

## ARTICLE XXV.

## Of the Sacraments.

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only Badges or Tokens of Christian Men's Profession, but rather they be certain sure Witnesses, and effectual Signs of Grace, and God's Will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm, our Faith in him.

There are Two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel: that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel; being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are States of Life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like Nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; for that they have not any visible Sign or Ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome Effect or Operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves Damnation, as St. Paul saith.

THERE is a great diversity between the form of this Article, as it is now settled, and that published by king Edward, which begun in these words: *Our Lord Jesus Christ gathered his people into a society by sacraments, very few in number, most easily to be kept, and of most excellent signification; that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.* There is nothing in that edition instead of the paragraph concerning the other five pretended sacraments. Next comes the paragraph which is here the last, only with the addition of these words after operation: *Not as some say, ex opere operato, which terms, as they are strange and utterly unknown to the holy scripture, so do they yield a sense which savoureth of little piety, but of much superstition:* and, in conclusion, the paragraph comes, with which the Article does now begin; so that in all this diversity there is no real difference: for the virtue of the sacraments being put in the worthy receiving, excludes the doctrine of *opus operatum*,\* as formally as if it had expressly been condemned; and the naming the two sacraments

\* For the canons of the Council of Trent respecting the sacraments, and doctrine of *opus operatum*, see note, page 164.—[Ed.]

instituted by Christ, is upon the matter the rejecting of all the rest.

It was most natural to begin this article with a description of sacraments in general. This difference is to be put between sacraments and other ritual actions; that whereas other rites are badges and distinctions by which the Christians are known, a sacrament is more than a bare matter of form; and as, in the Old Testament, circumcision and propitiatory sacrifices were things of a different nature and order from all the other ritual precepts concerning the cleansings, the distinctions of days, places, and meats. These were indeed precepts given them of God, but they were not federal acts of renewing the covenant, or reconciling themselves to God. By circumcision they received the seal of the covenant, and were brought under the obligation of the whole law: they were by it made debtors to it; and when by their sins they had provoked God's wrath, they were reconciled to him by their sacrifices, with which atonement was made, and so their sins were forgiven them. The nature and end of those was to be federal acts, in the offering of which the Jews kept to their part of the covenant, and in the accepting of which God maintained it on his part; so we see a plain difference between these and a mere rite, which, though commanded, yet must pass only for the badge of a profession, as the doing of it is an act of obedience to a divine law. Now, in the new dispensation, though our Saviour has eased us of that *law of ordinances*, that *grievous yoke*, and those *beggarly elements* which were laid upon the Jews; yet, since we are still in the body, subject to our senses, and to sensible things, he has appointed some federal actions, to be both the visible stipulations and professions of our Christianity, and the conveyances to us of the blessings of the gospel.

There are two extremes to be avoided in this matter. The one is of the church of Rome, that teaches, that as some sacraments imprint a character upon the soul, which they define to be a physical quality, that is, supernatural and spiritual, so they do all carry along with them such a divine virtue, that by the very receiving them (the *opus operatum*) it is conveyed to the souls of those to whom they are applied, unless they themselves put a bar in the way of it by some mortal sin. In consequence of this, they reckon, that by the sacraments given to a man in his agonies, though he is very near past all sense, and so cannot join any lively acts of his mind with the sacraments, yet he is justified; not to mention the common practice of giving extreme unction in the last agony, when no appearance of any sense is left. This we reckon a doctrine that is not only without all foundation in scripture, but that tends to destroy all religion, and to make men live on securely in sin, trusting to this, that the sacraments may be given them when they die. The conditions of

the new covenant are, repentance, faith, and obedience; and we look on this as the corrupting the vitals of this religion, when any such means are proposed, by which the main design of the gospel is quite overthrown. The business of a character is an unintelligible notion. We acknowledge baptism is not to be repeated; but that is not by virtue of a character imprinted in it, but because it being a dedication of the person to God in the Christian religion, what is once so done is to be understood to continue still in that state, till such a person falls into an open apostacy. In case of the repentance of such a person, we finding that the primitive church did reconcile, but not rebaptize apostates, do imitate that their practice; but not because of this late and unexplicable notion of a character. We look on all sacramental actions as acceptable to God only with regard to the temper, and the inward acts of the person to whom they are applied, and cannot consider them as medicines or charms, which work by a virtue of their own, whether the person to whom they are applied co-operates with them, or not. Baptism is said by St. Peter 'to save us,' not as it is an action that washes us; 'not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God.' And therefore baptism without this profession is no baptism, but seems to be used as a charm; unless it is said, that this answer or profession is implied, whensoever baptism is desired. When a person of age desires baptism, he must make those answers and sponsions, otherwise he is not truly baptized; and though his outward making of them being all that can fall under human cognizance, he who does that must be held to be truly baptized, and all the outward privileges of a baptized person must belong to him; yet as to the effect of baptism on the soul of him that is baptized, without doubt that depends upon the sincerity of the professions and vows made by him. The wills of infants are by the law of nature and nations in their parents, and are transferred by them to their sureties; the sponsions that are made on their behalf are considered as made by themselves; but there the outward act is sufficient; for the inward acts of one person cannot be supposed necessary to give the sacrament its virtue in another.

1 Cor. x. 16. In the eucharist, by our 'shewing forth our Lord's death till he comes,' we are admitted to the 'communion of his body and blood;' to a share in partnership with other Christians in the effects and merits of his death. But the unworthy receiver is guilty of his body and blood, and brings thereby down judgments upon himself; so that to fancy a virtue in sacraments that works on the person to whom they are applied, without any inward acts accompanying it, and upon his being only passive, is a doctrine of which we find nothing in the scriptures; which teach us that every thing we do is only accepted of God, with regard to the disposition of mind that

he knows us to be in when we go about it. Our prayers and sacrifices are so far from being accepted of God, that they are *abomination* to him, if they come from wicked and defiled hearts. The making men believe that sacraments may be effectual to them when they are next to a state of passivity, not capable of any sensible thoughts of their own, is a sure way to raise the credit of the clergy, and of the sacrament; but at the same time it will most certainly dispose men to live in sin, hoping that a few rites, which may be easily procured at their death, will clear all at last. And thus we reject, not without great zeal against the fatal effects of this error, all that is said of the *opus operatum*; the very doing of the sacrament: we think it looks more like the incantations of heathenism, than the purity and simplicity of the Christian religion.

But the other extreme, that we likewise avoid, is that of sinking the sacraments so low, as to be mere rites and ceremonies. St. Peter says, 'Baptism saves us.' St. Paul calls it, the 'laver of regeneration;' to which he joins 'the renewing of the Holy Ghost.' Our Saviour saith, 'He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved;' and, 'Except ye are born again of water and of the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' These words have a sense and signification that rises far above a mere ceremony done to keep up order, and to maintain a settled form. The phrase 'communion of the body and blood of Christ,' is above the nature of an anniversary, or memorial feast. This opinion we think is very unsuitable to those high expressions; and we do not doubt but that Christ, who instituted those sacraments, does still accompany them with a particular presence in them, and a blessing upon them; so that we coming to them with minds well prepared, with pure affections and holy resolutions, do certainly receive in and with them particular largesses of the favour and bounty of God. They are not bare and naked remembrances and tokens; but are actuated and animated by a divine blessing that attends upon them. This is what we believe on this head, and these are the grounds upon which we found it.

A sacrament is an institution of Christ, in which some material thing is sanctified by the use of some form or words, in and by which federal acts of this religion do pass on both sides; on ours, by stipulations, professions, or vows; and on God's by his secret assistances: by these we are also united to the body of Christ, which is the church. It must be instituted by Christ: for though ritual matters, that are only the expressions of our duty, may be appointed by the church; yet federal acts, to which a conveyance of divine grace is tied, can only be instituted by him who is the Author and Mediator of this new covenant, and who lays down the rules or conditions of it, and derives the blessings of it by what methods and in what channels he thinks fit. Whatsoever his apostles settled, was by authority and commission from him; therefore it is

1 Pet. iii.  
21.

Tit. iii. 5.  
Mark xvi.  
16.  
John iii.  
3, 5.

**A R T.**  
**XXV.** not to be denied, but that if they had appointed any sacramental action, that must be reckoned to be of the same authority, and is to be esteemed Christ's institution, as much as if he himself, when on earth, had appointed it.

Matter is of the essence of a sacrament; for words without some material thing, to which they belong, may be of the nature of prayers or vows, but they cannot be sacraments: receiving a sacrament is on our part our faith plighted to God in the use of some material substance or other; for in this consists the difference between sacraments and other acts of worship. The latter are only acts of the mind declared by words or gesture, whereas sacraments are the application of a material sign, joined with acts of the mind, words, and gestures. With the *matter* there must be a *form*, that is, such words joined with it as do appropriate the matter to such an use, and separate it from all other uses, at least in the act of the sacrament. For in any piece of *matter* alone, there cannot be a proper suitability to such an end, as seems to be designed by sacraments, and therefore a *form* must determine and apply it; and it is highly suitable to the nature of things, to believe that our Saviour, who has instituted the sacrament, has also either instituted the form of it, or given us such hints as to lead us very near it. The end of sacraments is double; the one is by a solemn federal action both to unite us to Christ, and also to derive a secret blessing from him to us: and the other is to join and unite us by this public profession, and the joint partaking of it, with his body, which is the church. This is, in general, an account of a sacrament. This, it is true, is none of those words that are made use of in scripture, so that it has no determined signification given to it in the word of God; yet it was very early applied by Pliny to those vows by which the Christians tied themselves to their religion, taken from the oaths by which the soldiery among the Romans were sworn to their colours or officers; and from that time this term has been used in a sense consecrated to the federal rites of religion. Yet if any will dispute about words, we know how much St. Paul condemns all those curious and vain questions, which have in them the subtilties and 'oppositions of science falsely so called.' If any will call every rite used in holy things, a sacrament, we enter into no such contentions.

The rites, therefore, that we understand when we speak of sacraments, are the constant federal rites of Christians, which are accompanied by a divine grace and benediction, being instituted by Christ to unite us to him, and to his church; and of such we own that there are two, *Baptism*, and the *Supper of the Lord*. In *Baptism*, there is *matter*, *water*; there is a *form*, the person *dipped* or *washed*, with words, 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:' there is an institution, 'Go preach and

baptize;' there is a federal sponson, 'The answer of a good conscience;' there is a blessing conveyed with it, 'Baptism saves us;' there is 'one baptism, as there is one body and one spirit; we are all baptized into one body.' So that here all the constituent and necessary parts of a sacrament are found in baptism. In the Lord's Supper, there is *bread* and *wine* for the *matter*. The giving it to be eat and drunk, with the words that our Saviour used in the first supper, are the *form*: 'Do this in remembrance of me,' is the institution. 'Ye shew forth the Lord's death till he come again,' is the declaration of the federal act of our part: it is also the 'communion of the body and of the blood of Christ,' that is, the conveyance of the blessings of our partnership in the effects of the death of Christ. 'And we being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread;' this shews the union of the church in this sacrament. Here then we have in these two sacraments, both matter, form, institution, federal acts, blessings conveyed, and the union of the body in them. All the characters which belong to a sacrament agree fully to them.

In the next place we must, by these characters, examine the other pretended sacraments. It is no wonder if, the word *sacrament* being of a large extent, there should be some passages in ancient writers, that call other actions so besides *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*; for in a larger sense every holy rite may be so called. But it is no small prejudice against the number of seven sacraments, that Peter Lombard, a writer in the twelfth century, is the first that reckons *seven* of them: from that mystical expression of the seven spirits of God, there came a conceit of the sevenfold operation of the Spirit; and it looked like a good illustration of that, to assert seven sacraments. This pope Eugenius put in his instruction to the Armenians, which is published with the Council of Florence; and all was finally settled at Trent.\* Now there might have been so many fine allusions made on the number *seven*, and some of the ancients were so much set on such allusions, that since we hear nothing of that kind from any of them, we may well conclude, that this is more than an ordinary negative argument against their having believed that there were seven sacraments. To go on in order with them:

The first that we reject, which is reckoned by them the second, is *confirmation*. But to explain this, we must con-

\* The following is the canon of the council of Trent, in which she adds her five new sacraments to those appointed by our Lord:—'Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo, Domino nostro, instituta; aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet, baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, penitentiam, extremam unctionem, ordinem, et matrimonium; aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum: anathema sit.' Sessio vii. can. 1.

The reader will find the same doctrine embodied in the creed of pope Pius IV. See Appendix.—[Ed.]

**A R T.**  
**XXV.**

1 Pet. iii.  
21.

Matt. xxvi.  
26, 27.

1 Cor. xi.  
23—27.

1 Cor. x.  
16, 17.

Lib. x.  
Ep. 97.

1 Tim. vi  
20.

Matt.  
xxviii. 19.

Lib. 3.  
dist. 2.

ART.  
XXV.Acts viii.  
12, 14, 15,  
16, 17.

Heb. vi. 2.

sider in what respect our church receives *confirmation*, and upon what reasons it is that she does not acknowledge it to be a sacrament. We find that after Philip, the deacon and evangelist, had converted and baptized some in Samaria, Peter and John were sent thither by the apostles, who 'laid their hands' on such as were baptized, and 'prayed that they might receive the Holy Ghost;' upon which it is said, that 'they received the Holy Ghost.' Now though ordinary functions, when performed by the apostles, such as their laying on of hands on those whom they ordained or confirmed, had extraordinary effects accompanying them; but when the extraordinary effects ceased, the end for which these were at first given being accomplished, the gospel having been fully attested to the world, yet the functions were still continued of confirmation as well as ordination: and as the 'laying on of hands,' that is reckoned among the principles of the Christian doctrine, after *repentance* and *faith*, and subsequent to *baptism*, seems very probably to belong to this; so from these warrants we find in the earliest writings of Christianity mention of a *confirmation* after *baptism*, which for the greater solemnity and awe of the action, and from the precedent of St. Peter and St. John, was reserved to the bishop, to be done only by him.

Upon these reasons we think it is in the power of the church to require all such as have been baptized, to come before the bishop and renew their baptismal vow, and pray for God's holy Spirit to enable them to keep their vow; and, upon their doing this, the bishop may solemnly pray over them, with that ancient and almost natural ceremony of laying his hands upon them, which is only a designation of the persons so prayed over, and blessed, that God may seal and defend them with his holy Spirit; in which, according to the nature of the new covenant, we are sure that such as do thus vow and pray, do also receive the Holy Spirit, according to the promise that our Saviour has made us. In this action there is nothing but what is in the power of the church to do, even without any other warrant or precedent. The doing all things to *order*, and to *edifying*, will authorize a church to all this; especially, since the now universal practice of *infant baptism* makes this more necessary than it was in the first times, when chiefly the *adult* were baptized. It is highly reasonable that they, who gave no actual consent of their own, should come, and by their own express act make the stipulations of baptism. It may give greater impressions of awe and respect, when this is restrained to the highest order in the church. Upon the sincere vows and earnest prayers of persons thus confirmed, we have reason to believe that a proportioned degree of God's grace and Spirit will be poured out upon them. And in all this we are much confirmed, when we see such warrants for it in scripture. A thing so good in

itself, that has at least a probable authority for it, and was certainly a practice of the first ages, is upon very just grounds continued in our church. Would to God it were as seriously gone about, as it is lawfully established!

But, after all this, here is no sacrament, no express institution, neither by Christ nor his apostles; no rule given to practise it, and, which is the most essential, there is no matter here; for the laying on of hands is only a gesture in prayer; nor are there any federal rites declared to belong to it; it being indeed rather a ratifying and confirming the baptism, than any new stipulation. To supply all this, the church of Rome has appointed *matter* for it. The *chrism*, which is a mixture of *oil*-olive and *balm* (*opobalsamum*), the *oil* signifying the clearness of a good conscience, and the *balm* the savour of a good reputation. This must be peculiarly blessed by the bishop, who is the only minister of that function. The *form* of this sacrament is the applying the *chrism* to the forehead, with these words, *Signo te signo crucis, et confirmo te chrismate salutis, in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*: 'I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' They pretend Christ did institute this; but they say the Holy Ghost which he breathed on his disciples, being a thing that transcended all sacraments, he settled no determined *matter* nor *form* to it; and that the succeeding ages appropriated this *matter* to it.

We do not deny, but that the Christians began very early to use oil in holy functions; the climates they lived in making it necessary to use oil much, for stopping the perspiration, that might dispose them the more to use oil in their sacred rites. It is not to be denied, but that both Theophilus and Tertullian, in the end of the second, and the beginning of the third century, do mention it. The frequent mention of *oil*, and of *anointing*, in the scripture, might incline them to this: it was prophesied of Christ, that he was to be 'anointed with the oil of joy and gladness above his fellows;' and the names of *Messias* and *Christ* do also import this; but yet we hold all that to be mystical, and that it is to be meant of that fulness of the Spirit which he received *without measure*. Upon the same account we do understand those words of St. Paul in the same mystical sense: 'He that establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts:' as also those words of St. John: 'But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you; and ye need not that any man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you all things.' These words do clearly relate to somewhat that the Christians received immediately from God; and so must be understood figuratively: for we do not see the least hint

ART.  
XXV.Theophil.  
1. i. ad Au-  
tolyt. Tert.  
de Bapt. c.  
7, 8. de Re-  
sur. Car. c.  
8. Cyp.  
Ep. 70.2 Cor. i.  
21, 22.1 John ii.  
20, 27.

A R T.  
XXV.

of the apostles using of oil, except to the sick; of which afterwards. So that if this use of oil is considered only as a ceremony of a natural signification, that was brought into the rituals of the church, it is a thing of another nature: but if a sacrament is made of it, and a divine virtue is joined to that, we can admit of no such thing, without an express institution and declaration in scripture.

Con. Arausic. can. 1, 2. Cod. Affr. Can. 6. Con. Tol. cap. 20. Labb. et Coss. vol. ii. pp. 1261, 1474.

Hieron. ad Lucifer.

Hilar. in cap. 4. ad Ephes. ut supra.

Greg. Ep. l. iii. Ep. 9.

The invention that was afterwards found out, by which the bishop was held to be the only minister of *confirmation*, even though presbyters were suffered to *confirm*, was a piece of superstition without any colour from scripture. It was settled, that the bishop only might consecrate the *chrism*; and though he was the ordinary minister of confirmation, yet presbyters were also suffered to do it, the *chrism* being consecrated by the bishop: presbyters thus confirming was thought like the deacons giving the sacrament, though priests only might consecrate the eucharist. In the Latin church Jerome tells us, that in his time the bishop only confirmed; and though he makes the reason of this to be rather for doing an honour to them, than from any necessity of the law, yet he positively says, the bishops went round praying for the Holy Ghost on those whom they confirmed. It is said by Hilary, that in Egypt the presbyters did confirm in the bishop's absence: so that custom, joined with the distinction between the consecration, and the applying of the *chrism*, grew to be the universal practice of the Greek church. The greatness of dioceses, with the increasing numbers of the Christians, made that both in France, in the councils of Orange; and in Spain, in the council of Toledo, the same rule was laid down that the Greeks had begun. In Spain some priests did consecrate the *chrism*, but that was severely forbid in one of the councils of Toledo: yet at Rome the ancient custom was observed of appropriating the whole business of confirmation to the bishop, even in Gregory the Great's time: therefore he reproved the clergy of Sardinia, because among them the priest did confirm, and he appointed it to be reserved to the bishop. But, when he understood that some of them were offended at this, he writ to the bishop of Carali, that though his former order was made according to the ancient practice of the church of Rome, yet he consented that for the future the priest might confirm in the bishop's absence. But pope Nicholas in the ninth century pressed this with more rigour: for the Bulgarians being then converted to the Christian religion, and their priests having both baptized and confirmed the new converts, pope Nicholas sent bishops among them, with orders to confirm even those who had already been confirmed by priests: upon which, the contest being then on foot between Rome and Constantinople, Photius got it to be decreed in a synod at Constantinople, that the *chrism* being hallowed by a bishop, it might be administered by presbyters: and Photius affirmed,

that a presbyter might do this, as well as baptize or offer at the altar. But pope Nicholas, with the confidence that was often assumed by that see upon as bad grounds, did affirm, that this had never been allowed of. And upon this many of the Latins did, in the progress of their disputes with the Greeks, say, that they had no confirmation. This has been more enlarged on, than was necessary by the designed shortness of this work, because all those of the Roman communion among us have now no confirmation, unless a bishop happens to come amongst them. And therefore it is now a common doctrine among them, that though confirmation is a sacrament, yet it is not necessary.

About this there were fierce disputes among them about sixty years ago, whether it was necessary for them to have a bishop here to confirm, according to the ancient custom, or not. The Jesuits, who had no mind to be under any authority but their own, opposed it; for the bishop being by pope Eugenius declared to be the ordinary minister of it, from thence it was inferred, that a bishop was not simply necessary. This was much censured by some of the Gallican church. If confirmation were considered only as an ecclesiastical rite, we could not dispute the power of the church about it; but we cannot allow that a sacrament should be thus within the power of the church; or that a new function of consecrating oil, without applying it, distinct from confirmation, and yet necessary to the very essence of it, could have been set up by the power of the church; for if sacraments are federal conveyances of grace, they must be continued according to their first institution, the grace of God being only tied to the actions with which it is promised.

We go next to the second of the sacraments here rejected, which is *Penance*, that is reckoned the fourth in order among them. *Penance*, or *penitence*, is formed from the Latin translation of a Greek word that signifies a *change* or *renovation of mind*; which Christ has made a necessary condition of the new covenant. It consists in several acts; by all which, when joined together, and producing this real change, we become true penitents, and have a right to the *remission of sins*, which is in the New Testament often joined with *repentance*, and is its certain consequent. The first act of this repentance is, confession to God, before whom we must humble ourselves, and confess our sins to him; upon which we believe that 'he is faithful,' and true to his promises, and 'just to forgive us our sins;' and if we have wronged others, or have given public offence to the body, or church to which we belong, we ought to *confess our faults* to them likewise; and as a mean to quiet men's consciences, to direct them to complete their repentance, and to make them more humble and ashamed of their sins, we advise them to use secret confession to *their priest*,

A R T.  
XXV.  
In Decr.  
Con. Florent.

1 John i. 9.

James v. 16.

A R. T.  
XXV. *or to any other minister of God's word; leaving this matter wholly to their discretion.\**

When these acts of sorrow have had their due effect, in reforming the natures and lives of sinners, then their sins are forgiven them: in order to which, we do teach them to pray much, to give alms according to their capacity, and to fast as often as their health and circumstances will admit of; and most indispensably to restore or repair, as they find they have sinned against others. And as we teach them thus to look back on what is past, with a deep and hearty sorrow, and a profound shame, so we charge them to look chiefly forward, not thinking that any acts with relation to what is past can, as it were, by an account or compensation, free us from the guilt of our former sins, unless we amend our lives and change our tempers for the future; the great design of repentance being to make us like God, pure and holy as he is. Upon such a repentance sincerely begun and honestly pursued, we do in general, as the heralds of God's mercy, and the ministers of his gospel, pronounce to our people daily, the offers that are made us of mercy and pardon by Christ Jesus. This we do in our daily service, and in a more peculiar manner before we

\* The church of England commands confession to be made *only to God*. She allows or recommends to the sick a confession of those things that afflict their minds, to their ministers, *in order to obtain advice or consolation*.—Is this the doctrine you are sworn to teach? Far from it. Must I then, besides exposing your sophistry, correct your ignorance of your own doctrines, by stating them from your (pretended) infallible councils?

The TRENT DOCTRINE is, that by the bare receiving of the sacraments grace is conferred. (See council of Trent, sessio vii. canon viii.) Confession you make part of one of your *new sacraments*, viz. of the sacrament of penance, as you call it, perverting the scripture where the word is *repentance*, and *not* penance, although you also translate the word *repentance* as we do, when it suits your purpose. (See Acts v. 31, Rhemish Testament.) 'You make confession, which only consists of words, the *matter* of your new sacrament!—"Sunt autem quasi materia hujus sacramenti ipsius penitentis actus, nempe contritio, confessio et satisfactio." (Council of Trent, sessio xiv. cap. 3.) Confession, according to TRENT, is part of the sacrament of penance, by which grace is conferred "*ex opere operato*."

'You have then not only recommended confession to the minister or priest, but commanded, *under pain of being accursed*, secret or auricular confession to be made at stated times—not to God, as we say, but unto the priest—not in order to obtain *advice*, as we say, but in order to obtain *grace and absolution*!! The question then is, *not* whether it be *adviseable* to make confession to the minister of those things that afflict our minds, *in order to obtain advice*, but whether to confess all our greater sins, and all that upon strict inquiry we remember, not to God, as we admit, but to a priest, be *necessary* to salvation. You assert that it is necessary to salvation; this the church of England denies; and protests against your unscriptural domination over the consciences and souls of men. The council of Trent (sessio xiv. can. 6, 7, 8.) decrees, "that to confess all and every mortal sin, which after diligent inquiry we remember, and every evil thought or desire, and the circumstances that change the nature of the sin," is necessary to salvation, and of divine institution, and whosoever denies this, is to be accursed! And that all is to be done according to the constitution of the great council of Lateran. The order of which council was, that all persons of years of discretion should confess their sins once at least every year to their own priest, or with his leave to another priest; otherwise, when living, they were to be driven from entrance into the church, and when dead, they were to have no Christian burial. Now how do you support this unscriptural tyranny over the consciences and souls of men? When, and where, was such a system as this of Trent and Lateran instituted by CHRIST, or commanded, or practised, by the Apostles? *Page's Letters to a Romish Priest.*—[Ed.]

go to the holy communion. We do also, as we are a body that may be offended with the sins of others, forgive the scandals committed against the church; and that such as we think die in a state of repentance, may die in the full peace of the church, we join both absolutions in one; in the last office likewise praying to our Saviour that he would forgive them, and then we, as the officers of the church, authorized for that end, do forgive all the offences and scandals committed by them against the whole body. This is our doctrine concerning repentance; in all which we find no characters of a sacrament, no more than there is in prayer or devotion. Here is no matter, no application of that matter by a peculiar form, no institution, and no peculiar federal acts. The scene here is the mind, the acts are internal, the effect is such also; and therefore we do not reckon it a sacrament, not finding in it any of the characters of a sacrament.

The matter that is assigned in the church of Rome, are the acts of the penitent; his confession by his mouth to the priest, the contrition of his heart, and the satisfaction of his work, in doing the enjoined penance. The aggregate of all these is the *matter*; and the *form*, are the words, *Ego te absolvo*. Now besides what we have to say from every one of these particulars, the matter of a sacrament must be some visible sign applied to him that receives it. It is therefore a very absurd thing to imagine that a man's own thoughts, words, or actions, can be the *matter* of a sacrament: how can this be sanctified or applied to him? It will be a thing no less absurd to make the *form* of a sacrament to be a practice not much elder than four hundred years; since no ritual can be produced, nor author cited, for this form, for above a thousand years after Christ; all the ancient forms of receiving penitents having been by a blessing in the form of a prayer, or a declaration; but none of them in these positive words, *I absolve thee*. We think this want of *matter*, and this new invented *form*, being without any institution in scripture, and different from so long a practice of the whole church, are such reasons, that we are fully justified in denying penance to be a sacrament. But because the doctrine of repentance is a point of the highest importance, there arise several things here that ought to be very carefully examined.

As to *confession*, we find in the scriptures, that such as desired St. John's baptism came 'confessing their sins;' but that was previous to baptism. We find also that scandalous persons were to be 'openly rebuked before all,' and so to be put to shame; in which, no doubt, there was a confession, and a publication of the sin; but that was a *matter* of the discipline and order of the church: which made it necessary to 'note such persons as walked disorderly, and to have no fellowship with them,' sometimes not so much as to eat with them, who being Christians, and such as were called *brothers*,

A R. T.  
XXV.

Innoc.3. in  
4 Later.  
Can. 21,  
92.  
Con. Trid.  
Sess. 14.  
c. 5.

Matt. iii. 6.

1 Tim. v.  
20.

2 Thess. iii.

14.  
1 Cor. v.  
11.

A R T.  
XXV.

were a reproach to their profession. But besides the power given to the apostles of *binding and loosing*, which, as was said on another head, belonged to other matters; we find that when our Saviour breathed on his apostles, and gave them the Holy Ghost, he with that told them, that 'whose soever sins they remitted, they were remitted; and whose soever sins they retained, they were retained.' Since a power of remitting or retaining sin was thus given to them, they infer, that it seems reasonable, that, in order to their dispensing it with a due caution, the knowledge of all sins ought to be laid open to them.

