

V I E W
O F T H E
New Communion-Office,

Printed at *London* in 1718.

Together with
Some THOUGHTS occasioned by reading Mr.
Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar unveil'd.
In TWO LETTERS.

Mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. Rom. xvi. 17.

Hear, I pray you, ye sons of Levi: Seemeth it but a small thing unto you, that the God of Israel hath separated you from the congregation of Israel, to bring you near to himself, to do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord, and to stand before the congregation, to minister unto them? And he hath brought thee near, and all thy brethren the sons of Levi with thee: AND SEEK YE THE PRIESTHOOD ALSO? Numb. xvi. 8. 9. 10.

Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi. Verse 7.

E D I N B U R G H:

Printed by J. COCHRAN and COMPANY. MDCCLXIII.

[Price Sixpence.]

W. J. Jones

London, England

T O

Sir GEORGE STEWART,
Of GRANDTULLY,
BARONET,

This View of the New Communion-Office,
as a Testimony of Gratitude and Re-
spect, is dedicated by

His much obliged and
Most humble Servant,

JOHN GLAS.

A

V I E W

O F T H E

NEW Communion-Office.

WHEN the first Protestants marked the *Roman Church*, as causing Divisions and Offences contrary to, or beside the Doctrine which they at first learned from the Apostles, and avoided them; they stood off from them upon the Profession of that *Faith in the Righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ* which the Apostle *Peter* declares to be Apostolical and Catholick, *2 Pet. i. 1.*

They contended for that Faith, according to *Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians*, against the Popish Merit of good Works: And they asserted in the strongest Manner the Sufficiency of Christ's Death, and his Blood, which he brought once into the holiest of all, as the only propitiatory Sacrifice and Offering for Sin, according to the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, in opposition to the Sacrifice of the Mass.

And so, in departing from the *Roman Communion*, they returned to that Faith by which the *Romans*, as well as other *Gentiles*, were at first grafted into Christ, when the *Jews*, the natural Branches, were broken off by Unbelief, *Rom. xi. 19. 20. 21.* with *chap. ix. 30. 31. 32.* and *chap. x. 2. 3. 4.*

This is the true Christian Faith, and the fundamental Principle of the Protestant Religion, solemnly professed, in opposition to the *Roman Apostasy from the Faith*, in the publick Confessions of Protestant Churches, and in the Liturgies of such of them as use Liturgies;

A

gies; even while, notwithstanding this Profession, this Truth may be still many ways opposed among them.

And no Church professes this more than the Church of *England*, in her Articles and Liturgy. See Art. 11. *Of the Justification of Man*; Art. 12. *Of Good Works*; and Art. 13. *Of Works before Justification*. And here are the Words of Art. 31. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross*.

The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

And, in the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion-office, we have this Profession of the Christian Protestant Faith, in opposition to the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, &c.

This Protestant Profession is likewise in *K. Edward VI.'s* first Liturgy, and in the *Scots* Liturgy. But the Compilers of the New Communion-office have set aside this Profession of the Protestant Faith, and thankful Acknowledgment of the divine mercy in the greatest Proof of it; and, in place of this, they give us, from their old Liturgies, a Recital of several Benefits previous to the Institution of the Supper; which they would have to be, Christ's offering up of Bread and Wine as his Body and Blood, and his Command to an Order of Priests to offer this after him as a Sacrifice for Sins, and to bring it before God for a propitiating Memorial. The Inconsistency of this, with the Profession of the *English* Church, which they have struck out of the Prayer of Consecration, is too obvious.

But they would have it believed, that they have made this Alteration for another Reason: They have made it, because they wanted to avoid too near a Conformity to the *Roman* Missal, which they observed in the *English* Prayer of Consecration! We may take it in the Words of *Mr. Thomas Brett, Dissert. on Liturgies, p. 59. 60.*

“ The Reader may satisfy himself, from the Liturgies here published, that, in all of them except the *Roman*, there is an Eucharistical Prayer immediately preceeding the Words of Institution, wherein Thanks are given for the Creation and Redemption of Mankind; though, as *Dr. Grabe* has observed, they are much shorter than that which is in the *Apostolical Constitutions*,
“ called

“ called here the *Clementine* Liturgy. However, it is evident from
 “ *Justin Martyr*, that the primitive Christians, in the Apostles
 “ Days, and down to his Time, that is about fifty Years after, u-
 “ sed a very long Prayer on this Occasion, which is a very good E-
 “ vidence in favour of this *Clementine* Liturgy, to satisfy that it is
 “ the best Exemplar of the Apostolical traditional Form of admi-
 “ nistring the Eucharist, no other Liturgy having a Prayer of more
 “ than ordinary Length on this Occasion. However, all have a
 “ Prayer to the same Effect, differing from this in length only, ex-
 “ cepting the *Roman* Missal, which has only the Preface, *It is right,*
 “ *meet, and our bounden duty, &c.* and the Seraphick Hymn, *Holy,*
 “ *holy, holy.* And therefore, in the New Communion-office late-
 “ ly published, this Thanksgiving Form of Oblation and Consecra-
 “ tion is restored, agreeable to the *Clementine*, and all the an-
 “ cient Liturgies, except the *Roman*: For even the first Liturgy of
 “ *K. Edward VI.* and the *Scots* Liturgy, as well as the present Li-
 “ turgy of the Church of *England*, had too nearly followed the *Ro-*
 “ *man* Missal in this Particular, to be imitated by those who had
 “ resolved to restore the Communion-service to its primitive In-
 “ stitution; of which the *Clementine* Liturgy is certainly the best
 “ Exemplar, particularly as to this Eucharistical or Thanksgiving
 “ Form; it being so firmly corroborated by the Testimony of *Ju-*
 “ *stin Martyr*, who, living within fifty Years after the Apostolical
 “ Age, could not but know a true Account of the Form which
 “ was used by the Apostles themselves, being contemporary to
 “ their immediate Successors.”

But, after all this Work about their *Clementine* Liturgy, as to the
 long Eucharistical Form of the Prayer of Consecration, it is Fact
 that they have not taken their Thanksgiving and Recital of Bene-
 fits from it; but, as they tell us in the Preface, it is paraphrastical-
 ly taken from St. *James's* Liturgy. As to which we may notice,
 by the Way, that *Dupin* gives this Reason, among others, why it
 could not be composed in St. *James's* Time: “ We find therein the
 “ Trifagion and the Doxology,—which were not generally recited
 “ in the Church until the fifth Century: For though it might be pro-
 “ ved that they were in use before, yet it must be confessed, that it
 “ was not the general Custom of the Church.” And why do these
 Restorers of the Communion-service to its primitive Institution,
 pass by the most ancient and best Exemplar of that Institution as
 to this Eucharistical Form, and give us this Form from a Liturgy
 of the fifth Century? It could not be the Antiquity of this, that
 gave it the Preference; for the *Clementine* is confessedly more an-
 cient: Nor could it be the Brevity of the Recital; for it is by the
 Length, compared with what *Justin* says of a long Thanksgiving, that
 they find the *Clementine* to be the most ancient and Apostolical: Nor

indeed can any other Reason be given for it, but because they found the Introduction to the Words of the Institution in St. *James's* Liturgy, answer better to their Purpose about these Words, than that in the *Clementine*. And what else could move them from following their *Clementine* Liturgy exactly in this as in other Things, if they themselves believe what they agree to say about it? Bp. *Hickes*, Mr. *Johnson* and Mr. *Brett*, are agreed in this, “ That the Eucharistical Office in the Apostolical Constitutions is the Standard and Test by which all others are to be tried :—And that, if we had the very Words in which St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* consecrated the Eucharist, it would not differ in Substance from that which is contained in this most ancient Liturgy. ” But indeed we may trust them in any Thing, if we give them Credit in this, that they have passed by the Protestant Profession against the Sacrifice of the Mass in all the *English* Liturgies, in their Prayers of Consecration, because these Liturgies had too nearly followed the *Roman* Missal in the Form of Consecrating Prayer.

These Restorers of the Communion-service to its primitive Institution have likewise set aside another Prayer, which immediately follows the Words of Institution in the first Liturgy of K. *Edward VI.* as also in the *Scots* Liturgy, and which is put after receiving with some Alteration in the *English*. And they have put in its place another Prayer taken out of the *Clementine* Liturgy ; which they follow when it makes for their Purpose : For in this Prayer the Bread and Cup is said to be offered to God by the Priest according to the Institution, and Thanks are given for vouchsafing him the Honour to stand before God, and to sacrifice to him. The Prayer which they have set aside did not come up to this. That Prayer had said, immediately after the Words, *Do this—in remembrance of me,*

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make ; having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection and glorious ascension ; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

Though this Part of the Prayer be passed by in the present *English* Liturgy, because Men of corrupt Minds might give it a wrong Construction ; yet the Compilers of the New Communion-office have rejected it as not coming up to their Sense, nor fit to express their Meaning : For here there is no Memorial made, but the thankful Remembrance of Christ's Passion, Resurrection and Ascension, which all Christians make with that Bread and Cup when they partake of it; here is no Sacrifice made but that of Praise and Thankgiving,

giving, and the Sacrifice of ourselves, which is made by all true Christians, as the Prayer itself says,

And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

And as it says again,

And here we offer unto thee, O Lord, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto thee.

But that which is most to be regretted, in setting aside this Prayer, is the Loss of the good Confession contained in this Petition :

Most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and thro' faith in his blood, we and all thy whole church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

For, in place of, *through Faith in his Blood*, we shall see the Remission of Sins, and all other benefits of Christ's Passion, declared to be obtained through the Priest's offering to God that Bread and Cup, and through a Work of the Spirit upon that sacrificed Bread and Cup, making them, not *to us*, but *absolutely*, the Body and Blood of Christ ; or, as Mr. Brett explains it, infusing the Virtue of Christ's Body and Blood into the Bread and Wine.

For, in the first place, at setting the Bread and Wine mixed with Water, in the View of the People, upon what they call the Altar, he who is called the Priest, standing humbly before it, is to say this Collect.

O Almighty God, who hast created us, and placed us in this ministry by the power of thy Holy Spirit, may it please thee, O Lord, as we are ministers of the New Testament, and dispensers of thy holy mysteries, to receive us who are approaching to thy altar, according to the multitude of thy mercies, that we may be worthy to offer unto thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice for our sins and the sins of the people. Receive it, O God, as a sweet-smelling savour, and send down the grace of thy Holy Spirit upon us. And as thou didst accept this worship and service from thy holy Apostles, so of thy goodness, O Lord, vouchsafe to receive these offerings from the hands of us sinners, that being made worthy to minister at thy holy altar without blame, we may have the reward of good and faithful servants at that great and terrible day of account and just retribution, through our Lord Jesus Christ thy Son, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen.

This is the Prayer for Acceptance, which, the Compilers of this New Communion-office tell us in their Preface, is abridged out of St. Basil's Liturgy. And of this Liturgy again we have this Account from Dupin : " Tho' it is certain that St. Basil composed a Liturgy, as St. Proclus, the Council in Trullo, and Leontius, assure us ; yet it cannot be positively affirmed, that any one of those which we have, is the Liturgy of that Father as he composed it : On

" the

“ the contrary, there is great Probability, that it has not been pre-
 “ served in its Purity, and many things have been added and
 “ changed in it, as usually happens to those kind of Works. It
 “ is observed also, that *Petrus Diaconus* cites a famous Prayer taken
 “ out of the Liturgy of *St. Basil*, which is not to be found in any
 “ of those Liturgies which now go under his Name.” Such are the
 ancient Liturgies by which these Men would have us to understand
 Christ’s Institution of his Supper, and the Apostolical Way of obser-
 ving it, after they have set aside the Apostolical Scriptures as insuf-
 ficient to direct us in this Matter! And when these Reformers of the
English Liturgy set up their *Clementine* Liturgy as the true Apostoli-
 cal Form, and the standard and Test by which all others are to be
 tried, we see, at the same time, they do not keep close by that Stan-
 dard: They do not follow it exactly; but copy sometimes from one
 later Liturgy, and sometimes from another, even as they find these
 making more for their purpose than the *Clementine*. And neither do
 they exactly follow these: They take their Consecrating Form pa-
 raphrastically from *St. James’s* Liturgy, and their Prayer for Ac-
 ceptance is abridged out of what is called *St. Basil’s*.

Now, according to this Prayer for Acceptance, they proceed
 and give us this Prayer of Oblation and Invocation, immediat-
 ly after the Words, *Do this—in remembrance of me*, and in place of
 the foresaid Prayer in the *Scots* Liturgy.

*Wherefore, having in remembrance his passion, death, and resurrecti-
 on from the dead, his ascension into heaven, and second coming † with
 glory and great power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to
 every man according to his works; we offer to thee our King and our
 God, according to his holy institution, this bread and this cup; giving
 thanks to thee through him, that thou hast vouchsafed us the honour to
 stand before thee, and to sacrifice unto thee. And we beseech thee to
 look favourably on these thy gifts which are here set before thee, O
 thou self-sufficient God, and do thou accept them to the honour of thy
 Christ, and send down thine Holy Spirit, the witness of the passion of
 our Lord Jesus, upon this sacrifice, that he may make this bread the
 body of thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ *, that they
 who*

† His second coming cannot be remembered as a Thing done and
 past; and so the common Sense of Remembrance, which is bringing a-
 gain to mind what is past, is here set aside: For here is no other Re-
 membrance or Memorial of his Death, than of his second coming.

* Here, the Partakers obtaining Remission, and all other Benefits
 mentioned, is declared to be through the Work of the Holy Spirit upon
 that Bread and Cup sacrificed by the Priest, making it the Body and
 Blood of Christ. And this stands for, through Faith in his Blood,
 in the *Scots* Liturgy.

who are partakers thereof, may be confirmed in godliness, may obtain remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his snares, may be replenished with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of thy Christ, and may obtain everlasting life; thou, O Lord Almighty, being reconciled unto them through the merits and mediation of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen.

