity, the *Holy Ghost*, the *gift* of God, are not in the *water*, but in *us*: and we were not made because of the Sacraments; but the Sacraments were made for our sake." *Jewell's Treatise of the Sacraments*, p. 263. fol. ed. Compare Def. of Apol. p. 208, 238.

<sup>r</sup> Quæ de duplici Christi corpore (Bertramum secutus) erudite disserit, facile aliquos offendat, quibus ex verbis Christi persuasum est, et quidem *vere*, non aliud corpus in Sacramento fidelibus dari, quam quod a Christo pro fidelium salute in mortem traditum fuit. Quamvis autem hic distinctione aliqua opus sit, malim tamen illam ad *modum* presentis et exhibitionis quam ad *ipsam rem subjectam*, hoc est, *corpus Christi*, adhiberi. Commodius itaque, et ad docendum accommodatius, et Christi instituto convenientius, et ad conciliationem aptius dici videtur, ipsum Christi corpus pro nobis traditum, etiam in Eucharistia fidelibus tradi; adhibita Augustini distinctione: "Ipsum quidem, et non ipsum; ipsum invisibiliter, et non ipsum *visibiliter*, &c." *Cassander, Epist.* p. 1084. Conf. Rivet. Animadv. ad Consult. p. 30. Apologet. p. 102. Grotii Opp. tom. iii. 621, 643, 660, 668.

Bishop Cosin<sup>s</sup>, speaking of Bishop Poynt, represents him (if there be not some error of the press) as making that very distinction which Cassander wished he had made, or which he suggested, by way of correction, as preferable to Poynt's. I say, Bishop Cosin represents Poynt as doing the very thing which Cassander required, and mostly in Cassander's own words, without naming him. Yet it is plain enough, that that distinction which Cosin ascribes to Poynt was not his, but Cassander's : wherefore I suspect some error of the *press* or of the *editor*, (as might easily happen in a *posthumous* piece,) and that Cosin really wrote *malim*, not *maluit*, making Cassander's censure his *own*. But of this let the considerate readers of both judge, as they see cause. Certain however it is, that Bishop Cosin (with all our other learned and judicious Divines) was zealous against the notion of two *true* bodies of Christ, and very strongly asserted, yea, and often inculcated, in that small treatise, where he had not much room to spare, that the *natural* body is the *thing signified*, the thing spiritually *given* and *received* by the *faithful* in the Eucharist. He was well aware, how much depended upon that *momentous* principle ; as well because it was the *safe*, the *only* clue to lead serious Christians through all the labyrinths of contending parties, as also because it was fixing the economy of man's salvation upon its true and firm *basis*, which is this : that in the Sacraments we are made and continued *members* of Christ's *body*, of his *flesh*, and of his *bones*<sup>t</sup>. Our *union* with the *Deity* rests entirely in our *mystical* union with our Lord's *humanity*, which is *personally* united with his

\* Licet discrimen ipse cum Patribus agnoscat inter *corpus Christi formam* humani corporis *naturalem* habens, et quod in Sacramento est *corpus mysticum*, *maluit* tamen discrimen illud *ad modum presentie et exhibitionis*, quàm *ad ipsam rem subjectam*, hoc est, *Christi corpus* verum, accommodari ; quum certissimum sit, *non aliud corpus in Sacramento fidelibus dari nisi quod a Christo pro fidelium salute in mortem traditum fuit*. Cosin. *Histor. Transubst.* p. 10.

<sup>t</sup> Ephes. v. 30.

*Divine nature*, which is *essentially* united with God the *Father*, the head and fountain of all. So stands the economy; which shows the high *importance* of the principle before mentioned. And it is well that Romanists, and Lutherans, and Greeks also, even the whole East and West, have preserved it, and yet preserve it: though some of them have miserably corrupted it by the *wood, hay, and stubble*, which they have *built* upon it; namely, by a *local* presence, a *literal* exhibition, and an *oral* manducation, with other the like *novel* additions or defalcations. But I return.

Twenty years after Poynt, a very learned physician, a German, building upon the same principles, and being much more sanguine and self-confident, pursued it to far greater lengths in two several treatises <sup>u</sup>, bearing different running titles <sup>z</sup>. His name was Harchius. It was a vast undertaking for that time. He set himself at once to oppose Romanists, Lutherans, and Calvinists, (*three sects*, as he called them <sup>y</sup>), condemning them all as guilty of great errors in the article of the *Eucharist*, and proposing a *fourth* system, wherein they should all unite. He boasted highly of the *Fathers*, as full and clear on his side <sup>z</sup>: he filled his two books with quotations of that kind: some *genuine* and some *spurious*, some *ancient* and some *middle-*

<sup>u</sup> *De Eucharistiæ Mysterio, Dignitate, et Usu: ex unanimi primitivæ Ecclesiæ Consensu, ad omnium eorum qui Christi Nomen profitentur, sedandas Controversias. Libri tres. 4to. Jodoco Harchio, Montense Medico, autore. Wormatiæ. 1573.*

Orthodoxorum Patrum—*Fides de Eucharistia et Sacrificio universali Ecclesiæ: ad Pontificiorum et Evangelicorum cognoscendas, dirimendasque Controversias, pro Christi Gloria, et Ecclesiarum Pace. Per Jodocum Harchium, Montensem Medicum. A. D. 1576. 8vo.*

<sup>z</sup> The running title of the first: *Concordia de Cœna.*

The running title of the second: *Patrum Consensus de Eucharistia.*

N. B. Hospinian says, this last was printed A. D. 1577. Hospin. *Histor. Sacram.* part ii. p. 354. Which may be true: for I take the date 1576, not from the title-page, (which has no date,) but from the end of the preface, written in 1576.

<sup>y</sup> Harch. *Patr. Consens.* p. 183, 230.

<sup>z</sup> *Ibid.* idem, p. 77, 127, 129, 270, 278.

aged, some Greek and some Latin; many of them *misconstrued*, more *misapplied*, but all made to serve the *system*<sup>a</sup> which he had before formed in his mind. As the attempt was considerable in its way, and commendable for its good meaning; and as it may be of use to know what the *system* was, and how *received*, and how *confuted*, (for *confuted* it was by a very able hand,) I shall here take the pains to draw out the chief lines of it, and next to exhibit a brief summary of the *answer* then made to it.

1. He pleads much for an *invocation* of the *Holy Ghost* in the Communion Offices<sup>b</sup>; and he speaks often of some *illapse* either of the *second* or *third* Person upon the *elements*, or else of some *virtue* of *life*, some *spiritual* and *eternal* gift, sent down from above, upon the consecrated bread and wine<sup>c</sup>.

2. He asserts a *spiritual* and marvellous *change* thereby made in the *elements*, but not destroying either their *substance* or their *figure*: a change of *qualities*, and a *melioration*, as it were, of the *substance* itself, by the powerful operation of the *Holy Ghost* and the supervening of the *Logos*<sup>d</sup>: on account of which change, he talks frequently of the elements as *passing into* the *virtue* of Christ's body and blood<sup>e</sup>. Sometimes he calls it *passing into* the *flesh*

<sup>a</sup> A brief summary of his *system*, in his own words, is as here follows.

Panis Eucharistiæ est corpus quoddam *sanctum*, consecratione sacerdotum factum *divinum*; existens veluti *imago*, *representatio*, seu *sacramentum* proprii et animati corporis Christi quod in cælo est; *impletum* a Christo *Spiritu Sancto* et *Verbo*: ut *offeratur* (mystice) Deo Patri, per ministerium *sacerdotum*; deinde ut *sumatur* ab omnibus fidelibus, &c. — in fide et charitate, ore et corde, ad remissionem peccatorum — in spem resurrectionis et vitæ æternæ, simul et ad memoriam passionis Christi, &c. Hæc definitio vera est et catholica, et a nobis in hoc libro probanda. *Harch. Patr. Consens.* p. 93. Conf. p. 68, 79.

<sup>b</sup> *Harch. Patr. Consens.* p. 25, 96, 98, 100. *Concord.* p. 146.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* *Concord.* p. 14, 45, 49, 79, 92. *Patr. Consens.* p. 56, 115, 151, 157, 168.

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* *idem*, p. 30, &c. 75, 82, 83, 86, 146. *Patr. Consens.* p. 54, 69, 100, 157, 185.

<sup>e</sup> *Ibid.* *idem*, p. 32, 35, 39, 45, 47, 53, 74, 79, 105.

of Christ, or *substance* of his body: but then he interprets it to mean, not the *personal* body or substance, but *another* very like it, or near akin to it in virtue; which he denominates a *spiritual* body, to distinguish it from the *natural* and *personal* body<sup>f</sup>.

3. He makes this pretended *spiritual* body sometimes the body of the *Divine Spirit*, meaning Christ's own *Divine Hypostasis*<sup>g</sup>; sometimes, the body of the *Word* and *Spirit* together<sup>h</sup>; and sometimes of the *Divine essence*, or whole *Trinity*<sup>i</sup>.

4. But as he could not admit of a *personal* union between the Deity and the bread-body, without calling it *Christ*, and *Lord*, and *God*, he was content to call it a *creature*, but a *most noble* creature<sup>k</sup>; an *image* of the natural body, but not full and adequate; extremely like it in power and energy, but not perfectly equal<sup>l</sup>: a *true*, and *holy*, and *Divine*, but *inanimate* figure, while full of the *Word*, and of the *Spirit*, and of *grace*, and of *life*<sup>m</sup>.

5. He supposed two *true* bodies of *Christ*; one in heaven above, another in the Eucharist below: one *natural*, and eaten by *contemplation* and *faith* at all times; the other *spiritual*, and eaten in the Eucharist both with *mind* and with *mouth*<sup>n</sup>. He conceived them to be so *nearly* the same thing, that they might be reckoned as *one flesh*, but yet considering that there was some *inequality*, he rather chose to make them *two*<sup>o</sup>.

6. He maintained an *infusion* of the *Divine essence*<sup>p</sup>, or

<sup>f</sup> Harch. Concord. p. 33, 35, 39, 45, 53, 74, 105. Patr. Consens. p. 69.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 15, 16. Patr. Consens. p. 28, 42, 47, 69.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. Patr. Consens. p. 29, 42, 46, 48, 53, 69, 98, 114, 128, 180.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. Concord. p. 31, 48, 70, 74. Patr. Consens. p. 91, 167, 172, 182, 183.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 36, 37, 38, 75, 76, 82, 83.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 36, 38, 53, 54, 65, 94, 95. Patr. Consens. p. 68, 79, 91, 117, 250.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. Patr. Consens. p. 68, 76, 85, 90, 91, 92, 93, 112, 131, 147.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. Concord. p. 27, 55, 70, 81.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. Patr. Consens. p. 215, 216.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. Concord. p. 31, 48, 70, 74. Patr. Consens. p. 74, 76.

of Christ<sup>q</sup>, or of some *virtue* of Christ's flesh<sup>r</sup>, into the elements: an *inhabitation*<sup>s</sup> also, and *union*<sup>t</sup>, and *mixture*<sup>u</sup> with the same.

7. He once supposed, that the spiritual body in the Eucharist is not so fully or perfectly Christ's body as every good Christian is<sup>x</sup>: but he appears to have changed his mind afterwards, upon a supposal that the *fulness* of the *Godhead* resides in the elements, and not ordinarily in *good men*<sup>y</sup>.

8. He supposed the *spiritual* body to be the vicarious *substitute* of the *natural*; not *equal* in power or virtue, but approximate<sup>z</sup>.

9. The spiritual body, not being *hypostatically* united with the *Divinity*<sup>a</sup>, has no title in his scheme (as he supposed) to formal *adoration*; but must be *reverenced* only, or highly *venerated*<sup>b</sup>.

10. He supposed the elements to *contain* within them the *grace* of Christ's body, the nature of the *Word* and *Spirit*, and the *essential* powers of Christ's body in a *permanent* way, abiding as long as the elements may serve for food<sup>c</sup>.

11. He imagined *brutes*, upon devouring the elements, to devour *them* only: but *unworthy* communicants are supposed to *receive* the *Deity* besides, but as a *judge* and

<sup>q</sup> Harch. Concord. p. 28, 31, 39, 48. Patr. Consens. p. 74, 77, 225.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. Patr. Consens. p. 128, 182, 209, 215.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. Concord. p. 56, 57, 63, 68, 74. Patr. Consens. p. 50, 91.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 15, 57, 71. Patr. Consens. p. 46, 48, 50, 58, 68, 70, 71, 91, 121.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. Patr. Consens. p. 28, 126, 131, 134, 181, 193, 204.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. Concord. p. 25, 48, 60, 64.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. Patr. Consens. p. 91, 154.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 85, 112, 173, 174, 176.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. Concord. p. 37, 63, 68, 86, 87, 105. Patr. Consens. p. 54, 91, 126, 173.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 59, 60, 106. Patr. Consens. p. 52, 53, 54, 65, 130, 213, 217, 262.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 89. Patr. Consens. p. 64, 83, 102, 175, 209, 213, 228.



an avenger; as a burning coal, or a consuming fire, not to save, but to destroy them<sup>d</sup>.

12. He maintained an *oral* manducation (as of course he must) of the eternal *Word*, of the *Divine* substance, and of essential grace<sup>e</sup>.

13. As to the *sacrifice*, he was reasonably modest and cautious in his first piece. He lashed the Romanists on that head, all the way, and blamed some Protestants, but with tenderness<sup>f</sup>, not denying them or others their just commendations<sup>g</sup>. He speaks handsomely of the first English Liturgy, as coming very near to the *primitive*, and particularly admires their *form* of consecration, beseeching God to sanctify the gifts with his *Holy Spirit* and *Word*<sup>h</sup>. He insisted much upon *self-sacrifice*, and the sacrifice of *alms*, and the *memorial* of our Lord's passion<sup>i</sup>. He expressed some contempt of a *bread-sacrifice*, a sacrifice of signs and shadows<sup>k</sup>. Had he said, *signs and shadows of a sacrifice*, rather than *sacrifice of signs*, he had said better. However, he observed, that a sacrifice of *bread* and *wine* is never mentioned in *Scripture*, no, nor in the *Fathers*; except in such a qualified sense as Irenæus speaks of<sup>l</sup>. He had a particular fancy, that the elements

<sup>d</sup> Harch. Concord. p. 41, 56, 71, 72, 87, 88. Patr. Consens. p. 61, 139, 140, 141, 175, 212.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 15. Patr. Consens. p. 28, 93, 138, 151, 154, 174, 201, 212.

<sup>f</sup> Ne quis putet in posterum in Cœna Domini nullum esse sacrificium: quod ab Evangelicis aliquot doleo nimis impudenter negatum, aut omisum, neque in catechismis explicatum. Harch. Concord. p. 132.

<sup>g</sup> Legite, O pontificii, Liturgiam Justini, et putabitis institutam fuisse a Calvino. Legite et eam quæ fertur Jacobi, et quid, precor, differt ab ea quam instituit Lutherus? Ibid. p. 132.

<sup>h</sup> Harch. Concord. p. 145, 146.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 52, 120, 131, 132, 133, 138, 139, 143, 147, 148, 158, 161, 167, 168, 171, 176.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 120, 139, 143, 147, 155, 157, 158.

<sup>l</sup> De panis et vini hostia nusquam leges in *Scripturis*, imo neque in *Patribus*; nisi ea ratione offeramus panem et ejusmodi visibilia, quæ Irenæus vocat *creaturas*, ut non appareamus in conspectu Dei aut vacui aut ingrati. Harch. Concord. p. 171.

should first be made food of, and then sacrificed from *within*: for so he hoped to avoid all *extrinsic* sacrifice, (condemned by Scripture,) and to account the better for the *order* of the words of *institution*<sup>m</sup>. Besides, it would suit the more aptly with another fancy of his, *viz.* that though the elements were the *body* of the *Logos* before manducation, yet they were not the body of Christ, *God-man*, till *eaten* and converted into *human flesh*<sup>n</sup>.

14. In his second treatise he altered his notion of the *sacrifice* more ways than one: whether *disgusted* with the Protestants for slighting his kind offices, or whether farther *instructed*, it is certain, that he came much nearer to the Popish sacrifice, and brought severer charges than before, both against Lutherans and Calvinists, as casting off the *visible* sacrifice of the Church<sup>o</sup>. He forgot his former speculations about the sacrifice *following* the manducation; for now he made it *go before*<sup>p</sup>. And whereas formerly he had disowned any *propitiatory* sacrifice<sup>q</sup>, content with *gratulatory*, after the Protestant way, he now made it *properly* propitiatory, inventing a colour for it, *viz.* that *Christ* himself consecrates by the minister, *fills* the elements with the *Logos* and *Spirit*, is *present* with them, and offered by himself in them and with them<sup>r</sup>.

15. As to our Lord's own sacrifice in the *original* Eucharist, he supposed him to have offered up that *spiritual* body there made, that compound body of spirit and ele-

<sup>m</sup> Harch. Concord. p. 171, 174, 175.

<sup>n</sup> Etiam si panis Eucharistiae sit *virtute* caro Christi, et *realiter* corpus Verbi ante manducationem, tamen ut fiat *actu* vera caro, debet prius manducari, et nutritionis lege in *carnis* formam converti. Harch. Concord. p. 80.

<sup>o</sup> Harch. Patr. Consens. p. 38, 39, 40, 234, 270, &c. 281, 282, 285.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 79, 274, 275.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. Concord. p. 132, 143, 161.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 240, 263. In hoc pane *præsens* et *oblatus*, p. 264. Hostia offertur, et grata est Patri, et simul *propitiatoria*: non ex se, sed oblata per Christum, p. 300.

ment : or else perhaps he offered up his own *natural body* to the Father, as it were *in effigy*, under the *symbols* of bread and wine<sup>a</sup>.

16. His construction of the words of *institution* may be worth the noting as a particularity. He interprets the words, "This is *my* body given for you," as if our Lord had said, "This is my *spiritual body*, given me by my *Father*, "for your consolation and conservation<sup>t</sup>." A construction scarce tolerable, if there had not been worse invented for the same words, to serve the like purposes.

I beg pardon, if I have been tedious in recounting the roving of that learned gentleman ; which may have their use, and which were not so much owing to the weakness of the *writer*, (for I much question whether any one else could have performed better in that way,) as to the weakness of the *principle* which he had the misfortune to set out with. Whoever else should take in hand to *enrich* the elements, either with what belongs *to us*, or with what belongs to *God only*, could not reasonably expect to succeed any better than that ingenious writer did. He is to be commended however for adhering to the *sacrifice of the cross*<sup>u</sup>, and for allowing, that the faithful partake of Christ's body *extra cœnam*<sup>x</sup>, and that the ancient Patriarchs feasted upon the same *spiritual food* that we do now<sup>y</sup>. In other points where he judged ill, he appears to have intended well : for he certainly had a warm zeal for God, loved religion, (or what he esteemed such,) and

<sup>a</sup> Christus in pane et vino accipiens, ut homo, a Patre corpus et sanguinem, Verbi scilicet æterni et Spiritus, obtulit illa eadem Deo Patri ad gratiarum actionem, agnoscens beneficium : vel in pane et vino obtulit, tanquam in symbolis, corpus suum proprium, sequenti die crucifigendum. *Harch. Patr. Consens.* p. 273, 274.

<sup>t</sup> Accipite hoc meum corpus, Divini mei Spiritus, quod mihi datur pro vobis a Patre meo, ad vestram consolationem, justificationem, vivificationem, conservationem. *Harch. Patr. Consens.* p. 28. conf. p. 29.

<sup>u</sup> Harch. Concord. p. 133.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. idem, p. 31, 80, 82, 91. Patr. Consens. p. 142, 228, 229.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. Patr. Consens. p. 200, 201, 202.

had firmness enough to submit to a kind of voluntary *exile* for it; as he has left upon record <sup>z</sup>.

What the Protestants, in general, thought of his *first* performance, and how coldly they received his *reconciling* scheme <sup>a</sup>, he has himself declared in his preface to the *second*. They were offended, it seems, with him, for mistaking his talents, and meddling out of his sphere: they approved not of his interposing, without judgment, in theological debates, and admonished him to return to the business of his own profession. The Romanists were either silent, or more favourable in their censures, so far as appears: and he was suspected, by some of the Lutheran way, to incline more to the Popish than to the Protestant interests <sup>b</sup>. He was very impatient for some *answer*, thinking it a tribute of respect due to himself or to the subject: but he lived not to see any. Beza was preparing one <sup>c</sup>, which appeared at length in the year 1580, some time after Harchius's decease. Beza had been dilatory in that matter, under a serious persuasion that such remote and fanciful speculations might best be left to die of

<sup>z</sup> Harch. Concord. in dedicatione. Mention also is made of a piece of his, printed in 1573, with this title: *De Causis Hæresis, proque ejus Exilio, et Concordia Controversiarum in Religione, Hæreticorum, Pontificiorum, et Pœnitentium, Oratio ad Deum Patrem.* Gesner, *Epit.* p. 515. This I have at second hand from Mr. Bayle, in the French Supplement to his Dictionary, in the article *Harchius*.

<sup>a</sup> Conabar dissentientes inter se Evangelicos appellatos, (Lutheranos inquam,) et Calvinistas, sive Zuinglianos, conciliare.—Sed tantum abest ut ex meis laboribus ullam reportarem gratiam, ut ambobus in sua opinione licet dissimillima hærentibus, ambo me veluti risui et contemptui habentes, ad *medicæ* meæ professionis harenam indignabundi relegarint. *Harch. Patr. Consens.* in præfat.

<sup>b</sup> Quomodo pontificii me exceperint, vix possum conjecturis assequi, contra quos tamen potissimum omnia argumentorum meorum tela dirigebantur.—Verum quomodocunque in ea re mecum sentiant aut dissentiant pontificii, relatione tamen postmodum accepi, me potius pontificium quam Evangelicum, ab Evangelicis aliquot esse judicatum. *Harch. ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> De Cœna Domini, adversus Jodoci Harchii Montensis Dogmata, Theodori Bezae Responsio. Genevæ. 1580. pages 8vo. 160. Reprinted in folio, among the *Tractatus Theologici*, (two volumes,) A. D. 1582. Genevæ. From p. 148 to p. 186.

themselves. But being at last overruled by friends, he submitted to undertake the work; as he tells us himself<sup>d</sup>. He complains frequently of the author's laboured *obscurity*, and of the difficulty of ascertaining his true and full meaning<sup>e</sup>. But to prevent any suspicion of unfairness, and to enable the readers to judge for themselves, he collected a competent number of passages out of Harchius's first treatise, and prefixed them to his own, filling more than forty pages with them.

After these preliminaries, he fell directly upon the *leading error* of the whole system: which was the making the elements *receptacles* either of the eternal *Word* or *Spirit*, or of some Divine *power* or *grace*, supposed to be *infused* into them, *inherent* in them, *intrinsic* to them, and *permanent* with them. He calls it a most grievous error, full of *impiety*<sup>f</sup>: a notion altogether *unscriptural* and *absurd*<sup>g</sup>; yea, and *wilder* than either *consubstantiation* or *transubstantiation*, which it aimed to correct<sup>h</sup>. He proceeds to confute it at large, in a strong, masterly way, worthy of his great abilities. I shall endeavour to give you a *taste* of his performance, in a few particulars; though it must be a great disadvantage to it, to appear as it were in *miniature*, when the whole is so *close* and *concise*: but it is necessary, in a manner, to give some kind of summary view of it.

I. He observes, that the system proposed, under colour of magnifying the *signs* one way, really lessened and

<sup>d</sup> Beza contr. Harch. p. 4. 8vo. edit. alias p. 148. fol. edit.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. p. 5, 49, 60, 147, 148. edit. prima.

<sup>f</sup> *Terrorum, et plane cum manifesta impietate conjunctum errorem, p. 52. Nego igitur et pernego Deitatem, aut vim ullam Divinam in ipsa signa infundi: et impium esse hoc dogma rursus dico, eo sensu quo loquitur et scribit Harchius; non quo locuti sunt Patres, quorum sententiam penitus depravat. Beza, p. 71.*

<sup>g</sup> Beza, p. 66.

<sup>h</sup> Harchius magis etiam *ineptam* sententiam tuetur: qui ut corporis naturalis *localem* presentiam excludat, *Deitatem* ipsius *Verbi*, ex carne assumpta in panem *illapsam*, velit *intra* ipsum panem habitare, adeoque ipsi re ipsa *uniri* et *permisceri*, p. 66, 67.

depreciated them another way, as making them *bare memorials* of what they ought spiritually to *exhibit*, namely, of the *natural* body, being in that respect made mere *signs*, (as any *picture* might be<sup>i</sup>;) rather than *exhibitive* signs. And though he endeavoured, another way, to give more honour to the *signs* than really belonged to them, yet he destroyed the very nature of *signs* by doing it, and made quite another thing of them, *viz. receptacles* of the *Divinity*, not *exhibitive signs* or *symbols* of the *humanity*<sup>k</sup>: which, in effect, was excluding the *thing signified* out of the Sacrament, and seeking salvation independently on Christ's *humanity*<sup>l</sup>; thereby subverting the economy of man's redemption, which stands in our *mystical* union with the *human nature* of Christ<sup>m</sup>.

2. Beza observes farther, at large, that it is manifestly wrong to interpret *body given for you*, and *blood shed*, of any thing but the *natural* body and blood *signified* in the Eucharist, and therein also *mystically* or *spiritually given* and *received*<sup>n</sup>.

3. Against *inherent* graces, virtues, powers, &c. he pleads, that to suppose *pardon-giving*, *grace-giving*, *life-giving* powers to be *lodged* in the elements, is transferring *Divine* powers from their *proper seat*, where only they can

<sup>i</sup> Docemus Sacramentorum significationem, divinitus institutam, neque *nudam* esse, qualis est *pictarum* imaginum et aliorum ejusmodi vulgarium signorum, sed cum ipsa rerum significatarum *præbitione* conjunctam. *Beza*, p. 50.

Ninium profecto, parce et jejune de isto signorum genere loquitur, cum ea *præbitione* tantum vocat, quod etiam *pictis* imaginibus convenit. *Beza*, p. 51.

<sup>k</sup> Quamvis enim postea plus etiam illis quam nos tribuere videatur, nedum ut illa extenuet; si quis tamen rem totam propius inspiciat, comperiet omnem *signorum* rationem ab ipso aboleri: ut qui panem illum et vinum illud, non *corporis* illius pro nobis traditi, et *sanguinis* illius pro nobis effusi *signa*, sed ipsius *essentialis* æterni Filii Dei *conceptacula* esse contendat. *Beza*, p. 51.

<sup>l</sup> Neque enim nunc quærimus, plus an minus in his vel illis detur, sed an *idem* detur, id est, illa ipsa Christi *humanitas*. Si hoc negatis, ergo *extra* Christi humanitatem salutem quæritis. *Beza*, p. 95.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. *Beza*, p. 96, 97, 123, &c.

<sup>n</sup> *Ibid.* p. 67, 68, 69, 70, 89, 90.

reside, to things altogether incapable of sustaining them or receiving them: in short, it is communicating to inanimate creatures the *incommunicable* attributes, properties, or powers of God<sup>o</sup>.

4. He enforces his plea by observing, that it is attributing more to the *signs*, than to the *Word of God* which *makes* them signs, and of which as high things are predicated in Scripture, but without any supposal of an *inherent* or *intrinsic* power infused into, or lodged in the sounds or syllables P.

5. He enforces it still further by observing, that it is attributing more to the *inanimate* elements than could be justly ascribed to the Apostles or others who wrought *miracles*; not by any *inherent* or *intrinsic* powers *infused* into them, but by the *sole* power of God *extrinsic* to them q.

6. He adds, that it is ascribing more to the bread and wine, the *sacramental body*, than could be justly ascribed even to our Lord's own *natural* body considered in itself, or abstracted from his *Divinity*, the only proper *seat* or *subject* of such powers r. He dwells upon this topic, as well to guard it from cavil and misconstruction, as to imprint it the deeper on the minds of his readers, being indeed singly sufficient and unanswerable, when rightly understood. For if even a *personal* union makes not the *humanity* of Christ life-giving in itself, or so as to become the *proper seat* or *subject* of such powers s, much less can

\* Spirituality ac divina (cujusmodi incorporatio in Christum, et in eodem collatum *justificationis, sanctificationis, et tandem glorificationis, seu vite aeternae donum*) per alium, ut ullo modo *efficientem* causam, si quis nobis tribui existimet; aut rerum Divinarum prorsus est imperitus, aut plane impius: ut qui quod *unius Dei* est incommunicabiliter, tam *proprium* quam *ipsa Deitas*, ad panem et vinum, res inanimatas, transferat, aut certe cum illis communicet. *Beza*, p. 70, 71. conf. 114, 115, 130—136.

† *Beza*, p. 133, 134, 135.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 75, 76, 77, 132, 133, 134.

§ *Ibid.* p. 77, 78, 79, 134.

• Διὰ τὴν ἡμεῖς αὐτῶν ζῶν, αὐτῶν [ράξ] ζωοῦς. *Theod. Dial.* p. 184. Caro Christi *per se* vivifica non est, sed vivificandi vim a *Spiritu* cui juncta est, id est, a *Divinitate* mutuatur. *Albertinus*, p. 341. conf. 758.

any supposed union of the *Logos* or of the *Spirit* with the elements make them the subject or seat of *life-giving* powers<sup>†</sup>. If it should be pleaded, that a *healing virtue* went out of Christ's *body*<sup>‡</sup>, even that would not reach the case, were it really fact; since *healing* virtues and *grace-giving* powers are widely different. But the texts say not that virtue went out of *his body*, but out of *him*, or *from him*: neither is it said, that he *felt* in *his body*, but that he *knew in himself*; knew that a *miraculous* operation [*δύναμις*] had gone forth from him; which was said, to intimate that a miraculous virtue or power really *resided* in him, as *God-man*, but in no man else<sup>¶</sup>.

I return to Beza.

7. He takes occasion to expose the doctrine of an *oral* manducation of *Christ*, or of the *Spirit*, as palpably absurd<sup>‡</sup>.

8. He more particularly exposes the notion of the *unworthy's* receiving the *res Sacramenti*, the grace of the Sacrament, and not with any *benefit*, but to certain *destruction*. A contradiction to all the Scripture phrases in that article, phrases of a kind and gracious import, words of favour, and blessing, and comfort; and such as will no more admit of a *destructive* meaning, than light, or life, or health, or peace, or immortality can admit of it. Indeed, Christ is *offered* both to worthy and unworthy in the holy Communion: and to the former, who *receive* him, he is a life-giver and preserver, while to the latter, who

† N. B. The *man* Christ (according to the rule of *communicatio idiomatum*, and after the *personal* way of speaking) may be said to be *God*, *Life-giver*, &c. But as the *human nature* cannot be said to be the *Divine nature*, so neither can it be said to be efficiently or properly *life-giving*. Much less can it be said of the *elements*, which are not so much as *hypostatically* united, nor can claim any benefit from the rule of *communicatio idiomatum*, or from the use of *personal* phrases.

‡ See Mark v. 30. Luke vi. 19. viii. 46.

¶ *Cognoecens divinum opus a se patratum.* Vid. Olearius in Matt. p. 275. 276. Wolfius, Cur. Crit. in loca.

‡ Beza, p. 86, &c. 100.

‡ Ibid. p. 99, 100, 101, 102, 103.



reject him, he is a judge and avenger. Still Christ *received* is always health, and life, and blessing to the receiver <sup>z</sup>: and it is Christ *rejected*, not Christ *received*, who becomes to every unworthy communicant both a *judge* and a *revenger* <sup>a</sup>. This reasoning appears to be just and solid: and it is worth observing, that, after the latest refinements in this article, by the help of a distinction between *external* and *internal* eating of the same *enriched* body <sup>b</sup>, yet the difficulty remains as before, and cannot be evaded. For unless the unworthy (who are the *external eaters*) are supposed externally and orally to eat both the *bread* and the *grace*, they cannot be said to eat the *body*, which is supposed to mean and to consist of *both*, and is not the *enriched body*, if either be wanting. All that can be made out, in that way, is, that the *unworthy* eat one *part* of the pretended *spiritual body*, and not the *other part*; they eat the *gross part*, *viz.* the *bread*, not the *finer*, *viz.* the *grace*: which, in other words, is saying, that they eat not the *body*; and therefore the distinction so applied destroys itself. The plain truth is, that nothing but the *sign* is *externally* eaten, and nothing but the *thing signified* is eaten *internally*: therefore to imagine an *external* or an *internal* eating both of *sign* and

<sup>a</sup> Omnes quidem manum et os afferentes *symbola* recipiunt, mens vero vera fide non prædita *rem* Sacramenti *repudiât*: ac proinde reus non fit talis quispiam indigne *sumpti* corporis et sanguinis Domini, (nisi per *corpus* et *sanguinem* ipsa illorum *symbola* metonymia sacramentali intelligas,) sed corporis et sanguinis Domini *contempti*, et per incredulitatem *repudiati*.— Usque adeo conjuncta sunt et connexa *vita* et *caro* Christi, quoniam caro Filii Dei est, ut neque vitæ particeps esse quisquam extra illius carnis, unci vinculi nostræ cum vita colligationis, participationem possit, neque quisquam illius esse *particeps*, sive in Verbo, sive in Sacramentis, qui ex ea non *vivificetur*: et qui contrarium statuunt, Christum *dividunt*: de quibus quid statuendum sit, docet Spiritus Sanctus, 1 John iv. 3. *Beza*, *ibid.* p. 103. *Conf. Beza contr. Pappum*, de *Unione hypostatica*, p. 138, 139, 140.

<sup>a</sup> Christus igitur ipse, tum in Verbo, tum in Sacramentis, eos quidem a quibus *sumitur*, id est, fideles, *vivificat*: incredulos autem non *receptus*, sed *repudiatus* judicat. *Beza contr. Papp.* p. 140.

<sup>b</sup> See Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 208, 351—356.

thing, confounded in one, and called a *spiritual body*, is joining together incompatible ideas. But I pass on.

9. Beza takes notice how Harchius's system might lay a foundation for *bread-worship*, stronger and firmer than even the Popish one does, because of the *union* or *mixture* of essential Divinity with the elements, which it introduces and rests upon<sup>c</sup>. He adds, that it would go near to destroy the *sursum corda*, the *lifting up* of the *heart*, so much, and so justly celebrated by the ancients. For if the elements really *contain* such immense *treasures*, what need have we to *look up* to the *natural body* above? Or what have we to do but to *look down* to those *impanated riches*, to the elements *ennobled* with all *graces* and *virtues*, and *replenished* with that very *Divinity* which makes the *humanity* so considerable<sup>d</sup>?

10. When Beza came to answer on the head of *sacrifice*, he appeared to be much concerned at Harchius's unfair and ungenerous dealing, in reviving stale accusations against Protestants, without so much as taking notice of the strong and repeated replies<sup>e</sup>. He avers solemnly, that the *reformed* had been so far from discarding the *eucharistical sacrifice*, that they *only* had most strictly preserved it, or rather *retrieved* it, fixing it upon its true and ancient *basis*. Therefore he resented Harchius's misreport, in this article, as a grievous *calumny*<sup>f</sup> upon the Protestant name, since the Protestants had not rejected *all sacrifice*, no nor so much as a *visible sacrifice* in the Eucharist<sup>g</sup>.

This was the turn that Beza gave to that matter; and it was the right turn, made use of before by Bucer in 1546. For Bucer was so far from submitting to the inju-

<sup>c</sup> Beza, p. 146, 147.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. p. 147.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. p. 152.

<sup>f</sup> Cum totidem illa constet a nobis diligenter fieri, *calumniator* in eo deprehendatur, quod *sacrificium* a nobis sublatum esse dicat. Beza, p. 153.

<sup>g</sup> Quo sensu veteres Cœnam Domini *sacrificium* vocarint, apertissime liquet. Ostendat autem Harchius equid tandem istorum in nostris ecclesiis prætermittatur; et tunc a nobis *visibile sacrificium* abolitum esse clamitet. Beza, p. 155.

rious charge of discarding *the sacrifice*, that he retorted that very charge, and justly, upon the accusers themselves: not merely pleading, in behalf of the Protestants against the Romanists, that we have a sacrifice as well as they, but that we *only* had kept it, and that they had *lost* it, or however had so lamentably depraved or smothered it, that what remained of it was next to none<sup>h</sup>. This he said, and this he proved, beyond all reasonable contradiction. They must be very little acquainted with those two excellent men, Bucer and Beza, who can suspect that they admitted of no sacrifice but *mental* or *vocal* only: for they were firm and constant friends to the *Christian sacrifice*, rightly understood; to *external sacrifice*<sup>i</sup>, and that principally in the Eucharist, as all the *Fathers* were. Had but the Protestant Divines, as many as came after them, been as careful and accurate as they were in the stating the

<sup>h</sup> Demonstrabo hæc ipsa veteris Ecclesiæ, et S. Patrum sacrificia nos vere offerre et sacrificare: vestros vero sacrificulos illa cuncta a missis suis omnique sua administratione aut prorsus removisse, aut certe pervertisse, ut autoritatibus omnibus S. Patrum extremæ impietatis convincantur et cendemur. *Bucer contr. Latom.* lib. ii. p. 146.

Planum faciam in nostris ecclesiis restituta esse cum genera omnia sacrificiorum et oblationum quæ offerre vetus Ecclesia solita est—deinde ostendam Ecclesiæ veteris sacrificia et oblationes per vestros sacrificos aut esse omnino sublata, aut penitus perversa. *Bucer, ibid.* p. 246. Conf. p. 144, 261.

<sup>i</sup> *External sacrifice* has been owned, not only by Bucer and Beza, but by Hoper, Jewell, Bilson, Fulke, Zauchius, Chrastovius, Mornæus, Scharpius, Field, Spalatensis, Montague, Lany, Patrick, and many more, who yet admitted none but *spiritual sacrifice*: neither do I know that any of the old Protestant Divines ever rejected *external sacrifice*, but in the sense of *extrinsic*, in which both Scripture and Fathers reject it.

N. B. *Extrinsic sacrifice* means something *ab extra*, as a goat, a lamb, a loaf, all *extrinsic* to us: *intrinsic* is what proceeds *ab intus*, from *within* ourselves; as all our true *services* do, whether internal and invisible, or *external* and *visible*: and therefore if all *true services* are properly *sacrifices*, there must of consequence be some *visible, external sacrifices*. But we ought carefully to note, how the ancient writers used *words* or *phrases*. If I mistake not, Lactantius and Austin rejected all *visible sacrifice*, admitting none but *invisible*, under the Gospel: but then they meant by *invisible*, the same with *intrinsic*; and they call it *invisible* with respect to its invisible source, as it comes from *within*.

main question, and as constant in abiding by it, many intricate disputes which have since risen might have been happily prevented. For, indeed, the great question between the Romanists and us, is not whether the Eucharist be a *proper*, or a *visible*, or an *external* sacrifice, but whether it be an *extrinsic* sacrifice or no; and whether *their* Eucharist or *ours* is that *Gospel sacrifice* which our Lord instituted, and which all antiquity acknowledged. It will be found, upon just inquiry, that our eucharistical sacrifice is the true one, and that their *bread-sacrifice* (for it is really no better, *fiction* set aside) is as much a corruption, though not altogether so *novel* or so *dangerous* a corruption, as their *bread-worship*. But I return.

From the time of Beza's answer, Harchius and his system have been very little mentioned: both seem to have been almost buried in oblivion for a hundred and twenty years or more. Only Mr. Bayle takes notice<sup>k</sup> of some slight mention made of Harchius, by Rivet, in some letters to Militiere, alias Brachet, in the last century. Indeed the Romanists, since that time, have sometimes invidiously and insidiously charged the Protestants as interpreting the words of institution to such a sense as either to make two *personal* bodies of Christ, or to imagine some other *fictionitious* body, substituted as the *res sacramenti*, instead of the *natural*. The Protestants rejected the *injurious* aspersion with disdain, resenting it as a great *reproach*, to be so much as suspected of any such thing<sup>l</sup>; but insisting upon it, in the strongest manner, that the words, *this is my body*, and *this is my blood*, could not reasonably be interpreted of any thing else but the *natural* body and blood, represented, and sacramentally exhibited in the holy Communion<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>k</sup> In the Supplement to Bayle's Dictionary, or in the last French edition, in the article *Harchius*.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Chamier, Paustrat. tom. iv. p. 528, 529.

<sup>m</sup> Quæritur ergo, quid sit *corpus meum, sanguis meus*. Nos candide, et libere, ac libenter respondemus, *κατὰ τὴν ἰστέραν* interpretandum, cum Hesychio in Levitici xxii.—est igitur *corpus illud*; id est, solida substantia *humanæ*

From the accounts now laid before you, my Reverend Brethren, I take the liberty to observe, that some late notions of the Eucharist appear to be little else but the remains of that *confusion* which first began in the decline of the seventh century: and the fundamental error of all lies in the want of a right notion of *symbolical* language, as before hinted. Hence it is that *signs* have been supposed either literally *to be*, or literally *to inclose*, the very things *signified*, viz. the *Divine* body, or the *Divine* graces, virtues, or powers. Beza cleared up what concerned the latter with great acumen and force: and the whole question has been more minutely discussed since by several able hands<sup>n</sup>; but more especially by the very acute and learned Chamier, who has in reality exhausted the question, both historically and argumentatively, in his disputes against the Romanists<sup>o</sup>.

I may note by the way; that the Romanists, from the time of the Trent Council<sup>p</sup>, have commonly maintained some kind of *physical* efficiency in the *outward* sacraments, together with *inherent* graces as infused into the elements: though some of their ablest Divines have scarce known what to make of the Trent doctrine on that head, but have in a manner given up the *thing*, contending merely for *words* or *names*. Cardinal Allen, one of the shrewdest of them, saw the absurdity of the notion, and exposed it: being aware how ridiculous it would be, to imagine any *inherent* or *intrinsic* powers to have been infused into *clay* and *spittle*, into *handkerchiefs* and *aprons*, or into St. Peter's

*natura*, quam assumptam in utero Virginis circumtulit in hypostasi sua *Verbum*; quam cruci affixam, et in sepulchro depositam suscitavit a mortuis—quam denique transtulit in caelos, inde reddendam terris postremo adventu. Chamier, *Panstrat.* tom. iv. p. 528.

<sup>n</sup> Hooker, vol. ii. b. 5. n. 237, 245, 326. Oxf. edit. Gasp. Laurentius, *Defens.* Sadeelis, p. 382, &c. Rivet. *Cathol.*—Orth. tom. ii. p. 5, &c. Vossius de Sacram. Vi et Efficacia. Le Blanc, *Thes.* p. 253. Preservative against Popery, vol. ii. tit. 7. p. 32. Albertinus, p. 503.

<sup>o</sup> Chamier, *Panstrat.* tom. iv. p. 51—96.

<sup>p</sup> Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novae legis non *continere gratiam* quam significant,——anathema sit. *Concil. Trident.* sess. vii. can. 6.

*shadow*<sup>9</sup>: neither durst Bellarmine afterwards be at all positive on that head<sup>r</sup>. But yet both of them were minded to contrive some *verbal* evasion, whereby to make a show of maintaining what in reality they had yielded up. They pretended I know not what *Divine movement*, raising or enabling the elements to produce the effect: which was somewhat like the subtilty of those who not knowing how to ascribe *thought* to *matter*, as such, either added *motion* to matter, or had recourse to *Divine* omnipotence; to salve the *hypothesis*. Only there is this difference between the two cases, that *thought* is a *communicable* attribute, which a *creature* may have; but a *grace-giving* power is *incommunicable*, and can reside only in a *Divine* Being. Gerard Vossius has well observed<sup>s</sup>, that the *evasion* before mentioned was a *mere* evasion: and indeed it amounts only to so many *unmeaning* words, artfully thrown together as a fine-spun covering, to hide the flaws of a false *hypothesis*. Be the *Divine movement* what it will, it can never shake God's *attributes* from his *essence*, or his *incommunicable* powers from his nature, so as to transfer or impart them to a foreign subject. God may *cooperate* with the elements, so as to affect the *soul*, while they affect the *body*: but his operations and powers, though

<sup>9</sup> Noli putare id Patres dicere, quasi sit aliqua *permanens* qualitas a Deo *infusa* Sacramento, aut ejus *materiæ*, cum ea qualitas neque *spiritualis*, neque *corporalis* esse possit. Nam si *corporalis* esset, nihil adjuvaret ad *spiritualitatem* effectum magis quam ipsa natura aquæ: et *spiritualis* qualitas non potest inesse in *corpore* tanquam in *subjecta*. Sed id volunt, hanc esse virtutem Sacramentorum, *ordinari, moveri, applicari, elevari* a Deo ad effectum spirituale.—Christus accipiendo *lutum* aut *salivam*, non *impressit* illis, multo minus *umbra* Petri, aliquam *qualitatem* medicam; sed utendo, ac applicando, elevavit eas, &c. *Alanus de Euchar.* p. 130. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 308, 309.

<sup>r</sup> Non esse controversiam de modo quo Sacramenta sunt causæ, an *physice*, &c.—et rursus si *physice*, an per aliquam qualitatem *inherentem*, an per solam Dei *motionem*. *Bellarm.* lib. ii. cap. 1. p. 30.

<sup>s</sup> Commentum hoc de effectu ab *actionis* vi orto, nec tamen a *vi interna* ejus, cujus actio est, profecto merum *anephoron* est, eademque facilitate, qua citra probationem nullam affertur, etiam rejici debet. *Vossius de Sacram. Vi et Efficacia*, p. 253.

*assistant* or *concurrent*, are not *inherent* or *intermingled*, but are entirely *distinct*; and are as truly *extrinsic* to the elements, as the *Deity* is to the *creature*. When and where the elements are duly administered and received, God does *then* and *there* work the effect, pursuant to his promise and covenant<sup>4</sup>. The elements are the *occasional* causes, as it were, and he the *efficient*: this is the whole of that matter.

If what hath been said may be thought sufficient to vindicate the received doctrine of this Sacrament, as a *sacrament*, then the other notion of it, together with the *bread-sacrifice* built upon it, must fall of course: and we may reasonably rest contented with what our excellent Church has all along taught us, both of the *sacrament* and *sacrifice*: which in truth is no other doctrine but what the New Testament, and the Fathers of the Church from the beginning, and downwards for six whole centuries, have delivered: here fix we, and abide. And that the reasonableness of our so abiding may yet more clearly and more succinctly appear, I beg leave here to throw in a few pertinent considerations, for a kind of recapitulation of what I have before said.

1. Let it be considered what pains have been taken some way or other to *enrich* and *ennoble* a bread-sacrifice, in order to make it bear, or to suit it to a Gospel state, and yet none of the ways will answer upon a strict trial; unless we could be content to rest in *words* which have no *consistent* or no *determined* ideas. Shall we fill the ele-

<sup>4</sup> Effectum non attingunt *proprie*, sed *operari* dicuntur, quia *ubi sunt*, Deus juxta promissionem suam *operatur*, et *concurrit* ad productionem effectus supernaturalis. *Albertinus*, p. 503.

*Res ipsa* quæ unitur *nobiscum* in conjunctione spirituali, nequaquam cum illis *signis* unitur: alioqui *sacramentalis* etiam hæc unio [unio pacti] esset dicenda *spiritualis*; quæ ipsa quoque *signa* *vivificaret*; et *signa* ipsa *sacramentalia* non amplius essent *instrumenta*, sed ipsa forent *causa efficiens* et *formalis*: quod est *ἀδίλογον*, et naturæ Sacramentorum, atque Spiritus Sancti *energiz*, fideique proprietati omnino repugnans. *Gasp. Laurent. Index Error. Greg. de Valent. in Opp. Saderl.* p. 380.

ments with *Divinity*, like as our Lord's *personal* body is filled<sup>u</sup>? A vain thought! But supposing it were fact, yet shall we *sacrifice* the Divine essence, or any of the Divine persons? God forbid. Yet Harchius, in his way, was forced to admit of that absurdity, in order to make out his *pure* and *unbloody*, and *propitiatory* sacrifice<sup>x</sup>: and so must all they who build upon the same *general* principles, if they mean to be *consistent* with themselves.

Or shall we, to avoid the former absurdity, endeavour only to enrich the elements with *grace-giving*, or *life-giving* powers? That would be sacrificing the *Divine attributes*, as before, only with the additional absurdity of abstracting them from the *essence*, and placing them in a creature, an *inanimate* creature.

Or shall we call it only the sacrificing of *grace* and *pardon*, first lodged in the elements, and next transferred from them to us? But how shall we make *sense* of it<sup>y</sup>: and if we could, how would it answer the purposes intended by

<sup>u</sup> The *similitudes* made use of for magnifying the consecrated elements, (chiefly since the seventh century,) are these five.

1. As the *Áíγες* deified, in a manner, the natural body; so, &c.
2. As the *fulness of the Godhead* dwelt in Christ's body; so, &c.
3. As the *Holy Ghost* formed the body in the womb; so, &c.
4. As the *Holy Ghost* inhabited the man Jesus; so, &c.
5. As the burning bush was a *shechinah* of God; so, &c.

All of them *novel*, and *foreign*; and betraying great forgetfulness of *symbolical* language, or *sacramental* phrases.

<sup>x</sup> Harchius, *Patr. Consens.* p. 240, 263, 273, 275, 280, 299, 300.