Some have thought that this was a personal thing given to the apostles with that miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost; with which such a discerning of spirits was communicated to them, that they could discern the sincerity or hypocrisy of those that came before them. By this St. Peter discovered the sin of Ananias and Sapphira; and he also saw that Simon of Samaria was 'in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity:' so they conclude that this was a part of that extraordinary and miraculous authority which was given to the apostles, and to them only. But others, who distinguish between the full extent of this power, and the ministerial authority that is still to be continued in the church, do believe that these words may in a lower and more limited sense belong to the successors of the apostles; but they argue very strongly, that if these words are to be understood in their full extent as they lie, a priest has by them an absolute and unlimited power in this matter, not restrained to conditions or rules; so that if he does pardon or retain sins, whether in that he does right or wrong, the sins must be pardoned or retained accordingly: he may indeed sin in using it wrong, for which he must answer to God; but he seems, by the literal meaning of these words, to be clothed with such a plenipotentiary authority, that his act must be valid, though he may be punished for employing it amiss.\*

\* The Trent doctrine of absolution is—'Si quis dixerit, absolutionem sacramentalem sacerdotis non esse actum iudiciale, sed nudum ministerium pronuntiandi et declarandi remissa esse peccata confitenti, modo tantum credat se esse absolutum; aut sacerdos non serio, sed joco absolvat; aut dixerit non requiri confessionem poenitentis, ut sacerdos eum absolvere possit; anathema sit!!!' Sessio xiv. canon ix.

'The absolution of the church of England is simply declaratory. The words, as you will find them in the daily form of prayer, are, "Almighty God the Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live; and hath given power and commandment to his ministers, to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins. HE pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel." But because the minister pronounces it thus in the visitation of the sick—"Our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who hath left power to his church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST"—you would, I suppose, wisely conclude, that when the reformers reached this part of the prayer book, they forgot what they had said in the commencement, and here claim a power which there is vested only in God. Or that

John xx.  
23.Acts v.  
3, 9.  
Acts viii.  
23.A R T.  
XXV.

An ambassador that has full powers, though limited by secret instructions, does bind him that so empowered him by every act that he does pursuant to his powers, how much soever it may go beyond his instructions; for how obnoxious soever that may render him to his master, it does not at all lessen the authority of what he has done, nor the obligation that arises out of it. So these words of Christ's, if applied to all priests, must belong to them in their full extent; and if so, the salvation or the damnation of mankind is put absolutely in the priest's power. Nor can it be answered, that the conditions of the pardon of sin that are expressed in the other parts of the gospel, are here to be understood, though they are not expressed; as we are said to be saved if we believe, which does not imply that a single act of believing the gospel without any thing else, puts us in a state of salvation.

In opposition to this, we answer, that the gospel having so described *faith* to us, as the root of all other graces and virtues, as that which produces them, and which is known by them,

by saying "by his authority committed unto me, I absolve" &c. &c.; it necessarily follows that they contradict what they had said before, "that power and commandment is given unto the minister, to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent," &c. &c. But a few words will explain this, and may discover to you, that in the language of scripture a thing is said to be done by a person, when his doing it only consists in his declaring and pronouncing it.—See Jeremiah i. 9, 10.—"And the LORD said unto me, Behold I have put my words in thy mouth." See I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant." Now we must all grant that Jeremiah had power over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, &c. &c.; for God gave it to him. We must likewise grant that Jeremiah exercised this power, and did throw down and destroy kingdoms: otherwise God's purpose in raising him up would have failed. The point then is, how, and in what way, did Jeremiah exercise this power, and throw down and destroy the kingdoms? There are but two ways. 1st—By being actively engaged in the battle in the day of the falling of these kingdoms, and by his own act and deed destroying them; or, 2dly—By his declaring and pronouncing their downfall by the authority committed to him, and by proclaiming the word of destruction. That he pulled down and destroyed the kingdoms in the first way, you must maintain: or contradict the council of Trent. That he did it in the second way we maintain, and say, just so hath CHRIST given power to his ministers to remit sin; but this power is only to be exercised by their declaring and pronouncing the absolution and remission of their sins to "all that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel." And the minister, pronouncing and declaring this absolution, may be said to absolve, in the same way that Jeremiah, declaring and pronouncing the downfall of nations and kingdoms, may be said, and is said, to have pulled down, rooted out, and destroyed them. . . . .

'Another portion of scripture, to which I refer, is that which concerns the cleansing of the leper; which is exactly parallel, as the leper typified the sinner defiled with sin. In Leviticus xiii. 3, 6, &c. "And the priest shall look upon him, and shall pronounce him unclean;" and again, "And the priest shall pronounce him clean." Here then we see, that the priest had only the power of declaring and pronouncing, and not the power of killing or curing, of making clean or unclean: and yet in the 14th chap. 11th verse, the thing is said to be done by the priest:—"And the priest that maketh him clean," &c. &c. This is plain, and proves, that in the language of scripture a thing is said to be done by a person, when his doing it only consists in his declaring and pronouncing it. Apply this now, and you shall discover that we may use the words "I absolve," and yet maintain that the absolution is only declaratory, without agreeing with the impious doctrine of the council of Trent, or "annihilating the book of Common Prayer." Page's Letters to a Romish Priest.—[En.]

all that is promised upon our *faith* must be understood of a *faith* so qualified as the gospel represents it; and therefore that cannot be applied to this case, where an unlimited authority is so particularly expressed, that no condition seems to be implied in it. If any conditions are elsewhere laid upon us, in order to our salvation, then, according to their doctrine, we may say that of them which they say of contrition upon this occasion, that they are necessary when we cannot procure the priest's pardon; but that by it the want of them all may be supplied, and that the obligation to them all is superseded by it:\* and if any conditions are to be understood as limits upon this power, why are not all the conditions of the gospel, faith, hope, and charity, contrition and new obedience, made necessary, in order to the lawful dispensing of it, as well as confession, attrition, and the doing the penance enjoined? Therefore since no condition is here named as a restraint upon this general power, that is pretended to be given to priests by those words of our Saviour, they must either be understood as simple and unconditional, or they must be limited to all the conditions that are expressed in the gospel; for there is not the colour of a reason to restrain them to some of them, and to leave out the rest: and thus we think we are fully justified by saying, that by these words our Saviour did indeed fully empower the apos-

\* 'The absolution of the priest is, according to Trent, of such importance and value, that it can, by some strange process, make attrition contrition, and save a man who has only imperfect repentance, in which there is no love of God. The Lord Jesus Christ says, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish:" Trent says, If ye have even attrition, (i. e. imperfect repentance, arising from base motives, such as fear of hell, &c.) ye shall surely be saved, if only ye can get the priest's absolution. You say, that contrition (perfect repentance) is indispensably necessary to give efficacy to the absolution. How can you assert this, when Trent lays down such soul-destroying doctrine as this, that attrition is sufficient, if the person can get the priest's absolution!!! This is such awful doctrine, that I shall give your own authorities, lest any should conclude that I misrepresent your system. The council of Trent speaks thus:—"Illam vero contritionem imperfectam, quæ attritio dicitur, quoniam vel ex turpitudinis peccati consideratione, vel ex gehennæ et pœnarum metu communiter concipitur, si voluntatem peccandi excludat, cum spe veniæ; declarat non solum non facere hominem hypocritam, et magis peccatorem, verum, etiam donum Dei esse, et Spiritus sancti impulsu, non adhuc quidem inhabitantis, sed tantum moventis, quo penitens adjutus, viam sibi ad justitiam parat. Et quamvis sine sacramento pœnitentiæ per se ad justificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat; tamen eum ad Dei gratiam in sacramento pœnitentiæ impetrandum disponit." *Sessio xiv. cap. 4.* You must now have another statement of this doctrine, from the "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine" revised by Dr. Doyle. (See the article on penance.) "Q. What is attrition? A. It is imperfect contrition, arising from the consideration of the turpitude of sin, or fear of punishment; and if it contain a detestation of sin with the hope of pardon, it is so far from being itself wicked, that though alone it justify not, yet it prepares the way to justification, and disposes us, at least remotely, towards obtaining God's grace in the sacrament. Q. What, if a dying man be in mortal sin, and cannot have a priest? A. Then nothing but perfect contrition will suffice, it being impossible to be saved without the love of God." So that, according to this impious doctrine, the absolution of the priest supplies the place of the love of God, which is lacking in attrition!! Need I say, that the church of England has too much respect for the character of God, and his truth, not to protest loudly against such a system as this? *Page's Letters to a Romish Priest.*—[En.]

ties to publish his gospel to the world, and to declare the terms of salvation, and of obtaining the pardon of sin, in which they were to be infallibly assisted, so that they could not err in discharging their commission; and the terms of the covenant of grace being thus settled by them, all who were to succeed them were also empowered to go on with the publication of this pardon and of those glad tidings to the world: so that whatsoever they declared in the name of God, conform to the tenor of that which the apostles were to settle, should be always made good. We do also acknowledge, that the pastors of the church have, in the way of censure and government, a ministerial authority to remit or to retain sins, as they are matters of scandal or offence; though that indeed does not seem to be the meaning of those words of our Saviour; and therefore we think that the power of pardoning and retaining is only declaratory, so that all the exercises of it are then only effectual, when the declarations of the pardon are made conform to the conditions of the gospel. This doctrine of ours, how much soever decried of late in the Roman church, as striking at the root of the priestly authority, yet has been maintained by some of their best authors, and some of the greatest of their schoolmen.

Thus we have seen upon what reason it is that we do not conclude from hence, that auricular confession is necessary; in which we think that we are fully confirmed by the practice of many of the ages of the Christian church, which did not understand these words as containing an obligation to secret confession. It is certain, that the practice and tradition of the church must be relied on here, if in any thing, since there was nothing that both clergy and laity were more concerned both to know and to deliver down faithfully, than this, on which the authority of the one, and the salvation of the other, depended so much. Such a point as this could never have been forgot or mistaken; many and clear rules must have been given about it. It is a thing to which human nature has so much repugnancy, that it must, in the first forming of churches, have been infused into them as absolutely necessary in order to pardon and salvation.

A church could not now be formed, according to the doctrine and practice of the church of Rome, without very full and particular instructions, both to priests and people, concerning confession and absolution. It is the most intricate part of their divinity, and that which the clergy must be the most ready at. In opposition to all this, let it be considered, that though there is a great deal said in the New Testament concerning sorrow for sin, repentance, and remission of sins, yet there is not a word said, nor a rule given, concerning confession to be made to a priest, and absolution to be given by him. There is indeed a passage in St. James's Epistle relating to confession; but it is 'to one another;' not restrained

to the priest; as the word rendered *faults* seems to signify those offences by which others are wronged; in which case confession is a degree of reparation, and so is sometimes necessary: but whatever may be in this, it is certain, that the confession, which is there appointed to be made, is a thing that was to be mutual among Christians; and it is not commanded in order to absolution, but in order to the procuring the intercessions of other good men; and therefore it is added, and 'pray for one another.' By the words that follow, 'that ye may be healed,' joined with those that went before concerning the *sick*, it seems the direction given by St. James belongs principally to sick persons; and the conclusion of the whole period shews, that it relates only to the private prayers of good men for one another; 'the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much:' so that this place does not at all belong to auricular confession or absolution.

Nor do there any prints appear, before the apostacies that happened in the persecution of Decius, of the practice even of confessing such heinous sins as had been publicly committed. Then arose the famous contests with the Novatians, concerning the receiving the lapsed into the communion of the church again. It was concluded not to exclude them from the hopes of mercy, or of reconciliation; yet it was resolved not to do that till they had been kept at a distance for some time from the holy communion; at last they were admitted to make their confession, and so they were received to the communion of the church. This time was shortened, and many things were passed over, to such as shewed a deep and sincere repentance; and one of the characters of a true repentance, upon which they were always treated with a great distinction of favour, was, if they came and first accused themselves. This shewed that they were deeply affected with the sense of their sins, when they could not bear the load of them, but became their own accusers, and discovered their sins. There are several canons that make a difference in the degrees and time of the penance, between those who had accused themselves, and those against whom their sins were proved. A great deal of this strain occurs often in the writings of the fathers, which plainly shews that they did not look on the necessity of an enumeration of all their sins as commanded by God; otherwise it would have been enforced with considerations of another nature, than that of shortening their penance.

The first occasion that was given to the church to exercise this discipline, was from the frequent apostacies, into which many had lapsed during the persecutions; and when these went off, another sort of disorders began to break in upon the church, and to defile it. Great numbers followed the example of their princes, and became Christians; but a mixed multitude came among them, so that there were many scan-

dals amongst that body, which had been formerly remarkable for the purity of their morals, and the strictness of their lives. It was the chief business of all those councils that met in the fourth and fifth centuries, to settle many rules concerning the degrees and time of penance, the censures both of the clergy and laity, the orders of the penitents and the methods of receiving them to the communion of the church. In some of those councils they denied reconciliation after some sins, even to the last, though the general practice was to receive all at their death; but while they were in a good state of health, they kept them long in penance, in a public separation from the common privileges of Christians, and chiefly from the holy sacrament, and under severe rules, and that for several years, more or fewer, according to the nature of their sins, and the characters of their repentance; of which a free and unextorted confession being one of the chief, this made many prevent that, and come in of their own accord to confess their sins, which was much encouraged and magnified.

Confession was at first made publicly; but the inconveniencies of that appearing, and particularly many of those sins being capital, instead of a public, there was a private confession practised. The bishops either attended upon these themselves, or they appointed a penitentiary priest to receive them: all was in order to the executing the canons, and for keeping up the discipline of the church. Bishops were warranted by the council of Nice to excuse the severity of the canons, as the occasion should require. The penitents went through the penance imposed, which was done publicly; the separation and penance being visible, even when the sin was kept secret; and when the time of the penance was finished, they received the penitents by prayer and imposition of hands, into the communion of the church, and so they were received. This was all the absolution that was known during the first six centuries.

Penitents were enjoined to publish such of their secret sins, as the penitentiary priest did prescribe. This happened to give great scandal at Constantinople, when Nectarius was bishop there; for a woman being in a course of penance, confessed publicly that she had been guilty of adultery, committed with a deacon in the church. It seems, by the relation that the historian gives of this matter, that she went beyond the injunction given her; but whether the fault was in her, or in the penitentiary priest, this gave such offence, that Nectarius broke that custom. And Chrysoston, who came soon after him to that see, speaks very fully against secret confession, and advises Christians to confess only to God; yet the practice of secret confession was kept up elsewhere. But it appears by a vast number of citations from the fathers, both in different ages, and in the different corners of the church, that though they pressed confession much, and magnified the

Dallæus  
de Confes-  
sione. Mo-  
rinus de  
Pœnitentia.

Socr. Hist.  
l. v. c. 19.

Thirteen  
passages  
out of him  
cited and  
explained  
by Daillé  
de Conf.  
l. iv. c. 25.

value of it highly, yet they never urged it as necessary to the pardon of sin, or as a sacrament; they only pressed it as a mean to complete the repentance, and to give the sinner an interest in the prayers of the church. This may be positively affirmed concerning all the quotations that are brought in this matter, to prove that auricular confession is necessary in order to the priest's pardon, and that it is founded on those words of Christ, 'Whose sins ye remit,' &c. that they prove quite the contrary; that the fathers had not that sense of it, but considered it, either as a mean to help the completing of repentance, or as a mean to maintain the purity of the Christian church, and the rigour of discipline.

In the fifth century a practice begun, which was no small step to the ruin of the order of the church. Penitents were suffered, instead of the public penance that had been formerly enjoined, to do it secretly in some monastery, or in any other private place, in the presence of a few good men, and that at the discretion of the bishop, or the confessor; at the end of which, absolution was given in secret. This was done to draw what professions of repentance they could from such persons who would not submit to settled rules: this temper was found neither to lose them quite, nor to let their sins pass without any censure. But in the seventh century, all public penance for secret sins was taken quite away. Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, is reckoned the first of all the bishops of the western church that did quite take away all public penance for secret sins.

Another piece of the ancient severity was also slackened, for they had never allowed penance to men that had relapsed into any sin; though they did not cut them off from all hope of the mercy of God, yet they never gave a second absolution to the relapse. This the church of Rome has still kept up in one point, which is heresy; a relapse being delivered to the secular arm, without admitting him to penance. The ancients did indeed admit such to penance, but they never reconciled them. Yet in the decay of discipline, absolution came to be granted to the relapse, as well as to him that had sinned but once.

About the end of the eighth century, the commutation of penance began; and, instead of the ancient severities, vocal prayers came to be all that was enjoined; so many *Patens* stood for so many days of fasting, and the rich were admitted to buy off their penance under the decenter name of giving alms. The getting many masses to be said, was thought a devotion by which God was so much honoured, that the commuting penance for masses was much practised. Pilgrimages and wars came on afterwards; and in the twelfth century, the trade was set up of selling indulgences. By this it appears, that confession came by several steps into the church; that in the first ages it was not heard of; that the apostacies in time

of persecution gave the first rise to it: all which demonstrates that the primitive church did not consider it as a thing appointed by Christ to be the matter of a sacrament.

It may be in the power of the church to propose confession, as a mean to direct men in their repentance, to humble them deeper for their sins, and to oblige them to a greater strictness. But to enjoin it as necessary to obtain the pardon of sin, and to make it an indispensable condition, and indeed the most indispensable of all the parts of repentance, is beyond the power of the church; for since Christ is the Mediator of this new covenant, he alone must fix the necessary conditions of it. In this, more than in any thing else, we must conclude that the gospel is express and clear; and therefore so hard a condition as this is cannot be imposed by any other authority. The obligation to auricular confession is a thing to which mankind is naturally so little disposed to submit, and it may have such consequences on the peace and order of the world, that we have reason to believe, that if Christ had intended to have made it a necessary part of repentance, he would have declared it in express words, and not have left it so much in the dark, that those who assert it, must draw it by inferences from those words, 'Whose sins ye remit,' &c. Some things are of such a nature, that we may justly conclude, that either they are not at all required, or that they are commanded in plain terms.

As for the good or evil effects that may follow on the obliging men to a strictness in confession, that does not belong to this matter: if it is acknowledged to be only a law of the church, other considerations are to be examined about it; but if it is pretended to be a law of God, and a part of a sacrament, we must have a divine institution for it; otherwise all the advantages that can possibly be imagined in it, without that, are only so many arguments to persuade us, that there is somewhat that is highly necessary to the purity of Christians, of which Christ has not said a word, and concerning which his apostles have given us no directions. We do not deny but it may be a mean to strike terror in people, to keep them under awe and obedience; it may, when the management of it is in good hands, be made a mean to keep the world in order, and to guide those of weaker judgments more steadily and safely, than could be well done any other way. In the use of confession, when proposed as our church does, as matter of advice, and not of obligation, we are very sensible many good ends may be attained; but while we consider those, we must likewise reflect on the mischief that may arise out of it; especially supposing the greater part both of the clergy and laity to be what they ever were, and ever will be, depraved and corrupted. The people will grow to think that the priest is in *God's stead* to them; that their telling their sins to him, is as if they confessed them to God; they will expect to be

easily discharged for a gentle penance, with a speedy absolution; and this will make them as secure, as if their consciences were clear, and their sins pardoned; so the remedy being easy and always at hand, they will be encouraged to venture the more boldly on sin. It is no difficult matter to gain a priest, especially if he himself is a bad man, to use them tenderly upon those occasions. On the other hand, corrupt priests will find their account in the dispensing this great power, so as to serve their own ends. They will know all people's tempers and secrets; and how strict soever they may make the seal of confession, to draw the world to trust to it; yet in bodies so knit together, as communities and orders are, it is not possible to know what use they make of this. Still they know all themselves, and see into the weakness, the passions, and appetites, of their people. This must often be a great snare to them, especially in the supposition that cannot be denied to hold generally true, of their being bad men themselves: great advantages are hereby given to infuse fears and scruples into people's minds, who, being then in their tenderest minutes, will be very much swayed and wrought on by them. A bad priest knows by this whom he may tempt to any sort of sin: and thus the good and the evil of confession, as it is a general law upon all men's consciences, being weighed one against the other; and it being certain that the far greater part of mankind is always bad, we must conclude that the evil does so far preponderate the good, that they bear no comparison or proportion to one another. The matter at present under debate is only whether it is one of the laws of God, or not? and it is enough for the present purpose to shew, that it is no law of God; upon which we do also see very good reason why it ought not to be made a law of the church; both because it is beyond her authority, which can only go to matters of order and discipline, as also because of the vast inconveniencies that are like to arise out of it.

The next part of repentance is *contrition*, which is a sorrow for sin upon the motives of the love of God, and the hatred of sin joined with a renovation of heart. This is that which we acknowledge to be necessary to complete our repentance; but this consisting in the temper of a man's mind, and his inward acts, it seems a very absurd thing to make this the matter of a sacrament, since it is of a spiritual and invisible nature. But this is not all that belongs to this head.

The casuists of the church of Rome have made a distinction between a perfect and an imperfect *contrition*; the imperfect they call *attrition*; which is any sorrow for sin, though upon an inferior motive, such as may be particular to one act of sin, as when it rises from the loss or shame it has brought with it, together with an act formed in detestation of it, without a resolution to sin no more. Such a sorrow as this is they teach does make the sacrament effectual, and puts a man in a

state of justification, though they acknowledge that without the sacrament it is not sufficient to justify him.

This was settled by the council of Trent.\* We think it strikes at the root of all religion and virtue, and is a reversing of the design for which sacraments were instituted, which was to raise our minds to a high pitch of piety, and to exalt and purify our acts. We think the sacraments are profaned when we do not raise our thoughts as high as we can in them. To teach men how low they may go, and how small a measure will serve turn, especially when the great and chief commandment, the consideration of the love of God, is left out, seems to be one of the greatest corruptions in practice of which any church can be guilty; a slackness in doctrine, especially in so great a point as this, in which human nature is under so fatal a bias, will always bring with it a much greater corruption in practice. This will indeed make many run to the sacrament, and raise its value; but it will rise upon the ruins of true piety and holiness. There are few men that can go long on in very great sins without feeling great remorse; these are to them rather a burden that they cannot shake off, than a virtue. Sorrow lying long upon their thoughts may be the beginning of a happy change, and so prove a great blessing to them: all which is destroyed by this doctrine: for if under such uneasy thoughts they go to confession, and are attrite, the sacrament is valid, and they are justified: then the uneasiness goes off, and is turned into joy, without their being any thing the better by it. They return to their sins with a new calm and security, because they are taught that their sins are pardoned, and that all scores are cleared. Therefore we conclude, that this doctrine wounds religion in its vitals; and we are confirmed in all this by what appears in practice, and what the best writers that have lived in that communion have said of the abuses that follow on the methods in which this sacrament is managed among them, which do arise mainly out of this part of their doctrine concerning *attrition*. All that they teach concerning those acts of *attrition*, or even *contrition*, is also liable to great abuse in practice: for, as a man may bring forth those acts in words, and not be the better for them; so he may force himself to think them, which is nothing but the framing an inward discourse within himself upon them; and yet these not arising genuinely from a new nature, or a change of temper, such acts can be of no value in the sight of God: yet the whole practice of their church runs upon these acts, as if a man's going through them, and making himself think them, could be of great value in the sight of God.

The third branch of the matter of this sacrament is the

\* For this decree, see note, p. 360.—[Ed.]

*satisfaction*, or the doing the penance; which, by the constant practice of the church for above twelve centuries, was to be performed before absolution could be given; except in extraordinary cases, such as death, or martyrdom; but in these latter ages, in which the necessity of confession is carried higher, the obligation to satisfaction or the doing of penance is let fall lower. A distinction is invented by which confession and contrition, attrition at least, are made essential parts of the sacrament, without which there is no sacrament; as soul and body are essential to the being of a man; and satisfaction is considered only as an integral part; such as an eye or a limb in a man, which is necessary to the order of it, but not to its being. If satisfaction is considered as that which destroys the habits of sin, and introduces the habits of virtue; if it is purgative and medicinal, and changes a man's principles and nature, then it ought to be reckoned the principal and least dispensable thing of all repentance. For our confessing past sins, and sorrowing for them, is only enjoined us as a mean to reform and purify our nature. If we imagine that our acts of repentance are a discounting with God, by so many pious thoughts which are to be set against so many bad ones, this will introduce a sort of mechanical religion; which will both corrupt our ideas of God, and of the nature of good and evil.

The true and generous notion of religion is, that it is a system of many truths, which are of such efficacy, that if we receive them into our minds, and are governed by them, they will rectify our thoughts, and purify our natures; and by making us like God here, they will put us in a sure way to enjoy him eternally hereafter. Sorrow for past sins, and all reflections upon them, are enjoined us as means to make the sense of them go so deep in our minds, as to free us from all those bad habits that sin leaves in us, and from those ill inclinations that are in our nature. If we therefore set up a sorrowing for sin as a merchandise with God, by so many acts of one kind to take off the acts of another, here the true design of our sorrow is turned into a trafficking, by which how much soever priests may gain, or the value of sacraments may seem to rise, religion will certainly lose in its main design, which is the planting a new nature in us, and the making us become like God. Confession and contrition are previous acts, that lead to this reformation, which, as they teach, is wrought by the satisfaction; therefore we must needs condemn that doctrine which makes it less necessary and more dispensable than the other. In the case of death we confess all the rights of the church with relation to a man's scandals, and his obligations to make public penance, may and ought to be then forgiven him; but we think it one of the most fatal errors that can creep into any church, to encourage men to

rely on a death-bed repentance. The nature of man leans so much this way, that it is necessary to bend the point as strong as may be to the other hand.

The promises of the gospel run all upon the condition of repentance; which imports a renovation of the inner man, and a purity of life: so that no repentance can be esteemed true, but as we perceive that it has purified our hearts, and changed our course of life. What God may do with death-bed penitents, in the infinite extent and absoluteness of his mercy, becomes not us to define: but we are sure he has given no promises to such persons in his gospel. And since the function of clergymen is the dispensing of that, we cannot go beyond the limits set us in it: so there is no reason to make this part of repentance less necessary or obligatory than the other, but very much to the contrary. Another exception that we have to the allowed practice of that church, is the giving absolution before the satisfaction is made; upon its being enjoined and accepted by the penitent. This is so contrary to all ancient rules, that it were a needless labour to go to prove it; the thing being confessed by all: and yet the practice is so totally changed among them, that such as have blamed it, and have attempted to revive the ancient method, have been censured as guilty of an innovation, savouring of heresy: because they condemn so general a practice, that it would render the infallibility of the church very doubtful, if it should be pretended to have erred in so universal a practice.

Hasty absolutions, contrary both to the whole design of the gospel, and to the constant practice of the church, for at least twelve centuries, are now the avowed methods of that church; to which in a great measure all that corruption of morals that is among them owes its rise and continuance: for who can be supposed to set himself against those inclinations to sin, that are deeply rooted in his nature, and are powerfully recommended by the pleasure and gain that arises out of vicious practices, if the way to pardon is cast so wide open, that a man may sin as long and as securely as he will, and yet all at once, upon a few acts that he makes himself go through, he may get into a state of grace, and be pardoned and justified? The power that is left to the priest to appoint the penance, is a trust of a high nature, which yet is known to be universally ill applied; so that absolution is generally prostituted among them.

The true penance enjoined by the gospel is the forsaking of sin, and the doing acts of virtue. Fasting, prayers, and almsgiving, are acts that are very proper means to raise us to this temper. If fasting is joined with prayer, and if prayer arises out of an inward devotion of mind, and is serious and fervent, then we know that it has great efficacy; as being one of the

A R T.  
XXV.

chief acts of our religious service of God, to which the greatest promises are made, and upon which the best blessings do descend upon us. Alms-giving is also a main part of charity: which, when done from a right principle of loving God and our neighbour, is of great value in his sight. But if fasting is only an exercise of the body, and of abstaining so long, and from such things, this may perhaps trouble and pain the body; but bodily exercise profiteth nothing; so not to mention the mockery of fasting, when it is only a delay of eating, after which all liberties are taken, or an abstinence which is made up with other delicious and inflaming nutritives, these are of no value, being only inventions to deceive men, and to expose religion to mockery. But even severe and afflicting fasting, if done only as a punishment, which, when it is over, the penance is believed to be completed, gives such a low idea of God and religion, that from thence men are led to think very slightly of sin, when they know at what price they can carry it off. Such a continuance in fasting in order to prayer, as humbles and depresses nature, and raises the mind, is a great mean to reform the world; but fasting as a prescribed task to expiate our sins is a scorn put upon religion.

Prayer, when it arises from a serious heart that is earnest in it, and when it becomes habitual, is certainly a most effectual mean to reform the world, and to fetch down divine assistances. But to appoint so many vocal prayers to be gone through as a task; and then to tell the world that the running through these, with few or no inward acts accompanying them, is contrition or attrition, this is more like a design to root out all the impressions of religion, and all sense of that repentance which the gospel requires, than to promote it. This may be a task fit to accustom children to; but it is contrary to the true genius of religion, to teach men, instead of that *reasonable service* that we ought to offer up to God, to give him only the *labour of the lips*, which is the *sacrifice of fools*. Prayers gone through as a task can be of no value, and can find no acceptance in the sight of God. And as St. Paul said, that 'if he gave all his goods to the poor, and had not charity, he was nothing;' so the greatest profusion of alms-giving, when done in a mercenary way, to buy off and to purchase a pardon, is the turning of God's house from being a *house of prayer*, to be a *den of thieves*.

