

SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

No SUFFICIENT

REASON

For Restoring the

PRAYERS and DIRECTIONS

O F

King *Edward* the Sixth's

FIRST

LITURGY;

PART I.

By a NON-JUROR.

*In Vain do they Worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Com-
mandments of Men, St. Mark vii. 7.
He said unto them, Full well ye reject the Commandments of
God, that ye may keep your own Tradition, Ver. 9.*

*Si solus Christus audiendus est, non debemus attendere, quid
alius ante nos faciendum putaverit, sed quid, qui ante
omnes Christus, prior fecerit. Neque enim hominis con-
tinerudinem sequi oportet, sed Dei veritatem. B. Cyr.
Epist. lxiin. ad Cæcil.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for *John Morphew* near *Stationers-Hall*.
1718. [Price 1s. 6d.]

E R R A T A.

PAGE 3. Line 20. Read *Ephes.* ii. 20. p. 7.
 l. 8. r. *Scriptures.* p. 11. l. 31. r. ; p. 12.
 l. 33. r. p. 101. p. 17. l. ult. r. *Lit.* p. 35. l.
 28. r. *Promises.* p. 38. l. 6. del. cited. p. 41. l.
 34. r. *ἔυφραίνεν.* p. 46. l. 7. r. For so *Justin.* p.
 52. l. 33. r. *σπονδαί.* and l. antep. r. *ὄνομα.* p. 58.
 l. 14. for *it.* r. *the Necessity of it.* p. 70. l. 33. r.
Sacrificium. p. 82. l. 16. r. *thinks that.* p. 98. l.
 18. r. *Side.* p. 113. l. 8. for *us.* r. *Christians.*

THE CONTENTS.

	Page
I Introduction.	1
<i>The Design of the whole.</i>	2
I. <i>Scripture, not Tradition, the Christian's Rule shewn from Scripture.</i>	Ibid.
<i>And from Tradition.</i>	6
<i>Pleas for Tradition.</i>	22
1. <i>That Tradition stands recommended by Scripture it self.</i>	Ibid.
2. <i>That we our selves are forced to fly to it in some Cases.</i>	26
II. <i>The Tradition for the Articles contended for is not so full as it is represented to be.</i>	36
1. <i>It is not so Extensive as is pretended.</i>	Ibid.
2. <i>And where it does extend, it is not so full and satisfactory as it is given out to be.</i>	44
<i>The Testimony of Justin Martyr considered.</i>	Ibid.
<i>As also those of Irenæus and Clemens Alexandri- nus.</i>	50
<i>And of St. Cyprian.</i>	53 & 73
<i>Some truly Apostolical Usages not thought necessary to be Revived.</i>	70
<i>To receive the Eucharist after Supper, at least, as ne- cessary as the Mixture.</i>	73
<i>Of the Jewish Talmud.</i>	74, 104, & 107
<i>The Custom of communicating Infants.</i>	76

The Contents.

<i>That our Blessed Saviour gives not the least Hint of any Thing in the Cup, but Wine.</i>	77
<i>Our Saviour's Cup not necessarily mixt.</i>	78
<i>St. Paul's calling it the Cup of Blessing.</i>	Ibid.
<i>Our Saviour an Antitype to Melchisedeck.</i>	82
<i>And to Noah.</i>	86
<i>The Drink-Offering amongst the Jews.</i>	87
<i>Of the Apostolical Constitutions.</i>	88
<i>The Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysoftom, no good Evidence in this Case.</i>	p. 89
<i>Nor the Council of Carthage.</i>	91
<i>Nor that in Trullo.</i>	Ibid.
<i>That Wine only is mentioned in Scripture because of its being a principal Ingredient, is a Begging the Question.</i>	99
<i>Of Moses's sprinkling the People, Hebr. ix. 19.</i>	103
<i>According to Dr. Lightfoot, he that drinks Wine not mingled at the Passover, performs his Duty.</i>	106
<i>The Mixture uncommanded by the Mosaick Institution.</i>	Ibid.
<i>Dr. Lightfoot cited to prove the Wine our Saviour used at the Institution of the Eucharist was mixt.</i>	107
<i>Buxtorf notes there were four Cups at the Passover.</i>	110
<i>The Importance of what Plutarch says of Κεραυα.</i>	111
<i>Dr. Lightfoot rightly cited, when speaking of the Mixture as a convenient Rite.</i>	112
<i>An unhappy Question.</i>	113
<i>No Cup said to be purposely mixed by our Saviour till the Apostolical Constitutions.</i>	Ibid.
<i>Whether our Saviour kept the Passover with Unleavened Bread.</i>	114
<i>Whether he took the mixt Cup, only because it was ready at Hand.</i>	117
<i>Christians as much at Liberty to use unmixt Wine, as Leavened Bread.</i>	118
<i>The Conclusion.</i>	119

POSTSCRIPT.

THIS Reply having grown to a greater Length than was designed, I thought it best, for more Reasons than one, to send out this Part first. Which had been Published some Weeks sooner, but that it has stuck much longer in the Press, than was expected. The other Part I promise myself will follow in a little time. At present I shall only subjoin a few Citations relating to the Mixture, that did not occur soon enough to be inserted in their proper Places.

Page 41. After these Words, *Remembrance of me*, these should follow. And in his 7th Homily on *Levit. x.* he speaks of *Wine*, and *new Wine*, and *new Wine* to be put into new Bottles, and new Wine in the Kingdom of Heaven, but without the least Hint of any Water to be mixt with it. And *Cyril of Jerusalem* puts the Question, (a) *Since our Saviour changed the Water, at the Feast at Cana in Galilee into Wine, why cannot he as well change Wine into his Blood?* Now it is agreed on all Hands, that our Saviour did not change the Water into Wine and Water, but into Wine only. And *St. Cyril* makes no difference betwixt this Wine, and that which he made his Blood. And a little after; (b) *In the Type of Bread he gave his*

pag. 41.

(a) Τὸ ὕδωρ ποτὲ εἰς οἶνον μεταβέβηκεν, ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, οἰκείῳ ρευματι καὶ ἐκ ἀξιοπύδος ὄσιν οἶνον μέλαβαλῶν εἰς αἷμα; *Catech. Myst. g. iv. p. 292.*

(b) Ἐν πύτῳ γὰρ ἄρτου, δίδωταί σοι τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου δίδωταί σοι τὸ αἷμα. *Ibid.*

Body,

Body, and in the Type of [not of Water and Wine, but barely of] Wine he gave his Blood.

Mag. 52.

At the End of Page 52. the Reader may please to add these Words. *Theodorus Mopsuestenus*, never charged with Heterodoxy in this Point, testifies that κέρασμα does not always signify a Mixture. For when commenting upon the lxxivth Psalm as it is in the Septuagint-Translation, but in the Hebrew the lxxvth, ver. 9. (c) *He hath*, says he, *in his Hand a Cup full of unmixt Wine; and that he may intimate the more terrible Punishments to be meant by this Wine not being mixt, he says of an unmingled κέρασμα.* But how is it that having spoken of Wine unmixed, he immediately says it is mixed? The Reason of this is, because we often call such a quantity of Liquor as may suffice for a Draught, a Κεῖσσις, [which Word signifies also a Mixture.] The Psalmist's Intent therefore in this place is to declare, that hereby is meant such a large Quantity as to fill the Cup. He would therefore by both Words express the Intensity of the Punishment spoken of; that is to say, both by the Wine being unmixt, and by it's filling the Cup; by the Purity of the Wine, shewing the Severity and Vehemence of it, and by its Fullness, the Sufficiency of it, so as to extend to all.

(c) Ἐχει γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐαυτοῦ χειρὶ ποτήριον πεπληρωμένον ἀκρά-
 τε οἴνου· ἵνα ἔπη φοβερῶς τειρωρίας, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκρατων οἴνον
 μειζόνων καθάπερ εἰς. Τὸ δὲ κέρασμα ἢ κεκραμένον λέγει·
 (πῶς γὰρ οἴον τε ἐπιπόνησεν ἀκράτῃ, πάλιν ἐπιπὼν κεκραμένον;)·
 ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ κρασιν πολλάκις καλέμεν τὸ μέτρον, ὃ πρὸς πό-
 σιν ἀρκεῖ. Τὸτο ἠβελήθη ἐπιπὼν, ὅτι τοιαύτην κρασιν, ἔπει
 μεγίστω ὡσεὶ πληρῶσαι τὸ ποτήριον. Βύβηται δὲ ἐπιπὼν εἰς
 ἀμφοτέρων τῆς τιμωρίας τὴν ἐπίτασιν. Καὶ ἐκ τῶ ἀκρατον
 εἶναι τὸ οἴνον, καὶ ἐκ τῶ πεπληρῶσαι τὸ ποτήριον· πῶ μὲν ἀ-
 κράτῳ τὸ αὐστηρὸν καὶ ἔυλονον δεικνύς, τῶ δὲ πλήρει τὸ δια-
 κές, καὶ πάντων ἀπλόμενον. *Corder. Caten. Græc. Patrum in Psalm.*
 lxxiv. 9.

St. *Athanasius* speaking of our Saviour's having prepared a Table, explains it thus, (d) That is to say the holy Altar, and upon that the heavenly Bread, and which gives Life to all that partake of it, even his holy and most holy Body, and Wine, that cheers the Heart, and yet works Sobriety in the Soul of every one of those that taste of it, as if he poured his own Blood into the Cup.

Agreeably whereto the lxxii render *Prov.* ix. 2. Ἐκέρασεν εἰς κρασίηρα ἢ ἐαυτῆς οἶνον. Of which I desire it may be considered, whether the most natural Construction of these Words, be not, *She hath poured her Wine into the Cup, or she has prepared her Cup*; rather than she hath mingled her Wine in it?

After what is said concerning *Melchisedeck's* Oblation as a Type of our Saviour's, Page 86. it may follow, (e) To this purpose St. *Athanasius* calls the Wine he gave to *Abraham* ἀκρατον, unmixed,

Mag. 86.

(d) Περὶ θεοκαίως τρέφειν, τρέφει τὸ ἄριον δυσιασίειον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἄρτον ἑράγιον καὶ ἄφθαρτον, καὶ πᾶσι ζωὴν χαλεβόμενον τοῖς μελαλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. τὸ ἄριον καὶ πανάριον αὐτῶ σῶμα, οἶνον τελευθερινούσα τῷ καρδίαν, καὶ νῆψιν ἐμπαίβητα ἐν τῇ ἐκάστῃ ψυχῇ αὐτῶ ἀπογενόμενον ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ὅτι κρασίηρα κέρατος τὸ ἐαυτοῦ αἷμα. B. Athanas. in Nic. Conc. c. Arium Diff. To. 2. p. 122. I own this Treatise is thought not to be genuine, and cannot therefore be appealed to for settling any Doctrine, yet I see not why it may not be used, for shewing the Nature and Sense of the Language it is written in.

(e) Ὡς ἔν ἀπῆντησεν ὁ Μελχισδεκ τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἕως σφόνδα ἀπὸ τῆ κοπῆς αὐτῶ Βασιλείων, ἐπέδωκεν αὐτῷ ποσίειον ἀκρατον, ὅπβαλλων αὐτῶ καὶ κλάσμα ἄρτου, καὶ τῷ λαῷ αὐτῶ πη. Καὶ ἕως τῆ σήμερον ἡμέρας κατὰ τόντον τρόπον ὁμοιωθή τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. Ἀλλ' ἐκ εἰς χεῖν ἀλλ' ἔτθ τύπος πρώτθ ἐγένετο τῶ ἀνάμακρον δυσίαν προσφέρειν, τὴν ἀγίαν προσφορὴν διδ λέγει αὐ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ αἰῶνα, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισδεκ, ἐπειδὴ τύπος ἐγένετο τῆς ἀγίας προσφορῆς, ὅπδεδωκεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ πῖς πη. B. Athanas. Hist. in Melchif. Vol. 2. p. 9.

and

and affirms that he was the *Type of the unbloody Sacrifice*, *Ἰσθίας ἀναιμακτοῦ*.

So *Eusebius* speaking of *Melchisedeck* relates, (f) That *blest Abraham with Wine ONLT and bread*. And to the same Effect also says *St. Augustine*; (g) *There first appeared the Sacrifice, which is now [so long after] offered to God by Christians all the World over, and then was fulfilled that which was done a long time after it was said by the Prophet to Christ, who was to come in the Flesh; thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedeck.*

(f) *Ὀίνῳ δὲ μόνῳ καὶ ἄρτῳ τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἐυλογοῦν. Demonstr. Evang. l. 5. c. 3.*

(g) *Ubi culpe primum apparuit Sacrificium, quod nunc à Christianis celebratur toto terrarum orbe, impetraturque illud quod Iugè post hoc factum, per Prophetam dicitur ad Christum, Tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedeck. B. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 16. c. 22.*

No sufficient

R E A S O N

For Restoring the Prayers, &c.

SINCE it is resolved this unhappy Controversy shall be carried on, we who cannot come into the Measures proposed, should be thought much wanting to our Cause, if we should not continue to shew the Reason of our Dissent. I should have thought it no small Happiness, if this Labour might have been spared, and the Dispute dropt. But our learned Author having thought fit, to publish a Defence of the former Reasons, I hope I shall be excused, if I take upon me to appear against it; in behalf not only of the Constitution of our own Church, but of our Blessed Saviour's Institution likewise; both which are apparently on our Side. As to our own Church, there is no Dispute, but that we keep closest to its Rules and Practices, and thereby acquit our selves its most genuine Sons and faithful Members. And as to the Doctrines of the *New Testament*, and our Saviour's Institution of the Holy *Eucharist* in particular, every one must see that the Scripture being the Measure we go by, there can be no justifiable Reason for any One's dividing from us upon this Account. And to shew that there is not, I shall set my self to make good these two following Propositions.

A

I. Scri-

I. Scripture, and not Tradition, is prescribed by our Lord to his Disciples, as the Rule they are to walk by, and which we are necessarily to adhere to.

II The Tradition pleaded for the four controverted Points, is not so full and unquestionable, as it is represented to be. If either of these Propositions, much more if both of them, can be proved to be true, the Pleas brought for the Essentiality of the Usages now contended for, must necessarily be acknowledged to be false. And by consequence, the Practices built upon those Pleas, must be Erroneous and Ill-grounded. And that this is the true State of the Case, I come now to shew. And here I say,

I. Scripture, and not Tradition, is prescribed by our Saviour to his Disciples, as the Rule for them to walk by, and which we are all necessarily to adhere to, for the Guidance of our Faith, and Worship, and our Behaviour in all Respects. *To the Law and to the Testimony*; says the Prophet *Isaiab*, *if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no Light in them*, *Is. viii. 20.* And again, *Seek ye out of the Book of the Lord, and read*, *ch. xxxiv. 16.* And so in the New Testament, *Search the Scriptures*, says our Saviour, *St. John v. 39.* And in the *Acts of the Apostles*, *ch. xvii. 11.* The *Jews at Berea* are commended as *more Noble*, of a milder and better Temper and Disposition, than those at *Thessalonica*, and for this Reason, *because they received the Word with all Readiness of Mind, and searched the Scriptures daily.* And indeed, that not Tradition, but Scripture, is the Rule for our Direction, is a Doctrine so agreeable to our most holy Profession, and has been so fully proved from time to time, that whensoever any Competition arises between them, I thought

thought there was no Room for doubting, whether of them were chiefly to be relied upon.