They tell us, in their Preface to the New Communion-office, this Prayer is from the Apostolical Constitutions; so here they follow their most ancient Apostolical Liturgy, the Standard and Test by which all others are to be tried. We see the Reason why this Eucharistical Office in the Constitutions is so much extolled by these Men; and we may afterwards see another Reason, why Mr. *Whiston* would make these Constitutions truly Apostolical and Canonical Scripture: But let us hear first what *Dupin* says of these Constitutions. As to the Liturgy comprised in the Apostolical Constitutions, he says, "Neither shall I examine that which is comprised
 " in the Constitutions of St. *Clement*, nor that which is extant in
 " the Writings that are attributed to St. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*;
 " in regard that these Books being forged, as I shall hereafter shew
 " in another Place, it is not to be doubted but that the Liturgies
 " which they contain, are in like manner fictitious." Again, after speaking of the Apostolical Canons as very ancient, though not belonging to the Apostles, he says, "I cannot say the same Thing
 " of the Apostolical Constitutions as I have done of the Canons,
 " viz. that they are not supposititious, but that in Process of Time
 " a false Title happened to be attributed to them. For the Author
 " of the Constitutions is an Impostor, that endeavours every where
 " to pass for *Clement*, a Disciple of the Apostles, and who imputes
 " to them all in general, and to every one in particular, divers Ordinances, that are in nowise consonant to the Apostolical ones:
 " Such are those concerning Churches built in the Form of Temples,
 " Catechumens, Energumens, Fasts, Liturgies, Unction, Prayers for
 " the Catechumens and Energumens; the Ordination of Deacons
 " and Deaconesses, Virgins, Confessors, Subdeacons; the Benediction
 " of Oil and Water; the First-fruits of Tithes, Festival-days,
 " the Celebration of *Easter*, and many other things that were not
 " practised in the time of the Apostles; not to mention a great
 " Number of Absurdities and Mistakes of Time, together with
 " some Errors that are contained therein, which evidently demonstrates beyond Contradiction, that these Constitutions were not
 " composed by the Apostles, and even that they do not belong to St.
 " *Clement*; as we shall shew more at large in discoursing concerning the Works of this Father; where we shall likewise endeavour to discover at what Time they were forged." And, in
 dis-

discourſing of the Works of that Father, he ſays, “ It is not known
 “ by whom, nor when they were compoſed. All that can be cer-
 “ tainly affirmed is, that they are cited by St. *Epiphanius*, and the
 “ Author of the Commentary on St. *Matthew* faſely attributed
 “ to *Chryſoſtom*; but the Paſſages which are produced by them,
 “ not perfectly agreeing with thoſe that are found in the Conſtitu-
 “ tions which are extant at this Day, we may be induced to con-
 “ jecture, that they have been ſince corrupted; and ſo much the
 “ rather, becauſe they are infected with the *Arian* Hereſy and ſe-
 “ veral other Errors. This is the Judgment that was given con-
 “ cerning them by the *Greek* Biſhops in the Synod that was con-
 “ vened in the Imperial Palace of *Conſtantinople* after the fifth Ge-
 “ neral Council. However, I admire that the learned *Photius*
 “ hath not made this Obſervation, and that he hath imputed the
 “ Errors of this Book to its primitive Author.—It is therefore
 “ extremely difficult to determine when the Conſtitutions aſcribed
 “ to the Apoſtles firſt appeared, ſince the Author of them is abſo-
 “ lutely unknown, neither can it be proved whether they were at
 “ firſt the ſame as they are now. We can only conjecture, that
 “ it is moſt probable, that the Conſtitutions aſcribed to the A-
 “ poſtles or St. *Clement*, belong to the third, or rather the fourth
 “ Century; and that they have been from time to time corrected,
 “ altered and augmented, according to the various Cuſtoms of dif-
 “ ferent Ages and Countries.” Yet Dr. *Brett* would prove, that
 the whole *Clementine* Liturgy was the Liturgy of the *Roman* Church
 in *Juſtin Martyr*’s Time: For, after ſpeaking of his being at *Rome*
 when he wrote his Apology, he ſays, *Differt. p. 61.* “ We may
 “ reaſonably conclude, that this very Euchariftical Prayer, which
 “ is tranſmitted to us in the *Clementine* Liturgy, was uſed in the
 “ Church of *Rome* in *Juſtin*’s Days; ſince there is no other Eucha-
 “ riſtical Prayer in any Liturgy whatſoever, that ſo fully agrees
 “ with the Account he has given of this Matter, there being in
 “ no other Liturgy a Prayer of *great Length* to this purpoſe. And
 “ if this long Prayer was uſed in the Church of *Rome* in *Juſtin*’s
 “ Days, as we have his Teſtimony that it was; then we have no
 “ Reaſon to queſtion but the whole *Clementine* Liturgy (of which
 “ this Prayer is the largeſt Part) was the ancient Liturgy of that
 “ Church.”

Here is fine Reaſoning! *Juſtin*, when at *Rome*, writes, that the
 Euchariftical Prayer in his Time was long; and ſo is that in the
Clementine Liturgy; therefore it is the ſame that was uſed at *Rome*
 in the Time of *Juſtin*, about fifty Years after the Apoſtolic Age.
 And this Argument ſtands on as fine a Criticiſm upon *Juſtin*’s
 Phraſe, *επιπολυ*, which is ſuppoſed to ſignify *great Length*, or *more*
than ordinary Length. But, according to *Juſtin* himſelf, it ſigni-
 fies

ties not *Length extraordinary*, but *great Fervency*, or *more than ordinary Fervency*; unless it can be said, that a Prayer cannot be very fervent, if it be not very long, or that we cannot pray with extraordinary Spirit and Life without praying to extraordinary Length: For *Justin*, repeating what he had said, gives us *ὡς δυναμισταυτω* in place of *επιπολυ*; and as that signifies, *as well as he is able*, it may even furnish an Argument against the Use of any Form in *Justin's Days*; because it may well be taken to import, that the President of the Brethren gave Thanks according to the best of his Ability, doing his utmost in it. But how shall one that considers the whole Subject of the long Eucharistical Prayer in the *Clementine Liturgy*, find it all imported in this Account that *Justin* gives of the Subject of his Thanksgiving, *viz. for being counted worthy of these things*; seeing these Things, Gifts or Benefits, can be no other but the same he there speaks of? And how then shall his Thanksgiving be supposed the same in Substance with the *Clementine*?

If this *Clementine Liturgy* be the same that was used in *Justin's Days*; if it shews us how *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* consecrated the Eucharist, as these Men affirm, and so interpret to us the Institution of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament; then the *Arians*, and *Dr. Clarke* and his followers, have as much to say for their Interpretation of the Apostolical Writings, concerning the Person of Christ, as these Men have for their Sense of the Institution of the Eucharist: And it must appear very surprising to them who have considered the *Arian Controversy*, that the Fathers of the Council of *Nice*, constantly using this long Prayer in consecrating the Eucharist, composed the *Nicene Creed*, and condemned *Arius* and his Adherents, who had no more to do but appeal constantly to this Apostolical Prayer; which says,

It is indeed meet and right to sing praises to thee, the true God, from everlasting, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named; who alone art unbegotten, without beginning, the supreme Lord, almighty King, and self-sufficient, the author and giver of all good things, without cause, without generation, self-existing, the same yesterday to day and for ever. At thy word, as from a necessary original, all things started into being: for thou art everlasting knowledge, sight before all objects, hearing before all sounds, wisdom without instruction; the first in nature, the fountain of being, the eternal One exceeding all number, incomprehensible. Thou createdst all things out of nothing by thine only begotten Son, begotten before all ages, N. B. by no other means than thy will, thy power and goodness; God the Word, the living Wisdom, the First-born of every creature, the Angel of thy great Council, thy High Priest; but the Lord and King of all sensible and intellectual creatures, who was before all things, and by whom all things were made. And,

having directed the seraphick Hymn, *Holy, holy, holy*, only to the Father, it says, *Thou art indeed holy, and most holy, and most highly exalted for ever. Holy also is thine only begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God, who always ministering to thee, his God and Father, not only in the various works of the creation, but in the providential care of it, did not overlook lost mankind.* And the Compilers of the New Liturgy, who have taken their Prayer of Oblation and Invocation out of this same Prayer, have yet departed from it in their Conclusion, wherein they acknowledge the Son to be one God with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

No Man that has any Notion of the State of the Question with the *Arians*, and their way of speaking, can be in any Strait to declare this Prayer *Arian*; nor is there any thing in the Constitutions that serves more to fix that Charge upon them, of being infected with the *Arian* Heresy, than this same Prayer; which is as far from *Peter's* or *Paul's* Faith of the Son of God, as it is from their Simplicity: And it is not so inconsistent with the *Arian* Notion of the Sufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice, to offer again for Sin another Offering, conceived to be appointed for making his Sacrifice effectual, as it is with the Faith of the *Self-sufficiency* of the Divine Person, who offered up himself for the Remission of Sins, and *purged our Sins by himself*.

What the *Arians* meant by the Holy Spirit of the self-sufficient God, the Witness of Christ's Passion, his making this Bread the Body of the Self-sufficient's Christ, and this Cup the Blood of his Christ, perhaps cannot be clearly told, or positively affirmed; but the Composers of the New Liturgy have been at some Pains to make us understand what they intend by it. Dr. Brett, in his *Dissertation on Liturgies*, p. 134. says, "The Consecration is completed
" and perfected by the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the Bread
" and Cup; by which Descent they receive their quickening and
" life-giving Virtue, without which they cannot profit, as our Sa-
" viour himself hath taught us." And, answering an Objection, p. 169. he says,

" But we pray, that the Holy Ghost may make them Christ's
" Body and Blood; which implies, as if we expected some ex-
" traordinary Change to be made in the Elements, requiring an
" omnipotent Power to produce it; and I freely confess, for my
" own Part, (and believe I may say the same for my Brethren in
" Communion with me), that I do believe so: But I believe no
" Transubstantiation. I do not believe the Bread and Wine to be
" annihilated, and the Substance of them, the Accidents remain-
" ing, to be changed into the natural Body and Blood of Christ,
" which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, suffered on the Cross, and
" is now in Heaven; neither do I believe, with the *Lutherans*,
" that,

“ that, the Substance of the Bread and Wine remaining, the very
 “ individual Body and Blood of Christ, is, by a certain Ubiquity,
 “ so united and incorporated with them as to be eaten and drunk
 “ by the Faithful in the Lord’s Supper ; neither do I believe, with
 “ the *Calvinists*, that the Body and Blood of Christ, which are now
 “ in Heaven, are sacramentally, or in an inconceivable Manner,
 “ united to the Bread and Wine, so as to be received together
 “ with them by the Faith of the Communicants : But I do believe
 “ the Bread and Wine to be the only Body and Blood appointed to
 “ be received in the holy Eucharist ; and I believe them to be
 “ made his sacramental Flesh and Blood ; that is, the full and per-
 “ fect Representative of his Body and Blood, his very Body and
 “ Blood in Power and Effect ; that very Body and Blood which he
 “ spake of when he said, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man,*
 “ *and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh,*
 “ *and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life ; and I will raise him up*
 “ *at the last day.* Mr. *Johnson*, to whom I refer the Reader, has
 “ proved these Words, and all belonging to them in the same Chap-
 “ ter, to refer to the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the holy Eucha-
 “ rist ; and that that Flesh and Blood are the Bread and Wine
 “ there given and received : And I believe, that the Holy Ghost
 “ descends upon them, and rests in them, not barely to sanctify
 “ them, or separate them to an holy Use, but to infuse into them
 “ a quickening Virtue to nourish and feed our Bodies and Souls un-
 “ to eternal Life.”

This Man would tell us something not so inconceivable as the
Calvinist relative Union of the Body and Blood of Christ, as the
 Thing signified, with the Bread and Wine, as the Sign separated
 to that holy Use by the Word of God instituting that Relation,
 and by Prayer according to that Institution. He does not believe,
 that the Body and Blood of Christ, now in Heaven, are sacramen-
 tally united to the Bread and Wine, so as to be received together
 with them by the Faith of the Communicants. And they who can
 distinguish what he believes from the Belief of the *Calvinists*, *Lu-*
tberans and *Papists*, which is not his Belief, and are capable to con-
 ceive it distinctly, or have any Idea of it, may talk distinctly,
 and in a conceivable Manner, about it. But, as to his Reference
 to Mr. *Johnson*, on *John*, chap. vi. I think I may refer the Read-
 er to the *second Letter* annexed, for Satisfaction, that no Word of
 that Chapter can refer to the Flesh and Blood of Christ, that he
 talks of, in the holy Eucharist.

These Reformers of the *English* Liturgy, have also found it ne-
 cessary to alter the Prayer for the whole State of Christ’s Church,
 which they have without any Preface ; and they find much Fault
 with that Preface in the *English* and *Scots* Liturgy, - *Let us pray for*

the whole state of Christ's church MILITANT HERE IN EARTH, as excluding all the Dead from the Prayers of the Church. In this Prayer they chuse to follow the first Liturgy of K. *Edward VI.* which they extol very much, with heavy Reflections on them who altered it, as Spoilers of the Reformation. But they themselves do not follow it exactly.

For, first, they place, *all Bishops and Curates*, in the Prayer, before *all Christian Kings, Princes and Governors*. And this is the Reverse of K. *Edward VI.*'s Order, which did not answer the great Scope and Design of this whole New Liturgy, *viz.* the Honour and Dignity of the Clergy. They are not so afraid here of following the *Roman Church*, as they were in the Prayer of Consecration. Yet they have something like Reason on their side in this Matter: For, if Kings be in the Church as Kings, (which the Title *Christian* seems to import), then certainly all Bishops and Curates must be above them, even as they are Kings. And so *Edward's* Prayer stands corrected.

But then they have changed the Order of his Liturgy as to this Prayer; which he had before the Prayer of Consecration, and they have placed after their Prayer of Oblation and Invocation, as an Appendix to it. For this Change of the Order, they give us this Reason in their Preface to the New Liturgy: "For when the Sacrifice, commemorative of that upon the Cross, is finished, and God the Father propitiated by this Memorial, it is the most proper Time to declare the Ends of the Oblation, and to commend the Church to the divine Protection." And by this Change of the Order, and this Reason for it, we may easily see, that we have the Ends of the Oblation of Bread and Wine, as a propitiatory Sacrifice, declared in this Prayer as it stands in the New Liturgy; by which it will be manifest, to them who consider this Prayer, that the Oblation is made for the Quick and the Dead, contrary to the 31st Article of the Church, which is far from being the Case as it stands in *Edward's* Liturgy.

When we view this Prayer as they have placed it for declaring the Ends of their propitiatory Oblation with respect to the whole Church of the Dead and the Living, we are led to consider the *Communion of Saints*, as it is called in the Creed; and this the more because we find this Article insisted on as importing all that these Men would be at on this Head; as if indeed the Communion of the dead and living Saints could not be, or were not entire, without their Oblation and Intercession by it for the whole!

The whole Church of Christ is *one Body*, whereof all Saints, and none but Saints, are Members, united with Jesus Christ as their Head set on the right Hand of God in Heaven, and from thence filling all in all, animating the whole as one Body by his Spirit, whereof every

every Member partakes according to its Measure; so having Communion with him the heavenly Head and with all the Members. It is one City, whereof all the Saints and Faithful in Christ Jesus (and every Believer in him is a Saint without difference) are Citizens; and this City is *Jerusalem which is above*, the true Catholick Mother Church, *the heavenly Jerusalem* unto which all Believers on Earth are come, as *Fellow-citizens with the departed Saints*. It is one Building, the Temple of God, wherein all the Saints and Faithful in Christ are *living Stones*, founded on him alive from the Dead, set forth as *the Foundation* in the Scriptures of the *Prophets and Apostles*, and all united in him as the *Corner-stone*, the Stone that was rejected by the Builders, and is now made the *Head of the Corner*. It is one Household, one Family, as the Apostle says, *the whole Family in Heaven and Earth*. There are not two Churches, one militant on Earth, and another triumphant in Heaven: The Saints, the Children of God in a State of Warfare, and sojourning on the Earth, are of the same Family and the same Household with those at rest with Christ, the first-born, in Heaven; and there is no middle Place for any of them. The House of this whole Family is the *Father's House* in Heaven, wherein are *many Mansions*, where Jesus is *preparing a Place for them*.

As the Union of this whole Church of all Saints is in Christ, who is alive from the Dead on the Father's right Hand; so their whole Communion centres there in him, as the Root, of which they all jointly partake as Branches. He declares his Father's Name to all his Brethren in Heaven and Earth; they all *have the Mind of Christ*, and so have Communion together in that Knowledge of the Lord which is Life eternal: For *they all know him from the least to the greatest*, those in Heaven by *Sight*, and these on Earth by *Faith*, believing, through the Word of his Apostles, on him whom the others see. But they who walk by Sight with Christ in Heaven, have no Communion with them who walk by Faith on Earth, in the Means of Faith that they use; they are not with them learning Christ from the Word of his Apostles in the Scriptures; they have no use for the Institution of Pastors and Teachers, by which Believers are edified.

The whole Congregation of Saints dead and living has Communion in Christ as *Lord* of that whole *holy Nation and Kingdom of God*: For, says the Apostle, *None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself: for whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living*. But the Dead, who are *Fellow-subjects* of this Lord with the Living, have no Fellowship with them in the Government and Discipline that is instituted for them

them upon the Earth; they are not under the Oversight of the Bishops that preside in any Congregation of the Faithful, or Church of the Saints on Earth; the Lamb, the chief Shepherd, who feeds them, does no more feed them by the Pastors of any Flock of his upon the Earth; and the Living, who walk together in this Order, have thereby no further Communion with the Dead, but in as far as therein they are subject to him who is also the Lord of the Dead.