Upon all these reasons we except to the whole doctrine and practice of the church of Rome, as to the satisfaction made by doing penance. And in the last place we except to the form of absolution in these words, *I absolve thee*. We of this church, who use it only to such as are thought to be near death, cannot be meant to understand any thing by it, but the full peace and pardon of the church: for if we meant a pardon with relation to God, we ought to use it upon many other occasions. The pardon that we give in the name of God is only

1 Cor. xiii.  
1, 2, 3.A R T.  
XXV.

declaratory of his pardon, or supplicatory in a prayer to him for pardon.

In this we have the whole practice of the church till the twelfth century universally of our side. All the fathers, all the ancient liturgies, all that have writ upon the offices, and the first schoolmen, are so express in this matter, that the thing in fact cannot be denied. Morinus has published so many of their old rituals, that he has put an end to all doubting about it. In the twelfth century some few began to use the words, *I absolve thee*: yet, to soften this expression, that seemed new and bold, some tempered it with these words, *in so far as it is granted to my frailty*; and others with these words, *as far as the accusation comes from thee, and as the pardon is in me*. Yet this form was but little practised: so that William, bishop of Paris, speaks of the form of absolution as given only in a prayer, and not as given in these words, *I absolve thee*. He lived in the beginning of the fourteenth century; so that this practice, though begun in other places before that time, yet was not known long after in so public a city as Paris. But some schoolmen began to defend it, as implying only a declaration of the pardon pronounced by the priest; and this having an air of more authority, and being once justified by learned men, did so universally prevail, that in little more than sixty years' time, it became the universal practice of the whole Latin church. So sure a thing is tradition, and so impossible to be changed, as they pretend, when within the compass of one age, the new form, *I absolve thee*, was not so much as generally known; and before the end of it the old form of doing it in a prayer, with imposition of hands, was quite worn out. The idea that arises naturally out of these words is, that the priest pardons sins; and since that is subject to such abuses, and has let in so much corruption upon that church, we think we have reason not only to deny that penance is a sacrament, but likewise to affirm, that they have corrupted this great and important doctrine of repentance, in all the parts and branches of it: nor is the matter mended with that prayer that follows the absolution; *The* Rituale Romanum de sacr. penitent.  
*passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the blessed Virgin and all the saints, and all the good that thou hast done, and the evil that thou hast suffered, be to thee for the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life.*

The third sacrament rejected by this Article is *Orders*; which is reckoned the sixth by the church of Rome. We affirm, that Christ appointed a succession of pastors in different ranks, to be continued in his church, for the work of the gospel, and the care of souls: and that, as the apostles settled the churches, they appointed different orders of *bishops, priests, and deacons*: and we believe that all who are dedicated to serve in these ministries, after they are examined and judged worthy of them, ought to be separated to them by the

imposition of hands, and by prayer. These were the only rites that we find practised by the apostles. For many ages the church of God used no other; therefore we acknowledge that *bishops, priests, and deacons*, ought to be blessed and dedicated to the holy ministry by imposition of hands and prayer; and that then they are received according to the order and practice settled by the apostles to serve in their respective degrees. Men thus separated have thereby authority to perfect the saints or Christians, that is, to perform the sacred functions among them, to minister to them, and to build them up in their most holy faith. And we think no other persons, without such a separation and consecration, can lawfully touch the holy things. In all which we separate the qualifications of the function from the inward qualities of the person; the one not at all depending on the other; the one relating only to the order and the good government of the society, and the other relating indeed to the salvation of him that officiates, but not at all to the validity of his office or service.

But in all this we see nothing like a sacrament: here is neither *matter, form, nor institution*; here is only prayer: the laying on of hands is only a gesture in prayer, that imports the designation of the person so prayed over. In the Greek church there is indeed a different form; for though there are prayers in their office of Ordination, yet the words that do accompany the imposition of hands are only declaratory; *The grace of God, that perfects the feeble and heals the weak, promotes this man to be a deacon, a priest, or a bishop; let us therefore pray for him*: by which they pretend only to judge of a divine vocation: all the ancient rituals, and all those that treat of them for the first seven centuries, speak of nothing as essential to orders but *prayer and imposition of hands*. It is true, many rites came to be added, and many prayers were used that went far beyond the first simplicity. But in the tenth or eleventh century a new form was brought in, of delivering the *vessels* in ordaining priests; and words were joined with that, giving them power to *offer sacrifices to God, and to celebrate masses*, and then the orders were believed to be given by this rite. The delivering of the *vessels* looked like a *matter*, and these words were thought the *form* of the sacrament; and the prayer that was formerly used with the imposition of hands, was indeed still used, but only as a part of the office; no hands were laid on when it was used: and though the form of laying on of hands was still continued, the bishop with other priests laying their hands on those they ordained, yet it is now a dumb ceremony, not a word of a prayer being said while they lay on their hands. So that though both prayer and imposition of hands are used in the office, yet they are not joined together. In the conclusion of the office, a new benediction was added ever since

Haberti  
pontif.  
Græcum.  
Morinus de  
Ordinat.  
sacris.

the twelfth century. The bishop alone lays on his hands, saying, *Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose sins ye retain, they are retained*. The number seven was thought to suit the sacraments best, so Orders were made one of them, and of these only priesthood; where the *vessels* were declared to be the *matter*, and the *form* was the delivering them with the words, *Take thou authority to offer up sacrifices to God, and to celebrate masses, both for the living and the dead; in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*.

The schoolmen have taken a new way of explaining this whole matter, borrowed from the eucharist, that is made up of two parts, the consecration of the bread and of the wine; both so necessary, that without the one the other becomes void: so they teach that a priest has two powers, of *consecrating* and of *absolving*; and that he is ordained to the one by the delivery of the vessels, and to the other by the bishop's laying on of hands, with the words *Receive the Holy Ghost*; and they make the bishop and the priest's laying on of hands jointly, to be only their declaring as by a suffrage, that such a person ought to be ordained; so totally have they departed from the primitive forms.

If this is a sacrament, and if the sacrament consists in this matter and form by them assigned, then since all the rituals of the Latin church for the first ten centuries had no such form of ordaining priests, this cannot be the *matter* and *form* of a sacrament: otherwise the church had in a course of so many ages no true orders, nor any sacrament in them. Nor will it serve in answer to this to say, that Christ instituted no special *matter* nor *form* here, but has left the specifying those among the other powers that he has given to his church: for a sacrament being an institution of applying a *matter* designed by God, by a particular *form* likewise appointed; to say that Christ appointed here neither *matter* nor *form*, is plainly to confess that this is no sacrament. In the first nine or ten ages there was no matter at all used, nothing but an imposition of hands with prayer: so that by this doctrine the church of God was all that while without true orders, since there was nothing used that can be called the matter of a sacrament.

Therefore, though we continue this institution of Christ, as he and his apostles settled it in the church, yet we deny it to be a sacrament; we also deny all the inferior orders to be sacred below that of deacon. The other orders we do not deny might be well, and on good reasons, appointed by the church as steps through which clerks might be made to pass, in order to a stricter examination and trial of them; like degrees in universities: but the making them, at least the subdiaconate, sacred, as it is reckoned by pope Eugenius, is, we think, beyond the power of the church; for here a degree

of orders is made a sacrament, and yet that degree is not named in the scripture, nor in the first ages. It is true, it came to be soon used with the other inferior orders; but it cannot be pretended to be a sacrament, since no divine institution can be brought for it. And we cannot but observe, that in the definition that Eugenius has given of the sacraments, which is an authentical piece in the Roman church, where he reckons *priests, deacons, and subdeacons*, as belonging to the sacrament of orders, he does not name *bishops*, though their being of divine institution is not questioned in that church. Perhaps the spirit with which they acted at that time in Basil offended him so much, that he was more set on depressing than on raising them. In the council of Trent, in which so much zeal appeared for recovering the dignity of the episcopal order, at that time so much eclipsed by the papal usurpations, when the sacrament of *orders* was treated of, they reckon seven degrees of them, the highest of which is that of priest. So that though they decreed that a bishop was by the divine institution above a priest, yet they did not decree that the office was an order, or a sacrament. And the schoolmen do generally explain episcopate, as being a higher degree or extension of priesthood, rather than a new order, or a sacrament; the main thing in their thoughts being that which, if true, is the greatest of all miracles, the wonderful conversion made in transubstantiation, they seem to think that no order can be above that which qualifies a man for so great a performance.

I say nothing in this place concerning the power of offering sacrifices, pretended to be given in orders; for that belongs to another Article.

The fourth sacrament here rejected is *Marriage*; which is reckoned the last by the Roman account. In the point of argument there is less to say here than in any of the other; but there seems to be a very express warrant for calling it a *sacrament*, from the translation of a passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, in which he makes an allusion, while he treats of marriage, to the mutual relation that is between Christ and his church, from that state of life, and says, 'There is a great mystery here;' the Vulgar has translated the word *mystery* by *sacrament*. So though the words immediately following seem to turn the matter another way, 'but I speak concerning Christ and the church;' yet from the promiscuous use of those two words, and because *sacraments* were called the *mysteries* of the Christian religion, the translator, it seems, thought that all mysteries might be called *sacraments*. But it is so very hard here to find *matter, form, a minister, and a sacramental effect*, that though pope Eugenius, in that famous decree of his, is very punctual in assigning these, when he explains the other sacraments; yet he wisely

passed them all over when he came to this, and only makes a true consent necessary to the making the sacrament.

We do not deny marriage to be an ordinance of God; but we think that as it was at first made in the state of innocence, so it is still founded on the law of nature; and though the gospel gives rules concerning the duties belonging to this state of life, as it does concerning the duties of parents and children, which is another relation founded on the same law of nature, yet we cannot call it a sacrament; for we find neither *matter, form, institution, nor federal acts, nor effects* assigned to it in the gospel, to make us esteem it a sacrament.

The *matter* assigned by the Roman doctors is the inward consent, by which both parties do mutually give themselves to one another: the *form* they make to be the words or signs, by which this is expressed. Now\* it seems a strange thing to make the secret thoughts of men the *matter*, and their words the *form* of a sacrament; all mutual compacts being as much sacraments as this, there being no visible material things applied to the parties who receive them; which is necessary to the being of a sacrament. It is also a very absurd opinion, which may have very fatal consequences, and raise very afflicting scruples, if any should imagine that the *inward consent* is the *matter* of this sacrament; here is a foundation laid down for voiding every marriage. The parties may and often do marry against their wills; and though they profess an outward consent, they do inwardly repine against what they are doing. If after this they grow to like their marriage, scruples must arise, since they know they have not the sacrament; because it is a doctrine in that church, that as intention is necessary in every sacrament, so here that goes further, the intention being the only *matter* of this sacrament; so that without it there is no marriage, and yet since they cannot be married again to complete, or rather to make the marriage, such persons do live only in a state of concubinage.

On the other hand, here is a foundation laid down for breaking marriages as often as the parties, or either of them, will solemnly swear that they gave no inward consent, which is often practised at Rome. All contracts are sacred things; but of them all, marriage is the most sacred, since so much depends upon it. Men's words, confirmed by oaths and other solemn acts, must either be binding according to the plain and acknowledged sense of them, or all the security and confidence of mankind is destroyed. No man can be safe if

\* Upon the whole doctrine of the church of Rome, concerning the sacraments, as it is explained by the schoolmen, I have followed the account given by Honoratus Fabri, in his *Summa Theologica*, who is dead within these ten years. I knew him at Rome, anno 1685. He was a true philosopher, beyond the liberties allowed by his order, and studied to reduce their school-divinity to as clear ideas as it was capable of. So that in following him I have given the best, and not the worst, face of their doctrine. His book was printed at Lyons, anno 1669.

this principle is once admitted; that a man is not bound by his promises and oaths, unless his inward consent went along with them: and if such a fraudulent thing may be applied to marriages, in which so many persons are concerned, and upon which the order of the world does so much depend, it may be very justly applied to all other contracts whatsoever, so that they may be voided at pleasure. A man's words and oaths bind him by the eternal laws of fidelity and truth; and it is a just prejudice against any religion whatsoever, if it should teach a doctrine in which, by the secret reserves of not giving an inward consent, the faith which is solemnly given may be broken. Here such a door is open to perfidy and treachery, that the world can be no longer safe while it is allowed; hereby lewd and vicious persons may entangle others, and in the mean while order their own thoughts so, that they shall be all the while free.

Next to *matter* and *form*, we must see for the institution of this sacrament. The church of Rome think that is strong here, though they feel it to be hardly defensible in the other points that relate to it. They think that though marriage, as it is a mutual contract, subsists upon the law of nature, yet a divine virtue is put in it by the gospel, expressed in these words, 'This is a great mystery, or sacrament;' so the explaining these words determines this controversy. The chief point in dispute at that time was, whether the Gentiles were to be received to equal privileges with the Jews, in the dispensation of the Messias. The Jews do not to this day deny, but that the Gentiles may be admitted to it; but still they think that they are to be considered as a distinct body, and in a lower order, the chief dignity being to be reserved to the seed of Abraham. Now St. Paul had in that Epistle, as well as in his other Epistles, asserted, that all were equal in Christ; that he had taken away the 'middle wall of partition;' that he had abolished the ground of the enmity, which was the Mosaical law, called 'the law of commandments contained in ordinances;' that he might make both Jew and Gentile one new man; 'one entire body of a church; 'he being the chief corner-stone, in whom the whole building was fitly framed together: and so became a holy habitation to God.' Thus he made use of the figure of a body, and of a temple, to illustrate this matter; and to shew how all Christians were to make up but one body, and one church. So when he came to speak of the rules belonging to the several states of human life, he takes occasion to explain the duties of the married state, by comparing that to the relation that the church has to Christ: and when he had said that the married couple make but one body and one flesh; which declares that, according to the first institution, every man was to have but one wife; he adds upon that, 'this is a great mystery:' that is, from hence another mystical argument might be brought, to shew that

Eph. ii. 15,  
16, 20, 21.

Jew and Gentile must make one body; for since the church was the spouse of Christ, he must, according to that figure, have but one wife; and by consequence the church must be one: otherwise the figure will not be answered; unless we suppose Christ to be in a state answering a polygamy, rather than a single marriage. Thus a clear account of these words is given, which does fully agree to them, and to what follows, 'but I speak concerning Christ and the church.'

This, which is all the foundation of making marriage a sacrament, being thus cleared, there remains nothing to be said on this head, but to examine one consequence, that has been drawn from the making it a sacrament, which is, that the bond is indissoluble; and that even adultery does not void it. The law of nature or of nations seems very clear, that adultery, at least on the wife's part, should dissolve it: for the end of marriage being the ascertaining of the issue, and the contract itself being a mutual transferring the right to one another's person, in order to that end; the breaking this contract and destroying the end of marriage does very naturally infer the dissolution of the bond: and in this both the Attic and Roman laws were so severe, that a man was infamous who did not divorce upon adultery. Our Saviour, when he blamed the Jews for their frequent divorces, established this rule, 'that whosoever puts away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.'<sup>32.</sup> Which seems to be a plain and full determination, that in the case of fornication, he may put her away and marry another. It is true, St. Mark and St. Luke repeat these words, without mentioning this exception; so some have thought that we ought to bring St. Matthew to them, and not them to St. Matthew. But it is an universal rule of expounding scriptures, that when a place is fully set down by one inspired writer, and less fully by another, that the place which is less full is always to be expounded by that which is more full. So though St. Mark and St. Luke report our Saviour's words generally, without the exception, which is twice mentioned by St. Matthew, the other two are to be understood to suppose it; for a general proposition is true when it holds generally; and exceptions may be understood to belong to it, though they are not named. The Evangelist that does name them must be considered to have reported the matter more particularly, than the others that do it not. Since then our Saviour has made the exception, and since that exception is founded upon a natural equity, that the innocent party has against the guilty, there can be no reason why an exception so justly grounded, and so clearly made, should not take place.

Matt. v.  
32.  
Matt. xix  
9.

Mark x. 11  
Luke xvi.  
18.

Both Tertullian, Basil, Chrysostom, and Epiphanius, allow of a divorce in case of adultery; and in those days they had no other notion of a divorce, but that it was the dissolution of

Tertull. lib.  
iv. cont.  
Marcion.  
c. 34.

A R T.  
XXV.Basil. Ep.  
ad Amphil.  
c. 9.  
Chrysos.  
Hom. 17,  
in Matt.  
Epiph.  
Hæres. 59.  
Cath.  
Conc.  
Ellib. c. 65.  
Conc. Arel.  
c. 10. Conc.  
Afric. c.  
69. Causa  
32. q. 7.  
In decr.  
Eug. in  
Conc. Flor.  
Erasm. in  
1 Ep. ad  
Cor. vii.  
Cajetan. in  
Matt. xix.  
c. 9.  
Cathar. in  
1 Ep. ad  
Cor. vii. 1.  
5. Annot.

the bond; the late notion of a separation, the tie continuing, not being known till the canonists brought it in. Such a divorce was allowed by the council of Elliberis. The council of Arles did indeed recommend it to the husband, whose wife was guilty of adultery, not to marry; which did plainly acknowledge that he might do it. It was, and still is, the constant practice of the Greek church; and as both pope Gregory and pope Zachary allowed the innocent person to marry, so in a synod held at Rome in the tenth century, it was still allowed. When the Greeks were reconciled to the Latins in the council of Florence, this matter was passed over, and the care of it was only recommended by the pope to the emperor. It is true, Eugenius put it in his instruction to the Armenians; but though that passes generally for a part of the council of Florence, yet the council was over and up before that was given out.

This doctrine of the indissolubleness of marriage, even for adultery, was never settled in any council before that of Trent. The canonists and schoolmen had indeed generally gone into that opinion; but not only Erasmus, but both Cajetan and Catherinus declared themselves for the lawfulness of it: Cajetan indeed used a salvo, in case the church had otherwise defined, which did not then appear to him. So that this is a doctrine very lately settled in the church of Rome. Our reformers here had prepared a title in the new body of the canon law, which they had digested, allowing marriage to the innocent party; and upon a great occasion, then in debate, they declared it to be lawful by the law of God: and if the opinion, that marriage is a sacrament, falls, the conceit of the absolute indissolubleness of marriage will fall with it.

The last sacrament which is rejected by this Article, that is, the fifth, as they are reckoned up in the church of Rome, is *Extreme Unction*.\* In the commission that Christ gave his

\* The council of Trent having made this sacrament, thus describes its virtue:

*De effectu hujus sacramenti.*

‘Res porro, et effectus hujus sacramenti illis verbis explicatur: et oratio fidei allevabit infirmum; et alleviabit eum Dominus; et, si in peccatis sit, dimittentur ei: Res etenim hæc gratia est Spiritus Sancti: cujus unctio delicta, si quæ sint adhuc expianda, ac peccati reliquias abstergit; et ægroti animam alleviat, et confirmat, magnam in eo divinæ misericordiæ fiduciam excitando; qua infirmus sublevatus; et morbi incommoda ac labores levius fert; et tentationibus dæmonis calcaneo insidiantis facilius resistit; et sanitatem corporis interdum, ubi saluti animæ expedierit, consequitur.’ *Sessio xiv. cap. 2.*

In the following chapter, ‘De ministro hujus sacramenti, et tempore quo dari debeat,’ the council states the reason of the name extreme unction: ‘Declaratur etiam, esse hanc unctionem infirmis adhibendam, illis vero præsertim qui tam periculose decumbunt, ut in exitu vitæ constituti videantur: unde et sacramentum exeuntium nuncupatur.’

In another place of the same session the council thus enforces her new article: Canon 1.—‘Si quis dixerit, extremum unctionem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum a Christo Domino nostro institutum, et a beato Jacobo apostolo promulgatum; sed ritum tantum acceptum a patribus, aut figmentum humanum: anathema sit.’

apostles, among the other powers that were given them to confirm it, one was to *cure diseases* and *heal the sick*; pursuant to which St. Mark tells, that ‘they anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.’ The prophets used some symbolical actions when they wrought miracles; so Moses used his rod often; Elisha used Elijah’s mantle; our Saviour put his finger into the deaf man’s ear, and made clay for the blind man; and oil being upon almost all occasions used in the eastern parts, the apostles made use of it; but no hint is given that this was a sacramental action. It was plainly a miraculous virtue that healed the sick, in which oil was made use of as a symbol accompanying it. It was not prescribed by our Saviour, for any thing that appears, as it was not blamed by him neither. It was no wonder, if, upon such a precedent, those who had that extraordinary gift, did apply it with the use of *oil*; not as if *oil* was the sacramental conveyance; it was only used with it. The end of it was miraculous: it was in order to the *recovery of the sick*, and had no relation to their souls, though with the cure wrought on the body there might sometimes be joined an operation upon the soul; and this appears clearly from St. James’s words, ‘Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up.’ All hitherto is one period, which is here closed. The following words contain new matter quite of a different kind; ‘and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.’ It appears clearly that this was intended for the recovery of the sick person, which is the thing that is positively promised; the other concerning the pardon of sins, comes in on the bye, and seems to be added only as an accessory to the other, which is the principal thing designed by this whole matter. Therefore, since anointing was in order to healing, either we must say that the gift of healing is still deposited with the *elders of the church*, which nobody affirms; or this *oil* was only to be used by those who had that special gift; and therefore if there are none now who pretend to have it, and if the church pretends not to have it lodged with her, then the anointing with oil cannot be used any more; and therefore those who use it not in order to the recovery of the person, delaying it till there is little or no hope left, use not that unction mentioned by St. James, but another of their own devising, which they call the *sacrament of the dying*. It is a vain thing to say, that because *saving* and *raising up* are sometimes used in a spiritual sense, that therefore the *saving the sick* here, and that of the *Lord’s raising him up*, are to be so meant. For the forgiveness of sin, which is

A R T.  
XXV.Mark vi.  
13.James v.  
14, 15.

sit.—Canon 2. ‘Si quis dixerit, sacram infirmorum unctionem non conferre gratiam, nec remittere peccata, nec alleviare infirmos; sed jam cessasse, quasi olim tantum fuerit gratia curationum: anathema sit.’—[Eb.]

A R T.  
XXV.

the spiritual blessing, comes afterwards, upon supposition that the sick person had committed sins. The *saving* and *raising up* must stand in opposition to the sickness: so since all acknowledge that the one is literal, the other must be so too. The supposition of sin is added, because some persons, upon whom this miracle might have been wrought, might be eminently pious; and if at any time it was to be applied to ill men who had committed some notorious sins, perhaps such sins as had brought their sickness upon them, these were also to be forgiven.

Matt. xxi.  
21.1 Cor. xiii.  
2.John xiv.  
13.

In the use of miraculous powers, those to whom that gift was given, were not empowered to use it at pleasure; they were to feel an inward impulse exciting them to it, and they were obliged upon that firmly to believe, that God, who had given them the impulse, would not be wanting to them in the execution of it. This confidence in God was the *faith of miracles*, of which Christ said, 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say to this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and nothing shall be impossible unto you.' Of this also St. Paul meant, when he said, 'If I have all faith.' So from this we may gather the meaning of the *prayer of faith*, and the *anointing with oil*; that if the *elders of the church*, or such others with whom this power was lodged, felt an inward impulse moving them to call upon God, in order to a miraculous cure of a sick person, then they were to 'anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord:' that is, by the authority that they had from Christ to heal all manner of diseases: and they were to pray, believing firmly that God would make good that inward motion which he had given them to work this miracle; and in that case the effect was certain, the sick person would certainly recover, for that is absolutely promised. Every one that was sick was not to be anointed, unless an authority and motion from Christ had been secretly given for doing it; but every one that was anointed was certainly healed. Christ had promised that 'whatsoever they should ask in his name, he would do it.' *His name* must be restrained to his authority, or pursuant to such secret motions as they shall receive from him. This is the *prayer of faith* here mentioned by St. James: it being an earnest application to God to join his omnipotent power to perform a wonderful work, to which a person so divinely qualified felt himself inwardly moved by the spirit of Christ. The supposition of the sick person's *having committed sins*, which is added, shews that sometimes this virtue was applied to persons of that eminent piety, that though all men are guilty in the sight of God, yet they could not be said to have committed sins in the sense in which St. John uses the phrase; signifying by it, either that they had lived in the habits of sin, or that they had committed some notorious sin: but if some should happen to be sick, who had been eminent sinners, and those sins had

A R T.  
XXV.

drawn down the judgments of God upon them, which seems to be the natural meaning of these words, 'if ye have committed sins;' then, with his bodily health, he was to receive a much greater blessing, even the pardon of his sins. And thus the *anointing* mentioned by St. James was in order to a miraculous cure, and the cure did constantly follow it: so that it can be no precedent for an extreme unction, that is never given till the recovery of the person is despaired of, and by which it is not pretended that any cure is wrought.\*

The matter of it is *oil-olive* blessed by the bishop; the form is the applying it to the five senses, with these words, *Per hanc sacram unctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam indulgeat tibi Deus quicquid peccasti, per visum, auditum, olfactum, gustum, et tactum*. The proper word to every sense being repeated as the organ of that sense is anointed. It is administered by a priest, and gives the final pardon, with all necessary assistances, in the last agony. Here is then an institution, that, if warranted, is matter of great comfort; and if not warranted, is matter of as great presumption. In the first ages we find mention is made frequently of persons that were cured by an anointing with oil: oil was then much used in all their rituals, the catechumens being anointed with oil before they were baptized, besides the chrism that was given after it. Oil grew also to be used in ordinations, and the dead were anointed in order to their burial: so that the ordinary use of oil on other occasions brought it to be very frequently used in their sacred rites; yet how customary soever the practice of anointing grew to be, we find no mention of any unction of the sick before the beginning of the fifth century. This plainly shews that they understood St. James's words as relating to a miraculous power, and not to a function that was to continue in the church, and to be esteemed a sacrament.

That earliest mention of it by pope Innocent the First, how much soever it is insisted on, is really an argument that proves against it, and not for it. For not to enlarge on the many idle things that are in that Epistle, which have made

\* 'This passage in St. James speaks of the sick person, anointed and prayed over, being RAISED UP. How then do you prove a sacrament of extreme unction from unction not extreme, not to be used, as Trent says, on those *past being raised up*, but on those that were to be raised up, "and the Lord shall raise him up?" Again, how can you promise remission of the sick man's sin, when you cannot promise the sign of it, viz. the recovery of the sick person? Two questions more. If extreme unction confers grace, wipes away and remits sin, and resists the assaults of the devil, as Trent says, why do you not give it to criminals about to die? Is it because they have no need of what this sacrament professes to give? Surely they have more need than other persons. Again, if extreme unction remits sin and wipes away the remainder of sin, why is it necessary, that those who receive this sacrament, should have masses said afterwards for the release of their souls from purgatory, where they are supposed to be detained, until all their sins be wiped away? If unction be effectual to do all that Trent says, why send those to purgatory who receive this unction? If it be not effectual to the wiping away the remainder of sin (as Trent says it is) in the dying person, of what use is it?' *Page's Letters to a Romish Priest*.

—[En.]

Rituale  
Rom. Con.  
Trid. Sess.  
14.Con. Apos.  
l. 3. c. 16.  
l. vii. c. 42,  
44.Tertul. de  
bapt. c. 7.  
Cyp. Ep.  
70. Clem.Alex.  
pædag.  
l. ii. c. 8.Dionys.  
Areop. de  
Eccles.  
Hier. 7. 8.Innocent.  
Ep. 1. ad  
Decent.

A R T. XXV. some think that it could not be genuine, and that do very much sink the credit both of the testimony and of the man; for it seems to be well proved to be his: the passage relating to this matter is in answer to a demand that was made to him by the bishop of Eugubium, whether the sick might be anointed with the oil of the chrism? and whether the bishop might anoint with it? To these he answers, that no doubt it is to be made but that St. James's words are to be understood of the faithful that were sick, who may be anointed by the chrism; which may be used not only by the priests, but by all Christians, not only in their own necessities, but in the necessities of any of their friends: and he adds, that it was a needless doubt that was made, whether a bishop might do it; for presbyters are only mentioned, because the bishop could not go to all the sick; but certainly he who made the chrism itself, might anoint with it. A bishop asking these questions of another, and the answers which the other gives him, do plainly shew that this was no sacrament practised from the beginnings of Christianity; for no bishop could be ignorant of those. It was therefore some newly begun custom, in which the world was not yet sufficiently instructed. And so it was indeed, for the subject of these questions was not pure oil, such as now they make to be the matter of extreme unction; but the oil of *chrism*, which was made and kept for other occasions; and it seems very clear, that the miraculous power of healing having ceased, and none being any more anointed in order to that; some began to get a portion of the oil of chrism, which the laity, as well as the priests, applied both to themselves and to their friends, hoping that they might be cured by it. Nothing else can be meant by all this, but a superstitious using the *chrism*, which might have arisen out of the memory that remained of those who had been cured by oil, as the use of *bread* in the eucharist brought in the *holy bread*, that was sent from one church to another; and as from the use of *water* in *baptism* sprung the use of *holy water*. This then being the clear meaning of those words, it is plain that they prove quite the contrary of that for which they are brought; and though in that Epistle the pope calls *chrism* a kind of sacrament, that turns likewise against them; to shew that he did not think it was a sacrament, strictly speaking. Besides, that the ancients used that word very largely, both for every mysterious doctrine, and for every holy rite that they used. In this very Epistle, when he gives directions for the carrying about that *bread*, which they blessed, and sent about as an emblem of their communion with other churches; he orders them to be sent about only to the churches within the city, because he conceived the sacraments were not to be carried a great way off; so these loaves are called by him not only a *kind of sacrament*, but are simply reckoned to be *sacraments*.