As to Rites and Ceremonies and all Matters of Indifferency, it is and must be in the Choice of every Church, to determine what they shall see proper, for their own People and Circumstances; unless it be resolved they shall have no Power left them, to order any Thing in the Worship of God. Which would be highly unreasonable, when every Master of a Family may do it in his own House. But in all the Essentials of Religion, the Case is very different; for here we are obliged to keep to the Laws of God, and the Directions of our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles, recorded in the holy Scripture. Nor could I ever learn that bare Tradition was sufficient of it self, to make any Thing a necessary indispensable Duty, that has no Foundation at all in Scripture. And I cannot find that the Points here insisted upon have. St. Paul teaches that the Church is *built upon the Apostles and Prophets*, and especially upon our blessed Lord and Saviour, as its *chief Corner-stone*, and not the Apostles and Prophets, and our Lord himself upon the Church. Our Saviour confuted the *Sadducees* from Scripture, St. Matt. xxii. 32. St. Paul confuted the false Apostles from Scripture, Gal. iii. 10. The Fathers in their Disputations with Hereticks, appealed to Scripture. But now we are taught to betake our selves not to Scripture, but Tradition, the Fathers, and the *Jewish Rabbies*; which though all of Use in their proper Place, yet are by no means to be compared to Scripture, or set in opposition to it.

Tradition, as the Answerer had said (a) before, may be of Use for confirming, what is delivered

(a) *No Reason*, p. 53.

in Scripture, though not so fully and clearly as some other Doctrines are. But when our Saviour, in the Institution of the holy Eucharist, mentions nothing more in the Cup than (b) *the Fruit of the Vine*, it wants yet to be proved, after all our learned Author has said, in behalf of a Mixture, that not Wine alone, but only as diluted with Water, such as never proceeded from the Vine, can be the only proper Essential Matter of the Cup in this Ordinance, or how any Tradition can evince it to be so. In like manner, when neither our Saviour nor his Apostles have given any Manner of Direction, about Prayers for the Saints departed this Life, nor have acquainted us what their Condition is now, before the Resurrection; or that their Happiness is capable of being any way improved by our Prayers, how unscriptural Tradition can ever make these Prayers essential to Christianity, and of absolute Necessity in order to Salvation, is a Paradox too hard to be maintained. And the like I may say also of the other Alterations proposed. Whatsoever may be offered otherwise in their behalf, their not being taught in Scripture, is an Objection not to be removed. Nor can they ever be proved, to be necessary Parts of our most holy Religion, to the Satisfaction of those who believe the Scripture to be the Rule of our Faith, and Life, and Worship, as our Church professes to do, as well as the Reformed Churches abroad.

(c) *That whatsoever is not read in Scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation, is*

(b) St Matt. xxvi. 29.

(c) Artic. VI.

undoubtedly the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; and not so only, but moreover of the (*d*) *Augustan*, the (*e*) *Helvetic*, the (*f*) *Wirtenburgh*, and the (*g*) *Bohemian* Confessions. And indeed it is the true Basis of the whole Reformation. And the Truth hereof might be easily evinced, by a plentiful Cloud of Witnesses, both from Scripture and other Ecclesiastical Writers, both in former and latter Ages, were there any Need of it. But that Tradition should be set in Competition with it, to be received *pari pietatis affectu*, is a Doctrine of the (*b*) *Council of Trent*, but not to be met with in Scripture, nor the Doctrines of the Primitive Church.

So that I may well affirm in the Words of our great Archbishop, that (*i*) *Some Traditions I deny not to be true and firm, and of great both Authority and Use in the Church, as Apostolical, but yet not Fundamental in the Faith*. And again, (*k*) *Not the Church of England only, but all Protestants agree, most truly and most strongly in this*, says the fore-named Great Prelate, *That the Scripture is sufficient to Salvation, and contains in it all Things necessary to it. And have not we Reason then to account it, as it is, the Foundation of our Faith*.

And it is well known, that the Apostle St. Paul denounces a severe *Anathema* against either Angel, or Man, (*l*) that ventures to teach any other

(*d*) *Corp. Confessionum*, p. 1.

(*e*) *Ibid.* p. 67.

(*f*) *Ibid.* p. 131.

(*g*) *Pag.* 177.

(*b*) *Sess.* 4.

(*i*) *Laud* against *Fisher*, §. 11. Numb. 2.

(*k*) *Sess.* 15. Numb. 1.

(*l*) *Cum ergo neque ipse Apostolus, neque Angelus de caelo, annuntiare possit aliter aut docere, praeterquam quod semel Christus*

other Doctrine than what our Lord himself and his Apostles had taught, *Gal.* i. 8, 9. Which deserves to be seriously attended to, and well considered, by all such as set up Tradition against Scripture, whereby to make those Doctrines or Usages necessary to Salvation, which the Word of God has not made so. The Word of God, I say, *which is able to make a Man wise unto Salvation, and perfect to every good work*; as the same St. Paul affirms it does, *2 Tim.* iii. 15, 16, 17. For to make it effectual to our Salvation, it must contain in it all Things that are of absolute Necessity, to be believed or practised by us. Because if only some of our Duty is to be found there, and we must depend upon Tradition for the rest, then Scripture is but a partial imperfect Rule to us, and not such as the Apostle represents it to be. Nor have we Scripture only to this purpose, but Tradition too. *Ut quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus*, says St. (m) *Jerom.* As we do not deny the Things which are written, so we do reject those that are not written. And the same might easily be proved from Numbers of others, all from time to time unanimously confirming the same Doctrine. Thus (n) *Irenæus*, disputing against the *Valentinians* and other Hereticks, sets up *Scriptures* in opposition to their blasphemous Conceits, (o) and Pro-

Christus docuit, & Apostoli ejus annuñciaverunt; miror farris unde hoc usurpatum sit, ut contra Evangelicam & Apostolicam Disciplinam, quibusdam in locis aqua offeratur in Dominico Calice, quæ sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere. *S. Cyprian, Epist.* 63. p. 152.

(m) *Adv. Heivid.* c. 9.

(n) Τα μὲν ἐκ τῆς γεγραμῶν ὀνόματα, καὶ τὰς λέξεις, καὶ τὰς ᾠρθολογίας ἐπιγνώσκειται, τὴν δὲ βλάσφημον καθόδιον ταύτης οὐκ ὀπιγνώσκειται. *Adv. Hæres.* l. i. c. 1.

(o) Ex scripturis sic accipiet probationem. *L. 2. c. 42.*

inises

mises to disprove their Tenets *from Scripture*. And upon another Occasion speaking of the Gospel, he teaches that the Apostles (p) *delivered it to us in the Scriptures, to be the Foundation, and Pillar of our Faith*. As he also complains of the Hereticks against whom he was writing (q) that *when they are confuted out of Scripture, they set themselves to accuse the Scripture, as if we had them not right, or as if they wanted Authority, or as differently expressed, and because Truth cannot be found out by their Help, except BY SUCH AS ARE ACQUAINTED WITH TRADITION*. Where we see his Charge against them was depending more upon *Tradition*, than upon the Holy Scriptures. And treating of their new (r) erroneous and blasphemous Gospel, he adds, that *they who will, may learn how it differs from the Gospel of Truth, as is shewn out of the SCRIPTURES*. And at another time, discoursing of our Blessed Saviour's Incarnation, he tells them, (f) *they are confuted from those Things which are related in the Scriptures, concerning the Coming of Christ*. Agreeably whereto Tertulian declares himself to (t) *adore the Fulness of*

(p) Per Dei voluntatem in scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum. L. 3. c. 1.

(q) Cum arguuntur ex Scripturis, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex autoritate, & quia variè sint dictæ, & quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his, qui nesciunt Traditionem. L. 3. c. 2.

(r) Si enim quod ab eis profertur, veritatis est Evangelium, dissimile est autem hoc illis, quæ ab Apostolis nobis tradita sunt; qui volunt, possunt discere, quemadmodum ex ipsis Scripturis ostenditur, jam non esse id quod ab Apostolis traditum est veritatis Evangelium. L. 3. c. 11.

(f) Confutati ab iis, quæ in Scripturis de Christi adventu referuntur. L. 4. c. 69.

(t) Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem. Adv. Hermog. c. 22.

the

the Scripture. And disputing against * *Hermogenes* who would not allow the World to be created out of nothing, he objects to him, that he could find nothing of his Doctrine in *Scripture.* And thereupon challenges both himself and his Followers, to shew it if there be. And if they cannot, charges them to beware of the dreadful *Woe denounced against those who add to, or detract from the Word of God.* In like manner *Clemens Alexandrinus* lays it down as an undoubted Truth, that (u) *those must certainly err in the greatest Matters, who engage themselves in them, unless they keep to the Rule of Faith.* And says, (w) *If they had a Judgment between Truth and Falshood, exercised to make choice of what Things are proper, they would obey the Scriptures.* I confess, a little after he says (x) *He that kicks against the Tradition of the Church, and starts aside into the Opinions of Mens Heresies, ceases hereupon to be a Man of God, and faithful to the Lord.* But that by this Ecclesiastical Tradition he means not any Thing distinct from Scripture, he gives us in the next words to understand; affirming that *He that shall return from this deceit, and HEAR-*

* An autem de aliquâ subjacenti materiâ facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat vix illud, adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum. *Ibid.*

(u) Σφάλλαξ γὰρ ἀνάγκη μέγιστα τῶν μεγίστων ἐγχειρήσας πράγμασιν, ἢν μὴ τὴ χάριτα τὴ ἀληθείας παρ' αὐτῆς λαβόντες ἔχουσι τὴ ἀληθείας. *Strom.* l. 7. p. 890. *Edit.* Oxon.

(w) Εἰ γὰρ ἐκέκμησιν, ταῖς θεαῖς ἐπίδοσιν ἂν γεγραμῖς. *Ibid.*

(x) Ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τῆ θεῶ καὶ πιστὸς τῷ κυρίῳ διαμένειν ἀπολώλεκται, ὁ ἀναλακτίσας τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παραδόσεων, καὶ ἀνασκηρίσας εἰς δόξας αἰρέσεων ἀνθρωπίνων. ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆ θεῶ τὴ ἀπάτης παλινδρομήσας, καθάκυσας τῶν γεγραμῶν, καὶ τὴ αὐτῶν βίον ἐπερέψας τῆ ἀληθείας, οἷον ὅτι ἀνδρώσασθε Θεὸς ἀποτερεῖσται. *Ibid.*

KEN TO THE SCRIPTURES, and be converted to the Truth, is in a Manner of a Man become a God. And again, (y) *We use the Scriptures, as the Criterion, to find out Things.* And a little after, (z) *We do not wait for the Testimony of Men, but prove that which is sought after by the Voice of the Lord, which is more satisfactory than all Demonstrations, or rather is the only Demonstration; according to which Knowledge, they who have tasted of the Scripture are faithful.* It is by the Words of God, says Origen (a), that the Spirit grows strong, as the Flesh does by Meats and Delights. And more expressly to our present purpose, at another time, speaking of the two Testaments, (b) *In which, says he, every Word that belongs to God may be searched out and discussed, and the whole Knowledge of Things may be taken from them. But if any Thing remains undetermined by these Divine Writings, no other third Scripture may be received for our Instruction.* So says St. Cyprian, (c) *Whence is this Tradition, whether descending from the Authority of our Lord*
and

(y) Ἀμέλει πρὸς τὴν τῆς πεπραγμάτων ἔυρεσιν, αὐτῆ [τῆς κυριακῆς γεαφῆ] χρώμεθα κειτηρία. *Ibid.*

(z) Οὐ τὴν δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμάρτου μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου φωνῆς ψέμεθα τὸ ζήτημα. ἢ πρῶτον ἀποδείξεον ἐχρησάμεθα, μᾶλλον δὲ, ἢ μόνον ἀπόδειξις ἔσται πυχάνει. Καθ' ἣν ἐπιστήμην οἱ μὲν ἀπογευσάμενοι μόνον τῶν γεαφῶν πρῶτοι. *Ibid.*

(a) Sicut cibus & deliciis caro, ita Spiritus verbis divinis convalescit. *In Levit. Hom. ix. p. 80.*

(b) In quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet (hoc enim est sacrificium) requiri & discuti, atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem super fuerit, quod non divina scriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam scripturam debere ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi. *Hom. v. p. 66.*

(c) Unde est ista Traditio? utrum de Dominicâ & Evangelicâ auctoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atque Epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt, Deus testatur, & proponit ad Jesum Nave, dicens: Non

and his Gospel, or coming from the Precepts and Epistles of the Apostles. For God witnesses, that those Things are to be done which are written, and propounds it to Jesus the Son of Nave, saying: The Book of this Law shall not depart out of thy Mouth, but thou shalt meditate in it Day and Night, that thou mayst observe to do all Things that are written in it. If therefore it be commanded in the Gospel, or be contained in the Epistles or Acts of the Apostles — let this divine and holy Tradition be observed. But if the contrary be true, how is it that they may seem not fit to be condemned by us, who appear by the Testimony of the Apostle to be condemned by themselves? And in his Discourse *de Lapsis*, he complains of the Forwardness of the Martyrs, to grant Letters for a Reconciliation to Penitents not duly humbled, and professes to them, (d) He is not joynd to the Church, who is separated from the Gospel. And again he asks; (e) Do the Martyrs order any Thing to be done? Yet if the Things they order are not written in the Law of the Lord, it is first to be inquired, whether they have obtained of God what they sued for. Then, [but not

recedet liber legis hujus ex ore tuo, sed meditaberis in eo die ac nocte, ut observes facere omnia quæ scripta sunt in eo.—Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum Epistolis aut Actibus continetur, ut à quacunque hæresi venientes non baptizentur, sed tantum manus illis imponatur in pœnitentiam; observetur divina hæc & sancta Traditio. Si verò ubique hæretici nihil aliud quam adversarii & antichristi nominantur: Si vitandi & perversi & à semet ipsis damnati pronunciantur; quale est ut videantur damnandi à nobis non esse, quos constat Apostolicâ contestatione à semet ipsis damnatos esse? *Epist.* 74. *Pompio.*

(d) Nec Ecclesiæ jungitur, qui ab Evangelio separatur. *De Lapsis*, p. 129.