He praises the Father, *in the midst of the Church* of all his Brethren, as the Minister of the heavenly Sanctuary, by that Sacrifice of himself, his own Blood, whereby he hath entered once into Heaven itself, as the holy Place, and made his Appearance for them all in the Presence of God there: And having, by this one Offering, put away Sin; having, by the Offering of his Body once, for ever perfected them that are sanctified by it, and obtained Remission of the Sins and Iniquities of his whole Church, so that they can be no more remembered in any propitiating Memorial, or Offering for Sin, he sat down on the right Hand of God, in a glorious eternal Rest from his Work, thus completed, to the eternal Satisfaction of the divine Justice, and Glory of the divine Mercy. In this Rest, all his departed Saints, who are present with him in Heaven, and see him there, partake with him, joying and glorying in God with him, and through him, by whom they have received the Atonement and eternal Reconciliation; and all the Saints living on the Earth partake of that same Rest, and that same Enjoyment, by the Faith of that same Thing which the Saints departed see; for they are raised up together by the Power of Christ's Resurrection through Faith, *to SIT TOGETHER in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.* And this is the Communion of all the Dead and Living who are sanctified by the Offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once, or of all Saints; in which Communion, no Man who makes any Oblation for Sin, or who thinks any more Offering for Sin needful, can have any Share. The whole Church in Heaven and Earth lives by Christ's Sacrifice once offered; enjoys God by that, and by that alone draws near to him, and worships him, having *Access to the Father through him by one Spirit*; and the Saints on Earth, who are *at home in the Body*, and so *absent from the Lord*, have their Part in this heavenly Altar only by Faith: For as Christ, the true Altar, Sacrifice, High Priest and Propitiation, through the Vail of whose Flesh the whole Church draws near to God, is bodily present only in Heaven, which must receive him until the Times of Restitution of all Things; the whole Worship of the Church and Communion of all Saints must center only there, where the Saints on Earth cannot have Access otherwise but by Faith. And so, drawing near with a true Heart in full Assurance of the Faith of his having put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself, who now sits on
the

the right Hand of God, they have Communion with the Saints, who are present with the Lord there, in *Prayer* and in *Praise*, which they offer continually with Jesus Christ and by him.

They have one Prayer: For all the Saints in Heaven and Earth pray for *the adoption, the redemption of the body, the manifestation of the sons of God*. The Lord himself sitting on the right Hand of the Majesty on high, is *expecting till his enemies be made his footstool*; when Death, the last Enemy, shall be destroyed, and his whole Church perfected in him at his glorious Appearing; and the Souls under the Altar cry, *How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth*; and all the Saints on Earth, who *have received the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within themselves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of their body*; they all cry, *Even so, come, Lord Jesus*.

And they have likewise Communion with the Saints in Heaven in that new Song of Praise, which no Man can learn but they which are redeemed from the Earth; the Song that is pointed at in such Words as these: *Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb*; and, *Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, Amen*; and, *Thou art worthy*;—*for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth*. No Man can bear a Part in this Song, who would have Redemption to be conditional, and would distinguish himself by his fulfilling the Condition whatever it be; nor can any one join in this common Song of the Redeemed with a true Heart, who inclines to any more Offering for Sin.

The *assembling of ourselves together*, on the Earth, in a Church or Congregation of the Faithful, *who come together in one Place to eat the Lord's Supper*, is connected with our Access into the holiest by the Blood of Jesus, as the Mean of our drawing near, and as the Profession of that Faith and Hope in the Blood of Jesus, and of the unfeigned Love of that Truth, in the Faith of which we draw near and have Communion in the heavenly Worship: For, when we come together into one Place, to eat the Lord's Supper, the Sacrifice of Christ's Body broken and his Blood shed on the Cross, once offered, is set before our Faith, in the Sign of the blessed Bread and Wine, by the Words of Institution, *This is my body broken for you*, and, *This is my blood of the new covenant shed for many for the remission of sins*; and the Communion of the whole Church, in Heaven and Earth, in Christ's Body and Blood, the Sacrifice already offered by him and eternally accepted for them all, is set before our Faith in the Sign of our joint-partaking of that Bread and Cup as one Body,
by

by the Word of God, which says, *The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many, are one bread, one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.* This visible Communion of Saints in a visible Church, assembling to eat the Lord's Supper, is the great Sign and Representation, and at the same time the most eminent Mean of our Communion with the whole true invisible Church, which partakes as one Body of Christ's Sacrifice, and lives by it. But departed Saints are no more Members of any visible Church, or Congregation of the Faithful on Earth, and so cannot be one Bread with them; they have no Communion with us in that Bread or in that Cup, nor in any life-giving Virtue that can be supposed to be infused into them; they do not shew the Lord's Death by eating that Bread and drinking that Cup, in his Absence, till he come: For they are present with him; and, walking by Sight, not by Faith, they have no more use for any Sign or Representation of Christ's Body and Blood, or of the Communion of his Body, the Church, in his Sacrifice, so as to discern that Body in eating of that Bread and drinking of that Cup. In short, they are beyond this Mean, and the whole Benefit of it, as it serves for them who walk by Faith, not by Sight. They live by Christ's Sacrifice; they draw near to God by his Blood, as they see it, being present with it where it is on the right Hand of the Majesty on high; and they have no more Communion with us, nor we with them, in the Lord's Supper, but in so far as we, in the Use of that Mean, partake with them by Faith in that Sacrifice which they see already offered in Heaven, and eternally accepted there. And indeed, without this Faith, whereby we partake in Christ's Sacrifice with all Saints both dead and living, we do not eat the Lord's Supper: For it is not completed in the visible Action, without entering into the holiest by Faith, and partaking of Christ's Sacrifice there where the Communion of the whole Body of Christ, the true Church, centers. And hence perhaps came that ancient Usage, of calling on them who were to eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup, *to lift up their hearts*, and their answering, *We have them lift up to the Lord*; for this agrees with what the Apostle says, *If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God*; and, *Our conversation is in heaven.*

But, according to the Oblation of Bread and Wine as a Sacrifice for Sin, with the Intent declared in the Prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church, the Communion of departed Saints with the Faithful on Earth, centers in a Sacrifice, and Intercession, by it, made by an earthly Priest for the Living and the Dead. Is not this a great Honour vouchsafed to this sinful Mortal, to stand before God,
and

and minister to him, interceding, by the Oblation which he makes, for God's whole Family in Heaven and Earth, who all partake in the Benefit of his Offering, and so depend together upon it as one Body? Does not this Priest stand up in the Place of Christ, as the Center of the Communion of his whole Church? Is not this the very Reverse of the heavenly Communion in Christ? And is not this the very Antichrist?

If we view the Ends of the Oblation, as declared in this Prayer, wherein they recommend the Church to the divine Protection, we shall see two of them very remarkable; and the first of them is in this Thanksgiving:

And here we do give unto thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints from the beginning of the world, and particularly in the glorious and ever blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs and Confessors.

This is indeed taken from the first Liturgy of *Edward*; but there it is not so placed, as to declare one of the Ends of the Oblation, as it is in this New Communion-office where they pretend to do what Christ commanded in Remembrance of him, unto the Remembrance of the glorious and ever blessed Virgin Mary and all the Saints. For they offer this for this End, to give most high Praise and hearty thanks to the Father for the wonderful Grace and Virtue declared in all his Saints, and particularly in the glorious and ever blessed Virgin Mary, &c. Now, as the Lord's Supper is the highest visible Act of Worship instituted in the New Testament, it has been looked on as an Argument for the Divinity of the Person of Jesus Christ, that this most solemn Act of Worship is done to his Remembrance and to his Honour: But, if it be done also to the Remembrance and the Honour of the divine Grace, as declared in all the Saints, particularly to the Honour of that Grace and Virtue declared in the glorious and ever blessed Virgin Mary; then there must be Divinity also particularly in her glorious and ever blessed Person, or else there is nothing in this Argument for Christ's own Divinity. The *Roman Church* indeed, by her Practice and famous Distinction of two Sorts of religious Worship, has done enough for her Part to make void the Argument drawn from the Worship of Jesus Christ against the *Arians* and *Securians*; but that same Church will not readily own, that she carries the Worship of any Saint, or even of the Virgin Mary, higher than doing religious Acts, especially the most notable of them, to the Honour of the divine wonderful Grace declared in her.

The other remarkable End of the Oblation, which is declared in this Prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church, is in this Petition for those who are thus distinguished from all the departed Saints.

We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all thy servants departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace.

This also is in the first Liturgy of *Edward VI.* And, though it do not there declare any End of that Oblation or Memorial whereby, the Authors of the New Liturgy say, God the Father is propitiated; yet it is no wonder if it was struck out of the *English* and *Scots* Liturgies; because it gave just Offence to Protestants, as too nearly following the *Roman* Missal, and as having no Warrant in the Word of God, either as a Prayer for the Dead, or as distinguishing Believers in the separate State from the Saints in that State, as if they needed Intercession to be made for Mercy and for Peace to them in that State, which is not made for the Saints.

If we inquire what the Composers of the New Communion-office mean by commending the Dead to God's Mercy, and beseeching his Mercy and everlasting Peace to them, their ancient Liturgies may satisfy us; and we may take this Sample from the Liturgy of *Basil.*

—Remember also, O Lord, all those of the sacerdotal order, and those of the laicks, who are already at rest: Grant rest to their souls in the bosom of our holy fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; gather them together in a green pasture, and lead them forth beside the waters of comfort in a paradise of pleasure, far from all grief, sorrow and mourning, N. B. in the glorious light of thy saints; receive their souls, O Lord, grant them rest, and vouchsafe them thine heavenly kingdom.

And may we not take the Meaning of *the Sign of Faith*, in this Prayer, from the Office of visiting the Sick in the New Liturgy, according to which the Priest is to anoint the Sick with the Sign of the Cross?

As to this anointing, they say in the Preface, "The anointing with Oil in the Office for the Sick, is not only supported by primitive Practice; but commanded by the Apostle *St. James*; it is not here administered by way of extreme Unction, but in order to Recovery." But in that Office itself, though the Oil, the Juice of the Olive, be blessed and sanctified for this End, "that those, who shall be anointed therewith, may be delivered from all Pains, Troubles and Diseases both of Body and Mind;" yet, when the Priest anoints the Sick with the Sign of the Cross, he professes no Faith of the Recovery of the Sick; though that be the Faith plainly intended by the Apostle *James*, as it seems the Christians of the first Ages understood him to be speaking of a miraculous Faith in Prayer, like that of *Elias*, and of the anointing with Oil as a miraculous Sign: For *Dupin*, who is ready enough to observe any thing in the Fathers that favours the Usages of his Church, tells us plainly,

ly, "there is no mention made in the three first Ages of the Church, of anointing the Sick, which St. *James* speaks of, perhaps because it was seldom used in that Time." The Priest, I say, professes no such Faith in Prayer as *James* speaks of; but speaks of the saving of the Sick, and raising him up from his Sickness, conditionally; saying, *If it be his blessed will to restore unto thee thy bodily health and strength to serve him; and again, Howsoever his goodness, by his divine and unsearchable providence, shall dispose of thee; while at the same time he speaks absolutely of the Pardon of all sins and offences committed by all the bodily senses, passions and carnal affections, and of perfect victory and triumph over the devil, sin and death. I dare say it is hard to distinguish this from extreme Unction; and yet, this mighty oily Sign of Faith, this Sign of the Pardon of all Sins and Offences, and of perfect Victory and Triumph, is after all but a Passport, for those who depart with it, to a Place in the separate State, where they need Oblation for Sin to be made, and Prayers put up by the Living for Mercy and Peace to them; far different from the glorious Light of the Saints, who it seems need no such Petition to be made for them by the sacrificing Priest.*

The Contenders for this New Liturgy pretend a Resolution to restore the Communion-service to its primitive Institution; and, not judging the New Testament Scripture a sufficient Rule for this most solemn Part of Christian Worship, and therefore not the perfect Rule of the Christian Religion, they set up the *Agreement* of ancient Liturgies as the Rule and Standard for this Part of Christian Worship: And, sustaining themselves the proper Judges of that Agreement, they find the *Clementine* Liturgy to be the most ancient, and the Standard and Test by which all others are to be tried; and so the New Liturgy, being taken from that *Clementine* and other ancient Liturgies, and from *Edward's* first Liturgy, as agreeing with that Standard, is the only Rule for performing the Communion-service, according to its primitive Institution.

They find the New Testament deficient in this, that it gives us no Form of Prayer for consecrating the Eucharist; and they take it for granted, that the Apostles used a Form, and likewise suppose that this same Form was faithfully handed down by unwritten Tradition through two full Centuries to the fourth Century, when the writing of Liturgies commenced: And by the *Length* of the *Arian* Prayer in the Constitutions, which they call the *Clementine* Liturgy, they have judged it to be the most ancient of written Liturgies, and the best Exemplar of the old traditional Apostolical Form, especially in the Things wherein they find other ancient Liturgies agreeing with it; which they have exhibited to us in the New Communion-office, as the true Apostolical Form of the Communion-service, fully supplying the Deficiency of the New Testament in

this great Matter, and very fit to be used by all those who will have a Form of Consecration; which they cannot have from the New Testament, and therefore must take from the Tradition of the Church as ancient and as universal as can be had.

But those who will have no such Form, because the New Testament gives them none; and who take the Scripture indeed from the Church, but not its Interpretation, which was never committed to any Church, because it interprets itself, and so applies directly to every Man's Conscience as a clear and perfect Rule: those who would walk according to this Rule, will easily see the Falshood of this traditional Form, as perfectly inconsistent with the primitive Institution of the Lord's Supper delivered to us in the Apostolical Writings; and at the same time they will be satisfied to see, from this remarkable Instance, the great Uncertainty of that Tradition that serves to justify the whole Corruption of that holy Religion that stands pure and entire in the Scriptures testifying against all that Corruption.

If the Uncertainty of Tradition, in this Instance, be not manifest enough from the foregoing Account given by them who plead for it, we may again hear *Dupin*, who has been all along quoted on the ancient Liturgies; because he can neither be suspected of less Acquaintance with Ecclesiastical Antiquity, nor of less Partiality to the *Roman Missal* against the *English Liturgy*, than the Compilers of the New Communion-office. He observes in the fourth Century, which gave birth to written Liturgies, a great Alteration from the Simplicity of the first three Ages as to the Manner of celebrating the Sacrament of the Eucharist: And, speaking of the Liturgies falsely attributed to the Apostles, he says,

“ We need only reflect on what we find recorded in the Epistle
 “ of *St. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, concerning the Administration of
 “ the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and upon the Accounts of
 “ *St. Justin* and other primitive Fathers of the Church, to be per-
 “ suaded, that the Apostles and their Successors celebrated the Eu-
 “ charist with great Simplicity. This hath been observed by all
 “ those that have written concerning Liturgies, who have unani-
 “ mously agreed, that the Celebration of the Mass was performed
 “ in those primitive Ages without much Ceremony, and that they
 “ used but few Prayers; but, by little and little, others were ad-
 “ ded, and several visible Ceremonies were annexed, to render the
 “ Service more venerable to the People. In fine, the Churches af-
 “ terwards regulated and committed to Writing the Manner of ce-
 “ lebrating it, and this is what they call Liturgies; which, being
 “ compiled conformably to the various Customs of divers Places, are
 “ likewise found to be different: And, for as much as Men are na-
 “ turally inclined to make some Alterations in their exterior Habit,
 “ many

"many Things from time to time have been successively added to them."

This Apostasy from the Apostolical Manner of celebrating the Eucharist, that is to be seen in those ancient Liturgies, came at last to its full Height in the *Roman* Missal; which is much reformed, and purged of several Things directly opposite to the Apostolical Way, in the *English* Liturgy, more agreeable to the Scripture-doctrine of the Lord's Supper than any ancient Liturgy: But the Friends of the New Communion-office think the *English* Liturgy has gone too far from *Rome*, and they would return again, not openly and directly, but by Stealth, fetching a Compass by the way of those ancient Liturgies.



Some THOUGHTS occasioned by reading Mr. *Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar unveil'd.* In TWO LETTERS.

L E T T E R I.