<sup>y</sup> N. B. Whatever the *Fathers* may be conceived to have, looking at all that way, is either to be understood of what is *concurrent* with the elements, not *inhering* in them; or else, it is to be interpreted of the *whole* sacramental solemnity, in which God bears his part: and then it is no more than saying, that God is in the Sacraments, as he really is, and operates in *both*, as he really does. It may be justly said, that the *abiding virtue* of Baptism, (not the *inherent virtue* of water, which is none,) operates as long as a man lives. See *Review*, vol. vii. p. 241. That is, God applies and continues the graces and privileges of that seal, and his work is sure and lasting. And if God operated with the *consecrated* elements reserved in the Church, or in private houses, for many days or weeks after; it was not because the elements retained any *inherent* virtues, but because God is true and constant to his own covenants or ordinances.



it? It is very certain, that good Christians are endowed with *infused* and *inherent* graces. Now, supposing that the elements have the same, (which however is a wild supposition,) yet that could only make the elements, *so far*, equal to every good Christian. But still the *good Christian*, though *equal* only in that view, will be as much a *nobler* sacrifice than the *elements*, as *man*, the *living* image of God, is better than a *dead loaf*. Why then so much earnestness for a *dead* sacrifice, (were it really any,) in preference to so many better *living* ones? Or what sense or consistency can there be in proclaiming, that such *dead* sacrifice, and offered by *man*, is the most *sublime* and *Divine* sacrifice that men or *angels* can offer<sup>a</sup>; especially considering, that the value of the *sacrifice* can never rise higher than the value of the *sacrificer*<sup>a</sup>?

Shall we at length say (which appears to be the last refuge) that the sacred elements are the *most perfect and consummate representatives* of the *natural* body and blood, answering to the *originals* as completely, as exemplified copies do to *charters*, or to *letters patents*? Such *words* are easily thrown out: but what *sense* do they bear, or what *Scripture* or *Fathers* have ever used them<sup>b</sup>? Or to what purpose can it be, to make use of swelling and magnificent phrases, without any *coherent* or *determinate* ideas? Besides that even the *original* body and blood do not operate *efficiently*, as the elements are supposed to do, but

<sup>a</sup> Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 60, 67, 141. Compare my Appendix, p. 188, 189.

<sup>a</sup> See my Christian Sacrifice explained, p. 176. Pet. Martyr. Comment. ad 1 Cor. p. 48, 65. Zanchius, tom. vi. p. 212, 215. alias ad Ephes. p. 424. Benedict. Aretius, Loc. Comm. p. 394. Pet. du Moulin, Buckler of Faith, p. 416. Anatome Missæ, p. 168. Rivet. Summ. Controv. tom. ii. p. 108. Animadv. ad Cassand. p. 28.

<sup>b</sup> Cardinal Perron made use of that vaunting plea, that affected and foreign similitude, and was thus answered:

Stupenda prorsus est hominis audacia, *veteribus* tribuentis id de quo ne per somnium quidem cogitarunt. Quis enim illorum unquam observavit, aut tantillum subinnuit, eucharistiam hoc sensu *antitypum* appellari? Nullus, nemo. *Albertin.* p. 277. *Conf.* p. 437, 443, 471.

*meritoriously* <sup>c</sup>, and that by means of the *Divinity* which *personally* resided and resides in them: therefore, unless the elements have the same *Divinity personally* united with them, they can be no such *consummate proxy* as hath been pretended. Upon the whole, this account must either at length resolve into a *personal* union of the elements with the *Logos*, or amount to nothing. I have endeavoured to turn and try this matter every way, in order to guard the more strongly against a common failing, *viz.* the resting in a string of *unmeaning* words, which really carry in them no *certain* or no *consistent* ideas. For so it is, that *false* systems generally have been kept up by such as intend not to deceive others, but are really deceived themselves: and it is difficult to persuade them to call over their *ideas*, or to examine their *terms* with due care.

2. To what has been said, I shall only add, that it is worth considering, that many true and sound principles of our own Church, and of the ancient churches also, (as may be understood from what has been hinted,) must be given up, before we could admit the *bread-sacrifice*; and that when it is brought in, it can never find rest, till it thrusts out the *sacrifice of the cross*, as I have shown elsewhere <sup>d</sup>. Some perhaps might *modestly* resolve to stop in the midway; but they would be the less *consistent* in doing it: for the natural, necessary, unavoidable consequence of the other principle, regularly pursued, must at length terminate in rejecting the *cross-sacrifice*. If our Eucharist is a sacrifice of the *elements*, so was our Lord's also; or else ours and his will not tally: and he must have sacrificed *himself* at the same time; or else other accounts will not answer <sup>e</sup>. And if such was the case, the sacrifice of the cross was effectually *precluded*, since our Lord was to make a sacrifice of *himself* but *once* <sup>f</sup>. The sacrifice of the

<sup>c</sup> *Agnosco carnem vere vivificare, quatenus oblata fuit Deo—tanquam causa meritoria, sed non vivificare corporibus nostris receptam. Rivet. tom. ii. p. 138.*

<sup>d</sup> Appendix, chap. iv. p. 207, &c.

<sup>e</sup> *Ibid.* p. 218.

<sup>f</sup> *Ibid.* p. 213, 219.

cross cannot, in this way, be considered as a *continuation* of the sacrifice of the *original* Eucharist, for these reasons: 1. The *subject-matter* could not be the *same*: for neither *bread* nor *wine* could have any place in the oblation of the cross. 2. The *number* could not be *one*; for in the original Eucharist are supposed *two* sacrifices, the *elemental* and *personal*, whereas upon the cross there could be no more than the *personal*. 3. The *form* of the sacrifice could not be the *same*, but different as *bloody* and *unbloody*. 4. The *priesthood* (which is most material) could not be the *same*: for it is denied that Christ offered at the cross a Melchizedekian sacrifice, or offered as a Melchizedekian priest<sup>g</sup>. 5. Lastly, the *value* could not be the *same*: for *two* must be supposed better than *one*, if *each* of them has its respective value; or if not, why was not one of them spared? And a Melchizedekian sacrifice must be supposed the most *honourable* and the most *valuable* of any, and so of course must *supersede* all other. In short, the cross-sacrifice, in this way, must either be *excluded*, or else grievously *disparaged*, by being brought in as *second*, and *inferior* to the *higher* sacrifice before made in the Eucharist. Some learned persons, ancient and modern, have reasonably conceived *three* several parts or views of *one continued oblation* of Christ our Lord<sup>h</sup>: but then they have conceived it in quite another sense, and upon very different principles, nothing at all akin to the notion of the *bread-sacrifice*. They might, in their way, *consistently* maintain one continued *oblation*; which others cannot, for the reasons just mentioned. Therefore, though it is a very great error to reject the *sacrifice of the cross*, yet since it is but the necessary consequence of the principle before mentioned, and is no more than arguing *right* from *wrong* premises; it seems that the *first* or *greatest* fault lies in *retaining the principle*, after it is clearly seen what company it must go with, and what precipices it leads to. I forbear to press these matters farther, and should have been glad to

<sup>g</sup> See Appendix, p. 200, &c. 208.

<sup>h</sup> See Review, vol. vii. p. 376.

have had no occasion for pressing them so far. May God give a blessing to what is sincerely intended for the service of *truth* and *godliness*: and may that Divine Spirit which *accompanies* the word and sacraments, and *dwells* in all the faithful, grant us a sound judgment and a right understanding in all things.



# DISTINCTIONS OF SACRIFICE :

SET FORTH IN

## A C H A R G E

DELIVERED IN PART TO

### THE CLERGY OF MIDDLESEX,

*At the Easter Visitation, 1740.*



Nos panem et vinum, in usu sacræ Cœnæ, *sanctificari* concedimus : *sacrificari* nunquam dabimus. *Mason. de Minister. Anglican. p. 575.*



## DISTINCTIONS.

	Page
1. <i>Patriarchal, Pagan, Levitical, Christian</i>	287
2. <i>Passive and Active</i> -        -        -	289
3. <i>Extrinsic and Intrinsic</i> -        -        -	291
4. <i>Visible and Invisible</i> -        -        -	294
5. <i>Material and Immaterial</i> -        -        -	298
<i>Corporeal and Incorporeal</i> -        -        -	ibid.
6. <i>Bloody and Unbloody</i> -        -        -	303
7. <i>Smoky and Unsmoky</i> -        -        -	312
8. <i>False and True</i> -        -        -	319
9. <i>Old and New</i> -        -        -	320
10. <i>Literal and Spiritual</i> -        -        -	323
<i>Carnal and Spiritual</i> -        -        -	ibid.
<i>Terrene and Spiritual</i> -        -        -	324
<i>Typical and True</i> -        -        -	ibid.
<i>Symbolical and True</i> -        -        -	ibid.
<i>Legal and Evangelical</i> -        -        -	ibid.
11. <i>Aaronical and Melchizedekian</i> -        -        -	330
12. <i>External and Internal</i> -        -        -	340
13. <i>Private and Public</i> -        -        -	341
14. <i>Lay and Clerical</i> -        -        -	ibid.
15. <i>Gratulatory and Propitiatory</i> -        -        -	345
16. <i>Ordinary and Extraordinary</i> -        -        -	347
<i>Common and Special</i> -        -        -	ibid.
<i>Common and Eminent</i> -        -        -	ibid.
<i>Common and Emphatical</i> -        -        -	ibid.
<i>Particular and Universal</i> -        -        -	348
<i>Common and Singular</i> -        -        -	ibid.
<i>Simple and Complex</i> -        -        -	349



			Page
17. <i>Nominal and Real</i>	-	-	350
<i>Instrumental and Real</i>	-	-	ibid.
<i>Metonymical and Real</i>	-	-	352
<i>Verbal and Real</i>	-	-	354
<i>Commemorative and Real</i>	-	-	358

---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

THOUGH I have dwelt some time upon the *Christian sacrifice*, perhaps even to a degree of tediousness; yet considering the great importance of the subject, I am not willing to dismiss it, while I see room left for throwing in any farther light upon it. This may be done, as I conceive, by a more minute consideration of the several *distinctions*, or *names* of distinction, which *sacrifice*, of one kind or other, has passed under, in Church writers; those especially of the earlier times, not neglecting others of later date.

My design therefore, at present, is to bring together into one summary view the most noted distinctions, or names of distinction; and to explain them one by one, taking in the authorities proper to illustrate their meaning, or to signify their use.

I.

The first and most comprehensive division, or distinction of *sacrifice*, is into four several kinds, denominated from so many several kinds of religion; *Patriarchal*, *Pagan*, *Mosaic*, and *Christian*.

I. The *Patriarchal* sacrifices commenced, very probably, soon after the fall, and consisted of *slain beasts*<sup>a</sup>, prefiguring Christ to be slain, pursuant to some Divine appointment<sup>b</sup>. Certain it is, that Cain and Abel offered sacrifices, and that very early<sup>c</sup>; one, of the *fruits* of the earth; and the other, of *cattle*<sup>d</sup>. Such were the *patriarchal* sacrifices

<sup>a</sup> This hath been probably collected from Gen. iii. 21. See Patrick and other commentators.

<sup>b</sup> See my first Charge of 1731. p. 24. Conf. Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. cap. 10. p. 35.

<sup>c</sup> A. M. 130. Bedford's Script. Chronol. p. 126.

<sup>d</sup> Gen. iv. 3, 4.

strictly so called, of the material and extrinsic kind. No doubt but the good Patriarchs offered *spiritual* sacrifices besides: but those were Gospel sacrifices, (as the *Gospel*, in some sense, obtained even from the time of the fall<sup>c</sup>;) and therefore I reckon not them as purely *patriarchal*.

2. The second branch of this division concerns the *Pagan* sacrifices; which appear to have been little else but the *patriarchal*, variously corrupted, at different times, and in different degrees, by superstitious additions or mutilations<sup>f</sup>.

3. The *Mosaical* sacrifices were the patriarchal *augmented*, *regulated*, and very minutely diversified, by Divine authority.

4. The *Christian* sacrifices are what both the *patriarchal* and *Mosaical*, strictly so called, pointed to: they are the *things signified*, the *truth*, the *substance*, the *anti-types* or *archetypes* of those *types*, *signs*, *figures*, *shadows*. Christians have a *sacrifice* of which they *participate*, and whereupon they *feast*, which is no other than the *grand sacrifice* itself, whereof the patriarchal and Jewish sacrifices were *types*, or *prefigurations*: and Christians have *sacrifices*, which they devoutly offer up as *presents*<sup>g</sup> to the Divine Majesty: those are their *spiritual* sacrifices, (all reducible to one, namely, *self-sacrifice*;) whereof the patriarchal sacrifices were *signs* or *symbols*<sup>h</sup>. So much, in

\* See my Review, vol. vii. p. 313.

† Tantum interest inter sacrificia Paganorum et Hebræorum, quantum interest inter imitationem errantem, et præfigurationem prænuntiantem. *Augustin. contr. Faust.* lib. xxi. cap. 21. p. 348. *Conf.* lib. xxii. cap. 17. p. 370. ed. Bened.

‡ Note, That the two oldest names of *sacrifice* are *mincha* (Gen. iv. 3.) and *corban* (Levit. i. 2.) both signifying a *gift*, or *present*; and in that case, a *gift to God*. This observation may be of use to cut off all fruitless speculations upon the critical meaning of the younger name *Swia*, in the Greek, and to vindicate the *propriety* of the appellation, as to *spiritual services*, the noblest of all *presents* to a *spiritual Being*.

‡ Of the difference between a *type* and a *symbol*, see Outram de Sacrificiis, p. 203. A *type*, strictly, is an image or figure of things *future*: but a *symbol* is an image or figure of things at large, whether *past*, *present*, or to

the general, of the first distinction, or fourfold division: some particulars just hinted shall be explained in the sequel, in the places proper. I proceed to a second distinction.

## II.

Sacrifices may be considered either in an *active* view as *offered*, or in a *passive* view as *participated*. The Jewish *Passover*, or paschal lamb, for instance, might be considered as a sacrifice *offered* up to God by the priests, or as a sacrifice *participated* by the people who feasted upon it. The case is the same, so far, with our Lord's sacrifice: for he is our *Passover*, sacrificed for us<sup>i</sup>. He is the *Lamb of God*, as he offered himself up a sacrifice *to God*: he is our *Paschal Lamb*, as we *participate* of him, and *feed* upon him<sup>k</sup>. This distinction of *active* and *passive* sacrifice is not met with among the ancients, in *terms*: but it is sufficiently warranted by the *ideas* of the New Testament, and by the doctrine of the primitive churches; and it is founded in the very reason and nature of things. To explain this matter, let it be observed, that our Lord's sacrifice, *actively* considered, as a proper *act* of *sacrificing*, was performed once for all, was one *transient* act: but the subject-matter of it, *viz.* Christ himself, and the *virtue* of that sacrifice, are *permanent* things, to be for ever commemorated, exhibited, participated. Christ entered into heaven with "his own blood<sup>l</sup>;" and in virtue of the cross-sacrifice, he "abideth a priest continually, ever living to "make intercession for us<sup>m</sup>." In such a sense his *sacrifice* abides, and we perpetually *participate* of it; sometimes

*come*. So that *symbol* is a more *general* name than *type*; though they are sometimes used promiscuously in ancient writers.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. v. 7.

<sup>k</sup> Ferus, a learned and moderate Romanist, who died A. D. 1554. expressed this matter very justly, and after the Protestant way.

In Ecclesia autem, *sacrificium* nostrum est *Christus*: qui semel quidem seipsum obtulit, *memoria* tamen et *representatio* ejus sacrificii quotidie in Ecclesia fit. Juxta hoc, offerre debemus sacrificium *laudis*, item sacrificium *justitiæ*, imo *nos ipsos*. *Johan. Fer. in Genes. cap. viii. p. 248. A. D. 1550.*

<sup>l</sup> Hebr. ix. 12.

<sup>m</sup> Hebr. vii. 3, 25.

*symbolically*, as in the *two Sacraments*; and at other times without symbols, by *faith* only and *good life*. In this sense it is, that Christians are said to “have an altar “whereof to eat<sup>n</sup>:” and if an altar, they must *have a sacrifice*, for the same reason, and in the like sense. The same thing is intimated by St. Paul, in the comparison which he draws between the partakers of the Jewish altar and the Christian communicants<sup>o</sup>: for as the Jews literally feasted upon the *typical* sacrifices, so Christians spiritually feast upon the *body* and *blood* of Christ, the *true* and *grand* sacrifice. Therefore Christ’s sacrifice is *our sacrifice*, but in the *passive* sense, for us to *partake of*, not to *give* unto God. Christ once *gave* himself to God for us, and now gives himself to us, to *feast* upon, not to *sacrifice*. This distinction is worth the noting, for the explaining numerous passages of the Fathers; either, where they speak of Christ himself as the *Church’s sacrifice*<sup>p</sup>, or where they consider the grand sacrifice as *dispensed* or *communicated*<sup>q</sup> in the Eucharist, by and through the symbols, to as many as are worthy.

But while *Scripture* and *Fathers* thus speak of Christ himself, or of his *body* and *blood*, as the *sacrifice* whereof Christians *partake*, that is, of sacrifice in the *passive* sense, or *passive* view, with respect to us the *receivers* of it; yet the same *Scripture* and *Fathers* do as plainly and as frequently speak of other *sacrifices* belonging to Christians,

<sup>n</sup> Hebr. xiii. 10. See my Review, vol. vii. p. 107, &c.

<sup>o</sup> 1 Cor. x. 16—21.

<sup>p</sup> See Christian Sacrifice explained, p. 150, 151, 152.

<sup>q</sup> Memoriam sui ad altare tuum, Deus, fieri desideravit [*Monica*] cui nullius diei intermissione servierat, unde sciret *dispensari victimam sacram*, qua deletum est *chirographum* quod erat contrarium nobis. *Augustin. Confess.* lib. ix. cap. 13. p. 170. tom. i. edit. Bened.

Ut jam de cruce commendaretur nobis *caro* et *sanguis* Domini, novum sacrificium. *Augustin. in Psal. xxxiii.* p. 211. tom. iv.

Quod addidit, *manducare panem*, etiam ipsum *sacrificii* genus eleganter expressit, de quo dicit *sacerdos ipse*, panis quem ego dedero, *caro mea* pro seculi vita. Ipsum est *sacrificium*, non secundum Aaron, sed secundum Melchizedech. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. xviii. cap. 5. p. 466. tom. vii.

such as they *actively* offer up to God, and present as *their own* sacrifices, the best they have to *give*; and those are their *spiritual* sacrifices, of which I shall say more under a distinct head, in its place. Enough, I hope, hath been said for the explaining both the meaning and the use of the distinction between *active* and *passive* sacrifice, between *performing* a sacrifice, and *participating* of what has been sacrificed. Our religious duties or services are our *only sacrifices* in the *active* view; and Christ once offered is our *only sacrifice* in the *passive* or *receptive* view; as was formerly well distinguished by a moderate Roman Catholic<sup>r</sup>, who met with hard usage for so freely speaking the truth. But I pass on.

## III.

Another very noted and necessary distinction is between sacrifice *extrinsic* and *intrinsic*. Christians have no *extrinsic* sacrifice but *Christ*; and that with regard to *participation* only, as before hinted: all their other *sacrifices*, wherein they themselves are the *sacrificers*, are of the *intrinsic* kind, are *ab intus*, from *within* the persons themselves; being either good thoughts, good words, or good ways, all of them issues of the *heart*<sup>s</sup>. This is ancient and catholic doctrine: for thus did the primitive Fathers distinguish the *Christian* sacrifices from the sacrifices of *Jews* and *Pagans*; which were of the *extrinsic* kind, were *extraneous* to the man, such as *sheep, goats, beeves, fruits, cakes*, or the like. What Barnabas says of God's now requiring an *human oblation*, instead of the old *legal* sacrifices<sup>t</sup>, may best be interpreted by this key: it is the *man*

<sup>r</sup> Rite in missa dicitur a sanctis Patribus offerri et sacrificari *corpus* Christi.

1. Eo sensu quo asserunt Ecclesiam offerre in missa *semetipsam* et preces.

2. Quia in missa *representatur* et *commemoratur* sacrificium crucis et passionis Christi, nuncupatur *sacrificium commemorativum*. 3. Capiendo sacrificium *passive*, pro *sacrificato*, noviter applicato nobis, asseritur rite sacrificium missæ; quia in ea *continetur* corpus Christi quod fuit vere *sacrificatum* in unico illo sacrificio crucis. *Joan. Barnes. Catholico Roman. Pacific. in Brown Fascic. tom. ii. p. 849.*

<sup>s</sup> Prov. iv. 23.

<sup>t</sup> Hæc ergo [sacrificia] vacua fecit, ut nova lex Domini nostri Jesu

that God requires as his *sacrifice*; and he is to give to God, not things *extrinsic*, but his whole self, his soul and body, his mind and heart <sup>u</sup>.

Origen expresses the distinction in plain and broad terms, observing that every good man has his sacrifice in *himself*<sup>w</sup>: that he sends it up to God from within, from his own self: that *sons*, or *daughters*, or *farms*, or *cattle*, are all of them *extraneous*, or *extrinsic* to the man: that *self-sacrifice* is beyond all other, as it is copying after the example of Christ<sup>x</sup>. Origen was not singular in thus commending *self-sacrifice*, as the *best* of any, and the sum total of all: other ancient Fathers of the Church have done the like<sup>y</sup>. It is a maxim of truth, and of common sense, that *self-sacrifice* is always the *best* that any *person* or *persons* can offer, because it comprehends *them*, and all *theirs*. An *angel's* self-sacrifice is the most that such angel can offer, and our *Lord's* self-sacrifice was the most that he could offer, and every *man's* self-sacrifice is the most that such *man* can offer. There is a seeming objection to this truth, drawn from the consideration of an authorized *minister's* offering up to God his own *people*; who, collectively at least, must be owned to be *better* than he. But then it is to be remembered, that such authorized

Christi, quæ sine jugo necessitatis est, humanam habeat oblationem — Nobis enim dicit, *sacrificium Deo* cor tribulatum, &c. *Barnab. Epist. cap. ii. p. 55.* Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 350.

<sup>u</sup> Deus non *pecudis* sanguine, sed *hominis* pietate placatur. *Lactant. Epist. p. 204.*

Non vult ergo sacrificium trucidati *pecoris*, sed vult sacrificium contriti cordis. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 5. p. 241. tom. vii.*

<sup>w</sup> Unusquisque nostrum habet in se holocaustum suum, et holocausti sui ipse succendit altare, ut semper ardeat. *Origen. in Levit. Hom. ix. p. 243.*

<sup>x</sup> Vota autem Domino offerre nemo potest, nisi qui habet aliquid in *semetipso*, et in *substantia sua*, quod offerat Deo. — Filium offerre, vel filiam, aut pecus, aut prædium, hoc totum *extra nos* est. *Semetipsum* Deo offerre, et non *alieno* labore, sed *proprio* placere, hoc est perfectius et eminentius omnibus votis: quod qui facit, imitator est Christi. *Origen. in Num. Hom. xxiv. p. 364. edit. Bened.*

<sup>y</sup> See references to them in Christian Sacrifice explained, Append. p. 188.

minister therein acts *in persona ecclesiæ*, in a public capacity, as an officer of the church<sup>z</sup>; and so it is the *whole church* which offers what is offered in and through him. But I return.

To Origen I may subjoin Lactantius, who rejects all *extrinsic* sacrifice, every thing *extraneous* to the man; alleging that God requires only what comes from *within*; from the *heart*, not from the *chest*; offered up by the *mind*, not by the *hand*<sup>a</sup>. This is not excluding good services, whether external or internal, whether mental, vocal, or manual: for they are *intrinsic* to the person, are as the *man himself*, amounting to, or resolving into *self-sacrifice*. What our Lord says of *evil* thoughts, words, and deeds, that they *come from within*, and out of *the heart*<sup>b</sup>, must be equally true of all *good* services; for the reason is the same in both. This I hint, lest any one should interpret *intrinsic* sacrifice of *mental* service only, exclusive of *vocal* or *manual*, confounding *intrinsic* sacrifice with *internal*, which is of different consideration, and belongs to another head of division, as will be seen in the sequel. But I proceed to other authorities.

Chrysostom understood the distinction between *extrinsic* and *intrinsic* sacrifice, rejecting the one as *Jewish*, and recommending the other as proper to the *Gospel*: those

<sup>a</sup> See Christian Sacrifice explained, Append. p. 187.

Object. 1. May not the value of an *offering*, by Divine *institution*, be made to rise higher than the value of the *man*? No: for if it is made the man's *property*, (and otherwise he cannot *give* or *sacrifice* it,) the *proprietor* is still more valuable than the *property*, as containing it. Object. 2. Is not the *offering Christ* to view, more valuable than offering *ourselves*? No: because it is *service* only, and no *service* is more valuable than the *servant* himself: besides, such *offering to view* is not *sacrificing Christ*: so the objection runs *wide* of the point.

<sup>a</sup> Quid igitur ab homine desiderat Deus, nisi cultum *mentis*, qui est purus et sanctus? Nam illa quæ aut digitis fiunt, aut *extra hominem* sunt, inepta, fragilia, ingrata sunt. Hoc est sacrificium *verum*, non quod ex *arca*, sed quod ex *corde* profertur; non quod *manu*, sed quod *mente* libatur. Hæc acceptabilis victima, quam *de seipso* animus immolaverit. *Lactant. Epist.* cap. lviii. p. 172. Conf. Zen. Veron. in Psal. xlix.

<sup>b</sup> Matt. xv. 18, 19. Mark vii. 15, 23.



he says were *from without*, these from *within*<sup>c</sup>. His disciple Isidore fell in with the like sentiments, in his reflections on Rom. xii. 1. "Present your bodies a living sacrifice<sup>d</sup>," &c. St. Austin is very clear and expressive on the same head: for after rejecting all *extrinsic* sacrifice, (*actively* considered,) he then asks the question, "What? have we therefore nothing to offer? Shall we so come before God? So hope to appease him?" He answers: "By all means *offer*: you have *within you* what you are to offer. Look not *abroad* for *frankincense*, but say, In me are thy *sacrifices of praise*, O God, which I am to render thee. Seek not *abroad* for *cattle* to slay; you have *within yourself* what you should slay. *The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit*<sup>e</sup>." I may hereupon remark, that St. Austin would not say in this case, *Offer Christ*: for though Christ is our sacrifice to *commemorate*, or to *feast upon*, he is not our sacrifice to *offer up* in a proper sacrificial sense. Much less would he say, *Sacrifice bread and wine*; for they are things *extrinsic*, as much as *cattle*, or *frankincense*, and cannot be the subject-matter of a Gospel sacrifice, any more than the other. What then was the only sacrifice left for a Christian *actively* and *properly* to offer? The *man* himself, (or *his services*, which amount to the same thing,) that was still left: and there St. Austin very justly and very consistently fixed the *Christian sacrifice*, (*actively* considered,) as he always does.

## IV.

I pass on to another ancient and useful distinction of sacrifice, into *visible* and *invisible*. A distinction near akin

<sup>c</sup> Ἐπινοῖαι μὲν γὰρ πλούτου καὶ τῶν ἰχόντων τούτων, αὐταὶ δὲ ἀρετῆς. Ἐπινοῖαι ἕρωδιον, αὐταὶ ἰσθῆδον. *Chrysost. in Hebr.* cap. vi. Hom. 11. p. 115. tom. xii. Bened. ed.

<sup>d</sup> Isidor. Pelusiot. lib. iii. Epist. 75. p. 284.

<sup>e</sup> Nihil ergo offeremus? Sic veniemus ad Deum? Et unde illum placabimus? Offer sane: *in te* habes quod offeras. Noli *extrinsecus* thura comparare, sed dic, *In me* sunt, Deus, vota tua, quæ reddam laudis tibi. Noli *extrinsecus* pecus quod mactes inquirere: habes *in te* quod occidas. Sacrificium Deo spiritus contribulatus, &c. *Augustin. in Psal.* l. p. 473. tom. iv. Conf. p. 14, 364, 527, 528, 529.

to the former, or rather resolving into it. *Pagan* and *Jewish* sacrifices were *visible*; but the Christian sacrifices were deemed *invisible*; not every way, but in respect of their invisible source, as arising from *within*, from the *heart* or *mind*, which is *seen* to God only. Lactantius argues, that our sacrifices ought to be *invisible*, that so they may suit the better with an *invisible* Deity <sup>f</sup>. St. Austin has the same distinction between *visible* and *invisible* sacrifices, meaning by the *visible* the noted sacrifices of *Jews* and *Pagans*, and by the *invisible*, the sacrifices made by good Christians only, the Gospel sacrifices. In one place, he observes, that the *Jewish* sacrifices, which God's people now read of only, and do not use, were *signs* of the evangelical; and thereupon he says, that "a visible sacrifice is a Sacrament, or holy sign, of an invisible sacrifice <sup>g</sup>." In another place, arguing, *ex hypothesi*, against Porphyrius, and other Pagans, (whose principle it was, to offer what they called *invisible sacrifices* to God supreme, and what they called *visible*, to inferior deities,) he pleads, that both the *visible* and *invisible* ought to go to the *supreme* only; those being *signs* of these, and requiring the same direction, to the same Deity: and hereupon he observes, that the persons themselves are, or ought to be, that *invisible sacrifice*, whereof the *visible* are the *signs* <sup>h</sup>.

<sup>f</sup> Si enim Deus non videtur, ergo his rebus coli debet quæ non videntur. *Lactant. de ver. Cult.* lib. vi. cap. 25.

<sup>g</sup> Nec quod ab antiquis Patribus talia sacrificia facta sunt in victimis pecorum (quæ nunc Dei populus legit, non facit) aliud intelligendum est, nisi rebus illis eas res fuisse significatas quæ aguntur in nobis, ad hoc ut inhæreamus Deo, et ad eundem finem proximo consulamus. *Sacrificium* ergo *visibile* *invisibilis sacrificii Sacramentum*, id est, *sacrum signum* est. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. x. cap. 5. p. 241. tom. vii.

<sup>h</sup> Qui autem putant hæc *visibilia* sacrificia *Diis aliis* congruere, illi vero tanquam *invisibilia*, et majori majora, meliorique meliora, qualia sunt puræ mentis, et bonæ voluntatis officia; profecto nesciunt hæc ita esse *signa* eorum, sicut *verba* sonantia *signa* sunt *rerum*. Quocirca, sicut orantes atque laudantes, ad eum *dirigimus* significantes voces, cui *res ipsas in corde*, quas significamus, *offerimus*, ita sacrificantes non alteri *visibile sacrificium* offerendum esse noverimus, quam illi cujus in *œrædibus* nostris *invisibile sacrificium* nos ipsi esse debemus. *Augustin. ibid.* lib. x. cap. 19. p. 255.

St. Austin here builds upon this Christian maxim, that what some call *visible sacrifice*, is really no better than the *sign, shell, shadow*, of true sacrifice; and that it is no more *true sacrifice*, than articulate *sounds* are *sense*, or *words* are *ideas*. Nothing with him is *true sacrifice*, or *acceptable sacrifice*, or *evangelical sacrifice*, (for those are so many phrases reciprocal and tantamount,) but the *invisible sacrifice*, the sacrifice of the *heart*, of the *mind*, of the *man*, for the mind is the man.

One may justly wonder what some Divines, among the Romanists, have meant, who, in order to maintain an *extrinsic* sacrifice in the Eucharist, have laid hold of Austin's account of a *visible sacrifice*, (that is, of a *sign, shell, shadow*,) as amounting to a *definition* of *true* or *proper* sacrifice<sup>i</sup>. They could not have contrived a shorter or surer way to depreciate the eucharistical sacrifice. For since it is manifest, that St. Austin rejected those called *visible sacrifices*, as what never were *true sacrifices*, (in his sense of *true*,) even when *required* under the law, and are not *required* at all, under the notion of *sacrifice*, by the Gospel<sup>k</sup>, the advancing of *signs* now into proper *sacrifices* is but a kind of *will-worship*, or *sacrilegious* usurpation. The *sacramental* elements are not that *true sacrifice* which St. Austin so often speaks of, but the *signs* of it<sup>l</sup>; not that *true* eucharistical *sacrifice* which that Father so magnificently sets forth, but the *shadows* of it<sup>m</sup>. And what can

<sup>i</sup> Sacrificium, *proprie* dictum, est sacrum signum. *Sylvius*, tom. iv. p. 624. Sacrificium est invisibilis sacrificii visibile Sacramentum. *Bayus*, lib. iii. cap. 2. p. 210.

<sup>k</sup> In hujus prophetæ verbis utrumque distinctum est, satisque declaratum, illa sacrificia per seipsa non requirere Deum, quibus *significantur* hæc sacrificia quæ requirit Deus. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. x. cap. 5. p. 242.

<sup>l</sup> Quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium, *signum* est veri sacrificii. *Ibid.*

<sup>m</sup> Nazianzen expressly teaches the same thing, where he declares that the *outward oblation* is but as *shadow* to *truth*, in respect of the true and spiritual sacrifices.

Οἶδα καὶ ἄλλο θυσιαστήριον, οὗ τύπος τὰ πρὸς ἑωμόνα—τούτω παραστήσιμαί, τούτω θύσω δικτὰ, θυσίαν, καὶ πρὸς θεόν, καὶ ἰλεκαυτώματα, κρίνοντα τῶν πρ

give a man a meaner idea of the *eucharistical oblation*, and *sacerdotal sacrifice*, than the placing it in the *signs* of *true sacrifice*, and thereby setting it much *lower* than the *private*, but *true sacrifice* of every single *laic* of the Church? In short, St. Austin's true sacrifice was really *self-sacrifice*<sup>n</sup>, the same with his *invisible sacrifice*: and his *eucharistical sacrifice* was the offering up the collective body of Christians, the whole *Church*, or *city* of God<sup>o</sup>. But of this I may say more in a proper place. All that I shall observe farther here is, that St. Austin never once gives (so far as appears) the name of *visible sacrifice* to any thing which he esteemed *true sacrifice*, or Gospel sacrifice, justly so called. What he said of *visible sacrifice*, in the two passages before cited, related purely to the *Jewish* and *Pagan* sacrifices, which he opposed to the *invisible*, that is, to the *Christian* sacrifices. He does indeed sometimes speak of the Christian sacrifices, as *appearing*<sup>p</sup>, or being *seen*; that is, in such a sense as things *invisible* may be said to be seen by their *signs*, or reasonably collected and inferred from what appears outwardly. Good works are *seen* by men, and they are *sacrifices*: but they are not seen as *good*, or as *sacrifices*, except to God only, who alone sees the *heart*. Good Christians are a *sacrifice* to God in St. Austin's account, and they are *visible*, as *men*: nevertheless, he calls

προσαγμαίνων, Ἰσὴ κρείττον ἐμοῦς ἢ ἁλόθωα. Nazianz. Orat. xxviii. p. 484. See my Review, vol. vii. p. 382—385.

Gregorius affirmat oblationem illam quæ fit in Eucharistia, esse *umbram* ac *imaginem* oblationum nostrarum *spiritualium*, ac iis longe inferiorem. Albertinus, p. 474. The reader may compare Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 32. if disposed to observe what may be *said*, where no just *answer* can be given. Albertinus had foreclosed all *evasions*: and yet no notice was taken of him.

▪ Augustin. tom. v. p. 268. tom. vii. p. 242, 243, 244, 256, 260, 569, 609, 674. tom. viii. p. 349, 568. tom. x. p. 94. ed. Bened.

• Vid. tom. vii. p. 243, 244, 256, 260, 569, 674.

† Ibi quippe primum *apparuit* sacrificium quod nunc a Christianis offertur Deo, toto orbe terrarum, &c. Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xvi. cap. 22. p. 435. tom. vii.

Cum *videt* sacrificium Christianorum toto orbe terrarum, &c. *Ibid.* l. xvii. cap. 5. p. 465.

them an *invisible sacrifice*, because in their *sacrificial capacity* they are seen to God only, the searcher of *hearts*. He would not allow that *Satan* himself could *see* what Job did, when he *sacrificed* unto God: Job was *visible*, but his *sacrifice* was *invisible*; because it was *true sacrifice*, arising from the *heart*<sup>9</sup>. From what hath been noted under this article, it may sufficiently appear, that the Gospel sacrifices are of the *invisible* kind, as contradistinguished from the *visible* sacrifices of Jews and Pagans; and that they have had the name of *invisible*, on the same account as they had the name of *intrinsic*; and so both the names resolve into one and the same notion. By these accounts, the *bread* and *wine* of the Eucharist could not be considered as *Gospel sacrifices*, being that they are *ab extra*, and *open to view*; and as they are not *intrinsic*, so neither are they *invisible*, either in *themselves* or in their *source*.

## V.

Another, more ancient and more famed distinction of sacrifice, was into *material* and *immaterial*, or *corporeal* and *incorporeal*: the Christian sacrifices were of the *immaterial* and *incorporeal* kind, and as such distinguished from the Jewish and Pagan sacrifices, which were *material* and *corporeal*. This distinction is as old as Justin Martyr, who rejected the sacrifices of Jews or Pagans, as *material* sacrifices. Such *material* things, he says, God has *no need* to receive of us, but that he accepts only of the men themselves, while copying after the Divine perfections, *purity*, *righteousness*, *philanthropy*, and the like<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Ablatis omnibus, *solus* remansit Job: sed in illo erant *vota laudis* quæ redderet Deo. In illo plane erant: arcam pectoris sui fur *diabolus* non invaserat. Plenus erat unde *sacrificaret*. Dens videbat in corde servi sui cultum suum gratuitum: placebat illud *cor* in *conspectu Domini*, in luce viventium. Diabolum *latebat*, quia in tenebris erat. *August. in Psal. lvi. p. 528, 529. tom. iv.*

<sup>r</sup> 'Αλλ' οὐ δίδωται τῆς παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ὑλιᾶς προσφερέας προσεληθήσμεν τὸν Θεόν, αὐτὸν παρῆχοντα πάντα ἐρώμεν· ἑαίνομεν δὲ προσδέχασθαι αὐτὸν μόνον διὰ δόξα-  
μιᾶς καὶ πιστώσεως, καὶ πιστιώμεν τοῦς τὰ πράσσοντα αὐτῷ ἁγαθὰ μισθούμεν,

This was pleaded in answer to the Pagan charge of *impiety*, thrown upon Christians for *not using* material sacrifices. Justin tacitly admits the charge as to *fact*, that the Christians did not use such sacrifices; but in vindication of their conduct in that article, he pleads that God had *no need* of material sacrifices: which in his phraseology, as circumstances show, amounted to saying, that God *did not require* them, but indeed *rejected* them. This appears very plainly by his use of the like phrase soon after, with respect to *blood, libations, and incense*, which, without all question, Justin understood to have been absolutely *rejected*: yet Justin, even in that case also, pleaded that God had *no need* of them<sup>a</sup>. He chose, very probably, that form of speaking, by way of oblique reproof to the Pagans, for their gross sentiments, in conceiving that the Deity *had need* of such offerings. Other Fathers, in the same cause, made use of the phrase of *no need*, exactly in the same way; so as not barely to teach that God is *all-sufficient*, but intimating withal, that God had really *rejected* what he is there said to have *no need* of<sup>b</sup>: otherwise their arguments on that head would have been of no force to justify the conduct of Christians, in their not admitting such or such sacrifices. It is observable, that in both the places where Justin speaks of the sacrifices which God has *no need* of, he uses the phrase in direct *opposition* to such sacrifices as God *accepts* of; which makes it still plainer, that that phrase, as it there stands, is used as equivalent to *disallowing* or *rejecting*. But to clear the matter up yet further, so as to cut off all evasive pretences or reserves, (as if Justin had left room for a *material* sacrifice in some shape or other,) it is worth

σωφροσύνη, καὶ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ φιλοθεωπία, καὶ ὅσα εἰσι τὰ Θεῷ ἴσα. *Just. Mart. Apol.* i. p. 14. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 353.

<sup>a</sup> Ἀνιδίῳ αἱμάτων, καὶ σποδῶν, καὶ θυμιαμάτων. *Just. Mart. Apol.* i. p. 19. See Review, vol. vii. p. 354. and Dodwell of Incense, p. 46.

<sup>b</sup> Athenagoras, p. 48, 49. Clem. Alex. p. 836, 848. Tertullian ad Scap. c. ii. p. 69. Arnobius, lib. vi. p. 190, 191. Lactantius, Epit. c. lviii. p. 171, 172.

noting, that he distinctly points out what is to be offered to *man*, and what to *God*, in the Eucharist: all the material part, all that God gives for *nutriment*, is to be *offered to ourselves and to the needy*, and to God are to be sent up *hymns and praises* <sup>t</sup>. Justin could never have expressed himself in that manner, had he thought that any part of that material *nutriment* was to be a *sacrifice* unto God. The words are very emphatical. We are not to *burn it*, as the Pagans did: well, what then are we to do with it? May we not *προσφέρειν*, *offer* it up as a sacrifice? No; but we must *offer* it, in a lower sense, to man. What then is to be offered up to God? Nothing? Yes, *thanks, praises, hymns*, and the like: that is God's tribute, that is a sacrifice fit for him, and worthy of him. I have dwelt the longer upon this Father, because of his great antiquity and authority, and because his sentiments on this head have been sometimes widely mistaken by contending parties.

I pass on to Lactantius <sup>u</sup>, who has the same distinction with Justin, but under the names of *corporeal* and *incorporeal*, instead of *material* and *immaterial*: he argues, that

<sup>t</sup> Τὸ γὰρ ὄψ' ἑαυτοῦ εἰς διατροφήν γινόμενα, οὐ πυρὶ κατακαῖν, ἀλλ' ἑαυταῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀποπέμψουσιν προσφέρειν, ἑαυτῶν δὲ εὐχαριστίας ὄντας διὰ λόγου σαρμάς καὶ ὕμνους ψιμύων. *Just. Mart. Apol.* i. p. 19.

Literally thus:

“Not to consume by fire the creatures made for nutriment, but to *offer* them to ourselves, and to the needy; and thankfully to send up to him [God] by speech, praises, and hymns.”

*N. B.* Mr. Reeves has diluted the meaning of this passage by a translation too paraphractical. It cannot be supposed that Justin meant only, that such things should not be offered to God by *wasting, burning*: for he declares plainly *what* things are to be *presented* to God, and *what* to man: besides that the taking from such offerings the very *essential characteristics* of all material *presents* to God, is the same with forbidding them to be used as *presents*, or *considered as presents* to the Divine Majesty.

<sup>u</sup> Sicut corporalibus *corporalia*, sic utique incorporali *incorporale* sacrificium necessarium est. *Lactant. Epit.* c. lxxviii. p. 171. Duo sunt quæ offerri debeant, *donum et sacrificium*.—Deo utrumque *incorporale* offerendum est, quo utitur. *Donum* est integritas animi, *sacrificium*, laus et hymnus. *Lactant. Instit.* lib. vi. c. 24. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 378, 379.

since God is *incorporeal*, he ought to have a *sacrifice* suitable, that is, *incorporeal*. Nay, he argues farther, that no other kind of sacrifice ought to be offered him, and that he requires no other <sup>w</sup>. It is observable, that his *incorporeal* sacrifices take in mental, vocal, and manual services; all *good works* <sup>x</sup>, external or internal, coming from a *good* mind. *Bodily* service is performed indeed by the *body*, as the instrument: but that *service* is not a *bodily substance*, not a *material thing*; as a *sheep*, a *bullock*, a *cake*, a *loaf*, or a vessel of *wine* is. Lactantius's notion of sacrifice includes all *acts* of obedience, all *true* services of the man <sup>y</sup>; but it excludes every thing *extraneous* to the man, from being the subject-matter of his sacrifice: so that this distinction of *corporeal* and *incorporeal*, or of *material* and *immaterial*, differs only (if it at all differs) in a mode of conception from the distinction of *extrinsic* and *intrinsic*, before explained.

Eusebius recommends the Christian sacrifices as *incorporeal*, in opposition to the *corporeal* sacrifices of Jews and Pagans <sup>z</sup>. Basil in like manner observes, that God rejects *corporeal* sacrifices <sup>a</sup>. Chrysostom also bears his testimony to the same thing, and in words of like import, where he speaks of the converted Jews as relinquishing

<sup>w</sup> Quid igitur ab homine desiderat Deus, nisi cultum mentis, qui est purus et sanctus? See above, p. 293.

<sup>x</sup> Hic cultor est veri Dei, cujus sacrificia sunt mansuetudo animi, et vita innocens et actus boni. *Lactant. Instit.* lib. vi. c. 24.

<sup>y</sup> Hæc sunt opera, hæc officia misericordiæ; quæ si quis obierit, verum et acceptum sacrificium Deo immolabit. *Lactant. Epit.* p. 204. Conf. Minuc. Fel. sect. 32. p. 183. in *Review*, vol. vii. p. 371.

<sup>z</sup> Ταύτας δὲ ψάλλει εἰς ἑαυμάτους καὶ τοιαύτης θείας τὰ προφητικὰ κηρύττει λόγῳ. *Euseb. Demonstr.* lib. i. c. 10. p. 39. conf. 35, 36. Origen. in Psalm. p. 563, 722. edit. Bened. and my *Review*, vol. vii. p. 379.

<sup>a</sup> Παρεπίττει τὰς σωματικὰς θυσίας. *Basil. Comm. in Isa.* tom. i. p. 398. edit. Bened.

*N. B.* In *Review*, vol. vii. p. 385. I took notice, that the editor had rejected that piece as of *doubtful* authority, in his preface, tom. i. p. 48. But I have since observed, that in a later tome he altered his mind, and admitted it as *genuine*, giving his reasons, tom. iii. in *Vita Basilii*, c. 42. p. 179, &c.



their *corporeal* services, upon their embracing Christianity<sup>b</sup>. Cyril, after observing that *beees, sheep, turtles, pigeons, fruits, fine flour, cakes, incenses*, are all discarded under the Gospel, as too gross to be offered for sacrifice; and that Christians are commanded to offer up something more *fine* and more *abstracted*, more *intellectual* and *spiritual*, namely, *meekness, faith, hope, charity, righteousness, temperance, obedience, dutifulness, praises*, and all kinds of virtues, (not a word of *bread* or of *wine* in all this long list,) adds, “For this sacrifice, as being purest “from *matter*, is most worthy of the Deity, who is by “nature *uncompounded* and *immaterial*”<sup>c</sup>. To the same purpose writes Procopius, of the next succeeding century; observing that *corporeal* sacrifice is abolished, and *spiritual* established<sup>d</sup>.

Could such writers, after all, believe *bread* or *wine* to be the *sacrifice* which God accepts? Are they finer than *fine flour*? Are they *purer* than *cakes*? Or say that they are: yet are they *immaterial*, or *incorporeal*? Or if even that were allowed, (which never can be allowed,) yet are they *faith*, or *hope*, or *charity*, or *good mind*, or *good life*? Every way they stand excluded. But still, colours have been invented, to evade the authorities here cited: sometimes it is said, that *immaterial*, or *incorporeal*, may not mean *perfectly* immaterial, but only less *gross*, or less *feculent*<sup>e</sup>. That is not very likely, if we consider, that

<sup>b</sup> Τὴν δὲ θυσίαν καὶ ἰλαστικὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν σωματικῶν ἀφίνας Σεραπίαν. Chrysost. *adv. Judæos*, Hom. vii. p. 664. tom. i. ed. Bened. Conf. ad Roman. Hom. xx. p. 658. tom. x.

<sup>c</sup> Ἀποστάσι γὰρ αὐτῆ θυσία τῆ παρὰ φύσιν ἐσλῆ καὶ ἀύλη πρὸς τὴν Θεῶν. Cyrill. *Alex. contr. Julian*. lib. x. p. 345. Compare Review, vol. vii. p. 385. Dodwell on Incense, p. 89.

<sup>d</sup> Οὐκ εἶν ἰσθλὸν ὡς τὸ σωματικὸν ἰαβαλὸν, τὸ πνευματικὸν πληροῦν ἰσαγγίλλεται. Procop. *Gaz. in Isa*. p. 22, 23. conf. p. 493.

<sup>e</sup> “When I call the eucharistic sacrifice *material*, I must here declare, “that I mean nothing by it but that it has such a real *corporeal* extension, “as natural *bread* and *wine*, as all other bodies are allowed to have; and “that I do not intend it as a word of the same adequate import with the “Greek ὑλικός. For I apprehend that some of the ancients may have asserted, that the eucharistic sacrifice is ἀύλος, as well as ἀσώματος; but then

the *immateriality* or *incorporeity* of the sacrifice spoken of, is understood to be analogous to God's *immateriality* or *incorporeity*, to which it is compared. But that is not all: for it is farther to be considered, that the *immaterial* quality of the *Christian* sacrifices was commended by the Fathers, in opposition to the *Jewish* and *Pagan* sacrifices. Now had they really meant no more than that they were *less gross*, or *less dreggy*, such an argument could not have failed to introduce a very *doubtful* debate between them and their adversaries, *viz.* whether the *Jewish* and *Pagan* *fine flour*, and *cakes*, were not as free from dregs as the *Christian's bread*; and whether their libations were not of wine as *pure*, and as free from *feculency*, as any that the *Christians* could pretend to. Yet we find nothing recorded, no not so much as a hint of any such debate: wherefore it is much more reasonable, as well as more natural to suppose, that those plain Fathers, who were both wise and honest men, understood *immaterial* and *incorporeal* in the usual and obvious sense of those words. And indeed the instances which they give to exemplify what they meant, such as *hope*, *faith*, *virtue*, all *immaterial*, (and those were their *sacrifices*,) demonstrate that they did so. I take no notice of some slighter *evasions* which have been offered, for fear of being tedious, or of giving offence to persons of true discernment.