A R T. XXV. We hear no more of anointing the sick with the chrism, among all the ancients; which shews, that as that practice was newly begun, so it did not spread far, nor continue long. No mention is made of this neither in the first three ages, nor in the fourth age; though the writers, and particularly the councils of the fourth age, are very copious in rules concerning the sacraments. Nor in all their penitentiary canons, when they define what sins are to be forgiven, and what not, when men were in their last extremities, is there so much as a hint given concerning the last unction. The Constitutions, and the pretended Dionysius, say not a word of it, though they are very full upon all the rituals of that time in which those works were forged, in the fourth or fifth century. In none of the lives of the saints before the ninth century, is there any mention made of their having extreme unction, though their deaths are sometimes very particularly related, and their receiving the eucharist is oft mentioned. Nor was there any question made in all that time concerning the persons, the time, and the other circumstances relating to this unction; which could not have been omitted, especially when almost all that was thought on, or writ of, in the eighth and ninth century, relates to the sacraments, and the other rituals of the church.

It is true, from the seventh century on to the twelfth, they began to use an anointing of the sick, according to that mentioned by pope Innocent, and a peculiar office was made for it; but the prayers that were used in it, shew plainly that it was all intended only in order to their recovery. Lib. Sacram. Gregor. Menardi Notæ.

Of this anointing many passages are found in Bede, and in the other writers and councils of the eighth and ninth century. But all these do clearly express the use of it, not as a sacrament for the good of the soul, but as a rite that carried with it health to the body; and so it is still used in the Greek church. No doubt they supported the credit of this with many reports, of which some might be true, of persons that had been recovered upon using it. But because that failed so often, that the credit of this rite might suffer much in the esteem of the world, they began in the tenth century to say, that it did good to the soul, even when the body was not healed by it; and they applied it to the several parts of the body. This begun from the custom of applying it at first to the diseased parts. This was carried on in the eleventh century. And then in the twelfth, those prayers that had been formerly made for the souls of the sick, though only as a part of the office, the pardon of sin being considered as preparatory to their recovery, came to be considered as the main and most essential part of it: then the schoolmen brought it into shape, and so it was decreed to be a sacrament by pope Eugenius, and finally established at Trent. Bede Hist. Angl. l. iii. c. 15. Euchol. sive Ritual. Græc. p. 408. Dec. Eug. in Con. Flor. Con. Trid. Sess. 14.

The argument that they draw from a parity in reason, that

because there is a sacrament for such as come into the world, there should be also one for those that go out of it, is very trifling; for Christ has either instituted this to be a sacrament, or it is not one: if he has not instituted it, this pretended fitness is only an argument that he ought to have done somewhat that he has not done. The eucharist was considered by the ancients as the only *viaticum* of Christians, in their last passage: with them we give that, and no more.

Thus it appears upon what reason we reject those five sacraments, though we allow both of *confirmation* and *orders* as holy functions, derived to us down from the apostles; and because there is a visible action in these, though in strictness they cannot be called a sacrament, yet so the thing be rightly understood, we will not dispute about the extent of a word that is not used in scripture. Marriage is in no respect to be called a sacrament of the Christian religion; though it being a state of such importance to mankind, we hold it very proper, both for the solemnity of it, and for exploring the blessing of God upon it, that it be done with prayers and other acts of religious worship; but a great difference is to be made between a pious custom begun and continued by public authority, and a sacrament appointed by Christ. We acknowledge true repentance to be one of the great conditions of the new covenant; but we see nothing of the nature of a sacrament in it: and, for extreme unction, we do not pretend to have the gift of healing among us: and therefore we will not deceive the world, by an office that shall offer at that, which we acknowledge we cannot do: nor will we make a sacrament for the good of the soul, out of that which is mentioned in scripture, only as a rite that accompanied the curing the diseases of the body.

The last part of this Article, concerning the use of the sacraments, consists of two parts: the *first* is negative, that they are not ordained to be gazed on, or to be carried about, but to be used: and this is so express in the scripture, that little question can be made about it. The institution of baptism is, 'Go preach and baptize:' and the institution of the eucharist is, 'Take, eat, and drink ye all of it:' which words being set down before those in which the consecrating them is believed to be made, 'This is my body;' and 'This is my blood;' and the consecratory words being delivered as the reason of the command, 'Take, eat, and drink;' nothing can be more clearly expressed than this, that the eucharist is consecrated only that it may be used, that it may be *eat* and *drunk*.

The *second* part of this period is, that the effect of the sacraments comes only upon the worthy receiving of them; of this so much was already said, upon the first paragraph of this Article, that it is not necessary to add any more here. The pretending that sacraments have their effect any other

way, is the bringing in the doctrine and practice of charms into the Christian religion: and it tends to dissolve all obligations to piety and devotion, to a holiness of life, or a purity of temper, when the being in a passive and perhaps insensible state, while the sacraments are applied, is thought a disposition sufficient to give them their virtue. Sacraments are federal acts, and those visible actions are intended to quicken us, so that in the use of them we may raise our inward acts to the highest degrees possible; but not to supply their defects and imperfections. Our opinion in this point represents them as means to raise our minds, and to kindle our devotion; whereas the doctrine of the church of Rome represents them as so many charms, which may heighten indeed the authority of him that administers them, but do extinguish and deaden all true piety, when such helps are offered, by which the worst of men, living and dying in a bad state, may by a few feint acts, and perhaps by none at all of their own, be well enough taken care of and secured. But as we have not so learned Christ, so neither dare we corrupt his doctrine in its most vital and essential parts.

## ARTICLE XXVI.

Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the Effect of the Sacraments.

Although, in the Visible Church, the Evil be ever mingled with the Good, and sometimes the Evil have chief Authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments; yet for as much as they do not the same in their own Name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his Commission and Authority, we may use their Ministry both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving the Sacraments. Neither is the Effect of Christ's Ordinance taken away by their Wickedness: Nor the Grace of God's Gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them, which be Effectual because of Christ's Institution and Promise, although they be ministered by Evil Men.

Nevertheless it appertaineth to the Discipline of the Church, that Enquiry be made of Evil Ministers; and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their Offences, and finally being found guilty, by just Judgment be deposed.

THE occasion that was given to this Article, was the heat of some in the beginnings of the Reformation; who, being much offended at the public scandal which was given by the enormous vices that were without any disguise practised by the Roman clergy of all ranks, did from thence revive the conceit of the Donatists, who thought that not only heresy and schism did invalidate sacred functions, but that personal sins did also make them void.

It cannot be denied but that there are many passages in St. Cyprian that look this way; and which seem to make the sacraments depend as much on the good state that he was in who administered them, as the answer of their other prayers did.

In the progress of the controversy with the Donatists, they carried this matter very far; and considered the effect of the sacraments as the answer of prayers: so since the prayers of a wicked man are abomination to God, they thought the virtue of these actions depended wholly on him that officiated.

Against this St. Augustin set himself very zealously; he answered all that was brought from St. Cyprian in such a manner, that by it he has set us a pattern, how we ought to separate the just respect that we pay the fathers, from an implicit receiving of all their notions. If this conceit were allowed of, it must go to the secret thoughts and inward state

in which he is who officiates; for if the sacraments are to be considered only as prayers offered up by him, then a man can never be sure that he receives them; since it is impossible to see into the hearts, or know the secrets, of men. Sacraments therefore are to be considered only as the public acts of the church; and though the effect of them, as to him that receives them, depends upon his temper, his preparation and application; yet it cannot be imagined that the virtue of those federal acts to which Christians are admitted in them, the validity of them, or the blessings that follow them, can depend on the secret state or temper of him that officiates. Even in the case of public scandals, though they may make the holy things to be loathed by the aversion that will naturally follow upon them; yet after all, though that aversion may go too far, we must still distinguish between the things that the ministers of the church do as they are public officers, and what they do as they are private Christians. Their prayers, and every thing else that they do, as they are private Christians, have their effect only according to the state and temper that they are in when they offer them up to God: but their public functions are the appointments of Christ, in which they officiate; they can neither make them the better nor the worse by any thing that they join to them. And if miraculous virtues may be in bad men, so that in the great day some of those to whom Christ shall say, 'I never knew you; depart from me ye that work iniquity,' may yet say to him, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?' then certainly this may be concluded much more concerning those standing functions and appointments that are to continue in the church. Nor can any difference be made in this matter between public scandals and secret sins; for if the former make void the sacraments, the latter must do so too. The only reason that can be pretended for the one, will also fall upon the other: for if the virtue of the sacraments is thought to be derived upon them as an answer of prayer; then since the prayers of hypocrites are as little effectual as the prayers of those who are openly vicious, the inference is good, that if the sacraments administered by a scandalous man are without any effect, the sacraments administered by a man that is inwardly corrupted, though that can be only known to God, will be also of no effect; and therefore this opinion that was taken up, perhaps from an inconsiderate zeal against the sins and scandals of the clergy, is without all foundation, and must needs cast all men into endless scruples, which can never be cured.

The church of Rome, though they reject this opinion, yet have brought in another very like it, which must needs fill the minds of men with endless distractions and fears; chiefly considering of what necessity and efficacy they make the

sacraments to be. They do teach that the intention of him that gives the sacrament is necessary to the essence of it, so that without it no sacrament can be administered. This was expressly affirmed by pope Eugenius in his decree, and an anathema passed at Trent against those that deny it.\* They do indeed define it to be only an intention of doing that which the church intends to do; and though the surest way, they say, is to have an actual intention, yet it is commonly taught among them, that an habitual or virtual intention will serve. But they do all agree in this, that, if a priest has a secret intention not to make a sacrament, in that case no sacrament is made; and this is carried so far, that in one of the rubrics of the Missal† it is given as a rule, that if a priest who goes to consecrate twelve Hosties, should have a general intention to leave out one of them from being truly consecrated, and should not apply that to any one, but let it run loosely through them all, that in such case he should not consecrate any one of the twelve; that loose exception falling upon them all, because it is not restrained to any one particular. And among the Articles that were condemned by pope Alexander the Eighth, the 7th of December 1690, the 28th runs thus; *Valet baptismus collatus a ministro, qui omnem ritum externum formamque baptizandi observat, intus vero in corde suo apud se resolvit, non intendo quod facit ecclesia.* And thus they make the secret acts of a priest's mind enter so far into those divine appointments, that by his malice, irreligion, or atheism, he can make those sacraments, which he visibly blesses and administers, to be only the outward shows of sacraments, but no real ones. We do not pretend that the sacraments are of the nature of charms; so that if a man should in a way of open mockery and profanation go about them, that therefore, because matter and form are observed, they should be true sacraments. But though we make the serious appearances of a Christian action to be necessary to the making it a sacrament; yet we carry this no further, to the inward and secret acts of the priest, as if they were essential to the being of it. If this is true, no man can have quiet in his mind.

It is a profanation for an unbaptized person to receive the eucharist; so if baptism is not true when a priest sets his intention cross to it, then a man in orders must be in perpetual doubts, whether he is not living in a continual state of sacrilege in administering the other sacraments while he is not yet baptized; and if baptism be so necessary to salvation, that no man who is not baptized can hope to be saved, here a perpetual scruple must arise, which can never be removed.

\* The doctrine of intention is thus stated by the council of Trent:—

† *Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt, et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit ecclesia: anathema sit.* Sessio vii. can. xi. —[Ed.]

† For this and the other Rubrics, see Appendix.—[Ed.]

Nor can a man be sure but that, when he thinks he is worshipping the true body of Jesus Christ, he is committing idolatry, and worshipping only a piece of bread; for it is no more, according to them, if the priest had an intention against consecrating it. No orders are given if an intention lies against them; and then he who passes for a priest is no priest; and all his consecrations and absolutions are so many invalid things, and a continued course of sacrilege.

Now what reason soever men may have in this case to hope for the pardon of those sins, since it is certain that the ignorance is invincible; yet here strange thoughts must arise concerning Christ and his gospel; if in those actions that are made necessary to salvation, it should be in the power of a false Christian, or an atheistical priest or bishop, to make them all void; so that by consequence it should be in his power to damn them: for since they are taught to expect grace and justification from the sacraments, if these are no true sacraments which they take for such, but only the shadows and the phantasms of them, then neither grace nor justification can follow upon them. This may be carried so far as even to evacuate the very being of a church; for a man not truly baptized can never be in orders; so that the whole ordinations of a church, and the succession of it, may be broke by the impiety of any one priest. This we look on as such a chain of absurdities, that if this doctrine of intention were true, it alone might serve to destroy the whole credit of the Christian religion, in which the sacraments are taught to be both so necessary and so efficacious; and yet all this is made to depend on that which can neither be known nor prevented.

The last paragraph of this Article is so clear, that it needs no explanation, and is so evident, that it wants no proof. Eli was severely threatened for suffering his sons to go on in their vices, when by their means the sacrifice of God was abhorred. God himself struck Nadab and Abihu dead, when they offered strange fire at his altar; and upon that these words were uttered, 'I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people will I be glorified.' Timothy was required to receive 'an accusation of an elder,' when regularly tendered to him; and to 'rebuke before all those that sinned;' and he was charged to withdraw himself from those teachers who 'consented not to wholesome words,' and that made a gain of godliness. A main part of the discipline of the primitive church lay heaviest on the clergy: and such of them as either apostatized, or fell into scandalous sins, even upon their repentance, were indeed received into the peace of the church; but they were appointed to communicate among the laity, and were never after that admitted to the body of the clergy, or to have a share in their privileges. Certainly there is nothing more incumbent on the whole body

1 Sam. iii.

11.

Levit. x. 3.

1 Tim. v. 1,

19, 20. vi.

3, 4, 5.

ART. XXVI. of the church, than that all possible care be taken to discover the bad practices that may be among the clergy: which will ever raise strong prejudices not only against their persons, but even against their profession, and against that religion which they seem to advance with their mouths, while in their works, and by their lives, they detract from it, and seem to deny its authority. But after all, our zeal must go along with justice and discretion: fame may be a just ground to inquire upon; but a sentence cannot be founded on it. The laity must discover what they know, that so these who have authority may be able to 'cut off those that trouble the church.' Discretion will require that things which cannot be proved, ought rather to be covered than exposed, when nothing but clamour can follow upon it. In sum, this is a part of the government of the church, for which God will reckon severely with those who, from partial regards, or other feeble or carnal considerations, are defective in that, which is so great a part of their duty, and in which the honour of God, and of religion, and the good of souls, as well as the order and unity of the church, are so highly concerned.

Gal. v. 12.

## ARTICLE XXVII.

## Of Baptism.

Baptism is not only a Sign of Profession and Mark of Difference, whereby Christian Men are discerned from others that be not Christened; but it is also a Sign of Regeneration or New Birth, whereby, as by an Instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church. The Promises of the Forgiveness of Sin, of our Adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly Signed and Sealed, Faith is confirmed and Grace increased by virtue of Prayer to God. The Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the Institution of Christ.

WHEN St. John Baptist began first to baptize, we do plainly see by the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, that the Jews were not surprised at the novelty of the rite; for they sent to ask *who he was?* And when he said he was not the Messiah, nor Elias, nor that Prophet, they asked, 'Why baptizest thou then?' Which shews, not only that they had clear notions of baptism, but in particular that they thought that if he had been the Messiah, or Elias, or that Prophet, he might then have baptized. St. Paul does also say, that the Jews 'were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea;' which seems to relate to some opinion the Jews had, that by that *cloud*, and their passing through the *sea*, they were purified from the Egyptian defilements, and made meet to become Moses's disciples. Yet in the Old Testament we find no clear warrant for a practice that had then got among the Jews, which is still taught by them, that they were to receive a proselyte, if a male, by *baptism, circumcision, and sacrifice*; and if a female, only by *baptism and sacrifice*. Thus they reckoned, that when any came over from heathenism to their religion, they were to use a washing; to denote their purifying themselves from the uncleanness of their former idolatry, and their entering into a holy religion.

And as they do still teach, that when the Messiah comes, they are all bound to set themselves to repent of their former sins; so it seems they then thought, or at least it would have been no strange thing to them, if the Messiah had received such as came to him by baptism. St. John, by baptizing those who came to him, took them obliged to enter upon a course of repentance, and he declared to them the near approach of the Messiah, and that 'the kingdom of God was

Matt. iii. 2.

A R T.  
XXVII.

at hand; and it is very probable, that those who were baptized by Christ, that is, by his apostles; for though it is expressly said that he baptized none, yet what he did by his disciples he might in a more general sense be said to have done himself; that these, I say, were baptized upon the same sponsions, and with the same declarations, and with no other; for the dispensation of the Messias was not yet opened, nor was it then fully declared that he was the Messias: howsoever this was a preparatory initiation of such as were fitted for the coming of the Messias; by it they owned their expectations of him, as then near at hand, and they professed their repentance of their sins, and their purposes of doing what should be enjoined them by him.

Water was a very proper emblem, to signify the passing from a course of defilement to a greater degree of purity, both in doctrine and practice.

Gal. iv. 4. Our Saviour in his state of humiliation, as he was subject to the Mosaical law, so he thought fit to fulfil all the obligations that lay upon the other Jews; which by a phrase used among them he expresses thus, 'to fulfil all righteousness.' For though our Saviour had no sins to confess, yet that not being known, he might come to profess his belief of the dispensation of the Messias, that was then to appear. But how well soever the Jews might have been accustomed to this rite, and how proper a preparation soever it might be to the manifestation of the Messias; yet the institution of baptism, as it is a federal act of the Christian religion, must be taken from the commission that our Saviour gave to his disciples; 'to go preach and make disciples to him in all nations, (for that is the strict signification of the word,) baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.'

Matt.  
xxviii. 19,  
20

By the first *teaching* or making of *disciples*, that must go before baptism, is to be meant the convincing the world, that Jesus is the Christ, the true Messias, anointed of God, with a fulness of grace and of the Spirit without measure, and sent to be the Saviour and Redeemer of the world. And when they were brought to acknowledge this, then they were to baptize them, to initiate them to this religion, by obliging them to renounce all idolatry and ungodliness, as well as all secular and carnal lusts, and then they led them into the water; and with no other garments but what might cover nature, they at first laid them down in the water, as a man is laid in the grave, and then they said those words, 'I baptize or wash thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost:' then they raised them up again, and clean garments

Rom. vi. 3,  
4, 5.  
Col. ii. 12,  
iii. 1.

being put on them: from whence came the phrases of 'being baptized into Christ's death;' of 'being buried with him by baptism into death;' of 'our being risen with Christ;' and of

'our putting on the Lord Jesus Christ;' of 'putting off the old man, and putting on the new.' After baptism was thus performed, the baptized person was to be further instructed in all the specialities of the Christian religion, and in all the rules of life that Christ had prescribed.

A R T.  
XXVII.  
Col. iii.  
9, 10.  
Rom. xiii.  
14.

This was plainly a different baptism from St. John's; a profession was made in it, not in general, of the belief of a Messias soon to appear, but in particular, that 'Jesus was the Messias.'

The stipulation in St. John's baptism was *repentance*; but here it is the belief of the whole Christian religion. In St. John's baptism they indeed promised repentance, and he received them into the earnest of the kingdom of the Messias; but it does not appear that St. John either did promise them *remission of sins*, or that he had commission so to do; for *repentance* and *remission of sins* were not joined together till after the resurrection of Christ; that he appointed that 'repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.'

Luke xxiv.  
47.

In the baptism of Christ, I mean that which he appointed after his resurrection, (for the baptism of his disciples before that time was, no doubt, the same with St. John's baptism,) there was to be an instruction given in that great mystery of the Christian religion concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; which those who had only received St. John's baptism knew not: 'they did not so much as know that there was a Holy Ghost;' that is, they knew nothing of the extraordinary effusion of the Holy Ghost. And it is expressly said, that those of St. John's baptism, when St. Paul explained to them the difference between the baptism of Christ, and that of St. John, that 'they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.' For St. John in his baptism had only initiated them to the belief of a Messias; but had not said a word of Jesus, as being that Messias. So that this must be fixed, that these two baptisms were different; the one was a dawning or imperfect beginning to the other, as he that administered the one was like the *morning star* before the *Sun of righteousness*.

Acts xix.  
2—5.

Our Saviour had this ordinance (that was then imperfect, and was to be afterwards completed, when he himself had finished all that he came into the world to do)—he had, I say, this visibly in his eye, when he spake to Nicodemus, and told him, that 'except a man were born again, he could not see (or discern) the kingdom of God:' by which he meant that entire change and renovation of a man's mind, and of all his powers, through which he must pass, before he could discern the true characters of the dispensation of the Messias; for that is the sense in which the kingdom of God does stand, almost universally through the whole gospel. When Nicodemus was amazed at this odd expression, and seemed to take

John iii. 3,  
5, 6.

A. R. T.  
XXVII.

it literally, our Saviour answered more fully, ' Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' The meaning of which seems to be this, that except a man came to be renewed, by an ablution like the baptism which the Jews used, that imported the outward profession of a change of doctrine and of heart; and with that, except he were inwardly changed by a secret power called the *Spirit*, that should transform his nature, he could not become one of his disciples, or a true Christian; which is meant by his entering into the *kingdom of God*, or the dispensation of the Messias.

Upon this institution and commission given by Christ, we see the apostles went up and down preaching and baptizing. And so far were they from considering baptism only as a carnal rite, or a low element, above which a higher dispensation of the Spirit was to raise them, that when St. Peter saw the Holy Ghost visibly descend upon Cornelius and his friends, he upon that immediately baptized them; and said, ' Can any man forbid (or deny) water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' Our Saviour has also made baptism one of the *precepts*, though not one of the *means*, necessary to salvation. A *mean* is that which does so certainly procure a thing, that it being had, the thing to which it is a certain and necessary *mean* is also had; and without it the thing cannot be had; there being a natural connection between it and the end. Whereas a *precept* is an institution, in which there is no such natural efficiency; but it is positively commanded; so that the neglecting it is a contempt of the authority that commanded it: and therefore in obeying the *precept*, the value or virtue of the action lies only in the obedience. This distinction appears very clearly in what our Saviour has said both of *faith* and *baptism*. ' He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned.'

Where it appears that faith is the *mean* of salvation with which it is to be had, and not without it; since such a believing as makes a man receive the whole gospel as true, and so firmly to depend upon the promises that are made in it, as to observe all the laws and rules that are prescribed by it; such a *faith* as this gives us so sure a title to all the blessings of this new covenant, that it is impossible that we should continue in this state, and not partake of them; and it is no less impossible that we should partake of them, unless we do thus believe. It were not suitable to the truth and holiness of the divine nature to void a covenant so solemnly made, and that in favour of wicked men, who will not be reformed by it: so *faith* is the certain and necessary mean of our salvation, and is so put by Christ; since upon our having it we shall be *saved*, as well as *damned* upon our not having it.

On the other hand, the nature of a ritual action, even when

Acts x. 44,  
47, 48.Mark xvi.  
16.A. R. T.  
XXVII.

commanded, is such, that unless we could imagine that there is a charm in it, which is contrary to the spirit and genius of the gospel, which designs to save us by reforming our natures, we cannot think that there can be any thing in it that is of itself effectual as a mean; and therefore it must only be considered as a command that is given us, which we are bound to obey, if we acknowledge the authority of the command. But this being an action that is not always in our power, but is to be done by another, it were to put our salvation or damnation in the power of another, to imagine that we cannot be saved without baptism; and therefore it is only a precept which obliges us in order to our salvation; and our Saviour, by leaving it out when he reversed the words, saying only, ' he that believeth not,' without adding, and is not baptized, shall be *damned*, does plainly insinuate that it is not a mean, but only a precept, in order to our salvation.

As for the ends and purposes of baptism, St. Paul gives us two: the one is, that ' we are all baptized into one body, we are made members one of another:' we are admitted to the society of Christians, and to all the rights and privileges of that body, which is the church. And in order to this, the outward action of baptism, when regularly gone about, is sufficient. We cannot see into the sincerity of men's hearts; outward professions and regular actions are all that fall under men's observation and judgment. But a second end of baptism is internal and spiritual. Of this St. Paul speaks in very high terms, when he says, that ' God has saved us according to his mercy, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.' It were a strange perverting the design of these words, to say, that somewhat spiritual is to be understood by this *washing of regeneration*, and not baptism; when as to the word *save*, that is here ascribed to it, St. Peter gives that undeniably to baptism; and St. Paul elsewhere, in two different places, makes our baptism to represent ' our being dead to sin, and buried with Christ;' and our being ' risen and quickened with him, and made alive unto God;' which are words that do very plainly import regeneration. So that St. Paul must be understood to speak of baptism in these words. Here then is the inward effect of baptism; it is a death to sin, and a new life in Christ, in imitation of him, and in conformity to his gospel. So that here is very expressly delivered to us somewhat that rises far above the badge of a profession, or a mark of difference.

That does indeed belong to baptism; it makes us the visible members of that one body, into which we are baptized, or admitted by baptism; but that which *saves us* in it, which both deadens and quickens us, must be a thing of another nature. If baptism were only the receiving us into the society of Christians, there were no need of saying, ' I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' It were

1 Cor. xii.  
13.

Tit. iii. 5.

Rom. vi.  
Col. ii. 12.

more proper to say, *I baptize thee in the name or by the authority of the church.* Therefore these august words, that were dictated by our Lord himself, shew us that there is somewhat in it that is internal, which comes from God; that it is an admitting men into somewhat that depends only on God, and for the giving of which the authority can only be derived by him. But after all, this is not to be believed to be of the nature of a charm, as if the very act of baptism carried always with it an inward regeneration. Here we must confess, that very early some doctrines arose upon baptism, that we cannot be determined by. The words of our Saviour to Nicodemus were expounded so as to import the absolute necessity of baptism in order to salvation; for it not being observed that the dispensation of the Messiah was meant by the kingdom of God, but it being taken to signify eternal glory, that expression of our Saviour's was understood to import this, that no man could be saved unless he were baptized; so it was believed to be simply necessary to salvation. A natural consequence that followed upon that, was to allow all persons leave to baptize, clergy and laity, men and women, since it seemed necessary to suffer every person to do that without which salvation could not be had. Upon this, these hasty baptisms were used, without any special sponson on the part of those who desired it; of which it may be reasonably doubted whether such a baptism be true, in which no sponson is made; and this cannot be well answered, but by saying, that a general and an implied sponson is to be considered to be made by their parents while they desire them to be baptized.

Another opinion that arose out of the former, was the mixing of the outward and the inward effects of baptism; it being believed that every person that was 'born of the water,' was also 'born of the Spirit;' and that the 'renewing of the Holy Ghost' did always accompany the 'washing of regeneration.' And this obliged St. Austin (as was formerly told) to make that difference between the *regenerate* and the *predestinated*; for he thought that all who were baptized were also *regenerated*. St. Peter has stated this so fully, that if his words are well considered, they will clear the whole matter. He, after he had set forth the miserable state in which mankind was, under the figure of the deluge, in which an ark was prepared for Noah and his family, says upon that, 'the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us.' Upon which he makes a short digression to explain the nature of baptism, 'not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer (or the demand and interrogation) of a good conscience towards God; by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is gone into heaven.' The meaning of all which is, that Christ having risen again, and having then had 'all power in heaven and in earth' given to him, he had put that

virtue in baptism, that by it we are *saved*, as in an ark, from that miserable state in which the world lies, and in which it must perish. But then he explains the way how it saves us; that it is not as a physical action, as it washes away the filthiness of the flesh, or of the body, like the notion that the Gentiles might have of their *februations*; or, which is more natural, considering to whom he writes, like the opinions that the Jews had of their *cleansings* after their *legal impurities*, from which their washings and bathings did absolutely free them. The salvation that we Christians have by baptism, is effected by that federation into which we enter, when upon the demands that are made of our renouncing the *Devil*, the *world*, and the *flesh*, and of our believing in Christ, and our *repentance* towards God, we make such *answers* from a *good conscience*, as agree with the end and design of baptism; then by our thus coming into covenant with God, we are saved in baptism. So that the salvation by baptism is given by reason of the federal compact that is made in it. Now this being made outwardly, according to the rules that are prescribed, that must make the baptism good among men, as to all the outward and visible effects of it: but since it is the 'answer of a good conscience' only that *saves*, then an answer from a bad conscience, from a hypocritical person, who does not inwardly think, or purpose, according to what he professes outwardly, cannot save, but does on the contrary aggravate his damnation. Therefore our Article puts the efficacy of baptism, in order to the forgiveness of our sins, and to our adoption and salvation, upon the virtue of prayer to God; that is, upon those vows and other acts of devotion that accompany them: so that when the seriousness of the mind accompanies the regularity of the action, then both the outward and inward effects of baptism are attained by it; and we are not only 'baptized into one body,' but are also 'saved by baptism.' So that upon the whole matter, baptism is a federal admission into Christianity, in which, on God's part, all the blessings of the gospel are made over to the baptized; and, on the other hand, the person baptized takes on him, by a solemn profession and vow, to observe and adhere to the whole Christian religion. So it is a very natural distinction to say, that the outward effects of baptism follow it as outwardly performed; but that the inward effects of it follow upon the inward acts: but this difference is still to be observed between inward acts and outward actions, that when the outward action is rightly performed, the church must reckon the baptism good, and never renew it: but if one has been wanting in the inward acts, those may be afterwards renewed, and that want may be made up by repentance.