(e) Mandant aliquid Martyres fieri? Sed si scripta non sint in Domini lege quæ mandant; ante est ut sciamus illos à Deo impetrasse quod postulant; tunc facere quod mandant: neque enim statim videri potest de Divinâ Majestate concessur, quod fuerit humanâ pollicitatione promissum. p. 130.

till

till then] *what they order may be done.* And again, (f) He thinks it strange, that *Custom should be thought greater than Truth, or that That should not be followed in Spirituals, which has been revealed for our Improvement by the holy Spirit.* (g) In our worldly Concerns, says St. Athanasius, we will not mind a Multitude of Men under false Names; And in our heavenly Doctrines, shall I follow unsupported Motions, leaving the Things we have been taught of old and very long ago, with great Consent, and with the Testimony of the Scriptures? And writing to (b) Dracontius he puts him in Mind, that the People expected to be fed by him, with Doctrines out of the holy Scriptures; and tells Marcellinus (i) that the Scripture is the Mistress of Virtue and true Faith; and positively affirms, that (k) the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient for the Declaration of the Truth. And upon another Occasion, having reckoned up the several Books of the Old and New Testament, he professes (l) that *These are the Wells of Salvation. In these only is the Doctrine of Godliness declared. Let no Man add any Thing to these, nor take any Thing from them.*

(f) Quasi consuetudo major sit veritate, aut non id sit in spiritualibus sequendum, quod in melius fuerit à Sancto Spiritu revelatum. *Epist. Jubiano. 73.*

(g) Γνήτων μὲν ἕνεκα περὶ γράμματα, ἐκ αἰδουόμεθα πληθὺν ψευδονύμων· ἕρηνίαν δὲ χάριν δογμάτων, νεύμασιν ἀναποδείκτοις ἀκολουθήσω. ἧν̄ πάλαι καὶ πρέσβαλοι μετὰ πολλῆς συμφωνίας, καὶ τῆν̄ γραφῶν μαρτυρίας παρεδεδότων ἀναχρήσας. Quod veritas non multat. *Judic.*

(b) Ὅτι λαοὶ προσδοκῶσι φέρυσθαι σε τερπνῶ ἀυλοῖς, τὴν ἐν τῶν γραφῶν διδασκαλίαν. *Ad Dracont. Epist.*

(i) Πᾶσα μὲν ἡ θεῖα γραφὴ διδασκαλὸς ἐστὶν ἀρετῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀληθείας. *Ad Marcellin. Epist.*

(k) Ἀυδάρκεις μὲν γὰρ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀγνοίαι καὶ θεόπνευστοὶ γραφοῦντες πρὸς τὴν ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν. *Orat. c. Gentes. p. 1.*

(l) Ταῦτα πηγαὶ σωτηρίας.—Ἐν τέτοις μόνοις τὸ εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι· μηδεὶς τέτοις ὀφθαλλέτω· μηδὲ τέτων ἀφαιρεῖσθω π. *Fragm. Epist. 39.*

Optatus teaches that our Blessed Saviour whilst he was upon Earth, gave in charge to his Apostles whatsoever was necessary for the time ; but that as an earthly Father when he apprehends himself about to leave the World, makes his Will, and executes it before Witnesse, that so it may continue after he is gone, for the Prevention of such Differences as might otherwise arise amongst his Children ; or for quieting and putting an end to them if they do arise and get to any Head ; And if it so fall out that any Contests happen amongst them, they do not consult their Father's Tomb, but search his Will, for reconciling them, and restoring Concord amongst them, and so he who lies at rest in his Grave, silently speaks by his last Testament. In like manner as he proceeds, (m) *He that is alive and whose the Will is, is in Heaven. Let his Will and Pleasure therefore be inquired after in his Gospel.* Thus we see how constantly it is inculcated, that the only Method for discovering the right Way of Salvation, is a diligent Search and Inquiry into the holy Scriptures. And the same Direction is left us also by a great many others. In particular, Cyril of Jerusalem gives this Advice: (n) *Gather from the holy Scriptures at your leisure a Summary of the Things contained therein. For the Substance of our Faith was not framed as it seemed good to Men, but the choicest Sayings collected out of the whole Scripture, make up one Doctrine of Faith.* And

(m) Vivus, is cujus est Testamentum, in cœlo est. Voluntas ejus, velut in Testamento, sic in Evangelio inquiratur. C. Furmen. l. 5. c. 101.

(n) Ἐκδέχεσθε δὲ κατὰ τὴν θέουσα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῶν γεγραπῶν περὶ ἕκαστου τοῦ ἐγκειμένου συστασίν· ἢ γὰρ ὡς ἔδοξεν ἀνθρώποις σωθεῖσθαι τὰ τὴ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ πίστεως γεγραπῆς τὰ καλειώμενα συλλεχθέντα μίαν ἀναπαληρῆ τὴ τὴ πίστεως διδασκαλίαν. Catech. v. c. 7.

it is, says St. Basil, (o) a manifest falling from the Faith, and a great Instance of Pride, either to set aside any Thing of those that are written, or to introduce any of the Things that are not written: As he had also said a little before, (p) Now I thought it suitable to the common Design both ours and yours, to fulfil the Commandment of your Love in Christ, in the Simplicity of a sound Faith, by declaring what I have been taught from the divinely inspired Scriptures. And presently after, (q) Utterly rejecting as strange and foreign from our Holy Faith, all those Doctrines, which besides a foreign Manner of Expression, instill moreover into the Mind a foreign Sense of Things, and which we do not find to have been preached by Holy Men. And again, (r) If I speak of my self, hear me not. If I rehearse the Things that are written, yield to the Truth. And yet again, (s) Believe the Things that are written: Those that are not written, seek not. And at another time more particularly and fully, (t) All Scripture is

(o) Φανερά ἐκπίσσις πίσεως, καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηρεία, ἢ ἀθεθεῖν πρὸς γεγραμμένων, ἢ ὀπισθενεῖσθαι πρὸς μὴ γεγραμμένων. De vera ac pia fide.

(p) Νῦν δὲ πρὸς τὸν κοινὸν ἡμῶν τε καὶ ὑμῶν σκοπὸν ἀρμόζον ἐλογοσάμην, ἐν ἀπλότῃ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσας πίσεως, τὸ ὅπιτασμα τῇ ὑμετέρας ἐν Χριστῷ ἀγάπῃ πληρῶσαι, εἰπῶν, ἃ ἐδιδάχθην παρὰ τῷ θεοπνεύσει γραφῆς. Ibid.

(q) Ὅσα δὲ παρὰ τῷ ξένῳ τῇ λέξεως, ὅτι καὶ τῷ νῦν ξένον ἡμῖν ἐπισημί, καὶ ἃ ἐκ ἐστὶν ὑπὸ πρὸς ἁγίαν κηρυσσόμενα εὐρεῖν, ταῦτα ὡς ξένα καὶ ἀλλότρια τῷ ἰσθεῦς πίσεως παντάπασι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. Ibid.

(r) Ἐἰ ἀπ' ἐμῆ λαλῶ, μὴ ἀκούετε με. εἰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἀναμνησθῶ, ὑποκύψω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Hom. 29. adverb. calum. Trinit.

(s) Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πίσετε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζητήετε. Ibid.

(t) Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεοπνευστὴ καὶ ὠφέλιμος, διὰ τῆς οὐκ ἔχουσα παρὰ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵν' ὡς περὶ ἐν κοινῷ πρὸς ψυχῶν ἰατρείῳ, πάντες ἀνθρώποι τὸ ἴαμα τὸ οἰκτεῖ πάθος ἕκαστος ἐκλεγομένη, &c. Id. Hom. in Psalm 1.

divinely

divinely inspired and profitable, being written by the Spirit on purpose, that here, as in a common Hospital for Souls, every one may collect a Medicine for his own Passions, &c. And yet once more, (u) having asked, *What is the Property of a Believer?* He answers, *To give a full and firm Assent to the Power of those Things that are spoken, without daring to detract from, or add to them. For if all that is not of Faith is Sin, as the Apostle speaks; and Faith is by Hearing, and Hearing by the Word of God, all that is besides the divinely inspired Scriptures, being not of Faith, is Sin.* (w) Gathering together from all Places the Testimonies of the Holy Scripture, says Epiphanius. And having spoken of our Saviour's being the Minister of Circumcision for the Truth of God, that he might fulfil the Promises: He subjoins, (x) *But that the Holy Spirit does minister together with him, we have learnt out of the Divine Writings.* (y) *The Course of Reading at present, says St. Ambrosè, Teaches that we must neither detract any Thing from the Divine Commandments, nor add to them.* And again he puts these Questions, (z) *Who will say any Thing, where the Scriptures say nothing?* (a) *How*

(u) Τὸ ἐν τοιαύτῃ πληροσφία συνδιατίθεσθαι τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ἐρημίαν, καὶ μηδὲν τολμᾶν ἀθετεῖν, ἢ ἐπιδιαλάσσειν. Ἐι γὰρ πᾶν, ὃ ἐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀμαρτία ἐστίν, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ἢ δὲ τίς τις ἐξ ἀκοῆς· ἢ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ· πᾶν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος γεγενῆσθαι, ἐκ πίστεως ἐστίν, ἀμαρτία ἐστίν. Id. in Moral. Reg. 20. c. 22.

(w) Πανταχόθεν συναρτῶν τὰς θείας γραφῆς τὰς μαρτυρίας. Anacorat. c. 64.

(x) Συνδιακονεῖν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συμπαραλήραμεν ἐκ θείων γραφῶν. c. 68.

(y) Docet igitur nos presentis series lectionis, neque detrudere aliquid divinis debere mandatis, neque addere. B. Ambros. de Paradiso. c. 12.

(z) Sanctis scripturis non loquentibus, quis loquetur? Id. de Vocat. Gent. l. 2. c. 3.

(a) Quæ in Scripturis sanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum usurpare possumus? Id. de Offic. l. 1. c. 23.

shall

shall we make use of those Things, which we find not in the Holy Scriptures? And treating of our Blessed Saviour, he delivers himself in this manner; (b) I read that he is the first, I read that he is not the second. Let them who say he is the second, shew where they read it. The next I shall name is Vincentius Lirinensis, who lays down these two Rules, in order to the Distinction of the Catholick Faith, from the Falschood of Heretical Pravity, that it is to be made (c) first, by the Authority of the Divine Law; and then by the Tradition of the Catholick Church. By the former, as the chief and proper Rule of our Faith, and by the other as a corroborating Evidence in divers Cases, shewing the true Sense of it. (d) We have no such Power, says Gregory Nyssen, I mean of saying whatever we please, since we have used the Rule and Law of all Doctrine, the Holy Scripture. Whilst we look this way, we necessarily receive that only which is consonant to the Intention of those Writings. And a while after, (e) We take it for granted, that That is fitter to beget Faith than all artificial Conclusions, which is proved from the Holy Doctrines

(b) Lego quia primus est, lego quia non est secundus. Illi qui secundum aiunt, doceant lectione. *Id. de Instit. Virg. c. 11.*

(c) Primo scilicet divinæ legis autoritate; tum deinde Ecclesiæ catholicæ Traditione. *Commonit. c. 1.*

(d) Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῆ ὀξυσίας ἀμοιβῆς ταύτης ἐσμὲν, τὴ λέγειν φημι ἄπερ βεβλήμεθα, κανόνι παντός δόγματος καὶ νόμου κεχηρημέοι τῆ ἁγίᾳ γραφῇ· ἀναγκαίως περὶ ταῦτα βλέποντες, τὰ το δεχόμεθα μόνον, ὅτι περ ἂν ἢ συμφωνῶν τῷ τῆ γεγραμμένων σκοπῷ. *Greg. Nyssen. de Anima & Resurrectione, p. 200.*

(e) Ἡμῖν δὲ πάντων τῶν τεχνικῶν συμπερασμάτων ἕξισ πρῶτον εἶναι ὁμολογεῖτο, τὸ διὰ τῆς ἱερῶν τῆ γραφῆς διδασμάτων ἀναραινόμενον. Ζητεῖν οἴμαι δεῖν ὅτι τοῖς ἐξημένοις, εἰ ἢ θεόπνευτος διδασκαλία τέτοις συμφέρει; ἢ δὲ καὶ περ ἂν ἀνηλείτοι, φησὶ, μὴ ἔχῃ ἐν τάτῳ μόνῳ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσι, ὧ σφραγὶς ἔπει: τῆ γραφικῆς μαρτυρίας. *p. 207.*

of Scripture. I am satisfied that as to the Things that have been said, our Business is to enquire, whether the divinely inspired Doctrine concurs with them? And this, says he, let whosoever will contradict, does not Truth consist only in that, which has the Seal of the Testimony of Scripture? Besides the Passage already mentioned from St. Jerome, there are others also of the same Father, which ought not to be passed over in silence. In his Exposition of St. Matthew, he professes (f) that what has not Authority from Scripture, is as easily despised as proved. And writing against the Montanists (g) Let them know, says he, that we do not so much reject all Prophecy; which was confirmed by our Lord's Passion, as that we receive not those who agree not [in their Prophecies] with the Authority of the Old and new Scripture. At another time, (h) Give me an Example, says he, from Scripture. And a little after, (i) No One's Saying has such an Authority as our Lord's Command. And at another time, (k) But those Things, which They readily find and fancy, without any Authority or Testimony of the Scriptures, and as it were by means [or under the false Notion] of Apostolical Tradition, these the Sword of God

(f) Hoc quia de scripturis non habet auctoritatem, eadem facilitate contemnitur, quâ probatur. B. Hieron. in S. Matt. c. xxiii.

(g) Sciant, à nobis non tam Prophetiam repelli, quæ Domini est signata passione, quàm eos non recipi, qui cum Scripturæ veteris & novæ auctoritate non congruant. Epist. 54. ad Marcellam.

(h) Da mihi exemplum de scripturis. In Psalm 98.

(i) Non habet tantam auctoritatem sermo dicentis, quantum Domini præceptum. Ibid.