S I R,

WHEN the Papists affirm, that these Words, *This is my Body*, and, *This is my Blood*, must be understood of Christ's Body broken, of his very Blood that was shed on the Cross, into which the Bread and Wine is turned; though we cannot reconcile our Senses to this, yet we have some Notion of what they call us to believe to be offered and eaten in the Eucharist: But it will be hard to have any Idea of the Body and Blood of Christ, that this Author would have us believe is offered by his Eucharistising Priest, and is not eaten by the Wicked who eat the Bread and drink the Wine. That material Bread and Wine, which is offered by his Priest, and which the Wicked eat, is not the substantial Body and Blood of Christ. It is not merely the instituted Sign or Representation of that Body and Blood that was once offered, broken and shed for us. What then? His Body and Blood in Power and Effect. Is this the Power and Efficacy of Christ's broken Body and shed Blood, or of his Death, as a Sacrifice shed forth by the Spirit upon Believers, who eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup, and who eat internally, in distinction from the Wicked, who, he says, eat only externally? Nor is it that either; but a heavenly Grace of the Spirit upon the Bread and Wine, communi-
cating

cating to it the whole Power and Efficacy of Christ's Body that was broken, and Blood that was shed, and so making that Bread and Wine to be the Body and Blood of Christ in Power and Effect. This is Christ's sacramental, representative, spiritual Body and Blood; this is the Bread of God that cometh down from Heaven to give Life to the World; and this is that Flesh and Blood of which the Lord speaks *John, chap. 6.* and that Body and Blood of which he speaks in the Institution of the Supper. But what is that Power and Efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood that the Spirit gives that Bread and Wine? Why, certainly, to be a Propitiation for our daily actual Sins and Transgressions of God's Law. Then the consecrated Bread and Wine has the whole Merit of that broken Body and shed Blood, or of Christ's Death, whereby it propitiates for these Sins, by virtue of some Work of the Spirit uniting it with that Body and Blood. Does the Spirit then unite it any way substantially with that Body and Blood, or with Christ, the Lamb that was slain, and is now alive in Heaven? No; there is neither Transubstantiation nor Consubstantiation in the Case. Is it then only united to it as the Sign and Representation to the Thing signified and represented by virtue of the Word of God, appointing the Relation betwixt the Sign and the Thing signified, applied to this Bread and Wine? No; a mere Sign and Representation cannot propitiate: There must be a real Work of the Spirit upon that Bread and Wine, making it some way the inherent Subject of the Merit of Christ's broken Body and shed Blood for propitiating for our Sins; for the Power and Efficacy of a Sacrifice is Merit. And yet the Wicked, partaking of the Bread and Wine thus made Christ's Body and Blood in Power and Effect do not partake of this its Power and Efficacy. Now, when I in this manner set that which the Author would have me believe, aside from what it is not, I declare I have nothing left for me to think upon; it is impossible for me to have any Notion of it: And therefore I must not be blamed, if I cannot apply Passages in Scripture, or the Fathers, to it, which are capable of a tolerable Sense, whereof I have some Notion.

As to the Tradition of the Fathers, for which I cannot see Foundation in the Scriptures, you may see, from my Letter on Tradition *, that it can have no Influence on me. Yet, as to the earliest Fathers, and what they said of unbloody, rational and spiritual Offerings and Sacrifices, I suppose it will not be denied, that they sometimes meant some or all of the four following Things.

1. The Offerings of the People, out of which the Bread and Wine used to be taken, to be consecrated in the Eucharist. The Scri-

* *Published in the Scots Magazine for April 1742.*

Scripture gave them Ground for this: For it plainly calls such Communications of our Substance, *Sacrifices*; as we may see from *Philip. iv. 18. Acts x. 4. Heb. xiii. 16. Of the well-doing and communion be not unmindful; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased* It is true, in this last Text, some imagine the Eucharist, which the Fathers called the Communion, is intended. But, though the Scripture calls the Lord's Supper, *the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*, it will be hard to find *Communion* simply, and without an appropriating Epithet, standing for any thing else but the Contribution of Alms. Thus we find it distinguished from the Eucharist, *Acts ii. 42.* by the Name *Communion, κοινωνία*. And *Well-doing* is ordinarily used for Almsgiving. See both for it and *Communion* or *Communication*, *Gal. vi. 6. 9. 10. Phil. iv. 14. 15. 2 Thess. iii. 13. 1 Tim. vi. 18.*

And it is undeniable, that the Fathers called this *Sacrifice*, as far down as *Cyprian*; who, reproving some niggardly rich Widows, in his Discourse *de opere & eleemosynis*, says, — *Dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ carbonam omnino non respicis, quæ partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulit sumis.*

2. The Prayers, Praises and Thanksgivings of the Saints, of which these were the most solemn, that the whole Brotherhood of the Christian People offered with one accord by the Mouth of their President, at the Consecration of the Bread and mixed Wine, to which they all said *Amen*.

They had Foundation in Scripture for calling such Prayers and Acknowledgments by the Name of *Offerings* or *Sacrifices*. *Heb. xiii. 15. By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise continually to God, that is the fruit of lips confessing to his name, καρπον χειλεων ομολογουντων.* The *Fruit of confessing Lips* points to *Hos. xiv. 3.* and other Passages of the Old Testament: And for *Confessing* we may consider *Jobn i. 20.* as one Instance among many in the New Testament, to shew that it cannot be restrained to proper sacrificing; and if it were, every Christian would be a proper Sacrificer. Christians are called here to offer the Sacrifice of Praise, which is the Fruit of Lips confessing to his Name, by him who suffered without the Gate, that he might sanctify the People by his own Blood; and so is their Priest and Sacrifice for Sin, and their Altar, which they have, and whereof they partake, in opposition to them who serve the Tabernacle. Praise, that is the Fruit of confessing Lips, offered to God by him, the Altar, the Priest, and atoning or reconciling Sacrifice for Sin, is here called *Sacrifice*; and *Rev. v. 8. golden vials full of incense, θυμιαματων, which are the prayers of saints.*

And we find the Fathers expressly referring to this Ground they had for calling them so; as *Irenæus, lib. 4. cap. 33.* — *In omni loco incensum offeretur nomini meo: incensum autem Joannes in Apocalypsi oratio-*

ves ait esse sanctorum. And I am much mistaken if *Justin Martyr* does not affirm, That Prayers and Thanksgivings made by the Worthy are the only perfect and acceptable Sacrifices to God, and that they offer no other in the Eucharist.

3. The making of that Portion of Bread and Wine that was used in the Supper of our Lord a Sign or commemorative Representation of the Body of Christ once broken, and his Blood once shed, which is the only propitiatory Sacrifice, sanctifying that Bread and Wine for the Use of signifying and bringing to mind Christ's once sacrificed Body and Blood, and of exhibiting it to his People, that they may feed spiritually upon it; sanctifying it, I say, to this sacred Use, by the Word of God, saying, *This is my body broken, and this my blood shed,* and by the Prayers and Thanksgivings wherein that particular Bread and Wine, that the Church devoted to that Use, was set before God, to be by him blessed, and appropriated to represent and signify the once offered Body and Blood of Christ, and the eating and drinking of it made an effectual Mean of conveying by his Spirit unto every believing Receiver the Power and Efficacy of that once offered Sacrifice.

This was to make it Christ's Body and Blood in the Sense of *Tertullian, lib. 4. adver. Marcion. Acceptum panem, & distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum, dicendo, i. e. figura corporis mei.* And therefore this was to make it the only propitiatory Sacrifice: For if the Fathers believed the Body of Christ broken, and his Blood shed and separate from it, to be that Sacrifice, they could not express this their Belief better, than by calling that Bread and Wine the Sacrifice which Christ called his broken Body and shed Blood, *i. e.* the Figure of it. And it certainly is so to every one that believes Christ's Word, appointing the Relation betwixt the Sign and Thing signified; and that particular Bread and Wine that is consecrated, is made so by the Church's blessing it, after Christ's Example and Command, or by their setting it before God in Prayer, calling on him to bless it for that most holy Use.

For as the Creatures of God are *sanctified* to our lawful Use in common Eating *by the Word of God*, that grants every living Creature for Food, and *by Prayer* for the divine Blessing upon it for that same Use, according to his Word; even so, when he has made Bread and Wine to stand for his absent Body and Blood, and appointed it to be used by us in Remembrance of him once sacrificed for us, and as a Mean of conveying the Virtue of his Sacrifice to us, it is sanctified for that Use by Prayer for his Blessing upon it according to his Word.

Sursum corda, with the Answer, *Habemus ad Dominum, αὐτὰ τ' ὕδρ. εὐχαριεῖν πρὸς τὸν κυρίον,* says to me, that the first Users of such Expressions (however they might be meant afterwards by their stupid Fol-

Followers, when they were turned into a Form) sought to have their Minds and Hearts fixed in celebrating the Eucharist only upon the true Sacrifice which is above where Christ the Lord is bodily present, and not upon any Sacrifice in the Bread, which *Tertullian* declares to be the Figure of that Body, even that Body that is now above, where they said they had their Hearts in celebrating the Eucharist.

4. The devoting of ourselves, our Bodies, to Sufferings and Death for Christ, in conformity to his Death, and in gratitude to him for his redeeming us by his Death, and bringing Life and Immortality to Light by the good News of his Resurrection.

If the Fathers called this *rational Service* and *Sacrifice*, they had the Scripture going before them, *Rom. xii. 1. 2. I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, your reasonable service; and be not conformed to this world.* See likewise *Philip. ii. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 6. Rev. vi. 9.*

And whatever might be the Case after Christianity was so far corrupted as to become national, or when it was making ready for that State; yet the first Christians could not miss to do this as oft as they commemorated their Lord's Sufferings for them, in his Supper, and especially in those Prayers at the Consecration of the Bread and Wine.

But I cannot justify the Fathers that spake of this Sort of Sacrifice as propitiatory, or for the Remission of Sins: For who, that loves the Redemption that is in Christ's Blood, can bear this Passage in *Tertullian's* Apology, if his Words be taken in their full Force, *Apolog. cap. 50. ad fin. ? Illa ipsa obstinatio, quam exprobratis, magistra est. Quis enim non contemplatione ejus concutitur ad requirendum quid intus in re sit ? quis non ubi requisivit accedit ? ubi accessit, pati exoptat ? et Dei gratiam redimat, ut omnem veniam ab eo compensatione sanguinis sui expediat ? omnia enim huic operi delicta donantur.* You may vindicate this if you will, and say the same Things, to shew it to be no Diminution of the Satisfaction made on the Cross, that are said to excuse the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Eucharist. You may make it a Condition of Forgiveness through Christ's Sacrifice, and a Mean of applying the Power and Efficacy of Christ's Death. But it will be hard to reconcile them to this Way of speaking who would be found in Christ, not having their own Righteousness, but that which is by the Faith of him, that it might be by Grace; and these only are they who desire to be made conformable to Christ's Death, that they may attain to the Resurrection of the Dead. And such are all true Christians. Their high Regard and fervent Love to the Righteousness which is of God by Faith, makes them jealous and afraid of all such Constructions of Scripture Words, and such unscriptural Terms as serve to encourage the natural Inclination of corrupted Man to establish a Righteous-

ness of his own, which is inconsistent with submitting to the Righteousness of God in Christ, the End of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth: For as they find this corrupt Disposition in themselves very criminal, and know by the divine Testimony, and by Experience, that the *Heart of Man is deceitful above all Things, and desperately wicked as to its Trust*, they must of course be most watchful, and keep the strongest Guard on that Side, against every thing slipping in any way as a Ground of Trust and Confidence for Remission and Justification, and drawing away our Confidence and Trust from the Obedience of the Son of God to the Death, wherewith the Father hath shewed himself well pleased by his Resurrection, discharging any more offering for Sin.

We see an Opposition managed against trusting in Christ, the End of the Law for Righteousness to every Believer of his Resurrection, in the very Time of the Apostles, and that by Christian Teachers and Preachers of Christ; and we find the Apostles guarding much against it in their Writings, as a most dangerous and damnable Opposition to the Cross of Christ. But the Writings of the Fathers that came after them, are manifestly more unguarded on this most important Head; and the farther down, still the looser. Few, if any of them, come near the Purity of *Clemens Romanus*, who writes the Sense of the Apostolick Roman Church on this Subject. His Words are, *και ημεις ουν, δια θεληματος αυτου εν Χριστω Ιησου κληθεντες, ου δι εαυτων δικαιουμεθα, ουδε δια της ημστερας σοφιας, η συνεσεως, η ευσεβειας, η εργαων ων κατειργασαμεθα εν οσιότητι καρδιας αλλα δια της πισεως, δι ης παντας τους απ' αιωνος ο παντοκρατωρ θεος εδικαιωσεν* *.

This blessed Doctrine of the primitive Roman Church was opposed by Christian Teachers, as has been said, while the Apostles were living and writing; and even they who boasted of their Faith without Works, the Fruits and Evidences of Faith, behoved to place a Merit in their believing, instead of the Object of Faith, even the Righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. But the Writers that came after the Apostles, though they knew that the Observation of the Law of *Moses* was inconsistent with the Faith, and so could not make it the Condition of Justification by Christ, as others had done before them; yet they did not apprehend any such Hazard in making the Christian Institutions, and the Graces and Works of the Gospel, to be such a Condition: They did not carefully

* *And we then, who are called by his Will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by any thing of ours, neither by our own Wisdom, or Understanding, or Godliness, or Works which we have wrought in Holiness of Heart; but by the Faith by which the Almighty God hath justified all who have been from the Beginning.*

fully distinguish betwixt what the Apostle said *makes* a Sinner *just*, and what they said *declares* him *to be just*, which they also called *justifying*: And so these Writers scruple not to speak of the Things that declare Men to be just in Christ, as the Conditions of their being made just by him. And, when the Philosophy of the Gentiles was called in to assist in the Defence of the Gospel, against the Gods and Sacrifices of the Gentiles, in the Apologies writ for Christianity, as a more reasonable and truly philosophical Religion, the Doctrine of Merit, inseparable from that Philosophy, came in with it; and, in order to establish that Merit in the Christian Virtues and Works of the Gospel, the Freedom of the human Will, in its Choice, from any Dependence on the secret Counsel and Purpose of God, was asserted and maintained by the Strength of that old Objection against the free distinguishing Grace of the Gospel, *Why doth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his Will?* But these Reasoners did not reflect, that the great Work of Righteousness, wherein all Christians acknowledged the greatest Merit, was verily foreordained before the Foundation of the World, *1 Pet. i. 18. 19. 20. 21. Acts ii. 23. and iii. 18. Luke xxiv. 46.* However, in this manner did the Doctrine of Merit at first take place among Christians, after the Days of the Apostles; and, from that Beginning, it grew to that Height wherein it appeared in the *Roman Church* at the Reformation, as contrary to the Sense of the Apostolick Church of *Rome* in the Time of *Clomens*, as it was to the Sentiments of the Reformers.

When Christians began to establish a Righteousness of their own by the Virtues and Works and Institutions of the Gospel, even as the *Judaijers* sought to do before by the Works of the Law of *Moses*, and so to seek a Merit in themselves for applying the Merit of Christ; it was then very natural for them to look upon every thing called *Sacrifice, well pleasing and acceptable to God*, in the New Testament, as a meriting Condition of Justification by Christ, and to place some propitiating Merit in it for the Remission of Sins thro' his Death. Though it be manifest there is no proper Sacrifice for Sin in the New Testament but Christ's Death alone, and all other Things called *Sacrifices* take that Name from his Sacrifice; because in doing them the same Graces or Virtues are exercised which acted in him when he offered up himself, and because they proceed from the Principle of Faith in his Blood shed for the Remission of Sins, and are only acceptable to God through him; yet they spake of these metaphorical Sacrifices as having some propitiating Merit in them. And so they humoured the Gentiles, who came into the Church in great Numbers, not sufficiently purged from the superstitious Regard of their Education to Sacrifices and Priests. Christ was out of Sight; the World saw him not, and behoved to have some-

thing to look to ; and they shewed them propitiatory Sacrifices, which issued at last in the Sacrifice of the Mass, justly held in abomination, as most derogatory to the Sacrifice of Christ once offered, laying a Stress on an unbloody Sacrifice made by a Mass-saying Priest, that ought only to be laid on Christ's Offering once made.

Our Author is far from mending this Matter, by denying Transubstantiation, and putting in place of it a Work of the Spirit on the Bread and Wine, making it the Body and Blood of Christ in Power and Effect : For this is far from making his Offering any more the same with Christ's once offering up of himself, than Transubstantiation made the Popish Offering. His propitiatory Offering is liable to every Objection that has been made to the Mass as propitiatory : And, if God regard this Bread and Wine offered to him as the Body and Blood of his own Son, it requires as much Regard from Men as the Papists can pay to the consecrated Host.