Thus all that the scriptures have told us concerning baptism seems to be sufficiently explained. There remains only one place that may seem somewhat strange. St. Paul says, that 'Christ 1 Cor. i. 17.

ART.  
XXVII.

sent him not to baptize, but to preach;’ which some have carried so far as to infer from thence, that preaching is of more value than baptism. But it is to be considered, that the preaching of the Apostles was of the nature of a promulgation made by heralds; it was an act of a special authority, by which he in particular was to convert the world from idolatry and Judaism, to acknowledge ‘Jesus to be the true Messiah.’

Acts viii.  
26. to the  
end.

Now when men, by the preaching of the apostles, and by the miracles that accompanied it, were so wrought on as to believe that ‘Jesus was the Christ;’ then, according to the practice of Philip towards the eunuch of Ethiopia, and of St. Paul to his jailor at Philippi, they might immediately baptize them; yet most commonly there was a special instruction to be used, before persons were baptized who might in general have some conviction, and yet not be so fully satisfied, but that a great deal of more pains was to be taken to carry them on to that full assurance of faith which was necessary. This was a work of much time, and was to be managed by the pastors or teachers of the several churches; so that the meaning of what St. Paul says was this, that he was to publish the gospel from city to city, but could not descend to the particular labour of preparing and instructing of the persons to be baptized, and to the baptizing them when so prepared. If he had entered upon this work, he could not have made that progress, nor have founded those churches, that he did. All this is therefore misunderstood, when it is applied to such preaching as is still continued in the church; which does not succeed the apostolical preaching that was inspired and infallible, but comes in the room of that instruction and teaching which was then performed by the pastors of the church.

The last head in this Article relates to the baptism of infants, which is spoken of with that moderation, which appears very eminently through the whole Articles of our church. On this head, it is only said to be most agreeable with the institution of Christ, and that therefore it is to be in any ways retained in the church. Now to open this, it is to be considered, that though baptism and circumcision do not in every particular come to a parallel, yet they do agree in two things: the one is, that both were the rites of admission into their respective covenants, and to the rights and privileges that did arise out of them; and the other is, that in them both there was an obligation laid on the persons to the observance of that whole law to which they were so initiated. St. Paul, arguing against circumcision, lays this down as an uncontested maxim, that if a man was circumcised, ‘he became thereby a debtor to the whole law.’

Galat. v. 3.

Parents had, by the Jewish constitution, an authority given them to conclude their children under that obligation; so that the soul and will of the child was so far put in the power

ART.  
XXVII.

of the parents, that they could bring them under federal obligations, and thereby procure to them a share in federal blessings. And it is probable, that from hence it was, that when the Jews made proselytes, they considered them as having such authority over their children, that they baptized them first, and then circumcised them, though infants.

Now since Christ took baptism from them, and appointed it to be the federal admission to his religion, as circumcision had been in the Mosaical dispensation, it is reasonable to believe, that, except where he declared a change that he made in it, in all other respects it was to go on and to continue as before; especially when the apostles in their first preaching told the Jews, that the promises were made to them and to their children; which the Jews must have understood according to what they were already in possession of, that they could initiate their children into their religion, bring them under the obligations of it, and procure to them a share in those blessings that belonged to it. The law of nature and nations puts children in the power of their parents; they are naturally their guardians; and if they are entitled to any thing, their parents have a right to transact about it, because of the weakness of the child; and what contracts soever they make, by which the child does not lose, but is a gainer, these do certainly bind the child. It is then suitable both to the constitution of mankind, and to the dispensation of the Mosaical covenant, that parents may dedicate their children to God, and bring them under the obligations of the gospel; and if they may do that, then they certainly procure to them with it, or in lieu of it, a share in the blessings and promises of the gospel. So that they may offer their children either themselves, or by such others of their friends, to whom for that occasion they transfer that right which they have, to transact for and to bind their children.

Acts ii. 39.

All this receives a great confirmation from the decision which St. Paul makes upon a case that must have happened commonly at that time; which was, when one of the parties in a married state, *husband* or *wife*, was converted, while the other continued still in the former state of idolatry, or infidelity: here then a scruple naturally arose, whether a believer or Christian might still live in a married state with an infidel. Besides the ill usage to which that diversity of religion might give occasion, another difficulty might be made, whether a person defiled by idolatry did not communicate that impurity to the Christian, and whether the children born in such a marriage were to be reckoned a *holy seed*, according to the Jewish phrase, or an *unholy*, unclean children, that is heathenish children; who were not to be dedicated to God, nor to be admitted into covenant with him: for *unclean* in the Old Testament, and *uncircumcised*, signify sometimes the same thing; and so St. Peter said that in the case of Cornelius God had

ART.  
XXVII.Acts x. 28.  
1 Cor. vii.  
14.

shewed him, that he should call no man *common* or *unclean*; in allusion to all which St. Paul determines the case, not by an immediate revelation, but by the inferences that he drew from what had been revealed to him; he does appoint the Christian to live with the infidel, and says, that the Christian is so far from being defiled by the infidel, that there is a communication of a blessing that passes from the Christian to the infidel; the one being the better for the prayers of the other, and sharing in the blessings bestowed on the other: the better part was accepted of God, 'in whom mercy rejoices over judgment.' There was a communication of a blessing that the Christian derived to the infidel; which at least went so far, that their children were not *unclean*; that is, shut out from being dedicated to God, but were *holy*. Now it is to be considered that in the New Testament *Christians*, and *saints*, or *holy*, stand all promiscuously. The purity of the Christian doctrine, and the dedication by which Christians offer up themselves to God, makes them *holy*.

In scripture, *holiness* stands in a double sense; the one is a true and real purity, by which a man's faculties and actions become holy; the other is a dedicated holiness, when any thing is appropriated to God; in which sense it stands most commonly in the Old Testament. So times, places, and not only persons, but even utensils applied to the service of God, are called *holy*. In the New Testament, *Christian* and *saint* are the same thing; so the saying that children are *holy* when one of the parents is a Christian, must import this, that the child has also a right to be made *holy*, or to be made a Christian; and by consequence, that by the parents' dedication that child may be made *holy*, or a *Christian*.

Upon these reasons we conclude, that though there is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants, yet it is most agreeable to the institution of Christ, since he conformed his institutions to those of the Mosaical law, as far as could consist with his design; and therefore in a thing of this kind, in which the just tenderness of the human nature does dispose parents to secure to their children a title to the mercies and blessings of the gospel, there is no reason to think that this being so fully set forth and assured to the Jews in the Old Testament, that Christ should not have intended to give parents the same comforts and assurances by his gospel that they had under the law of Moses: since nothing is said against it, we may conclude from the nature of the two dispensations, and the proportion and gradation that is between them, that children under the new testament are a *holy seed*, as well as they were under the old; and by consequence, that they may be now baptized as well as they were then circumcised.

If this may be done, then it is very reasonable to say what is said in the Article concerning it, that *it ought in any wise*

*to be retained in the church:* for the same humanity that obliges parents to feed their children, and to take care of them while they are in such a helpless state, must dictate, that it is much more incumbent on them, and is as much more necessary as the soul is more valuable than the body, for them to do all that in them lies for the souls of their children, for securing to them a share in the blessings and privileges of the gospel, and for dedicating them early to the Christian religion. The office for baptizing infants is in the same words with that for persons of riper age; because infants being then in the power of their parents, who are of age, are considered as in them, and as binding themselves by the vows that they make in their name. Therefore the office carries on the supposition of an internal regeneration; and in that helpless state the infant is offered up and dedicated to God; and provided, that when he comes to age he takes those vows on himself, and lives like a person so in covenant with God, then he shall find the full effects of baptism; and if he dies in that state of incapacity, he being dedicated to God, is certainly accepted of by him; and by being put in the second Adam, all the bad effects of his having descended from the first Adam are quite taken away. Christ, when on earth, encouraged those who brought *little children* to him; 'he took them in his arms, and laid his hands on them, and blessed them,' and said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God.' Whatever these words may signify mystically, the literal meaning of them is, that little children may be admitted into the dispensation of the Messiah, and by consequence that they may be baptized.

ART.  
XXVII.Matt. xix.  
13, 14.

## ARTICLE XXVIII.

## Of the Lord's Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a Sign of the Love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death: Inasmuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with Faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. Transubstantiation (or the Change of the Substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but it is repugnant to the plain Words of Scripture, overthroweth the Nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many Superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a Heavenly and Spiritual Manner; and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's Ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, and worshipped.

In the edition of these Articles in Edward VI.'s Reign, there was another long paragraph against Transubstantiation added in these words: Forasmuch as the Truth of Man's Nature requireth that the Body of one and the self-same Man cannot be at one Time in divers Places, but must needs be in one certain Place; therefore the Body of Christ cannot be present at one Time in many and divers Places: and because, as Holy Scripture doth teach, Christ was taken up into Heaven, and there shall continue unto the End of the World; a Faithful Man ought not either to believe, or openly confess, the Real and Bodily Presence, as they term it, of Christ's Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

WHEN these Articles were at first prepared by the convocation in queen Elizabeth's reign, this paragraph was made a part of them; for the original subscription by both houses of convocation, yet extant, shews this. But the design of the government was at that time much turned to the drawing over the body of the nation to the Reformation, in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament; therefore it was thought not expedient to offend them by so particular a definition in this matter; in which the very word *real presence* was rejected. It might, perhaps, be also suggested, that here a definition was made that went too much

upon the principles of natural philosophy; which how true soever, they might not be the proper subject of an article of religion. Therefore it was thought fit to suppress this paragraph; though it was a part of the Article that was subscribed, yet it was not published, but the paragraph that follows, *The body of Christ, &c.* was put in its stead, and was received and published by the next convocation; which upon the matter was a full explanation of the way of Christ's presence in this sacrament; that *he is present in a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that faith is the mean by which he is received.* This seemed to be more theological; and it does indeed amount to the same thing. But howsoever we see what was the sense of the first convocation in queen Elizabeth's reign; it differed in nothing from that in king Edward's time: and therefore though this paragraph is now no part of our Articles, yet we are certain that the clergy at that time did not at all doubt of the truth of it; we are sure it was their opinion; since they subscribed it, though they did not think fit to publish it at first; and though it was afterwards changed for another, that was the same in sense.

In the treating of this Article, I shall first lay down the doctrine of this church, with the grounds of it; and then I shall examine the doctrine of the church of Rome, which must be done copiously; for next to the doctrine of infallibility, this is the most valued of all their other tenets; this is the most important in itself, since it is the main part of their worship, and the chief subject of all their devotions. There is not any one thing in which both clergy and laity are more concerned; which is more generally studied, and for which they pretend they have more plausible colours, both from scripture and the fathers: and if sense and reason seem to press hard upon it, they reckon, that, as they understand the words of St. Paul, 'every thought must be captivated into 2 Cor. x. 5. the obedience of faith.'

In order to the expounding our doctrine, we must consider the occasion and the institution of this sacrament. The Jews were required once a year to meet at Jerusalem, in remembrance of the deliverance of their fathers out of Egypt. Moses appointed that every family should kill a lamb, whose blood was to be sprinkled on their door-posts and lintels, and whose flesh they were to eat; at the sight of which *blood* thus sprinkled, the destroying angel, that was to be sent out to kill the firstborn of every family in Egypt, was to *pass over* all the houses that were so marked: and from that *passing by* or *over* the Israelites, the lamb was called *the Lord's passover*, as being then the sacrifice, and afterwards the memorial of that *pass-over*. The people of Israel were required to keep up the memorial of that transaction, by slaying a lamb before the place where God should set his name; and by eating it up that night: they were also to eat with it a salad of bitter

**ART. XXVII.** herbs and unleavened bread; and when they went to eat of the lamb, they repeated these words of Moses; 'that it was the Lord's passover.' Now though the first lamb that was killed in Egypt was indeed the sacrifice upon which God promised to *pass over* their houses; yet the lambs that were afterwards offered were only the memorials of it; though they still carried that name, which was given to the first, and were called the *Lord's passover*.

So that the Jews were in the *paschal supper* accustomed to call the memorial of a thing by the name of that of which it was the memorial: and as the deliverance out of Egypt was a type and representation of that greater deliverance that we were to have by the Messias, the first lamb being the sacrifice of that deliverance, and the succeeding lambs the memorials of it; so, in order to this new and greater deliverance, Christ himself was our 'passover, that was sacrificed for us;' he was the 'Lamb of God' that was both to 'take away the sins of the world,' and was to 'lead captivity captive;' to bring us out of the bondage of sin and Satan into the obedience of his gospel.

He therefore chose the time of the passover, that he might be then offered up for us; and did institute this memorial of it while he was celebrating the Jewish *pascha* with his disciples, who were so much accustomed to the forms and phrases of that *supper*, in which every master of a family did officiate among his household, that it was very natural to them to understand all that our Saviour said or did according to those forms with which they were acquainted.

There were after supper, upon a new covering of the table, loaves of unleavened bread, and cups of wine set on it; in which, though the bread was very unacceptable, yet they drank liberally of the wine: Christ took a portion of that bread, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, 'This is my body which is broken for you: Do this in remembrance of me.' He did not say only, 'This is my body,' but 'This is my body broken;' so that his body must be understood to be there in its broken state, if the words are to be expounded literally. And no reason can be assigned why the word *broken* should be so separated from *body*; or that the *bread* should be literally his *body*, and not literally his *body broken*: the whole period must be either literally true, or must be understood mystically. And if any will say, that his body cannot be there, but in the same state in which it is now in heaven; and since it is not now *broken*, nor is the *blood shed* or separated from the body there, therefore the words must be understood thus; 'This is my body which is to be broken.' But from thence we argue, that since all is one period, it must be all understood in the same manner; and since it is impossible that *broken* and *shed* can be understood literally of the *body* and *blood*, that therefore the whole is to be mystically

1 Cor. v. 7.  
John i. 29.

Compare  
Matt. xxvi.  
26.  
Mark xiv.  
22.  
Luke xxii.  
19.  
1 Cor. xi.  
23.

**ART. XXVIII.** understood: and this appears more evident, since the disciples, who were naturally slow at understanding the easiest mysteries that he opened to them, must naturally have understood those words as they did the other words of the paschal supper, 'This is the Lord's passover;' that is, this is the memorial of it: and that the rather, since Christ added these words, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' If they had understood them in any other sense, that must have surprised them, and naturally have led them to ask him many questions: which we find them doing upon occasions that were much less surprising, as appears by the questions in the 14th of St. John, that discourse coming probably immediately after this institution: whereas no question was asked upon this: so it is reasonable to conclude that they could understand these words, 'This is my body,' no other way, but as they understood that of the lamb, 'This is the Lord's passover.' And by consequence, as their celebrating the *pascha* was a constant memorial of the deliverance out of Egypt, and was a symbolical action by which they had a title to the blessings of the covenant that Moses made with their fathers; it was natural for them to conclude, that after Christ had made himself to be truly that, which the first lamb was in a type, the true *sacrifice* of a greater and better *passover*; they were to commemorate it, and to communicate in the benefits and effects of it, by continuing that action of *taking, blessing, breaking, and distributing* of bread: which was to be the memorial and the communion of his death in all succeeding ages.

This will yet appear more evident from the second part of this institution: he took the cup and blessed it, and gave it to them, saying, 'This cup is the new testament,' or new covenant, 'in my blood: drink ye all of it.' Or, as the other gospels report it, 'This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' As Moses had enjoined the sprinkling of the blood of the lamb, so he himself sprinkled both the book of the law and all the people with the blood of calves and of goats, saying, 'This is the blood of the testament (or covenant) which God hath enjoined you.' The blood of the paschal lamb was the token of that covenant which God made then with them.

The Jews were under a very strict prohibition of eating no blood at all: but it seems by the Psalms, that when they paid their vows unto God, they took in their hands 'a cup of salvation,' that is, of an acknowledgment of their salvation, and so were to rejoice before the Lord.

These being the laws and customs of the Jews, they could not without horror have heard Christ, when he gave them the cup, say, 'This is my blood:' the prohibition of blood was given in such severe terms; as that 'God would set his face against him that did eat blood, and cut him off from among

**ART. XXVIII.**

Heb. ix. 20.

Psal. cxvi.

Levit. vii.  
26, 27.  
xvii. 14.

his people.\* And this was so often repeated in the books of Moses, that besides the natural horror which humanity gives at the mention of drinking a man's blood, it was a special part of their religion to make no use of blood: yet after all this, the disciples were not startled at it; which shews that they must have understood it in such a way as was agreeable to the law and customs of their country: and since St. Luke and St. Paul report the words that our Saviour said when he gave it, differently from what is reported by St. Matthew and St. Mark, it is most probable that he spake both the one and the other; that he first said, 'This is my blood,' and then, as a clearer explanation of it, he said, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood:' the one being a more easy expression, and in a style to which the Jews had been more accustomed. They knew that the blood of the lamb was sprinkled; and by their so doing they entered into a covenant with God: and though the blood was never to be sprinkled after the first passover; yet it was to be poured out before the Lord, in remembrance of that sprinkling in Egypt: in remembrance of that deliverance, they drank of the cup of blessing and salvation, and rejoiced before the Lord. So that they could not understand our Saviour otherwise, than that the cup so blessed was to be to them the assurance of a *new testament* or *covenant*, which was to be established by the blood of Christ; and which was to be shed: in lieu of which they were to drink this 'cup of blessing' and praise.

According to their customs and phrases, the disciples could understand our Saviour's words in this sense, and in no other. So that if he had intended that they should have understood him otherwise, he must have expressed himself in another manner; and must have enlarged upon it, to have corrected those notions, into which it was otherwise most natural for Jews to have fallen. Here is also to be remembered that which was formerly observed upon the word *broken*, that if the words are to be expounded literally, then if the cup is literally 'the blood of Christ,' it must be his blood *shed*, poured out of his veins, and separated from his body. And if it is impossible to understand it so, we conclude that we are in the

\* Transubstantiation is built on this error; that our LORD JESUS CHRIST did, on the night of his instituting this sacrament, eat his own flesh, and drink his own blood, and give both to his disciples. And this makes our LORD a transgressor of the law of God, which forbids any man to eat blood, Levit. xvii. 14. "For it is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof: therefore I said unto the children of Israel, YE SHALL EAT THE BLOOD OF NO MANNER OF FLESH: for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it shall be cut off." Perhaps you will say, that our LORD was not bound by this law, or that he had power to set it aside. He was bound by it inasmuch as he was the man CHRIST JESUS; for it is written in Gal. iv. 4, that he was, "made under the law." And although he had power to set aside the law, yet he did not do so, for he himself says in Matt. v. 17, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." The decree of the Apostles, Acts xv. 29, also binds the Christians to abstain from blood.' *Page's Letters to a Romish Priest.*—[Ed.]

right to understand the whole period in a mystical and figurative sense. And therefore since a man born and bred a Jew, and more particularly accustomed to the paschal ceremonies, could not have understood our Saviour's words, chiefly at the time of that festivity, otherwise than of a new *covenant* that he was to make, in which his 'body was to be broken,' and his 'blood shed' for the 'remission of sins;' and that he was to substitute bread and wine, to be the lasting memorials of it; in the repeating of which, his disciples were to renew their covenant with God, and to claim a share in the blessings of it; this, I say, was the sense that must naturally have occurred to a Jew; upon all this, we must conclude, that this is the true sense of these words; or, that otherwise our Saviour must have enlarged more upon them, and expressed his meaning more particularly. Since therefore he said no more than what, according to the ideas and customs of the Jews, must have been understood as has been explained, we must conclude, that it, and it only, is the true sense of them.

But we must next consider the importance of a long discourse of our Saviour's, set down by St. John, which seems such a preparation of his apostles to understand this institution literally, that the weight of this argument must turn upon the meaning of that discourse. The design of that was to shew, that the doctrine of Christ was more excellent than the law of Moses; that though Moses gave the Israelites manna from heaven to nourish their bodies, yet notwithstanding that 'they died in the wilderness:' but Christ was to give his followers such food that it should give them *life*; so that if they 'did eat of it, they should never die:' where it is apparent, that the bread and nourishment must be such as the *life* was; and that being eternal and spiritual, the bread must be so understood: for it is clearly expressed how that food was to be received; 'he that believeth on me hath everlasting life.'<sup>John vi. 32, 33.</sup>

Since then he had formerly said, that the *bread* which he was to give, should make them 'live for ever;' and since here it is said, that this life is given by faith; then this bread must be his doctrine: for, this is that which faith receives. And when the Jews desired him to give them evermore of that bread, he answered, 'I am the bread of life: he that comes to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.'<sup>ver. 47, 48, 51.</sup>

In these words he tells them that they received that bread by coming to him, and by believing on him. Christ calls himself that *bread*, and says, that a 'man must eat thereof;' which is plainly a figure: and if figures are confessed to be in some parts of their discourse, there is no reason to deny that they run quite through it. Christ says, that this 'bread was his flesh,' which he was to give for the life of the world;

ART. XXVIII. which can only be meant of his offering himself up upon the cross for the sins of the world. The Jews murmured at this, and said, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' To which our Saviour answers, that 'except they did eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, they had no life in them.'

John vi.  
53, 54, 55.

Now if these words are to be understood of a literal eating of his flesh in the sacrament, then no man can be saved that does not receive it: it was a natural consequence of the expounding these words of the sacrament to give it to children, since it is so expressly said, that life is not to be had without it. But the words that come next carry this matter further; 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.' It is plain that Christ is here speaking of that, without which no man can have *life*, and by which all who received it have *life*: if therefore this is to be expounded of the sacrament, none can be damned that does receive it, and none can be saved that receives it not.

Therefore since *eternal life* does always follow the 'eating of Christ's flesh,' and the 'drinking his blood,' and cannot be had without it; then this must be meant of an internal and spiritual feeding on him: for, as none are saved without that, so all are saved that have it. This is yet clearer from the words that follow, 'my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed:' it may well be inferred, that Christ's flesh is eaten in the same sense, in which he says it is *meat*: now certainly it is not literally *meat*; for none do say that the body is nourished by it; and yet there is somewhat emphatical in this, since the word *indeed* is not added in vain, but to give weight to the expression.

ver. 56.

It is also said, 'he that eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, dwells in me, and I in him.' Here the description seems to be made of that eating and drinking of his flesh and blood; that it is such as the mutual indwelling of Christ and believers is. Now that is certainly only internal and spiritual, and not carnal or literal: and therefore such also must the *eating* and *drinking* be.

ver. 63.

All this seems to be very fully confirmed from the conclusion of that discourse, which ought to be considered as the key to it all; for when the Jews were offended at the hardness of Christ's discourse, he said, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life:' which do plainly import, that his former discourse was to be understood in a spiritual sense, that it was a divine *Spirit* that quickened them, or gave them that *eternal* life, of which he had been speaking; and that the *flesh*, his natural body, was not the conveyer of it.

All that is confirmed by the sense in which we find *eating* and *drinking* frequently used in the scriptures, according to what is observed by Jewish writers; they stand for wisdom,

learning, and all intellectual apprehensions, through which the soul of man is preserved, by the perfection that is in them, as the body is preserved by food: So, 'Buy and eat: eat fat things; drink of wine well refined.'

ART.  
XXVIII.

Maimonides also observes, that whensoever eating and drinking are mentioned in the Book of Proverbs, they are to be understood of wisdom and the law: and after he has brought several places of scripture to this purpose, he concludes, that because *this acceptation of eating occurs so often, and is so manifest, as if it were the primary and most proper sense of the word; therefore hunger and thirst stand for a privation of wisdom and understanding.* And the Chaldee paraphrast turns these words, 'ye shall draw water out of the wells of salvation;' thus, 'ye shall receive a new doctrine with joy from some select persons.'

Isa. xi. 3

Since then the figure of *eating* and *drinking* was used among the Jews, for receiving and imbibing a doctrine; it was no wonder if our Saviour pursued it in a discourse, in which there are several hints given to shew us that it ought to be so understood.

It is further observable, that our Saviour did frequently follow that common way of instruction among the eastern nations, by figures, that to us would seem strong and bold. These were much used in those parts to excite the attention of the hearers; and they are not always to be severely expounded according to the full extent that the words will bear. The parable of the unjust judge, of the unjust steward, of the ten virgins, of plucking out the right eye, and cutting off the right hand or foot, and several others, might be instanced. Our Saviour in these considered the genius of those to whom he spoke: so that these figures must be restrained only to that particular, for which he meant them; and must not be stretched to every thing to which the words may be carried. We find our Saviour compares himself to a great many things; to a vine, a door, and a way: and therefore when the scope of a discourse does plainly run in a figure, we are not to go and descant on every word of it; much less may any pretend to say, that some parts of it are to be understood literally, and some parts figuratively.

For instance, if that chapter of St. John is to be understood literally, then Christ's *flesh* and *blood* must be the nourishment of our bodies, so as to be *meat indeed*; and that we shall 'never hunger any more, and never die after' we have eat of it. If therefore all do confess that those expressions are to be understood figuratively, then we have the same reason to conclude that the whole is a figure: for it is as reasonable for us to make all of it a figure, as it is for them to make those parts of it a figure which they cannot conveniently expound in a literal sense. From all which it is abundantly clear that nothing can be drawn from that dis-

A. R. T.  
XXVIII.

course of our Saviour's, to make it reasonable to believe that the words of the institution of this sacrament ought to be literally understood: on the contrary, our Saviour himself calls the wine, after those words had been used by him, the 'fruit of the vine,' which is as strict a form of speech as can well be imagined, to make us understand that the nature of the wine was not altered: and when St. Paul treats of it in those two chapters, in which all that is left us besides the history of the institution concerning the sacrament is to be found, he calls it five times bread, and never once *the body of Christ*. In one place he calls it the 'communion of the body, as the cup is the communion of the blood of Christ.' Which is rather a saying, that it is in some sort, and after a manner, the body and the blood of Christ, than that it is so strictly speaking.

1 Cor. x.  
16.

If this sacrament had been that mysterious and unconceivable thing which it has been since believed to be, we cannot imagine but that the books of the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles, and their Epistles, should have contained fuller explanations of it, and larger instructions about it.

There is enough indeed said in them to support the plain and natural sense that we give to this institution; and because no more is said, and the design of it is plainly declared to be to remember Christ's death, and to 'shew it forth till he come,' we reckon that by this natural simplicity, in which this matter is delivered to us, we are very much confirmed in that plain and easy signification, which we put upon our Saviour's words. Plain things need not be insisted on: but if the most sublime and wonderful thing in the world seems to be delivered in words that yet are capable of a lower and plainer sense, then unless there is a concurrence of other circumstances, to force us to that higher meaning of them, we ought not to go into it; for simple things prove themselves: whereas the more extraordinary that any thing is, it requires a fulness and evidence in the proof, proportioned to the uneasiness of conceiving or believing it.

We do therefore understand our Saviour's institution thus, that as he was to give 'his body to be broken' and his 'blood to be shed for our sins,' so he intended that this his death and suffering should be still commemorated by all such as look for 'remission of sins' by it, not only in their thoughts and devotions, but in a visible representation: which he appointed should be done in symbols, that should be both very plain and simple, and yet very expressive of that which he intended should be remembered by them.

*Bread* is the plainest food that the body of man can receive, and *wine* was the common-nourishing liquor of that country; so he made choice of these materials, and in them appointed a representation and remembrance to be made of his *body*

A. R. T.  
XXVIII.

*broken*, and of his *blood shed*; that is, of his death and sufferings till his *second coming*: and he obliged his followers to repeat this frequently. In the doing of it according to his institution, they profess the belief of his death, for the remission of their sins, and that they look for his second coming.

This does also import, that as bread and wine are the simplest of bodily nourishments, so his death is that which restores the souls of those that do believe in him: as bread and wine convey a vital nourishment to the body, so the sacrifice of his death conveys somewhat to the soul that is vital, that fortifies and exalts it. And as water in baptism is a natural emblem of the purity of the Christian religion, bread and wine in the eucharist are the emblems of somewhat that is derived to us, that raises our faculties, and fortifies all our powers.