(k) Sed & alia, quæ absque auctoritate & testimoniis scripturarum, quasi Traditione Apostolicâ sponte reperiunt atq; confingunt, percutit gladius Dei. Id. in Agge. c. 1.

smites.

smites. And once more; (l) *It is good to submit to our Betters, to obey them that are Perfect; and next AFTER THE RULES OF THE SCRIPTURES, to learn the Course of our Life from others.* St. *Augustin* having reckoned up the several Books of the Old and New Testament, subjoins, (m) *In all these Books they that fear God and are meekly pious seek the Will of God; adding moreover that (n) Amongst the Things that are openly laid down in Scripture, all those are to be found that contain the Faith, or Manners of living.* And he tells us, (o) *The City of God believes the holy Scriptures both Old and New, which we call Canonical, whence Faith it self is conceived, whereby the just Man liveth.* So likewise Writing against the *Donatist Petilian*, he says, (p) *If any one, I will not say, if we, who are in no wise to be compared to him, who said, Though we; but as he added in the following Words; Though an Angel from heaven should preach to you, either concerning Christ, or his Church, or any other Thing belonging to our Faith or Life, besides what ye have received in the legal and evangelical Scriptures, let him be Anathema.*

(l) *Bonum est igitur obedire majoribus, parere perfectis; & post regulas Scripturarum, vitæ suæ tramitem ab aliis dicere. Id. ad Demetriad. de Virgin. servanda.*

(m) *In his omnibus libris timentes Deum, & pietate mansueti quærunt voluntatem Dei. B. Aug. de Doctr. Christiana. l. 2. c. 9.*

(n) *In his enim quæ apertè in Scripturâ positi sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi. Ibid.*

(o) *Credit etiam Scripturis sanctis & veteribus & novis, quas Canonicas appellamus, unde fides ipsa concepta est, ex quâ justus vivit. De Civ. Dei. l. 19. c. 18.*

(p) *Sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesiâ, sive de quacunque aliâ re, quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque nostram, non dicam nos, nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit, Licet si nos, sed omnino qui secutus adjecit, si Angelus de cælo vobis annuntiaverit, præterquàm quod in Scripturis legalibus & evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit. Cont. Lis. Petil. l. 3. c. 6.*

And at another time, (q) *Neither are Catholick Bishops to be concurred with, if they happen at any time to be so far deceived, as to think any thing against the Canonical Scriptures of God.* And again he teaches, that the Letters of Bishops may be corrected by other Bishops upon good Consideration, and by the Authority of Councils, and the Decrees of Provincial or National Councils by such as are general; and even General Councils may upon new Emergencies have their Canons altered or revoked by those that come after them. But in the mean time, (r) *The holy Canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament, is of that Authority, that there is no Room left for doubting or disputing, whether whatsoever is found written in it be not true and right.* And again upon another Occasion he exhorts to a diligent Study of holy Scripture, as the only proper Way to be fully instructed in the Mysteries of our Religion. (s) *Read therefore my Brethren the holy Scripture, read it that ye be not blind, and the Leaders of the blind. Read the holy Scripture, in which you will fully find what is to be stuck to, and what to be avoided. Read it because it is found to be*

(q) Quia nec catholicis Episcopis consentiendum est, sicuti forte falluntur, ut contra canonicas Dei Scripturas aliquid sentiant. *Id. de Unit. Eccles. c. 10.*

(r) Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam Canonicam, cum veteris quam novi Testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum litteris ita proponi, ut de illâ omnino dubitari & disceptari non possit utrum verum, vel utrum rectum sit, quicquid in eâ scriptum esse constiterit. *De Bapt. c. Dm. l. 2. c. 3.*

(s) Legite ergo fratres mei Scripturam sacram, legite eam ne cæci sitis, & duces cæcorum. Legite sacram Scripturam in quâ quid tenendum, & quid fugiendum sit plenè invenietis. Legite eam quia omni melle dulcior, omni pane suavior, omni vino hilarior invenitur, &c. *Ad fratres in eremo. Ser. n. 38.*

sweeter

sweeter than all Honey, more pleasing to the Palate than all Bread, more chearing than all Wine. With a great deal more to the same effect. In a word, (t) This is it which whosoever finds he will find Life, and receive Salvation from the Lord. St. Chrysostom Prays and Beseeches the Corinthians that not minding (u) what pleases this or that Man, they inquire of all Things from the Scriptures. And upon those Words of our blessed Saviour, Verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever entreteth not by the Door into the Sheepfold, but climbeth up another Way, the same is a Thief and a Robber, he discourses thus, (w) Behold the Signs of a Thief: First he enters not in boldly; and in the next place, not according to the Scriptures. For this is, Not by the Door.—He called the Scriptures the Door, for they bring us to God, and open the Knowledge of God. These make us Sheep: These protect us, and suffer not the Wolves to enter in. Whereto agree the Words of St. Cyril of Alexandria, putting this Question, (x) What the Divine Scripture has not said, how shall we receive, and reckon it among the Things that are true? And those other of Theodoret Bishop of Cyr, with which I shall conclude; (y) Our Business is not to seek after the

(t) Hæc est, quam qui invenerit inveniet vitam, & hauriet salutem à Domino. *Ibid.*

(u) Παρακαλῶ καὶ δεόμεαι πάντων ὑμῶν ἀφέντες τι τῷ δεῖνι ἢ τῷ δεῖνι δοκῆ περι τῶτων, παρὰ τῶν γεγραφῶν ταῦτα ἅπαντα πυνθανέντες. *Hom. 13. in 2 Cor.*

(w) Ὅσα τὰ δειγμάσια τῶ ληστῆ πρῶτον, ὅτι ἐ παρρησία εἰσέρχεται. δεύτερον, ὅτι ἐ κατὰ τὰς γεγραφῆς. τῶτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ διὰ τῆ δύρα.—δύραν τὰς γεγραφῆς ἐκάλεσιν αὐται γόρυμας προσάγει τῷ δεῶ, καὶ τὴν θεογνωσίαν ἀναίγεισιν. αὐταὶ πρόβατα ποιῶσιν, αὐταὶ φυλάττεισιν, καὶ τὸς λύκος ἐκ ἀφαιῶσιν ἐπιπλάθειν. *K. T. A. B. Chysof. in S. Jo. x. i.*

(x) Ὁ δὲ ἐκ εἰρηκῶν ἡ δεῖα γεγραπῆ, πῶα δὲ τρῶπων παρεδεξόμεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἔχεισι καλαλογιέμεθα; *Glarhyr. in Gen. l. 2.*

(y) Ὁυ δεῖ ζῆεῖν τὰ σσιγημένα, εἰργκιν δὲ τὰ γεγραμμένα. *In Genes. Qu. 45.*

Things that have been kept in Silence, but to stick to those that are written. I forbear to proceed farther in this Argument. For it would be an endless Task to shew at large the singular Harmony, and Consent of both ancient and latter Writers in this great and known Truth.

Here the Reader may see, we are invited to study the holy Scriptures, to keep to what is written, to stick to, obey, and be determined by the Scriptures; have them recommended to us, as the properest Test whereby to judge what is Orthodox and Right, and those condemned who held them not sufficient, without the Help of Tradition; are put in Mind of the heavy Woe denounced against such as either add to, or detract from them; are taught that they are a sufficient Guide in our Way to eternal Happiness, and the Mistress and only sure Teacher of Virtue and true Faith; that they are the Wells of Salvation, and in them the Doctrine of Godliness is declared; that even Catholick Bishops are not to be followed, if their Sentiments be not according to Scripture. That it is great Pride, and no less than a Falling from the Faith, not to content our selves with what is written; are cautioned against seeking after Things not written, against saying any Thing where the Scriptures say nothing, against setting up Traditions against Scripture; and have Life and Salvation promised to those that prefer and faithfully adhere to what they find in Scripture. So that it is fully apparent, we have both Scripture and Tradition, an abundantly larger and more unquestionable Tradition; than can any way be pretended for the Mixture and other Usages, so hotly contended for, for the Use of Scripture as the Rule left us by our Blessed Saviour, for our Guidance in all Cases; and particularly in all the necessary and essential Branches of his Worship. And

And besides this Cloud of Witnesses in the ancient Church, we have the same great Truth asserted by many still, and in particular by a very ingenious and learned Writer of our own, in a Discourse very lately published; who against the Intrusion of Lay Persons, in taking upon them to administer the Sacraments in case of Necessity, argues thus, (z) *Where does the Scripture teach us that God will accept of such Ministrations in Cases of Necessity? Is there any Promise of God for it? If there is not, we have no Ground to believe it. For Faith is, and must be founded upon some Promise. For when Christ says, He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved, he plainly means, he that shall believe what He and his Apostles had, and should preach as the Revealed Will of God; not what any one should believe upon the Dictates of his own Phantasy, or upon meer human Reason, without any Authority from the Word of God, whereon to ground his Belief. For WHEN WE BUILD OUR HOPES UPON WHAT HAS NO FOUNDATION IN THE WORD OF GOD, this is not FAITH, but PRESUMPTION. And the Scripture teaches, that there is no Faith, but what is derived from the Word of God. And the same Scriptures teach us that whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin. And even our learned Author himself when treating of the holy Kiss, &c. pleads, (a) that These Customs though mentioned in Scripture, are not mentioned as Commands and binding Rules for Practice; and throws them aside upon this Account. Then which, what can be a plainer Acknowledgment that in his Opinion, nothing less than a Scripture Command and binding Rule for Practice, can make any Thing a necessary Christian Duty? Thus have we the Authority of the Scriptures taught from time to time, as the only*

(z) Dr. Brett's *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, p. 61.

(a) *Defence*, p. 20.

Rule prescribed by our Blessed Lord, for the right Government of our Conversation; and which alone can be infallibly depended upon, for our Guidance in order to Salvation.

Which makes me justly wonder, that now at length we should be directed to have less Regard to our Blessed Saviour's Words, interpreted in their most natural and genuine Sense, than to the Traditions of such as have lived since, or even of the *Jewish Talmud*; or that any Practice should be proposed and urged, as of absolute Necessity in order to Salvation, that has neither Precept to enjoin it, nor Example to enforce it, in all the Word of God, seeing we have such a plentiful Cloud of Witnesses for the Authority of Scripture; and so besides its divine Original, have incomparably more and plainer Tradition for our Dependance upon it, than can possibly be brought for any human Tradition whatsoever. Nevertheless against this two Pleas are offered.

1. (b) *That Tradition stands recommended by Scripture it self, and they are not opposite and destructive of each other.*

2. (c) *That we our selves are forced to fly to it in some other Cases.* Each of which I am therefore to consider in this Place, before I proceed to my next Proposition. The former is,

1. *That Tradition stands recommended by Scripture it self; and that these two Conveyances are not opposite and destructive to each other, but only different Ways of publishing the Will of God.*

First, It is pleaded, that *Tradition stands recommended by Scripture it self.* And for the Proof of this three Passages in Scripture are appealed to. The first is St. Paul's Command to the *Corinthians*,

(b) *Defence*, p. 18.

(c) *Pag.* 15. &c.

1 Cor. xi. 2. *To keep the Ordinances as be delivered them unto them.* In the Greek it is *ᾠδοδοσεις*, the Traditions. But then it is to be remembred, that the Word *ᾠδοδοσεις*, denotes Doctrines, and may be applied to such as are either written or unwritten. It signifies the same, that the Greek Philosophers termed *δύγματα*, and St. Paul *διδάχην*, or *πῶς διδάχης*, Rom. vi. 17. As is plain from the Use of the Verb *ᾠδοδοσιμ* in the Text now mentioned, and other Places of the New Testament. Here says the Apostle, *Ye have obeyed from the Heart that Form of Doctrine, which was delivered you,* according to our Translation. But in the Original it is *eis ὃν παρεδόθητε*, in which ye have been instructed, or taught. So 1 Cor. xi. 23. *I received of the Lord, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῶν, that which I also delivered, or taught you, that the Lord Jesus the same Night in which he was betrayed took Bread.* So 1 Cor. xv. 3. *I delivered unto you, that is, I taught you, first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our Sins, according to the Scriptures.* In like manner, St. Jude 3. *Beloved, says that Apostle, when I give all Diligence to write unto you of the common Faith, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the Faith which was once delivered to, or taught, the Saints (d).* So that nothing more can be meant by Traditions in these Places, but the Doctrines the Apostle had taught the Christians, whether by Writing, or Word of Mouth. And if no more be intended by the Ordinances here (e) referred to, I know no Occasion there

(d) In this Sense, the Word is used also by Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nyssen, and Cyril of Alexandria. Vid. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. V. Edit. Oxon. p. 75. And by Justin Martyr, *Ὅπως βίβλην ἃς ὁ χριστὸς παρέδωκεν.* Apol. 2. p. 92.

(e) Defence, p. 18.

is for any Dispute about them. But yet it will never follow from hence, that the Scripture is not the Rule that we are stedfastly to adhere to, whensoever any unscriptural Tradition comes in competition with it. As for instance, when our Saviour makes not the least Mention, of any thing more in his Eucharistick Cup than the *Fruit of the Vine*, and yet humane Tradition is appealed to, for making a Mixture of Water, of which our Saviour says not a Tittle, as though it were as necessarily incumbent upon all Christians, as the Wine it self, of which he makes express Mention : Here is a manifest Opposition between Scripture and Tradition, unless it can be allowed, that Water and no Water, or a Mixture and no Mixture, are one and the same Thing. And *St. Paul* does by no means teach that Scripture is here to submit to Tradition, how extensive soever.

The next Text produced in behalf of Tradition, is 2. *Theff.* ii. 15. *Therefore Brethren stand fast and hold the Traditions you have been taught, whether by Word, or by our Epistle.* Which was the Apostle's Exhortation to the *Theffalonians*, to stick faithfully to, and carefully retain and practise those Doctrines of Christianity which he had taught them, either by Word of Mouth when present with them, or by his Letters when at a Distance from them. But of what Service can this be now to any Traditions, or any Sort of Doctrine that does not appear to have been taught by the Apostles either of these ways?

The only remaining Text is 2 *Tim.* i. 13. *Hold fast the Form of sound Words, which thou hast heard of me in Faith and Love, which is in Christ Jesus.* Here *Timothy* is required to hold fast the sound Doctrine he had been taught by the Apostle, with a firm Faith, and a truly Christian Affection,

fection, and brotherly Kindness towards all that stood in need of it. But I never expected to have had these Words pressed in Favour of such Practices, of which we find no Footsteps in the Apostolick Age, nor one Word is to be met with concerning them, in the Writings of this, or any other of the Apostles. How a *Form of Sound Words* taught by *St Paul*, can denote such Practices as have nothing to be pleaded for them, but the Authority of such as lived after the Apostles Death, is a Discovery I am not yet acquainted with. And how (*f*) plain so ever it may be in our learned Author's Opinion, every one else must needs see here is no Proof, that *if we be governed by Scripture, we must be governed by Tradition too*, at least by any Sort of Tradition that never appeared till after the Apostolick Age, and cannot well be reconciled to Scripture.

But we are told farther, (*g*) that *these two Conveyances are not opposite, and destructive of each other, but only different Ways of publishing the Will of God, and only two Streams flowing from the same Fountain*. But now if they happen in some Instances to teach contrary Doctrines, as in the Case of the Mixture; if our Saviour teach one Thing, and Tradition is cited for another of a different Nature, what can hinder their being in this Case *opposite and destructive of each other*? What if the Scripture say nothing of Prayer for the Dead, can an after Tradition, make that a necessary Duty for all Christians? And if it can, is not here some Opposition between them, and such as is destructive of the Directions given us to stick to Scripture, as of it self sufficient (*b*) to lead us to Salvation? What if our Saviour only enjoyn us to offer up

(*f*) *Defence*, p. 19. (*g*) *Page*. 18. (*b*) 2 *Tim.* iii. 16, 17.

our eucharistical Sacrifice, according to his own Institution, and yet Tradition is produced to prove this not sufficient, but it must be done in a certain unscriptural Form, or else it is no Sacrament? Is not here an Opposition again, and such as, if not destructive of the Institution, is yet no way necessary to make it compleat for the great End whereto it was designed? These Instances shew, that Scripture and Tradition are not always agreed upon, for conveying the same Truth, but may in divers Cases be *opposite and destructive of each other*. And whensoever this happens, I do not meet with any Thing here offered, which can pass for a Proof, that the latter *Way of Conveyance* is most authentick, and rather to be relied upon than Scripture. And so I proceed to the other Plea alledged in behalf of Tradition. That,

2. *We our selves are forced to fly to it in some other Cases*; and amongst others in these following.