## VI.

I pass on to the famous distinction of *bloody* and *unbloody* sacrifice: a distinction, probably, borrowed from the *Pythagorean* philosophers & by the *Christian* Fathers, of a philosophic turn, who, by some easy and proper refinements of the idea, adapted it to *Christian* purposes. *Justin Martyr* here seems to have led the way; who to the *Pagan* sacrifices of *blood*, and to their *libations*, opposes the *true spiritual* praises and thanksgivings offered

“ they did not mean *perfectly immaterial*, or *without bodily substance*, but *not gross or dreggy.*” *Unbloody Sacrifice*, part i. p. 27.

† Vid. *Clem. Alex.* p. 848, 849. ed. Ox.

up by Christians<sup>h</sup>. He did not say, unbloody, or spiritual *bread* and *wine*, but spiritual *praises* and *thanksgivings*. Athenagoras, of the same age, says, that it is meet to offer an *unbloody sacrifice*, and to bring a *rational service*<sup>i</sup>. Had he intended *bread* and *wine* by the *unbloody sacrifice*, this would have been the place wherein to have mentioned them: but he has not one word of them. All that he opposes to the sacrifices of *blood*, are the *knowledge of God's works and ways*, the *lifting up holy hands*, and the like; which, according to him, are *θυσία μεγίστη*, the *noblest sacrifice*; and therefore, undoubtedly, the same that he recommends under the names of *unbloody sacrifice* and *rational service*<sup>k</sup>. He had said before, God needs no *blood*, nor *fat*, nor *scents*, nor *incense*; that is, he does not now *accept* them. What then does he *accept* instead of *blood*, &c.? Did he say *bread* or *wine*? No: but he tells us of that *greatest sacrifice*, describing it as consisting of religious *faith*, and *prayers*, and *services*: those God accepts in opposition to *blood*, &c. wherefore those are what this Father recommended as *unbloody sacrifice*, in the place now cited. The case is plain in the author himself, and will, besides, be abundantly confirmed by other similar passages in the *Fathers* that followed, whose testimonies I shall take in their order of time.

Tertullian, to the *bloody sacrifices*, opposes *pure prayer*<sup>l</sup>: not a word of pure *bread* and *wine*, as a Christian sacrifice in opposition to the other. But in another place, where he again recommended prayer sent up from a chaste body, an innocent soul, and a sanctified spirit, he

<sup>h</sup> Οὐ ἐν τῇ πάλῳ παρουσίᾳ, μὴ δέχηται λίγυν Ἡσαΐαν, ἢ τοὺς ἄλλους προσφάτας θυσίας ἀφ' αἱμάτων ἢ σποδῶν ἐπὶ τῷ θυσιαστήριον ἀναφέρισθαι, ἀλλ' ἀληθινῶς καὶ πνευματικῶς αἶθους καὶ ὑπερωσίας. *Just. Mart. Dial.* p. 389. ed. Lond.

<sup>i</sup> Προσφέρειν δὲν ἀσπίμακτοι θυσίαν, καὶ ἐν λογικῇ προσάγειν λατρείαν. *Athenag. Legat.* p. 49.

<sup>k</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 360, 361. and compare Jewell's Answer to Harding, p. 427, 428.

<sup>l</sup> Sacrificamus—sed quomodo Deus præcepit pura prece: non enim eget Deus, conditor universitatis, odoris, aut sanguinis alicujus. *Tertull. ad Scap.* c. ii. p. 69. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 367, 368.

adds, not worthless grains of *frankincense*, the tears of an Arabian tree, nor *two drops of wine*<sup>m</sup>. He must have been very imprudent, not to say worse, in touching upon so tender an article as the *two drops of wine*, had he conceived that such in part was the real *sacrifice* of every Christian communicant at the holy altar.

Origen<sup>n</sup>, Lactantius<sup>o</sup>, Eusebius<sup>p</sup>, Austin<sup>q</sup>, all state the *opposition* in the same way; not between *bloody animals* and *bloodless bread or wine*, (as they should have done upon the *material* scheme,) but between *bloody sacrifices* and sacrifices of the *spiritual* kind, such as prayers, praises, and good works. More particularly, Eusebius joins *rational* with unbloody, and calls it unbloody *service*, not unbloody *elements, symbols*, and the like<sup>r</sup>. Eusebius further teaches, that the *unbloody sacrifices* will obtain in heaven<sup>s</sup>. From whence it is manifest, that he meant not the *elements* by that phrase, but religious *services*. Neither has there been produced so much as a single passage from his writings, where that phrase *must* mean the material elements, or where it may not reason-

<sup>m</sup> Offero ei opimam et majorem *hostiam*: quam ipse mandavit: *orationem* de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de Spiritu Sancto profectam: non grana thuris unius assis, Arabicæ arboris lachrymas, nec duas *meri* guttas, &c. *Tertull. Apol. c. xxx. p. 277. Conf. Arnob. lib. vi. p. 190. edit. Lugd. Bat.*

<sup>n</sup> Decet enim Deo immolari victimam *cordis*, et *hostiam* contribulati spiritûs, non *carnis* et *sanguinis* jugulari. *Origen. in Num. Hom. xxiv. p. 363.*

<sup>o</sup> Deus non pecudis *sanguine*, sed hominis *pietate* placatur. *Lactant. Epit. 204.*

<sup>p</sup> Οὐ δι' αἱμάτων, ἀλλὰ δι' ἔργων ἰουστῶν καθαρῶν ἀνομασμένη θυσίαν τῇ ἰπὶ πᾶσιν ἀναφέρειν Θεῷ. *Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. c. vi. p. 19. conf. p. 20, 21, 23, 39. in Psal. p. 212.*

<sup>q</sup> Non vult ergo sacrificium trucidati pecoris, sed vult sacrificium *contriti* cordis. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. c. 5. p. 241.*

<sup>r</sup> Θυσιασθήριον ἀναιμων καὶ λογικῶν θυσιῶν. *Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. c. 6. p. 20. Πιτύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀναιμων καὶ καθαρῶν ἀποδοῦς αὐτῷ λατρείαν. Euseb. ibid. p. 21.*

<sup>s</sup> See the passage in my Review, vol. vii. p. 381. How *sacrifices* shall be offered in heaven, or *what* sacrifices, see Origen in Num. Hom. xviii. p. 359. ed. Bened. Lactantius, Instit. lib. vi. c. 24. Augustin, tom. iv. p. 474. tom. vii. p. 610. Gregor. Magn. tom. iii. p. 5<sup>09</sup>. ed. Bened.

ably mean religious *acts, services, performances*<sup>t</sup>. Attempts have been made upon a place or two<sup>u</sup>, to warp them to another meaning, but so slight, and so easily seen through at once, that I shall not here trouble you with any particular confutation of them. The error lies in confounding the *material things* with the *religious work*; and the *sacrificial instruments* with the *sacrificial service*; that is, with the *sacrifice* itself. But I proceed.

The Emperor Constantine, in a letter to King Saporis, says, that Christians are content with *unbloody prayers* only, in supplicating God; and that *prayer, free from blood and filth*, together with the *sign of the cross*, was sufficient for victory<sup>w</sup>. Here we have the epithet *unbloody* directly applied to religious *services*, (not to *material things*;) so that there is no arguing from the *Pagan* application of that epithet to the *Christian*, which was widely different, as their *sacrifices* were different. It is in vain to plead, that the difference lay only in this, that the Jews and Pagans used *animal sacrifices*, and the Christians *bloodless* bread and wine: for then, why did not the Fathers mention *unbloody bread and wine*, rather than *unbloody prayers*? And why should they so industriously smother the *true* state of the *competition*, (if it were *true*,) and run off so *wide*, that nobody, by their way of speaking, could suspect any other, than that the *opposition* entirely lay between *bloody victims* and *unbloody services* of

<sup>t</sup> Θυσίαι ἀναιμίαι καὶ μυστήριας ἱεροουργίας τὸ θύον ἰλάσκοντο. Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. c. 45. p. 651.

<sup>u</sup> Ἀναιμίαι καὶ λογικὰς θυσίας, τὰς δὲ ὑχῶν καὶ ἀπορήτου διηλογίας, ταῖς αὐτῶ διασώσας εἰς ἰσχυρίων παρῖδων ἄλλοι, ἢ μόνος ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτήρ. Euseb. de Laud. Constant. p. 768, ed. Cant. Conf. Demonstr. lib. i. c. 6, 10.

<sup>w</sup> See Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 21. N. B. Eusebius asks, "Who but our Saviour ever taught his votaries to offer by prayer and an ineffable theology, these unbloody and rational sacrifices?" That is, *memorial services*; which is Eusebius's constant notion of the *eucharistic sacrifices*. Demonstr. Evang. p. 27, 38, 39, 40. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 40.

<sup>x</sup> Μόναις ὑχαιῖς ἀναιμάταις πρὸς ἰσχυρίων Θεῶ ἀρχόνται—ἀποχεῖσαι αὐτῶ εἰς ἰσχυρίων τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ σύμβολον—καὶ ὑχὴν καὶ θυσίαν αἰμάτων καὶ βύτου. Constantin. apud Sozom. lib. ii. c. 15. p. 63.

lauds, prayers, and good works? For those are what they directly call *sacrifices*, and what they expressly point to, as often as they specify or explain their *unbloody sacrifices*.

Cyril of Jerusalem in plain terms characterizes the *spiritual sacrifice* by *unbloody service*<sup>x</sup>. Now, as sure as that a *service*<sup>y</sup> is not a *substance*, and a *spiritual sacrifice* is not a *corporeal host*, so sure is it, that the epithet of *unbloody* belongs not to the *elements* in that passage of Cyril. There may be some doubt of what Cyril meant by the *sacrifice of propitiation*, in the same paragraph: but a wise interpreter will not therefore depart from what is *clear* and *certain*. What I apprehend is, that Cyril, by *spiritual sacrifice* and *unbloody service*, meant the *consecratory service*, whereby the elements became *symbols* of the *real body* and *blood*, symbols of the *grand sacrifice*. When the elements were once so constituted *exhibitive symbols* of the *grand sacrifice*, which is the true *sacrifice of propitiation*, Cyril scrupled not to give them the *name* of what they represented and exhibited, by an usual metonymy of *sign* for *thing*: for, in the very same way, he there also gave them the *name* of *Christ slain*<sup>z</sup>, and of the *most tremendous sacrifice*<sup>a</sup>. The symbols therefore,

<sup>x</sup> Μισὰ τὸ ἀκαρτισθῆναι ἐν πνευματικῇ θυσίᾳ, τὴν ἀνέμικτον λατρίαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἰαίτης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν Θεῷ ὑπὲρ κοίτης τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἰσότης. Cyril. *Mystag.* v. sect. 8. p. 327. Compare Review, vol. vii. p. 247, 248, 249.

“ After that the *spiritual sacrifice*, the *unbloody service*, is finished, upon “ that sacrifice of propitiation we beseech God in behalf of the common “ peace of the churches.”

<sup>y</sup> It has been sometimes pleaded, (*Unbloody Sacrifice*, part i. p. 24.) that *service* may import a *material thing*; and Exod. xii. 26. is appealed to, as affording an example of it. But the whole context shows, that *service* there really means *service*, the celebration of the paschal sacrifice, the keeping that feast.

<sup>z</sup> Χριστὸν ἰσφαγισμένον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων προσφέρμεν, ἕξιλοῦμαι ὑπὲρ πάντων τε καὶ ἡμῶν τοῖς φιλάδελφοις Θεῷ. Cyril. *Mystag.* p. 328.

<sup>a</sup> Τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικωδιστάτης προστιμῆτης θυσίας. Cyril. *ibid.* p. 327. Conf. Ephrem. Syr. de Sacerdot. p. 2, 3. Chrysostom, tom. i. p. 382, 383, 424. tom. vii. p. 272, 310. tom. ix. p. 176. tom. xi. p. 217, 218. Nazians. Orat. xvii. p. 273.

in a *figure*, are there called the *sacrifice of propitiation*; but the *spiritual sacrifice* and *unbloody service*, spoken of just before, express that *service* of ours, that *sacrifice* which we *actively* offer up, in order to the consecrating the *elements* into *holy symbols*, exhibitivē of the *grand sacrifice* to every faithful receiver<sup>b</sup>. So that the phrases of *spiritual sacrifice* and *unbloody service* do here retain their usual meaning; and Cyril has neatly contrived to insinuate to his readers a just notion of the *two sacrifices* of the Eucharist; the one actively *offered*, and the other passively *received* or *participated*<sup>c</sup>.

I pass on to Zeno of Verona, who lived about the same time with Cyril. He makes use of the same distinction of *bloody* and *unbloody*, while recommending the sacrifices of *Christians* as preferable to the animal sacrifices of Jews and Pagans<sup>d</sup>. By *unbloody* sacrifices, he understood *clean thoughts* and *pure manners*, intimating nothing of *clean bread*, or *pure wine*, as set in competition with the *bloody* sacrifices. A strange omission, had he been at all aware that the *elements* were the proper Christian sacrifice.

<sup>b</sup> Cyril's whole context will set this matter clear.

Παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλόθερον Θεόν, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἱερασοῦνται ἐπὶ τὰ προσκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ αἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ· πάντως γὰρ εὐὲν ἰφάψαιτο τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τούτου ἡγιασσαι, καὶ μεταβίβησται. Εἶτα, μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀνάμακτον λατρίαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν. κ. τ. λ.

Here I understand ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης to refer to σῶμα and αἷμα Χριστοῦ, before mentioned. They are *that sacrifice of propitiation* into which the elements are supposed to be *symbolically* changed, by the *spiritual sacrifice* and *unbloody service*: that is, by the *consecratory* prayers and lauds, *instrumentally*, as by the Spirit *efficiently*. In a word, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης means the same, as if it had been said ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος ἐκείνου καὶ αἵματος. And indeed, if θυσίας had referred to πνευματικὴν θυσίαν next preceding, Cyril, probably, would have said, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ταύτης, not ἐκείνης.

<sup>c</sup> See above, p. 289, &c.

<sup>d</sup> *Spirituali* Deo sacrificium est necessarium *spiritale*, quod non ex sacculo, sed ex corde profertur: quod non bromosis pecudibus, sed suavissimis moribus comparatur; quod non *cruentis* manibus, sed sensibus *mundis* offertur; quod non jugulatur ut, *percat*, sed, sicut Isaac, immolatur ut *vivat*. *Zeno. Veron. in Psal. xlix.* This I take from Dodwell on Incense, p. 97, 98.

Nazianzen speaks of his purifying the people at the *mystical table*, that is, in the Eucharist, with *unbloody* and perfect *ordinances*<sup>e</sup>. From whence it is plain, that he thought not the epithet *unbloody* to be appropriated to *material* substance. And this may help to explain another passage of his, relating to Julian, whom he represents as *desecrating* his hands by *profane blood*, thereby wiping out the consecration he had received in *Baptism*, and washing his hands of the *unbloody sacrifice*<sup>f</sup>; that is, of the *consecration* received in the eucharistical solemnities. Had this plain sense of the place been thought on, there would have been no room left for the speculations which some have raised upon that passage §.

There is another noted place of the same Father, where he speaks, I think, of the Pagans, set on by Arians, and defiling the *unbloody sacrifices* with the blood of men and of victims<sup>h</sup>. I see no reason for interpreting *unbloody sacrifices*, in this passage, at all differently from the common usage of that phrase in Church writers of those ancient times. Both the thought and the expression seem to be near akin to what Optatus uses, upon a like occasion, in relation to the rudeness and profaneness of some Donatists; who had overturned, as he terms it, the *vows* and *desires* of the people, together with the *altars*<sup>i</sup>. I suppose, Gregory might as properly and as reasonably say, that the *devotions* of the people were *polluted* in one case,

- Ἐγὼ τραπίζης μυστικῆς παραστάτης,  
Ἐγὼ καθάρω λαὸν, ὃν σοὶ προσφέρω,  
Ἐν τοῖς ἀναίμοις καὶ τιλίοις δόγμασι.

Nazianz. *Iamb.* vol. ii. p. 182.

<sup>f</sup> Καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀφαιγίζονται, τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας ἀποκαθαίρων, δι' ἧς ἡμεῖς Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν σαθρημάτων, καὶ τῆς θιότητος. Nazianz. *Orat.* liii. p. 70.

§ See *Unbloody Sacrifice*, part i. p. 20.

<sup>h</sup> Θεσιασθηρίων καταρχοῦμενοι, καὶ τὰς ἀναιμάκτους θυσίας, ἀνθρώπων καὶ θυσίων αἵμασι χραίνοντες. Nazianz. *Orat.* xx. p. 348.

<sup>i</sup> *Vota et desideria hominum, cum ipsis altaribus, evertistis.* Illac ad aures Dei ascendere solebat oratio. *Optat. contr. Parmen.* lib. vi. p. 289.



as Optatus might say, that they were *overturned* in the other case: the expressions are alike rhetorical.

Asterius Amasenus, in a work ascribed to Gregory Nyssen, speaks expressly of *incorporeal repentance* and *unbloody supplication*, as obtaining in the Church, in the room of animal sacrifices<sup>k</sup>. So that the epithet *unbloody*, for the first four centuries, at least, appears not to have been so much as *applied* to the eucharistical *elements*, much less *appropriated*.

Some pieces have been quoted on this head<sup>l</sup>, under the admired names of Athanasius and Chrysostom, which might have been worth examining, were they not now known to be *spurious*<sup>m</sup>. But Chrysostom, in his *undoubted* writings, abundantly discovers how he understood the distinction which we are now upon, by his opposing the *bloody* antiquated *sacrifices*, not to clean *elements*, but to Christian *virtues*, lauds, prayers, and good works<sup>n</sup>. Isidore Pelusiot uses the phrase of *unbloody sacrifice*<sup>o</sup>, but without explication; so that his sense of it must be determined, either by his general doctrine elsewhere, or by the constant usage of contemporary writers.

St. Austin opposes to the antiquated *bloody victims*, the *sacrifices of praise*<sup>p</sup>. Cyril of Alexandria says, that the angels of heaven offer *unbloody sacrifices*<sup>q</sup>. A very clear

<sup>k</sup> Ὅτις δὲ ἢ τὸν ἰσχυρὸν μύχον, τοῦτο ἔν τε καὶ ἡ ἀσώματος μεταπίλιον, καὶ ἀνίματος θύσις. *Greg. Nyssen. de Pœnit.* p. 170. That work belongs to Asterius Amasenus of the fourth or fifth century. Vid. Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* tom. viii. p. 160.

<sup>l</sup> *Unbloody Sacrifice*, part i. p. 20.

<sup>m</sup> That ascribed to Athanasius is among the *spuria* of the Benedictine edition, tom. ii. p. 241.

The other ascribed to Chrysostom is among the *spuria* of the Benedictine edition, tom. v. p. 630.

<sup>n</sup> Chrysostom contra Jud. Hom. vi. p. 648. Hom. vii. p. 617, 664. tom. i. In Psal. iv. p. 20. In Psal. xlix. p. 231. In Johann. Hom. lxxiv. p. 437. tom. viii. In Hebr. Hom. xi. p. 115, 116. tom. xii.

<sup>o</sup> Isidor. Pelusiot. lib. iii. Ep. 75. p. 284.

<sup>p</sup> Augustin. ad Honorat. Epist. cxv. p. 439. tom. ii.

<sup>q</sup> Cyrill. Alex. de Rect. Fide, p. 160. See my Review, vol. vii. p. 381, 385.

passage, by which we may reasonably interpret his meaning in other passages † not so clear, or left doubtful and undeterminate. I shall here take notice but of one, which runs thus: “The table bearing the *shewbread* (proposition of loaves) signifies the *unbloody sacrifice*, by which we are blessed, while we eat the *bread* from heaven, that is, *Christ*.” Here the phrase of *unbloody sacrifice* undoubtedly refers to the sacrament of the *Eucharist*, in and by which we are *blessed, sanctified, &c.* It may be a name for some part of the *service*, or for the *whole solemnity*, (as the whole is often denominated for some eminent part,) but cannot reasonably be construed as a name for the *elements*, considered as a *material sacrifice*. The *bread* from *heaven*, the *thing signified*, rather than the *signs*, would, by Cyril’s account, have the better title to that name. But I apprehend, that the phrase of *unbloody sacrifice* in that place, denotes not the *heavenly bread* itself, nor the *signs*, but the *memorial service* performed by those signs, which is the usual signification of the phrase. Upon the whole, I may presume to say, that no clear testimony hitherto, within the six first centuries, has been produced, whereby to prove that *unbloody sacrifice* was ever made a name for the *elements* of the *Eucharist*. If the *Fathers* had entertained such a notion, no doubt but they could have expressed it, in words as clear and as full as the

† Cyrill. Alex. explicat. Anthem. xi. p. 156. De Adorat. in Spiritu, lib. xiii. p. 457. Epist. ad Nestor. p. 72. In Malach. p. 830.

‡ Σημαίνει μὴ ἡ τράπεζα τὴν περίθειον ἰχουσα τῶν ἄρτων, τὴν ἀνάμικτον θυσίαν δι’ ἧς εὐλογούμεθα, τὸν ἄρτον ἰεθίουται τὸν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ταυτίστι. Χρυσόστ. Cyrill. Alex. de Adorat. in Spiritu. lib. xiii. p. 457.

N. B. This passage, or part of it, [in Unbloody Sacrif. p. 20.] is strangely rendered thus: “The table which had the shewbread denotes the unbloody sacrifice of the bread, or loaves.” Here τῶν ἄρτων, which belong to περίθειον going before, (for περίθειον τῶν ἄρτων amounts to the same with τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς περιθίσεως,) are separated from περίθειον, and περίθειον alone is rendered *shew-bread*, very oddly, that so τῶν ἄρτων may be thrown to ἀνάμικτον θυσίαν, to make an unbloody sacrifice of loaves in the *Eucharist*: not considering, that ἄρτων, in the apodosis of the comparison, follows after, and means, not the *elements*, but the *bread from heaven*, that is, *Christ*, as Cyril himself interprets.

Church writers of the eighth<sup>r</sup> and following centuries expressed it; for they wanted no command of language: but since they never did so express it, but those later writers are (so far as appears) the first that did so; it is reasonable to conclude that such an use of that phrase came in about the time that *transubstantiation* (or something very like it) was creeping in. And it is no great wonder if the *signs* then came to be looked upon as the *unbloody sacrifice*, when they were believed to be, or to contain the very *things signified*, the real *body* and *blood* that was once *sacrificed* upon the cross<sup>s</sup>. I would not be understood, by my tracing the use of the phrase of *unbloody sacrifice* in so particular a manner, as if I thought that much depended upon it: for had the Fathers really denominated the *elements* by that name, it would amount only to this, that as the elements, by a *metonymy*, have been sometimes called *tremendous sacrifice*, often *body* and *blood*, or *Christ slain*, and the like; so, by the same *metonymy*, they have been likewise called *unbloody sacrifice*. But as the fact has not been proved, that the elements were ever so named by the ancient *Fathers*, I thought it proper first to consider the fact, and to give what light I could to it, because it may be of some use to know, how the ancients understood and applied their *terms* or *phrases*.

## VII.

There was another ancient distinction similar to the

<sup>r</sup> The Second Council of Nice (A. D. 787.) speaks plainly enough: *ὅτι ὁ Κύριος οὗτοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ἢ πατέρες, οὐδένα ἴσταν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ προσφερόμενῳ ἀναιμάκτῳ θυσίαν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ αἷμα. Concil. Nicæna. ii. Act. vi. p. 370, 371. So also had Damascen before, tom. i. p. 272. So likewise Ambrosiaster, of the same century, [vid. Oudin, tom. i. p. 1858.] in these words:*

Offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam, rationabilem hostiam, *incruentam hostiam*, hunc *panem* sanctum, et *calicem* vitæ æternæ. *Pseud-Ambros.* serm. v. In Oudin. tom. i. 1904. So the interpolated Sacramentary of Greg. I. and so other *late* liturgies.

<sup>s</sup> See Sacramental Part of the Eucharist explained, in the preceding Charge, p. 235—253.

former, though of somewhat less note; and that was the distinction of *smoky* and *unsmoky* sacrifice. The Jewish and Pagan sacrifices were of the *smoky*, *fiery* kind; but the Gospel sacrifices were free from *fumes* and *vapours*, and inflamed only with the *fire* of the Holy *Spirit*. It will be of use, carefully to examine this distinction, on two accounts: first, in order to observe whether the Fathers *opposed* to the *smoky* sacrifices, which they rejected, clean *bread* and *wine*, or *clean life*; and, next, to see whether that *fire* of the *Spirit*, which they supposed to fall upon the *Christian sacrifice*, was conceived to come upon the eucharistical *elements*, or upon the *communicants*. By these two marks, we may as easily and as certainly discern what was or what was not the *Christian sacrifice*, in their estimation, as a *tree* is known by its fruits, or a *face* by its lines and features.

1. Let us see then, first, how the Fathers expressed the distinction, and what it was that they *opposed* to the *smoky* sacrifices of Jews and Pagans.

Justin, according to his way of stating the *Christian sacrifice*, in opposition to *incensings*, among other articles, opposes only the *sacrifice of praise*<sup>t</sup>. Athenagoras does the like<sup>u</sup>. Irenæus opposes a contrite heart, and *prayers*<sup>w</sup>, upon the strength of St. John's authority in the Revelations<sup>x</sup>. Clemens of Alexandria opposes to *incensings*, &c. a sacrifice of the *heart*, and of *speech* exhaled from *holy souls*, and the like<sup>y</sup>. Tertullian opposes *clean prayers*<sup>z</sup>. So does Origen<sup>a</sup>. Lactantius opposes to *blood*,

<sup>t</sup> Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 19. See above, p. 299. and Review, vol. vii. p. 353, &c.

<sup>u</sup> Athenag. p. 48, 49. See above, p. 304. Review, vol. vii. p. 360.

<sup>w</sup> Irenæus, lib. iv. c. 17. p. 248, 249. ed. Bened. See Review, vol. vii. p. 353, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Revel. v. 8.

<sup>y</sup> Clem. Alex. Pædag. lib. iii. c. 12. p. 306. Strom. ii. p. 369, 370. Strom. vii. p. 848. Compare Review, vol. vii. p. 365, 366.

<sup>z</sup> Tertull. Apol. c. xxx. p. 277. Ad Scap. c. ii. p. 69. See above, p. 304. and Review, vol. vii. p. 367, 368.

<sup>a</sup> Origen contr. Cels. p. 755. See Review, vol. vii. p. 371.

*fumes*, and *libations*, a *good mind*, a *clean breast*, an *innocent life*<sup>b</sup>. Hitherto no one thought of opposing *clean bread* or *pure wine* to the *smoky* sacrifices.

Eusebius, speaking of Constantine, says; “*To God*, “the King of all, he sent up gratulatory prayers, being a “kind of *unfery* and *unsmoky* sacrifices<sup>c</sup>.” Elsewhere, to *blood*, *smoke*, and *nidor*, he opposes purity of thought, sincerity of affection, soundness of principles, and the like<sup>d</sup>. The author of some commentaries under the name of Ambrose, who is supposed to have collected much from Chrysostom, opposes *faith* and *prayers* to the *smoky* sacrifices<sup>e</sup>. Now, if the eucharistical *elements* had been the *Christian sacrifice*, how easy and how natural must it have been for the *Fathers* to flourish upon that topic; the cleanness, the pureness, the usefulness of *bread* and *wine*, or the *intrinsic value* of it, (as some have done since<sup>f</sup>;) beyond all the *gold and silver of the Indies*. Indeed, how could they miss of it? Or how could they forbear to employ their finest strokes of oratory upon it? Yet they were totally silent on that head. Say, that their *disciplina arcani*, in some measure, restrained them from exposing their *mysteries* to strangers and aliens: yet that *disciplina* scarcely commenced so soon as some of these *authorities* g. Besides that, their *mysteries* were not un-

<sup>b</sup> Illic nihil exigitur aliud quam sanguis pecudum, et fumus, et inepta libatio: hic bona mens, purum pectus, innocens vita. Lactant. Instit. lib. v. c. 19. p. 279.

<sup>c</sup> Τῶ πάντων Βασιλεῖ Θεῷ ἰσχυρίστους ἰσχύς, ὑπερὶ τινος ἀπέρου καὶ ἀπάτου θυνίας ἀπερίμωτο. Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. i. c. 48. p. 526.

<sup>d</sup> Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. e. 6. p. 23. c. 8. p. 29. c. 10. p. 40. See Review, vol. vii. p. 380.

<sup>e</sup> Nonne altare est cœleste fides nostra, in quo offerimus quotidie orationes nostras, nihil habens carnalis sacrificii quod in cineres resolvatur, nec in fumos extenuetur, nec in vaporations diffundatur. Pseud.-Ambros. in Hebr. viii.

<sup>f</sup> See Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 62. Compare my Appendix above, p. 186.

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Tentzelii Exercitationes: contr. Schelstrat. part. ii. p. 32, &c. Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. p. 407, 408. Dallæus de Cult. Relig. p. 1085, 1113. Calvoer de Rit. p. 639.

known to Julian, for instance, (who had been a Christian reader,) nor to several other adversaries: and they would not have been *silent*, whatever the *Christians* themselves were. Yet Julian charged not the Christians with *bread sacrifice*, but with *no sacrifice*<sup>h</sup>, (excepting *Christ's*,) and so the general charge used to run<sup>i</sup>. I know but one instance, and that as late as the fifth century, which looks at all like a charge of *bread-sacrifice* upon Christians: and perhaps by that time there might be more colour for it (though *colour* only hitherto) than there had formerly been. It is the instance of Benjamin the Jew, mentioned in Isidore, who objected, that the Church's *oblation* appeared *new* and *strange*, with respect to *bread's* receiving a *sanctification*, considering that the *law* had prescribed *bloody* sacrifices. Isidore makes a very obscure reply, telling the Jew, that the *law* had prescribed *blood* and *nidors*, in the court of the temple *without*, but that *within* there was a *table* of *bread*, (meaning the *shewbread*,) which was not exposed to the *view* of the ancient people<sup>k</sup>. It does not appear from this passage, either that Isidore admitted the bread for a *sacrifice*, or that Benjamin the Jew (who speaks only of bread's being a sanctified offering) charged him with it. But suppose it related to the name of *sacrifice*, as sometimes given to the elements in the *passive* view, (metonymically called *sacrifice*, as representing and exhibiting the grand sacrifice *received* or

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Cyrill. Alex. contr. Jul. lib. ix. p. 307, 308. lib. x. p. 345. edit. Spanhem.

<sup>i</sup> Justin. p. 14, 19, 387. ed. Lond. Athenag. p. 48, 49. Clem. Alex. p. 306, 369, 370, 688, 836, 848, 860. Minuc. Fel. sect. 32. p. 183. Tertull. Apol. 277. Ad Scap. c. ii. p. 69. Origen. contr. Cels. lib. viii. p. 755. ed. Bened. Arnobius, lib. vi. p. 189. Lactantius, Instit. lib. v. c. 19. Epit. p. 169, 204. Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. lib. x.

<sup>k</sup> Καὶ τὴν ἑξήγησιν τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἴσθι· προσφορὰν ἑπινοῆσθαι, ἰσχυρὰν ἄρτος τὸν ἀγιασμένον ἐπισπεισῶμεν, τοῦ νόμου αἵματι τὰς θυσίας ἐρίζοντες. Πῶς δὲ οὐ συνεχῆς — ἵτι τὰ αἵματα καὶ τὰς πύσσας ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ, καὶ τῶς προσκεκρίτους τοῦ ἀγιασμένου νόμου ἐκάλεισιν γίνεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ ἄρτους ἢ ἴσω ἰδιόχριστο κράσιζα, ἢ τῇ σπλαχνίᾳ ἀθίωτος λαῷ· ὡς ὑπάρχει αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κρησσομένη καὶ ὡς διδουμένη ἀλλόθιαι μὴ γινούσιν. Isidor. Petus. lib. i. Ep. 401. p. 104. alias 92.

participated in the Eucharist,) it would not concern the question about the *active* sacrifices performed in the Eucharist, but the sacrifice *received* in it, *symbolically* received; and so the instance would be foreign to the point now in hand<sup>1</sup>. I shall have occasion to say more of the *elements*, as denominated as a sacrifice, in the *receptive* way, and in a *metonymical* sense, as I go on, and therefore may pass it over now.

2. Having observed what kind of Christian sacrifices were constantly *opposed* to the *smoky* and *fiery* sacrifices of Jews and Pagans, (not pure and clean bread or wine, but pure heart and life,) I am next to take notice what kind of *fire* the Christians acknowledged in their sacrifice, and how they interpreted it. As *Pagans* boasted of their *culinary* fires, which consumed their sacrifices, Christians, in their turn, spake as highly of the *fire* of the *Spirit*: let us now see in what manner they managed that topic.

Clemens of Alexandria, opposing the *fire* of the *Spirit* to the gross culinary fires, observes, that that spiritual fire does not sanctify the *flesh*, (of animals,) but *sinful souls*<sup>m</sup>. The *souls* were the sacrifice in his account. Upon the *material* scheme, had it been his, he must have said, that the *fire* does not sanctify *animal flesh*, but *bread* and *wine*.

Origen supposes every man to have his *burnt sacrifice*

<sup>1</sup> I may just take notice of another instance, sometimes pretended out of Origen; as if he had *opposed* an *offering* to God of *bread*, to the *sacrifices* which Pagans offered to *dæmons*. See the passage in Review, vol. vii. p. 97. The strength of the objection lies only in a *false* rendering of that passage in Origen: the material words, justly rendered, run thus: "We eat the *loaves brought*, with thanksgiving and prayer over the things *given*." Bellarmine would translate *προσφερόμενους ἄρτους*, *loaves offered*, understanding them as offered *to God*: whereupon Albertine makes this reflection:

Quod Bellarminus ambigue vertit *oblatus*, et de oblatione *Deo* facto intelligit, id partim ex linguæ Græcæ ignorantia, partim ex præjudicio inepte supponit. *Albertin.* p. 362.

<sup>m</sup> Φαμὶν ὃ ἡμῖς ἀγιάζω τὸ πῦρ, οὐ τὰ κρέα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτωλοῦς ψυχάς. Πῦρ οὐ σαρμῶνον καὶ βάνανον, ἀλλὰ τὸ φρόνημον λίγοντες, τὸ διακονούμενον διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς δευχαμίτης [f. δευχαμίτης] τὸ πῦρ. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* vii. p. 851.

in himself, offered from the *altar* of his heart, which *altar* he himself *fires*, and keeps always *burning*<sup>n</sup>: that is to say, by the fire of the Spirit *within*, not by any fire from *without*, as in the case of the Jewish and Pagan *burnt offerings*.

Jerome represents the *man*, his *thoughts*, *words*, and *works* sublimated, in a manner, by the *fire* of the Spirit, and, as it were, *spiritualized* into an heavenly composition, so as to become a most acceptable *sacrifice* unto God<sup>o</sup>. The persons themselves, by his account, are the *sacrifice*; and upon them the *fire* of the Spirit falls: whereas, had the *elements* been supposed the *sacrifice*, the *fire* must have fallen there, and the whole turn of the comparison must have been differently contrived. Austin's accounts are much the same with Jerome's, while he supposes the *old man* to become in a manner *extinct*, and the *sacrifice* of the *new man* to be lighted up by the *fire* of the Spirit P.

The most eloquent Chrysostom frequently flourishes upon the same topic. In one place, elegantly describing the nature and excellency of *self-sacrifice*, he proceeds to speak of the *fire* which comes upon it, as being of a very

▪ Unusquisque nostrum habet in se holocaustum suum, et holocausti ipse succendit altare, ut semper ardeat. Origen. in Levit. Hom. ix. p. 243.

◦ Ut corpus pinguis literæ, quod significatur in lege, et prophetæ nubilum igne Domini, hoc est, Spiritu Sancto (de quo dicit Paulus, Spiritu ferventes) in spiritualem et tenuem substantiam convertantur.—Ut per ignem Spiritus Sancti omnia quæ cogitamus, loquimur, et facimus, in spiritualem substantiam convertantur, et hujusmodi Dominus delectatus sacrificiis placabilis fiat. Hieronym. in Ezech. xlv. p. 1021, 1022.

‡ Extincto vel infirmato per pœnitentiam veteri homine, sacrificium justitiæ, secundum regenerationem novi hominis, offeratur Deo; cum se offert ipsa anima jam abluta, et imponit in altare fidei, divino igne, id est, Spiritu Sancto, comprehendenda. Augustin. in Psal. iv. p. 14. tom. iv. Conf. tom. v. p. 973, 976. and Gaudentius Brix. de Exod. ii. p. 807.

Totos nos divinus ignis absumat, et fervor ille totos arripiat. Quis fervor? De quo dicit Apostolus, Spiritu ferventes. Non tantum anima nostra absumatur ab illo divino igne sapientiæ, sed et corpus nostrum, ut mereatur ibi immortalitatem. Sic levetur holocaustum ut absorbeatur mors in victoriam. Augustin. in Psal. l. p. 474.



new and uncommon kind, such as subsists not upon *wood*, or material *fuel*, but is *self-subsisting*, *lives* of itself, and *gives life* to the *sacrifice*, instead of consuming it<sup>9</sup>. Most certainly he thought not of the *material* elements: for he excludes all such gross *fuel*; neither were the elements capable of receiving *life* by the *fire* of the *Spirit*. Cyril of Alexandria reasons on this head exactly the same way, mysticizing the *fire*, and appropriating it to the *persons* considered as the *sacrifice*<sup>1</sup>. What the Fathers aimed at in all was, to point out something in the *Christian sacrifices* correspondent or analogous to the ordinary sacrificial *fires* of the Pagans, and to the *holy fire* of the Jews, but yet far *exceeding* both, in purity, dignity, and energy.

But perhaps it may be here asked, Do not the same Fathers often speak of the *Holy Spirit's* coming upon the eucharistical *elements*, as well as upon the *persons* of the communicants? It is very certain that they do; for they supposed the Holy Ghost to *consecrate*, or *sanctify*, the elements into *holy signs*, or *sacred symbols*, representative and exhibitivive of the *body* and *blood* of Christ: not to make *holocausts* or *sacrifices* of them, but *sacraments* only<sup>2</sup>; *signs* of the *grand sacrifice*, spiritually given and received in and through them. Therefore the *Fathers* do not speak of the *fire* of the *Spirit*, as inflaming or warming the *elements*; neither could they with any propriety or aptness do it: if there be any chance expression seeming to look that way<sup>3</sup>, it can be understood only of the

<sup>9</sup> Κατὰ γὰρ αὐτὸς τῆς θουίας ἰ νόμος διὰ καὶ παραδέχεται τοῦ πνεύματος ἰ τρίτου. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ξύλον δύταυ καὶ ὕλης ὑποκυμίνης, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ζῆ τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἡμῖν τρεφόν, καὶ οὐδὲ κατακαίου τὸ ἱερῶν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον αὐτὸ ζωοποιῶ. *Chrysostom. in Rom. Hom. xx. p. 657. tom. ix. Conf. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. p. 383. tom. i. Item de Pœnitent. Hom. ix. p. 349. tom. ii. Item de Beat. Philogon. Hom. vi. p. 500. tom. i. et in Hebr. Hom. xi. p. 115, 116. tom. xii. Item, tom. i. p. 648, 671.*

<sup>1</sup> Cyrill. Alex. contr. Jul. lib. x. p. 345. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 385.

<sup>2</sup> See Sacramental Part of the Eucharist explained in the preceding Charge, p. 231, &c.

<sup>3</sup> There is a passage of Ephræm Syrus, which has been thought to contain some such meaning: Christus Salvator noster *ignem et spiritum manducan-*

gift of the Spirit *accompanying* the elements to every worthy communicant. Upon the whole, it is manifest, that when the Fathers oppose their *sacrificial fire* (*viz.* the fire of the Spirit) to the *sacrificial fires* of Jews and Pagans, they supposed it to enlighten, inflame, and spiritualize, not the *elements*, but the *persons*: therefore the persons were the true and acceptable sacrifices, *living sacrifices*, burning and shining *holocausts*.

## VIII.

There was another ancient, but less noted distinction of sacrifice, into *false* and *true*; or into *untrue* and *true*, which amounts to the same.

Philastrius, speaking of the Jewish sacrifices, observes, that they were not perpetual, nor *true*, nor salutary<sup>a</sup>. That is to say, that though they had truth of *propriety*, and were, properly speaking, *sacrifices*, yet they had not truth of *excellency*, as the Christian sacrifices have. Justin Martyr, long before, had hinted the same thought<sup>w</sup>. And so also had Lactantius in opposing the *true* sacrifices of Christians to the *false* ones (though he does not expressly so call them) of Jews and Pagans<sup>x</sup>. St. Austin expresses the distinction of *false* and *true* in plain terms; opposing the *true* Christian sacrifice, performed in the Eucharist, to all the *false* sacrifices of the *aliens*. The context may perhaps make it somewhat *doubtful*, whether *true sacrifice* in that place refers to the *grand sacrifice*, or to the *eucharistical sacrifice*, since they are both of

dum atque bibendum præstitit nobis carne vestitis, *corpus* videlicet et *sanguinem* suum. *Ephr. Syrus, de Natura Dei incomprehensibili*, p. 682. But *ignis* there seems to mean the *Logos*, received with the *Spirit*; received, not by the *elements*, but by the *persons* upon their partaking of the elements. Vid. Albertin. p. 453, 454. The same is received in *Baptism* also.

<sup>a</sup> Necessitate indocilitatis cogente, *sacrificia temporalia, non perpetua, nec vera fuerunt* iudæis, nec salutaria. *Philastr. Hæc. cix. p. 221.*

<sup>w</sup> Just. Mart. Dial. p. 389.

<sup>x</sup> Lactant. Epit. p. 169, 204, 205.

<sup>y</sup> Hinc summo veroque sacrificio cuncta sacrificia *falsa* cesserunt. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. c. 20. p. 256.* Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 387.

them mentioned in the same chapter. But I choose to refer the words to the *nearer*, rather than to the more *remote* antecedent, as most natural, and therefore most *probable*: and the commendation there given to the *true sacrifice*, by way of preference, runs no higher than what he elsewhere says of the *sacrifice of the Church*, offered in the Eucharist. <sup>z</sup>That sacrifice Austin prefers, under the name of *true*, before the *false* sacrifices both of Jews and Pagans.

I may just note by the way, that there is another sense of *false* sacrifice to be met with in Cyprian, which belongs not to this place; for he understood *schismatical* sacrifices; which he calls *false* and *sacrilegious* sacrifices, as offered in opposition to the *true* pastors<sup>a</sup>. The Jewish and Pagan sacrifices were denominated *false*, in such a sense as we speak of a *false* diamond, or *false* money, meaning *counterfeit*, *figure*, *imitation*: schismatical sacrifices are called *false* in such a sense as we say a *false* title, a *false* patent, or the like. But enough of this.

## IX.

Hitherto I have been considering such names of distinction as served to discriminate the *Christian* sacrifices from the sacrifices both of *Jews* and *Pagans*. I proceed next to some other distinctions which respected only the *Jewish* sacrifices as opposed to the sacrifices of the *Gospel*. Hereto belongs the distinction between *old* and *new*; which we

<sup>a</sup> Hujus autem *præclarissimum* atque *optimum* sacrificium nos ipsi sumus: hoc est civitas ejus; cujus rei mysterium celebramus oblationibus nostris. Cessaturas enim victimas, quas in *umbra* futuri offerebant Judæi: et *unum sacrificium* Gentes a solis ortu usque ad occasum, sicut jam fieri cernimus oblaturas, per Prophetas oracula increpuere divina. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. xix. cap. 23. tom. vii.

Unde et in ipso *verissimo* et *singulari* sacrificio, Domino Deo nostro agere gratias admonemur. *Augustin. de Spir. et Lit.* c. 11. p. 94. tom. x. *Conf. de Civit. Dei*, lib. x. c. 6. p. 243. tom. vii. Et contr. *Advers. Leg.* lib. i. c. 18. p. 568. tom. viii.

<sup>a</sup> *Dominicæ hostiæ veritatem* per *falsa* sacrificia profanare. *Cyprian. de Unit. Eccles. Eccles.* Sacrilega contra *verum* sacerdotem sacrificia offerre. *Cyprian. Ep.* 69.

meet with first in Irenæus of the second century<sup>b</sup>: who appears to understand the *new oblation* of the offices of piety and benevolence performed at the Christian altar<sup>c</sup>. The sum of his doctrine is, that the *old* sacrifices which the *law* required, and which even then had the *second* place only, have now under the Gospel *no place* at all; and that the *true* sacrifices which then had the *first* place, have now the *sole* place under a *new* form, with many *new* and *great* improvements. The *service*, not the *elements*, are with him the *new oblation*<sup>d</sup>.

Cyprian, after Irenæus, has the same distinction, under the terms of *old* and *new*; observing, that by the accounts given in the Old Testament, the *old sacrifice* was to be abolished to make way for the *new*<sup>e</sup>. He refers to Psalm l. 13, 23. Isaiah i. 11. iv. 6. Mal. i. 10. Not that every text there cited directly asserted so much; for at the same time that the prophets spake slightly of the *old* sacrifices, in comparison, yet God required a religious observance of them: but since those sacrifices were so slightly spoken of, even while their use and obligation remained, that single consideration was sufficient to intimate, that they were to *cease* entirely under a more *perfect* dispensation. So the Fathers understood that matter; and therefore those texts out of the Psalms, and out of the Prophet Isaiah, with others of like kind, were not *foreign*, but were conclusive and pertinent, with respect to

<sup>b</sup> Novi Testamenti *novam* docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo *offert Deo*, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, *primitias* suorum munerum in *Novo Testamento*. *Iren.* lib. iv. c. 17. p. 249. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 362, 364, 365.

<sup>c</sup> The following words of Origen are a good comment upon what is said by Irenæus:

Si quis vel *egentibus* distribuat, vel faciat aliquid *boni operis* pro mandato, *munus* obtulit Deo. *Origen. in Num.* Hom. xi. p. 311. Compare Review, vol. vii. p. 362, 363.

<sup>d</sup> Irenæus hath plainly said, *Deus in se assumit bonas operationes nostras*. *Iren.* lib. iv. c. 18. p. 251. But where hath he said, *Deus in se assumit panem nostrum et vinum nostrum, or pecuniam nostram?* No where.

<sup>e</sup> *Quod sacrificium vetus evacuaretur, et novum celebraretur.* *Cyprian. Testim.* lib. i. c. 16.

the purpose for which they were cited. They did not only prove that the *new* were then comparatively *better* than the *old*, but that a *new* and *better* dispensation should admit of *no other*<sup>t</sup> but the *best*. This I hint, to prevent any one's imagining, because *material* sacrifices obtained along with *spiritual* then, though the spiritual were *preferred*, that therefore so it may be now, under the *last* and most *perfect* economy, where the circumstances are widely different. But I return.

Cyprian, among the *new* sacrifices, reckons the sacrifice of *praise*, the sacrifice of *righteousness*, spiritual incense, that is, *prayers*, and the *pure offering*, whatever it means §.

Eusebius mentions the *new mysteries* of the *New Testament*, contained in the *unbloody* and *rational* sacrifices<sup>h</sup>. From whence appears the vanity of arguing, (as some have done<sup>i</sup>;) that the *new sacrifice*, spoken of by the *Fathers*, could not mean *spiritual* sacrifice, which had obtained long before: for it is *certain* fact, that the *Fathers* did so understand and so apply the name of *new sacrifice*; and therefore it is reasoning against *fact*, or disputing against the *Fathers* themselves, to argue in that

<sup>t</sup> "Prayer and sacrifice, strictly so called, were both acts of worship; " but prayer more *excellent* than *sacrifice*, because *sacrifice* was a rite of " prayer, and a rite which God required *no longer* than till that *most precious sacrifice* of the Son of God was offered for us: the *merit* of which " alone it is, that made the prayers of good men in all ages acceptable." *Cluget on the Worship of the Blessed Virgin*, vol. ii. p. 189. fol. edit.

§ See the meaning of the *pure offering*, mentioned in *Malachi*, explained by *Tertullian* and *Eusebius*, cited in *Review*, vol. vii. p. 368, 379.

<sup>h</sup> Ἐνὶ δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ μόνῃ θυσιαστήριον ἀναίμων καὶ λογικῶν θυσίων κατὰ καιρὸν μυστήρια τῆς πᾶσ καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης. *Euseb. Demonstr. Evang.* lib. i. c. 6. p. 20. Θύσιν καινῶν, κατὰ τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην. *Ibid.* cap. 10. He explains the meaning of *new*, lib. i. c. 6. p. 16.

<sup>i</sup> *Bellarmin. de Eucharist.* p. 749, 751. *Conf. Unbloody Sacrifice*, part i. p. 268, 269.

That pretence has been often answered by learned Protestants. *Pet. Martyr* contr. *Gardin.* p. 54. *Jewell* against *Hard.* p. 421. *Bilson*, p. 696. *Hospinian*, p. 568. *Chrastovius* de *Missa*, lib. i. p. 57. *Mason*, 585. *Du Moulin*. *Buckl.* 432. *Rivet. Cathol.* 106. *Buddæus*, *Miscel. Sacr.* tom. i. p. 54. *Deylingius*, *Miscel. Sacr.* p. 98, 99.

way. Besides that the argument may very easily be retorted, since neither *material* sacrifice, nor *bread sacrifice*, nor *wine sacrifice*, could be reckoned altogether *new*: for they obtained under the *old*, that is, under the *Jewish* economy <sup>k</sup>. In one sense, indeed, they are *new*, (which is no commendation of them,) they are *new Christianity*, having been *unknown* in the Church for six whole centuries or more, and not brought in before the late and dark ages; probably, about the time when *material incense* came in, under the notion of a *Christian* sacrifice<sup>l</sup>. But of this I may say more in another article below. I shall only add here, that St. Austin called the *cross-sacrifice*, Christ's *body* and *blood*, as participated, the *new* sacrifice <sup>m</sup>.