St. Paul does very plainly tell us, that 'unworthy receivers,'<sup>1 Cor. xi. 27, 29.</sup> that did neither examine nor discern themselves, nor yet discern the Lord's body, 'were guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and did eat and drink their own damnation:' that is, such as do receive it without truly believing the Christian religion, without a grateful acknowledgment of Christ's death and sufferings, without feeling that they are walking suitably to this religion that they profess, and without that decency and charity, which becomes so holy an action; but that receive the bread and wine only as bare bodily nourishments, without considering that Christ has instituted them to be the memorials of his death; such persons are guilty of the body and blood of Christ: that is, they are guilty either of a profanation of the sacrament of his body and blood, or they do in a manner crucify him again, and put him to an open shame; when they are so faulty as the Corinthians were, in observing this holy institution with so little reverence, and with such scandalous disorders, as those were for which he reproached them.

Of such as did thus profane this institution, he says further, that they do eat and drink their own *damnation*, or *judgment*; that is, punishment: for the word rendered *damnation* signifies sometimes only temporary punishments.

So it is said, that 'judgment (the word is the same) must<sup>1 Pet. iv. 17.</sup> begin at the house of God:' God had sent such judgments upon the Corinthians for those disorderly practices of theirs, that some had fallen sick, and others had died, perhaps by reason of their drinking to excess in those feasts: but as God's judgments had come upon them; so the words that follow shew that these judgments were only chastisements, in order to the delivering them from the condemnation under which the world lies. It being said, that 'when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.' Therefore though God may very justly and even in great mercy punish men who profane this

holy ordinance; yet it is an unreasonable terror, and contrary to the nature of the gospel covenant, to carry this so far, as to think that it is an unpardonable sin; which is punished with eternal damnation.

We have now seen the ill effects of unworthy receiving, and from hence according to that gradation, that is to be observed in the mercy of God in the gospel, that it not only holds a proportion with his justice, but 'rejoiceth over it,' we may well conclude that the good effects upon the worthy receiving of it are equal if not superior to the bad effects upon the unworthy receiving of it: and that the nourishment which the types, the *bread* and the *wine*, give the *body*, are answered in the effects, that the thing signified by them has upon the *soul*.

In explaining this there is some diversity: some teach that this memorial of the death of Christ, when seriously and devoutly gone about, when it animates our faith, increases our repentance, and inflames our love and zeal, and so unites us to God and to our brethren; that, I say, when these follow it, which it naturally excites in all holy and good minds, then they draw down the returns of prayer, and a further increase of grace in us; according to the nature and promises of the new covenant: and in this they put the virtue and efficacy of this sacrament.

But others think that all this belongs only to the inward acts of the mind, and is not sacramental: and therefore they think that the eucharist is a federal act, in which as on the one hand we renew our baptismal covenant with God, so on the other hand we receive in the sacrament a visible consignation, as in a tradition by a symbol or pledge, of the blessings of the new covenant, which they think is somewhat superadded to those returns of our prayers, or of other inward acts.

This they think answers the nourishment which the body receives from the symbols of *bread* and *wine*; and stands in opposition to that of the unworthy receivers being guilty of *the body and blood of the Lord*; and their *eating and drinking* that which will bring some judgment upon themselves. This they also found on these words of St. Paul, 'The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?'

St. Paul considers the *bread* which was offered by the people as an emblem of their unity, that as there was one loaf, so they were *one body*; and that they were all *partakers* of that one loaf: from hence it is inferred, that since the word rendered *communion* signifies a *communication in fellowship*, or *partnership*, that therefore the meaning of it is, that in the sacrament there is a distribution made in that symbolical action of the death of Christ, and of the benefits and effects

of it. 'The communion of the Holy Ghost' is a common sharing in the effusion of the Spirit; the same is meant by that, 'if there is any fellowship of the Spirit;' that is, if we do all partake of the same Spirit, we are said to have a 'fellowship in the sufferings of Christ,' in which every one must take his share. 'The communication,' or fellowship, 'of the mystery of the gospel,' was its being shared equally among both Jews and Gentiles; and the fellowship in which the first converts to Christianity lived, was their liberal distribution to one another, they holding all things in common. In these and some other places it is certain, that communion signifies somewhat that is more real and effectual, than merely men's owning themselves to be joined together in a society; which it is true it does also often signify: and therefore they conclude, that as in bargains or covenants, the ancient method of them before writings were invented was the mutual delivering of some pledges, which were the symbols of that faith, which was so plighted, instead of which the sealing and delivering of writings is now used among us; so our Saviour instituted this in compliance with our frailty, to give us an outward and sensible pledge of his entering into covenant with us, of which the *bread* and *wine* are constituted the symbols.

Others think, that by the communion of the body and blood of Christ can only be meant the joint owning of Christ and of his death, in the receiving the sacrament; and that no *communication* nor *partnership* can be inferred from it: because St. Paul brings it in to shew the Corinthians how detestable a thing it was for a Christian to join in the idols' feasts; that it was to be a 'partaker with devils:' so they think that the *fellowship* or communion of Christians in the sacrament must be of the same nature with the 'fellowship of devils' in acts of idolatry: which consisted only in their associating themselves with those that worshipped idols; for that upon the matter was the worshipping of devils: and this seems to be confirmed by that which is said of the Jews, that they 'who did eat of the sacrifices were partakers of the altar;' which it seems can signify no more but that they professed that religion of which the altar was the chief instrument; the sacrifices being offered there.

To all this it may be replied, that it is reasonable enough to believe, that according to the power which God suffered the Devil to exercise over the idolatrous world, there might be some enchantment in the sacrifices offered to idols, and that the Devil might have some power over those that did partake of them: and in order to this, St. Paul removed an objection that might have been made, that there could be no harm in their joining to the idol feasts; for 'an idol was nothing;' and so that which was offered to an idol could contract no defilement from the idol, it being *nothing*. Now if the meaning of their being 'partakers with devils' imports only

their joining themselves in acts of fellowship with idolaters, then the sin of this would have easily appeared, without such a reinforcing of the matter; for though an idol was *nothing*, yet it was still a great sin to join in the acts that were meant to be the worship of this *nothing*; this was a dishonouring of God, and a debasing of man. But St. Paul seems to carry the argument further; that how true soever it was that the *idol* was *nothing*, that is, a dead and lifeless thing, that had no virtue nor operation, and that by consequence could derive nothing to the sacrifice that was offered to it; yet since those idols were the instruments by which the Devil kept the world in subjection to him, all such as did *partake* in their sacrifices might come under the effects of that magic, that might be exerted about their temples or sacrifices: by which the credit of idolatry was much kept up.

And though every Christian had a sure defence against the powers of darkness, as long as he continued true to his religion, yet if he went out of that protection into the empire of the Devil, and joined in the acts that were as a homage to him, he then fell within the reach of the Devil, and might justly fear his being brought into a *partnership* of those magical possessions or temptations that might be suffered to fall upon such Christians, as should associate themselves in so detestable a service.

1 Cor. x. 18. In the same sense it was also said, 'that all the Israelites who did eat of the sacrifices were partakers of the altar:' that is, that all of them who joined in the acts of that religion, such as the offering their peace-offerings, for of those of that kind they might only eat, all these were 'partakers of the altar;' that is, of all the blessings of their religion, of all the expiations, the burnt-offerings and sin-offerings, that were offered on the altar, for the sins of the whole congregation: for that as a great stock went in a common dividend among such as observed the precepts of that law, and joined in the acts of worship prescribed by it: thus it appears that such as joined in the acts of idolatry became *partakers* of all that influence that devils might have over those sacrifices; and all that continued in the observances of the Mosaical law, had thereby a *partnership* in the expiations of the altar: so likewise all Christians who receive this sacrament *worthily*, have by their so doing a share in that which is represented by it, the death of Christ, and the expiation and other benefits that follow it.

This seemed necessary to be fully explained: for this matter, how plain soever in itself, has been made very dark, by the ways in which some have pretended to open it. With this I conclude all that belongs to the first part of the Article, and that which was first to be explained of our doctrine concerning the sacrament: by which we assert a *real presence* of the *body* and *blood* of Christ: but not of his *body* as it is now glorified in heaven, but of his *body* as it was *broken* on the cross, when

his 'blood was shed' and separated from it: that is, his death, with the merit and effects of it, are in a visible and federal act offered in this sacrament to all worthy believers.

By *real* we understand *true*, in opposition both to fiction and imagination: and to those shadows that were in the Mosaical dispensation, in which the *manna*, the *rock*, the *brazen serpent*, but most eminently the *cloud of glory*, were the types and shadows of the Messiah that was to come: with whom came 'grace and truth;' that is, a most wonderful manifestation of the mercy or grace of God, and a verifying of the promises made under the Law: in this sense we acknowledge a *real presence* of Christ in the sacrament: though we are convinced that our first reformers judged right concerning the use of the phrase *real presence*, that it were better to be let fall than to be continued, since the use of it, and that idea which does naturally arise from the common acceptance of it, may stick deeper, and feed superstition more, than all those larger explanations that are given to it can be able to cure:

But howsoever in this sense it is innocent of itself, and may be lawfully used; though perhaps it were more cautiously done not to use it, since advantages have been taken from it to urge it further than we intend it; and since it has been a snare to some.

I go in the next place to explain the doctrine of the church of Rome concerning this sacrament. Transubstantiation does express it in one word: but that a full idea may be given of this part of their doctrine, I shall open it in all its branches and consequences.

The matter of this sacrament is not *bread* and *wine*: for they are annihilated when the sacrament is made. They are only the remote matter, out of which it is made: but when the sacrament is made, they cease to be; and instead of them their outward appearances or *accidents* do only remain: which though they are no *substances*, yet are supposed to have a nature and essence of their own, separable from matter: and these appearances, with the body of Christ under them, are the *matter* of the sacrament.

Now though the natural and visible *body of Christ* could not be the sacrament of his *body*, yet they think his *real body*, being thus veiled under the appearances of bread and wine, may be the sacrament of his glorified body.

Yet, it seeming somewhat strange to make a *true body* the sacrament of itself, they would willingly put the sacrament in the appearances; but that would sound very harsh, to make accidents which are not *matter* to be the *matter* of the sacrament: therefore since these words, *This is my body*, must be literally understood, the matter must be the *true body of Christ*; so that *Christ's body* is the sacrament of his *body*.

Christ's body, though now in heaven, is, as they think,

ART.  
XXVIII.

presented in every place where a true consecration is made. And though it is in heaven in an extended state, as all other bodies are, yet they think that extension may be separated from matter, as well as the other appearances or accidents are believed to be separated from it. And whereas our souls are believed to be so in our bodies, that though the whole soul is in the whole body, yet all the soul is believed to be in every part of it; but so, that if any part of the body is separated from the rest, the soul is not divided, being one single substance, but retires back into the rest of the body: they apprehend that Christ's body is present after the manner of a spirit, without extension, or the filling of space; so that the space which the appearances possess is still a vacuum, or only filled by the accidents: for a body without extension, as they suppose Christ's body to be, can never fill up an extension.

Christ's body in the sacrament is denominated one; yet still, as the species are broken and divided, so many new bodies are divided from one another; every crumb of bread and drop of wine that is separated from the whole, is a new body, and yet without a new miracle, all being done in consequence of the first great one that was all at once wrought.

The body of Christ continues in this state as long as the accidents remain in theirs; but how it should alter is not easy to apprehend: the corruption of all other accidents arises from a change in the common substance, out of which new accidents do arise, while the old ones vanish; but accidents without a subject may seem more fixed and stable: yet they are not so, but are as subject to corruption as other accidents are: howsoever, as long as the alteration is not total; though the bread should be both musty and mouldy, and the wine both dead and sour, yet as long as the bread and wine are still so far preserved, or rather that their appearances subsist, so long the body of Christ remains: but when they are so far altered that they seem to be no more bread and wine, and that they are corrupted either in part or in whole, Christ's body is withdrawn, either in part or in whole.

It is a great miracle to make the accidents of bread and wine subsist without a subject; yet the new accidents that arise upon these accidents, such as mouldiness or sourness, come on without a miracle, but they do not know how. When the main accidents are destroyed, then the presence of Christ ceases: and a new miracle must be supposed to produce new matter, for the filling up of that space which the substance of bread and wine did formerly fill; and which was all this while possessed by the accidents. So much of the matter of this sacrament.

The form of it is in the words of consecration, which though they sound declarative, as if the thing were already done; 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood;' yet they

ART.  
XXVIII.

believe them to be productive. But whereas the common notion of the form of a sacrament is, that it sanctifies and applies the matter; here the former matter is so far from being consecrated by it, that it is annihilated, and new matter is not sanctified, but brought thither or produced: and whereas whensoever we say of any thing, *this is*, we suppose that the thing is, as we say it is, before we say it; yet here all the while that this is a saying till the last syllable is pronounced, it is not that which it is said to be, but in the minute in which the last syllable is uttered, then the change is made: and of this they are so firmly persuaded, that they do presently pay all that adoration to it, that they would pay to the person of Jesus Christ if he were visibly present: though the whole virtue of the consecration depends on the intention of a priest: so that he with a cross intention hinders all this series of miracles, as he fetches it all on, by letting his intention go along with it.\*

\* The adoration of the Eucharist is thus decreed by the council of Trent.

*De cultu et veneratione huic sanctissimo sacramento exhibenda.*

'Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in catholica ecclesia semper recepto patriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant; neque enim ideo minus est adorandum, quod fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur, institutum: nam illum eundem Deum præsentem in eo adesse credimus, quem Pater æternus introducens in orbem terrarum, dicit: Et adorent eum omnes angeli Dei.' *Sessio xiii. cap. 5.*

'Si quis dixerit, in sancto eucharistiæ sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei filium non esse cultu patriæ, etiam externo, adorandum, atque ideo nec festiva peculiari celebritate venerandum, neque in processionibus secundum laudabilem et universalem ecclesiæ sanctæ ritum et consuetudinem, solemniter circumgestandum, vel non publice, ut adoretur, populo proponendum, et ejus adoratores esse idololatrias: anathema sit.' *Sessio xiii. canon 6.*

The novelty and danger of this adoration is clearly and forcibly stated in the following:

'Now touching the adoration of the sacrament, Mr. Harding is not able to shew, neither any commandment of Christ, nor any word or example of the Apostles, or ancient Fathers concerning the same. It is a thing very lately devised by pope Honorius, about the year of our Lord 1226. Afterward increased by the new solemn feast of Corpus Christi day by pope Urbanus, anno 1264. And last of all confirmed for ever by multitudes of pardons in the council of Vienna by pope Clement V. anno 1310. The church of Asia and Græcia never received it until this day. The matter is great, and cannot be attempted without great danger. To give the honour of God to a creature, that is no God, it is manifest idolatry. And all idolaters, as St. John saith, shall have their portion in the lake burning with fire, and brimstone, which is the second death.'

'The greatest doctors of that side say, that, unless transubstantiation be concluded, the people cannot freely worship the sacrament, without occasion of idolatry. Now it is known that transubstantiation is a new fantasy, newly devised in the council of Lateran, (A. D. 1215) in Rome. And Doctor Tonstal saith, that before that time it was free and lawful for any man to hold the contrary. Wherefore it is likely, that before that time, there was no such adoration. Otherwise, it must needs have been with great danger of idolatry. But after that, as it is said before, pope Honorius took order and gave commandment, that the people should adore: pope Urbanus added thereto a new solemn feast of Corpus Christi day: and pope Clement confirmed the same with great store of pardons. This is the antiquity and petite degree of this kind of adoration. The great danger and horror of idolatry that hereof riseth, Mr. Harding thinketh may easily be solved by the example of Rachel, and Leah: and thus he bringeth in God's mystical providence for defence of open error: and thus instead of Rachel to take Leah, and to honour a creature instead of God.

'Wherein it shall be necessary briefly to touch, how many ways, even by their

If it may be said of some doctrines, that the bare exposing them is a most effectual confutation of them; certainly that is more applicable to this, than to any other that can be imagined: for though I have in stating it considered some of the most important difficulties, which are seen and confessed by the schoolmen themselves, who have poised all these with much exactness and subtilty; yet I have passed over a great many more, with which those that deal in school-divinity will find enough to exercise both their thoughts and their patience. They run out in many subtilties, concerning the accidents both *primary* and *secondary*; concerning the ubication, the production and reproduction of bodies; concerning the penetrability of matter, and the organization of a penetrable body; concerning the way of the destruction of the species; concerning the words of consecration; concerning the water that is mixed with the wine, whether it is first changed by natural causes into wine; and since nothing but wine is transubstantiated, what becomes of such particles of water that are not turned into wine? What is the grace produced by the sacrament, what is the effect of the presence of Christ so long as he is in the body of the communicant; what is got by his presence, and what is lost by his absence? In a word, let a man read the shortest body of school-divinity that he can find, and he will see in it a vast number of other difficulties in this matter, of which their own authors are aware, which I have quite passed over. For when this doctrine fell into the hands

own doctrine, the poor simple people may be deceived, and yield the honour of God to that thing, that in their own judgment is no God. Thus therefore they say, if the priest chance to forget to put wine into the cup, and so pass over the consecration without wine: or, if the bread be made of any other than wheaten flour, which may possibly and easily happen: or, if there be so much water in quantity, that it overcome and alter the nature of the wine: or, if the wine be changed into vinegar, and therefore cannot serve to consecration: or, if there be thirteen cakes upon the table, and the priest for his consecration determine only upon twelve, in which case they say not one of them all is consecrated: or, if the priest dissemble, or leave out the words of consecration: or, if he forget it, or mind it not, or think not of it: In every one of these, and other like defects, there is nothing consecrate, and therefore the people in these cases, honouring the sacrament, by their own doctrine giveth the glory of God to a creature: which is undoubted idolatry. And that the folly thereof may the better appear, one of them writeth thus: "Quod si Sacerdos," &c. If the priest having before him sundry cakes at the time of consecration, do mind only and precisely to consecrate that only cake that he holdeth in his hand, some say, the rest be not consecrate: but say thou, as Duns saith, they be all consecrate: yea, further he saith, If the priest do precisely determine to consecrate only the one half part of the cake, and not likewise the other half, that then, the cake being whole, that one part only is consecrate, and not the other. Pope Gregory saith, If the priest be a known adulterer, or fornicator, and continue still in the same, that his blessing shall be turned into cursing: and that the people knowing his life, and nevertheless hearing his mass, commit idolatry.

In this case standeth the simple people: so many ways and so easily they may be deceived. For notwithstanding they may, in some part, know the priest's life and open dealing, yet how can they be assured of his secret words, of his intention, of his mind, and of his will? or, if they cannot, how can they safely adore the sacrament, without doubt and danger of idolatry? *Jewel.*—[Ed.]

of nice and exact men, they were soon sensible of all the consequences that must needs follow upon it, and have pursued all these with a closeness far beyond any thing that is to be found among the writers of our side.

But that they might have a salvo for every difficulty, they framed a new model of philosophy; new theories were invented, of substances and accidents, of matter and of spirits, of extension, ubication, and impenetrability; and by the new definitions and maxims to which they accustomed men in the study of philosophy, they prepared them to swallow down all this more easily, when they should come to the study of divinity.

The infallibility of the church that had expressly defined it, was to bear a great part of the burden; if the church was infallible, and if they were that church, then it could be no longer doubted of. In dark ages miracles and visions came in abundantly to support it: in ages of more light, the infinite power of God, the words of the institution, it being the testament of our Saviour then dying, and soon after confirmed with his blood, were things of great pomp, and such as were apt to strike men that could not distinguish between the shows and the strength of arguments. But when all our senses, all our ideas of things, rise up so strongly against every part of this chain of wonders, we ought at least to expect proofs suitable to the difficulty of believing such a flat contradiction to our reasons, as well as to our senses.

We have no other notion of accidents, but that they are the different shapes or modes of matter; and that they have no being distinct from the body in which they appear: we have no other notion of a body but that it is an extended substance, made up of impenetrable parts, one without another; every one of which fills its proper space: we have no other notion of a body's being in a place but that it fills it, and is so in it as that it can be nowhere else at the same time: and though we can very easily apprehend that an infinite power can both create and annihilate beings at pleasure; yet we cannot apprehend that God does change the essences of things, and so make them to be contrary to that nature and sort of being of which he has made them.

Another argument against transubstantiation is this; God has made us capable to know and serve him: and, in order to that, he has put some senses in us, which are the conveyances of many subtle motions to our brains, that give us apprehensions of the objects which by those motions are represented to us.

When those motions are lively, and the object is in a due distance; when we feel that neither our organs nor our faculties are under any disorder, and when the impression is clear and strong, we are determined by it; we cannot help being

A R T.  
XXVIII.

so. When we see the sun risen, and all is bright about us, it is not possible for us to think that it is dark night; no authority can impose it on us; we are not so far the masters of our own thoughts, as to force ourselves to think it, though we would; for God has made us of such a nature, that we are determined by such an evidence, and cannot contradict it. When an object is at too great a distance, we may mistake; a weakness or an ill disposition in our sight may misrepresent it; and a false medium, water, a cloud, or a glass, may give it a tincture or cast, so that we may see cause to correct our first apprehensions, in some sensations: but when we have duly examined every thing, when we have corrected one sense by another, we grow at last to be so sure, by the constitution of that nature that God has given us, that we cannot doubt, much less believe, in contradiction to the express evidence of our senses.

It is by this evidence only that God convinces the world of the authority of those whom he sends to speak in his name; he gives them a power to work miracles, which is an appeal to the senses of mankind; and it is the highest appeal that can be made; for those who stood out against the conviction of Christ's miracles, had no cloak for their sins. It is the utmost conviction that God offers, or that man can pretend to: from all which we must infer this, that either our senses in their clearest apprehensions, or rather representations of things, must be infallible, or we must throw up all faith and certainty; since it is not possible for us to receive the evidence that is given us of any thing but by our senses; and since we do naturally acquiesce in that evidence, we must acknowledge that God has so made us, that this is his voice in us; because it is the voice of those faculties that he has put in us; and is the only way by which we can find out truth, and be led by it: and if our faculties fail us in any one thing, so that God should reveal to us any thing, that did plainly contradict our faculties, he should thereby give us a right to disbelieve them for ever.

If they can mistake when they bring any object to us with the fullest evidence that they can give, we can never depend upon them, nor be certain of any thing, because they shew it. Nay, we are not and cannot be bound to believe that, nor any other revelation that God may make to convince us. We can only receive a revelation by hearing or reading, by our ears or our eyes. So if any part of this revelation destroys the certainty of the evidence, that our senses, our eyes, or our ears, give us, it destroys itself: for we cannot be bound to believe it upon the evidence of our senses, if this is a part of it, that our senses are not to be trusted. Nor will this matter be healed, by saying, that certainly we must believe God more than our senses: and therefore, if he has revealed any thing to us, that is contrary to their evidence, we must as to

A R T.  
XXVIII.

that particular believe God before our senses; but that as to all other things where we have not an express revelation to the contrary, we must still believe our senses.

There is a difference to be made between that feeble evidence that our senses give us of remote objects, or those loose inferences that we may make from a slight view of things, and the full evidence that sense gives us; as when we see and smell to, we handle and taste the same object: this is the voice of God to us; he has made us so that we are determined by it: and as we should not believe a prophet that wrought ever so many miracles, if he should contradict any part of that which God had already revealed; so we cannot be bound to believe a revelation contrary to our sense; because that were to believe God in contradiction to himself; which is impossible to be true. For we should believe that revelation certainly upon an evidence, which itself tells us is not certain; and this is a contradiction. We believe our senses upon this foundation, because we reckon there is an intrinsic certainty in their evidence; we do not believe them as we believe another man, upon a moral presumption of his truth and sincerity; but we believe them, because such is the nature of the union of our souls and bodies, which is the work of God, that upon the full impressions that are made upon the senses, the soul does necessarily produce, or rather feel those thoughts and sensations arise with a full evidence, that correspond to the motions of sensible objects, upon the organs of sense. The soul has a sagacity to examine these sensations, to correct one sense by another; but when she has used all the means she can, and the evidence is still clear, she is persuaded, and cannot help being so; she naturally takes all this to be true, because of the necessary connection that she feels between such sensations, and her assent to them. Now, if she should find that she could be mistaken in this, even though she should know this, by a divine revelation, all the intrinsic certainty of the evidence of sense, and that connection between those sensations and her assent to them, should be hereby dissolved.

To all this another objection may be made from the mysteries of the Christian religion: which contradict our reason, and yet we are bound to believe them; although reason is a faculty much superior to sense. But all this is a mistake; we cannot be bound to believe any thing that contradicts our reason; for the evidence of reason as well as that of sense is the voice of God to us. But as great difference is to be made between a feeble evidence that sense gives us of an object that is at a distance from us, or that appears to us through a false medium; such as a concave or a convex glass; and the full evidence of an object that is before us, and that is clearly apprehended by us: so there is a great difference to be made between our reasonings upon difficulties that we can neither

understand nor resolve, and our reasonings upon clear principles. The one may be false, and the other must be true: we are sure that a thing cannot be one and three in the same respect; our reason assures us of this, and we do and must believe it; but we know that in different respects the same thing may be one and three. And since we cannot know all the possibilities of those different respects, we must believe upon the authority of God revealing it, that the same thing is both *one* and *three*; though if a revelation should affirm that the same thing were *one* and *three* in the same respect, we should not, and indeed could not, believe it.

This argument deserves to be fully opened; for we are sure either it is true, or we cannot be sure that any thing else whatsoever is true. In confirmation of this we ought also to consider the nature and ends of miracles. They put nature out of its channel, and reverse its fixed laws and motions; and the end of God's giving men a power to work them, is, that by them the world may be convinced, that such persons are commissioned by him, to deliver his pleasure to them in some particulars. And as it could not become the infinite wisdom of the great Creator, to change the order of nature (which is his own workmanship) upon slight grounds; so we cannot suppose that he should work a chain of extraordinary miracles to no purpose. It is not to give credit to a revelation that he is making; for the senses do not perceive it; on the contrary, they do reject and contradict it: and the revelation, instead of getting credit from it, is loaded by it, as introducing that which destroys all credit and certainty.

In other miracles our senses are appealed to; but here they must be appealed from; nor is there any spiritual end served in working this miracle: for it is acknowledged, that the effects of this sacrament are given upon our due coming to it, independent upon the corporal presence: so that the grace of the sacrament does not always accompany it, since unworthy receivers, though, according to the Romish doctrine, they receive the true body of Christ, yet they do not receive grace with it: and the grace that is given in it to the worthy receivers, stays with them after that, by the destruction of the species of the bread and wine, the body of Christ is withdrawn. So that it is acknowledged, that the spiritual effect of the sacrament does not depend upon the corporal presence.

Here then it is supposed, that God is every day working a great many miracles, in a vast number of different places; and that of so extraordinary a nature, that it must be confessed, they are far beyond all the other wonders, even of omnipotence; and yet all this is to no end, that we can apprehend; neither to any sensible and visible end, nor to any internal and spiritual one. This must needs seem an amazing thing, that God should work such a miracle on our

behalf, and yet should not acquaint us with any end for which he should work it.

To conclude this whole argument, we have one great advantage in this matter, that our doctrine concerning the sacrament, of a mystical presence of Christ in the symbols, and of the effects of it on the worthy and unworthy receivers, is all acknowledged by the church of Rome; but they have added to this the wonder of the corporal presence: so that we need bring no proofs to them at least, for that which we teach concerning it; since it is all confessed by them. But as to that which they have added, it is not necessary for us to give proofs against it; it is enough for us, if we shew that all the proofs that they bring for it are weak and unconvincing. They must be very demonstrative, if it is expected, that, upon the authority and evidence of them, we should be bound to believe a thing which they themselves confess to be contrary both to our sense and reason. We cannot by the laws of reasoning be bound to give arguments against it; it is enough if we can shew that neither the words of the institution, nor the discourse in the sixth of St. John, do necessarily infer it; and if we shew that those passages can well bear another sense, which is agreeable both to the words themselves, and to the style of the scriptures, and more particularly to the phraseology to which the Jews were accustomed, upon the occasion on which this was instituted; and if the words can well bear the sense that we give them, then the other advantages that are in it, of its being simple and natural, of its being suitable to the design of a sacrament, and of its having no hard consequences of any sort depending upon it; then, I say, by all the rules of expounding scripture, we do justly infer, that our sense of those words ought to be preferred.

This is according to a rule that St. Augustin gives to judge what expressions in scripture are figurative, and what not; 'If any place seems to command a crime or horrid action, it is figurative: and for an instance of this he cites those words, "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, you have no life in you:" which seems to command a crime and a horrid action; and therefore it is a figure commanding us to communicate in the passion of our Lord, and to lay up in our memory with delight and profit, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us.' As this was given for a rule by the great doctor of the Latin church, so the same maxim had been delivered almost two ages before him, by the great doctor of the Greek church, Origen, who says, 'that the understanding our Saviour's words of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, according to the letter, is a letter that kills.' These passages I cite by an anticipation, before I enter upon the inquiry into the sense of the ancient church, concerning this matter; because they belong to the

Lib. iii. de  
Doct.  
Chris. c. 16.