Now, if the Fathers meant what our Author would have them, when they spake of Sacrifice in the Eucharist, then it must be manifest they meant more than any or all of the four Things I have mentioned : For in all these it must be owned, there is no proper propitiatory Sacrifice but Christ's Death alone, which is shewed in the Lord's Supper. And there is no Argument that will prove the Fathers made any other Sacrifice beside that propitiatory, but what will as well prove, that they made the Offerings of the People, and Martyrdom, and the united Force of the Prayers of the whole Church, propitiatory. *Tertullian*, above cited, is no more express as to Martyrdom than *Cyprian* is as to Almsgiving in his Discourse *de opere & eleemosynis* ; and see how he speaks, *de lapsis*, of the Penance and Absolution necessary for the Lapsed before their partaking of the Eucharist. His Words are : *Ante expiata delicta, ante exomologesin factam criminis, ante purgatam conscientiam sacrificio & manu sacerdotis, ante offensam placatam indignantis Domini & minantis, pacem putant esse quam verbis fallacibus venditant*. This cannot be the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, whereof the Lapsed cannot lawfully partake till his Crimes be first thus *expiated* ; as *Cyprian* could say !

And this brings to mind another Scripture-expression concerning Sacrifice well pleasing to God, who would not be pleased with the Sacrifices of the Law. *David*, in his penitential Psalm, speaking of the Insufficiency of the legal Sacrifices, says, *Psal. li. 17. The sacrifices of God a broken spirit ; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise*. Compare with this *Is. lvii. 15. 16. I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also of a humble and contrite spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones ; for I will not contend for ever*. And, *Is. lxvi. 2. 3. But to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word. He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man, he*
that

that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck. But this he, with whom God dwells to revive the Heart of the contrite ones, must be Jesus Christ, who *humbled himself, and became obedient to the death, even the death of the cross:* And this Contrition of Heart, which is for all the Sacrifices, this poor and contrite Spirit to which God has respect, when he forbids the Sacrifices of the Law, is no other than that Humiliation and Contrition of the Heart of the Lord Jesus, when, *in the days of his flesh, he offered up prayers and supplications (as in his Agony in the Garden and on the Cross) with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death: Though he were the Son, yet learned he obedience by the things, which he suffered.* The humble and contrite ones, who have no Confidence in themselves, but look to the Humiliation and Contrition of Jesus Christ, which God respects, are revived by it: But it is a great Perverision of Scripture, to make the Contrition of our Hearts to be the Sacrifices of God; and nothing can be more contrary to the whole Scope of the Scripture, than to think of that Expiation in our Humiliation and Contrition which God only finds in the Humiliation and Contrition of his Son.

When we take our Notion of a Sacrifice for Sin from the Sacrifices of the Law, which prefigured the true Sacrifice, we plainly see those Sacrifices substituted in the place of the Sinner, having Guilt transferred on them to suffer what was due to him, that so he might be cleared of those Sins for which they were thus offered, by their being accepted in his stead: And that Suffering was by slaying, if the Sacrifices were Animals; or, if not Animals, burning with fire served in place of it. The two Birds used in cleansing the Leper, the one killed, and the other dipped in its Blood and let fly away, served as a Prefiguration of the Death and Resurrection of Christ; because, without a constant Miracle, he could not be prefigured in both by one Bird: And, if the sending of the Scape-goat into the Wilderness be not looked on as any Hurt done to that Goat, the same thing may be said of the Goat that was killed, and the Scape-goat, that is said of the two Birds. And one Thing must be remarked, that every material Thing offered to the Lord, and eaten in the Place which he chused, was not Sacrifice. See what is said of the Oblation of the First-fruits in distinction from the Meat-offering, which was a Sacrifice, *Levit. ii. 12. As for the oblation of the first-fruits, ye shall offer them unto the Lord; but they shall not be burnt on the altar for a sweet savour.* See *Deut. xxvi.* In this Offering there was no Substitution of the Thing offered in the stead of any; it was not admitted to be destroyed in the Place of the Guilty to free them: And so it had nothing of the Nature of the Sacrifices of which Christ is the Truth. Nor was the eating of the Sacrifices by the Priests or the People any Part of that Suffering of the Substitute that was accepted
for

for the Guilty to make him free: For the eating of the Sacrifices was a Part of the Worship of him to whom they were offered, to which none who were guilty or unclean could be admitted, till the Sacrifice was made and accepted for them, and they made free by it to come near and feast with God on the Remains of the accepted Sacrifice, of which the Memorial was burnt for a sweet Savour to him. Now we easily see the Truth of this emblematical Matter in Christ's Sufferings and Death for Sinners, and in our spiritual eating with God of that accepted Sacrifice, signified in the eating of the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper. But, in our Author's Sacrifice of the Eucharist, no such Thing appears. He may say indeed the Bread and Wine is substituted for Christ's Body and Blood: But how is it substituted for us to undergo any Sign or Likeness of suffering for our Sins to make us free? and yet this is that which is most essential in the Notion we have of Sacrifice and Offering for Sin, from the Sacrifices of the Law, as prefiguring the Sacrifice of Christ. The Author's Definition of a proper Sacrifice is imperfect without this; and so all that is built upon his Definition must fall to the Ground.

It will not be easy to find in the Scripture any Foundation for a proper propitiatory Sacrifice, or Offering for Sin, after Christ's Sacrifice of himself once made, and not to be repeated. There are no such Sins now to be purged by Sacrifice, no such Impurities of the Flesh debarring Men from the Presence of God, as those from which the Sacrifices of the Law purified *Israel* according to the Flesh. For it cannot be proved that these *sanctified* any further than to the purifying of the Flesh, or that they ever purged the Conscience from any one real Sin: For, as the divine Presence in the worldly Sanctuary, to which *Israel* after the Flesh was admitted, was but typical of the true Presence, to which *Israel* after the Spirit has Access; and as the Sacrifices, by which they approached him in that Sanctuary, were but Figures of the true Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, by which we draw near truly to God; even so the Sins and Defilements purged by those Sacrifices were not real Sins defiling the Conscience, and rendering the Sinner unfit for Nearness and Communion with the holy God, but Types, Figures and Emblems of real Sins, and of that Defilement of the Conscience by them: And so was the Remission of those emblematical Sins, only typical and figurative of the true Remission of true Sins by the true Sacrifice. It is the Property of the Sacrifice once offered by Jesus Christ, to purge the Conscience from the Defilement of Sin, and to cleanse us from all true Unrighteousness. This Sacrifice was made, and accepted for all true Sins that ever were or can be remitted. His Death was for the Redemption of Transgressions that were under the first Testament, and he hath obtained eternal Redemption for his whole Church,

Church, for whom he gave himself, that he might redeem them from all Iniquity. His Blood was shed for the Remission of all pardonable Sins, and obtained the Remission of them. There is one indeed unpardonable, and for which this Sacrifice was not offered; and that, as the Apostle describes it in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, seems to be utter Apostasy from the Profession of Faith in the Blood of the Son of God, shed for the Remission of Sins, and in the Sufficiency of his Sacrifice, with such spiteful Opposition to that Faith, and the Profession of it, as appeared against Christ in the most spiteful *Jews* who crucified him, and this after being enlightened by the Holy Ghost in the Knowledge of the Son of God, and of the Remission of Sins by his Blood. But unless some Sin, for which Sacrifice is to be made, can be condescended on, that was not purged by Christ's Blood once offered for the Remission of it; or unless it can be said, that Christ's Sacrifice obtained Remission for the Sins for which it was made, only so far, and in part, and left the other Part to a Representative Sacrifice; there can be no other propitiatory Sacrifice or Offering made for the Remission of Sins.

The Apostle, in the 10th Chapter of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, x shews the Sufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice for the Remission of Sins, from his *sitting down for ever*, as having eternally perfected his Work of Sacrifice, in opposition to the *Priests of Aaron's Order, standing daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins*. For, while the Priests stood, and were never allowed to sit down in the Presence of God, but behoved to repeat their Sacrifices, there was still more to be done for obtaining the Remission of Sins, which were *remembered again* in these Sacrifices: But when Christ brought his Offering as the true High Priest into the Holiest of all, and sat down for ever; *because by one Offering he had for ever perfected them that are sanctified*, there was no more to be done for obtaining the Remission of Sins, no more Offering for Sins to be made for ever, because that Remission was now fully obtained. For this he brings the Testimony of the Holy Ghost, in the Prophecy of *Jeremiah*, concerning the new Covenant, where it was said, *Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more*. Of this the Apostle makes this Account, *Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin*.

By *Sins* here we must understand those which defile the Conscience, and render us unfit for true Nearness and Communion with the infinitely holy God. And these are all real Sins: For every Transgression of the divine Law defiles the Conscience, *and he that offends in one Point, is guilty of all*, is cursed, and must be as such for ever separated from God, except he be cleared by Sacrifice. These are the Sins from which all the Sacrifices of the Law could never

never purge the Conscience ; while, by purging the Uncleanness of the Flesh to serve God in the worldly Sanctuary, they prefigured the Purification from the spiritual Uncleanness of these true Sins by the Sacrifice and Offering which Christ finished, when he sat down for ever on the right Hand of God, by which we draw near to God.

The *Remission* of all these real Sins, which always and at all times serve to separate Men from God, and unfit them for serving and drawing near to him in his Worship, as often as they are committed ; the Remission of all these Sins, which was not granted to the legal Sacrifices ; the Remission of all these Sins, for which Christ once offered up himself, is now granted to that Offering which he once made. But it was not, it did not take place while God was calling Sins to Remembrance, by Sacrifices to be continually offered by Priests standing, and not allowed to sit down : For the Apostle makes this an Argument to shew, that, however they sanctified to the purifying of the Flesh, and so typified the Sacrifice that sanctifies to the purifying of the Conscience, they could not by themselves purge the Conscience, they could not take away real Sin ; because, if they could, *they would have ceased to be offered*. They behoved to be repeated, till Remission should take place by a Sacrifice.

And what is that Remission of Sins which took not place, and was not, till Christ offered his Sacrifice for Sin ? What, but the Discharge of the Debt of Sin as fully paid by the Surety graciously given, which, by the repeated Sacrifices, was declared to be not yet paid ? Now, this Discharge of the Debt of Sin as fully paid, was not, could not be granted before Jesus Christ the Surety was cleared of the Guilt of all those Sins that he bare on his own Body on the Tree, when he was made a Curse for his People, and when he suffered for their Sins, the Just for the Unjust, that he might bring them to God. He, who knew no Sin, had Conscience of his People's Sins, was exceeding sorrowful unto Death, as debarred from the Light of his Father's Countenance, and made sensible of his Wrath due to those Sins, wherewith he was charged, so that he cried, *Why hast thou forsaken me ?* From this Conscience of the Sins for which he suffered this Death, he was purged, when being raised from the Dead, and having entered the holiest of all by his own Blood, he sat down on the right Hand of the Father, making him most blessed for ever for his People, by the Light of his Countenance lifted up on him, which had been hid from him for their Sins. And this is the Remission of Sins, not his own, but theirs for whom he suffered, all their Iniquities whatsoever, which, without his Sacrifice, would every one of them have rendered them eternally unfit for Nearness with God, or for his gracious
Pre-

Presence. This is the true Remission; and indeed there is no other Remission of Sins but this: It is this same Remission, and no other, that touches the Conscience of the Sinner himself, when he receives the Remission of Sins from Christ; for then he but partakes with him by Faith in that everlasting Purgation of the Conscience, and that Remission of Sins which he hath by his own Sacrifice. There is not therefore another Purification of the Conscience from Sins, nor any other perfecting of any one to come boldly into the Presence of God, at any time, but that very same wherewith Christ himself, as is before said, was sanctified and perfected for his People's sakes, that they might also be sanctified through the Word of God, which is Truth, declaring this to their Faith. And, when we conceive Remission as a Discharge of Debt, we get no other Discharge of our Debts, our Sins, at any time, but as it were an Extract of the Discharge that is actually in his Possession, who fully paid these Debts. This Extract is in the Word of Faith, which the Apostles preached, now written in the Scriptures, declaring this Remission of Sins, and he that believeth receives it. Now, if by the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once, by which he sanctified and perfected himself for his People, they also are sanctified and perfected for ever, how can there be any more Offering for Sin?

The Apostle says expressly, *no more offering for sin*. And if there be any more Offering for Sin to be continued, as the Lord's Supper must be continued to the End of the World, then the Apostle's Argument against the Sufficiency of the legal Offerings will not stand. He shews their Insufficiency from their being continued. If therefore there be any Offering for Sin after Christ brought his Offering into the holiest of all, his Offering has not been sufficient to take away Sin. And suppose there were an Offering of the sacramental Body and Blood for Sin in the Eucharist taking away Sin, it behoved then to *cease to be offered*, according to the Apostle's Argument.

How thoughtless is the Question proposed here by our Author, How can Sins be forgiven before they are committed? Should not this very Question have made him reflect on this other, *viz.* How could our Sins be punished in Christ's Death, who was made a Curse for us, before we committed them?

And how disagreeable is it to the Apostle's Scope and express Assertions, to alledge that there must be a continual Offering for Sin to apply the Merits of Christ for the Expiation of our Sins? For this is to say, that Christ's Sacrifice, set before us as having obtained the Remission of Sins, in the Word of Faith that the Apostles preached, and in the Signs of Baptism, the Lord's Supper and the Lord's Day, instituted for our Confirmation in that Faith,

which we also profess in the Observation of them, is not enough to purge the Conscience of him that believes the Sufficiency of it thus set before him, is not sufficient to apply unto him the Remission of Sins, already granted for him, without another Offering for these same Sins, without which all must go for nothing. If we must draw near to God in the firm Belief of this, that Christ's once offering of himself, hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified; how is it consistent with the full Assurance of this Faith, so much as to suspect that there must be more Offering for Sins to sanctify and perfect us? It cannot be easy for one who believes this according to the Apostle's Words and plain Scope, to hear it said, that God granted the Remission of Sins to Christ's offering himself once for them, upon Condition that Offering for these Sins should be continually made by Eucharistifying Priests. And may it not be said, If Perfection be by the Priesthood of Christ, what further need that another Order of sinful mortal Sacrificers for Sin, and Intercessors with God by the Sacrifice they offer continually, should arise and succeed one another, as not continuing, by reason of Death, to offer Sacrifice for their own Sins and for the People's? The true *Melchisedeck* is not succeeded by any other Priest of his own Order, and he needs not again to offer for himself and the People: For this he did once, when he offered up himself, and was perfected for evermore; and by that he is able to save them to all Intents and Purposes for ever that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make Intercession for them, that they may be all perfected by that same Sacrifice that perfected him, and by no other.

Now, in the repeated Sacrifices of the Law, or first Covenant, God remembered Sins, as the Apostle says, *In those a remembrance again of sins every year*; but, in the New Covenant, God remembers his People's *sins and iniquities no more*. And this is the plain Sense of it given by the Apostle: *Where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin*. Yet our Author shews us *more offering for sin* to be continually made, in the New Covenant. And though he would establish this in place of the Sacrifices of the first Covenant; yet he would have us believe this is no Diminution of the once offering of the Body of Jesus Christ, which is *established* upon the *taking away* of all the Offerings and Sacrifices of the Law; because it serves to represent that Offering of the Body of Christ; but so did all the Sacrifices of the Law: and because it is only by the Power and Efficacy of that original Sacrifice that the material Thing offered in the Eucharist propitiates; but the same Thing may be said of the old Sacrifices, which, though they could not of themselves take away Sin, were more acceptable to God, when offered by them who believed in Christ coming to take it away, as *Abel*,
than

than when offered without respect to that : *For by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts.* Yea our Author would bring in his Order of sinful mortal Eucharistising Priests succeeding one another, and Christ himself, upon the Priesthood of *Melchisedeck* : Nor would he have this taken as any Disparagement to him to whom God hath sworn, *Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedeck* ; though that true *Melchisedeck* knows no Successor, and is a High Priest, *holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens* ; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's ; for this he did once when he offered up himself. A Distinction betwixt the High Priest typifying Christ, (who is *Melchisedeck* as a High Priest), and the other Priests, can signify nothing here to our Author : For he makes his Eucharistising Priests succeed Christ in his *Melchisedecian* Priesthood and Sacrifice, doing the same thing over again that he did in his *Melchisedecian* Offering. And if the Eucharistising Priests be made to come in place of the ordinary Priests, while Christ himself stands alone in the Place of the High Priest, this will be utterly inconsistent with what our Author gives us as the Sense of *Clemens Romanus*, and holds as firmly as he does the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, *viz.* that the sacrificing Bishops come in place of the High Priest, and the sacrificing Presbyters in place of the other Priests : Though this also be inconsistent with what *Clemens* himself testifies, that the Apostles, foreseeing a Controversy that would arise about the Episcopacy, constituted and left these two Orders of Church-office, the *Bishops* and the *Deacons*, according to *Isaiab lx. 17.*

From what I have been hitherto saying, you will easily see, that I cannot but look on our Author's propitiatory Sacrifice of the Eucharist, as inconsistent with the full Assurance of that Faith wherein Christians draw near to God by the Blood of Jesus ; contrary to what we are commanded in the Gospel to believe concerning Christ's Death and Resurrection on pain of Damnation ; contrary to the Belief of the Remission of Sins through Christ's Blood, that is the Principle of all true Repentance ; contrary to the baptismal Profession of Faith in Christ's Death and Resurrection for the Remission of Sins ; contrary to what is shewed of Christ's Death by every worthy Partaker of his Supper, and contrary to the Faith of Christ's entering into his eternal Rest, having ceased from his Works, that is professed by his People, keeping his Day of Rest : And, while I am thus minded, I must think it ought to be abhorred by all Christians.