1. The Case of *Infant Baptism*. For (i) *which way can we prove the Necessity, or indeed the Lawfulness of it, without the Help of Jewish and Christian Tradition?* In Answer hereto, it is observable, that this Practice has no Opposition to any part of Scripture, as the Necessity of the Mixture now under debate has; and so no Ground appears for questioning the Lawfulness of it. Besides, that Scripture assures us, that Children, were not only allowed, but strictly (k) required to be entered into Covenant with God under the old Law, and are certainly as capable of being admitted into Covenant with him now as they were then,

(i) *Defence*, p. 15.

(k) *Gen.* xvii. 12. *Levit.* xii. 3. *St. Luk.* ii. 21.

and (l) whole Houses were baptized, in which it is hardly to be supposed there should be no Children, which is abundantly enough to shew their Baptism lawful. And then as to the Necessity of it, not only our Blessed Saviour (m) gave Commission for *Baptizing all Nations*, of which Children are undoubtedly a Part, but the Apostle St. Paul having taught us, that amongst Christians, (n) Baptism succeeded in the Room of Circumcision, it is a natural Inference, that Children not being excepted, and being withal now as capable of Baptism, as they had been before of Circumcision, here is therefore a good Foundation for Pædo-Baptism in Scripture. Especially if here to be added what St. Paul says to this purpose, 1 Cor. vii. 14. But to this Text our Author objects, that (o) *the Meaning of it is expounded to different Senses not only by our modern Antipædo-baptists, but by Tertullian, and some other ancient Writers.* But he does not say, that the most and best Expositors do not ordinarily interpret the Words in favour of Infant-Baptism. Though withal it is readily owned, that the Practice of the Church since is a good corroborating Evidence, and makes the Necessity of it more apparent and unquestionable, than it might otherwise have been. However, here is something more *to warrant the Practice, and justify the Necessity, than barely primitive Usage, and consentient Tradition.* The Summ is, that our Saviour commanded all Nations to be baptized; and so the only Enquiry here is, whether Children be included in this Expression. That they are so, is rightly collected from their being taken into Covenant with God, before our Saviour's Incar-

(l) Acts xvi. 15 & 33. 1 Cor. i. 16. (m) St. Matt. xxviii. 19.
 (n) Coloss. ii. 11, 12. (o) Defence, p. 6.

nation, and other Passages in Scripture. So that all that Tradition has to do in this Case, is only to come in as a collateral subsidiary Evidence ; but by no means to institute a new unscriptural Duty.

2. The Case (p) of the *Lord's Day*. For upon what Grounds is the keeping Sunday instead of Saturday defensible ? The Scripture. says our learned Author, has nothing determining : The Apostles have left us no Command for Translating the Festival, from the Seventh to the First Day. And yet I cannot but think we have considerable Authority for this from Scripture, though not so clear and strong without the Assistance of Tradition, as with it. Our Saviour (q) rebuked the Pharisees for their over zealous Observation of their Sabbath, telling them moreover that (r) *the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath* ; and so could dispense with that, or wholly abolish and lay it aside, as he pleased. And that the First day of the Week should be preferred before it is fairly intimated in our Saviour's choosing to rise from the dead on that Day. Which being an Occasion of infinitely greater Joy and Comfort to his Disciples than any before him could have from the Blessing of the Seventh day, whether upon Account of the Creation of the World, or the Deliverance of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*, was a very reasonable Foundation for the Observation of that Day amongst Christians. And a yet farther inestimable Blessing on that Day, on the Feast of Pentecost, I mean (s) the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apo-

(p) *Defence*, p. 16.

(q) *St. Mark* ii. 25.

(r) *Vers* 28.

(s) *Acts* ii. 1, &c.

files assembled at *Jerusalem* might still be a farther Inducement to the peculiar Observation of this Day, which had brought so great Good to Mankind. And indeed what Day could possibly be thought fitter for the Christian Worship, than that wherein the whole Myſtery of our Redemption was compleated, wherein our Saviour who had *died for our Sins, roſe (t) again* alſo from the Dead for our *Juſtification*? And wherein alſo the Holy Spirit was ſo wonderfully conferred upon the Apoſtles, to qualify them for the great Work of Preaching the Goſpel, and converting the World, whereto they were appointed? Though I confeſs, it was the former of theſe Bleſſings that diſſolved the *Jewiſh* Oeconomy, and introduced the Observation of the firſt Day of the Week. For ſo we read, (u) *That on the firſt Day of the Week the Diſciples were aſſembled, but privately, for fear of the Jews, and with their Doors ſhut, when our Lord came unexpectedly, and ſtood in the miſt of them, wiſhing them Peace, and ſhew- ing them his Hands and his Side. (w) And after eight Days again, that is on the next firſt Day, his Diſciples were within, and Thomas with them, when our Saviour gave him all the Satisfaction he had deſired, concerning the Truth of his Reſurrection. The next Day of their Aſſembly we meet with in Scripture was the great Day of Pentecoſt, but juſt now mentioned, and it were eaſy to ſhew, that this was not on the ſeventh but the firſt Day. After this we find, That (x) upon the firſt Day of the Week, the Diſciples came together, at Troas, to break Bread, that is, to worſhip God, and more eſpecially to celebrate the Holy Eucharift. And*

(t) Rom. iv. 25. (u) St. Joh. xx. 19. (w) Ver. 26.
 (x) Acts xx. 7.

again,

again, the Apostle St. Paul writing to the *Corinthians*, (y) directs them to make Collections for the Relief of such as were in want of their Assistance, and that this should be done on the first Day of the Week, as being the known Time of their solemn religious Assemblies. Nor was this any Usage peculiar to the *Corinthians*, but what was practised in other distant Places likewise, as is plain from the Orders he had sent to the Disciples at *Galatia*. For so says the Apostle, *Concerning the Collections for the Saints, as I have given Order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first Day of the Week, let every one of you lay by him in store, &c.* Whereto, if we add St. John's Declaration (z), *That he was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day*, the Day peculiarly appointed for the Service and Worship of our Blessed Lord, I cannot but think that we have here considerable Authority for the Observation of the first rather than the seventh Day. It is true, *the Apostles*, as our learned Author notes (a), *were daily in the Temple, and went into the Synagogues, and Preached on the Sabbath*, taking all Opportunities they could to meet with, and instruct and convert the *Jews*. But this will by no means shew, that when they assembled with the Christians, this was not principally on the Lord's Day. So that here we do not depend solely upon unscriptural Tradition, for the Change of the Day, but are led to it even by the Scriptures themselves. Let but such Evidence as this be brought for any of the Points now contended for, and we will never oppose the Use of them.

3. The Case of the *Holy Scriptures* themselves. 'Tis from Tradition, says our learned Author (b),

(y) 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. (z) Rev. i. 10. (a) Defence, p. 16.
(b) Pag. 17.

we are assured that the Books of the old and new Testament are Divine Revelation. — We believe the Books of the new Testament are inspired Writings, because those who were contemporary with the Apostles, those who lived with such Contemporaries, and all succeeding Ages, have received them as such. Either we must rest the Motives of Credibility upon human Testimony, or lie open to the Delusion of a private Spirit. And thus we shall either wander through Enthusiasm, or want a new Inspiration to prove the old one. Which Assertions, together with others to the like Purpose, look as if no Proof of the Divinity of Scripture were to be hoped for any other way, than merely by human Tradition. And again he positively affirms, (c) *There is nothing in Scripture, to prove Scripture.* In direct Contradiction to one of his own Fathers, *Clemens Alexandrinus* professing that (d) the Scriptures are a demonstrative Proof of themselves. And yet whosoever sets himself seriously to study those Sacred Writings, will soon discover they oftentimes bear Witness to themselves; and at other Times one Part or Book of Scripture bears Witness to another. Most of the Books of the old Testament tell who were their Authors, and what Commission they had for the Messages and Doctrines they delivered: And the new Testament also bears Witness for them, that they were written by no less than (e) a Divine Inspiration, and for the general Good of the Church. And again, we are taught that (f) *no Scripture is ιδίας ἐπιλύσεως*, (g) *of Mens own Motion*, or setting out: For the Pro-

(c) Page 45. (d) Ὅτιως ἔν κ' ἡμεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῶν ἢ γερῶν τελείως ἀποδεικνύσσει ἐκ πίστεως πισόμεθα ἀποδεικτικῶς. *Strom.* 7. p. 891. *Edit.* Oxon.

(e) 2 *Tim.* iii. 15. (f) 2 *Pet.* i. 19, 20. (g) See Dr. Hammond on the Words.

phcy came not of old Time by the Will of Man: but holy men of God spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Add hereto the Miracles, wherewith they declare themselves attested; the Assistance of the Holy Ghost for opening our Understanding, that we may understand them, as (b) our Saviour did those of the Apostles, when assembled at Jerusalem; together with the Use of natural Reason for inquiring into, and judging of the Credibility of the Evidence offered in their Favour; the Completion of the Predictions of those from whom they came, and more especially as to the Dispersion of the Jews, and the wonderful Progress of Christianity, the Effects of both which we now see in our own Days; the admirable Harmony and Concord there is in these holy Writings, tho' writ at very distant Times, and by Persons of very different Educations, Employments and Interests, in the World; the Excellency of the Doctrines contained in them, as worthy of the God of Heaven to reveal them, and their singular Usefulness for proclaiming the Honour and Glory of God, declaring his Power, shewing forth his Goodness and exalting his Praise; and then in relation to ourselves, for informing our Minds, correcting our Wills, amending our Lives, establishing our Faith; and in a Word, for both preparing us for, and entitling us to a better State, against we shall be taken hence. And whosoever puts all these Testimonies for the Divine Inspiration of Scripture together, cannot but see that it is not only (i) Church Authority, which brings Evidence for this Revelation, and enables us to distinguish between the inspired Writings, and human Compositions, but that we have many other very

(b) St. Luke xxiv. 45.

(i) Defence, p. 17.

material Witnesses, besides *the* *Scriptures* *themselves*, there is no Occasion for us, either to reject the *Testimonies of Credibility upon human Testimony*, or to be open to the *Delusion of a private Spirit*, as is here suggested. And yet this is not all, for if we were to appeal barely to Tradition, the Tradition in behalf of the Divine Inspiration of Scripture, is not only avowed as I have shewn, and might have done it much more fully, by the Christians themselves, professing pleading and contending for it; but even their most inveterate Enemies, such as *Celsus*, and *Julian*, bare some Sort of Testimony to it, whilst they sought for Arguments from Scripture, whereby to undermine the Apologists for Christianity: As also several Matters of Fact contained in Scripture were acknowledged by them for true. *The Authors*, as Bishop *Ward* notes, (n) were owned by *Julian*; the *Miracles confessed*, by *Celsus*; the *checking of the Operation of the Devil*, by *Porphyrius*; the *Darkness and Earthquake at the Death of Christ*, by *Thallus* and *Phlegon Trallianus*; the *Crucifixion of Christ*, (by *Pilate under Tiberius*) by *Tacitus*. Not to mention the Testimony born to *Noah's Flood* by the Poets; and more particularly by (o) *Ovid*, (p) *Virgil*, (q) *Horace*, and (r) *Juvenal*; as likewise by (s) *Lucian*, and (t) *Plutarch*; and the *Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah* by (u) *Strabo*, (x) *Tacitus* and (y) *Solinus*. So that the Tradition for Scripture is so abundantly both fuller and more extensive than can be pretended in behalf of the Usages now under debate, that there is no pretence for a comparison between them. Wherefore to con-

(n) *Sermon against Antiscripturists.* (o) *Metamorph.* l. 1.
 (p) *Georg.* l. 1. (q) *Carm.* l. i. *Od.* 7. (r) *Sat.* 1.
 (s) *De Deâ Syr.* (t) *De Solert. animal.* (u) *Lib.* 16.
 (x) *Histor.* l. 5. (y) *Polyhistor.* c. 48.

clude this Point ; since not only the Tradition in behalf of the Scripture, is incomparably beyond that for the *Mixture, Prayer for the Dead, &c* but we have besides, divers other weighty Considerations, and which deserve to be well attended to as of great Use, for evincing the Divine Inspiration of these Sacred Writings ; I am not yet able to discover whence it is, that (z) *could we succeed against the Force of our learned Author's Tradition, the Issue of the Victory would prove any way unhappy, much less that it would be very unhappy; or that it would in the least degree shake the main Pillars, and sop the Foundations of Religion, as he is pleased to express himself.* For by what has been said, it is very plain, that these Instances are in no wise parallel (a). On the contrary, to take in Tradition as an Assistant only, and to depend upon the written Word, as our sure Foundation, is the only way to have our Superstructure firm and durable, like a House built upon a Rock. Here we may securely stand our Ground, without Fear or Danger ; whilst those who take Tradition for their Rule, and leave the Scriptures to follow its imperfect Light, are liable to be always in Motion, and never know where to stop, or what will at last become of them. Yet after all, I deny not, but we are indebted to Tradition for our Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures ; but in such a Sense as will never prove that Tradition is to be preferred to Scripture, or that we are to learn our Du-

(z) *Defence, p 17.* (a) *If the Reader desire to inform himself more fully as to this Argument, about the Divine Authority of Scripture, he may please to consult Archbishop Laud's Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, Sect. 16th, I did never love too curious a Search, &c. and so on to the End of that long Session, where he will find it most judiciously and learnedly discussed ; and I doubt not, to his full Satisfaction.*

ty from any other Code of Laws, than that of Scripture. Tradition indeed conveys down to us the Books of Scripture, as it does those of *Homer* or *Virgil*, *Demosthenes* or *Tully*, or other Authors; and so it serves as a Deliverer of those Laws we are to be governed by, and not as being itself our Law; as may appear by a familiar and obvious Instance. The City of *London* is settled by virtue of a royal Charter; which Charter is descended to the present Rulers of the City by Tradition. Yet if any Dispute arise concerning its Priviledges, Recourse for composing this is not to be had to the conveying Tradition, but to the Charter conveyed by it, to see the Nature and Importance of the Grant, and what Rights or Liberties it invests them in. In like manner the Deeds of an Estate are transmitted from one Generation to another by Tradition; yet this makes it not at all the less necessary to apply to those Deeds in Case of any Suit, or Sale. And he that in such a Case should lay aside his Writings, and tell his Lawyer, or Purchaser, that he has Tradition for the Conditions of holding his Estate, will egregiously expose himself by it. Thus in Matters of Religion, when we have had the Instrument of our Christian Charter delivered down to us, it is from that we must seek our Information concerning the Promise contained in it, and the Duties required by it, and must reckon our selves obliged carefully to observe its Rules and Directions, and in no Case to set up any Tradition, as rather to be attended to. I shall conclude this Argument with our Saviour's severe Reprehension to the Scribes and Pharisees; but which deserves also to be seriously attended to by all, who like them, plead Tradition for making such their Doctrines or Practices necessary to Salvation, as our Lord himself in Scripture has not made so. *S. Mar. vii. 7.*

In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.

Thus having briefly shewn, the Advantage Scripture has above Tradition, whensoever any Competition happens between them; and having thereby subverted the Foundations of the Alterations so zealously contended for, I might have stop'd here, as concluding they must necessarily fall of Course, and every one may see they must. But however to make the Matter yet more plain, I proceed to enquire concerning the Four controverted Articles, and to shew that,

II. The Tradition for them is not so full and unquestionable as it is represented to be. And if upon Examination they shall be found Defective here also, if not only bare Tradition be an incompetent Medium, for proving any Usage essentially necessary in order to Salvation, though ever so fully and clearly recommended by it, but the Traditions for these Usages come short of the Evidence they are declared to have in them; a Man must be miserably regardless of his own Salvation, before he will venture it upon such unequal Terms as these. Yet that this and no better is really the Case before us, I am now to prove.