## X.

I proceed to another distinction, as considerable as any before mentioned; and that is of *legal* or *literal*, and *spiritual* or *evangelical*. Indeed, the word *spiritual* may, and sometimes has been *opposed* to *material* or *corporeal*; and so far the distinction would resolve into article the fifth, before considered under the names of *material* and *immaterial*: but here I consider the same of *spiritual* under another conception, as opposed to *literal* and *legal*. The New Testament itself often distinguishes between the *letter* and the *spirit* <sup>n</sup>, that is, between the *Law*, which is the outward *shell*, and the *Gospel*, the inward *kernel*. This distinction may be otherwise expressed by the words *carnal* and *spiritual*: for the word *flesh* is frequently a Scripture name for the external and legal economy <sup>o</sup>, as

<sup>k</sup> Exod. xxix. 40. v. 11, 12, 13. Levit. ii. 4, &c. Numb. xxvii. 13, 14. Compare Brevint on the Mass, p. 116, 121. Kidder, p. 93. new edit. fol.

<sup>l</sup> See Christian Sacrifice explained, Appendix, p. 185. Compare Dodwell on Incensing, p. 222. Claget on the Worship of the Blessed Virgin, p. 188. vol. ii. in fol.

<sup>m</sup> Ut jam *de cruce* commendaretur nobis *caro et sanguis* Domini, *novum sacrificium*. *Augustin. in Psalm. xxxiii.* p. 211. tom. iv. ed. Bened.

<sup>n</sup> Rom. ii. 29. vii. 6. viii. 2. 2 Cor. iii. 6. Compare Christian Sacrifice explained, p. 148. and Glassius's Philolog. Sacr. p. 1427.

<sup>o</sup> Rom. iv. 1. 2 Cor. v. 16. Gal. iii. 3. iv. 23, 29. Philipp. iii. 4. Hebr. vii. 16. Tertullian expresses the distinction by the words *carnalia et spiri-*

opposed to the *spirit*, which is the name for the Gospel, as before hinted. *Earthly* and *spiritual* mean the same with the other  $\rho$ . *Typical* and *true* is but another way of wording the same distinction  $^{\rho}$  between legal and evangelical, as the *Law* was a *type* or *prefiguration* of Gospel-blessings, and as *figure* is opposed to *truth*.

*Symbolical* and *true* differs from the other, only as a *type* differs from a *symbol*, or as a particular from a general: for a *type*, strictly, is a figure of things *future*, as before noted; whereas a *symbol* is a figure of things *past*, *present*, or *to come*. So that both are *figures*, and as such are opposed to *truth*, like as *shadows* to *substance*. In short, the Jewish sacrifices were comparatively *literal*, *carnal*, *terrene*, *typical*, *symbolical*; and the Christian sacrifices are *spiritual* and *true*: such is the import of the present *distinction*, variously expressed in Scripture or in Church writers.

St. Peter uses the name of *spiritual sacrifice* $^{\tau}$ , in such a sense as *spirit* and *truth* are opposed to *type*, *figure*, *shadow*, *symbol*, or *emblem*: for he understood it in the same way as he understood the Church to be a *spiritual house*, and the Jewish *temple* to have been an *emblem* or *figure* of it. So much appears from St. Peter's context. The Fathers took their hints from the Apostle: and their notion of *spiritual sacrifice* appears conformable thereto, as being regulated by it, and copied from it; only taking in St. Paul's account of *reasonable service* $^{\sigma}$ , and our Lord's own rule of worship "in spirit and in truth" $^{\tau}$ , and the several other descriptions given in the New Testament of evangelical sacrifice. There were two things pointed to by the *legal* sacrifices; our *Lord's* sacrifice, and *ours*; his

*talia*. *Adv. Jud.* cap. v. p. 188. So also Jerome on Malachi; and probably some others.

$\rho$  Tertullian uses the distinction of *terrene* and *spiritual*.

$^{\rho}$  Irenæus particularly uses the distinction of *typical* and *true*, lib. iv. cap. 17. Note, that the *truth* of a thing, in Scripture phrase, means the *true interpretation* of it. Dan. vii. 16.

$^{\tau}$  1 Pet. ii. 5.

$^{\sigma}$  Rom. xii. 1.

$^{\tau}$  John iv. 24.

propitiating *merits*, our qualifying *duties* or *services*. The truth of this matter may best appear by a distinct enumeration of particulars, as follows :

1. The legal *incense* pointed to the *perfume* of Christ's mediation<sup>u</sup>, and at the same time to the *prayers* of the *saints*<sup>w</sup>. In these it centered, in these it terminated : and thus the *material* incense is now spiritualized into the evangelical sacrifice of prayer.

2. The *blood* of the ancient sacrifices typically referred to the blood of Christ ; which none can dispute : but it seems withal, that it *symbolically* referred to the *blood* of *martyrs*, who *sacrifice* their lives unto God<sup>x</sup>.

3. The *mincha* of the Old Testament had a *typical* aspect to Christ, as all the *sacrifices* had : but it seems likewise to have had a *symbolical* aspect to the oblation of Christ's *mystical body*, the *Church*<sup>y</sup>.

4. The *daily sacrifice* looked principally to our Lord's *continual* intercession : but it appears to have been likewise a kind of emblem or symbol of Christian *faith* and *service*<sup>z</sup>.

5. The Levitical *memorial* typified the *sweet odour*<sup>a</sup> of Christ : but in symbolical construction it seems also to have pointed to *prayers* and *benevolent works*<sup>b</sup>.

6. Sacrifices in general, typically looking to Christ, are symbolically interpreted of *almsdeeds*<sup>c</sup>.

7. The animal sacrifices of the old law, pointing to

<sup>u</sup> Revel. viii. 3, 4. Vid. Vitringa in loc. Wolfius in loc. Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 1260. Outram, p. 359.

<sup>w</sup> Revel. v. 8. Vid. Vitringa in loc. Dodwell on Incensing, p. 36, &c. Outram, p. 357.

<sup>x</sup> Revel. vi. 9. Vid. Vitringa in loc. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 536—561. Biblioth. Antiq. tom. i. p. 505. Outram, p. 181.

<sup>y</sup> Rom. xv. 16. Vid. Vitringa in Isa. lxvi. 20. p. 950.

<sup>z</sup> Philipp. ii. 7. Vid. Vitringa de vet. Synagog. l. i. c. 6. p. 70, 71. Wolfius in loc. Conf. Rom. xii. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Ephes. v. 2. Conf. Deylingius's Observ. Sacr. tom. i. p. 315.

<sup>b</sup> Acts x. 4. Phil. iv. 18.

<sup>c</sup> Hebr. xiii. 16. Vid. Wolfius in loc.



the *grand sacrifice*, appear to have had a secondary, symbolical aspect to the *calves* of the *lips* <sup>d</sup>.

8. *Libations* of *wine*, typifying the blood of Christ, are represented as emblems of pouring forth one's blood in martyrdom <sup>e</sup>.

9. Lastly, the *mactation* of animals for sacrifice is interpreted of *mortifying* our lusts and passions <sup>f</sup>.

Thus has the New Testament itself unfolded the *mystical* intendment of the *Law*; giving us the *spirit* instead of the *letter*, *truth* for *figure*, and, in the room of the antiquated *signs*, the *things* themselves *signified* by them. Upon this principle, the *Fathers* of the Church constantly believed and taught, that the *legal* sacrifices were not barely typical of the sacrifice of the cross, but were *signs* also and *symbols* of the *evangelical* sacrifices offered up by Christians <sup>g</sup>; and were to be considered as semblages to realities, or as shadows to substance, or as flesh to spirit. It remains only, that we inquire what they understood the *spiritual sacrifice* to be; for as to the *legal sacrifices*, every one knows what they were, being so particularly set forth, and so minutely described in the Old Testament, and referred to also in the New.

Now as to the *spiritual sacrifices*, besides what is said of them in both Testaments <sup>h</sup>, the *Fathers* have so plainly deciphered them, and so distinctly enumerated them, that there can be no reasonable question made as to what sacrifices they intended by that name. I have elsewhere traced this matter from *Father* to *Father*, through the

<sup>d</sup> Hosea xiv. 2. Hebr. xiii. 15.

<sup>e</sup> Phil. ii. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 6. Conf. Deyling. Observat. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 547, &c. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 48, &c.

<sup>f</sup> Rom. vi. 6. Coloss. iii. 5. See Dodwell on Incense, p. 34. and Cranmer against Gardiner, p. 109. alias p. 422, 423.

<sup>g</sup> Irenæus, lib. iv. cap. 7. ed. Bened. Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 849. ed. Ox. Origen in Levit. Hom. ii. p. 191. edit. Bened. Nazianz. Orat. xxxviii. p. 484. Chrysostom. in Hebr. Hom. xi. p. 807, 808. Augustin, tom. vii. p. 241, 242, 255. viii. 345, 586. x. 94. Pseud-Ambros. in Hebr. viii. p. 447.

<sup>h</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 348, 349.

first *four* centuries<sup>i</sup>, and I need not repeat here: only I may add two or three authorities to the *many* before cited, for confirmation.

Origen is very full and express in his accounts of *spiritual sacrifice*<sup>k</sup>. Chrysostom is so minute and particular in specifying what the *spiritual sacrifices* are, that nothing can be more so<sup>l</sup>. He does it by giving in a *catalogue of Christian virtues* or *graces*: those are the *spiritual sacrifices*, in his estimation. When he says, they need no *instruments*, nor are confined to *place*, he is to be understood of the virtuous *habits* resting in the mind, and which, if all *opportunities* of outward exercise were wanting, would still be *spiritual sacrifices*; so that they do not *absolutely* need *instrument* or *place*, as *material* sacrifices do. And when they do need both, as to the *outward* exercise of those *virtues* or religious *habits*, still it is the *inward heart*, rather than the *outward work*, which is properly the acceptable sacrifice. Such is Chrysostom's account of this matter, and such the concurring sentiments of all *antiquity*. Great pains have been taken<sup>m</sup> to find, if it were possible, some ancient voucher for a different account of *spiritual sacrifice*, or for some different application of that *name*: but not a single instance has been found, nor, I suppose, ever will be.

Bellarmino pretended<sup>n</sup> that Tertullian understood Abel's sacrifice of a *sheep* to have been a *spiritual sacrifice*. All

<sup>i</sup> See my Review, vol. vii. p. 350—430.

<sup>k</sup> *Immolatio spiritalis est illa quam legimus, immola Deo sacrificium laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua. Psal. l. 14. Laudare ergo Deum, et vota orationis offerre, immolare est Deo. Origen. in Num. Hom. xi. p. 311. tom. ii. ed. Bened. conf. p. 191, 205, 248, 363, 418, 563.*

<sup>l</sup> *Τί τί ἐστιν ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία; τὰ διὰ ψυχῆς, τὰ διὰ πνεύματος. Joh. iv. 24. "Ὅσα μὴ διῶται σώματος, ὅσα μὴ διῶται ἰσχύων, μὴ τόπων. Τὰ δὲ ἐστὶν ἰσχύια, σωφροσύνη, ἰλιμωσύνη, ἀνημακία, μακροθυμία, ταπεινοφροσύνη. Chrysostom. in Hebr. Hom. xi. p. 115. tom. xii.*

<sup>m</sup> *Τί τί ἐστι λογικὴ λατρεία; ἡ πνευματικὴ διακονία, ἡ πολιτεία ἢ κατὰ Χριστὸν— ταῦτα γὰρ πῶν, ἀναφέρεις λογικὴν λατρείαν. Τουτίστιν, οὐδὲν αἰσθητόν. Chrysost. in Rom. Hom. xx. p. 658. tom. ix.*

<sup>n</sup> See Unbl. Sacrifice, part i. p. 22—27, 61.

<sup>o</sup> Bellarmin. de Eucharist. p. 751. Comp. Unbl. Sacrifice, part i. p. 25.

invention and misconstruction. Tertullian did not, could not suppose so wild a thing; which would have been a flat contradiction to his known, certain, settled principles every where else in his works<sup>o</sup>, and in that very work also which Bellarmine referred to. Tertullian does not say, that Abel's sacrifice was a *spiritual* sacrifice, but that Cain, the elder brother, was a type or prefiguration of the elder people Israel, and Abel a type or prefiguration of the younger people, the Christian Church; and that as their sacrifices were *different*, (one being of the fruits of the ground, the other of the flock,) so a *difference* in the sacrifices of the two different people was thereby intimated<sup>p</sup>. Not precisely *the same* difference, but a *difference*: and as to the kind of difference, Tertullian sufficiently explains it afterwards, when, to the *terrene* sacrifices of the elder people, the *Jews*, he opposes the *spiritual* sacrifices of the younger people, the *Christians*, and specifies what they are; namely, the sacrifices of *lauds*, and of a *contrite heart*<sup>q</sup>. But some may ask, how then did Tertullian make out what he pretend'd? He made it out thus: that the *Jewish* and *Christian* sacrifices would be *different*, like as Cain's and Abel's were, and that one should be *rejected*, and the other *accepted* by God: so far the analogy or similitude holds, and no farther. For if we were to strain it with the utmost rigour, the Jewish sacrifices ought *all* to have been of the *fruits* of the

<sup>o</sup> See some of the passages collected in Review, vol. vii. p. 367—370.

<sup>p</sup> Sic et sacrificia *terrenarum* oblationum et *spiritualium* sacrificiorum prædicata ostendimus. Et quidem a primordio majoris filii, id est, Israel terrena fuisse in Cain præostensa, et minoris filii Abel, id est, populi nostri, sacrificia *diversa* demonstrata. Namque major natu Cain de fructu *terre* obtulit munera Deo, minor vero filius Abel de fructu *ovium* suarum. Respexit Deus in Abel et in munera ejus, in Cain autem et in munera ejus non respexit.— Ex hoc igitur *duplicita* duorum populorum *sacrificia* præostensa jam tunc in primordio animadvertimus. *Tertull. adv. Jud.* cap. v. p. 187.

<sup>q</sup> Quod non *terrenis* sacrificiis, sed *spiritualibus* Deo litandum sit, ita legimus ut scriptum est; *Cor contribulatum et humiliatum hostia Deo est: et alibi, Sacrificu Deo sacrificium laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua.* Sic igitur sacrificia *spiritualia laudis* designantur, et *cor contribulatum* acceptabile sacrificium Deo demonstratur. *Tertull. ibid.* cap. v. p. 188.

ground, which is false in fact; and the *Christian* sacrifices ought to be *animal sacrifices*, which is manifestly absurd. In short, as Tertullian has not said, nor could consistently say, that Abel's sacrifice was a *spiritual* sacrifice; so neither can it, by any clear or just consequence, be concluded that he meant it, or had any thought of it. But it is farther pleaded, that *material* things have sometimes the epithet of *spiritual* or *rational* superadded; and why then may not a *material* sacrifice be a *spiritual* or *rational* sacrifice in a just sense of the word? I answer: the question is not, whether the epithet *spiritual* may not in a just sense be applied to a *material* subject; for it is certain that it may, and St. Paul<sup>r</sup> himself more than once so applies it: the question is not, how the single word *spiritual* may be applied, but what the phrase of *spiritual sacrifice*, according to Scripture usage, and according to Church usage, signifies. It has not been shown, that either the New Testament or the ancient Fathers ever gave the name of *spiritual sacrifice*, either to the *elements* of the Eucharist, or to any *material* offerings. *Spiritual sacrifice* is a *phrase* of a *determined* meaning in the New Testament and ancient Church writers; and it is but a vain attempt to look for any real countenance from them, by retaining the *phrase*, unless the *ideas* which they affixed to it be retained also: for the *doctrine* will be *different*, though the *words* or *phrases* should still continue the *same*.

<sup>r</sup> 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. xv. 44.

N. B. The word *spiritual* sometimes means the same with *mystical*, and may be applied to any *material* thing considered as a *sign* of something *spiritual*. In such a sense, St. Paul speaks of *spiritual* (that is, *mystical*) *meat*, *drink*, *rock*. In the like sense, we may, among the Fathers, meet with the phrases of *mystical* (or *spiritual*) *oil*, or *waters*, or *bread*, or *cup*, or *supper*, or *table*, meaning a *material* sign or symbol of something *spiritual*. Cyprian seems to denote the elements by the name of *spiritual and heavenly Sacrament*. *Epist.* lxxiii. p. 108. But still the phrase of *spiritual sacrifice* is not applied to them (so far as appears) among Church writers truly *ancient*: for in that phrase *spiritual* denotes not the *sign* of something else, but the very *thing signified*, like as in the phrase of *spiritual house*, parallel to it in the same verse of St. Peter. (1 Pet. ii. 5.)

If it should be suggested, after all, that the *carnal, earthly, legal* sacrifices meant only such sacrifices as wanted the *inward* service of the *heart*, and that *spiritual sacrifices* meant sacrifices offered from and with the *spiritual service* of the heart; it is obvious to reply, that then the *distinction* which we are now upon could not have served the purpose for which it was brought, could not have shown the *absolute* preference due to the *Christian* sacrifices above the *Jewish*. The *Jews*, as many as were really good men, joined the sacrifice of the *heart* with the *material* offerings: and if that had been all the meaning which the *Fathers* went upon in their disputes with the *Jews*, the *Jews* might have retorted, irresistibly, that their sacrifices were as truly *spiritual* as the Christian sacrifices could be, and *more valuable*, as having *all* that *spirituality* which the *Christians* pretended to, and a rich offering besides, of *bullocks*, suppose, or *rams*. The *Fathers* were wiser than to lay themselves open, and to expose the Christian cause, by any such meaning: besides that, their own repeated explications of the phrase of *spiritual sacrifice* are a flat contradiction to it.

#### XI.

I pass on to another celebrated distinction of sacrifice, into *Aaronical* and *Melchizedekian*; which served also to distinguish the *Christian* sacrifices from the *Jewish* ones, but in a view somewhat different from that of the distinction immediately preceding. For as the distinction of *literal* and *spiritual* was intended chiefly to set forth the superior excellency of what Christians *actively* offered by way of sacrifice, so the present distinction of *Aaronical* and *Melchizedekian* was intended chiefly to set forth the superior excellency of what Christians *passively* receive, participate, or feast upon, under the name and notion of a sacrifice.

Christians have an *altar*, whereof they partake<sup>s</sup>. And

<sup>s</sup> Hebr. xiii. 10. See my Review, vol. vii. p. 107, &c. And compare Dalmæus de Cult. Lat. Relig. lib. viii. cap. 24. p. 1117. Patrick, Mens. Myst.

that altar is *Christ* our Lord<sup>t</sup>, who is *altar*, *priest*, and *sacrifice*, all in one. Under the law, those were different things, because any one of the legal *figures* alone could not represent Christ in all the three several capacities: but in him they are all united. He performed his sacrifice in the *active* and *transient* sense, once for all, upon the cross: he distributes it daily in the *passive* and *abiding* sense of it, to all his true servants, to every faithful communicant. His table here below is a secondary *altar* in two views; first, on the score of *our own* sacrifices of *prayers*, *praises*, *souls*, and *bodies*, which we offer up from thence<sup>u</sup>; secondly, as it is the *seat* of the consecrated *elements*, that is, of the *body* and *blood* of Christ<sup>w</sup>, that is, of the *grand sacrifice*, symbolically represented and exhibited, and spiritually there *received*; received by and with the *signs* bearing the name of the *things*.

These things premised, we may now find our way opened towards a right conception of the *Melchizedekian* sacrifice, whereof we *partake* in the Eucharist, and which is

p. 85. Spanheim. Dub. Evang. tom. ii. p. 843. Mason de Minister. Anglic. p. 625.

<sup>t</sup> Revel. viii. 3, 5. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 362. and Vitringa in loc. with Dodwell on Incensing, p. 39—44. and Dallæus de Cult. Lat. Relig. p. 1117.

Est ergo *altare* in cœlis (illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes diriguntur) et *templum*; quemadmodum Johannes in Apocalypsi ait, et apertum est templum Dei. *Irenæus*, lib. iv. cap. 17. p. 249. Conf. Clem. Alex. p. 209. Origen. in Levit. Hom. i. p. 186. In Josh. Hom. xvii. p. 438. and others referred to in Review, vol. vii. p. 362.

<sup>u</sup> " It is called a *table* with reference to the *Lord's Supper*, and an *altar* " on the score of the *sacrifice of praise* and *thanksgiving* there offered to " God Almighty." *King Edward's Letter*, A. D. 1550. in Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 304. See Reasons against Altars in 1559. Ibid. p. 433. and compare my Christian Sacrif. expl. p. 156. Dow's Answer to Burton, p. 116.

<sup>w</sup> Quid enim est *altare*, nisi *sedes* corporis et sanguinis Christi? Quid vos offenderat Christus, cujus illic per certa momenta *corpus* et *sanguis* habitabat—fregistis etiam calices, *sanguinis Christi* portatores. *Optat. adv. Parmen.* lib. vi. p. 289.

In the other sense or view of an *altar*, the same author says, *Altaria Dei*, in quibus *vota* populi, et *membra* Christi portata sunt.—Illac ad aures Dei ascendere solebat oratio. *Optat. ibid.*

infinitely preferable to all the sacrifices of Aaron, considered barely as *sacrifices*: for as to their *sacramental* capacity, that is of distinct consideration. For the first two centuries and a half, Melchizedek was considered as giving *holy food* to Abraham, a symbol of the *true food* from heaven, and a prelude to what our Lord himself should afterwards do in the *institution* of the *Eucharist* <sup>x</sup>.

About the middle of the third century, Cyprian, considering our Lord's *passion* as the *sacrifice* commemorated and participated in the Eucharist, (which is a right notion, rightly understood,) expressed that commemorative act by the word *offer* <sup>y</sup>: by which he could mean only the *presenting to view*, or *representing*; as is very evident, since our Lord's *passion* could be no otherwise *offered*, neither could the *cross-sacrifice* be reiterated. Christ cannot again be *sacrificed*, no, not by himself; much less by any one else. From hence it may be perceived in how lax a sense Cyprian used the word *offer*. Therefore no certain conclusion can be drawn from it, in favour of the strict *sacrificial* sense of the word, whether he speaks of *offering* bread and wine <sup>z</sup>, or of offering Christ's *passion*, unless some other circumstances determine the

<sup>x</sup> Μελχισεδεκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλῆμ, ὁ Ἰερὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ ἐν ὄντι καὶ ἐν ἔργῳ, τὴν ἀγιασμὴν διδοὺς τροφὴν, εἰς τύπον ὑψιστοσύνης. Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. p. 632. Conf. Tertullian. adv. Judæos, cap. iii. p. 185. Contr. Marc. lib. v. p. 472.

<sup>y</sup> Passionis ejus mentionem in *sacrificiis* omnibus facimus: *passio* est enim Domini *sacrificium* quod *offerimus*. Calicem in *commemorationem* Domini et passionis ejus *offerimus*. Cyprian, Ep. lxiii. p. 109. Calix qui in *commemorationem* ejus offertur, p. 104.

<sup>z</sup> Quod Melchizedech sacerdos Dei summi fuit, quod *panem* et *vinum* obtulit, quod Abraham benedixit.—Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui *sacrificium* Deo Patri obtulit, et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchizedech obtulerat, id est, *panem* et *vinum*, suum scilicet *corpus* et *sanguinem*, p. 105.

Compare St. Austin on the same head:

Ipse est etiam sacerdos noster in æternum, secundum ordinem Melchizedech, qui seipsum obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris, et ejus *sacrificii similitudinem* celebrandam in suæ passionis memoriam commendavit; ut illud quod Melchizedech obtulit, Deo jam per totum terrarum orbem in Christi Ecclesia videamus offerri. Augustin. de divers. Quest. q. 61. p. 34. tom. vi.

meaning. Cyprian cannot be understood of our Lord's sacrificing *himself* in the Eucharist, because that would be too *high* for *us* to aim at; nor of his sacrificing the *elements*, because that would have been too *low* a sacrifice for *him*, at least, to offer. When he speaks of offering a *true and full sacrifice* <sup>a</sup>, (meaning *bread* and *wine* jointly, and not either singly,) he understands that bread and wine (which he calls *sacrifice*, by the same figure as he often calls them *body* and *blood*) to be a *true* and *full* representation or *image* of the sacrifice of the cross. So Cyprian himself explains it, *viz.* by *offering* (that is, *presenting*) an *image* of Christ's sacrifice in *bread* and *wine* <sup>b</sup>. The sum of his doctrine is, that the *typical* Melchizedek blessed Abraham in and by *bread* and *wine*, considered as *symbols*, *images*, *figurations* of our Lord's passion and sacrifice; and that the true Melchizedek so blessed his own disciples in delivering to them the *benefits* contained in his *passion*, by the like symbols. We may go on to Eusebius, who explains this matter more clearly, and who, besides, more distinctly expresses the difference between Aaronical and Melchizedekian sacrifices, in these words :

“ As he (Melchizedek) being a priest of the Gentiles,  
 “ no where appears to have used *corporeal* sacrifices, but  
 “ *blessed* Abraham with wine only and bread; just in the  
 “ same manner, first our Lord and Saviour himself, and  
 “ then all priests from him, among all nations, consum-  
 “ mating the *spiritual hierourgy*, according to the laws of  
 “ the Church, do represent the mysteries of his *body* and  
 “ of his salutary *blood*, in *bread* and *wine*. Melchizedek  
 “ foresaw these (mysteries) by a *divine* spirit, and previ-

<sup>a</sup> Ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur; et sacrificium *verum et plenum* tunc *offert* in Ecclesia Deo Patri, si sic incipiat *offerre* secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse. Ep. lxiii. Compare my Review, vol. vii. p. 375.

<sup>b</sup> Ut ergo in Genesi per Melchizedech sacerdotem benedictio circa Abraham possit rite celebrari, præcedit ante *imago* sacrificii Christi, in *pane* et *vino* scilicet constituta. Quam rem perficiens et adimplens Dominus, panem et calicem mixtum vino *obtulit*, et qui est plenitudo veritatis, veritatem præfiguratæ *imaginis* adimplevit. P. 105.



“ously made use of those *images* of things to come<sup>c</sup>.” Whereupon we may observe, 1. That Melchizedek, by this account, used no *corporeal* sacrifices: therefore he did not sacrifice *bread* and *wine*, which undoubtedly are both *corporeal*. It is in vain to contend that he meant *bloody*, as opposed to *unbloody*. His word is *corporeal*, not *bloody*; and he had used the same word just before, speaking of *corporeal* oil, in the common sense of *corporeal*<sup>d</sup>. 2. That the Melchizedekian priests, after our Lord, exercise a *spiritual hierourgy*, as opposed to *corporeal* sacrifices before mentioned: therefore their sacrifices are *spiritual*; and therefore, again, they sacrifice not *bread* or *wine*, but they represent or signify the *mysteries* of the passion in *bread* and *wine*<sup>e</sup>; they perform a *memorial service* by those symbols, a direct memorial of the *grand sacrifice*. 3. That Melchizedek, by a *divine* spirit, foresaw the *mysteries* of the same *grand sacrifice*, and made a *figuration* of it in *bread* and *wine*, and by those symbols conveyed a *blessing* to Abraham<sup>f</sup>, the blessing of the great atonement. Herein lay the superior excellency of *Melchizedek's sacrifice*, (that is, *figuration* of the grand sacrifice,) that it directly pointed to and exhibited *true* expiation,

<sup>c</sup> Ὡςτις γὰρ ἱερεὺς ἰσθῶν τυγχανῶν, οὐδαμῶ φάινεται θυσίας σωματικαῖς κίχρημίνας, οἷον ἢ μίση καὶ ἄρτην τὸν Ἀβραάμ εὐλογῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρεῖς αἰῶνες μὴν αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν, ἴσχυρα οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες ἱερεῖς ἀπὸ πάντων τὰ ἰσθῶ τὴν πνευματικὴν ἰσχυροῦντες, κατὰ τοὺς ἑκατημιστικοὺς διαμοῖς, ἱερουργίαν, οἷον καὶ ἄρτην, τοῦτοι σάματος αὐτοῦ καὶ σωτηρίου αἵματος αἰνέσσονται τὰ μυστήρια, τοῦ Μελχισεδεκ ταῦτα πνύματι θείῳ προτιδιωρημένος, καὶ τῶν μίλλοτων ταῖς ἰπίαις προκίχρημίνας. Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. v. cap. 3. p. 223. Conf. Theodorit. in Psal. cx. p. 852.

<sup>d</sup> Οὐδὲ διὰ σινουστοῦ καὶ σωματικοῦ ἑλαίου κίχρηστο, οὐδὲ τίλος ἔξην ἱμαλλί τῆς ἱεροσύνης. Euseb. *ibid.* p. 223.

<sup>e</sup> So Epiphanius on this article. Ὁ Μελχισεδεκ αὐτῷ [Ἀβραάμ] ἀπέστα, καὶ ἔξιστα αὐτῷ ἄρτην καὶ οἶνον, προτυπῶν τῶν μυστηρίων τὰ αἰνύματα, ἀντίτυπα τοῦ σάματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, λίγοντος, ὅτι ἰγῶ ἰμι ἄρτης ὁ ζῶν, καὶ ἀντίτυπα τῶ αἵματος, τοῦ ἰκ τῆς πλυτῆς αὐτοῦ νυχθίντος καὶ βύσαντος εἰς κάθαρσην τῶν κικνωμένων καὶ βαντιμένων, καὶ σωτηρίαν τῶν ἡματιῶν ψυχῶν. Epiaphan. Panar. Hær. iv. n. 6. p. 472.

So Julius Firmicus of that time: Melchizedech, rex Salem, et sacerdos summi Dei, revertenti Abraham, cum pane et vino, benedictionis obtulit gratiam. *Bibl. P. P.* tom. iv. p. 114. ed. 1618.

while Aaron's directly conveyed *temporal* blessings only, and a *temporal* atonement<sup>ε</sup>. It must indeed be owned, that *true* expiation was conveyed under the *legal veils* to persons fitly qualified: but those legal sacrifices, in their *sacrificial* capacity, did nothing of that kind. What they did of a *saving* kind was in their *sacramental* capacity: for, that they were *sacraments*, as well as sacrifices, is an allowed principle among knowing Divines of all principles or persuasions<sup>h</sup>. Where then was the difference between the Aaronical sacrifice and Melchizedekian, if both were *sacramental* conveyances of the same blessings, and if neither of them availed any thing in their *sacrificial* capacity, properly speaking? The difference lay here, that Melchizedek was considered as conveying the *true* expiation *directly* and *plainly*, by the symbols of bread and wine, and not under the *dark* covers of a *legal* expiation, which but *remotely* and *obscurely* pointed to it. He feasted himself and Abraham directly upon the *grand sacrifice* itself, as Christian priests do now: Aaron feasted himself and his people directly upon nothing but the *legal* sacrifices, and the *legal, temporal* expiations. But this distinction will yet be better understood, by some other passages of the *Fathers*, which I am going to subjoin in their order.

St. Jerome, more than once, mentions the distinction between the Aaronical and Melchizedekian sacrifices. He declares, in one place, that Melchizedek did not (like Aaron) sacrifice *irrational* victims, but *offered* bread and

<sup>ε</sup> This matter is clearly expressed by an author of the twelfth century, under the name of Cyprian.

Hoc maxime discernere debet Christiana religio, quod sanguis *animalium* a sanguine *Christi* per omnia differens, *temporalis* tantum habeat vivificationis effectum, et vita eorum *finem* habeat, et sine ulla revocatione terminum constitutum, ideoque ad obtinendam *æternitatem* non potest proficere —Bibimus autem de sanguine *Christi*, ipso jubente, vitæ *æternæ* cum ipso et per ipsum participes. *Pseudo-Cyprian. de Cena*, p. 113. edit. Bened.

<sup>h</sup> Cudworth on the Sacram. chap. ii. p. 23, &c. Gerhard, tom. iv. p. 292, 297. Alanus de Eucharist. p. 502. Chamier, tom. iv. p. 14, 15. Vossius de Idololatr. lib. i. cap. 41. p. 151, 152. Cloppenburg, Schol. Sacrific. p. 9, &c. Buddæus, Instit. Theolog. p. 687.

wine, that is, the *body* and *blood* of the Lord<sup>1</sup>. He does not say, *sacrificed* bread and wine, but *offered*, (a word of some latitude,) and he presently after interprets them by the *body* and *blood*. So that Melchizedek, according to him, offered no sacrifice but the *grand sacrifice*: and he could not properly *sacrifice* that *body* and *blood*, which were not then in being, but he *figured* it by *symbols*<sup>k</sup>, and therewith conveyed the  *blessings* of it; feasting Abraham, not with legal victims, but with *Christ* himself. This appears to be his sense of that matter; which will be farther confirmed by other passages of the same Father. He gives a kind of summary of the sentiments of Hippolytus, Irenæus, two Eusebius's, Apollinaris, and Eustathius, in relation to Melchizedek; importing, "that he sacrificed " no victims of flesh and blood, took not the blood of the " brute animals upon his right hand; but he dedicated a " *Sacrament* in bread and wine, in the simple and pure sacrifice of Christ<sup>l</sup>." So I point and translate the sentence; altering the common punctuation, only as to the placing of a single comma, to make out the sense. As to what he says of not receiving blood on the *right hand*, (or *right thumb*,) I suppose it alludes to the Levitical rites of consecration to the priesthood<sup>m</sup>, which Melchizedek had nothing to do with. He received his *priesthood* in some

<sup>1</sup> Quod autem ait, *Tu es sacerdos in æternum, secundum ordinem Melchizedech*, mysterium nostrum in verbo *ordinis* significatur, nequaquam per Aaron irrationalibus victimis immolandis, sed oblato *pane* et *vino*, id est *corpore* et *sanguine* Domini. *Hieron. Quæst. Hebraic.* p. 520. tom. ii. ed. Bened.

<sup>k</sup> Postquam *typicum* Pascha fuerat completum, et agni *carnes* cum Apostolis comederat, assumit *panem* qui confortat cor hominis, et ad *verum* Paschæ transgreditur *Sacramentum*: ut quomodo in *prefiguratione* ejus Melchizedech, summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum *offerens* fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis *representaret*. *Hieronym. Comment. in Matt.* xxvi. p. 128. tom. iv. part. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Neque carnis et sanguinis victimas immolaverit, et brutorum sanguinem animalium dextra susceperit, sed pane et vino, simplici puroque sacrificio Christi, dedicaverit *Sacramentum*. *Hieron. Epist. ad Evangel.* p. 571. tom. ii.

<sup>m</sup> Exod. xxix. 20.

other way, and he exercised it in a different manner; not by *sacrificing* animals, but by *dedicating* or consecrating a *Sacrament*<sup>n</sup>, in or with *bread* and *wine*: that is to say, with the *simple* and *pure* sacrifice of *Christ* alone, represented and exhibited by and under those symbols. This appears to be St. Jerome's sense, and his full sense. For like as he had, in a passage before cited, interpreted bread and wine by what they are *signs* of, namely, by *body* and *blood* of the *Lord*, so here he interprets them by the same thing, under the equivalent expression of the *simple and pure sacrifice of Christ*. And as he had in a second passage, before cited, interpreted the *offering* bread and wine, of a *figuration* and *representation* of the *true body* and *blood*, so he may reasonably be presumed to *mean* the same thing here. He calls the *sacrifice of Christ*, thus represented, thus exhibited, *simple* and *pure*, as not blended with any *typical sacrifices* or legal *expiations*, but standing perfectly clear of them, and nakedly viewed in its own *simplicity*, free from such legal incumbrances: *represented*, indeed, by *symbols*, but yet so represented as that the *things signified*, the *body* and *blood*, and the *true expiation*, are as plainly, as directly offered to every man's *faith* and *understanding*, as the *signs* are to the outward

<sup>n</sup> Recurre ad Genesim, et Melchisedech regem Salem hujus principem invenies civitatis: qui jam tum in *typo Christi* panem et vinum obtulit, et *mysterium Christianum* in Salvatoris sanguine et corpore dedicavit. *Hieron. ad Marcell.* p. 547. tom. iv. part 2.

N. B. Jerome considered Christ's *body* and *blood* as *symbolically* contained in the exhibitiv signs: and no wonder, when in the same Epistle he could write thus: Sepulchrum Domini quotiescunque ingredimur, toties *jacere in syndone cernimus Salvatorem*, &c.

I interpret the dedicating a *Sacrament* in or with Christ's *body* and *blood*, in such a sense as St. Austin says, *Mare rubrum — passione et sanguine Domini consecratum*. [In Psal. lxxx.] And, *Unde rubet Baptismus, nisi Christi sanguine consecratus*? In Johan. Tract. xi. That is to say, the *Sacrament* of Baptism is made an *exhibitiv sign* of Christ's *blood*: which is, its *consecration*, or *sanctification*, or *dedication*, to high and holy purposes. The *blood signified*, and spiritually exhibited, by *water* in one *Sacrament*, by *wine* in the other, gives the *holy sanction* to both *Sacraments*: for without that, they would be no *Sacraments* at all.

senses, and both are alike spoken of in *plain* and *clear* terms. If it was not altogether so in Melchizedek's sacrament, or figurative sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, yet certainly it is in *ours*: and this consideration renders it vastly preferable to the *legal* sacrifices; though they also darkly were *sacraments* of the same things, and were much more valuable in that their *sacramental* capacity than in any other.

St. Austin often speaks of this matter. He understood the Melchizedekian sacrifice, (as opposed to Aaron's,) of sacrifice *passively* considered; not as *offered* to God, in a proper sense, but as exhibited to, and *received*, or participated by men<sup>o</sup>. The want of observing the difference between a *sacrifice* considered as *actively* offered, and as *passively* received, has made strange confusion in what concerns the Melchizedekian *sacrifice*, spoken of by the Fathers<sup>p</sup>. Yet this matter was clearly understood, as low as the times of Charles the Great<sup>q</sup>, and much lower: and even Thomas Aquinas, of the thirteenth century, has given a just account of it; rightly distinguishing between the *oblation* of a sacrifice and a *participation*<sup>r</sup>. To be

<sup>o</sup> Quod ergo addidit, *manducare panem*, etiam ipsum *sacrificii* genus eleganter expressit.—Ipsum est sacrificium, non secundum ordinem Aaron, sed secundum ordinem Melchisedech: qui legit intelligat.—Quia enim dixerat superius, dedisse se domui Aaron cibos de victimis Veteris Testamenti, ubi ait, *Dedi domui patris tui omnia quæ sunt ignis, filiorum Israel in escam*. Hæc quippe fuerunt sacrificia Judæorum: ideo hic dixit *manducare panem*: quod est in Novo Testamento *sacrificium* Christianorum. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. xvii. cap. v. p. 466, 467. tom. vii. Conf. Ep. 177. p. 626. tom. ii. Et in Psal. xxxiii. p. 210, 211. tom. iv. In Psal. cvi. p. 1211. In Psal. cix. p. 1241. tom. iv. De Quæst. Octogint. q. lxi. p. 34. tom. vi. De Civit. Dei, lib. xvii. p. 435, 480. Contr. Advers. Leg. p. 570, 571. tom. viii.

<sup>p</sup> See my Appendix, p. 199—202, 208.

<sup>q</sup> Jam verus Melchisedech, Christus videlicet, rex justus, rex pacis, non *pecudum victimas*, sed sui nobis corporis et sanguinis *contulit* Sacramentum. *Carol. Magn. Capit. prolix.* lib. iv. cap. 14. p. 520. Conf. Haymo Halberst. In Psal. cix. p. 597. Theodulf. de Ordinat. Baptismi, cap. 18. Anselm [sive Herveus Dolensis] in Hebr. v. p. 416. et in Hebr. vii. p. 423. Walafrid. Strab. de Reb. Eccl. cap. xvi. p. 674.

<sup>r</sup> In sacerdotio Christi duo possunt considerari, scilicet ipsa *oblatio* Christi, et *participatio* ejus. Quantum ad ipsam *oblationem*, expressius figurabat

short, as the sacrifices of Aaron, in their *oblatory* view, were no way comparable to the *spiritual* Gospel sacrifices, in their intrinsic value, or in regard to the *Divine* acceptance; so neither were the blessings, or the sacrificial *feasts* of Aaron and his *altars*, worthy to be named in comparison to the spiritual blessings, or spiritual banquet, given to believers, whether by the *typical* or the true Melchizedek. If we interpret what the *Fathers* say in relation to the Melchizedekian sacrifices, as opposed to the Aaronical, by this key, every thing, I presume, will be easy and clear: but without it all is confusion. I know but of one objection to this account, and that not weighty; namely, that the *Fathers* sometimes speak of Melchizedek as *offering* something to *God*, and not barely as *distributing* to Abraham and his company. But then let it be remembered, that the word *offer* is a word of a *large* and *lax* meaning, importing any kind of *presenting*, either *to view*, (as when Hezekiah spread a *letter* before the *Lord*;) or *for consecration*, or the like. And it is further to be noted, that the *Fathers*<sup>t</sup>, some of them at least, (as Am-

sacerdotium Christi sacrificium legale per sanguinis effusionem, quam sacerdotium Melchisedech, in quo sanguis non effundebatur. Sed quantum ad *participationem* hujus sacrificii et ejus *effectum*, expressius præfigurabatur per sacerdotium Melchisedech, qui *offerebat* panem et vinum, significantia, ut Augustinus dicit, ecclesiasticam *unitatem*, quam constituit *participatio* Christi: unde etiam, in nova lege, *verum* Christi sacrificium *communicatur* fidelibus sub specie panis et vini. *Aquin.* part. iii. q. 22. art. 6. p. 61.

<sup>s</sup> 2 Kings xix. 14. Isa. xxxviii. 14.

<sup>t</sup> Ambrosius, tom. i. p. 714. ed. Bened. Philastr. Hær. cix. p. 221. Hær. cxliv. p. 314, 316. Chrysostom. adv. Jud. Hom. vii. p. 671. tom. i. in Hebr. p. 128, 129. tom. xii. Augustin. contr. Advers. Leg. p. 570, 571. tom. vii. Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. lib. v. cap. 3. p. 223.

Ambrosiaster well expresses that notion. Quantum est inter Aaron et Christum, tantum est quodammodo inter Judæos et Christianos; superiora etiam et *sacrificia*. Talia videlicet offeramus sacrificia, quæ in illud sanctuarium cœlestis offerri possunt: non jam pecudem et bovem, non sanguinem et adipem; omnia hæc soluta sunt, et pro eis introductum est *rationabile obsequium*. Quid est *rationabile* obsequium? Quod per *animam*, quod per *spiritum* offertur.—Quid est Deum *in spiritu* adorare, nisi in *charitate* et *fide* perfecta, et *spe* indubia, et sanctis animæ *virtutibus*? *Pseud-Ambros. in Hebr.* vi. p. 443.

brose, Philastrius, Chrysostom, Austin, and perhaps Eusebius,) understood Melchizedek to have *offered* a sacrifice of *lauds* to God, besides his *conveying* the *grand sacrifice*, that is, the blessings and benefits of it to Abraham.

## XII.

Having thus far observed, by what names of distinction Christian sacrifices were discriminated from Jewish and Pagan, jointly or singly considered, I may pass on to some other notes of distinction, by which Christian sacrifices, differently circumstantiated, were distinguished one from another. Here may come in the distinction between *external* and *internal* sacrifice, which is of very different consideration from a distinction before mentioned, between *extrinsic* and *intrinsic*.

Origen, mysticizing the two *altars* which belonged to the *temple*, the *inner* and the *outer* altar, makes *mental* prayer or service to answer to the incense on the one, and *vocal* prayer to answer the burnt offerings on the other. Such was his notion of *internal* and *external* sacrifice under the Gospel<sup>u</sup>. Neither is it amiss, provided we take in *manual service*, or *good works*<sup>w</sup>, into the notion of *external sacrifice*, to render that branch of the division complete. But here it is to be noted, that though *mental* service *alone* may make *internal* sacrifice, yet *vocal* or *manual* alone, without *mental*, will not make *external* sacrifice. *Outward* service is but the *shell* and *carcase* of sacri-

<sup>u</sup> *Altaria vero duo, id est interius et exterius, quoniam altare orationis indicium est, illud puto significare quod dicit Apostolus, Orabo spiritu, orabo et mente. Cum enim corde oravero, ad altare interius ingredior—Cum autem quis clara voce, et verbis cum sono prolatis, quasi ut ædificet audientes, orationem fundit ad Deum, hic spiritu orat, et offerre videtur hostiam in altari quod foris est ad holocaustumata populi constitutum. Origen. in Num. Hom. x. p. 303.*

<sup>w</sup> *Good works* were always eminently reckoned among the *Christian sacrifices*, as may be seen in Justin, p. 14. Clemens of Alexandria, p. 836, 848. Chrysostom, tom. v. p. 231, 503. and indeed in all the Fathers. How that is to be understood, see in Review, vol. vii. p. 354, 355.

fice, without the sacrifice of the *heart*<sup>z</sup>. How both the *internal* and *external* sacrifice are performed in the Eucharist, see particularly noted and explained in Dean Field<sup>y</sup>.

## XIII.

Christian sacrifices may be divided into *private* and *public*: which is a distinction somewhat *like* to, but not altogether the *same* with the former. For though *internal* sacrifice, as such, is always *secret*, yet it may be performed *in company* with others, as well as when we are *alone*: and though *external* sacrifice, as to the *outward* part, is open to view, may be *seen* or *heard*, yet it may be performed *in private*, as well as *in company*. Therefore both external and internal sacrifices may be subdivided into *private* and *public*, accordingly as they are respectively offered up to God, either from the *private closet* in retirement, or from among our brethren met together in the public *assemblies* for the same purpose. Private prayer is *private sacrifice*, and public prayer is *public sacrifice*. Good works likewise are *sacrifices*, if really and strictly *good*, if *referred* to God and his *glory*: therefore when they are done in private, they are *private sacrifices*; but if so done as to “shine before men,” for an example to them, then they become *public sacrifices*.

## XIV.

Christian sacrifices may be distinguished likewise into *lay-sacrifice* and *clerical*. In a large sense, all good Christians are *sacrificers*, and, so far, *priests* unto God<sup>z</sup>. St. Austin, in few words, well sets forth both the *agreement*

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Chrysostom. in Rom. Hom. xx. p. 657. tom. ix. Origen, tom. ii. p. 363. ed. Bened. Nazianz. Orat. i. p. 38. Gregor. M. Dial. iv. cap. 59.

<sup>y</sup> Field on the Church, p. 204.

<sup>x</sup> Exod. xix. 5, 6. 1 Pet. ii. 9. Revel. xx. 6. Just. Mart. Dial. p. 386. Irenæus, lib. iv. cap. 8. p. 237. Tertullian de Monogam. cap. vii. p. 529. Origen in Levit. Hom. ix. p. 236, 238. Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. xviii. c. 33. p. 301. Ambros. in Luc. vi. Hieronym. contr. Lucif. p. 290. tom. iv. Augustin, tom. viii. p. 477, 478, 588. Leo Magn. Serm. iii. p. 107. Isidor. Pelus. lib. iii. Ep. lxxv. p. 284. And compare Review, vol. vii. p. 390, 391. Christian Sacrifice explained, above p. 154, 165.



and the *difference*; observing that all Christians are *priests*, as they are *members* of Christ, members of one and the same *High Priest*; but that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are in a more *peculiar* or *emphatical* manner entitled to the name of *priests*<sup>a</sup>. So I interpret *proprie*<sup>b</sup>; not to exclude Christian laics from being, *properly speaking*, sacrificers, but so only as to exclude them from being *emphatically* and *eminently* such as the *clergy* are: for though they are all equally *sacrificers*, they are not equally *administrators* of sacrifice, in a public, and solemn, and authorized way.

The Protestant doctrine, commonly, has run, that clergy and laity are equally *priests*: not equally *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, or *Deacons*, but equally *priests*, (in the sense of *ιερείς*,) that is, equally *sacrificers*<sup>c</sup>. For like as when a senate presents a petition, by their *speaker*, to the crown, every member of that senate is equally a *petitioner*, though there is but one authorized *officer*, one *speaker* commissioned to prefer the petition in the name of the whole senate; so in this other case, the whole body of Christian people are equally *sacrificers*, though the *clergy* only are commissioned to *preside* and *officiate* in a public character<sup>d</sup>. The *sacrifice* is the *common* sacrifice of the whole body, and so the name of *sacrificer* is also common: but the *leading* part, the *administration* of the sacrifice, is *appro-*

<sup>a</sup> Erunt sacerdotes Dei et Christi, et regnabunt cum illo mille annis, Apoc. xx. 6. Non utique de *solis* *episcopis* et *presbyteris* dictum est, qui *proprie* jam vocantur in ecclesia *sacerdotes*: sed sicut omnes Christianos dicimus, propter *mysticum* *chrisma*, sic omnes *sacerdotes*, quoniam *membra* sunt *unius* sacerdotis. *Augustin de Civit. Dei*, lib. xx. cap. 10. p. 588. tom. vii.

<sup>b</sup> Compare Whitaker upon that place of St. Austin. *Answer to Reynolds*, p. 77. *Chrastovius de Opific. Missæ*, lib. i. cap. 11. p. 104. *Falke's Defence of Translations*, p. 62.

<sup>c</sup> Cranmer against Gardiner, p. 424, 440. *Jewell's Answer to Harding*, Art. xvii. p. 429. *Defence of Apol.* p. 576. *Pet. Mart. Loc. Comm.* p. 788. *Hoepinian. Histor. Sacram.* part. i. p. 584, 590.