Hom. 7. in  
Levit.

A R T.  
XXVIII.

words of the institution, at least to the discourse in *St. John*: now if the sense that we give to these words is made good, we need be at no more pains to prove that they are capable of no other sense; since this must prove that to be the only true sense of them.

So that for all the arguments that have been brought by us against this doctrine, arising out of the fruitfulness of the matter, we were not bound to use them: for, our doctrine being confessed by them, it wants no proof; and we cannot be bound to prove a negative. Therefore though the copiousness of this matter has afforded us many arguments for the negative, yet that was not necessary: for as a negative always proves itself; so that holds more especially here, where that which is denied is accompanied with so many and so strange absurdities, as do follow from this doctrine.

The last topic in this matter is the sense that the ancient church had of it: for, as we certainly have both the scriptures and the evidence of our senses and reason of our side, so that will be much fortified, if it appears that no such doctrine was received in the first and best ages; and that it came in not all at once, but by degrees. I shall first urge this matter by some general presumptions; and then I shall go to plain proofs. But though the presumptions shall be put only as presumptions; yet if they appear to be violent, so that a man cannot hold giving his assent to the conclusion that follows from them, then though they are put in the form of presumptive arguments, yet that will not hinder them from being considered as concluding ones.

By the stating this doctrine it has appeared how many difficulties there are involved in it: these are difficulties that are obvious and soon seen: they are not found out by deep inquiry and much speculation: they are soon felt, and are very hardly avoided: and ever since the time that this doctrine has been received by the Roman church, these have been much insisted on; explanations have been offered to them all; and the whole principles of natural philosophy have been cast into a new mould, that they might ply to this doctrine: at least those, who have studied their philosophy in that system, have had such notions put in them, while their minds were yet tender and capable of any impressions, that they have been thereby prepared to this doctrine before they came to it, by a train of philosophical terms and distinctions, so that they were not much alarmed at it, when it came to be set before them.

They are accustomed to think that ubication, or the being in a place, is but an accident to a substance: so that the same body's being in more places, is only its having a few more of those accidents produced in it by God: they are accustomed to think that accidents are beings different from matter: like a sort of clothing to it, which do indeed require

A R T.  
XXVIII.

the having of a substance for their subject: but yet since they are believed to have a being of their own, God may make them subsist: as the skin of a man may stand out in its proper shape and colour, though there were nothing but air or vacuity within it.

They are accustomed to think, that as an accident may be without its proper substance, so substance may be without its proper accidents; and they do reckon extension and impenetrability, that is, a body's so filling a space, that no other body can be in the same space with it, among its accidents: so that a body composed of organs and of large dimensions, may be not only all crowded within one wafer, but an entire distinct body may be in every separable part of this wafer; at least in every piece that carries in it the appearance of bread.

These, besides many other lesser subtilties, are the evident results of this doctrine: and it was a natural effect of its being received, that their philosophy should be so transformed as to agree to it, and to prepare men for it.

Now to apply this to the matter we are upon, we find none of these subtilties among the ancients. They seem to apprehend none of those difficulties, nor do they take any pains to solve or clear them. They had a philosophical genius, and shewed it in all other things: they disputed very nicely concerning the attributes of God, concerning his essence, and the Persons of the Trinity: they saw the difficulties concerning the incarnation of the Eternal Word, and Christ's being both God and man: they treat of original sin, of the power of grace, and of the decrees of God.

They explained the resurrection of our bodies, and the different states of the blessed and the damned.

They saw the difficulties in all these heads, and were very copious in their explanations of them: and they may be rather thought by some too full, than too sparing, in the canvassing of difficulties; but all those were mere speculative matters, in which the difficulty was not so soon seen as on this subject: yet they found these out, and pursued them with that subtilty that shewed they were not at all displeased, when occasions were offered them to shew their skill in answering difficulties: which, to name no more, appears very evidently to be *St. Augustin's* character. Yet neither he nor any of the other fathers seem to have been sensible of the difficulties in this matter.

They neither state them nor answer them; nor do they use those reserves when they speak of philosophical matters, that men must have used who were possessed of this doctrine: for a man cannot hold it without bringing himself to think and speak otherwise upon all natural things than the rest of mankind do.

They are so far from this, that, on the contrary, they deliver

A R T. XXVIII. themselves in a way that shews they had no such apprehensions of things.

They thought that all creatures were limited to one place: and from thence they argued against the heathens, who believed that their deities were in every one of those statues which they consecrated to them.

From this head they proved the divinity of the Holy Ghost; because he wrought in many different places at once: which he could not do if he were only a creature.

They affirm, that Christ can be no more on earth, since he is now in heaven, and that he can be but in one place.

They say, that which hath no bounds nor figure, and that can neither be touched nor seen, cannot be a body: that bodies are extended in some place, and cannot exist after the manner of spirits.

They argue against the eternity of matter, from this, that nothing could be produced, that had a being before it was produced; and on all occasions they appeal to the testimony of our senses as infallible.

They say, that to believe otherwise tended to reverse the whole state of life, and order of nature, and to reproach the providence of God; since it must be said, that he has given the knowledge of all his works to liars and deceivers, if our senses may be false: that we must doubt of our faith, if the testimony of hearing, seeing, and feeling, could deceive us.

And in their contests with the Marcionites and others, concerning the truth of Christ's body, they appeal always to the testimony of the senses as infallible; and even treating of the sacrament, they say, without limitation or exception, that it was bread, as their eyes witnessed, and true wine that Christ did consecrate to be the memorial of his body and blood; and they tell us in this very particular, that we ought not to doubt of the testimony of our senses.

Another presumptive proof, that the ancients knew nothing of this doctrine, is, that the heathens and the Jews, who charged them, and their doctrine, with every thing that they could invent to make both it and them odious and ridiculous, could never have passed over this, in which both sense and reason seemed to be so evidently on their side.

They reproach the Christians for believing a God that was born, a God of flesh that was crucified and buried: they laughed at their belief of a judgment to come, of endless flames, of a heavenly paradise, and of the resurrection of the body. Those who writ the first apologies for the Christian religion, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Arnobius, and Minutius Felix, have given us a large account of the blasphemies both of Jews and Gentiles, against the doctrines of Christianity.

Cyril of Alexandria has given us Julian's objections in his

own words; who having been not only initiated into the Christian religion, but having read the scriptures in the churches, and being a philosophical and inquisitive man, must have been well instructed concerning the doctrine and the sacraments of this religion: and his relation to the emperor Constantine must have made the Christians concerned to take more than ordinary pains on him. When he made apostacy from the faith, he reproached the Christians with the doctrine of baptism, and laughed at them for thinking that there was an ablution and sanctification in it, conceiving it a thing impossible that water should wash or cleanse a soul: yet neither he nor Porphyry, nor Celsus before them, did charge this religion with the absurdities of transubstantiation.

It is reasonable to believe, that if the Christians of that time had any such doctrine among them, it must have been known. Every Christian must have known in what sense those words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' were understood among them. All the apostates from Christianity must have known it, and must have published it, to excuse or hide the shame of their apostacy; since apostates are apt to spread lies of them whom they forsake, but not to conceal such truths as are to their prejudice. Julian must have known it; and if he had known it, his judgment was too true, and his malice to the Christian religion too quick, to overlook or neglect the advantages which this part of their doctrine gave him. Nor can this be carried off by saying, that the *eating of human flesh* and the *Thyestean suppers*, which were objected to the Christians, relate to this: when the fathers answer that, they tell the heathens that it was a downright calumny and lie: and do not offer any explanations or distinctions taken from their doctrine of the sacrament, to clear them from the mistake and malice of this calumny. The truth is, the execrable practices of the Gnostics, who were called Christians, gave the rise to those as well as to many other calumnies: but they were not at all founded on the doctrine of the eucharist, which is never once mentioned as the occasion of this accusation.

Another presumption, from which we conclude that the ancients knew nothing of this doctrine, is, that we find heresies and disputes arising concerning all the other points of religion: there were very few of the doctrines of the Christian religion, and not any of the mysteries of the faith, that did not fall under great objections: but there was not any one heresy raised upon this head: men were never so meek and tame as easily to believe things, when there appeared strong evidence, or at least great presumptions, against them. In these last eight or nine centuries, since this doctrine was received, there has been a perpetual opposition made to it, even in dark and unlearned ages; in which implicit faith and blind obedience have carried a great sway. And though the secular arm has

been employed with great and unrelenting severities to extirpate all that have opposed it; yet all the while many have stood out against it, and have suffered much and long for their rejecting it. Now it is not to be imagined that such an opposition should have been made to this doctrine, during the nine hundred years last past, and that for the former eight hundred years there should have been no disputes at all concerning it: and that while all other things were so much questioned, that several fathers writ, and councils were called, to settle the belief of them, yet that for about eight hundred years, this was the single point that went down so easily, that no treatise was all that while writ to prove it, nor council held to establish it.

Certainly the reason of this will appear to be much rather, that since there have been contests upon this point these last nine ages, and that there were none the first eight, this doctrine was not known during those first ages; and that the great silence about it for so long a time, is a very strong presumption, that in all that time this doctrine was not thought of.

The last of those considerations that I shall offer, which are of the nature of presumptive proofs, is, that there are a great many rites and other practices, that have arisen out of this doctrine as its natural consequences, which were not thought of for a great many ages; but that have gone on by a perpetual progress, and have increased very fruitfully, ever since this doctrine was received. Such are the elevation, adoration, and processions, together with the doctrine of concomitance, and a vast number of rites and rubrics; the first occasions and beginnings of which are well known. These did all arise from this doctrine, it being natural, especially in the ages of ignorance and superstition, for men upon the supposition of Christ's being corporally present, to run out into all possible inventions of pomp and magnificence about this sacrament; and it is very reasonable to think, since these things are of so late and so certain a date, that the doctrine upon which they are founded is not much ancients.

The great simplicity of the primitive forms, not only as they are reported by Justin Martyr and Tertullian in the ages of the poverty and persecutions of the church, but as they are represented to us in the fourth and fifth centuries by Cyril of Jerusalem, the Constitutions, and the pretended Areopagite, have nothing of that air that appears in the latter ages. The sacrament was then given in both kinds; it was put in the hands of the faithful; they reserved some portions of it: it was given to children for many ages: the laity and even boys were employed to carry it to dying penitents; what remained of it was burnt in some places, and consumed by the clergy, and by children in other places, the making cataplasms of it, the mixing the wine with ink, to sign the

condemnation of heretics, are very clear presumptions that this doctrine was not then known.

But above all, their not adoring the sacrament, which is not done to this day in the Greek church, and of which there is no mention made by all those who writ of the offices of the church in the eighth and ninth centuries so copiously; this, I say, of their not adoring it, is perhaps more than a presumption, that this doctrine was not then thought on. But since it was established, all the old forms and rituals have been altered, and the adoring the sacrament is now become the main act of devotion and of religious worship, among them. One ancient form is indeed still continued, which is of the strongest kind of presumptions that this doctrine came in much later than some other superstitions which we condemn in that church. In the masses that are appointed on saints-days, there are some collects in which it is said, that the sacrifice is offered up in *honour to the saint*; and it is prayed, that it may become the *more valuable and acceptable, by the merits and intercessions of the saint*. Now when a practice will well agree with one opinion, but not at all with another, we have all possible reason to presume at least, that at first it came in under that opinion, with which it will agree, and not under another which cannot consist with it. Our opinion is, that the sacrament is a federal act of our Christianity, in which we offer up our highest devotions to God through Christ, and receive the largest returns from him: it is indeed a superstitious conceit to celebrate this to the honour of a saint; but howsoever upon the supposition of saints hearing our prayers, and interceding for us, there is still good sense in this: but if it is believed that Christ is corporally present, and that he is offered up in it, it is against all sense, and it approaches to blasphemy, to do this to the honour of a saint, and much more to desire that this, which is of infinite value, and is the foundation of all God's blessings to us, should receive any addition or increase in its value or acceptance from the *merits or intercession* of saints. So this, though a late practice, yet does fully evince, that the doctrine of the corporal presence was not yet thought on, when it was first brought into the office.

So far I have gone upon the presumptions that may be offered to prove that this doctrine was not known to the ancients. They are not only just and lawful presumptions, but they are so strong and violent, that when they are well considered, they force an assent to that which we infer from them. I go next to the more plain and direct proofs that we find of the opinion of the ancients in this matter.

They call the elements bread and wine after the consecration. Justin Martyr calls them *bread and wine, and a nourishment which nourished*: he indeed says it is not common *bread and wine*; which shews that he thought it was still so

A R. T.  
XXVIII.

in substance; and he illustrates the sanctification of the elements by the incarnation of Christ, in which the human nature did not lose or change its substance by its union with the divine: so the bread and the wine do not, according to that explanation, lose their proper *substance*, when they become the flesh and blood of Christ.

Lib. iv. de  
Hær. c. 34.

Irenæus calls it that *bread over which thanks are given*, and says, *it is no more common bread, but the eucharist consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly.*

Tertullian arguing against the Marcionites, who held two gods, and that the Creator of this earth was the bad god; but that Christ was contrary to him; urges against them this, that Christ made use of the creatures: and says, *he did not reject bread by which he represents his own body*: and in another place he says, *Christ calls bread his body*, that from thence you may understand *that he gave the figure of his body to the bread.*

Lib. i. adv.  
Marcion.  
sect. 9.  
Lib. iii.  
adv. Marcion.  
sect. 12.

Origen says, *We eat of the loaves that are set before us; which by prayer are become a certain holy body, that sanctifies those who use them with a sound purpose.*

Ep. 69.

St. Cyprian says, *Christ calls the bread that was compounded of many grains, his body; and the wine that is pressed out of many grapes, his blood, to shew the union of his people.* And

Ep. 63.

in another place, writing against those who used only water, but no wine, in the eucharist, he says, *We cannot see the blood by which we are redeemed, when wine is not in the chalice; by which the blood of Christ is shewed.*

In Ancho-  
reto.

Epiphanius being to prove that man may be said to be made after the image of God, though he is not like him, urges this, *That the bread is not like Christ, neither in his invisible Deity, nor in his incarnate likeness, for it is round and without feeling as to its virtue.*

In orat. de  
Baptis.  
Christi.

Gregory Nyssen says, *The bread in the beginning is common; but after the mystery has consecrated it, it is said to be, and is, the body of Christ*: to this he compares the sanctification of the mystical oil, of the water in baptism, and the stones of an altar, or church, dedicated to God.

De Benedi-  
dict.  
Patriarch.  
c. 9.

St. Ambrose calls it still bread: and says, *this bread is made the food of the saints.*

Hom. 24.  
in Ep. ad  
Cor.

St. Chrysostom on these words, *the bread that we break*, says, *What is the bread? The body of Christ: What are they made to be who take it? The body of Christ.* Which shews that he considered the bread as being so the body of Christ, as the worthy receivers became his body; which is done, not by a change of substance, but by a sanctification of their natures.

Comm. in  
Matt. c. 26.

St. Jerome says, *Christ took bread, that as Melchisedec had in the figure offered bread and wine, he might also represent the truth (that is in opposition to the figure) of his body and blood.*

St. Augustin does very largely compare the sacraments

being called the body and blood of Christ, with those other places in which the church is called his body, and all Christians are his members: which shews that he thought the one was to be understood mystically as well as the other. He calls the eucharist frequently our daily bread, and the sacrament of bread and wine. All these call the eucharist *bread and wine* in express words: but when they call it *Christ's body and blood*, they call it so *after a sort*, or that *it is said to be*, or with some other mollifying expression.

A R. T.  
XXVIIICit. apud  
Fulgent.  
de Bap-  
tismo.

St. Augustin says this plainly, *After some sort the sacrament of the body of Christ is his body, and the sacrament of his blood is the blood of Christ; he carried himself in his own hands in some sort, when he said, This is my body.*

Aug. Ep.  
23. ad Bo-  
nifac.Serm. 11.  
in Psal. 33.Chrys. Ep.  
ad Casar.  
et in  
Comm.in Ep. ad  
Gal. c. 5.

St. Chrysostom says, *The bread is thought worthy to be called the body of our Lord*: and in another place, reckoning up the improper senses of the word *flesh*, he says, the scriptures used to call the *mysterics* (that is, the sacrament) *by the name of flesh, and sometimes the whole church is said to be the body of Christ.*

So Tertullian says, *Christ calls the bread his body, and names the bread by his body.*

Tertul. lib.  
iv. adv.  
Marc. sect.

60.

The fathers do not only call the consecrated elements bread and wine; they do also affirm, that they retain their proper nature and substance, and are the same thing as to their nature that they were before. And the occasion upon which the passages, that I go next to mention, are used by them, does prove this matter beyond contradiction.

Apollinaris did broach that heresy which was afterwards put in full form by Eutyches; and that had so great a party to support it, that as they had one general council (a pretended one at least) to favour them, so they were condemned by another. Their error was, that the human nature of Christ was swallowed up by the divine, if not while he was here on earth, yet at least after his ascension to heaven. This error was confuted by several writers who lived very wide one from another, and at a distance of above a hundred years one from another. St. Chrysostom at Constantinople, Theodoret in Asia, Ephrem patriarch of Antioch, and Gelasius bishop of Rome. All those write to prove that the human nature did still remain in Christ, not changed, nor swallowed up, but only sanctified by the divine nature that was united to it. They do all fall into one argument, which very probably those who came after St. Chrysostom took from him: so that though both Theodoret and Gelasius's words are much fuller, yet because the argument is the same with that which St. Chrysostom had urged against Apollinaris, I shall first set down his words. He brings an illustration from the doctrine of the sacrament, to shew that the human nature was not destroyed by its union with the divine; and has upon that these

Epist. ad  
Casarium.

ART.  
XXVIII.

words, *As before the bread is sanctified, we call it bread; but when the divine grace has sanctified it by the means of the priest, it is freed from the name of bread, and is thought worthy of the name of the Lord's body, though the nature of bread remain in it: and yet it is not said there are two bodies, but one body of the Son: so the divine nature being joined to the body, both these make one Son and one Person.*

In Phot.  
Bibl. Cod.  
229.

Ephrem of Antioch says, *The body of Christ received by the faithful does not depart from its sensible substance: so baptism, says he, does not lose its own sensible substance, and does not lose that which it was before.*

Dial. 1.  
et 2. cont.  
Eutych.

Theodoret says, *Christ does honour the symbols with the name of his body and blood; not changing the nature, but adding grace to nature.* In another place pursuing the same argument, he says, *The mystical symbols after the sanctification do not depart from their own nature: for they continue in their former substance, figure, and form, and are visible and palpable as they were before; but they are understood to be that which they are made.*

Lib. de  
duabus  
nat. Christ.

Pope Gelasius says, *The sacraments of the body and blood of Christ are a divine thing; for which reason we become by them partakers of the divine nature: and yet the substance of bread and wine does not cease to exist: and the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in holy mysteries.* Upon all these places being compared with the design with which they were written, which was to prove that Christ's human nature did still subsist, unchanged, and not swallowed up by its union with the divinity, some reflections are very obvious: first, if the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament had been then received in the church, the natural and unavoidable argument in this matter, which must put an end to it, with all that believed such corporal presence, was this: Christ has certainly a natural body still, because the bread and the wine are turned to it; and they cannot be turned to that which is not. In their writings they argued against the possibility of a substantial change of a human nature into the divine; but that could not have been urged by men who believed a substantial mutation to be made in the sacrament; for then the Eutychians might have retorted the argument with great advantage upon them.

The Eutychians did make use of some expressions, that were used by some in the church, which seemed to import that they did argue from the sacrament, as Theodoret represents their objections. But to that he answers as we have seen, denying that any such substantial change was made. The design of those fathers was to prove, that things might be united together, and continue so united, without a change of their substances, and that this was true in the two natures in the person of Christ: and to make this more sensible, they

ART.  
XXVIII.

bring in the matter of the sacrament, as a thing known and confessed: for in their arguing upon it they do suppose it as a thing out of dispute.

Now, according to the Roman doctrine, this had been a very odd sort of an argument, to prove that Christ's human nature was not swallowed up of the divine; because the mysteries or elements in the sacrament are changed into the *substance of Christ's body, only they retain the outward appearances of bread and wine.*

To this an Eutychian might readily have answered, that then the human nature might be believed to be destroyed: and though Christ had appeared in that likeness, he retained only the accidents of human nature; but that the human nature itself was destroyed, as the *bread* and the *wine* were destroyed in the eucharist.

This had been a very absurd way of arguing in the fathers, and had indeed delivered up the cause to the Eutychians: whereas those fathers make it an argument against them, to prove, that notwithstanding an union of two beings, and such an union as did communicate a sanctification from the one to the other, yet the two *natures* might remain still distinguished; and that it was so in the *eucharist*; therefore it might be so in the person of Christ. This seems to be so evident an indication of the doctrine of the whole church in the fourth and fifth centuries, when so many of the most eminent writers of those ages do urge it so home as an argument in so great a point, that we can scarce think it possible for any man to consider it fully without being determined by it. And so far we have considered the authorities from the fathers, to shew that they believed that the substance of bread and wine did still remain in the sacrament.

Another head of proof is, that they affirm, that our bodies are nourished by the sacrament; which shews very plainly, that they had no notion of a change of substance made in it.

Justin Martyr calls the eucharist, *That food by which our flesh and blood, through its transmutation into them, are nourished.* Apol. 1.

Irenæus makes this an argument for the resurrection of our bodies, that they are fed by the body and blood of Christ: *When the cup and the bread receives the word of God, it becomes the eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, by which the substance of our flesh is increased and subsists: and he adds, that the flesh is nourished by the body and blood of Christ, and is made his member.* Lib. v. adv. Hæres. c. 4.

Tertullian says, *The flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ.* De Resurrect. Carn. sect. 6.

Origen explains this very largely on those words of Christ, *It is not that which enters within a man, that defiles the man: he says, if every thing that goes into the belly is cast into the draught, then that food which is sanctified by the word of God,* In Matt. c. 15.

A R T. XXVIII. *and by prayer, goes also into the belly, as to that which is material in it, and goes from thence into the draught. And a little after he adds, It is not the matter of the bread, but the word that is pronounced over it, which profits him that eats it, in such a way as is not unworthy of the Lord.*

16th Con. Tol. can. 6. The bishops of Spain, in a council that sat at Toledo in the seventh century, condemned those that began to consecrate round wafers, and did not offer one entire loaf in the eucharist, and appointed, for so much of the bread as remained after the communion, that either it should be put in some bag, or if it was needful to eat it up, that *it might not oppress the belly of him that took it with an overcharging burden, and that it might not go into the digestion*; they fancying that a lesser quantity made no digestion, and produced no excrement.

In the ninth century both Rabanus Maurus and Heribald believed, that the sacrament was so digested, that some part of it turned to excrement, which was also held by divers writers of the Greek church, whom their adversaries called, by way of reproach, *stercoranists*. Others indeed of the ancients did think that no part of the sacrament became excrement, but that it was spread through the whole substance of the communicant, for the good of body and soul. Both Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Chrysostom, and John Damascene, fell into this conceit; but still they thought that it was changed into the substance of our bodies, and so nourished them without any excrement coming from any part of it.

Cyrl. Ca- tech. Myst. 5. Chry- ost. Sermo de Pœni- tent. et Eu- charist. Da- mas. lib. iv. de Ortho- fide, c. 13. Lib. iv. adv. Marcion. sect. 60. The fathers do call the consecrated elements the *figures*, the *signs*, the *symbols*, the *types*, and *antitypes*, the *commemoration*, the *representation*, the *mysteries*, and the *sacraments*, of the body and blood; which does evidently demonstrate, that they could not think that they were the very substance of his body and blood. Tertullian, when he is proving that Christ had a true body, and was not a phantasm, argues thus, *He made bread to be his body, saying, This is my body; that is, the figure of my body*: from which he argues, that since his body had that for its *figure*, it was a true body; for an empty thing, such as a phantasm is, cannot have a *figure*. It is from hence clear, that it was not then believed that Christ's body was literally in the sacrament; for otherwise the argument would have been much clearer and shorter; Christ has a *true body*, because we believe that the sacrament is truly his *body*; than to go and prove it so far about, as to say a phantasm has no figure: but the sacrament is the figure of Christ's body, therefore it is no phantasm.

Ennarat. in Psal. iii. St. Austin says, *He commended and gave to his disciples the figure of his body and blood*. And when the Manicheans objected to him, that *blood* is called in the Old Testament the *life* or *soul*, contrary to what is said in the New; he answers, that *blood* was not the *soul* or *life*, but only the sign of it;

and that the sign sometimes bears the name of that of which it is the sign: so says he, *Christ did not doubt to say, This is my body, when he was giving the sign of his body*. Now that had been a very bad argument, if the bread was truly the body of Christ; it had proved that the sign must be one with the thing signified.

The whole ancient liturgies, and all the Greek fathers, do so frequently use the words *type*, *antitype*, *sign*, and *mystery*, that this is not so much as denied; it is their constant style. Now it is apparent that a thing cannot be the *type* and *symbol* of itself. And though they had more frequent occasions to speak of the eucharist, than either of baptism or the chrism; yet as they called the *water* and the *oil*, *types* and *mysteries*, so they bestowed the same descriptions on the elements in the eucharist; and as they have many strong expressions concerning the *water* and the *oil*, that cannot be literally understood: so upon the same grounds it will appear reasonable, to give the same exposition to some high expressions that they fell into concerning this sacrament. Facundus has some very full discourses to this purpose: he is proving that Christ may be called the *adopted Son of God*, as well as he is truly his *Son*; and that because he was baptized. *The sacrament of adoption, that is baptism, may be called baptism; as the sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the consecrated bread and cup, is called his body and blood: not that the bread is properly his body, or the cup properly his blood; but because they contain in them the mystery of his body and blood*. St. Austin says, *That sacraments must have some resemblance of those things of which they are the sacraments: so the sacrament of the body of Christ is after some manner his body; and the sacrament of his blood is after some manner his blood*. And speaking of the eucharist as a sacrifice of praise, he says, *The flesh and blood of this sacrifice was promised before the coming of Christ, by the sacrifices that were the types of it. In the passion the sacrifice was truly offered; and after his ascension it is celebrated by the sacrament of the remembrance of it*. And when he speaks of the murmuring of the Jews, upon our Saviour's speaking of giving his flesh to them, to eat it; he adds, *They foolishly and carnally thought, that he was to cut off some parcels of his body, to be given to them: but he shews that there was a sacrament hid there*. And he thus paraphrases that passage. *The words that I have spoken to you, they are spirit and life: understand spiritually that which I have said; for it is not this body which you see, that you are to eat, or to drink this blood which they shall shed, who crucify me. But I have recommended a sacrament to you, which being spiritually understood, shall quicken you: and though it be necessary that it be celebrated visibly, yet it must be understood invisibly*.

Primasius compares the sacrament to a pledge, which a dying man leaves to any one whom he loved. But that which

**A R 1.** is more important than the quotation of any of the words of **XXVIII.** the fathers is, that the author of the books of the sacrament, which pass under the name of St. Ambrose, though it is generally agreed that those books were writ some ages after his death, gives us the prayer of consecration, as it was used in his time: he calls it the *heavenly words*, and sets it down. The offices of the church are a clearer evidence of the doctrine of that church than all the discourses that can be made by any doctor in it; the one is the language of the whole body, whereas the other are only the private reasonings of particular men: and, of all the parts of the office, the prayer of consecration is that which does most certainly set out to us the sense of that church that used it. But that which makes this remark the more important is, that the prayer, as set down by this pretended St. Ambrose, is very near the same with that which is now in the canon of the *mass*; only there is one very important variation, which will best appear by setting both down.

Ut supra.

That of St. Ambrose is, *Fac nobis hanc oblationem, ascriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui pridie quam pateretur, &c.* That in the canon of the mass is, *Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quæ sumus benedictam, ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris: ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*

We do plainly see so great a resemblance of the latter to the former of these two prayers, that we may well conclude, that the one was begun in the other; but at the same time we observe an essential difference. In the former this sacrifice is called the *figure of the body and blood of Christ*. Whereas in the latter it is prayed, that *it may become to us the body and blood of Christ*. As long as the former was the prayer of consecration, it is not possible for us to imagine, that the doctrine of the corporal presence could be received; for that which was believed to be the *true body and blood of Christ*, could not be called, especially in such a part of the office, *the figure of his body and blood*; and therefore the change that was made in this prayer was an evident proof of a change in the doctrine; and if we could tell in what age that was done, we might then upon greater certainty fix the time in which this change was made, or at least in which the inconsistency of that prayer with this doctrine was observed.