And here I begin with,

I. The Mixture of Water with the Wine in the sacramental Cup. Of which I have these Two Things to say.

1. The Tradition for it is not so Extensive as is pretended.

2. Where it does extend, it is not so full and satisfactory as it is given out to be.

1. This Tradition is not so Extensive as is pretended. It is said to be *(b) Early, General and Uninterrupted*. But what a Condition will it be in,

(b) Defence, p. 19.

if it fail in each of these Particulars? Yet that it does so, is no difficult Matter to shew.

And first, as to its Antiquity : I do not deny but it is Ancient, but only I look upon it as a great Failure that it is not old enough, at least it does not any way appear to be so. For there is no one Authority so much as pretended to be brought for it, during the Apostolical Age, whose Tradition would have been most Authentick, and have had much greater Deference paid to it, than to any, or even to all those that follow after. This our learned Author does not in the least dispute. (c) He tells us most truly, that the Apologies of *Quadratus* and *Aristides* are lost, and therefore *Justin Martyr* is the first Father, who gives an Account of the Christian Worship. These the Reader may observe were all Writers of the Second Century. And can there possibly be a franker Concession, that there is no Evidence for the *Mixture* from any Author of the first Age, than that the First who mentions it lived not till after that Time. But (d) is not *Justin Martyr* early enough, says our Author? No certainly, not to speak for the first Century, since he flourished not till about the Middle of the next Age; as I shall observe in its proper Place. But perhaps it may be said we have very few Writers of that Age, and their Works being short, they might easily not mention it. Be it so as to the others, yet we have the Writings of the new Testament, which could not have been expected to pass over this Usage in Silence, had it been then known to be a Part of our Saviour's Institution. And since neither these, nor any other, for that Age does so much as once mention it, I must conclude, we have no Testimony for it in the first Age, and so it is not old enough.

(c) *Defence*, p. 3.

(d) *Page* 2.

2dly, Neither was this Usage so *General*, I mean so *Universal*, as it is pretended to be. How early soever it were, I have observed, it had no Evidence for it in the first Age, and so not from the Beginning. And now I add, that the Evidence cited for it in the following Ages, lived for some considerable Time, in no great Part of the World. For it is to be noted, that during the first Three Hundred Years, there being only Four Witnesses produced for it; one in *Palestine*, one in *France*, another in *Egypt*, and another at *Carthage*, it will be hard to collect, as an undoubted Truth, from these, that it was constantly used in other Parts, at a great distance from them, of which they make no mention. This I say, supposing their Evidence to answer our Author's Expectation in other Respects. But if it does not answer, as I shall presently shew it does not, then here is still less Proof of the General Use of this Mixture. And if there be no Proof of a *General* Use of the *Mixture*, we may be very sure there is none for the *Universal* Belief of the Necessity of it. For we are not presently to conclude, from our hearing nothing of it, either for, or against it, from other Places, that they had all our Author's Notion of it. This is by no means a Proof that they all concurred in the Reception of it, or especially that they all held it necessary, but rather that they knew nothing of it. I am sure he must prove this to have been their Sentiment, by good and substantial Witness, before he can take it for granted, that they unanimously concurred with him in that they say nothing of. And inasmuch as such Witness is not to be produc'd, it unquestionably follows that it can no way be shewn to have been *Universally* held necessary: Nor is their Silence in the Case an Argument for their Reception of these Practices, any more than it is for Tran-
sub-

substantiation, that it was the known Doctrine of the Church from the Beginning, because there were no Disputes about it in the Primitive Times, before it had ever been thought of.

Again, 3dly, If a contrary Practice or Persuasion can be shewn to have prevailed in a considerable Part of Christendom, then this Usage cannot be said to have been *Uninterrupted*: And this likewise is too Evident to be denied. *Tertullian* professes very plainly (e) that it was *Wine that our Saviour consecrated for the Commemoration of his Blood*. And even *St. Cyprian*, who is said by our learned Author to be (f) DECISIVE in behalf of the Mixture, yet acknowledges all Bishops of his Days (g) did not hold this Tradition; and grants both himself and some of his Predecessors, not to have used the *Mixture* contended for. (h) *If any, says he, of our Predecessors, either ignorantly, or simply, has not observed or kept, what our Lord taught us by his Example and Authority, Pardon may be granted by the Compassion of God to his Simplicity; but we cannot hope for the like Forgiveness, who are now admonished and taught by the Lord, to offer the Lord's Cup mixed with Wine, as our Lord himself offered.*

Hence it appears, that this Tradition of the MIXTURE could not be fixed universally in the Days of this great Father; because his Predecessors could not have been ignorant of it if it had.

(e) Vini---quod in sanguinis sui memoriam consecravit. *De Anima. c. 17.* (f) *Reasons, p. 4.* (g) *Quamquam sciam, frater carissime, Episcopos plurimos----- Evangelicæ veritatis ac Dominicæ traditionis tenere rationem. Epist. 63. Cecil. p. 156.* (h) *Siquis de antecessoribus nostris, vel ignoranter vel simpliciter non hoc observavit & tenuit, quod nos Dominus facere exemplo vel magisterio suo docuit; potest simplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini venia concedi; nobis vero non poterit ignosci, qui nunc à Deo admoniti & instructi sumus, ut calicem Dominicum vino mixtum, secundum quod Dominus obtulit, offeramus, p. 156.*

And that he says, but Now *we are admonished and instructed by God*, is a plain Intimation that this Tradition was new to them, and that they had not been acquainted with it before. And accordingly in the next Words, he adds, *(i) And of this let us write to our fellow Bishops, that so the evangelical Law and our Lord's Tradition may be observed EVERY WHERE.* So that it seems this Tradition was not yet of universal Observation, since otherwise he would not have needed to write that it might be so for the future. And once more, *(k) Giving Thanks, that whilst he instructs us for the future, he forgives us as to the Time past, what we have simply erred in* Whereas there could be no need, either of such Instruction for the future, or of such Forgiveness as to what was past, if the Observation of the Mixture had been always used, and by all. From which several Passages of this Father, any one may observe, the main *Decisive* Witness for the Mixture, is an undeniable Evidence against the Constancy and Universality of it. His Predecessors had not all observed it, and it was not till *Now*, that he and his Collegues were *admonished and taught it*, and that he would write to have it observed *every where*. I grant now that he had espoused it, he blames the Neglect of it and hopes to have it pardoned, in consideration that they did not know of it before. But nothing can be a plainer Proof than this, that it had not universally obtained till then, and particularly not in *Africk*, where this Father lived. If it be objected, that his Complaint was that they used Water only in the

(i) De hoc quoque ad Collegas nostros literas dirigamus, ut *ubique* lex evangelica & Traditio Dominica servetur. *Ibid.*

(k) Agentes gratias quod dum instruit in futurum quid facere debeamus; de praterito ignoscit quod simpliciter erravimus. *Ibid.*

Sacrament, and so were justly to be blamed for it. This does not at all affect my Cause, who do not pretend to justify their Conduct, but only to shew in Fact what their Practice was. And every one must yield that *pure Water* is no more a Mixture, than *pure Wine* is. At the same Time, with this Father lived *Origen*, though the elder of the Two, and he declares himself openly against any Necessity of a Mixture. For speaking of our Saviour's Institution of the Sacrament, he flatly denies his Use of a mix'd Cup. (l) He not only has these Words, not to be answered by our Author, *ὄχι ἐκέρασε*, not that he mix'd his Wine: But more expressly a little after, (m) *Jesus when he entertains his Disciples, entertains them, ἀκράτω, with unmix'd Wine,* (in *Joannes Exiguus's* Edition *Meraco*, with *pure Wine*;) for he saith unto them, *Take Drink, this is my Blood, that is shed for you for the Remission of Sins, do this, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.* † *vidē* ~~Joannes Exiguus~~ *Postrep. pag. 1.*

And then as to the *Greek Church*, *Balsamon* in his Comment upon the Council in *Trullo* gives such an Account of their Eucharistick Cup, as will not consist with the Mixture recommended to us. For he tells us, (n) they put warm Water into the consecrated Cup. For which I am perswaded our learned Author would be as ready to blame them as the *Latines*, (who *Balsamon* owns were dissatisfied with them for it) as not agreeable to the Method of Administring now (o) required and pressed, as Essential to the Sacrament. Which shews the Mixture insisted upon is not of such *uninterrupted*

(l) In *Jeremi. hom. 12.*

(m) Ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐφοραίνων

τὸς μαθητὰς ἀκράτω ἐφοραίνων, καὶ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς λάβετε, πίετε, ὅσο μὲν ἔστι τὸ αἶμα, &c. *Ibid.*

(n) Οἱ λατῖνοι

ἀβιῶνται τὴν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον ὅσον ζέουλος ἐσβολὴν, &c.

In *Can. 32.*(o) *Defence, p. 50.*

Practise, nor the Manner of using it so constantly observed as some might fancy it to be. Agreeably whereto, St. *Chrysostom* also professes against some who were for the Use of Water in the Sacrament, that our Saviour (p) *when he delivered the Mysteries, delivered Wine*, such as the Vine produces: And I hope he may pass for a good Witness. It is true, his Liturgy, and St. *Basil's* are both cited (q) for the Proof of the Mixture; but how they will be of any service to this Cause will not be easily shewn. St. *Basil*, as far as I remember, for I have not *Goar* by me, has not a Word to the Purpose, but only (r) *κεράσας*, which our Author takes to mean that our Saviour mingled a Cup for the Eucharist. But whether this be necessarily the Sense of that Word, and might not to all Intents and Purposes, as properly import, that he only had prepared a Cup by pouring of Wine into it, I desire the Reader to suspend his Judgment, till he shall have considered what follows, not many Pages hence, in relation to *Irenæus's Commixtionem & Temperamentum calicis*. And yet this is the only Word I am sensible of in all that Liturgy, that can be applied to the present Occasion. And here I beg leave by the way to observe concerning this Liturgy, that it is manifestly against the *Talmudick* Distinction about the *Fruit of the Tree*, if understood in our Author's Sense; inasmuch as the Cup before it is pretended to be mixed is called here Ποτήριον ἐκ τῆς γεννήμαλις τῆς ἀμπέλου, *The Cup of the Fruit of the Vine*, that is

(p) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἱ τινὲς ἐν ταῖς μυστηρίοις ὕδατι κεχημένοι, δεικνύς ὅτι καὶ ἡνίκα τὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν, οἶνον παρέδωκε, — ἐκ τῆς γεννήμαλις, φησι, τῆς ἀμπέλου, &c. In St. Matt. xxvi. 29.

(q) *Reasons*, p. 8. (r) Ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἐκ τῆς γεννήμαλις τῆς ἀμπέλου λαβὼν, κέρασας, εὐχαριστήσας, ἐυλόγησας, ἀγάσας. *Go. Euchol.* p. 168.

to say, of Wine without Water, it not being yet supposed to be mix'd. Wherefore in short, our Author I think is brought into this *Dilemma*, that either κέρατος does not signify a *Mixture*, contrary to the End he produced it for ; or the Cup, before this *Mixture* consisted of Wine only, and so the *Fruit of the Vine* signifies pure Wine, contrary to his Distinction from the *Talmud*. And by consequence this Liturgy, instead of assisting his Cause, lies as a positive Objection against it. And yet farther our learned Author, if he pleases, may undertake to prove from this Word, not only, that our Saviour instituted a *Mixture*, but that he did it in a Vessel of Horn, and so made that Essential too. For it is certain the Etymology of the Verb κερώννυμι is taken from the Custom of drinking out of that sort of Cup. As both (s) *Eustathius* and (t) *Athenæus* testify. And St *Crysostom's* will not answer to this *Mixture*, but on the contrary makes use of Two different ones, a cold before, and a warm one after Consecration, which would not be thought proper at this Time, and is not in the least pretended to be of our Saviour's Institution. Which yet it may reasonably be supposed they would have taken care to stick to, had they really believed the Water in the Eucharist to be any necessary Part of it.

And now since this Tradition for the *Mixture* is neither from the Beginning, nor Universal, nor Uninterrupted, and so fails as to each of the Branches of *Vincentius Lirinensis's* (u) Rule, a great Part of the Pleas for it are already sunk, and its

(s) Τὸ κερῶν δὲ παλαιᾶς οἰνοποιίας διὰ κέρατος ὄνομα. In II. 3. p. 319. (t) Ὅτι δὲ τοῖς κέρασιν ἔπινον, δῆλον, &c. *Deipnosoph.* l. II. c. 7. (u) Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ad omnibus.

Proof hereby very much weakened, if not totally demolished. However, let us see what Evidences there are for it, and whether they amount at best to more than the bare Use of it, in those Places where it was; or whether any of them urge it as of Necessity, to the Effence and Efficacy of the Sacrament. And here I hope I shall be able to prove that

2. This Tradition, where it does extend, is not so full and satisfactory, as it is given out to be.

The first Witness produced for it is *Justin Martyr*. And as to him the Answerer had said, he mentioned it not till about (w) 150 Years after our Saviour's Incarnation? And (x) is not this early enough? says our Author. To which I answer, no; not early enough to prove it was from the Beginning; not early enough to prove it was in our Saviour's Time; not early enough to prove it was in the Days of his Apostles. But farther, our Author (y) believes Ten Years may fairly be cut off from this Computation. And if he, or any one else, will please to give me a good Reason for it, I shall readily submit. But at present I cannot do it, because *Justin* himself forbids it; plainly intimating that our Blessed (z) Saviour was born 150 Years before his writing the Apology here referred to. But to proceed, it was farther objected, (a) that what *Justin* meant by his *κράμα* is not easy to define. Because, though this Word frequently denotes a Composition of Wine and Water, it cannot signify so in this Place, where the Father speaks of a Mixture before the Water was put to it. Nor does our learned Author undertake in the least to shew,

(w) *No Reas'n.* p. 3. (x) *Defence,* p. 2. (y) *Pag.* 3.
 (z) Πρὸ ἰσθ' ἐκάλει πεντήκοντα γεγονήσθαι τὸν χεῖρον λέ-
 γειν ἡμᾶς ὅτι κρημνία. *Apol.* 2. p. 83. *Edit. Par.*
 (a) *No Reason,* p. 4.

what Sort of Mixture it was, that was made without Water; but he tells us roundly, (b) *That Justin Martyr meant Wine mixed with Water by κρᾶμα, is beyond Dispute, notwithstanding our Author's Objection.* As much as to say, it must, and shall be so, though the Argument against it cannot be answered. This is making short Work of it. Nevertheless, *This*, he says, *is clear beyond Dispute, from Two other Testimonies of this Father, informing us that Bread, and Wine, and Water, was brought to the President, or Bishop, and that the Deacons gave all the Congregation Part of the Bread, and Wine, and Water, which was eucharistiz'd.* But I must beg this worthy Gentleman's Pardon, if I cannot think we have here any Answer to the Objection; which was that in the Place chiefly referred to, there was a κρᾶμα besides the Water; which therefore could not be Wine and Water by his own Confession. For he not only brings no Instance, that κρᾶμα signifies Wine without Water, but on the contrary, he expressly affirms, (c) that κρᾶμα never signifies Wine unmix'd. And again, (d) *Though Wine does not always import a Mixture, yet κρᾶμα does.* But what then becomes of the Water Justin Martyr speaks of, besides the κρᾶμα? For it is ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κρᾶματος, a Cup of Water and Mixture. Our learned Author tells us, *It was most probably the Water the Deacon gave the Bishop and Priests, who assisted at the Altar to wash their Hands, &c. and That this was a Custom before officiating at the Communion-Service, we learn from Cyril of Jerusalem.* To which Doctrine I have two Exceptions that are not to be got over. The one, that the Use of such a Custom in Cyril's Time will not prove, that the same was known in Justin's, who lived 200

(b) Defence, p. 3.