<sup>d</sup> Ut ut omnes *offerant* preces, laudes, eleemosynas, et hujusmodi *sacrificia*, non tamen *codem modo* omnes hæc *offerunt*: nec debent homines *privati* pastorum *munus* et officium usurpare. *Suliff. contr. Bellurmin.* p. 294.

priate to the *commissioned* officers; and so also are the names of *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*. This is all that any sober Protestants have meant; though their expressions have been sometimes liable to misconstruction, by reason of the latent ambiguity of words and names. The word *priest* is equivocal, as denoting either a *presbyter* or a *sacrificer*: and the word *sacrificer* is still farther equivocal, as meaning either one who barely *sacrifices*, or one that *administers* a sacrifice in a *public* capacity, as the *head* or *mouth* of an assembly.

Perhaps, after all, some shorter and clearer way might be thought on, for compromising the debates concerning *lay-priesthood*. If “steward of the mysteries of God<sup>e</sup>,” may be thought a good general definition of *sacerdos*, or a title equivalent to *priest*<sup>f</sup>, then the disputes about the precise meaning of *ιερωδς*, *sacrificer*, and how far that name is common to *clergy* and *laity*, may be superseded, and the name of *priest* may be *appropriated* in the sense of *ambassadors* of God, or *stewards* of Divine mysteries, to the *Bishops* only in the *first* degree, and to *Presbyters* in the second<sup>g</sup>, or in a *third* degree to *Deacons* also<sup>h</sup>, as some of the ancients have estimated, perhaps not amiss.

There is yet another way of compromising this matter, *viz.* by passing over the Greek *ιερωδς*, *sacrificer*, and running higher up to the Hebrew word *cohen*<sup>i</sup>, as of the elder house, and primarily signifying a person of *nearest access to God*, or a *commissioned agent between God and*

<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 1.

<sup>f</sup> *Æquipollent ista dispensator mysteriorum Dei, et sacerdos: mysteria namque Dei sancta sunt, et sacerdos dictus est a sacris dandis. Chrastovius, Polan. p. 197.*

<sup>g</sup> Nazianz. Carmin. tom. ii. p. 6. Eusebius, Demonstr. lib. x. cap. 6. Hieronym. in Epitaph. Paulæ. Optatus, lib. i. p. 15. Leo I. de Quadrig. Serm. x. Sidonius, Ep. xxv. Facundus, lib. xii. cap. 3. Conf. Basnag. Annal. tom. ii. p. 652. Hickeys's Christian Priesthood, vol. i. p. 36.

<sup>h</sup> Optatus, lib. i. p. 15. See Hickeys's Christian Priesthood, vol. i. p. 36, 37.

<sup>i</sup> Vox כהן genuina sua significatione notat *familiarioris accessus amicum. Vitringa, Observat. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. 2. p. 272. Conf. in Isa. vol. ii. p. 830, 885, 950, 951.*

*man.* Let but that, or something of like kind, be the proper notation of *priest*, and then it will be a clear case that God's peculiar ambassadors *in ordinary*<sup>k</sup>, solemnly set apart for that office, are more *properly* priests than any other persons can be justly presumed to be.

It has been thought that the *Aaronical* priests were as *agents for men* with God, and that the *evangelical* priests are as *agents for God* with men<sup>l</sup>. There may be something in that distinction: but considering that the *evangelical* priests do offer up both the *spiritual* sacrifices and sacrificers *to God*<sup>m</sup>, as well as bring God's messages and God's blessings *to men*, it seems that their *agency* looks both ways, and perhaps equally; and they appear to be indifferently and reciprocally *agents* from God *to man*, and from man *to God*.

Some have made it a difficulty to conceive how a priest, being ignorant of what passes in the *heart*, can be said to present to God the *intrinsic* and *internal* sacrifices of his people. The truth is, that which the priests offer, they offer in the name or in the person of the Church, as before noted<sup>n</sup>: and therefore what they therein do, is to be considered as the *act* and *deed* of the whole Church, independent of the *knowledge*, or *attention*, or *intention*, or *personal* virtues of the officiating ministers. Their *ministration* is the *outward mean* appointed by God, and by that appointment made the *ordinary* condition of God's acceptance. As God accepts not the devotions of the people, however otherwise sincere or fervent, without the outward

<sup>k</sup> *In ordinary*, to distinguish them from *prophets* as such, who were ambassadors or legates *extraordinary*.

<sup>l</sup> *Prophetarum* et *Apostolorum* erat *res Dei* apud homines agere, *sacerdotum* autem *res hominum* apud Deum. Illi *Dei legati* apud homines, hi *hominum patroni* apud Deum.—*Ministerium Evangelicum* a sacerdotio *Aaronico* multum differt, idque in eo præcipue cernitur, quod illud *pro Deo* apud homines præcipue constitutum sit, hoc *pro hominibus* apud Deum. *Outram de Sacrif.* lib. i. cap. 19. p. 220, 222.

<sup>m</sup> See my *Review*, vol. vii. p. 349, 390, 391. and compare *Vitringa* in *Isa.* lxvi. 20. p. 951.

<sup>n</sup> See above, p. 293.

*Sacraments*, (which are the *ordinary* instruments of conveyance, both with respect to *our* sacrifices and *God's* graces,) so he accepts not, ordinarily, of what Christians presume to *offer* in a solemn public way, without the external ministration of the *proper* officers. And why should not they be supposed as proper instruments to convey the *invisible sacrifices* of men to God, as to convey the *invisible graces* of God to men? To suppose otherwise, would be strangely depreciating the *sacerdotal function*, as if that were concerned only in the *external* part, the *shell* and *carcase* of a *sacrifice*, and the *internal* and *invisible* part (which, strictly, is the sacrifice) were really presented by *none* but the *devout* worshippers themselves. In this way, the *devout laity* (supposing the *priests* to be unattentive) would be the only *sacrificers*, and the *priests*, as such, would not be *sacrificers* at all. But it is certain that the *priests*, in this case, are and ought to be considered, as conveying and recommending all the *invisible* sacrifices, and therefore are properly *sacrificers* in their *sacerdotal* capacity, yea, and more than sacrificers, because *leaders*, *conductors*, commissioned *officers* in the *public sacrifice*, which must be accepted *through them*, even when they themselves (*if unworthy*) shall not be accepted<sup>o</sup>. But enough of this.

## XV.

I pass on to another very celebrated distinction of Christian sacrifices, into *gratulatory* and *propitiatory*: though we have really none of the latter sort but *one*, and that not properly *ours*, but our *Lord's*, performed once upon the cross, but in *virtue* always abiding<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>o</sup> To enforce this consideration, I may add, that the *priesthood* below will thus correspond the more aptly to the *high priesthood* above, if Dr. Lightfoot judged rightly in the words here following:

“ Christ is a *Priest for ever*, still offering *sacrifice* to God; but no more *himself*, but his *people's* sacrifice. And that offering is twofold, *viz.* offering the *persons* of his people to God, as an *acceptable living* sacrifice, (Isa. viii. 18.) and offering their *services* as an acceptable *spiritual* sacrifice to God, Rev. vii. 3.” *Lightfoot*, tom. ii. p. 1261.

<sup>p</sup> Singuli Christiani habent *duplex* sacrificium, *propitiatorium* et *eucharis-*

The word *propitiatory* is equivocal, capable of a *larger* or a *stricter* sense. In a *lax* and *less proper* acceptation, every service *well pleasing* to God is *propitiatory*. In this view, *Baptism* and all our *spiritual* sacrifices are *propitiatory*: particularly *almsgiving* is said to *propitiate* in this qualified sense of the word<sup>9</sup>. And the Fathers frequently so apply the word, with respect to any *good works*<sup>r</sup>. Tertullian sometimes, and Cyprian often, speaks of making *satisfaction* to God by *repentance*, &c. Nevertheless, in the strict and proper sense of *propitiation*, *expiation*, or *satisfaction*, no service, no sacrifice, nor any thing else, ever did or ever could make it, excepting only the all-prevailing sacrifice of the cross. The sacrifice of Christ from *without* is the *meritorious* cause of *propitiation*: our own *qualifying* sacrifices from *within* are the *conditional*: and the two *Sacraments*, ordinarily, are the *instrumental*. As to the *material* elements, in either Sacrament, they are neither an *extrinsic* expiation nor an *intrinsic* qualification, and therefore cannot, with any propriety, be called an *expiatory* or a *propitiatory* sacrifice, no not in the lowest sense of *propitiatory*. Indeed, the *religious use* of them is *propitiatory*, in such a sense as *Christian services* are so<sup>s</sup>: therefore our so *using them*, that is,

*ticum*: sed alterum habent *alienum*, alterum *proprium*. Alienum est propitiatorium a *Christo* oblatum.

Singuli *sacerdotes* habent *duplex* sacrificium; *propitiatorium* et *eucharisticum*.—Non habent *proprium* sacrificium *propitiatorium*, nec placant *suo* sacrificio, sed *alieno*. Quod tamen neque ipsi *offerunt*, sed tantum *accipiunt* fide *fructum* alieni sacrificii. *Melancth. Opp.* tom. iv. p. 514. Unicum est autem re ipsa *propitiatorium*, videlicet *obedientia* filii Dei, quæ est *læteræ* pro nobis, et *meretur* nobis reconciliationem. *Ibid.* p. 603. Conf. Cranmer, *Opp. Posth.* p. 139—150. Pet. Mart. *Loc. Comm.* p. 704. Zanchius's *Tractat. Posth.* p. 421.

<sup>9</sup> Phil. iv. 18. Hebr. xiii. 16. Eccles. iii. 30. xxxv. 2.

<sup>r</sup> Verum sacrificium insinuans, quod offerentes *propitiabuntur* Deum. *Iren.* lib. iv. cap. 17. p. 248.

Qui fraudibus abstinet, *propitiat* Deum. *Minnuc. Fel.* sect. xxxii. p. 183. Conf. Origen in *Levit.* Hom. xiii. p. 255. cited in *Review*, vol. vii. p. 247.

<sup>s</sup> In this sense, *propitiatory* sacrifices are allowed by Protestant Divines: Cranmer against Gardiner, p. 437, 438. Guallelm. Forbes. Consider. Modest.

our *service*, is the *sacrifice*, and not they; and it is an *intrinsic* and *qualifying* sacrifice, not *extrinsic* or *expiatory*. Nothing *ab intus* can properly *expiate*, as is justly observed by a learned writer<sup>t</sup>: *propitiate* it may, but still in such a secondary, subordinate sense as has been mentioned. The extrinsic legal expiations reached only to *temporals*: the *intrinsic*, under Christ's *extrinsic* sacrifice, were even then the *saving* sacrifices, and must for ever be so. *Sacraments*, as such, (not *sacrifices* <sup>u</sup>,) are the *rites of application*, the *means* and *instruments* of conveyance and reception, with respect to the *benefits* of the *great atonement*. The Jewish sacrifices, considered as *Sacraments*, and not otherwise, were such *rites*. The *Eucharist* is eminently so now; and *Baptism*, perhaps, yet more eminently, as it was anciently reckoned the *grand absolution*, and as *life* is before *nutriment* <sup>w</sup>.

## XVI.

There is another distinction of Christian sacrifice, not so commonly observed, but worth the noting; and that is, between sacrifice in a *large, general* sense, and sacrifice in a more *restrained, eminent, or emphatical* meaning<sup>x</sup>. Our

p. 694. Johann. Forbes. Opp. tom. i. p. 619. Spalatens. p. 283. Thorndike's Epil. b. iii. p. 42, 46. Payne on the Sacrif. of the Mass, p. 77. Jackson, vol. iii. p. 299. Morton on the Eucharist, b. vi. p. 60, 72. cum multis aliis.

<sup>t</sup> Johnson's Unbl. Sacrif. part i. p. 299, 300. The use which the learned author intended by that principle, (that nothing *ab intus* can expiate,) was to introduce another *extrinsic, expiatory* sacrifice, after Christ's. A very wrong thought; but which shows, however, that he aimed at a very different kind of *propitiation* and *expiation* than what Divines allow to *intrinsic* and *spiritual* sacrifices.

<sup>u</sup> How absurd the notion is of *applying* one expiatory sacrifice by another expiatory sacrifice, as such, has been often shown: particularly by Morton, b. vi. cap. 11. and Sutfiff. [adv. Bellarmin. p. 233, 249, 308.] and others; but by none better than by Dean Brevint's *Depth and Mystery of the Rom. Mass*, p. 31—34.

<sup>w</sup> See my *Review*, vol. vii. p. 246, 257—260. and Salmasius (alias Simplicius Verinus) contr. Grot. p. 402.

<sup>x</sup> N. B. Most of Bellarmine's arguments to prove that *spiritual* sacrifices are not *proper* sacrifices, resolve into an *equivocation* in the word *proper*: not distinguishing between *proper*, (that is, *special*,) as opposed to *large*, and

Lord's sacrifice, for instance, is eminently *the sacrifice*, infinitely superior to all other: not that it is more *properly* a sacrifice than others which equally fall within the same *general* definition, but it is a more *excellent* sacrifice: in scholastic terms, *non magis sacrificium, sed majus*: not *more* a sacrifice, but a *greater* sacrifice.

The like may be observed of our *spiritual sacrifices*, compared one with another. All religious duties, all Christian services, are *sacrifices* properly so called: but some are more *emphatically* or more *eminently* called by that name, because of some *eminent* circumstances attending them, which give them the greater value and dignity. St. Austin makes every religious act, work, or service, a sacrifice<sup>γ</sup>. Nevertheless, he supposed the work of the *Eucharist*, the sacrifice there offered, to be emphatically and eminently *the sacrifice* of the Church: the *singular sacrifice*<sup>z</sup>, as being, comparatively, of *singular value*; and also the *universal sacrifice*<sup>a</sup>, as comprehending many sacrifices of the spiritual kind, and taking in the whole *redeemed city*, the whole *city of God*.

*Baptism*, in St. Austin's account, was a sacrifice of a

*proper* as opposed to *metaphorical* or *figurative*. From thence appears the use of the present *distinction*.

<sup>γ</sup> Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhaeremus Deo, relatum scilicet ad illum finem boni, quo veraciter beati esse posimus. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 242. See Review, vol. vii. p. 345. and Christian Sacrif. expl. p. 149, 150.

<sup>a</sup> Hæc quippe Ecclesia est *Israel secundum spiritum*, a quo distinguitur ille *Israel secundum carnem*, qui serviebat in umbris sacrificiorum, quibus significabatur *singulare sacrificium*, quod nunc offert *Israel secundum spiritum*. *Augustin. contr. Adversar. Leg. et Prophet.* lib. i. cap. 20. p. 570. tom. viii.

Unde et in ipso verissimo et *singulari sacrificio*, Domino Deo nostro agere gratias admonemur. *Augustin. de Spirit. et Lit.* cap. xi. p. 94. tom. x.

<sup>z</sup> Ut tota ipsa redempta civitas, hoc est, congregatio societasque sanctorum, *universale sacrificium* offeratur Deo, per sacerdotem magnum, &c. Hoc est sacrificium Christianorum, *multi unum corpus in Christo*: quod etiam *sacramento altaris*, fidelibus noto, frequentat Ecclesia; ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea re quam offert, *ipsa* offeratur. *Augustin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 243. tom. vii.

single person, or of a few in comparison<sup>b</sup>: the several single good works of every Christian, were so many sacrifices in his estimation, true sacrifices, not nominal or metaphorical: but still the sacrifice offered in the Eucharist was emphatically the sacrifice of Christians, being a complicated sacrifice, the joint-worship of all, and containing many circumstances which gave it a more eminent right and title to the name of the sacrifice of the Church<sup>c</sup>. The Eucharist therefore was emphatically or peculiarly the sacrifice<sup>d</sup>: that is to say, in a peculiar manner, or with peculiar circumstances, but not in a peculiar or different sense of the name sacrifice; for those things ought to be distinguished, though they have been often confounded. All the confusion, in this matter, lies in the equivocalness of terms, and particularly of the word *proprie*, *properly*, which is variously used, and is subject to various meanings<sup>e</sup>. It may mean *proper*, as opposed to *improper* and *metaphorical*: or it may mean *proper*, as opposed to *large* or *general*; which is the same with *peculiar* as to *manner* and *circumstances* only, not as to propriety of *phrase* or *diction*. All *spiritual* sacrifices are sacrifices *properly* so called, falling under the same *general* reason and definition of sacrifice<sup>f</sup>: nevertheless, the Eucharist is a sacrifice in a

<sup>b</sup> See my Appendix, p. 223. and compare Ambros. tom. i. p. 214, 215. Origen, tom. ii. p. 405. ed. Bened. Chrysost. in Hebr. x. Hom. 20. p. 186. tom. xii. ed. Bened. Bede, Homil. tom. vii. p. 59.

<sup>c</sup> Quomodo autem Spiritui Sancto in pane et vino sacrificium Ecclesie non offertur, quando ipsam Ecclesiam, et templum et sacrificium ipse Spiritus habere cognoscitur. Fulgentius inter Fragment. p. 641.

<sup>d</sup> See Review, vol. vii. p. 348, 349. Christian Sacrif. expl. above, p. 153, 154. Appendix, above, p. 223.

<sup>e</sup> The various meanings are these:

1. *Proper*, as opposed to *aliene*: in Latin, *proprium et alienum*.
2. *Proper*, as opposed to *common*: *proprium et commune*.
3. *Proper*, as opposed to *allusive* or *metaphorical*: in Latin, *proprie dictum, et improprie dictum*.
4. *Proper* or *peculiar*, as opposed to *large* or *general*: *proprie, et lato modo, or largo modo*.

<sup>f</sup> See Review, vol. vii. p. 346, 347. Christian Sacrif. expl. above, 148, 149. N. B. The old Protestant Divines, for the most part, maintained this



more *eminent* way; not *more* a sacrifice, but a more *excellent* sacrifice, as I before distinguished in another case. I thought it necessary to be thus minute and explicit in this article, for the removing vulgar prejudices, and for the preventing common mistakes.

## XVII.

I shall mention but one distinction more, (if it may be called a distinction,) and that is, between sacrifice *real* and *nominal*, between sacrifice *truly* such, and sacrifice in *name* only. It may sound oddly, to distinguish sacrifice into *sacrifice* and *no sacrifice*, which is really the case here: but it is necessary, for the preventing *confusion*, and for the obviating mistakes which frequently arise from a figurative or catachrestical use of *names*. This distinction of *nominal* and *real* is of large extent, comprehending under it several subdivisions; as *instrumental* and *real*, *symbolical* and *real*, *verbal* and *real*, and lastly, *commemorative* and *real*: of which in their order, as follows.

1. The first I call *instrumental* and *real*; as when the *instrument* of a sacrifice (whether for brevity or for any other reason) bears the name of *sacrifice* or *oblation*. Thus,

point against the Romanists, (who first denied it,) that *spiritual* sacrifices are *proper* sacrifices, that is, *properly* so called; which might be particularly proved from their standing *definitions*. See Christian Sacrif. expl. p. 149, 150. I shall only add here the testimony of an adversary, who, speaking of the Protestants, says,

Putant actum contritionis, laudationis, gratiarum actionis pertinere ad sacrificia *proprie dicta*, ex Davide, Psal. l. et ex illo D. Augustini, lib. x. cap. 6. Ceterum toto cœlo errant, &c. *Johan. Puteanus*, q. lxxxiii. Dub. 2. p. 299. A. D. 1624. He goes on to argue the point: a bye-point, which Allen, in 1576, and Bellarmine, about twelve or twenty years after, had insisted upon, for the sake of perplexing a cause, and for the turning a reader off from the main point in dispute. For whatever becomes of the question about *proper* and *improper* sacrifice, (a strife about a *name* only,) one thing is certain, that *spiritual* services are the only *true* and *acceptable* services under the Gospel; and that *material* sacrifices, however *proper*, in respect of *diction*, or use of *language*, are now out of date, and are rejected of God, and are therefore so far from being properly *worship*, that they are more properly *sacrilege* and *profanation*. See my Christian Sacrif. expl. p. 147—152, 156, 157. The Romish sacrifice is neither *true* nor *proper*: but they apply that epithet to a mere *fiction* and *idol* of their own.

for instance, jewels of gold, chains, bracelets, rings, earrings, and tablets, were called an *oblation* for the Lord, to make an *atonement* for souls, before the Lord, as if they had really been *sacrifices*: but it is certain, that those offerings were no more than *instruments* subservient to sacrifices; and that appears to have been the ground and foundation of the way of speaking<sup>h</sup>.

By the like *figure* of speech, by a metonymy of *instrument* for *principal*, we sometimes find the Fathers giving the name of *sacrifice* to the *altar-offerings*, to the *bread* and *wine*; which were the *instruments* of the *benevolent acts*, as also of the *memorial services*, that is, of the *real sacrifices*. Cyprian<sup>i</sup>, certainly, so uses the word *sacrifice*; and probably Tertullian before him<sup>k</sup>; and others after<sup>l</sup>. Such expressions were very innocent in *ancient times*, while Christians were too wise and too well instructed to make any such gross mistakes as the ignorance of later times introduced. The *Fathers* could not then suspect, that such *figures* of speech should ever come to be interpreted with rigour, and up to the *letter*, while sufficiently

<sup>f</sup> Numb. xxxi. 50.

<sup>h</sup> *Aurum* offerri dicitur ad *expiationem* pro animabus. At qui tandem *aurum* aut *stat* aut *figuretur* expiatio, nisi *mediate* et *instrumenti* modo? Dum scilicet sufficientis sacris, et ignitis *subservit* oblationibus: adeo ut nihil sit aliud ad *expiationem* offerri, quam ad usum eorum quæ expiando. *Mede, Dissertat. Triga*, p. 28.

<sup>i</sup> Locuples et dives es, et Dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ *corban* omnino non respicis, quæ in Dominicum sine *sacrificio* venis, quæ partem de *sacrificio* quod pauper obtulit, sumis? *Cyprian de Opere et Eleemos.* p. 242. ed. Bened.

<sup>k</sup> De stationum diebus non putant plerique *sacrificiorum* orationibus interveniendum, &c.—Accepto corpore Domini et conservato, utrumque salvum est, participatio *sacrificii*, et executio officii. *Tertull. de Orat.* cap. xiv. p. 135, 136.

<sup>l</sup> Dum sacris altaribus nullam admovent *hostiam*. Propterea decernimus, ut omnibus Dominicis diebus, altaris *oblatio* ab omnibus *viris* et *mulieribus* offeratur tam *panis* quam *vini*; ut per has *immolationes*, et peccatorum fascibus careant, et cum Abel vel cæteris juste *offerentibus* promereantur esse consortes. *Concil. Matiscons.* ii. Can. 4. Conf. Bona. *Rer. Liturg.* p. 436. A. D. 585. Apostol. *Constit.* lib. ii. cap. 27.

Ille bonus Christianus est, qui—*oblationem* quæ offeratur Deo, in *altari* exhibet. *Eliægius Noviomens. apud Bonam, ibid.* p. 436. A. D. 640.

guarded by the well known standing doctrine of *spiritual* sacrifices. 2. By a like *figure* of speech, the *sign* or *symbol* of a sacrifice often bore the *name* of *sacrifice*; that is to say, by a metonymy of the *sign* for the *thing signified*<sup>m</sup>. Our blessed Lord had used the like *figure* in the very *institution* of the *Eucharist*, as it were, giving the names of *body* and *blood* to the elemental *signs* and *symbols* of them. And what wonder is it, if the *Fathers*, considering that the real *body* and *blood* were a *sacrifice* upon the cross, should sometimes call the elements by the name of *sacrifice*; which was but following the like *figure*, and saying the same thing that our Lord had said, only in *equivalent* terms<sup>n</sup>? If any one should doubt of this solution, with respect to the name of *sacrifice*, sometimes (though rarely in comparison) given to the *elements*; let him say, what other solution can be justly given for their being much more frequently called by the name of *body* and *blood*<sup>o</sup>, yea and of *Christ slain*, or simply *Christ*, or *Lord*, or *God*, or the like. Instances out of antiquity might be here given in great numbers: but I shall content myself with a single passage of St. Ambrose, wherein the *elements* appear to be denominated *Christ*, and *Christ's body*, and *sacrifice*, all in the compass of a few lines<sup>p</sup>, and all by the same *metonymy* of *sign* for *thing signified*, exhibited, participated. He uses the word *offer* in a lax sense, for com-

<sup>m</sup> How usual a *figure* this is, in Scripture itself, with relation especially to *exhibitive* signs, see proved at large, in *Review*, vol. vii. chap. 7. p. 146—158. And compare St. Austin, *Epist.* xviii. p. 286. tom. ii. In *Levit.* q. lvii. p. 516. tom. iii.

<sup>n</sup> Ad summam, regula hæc tenenda est, *Patres quo sensu intellexerunt corpus et sanguinem Christi adesse in cœna, panemque esse ipsum corpus Christi, eodem etiam senserunt in cœna offerri Christum, cœnamque ipsam esse sacrificium hilasticum, sed incruentum; nempe in mysterio, in figura, et imagine.* Zanchius, *ad Ephes.* v. p. 422.

<sup>o</sup> Pene quidem Sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt. *Augustin.* *Serm.* cccliv. p. 1375. tom. v.

<sup>p</sup> Etsi nunc Christus non videtur *offerre*, tamen ipse *offertur* in terris, quando Christi *corpus* offertur: imo ipse *offerre* manifestatur in nobis, cuius sermo sanctificat *sacrificium* quod offertur. *Ambros.* in *Psal.* xxxviii. p. 853. ed. Bened.

memorating, or presenting to Divine consideration: for it cannot be supposed that he thought of literally *sacrificing* Christ, either *above* or *below*. Indeed, he explains his sense of that matter elsewhere<sup>q</sup>, by Christ's *presenting* himself as *intercessor above*, in virtue of his *blood* shed, and by our representing the same thing *below*, in a kind of *imagery*, made of the symbols of bread and wine. Christ's *offering* himself above, is rather *commemorating* a sacrifice, than *sacrificing*<sup>r</sup>: and our doing the like below, is but an *imitation* even of that<sup>s</sup>; so far is it from *sacrificing* either the *signs* or the *things*. But as the *bread* and *wine* represent the *real* body and blood, which were a *real* sacrifice, so they have the names of *body*, and *blood*, and *sacrifices*: and there is no more room for arguing, barely from the *name* of sacrifice, to *real* sacrifice in the one case, than there is for arguing, barely from the names of *body* and *blood*, to *real* body and blood, (that is to say, to *transubstantiation*,) in the other case. The argument proves too much to prove any thing.

It may be said perhaps, that the ancients, while they call the elements *body* and *blood*, do yet by some *additional words* give us to understand, that they meant not the *real* body and *blood*; but where do they give us to understand, that when they called the elements a *sacrifice*, they did not

<sup>q</sup> *Umbra in lege, imago in Evangelio, veritas in cœlestibus. Ante agnus offerebatur, offerebatur vitulus; nunc Christus offertur. — Et offert se ipse quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat. Hic in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit. Ambros. de Offic. lib. i. cap. 48.*

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Grotius de Satisfact. in fine. Compare Review, vol. vii. p. 77.

<sup>s</sup> "As Christ is a *Priest* in heaven for ever, and yet does not *sacrifice* himself afresh, (nor yet without *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, by a *ministry* like to his in heaven." Taylor, *Great Exempl.* p. 407. Conf. Grotius, *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 620, 643, 660. Field, p. 204, 205. Hospinian. *Histor. Sacram.* p. 580, &c. Bucer. *contr. Latom.* p. 147, 175, 249. Brevint on the Mass, p. 74.

believe them to be a *real* sacrifice<sup>†</sup>? I answer, they do it in hundreds of places: by what they say of *extrinsic* and *intrinsic* sacrifice: by what they say of *visible* and *invisible*: by what they say of *material* and *immaterial*: by what they teach of *bloody* and *unbloody*, of *smoky* and *unsmoky*, of *false* and *true*, of *old* and *new*, of *literal* and *spiritual*; and in short, by the whole tenor of their doctrine concerning *spiritual sacrifices*, for six whole centuries together. Could we suppose, that they made the *elements* themselves a proper *sacrifice*, they would be all over *perplexity*, *confusion*, and *self-contradiction*: but allow only, that they made use of the same easy and common *figure* when they called them *sacrifice*, as when they called them *body* and *blood*, and *Christ slain*, or the like<sup>‡</sup>, and then their whole doctrine is *consistent*, *uniform*, and *clear*, all the way through, and without embarrassments? But I proceed.

3. To the head of *nominal* and *real*, I refer *verbal* and *real*. The Latin name *sacrificium*, through the unskilfulness of declining ages, came to be used as equivalent to the word *sacramentum*: so that when the Church writers of those times called the elements a *sacrifice*, they really meant no more than a *sacrament*, that is, *sign* of a sacrifice. The *idea* remained the same as before; but there was a change in the *terms*, a confusion in *words* or *names*. This is plain from the odd *definition* of *sacrifice* given by

<sup>†</sup> See Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 455.

<sup>‡</sup> It may be noted that Vasquez (who admits not the elements to be a *sacrifice*) assigns *three* reasons why the *Fathers* might so call them: the *first* of the three is adapted to the Romish principles: but the *second* and *third* are good.

1. Quia sunt *materia*, quæ *transit* in id quod in *sacrificium* offertur.

2. Quia ipsum Christi *corpus* vocatur panis, et *sanguis* vinum.

3. Quia proponuntur Deo *consecranda*: latius autem patet *oblatio* quam *sacrificium*. Vasquez, *Opp.* tom. iii. p. 414.

Alia ratione dici potest panis et vinum *Deo offerri*, si non addatur in *sacrificium*: quia hoc ipso quod *proponitur* coram Deo *consecrandum*, Deo *offertur*: latius enim patet *oblatio* quam *sacrificium*: et hoc modo explicari possent aliquæ *orationes Ecclesie* in officio missæ, in quibus dicitur panis et vinum *offerri*, vel illorum *propositio* dicitur *oblatio*. Vasquez, *ibid.*

the famous Isidore of Seville, about the close of the sixth century, or beginning of the seventh. He defines *sacrifice* by a *thing made sacred*<sup>x</sup>; which is rather the definition of a *sacrament*, as denoting *an holy sign*, or a thing, before common, *consecrated into an holy symbol*: and it will serve as aptly for the *waters* of Baptism, as for the *elements* of the *Eucharist*. It would be ridiculous to claim Isidore, as making the *elements* a *sacrifice*, in the old or true sense of that name: his sacrifice was *verbal* only, not *real*; a *verbal sacrifice*, a *real sacrament*. However, in process of time, this change of language, this misapplication of a *name*, might, very probably, become a snare to many; and might, with several other concurring circumstances, during the *dark ages*, help to bring in *bread-sacrifice*. When *transubstantiation*, or something like it, was creeping in, one argument pleaded for it ran thus: either the elements must be the *real* and *natural* body and blood, or else the *Christian sacrifices* will be *meaner* than the *Jewish sacrifices* were<sup>y</sup>. Which shows, that the *bread-sacrifice*, or *elemental sacrifice*, was then made a *principle* whereon to build, and therefore had gained some footing in the Church before that time. Then, that very consideration which should have made them look back, to correct their

<sup>x</sup> *Sacrificium est* — omne quod Deo datur, aut dedicatur, aut consecratur. *Sacrificium* dictum, quasi *sacrum factum*: quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis: unde hoc, eo jubente, *corpus et sanguinem* dicimus. Quod dum fit ex fructibus terræ, *sanctificatur et fit Sacramentum*, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei. *Isidor. Hispanens. Orig.* lib. vi. cap. 19. p. 142, 143.

This description, or definition, seems to have prevailed among the Irish Divines of the seventh and eighth centuries. See Usher's *Relig. of ancient Irish*, chap. iv.

Cangius, under the word *sacrificium*, in his Glossary, has brought no higher authorities for such use of the *name* than the seventh century; excepting Patricius, whose pretended writings are of *suspected credit*.

Rabanus of the ninth century, (*De Instit. Cleric.* lib. i. cap. 32.) Honorius of the twelfth, (*Gemm. Anim.* cap. 93.) and Alensis of the thirteenth, (*tom. iv.* p. 192.) seem to follow Isidore. As also do several of the elder Romanists of the sixteenth century: such as Fisher, Tonstall, &c.

<sup>y</sup> *Paschas. Radbert de Corp. et Sangu.* cap. ii. Opp. p. 1559. Algerus, p. 268.

*first error*, served only, in the days of ignorance, to lead them on to *more* and *greater*. If an *elemental* sacrifice is *meaner* (as it really is) than a *Jewish* one, and they were sensible of it, they should have corrected that *false principle* by returning to *spiritual* sacrifice, and then all had been right: they should have considered the elements as symbols of Christ's body, *natural* and *mystical*, and as *instruments* of a *memorial-service*, and so all had been well.

If it should here be objected, that in this way of distinguishing between the *material* symbol and *spiritual* service, even the *Jewish* sacrifices might all be distinguished off into *services*, and no room left for *material* sacrifices under the *Law*, any more than under the *Gospel*: I say, if this should be objected, it is obvious to reply, that the two cases are exceeding *wide*, and the circumstances extremely *different*: for,

1. Material things are frequently called sacrifices under the *Law*, and *accepted* as sweet odour; but the *elements* are never so called under the *Gospel*, nor accepted of, as *sweet odours*.

2. Under the *Law*, God considered the *fat* and the *blood* as his *portion*, to be separated from man's use; and he *accepted* them as entirely his<sup>x</sup>: no such thing is appointed with respect to the *elements* under the *Gospel*; neither does God *accept* them, or any *part* of them as *his*, or as exempt from man's use.

3. Legal and typical *expiations* (sure marks of a proper legal *sacrifice*) were annexed to the *Jewish* oblations: but no such *typical* and *temporal* expiations, distinct from the *true* expiation, is annexed to the oblation of the *elements*, to show them to be a *sacrifice* in themselves<sup>y</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> See Review, vol. vii. p. 152. and compare Mede's *Christian Sacrifice*, p. 471. Cudworth on the *Sacrament*, chap. v. p. 89, 90. Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice*, part i. p. 238. part ii. p. 77, &c.

<sup>y</sup> Eusebius well observes, that God accepted of *animal sacrifices*, while as yet no *better* sacrifice of expiation could be had; that is, while the sacrifice of Christ, signified by the other, was yet *future*: but afterwards the case

4. Under the *Law*, there was need of *extrinsic* sacrifices, and *extrinsic* expiations, to signify, by such *shadows*, that men must be saved by an *extrinsic* sacrifice, to appear in due time; namely, the grand sacrifice<sup>2</sup>: but under the Gospel, the true sacrifice is come, and so that great truth is no longer *shadowed*, or *darkly* insinuated, but *openly* and *fully* declared. And we have now direct immediate access to the *true* sacrifice, and to the *true* expiations: not kept at a distance, as before, by the intervention of *typical* sacrifices, or *typical* expiations: such is our Gospel privilege<sup>3</sup>.

5. All sacrifices, properly *expiatory*, must be something *extrinsic*, for nothing *ab intus* can expiate, as before noted<sup>b</sup>. The *extrinsic* thing, in such a case, is demanded by way of *price*, or *compensation*, for the forfeited *life* of the *man*, or in *lieu* of it<sup>c</sup>. Therefore as the *Jewish* sacrifices were properly *expiatory*, (though in a *legal* and *temporal* way<sup>d</sup>), they must of course be *extrinsic* to the *persons*, and they were so: but *Christians* owning no expiation at all, save only the true and heavenly *expiation* made upon the cross, cannot have any *expiatory* or *atoning* sacrifice besides that. They may have, and they have, *intrinsic*, *gratulatory*, and *qualifying* sacrifices; and those are their *religious duties* and *services*, and nothing else.

was altered, and all such sacrifices were superseded by the sacrifice of Christ. Vid. Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> *Spiritualis effectus est solutio a reatu interno, &c. quam sacrificia adumbrant, non præstant.*—Sed si sacrificia adumbrant ac significant ablationem reatus æterni, necesse est ut *substernatur effectus temporalis*, per quem *spiritualis* ille effectus *representetur*: is vero est ablatio reatus, ratione pœnæ temporalis. *Vossius ad Judic. Ravensp.* p. 86. conf. p. 98.

<sup>3</sup> See Christian Sacrifice explained, above, p. 178, 179. Append. p. 197, 198.

<sup>b</sup> See above, p. 347.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. p. 35.

<sup>d</sup> Hence arises another irresistible argument against the notion of the *elements* being *expiatory sacrifices*: for, if they were so, they should have a *real* and *distinct* expiation of their own, to *adumbrate* the true sacrifice as *future* still: which would amount to declaring that Christ is *not come*, and so would be a flat contradiction to Christianity.



Therefore the reason is plain, why the *Jewish* sacrifices cannot be distinguished off, or advanced into *spiritual services*, nor the *Christian* sacrifices sunk into *material and extrinsic* oblations. But I return.

4. To the same head, of *nominal* and *real*, belongs the distinction of *commemorative* and *real*: which is an old distinction. Chrysostom observes, that we do not offer, as the Jews formerly did, *one lamb* one day, and the next day *another*, and so on; but that we every day offer the *same Lamb*, which Lamb is Christ, and consequently the *same sacrifice*; or rather, as he adds, correcting the expression, a *commemoration of a sacrifice*<sup>e</sup>. Thus he distinguishes a *commemorative* sacrifice from a *real* one, or a *commemoration* of a sacrifice from the *sacrifice* itself. That he here understood an *expiatory* sacrifice is plain, because he interprets it of *Christ himself*, our *only* sacrifice of propitiation. It may be suggested, that a *commemoration* of a sacrifice, though it is not *that sacrifice*, may yet be a *sacrifice*, or *another* sacrifice notwithstanding: and it may be said, that a *symbol* of a sacrifice may itself also be a *distinct* sacrifice. Both parts are true: for a *memorial service* is a *sacrifice*<sup>f</sup>, while it is also a *commemoration*.

<sup>e</sup> Τί οὖν; ἡμεῖς καὶ ἰδούσθην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.—τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰὶ προσφέρομεν, οὐ τῶν μὲν ἱερῶν πρόβατος, αἷριον δὲ ἱερῶν, ἀλλ' αἰὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, ὅσπερ μία ἰσθὶν ἡ θυσία.—ὡς πανταχοῦ ὁ Χριστὸς—πολλαχοῦ προσφερόμενος, ἢ σῶμα ἰσθὶν, καὶ οὐ πολλὰ σώματα, οὕτω καὶ μία θυσία.—οὕτως ἄλλην θυσίαν καὶ θάσπερ ὁ Ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰὶ ποιούμεν μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἰργαζόμεθα θυσίας. Chrysost. in Hebr. x. Hom. xvii. p. 168, 169. tom. xii. edit. Bened. Other authorities to the same purpose are referred to in Review, vol. vii. p. 40. and more might be added.

<sup>f</sup> Eusebius observes, that our Lord has ordered us a *memorial, instead of a sacrifice*: μνήμην καὶ ἡμῶν παραδοῦς, ἀντὶ θυσίας, ἐφ' οὗ ἡμεῖς προσφέρομεν. Demonstr. lib. i. c. 10. p. 38. One would think by this, that he had excluded a *memorial* from being a sacrifice. But he does not: for he presently after explains what he means by, *instead of a sacrifice*, adding ἀντὶ τῶν παλαιῶν θυσιῶν καὶ ἰλοκαυτωμάτων, *instead of the ancient sacrifices and burnt offerings*. Ibid. p. 38. But as to the *memorial services*, he does as plainly call them *sacrifices*, in the next page, as words can do it.

Τὰ σημεῖα τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα, δι' ἃν καλλιερῶντες, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν καὶ λογιᾶς, αὐτῶν τι προσενεῖς θυσίας προσφέρειν Θεῷ, &c. p. 39. Where I under-

moration of the *grand sacrifice*; and the *Jewish sacrifices* were *sacrifices* in themselves, while *types* of Christ's sacrifice, and *symbols* also of *ours*. But then, let it be observed, that when Chrysostom here speaks of the real *sacrifice* in the Eucharist, he does not mean the *signs*, but the *thing signified* by them, namely, *Christ himself*, the *one sacrifice*, as he expressly mentions: besides, had he intended the *elements*, he could not have said, that we have *one sacrifice*, or *always the same sacrifice*; for he very well knew, that we offer one day *one loaf*, and another day *another loaf*, and so that would have amounted to the same with one day *one sheep*, and another day *another*; and the very objection which he was there answering, would have returned upon him with all its force.

But will not the same objection lie against offering any *sacrifices* at all, even *spiritual sacrifices*, so many distinct *acts*, and therefore one day *one sacrifice*, and another day *another*, and so on? No: for Chrysostom was there speaking only of *expiatory sacrifices*, or *sin offerings*; as the chapter, which he was commenting upon, led him to do: and there is really no *sin offering*, or *expiatory sacrifice*, under the Gospel, but *Christ* alone; who is not properly *offered* in a *sacrificial way*, but *commemorated* only, in the Eucharist. There may be in the Eucharist *gratulatory sacrifices*, consistently with what is here said by Chrysostom: but whether the *elements* or the *service*, properly, are such *gratulatory sacrifices*, he has not determined in this place, not entering into that question: though he has sufficiently determined it elsewhere, by what he constantly teaches with respect to *self-sacrifice*, *intrinsic sacrifice*, and all *spiritual services*; which he call-

stand by *συνὰ θύματα* the *symbols*, metonymically called *victims*, as *body* and *blood*: and Eusebius takes notice, that *by them* (that is, by them as *symbols* and *instruments*) we offer, we perform our *unbloody* and *rational sacrifices*. He had said before, *Τούτου δῆτα θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἱερικῶν διὰ συμβόλων*, &c. That is, the *memorial* of the *victim*, Christ crucified, is performed by those *symbols*; by consecrating, by breaking, distributing, pouring, eating, and drinking them with devout hearts, prayers, praises, &c.

ed *sacrifices* without any scruple, and without any self-correction.

Some have thought, that the very *phrase* of *commemorative sacrifice*, as applied to the *Eucharist*, imports, that the *Eucharist* is a *sacrifice*: but that is a very great mistake. It neither *implies* it nor *contradicts* it, but *abstracts* from it, expressing no more than this, that the *Eucharist* is a *commemoration* of a *sacrifice*, namely, of the *grand sacrifice*. It is a contracted, compendious form of speech, which, drawn out at full length, expresses a *sacrament commemorative of a sacrifice*; as appears from Aquinas<sup>h</sup>, who may be allowed to be a good interpreter of a *scholastic* phrase. That sense passed current, and was not only admitted by Calvin and other Protestants, but contended for, when the Romanists began to give a *new* sense and *new* turn to it. Cardinal Allen was not pleased with the Schools for speaking the plain truth<sup>i</sup>, nor with

\* It has been observed by some, that the *spiritual sacrifices*, among the Fathers, often go under *metaphorical* names, such as *odour of suavity*, and the like: and it has been urged, as of moment, that if a sacrifice of the heart is not an *odour of suavity* in a *proper* sense, why must it be thought a *sacrifice* in a *proper* sense? The argument is wrong, because it proves too much. Our Lord, as a *sacrifice*, is called our *Passover*, and the *Lamb* of God, and likewise an *odour of suavity*, Ephes. v. 2. Might it not therefore as well be pleaded against his *sacrifice*, that since he is not a *lamb*, nor a *passover*, nor an *odour*, in a *proper* sense, why must he be a *sacrifice* in a *proper* sense? The truth is, proper sacrifices may often have *metaphorical* names: but they are *proper* sacrifices notwithstanding, if they fall within the *general* reason and definition of *sacrifice*. The sacrifices called *zebachim*, for instance, in Hebrew, or *Swēis* in Greek, or *hostiæ* in Latin, or *victimæ*, were not therefore sacrifices merely because *so called*, or because they were of such a particular *kind*, but because they were considered as *presents* to God, and as expressions of *worship* and *homage* offered to the Divine Majesty.

<sup>h</sup> *Sacramentum* hoc est *commemorative* Dominicæ passionis, quæ fuit *verum* sacrificium, et sic *nominatur* sacrificium. *Aquin. Sæm. part. iii. qu. 73. art. 4.*

Successit autem ei [paschat] in Novo Testamento *Eucharistia*, *sacramentum* quod est *rememorative* præteritæ passionis, sicut et illud erat *præfigurative* futuræ. *Aquin. ibid. art. 5. Conf. Lombard. lib. iv. distinct. 12. lit. G.*

<sup>i</sup> Alanus de *Eucharistia*, p. 551.

the Protestants for following them in that just sense of the *phrase*: so he endeavoured to warp it to a new and foreign meaning<sup>k</sup>. He pleaded that a *commemorative sacrifice* may consistently be *proper* also: which was no part of the question. The question was, whether any certain conclusion could be drawn from the *name* of sacrifice, sometimes given to the *elements* by the ancients, when those very ancients declared their own meaning in such instances to be, that the Eucharist, so considered, was a *commemoration* of a *sacrifice*, rather than a *sacrifice*. But I pass on. The phrase of *commemorative sacrifice*, in such a sense as Aquinas used it in, and as signifying a *sacrament commemorative* of a *sacrifice*, has been admitted by the best learned Protestants<sup>l</sup> all along, without any scruple. The sum is, that a *commemorative sacrifice*, in the *relative* sense of the phrase, is the same as a *nominal* sacrifice, opposed to a *real* one; a *sign* opposed to the *thing signified*; a *memorial* of a sacrifice, not *that sacrifice*. Such was the *original*, such has been the *customary* use of the phrase, from the time it first came in: and the question is not, whether a *commemorative sacrifice* may not also, in an *absolute* view, be a distinct *sacrifice*; but whether that *phrase* ordinarily had *expressed both*? It is certain, that it had not; but, among the Schoolmen formerly, and among the best learned Protestants since, it *expressed* no more commonly than a *sacramental* commemoration or memorial of a *sacrifice*, namely of the *grand sacrifice*. In this sense, our present most learned Metro-

<sup>k</sup> Majores certe nostri cum Eucharistiæ confectionem appellarunt nonnunquam *commemorative* sacrificium—non ita dicebant, quod judicarent hæc vocabula *non consistere* cum sacrificio *vero*, ut propterea non esset *proprie dictum* sacrificium, quia esset *commemorative*. *Alanus de Eucharistia*, p. 547.

<sup>l</sup> Cranmer against Gardiner, book v. p. 435. R. Jacobi Epist. ad Perron. p. 52. Andrews, Resp. ad Bellarm. p. 184. Spalatensis, lib. v. p. 82, 83, 149, 204, 882, 911. Buckeridge, p. 4. See my *Christian Sacrifice*, p. 164. Morton, book v. p. 440. alias 35, 38. Field, p. 205. Laud. conf. p. 305, 306. Tower-son on the Sacraments, p. 169. Payne on the Sacrifice of the Mass, p. 49, 51, 53, 75. Patrick, Mens. Myst. p. 15, 16. Brevint on the Mass, p. 23.

politan admits of it. His words are : " In the *Christian* " Church, there is only *one proper* sacrifice, which our " Lord offered upon the cross ; and consequently *Chris-* " *tians* cannot *partake* of any sacrifice in a *literal* and " *strict* sense, without allowing *transubstantiation*," p. 262. The Lord's Supper is " a *commemorative sacrifice*, or " the *memorial* of our Lord offered upon the cross ; which " is first dedicated to God by prayer and thanksgiving, " and afterwards *eaten* by the faithful," &c. p. 267. When it is said, that *Christians* cannot partake of *any* sacrifice in a *literal* sense, and that there is but *one proper* sacrifice for *Christians* to partake of ; the meaning, I presume, of those *few, chosen* words is this : we may indeed partake of *Christ's* sacrifice, a *proper* sacrifice, but not in a *literal* sense ; for the participation is *spiritual* : we may *literally* partake of the elements ; but then they are not a *proper* sacrifice, but *symbolical*, and *commemorative*<sup>m</sup>, being that they are *memorial signs* of the sacrifice, not the sacrifice itself. Therefore, upon the whole, we have no sacrifice to partake of in a *literal* sense ; for either the sacrifice we partake of is not *literal* and *proper*, or else the *participation*, at least, is not *literal* and *proper* : so stands the case. And what is this but very plainly declaring, that the elements are not a *proper* sacrifice ? Well, but is it not as plainly declaring, that *spiritual* sacrifices are no *proper* sacrifices, since we have but *one* proper sacrifice ? No, it is not declaring any such thing : for, observe the words, *Christians* cannot *partake* of any sacrifice ; it is not said, cannot *offer*, but the thought entirely runs upon a sacrifice of *participation*<sup>n</sup>. So there is room left to say,

<sup>m</sup> " The elements are made 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," p. 263. " To eat of the Lord's " Supper, is to *partake* of the *sacrifice* of *Christ*, which is there *commemo-* " *rated* and *represented*." *Abp. Potter on Church Government*, p. 264.

<sup>n</sup> Accordingly, these words are added : " Hence it is manifest, that to " eat of the Lord's Supper is to *partake* of the *sacrifice* of *Christ*, which is " there *commemorated* and *represented*." *Ibid.*

that we *offer* proper sacrifices, namely, *spiritual* sacrifices. But will there not also be room left for saying, that we *offer* the elements as a *proper* sacrifice? No: for if they are not a *proper* sacrifice when *participated*, they could not be such when *offered*<sup>o</sup>: if the feeding barely upon *them* amounts not to a *feast* upon a *proper* sacrifice, they never were a *proper* sacrifice at all. The words are so exactly *chosen*, as plainly to exclude the *elements* from being a *proper* sacrifice, and at the same time not to exclude our *religious services* from really being so. This, I presume to say, (without *his Grace's* leave or knowledge,) appears to be his sense, and his whole sense; no way favouring the *material hypothesis*, but the contrary; however some may have misconstrued his words, for want of considering them with due *attention*.