As for the Orders of Priests that offer this Affront to the Lord's Death, shewed by all his People who eat that Bread and drink that

Cup, I must deny the Gospel, and renounce my Faith in Christ, when I acknowledge them.

And shall a Man, that has once read the New Testament, think of any Institution there for them? You may as well seek the Institution of an Order of such Offerers for Sin in the Alcoran as in the New Testament. Is there any Priest there but Christ, the true *Melchisedeck*, and all the Members of his Body without Difference partaking with him in the Dignity of the Royal Priesthood, by virtue of his Sacrifice, which he made once when he offered up himself, sanctifying and perfecting himself and all them for ever more? Did Christ make the Apostles Priests to offer any propitiatory Sacrifice or Offering for Sin? They preached Christ crucified; they proclaimed his Death by the good News of his Resurrection, as the alone sufficient Sacrifice for all pardonable Sins; and ordered all Christians to shew it, as such, in the Lord's Supper. They preached Christ himself, the only true Altar, as well as the only true Propitiation, and the only Sacrificer for Sins. And how otherwise did they once insinuate that they attended in their Ministry upon any Altar? *Paul*, referring to the Prophecies that spake of the Conversion of the Gentiles under the Notion of free-will Offering and Sacrifices coming up with Acceptance on God's Altar, says, that he served Jesus Christ, ministering the Gospel, whereby the Gentiles became such Sacrifices, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, *Rom. xv. 16*; and he takes a Similitude from their partaking with the Altar who waited at it, when he is putting the *Corinthians* in mind of the Lord's Appointment, *Matth. x. 10. Luke x. 7. that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. See 1 Cor. ix. 13. 14.* But here, in place of the Altar, he gives us the Gospel; and, in place of ministering about holy Things, and waiting at the Altar, he gives us preaching the Gospel; and, in place of living of the Temple, and partaking with the Altar, he gives us living of the Gospel, or living of the Contributions rising by the Influence of the Gospel from Christ's willing People: And as there is nothing in all this that can give occasion to think of any Thing like the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Eucharist, I dare say Christ's Commission to his Apostles was very far from being an Ordination of them, or any other after them, to serve as Sacrificers for Sin at the Communion-table as an Altar.

For where shall we find a New Testament Altar besides Christ himself, by whom all true Christians offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually, that is the Fruit of Lips confessing to his Name, doing good and communicating? When I take the Lord's own Account of the Altar as sanctifying the Gift, and apply this to his Gift, I can find the Altar no where but in his own Person. His Gift, his Body and Blood, was sanctified by the divine Nature with
which

which it was united in his divine Person: For, says he, *whether is greater the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?* It seems the Men to whom our Lord proposed this Question, with a Reflection on their *Folly and Blindness*, esteemed the Gift upon the Altar greater than the Altar; as they also must do, who look upon the Board upon which the Bread and Wine is set, as the Altar, and upon that Bread and Wine, as no less a Gift offered to God, than the Body and Blood of his Son on that Altar. If there were such a thing as the offering of his sacramental Body and Blood to God for Sins, I might ask, where shall we find an Altar greater than that Gift to sanctify it? And if the Altar sanctifies the Gift, as Christ himself strongly affirms, where else is the Altar, that sanctifieth his Gift of his Body and Blood, to be found, but in himself? Certainly where his Death is shewed as the only Sacrifice for Sin in his Supper, there the Altar is declared likewise by the Words of Institution: For when the Lord says *my Body* and *my Blood*, he speaks both of the Gift, and of the Altar that sanctified it. And this makes us believe that Gift, that Body and Blood, sufficient to take away Sin; because it was united with the divine Nature in the Person of the Son of God. But how the Board on which the Bread and Wine was set, and off which it was eaten, came to be look'd on as the Altar, and so called, let the Folly and Blindness of the Authors of unscriptural Traditions and Compilers of Liturgies answer for that; yet even in the *Clementine Liturgy*, mention is made of the heavenly Altar, *επουρανιον θυσιαστηριον*. What they meant by it, I shall not pretend to tell, or whether they thought of another Altar there besides Christ himself; though he be the Temple there, let be the Altar. But the earliest Fathers cannot be understood to speak of any Altar in the Eucharist but Christ himself, whose Death is shewed there: For what *Ignatius* says of being *within the Altar*, cannot be understood of any thing else than partaking, as a Member of the communicating Body, of the Eucharist, wherein Christ, who is both Altar and Sacrifice, is set forth to be partaked of by Christians in eating together, as a Body, of that Bread and Wine of which he says, *This is my Body and my Blood*. For if, by being *within the Altar*, he be understood to mean, as our Author says, *within the Chancel*, it will be hard to find that Sense supported by any Report from the second Century. *Irenæus* reports the Sentiment of that Century, when he says, *Nos offerre vult munus ad altare frequenter sine intermissione: est ergo altare in cœlis, (illuc enim preces nostræ & oblationes diriguntur), & templum, quemadmodum Joannes in Apocalypsi ait*. There could be no religious Consideration of the Board, or Place where it was set, among the earliest Fathers, who were oftentimes far from having the Conveniency of an House, let be an Altar, Room, or Chancel: And what shall we think of the Chancel where the sick Man lay on his

his Back, and gave the Bread and Wine off his Breast? An Altar, Room, or Chancel, is a thing so much later than the Time of *Ignatius*, that if this were the Sense of being *within the Altar* in his genuine Epistles, it would do much to support their Opinion who look even upon these Epistles as greatly interpolated.

What our Author says on *Heb. xiii. 10.* of every Man's having a Right to believe, will not make out his Point there. For, in that Text, the Apostle is saying the same thing to the *Hebrews*, whom he is calling off wholly from the Tabernacle-service, with respect to that Service, that he had said before to the Gentiles with respect to Circumcision, *If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.* Eating of the Christian Altar, or partaking of the refreshing and spiritually nourishing Benefit of Christ's Death, cannot be without Faith. And to cleave to the Service of the Tabernacle now, after God was revealing his Will, that it was wholly set aside by Christ's Priesthood and Sacrifice, who suffered without the Gate that he might sanctify the People by his own Blood, was, in effect, to renounce the Faith, and so give up with any part in the Profit Christians have by him their Altar, of which they eat by Faith.

There is nothing more surprising in Mr. *Johnson's* Book, than the Account he gives of the Words of the Institution, to turn them from speaking any thing of Christ's Death, directly to signify the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Eucharist. He would not have the Words, *This is my Body which is given and broken,* and, *This is my Blood shed or poured out,* to be understood of Christ's substantial Body and Blood, but only of the sacramental Body and Blood which is still offered by Priests in the Eucharist; because the Words are in the present Tense, and so would be false if taken to signify the breaking and shedding of his substantial Body and Blood, or if understood to mean his Death: For that was a thing to come, and not present, as was the breaking and shedding of his sacramental Body and Blood; and the Words in the present Tense speak only of what was presently done: Yea he thinks *Luke* must be guilty of a Solecism, if he means the shedding of Christ's substantial Blood, when he says, *τοῦτο τὸ πικτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*; for *ἐκχυνόμενον* agrees only with *πικτήριον*, as being a Nominative, and not with *αἷμα*, which stands in the Dative, *αἵματι*.

Yet Mr. *Johnson* himself makes the present Tense as the future, on *Jahn vi. 32.* which he understands of a thing that was not then, but was to be afterward: And it seems he will not allow any Ellipsis in *Luke's* Words, though it is manifest *εἶ* must be supplied, and though *Matthew* and *Mark* both plainly predicate *shedding* or *pouring out* of the Blood.

Must we then be persuaded by this fine Criticism, that the Lord, in the Institution of his Supper, speaks not of his Death, or the Separation

paration of his Blood from his Body as a Sacrifice? Then we must think his Disciples do not now, by virtue of that Institution and Command, eat his Supper in Remembrance of his Death, *nor shew his Death* in that Action as a thing past. It was not instituted as a Remembrance of a Thing not so much as mentioned in the Institution, which, in our Author's View, speaks only of the breaking of the sacramental Body, and the shedding of the sacramental Blood, that is the *Cup*: and so, when Christ says, *This do ye to my remembrance*, this cannot be a Command to all his Disciples, after his Death and Resurrection, and the sending of his Spirit, (whereby he said he would drink of this Fruit of the Vine new with them in his Father's Kingdom, or New Testament Church), to bless, to take, eat and drink in Remembrance of his Body once broken, and his Blood once shed for them when he died; but it must, it seems, be a Command to the Apostles, and an Order of Eucharistifying Priests in Succession after them, to give or offer this sacramental Body, the Bread, that he gave or offered, as a propitiatory Sacrifice, and to pour out this sacramental Blood, the Cup, as a Libation to God, even as he did: For, to consider it as the Institution of a Remembrance of his Death, as of a Sacrifice made and accepted, will not stand with our Author's Account of the Words, as in the present Tense, and of the Command, *Do this*, which is to offer what he was then presently offering; for he offered what was then broken, and what was then presently poured out; not his substantial Body, nor the Blood and Water from his pierced Side, (which the Fathers found out in their mixed Cup), for that was not yet; but his spiritual Body, that is the Bread, and his spiritual Blood, the Cup, which was then poured out. But, while I thus insist on the Word *Remembrance*, in the Institution of the Supper, I must do our Author Justice: He takes not that Word there in the common Sense, but makes it a sacrificial Word, and takes *αναμνησις*, which is translated *Remembrance*, not to signify here the bringing of a Thing again to mind, but to have the same Sense with the *Hebrew AZCARAH*, translated *Memorial*, as applied to that Part of the Meat-offering that was burnt upon the Altar for a sweet Savour unto the Lord, while the Remnant of that Meat-offering was *Aaron's* and his Sons. See *Levit. ii. 2. 3.* And he takes it to signify the same way as *μνημοσυρον*, rendered *Memorial*, *Acts x. 4.* where the Acceptableness of *Cornelius's* Prayers and Alms is thus expressed, *Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God.* So that we must not take Christ's Command concerning his Remembrance, to oblige all his People to call his Death often again to mind by eating his Supper; but must, it seems, in place of that, take it as an Order to Eucharistifying Priests, to make the sacramental Body and Blood, that is the Bread and Wine, come up for a Memorial before

fore God, as *Cornelius's* Prayers and Alms did, and as that of the Meat-offering, which was burnt on God's Altar for a sweet Savour unto him; even as, he says, Christ did, when he offered this spiritual Body and Blood in the Eucharist. Now, if it be alledged, that Christ then gave himself, or made any Offering of his substantial Body and Blood to be afterward broken and shed; this must be alledged without any Foundation in the Words, as explained by our Author; and it will not consist with his present Tense, or his pouring out, not the Blood, but the Cup; nor with his Command, to offer this Memorial of Christ, which Christ himself then offered, and which is the same that every Priest offers; and the Words, as he explains them, say nothing of any different Ends in his doing, and their doing this.

Upon the whole, I cannot think of a clearer Instance, in the World called *Christian*, of making void a plain Commandment of God through Tradition, than this Author gives me, in this shameless Perverision of the Words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, to make them agree with what he would have me believe is the Tradition of the Fathers. If I were a Member of the Church of *England*, I would be ready to wish this Petition might be added to the Litany, *From such Tradition of the Fathers, and such Interpretation of Scripture, Good Lord deliver us!*

This Author has taken the greatest Pains to divert our Minds from thinking directly on Christ's Death, as the Sacrifice for our Sins, in eating his Supper. When we would by this Action bring again to mind that once giving of his real Body and shedding of his Blood once for us in his Death, he would fix our Minds and Hearts on the Sacrifice of the representative Body and Blood, the Bread and Wine, coming up for a Memorial before God, by the Priest's offering it to him. When we would call Christ's Death again to mind, and fix our Minds and Hearts upon it, as the End of all the Sacrifices of the Law, he would turn us to the spiritual Body and Blood, the Bread and Wine, offered by the Priest, as coming in place of those Sacrifices. When we would remember the Lord's Death in his Supper, as the Ratification of the new and everlasting Covenant with God, granting to that Death the eternal Remission of Sins, and remembering our Sins and Iniquities no more by any Sacrifice for them, he would present to our Minds the Offering made by his Eucharistifying Priest, an Offering of Memorial, bringing Iniquity to Remembrance, as often as it is offered to propitiate for Sin: And all the Room he leaves for Christ's Death is, to consecrate the Church, and this Order of Priests, to offer this Sacrifice for Sins continually, and to come to God by it. When we would remember Christ in his Supper, as the true *Melchisedeck*, who needeth not daily, as the High Priests of *Aaron's* Order, to offer up

up Sacrifices, as having eternally perfected himself and all his People when he once offered up himself, and as being able to make that Offering effectual, to save to all Intents for ever all them that come to God by him, as their only *Melchisedecian* Priest, seeing he ever liveth to make Intercession for them by that Sacrifice, which he once offered, and needs no repeat; he would turn our Thoughts to an Order of sinful mortal Priests succeeding him in his *Melchisedecian* Priesthood, offering the propitiatory Sacrifice of Bread and Wine after him, and making Intercession by their Offering. And, in place of the true *Melchisedeck*, now a Priest on his Throne at the right Hand of the Father, his bringing forth to us, under the instituted Signs of Bread and Wine, as it were the Remains of his Sacrifice of himself, which he once offered for a sweet Savour to God, that we may feast with God upon that Sacrifice, and be refreshed in our spiritual Warfare: he gives us a sinful mortal Priest, bringing forth that Bread and Wine, as a Sacrifice to God and Offering to him for Sin, that we may consume it wholly by eating, and so have no Part in it with God, who always took some Memorial of all the Sacrifices, wherein Men partake with him, eating the Remains.

And lastly, when we would, according to the Lord's Words in his Supper, *my Body and my Blood*, remember him, as having come down from Heaven in his Incarnation to give his Flesh for the Life of the World, and to die a bloody Death as a Sacrifice, that we might live eternally by believing this, even as (*John, chap. 6.*) the Multitude was fed by the Loaves, as *Israel* was fed by the *Manna* that came down from Heaven, and as the Priest's Meat and his Living, and the Living of those that partook with him, was the Sacrifices of God; he would turn our Minds from this to the Descent of the Power and Efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood, from Heaven, upon the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, by the Power of the Holy Ghost, to make it propitiatory, as offered to God by the Eucharistising Priest, that we may eat Bread and Wine thus Eucharistised, and so live for ever by it.

And this, he would have us think, is wholly for the Honour of Christ's original Sacrifice, which gives Dignity to his Eucharistical Sacrifice and Priesthood. But, I dare say, all that is given to this is taken from that: And I can find nothing to which such an Order of Priests, usurping upon the Priesthood of the true *Melchisedeck* in this Manner, can be more fitly compared, than the Rebellion of *Korah* seeking the Priesthood of *Aaron*. What *Moses* said on that Occasion applies well in my View: — *Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi — A small thing unto you, that the God of Israel hath separated you from the congregation of Israel, to bring you near to himself, to do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord, and to stand before the congregation, to minister,* N. B.

unto them? and he hath brought thee near, and all thy brethren the sons of Levi with thee: AND SEEK YE THE PRIESTHOOD ALSO?

This is what occurred to me in reading the Book you gave me: I have more to say, and may say it, when you have considered this; but I think this enough to trouble you with at once, and I am, &c.

Dundee, July 13. 1742.

L E T T E R II.