(c) Page 4.

(d) Page 56.

Years before him. The other, that though the Bishop and Priests should be supposed to wash their Hands before communicating, as is said; we are very sure, it was not in the Eucharistick Cup that they did it. And the Water spoken of by the Answerer was undoubtedly in that Cup. For *Justin Martyr* is very positive. So that howsoever, that Father speaks of no other Mixture but Water and Wine in Two other Places, yet according to our Author's own Doctrine he could not do it here. And by Consequence the Answerer's Objection stands as firm and unshaken as ever.

And in the Two Places where he speaks only of Bread, and Wine, and Water, he only tells us how they used such a Mixture; but does not say our Lord, whether by himself or his Apostles, commanded all his Disciples in all Ages to use it. Which yet would have been necessary to prove it an Essential Part of our Religion. *Justin* I say does not teach this; though our learned Author is pleased to affirm he does. (e) *He acquaints the Emperor*, says our Author, that the Deacons gave all the Congregation Part of the Bread, Wine and Water which was Eucharistized, or *Blessed by Consecration*. This *Justin* speaks of as a Practice in his Time, but does not say our Saviour did the same at his Institution: Which makes what follows very surprising. *Then he adds*, says our Author, *that the apostles were commanded by our Saviour to celebrate in the same manner*; and refers to the same Place for the Proof of this Assertion. But he was so wise as not to produce *Justin's* Words; which if he had related, every one would immediately have seen, that they could

(e) *Defence*, p. 2.

never answer his Design. *Justin* writes that (f) the Apostles in those Records of theirs called the Gospels, teach that *Jesus* commanded them thus; That having taken Bread, and given Thanks, he said, Do this in remembrance of me; This is my Body; and likewise having taken the Cup and given Thanks, he said this is my Blood. Where is not one Word, that we do not as readily assent to, as our learned Author himself, here not being so much as any the least Hint of a Mixture to be made by them.

Our Author subjoins, that unless our Saviour really instituted such a Mixture, (g) we must suppose these *Primo-primitive Christians*. This I should have thought to mean those of the first Age, before which there was none others, not such as came after them, though in the Ages immediately following. But to let that pass. We must suppose these *Primo-primitive Christians* guilty of going off from his Precedent and Command. By which I presume is meant transgressing his Institution. And if so, the Inference I would rather make from hence, as much more reasonable, since I find nothing in Scripture to the contrary; is, that they looked upon the Mixture as an indifferent Rite, to which they were no more obliged, than to the Use of unleavened Bread. It had been said before, (h)
 “ Where there is no Law, there is no Transgression,
 “ Rom. iv. 15. And by consequence, to make
 “ Water necessary with the Wine, some Precept
 “ enjoining it should have accompanied the In-

(f) Ὅτι ἡ ἀπόστολος ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπὸ αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, α καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, ἕως παρέδωκεν ἐπιτάλματα αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λαβόντα ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσας αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν, τὸτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου καὶ τὸ ποθεῖτε ὑμῶν λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, τὸτό ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα μου. *Apol. 2. p. 98.*

(g) *Defence, p. 4.*

(h) *No Reason, p. 37. 38.*

“stitution. Which seeing there is not, the most
 “that can be made of it is only, that it is to be
 “accounted as an uncommanded Usage, which if
 “it may be lawfully practised, may yet as law-
 “fully be let alone. And as our Saviour says no-
 “thing of the Mixture, so it is no impertinent
 “Argument of Mr. *Daillée* in relation to his Ap-
 “postles. *This is a sufficient Satisfaction to me, that*
 “*a Mixture of Water with the Wine is not necessary,*
 “*to the right Performance of the Sacrament, that we*
 “*see neither Christ did appoint and command it, nor*
 “*the Apostles deliver any thing like it, or give the*
 “*least Intimation of it, in their Discourses, either*
 “*about the Eucharist, or not. For if they had either*
 “*used any thing of this Nature, or approved of it,*
 “*it could hardly be that they should not somewhere,*
 “*either designedly, or by the By, have interspersed*
 “*something concerning it ; as it is well known the*
 “*Latins do now, and the Fathers did formerly,*
 “*philosophizing upon many Occasions, and largely,*
 “*concerning the mingling of Water with the Wine,*
 “*and discovering wonderful Mysteries in it. That*
 “*these have acted after this manner, but the Apostles*
 “*did not, I see no other Cause, but that the one were*
 “*little concerned, whether the Celebration was in pure*
 “*Wine or a Mixture, and therefore would not trouble*
 “*the World about it, but the others were Zealous*
 “*for it, as for a Matter of great Moment.*” And
 whether the Apostles, or those that came after, are
 chiefly to be attended to, is no difficult Matter to
 determine. And now what does our learned Au-
 thor answer to all this? To the former Part he
 says nothing. And to Mr. *Daillée's* Assertion that
 the Apostles did not give the least Intimation
 of the Mixture, he tells us (i) *Justin Martyr*

(i) *Defence*, p. 50.

did. *This Father*, says he, *where he gives the Emperor an account, that the Bread, and Wine, and Water, were Eucharistized or Blessed, adds, that our Saviour commanded his Apostles to celebrate in the same manner.* Than which he could not well have said more, if he had looked upon his Apology as Canonical Scripture, which it was never yet pretended to be. So that according to this way of arguing, our Faith in this Point is not to be resolved into the Doctrine of the Scriptures, but into the Sayings of *Justin Martyr*, and the following Ecclesiastical Writers. And thus we are to have henceforward a new Rule of Faith never taught by our Saviour or his Apostles, nor known to *Justin* himself, and those that are appealed to with him. To promote this he adds, (*k*) *Justin Martyr*, as *Photius* speaks, *was little behind the Apostles, either in Time, or Value.* Which shews sufficiently that *Photius* owned, and indeed he could not but own, that he was behind them in both, and so not to be equalled to any of them in either. He proceeds, *Against this celebrated Father Daillé's Testimony is produced, an Antiepiscopal Divine.* But if he had taken Time to write a little more deliberately, he might have seen that *Daillé's* Testimony was not produced against *Justin Martyr*, or any one else. For it was not his Authority, but his Argument that was referred to, to prove that the Water in the Mixture could be looked upon, in the Apostolical Age, as no more than an uncommanded indifferent Rite. And if the Argument were strong and conclusive, I am not concerned whatever Sort of Divine it was that made use of it. And now that we have mentioned this *Antiepiscopal Divine*, I hope I may make use of another Saying of his to our Purpose, without affronting *Justin Martyr*; and I desire our learned Author to

(*k*) *Ibid.*

disprove it, if he can. (l) *We know from Justin Martyr that Water was mixed with the Wine: But that any one was ever condemned by him, as guilty of a grievous Sin, for celebrating the Eucharist in Bread and Wine only, we do not know.* Whence it appears, our Author had no Reason for his undeserved Reflection, *Whether St. Justin's or Daillée's Authority is chiefly to be attended to, is no difficult Matter to determine,* there being no Occasion given for it, as neither is it at all an Answer to the Argument proposed. The Result of what has been said as to this Father's Testimony is, that as it is not yet shewn what *κράμα*, or Mixture, there was in the Cup besides Water; so neither are they that used it to be charged with Prevarication, if they used it only for Convenience, and as an indifferent Circumstance, and that it does not yet appear they made more of it.

Next come (m) *Irenæus* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*: And as to these the Answerer had objected, that though they speak of a Mixture, neither of them said any thing of its Necessity. Whereto is answered, (n) as to the former of them, that he said our Saviour called *the mix'd Cup* his Blood; that he charged the *Ebionites* with *rejecting the Mixture of the heavenly Wine*, and only made use of Water; and again, that our Lord promised his Disciples *to drink the mix'd Cup now with them in his Kingdom.* To all which Passages I reply.

1. He speaks after a very different manner upon other Occasions. He affirms of our Saviour, that (o) *He confessed the Cup, which is of the Creature,*

(l) A Justino mixtam vino aquam scimus: Damnatum ab eo gravis peccati quenquam ideo iustic, quod ex pane & mero Eucharistiam faceret, nescimus. *De cult. Relig. Latinorum.* l. 3. c. 7.

(m) *No Reason*, p. 5. (n) *Defence*, p. 5. (o) Το ἀπὸ τῆ κτίσεως ποτήριον, αἷμα ὁμολόγησε. *Adv. H. res.* l. 5. c. 2.

to be his Blood. Which surely would have been of the Creatures, in the plural Number, if he had meant it of Water as well as Wine. And again, (p) He promised to drink of the Fruit of the Vine, with his Disciples; hereby shewing both the earthly Inheritance, in which the new Fruit of the Vine is drunk, and the Resurrection of the Flesh of his Disciples. And to explain himself the better a little after, he speaks of (q) the Drink which is from the Vine; which can be nothing else but Wine. And can it be thought he would have delivered himself in this manner, if he had believed a Mixture of Water necessary with the Wine?

2. It is not certain *Irenæus's* *Temperamentum calicis, & Commixtio calicis*, mean as our Author understands them; that is to say, it is not certain that they, or either of them, can be taken necessarily to imply a Mixture of Water in the Cup. And the Reason is, because in very good Authors, both *Greek* and *Latine*; Profane and Sacred, *Miscere*, and *Μιγρῶναι*, or *Κεζαρῶναι*, and other Words of affinity with them, frequently signify no more than to pour into a Cup, or to give to drink. Thus (r) *Miscere* is used by *Juvenal*, (s) *Misceri* &

(p) Promisit bibere de generatione vitis, cum suis Discipulis, utrumque ostendens, & hereditatem terræ, in quâ bibitur nova generatio vitis, & carnalem resurrectionem Discipulorum ejus. l. 5. c. 33.

(q) Qui ex vite accipitur potus. *Ibid.*

(r) Nescit tot milibus emptus Pauperibus miscere puer. *Sat. v. v. 60.* Which Words *Lubin*, expounds to mean, Non vult pauperibus clientibus infundere.

(s) Misceri sibi protinus deunces, sed crebros jubet. l. 6. *Epig. 78.* Id est, Imperat sibi porrigi deunces, sed frequentes. *Vincen. Coles. in loc.* Hic Scyphus est, in quo misceri insit amicis Largius Æacides l. 8. *Epigr. 6.* Scilicet hic est Scyphus, in quo Achilles imperavit plenius infundi amicis. Id. Quis mihi qui nectar misceat alter erit? l. 9. *Epig. 37.* Id est, Quem habebit alterum, qui ministret nectar? Id.

Misceat, by *Martial*; (t) *Misceat*, by *Tully*; & *Μίσζον*, *Κέρασαι*, & *Κεράντες*, by (u) *Homer*. But the Instances I principally depend upon, are those Two of the Apostle *St. John* in the Revelation. *Chap. xiv. 10.* He speaks of the *Wine of the Wrath of God poured forth without Mixture*; *κεκρασίδις ἀκράτη*, unmix'd Wine, which therefore cannot be said to be mix'd, but only to be poured forth. And so our Translation renders it very rightly, *The same shall drink of the Wine of the Wrath of God, which is Poured forth without Mixture into the Cup of his Indignation.* And again, *Chap. xviii. 6.* *Ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ᾧ ἐκράσαε, κεράσαιε αὐτῇ διπλῶν.* In the Cup, not which she hath mixed, but which she hath filled, fill unto her double. From which Use of these Words, it is manifest, that some considerable Pains will be required to assure us, that the pretended Mixture is implied in these Expressions of *Irenæus*. And if this cannot be effected, as it certainly never can, then they are brought to no Purpose; and still there is not a Word in this Father, from whence the Necessity of the Mixture may fairly be inferred, but rather the contrary. X

3. But it may be what he testifies of the *Ebionites*, may be thought more convincing, (w) *That they rejected the Mixture of the heavenly Wine, and only made use of Water*; because if there had been

(t) *Dico ergo in eadem voluptate eum qui alteri misceat mulsam, ipse non sitiens, & eum qui illud sitiens bibit? De fin. bon. & mal. l. 2.*

(u) *Ὅρχια πρὸς θεῶν σύναγον, κρηθεὶ δὲ ὄνον Μίσζον. Il. 3.* On which Words says *Eustathius*; *Ὁυ μειμνημένοι, ἀλλ' ἀκράτοι αὶ σπονδαί. Ζωρότερον δὲ κέρασαι, διότι αὐτὸ ἐνυμνον ἐκράσῳ. Il. 10.* where he expounds *ζωρον* by *ἀκράσον*; and so in Effect declares, that *κέρασαι* could not signify *Mix*, but *Pour out*.

Κεράντες τ' αἰθοπα οἶνον. Odyss. 22. *Τελέσι*, says he, *ἐμβέλλοντες ἐς κρασίδας.* And again, on *Il. 3. p. 319.* he gives this Etymology of the Verb *κράσαι*, as I noted before, that *τὸ κεράν δὲ παλαιὰς οἰνοχρείας διὰ κέρατος ὄνομα.* Which does not any way look towards a Mixture.

(w) *Defence, p. 6.*

both

both Wine and Water, there must inevitably *have been a Mixture*. But neither will this at all Answer the Design. For,

1. *Irenæus's* Words are by no means rightly translated. We are told indeed *They only made use of Water*. But in *Irenæus* it is, *sola aqua secularis volunt esse, They will be only secular Water*. And what the Meaning of this Phrase is, is not easy to be known : But these Two Things are indisputable in relation to it. That the true rendering of it cannot possibly be, *They only made use of Water*. And that it is no Sign of a good Cause, that it is to be supported by such unintelligible Citations, as are not to the purpose, and prove nothing ; nor can be made to seem to do it, if truly represented.

2. It is beyond Question, that it was the Wine, not the Water, *Irenæus* argues for, and of the Want whereof he complains, in these *Ebionites*.

3. The latter Part of the Sentence is advantageously omitted ; *non recipientes Deum ad Commixtionem suam*, not receiving God to their filled Cup. For so I presume I may justly translate it, after what has already been said. Wherein *Irenæus* seems plainly to suggest these Two Things. First, That God was represented and convey'd by the Wine alone ; since their Cup could not thus convey or represent him. And Secondly, That he calls *their* Cup, which our Author declares to have consisted of *Water only, Commixtionem suam* ; a manifest Instance that *Irenæus* did not mean so much by *Commixtionem*, as our Author infers from it, and as is absolutely necessary for his Argument.