As to the name *memorial*, it may be noted, that it is capable of a twofold meaning, according as it may be applied. Apply it to the elements, and so it means a *memorial sign*, no sacrifice at all: apply it to the *prayers*, *praises*, and eucharistical actions<sup>p</sup>, and then it means a *memorial service*, and is a *sacrifice*, a *spiritual sacrifice*. But it is time to take leave.

I have now run through the most considerable *distinctions* of sacrifice, which have fallen within the compass of my observation; and I am willing to hope, that the explications here given may be of use, as spreading some

Sacrifice is here taken in the *passive* view, as *participated*, according to Dr. Cudworth's notion of a *symbolical* feast upon a sacrifice. See my Review, vol. vii. p. 325, &c.

<sup>o</sup> *Offered* here means offered for *consecration*: "To consecrate the Lord's Supper is so constantly called *ἁγιάζειν* in Greek, and *offerre* in Latin, "that it is needless to cite any testimonies for them." *Ibid*.

N. B. The offering for consecration, means no more than presenting them to God, in order to have them consecrated into *memorial signs*, or *symbols* of Christ's sacrifice, that is, into a *commemorative*, not *real*, sacrifice.

<sup>p</sup> Recordatio ergo, seu commemoratio, ponitur—in rebus sensibilibus. Omnia enim *memorialia*, seu *monumenta*, sunt sensibilia et patentia sensui: ac propterea *benedictio* illa sensibilis, *fractio*, *distributio*, *comestio* panis sacramentalis, nobis est *memoriale* passionis Christi, &c. *Spalatens.* p. 83.

further light upon the subject. Had the difference lain in *words* only<sup>¶</sup>, (*ideas* remaining the *same*;) it would not have deserved one moment's care or thought: but as this question had been lately managed, it is too plain, that the true *idea* both of the *sacrament* and *sacrifice* had been *changed* into quite another thing; and that such a *change* could not be supported, without making *other* very considerable *changes* in the whole system of *theology*, and in points of high consequence both to *truth* and *godliness*. Wherefore it appeared as necessary to endeavour, with all *Christian* mildness, to set these matters right, as it was to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto "the saints."

Faxit Deus omnipotens, ut *uni* Christi *sacrificio* vere in-  
nitamur, ac illi rursus rependamus *sacrificia* nostra *gratiarum* actionis, *laudis*, *confessionis* nominis sui, veræ *resipiscentiæ*, *pœnitentiæ*, *beneficentiæ* erga proximos, aliorumque omnium *pietatis officiorum*: talibus enim *sacrificiis*, exhibebimus nos nec Deo ingratos, nec Christi sacrificio indignos<sup>†</sup>.

¶ Pfaffius, in the view he took it, and with respect to one learned writer, looked upon the *dispute* as a kind of *logomachy*, p. 53, 344. and pref. p. 7. which I noted in Review, vol. vii. p. 345. adding, that *there* was a *good deal of truth* in what Pfaffius had said, and that a *great part* of the debate was chiefly about *names*. I have since noted, that the *original scheme* of a *principal* writer in that cause appeared to me to be little more. Christian Sacrifice explained, above, p. 177. But I was well aware, that some writers had carried matters a great deal farther. Where a road first *divides*, two travellers may almost shake hands: but if one goes on here, and another there, as far as the *diverging* roads will lead them, they may at length be found at a very wide distance from each other: so it is here. An *equivocal* word, perhaps, or phrase, in which both parties agree, first strikes out *two* very different *ideas*; and those two *ideas*, having their different *trains* or *connections*, do at length carry the two parties off, wide and far from each other, into very opposite systems.

† Cranmer in Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. Collection of Records, p. 84.

**SIX OCCASIONAL SERMONS.**





**THE DUTY OF DOING GOOD,**

**A SERMON**

**PREACHED BEFORE**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,**

**AT**

**ST. MARY'S CHURCH,**

**ON COMMEMORATION SUNDAY,**

*Nov. 2, 1712.*



*As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.*

THESE words having relation to what went before, it may be convenient to look back to the sixth verse of this chapter, where the Apostle begins his exhortation to acts of charity and kindness towards the ministers of the Gospel. "Let him," saith he, "that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things," that is, in all good offices; particularly those of beneficence and liberality for their support and maintenance. He proceeds in the two next verses to press the duty farther, from the consideration of God's strict and impartial justice in punishing any omission or neglect of it. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but" then, for their encouragement, he adds, that "he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." And, to obviate any mistrust about it, he exhorts them "not to be weary of well doing," from the certainty of the reward attending it, "in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." Then follows, "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." This is the connection of the words with those foregoing, which may be sufficient to let us into the general drift and design of them at present; their more particular explanation shall come in due time and place, according to the order and method in which I mean to treat of them, as follows:

I. I shall consider in general the duty of doing good to all men; the reasonableness, necessity, and excellency of it: "Let us do good unto all men."

II. The limitations of his duty to some particular seasons; "as we have opportunity:" and to particular persons; "especially unto them who are of the household of "faith."

I shall beg leave to detain you a while upon these points; and then endeavour briefly to apply the whole to the present occasion.

I. I am to consider in general the duty of doing good to all men; the reasonableness, necessity, and excellency of it.

It hath pleased Almighty God so to order the affairs of the world, that the welfare and happiness of mankind both present and future shall in a great measure depend upon their mutual kindness, their amicable and friendly offices towards one another. Not only our food and raiment, the necessaries and conveniences of life, come in to us this way, but even our spiritual food and sustenance, our instruction and improvement in piety and virtue, are in a great measure owing to the same; we are beholden to each other for them. God is pleased to convey his mercies and blessings, spiritual and temporal, by the mediation and service of men, making us the dispensers and stewards of the bounties of Heaven. He feeds and clothes us, while tender and helpless, by the assistance of kind parents; instructs us, as we grow up, by masters and teachers; calls us to our duty by his ministers; and provides for us, all along through our manifold wants and necessities, by our friends. Our *obligations* therefore to do good, to be kind and serviceable to each other in our respective capacities, are laid deep in our nature, are the necessary result of *our state and condition* here, are what we are all born to, and mainly designed for, and that no doubt for very wise and good reasons.

It would be easy for Almighty God to make every man independent upon any but himself, to send us bread

from heaven, or to make every thing we have occasion for spring up ready to our hands ; or he might administer to our necessities a thousand other ways, which we know not of, without the least assistance or service of our neighbours. But not to mention other things, where would there be that lovely harmony of society consisting of mutual offices ? What charms of conversation would be left us, which is rendered so agreeable by our contributing to each other's happiness ? What exercise of love and amity, which endears us to one another, and so unites us together ? In fine, what foundation would there be for the many social virtues to which we are trained up here, in order to prepare us for much nobler and diviner exercises of love hereafter ? Love and amity are the delight of heaven, and make up the blessedness of saints and angels. We are therefore taught the practice of those virtues now, which in greater perfection are to be our chief employment, our joy and bliss for ever. And hence perhaps it is, that we are made in a manner to depend upon one another from the first moment we breathe till our last ; and that we have all some means or other of being useful and beneficial to our kind put into our hands, that by the exercise of love and amity in this life we may be duly qualified for a better.

As God has thus taken care, by the very state and condition of our being, to oblige us to this duty of doing good, so to enforce it yet farther, it comes recommended to us by our own *natural instinct* and *passions*, by the best and brightest *examples*, the most frequent and solemn *exhortations*, and the most engaging *motives*.

There is no man, who has not very much debauched his nature, but finds in himself a very strong propensity to acts of mercy and pity upon some special occasions ; and feels a sensible pleasure and satisfaction within arising from them. To relieve the needy, to assist the helpless, to raise the drooping soul, and to bring comfort to the afflicted and heavy laden, these are very delightful and pleasurable duties. And it is hard to determine whether

the pleasure of bestowing a favour in this manner does not equal or even exceed the joy of the receiver. Thus by the very bent and inclinations of our nature are we incited to do good; we find pain and trouble in resisting these inward motions of our own breasts, and are never better pleased than when we indulge and gratify them. These soft and tender impressions are the dictates of nature to us, the silent notices of Heaven, and, as it were, the still voice of God unto our souls; and so far as we yield ourselves up and are conformable to them, we resemble in some measure the Divine love, and copy after the pattern which God himself hath set us. To delight in doing good is to imitate him in the noblest and most charming of his excellences. His wisdom and power are infinite, but his goodness is the flower and the perfection of both. This is his darling attribute, which he seems most to delight and triumph in, and which renders him so Divine and so adorable a Being. His happiness is infinite, too great and too secure to be either heightened or impaired. All that he hath in view, if we may so speak, is to communicate some degrees and measures of it; to shed abroad his love, and scatter his rich bounties through the compass of the wide world. This is the design of the creation, and the end of all things. There are as many instances of his goodness, as there are creatures of his making; the heavens and the earth are full of the goodness of the Lord. He is kind even to the brutal part of the creation, in giving them being, and preserving it when given. "He giveth fodder unto the cattle, and feedeth the young ravens that call upon him; and even the lions roaring after their prey do seek their meat from God," as the Psalmist very elegantly observes. But his kindness to man is the most remarkable; since it is for his sake that both the animate and inanimate part of this lower world were created and are preserved. He provideth for the necessities of all men, as seemeth good to his wisdom, in a surprising manner, "filling their hearts with joy and gladness." Above all, his marvellous lov-

ing-kindness is seen in the provision made for our eternal happiness, in his sending his own Son to suffer, bleed, and die to save us. And when this Divine Saviour was pleased to take upon him our nature, to converse with sinful men, all his endeavours were to do them good; and every action of his life and circumstance of his death was a fresh instance of it. He healed diseases, cast out devils, fed thousands by miracle, at once contributing both to the happiness of this life and of that which is to come. He laid hold on all opportunities of being kind and serviceable, and industriously sought out more; in fine, his character is summed up in this, that "he went about doing good." The like may be observed of the whole host of heaven, the blessed company of saints and angels, who have been always engaged in the same friendly designs, constantly employed in doing good. After so many, and so great and glorious examples, need we any precept, any persuasion, to incite us to this duty? Yet to secure our compliance in this point, to imprint and rivet it into our hearts and minds, every page almost of the Old and New Testament inculcates this lesson to us, and presses it most earnestly upon us. There we find God declaring, that he prefers the works of charity and mercy to his own more immediate service, in as much as he does not stand in need of our services, but our brethren do, and may be benefited by them. He therefore rejects all our prayers and praises in comparison, looking upon them as nothing, if brought into competition with relieving the widow and fatherless in their affliction, or doing good to the bodies or the souls of men. There also we find our blessed Saviour acquainting us with the particulars of the inquiry to be made at the last day; whether we have fed the hungry, or clothed the naked; given drink to the thirsty, or visited the sick and afflicted, to speak comfort to them. And there we see that the unprofitable and wicked servant are the same in God's account of them; that it is in vain for any man who does no good, to pretend he has done no harm: he must answer for his neglects and omissions of



this kind. The not doing good, when we might and ought to have done it, is a high crime, and will be enough to condemn us at the great day. So strong, so indispensable are our obligations to this duty. Indeed it is the very life and soul of Christianity, the sum and substance of all religion; and love is the fulfilling both of the Law and the Gospel. All other duties either yield to it, or else are implied in it; and that we may not pretend to want objects of compassion and charity, or to grow straitened and narrow in our affections, all mankind have an interest and concern in them. No distance of place or time can limit the extent of this duty: for our good wishes and prayers at least may reach unto the ends of the earth, and be serviceable where we cannot know it; and the fruits of our present services may spring up and grow to all succeeding generations. No difference in opinions or opposition of parties can make void our obligations; for all are in a Christian sense neighbours; and we are to "love our neighbours as ourselves." No affronts or injuries, no injustice, violence, or oppression, ought to stifle our sense of this duty; for we are to "love our enemies, to do good to them that hate us, and to pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us. If our enemy hunger, we must feed him" never the less for being such; and "if he thirst, we must give him drink; that by so doing," if possible, we may melt him into love and gratitude, "heaping," as it were, "coals of fire upon his head." And this indeed is as great an instance of pity and compassion, as curing either the blind or lame; nay, a much greater, thus to heal the rage of a distempered mind, and to bring a man back again to his right senses. "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men," whether friends or enemies, whether brethren or aliens, to all who can stand in need of, and may be any thing the better for us.

Having thus considered the duty in general, the reasonableness, necessity, and excellency of it in its largest extent, I proceed, in the second place,

II. To consider the limitation of it to particular times

and seasons, "as we have opportunity;" and to particular persons, "especially unto them who are of the household "of faith."

The words *ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν* are sometimes rendered, *while we have time*; that is, while by the mercy of Almighty God our frail and uncertain lives are continued to us. And this is evident, that we ought always to be "doing the work of him that sent us, while *our* day lasts, "and before *our* night cometh, when no man can work." And so our season for doing good, taken at large, is the whole time of our sojourning here in this world. But then as to some particular acts and kinds of it, there are some special seasons and opportunities proper for them; the well-observing of which will be the best means to direct us as well what good to do, as in what manner, so as to answer the ends and designs of it. And in this sense it is, that I would here understand the words of my text, "as we have opportunity."

Now these proper seasons or opportunities of doing good may be conceived to respect either the persons who are to do a kindness, or those it should be done to. In regard to the former, every advantage which accrues to them, every increase of their substance, power, or ability in any kind, affords a fresh occasion; and is, as it were, a new opportunity given them for doing good. Does any man abound in wealth, and riches flow in upon him? This is the season, the opportunity which God hath put into his hands, that he may do good by his liberality and bounty towards his poorer brethren. Is he withal advanced to great honours, power, and authority? This must be looked upon as an opportunity given him of doing good, by protecting and encouraging virtue and piety, by discountenancing and restraining vice and immorality. Hath any man, by the blessing of God and his own industry, attained to a good degree of learning, or by years, thought, and experience, to more than ordinary measures of wisdom? This then is the season and opportunity for his doing good, by instructing the ignorant and unlearn-

ed, or by advising and admonishing the unwise and unthinking. Or is he by God's grace, prayer, and endeavour, arrived to a better sense of religion, and a more exalted piety, than his neighbours? This likewise is another opportunity of doing good, that "being himself converted he may *then* strengthen his brethren." And, that it may not be thought, that only the rich, great, wise, learned, or eminently good, are blessed with opportunities, it must be observed, that all others, in different proportions, or in different ways, have their opportunities too, and are obliged in their respective capacities to do what they can. The offices of humanity, civility, and courtesy, lie open and common to all; and the very meanest and lowest may do good by their honest industry in time of health, and at all times by humility, modesty, and peaceable carriage, by good advice, by prayer, or by example. Hitherto I have considered how a man may be said to have opportunity with respect to his own power and abilities of doing good.

Next we may observe the like with respect to the wants and occasions of others whom we ought to do good to. These indeed are innumerable, and we can never want opportunities in this sense of any sort or kind. "The poor we have always with us, and when we will we may do them good." There will be always ignorance, weakness, folly, sin, and misery enough in the world, to furnish us with matter for our compassion and charity, and to exhaust all our services. But because our time is short, our talents few, and our abilities at the highest finite and limited; our business must be, out of so great variety to choose such instances of doing good as we are best qualified for; and of those such as are most wanted, or by some peculiar circumstances come more particularly recommended to us. Some special times and occasions may require our service more than others; and some opportunities may be offered, which, if not presently laid hold on, may be lost for ever. On this account the offices of love and charity may reasonably be distinguish-

ed into two sorts, constant and occasional, from the matter or the objects of them. We are constantly obliged to be doing good, of some kind or other, in proportion to our abilities; and the ordinary standing necessities of mankind afford constant matter for it. But besides this, we are also occasionally obliged to exert ourselves with greater zeal, vigour, and activity upon some special emergencies, and very urgent and pressing engagements. As if a church and nation be in present danger of sinking into heresy and schism, profaneness, irreligion, or atheism; this is a special opportunity, calling for as special assistance; and at such a time all, who are capable of doing any good service, are obliged forthwith to employ their wits, tongues, pens, interest, and authority for the prevention and cure of such a threatening mischief. In cases of inferior and private concern, for instance, if any person or persons are nearly reduced to extremities, labouring under some heavy and severe pressures, and not being able to subsist, if not speedily relieved by kind neighbours; such opportunities as these are what no good Christian, who has any bowels of compassion, no good heathen, would let slip from him. In this sense therefore, "as we have opportunity" offered, "let us do good unto all men," after the example of the good Samaritan, laid down for a rule of practice by our blessed Saviour in all cases of this nature.

There is another limitation of this duty, taken notice of in my text, and that is, to particular *persons*, as well as to times. Not that any persons, whom it may be in our power to serve, are to be excluded from our charity; only it may admit of different degrees, and is principally to be applied to some more than others: we may be allowed both in our constant and occasional charities to make a difference in regard to the quality and circumstances of the persons, and when all cannot be equally served, to prefer the most deserving. We are to "do good unto all men, but especially unto the household of faith;" that is, to Christ's church or family, and those particularly whose

labours and services most eminently deserve and require it; to them especially, in whose support and welfare the interest of religion, the honour of God, and the good of souls is so deeply concerned. Where other circumstances are equal, or but nearly equal, the value and character of the person, or the relation to us, ought to give them the preference in our charitable offices, and to entitle them to our first and best services. Indeed a stranger, or even an enemy in extremities, is to be relieved before a friend or a brother who is in no such want of us; for the offices of humanity seem equally due to them as men, and a bare convenience of one may reasonably be postponed, and give way to the extremities of the other. But where this is not the case, or where both seem to lie under almost equal necessities, there certainly a man may be allowed and even obliged more especially to assist his friends before his enemies, brethren before aliens, Christians before heathens, kindred before acquaintance, good and well-deserving before those who have less pretensions; and though we may be willing to assist all or any of them as we are able, and as we see proper occasions, yet towards some more especially we may give a loose to our affections, and be enlarged in our bowels of compassion; may open both our hearts and hands to receive and embrace them, and even overflow in our kindness and bounty towards them. To feed the hungry, and clothe the naked, is kind and Christian, though the persons so relieved be strangers and aliens, and even useless or ill-deserving. But if such offices be done to Christians, and good Christians, and such as have deserved well by their pious and painful endeavours, then the charity is the greater, as the design of it is nobler, and the good effect of it more diffusive, lasting, and beneficial than the other. The rule then which the voice of nature and reason, as well as the laws of God, have marked out for our charities, is this, that if at any time we can serve the honour of God and the interests of the public more by one sort of charity than another, or by relieving some persons before others, and in

one particular manner beyond any else, we are always to choose that which may probably do most good, may spread the widest and last the longest. Thus to relieve any persons in necessity is an act of humanity and Christian charity; but more so, if they are persons of uncommon merit, or undeserved sufferings; and relieving them in such a way as shall promote the welfare of their souls, makes it yet more excellent than if it concerned only their bodily wants; and if it be at the same time useful and beneficial to many more besides, it is then better than if it were confined to them only; and if the influence of it may reach to after ages, it is a nobler height of charity than if it should conclude with the present.

Having thus shown the nature and measures of the duty, and what sort of management is requisite to make it the most excellent and valuable in the sight of God and man, it may now be proper to come to the application of all to the particular instance of it now before us, which calls for our returns of gratitude, our joyful praises and thanksgivings at this day.

III. Of all the methods and contrivances of doing good, there is none more excellent and praiseworthy than that of founding schools and universities for the propagation of religion and sound learning. This seems to imply and contain under it all other instances of doing good, is a large and complicated charity, reaching both to the bodies and souls of men; to private persons and the public weal, to present and to future ages.

The first, but least thing to be considered in it, is the provision thereby made for a set number of persons successively to live creditably and comfortably in their generation. This is in itself a nobler height of Christian charity than dealing our bread to the hungry, or clothes to the naked. For the provision herein made is large and generous; it is a remedy not only against present but future wants; and hinders such evils from being ever felt, as the other only are designed to remove; and is therefore as much better, as it would be to have prevented a stroke

while it is threatened only at a distance, than afterwards to heal the wound.

Besides this, the persons thus provided for as to bodily necessities, are at the same time put into the most happy circumstances that can be with regard to their souls. Many perhaps thus brought up might in some other method of life, in trade or in merchandise, have enriched themselves more; but they could never have been placed in a better way for eternity, nor set out with a fairer or a more promising prospect. For besides the advantage of good books, and, what is more, of good men, as well for instruction as example; besides the benefits of regularity and discipline, and the daily, stated exercises of devotion; the freedom and disincumbrance from cares and business, the leisure and liberty they enjoy in such places, give the greatest encouragement to the study of piety and virtue, and make way for the highest and noblest improvement of the mind. "He that hath little business shall become wise," saith the son of Sirach, and we may say, *good too*, for the same reason; for leisure is a foundation for both. While secular care and multiplicity of engagements disturb and even distract a great part of mankind, here our very business, which for the pleasure of it is but diversion, tends also to regulate and compose the soul; and we have little else to do, if we rightly consider it, but to be advancing and improving daily in all wisdom and virtue, and to be laying up a good foundation for the time to come, that we may "lay hold on eternal life." How blessed then are the fruits of such public charities, to which so many may in a great measure owe not only their comfortable subsistence here, but their eternal happiness hereafter!

Yet this is not all, nor a thousandth part of the benefits arising from them: they are not confined to those persons only who are immediately concerned in them, but are of universal influence, are spread wide and far, and can neither be numbered nor measured for greatness. From these fountains come wise and able men for the service of

Church and State, for the ornament and defence of both : by these, a nation is made happy, and religion grows and prospers : by these, wise counsels are framed, and under God the course of the world steered : by these, justice and fidelity are kept up, the peace and harmony of society maintained, order and government preserved. In a word, by these, multitudes are trained up to all the virtues of the civil and social life, and at the same time qualified to become citizens of heaven.

I shall but just observe farther of these public charities, that as the happy effects of them are almost unlimited as to place, so are they in a manner as to time too. Late posterity may enjoy the blessed fruits of them as well as we, who live behind many others ; and the children which are yet unborn may praise the Lord for them. As time drives on, and one age succeeds another, these unexhausted mines are daily productive of new blessings to enlighten and enrich mankind. From these fruitful stores may yet arise lights and ornaments to the Church ; patriots and counsellors to support the State ; wise, great, and good men to supply the necessities of this world, and to fill the mansions of the other.

It might be easy to enlarge upon this head, and may be difficult to contain ; but I know not whether I could be excused for having said so much on matters so well known and understood by all here, were it not that the occasion is as proper as the subject is inviting ; and besides, the clamours of some against these venerable societies, and the institution of them, have made it the more necessary to speak out, and to open our most just pretensions, as well for the honour of our pious founders, as our own vindication. It has been the humour of some persons, with what reason or justice let the world judge, to defame and decry these nurseries of religion, sometimes as useless, at other times hurtful to the public ; and to discourage as much as possible the youth of the nation from resorting to them. The learning there taught, be-



cause perhaps above their capacities, passes with them for pedantry; their principles, because loyal, are principles of slavery; and their methods of instruction, because different from the schemes of some modern projectors, are reckoned old and superannuated. Now if what these men pretend be true, we should appear, methinks, with no very good grace upon this occasion, and should be but ill employed in reciting the names of our benefactors, only to publish their shame for having misplaced their charities, and thereby done such mischief to the world. But our comfort is, that the pretences of these men are so easily seen through, as not to bear refuting. Had they singled out some particular persons, and there placed their censure, their modesty perhaps had been commendable, and their attempts feasible: but when they presume to strike at whole bodies, and throw their scandal at large, this treatment is too coarse, and the management too gross, to go down even with the unthinking vulgar.

Enough has been said already to show (and it is visible to all the world) how much the public has been indebted, and ever will be, to the founders of such religious societies, and the worthy members of them. But no wonder, if, when empirics profess the art of medicine, the sounder and abler physicians be decried. While ignorance or lusts, pride or faction, are predominant with some, what wonder is it, if these learned bodies, which are so directly opposite to them, and I hope will ever be so, fall under their censure? Such enemies we shall ever have, and it is our glory to have such. These places were designed to combat ignorance and vice, and to stand in direct opposition to them. The world would not be so sensible of the great need they have of them, were it not for such men, as make it their business to oppose them. The louder they exclaim against them, the more do they publish and proclaim to all wise judges the great usefulness and necessity of them. When they grow impatient of the curb,

and are so fretted with it, they do but show how much they wanted it, and how much more unruly and unmanageable they had been without it.

But leaving these gentlemen to be better handled by those who shall think it worth their while to do it in a more public way, I shall beg leave to close all with a few short advices suitable to the present occasion.

How ought we in the first place to bless the memory of our pious founders and benefactors, who under God have been the authors and contrivers of so much good to mankind; who have thereto contributed so largely and generously, and yet contribute, and will continue to do so, in effect, to the end of the world! If “they who turn  
“many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever  
“and ever,” how great must be their glory, how ample their rewards, who have been so remarkably instrumental in reforming the world, not only encouraging true piety and goodness while they lived, by counsel, by command, and by example, but perpetuating these great designs to all after ages, taking care that there never may be wanting a supply of such persons, whose business it should be to instruct the ignorant, to convert the wicked, to multiply the number of God’s saints on earth, and to enlarge the company of the blessed in heaven!

And how ought we to return our humblest thanks and praises to Almighty God, for putting into their hearts such good and great designs; for bringing them to perfection, giving success to them, and showering down his mercies and blessings upon them!

Let us from hence learn to have a just sense of the honour and happiness we enjoy, that we may the better answer the ends of it. Let us often reflect that we are trained up here in order to be qualified in some measure to enlighten and reform the world; that a great deal depends upon our making a right use of the present season; that by improving ourselves we shall be enabled also to improve others, and contribute singly to make thousands both wiser and better, and to bring them on to heaven

with us. Let us therefore pursue our studies with industry and care, having always our eye fixed upon the great end and design of them; the glory of God, and the good of mankind. This may serve to regulate our searches after knowledge, and fix their due bounds and measures better than all the rules of philosophy or logic. It is easy for a man to know, who knows any thing of himself, in what sort of study he may improve most, and be most useful to the world; and the same consideration will be a safe rule to direct him how far it may be proper to pursue it; so far certainly, and no farther than as it may turn to a good use, and may not prevent some greater good, which he might and ought to have been doing in the mean time. To our searches after knowledge we are more especially to be careful to join the practice of true piety, and to begin with reforming ourselves, if ever we hope to reform others. This will go farther towards improving and bettering mankind than the most refined and elevated knowledge, or the greatest compass of learning; and without this, it is to be feared, we can do but little good to others, and yet less to ourselves. The present age, to say the least of it, is bad enough; and if all, who are thus religiously educated, were as good as they should be, and were to join their best endeavours, they would yet find it work enough to improve and reform it. But if some of these also should run in with the crowd, and by their bad example or counsel turn seducers and corrupters, like the libertines of the times; if they spread the poison which it should be their business to draw out, and heighten the distemper which they ought to heal; then the case would be yet more justly deplorable, and "woe to those persons by whom the offence cometh," strict and severe will be their condemnation.

But I shall not go on in any such melancholy reflections, which I hope can concern very few here. Nor shall I venture beyond these few hints to be farther tedious in this assembly, where are present so many whose own better thoughts will be a safe direction to them-

selves, and their examples the most persuasive sermons to others. May Almighty God bless the endeavours of all such, reward their services, and increase their numbers, and grant us all to be like-minded, striving in nothing but how we may best promote the glory of God, the good of mankind, and the salvation of our own souls.



# **A SERMON**

**PREACHED BEFORE**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,**

*On Thursday the 7th of June, 1716.*

**Being the Day of Public THANKSGIVING to Almighty  
God for suppressing the late unnatural REBELLION.**



---

2 SAM. XX. I, 2.

*And there happened to be there a man of Belial, whose name was Sheba, the son of Bichri, a Benjamite: and he blew a trumpet, and said, We have no part in David, neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: every man to his tents, O Israel.*

*So every man of Israel went up from after David, and followed Sheba the son of Bichri: but the men of Judah clave unto their king, from Jordan even to Jerusalem.*

**T**HIS and the foregoing chapter give us the history of the rise, progress, and conclusion of an unnatural rebellion raised against good King David: one that appeared formidable, and might have been of unhappy consequence to him and his kingdoms, had not his timely care and vigilance (with the blessing of God thereupon) seasonably suppressed it. The narrative of the matter is this.

King David<sup>a</sup> had been some time absent from his royal city, having “fled out of the land for Absalom.” But as soon as the death of Absalom had removed all difficulties, “the people were at strife throughout all the tribes of “Israel,” about bringing the King back to Jerusalem, to reinstate him in his throne.

The King, hearing of the zeal and concern which his subjects of Israel had for him, thought proper to intimate it to the *elders of Judah*<sup>b</sup>, inviting them, as being nearest akin to him, of the same tribe with himself, his *brethren*, his *bones*, and his *flesh*<sup>c</sup>, as himself expresseth it, to come to him with all convenient speed, that they might not be “the last to bring back the King.”

By this affectionate and endearing message, “he bowed “the heart of all the men of Judah, even as the heart of

<sup>a</sup> 2 Sam. xix. 9.

<sup>b</sup> Ver. 11.

<sup>c</sup> Ver. 12.



“one man, so that they sent this word unto the King, “Return thou, and all thy servants <sup>d</sup>.” And soon after they went in person to meet him, and to conduct him over Jordan <sup>e</sup>, in his way to Jerusalem.

While the *men of Judah* were thus paying their early offices of duty and respect to their royal master, *the men of Israel*, thinking themselves neglected and postponed, in a matter which concerned their honour and their interest, began to be full of anger and resentment against their brethren of Judah; and accordingly came to the King with remonstrances and complaints against them. “Why “have our brethren, the men of Judah, stolen thee away, “and have brought the King and his household, and all “David’s men with him, over Jordan <sup>f</sup>?” To which the men of Judah replied very justly, that the reason was, because the King was *near of kin* to them; intimating withal, that what they did, was not so much with an eye to their own advantage, (not having “eaten at all of the “King’s cost,”) as out of their particular duty and affection to their sovereign, to whom they were so nearly related.

This did not satisfy: but still the Israelites insisted, that they had “ten parts in the King <sup>h</sup>,” according to the number of their tribes, and therefore “more right in David” than the other: and “why then,” say they, “did ye despise us, that our advice should not be first had in “bringing back our King?” The men of Judah being hereby warmed and irritated, gave them rough language in return; and “their words were fiercer than the words “of the men of Israel.”

And now matters began to look towards a rupture. Which yet, very probably, might have been prevented, but that “there happened to be there a man of Belial,” a factious, turbulent man, (one who probably had had an inveterate hatred to the house of David;) whose name was

<sup>d</sup> 2 Sam. xix. 14.

<sup>e</sup> Ver. 42.

<sup>g</sup> Ver. 15.

<sup>h</sup> Ver. 43.

<sup>f</sup> Ver. 41.

“Sheba, the son of Bichri, a Benjamite,” perhaps of the house and lineage of Saul, as was Shimei: he knowing how to take advantage of a popular discontent, and wanting not the will to do it, presently “blew a trumpet, and said, We have no part in David, neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: every man to his tents, O Israel.” As much as to say, “We, of the tribes of Israel, are dismissed from King David; and have no farther interest or concern with him. He has discarded us, to take our brethren in; and has no regard but to the house of Judah. To your tents, O Israel: and look ye out for another king.” This was putting the most invidious and malicious construction upon what had been done that could be; and was turning the rage of the discontented people upon the King himself, who had no way affronted them, except it was by his inviting and admitting the men of Judah, which he had so great reason to do.

But when men’s minds are sore, and fretted with contention, they are very apt to run into extremes, and to take every thing by the worst handle; and “so every man of Israel went up from after David,” (deserted and revolted from him,) “and followed Sheba the son of Bichri.” It was presently made a *party concern*, and accordingly all that were there joined in it. Some, we may suppose, out of resentment and ill will; and others out of fear or shame; lest they should seem unconcerned for, or regardless of, what was, or what was pretended to be, the common cause of their brethren.

By “every man of Israel,” in the text, we are not to understand all the ten tribes; but that part only who were there present; all that came to conduct the King over Jordan; probably a small number in comparison to the whole.

“The men of Judah” however, as well out of affection and bounden duty, as because they had been the unhappy occasion of the others revolt, “clave unto their King from Jordan even to Jerusalem,” conducting him all the way

to his royal seat, placing him in his throne, and steadily adhering to his interest, against all opposers.

No sooner had the King dispatched his necessary affairs, but he “assembled the men of Judah<sup>i</sup>” together, thinking it high time to look after the growing rebellion. For Sheba was so vigilant, that “he went through all the “tribes of Israel<sup>k</sup>,” poisoning the minds of the King’s loyal subjects, and drawing many after him. King David was sufficiently apprehensive of it; and therefore suddenly gave orders to his forces to pursue him. <sup>l</sup>“David said to “Abishai, Now shall Sheba the son of Bichri do us more “harm than did Absalom: take thou thy lord’s servants, “and pursue after him, lest he get him fenced cities, and “escape us.

“And there went out after him Joab’s men, and the “Cherethites, and the Pelethites, and all the mighty men: “and they went out of Jerusalem to pursue after” him with all expedition, to stop his progress, and thereby to prevent a general defection of the tribes. This so seasonable and prudent dispatch of the King’s forces had, by the blessing of God, its desired effect.

Sheba was in a little time besieged and blocked up, at the place of his rendezvous, which was Abel of Bethmaachah<sup>m</sup>; and the people of the town, either out of a sense of loyalty, or out of tenderness for themselves, finding they had no other remedy, were glad to capitulate, and to buy their peace at the price of the traitor’s head. Upon this they dispersed, and the rebellion ended. This is a brief but full account of the matter of fact. These things, no doubt, “were written for our admonition,” and may be useful to us when carefully considered. My design is,

1. To draw such reflections and observations as naturally occur to us, from the contents of the foregoing history.
2. To make some brief application of them, so far as is suitable, to the occasion of this day’s solemnity.

<sup>2</sup> Sam. xx. 3, 4.

<sup>k</sup> Ver. 14.

<sup>l</sup> Ver. 6, 7.

<sup>m</sup> Ver. 15.

3. To conclude the whole with a few practical advices proper to the place and audience.

I. I am to draw such reflections and observations, as may naturally occur to us, from the contents of the foregoing history.

1. And the first is, how men's passions, beginning often from some very slight and inconsiderable occasions, swell, by degrees, to an amazing height; and carry them farther than they at first intended, or so much as suspected; even to things which themselves, when cool and sedate, would have heartily abhorred.

How small and trifling a circumstance was it, (if rightly considered,) that the men of Judah happened to come *first* to the King; and were beforehand with their brethren of Israel, in paying their dutiful addresses to him. Might it not have contented the men of Israel, that their own hearts were loyal, that they meant the same thing with the other, had done their best to signify it, and only failed in a small circumstance of time, and that not through any neglect or fault of theirs, but by being prevented by their brethren? Was it worth contending so eagerly, who should be there *first* to conduct the King over Jordan, so long as both were agreed in the principal matter, that he ought to be conducted; and that it was for the common interest that he should return, and be set at the head of his people? Admitting that the men of Judah had the advantage by ingratiating themselves first with the King: yet was this any thing more than what was very natural for men to take, when they had so fair an opportunity for it; or than the men of Israel themselves would gladly have taken in the like circumstances, and have approved very well, when it had been their own? Could one ever have imagined, that this should be thought reason sufficient to justify a revolt, and the taking up arms against their sovereign? Had it been told the Israelites beforehand, what monstrous extravagances they should run into; that they should engage in a rebellion against the Lord's anointed, and enter into measures equally destruc-

tive to their country and themselves; that they should run the risk of sacrificing the lives of many innocent subjects; of bringing destruction and desolation on many well deserving families; of filling their country with cries and tears, laying cities waste, or burying them in blood and ashes: had these or the like scenes of barbarity and cruelty (the certain attendants of a civil war of any long continuance) been represented to them in their blackest colours beforehand; which of them might not have said, as Hazeal to the prophet, "What, is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing<sup>n</sup>?"

But when once men give way to their unruly passions, they are no longer masters of their own thoughts or designs; but are hurried on by an impetuous force. Consideration leaves them, and they advance by imperceptible steps so far, that they know not how to retreat. "The beginning of strife is," (as the Wise Man observes,) "as when one letteth out water<sup>o</sup>." It rages and swells more and more, till it makes an inundation, and overflows a country.

The contest between the men of Judah and the Israelites was at first little more than a strong passion for the King's interest and their country's good; joined with some impatience, that any should rival or go beyond them in it. Thus far it was laudable and generous; and had it stopped here, all had been well. But they proceeded to quarrel with each other, until both were inflamed to the utmost. A rupture ensues, a secession follows, and the next step is rebellion.

2. You may please to observe farther, that the contest, however sharp and fierce before, had never come to that height it did, had not there happened to be a Sheba amongst them, to *blow the trumpet* to sedition and rebellion. Artful representations, and studied disguises; invidious constructions, and malicious aggravations; these were what fired their passions to the utmost, and turned

<sup>n</sup> 2 Kings viii. 13.

<sup>o</sup> Prov. xvii. 14.

them into fury. Then they were prepared to go any lengths with their leader. Then they flew off in rage from that very King, whom, but a little while before, they beheld with the greatest respect and veneration.

And here I cannot but reflect a little upon the nature of *incendiaries*, the leaders and promoters of tumults and seditions; how mischievous a sort of men they are; how dangerous to any state or kingdom. Generally speaking, the bulk or body of any people are disposed to be peaceable and quiet. They love to mind their own proper business; and would of themselves be easy almost under any government. They would never think of rebelling, till loaded with oppressions; such, as it were better to die, than to bear any longer. Reason, or the love of peace, or the public good, or their own private interest, would incline them to lie still, and bind them down to submission and order. There is no pleasure or safety in seditions and riots, which should make men fond of being active in them. They are first drawn in by artificial insinuations and crafty pretences: such as they have neither skill, nor inclination, nor leisure to inquire into, but, as Scripture observes of some that followed Absalom, "they go in their simplicity, and they know not any thing." The consequence however is the same, when once their passions are wound up to a pitch, whatever were the motives, real or imaginary, which raised them. This their designing leaders know; and they understand too well what use to make of it. But,

3. We are next to take notice, what absurd and inconsistent things men are hurried into, by a predominant humour or passion; heightening and increasing those very evils, seeming or real, which they seek to redress.

The apprehension of being second only in the King's favour was what much afflicted the men of Israel. What course do they take to remedy this grievance? Not the

true and only pious or prudent method, that of patience and meekness, of dutiful and loyal behaviour, of zeal for the King's service, and for the honour and interest of their country; which must have gained them the favour and affection of their sovereign, and the love and esteem of all wise and good men: but the direct contrary. They rebel against that sovereign, whose favour they so much desired, and slight the happiness which they courted. And how were they now to better their circumstances, or to redress the grievance complained of? Could they hope for a milder, gentler, or better prince than King David? Or could any of them be secure that, under a new government, they might not as soon break out into factions and parties, and as soon supplant or ruin one another? Besides, how could they expect that God should give success to a design so ill formed, and laid in perfidiousness and treason? Or if he should, that the success itself might not prove a snare and a curse to them; as it is the usual method of Divine Providence to make the prosperity of wicked men, first or last, an inlet to their greater misery? We find this eminently verified in those very Israelites, within a reign or two after. They were displeased at some rough usage they had met with from their king Rehoboam; and they "rebelled against the house of David" from that day. This God was pleased to permit, partly in consequence of what he had denounced against Solomon; and partly by way of penalty to the Israelites themselves; who had been partakers in his sins. The issue of this was, that, as they revolted from their lawful sovereign, so they revolted from their religion too, and went out of rebellion into idolatry. When principles of morality once sit loose upon men, it is not to be expected that principles of religion will stay long. But to proceed.

Another grievance which lay heavy upon the minds of the Israelites was the appearing slight and contempt

¶ 1 Kings xii. 19.

¶ 1 Kings xi. 12, 33.

thrown upon them by the men of Judah. But is sedition the way to take off contempt? Or is rebellion the ready road to honour? Would not a manly and generous behaviour, a steady loyalty to their lawful sovereign, a noble ardour for the true good of their country, not to be shaken by any private resentment or impotent passion; would not this have abundantly retrieved their honour, and have set them above contempt and obloquy? Would not this have been infinitely better than to betray a weak mind, or a corrupt heart; the surest way to render any person contemptible, as the contrary is to create reverence and respect? Besides that if such designs fail of success, (as they commonly do,) the contempt is so far from being removed, that it returns upon them with double and triple weight. Thus it proved in the case before us. God was pleased to defeat their wicked purposes. Their leader suffered, and the rest were content to bear much greater ignominy than what they first complained of.

Another thing, which we may reasonably suppose afflicted the Israelites, was, that they knew not how otherwise to be revenged on the men of Judah. But it should have been considered, that all such desire of revenge is both foolish and hurtful: hurtful to the world, and most of all generally to the enraged persons themselves, both as to the inward torment it carries with it, and the ill effects and consequences of it. The mischief which they intended for others, (as is usual in such cases,) fell chiefly upon themselves. And the unhappy men found, to their sorrow, that it would have been infinitely better to have borne a slight grievance, than to have ventured upon unwarrantable methods of redressing it.

4. You may please to observe farther, how strong and invincible the prevalence of some passions is for the time, maugre all the remonstrances of religion, or even common humanity. As to religion, could not the men of Israel have reflected what a great and crying sin they were running into? That they were to lift up their hands against the Lord's anointed; the man whom they knew to be



chosen of God, "to feed his people Israel," and to be "a captain over Israel;" whom they had solemnly sworn to, or "made a league with, in Hebron before the Lord," and "anointed king over Israel<sup>s</sup>." Notwithstanding all which, upon slight pretences, they rebel against him. So little does a sense of religion avail, when men are under the power of strong resentments, and so true is it, (however melancholy a truth it be,) that nature, corrupt nature, will, for the most part, prevail over duty and principle. And hence it is, that the strength of any government, generally, lies more in the *affections*, than in the *consciences* of the people. This is the less to be wondered at, since even the common principles of humanity, strong as they are in most persons, yet bend and yield to unruly passions. Had the rebel Israelites had any pity or compassion left either for enemies or friends; any tenderness for their native country, which they were endeavouring to lay waste; any bowels for their brethren, whose blood they had a mind to spill; any consideration for the cries or tears, the frights or agonies, of such as they were blindly hasting on to ravage, plunder, murder, and destroy; they could never have entered, upon so slight motives, into so rash and desperate an undertaking. But I proceed,

5. To observe, what is of more comfortable consideration to us, that such violent and impetuous passions, as make men deaf to the remonstrances of religion and humanity, seldom last long.

No sooner was Sheba, the promoter of the mischief, removed, but the people whom he had seduced, cooled into duty and order, grew calm and easy. As it was a sudden passion which hurried them on, fed by mistakes and misconstructions; so it died upon the first check and disappointment. They returned to their allegiance, and the King lived peaceably ever after.

A state of anger and resentment, fierceness and bitterness, is not the natural state of man's mind. It requires

• 2 Sam. v. 2, 3.

some outward force and violence, as to raise it at first, so to keep it up afterwards. Afflictions will bow it down, or reflections calm it, or time will wear it out, if no new fuel be administered to revive it. Thus it happened in the instance which I have been considering: and thus, I hope, it hath happened also in the nearer instance which I am next to consider; and which gave occasion to this day's joyful thanksgiving.

But when I say *joyful*, mistake me not, as if I thought it all matter of joy and triumph, without a proper mixture of compassion, shame, and sorrow. This is not like the triumph over a foreign enemy; nor does it become us to show our rejoicings in the same manner, or with the same unbounded freedoms. For though the blessing of Heaven be as great, or greater, and the Divine goodness as remarkable, in putting an end to a rebellion, and preventing a civil war *at home*, as in repeated victories *abroad*: yet there is a tenderness due to the misfortunes of our fellow subjects; and not of those only who spent their loyal blood in the service of their king and country, but of them likewise who were unwarily drawn in and enticed the other way, and have either fallen in battle, or have died ingloriously by the hands of justice: or of such as still survive; but are too much filled with shame or grief, to rejoice with us; and such also as have their minds so unhappily divided, between private affections and the public good, that they are not yet able to have a full and perfect sense of the blessings of Heaven, or to relish the happiness of their country. These and the like considerations must cast a damp upon our joy, on this occasion; and render it something like to what a man feels within himself, when by the loss of his limbs he has had the good fortune to preserve his body. This shall make me the more tender of speaking to the case in hand: and it were well if we could draw a veil over what can hardly be remembered without a silent shame and sorrow for it. I shall however proceed to my second general head, namely,

II. To make some brief application of the foregoing reflections to the occasion of this day's solemnity.

I shall not minutely consider (nor indeed do I pretend to know) the birth and rise, or the particular springs and motives of the late rebellion.

I. Only I shall beg leave to observe in general, what is open and visible to all, that passion and resentment had the greatest hand in it; as it is the best excuse for it: I mean in those who were professed Protestants; and such of them especially, as had no scruple about the *settlement* in the late reign, nor in the beginning of this, nor since, if we may be allowed to think (as certainly we may) that a man is not influenced by any principles of conscience, who at the same time swears, and acts against it.

*Title* indeed was here pretended, as is usual in such cases. But whoever considers that the pretended title had been, in a manner, universally disowned and disclaimed in the two preceding reigns, and frequently rejected by the whole legislature, and abjured by men almost of all ranks, orders, or denominations amongst us, both then and since, will easily allow that title was the pretence only, and disgusts and discontents the true motives. Which reminds me of an observation made by a great statesman and a polite writer of our own<sup>t</sup>; "that upon the disputes of right and title to the crown, between the two roses, or races, of York and Lancaster, the popular discontents at the present reign made way for the succession of a new pretender, more than any regards of right or justice in their title; which served only to cover the bent and humour of the people to such a change." Men may pretend conscience for their humours, their passions, their follies, their vices; and it is frequent enough so to do; and not easy to discover whether they are sincere or no, while they act consistently with themselves. But it must be a strange sort of conscience, that cannot be brought to comply with a government, and yet can be brought to

<sup>t</sup> Temple, Miscell. part iii. p. 46.

swear to it : which is full of scruples about so uncertain a thing as the pretended title, and yet has no scruple about so plain and clear a thing as the obligation of an oath : which dares not give up some supposed rights of another, on any consideration whatever, for fear of damnation ; and yet is not afraid to give up the very bonds and links of human society, and the most sacred ties of all governments ; in a word, to make God's name cheap, his authority contemptible, and his vengeance despicable in the eye of the world. But to proceed,

2. I crave leave to observe next, that it may reasonably be presumed, that matters had never proceeded so far as to an open rebellion, had they not been industriously and artfully managed by the Shebas of our land, the emissaries of the Church of Rome ; I mean the professed Papists : men of the most inveterate hatred to our religion, laws, and establishment, and to whatever tends to the prosperity and honour of the English Church or the English nation ; who have been contriving all imaginable ways to blast and ruin our happy Reformation from the first commencing of it ; have been concerned almost in every commotion of State, and active in every rebellion ; feeding upon our factions, and rejoicing daily in our unhappy divisions. These, as is well known, were the chief promoters of the late disturbances ; actuated with revenge against our king, our country, our laws, and constitution ; and with a zeal for that Church, which scruples not to allow, and even to bless and sanctify, any fraud or deceit, any treachery or perfidiousness, any rage or violence, in order to extirpate what they call heresy, and to carry on the cause of their own superstition and idolatry. How would they rejoice and insult over us, to find us doing with our own hands what they have been labouring unsuccessfully for above a century and a half together ! As to our heats and animosities amongst ourselves, they may subside and fall by degrees ; and every thing may revert into right order, so long as we keep out the common enemy. But if once we open a door to Papal tyranny and usurpation, and submit our-

selves to that yoke of bondage, all will be lost, and past recovery. It is worth remarking, that, amidst our many distractions and confusions, during the grand rebellion and usurpation, there was so much of the English spirit still left, that they preserved themselves against any attempt of foreign powers. The nation was still honoured and revered abroad, though dismally divided and distracted at home. In a while their heats abated, and they settled into order and regularity : still retaining their own sovereignty and independency, and their religious and civil rights whole and entire. These reflections have carried me a little out of method : but I return.

I should here go on to pursue the parallel between the case of the revolting Israelites and that of the persons concerned in the late rebellion, in many particulars ; as the strange absurdity and inconsistency of the design, how improbable a method to redress any imaginary or real grievances, without involving the whole nation in infinitely more and greater ; how repugnant to the principles of religion and to common humanity ; how unlikely to prosper, and how destructive in its consequences if it had. The last I shall speak to presently ; the rest I pass over : the thing speaks itself, or may be easily understood from what hath been observed above ; and we may spare ourselves the trouble of an ungrateful remembrance. It is sufficient that the good hand of Providence has defeated and blasted the designs of our enemies ; that our country is not made a scene of war, or a field of blood ; that neighbours and brethren are not, at this present, destroying and murdering one another ; that our goods and possessions are not violently torn from us, our houses rifled, our temples defaced, villages burned up, or cities consumed, and turned into ruinous heaps ; that "Judah and Israel may dwell safely, every man under his vine and under his fig tree:" in a word, that we have the comfort and happiness to meet together this day, to bless and praise Al-

\* 1 Kings iv. 25.

mighty God for the preservation of our King and our country, our religion, laws, and liberties, and all we hold dear, from impending ruin. What the consequences of a successful rebellion (after a severe struggle, and wading through a sea of blood) might have been, we do not certainly know; and it is happy for us that we do not. But in all human views, and according to the probable issues of things, (without a miracle to prevent them,) the least we could expect was, to have had the noblest and happiest island in the world ravaged and defaced by foreign invaders; the bravest people, who have been used to give the law or the balance to Europe, made the scorn and the derision of those that hate them; and, to finish our misery, the purest and best constituted Church in the Christian world, which was founded in the blood of martyrs, and has been preserved hitherto by marvellous providences, given up for a prey to seducers, and overrun with bigotry, superstition, and idolatry.