S I R,

I TOLD you I had some more to say of *Melchisedeck*, and upon the sixth Chapter of the Gospel according to *John*; and here it is.

M E L C H I S E D E C K.

THOUGH the Apostle, in his whole Discourse of Christ as the true *Melchisedeck*, speaks not one Word of the *bringing forth of Bread and Wine*, upon which Mr. *Johnson* builds so much; yet I shall suppose, that the true *Melchisedeck* does something, in the Supper, to his People, answerable to what was done by *Melchisedeck* when he *brought forth Bread and Wine*. But I make not this Supposition to build any more upon it than the Apostle does; but to shew that it is not capable to bear what our Author would lay upon it. And, notwithstanding this Supposition, I am very far from being persuaded, that Jesus Christ exercised his *Melchisedecian* Priesthood in the Days of his Flesh, when he instituted his Supper, and delivered it to his Apostles, not yet knowing the Intent of it; and left the Pattern of it with them to be delivered to his Disciples in the Churches, that they might observe it after his Resurrection and Ascension, in remembrance of his Death as a Thing past, and in remembrance of him as gone to the Father, and no more bodily present with them, till he come from Heaven at his second appearing.

It cannot appear to me, that he was exercising his *Melchisedecian* Priesthood in the Days of his Flesh; because I see the Apostle, *Heb. v.* plainly distinguishing the Days of his Flesh, from the Time of his Consecration as *Melchisedeck*, the Author of eternal Salvation to them that obey him; and from the Time when it was said to him, *Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee*, (*Psal. ii. 7.* with *Acts xiii. 33.*), and, *Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedeck*. If we look to the Prophecy whence this is taken, *Psal. cx.* we see plainly it points to the Time of his being set at the Father's

ther's right Hand, to rule in the midst of his Enemies. Till then he was not a reigning Priest, a Priest on his Throne, as the King of Righteousness and the King of Peace. And he was not immortal before his Resurrection; nor was he consecrated before his Death to bring his Offering as High Priest into the Holiest of all, not on Earth, but in Heaven. He had nothing to offer in that Holiest till he was slain; he had not till then his Hand filled with the Offering that he presented there, where, when he finished his Offering, he sat down on his Throne at the Father's right Hand. See *Heb. viii. 3. 4.* While he was yet to die, he did not answer to the plain Distinction the Apostle makes betwixt the mortal Priests of *Aaron's* Order, and that High Priest of *Melchisedeck's* Order, who lives for ever to make Intercession. *Heb. vii. 8. Here men that die receive tithes; but there be of whom it is witnessed that he liveth; ver. 16. Who is not made after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. Ver. 23. And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood, &c.* to the End of the Chapter. Yea the Apostle tells us, *Heb. viii. 1.* that this is the Sum of what he had been speaking concerning the Priesthood of Christ, after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, *We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.* He interceeds, by his own Sacrifice once offered, in Heaven itself, now opened as the Holiest of all to the whole Church of the New Testament, *the general assembly and church of the first-born, the whole family in heaven and earth;* where all Believers of all Nations on Earth, together with the Spirits of just Men made perfect in Heaven, have Access to the Father, by one Spirit, through his Blood, by a new and living Way consecrated for them through the Vail; that is to say, his Flesh: And so he is the *priest of the most high God, POSSESSOR OF HEAVEN AND EARTH.* The Apostle speaks not a Word of any priestly Action or Offering of Christ in the Days of his Flesh, but that which he made in the Prayers and Supplications, with strong crying and Tears, unto him that was able to save him from Death, when he learned Obedience, being the Son, from the Things that he suffered in the Garden and on the Cross, when he was slain and his Blood was shed; and this is that same Offering of himself that he brought as the High Priest of the New Testament Church into the Holiest of all; where, being *made higher than the heavens,* he exercises his *Melchisedecian* Priesthood of which the Apostle speaks: So far was he from accomplishing his *Melchisedecian* Priesthood in the Institution of his Supper. And, if the Authors of Tradition make Christ's Action in that Institution, or what he then did, to be the Exercise of his *Melchisedecian*

Priesthood, wherein, after his Death, he is succeeded by many mortal Priests; then let this stand as a most remarkable Instance of their leading Men off from the Scriptures by their foolish unscriptural Fancy.

The Action of bringing forth Bread and Wine, is not the offering of it to God, but the bringing it forth to *Abram* and his Company; yea there is no way to prove, that the Bread and Wine was the Remains of a Sacrifice, the Memorial of which had been first offered to God, but this, that *Melchisedeck* was a Priest; and the Priest's Meat, that he was to give, or bring forth, to entertain Men with, is Sacrifice: For he lives upon the Offerings of God. Yet this bringing forth of Bread and Wine, for the Refreshment of *Abram* and his Men, is an Action as like a King as a Priest: For thus we see *David* the King entertaining the People of *Israel* with the Remains of the Sacrifices, *1 Chron. xvi. 3.* After he had made an End of offering the Burnt-offerings and the Peace-offerings, he blessed the People; *And he dealt to every one of Israel, both man and woman, to every one a loaf of bread, and a good piece of flesh, and a flagon of wine.*

Now, say that what *Melchisedeck* brought forth for the Refreshment of *Abram* and his Men, was the Remains of a Sacrifice he had made to God, by burning its Memorial for a sweet Savour to him, and that he made them eat and drink with his God in that which he brought forth to them; and say likewise, that Christ's Action to the End of the World in his Supper answers to this Action of *Melchisedeck*: what more can be made of it than this, that our High Priest, who is made *higher than the heavens*, brings forth to us his broken Body and shed Blood, which he once offered a Sacrifice to God of a sweet Savour; that he brings this forth to us; under the Symbols of broken Bread and poured out Wine, and so gives us his Body and Blood to feast upon with God by means of this Sign of his Institution, the eating of that Bread and drinking of that Cup? Here is no bringing of any Sacrifice to God, but to us; even as *Melchisedeck, Gen. xiv. 18.* is not bringing the Bread and Wine to God, making it a Sacrifice to him: For, if that was, it must be supposed to have been done before it was brought forth to *Abram* and his Men to eat and drink. If *Melchisedeck* offered it as a Sacrifice to God, we know that Christ offered up himself once, and needs not repeat that Offering: But that is not the Action of *Melchisedeck* mentioned in his History; the Action there is only his bringing it forth to *Abram* and his Company; and the Silence of the Scriptures is very considerable in this Case. Now, he brought forth only Bread and Wine; wherein, if its Memorial was burnt for a sweet Savour, *Abram's* Company had Fellowship with the most high God, and with him the Priest of that God. But Christ brings forth his own Body and Blood, as the true Bread of God,

God, and the Wine that is of a sweet Savour to him, under the instituted Signs of Bread and Wine; and Believers feast with God, and with him the Priest, in the great Thing signified: For they partake not with him of the Symbols; they have no Fellowship with God in the Bread and Wine whereof they partake with one another; because no Portion of it is set aside to him, and he takes not any Memorial of it; the whole is eaten and drunk by the Communicants. If the Lord's Supper then answer to this Action of *Melchisedeck*, there is no offering of a Sacrifice there; but Believers, who are blessed with faithful *Abraham*, are there refreshed in their spiritual Warfare with the Sacrifice which the true *Melchisedeck* once made, when he offered up himself, and which he now brings forth to them to eat of it, and feast upon it with God and with him.

They who did eat Sacrifices, were Partakers with the God unto whom they were offered for a sweet Savour: For, after he took his Part, the Memorial given to him on his Altar and in his Fire, the Priests and the People had Fellowship with him, and feasted with him in eating and drinking the Remains; and so, in partaking of the Altar, they had Communication with the God to whom the Sacrifices were offered on that Altar as his Food. God took some Part of all the Sacrifices of material Things whereof the People or Priests did eat: The Memorial of the Meat and Drink Offering was burned on his Altar for a sweet Savour; the Blood sprinkled on his Altar, and the inward Fat burned there, as the Food of the Offering of the Lord made by Fire, was his Part of the Peace-offerings; and in the Passover itself, the Blood sprinkled on the Door-posts was to the Lord passing through the Land, and he testified his Acceptance of it by passing over their Houses; and the inward Fat, which was the Lord's, and of which the *Israelites* could not eat throughout their Generations, behoved to be burned to him. The Truth of this carnal and typical Communion and Fellowship with God, which was the nearest Approach that *Israel* after the Flesh made to God in the worldly Sanctuary, must be found in the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ: And he himself intimates to the *Jews* how Men are to have true Communion with God by his Sacrifice, when he says, *John vi. 57. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live by me.*

As the living Father hath sent me. The Father's Life and Happiness lies in the Enjoyment of his own boundless Perfection and Glory that the Son had with him before the World began, even that same Glory that he sent the Son to manifest among Men by his Obedience to the Death, the Glory of his Justice and Mercy, and all the divine Perfections manifested by the Sacrifice of Christ: So the living Father sent him to bring his Life near to Man.

And

And I live by the Father. The Son, who lived with the Father as God from Eternity, lives in his human Nature by that same Glory of the Father, as it is manifested by the Sacrifice of himself; and he was raised from the Dead by that Glory of the Father: So he lives by the Father as his Priest. Accordingly he prays the Father, *John xvii. 4. 5. I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do; and now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*

So he that eateth me, shall also live by me. As Jesus Christ the Priest does not live by any bodily eating of his own Sacrifice, like the Priests living by the Sacrifices; yet the Truth of their eating of the Sacrifices of God is found in his living by the Father: Even so our eating him, so as to partake with him in the divine Life, or in the Enjoyment of the divine Glory manifested in his Sacrifice, and in his Resurrection from the Dead by that Glory, cannot be any bodily eating of his Sacrifice; but the Truth of partaking with God, by eating of the Sacrifices, must be found in it. We cannot partake with Jesus Christ, and so with his Father, in the divine Life, or in the Enjoyment of the divine Glory, but as that Glory is manifested to us in Christ, who came down from Heaven to give this Life to Men; and in him it is manifested by the Word of God to Faith: So that it is by believing in Christ, the Truth of the Sacrifices, that we have Communion with Jesus Christ, and by him with the Father in the divine Life: And this is the Truth of the carnal Communion with God by the fleshly eating of the typical Sacrifices. And we see this true spiritual Communion with God by Faith described by Jesus Christ in his Prayer to his Father, *John xvii. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Verse 6. I have manifested thy name to the men whom thou gavest me out of the world.—Verse 8. For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. Verse 20. Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; verse 21. that they all may be one.—Verse 25. O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee; but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me. Verse 26. And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be in them, and I in them.* This same Communion with the Father and Son, by the Spirit of Faith in God's Word, is spoke of by the Apostle in this Manner, *1 John i. 2. 3. 4. The life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested*

fested unto us. That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full. As this Communion with God, by the Sacrifice of Christ, is the most glorious Thing that can be thought of, it was worthy to be typified by the Communion with God in the Sacrifices of the Old Testament; and it was very proper for our Lord to speak of it in a Stile borrowed from thence.

J O H N, Chap. VI.

Verse 26. 27. The Multitude that was miraculously fed by Jesus, took him for the Messiah that was to come, according to the Notion they had of that Messiah: For, seeing the Sign that was wrought by him, they said, *verse 14.* *This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world.* And, *verse 15.* Jesus withdrew from them, perceiving that they would come and take him by force to make him a King. They sought him till they found he was not on that Side of the Lake where they ate the Loaves; and then took shipping, and came to Capernaum seeking for him. Jesus observed what they proposed by their great Labour or Work in seeking after him, that it was to make Bread of him; and that they did not perceive the Intent of the Sign wrought by him; and he proposed to them a far greater End of following and seeking him; for that was their Work: They were not working at their Employments for Bread, but seeking him for it over Sea and Land. He tells them this Work should be for a better Purpose than perishing Meat: For he says, *Ye seek me not, because ye saw signs; but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled. Work not, (i. e. seek not me as you do for) the meat which perisheth; but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you.* This should have been the End of the Work they were at in seeking him. Christ's Miracles were Signs, and his filling this Multitude with the Loaves, is here pointed out to them as a Sign of his being to give Meat enduring to eternal Life. The Eucharistified Loaves and Fishes, wherewith they were miraculously fed, was but perishing Meat, given as a Sign of everlasting Meat; which he tells them they ought to seek him for, and not for that perishing Meat: Therefore this Meat that endures to everlasting Life, can neither be Bread and Wine, nor any thing that nourishes this perishing Life, however Eucharistified and miraculously given; for that perishes as the Meat of the Loaves.

He points out that Meat of eternal Life as a Sacrifice, when he gives this Reason why he will give that Meat, *For him the Father hath sealed, God*: For this plainly refers to the graving of the Name
of

of God on the Plate of the Front of the High Priest's Crown, with the Engravings of a Signet or Seal. As the typical High Priest was sealed with the Name of God graven on his Forehead, that he might bear the Iniquity of the holy Things of *Israel*, and that they might be accepted before the Lord, *Exod. xxviii. 36. 37. 38.*; so this true High Priest was sealed by the Father, when he sent forth his Son made of a Woman, and when that holy Thing, that Flesh and Blood, which was conceived by the Power of the Holy Ghost in the Womb of the Virgin, became the Flesh and Blood of the Son of God. Thus the true High Priest is truly God. The High Priest of the Law was fit to bear Iniquity, and make the holy Things of *Israel* accepted, by having the Name of God; and he was called God in a Figure: But Jesus is fitted for the true Priesthood by being really God, *Immanuel*, God with us. Now, as the Priest's Meat, that he has to give, is Sacrifice, (for a Priest lives upon the Offerings of God), Jesus here signifies to the *Jews*, that he will make them eat of his Sacrifice, and by that feed them to Life eternal. And this will appear further by what he says, *verse 51.* where he returns to this Subject, after they had diverted him from it by what they had said of their working for Life eternal, and of his feeding them as their Fathers were fed by *Manna*; for, in that 51st Verse he resumes this again that he says here concerning his *giving* this *Meat*,

Verse 28. When they hear of Life eternal, in opposition to this mortal Life, they think of no other way of coming at that, but by their working the Works of God, or doing the Deeds of their Law: For, looking only for a secular and earthly Messiah, they expected no more from him as to Life eternal, but that he would direct them in the Observation of the Law of God, and pray for them as a Prophet, and that he would maintain and promote the Obedience of it, with all the glorious Power of his worldly Kingdom. This Multitude took him for that great Prophet, and sought to take him by Force to make him a King: And there is nothing more notour than that this was the Notion of the *Jews*, which they held against the Apostles, that, by their doing the Deeds of their Law, or working the Works of God, they were to have eternal Life. We need no more but *Paul's* Testimony for this, *Rom. x. 2. 3. 4.* *For I bear them [Israel] record, that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge: for they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.* Thus they speak in Character, when they say to their Prophet, *What shall we do that we might work the works of God?*

Verse 29.