I have now set down a great variety of proofs reduced under different heads; from which it appears evidently that the fathers did not believe this doctrine, but that they did affirm the contrary very expressly. This sacrament continued to be so long considered as the figure or image of Christ's body, that the seventh general council, which met at Constantinople in the year 754, and consisted of above three hundred and thirty bishops, when it condemned the worship of images,

affirmed that this was the only *image* that we might lawfully have of Christ; and that he had appointed us to offer this *image of his body*, to wit, the *substance of the bread*. That was indeed contradicted with much confidence by the second council of Nice, in which, in opposition to what appears to this day in all the Greek liturgies, and the Greek fathers, they do positively deny that the sacrament was ever called the *image of Christ*: and they affirm it to be the *true body of Christ*. **A R T. XXVIII.**

In conclusion, I shall next shew how this doctrine crept into the church; for this seems plausible, that a doctrine of this nature could never have got into the church in any age, if those of the age that admitted it had not known that it had been the doctrine of the former age, and so upwards to the age of the apostles. It is not to be denied, but that very early both Justin Martyr and Irenæus thought, that there was such a sanctification of the elements, that there was a divine virtue in them: and in those very passages which we have urged from the arguings of the fathers against the Eutychians, though they do plainly prove that they believed that the *substance of bread and wine* did still remain; yet they do suppose an union of the elements to the body of Christ, like that of the human nature's being united to the divine. Here a foundation was laid for all the superstructure that was afterwards raised upon it. For though the liturgies and public offices continued long in the first simplicity, yet the fathers, who did very much study eloquence, chiefly the Greek fathers, carried this matter very far in their sermons and homilies. They did only apprehend the profanation of the sacrament, from the unworthiness of those who came to it; and being much set on the begetting a due reverence for so holy an action, and a seriousness in the performance of it, they urged all the *topics* that sublime figures or warm expressions could help them with: and with this exalted eloquence of theirs we must likewise observe the state that the world fell in in the fifth century; vast swarms out of the north overrun the Roman empire, and by a long continued succession of new invaders all was sacked and ruined. In the west, the Goths were followed by the Vandals, the Alans, the Gepides, the Franks, the Sweves, the Huns, and the Lombards, some of these nations; and in the conclusion the Saracens and Turks in the east made havoc of all that was polite or learned; by which we lost the chief writings of the first and best times; but instead of these, many spurious ones were afterwards produced, and they passed easily in dark and ignorant ages. All fell under much oppression and misery, and Europe was so overrun with barbarity and ignorance, that it cannot be easily apprehended, but by such as have been at the pains to go through one of the ungratefulest pieces of study that can be well imagined, and have read the productions of those ages.

**A R T. XXVIII.** The understanding the scriptures, or languages, or history, was not so much as thought on. Some affected homilies or descantings on the rituals of the church, full of many very odd speculations about them, are among the best of the writings of those times. They were easily imposed on by any new forgery; witness the reception and authority that was given to the Decretal Epistles of the popes of the first three centuries; which for many ages maintained its credit, though it was plainly a forgery of the eighth century, and was contrived with so little art, that there is not in them colour enough to excuse the ignorance of those that were deceived by it. As it is an easy thing to mislead ignorant multitudes, so there is somewhat in incredible opinions and stories, that is suited to such a state of mankind: and as men are apt to fancy that they see sprights, especially in the night, so the more of darkness and unconceivableness that there is in an opinion, it is the more properly calculated for such times. The ages that succeeded were not only times of ignorance, but they were also times of much corruption. The writers of the fourth and fifth centuries give us dismal representations of the corruptions of their times; and the scandalous unconstancy of the councils of those ages, is too evident a proof of what we find said by the good men of those days: but things fell lower and lower in the succeeding ages. It is an amazing thing, that in the very office of consecrating bishops, examinations are ordered concerning those crimes, the very mention of which give horror; *De Coitu cum Masculo et cum Quadrupedibus*.

The popes more particularly were such a succession of men, that, as their own historians have described them, nothing in any history can be produced that is like them. The characters they give them are so monstrous, that nothing under the authority of unquestioned writers, and the evidence of the facts themselves, could make them credible.\*

But that which makes the introduction of this doctrine appear the more probable is, that we plainly see the whole body of the clergy was every where so influenced by the management of the popes, that they generally entered into combinations to subject the temporality to the spirituality: and therefore every opinion that tended to render the persons of the clergy sacred, and to raise their character high, was sure to receive the best entertainment, and the greatest encouragement possible. Nothing could carry this so far as an opinion that represented the priest as having a character by which, with a few words, he could make a god. The opinion of *transubstantiation* was such an engine, that it being once set on foot, could not but meet with a favourable reception from those who were then seeking all possible

\* See note, page 253.

**A R T. XXVIII.** colours to give credit to their authority, and to advance it. The numbers of the clergy were then so great, and their contrivances were so well suited to the credulity and superstition of those times, that, by visions and wonderful stories confidently vouched, they could easily infuse any thing into weak and giddy multitudes. Besides, that the genius of those times led them much to the love of pomp and show; they had lost the true power and beauty of religion, and were willing, by outward appearances, to balance and compensate for their great defects.

But besides all those general considerations, which such as are acquainted with the history of those ages know do belong to them in a much higher degree than is here set forth; there are some specialties that relate to this doctrine in particular, which will make the introduction of it appear the more practicable. This had never been condemned in any former age: for as none condemn errors by anticipation or prophecy; so the promoters of it had this advantage, that no formal decision had been made against them. It did also in the outward sound agree with the words of the institution, and the phrases generally used, of the elements being changed into the body and blood of Christ: outward sound and appearance was enough in ignorant ages to hide the change that was made. The step that is made from believing any thing in general, with an indistinct and confused apprehension, to a determined way of explaining it, is not hard to be brought about.

The people in general believed that Christ was in the sacrament, and that the elements were his body and blood, without troubling themselves to examine in what manner all this was done: so it was no great step in a dark age to put a particular explanation of this upon them: and this change being brought in without any visible alterations made in the worship, it must needs have passed with the world the more easily: for in all times visible rites are more minded by the people than speculative points, which they consider very little. No alterations were at first made in the worship; the adoration of the host, and the processions invented to honour it, came afterwards.

Honorius the III<sup>d</sup>, who first appointed the adoration, does not pretend to found it on ancient practice: only he commands the priests to tell the people to do it: and he at first enjoined only an inclination of the head to the sacrament. But his successor, Gregory the IX<sup>th</sup>, did more resolutely command it, and ordered a bell to be rung at the consecration and elevation, to give notice of it, that so all those who heard it might kneel and join their hands, and so worship the host.

The first controversy about the manner of the presence arose incidentally upon the controversy of images: the council at Constantinople decreed, that the sacrament was the *image of Christ, in which the substance of bread and wine remained*.

**A R T. XXVIII.**

Greg. Decret. lib. iii. tit. 41. cap. 10.

ART.  
XXVIII.

Those of Nice, how furiously soever they fell upon them for calling the sacrament the *image of Christ*, yet do no where blame them for saying that *the substance of bread and wine remained in it*: for indeed the opinion of Damascene, and of most of the Greek church, was, that *there was an assumption of the bread and wine into an union with the body of Christ*. The council of Constantinople brought in their decision occasionally, that being considered as the settled doctrine of the church; whereas those of Nice did visibly innovate and falsify the tradition: for they affirm, as Damascene had done before them, that the elements were called *antitypes of Christ's body*, only before they were consecrated, but not after it: which they say none of the fathers had done. This is so notoriously false, that no man can pretend now to justify them in it, since there are above twenty of the fathers that were before them, who in plain words call the elements after consecration, the *figure and antitype of Christ's body*: here then was the tradition and practice of the church falsified, which is no small prejudice against those that support the doctrine, as well as against the credit of that council.

About thirty years after that council, Paschase Radbert, abbot of Corby in France, did very plainly assert the corporal presence in the eucharist: he is acknowledged both by Bellarmine and Sirmondus to be the first writer that did on purpose advance and explain that doctrine: he himself values his pains in that matter; and as he laments the slowness of some in believing it, so he pretends that he had moved many to assent to it. But he confesses, that some blamed him for ascribing a sense to the words of Christ that was not consonant to truth. There was but one book writ in that age to second him; the name of the author was lost, till Mabillon discovered that it was writ by one Herigerus, abbot of Cob. But all the eminent men and the great writers of that time wrote plainly against this doctrine, and affirmed, that the bread and wine remained in the sacrament, and did nourish our bodies as other meats do. Those were Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz; Amalarius, archbishop of Triers; Heribald, bishop of Auxerre; Bertram, or Ratramne; John Scot Erigena; Walafridus Strabus; Florus, and Christian Druthmar. Three of these set themselves on purpose to refute Paschase.

Rabanus Maurus, in an epistle to abbot Egilon, wrote against Paschase for saying, that it was that body that was born of the Virgin, that was crucified and raised up again, which was daily offered up. And though that book is lost, yet as he himself refers his reader to it in his Penitential, so we have an account given of it by the anonymous defender of Paschase.

Ratramne was commanded by Charles the Bald, then emperor, to write upon that subject; which he in the beginning

ART.  
XXVIII.

of his book promises to do, not trusting to his own sense, but following the steps of the holy fathers. He tells us, that there were different opinions about it: some believing that the body of Christ was there without a *figure*: others saying that it was there in a *figure*, or *mystery*: upon which he apprehended that a great schism must follow. His book is very short, and very plain: he asserts our doctrine as expressly as we ourselves can do: he delivers it in the same words, and proves it by many of the same arguments and authorities, that we bring.

Raban and Ratramne were, without dispute, reckoned among the first men of that age.

John Scot was also commanded by the same emperor to write on the same subject: he was one of the most learned and the most ingenious men of the age; and was in great esteem both with the emperor, and with our king Alfred. He was reckoned both a saint and a martyr. He did formerly refute Paschase's doctrine, and assert ours. His book is indeed lost; but a full account of it is given us by other writers of that time. And it is a great evidence, that his opinion in this matter was not then thought to be contrary to the general sense of the church in that age: for he having writ against St. Austin's doctrine concerning predestination, there was a very severe censure of him and of his writings published under the name of the church of Lyons: in which they do not once reflect on him for his opinions touching the eucharist. It appears from this, that their doctrine concerning the sacrament was then generally received; since both Ratramne and he, though they differed extremely in the point of predestination, yet both agreed in this. It is probable that the Saxon homily,\* that was read in England on Easter-day, was taken from Scot's book; which does fully reject the corporal presence. This is enough to shew that Paschase's opinion was an innovation broached in the ninth century, and was opposed by all the great men of that age.

The tenth century was the blackest and most ignorant of all the ages of the church: there is not one writer in that age that gives us any clear account of the doctrine of the church: such remote hints as occur do still savour of Ratramne's doc-

\* Throughout the whole of this Homily, the bread and wine are stated to be understood *ghostly* and *spiritually*, as the body and blood of Christ. Quoting 1 Cor. x. *They ate the same spiritual meat, and drank the same spiritual drink*, it is said, "Neither was that stone then from which the water ran *bodely* Christ, but it signified Christ, because that heavenly meat that fed them forty years, and that water which from the stone did flow, had signification of Christes bodye and his bloude, that now be offered daylye in Godes church: it was the same which we now offer not *bodely* but *ghostly*. Moyses and Aaron saw that the heavenly meat was visible and corruptible; and they understood it *spiritually* and received it *spiritually*. The Saviour saith, *He that eateth my fleshe and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life*: and He bade them eat, not that body which he was going about with, nor that blood to drink which he shed for us; but he meant by that

trine. All men were then asleep, and so it was a fit time for the tares that Paschase had sown to grow up in it. The popes of that age were such a succession of monsters, that Baronius cannot forbear to make the saddest exclamations possible against their debaucheries, their cruelties, and their other vices. About the middle of the eleventh century, after this dispute had slept almost two hundred years, it was again revived.

Bruno bishop of Angiers, and Berengarius his archdeacon, maintained the doctrine of Ratramne. Little mention is made of the bishop; but the archdeacon is spoken of as a man of great piety; so that he passed for a saint, and was a man of such learning, that when he was brought before pope Nicolaus, no man could resist him. He writ against Paschase, and had many followers: the historians of that age tell us that his doctrine had overspread all France. The books writ against him by Lanfranc and others are filled with an impudent corrupting of all antiquity. Many councils were held upon this matter; and these, together with the terrors of burning, which was then beginning to be the common punishment of heresy, made him renounce his opinion: but he returned to it again; yet he afterwards renounced it: though Lanfranc reproached him, that it was not the love of truth, but the fear of death, that brought him to it. And his final retracting of that renouncing of his opinion is lately found in France, as I have been credibly informed. Thus this opinion, that in the ninth century was generally received, and was condemned by neither pope nor council, was become so odious in the eleventh century, that none durst own it: and he who had the courage to own it, yet was not resolute enough to stand to it: for about this time the doctrine of extirpating heretics, and of deposing such princes as were defective in that matter, was universally put in practice: great bodies of men began to separate from the Roman communion in the southern parts of France; and one of the chief points of their doctrine was their believing that Christ was not corporally present in the eucharist; and that he was there only in a *figure* or *mystery*. But now that the contrary doctrine

word the holy Eucharist, which SPIRITUALLY is His body and His blood.

In the old law faithful men offered God divers sacrifices that had for signification of Christes body; certainly this Eucharist, which we do now hallow at God's altar is a REMEMBRANCE of Christ's body, which he offered for us: and of His blood which He shed for us."

For these extracts the Editor is indebted to Dr. Adam Clarke, who, in his 'Discourse on the nature and design of the Eucharist,' quotes them from a very rare work, intituled 'A Testimonie of Antiquitie, shewing the auncient sayth in the Church of England, touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lorde here publicly preached, and also received in the Saxons' tyme, above 600 years ago. Imprinted at London, by John Day.' 18mo. without date, but known to have been printed in 1567. At the conclusion is an attestation signed by Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas archbishop of York, and thirteen other bishops.—[Ed.]

was established, and that those who denied it were adjudged to be burnt, it is no wonder if it quickly gained ground, when on the one hand the priests saw their interest in promoting it, and all people felt the danger of denying it. The anathemas of the church, and the terrors of burning, were infallible things to silence contradiction at least, if not to gain assent.

Soon after this doctrine was received, the schoolmen began to refine upon it, as they did upon every thing else. The master of the sentences would not determine how Christ was present; whether formally or substantially, or some other way. Some schoolmen thought that the *matter* of bread was destroyed; but that the *form* remained, to be the *form* of Christ's body, that was the *matter* of it. Others thought that the *matter* of the elements remained, and that the *form* only was destroyed: but that to which many inclined, was the assumption of the elements into an union with the body of Christ, or a hypostatical union of the Eternal Word to them, by which they became as truly a body to Christ, as that which he has in heaven: yet it was not the same, but a different body.

Stephen bishop of Autun was the first that fell on the word *transubstantiation*. Amalric, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, denied in express words the corporal presence: he was condemned in the fourth council of the Lateran as an heretic, and his body was ordered to be taken up and burnt: and in opposition to him transubstantiation was decreed. Yet the schoolmen continued to offer different explanations of this for a great while after that: but in conclusion all agreed to explain it as was formerly set forth. It appears, by the crude way in which it was at first explained, that it was a novelty; and that men did not know how to mould and frame it: but at last it was licked into shape; the whole philosophy being cast into such a mould as agreed with it. And therefore, in the present age, in which that philosophy has lost its credit, great pains are taken to suppress the new and freer way of philosophy, as that which cannot be so easily subdued to support this doctrine, as the old one was. And the arts, that those who go into the new philosophy take to reconcile their scheme to this doctrine, shew that there is nothing that subtle and unsincere men will not venture on: for, since they make *extension* to be of the *essence* of *matter*, and think that *accidents* are only the *modes* of *matter*, which have no proper being of themselves, it is evident, that a body cannot be without its *extension*, and that *accidents* cannot subsist without their subject; so that this can be in no sort reconciled to transubstantiation: and therefore they would willingly avoid this special manner of the presence, and only in general assert that Christ is corporally present. But the decrees of the Lateran and Trent councils make it evident, that *transubstantiation* is now a doctrine that is bound upon

them by the authority of the church and of tradition; and that they are as much bound to believe it, as to believe the corporal presence itself. Thus the going off from the simplicity in which Christ did deliver the sacrament, and in which the church at first received it, into some sublime expressions about it, led men once out of the way, and they still went further and further from it. Pious and rhetorical figures, pursued far by men of heated imaginations and of inflamed affections, were followed with explanations invented by colder and more designing men afterwards, and so it increased till it grew by degrees to that to which at last it settled on.

But after all, if the doctrine of the corporal presence had rested only in a speculation, though we should have judged those who held it to be very bad philosophers, and no good critics; yet we could have endured it, if it had rested there, and had not gone on to be a matter of practice, by the adoration and processions, with every thing else of that kind, which followed upon it: for this corrupted the worship.

The Lutherans believe a consubstantiation, and that both Christ's body and blood, and the substance of the elements, are together in the sacrament: that some explain by an *ubiquity*, which they think is communicated to the human nature of Christ, by which his body is every where as well as in the sacrament: whereas others of them think, that since the words of Christ must needs be true in a literal sense, his body and blood is therefore in the sacrament, but *in, with,* and *under* the bread and wine. All this we think is ill grounded, and is neither agreeable to the words of the institution, nor to the nature of things. A great deal of that which was formerly set forth in defence of our doctrine falls likewise upon this. The *ubiquity* communicated to the human nature, as it seems a thing in itself impossible, so it gives no more to the sacrament than to every thing else. Christ's body may be said to be in every thing, or rather every thing may be said to be his *body* and *blood*, as well as the elements in the sacrament. The impossibility of a body's being without extension, or in more places at once, lies against this, as well as against *transubstantiation*. But yet, after all, this is only a point of speculation, nothing follows upon it in practice, no adoration is offered to the elements; and therefore we judge that speculative opinions may be borne with, when they neither fall upon the fundamentals of Christianity, to give us false ideas of the essential parts of our religion, nor affect our practice; and chiefly when the worship of God is maintained in its purity, for which we see God has expressed so particular a concern, giving it the word which of all others raises in us the most sensible and the strongest ideas, calling it *jealousy*; that we reckon we ought to watch over this with much caution. We can very well bear with some opinions, that we think ill grounded, as long as they are only matters

of opinion, and have no influence neither on men's morals nor their worship. We still hold communion with bodies of men, that, as we judge, think wrong, but yet do both live well, and maintain the purity of the worship of God. We know the great design of religion is to govern men's lives, and to give them right ideas of God, and of the ways of worshipping him. All opinions that do not break in upon these, are things in which great forbearance is to be used; large allowances are to be made for men's notions in all other things; and therefore we think that neither *consubstantiation* nor *transubstantiation*, how ill grounded soever we take both to be, ought to dissolve the union and communion of churches: but it is quite another thing, if under either of these opinions an adoration of the elements is taught and practised.\*

This we believe is plain idolatry, when an insensible piece of matter, such as bread and wine, has divine honours paid it: when it is believed to be God, when it is called God, and is in all respects worshipped with the same adoration that is offered up to Almighty God. This we think is gross idolatry. Many writers of the church of Rome have acknowledged, that if *transubstantiation* is not true, their worship is a strain of idolatry beyond any that is practised among the most depraved of all the heathens.

The only excuse that is offered in this matter is, that since the declared object of worship is Jesus Christ, believed to be there *present*, then, whether he is *present* or *not*, the worship terminates in him; both the secret acts of the worshippers, and the professed doctrine of the church, do lodge it there. And therefore it may be said, that though he should not be actually present, yet the act of adoration being directed to him must be accepted of God, as right meant, and duly directed, even though there should happen to be a mistake in the outward application of it.†

\* See note, pp. 417, 418.

† This vain pretence of worshipping on condition that the consecrated bread is Christ, is thus met and ably refuted by Bishop Taylor:—

‘I will not censure the men that do it, or consider concerning the action whether it be *formal idolatry* or no. God is their judge and mine, and I beg he would be pleased to have mercy upon us all; but yet they that are interested, for their own particulars, ought to fear and consider these things. 1. That no man, without his own fault, can mistake a creature so far, as to suppose him to be a God. 2. That when the heathens worshipped the sun and moon, they did it upon their confidence that they were gods, and would not have given to them divine honours, if they had thought otherwise. 3. That the distinction of material and formal idolatry, though it have a place in philosophy, because the understanding can consider an act with its error, and yet separate the parts of the consideration; yet hath no place in divinity, because in things of so great concernment it cannot but be supposed highly agreeable to the goodness and justice of God, that every man be sufficiently instructed in his duty and convenient notices. 4. That no man in the world upon these grounds, except he that is malicious and spiteful, can be an idolater: for if he have an ignorance great enough to excuse him, he can be no idolater; if he have not, he is spiteful and malicious; and then all the heathen are also excused as well as they. 5. That if good intent and ignorance in such cases can take off

ART.  
XXVIII.

In answer to this, we do not pretend to determine how far this may be pardoned by God; whose mercies are infinite, and who does certainly consider chiefly the hearts of his creatures, and is merciful to their infirmities, and to such errors as arise out of their weakness, their hearts being sincere before him. We ought to consider this action as it is in itself, and not according to men's apprehensions and opinions about it. If the conceits that the ancient idolaters had both concerning their gods, and the idols that they worshipped, will excuse from idolatry, it will be very hard to say that there were ever any idolaters in the world. Those who worshipped the *sun*, thought that the great divinity was lodged there, as in a vehicle or temple; but yet they were not by reason of that misconception excused from being idolaters.

If a false opinion upon which a practice is founded, taken up without any good authority, will excuse men's sins, it will be easy for them to find apologies for every thing. If the worship of the elements had been commanded by God, then an opinion concerning it might excuse the carrying of that too far; but, there being no command for it, no hint given about it, nor any insinuation given of any such practice in the beginnings of Christianity, an opinion that men have taken up cannot justify a new practice, of which neither the first, nor a great many of the following ages knew any thing. An opinion cannot justify men's practice founded upon it, if that proves to be false. All the softening that can be given it is, that it is a sin of ignorance; but that does not change the nature of the action, how far soever it may go with relation to the judgments of God: if the opinion is rashly taken up

the crime, then the persecutors that killed the apostles, thinking they did God good service, and Saul in blaspheming the religion and persecuting the servants of Jesus, and the Jews themselves in crucifying the Lord of life, *who did it ignorantly as did also their rulers*, have met with the excuse upon the same account. And therefore it is not safe for the men of the Roman communion to take anodyne medicines and narcotics to make them insensible of the pain; for it will not cure their disease. Their doing it upon the cloak of error and ignorance, I hope will dispose them to receive a pardon: but yet also that supposes them criminal; and although I would not for all the world be their accuser, or the aggravator of the crime; yet I am not unwilling to be the remembrancer, that themselves may avoid the danger. For though Jacob was innocent in lying with Leah instead of Rachel, because he had no cause to suspect the deception, yet if Penelope, who had not seen Ulysses in twenty years, should see one come to her nothing like Ulysses, but saying he were her husband, she should give but a poor account of her chastity if she should actually admit him to her bed, only saying, if you be Ulysses, or on supposition that you are Ulysses, I admit you. For if she certainly admits him, of whom she is uncertain, she certainly is an adulteress; because she having reason to doubt, ought first to be satisfied of her question. Since therefore besides the insuperable doubts of the main article itself, in the practice and particulars there are acknowledged so many ways of deception, and confessed that the actual failings are frequent, it will be but a weak excuse to say, I worship thee if thou be the Son of God; and I do not worship thee if thou beest not consecrated; and, *in the mean time, the Divine worship is actually exhibited to what is set before us*. At the best we may say to these men, as our blessed Saviour to the woman of Samaria, "ye worship ye know not what; but we know what to worship."—[En.]

ART.  
XXVIII.

and stiffly maintained, the worship that is introduced upon it is aggravated by the ill foundation that it is built upon. We know God by his essence is every where; but this will not justify our worshipping any material object upon this pretence, because God is in it; we ought never to worship him towards any visible object, unless he were evidently declaring his glory in it; as he did to Moses in the flaming bush; to the Israelites on mount Sinai, and in the cloud of glory; or to us Christians in a sublimer manner in the human nature of Jesus Christ.

But by this parity of reason, though we were sure that Christ were in the elements, yet since he is there invisible, as God is by his essence every where, we ought to direct no adoration to the elements; we ought only to worship God, and his Son Christ Jesus, in the grateful remembrance of his sufferings for us; which are therein commemorated. We ought not to suffer our worship to terminate on the visible elements; because if Christ is in them, yet he does not manifest that visibly to us: since therefore the opinion of the corporal presence, upon which this adoration is founded, is false, and since no such worship is so much as mentioned, much less commanded in scripture; and since there can scarce be any idolatry in the world so gross, as that it shall not excuse itself by some such doctrine, by which all the acts of worship are made to terminate finally in God; we must conclude that this plea cannot excuse the church of Rome from idolatry, even though their doctrine of the corporal presence were true; but much less if it is false. We do therefore condemn this worship as idolatry, without taking upon us to define the extent of the mercies of God towards all those who are involved in it.

If all the premises are true, then it is needless to insist longer on explaining the following paragraph of the Article; that *Christ's body is received in the sacrament in a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that the mean by which it is received is faith*; for that is such a natural result of them, that it appears evident of itself, as being the conclusion that arises out of those premises.

The last paragraph is against the *reserving, carrying about, the lifting up, or the worshipping, the sacrament*. The point concerning the worship, which is the most essential of them, has been already considered. As for the reserving or carrying the sacrament about, it is very visible that the institution is, 'Take, eat,' and 'drink ye all of it;' which does import, that the consuming the elements is a part of the institution, and, by consequence, that they are a sacrament only as they are distributed and received. It is true, the practice of *reserving* or sending about the elements began very early; the state of things at first made it almost unavoidable. When there were yet but a few converted to Christianity, and when there

A R T.  
XXVIII.Eus. Hist.  
lib. vi. c. 44.

were but few priests to serve them, they neither could nor durst meet altogether, especially in the times of persecution; so some parts of the elements were sent to the absent, to those in prison, and particularly to the sick, as a symbol of their being parts of the body, and that they were in the peace and communion of the church. The bread was sent with the wine, and it was sent about by any person whatsoever; sometimes by boys; as appears in the famous story of Serapion in the third century. So that the condition of the Christians in that time made that necessary, to keep them all in the sense of their obligation to union and communion with the church; and that could not well be done in any other way. But we make a great difference between this practice, when taken up out of necessity, though not exactly conform to the first institution: and the continuing it out of superstition, when there is no need of it. Therefore instead of consecrating a larger portion of elements than is necessary for the occasion, and the reserving what is over and above; and the setting that out with great pomp on the altar, to be worshipped, or the carrying it about with a vast magnificence in a procession invented to put the more honour on it; or the sending it to the sick with solemnity; we choose rather to consecrate only so much as may be judged fit for the number of those who are to communicate. And when the sacrament is over, we do, in imitation of the practice of some of the ancients, consume what is left, that there may be no occasion given either to superstition or irreverence. And for the *sick*, or the *prisoners*, we think it is a greater mean to quicken their devotion, as well as it is a closer adhering to the words of the institution, to consecrate in their presence: for though we can bear with the practice of the Greek church, of reserving and sending about the eucharist, when there is no idolatry joined with it; yet we cannot but think that this is the continuance of a practice, which the state of the first ages introduced, and that was afterwards kept up, out of a too scrupulous imitation of that time; without considering that the difference of the state of the Christians, in the former and in the succeeding ages, made that what was at first innocently practised (since a real necessity may well excuse a want of exactness in some matters that are only positive) became afterwards an occasion of much superstition, and in conclusion ended in idolatry. Those ill effects that it had are more than is necessary to justify our practice in reducing this strictly to the first institution.

As for the lifting up of the eucharist, there is not a word of it in the gospel; nor is it mentioned by St. Paul: neither Justin Martyr nor Cyril of Jerusalem speak of it; there is nothing concerning it neither in the Constitutions, nor in the Areopagite. In those first ages all the elevation that is spoken of is, the lifting up of their hearts to God. The

elevation of the sacrament began to be practised in the sixth century; for it is mentioned in the liturgy called St. Chrysostom's, but believed to be much later than his time. German, a writer of the Greek church of the thirteenth century, is the first that descants upon it: he speaks not of it as done in order to the adoration of it, but makes it to represent both Christ's being lifted up on the cross, and also his resurrection. Ivo of Chartres, who lived in the end of the eleventh century, is the first of all the Latins that speaks of it; but then it was not commonly practised; for the author of the *Micrologus*, though he writ at the same time, yet does not mention it, who yet is very minute upon all particulars relating to this sacrament. Nor does Ivo speak of it as done in order to adoration, but only as a form of shewing it to the people. Durand, a writer of the thirteenth century, is the first that speaks of the *elevation* as done in order to the *adoration*. So it appears that our church, by cutting off these abuses, has restored this sacrament to its primitive simplicity, according to the institution and the practice of the first ages.

A R T.  
XXVIII.Germ.  
Const. in  
Theor.  
Tit. 12.  
Bibl. patr.  
Ivo. Carn.  
Ep. de Sac.  
Missæ. t. ii.  
Bibl. pat.Dur. Rat.  
div. Offic.  
lib. iv. de  
sexta parte  
Can.