But some perhaps may think, might not God's good providence have prevented all this, even under a succession of Popish princes? Yes certainly, it might. For what might not an omnipotent God do for us, under the most deplorable and desperate circumstances? But who shall assure us that he will do it, if we suffer ourselves to fall into such circumstances by our own supineness, or, what is worse, perverseness? Let any man tell us why Providence has not prevented the like in other countries; or how it comes to pass that a succession of Popish princes hath ever proved fatal to the Protestant religion. The Roman Conclave understand this well enough, and have been labouring this point with indefatigable zeal and pains; never doubting, but that by the gaining of this only, they may soon have what they please.

It is frankly said by a late writer of the order of the Jesuits, speaking of the consequence of a Popish successor to these kingdoms, that "it must perpetuate it (the " Romish religion) upon the throne, and in time bring it

“to prevail among the people<sup>x</sup>.” The remark is true and just, founded on history and observation, and the plain reason of things. We humbly trust that God’s good providence will prevent this, and will support that blessed Reformation which his own right hand hath planted in these kingdoms: but not by miracles, nor out of the ordinary way, but by means proper to it; that is, by perpetuating to us a succession of Protestant princes; the way by which he has been pleased hitherto to support it, and to preserve it down to this day. And we have reason to think and hope that he will still so preserve and continue it, so long at least as till the sins of the nation are full grown, till we have filled up the “measure of our iniquities,” and are become *ripe* for vengeance. God grant the ingratitude of many for mercies received, their unreasonable murmurs and complaints, their discontentedness with a well settled government, which they have frequently owned and solemnly sworn to, their heats and animosities, and party rage, may not hasten the approaches of the day of vengeance, and too soon eclipse the blessed light of the Reformation amongst us.

But these are too melancholy presages upon a day of thanksgiving, which lets us into a more comfortable scene, and gives us a pleasing prospect of better things. I shall pass on to the last part of my design;

III. To draw a few practical advices proper to the place and audience.

1. And the first is, to beware of the approaches of passion, and to guard against any temptation or provocation thereto. The studious life may be an advantage to us in this respect, by affording us a more thorough insight into the affections and workings of human nature; acquainting us with the distempers of the mind, and the causes of them, and the methods proper to heal them; teaching us to think and reflect, and to turn our eyes inward upon our-

<sup>x</sup> F. I. D’Orleans Hist. Stuarts, p. 298.

selves. This must render us less liable to be ensnared by passion, and better able to discern what use we are to make of any trials or provocations we may meet with from the world.

We have complained sometimes, and indeed with reason, of the general reflections thrown upon the Universities and Clergy: such treatment was as injurious as it was rude and uncivil. To throw scandal at large, and to condemn whole bodies for the faults of a few, is an uncharitable and unwarrantable procedure. And this might have been enough to exasperate some men. But such as consider that this was chiefly owing to the petulance of a few writers, and those the least considerable; and how unavoidable such things are, and how little they deserve the notice of understanding men, and how easily they are wiped off by a prudent and exemplary conduct: I say, such as consider thus, will think such censures proper only to provoke their pity, or to exercise their virtues, or to put them upon the practice of the Apostle's rule, "not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing; knowing that they are thereunto called, that they should inherit a blessing."

2. A second useful caution is, to be upon our guard against any popular pretences or vulgar delusions. It should seem the privilege and happiness of such as are trained up to think justly, and to reflect coolly, to be above any thing of that kind; to be able to distinguish between persons and principles, between men and things. It is natural for many to run in implicitly with whatever happens to be espoused by any particular set of men, with whom they have been engaged in some common interests. The reputation of constancy, the fear of disobliging, and the shame of deserting, are very powerful prejudices and strong temptations. But the best philosophy, as well as religion, teaches us to arm against this delusion; acquainting us, that it is the part of a wise and good man to

γ 1 Pet. iii. 9.



be constant to none, farther than they are constant to themselves, and to their duty; and that the truest constancy is, to sit loose to men, and to keep fixed to sound and good principles. Men are uncertain, fickle, various: principles are settled things, and change not. These are what will hold, and what we may safely trust to, while men's humours are afloat, and their passions toss them to and fro: and these are what, after they have been weary of a vain pursuit, they will at length return to, when they grow cool, and reflect.

When a nation is unhappily divided, and animosities run high, it is easy to imagine there may be danger of extremes either way. A good man has no security in such cases, nor any firm ground to rest himself upon, but by examining carefully what is true, right, and just in itself, separate from common vogue or popular opinion. And this is so necessary a part of Christian conduct, that, amidst the variety of cases and incidents which may happen, there is no other way of preserving a good conscience, and keeping up to one certain rule and tenor of life and conversation. And he that wants either the courage or the will to do this, knows not yet what it is to be a good Christian, or a good man. But,

3dly and lastly, It should be our especial care not only to forbear any thing tending to promote divisions, but to use our best endeavours to heal and reconcile them.

As there are none more sensible of these things than ourselves, or more likely to suffer by them; so I beg leave to intimate, how becoming and proper a part of our profession and business it is, to do what in us lies to prevent the growth and increase of them. While animosities prevail, arts and sciences will gradually decay and lose ground; not only as wanting suitable encouragement, but also as being deprived of that freedom, quiet, and repose, which are necessary to raise and cherish them. As divisions increase, Christian charity will decline daily, till it becomes an empty name, or an *idea* only. Discipline will of course slacken and hang loose; and the conse-

quence of that must be a general dissoluteness and corruption of manners. Nor will the enemy be wanting to sow tares to corrupt our faith, as well as practice; and to introduce a general latitude of opinions. *Arianism*, *Deism*, *Atheism*, will insensibly steal upon us, while our heads and hearts run after politics and parties.

It were a happy thing, if any remedy could be found out for these *grievances*; if all odious names of distinction could be forgotten and laid aside, and moderate counsels might take place; if men would learn humility and contentedness, meekness and charity; and consider that the "wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God;" and that all envy and malice and party rage are directly opposite to the mild and gentle spirit of the Gospel.

Permit me to observe, that the great warmth and eagerness, which is shown by many, is not about heaven and happiness, and the blessedness of the life to come. It is not so much as pretended that the glory of God, or the salvation of men, is what engages their thoughts and concern, or what they so eagerly contend for. It is all for the fading and perishing things of this life; power, honour, and riches. These are the things which divide and distract us. Were it possible to restore a true spirit of heavenly mindedness, those eager contests would soon fall of themselves, as having no longer any sufficient foundation.

We profess to believe a God, and a future judgment; a state of eternal happiness, and a state of eternal misery. We have been taught that we are as *strangers* and *pilgrims* here on earth; that we are to seek for a *better country*, and are to look upon ourselves as citizens of heaven; of that blessed place, from whence all envy and ill-will, all wrath and bitterness, all rancour and malice, all fury and violence, must be for ever shut out; and nothing but love, peace, gentleness, harmony, and goodness, abound for evermore. These things, I presume, are not

• Hebr. xi. 13. 1 Pet. ii. 11.

told us, in Scripture, as matters of theory and speculation only, or as subjects to talk on; but are designed to influence our practice, and to make us good men.

It is a moving and a solemn reflection, made by \* a great Prelate of our Church on another occasion,

“That a good man would be loath to be taken out of  
 “the world reeking hot from a sharp contention with a  
 “perverse adversary, and not a little out of countenance to  
 “find himself in this temper translated into the calm and  
 “peaceful *regions* of the *blessed*, where nothing but per-  
 “fect *charity* and *good-will* reign for ever.” This was  
 meant of controversial disputes; but may be applied with  
 equal or greater force to our party contests, which are  
 neither so innocent nor so useful, nor carried on so coolly  
 as the other.

But this I leave to your serious and pious meditation.  
 And shall conclude with a word or two of advice to the  
 youth of the University, whose want of years and sedate-  
 ness may render them most liable to intemperate sallies.

As the privilege of their education raises them above the  
*vulgar crowd*, and is apt to inspire larger thoughts and  
 views in *them*, as well as to create expectation in *others*;  
 so it concerns them highly, to demean themselves suitably  
 thereto, and to act up to their *character*.

To behave themselves soberly, peaceably, and dis-  
 creetly; to let party disputes alone, which can hardly  
 be managed with temper even by men of years and  
 gravity.

Not to provoke or to exasperate one another by any op-  
 probrious words or invidious names, invented only to sow  
 discord and to propagate mischief in the world. In fine,  
 to use no insulting, no rudeness, no misbecoming beha-  
 viour, on this day of thanksgiving, or on any day after:  
 but to curb their passions, to observe rules and orders, to  
 submit to their proper governors, and to pursue their re-  
 spective studies; such as may hereafter render them the

\* Tillotson, vol. i. p. 583.

supports and ornaments of our most holy Church, and so many blessings and comforts of the age and place they shall live in.

In the mean while, to set a shining example of sobriety, modesty, regularity, and all other graces and virtues that may tend to promote the glory of Almighty God, the security and satisfaction of our most gracious, and, to us particularly, most indulgent Sovereign, and the peace of his kingdoms; together with the honour and prosperity of the *University* whereunto they belong; and their own comfort, welfare, and happiness, both now and for ever.



**A SERMON**  
**PREACHED BEFORE**  
**THE SONS OF THE CLERGY,**  
**AT THEIR**  
**ANNIVERSARY MEETING**  
**IN THE**  
**CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. PAUL,**  
*December 14, 1721.*



---

MATTH. v. 16.

*Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.*

THESE words of our blessed Lord have relation to what went before; being a continuation of the same thought, and a kind of practical conclusion drawn from it. In the thirteenth verse of this chapter, he tells his disciples that they "are the salt of the earth;" thereby intimating their character and office, to *season* the world with their instruction, to *purify* it by their example, and by both to spread such a *sweet savour of life* to all around them, as should preserve them from corruption, and render their persons acceptable unto God. To enforce this farther, and to imprint it deeper, he carries on the same thought in the verses following, but under another metaphor, lively and elegant as the former; "Ye are the light of the world," says he, verse 14. to the same disciples; signifying thereby their qualifications and endowments, together with the duties arising from them: they were to hold out the *light* of their instruction, persuasion, and example, to an ignorant and immoral world; that is, in the words of the text, "to let *their* light shine before men, that they *might* see *their* good works, and glorify *their* Father which is in heaven."

Which is as much as to say, "Be ye *shining* professors, and *bright* examples of religion and virtue in a dark, misguided age; but not so much for your own honour or reputation, as for the glory of God: let strangers see and admire your *work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope*, that they may be converted and edified thereby: but let the praise and glory of



“all be returned up to the author and fountain of all, to  
“*your Father which is in heaven.*”

Having shown the connection of the words with the words preceding, and briefly intimated the general meaning and design of them, I may now proceed to consider them more distinctly and largely, in the method here following.

I. To show what is implied in the duty of “letting our light shine before men.”

II. To lay down some considerations, proper to enforce the practice of it.

III. To observe how far those considerations may affect Christians in *general*, or some in *particular*: concluding with a suitable *application* of the whole to the present occasion.

I. I shall endeavour to show what is implied in the duty of “letting our light shine before men.”

The duty taken in its full latitude, with all it contains and comprehends, is not so properly a distinct duty in itself, as the sum total, or completion of all. It is not only to be religious, but to be eminently so; not only to be good and virtuous, but to be exact and exemplary in it; not only to be truly pious, but to be remarkable and conspicuous in the face of the world for it. We may however distinguish between the foundation and the superstructure, between goodness in the general and a supereminent degree of it; and so the text may be considered as containing a duty distinct by itself, namely, the duty of being open and exemplary in our virtues; not concealing or smothering our good principles or practices, but producing them and drawing them forth in the face of the world. But I shall not affect to be very nice and critical, in distinguishing the foundation from the superstructure, choosing rather to take both in; only insisting more particularly on the latter, as most agreeable to the design of the text. A point of this nature, if treated of in any measure suitable to its dignity and importance, may, I presume, deserve the attention of any Christian auditory, and of this especially;

where are many present whose education and circumstances give them a more peculiar concern in it, and are such as will bear in the application. Now, to come to the business in hand; the advice of the text, to "let our light shine before men," may be conceived to imply two things.

1. That we give sufficient outward proofs of being ourselves moved and actuated by a true spirit of godliness.

2. That we make it our endeavour, by all practicable and prudent methods, to implant and propagate the same in others.

1. As to the first part, our giving sufficient outward proofs of our being actuated by a true spirit of religion, or godliness; this is to be done partly by the *constant tenor* of our lives and conversations, and partly by our *occasional* joining in any public services tending to the honour of God and the happiness of mankind.

Pious and good men may give sufficient proof of what they are, by the *constant tenor* of their lives and conversations. Indeed, a man cannot be throughly religious, but the world must see a great deal of it; and every fair and impartial judge will readily understand it. Humility, temperance, modesty, friendliness, affability, and other the like social virtues, will of course appear; and it will not be difficult for bystanders, of any reasonable discernment, to distinguish between real unaffected goodness and any false appearances of it, especially if it be accompanied with a religious observance of such *public* duties as cannot be hid from the world. Of this kind are these; a careful attendance upon the solemn and public worship, a reverent regard to God's holy word and sacraments, a conscientious performance of charitable exercises, such as visiting the sick, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and relieving the oppressed: to all which may be added, any *occasional* promoting and encouraging *public* designs set on foot for the glory of God and the benefit of men. Such instances of duty, if done at all, must be done in public, and cannot be concealed. The world is the pro-

per stage for them : it is scarce possible for a man to be, as it were, a common friend or benefactor, but men must see it and take notice of it. And it is very agreeable to the precept of the text, for a man to desire even to be *seen of men*, while he sets them such good example : provided only that he disclaim the *glory* of it, rendering it up entire to Almighty God, to whom alone all *glory* does of right belong.

It may perhaps be objected to what hath been said, that our blessed Saviour, in the next chapter, cautions us very strictly against *fasting, praying, or giving alms*, with any design to be *seen of men*. And that he means a great deal more than the forbidding us to make that the *only motive* for what we do, is very plain from the strict *secrecy* which he enjoins in the performance of those duties : we must industriously hide and conceal them from the view of the world, to prevent the very suspicion of our being so employed. How is this reconcileable with the advice of the text, to “let our light shine before men;” and for this very end and purpose, “that they may see “it?”

This seeming difficulty will admit of a very plain and obvious answer, if we distinguish between *private* and *public* duties; which have their several ends and uses, and are therefore to be conducted by different rules and measures. To clear this point, let us take into consideration the three duties before specified, *prayer, fasting, and almsgiving*. There is a *private* kind of *prayer*, proper for the closet; a secret intercourse to be religiously kept up between God and our own souls. For this kind of *prayer, enter your closet, and shut the door, and pray only in secret*.

But then there is also a *public* kind of *prayer*, in the *family*, or in the *Christian assemblies*; the very end and design of which is to implore *public* blessings, and to keep up an open show, an outward face of religion in the world : here “let your light shine before men,” by your constant attendance thereunto, and by all the outward becoming tokens of a serious and fervent devotion.

The like may be said for *fasting*. Good men will, for many private reasons proper to themselves, undertake sometimes voluntary *fasts*, such as the world need not, ought not to be acquainted with. Here let the rule be, to “anoint the head, and wash the face, that you appear not unto men to fast.” But besides these private *fasts*, there are also public *standing* fasts of the Church, and *occasional* ones of the State: here “let your light shine before men:” fast as you are commanded to do, and let others know that you do so, for the sake of the benefit they may receive from your good example.

The third instance is *almsgiving*. A pious and good man will often do alms in *secret*, for reasons proper and private to himself. In such cases as these, “let not your left hand know what your right hand doeth:” be as secret and reserved as possible. But there are also many *public* occasions for the exercise of the duty of *almsgiving*: here “let your light shine before men, that they may see it:” be charitable and generous in the face of the world, that men may observe it, bless God for it, and take example by it.

Thus are the *private* and *public* duties admirably contrived and tempered together, so as mutually to support and strengthen each other. Were they all of a *public* kind, religion might become matter of form, and degenerate into hypocrisy and vain-glory: or were they all to be done in *secret*, the benefit of example would be lost, and religion would of course decline daily, for want of public countenance and encouragement. *Private* duties are, as it were, the life and spirit of religion; without which it would be a kind of dead ceremony and lifeless form: while the *public* serve to give the greater gloss, grace, and strength to the other; and most of all contribute to the continuance and propagation of religion in the world.

Having shown how we are to “let our light shine” by the proofs we give of our own righteousness, I come now,

2. To consider the other way of “letting our light

“shine,” by our endeavours to implant and propagate the same spirit in others. *Example* is of greatest force in this matter: and so far this article will coincide with the former. Only, there I considered it as a proof of what the man is in himself; here I am to consider it under another view, in respect of its happy influence upon other persons. Any duty or virtue may be sooner learnt by *example* than by *rule*. This shows at once what many words would but imperfectly describe. It is a lesson suited to all capacities; such as a child may apprehend, and yet the oldest and wisest may improve by. It is learnt without trouble, and steals upon us almost without thought. It comes in by the eyes and ears, and slips insensibly into the heart, and so into the outward practice; by a kind of secret charm transforming men’s minds and manners into its own likeness. When I speak of *example*, I suppose it to consist in *words* as well as in *actions*. A good man’s *discourse*, in the way of pattern and example, may be as edifying as his life. His ordinary conversation, tempered with prudence, sweetness, and modesty, may be very instructive in the main; and, even without the formality of grave admonitions, may be a kind of lecture of morality to all around him. There will be something peculiar and distinguishing in his manner, something savouring of the pious frame and disposition of his heart. His candour in judging, his modesty in censuring, his caution and reserve in believing or reporting ill of any man, his charity in excusing, or giving every thing the kindest turn that it can bear; these and many other graces may appear, even when he seems least to design it; and may be highly useful and edifying to as many as observe it. The due *government* of the *tongue*, which is the glory of a man, as well as the perfection of a Christian, can be no other way so easily and so handsomely taught as in the way of example.

But though *example* be the standing and the most effectual method of diffusing our *light*, yet there are many other occasional means, proper at some seasons, to en-

force and strengthen it. Among which, in the first place, may be mentioned *exhortation*; which, as it is more direct and plain, so it may sometimes awaken and rouse those whom no example could move. The office of *exhorting* more especially becomes persons of superiority and eminence, in profession, age, dignity, or abilities; as magistrates, ministers, parents, masters, &c. It may indeed be exercised toward *equals* or *superiors*: only then it requires a different manner, a more cautious treatment, and a more ceremonious address. "To exhort one another daily" seems to be the duty of Christians at large, the duty of all towards all; provided only it be done pertinently, discreetly, and seasonably; with due regard to time, place, person, and other circumstances. It is however a duty very much grown into disuse, since we have fallen from the primitive simplicity: nor is it easy to revive it in these times; there being few fit to discharge it as they ought, and fewer that would bear it. Yet those who are really good men themselves, and endowed with the gift of prudence, may often engage in it with success, and thereby diffuse their *light* farther than they can by *example* alone.

Another method, near akin to the former, is that of *reproof*. It is the duty of persons in authority to rebuke and reprove offenders, in such a way and at such seasons as are the fittest and most proper for answering the ends of it; *viz.* the reclaiming of the sinners themselves, and putting a stop to the contagion of their example. Great tenderness and caution are required in a point of this extreme nicety; though the same general rules may, for the most part, serve either for *exhortation* or *reproof*, and I need not repeat them.

To conclude this head, whatever endowments, stations, or abilities a man is possessed of, affording him means for the promoting of piety or the suppression of vice; these are all so many ways pointed out for diffusing his *light* abroad, and making it *shine* out with lustre, and to advantage. The world has been much obliged to the seve-

ral *religious societies*, happily set on foot in this kingdom, for the many and various means they have devised of spreading a sense of religion and piety far and near; by forming of *schools of charity*, by taking care of the *execution of good laws against profaneness and immorality*, by dispersing *religious books*, by improving and augmenting *parochial libraries*, by sending out *missionaries* into foreign parts to *propagate the Gospel*, and by sundry other commendable services too long to be mentioned. In a word, whatever ways and means can be thought on for instructing, converting, or improving present or future generations; all are referred to this head, and fall under the precept of the text, to "let our light shine before men." Having thus stated and cleared the duty, I now proceed to my second general head,

II. To lay down some considerations proper to enforce the practice of it.

And these are three: the glory of God, the public good, and our own particular interest in a life to come.

1. Let the first consideration be the *glory of God*, which is the motive hinted in the text; "that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." It must be a public and exemplary profession or practice, that must bring the greatest honour to Almighty God, and make his name famous to all the ends of the earth. A private, retired virtue, however safe and easy to a man's self, does but little, in comparison, to promote God's honour in the world. It is well known how very shy and reserved many otherwise pious and good men are with respect to any outward show or appearance of religion. They are apt to seek corners and privacies on purpose to conceal it; as if they had a mind to go to heaven in disguise, and to steal through the crowd into a better world. And though the saving of our souls be the great business of life, and what, it is to be hoped, we have most of us a real and hearty concern for in our secret retirements; yet it must, I am afraid, be owned, that there is too little mention made of it, even

when it might be proper, and too general a silence and reserve about it. This so close and wary carriage in our religious concernments is more than need be or should be; and is attended with some ill effects. For while bad example is open and daring, and solicitations to vice public and common; if there be not some exemplary instances of true piety and godliness to confront them, God's honour must of course suffer, and the cause of religion decline daily. If impious wretches form their clubs and cabals, (and such we have been lately told of as cannot be mentioned without horror, nor paralleled in any history;) I say, if they gather together to carry on the interests of the kingdom of darkness, to keep lewdness in countenance, and to stamp some credit even upon the most execrable blasphemies; it concerns every good man, on the other hand, to be zealous for God's honour in the face of the world, in order to give the greater life and vigour to religion, and to make the adversary, at length, sink down in utter shame and confusion. There is ordinarily that force in truth, and in a just and righteous cause, that while men stand up for it with resolution and constancy, they are in a manner secure of triumphing over all its opposers. But,

2. As the *glory of God* requires this exemplary conduct, so also does the good of man. This is not so properly a different topic from the former, as the same under a different view. For whatever tends to make men wiser and better, does in the same degree tend to the furtherance of God's glory; which is then at the highest when the greatest numbers join in celebrating his name. Now that the exemplary lives and services of good men are of great force and efficacy to convince and convert others, is too plain a thing to need many words; and it has been already hinted. Let those therefore who have learnt the true art of living, come abroad, and practise in the view of the world. However highly some may speak of the *contemplative* and *devotional* life, it seems to be the perfection of those only who either have no call to, or are



too weak and unfurnished for, the *active*. Such as live like anchorites in a cell or a cloister, may do well in some particular circumstances, when their service is not wanted, or would be fruitless: but these are not the men to whom the world must be indebted for the example of holy living. They are too private to be seen, and too singular in their way for the generality of men to take their rules and measures from. Men must be taught to be religious and virtuous after another method, or not at all; there being few, in comparison, whose circumstances will admit of such abstraction and retirement. They must be taught how to be much in company, and to be religious all the while; how to converse daily with the world, without being corrupted thereby; how to dispatch business, and manage the affairs of life, still preserving their integrity, and keeping up a real and hearty sense of true godliness and piety. Examples of this kind are highly necessary, and of all the most useful. From such the foolish may learn wisdom, and the wicked be wrought over to virtuous and godly living; from them the intemperate may learn sobriety; the unclean, chastity; the proud and high-minded, modesty and humility; the dissolute and profane, recollection and gravity. These things must be learnt, not from *recluses*, but from men of *public* life and character, that mingle with the crowd, and act their parts upon the stage of the world. Thus lived Christ and his Apostles; thus also John the Baptist, for the latter part of his life, to show that his former had not been spent in vain. For though it be necessary to retire sometimes, for the sake of improvement; yet the design of such improvement is, in a great measure, lost, if it does not prepare and qualify us for a more public life, or public services, whenever we shall be called to them; that so the world may have the benefit of our improvements, and take their pattern and direction from us.

3. To this I must add, thirdly, a farther consideration, drawn from our own particular interest in a life to come. Such as "turn many to righteousness," saith the Pro-

phet, “ shall shine as the stars for ever and ever <sup>a</sup>.” And our blessed Lord hath said ; “ Whosoever shall confess “ me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven <sup>b</sup>.” And in another place, “ Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the “ Son of man also confess before the angels of God <sup>c</sup>.” There is some uncommon happiness in reserve, some *exceeding*, as well as *eternal*, weight of *glory* laid up for those who make it their more especial care to stand up against a deluge of iniquity, heresy, or profaneness ; and, by their exemplary labours and endeavours, do their best to confront and shame a wicked world. Troubles and difficulties there are, great and many, in doing it, (as in all glorious enterprises,) and they enhance its value, and heighten the reward. And let this suffice by way of motive to the duty laid down in the text. I proceed,

III. Thirdly, to observe how far these considerations may affect Christians in *general*, or some in *particular* ; where I shall conclude with a suitable application of the whole to the present occasion.

The duty here recommended, more or less, concerns all Christians. For there is no one so mean or low but may set a good example, and in some measure promote the interests of religion, suitably to the station, whatever it be, wherein God has placed him. But more particularly does the precept of the text concern those who are *set upon a hill* ; persons of quality and high station, who move in a larger sphere, and are able to do much by their countenance, interest, and authority. Nothing can sooner or more effectually recommend virtue and piety than illustrious and great examples. This is the way to bring religion into vogue, and to render it genteel and fashionable ; which is a considerable advantage to it. Vice, in itself vile and odious, will by this means become more and more despicable. Many will grow perfectly ashamed of it, while they see none but the inferior rank giving in to

<sup>a</sup> Dan. xii. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Matth. x. 32.

<sup>c</sup> Luke xii. 8.

it. They will put on the outward garb of sanctity (at least) as a part of good breeding, and a gentlemanly accomplishment. And though it should sometimes rise no higher than a refined *hypocrisy*, yet even that may have its use, and be of much better consequence, in respect of example, than *open profaneness*. But we may reasonably hope that good and great examples would strike much deeper into the hearts of many; and by degrees spread a real and hearty sense of religion and piety through the kingdom.

After persons of high station and authority, in Church or State, the *Clergy* in general may be mentioned, as men particularly concerned in the advice of the text. They are in a special manner set up for "lights of the world," for ensamples and patterns to others. It is their profession and business to promote virtue, and rebuke vice; to maintain God's honour, and to keep up a sense and face of religion in the world. It cannot be thought pretending in them, however it might in others, to stand up for God and religion. A more than ordinary zeal for God's glory, a devout earnestness in prayer, a religious gravity, and even great appearances of sanctity, at proper seasons, such as might look like ostentation in others, may be becoming and graceful in them, when joined with a good life. Indeed, it is no more than what their high office and sacred character demand of them, suitable to that peculiar relation they bear to God, and to the work which they are sent to do, that of reforming the world.

From the *Clergy* I descend, with pleasure, to the *Clergy's Sons*, here met together; and making a becoming and venerable appearance upon this our solemn festival. Surely they also are raised up for "lights of the world." God hath this day called us to his holy sanctuary, singled us out from city and country, from remote and distant retirements, to appear in one collective body, and in the view of the world. Now is the time to "let our light shine before men," while their eyes are upon us, and

they are expecting to "see our good works," that they may "glorify our Father which is in heaven." You are an *holy seed*, sanctified from your *birth*, and eminently consecrated to the service and glory of God. Your *education* is a farther privilege; you have been bred up within the verge of the tabernacle, amidst holy offices, under the nurture and admonition, the example and the benediction of the sacred calling. Let it be seen by our lives and conversations, under whose roofs we have some time dwelt, by whose instructions we have profited, and by whose examples we have been formed. Let our *manners* declare our extraction, and every *line* of our behaviour show the work of some *masterly* hand. I cannot here run through the whole circle of divine graces and virtues, wherein we ought to be exemplary, after the pattern set us by our pious progenitors. Your own better thoughts will suggest to you more than I can find words to express. *Three* things only I will take leave to mention, whereby we may make our "light shine" to very excellent purposes.

1. By a becoming zeal for the *primitive faith* and *doctrine*.

2. By our promoting *works of charity*.

3. For the sake of both the other, by our expressing, on all proper occasions, a religious concern for the *Establishment* in Church and State.

1. Let us, in the first place, manifest a becoming zeal for the *primitive faith* and *doctrine*: that faith which was taught us by our fathers, and which they received and professed as handed down to them, by a long series and succession of bishops and martyrs, from Christ and his Apostles. We are now called to a more than common zeal for the *faith*, while *Atheism* and *Deism* make daily advances; and *Arianism*, paving the way to both, appears open and barefaced. It has been the glory of our Clergy, our immediate and our remote progenitors, that they ever held in veneration the mysterious doctrine of

the ever blessed Trinity. When *Socinianism*, some years ago, made large steps and loud triumphs, very little impression could be made upon the *Clergy*; who, conformable to their *subscriptions*, still adhered to the true faith, almost without exception. They knew how ancient that faith was, and what value had been set upon it by all the primitive churches. Let it then be one principal part of our care and concern, to copy after those bright examples, by our constant and unshaken zeal for the *ancient faith*: so may we approve ourselves as true sons of this Church, by inheriting those principles which our fathers preserved as a sacred *depositum*, to be handed down to their children, and to children's children, and to all succeeding generations. To desert this faith, or even to be cold and indifferent towards it, is to sully our extraction, cancel our sonship, and to strike ourselves at once out of privilege and character.

2. A second method of making our light shine, is by promoting *works of charity*. This subject hath been often and excellently handled in this place, and upon the same occasion. The usefulness and necessity of public charities in general, and of this in particular, have been set forth in the strongest colours; and are, no doubt, so deeply imprinted in the hearts and minds of the audience, that they can never be erased or blotted out. Your light has shone abroad from hence to distant quarters, even to the darkest corners of the land: and both *widows* and *orphans*, with as many as wish well to them, have often "seen your good works, and glorified your Father which "is in heaven," for them.

*Widows* and *orphans* have been ever looked upon as very proper objects of compassion and charity. Their helpless condition and afflicted circumstances plead strongly in their behalf: and lest they should ever want a friend to *prefer* their *petitions*, God himself has condescended to recommend their case, and in moving terms to intercede, and almost entreat for them. Now, if *wi-*

*dows* and *orphans*, in general, have so just a claim to our charity, much more those of our own household and family; whose husbands, whose fathers have served at the altar; and some of them by their integrity, or generous disdain of mean compliances, others by their suffering for conscience sake, many for want of provision suitable to their merit, have entailed poverty and distress upon their unhappy families. But these and the like considerations are so well known, and have been so often repeated, that I forbear. It may be a comfortable thought to us, that, amidst our sorrowings for the ravages made by *avarice* at home, and our consternation at the advances of a *pestilence* abroad, there are yet many great and excellent designs on foot, many commendable *charities* going on, promoted and encouraged by some of all ranks and orders of men, through the whole nation. These, we hope, may in some measure atone for a deluge of iniquity, and be sufficient to draw down still more and more blessings and mercies upon this Church and kingdom. Happy they that join hands and hearts in these good works; they shall not be afraid in the *evil day*, but shall *stand in the gap*, before the Lord, for *this land*, that it may not be destroyed when God comes to visit us.

Thirdly and lastly, to our zeal for the *true faith* and for *works of charity*, let us add, for the sake of both the other, a religious concern for the *Establishment* in Church and State. This will be securing the *outworks*, and preserving the necessary *fences*: which if we neglect to do, our *faith* will be broke in upon and trampled down; and all our promising foundations for *public charities* will be razed and tore up. I need not remind you how much these depend upon the *Protestant settlement* in the State. This in particular, which we are now met to solemnize, is perfectly wrapped up in it; and must either stand or fall with it. An anniversary festival of the *Sons of the Clergy*, what is it but a triumph over *Popery*, an insult upon their doctrine of the Clergy's *celibacy*, and an affront to their policy and practice? Who sees not that our ground

is entirely *Protestant*, that our *charter* subsists by the present *settlement*, and must dissolve with it?

As our zeal for the *settlement* in *State* is thus highly becoming our place and character, so likewise is our hearty concern for the *Establishment* of the *Church*. This is the band of union which keeps us in, and shuts heresy, Popery, enthusiasm, and every wild disorder, out. Take away this, and what are we but a broken, disconcerted multitude, without order or discipline, exposed to every rude assault, and unable to make head against foreign or domestic enemies? If therefore we value our religion, we must look well to the *Establishment* of the *Church*, the only outward *human* means of preserving our faith and doctrine, and handing them down safe to our posterity.

Let us therefore, my brethren, be hearty and constant friends to our present Establishment in Church and State. I put both together; neither can they subsist asunder: none can be really friends or enemies to *either*, without being such to *both*. They that strike immediately at the *Church*, pave the way, at a distance, to the ruin of the *State*: as, on the other hand, they that aim directly at the overthrow of the *settlement*, indirectly and remotely lay a train for the destruction of the *Church* also. *Church* and *State* are vitally linked together, united in their interests, and inseparable from each other. This was well understood by our pious and wise forefathers; who, as they have, many ways, preserved the *Church*, by their close attachment to the *constitution* in *State*; so have they as effectually secured the *State*, by their resolute adherence to, and unanswerable defences of, the doctrines of the *Church*. Let us, their progeny, take pattern from their examples; discountenancing, on the one hand, every wild conceit of a *State's* subsisting without an *Established* *Church*; and on the other, all vain and delusive hopes of a *Reformed* *Church's* subsisting under a *Popish* settlement.

To conclude; may every one of us here descended of

the *sacred line* take the instructions of Solomon for the advice of a father; "My son, fear thou the Lord and the King: and meddle not with them that are given to change<sup>d</sup>."

<sup>d</sup> Prov. xxiv. 21.





A  
FAMILIAR DISCOURSE  
UPON THE  
DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY,  
AND THE  
USE AND IMPORTANCE OF IT:  
IN  
A SERMON  
PREACHED UPON  
TRINITY SUNDAY,  
AT THE  
PARISH CHURCH OF ST. AUSTIN.



---

2 COR. xiii. 14.

*The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God,  
and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.  
Amen.*

**T**HIS solemn form of blessing, or benediction, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, laid down by St. Paul, and from him derived into the common liturgies, may be a proper subject for our meditation upon the festival of the Holy Trinity, which we this day celebrate. It is a festival of long standing in the Church; though not so ancient as those of Christmas, Easter, Ascension-Day, or Whitsuntide.

Every Lord's Day, formerly, was looked upon as the feast of the Holy Trinity, being in memory of the *creation* and of Christ's *resurrection*; in both which the three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were all jointly concerned. Besides that in every festival, of old time, it had been customary to celebrate the praises of the Holy Trinity, in the common doxology, ("Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost,") and in other the like forms, in the daily offices of the Church; so that it appeared the less necessary to set apart any particular day in the year for the commemoration of the Holy Trinity, when the memory thereof was otherwise kept up in the ordinary and standing liturgies all the year round.

However, since the doctrine of the blessed Trinity is in itself of the highest concernment to all Christians, and had met with many opposers, even among Christians themselves, (by reason of its sublimity far surpassing human understanding,) the piety of our ancestors took care to have this momentous article more particularly inculcated; and, for that very purpose, set apart one more

especial Sunday in the year, to be called Trinity Sunday, as a standing memorial of it. Which seems to have been first done about nine hundred years ago, or at the least six, in some churches or monasteries; and in process of time became the usual and customary way in all churches throughout the world. The day chosen for it is the Sunday after Whitsunday, the most proper of any. For as the festival of Whitsunday is in memory of the great things done for us by *God the Holy Ghost*, Christmas and Easter, of what hath been done by *God the Son*, and all of them set forth the inestimable love of *God the Father*, by whom the Son was sent, and the Holy Spirit shed abroad; after such particular notice taken of the Divine Persons singly and separately, nothing could be more suitable than to have this festival immediately follow, wherein to celebrate the praises of all *three* together: so that the preceding festivals naturally conclude in this of the present day.

And that I may do some justice to this day's solemnity, I have made choice of a text, which is in effect a prayer put up to the three Divine Persons, imploring their aid, grace, and assistance. It is St. Paul's *prayer*, while we consider him as looking up to the three Divine Persons, imploring a blessing from them; and it is his *benediction*, if you consider him as imploring the same for and upon the Corinthians, to whom he is writing: so that the words have a double aspect; are *petitionary*, with respect to the *Divine Persons*, asking a blessing of them; and *authoritative*, with respect to the Corinthians, upon whom, as God's minister, by apostolical authority, he conveys the blessing derived from above. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen."

I must make a few remarks upon the several parts of the text, for the better understanding of it: which when I have done, I shall proceed to the consideration of the matter contained in it.

“The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.” Our common way of expressing it in the Liturgy is, “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.” And so many of the old Greek copies and versions, and ancient Fathers, read this text of St. Paul: instead of *the* Lord Jesus, *our* Lord Jesus; though the difference is not very material. The next words are, “and the love of God;” that is, of *God the Father*. And so also some Greek copies, one version, and a Greek Father read the place. But the other reading is best warranted, and therefore rightly preserved in our translation. God the Father has particularly and eminently the name of *God* given him, in the Scripture style, because he was first made known to the world, and because God the Son and God the Holy Ghost (though one God with the Father) are yet represented as submitting to *inferior offices*, and to be *sent* by the Father: and one of them is *his Son*, and the other *his Spirit*, referred to him, as being the *first* in the Godhead, and *fountain* of both the other.

The following words, “the communion of the Holy Ghost,” in the usual form, is *the fellowship of the Holy Ghost*: in which there is no more difference, than the putting one English word for another. *Fellowship* is the old word, and more properly English, the word *communion* being borrowed from the Latin. Our Liturgy being older than the present English translation of the New Testament, keeps the old word *fellowship*, which the people had been used to in the daily service. But *communion* being thought the handsomer expression of the two, after *fellowship* became vulgar, it was chosen rather than the other.

The *Amen* at the end of this text has been thought not to be St. Paul’s, but to have been added by the Church of Corinth; it having been customary for them to say *Amen* after the reading of this epistle to them. This conjecture is founded upon the *Amen*’s being wanting in some ancient copies: but since a much greater number of copies have it, the conjecture goes upon very

slight grounds. And this is all I thought necessary to be said, in relation to the *words* of the text. I now proceed to the matter. My design is to treat of the *nature, distinction, union, and offices* of the three Divine Persons herein mentioned: not in the dry controversial way, which I think not proper for popular discourses, but in such a way as may be sufficient to give every common hearer a good notion of what I am talking about, and may be useful to him, in respect both of his *faith* and *practice*.

In the text, we find first *grace*, as coming from God the Son; then *love*, as from God the Father; and lastly, *communion*, as being of the *Holy Ghost*.

What these three things mean, I shall show, when I come to speak of their distinct offices.

The method I intend is this.

I. To treat of the nature, distinction, union, and offices of the three Divine Persons. And,

II. To intimate the use and importance of these great articles of our Christian faith.

I. I am first to treat of the nature, distinction, union, and offices of the three Divine Persons.

1. In the first place, it is proper to say something of the *nature* of each Person, that you may the better conceive what kind of Persons they are.

The first and most general distinction of all things that are, is into two kinds, *created* and *uncreated*. The nature of a *creature* is this, that it comes into being by the order, will, and pleasure of another, and may cease to be whenever the Creator pleases. Of this kind are the sun, moon, stars, men, angels, and archangels: they are all of a frail, changeable nature; they might cease to be, and sink into nothing, as from nothing they came, were they not supported by a superior hand. Only the three *Divine* Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, they can never fail or cease: they always were, and always will be; their property is always to exist from everlasting to everlasting, without the help or support of any thing else whatever, being indeed the stay and support of the whole

creation, of the whole bulk and mass of beings. Our thoughts are quite lost, as often as we think of any person's existing before all beginning: yet we are very certain that so it must be, or else nothing could ever begin to be at all. Whether one only, or more Persons might or do exist in this most perfect and incomprehensible manner, we could never know by our own reason alone, unassisted with Divine revelation. But sacred Writ sufficiently assures us, that three such Persons there are, who have been from all eternity without beginning, and who cannot but be to all eternity; and these are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. I will not stand to prove this to you particularly from holy Scripture, because it would lead me into a large field of inquiry, beyond the compass allowable in discourses of this nature. It is sufficient to say, that this is and has been all along the faith of Christ's Church, founded upon Scripture: and my design now is rather to tell you what the true faith is, and to assist you in conceiving it, than to lay down the particular proofs and arguments on which it rests.

To conceive then rightly of the three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, consider them as being just the reverse of what *creatures* are; not frail, mutable, or depending on any one's pleasure; not as beginning to be, or capable of ever ceasing to be; but as being perfect and unchangeable, all-sufficient, and independent, without beginning, and without possibility of ever coming to an end. Such is the *nature* of these three; and for that reason they are all properly *Divine*.

2. After this brief account of their nature, I may next consider their *distinction*. They are constantly represented in Scripture as *distinct* from each other: the Father is not the Son, nor is the Holy Ghost either of the other two. They are described, as any other distinct persons are, by different characters and offices. This is so plain through every page almost of the New Testament, that it were needless to instance in particulars. The Father is



said to *send*, the Son to be *sent*, and the *Holy Ghost* to *proceed*, or *go forth*. The Father is represented as *one witness*, and the Son as *another witness*: the Son as *one comforter*, the *Holy Ghost* as *another* comforter, not both one comforter. The Father is introduced as speaking to the Son, and the Son as speaking to the Father, and the Holy Ghost as delivering commands from both. These and a multitude of other particulars plainly prove their distinction one from another; which being analogous to, and nearly resembling the distinction of persons among men, or angels, or other rational creatures, we therefore presume to call it a *personal* distinction, and to call the three, *three Persons*.

3. But as there is a distinction amongst them, there is also an *union*, a very close and unexpressible union, among the Divine Three. And though Scripture every where represents these three Persons as *Divine*, and every one singly *God* and *Lord*; yet the same Scriptures do as constantly teach that there is but *one God* and *one Lord*. From whence it evidently follows, that these three are *one God* and *one Lord*. And if such an imperfect union as that of *husband* and *wife* be reason sufficient to make them twain to be *one flesh*; and if the union of a good man to Christ shall suffice to make them in a certain sense *one spirit*<sup>a</sup>, how much more shall the incomparably closer and infinitely higher union of the three Divine Persons one with another, be sufficient to denominate them *one God*, or *one Lord*! There is no other union like it, or second to it; an union of will, presence, power, glory, and all perfections: an union so inseparable and unalterable, that no one of the Persons ever was or ever could be without the other two; it being as necessary for the three to be, and to act *together*, as to *be at all*; which is the perfection of unity, and the strongest conjunction possible.

Our blessed Lord therefore intimates, that he and the

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 17.

Father *are one*: and they are represented by St. John in his Revelations, as being *one temple*<sup>b</sup>, and as having but *one throne*<sup>c</sup>, and making but *one light*.

The Holy Ghost likewise is represented as being one with the Father, as much as the *soul of man* is *one* with the *man* whose soul it is<sup>d</sup>. And they are all three together said to be *one*; “these three are one<sup>e</sup>,” which though a disputed text, is yet not without very many and very considerable appearances of being truly genuine. The doctrine however is certain from many other places of Scripture, whatever becomes of that text; and the *unity* of three Persons in one *Godhead* sufficiently revealed, as well as their distinction. Neither is there any difficulty in admitting that three things may be *three* and *one* in different respects; distinct enough to be *three*, and yet united enough to be *one*; distinct without division, united without confusion. These therefore together are the *one Lord God* of the Christians, whom we worship, and into whom we have been baptized.

I proceed now, after considering what the Divine Persons are in themselves, to observe also what their *offices* are, *relative* to us. We are taught in our common and excellent Church Catechism, taken from Scripture, to believe in God the Father who *made* us, in God the Son who *redeemed* us, and in God the Holy Ghost who hath *sanctified* us. So that the peculiar offices of the three Divine Persons are, to *create*, *redeem*, and *sanctify*. To the Father it peculiarly belongs to *create*, to the Son to *redeem*, to the Holy Ghost to *sanctify*. The Father is God the *Creator*, the Son is God the *Redeemer*, the Holy Ghost is God the *Sanctifier*. Which is not to be so understood, as if neither the Son nor Holy Ghost were concerned in *creating*; nor as if neither the Father nor Holy Ghost were concerned in *redeeming*; nor as if neither Father nor Son were concerned in *sanctifying*. All the three Persons concur in every work; all the three toge-

<sup>b</sup> Rev. xxi. 22.

<sup>c</sup> Rev. xxii. 1.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 11.

<sup>e</sup> 1 John v. 7.

ther *create, redeem, and sanctify*: but each Person is represented, in Scripture, as having his more peculiar part or province in regard to these several offices; on account of which peculiarity, over and above what is common to all, one is more eminently and emphatically *Creator*, another *Redeemer*, and a third *Sanctifier*. So much as is *common* to all, serves to intimate their *union* one with the other: and so much as is *peculiar* to any one, in like manner serves to keep up the notion of their *distinction*. We may observe something of like nature in the words of the text. "The *grace* of the Lord Jesus Christ." God the Father giveth *grace*, and the Holy Spirit likewise giveth *grace*, and is particularly called the *Spirit of grace*; and *grace* is the common gift of the whole *Trinity*: but yet here it is peculiarly attributed to Christ, as his gift and blessing, and denoting the special *grace* of *redemption*. The next words are, "the love of God," that is, of God the Father. We read of the "love of Christ," and of the "love of the Spirit;" and love is common to the whole *Trinity*, for "God is love." But here one particular kind of love, the love of the Father in sending his Son to redeem us, the Holy Ghost to sanctify us, is intended.

The last words are, "and the communion of the Holy Ghost." Now there is a *communion* both of the *Father* and the *Son* with every good man; according to what our Lord says, "If any 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<sup>f</sup>." Every good man is the *temple* of the whole *Trinity*, which has *communion* with him, and abides in him; as is plain from innumerable texts of Scripture. But, in this text, one special and peculiar kind of *communion*, appertaining to the Holy Ghost, is signified.

One thing however is observable, that though St. Paul might have indifferently applied *grace*, or *love*, or *communion*, to either Father, or Son, or Holy Ghost, or to all

<sup>f</sup> John xiv, 23.

together; yet he chose rather to make the characters *several* and *distinct*, to keep up the more lively sense of the distinction of persons and offices. Having intimated as much as is needful, of the *nature, distinction, union, and offices* of the three Divine Persons of the ever blessed Trinity, I now design very briefly,

II. To intimate likewise the importance and use of these great articles of our Christian faith. The importance of those weighty truths may be judged of from the nature of the thing itself, as well as from the concern which God hath shown to inculcate and fix them upon our hearts and minds.

1. From the nature of the thing itself. If there really be three such Divine Persons as I have described, (and no one can doubt of it, that reads the Scripture without prejudice,) it must have been as necessary to let mankind into some knowledge of them all, as it is that we should have right and just sentiments of any one. For there is no having a right apprehension of any one, without knowing what relation he stands under to the other two. To know or conceive of God as a *single* Person, is to know God very imperfectly, or is rather a *false* conception of God. It is therefore of as great concernment to know that God is three Persons, (supposing it really so,) as it is to conceive truly, rightly, and justly of God. Farther, if there really be three *Divine* Persons, it is as necessary that man should be acquainted with it, as it is that he should direct his *worship* where it is due, and to whom it belongs. For if all honour, and glory, and adoration, be due to *every* Person, as much as to *any*; it was highly requisite that a creature made for worship, as man is, should be instructed where and to whom to pay it. To offer it to any *single* Person only, when it is claimable by *three*, is defrauding the other two of their just dues, and is not honouring God perfectly, or in full measure and proportion. Besides, how shall any one Person *justly* claim all our homage and adoration to himself, and not acquaint us that there are two

Persons more, who have an equal claim to it, and ought therefore to receive equal acknowledgments?

Add to this, that if man is to be trained up to a knowledge of God here, in order to be admitted to "see God "as he is," in the life that shall be hereafter; it seems highly requisite that he should know at least *how many* and *what* Persons stand in that character, that by his acquaintance with them now, in such measure as is proper to this state, he may attract such love and esteem for them here, as may prepare him for the fuller vision and fruition of the same hereafter. Thus far I have presumed to plead, from the very nature and reason of the thing itself. But to this I must add,

2. That this reasoning is abundantly confirmed, from the concern that God hath shown to imprint and inculcate this so necessary and saving belief upon us. I shall not here cite the many texts of Scripture bearing testimony to the *Divinity* of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and engaging us to place our hope, trust, and confidence in them all, and to pay our worship to them. This would be too large a task, and is a work more proper for a divinity chair than for the pulpit. But I shall single out two or three considerations appearing to me of great force; leaving you at leisure to consult the Scriptures themselves, for the many and plain testimonies of the Divinity of the three Persons.

You will observe, that as soon as ever our Lord had given his disciples commission to form a church, he instructs them to baptize in the name of the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*.

This was the one short and important lesson to be first instilled and inculcated into the new converts through every nation. From whence we may justly infer, that the faith in these three Persons as *Divine*, in opposition to all the *gods* of the Gentiles, was to be the *fundamental* article of Christianity, the *distinguishing character* of the true religion. Such care has been taken to impress the belief

of the ever blessed Trinity upon the minds of all Christ's disciples.