Verse 29. Jesus opposes them in his Answer, and satisfies their Question the very same way his Apostle did after him. He says, with Reference to *the Works of God* in their Question, and not at all to *their Work* of seeking and following him over Sea and Land, of which he spake before, *This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.* Now, as Faith or Belief hath its Efficacy, to any Purpose for which it is required, from the Truth or Thing believed; this served to lead the *Jews*, this leads us to consider what is here to be believed as that by which we are to have eternal Life. *On him whom God hath sent*; hath sent forth, made of a Woman, made under the Law, to fulfil all its Righteousness; on the Son of God, whom the Father hath sent to work his Works for eternal Life, and who is the End of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth. Thus, in place of working for eternal Life themselves, he bids them believe on him as the sent of the Father to work the Works of God, by which they might have eternal Life; and as this that is proposed to be believed, answers the whole Demand of the Law, this Faith is the Work of God in effect, and fully satisfies the Question about working the Works of God for eternal Life. It is a fixed Point betwixt our Lord and the *Jews*, that eternal Life was not to be obtained, but by working the Works of God, or keeping the Commandments. But as they found the great Difficulty of working these Works, and their great Need of Direction and Assistance for working them; and did not perceive that it was utterly impossible for them, he bids them believe on him whom God had sent to work them, and so they would have the Works of God and eternal Life in him on whom they believed. And this is all that Christ teaches them, in answer to their Question, to do for eternal Life; which is indeed doing nothing: It is not so much as an Endeavour to intitle ourselves to eternal Life, either by feeling or working; because, on the contrary, it is giving Credit to God, that Jesus Christ his Son was sent by him to do the whole that the Law required for eternal Life; and so it is the Work of God. And this is the same Thing that the Apostles taught afterward with respect to the Faith of Christ's Resurrection, as importing his having fulfilled the Law, and obtained eternal Life and Salvation for all his People, of all Nations, as the Reward of his fulfilling it. Consider *Rom. x. 4. 5. 8. 9.* and *Acts xvi. 30. 31.*

Verse 30. 31. When he speaks of believing his Mission, they, still holding their own Notion of the Messiah, and still intent on the earthly Life, require a Sign to make them believe his Mission, and propose to him a Sign like Manna, referring him to *Psalms lxxviii. 24. 25.*

Verse 32. 33. In answer to this, Jesus, agreeably to the Intimation

mation given in the 2d Verse of that Psalm, speaks of the Manna there mentioned as a Parable, and tells them, that the Bread intended there, is not the Bread which *Moses* gave from Heaven; for that is but the Figure: The true Bread under that Figure, is that which his Father was now giving them from Heaven; for, says he, *The bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world.*

Verse 34. They, not knowing this true Bread, the Truth of the Manna, but conceiving it to be something far more excellent in the same kind, say, *Lord, always give us this bread.*

Verse 35. 36. Jesus informs them, that he himself whom they saw, though they did not believe him to have come from Heaven, is that Bread of Life; and he tells them, that he that cometh to him, *i. e.* he that believeth on him, shall never hunger nor thirst. This Hunger and Thirst cannot be that which is relieved by perishing Meat; even as the Bread that satisfies this Hunger, doth not at all serve to maintain this mortal Life, as Manna did, but only an eternal Life, which takes in the Resurrection of the Body, as in *verse 39. 40.* and that supposes the Dissolution or Death of it. This Hunger and Thirst therefore must be the want of a Right to eternal Life, and the Favour of God, wherein that Life especially consists: And this is that great Want that is supplied by Christ's coming down from Heaven to give his Flesh and Blood for the Life of the World. The *Jews* saw him who is the Bread of Life; but they could not come to him for Life; they could not live by this Bread, because they believed not that it came down from Heaven: They did not believe that he, whom they saw, was the Son of God incarnate; and so they could not live by him; they could not live that Life which is by the Faith of the Son of God. The true Bread, then, that the Father was giving them from Heaven, *the bread of God*, is manifestly that same which these *Jews* had seen, even the Flesh of the Son of Man, while they believed not that he came down from Heaven to give eternal Life*. But it is no less manifest, that they had not yet seen the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist: And so that cannot be what our Lord means here by the Bread of God.

Verse 37. 38. 39. 40. He shews how they that come to him, or believe on him, shall never hunger nor thirst. They were all given him of the Father, and therefore must come to him, and he will never cast them out; because it is the Father's Will that sent him, that none of those given to him should perish for want of the Bread of eternal Life; and that every one who then saw him, and believed him to have come from Heaven to give eternal Life, should have

* Compare Psalm lxxviii. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25.

have that Life, and be raised up by him at the last Day: And so they would never hunger nor thirst.

Verse 41. 42. The *Jews* verify what he had been saying of their Unbelief, by their murmuring at him on account of his saying he came down from Heaven. They saw him a Man like other Men; they knew his Mother and supposed Father: And *how*, say they, *is it that he saith, I came down from heaven?* It was the Incarnation of the Son of God that they believed not; and this is the coming down from Heaven that is spoke of here as the Truth of the *Manna*. It was upon the Belief of this coming down from Heaven that eternal Life then turned: For this was the Faith of his Disciples, in opposition to the Multitude who left him, *verse 68. 69. Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure, that thou art that Christ the Son of the living God.* So they believed his coming down from Heaven, and expected eternal Life by him, and, for the sake of that, cleaved to him: And to this Day we live by his Death, as we believe his Blood to be the Blood of God incarnate. We live by the Faith of the Son of God, as the Apostle says, *Gal. ii. 20.*

Verse 43. 44. 45. 46. He shews these Murmurers how it came, that they did not come to him, or believe on him. It is not natural to Man to believe in Christ for eternal Life, and the Resurrection from the Dead; he has no Principle in him naturally that can lead him to it. Yea, as Man was originally made and framed for living the earthly Life by his own Obedience, such is the Bias of corrupted Man (who has lost that Life by Disobedience) toward his own Righteousness, and so bent is he upon the earthly Life that was originally annexed to that Righteousness, that he cannot believe on Christ for that eternal Life from the Dead, which is the Reward of his Righteousness that the Father sent him to work, till such time as the Father draw him, against that Bias, to Christ, by that same Grace that sent forth his Son made of a Woman, and by that same Power wherewith the Son will raise him up at the last Day. This Bias toward a Righteousness of our own, and toward the earthly Life, was very manifest in this Multitude, by what is before said; and it was very agreeable to the *Letter* of their Law, annexing national Happiness in the good Land to the national Obedience, but very opposite to the *Spirit* of that Law, and to Christ, the End of it for Righteousness to every one that believeth. Nor was this peculiar to these *Jews* with whom the Lord is here conversing: It is common to them with Multitudes, who, under the Christian Name, are ready to look on those *Jews* as very blind, stupid and carnal, when they read or hear of this Passage; yea, Jesus says, *No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him.* Now, he shews them, that the Father draws Men to him by divine Teaching; even that same

Teaching that was foretold by *Isaiah*, chap. liv. 13. and *Jeremiah*, chap. xxxi. 34. as the common Privilege of the whole New Testament Church: So that every Man, that heard and learned of the Father, cometh to Christ, or believeth on him, being thus drawn to him, being taught of God by the Son who hath seen him. Compare *Matth.* xvi. 16. 17. and *Matth.* xi. 25. 26. 27. The *Jews*, who murmured at his coming down from Heaven, had not been taught of God, had not heard and learned of the Father by him who was of the Father, and had seen him; and so they came not to him, *i. e.* they believed not on him for Life eternal. But his Disciples, who were taught of God, cleaved to him, saying, *Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure, that thou art the Son of the living God.*

Verse 47. 48. 49. 51. He tells them plainly the Meaning of eating the Bread that came down from Heaven to give Life, *viz.* That he that believeth on him, hath everlasting Life, even as they who ate the Manna, lived a temporal Life by it in the Wilderness. But he feeds not the mortal Life, as did that Type; he feeds to Life eternal: For if he had been given for the Sustainance of the mortal Life, he would not therein have excelled the Manna: For if his People have Hope in him in this Life only, they are of all Men most miserable. The Life that he sustains, is another Life, that endureth for ever; the Life that he gives, he giveth for evermore.

And it must be observed here, that he tells the *Jews*, who had seen him who is the Bread of God, that he had already come down from Heaven; therefore this coming down from Heaven cannot be understood of any Descent of heavenly Grace upon the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist: But as Jesus himself, whom the *Jews* saw, was the living Bread; so the coming down of this Bread from Heaven must be the Incarnation of the Son of God, which was testified to them as a Thing that had actually taken place in Jesus, and they believed not. He says, *I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.*

And the bread that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

He had been speaking of himself as the Truth of that Parable and dark Saying of old, concerning the Bread given from Heaven; and all his Discourse of that, was occasioned by the Proposal the *Jews* made to him, of feeding them with Bread, as their Fathers were fed with Manna. But now in these Words he returns to what he himself had proposed to them before, on occasion of their following him because of the Loaves, and resumes what he began to say, of his giving them Meat that endures to everlasting Life: For he tells them here what that Meat is that he had been saying he would give; so he says, *The bread that I will give, is my flesh,*

flesh, ἢ ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοῦ κόσμου ζῶντος. Thus he plainly speaks of his Flesh as a Sacrifice, made by himself as Priest, given to God by him for the Life of the World; and so his Flesh, thus sacrificed by himself, (not by another), is the Meat enduring to eternal Life that he, as the Priest of God, gives to us. And, when he speaks, in the following Verses, of his Blood as separate from his Flesh, he plainly enough points out himself in his bloody Death, as a slain Sacrifice to be feasted on, as the Truth of feasting on the Sacrifices.

Verse 52. This gives the *Jews* new Disturbance. They are uneasy at the first Motion of his being sacrificed and dying for the Life of the World, and of their being fed by that. *They strove among themselves, saying, How can he give us his flesh to eat?* Their Difficulty could not be, that one Carcass could not suffice such a Multitude, much less the whole World; as Mr. *Johnson* would have it: For they saw by the Miracle of the Loaves, that the Smallness of the Carcass and Greatness of the Multitude could be no Objection. They might indeed strive among themselves about being fed with the Flesh of a human Sacrifice; but the Bone of Contention, and the greatest Difficulty, that could not be overcome by the unbelieving *Jews*, was his Death: For how could he be their Leader and Commander as the Messiah they looked for, if his Flesh was sacrificed for Meat to them? And certainly his Death was always the great Stumbling-block to the *Jews*, and nothing the less when it is set forth as a Sacrifice. For how could that stand with their Law concerning Sacrifices and the *Aaronical* Priesthood? How could he then be the Messiah, and give them his Flesh in this manner to eat?

Verse 53. But he insists on the Necessity of this, and affirms, in the most solemn manner, that their partaking by Faith of the Virtue of his bloody Death as a Sacrifice, is as necessary to their having the only true Life which is eternal, as their Meat and Drink could be to their temporal Life. There is no other way of eating this Meat of eternal Life, in distinction from perishing Meat, but by *believing*, so much as once mentioned or pointed at in this whole Passage: And as to *drinking*, it is expressly said, *verse 35. He that believeth on me, shall never thirst.* And so this is the same thing that is said *John iii. 36. He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life.*

Verse 54. And he declares, that his bloody Death, as a Sacrifice, is as effectual to make every Believer live the eternal Life, and to raise him up at the last Day, as Meat and Drink can be to sustain the temporal Life of him that eats and drinks: For, as truly as he is a living Man who eats and drinks, he has eternal Life, through Christ's Death, who believes in him, and he will raise him up at the last Day: *For he that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life, John iii. 6.* And whereas Jesus had said to these *Jews, verse 47. Verily, verily, be*

he that believeth on me, hath everlasting life, he here tells them, that this Life everlasting is by virtue of his Death;

Verse 55. Because his *Flesh*, and his *Blood*, separate from it, and poured out in his Death, is *truly Meat* and *truly Drink*; the true Meat and Drink Offering; the Truth of all the Meat and Drink Offerings whereon the Priests and all the People feasted with God.

Verse 56. And as Meat and Drink is incorporated with the Body that is nourished and lives by it, so is he united with all them that by Faith partake of the Virtue and Efficacy of his bloody Death as a Sacrifice: *Ephes. iii. 16. 17.* — *to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith. 1 Cor. vi. 17.* — *He that is joined unto the Lord, is one spirit. 1 John v. 10. 11. 12.* — *He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the record in himself: — and this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, hath life; he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life. See Rom. x. 8. 9. and 1 Thes. ii. 13.*

Verse 57. He points out the Communion that they have with the Father in the divine Life, and with himself as the Father's Priest, who believe in him, and live by his Death, as the Truth of the Communion with God in the carnal Sacrifices. And of this enough was said before.

Verse 58. He declares that this his Sacrifice, his Flesh and Blood, that brings the divine Life to Men, and gives them Communion with God in his Life, is *that bread which came down from heaven* when he was incarnated; and that the Life this Bread gives, is not temporal, as that sustained by Manna, which, though it came down from Heaven in a Sense, could not perpetuate the Life that it fed; but the Life this Meat gives, is eternal, and he that eateth of it shall live for ever: *Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead.* This eating differs as much from the fleshly eating of the Manna, as this eternal Life differs from that fleshly mortal Life they had by eating it. Therefore this Meat, this Flesh and Blood, cannot be the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist; nor can the eating of it be the consuming of that Bread and Wine, as Mr. *Johnson* says, by Manducation: For that Bread and Wine was not then come down from Heaven in any Sense; and it sustains this mortal Life, so far as it nourishes the Body, and is incorporated with it; and thereby is but a Sign of the true Bread that gives eternal Life: And every one that eateth of that Bread, and drinketh of that Cup, as the Fathers ate the Manna, and drank of the Rock, hath not eternal Life, shall not live for evermore. Yea, these *Jews*, if they had then believed that he was come down from Heaven to give eternal Life, as did his believing Disciples, would at that time have had eternal Life by him, though they could not yet eat the
Bread

Bread and Wine in the Eucharist: For the Virtue and Efficacy of his Death to come, for the Redemption of Transgressions that were under the first Covenant, would have reached them, if they had believed that Jesus whom they saw was the Son of God come down from Heaven to give eternal Life, as the believing Disciples did; even as the Virtue of his Death reached all who from the Beginning died in the Faith of him to come, as the *Seed of the Woman*, or that *Seed of Abraham*, or the *Son of David*.

Verse 59. 60. When many of his Disciples had heard all this, they said, *This is an hard saying, who can bear it?* Is he then to be sacrificed? Are men to live, not only by eating human Flesh, but drinking Blood? and can they have no true Life without it? Is his Flesh and Blood to be ate and drunk as the true Meat and Drink Offering? Is it to be incorporated with theirs? Would this make them Partakers of the divine Life, and raise them from the Dead? It is hard to think of living by the Death of the Messiah! And, as to this eating his Flesh, and drinking his Blood, who can understand it, or take it in any tolerable Sense?

Verse 61. 62. 63. 64. Jesus, seeing in himself that his Disciples murmured about this, said to them, *Doth this offend you? If then ye should see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? i. e. before he came down from Heaven.* If they should see him ascend into Heaven, as he did in consequence of his being slain; though this would demonstrate, that he came down from Heaven to give eternal Life by his Death; yet it would be full as inconsistent with their Notion of the Messiah, as any Thing he had said about his Death: And, as he would not be bodily present with them, and they could no more see him as they now did, their Difficulty about living by eating and drinking his Flesh and Blood would be no less. But he shews them their Mistake of his Words on this Matter that occasioned their Difficulty. *It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, are spirit, and are life.* They did not observe what was said in the Beginning of the Psalm to which they referred him when seeking Bread from Heaven: *Give ear, O my people, to my law; incline your ear to the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter dark sayings of old, which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us.* For here the Lord is accordingly speaking to them in a Parable, and signifying the Way of eternal Life by his Death, in Figures taken from the Old Testament. Now, in every Parable, the Figure or Letter is the *Flesh*, and the Meaning clothed with that Figure, and hid under it, is the *Spirit* that enlivens it, without which it is unprofitable, as a Carcass without a Soul. It is therefore the Meaning of this *eating his Flesh* that gives eternal Life. His Words have a spi-

spiritual Sense, clothed with that Figure of bodily eating, and so they give Life to him that believeth; for they hold forth him come down from Heaven to be sacrificed for the Life of the World: And he that believes this, shall as verily live eternally, through the Efficacy of his Death, as *Israel* lived in the Wilderness by Manna; and have as real a spiritual Feast with God, as ever *Israel* had a fleshly one on the Sacrifices; and be as verily fed in a spiritual Manner to Life eternal, as this Multitude found their temporal Life fed by the Loaves. These are all the Figures used in this Passage to signify our living by the Faith of the Son of God, who loved us, and gave himself for us. And though the same Thing be represented to us now in the instituted Sign of eating Bread and drinking Wine in the Eucharist, yet there is not one Word in this whole Passage that points to this Sign, of which the Hearers could know nothing, while they knew all the other Figures. The Thing signified in the Eucharist, is the Subject of our Lord's Discourse here; he speaks of that self-same Thing that is now shewed to us in that Action, and so far it can be applied to the Eucharist. But there is not one Syllable in this whole Chapter of giving or receiving, or of eating and drinking that Bread and Wine; yea, the bodily eating there is as unprofitable, without the Spirit and Sense of it, as any eating that the *Jews* could be thinking of here. The Lord's Supper is not compleat without the Thing signified, even the eating of Christ's Flesh and Body, and drinking his Blood, by Faith. But, says our Lord to those to whom he signified the same Thing by other Figures, *There are some of you that believe not.* And so they could not come into the Spirit of his Words, as those who by Faith beheld the Glory of the Word made Flesh, and of his Fulness received Grace for Grace; and so they could no more understand the spiritual eating than Mr. *Johnson* does. *I am, &c.*

Dundee, August 10. 1742.