Another thing I would observe, not so obvious perhaps as the former, but not less worthy of notice; and that is, how the whole scheme and frame of the Divine dispensations seem purposely calculated to introduce men gradually into the knowledge of these three Persons. This appears all the way down from the *fall* of Adam, to the completion and perfection of all by the descent of the Holy Ghost. One might justly wonder why man, created after God's image, should be so soon suffered to fall; and why, after his fall, such a vast preparation, such a long train should be laid for his recovery, that there should be no way for it but by means of a *Redeemer* to mediate, to intercede, to suffer for him, to raise and restore him, and at length to judge him. Why might not the thing have been done in a much shorter and easier way? Why might not God the Father (so graciously disposed towards all his creatures) have *singly* had the honour of pardoning, restoring, raising, and judging mankind? Or supposing both the Father and Son joined in the work, why should it be still left, as it were, *unfinished* and *incomplete*, though in the hands of *both*, without the concurrence of the *Holy Ghost*? Can any doubt be made, whether God the Father singly was able or willing to do all that the Holy Ghost has done for us; to work miracles, to shed gifts, to sanctify and purify man's nature, and to qualify him for the enjoyment of God? These things must appear strange and unaccountable, full of darkness and impenetrable mystery. But our wonder ceases as soon as we consider that mankind were to be gradually let into the knowledge of *three Divine Persons*, and not one only; that we were to be equally obliged to every one of them, that so we might be trained up to place our love, our fear, and trust in all, and pay acknowledgments suitable to their high quality and perfections. This is the reason of that long train and vast preparation in man's redemption: and with this view, there appear so many characters of consummate wisdom

all the way, that nothing can furnish us; with a more charming and august idea of the Divine dispensations from first to last. Consider but a little our Lord's conduct, when he was going to take his leave of his disciples, and what he said to them upon that occasion: "It is expedient," says he, "for you, that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you<sup>g</sup>." And in another place, "I will pray the Father, and he shall send you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever<sup>h</sup>." What is the meaning of this? Could the disciples want any *other comforter*, when he had told them, in the same chapter, that he himself and the Father should come and *make their abode* with them<sup>i</sup>; and when he had determined himself to be with them "always, even to the end of the world<sup>k</sup>," what occasion could they have for any *other comforter*? Or what *comforter* could do more or greater things than the Father and Son could do, by their constant presence with them? But the reason of the whole procedure is very plain and manifest. The *Holy Ghost*, the third Person of the ever blessed Trinity, was to be introduced with advantage, to do as great and signal things for mankind, as either Father or Son had done; that so *he* likewise might partake of the same Divine honours, and share with them in glory: and thus Father, Son, and Holy Ghost might be acknowledged as one God, blessed for ever.

It can never be imagined that an allwise God, jealous of his honour, and strictly prohibiting all *creature worship*, would ever have laid such a scheme as has been laid to magnify two *creatures*, and to raise them to such a height of honour and dignity, as to be made partakers of that glory and worship which can be due to God only. No, certainly; the Son and the Holy Ghost are no *creatures*, but strictly *Divine*, and of the same true and eternal God-head with the Father himself. In this faith was the

<sup>g</sup> John xvi. 7.    <sup>h</sup> John xiv. 16.    <sup>i</sup> John xiv. 23.    <sup>k</sup> Matt. xxviii. 20.

Church founded; in this faith have the renowned martyrs and confessors of old lived and died; in the same faith are all the churches of the Christian world instructed and edified at this day. Let it therefore be the especial care and concern of every one here present, to continue firm, stedfast, and unshaken in this faith; and never to be moved from it by the "disputers of this world;" who are permitted for a while to gainsay and oppose it, for a trial and exercise to others, that "they which are approved " may be made manifest." Persevere in paying all honour, worship, and praise to the three blessed Persons; knowing how great and how Divine they are, and how securely they may be confided in. And let the intimate *union* they have one with another put us in mind of that brotherly love and union which ought to be among Christians; that we may become, as it were, *one heart* and *one soul*, knit together in one faith, in the unity of the spirit, and the bond of peace. So may the "grace of our Lord " Jesus Christ," and the "love of God the Father," and the "communion of the Holy Ghost," be with us all evermore.





**A SERMON**

**PREACHED AT THE**

**CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. PAUL,**

**BEFORE THE**

**RIGHT HON. THE LORD MAYOR,**

**THE**

**ALDERMEN, AND CITIZENS OF LONDON,**

*On Wednesday, May 29, 1723.*

**Being the Anniversary Day of Thanksgiving for the  
Restoration.**



---

ECCLES. vii. 14.

*In the day of prosperity be joyful, but in the day of adversity consider : God also hath set the one over against the other, to the end that man should find nothing after him.*

THE words which I have here cited are in some measure obscure, and of doubtful meaning; which is no fault of the *translation*, since the *original* itself is here also ambiguous, and fairly capable of more meanings than one.

Our translators have left a latitude in their version of the place, not taking upon them to determine the sense where the *generality* of the expression in the *original* had left it undetermined; lest they should thereby forestall the reader's judgment, and make a comment instead of a translation. A safe and prudent rule in *translations*, to leave a text in the same doubtful state wherein it was found; rather than to fix and determine it to a *certain* meaning, upon *uncertain* conjectures. It may be left to *commentators*, whose proper business it is, to point out some determinate sense for a reader to fix upon: and if it be not certainly the true sense, yet if it be a good sense, and as probable as any other, it may very well pass for the true one, till a truer can be found.

Now as to the text before us, the first words of it, "In the day of prosperity be joyful," have no difficulty: the sense is plain and obvious, and thus far interpreters are agreed. The next clause, "but in the day of adversity consider," may well enough bear to be changed into this; *but consider also the day of adversity*; that is, look backwards or forwards to the *day of adversity*; as being that which went before, and may also ensue upon the day

of prosperity: *for God hath set the one over against the other*; so I render this clause, (instead of "God also hath set," &c.) the better to preserve the connection and coherence of one part with another. The last words of the text are the most obscure of any, and capable of divers meanings; "to the end that man should find nothing after him." I shall not trouble you with a tedious recital of the several constructions put upon them by different interpreters; some referring the words, *after him*, to *man*, the nearest *antecedent*; and others, I think rightly, to *God*, the more remote. Instead of the words, "to the end that man should find nothing after him," I should rather choose another rendering, which the words of the original will very well bear, and which makes the sense more natural and coherent; *in such a way* (order, or method) *that man can find nothing after him*: nothing after *God*, nothing to correct or justly complain of. The whole verse then may, I conceive, be thus rightly paraphrased.

"*In the day of prosperity be joyful, receiving and enjoying the blessings of Heaven with thankfulness and cheerfulness; but consider also the day of adversity, as what went before, or may again return: for God hath set the one over against the other, in such a way; he hath so mingled and tempered prosperity and adversity together, and hath so exactly balanced one with the other, that no man, after him, can find any thing to correct or complain of with any reason; nothing wiser or better can be contrived or thought on, for the due government of the moral world, after what unerring wisdom has once fixed and settled.*"

The text, thus understood, will lead me to discourse upon the manifold wisdom of Divine Providence, in the various turns and vicissitudes of human affairs; the interchangeable successions of judgments and mercies, whether towards particular men, or whole bodies of men, churches, and kingdoms; the revolutions of states, and

fortune of empires, public calamities and public blessings returning in their appointed seasons: a subject useful at all times, and particularly suitable to this day's solemnity. For though (God be thanked) the blessings which we now commemorate may turn our thoughts chiefly to the *brighter* side of Divine Providence; yet both the advice of the text, and the reason of the thing, call upon us to consider the *dark* side also. We shall have no full sense of the mercies we enjoy, till we look back to the calamities which we once lay under: neither shall we be in a right disposition to make the best use of what we have, unless we look forward to the great uncertainty and instability of all things here below; how suddenly adversity may overtake us, and a cloud overshadow us, amidst our rejoicings. We have had our days of *prosperity* and our days of *adversity*, as all other nations also have had theirs: "God hath set the one over against the other," in the ordinary course of his Providence, to chastize, try, exercise, or improve mankind. His *goodness* is chiefly seen in one, his *justice* in the other; his *wisdom* and his *power* in both. In discoursing farther,

I. I shall first observe, in the general, that we ought to look up to God as the *supreme Author* both of *calamities* and *blessings*.

II. I shall apply the general doctrine to the particular case of our late troubles, and our deliverance from them in the happy *Restoration*.

III. I shall point out the proper use and improvement to be made of all.

I. I am, first, to observe, in the general, that we ought always to look up to God, as the *supreme Author* both of *calamities* and *blessings*. His Providence steers and governs all things both in heaven and earth. Every seemingly uncertain chance or wandering casualty is directed to its proper end by his unerring wisdom. Not a *hair* of any man's head perishes, nor so much as a *sparrow* falls, but by his guidance or permission. *Second* causes are entirely in the hands of their *first mover*: even the volun-

tary counsels and contrivances of moral agents are all conducted by his rule and governance; and are so curiously wrought in and interwoven with his eternal purposes, as to make up, in the whole, one entire, uniform, and beautiful contexture. He hath the hearts and wills of all men under his sovereign command, winding and turning them by secret and irresistible influences, to bring about his own good and great designs. So that all events, whether calamitous or prosperous, are in the last result to be ascribed to his *directive* or *permissive* Providence: which I may show a little more particularly, first of *calamities*, and next of *blessings*.

1. As to *calamities*, it is said, “ Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it<sup>a</sup>?” And in another place; “ I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things<sup>b</sup>:” that is, either by direction or permission. Accordingly, David scrupled not to say, that *the Lord* had *bidden Shimei to curse him*<sup>c</sup>. And Absalom’s wickedness in *rebelli*ng against his royal father, and going in unto his *father’s concubines*<sup>d</sup>, were a judgment of God upon David, consequent upon God’s avenging sentence pronounced against him in the matter of Uriah. For “ thus saith the Lord, “ Behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbour, and he shall lie with thy wives in the sight of this sun. For thou didst it secretly: but I will do this thing before all Israel, and before the sun<sup>e</sup>.” When God sees fit to execute vengeance, he unties the hands of wicked men, and lets them loose to commit all uncleanness and iniquity with greediness. He withdraws his protecting arm, for a time, from those whom he has once determined to chastize. And in such a case it is all one to him, whether the fury of wild beasts or that of wilder men be let in upon them to execute

<sup>a</sup> Amos iii. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Isa. xlv. 7.

<sup>c</sup> 2 Sam. xvi. 10, 11.

<sup>d</sup> 2 Sam. xvi. 22.

<sup>e</sup> 2 Sam. xii. 11, 12.

his righteous judgments. This is no reflection upon his holiness, or unspotted purity; as if he either stood in need of men's wickedness, or were consenting unto it: but it is a marvellous instance of Divine wisdom in conducting all things to some excellent purpose, that the very worst of all shall not return useless or empty; but the very things which of all others are the most displeasing and hateful to him, shall yet be turned to a good use, and made to serve the ends of his glory; while the wicked actors either design nothing of it, or design the quite contrary. To *them* remains shame and confusion of face, for the evil of their doings: to *him* glory and praise, for bringing *good* out of *evil*. Thus the *serpent* was suffered to beguile Eve, and Eve to deceive Adam, which brought on a curse upon *them* and *theirs*: but out of this mischief was made to spring up an everlasting covenant of mercy; and the *curse* was thereby converted into a *blessing*. Joseph was meanly and maliciously sold into Egypt by his inhuman brethren: they did wickedly therein, but God was wise and gracious in permitting it, as fully appeared by what followed after. God suffered Satan to afflict Job in a very grievous measure: but then he made it subservient to Job's happiness and to his own glory. In like manner he suffered Judas to betray, and the Jews to crucify our blessed Saviour: they acted wickedly, exceeding wickedly; but God was very just and kind in permitting them so to do, to bring about the great and glorious purposes of man's redemption.

Such is the wisdom and goodness of Almighty God in conducting all events to his own glory; and making both wicked men and devils undesigning instruments to execute his all-wise and secret counsels.

The ends which God hath to serve, in any great *calamities*, are many and various, and often dark and mysterious; that it may be hard to know on what special errand they come, and whether they be designed more for *trial* and *exercise*, than for *vengeance* or *punishment*. Only in *national* visitations we may reasonably judge, for the



most part, that one particular end and design of them is correction and chastisement for national sins. This was manifest all along in the Jewish Church and nation. The calamities they suffered by *sword, pestilence, famine, or captivity*, were all so many judgments upon them, bearing a visible reference and proportion to the nature, number, and aggravations of their sins and impieties. And the reason given by Almighty God, in the case of the Amorites, whom he would not finally cut off before their iniquities were *full*<sup>f</sup>, seems to carry in it the force of an argument for the truth of the observation in general; and may give light into the methods of God's vindictive dealings with whole nations or communities. From the consideration of *calamities* let us turn our eyes to a more pleasing prospect, namely, to that of *blessings*.

2. The very name of *blessings* intimates their author, and speaks their *Divine* original. The common sentiments of mankind, upon which the custom of speech is formed, seem to agree in this; that prosperous events are the blessings of Providence and the gifts of God. And they ought indeed to be esteemed of as such, being more peculiarly and eminently his works. They are what he particularly delights, and, as it were, triumphs in; and more abundantly displays his power in effecting. They fall in with his primary and original design in creating us; which was no other than to set forth his own goodness, and to promote our welfare and happiness. And though calamities are, in their season, necessary to this very end; yet it is that *necessity* alone which makes them eligible: for God "does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of "men."

Besides that afflictions and troubles are, for the most part, owing rather to God's *permissive*, than *directing* Providence; and are often little more than the natural fruits and consequence of men's sins. As when animosities run high, and ambition and avarice, and other vile

<sup>f</sup> Gen. xv. 16.

affections reign; when public spiritedness decays, and religion declines, and charity waxes cold; the natural effect and result hereof can be nothing else but the desolation, the misery, the ruins of a land: so that men may justly blame themselves for the calamities of their own making. But blessings and comforts are more directly and plainly the work of God. No device or art of man could ever be able to procure even the *ordinary* comforts of life, without God's special assistance: and as to *extraordinary* turns and revolutions of State, such as we this day commemorate, his interposal in such cases is often clear and manifest. They are brought about by surprising incidents, and by some marvellous train of providences; to show that the whole contriving, conducting, and completing them are entirely his. I proceed then,

II. To apply the general doctrine to the particular case of our late troubles, and our deliverance from them in the *happy Restoration*.

We must first take a brief, summary survey of those calamities, under which this Church and nation had for many years groaned. Whoever will be at the pains to peruse the black history of those rebellious times, will there find such amazing circumstances of distraction, horror, and confusion, as are scarce to be paralleled in any Christian annals: such insolencies, oppressions, rapines, murders, treasons, so openly carried on, without remorse or shame, among *Christians, reformed* Christians, neighbours of the same kingdom, and brethren of the same household; and all this with such a glozing show of piety and devotion, with hands and eyes lift up to heaven, *seeking the Lord*, as the phrase then was: such a scene, I believe, as was never before seen or heard of; and when it was, might have made a *generous* mind almost disdain the relation he bears to the *species*, or even to blush for the reproach of being reckoned to the *kind*. Misguided zealots took upon them to set rules to their superiors; to trample on all laws, *sacred or civil*; to involve three kingdoms in a dreadful war, wherein were lost above two hundred thousand lives;

the bravest blood of the country spilled, the worthiest families stripped, plundered, and undone. Under pretence of espousing *liberty* and *property*, those wretched patriots pulled down all the ancient fences made for the security of both; showing at length what kind of *liberty* it was that they affected: liberty to imprison, banish, plunder, and destroy all that had either loyalty to provoke their resentments, or revenues to supply their avarice: liberty first to deface, spoil, and crush the *monarch*, and next to accuse and condemn, and in the end to murder the *man*: liberty to tread under foot all authorities, to set up and pull down *parliaments*, or to model them at pleasure; to abolish a whole *House of Peers*, and almost to extinguish the *nobility*, raising up the very dregs of the populace to usurp their places: in a word, liberty to turn a kingdom upside down, and to leave it languishing, and well nigh expiring in its miserable distractions and most deplorable confusions. Such was the sad and mournful estate of this unhappy island in its *civil* capacity. But its *religious* one was still worse, and of more melancholy consideration; inasmuch as the concernments of it are higher, and reach farther than the other. Our excellent Church was soon vanquished and trodden down, after the King, its *nursing father*, had lost his head in defence of it. When *monarchy* once failed, *episcopacy* could not long survive: that venerable, ancient, *apostolical* order fell a sacrifice to misguided zeal and blind popular fury. Then began conceited ignorance to triumph wide and far over learning and sound knowledge; novelty over antiquity; confusion over order; schism, heresy, and blasphemy, over unity, orthodoxy, and sincere piety. This was *refining* upon the Church of England! These our *reformers*!

It were endless to proceed in the melancholy story of the *Church*, and most deplorable state of *religion* in those times; when it seemed all to degenerate into a solemn cant, or into the vilest hypocrisy; was mostly outside, cover, and pretence, to beguile some persons out of their *estates*, and others out of their *lives*.

But I forbear: let us come to the consideration of God's overruling providence in those sad calamities. It may sound harsh to say it, but so it was; the hand of *the Lord* was in all this. Those deplorable distractions were his judgments; the enraged multitudes were the ministers of his vengeance: and what they did wickedly, traitorously, rebelliously, was by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, wisely, righteously, and even graciously permitted. Perhaps for the trial and exercise of good men, to improve their virtues, and to heighten their rewards: perhaps, to teach us, by dear-bought experience, to set the higher price and value upon good order and regularity, and to make us for ever after abhor such principles or such practices as tend to overthrow them. Perhaps for the greater honour of our excellent Church, permitted, for a while, to lie bleeding of the wounds received from her enemies; that as in most other circumstances she had come the nearest to the primitive churches, so she might not be far behind them in sufferings also.

However dark and mysterious the designs of Providence may be, one thing however is evident, that God's avenging *justice* was particularly seen in those times of trouble; justice upon a *sinful* nation, upon all orders and degrees of men, upon all kinds, sects, and parties; as all, more or less, contributed either to the rise, or growth, or continuance of them. Faults there were, many and great, on all sides; and all in their turns suffered for them. The *churchmen* and *royalists*, many of them, for being too full of heat and resentment, for taking unwarrantable steps at the beginning, and making use of unseasonable severities, and some unusual stretches of prerogative; which gave great offence, and first paved the way to our future troubles. And these were the first that felt the weight of the ensuing calamities.

The *disciplinarians* as justly suffered for the lengths they ran in the *rebellion*; for their unreasonable prejudices against the *crown* and the *mitre*; and for the desperate steps they took to introduce their *discipline*, and to new

model our *religion*. They were remarkably defeated and disappointed in all their fairest hopes and most promising expectations; the Divine justice, at length, raising up a *new sect* to be a *scourge* for them, as they had been to others.

And even the new sect, or medley of *sectaries*, (as they were then called,) they did not long enjoy the spoils of their iniquity, but were many of them grievously oppressed and harassed by the *tyrannical power* which themselves had set up. Thus was the Divine justice visibly exercised upon all parties one after another: which at length happily ended in disposing all to accept of their true and only cure, the *Restoration*. The *Sovereign* resumed his *throne*; the *nobility* their ancient grandeur, and *seats* in *parliament*; the *Bishops* their *sees*; the loyal *gentry* their estates and privileges; the *commons* their rights and franchises; the whole kingdom their freedom, safety, and tranquillity. The power *military* again became regularly subject to the *civil*; and now law and justice flowed in their ancient channels: mutiny and discord ceased; all things reverted to their primitive order and regularity, calm, quiet, and composed: nothing but joy and gladness seen in every face; some few only excepted, whom their crimes had made desperate, and who were left to repine in corners. "This was the Lord's doing, and it is yet marvelous in our eyes:" that so many jarring factions, and disunited parties, with so many different views, divided interests and affections, should yet unite together in one common design, should join heads, hearts, and hands in the *Restoration*; though they had most of them again and again entered into solemn resolutions and repeated *oaths, covenants, and engagements* to the contrary. What could ever have brought about so surprising a revolution, so easily, so suddenly, so irresistibly, but an Almighty arm presiding over kingdoms, and bearing sovereign sway over the very hearts and wills of men? I need not proceed farther in describing the happiness of the *Restoration*: I have been doing it in effect, and perhaps in the strongest

and most awakening manner, while I have been setting forth the many and dreadful miseries which preceded it, and from which we were delivered by it.

All happiness in this world is but comparative, and is never so clearly seen, or sensibly perceived, as when we duly consider or experimentally know what it was to want it. The blessing of *health* is then best understood after we have felt the pain, the wearisomeness, the anguish of an acute disease or a long sickness. The fruits of *liberty* have the more grateful relish after the uneasy hours of a close and tedious confinement. How welcome is repose and rest after great toils and fatigues ! How comfortable is peace after the doubtful hazards and hardships of a consuming war ! And how exceedingly delightful and transporting must *good order* and *government* appear, after recounting the miseries of popular tumults, the distracting scenes of *anarchy* and *confusion* !

Seeing then it hath pleased Almighty God thus miraculously to heal our breaches and to bind up our wounds ; what remains, but that we “rejoice in the day which the “ Lord hath made,” and that we endeavour proper and suitable returns of praise and adoration, of obedience and service to him ? Which brings me to my last general head, namely,

III. To point out the proper use and improvement to be made of all. And here I need not go farther than the advice of the text ; “ In the day of prosperity be “ joyful ;” but *consider* also that the *day of adversity* may come. Therefore prepare for it, and *guard* against it. And in order thereto, out of many good rules which might be proper to this end, I shall mention *two* only, that I may draw to a conclusion.

I. The first is, *to be watchful over the beginnings*, over the first tendencies to *public broils* or distractions. To what a hideous length did many run in our late troubles, who at first never intended it ? But one thing insensibly drew on another ; and many unforeseen incidents drove men on, when once entered, beyond their first

thoughts and counsels, till they were gradually led up to the very highest pitch of impiety and wickedness. From representing *grievances*, they proceeded to undutiful *petitions*, from petitions to seditious *remonstrances*, from remonstrances to *covenants* and *associations*, then to *riots* and *tumults*, and so on to open *rebellions*. Thus came our miseries rolling on, like the waves of the sea, till they overwhelmed us. A few wise counsels and healing measures, at the *beginning*, might have accommodated the rising differences, and have prevented what followed.

2. A second good rule of prudence and necessary maxim of life is, for men *to know when they are well*: not to be too humoursome and delicate, if things do not exactly answer what they may fondly expect or wish for; nor to affect *changes* at any time without the greatest *necessity*. This one lesson, well studied and practised, might have prevented our twenty years miseries; and might have *preserved* to us, for the whole time, all that happiness which in the end we only *gained*. We have felt the mischief of disturbing *settlements*, and throwing *government* off the hinges: let it be a warning to all, not to be fond of *experiments* of that kind, but to prize and value an *establishment* when they have it; particularly to be thankful for the *present* one, which, through many doubtful struggles and weary strifes, has been transmitted to us, from the *Restoration* down to this very day; but withal augmented, improved, and strengthened, as later experiences have brought in more wisdom.

Some, perhaps, led away with the empty *name*, not considering the *thing*, may be *weak* enough to wish for, or even *vain* enough to expect another *restoration*, as they would falsely call it. To such, let the advice be, *to know when they are well*. *Restorations*, properly so called, such as we this day commemorate, are truly valuable. The *restoring* a king to his just rights, and a people to their religion, liberty, and estates, and all orders and degrees of men to their ancient powers and privileges: such a *restoration* is a blessed thing indeed; it is like restoring *life* to

*three kingdoms*. But what is it that wants to be *restored* at this day? Is it the people's liberties? But no nation under the sun enjoys more or greater: or if they did not, yet certainly they can never improve national liberty by the admission of *arbitrary* rule and *Papal* tyranny.

Is it *religion* that wants *restoring*? But though religion is not perhaps altogether in so flourishing a state as its best friends may wish, or its enemies fear; yet (God be thanked) it still retains a good degree of *strength* and *splendour*; both which would be mightily impaired and obscured, and in a while destroyed, by letting in upon us Popish superstition and idolatry.

Does *monarchy*, or *episcopacy*, or *parliamentary* powers, want to be *restored* as formerly? the *nobility* to their seats, the *clergy* to their cures, the *gentry* to their paternal inheritances? No. Nor would the return of *Popery* be a proper means, were there any thing wanting of this kind to restore or to resettle men in their just rights, but rather to unsettle every thing, and to throw us back again into the wildest confusions.

Does the *royal family*, as formerly, still want *restoring*? But who knows not that *his Majesty* now reigning (and long may he reign) is a branch of the same *royal* stock with him whose *restoration* we are now celebrating; and but one remove farther distant, in the course of natural descent, from the same *royal progenitor*.

But *strict lineal succession*, perhaps, is wanting. Be it so: it is a happiness which many or most of our *ancient* and *best* kings, from the conquest downwards, have also wanted. A *happiness*, no doubt, it is to have it, (for *peace* and *tranquillity* sake,) when it can be had; that is, when it falls in with, or is not a bar to a kingdom's *safety*; which is always of nearer concernment than *peace* or *tranquillity*. As bare *conveniencies* must ever yield to *necessities*, so must considerations of *peace* to those of *safety* and *preservation*, such as without which a kingdom cannot tolerably subsist.

To be short, *lineal succession* is still kept up, as far as is



consistent with the nation's just rights and liberties, or with the fundamental laws and constitution of the kingdom; that is, as far as our *ancestors* (in whose power it was) ever intended any such *strict rule* of succession, or in fact observed it: nor can reason, or good sense, or common justice to a *free people*, and under a *limited monarchy*, demand or admit of more. All parties, in their turns, will make use of such a plea or pretext about *hereditary right*, when it favours their purposes, or falls in with their inclinations: but as it never has been, so we may be confident it never will be, a *reason* with any considerable numbers of men, but such as have been before determined by other reasons, *stronger and more prevailing*.

Real scruples of *conscience*, as to this particular, remain but with a *few*, and those the most *sedentary* and least *enterprising* of any: and it will always cast a damp upon men of that *religious* frame and *devout* temper of mind, to consider, that what they would call restoring a *king* to his just right, would yet be restoring the *kingdom* to *nothing* but *slavery*, *penury*, or *persecution*, it may be, for the present, and in the end, superstition, darkness, and idolatry. What *good man*, however scrupulous about the *rights of princes*, would not even *dread* such a *restoration*; and rather sit down with his *scruples* in retirement, solitude, and repose, than be ever consenting (upon very *uncertain* reasonings, and as *uncertain* prospect of success) to bring *certain* misery upon his fellow subjects?

Upon the whole it appears, (which is what I intend by all I have here said,) that such a *restoration* as some have vainly thought on, or endeavoured, could be nothing akin to that which we now commemorate; but as unlike it and contrary as possible in all *material* circumstances. And the reasons which once so strongly pleaded *for* the *one*, do now as strongly plead *against* the *other*; since it would not be restoring us to any *happiness* we want, but to such *miseries*, or even to *greater* than those from which we were this day delivered.

Let us then be thankful to Almighty God for the bless-

ings which he hath sent us, and has preserved to this time ; for restoring to us our happy constitution and legal establishment in *one* reign, and for watching over it in *another* ; for securing and strengthening it in a *third*, and for improving, fixing, and perfecting it in the reigns following. All which gives us grounds to hope, (unless God for our sins shall otherwise determine,) that the *blessings* which we now commemorate may prove as lasting and durable for ages to come, as they are highly valuable for the present. Let but the spirit of contention cease, and brotherly love return : “ Depart from evil, and do good ; and dwell for “ evermore.”



**RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF CHILDREN,**

**RECOMMENDED IN**

**A SERMON**

**PREACHED IN THE**

**PARISH CHURCH OF ST. SEPULCHRE,**

*June the 6th, 1723.*

**BEING**

**THURSDAY IN WHITSUN-WEEK ;**

**AT THE**

**Anniversary Meeting of the CHILDREN educated in the  
Charity Schools in and about the Cities of London and  
Westminster.**

**VOL. VIII.**

**H h**



---

PROV. xxii. 6.

*Train up a child in the way he should go : and when he is old, he will not depart from it.*

THE meaning and design of these words of King Solomon is plain and obvious at first hearing : from whence we may reap this advantage, that the time which upon more difficult texts would be spent in prefatory explications, may here be more agreeably (and perhaps more usefully too) laid out upon the subject. The pertinency of the text to the present occasion will, I doubt not, be as clear and manifest as the meaning and purport of it : so that your thoughts, very probably, will run quicker upon it than any words can do, and will be beforehand with me in the application. My design from it is to *offer*, or rather to *repeat*, some of the most obvious and most approved rules and directions for the training up children ; and to intimate of how great moment and importance they are to the *children* themselves, to their *parents* and others having the charge over them, and to the *public* at large.

You will not, I presume, expect any *new* directions from me on this head, (the *older* they are the better,) nor indeed any so exact and accurate as those which have been more maturely weighed, and after long experience, perfected by the united wisdom and joint counsels of those whom God hath raised up to inspect, promote, and conduct this weighty affair through this great city, and other parts of the kingdom. All I shall endeavour is, to collect and lay before you a few useful hints, out of many you will think on ; such as may deserve to be treasured up in our memories, and such as, in regard either to their own weight or to our forgetfulness, may very well bear the repeating and frequent inculcating. And now not to

detain you with any farther preface, I proceed directly to what I intend.

First, To point out some of the principal rules or directions for the religious training up of children.

Secondly, To remind us of some special reasons and motives proper to enforce the use and exercise of them : concluding all with a brief application of the whole to as many as are any way capable of promoting, assisting, or encouraging so good a work.

I. I am, first, to point out some of the principal rules or directions for the religious training up of children. The persons herein chiefly concerned are *fathers* and *mothers*, natural and spiritual, *masters* and *mistresses*, *tutors*, *guardians*, *governors*, and the like. All the branches of this duty belong not equally to all : many of them are indeed common to parents, masters, guardians, &c. but some are special to *parents* only, or to them chiefly, and not to the rest. In the enumeration of particulars, I shall think it sufficient if they belong to any, and if they be of such importance as may make it necessary to mention, and not to omit them.

1. I shall begin with what comes first in order, and which chiefly belongs to *fathers* and *mothers*, *godfathers* and *godmothers*, the bringing children to the font, to be publicly baptized according to the rules and orders of the Church of England, formed exactly upon the *primitive* model ; saving only as to the allowing and dispensing with the *pouring* on of water upon the child, instead of *immersion* : which allowance has at length, by custom, took place of the rule, and unhappily excluded it, perhaps beyond recovery ; though many good and pious men have hinted their desires, or wishes, for restoring the primitive practice, which had constantly obtained in England, from the first planting of Christianity, till within less than two hundred years ago, and has not been entirely laid aside, above a century and a half at most. But enough of that.

I said *publicly* baptized. For as to the custom of ad-

ministering Baptism by reading the office for *public Baptism* in private houses, it is of very late date, and is neither so decent nor so regular as the public method which our Church prescribes in her *Rubrics*. It has indeed, with great reluctance, been submitted to, and still is so; and especially in this *city* more than in any other place of the kingdom. *Custom* hath here also prevailed against *rule*; and many have been, in a manner, forced to comply with it, upon prudential reasons; submitting to it as a tolerable inconvenience, to prevent greater. But it were much to be wished that the more public and solemn way were again restored, and universally practised as formerly. To proceed.

When *Baptism* is once over, nothing more remains to be done for the *infant*, in the *religious* way, for some time; except it be *praying* for him. The care of supporting and cherishing the growing infants, while unable to speak, or to learn any thing, falls not under the head of *religious* education: as neither does the method of *nursing*, or *suckling* them; though it may not be improper to throw in a word or two of it, because a *case* of *conscience* has been thought to be nearly concerned in it. Some *Divines* of great note have been very particular and pressing upon the duty of *mothers*, as obliged to nurse and suckle their own children. I cannot stay to examine their reasons for it, which are not all of the same weight, but differing in the degrees of more and less. One thing, however, is certain, that it is no unalterable duty of mothers so to do: in some circumstances they cannot, and in others they need not; there is a latitude left for discretion and prudence in such cases. They are in duty bound to do the best they can for the health of their children, and the right forming their tempers and manners; both which may, in some measure, depend on their first milk, or on the method of nursing. But if both these points may be effectually secured, (as they often may,) as well by a *nurse*, as by the proper *mother*, then the thing is indifferent, and either way may be taken without scruple.



But I pass on to something of much greater moment, and of more necessary and standing obligation.

2. As soon as children are grown up to be capable of learning any thing, it is the business of those, under whose care they are, to use all proper precautions to prevent their learning any evil customs or bad habits; and to season them betimes with a just and awful sense of a God and a world to come. They have *souls* to provide for as well as *bodies*: and therefore due care must be taken of the more precious part, which shall survive the other, and endure for ever. When children arrive to little notices of things, (sooner or later, according to their different capacities,) care must be taken to prevent their receiving or retaining any ill impressions. A child of three or four years growth, though he will have but a very faint and imperfect sense of what is good or evil, may yet contract habits of either. He may learn *stubbornness* at that age, which, if it grows up with him, will prove a very ill quality: or he may learn submission, modesty, and obedience, which will, in time, produce excellent fruits in his after life and conversation. A child will, at that age, learn to *curse* or *swear*, if he becomes acquainted with such language: or he may be taught to abhor and detest every thing of that kind, and to form his tongue to quite another accent. Early care must be taken in a matter of so great concernment.

Telling of *lies* is a thing which children will soon learn, and especially if they find benefit in it, or can escape the rod by it. This should be prevented with all possible care, by possessing them very early with the greatest abhorrence and detestation of a *lie*. And instead of letting them escape punishment by any such little and mean artifice, they should be detected in it, and immediately brought to shame, and smart for it. *Sincerity* is the noblest and best of qualities, and ought to be timely instilled and implanted in them. If that be wanting, there will scarce be any thing truly good and valuable remaining. To be deceitful and disingenuous is to be all that

is bad : above all things therefore encourage and promote in children an honest heart, a plain and open speech, a frank and ingenuous demeanour.

It is hard to say, precisely, at what age children become capable of knowing what we mean by *Almighty God*, by *heaven*, or by *hell*. Some imperfect notion of these things may certainly be wrought into them very soon ; and they will retain and improve their first notices as they grow up. They may be told that God will be *angry* with them when they do amiss ; that he will torment them in *hell-fire*, where they shall feel excessive pain, and be more sensible of smart than they are now : and they may be informed, that God will be kind to them and bless them, and give them all the good things their hearts can wish, provided they do well. Such advices as these will at first appear new and strange to them, and will put them upon asking many little childish questions about them ; which should, however, be carefully and discreetly answered : and the answers will be well remembered by children as they grow in years, and may have a good effect upon them all their lives long.

It is observable, that many by the hearing of foolish stories of *apparitions*, while they were young, have received so deep and lasting impressions, as not to be able, when grown up to be men and women, to correct this early dread, or even to trust themselves *alone* in the *dark*. This is but a silly and superstitious fear, doing more hurt than good : and it would be a prudent and charitable part in parents or governors, to prevent as much as possible the frightening of children with any idle tales of that kind. But I would observe from it, how strongly those fears work afterwards, which have been implanted in young and tender minds. And therefore, instead of making children afraid where no fear is, let them be taught when, and whom to fear, namely, Almighty God. Let them be informed how dreadful his vengeance is towards those that offend him ; how he drowned a whole world at once for sinning against him ; how he rained down

fire and brimstone out of heaven upon sinful Sodom; how he made the earth open and swallow up Corah and his company, for resisting God's *high priest*, and for being stubborn and rebellious; how he ordered a man to be stoned to death for breaking the holy Sabbath, caused Achan to be as severely punished for *stealing*; and struck Gehazi with leprosy, and Ananias and Sapphira with present death, for *lying*. Let but children have a list of these and the like examples of Divine vengeance lodged in their memories, by frequent inculcating, and by repeated inquiries how they retain or resent them, and it will be to them a standing lesson of religious awe and reverential fear of Almighty God, that they shall not dare to offend him in any known instance. Then, to give them a more present and constant sense of what *offences* are, and what the contrary, let them have notice of them as often as they occur before their eyes, in bad and in good examples. If they happen, as they often will, to meet with any sad examples of drunkenness, swearing, cursing, and the like, let not such example pass without its just censure and condemnation, that children may be thereby taught what to avoid. And when they see the contrary examples of piety, modesty, sobriety, and the like, let them hear these things commended, that they may be thereby taught to go and do likewise. In such a method as this may the minds of children be formed up to virtue, and steeled against ill impressions; which is the principal end and aim of a religious education.

3. To do this the more effectually, it will be necessary to maintain a just *authority* over them, either correcting or encouraging them, as need may require. If they be first taught to submit to the reason of their governors while they are young, they will be the more easily and certainly conducted by their own reason, when grown up to be men and women. They should be taught the lesson of submission betimes, before ever their passions grow to a head, and become unmanageable. It may be sometimes proper to cross and disappoint them: never comply

with a froward temper, nor humour a child even in trifles, if he appears too stubborn and self-willed. One that has been always indulged, though in slight matters, during his childhood, will expect the like indulgence afterwards in matters of much greater consequence. Let them therefore be trained up to submission and modesty; not to murmur or dispute, but to conform quietly and contentedly to rules and orders; to be patient under discipline, and to take it as a favour whenever their desires are gratified, or their inclinations indulged. By such a conduct they will be made gentle and tractable, dutiful and well-disposed; and they will love their parents or their governors the better for it. It is a mistake to imagine that excessive fondness is the way to oblige and gain them. It will rather produce pride and sturdiness for the present: which will at length show itself in ill manners, contempt, and rudeness towards their best and kindest friends. The foundation of love must be laid in humility and submission: teach them first to stand in awe by seasonable correction; and it will be easy afterwards, a thousand ways, to attract their love and esteem also. "He that spareth his rod hateth his son," says Solomon: "but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes<sup>a</sup>." And again; "Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying<sup>b</sup>." In another place; "Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him<sup>c</sup>."

But while I am advising a just and seasonable severity, I would not forget to throw in some proper cautions, to prevent any extreme on that hand. As first, let it not be used but when *necessary*, or when *gentler* means fail. If a soft rebuke will be as effectual as a sharp reproof, use it rather. The tempers of children are not all the same, but sometimes widely different; and so requiring a different kind of treatment. If any can be allured and enticed to their duty, it is sufficient, and there will be no need of

<sup>a</sup> Prov. xiii. 24.

<sup>b</sup> Prov. xix. 18.

<sup>c</sup> Prov. xxii. 15.

threats, which, in such a case, will do harm. However, do their duty they must: and it does not become a parent or a governor to use much *intreaty* where he ought to *command*.

Another caution, in the matter of correction, is, that it be done, as much as possible, without anger, passion, or resentment; though always with *authority*. Passion is never a good guide, and least of all in matters which require cool and sober thought. Besides, it sets an ill example to a child, and often tends to alienate his love and affections. And there is no occasion at all for anger or resentment in the affair of correction. The only end it aims at is the good of the child: and it should be considered only as a bitter potion in the hand of a kind physician, who, though he gives his patient some uneasiness, is his friend in doing so, and has no resentment or anger against him.

Another caution in this matter is, to proportion, as near as may be, the penalty to the offence: not to be as severe for every childish neglect as for stubbornness and wilful disobedience, for swearing, or for lying, or other sins against God. Slight indiscretions and weaknesses, which have no ill meaning nor evil tendency, may be slightly passed over: while offences of a more heinous nature are to be chastised with proportionable severity. Having intimated what course is proper in order to maintain a just authority over children, I now proceed to another branch of a parent's or a governor's duty; namely,

4. To bring them to *church*, and to instruct them duly in their *catechism* and their daily prayers. The design of bringing them so soon to church, even before they can well understand what is doing there, is to inure them to the constant practice of so necessary a duty. If they know little for the present as to what it means, they will however be sensible that it is their duty to attend: and as they grow older, they will both understand what the thing is, and reap the benefit of it.

As to teaching them the Church Catechism, it is a duty so well known, and, I presume, so punctually observed, that it may suffice barely to have mentioned it. I suppose the same of bringing them to be *confirmed*. They are to be taught likewise to say their daily prayers, morning and evening. This is a thing very necessary to be strictly insisted on. Children will soon be apt to grow weary of it: and if they be neglected, they will either not perform it at all, or quickly lay it aside. They must be told, that it is not a task, imposed upon them merely as children, but what must carefully be observed and practised as long as they live. And this must be often inculcated, and earnestly pressed upon them: otherwise they will be much tempted, in the following stages of their lives, through cares, and business, and sundry distractions, to leave off the practice, to the great prejudice of their virtue, and with the manifest hazard of their souls.

5. Another duty of parents and governors, as such, is to *pray* and intercede with God for the children under their care. Means must be used, and prudent methods carefully observed: but it is God alone that can warrant the success of them. Paul has planted, and Apollos watered; but it is God that giveth the increase. A *father* may sow the principles of piety in his children, and a *mother* may improve and cherish them; a *master* or a *mistress* may add to both, and a *minister* may give a helping hand to all: and yet without God's grace and blessing to improve and further it, it will come to nothing. It therefore highly concerns all that have the charge of children, to be often on their knees to implore God's favour and assistance upon their pious and painful endeavours. And they need not doubt, but if they do faithfully and truly perform their parts, God will do his.

6. One thing more I have reserved for the last place, as being most considerable; which is to set good examples before children, and to keep them as much as possible from the sight of bad ones. It is indeed the

bounden duty of all men to lead sober and exemplary lives; but of those especially who are to go in and out before children, and have the daily charge of them. Children are very prone to imitate what they hear and see. If you show them nothing but what is good, they will assuredly take to nothing ill. A child that never heard an *oath*, will not invent one: and if he never sees an ill thing done, it is more than probable he will never do one. It is bad example commonly which first shows them the wrong way, and a certain depravity of nature, prone to follow, confirms them in it after. And let this suffice just briefly to have intimated the necessity and usefulness of setting good examples before children, and of guarding them, as much as may be, from the sight, or however from the influence of bad ones.

I have now run through the principal articles, such as have to me occurred, relating to the good education of children. If the rules I have laid down happen to fall short of what hath been already practised in many of our *schools of charity*, (which I am willing to hope hath often been the case,) then let what hath been said pass only for an imperfect recital of what have been done in times past, for the instruction, imitation, and encouragement of times to come. The very worthy *trustees* of these charities have thought it proper, upon the election of a new *master* or *mistress*, to renew and reinforce these kind of instructions in the strongest manner: and they have had some thoughts of erecting a *superior school, for the training up of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses*, on purpose to carry on and more effectually to secure the same good end. All which shows their judgment of what moment and importance it is, that the office of training up children be punctually executed: and it may well become our place and function, in our discourses from the pulpit, to endeavour to add some farther strength and encouragement to so good and great designs. In order hereunto, I proceed now, secondly,

II. To remind us of some special reasons and motives,

proper to enforce the duties laid down. And these are such as respect either the children themselves, or those who have the charge over them, or the public in general.

1. In regard to the *children*; the text itself intimates a very important reason, or motive; namely, that if they be trained up, while young, to what is good, they will not, when they come to be *old*, depart from it. Which is not to be so strictly understood, as if the general rule admitted of no exception. There have been, and there will be again, instances to the contrary: but such instances, we hope, are, in comparison, rare and uncommon. Those who have been well educated from the first, will, for the most part, hold on in the same pious course. It seems to fare with our minds as it does with our bodies, to a great degree of resemblance. They are supple and pliable in their first and early years, easily bowed and turned this way or that: but they grow fixed and stiffened as they ripen in age, then preserving the same shape, figure, and frame, into which they had been first moulded. The very disposition and turn of the mind depends much upon it: and perhaps a great deal of what we are used to call *natural temper*, is little more than that particular frame of heart which was first infused in our education. It is a great advantage to religion to have been timely planted in the tender soil, and to have taken the first possession: and education, though not the only, is yet the principal circumstance, and has the most considerable share in our tempers and manners. Of the few good men there are, most of them may probably, upon reflection, find, that their pious dispositions were at first owing, under God, to the prudent care of some that had the charge of their infancy. Not but that persons, however well trained up in infancy, may afterward fall away in time of temptation: but they do not ordinarily do so; or if they do, their consciences soon recoil, their good principles formerly imbibed still remain; and they will at one time or other exert themselves again with force and vi-



gour. When once the heat is over, and a little cool reflection succeeds, such persons generally will relent, and remember from whence they are fallen, will return and live: and it but rarely, perhaps, is found that they totally and finally miscarry. From hence appears how invaluable a blessing it is to have been set right at first. How easily, I had almost said insensibly, may such arrive to the greatest heights. They run through the difficulties of a religious course without so much as feeling the pain and toil of it. Happy they that have been thus conducted through the paths of virtue, almost insensible of the dangers every way surrounding them; who have never known what it is to have been captive to sin and Satan, never felt the weight of prevailing lusts, corrupt customs, or vicious habits. How easily may they obtain a *crown*, which must cost others dear, and be but hardly at length gained, (if gained at all,) after many doubtful struggles, many sighs and tears, many bitter pains and agonies of mind! So much for the advantage of good education to the *children* themselves.

2. I may next mention the advantage accruing to *parents*, or others who have the care over them, in respect of their peace and comfort in this life, and their rewards in a life to come. As ever they hope to have any joy or consolation in the children grown up, let them be careful to season them betimes with principles of piety. For if they be not taught to fear God, they will not fear man: if they have no love or reverence for their Creator, they will not love or reverence their other best friends. Where there is little or no sense of religion, all other bonds or ties, such as nearness of blood or kindnesses received, signify nothing. They will be sturdy and stubborn toward those who had the rule over them, will despise their aged parents, and pay no reverence to their grey hairs. And what can we expect better? Would we have *wheat* spring up where nothing hath been sown but *tares*? Or should we look for any thriving fruits from a neglected and barren soil? No: according to what we

sow, that we may expect to reap: and if children be rightly educated, then and then only may their parents, guardians, governors, or other friends, find joy, and comfort, and satisfaction in them. But besides the present comfort, there is a much greater in reserve hereafter. The children whom they have well instructed and piously educated shall as certainly accompany them to *heaven*, as they now do to *church*; and shall there, with united melody, tune their *hallelujahs*, here begun, to a more exalted strain of praises and thanksgivings. There shall they return their joyous thanks to their kind preservers, for so happily conducting them to that blessed place: which will be so much the more welcome and delightful to *both*, for the mutual joy and satisfaction they shall have in each other. It remains now only to consider,

3. The advantage hence arising to the *public* in general. If children be well educated, it must of course turn to the public peace and prosperity of a church or kingdom. Every good man, so raised, becomes a blessing to the neighbourhood where he dwells; as, on the other hand, every bad man is a common pest and nuisance. There cannot then be any surer foundation laid, than what we are now mentioning, for the security, peace, and welfare of any state or people. Which is the reason why in Rome, and Athens, and Sparta, and other well ordered governments of old time, a more especial care was taken about the training up youth. Without this, men would grow wild and savage, and unfit for society. Rebellions, rapines, murders, and other monstrous impieties, are but the natural fruits of depraved nature, uncultivated by education. But if youth be wisely and justly managed, how happy will its influence be upon society, and what blessings will it draw down from heaven upon men! This will be the surest way to make our Church flourish and prosper. If the youth be brought up to understand her doctrines and to practise her rules, they will one day be both supports to it and ornaments of it. They will, we hope, from these good beginnings proceed daily to make

greater and greater improvements: they will come better prepared to attend upon God's ministers, and to receive fuller instructions to complete and perfect them in all virtuous and godly living. Religion will hereby daily abound more and more, and gather new life and strength through the whole kingdom. These are some of the advantages proposed by our *schools of charity*, happily set on foot, and wonderfully blessed with success, through all parts of our island. The application and inference from all is, that we be every one of us willing and desirous to join our sincere endeavours for the promoting so good a work; contributing our *quota* of money at least, if not of our service, according to our several stations and abilities, toward thus making the world wiser, and the Church larger; towards the improving of mankind here, and the enlarging the number of the blessed hereafter. There is no need to multiply persuasives in so plain a case: the thing speaks itself, and carries all the force of the most moving eloquence or commanding rhetoric along with it. Who that hath any bowels of compassion for his Christian brethren, any love for his native country, any concern for our excellent Church, any regard for God and religion, or any tenderness for the souls of men, can ever turn away his face, or draw back his hand from promoting and encouraging, to the utmost of his power, so desirable and so blessed a work as we are now upon? a work, which, if it be as wisely and as carefully pursued, as it is piously intended and laid, will, I doubt not, go on prosperously while the Church stands, or the world lasts. If *proper persons* be employed for inspecting and educating the poor children, and a conscientious care be all along taken in *collecting* and *disposing* the charitable contributions in such a manner as may best answer the purposes intended: if the provision thus raised be ever prudently regulated and portioned out, so as neither to *exceed* nor *come short* of the first and main design; *large enough* to invite the poor parents to send their children to these schools; and *not too large*, so as either to puff the

children up, and set them above their proper rank and order, or to make them disdain any the *lowest* kind of work or service, such as they are born to, and wherein they may be most useful: I say, if these, and the like prudent regulations, (such as the worthy *trustees*, the best judges of them, shall find most expedient and practicable,) be from time to time carefully observed, and constantly conveyed down, in succession, to others; I will even venture to foretell, that there will never be wanting hands sufficient to promote and carry on this great design to distant generations. All that are *well-disposed*, and understand their *true happiness*, will be ambitious to bear part in this charitable work of ours; wisely considering, how much they shall thereby serve the interests of the *public*, and their *own* also, both here and hereafter.

END OF VOL. VIII.