The Summ is, that *Irenæus* says our Saviour's Cup was of *the Creature*, not of the *Creatures*, as Wine and Water are, and calls it *the Fruit of the Vine*, and *the Drink which is from the Vine* ; that when he calls the Cup a Mixture he does not neces-

cessarily appear to mean it in our Author's Sense, and when he speaks of the *Ebionites* he shews plainly he does not and cannot mean it so; and that it is the Wine and not the Water he pleads for; and charges the *Ebionites* that for want of it God had nothing to do with their Cup. Which several Particulars, if our Author will please impartially to consider, I may leave it to himself to judge, whether this Father can be thought to be of his Side of the Cause; and especially whether he has said any Thing to prove the Essentiality of the Mixture.

The next Evidence is *Clemens Alexandrinus*; and of him it is observable, that as he says nothing for the Mixture, so he has divers Testimonies against it. Our Author is pleased to teach, that both *Irenaeus* and *Clement* (x) give in plain Evidence for the *Usage*. As to the former, of whom I have already shewn, that he has, if rightly interpreted, said nothing material for the Mixture, but on the contrary has owned the *Wine* to be our Saviour's Blood: Which in my Opinion is good Evidence against it. And the same I shall now shew of the other. Only in the mean Time, if I shall not be said to grant, by supposing it, I will suppose the Words of both of them to be meant in our Author's Sense, and see then what he can make of them. Suppose they speak sometimes of *Wine alone*, and at others of a *Mixture*, rather than an Effusion; what else can be collected from hence, but that howsoever they express themselves, they could lay no great Weight upon it, whether the Wine were mix'd or pure? But our Author farther takes notice, (y) that the Answerer had replied in relation to the Mixture, *That neither of them speak a Word of its being Necessary*. And I thought upon

(x) *Defence*, p. 5.(y) *Ibid*.

this I might reasonably have expected to see it very plainly proved that they do it. But when I came to examine their Evidence, if I had, I should have found my self sadly disappointed. *Irenæus* indeed pleads a Necessity of Wine against the *Ebionites*; but neither of them says, our Saviour enjoyned his Disciples, to use any thing more as necessary to the Sacrament, than Wine. And consequently they have never declared the Necessity of a Mixture; which our Author would infer from some Words of theirs, but cannot find it said by them, or either of them. This I have already shewn as to *Irenæus*; and now I proceed to shew the same of *Clement*. Our Author indeed professes, (a) *Nothing can be fuller to the Purpose, than what we find in Clemens Alexandrinus*; “ That “ the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{C}$, or eternal Word of God, ordered “ the Blood of the Grape to be mix’d with Wa- “ ter, as his own Blood has Happiness or Salva- “ tion incorporated with it. „ Yet what he can make of this, that should prove so wonderfully to his *Purpose*, would puzzle any one else to discover. For I cannot see how the original Words, as cited in his own Margin, can have any other Signification, than what the ingenious Author of the *No Necessity to alter the Common-prayer* has assign’d them, (b) namely, either *The Divine $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{C}$ being willing to be mix’d with the Water of the Blood of the Grape, as his Blood is mingled with Salvation*: Or else, *The Blood of the Grape, to wit, the WORD being willing to be mix’d with Water, &c.* And either way the Expression is so Dark and Mystical, that it is hard to explain the Sense of it, but impossible to shew it is at all to the *Purpose*, to which it is said to be so *Full*. Especially, if it be remembered, that our Saviour’s supposed Mixture

(a) Page 6.

(b) *No Necessity*, p. 12.

cannot be imagined to be recommended here, as a Pattern for the Celebration of the Eucharist, but only in order to a strict Sobriety in all our Conversation ; this whole Chapter being levelled, not against such as would have the Sacrament admixtred in pure Wine, but against Drunkenness and Excess at other Times ; and therefore far from an Evidence full to our present Purpose, had the Words been more intelligible than they must be allowed to be. Besides, it is worth noting, that towards the End of this same Chapter, being earnest in proving our Saviour used to drink Wine, he not only says, (c) Μετέλαβεν ὄνυ καὶ αὐτοῦς, *He himself partook of WINE* ; but farther, (d) *He blessed the WINE, saying, Take, drink, this is my Blood, the Blood of the Grape.* And a little after, (e) *He shewed again, that what was blessed was WINE, saying to his Disciples I will drink no more of the Fruit of this Vine, until I drink it with you in my Father's Kingdom.* Which Words I may well say are much fuller to the Purpose, for the Use of Wine only, than those produced by our Author for the Use of the Mixture. For the Father not only says, *He partook of the Wine*, but that *He blessed the Wine*, and called it *his Blood, the Blood of the Grape* ; that *what he blessed was Wine*, not a Mixture, but Wine, calling it expressly *the Fruit of the Vine*. So that it is strange this Father should be brought in in behalf of the Mixture, of which he says nothing, and against Wine alone in the Eucharist, for which he says so much. And yet to improve his Autho-

(c) Ραδ. 2. c. 2. p. 186.

(d) Ἐυλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν, λάβετε, πίνετε, τὸ πρὸς μου ἔστιν τὸ αἶμα, αἶμα τῆς ἀμπέλου. *Ibid.*

(e) Ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθὲν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων. Ὅτι μὴ πῖω ἔτι τῆς γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ταύτης, μέχρις αὐτοῦ πῖω αὐτὸ μετ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου. *Ibid.*

rity a little farther; he presently applies what he
 had been saying to the *Encratites*, (*f*) great Pro-
 fessors of Abstemiousness, and *who condemned Wine*
as Diabolical, to shew how much they were out in
 their Refusal of it. And if from hence any should
 conclude that our Lord by this Argument was
 proved to drink Wine, but not exclusive of Wa-
 ter with it; it is easy to reply, not only that 'tis
 not reasonable to conceive the holy Father would
 expound so solemn a Text as this is, in so defe-
 ctive a manner; but that moreover, the Business
 he was at that very Time upon, being to press
 Temperance in Drinking, it would have given his
 Argument the greater Force, if he could have told
 them our Lord would not bless his own Cup, o-
 therwise than as diluted with Water. And had
 he been of our learned Author's Opinion, no doubt
 he would have done it. And even as to the *En-*
cratites themselves, it had not been less convin-
 cing; in as much as the Use of Wine by our Sa-
 viour himself, would have confuted their Abomi-
 nation of it, and by Informing them farther that
 Water was mix'd with it, it had more probably
 won those *Zealots for Water alone*, to receive the
 Truth. So that nothing seems to incline this
 learned Father, to apply the Text of Consecra-
 tion to our Saviour's drinking Wine, and at the
 same Time to conceal the Mixture of it, but that
 he either had no Notion of such a Mixture, or else
 conceived the Water to be a Circumstance of no
 Consideration in the consecrated Cup. Though I
 must own the former of these, that he knew of no
 such Mixture, to be most likely, because suiting
 best with the Argument he was then upon. So
 that the Matter in short, as to this Father, is this;

(f) Epiphan. Hæres. 47. c. 1.

he not only does not teach the great Necessity of a Mixture in the Holy Eucharist, but it cannot be proved that he does any way recommend it, or in Truth so much as once mention it, though he speaks over and over of Wine alone as the proper Matter of our Saviour's Cup.

Thus we have gone through the two first Ages of the Church: And by what has been said it may be seen, that as there is not any one Writer of the former of them, that is so much as pretended to have made the least Mention of the Mixture so zealously insisted upon; so neither is there any in the next, that gives any manner of Proof for it. And we have no other offered till the middle of the Third Age, and none then, that shews any necessity of the Mixture, the Point that was to have been proved.

The only supposed Advocate that we know of for the Mixture in the Third Century is St. Cyprian; of whom we are told, (g) *The Answerer confesses this Father is very positive for the Use of the Water, and avers it our Saviour's Institution.* And I deny not but St. Cyprian speaks sometimes this way, and especially where he is treating of his supposed emblematical Use and Signification of the Cup, to denote the Union betwixt Christ and Believers. But then it is to be noted on the other hand, that at other times he delivers himself after a very different Manner, earnestly contending for the Wine to be put in the Cup; and not so for the Water, which though he often allows to be there, yet he undertakes not to prove it necessarily so, the only Thing we differ about. Besides that sometimes again he speaks of Wine only; which does not look as if his fixed Judgment were, that the Water is so highly and absolutely necessary, as is pretended.

First, I say, his Arguments for the Mixture are in behalf of the Wine not of the Water. Thus he speaks in the first Page of his Epistle to *Cecilius*, (b) *Admonitos autem nos scias &c.* Know we are admonished, to observe our Lord's Tradition in offering the Cup, and that nothing else be done by us, but what our Lord himself did first: That the Cup which is offered in Commemoration of him, be offered with a Mixture of Wine. For when Christ says, *I am the true Vine, the Blood of Christ is NOT WATER BUT WINE.* Nor can his Blood, whereby we are redeemed, and enlivened be seen to be in the Cup, when the Wine is wanting by which his Blood is Shewn forth. And a little after speaking of Noah, that (i) exhibiting a Type of what should afterwards truly come to pass, he drank not Water but Wine, and so expressed the Image of our Lord's Passion. It follows, (k) We see also the Sacrament of our Lord's Sacrifice prefigured in the Priest *Melchisedeck*, as the divine Scripture testifies, and says; *And Melchisedeck King of Salem, brought forth Bread and Wine—But that Melchisedeck bare a Type of Christ, the Holy Spirit declares in the Book of Psalms, from the Person of the Father, saying to the Son, Before the Morning I begat thee, thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedeck; (l) The Image of Christ's Sacrifice preceeds, consisting of Bread and Wine, which Thing our Lord perfecting and fulfilling, offered Bread and a Cup, mixt with*

(b) Page 148. (i) Quod Noe typum futuræ veritatis ostendens; non aquam, sed vinum biberit; & sic imaginem Dominicæ passionis expresserit. Pag. 148.

(k) Item in sacerdote *Melchisedech* sacrificii Dominicæ sacramentum præfiguratum videmus, secundum quod scriptura divina testatur & dicit; & *Melchisedech* rex salem protulit Panem & Vinum.—Quod autem *Melchisedech* typum Christi portaret, declarat in Psalmis Spiritus sanctus, &c. *Ibid.*

(l) Præcedit ante imago sacrificii Christi in pane & vino scilicet constituta, quam rem perficiens & adimplens Dominus, panem & calicem mixtum vino obtulit. *Ibid.*

Wine. And again (m) *Come, eat of my Bread, and drink of the Wine which I have mingled for you.* He declares it to be mixt Wine, that is he in a prophetic manner foretels, that the Lord's Cup shall be mixt with Wine and Water; to the end it may appear that in our Lord's Passion, that was performed which had been foretold. (n) *We see the Cup was mixt which our Lord offered, and that it was Wine that he called his Blood.* Whence it is apparent, that the Blood of Christ is not offered, unless there be Wine in the Cup. And speaking of those who used a Cup without Wine, he complains, (o) *Thus the Brotherhood begins from the Passion of Christ, to be slopt in their Career in Times of Persecution, whilst in their Oblations they learn to be ashamed of his Blood and Gore.* And in the next Page he asks to the same purpose, (p) *How can we shed our Blood for Christ, who are ashamed to drink Christ's Blood?* And yet once more, (q) *We are admonished and caught by the Lord, to offer the Lord's Cup mixt with Wine, as the Lord himself offered.* Here every one may see that St. Cyrian's Zeal for the Mixture

(m) Venite, edite de meis panibus, & bibite vinum quod miscui vobis. Vinum mixtum declarat, id est, calicem Domini aquâ & vino mixtum prophetica voce prænunciat; ut apparet in passione Dominicâ id esse gestum, quod fuerat ante prædictum. *Ibid.*

(n) Quâ in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse, quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit. Unde apparet sanguinem Christi non offerri, si desit vinum calici. *Pag. 152.*

(o) Sic ergo incipit à passione Christi in persecutionibus fraternitas retardari, dum in oblationibus discit de sanguine ejus & cruore confundi. *Pag. 155.*

(p) Quomodo autem possumus propter Christum sanguinem fundere, qui sanguinem Christi erubescimus bibere? *P. 156.*

(q) A Domino admoniti & instructi sumus, ut calicem Dominicum vino mixtum, secundum quod Dominus obtulit, offeramus. *Pag. 157.*

was not for the Water to be put into the Cup, but for not leaving the Wine out of it. This he knew to be of absolute Necessity, because our Saviour's Blood could not be represented without it, and therefore presses to have it by no means omitted, against such as were for communicating in Water only; whether because they thought it more suitable for the Morning in their early Communion, or least their Breath should betray them to their Enemies, or for whatsoever other Cause; disputing with such he does not condemn the Use of Water together with Wine, and therefore several times calls it *a mixt Cup*. But yet the Bent of his Argument is constantly in favour of the Wine, as without which our Saviour's Blood cannot be shewn forth.

2. In the next place speaking of Water, he teaches that (r) whensoever this is named alone in Scripture, it is to be looked upon as an Emblem, not of the holy Eucharist, but of the other Sacrament of Baptism. An Instance whereof he gives us (s) in *Isaiab*, in these Words, *Behold I do a new thing: now it shall spring forth, shall ye not know it? because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen.* (t) There, says St. Cyprian, God foretold by the Prophet, that amongst the Gentiles, in Places which had formerly been without Water, in time Rivers should abound; and should refresh the chosen People of God, being made his Sons by baptismal Re-

(r) Quotiescunque autem aqua sola in scripturis sanctis nominatur, baptismus predicatur. *Ead. Epist. p. 150.*

(s) *Is. xliii. 19, 20.*

(t) Prænuñciavit per prophetam Deus, quod apud gentes in locis, quæ iniquosa prius fuissent, flumina postmodum redundarent: Et electum genus Dei, id est, per regenerationem baptismi, filios Dei factos adquirent. *Pag. 150.*

generation.

generation. And again, (u) *He that believeth in me, as the Scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living Water. And that it may the more clearly appear, that the Lord speaks not there of the Cup, but of Baptism, the Scripture says farther, But this he spake of the Spirit which they that believed in him should receive. For by Baptism the holy Spirit is received.* Thus you see he distinguishes between the Matter of the two Sacraments, observing Water properly to belong to the One, and Wine to the Other. Which evidently shews, as I said, that though he does not disapprove of Water in the Cup, and therefore calls it a mixt Cup, yet Wine is what he looks upon as essentially necessary to it, and therefore argues earnestly for the constant Use of it.

3. And thus much he more expressly affirms, in another Part of the same Epistle; (w) *How perverse, and how contrary is it, that when our Lord at the Marriage had made Wine of the Water, we on the other hand should make Water of Wine, Whereas the Mystery of that Thing ought to instruct and teach us, that we are rather to offer Wine in the Lord's Sacrifices.*

4. And lastly, He speaks divers times of the Wine in the Sacrament, without mentioning any Water, so as that an impartial Reader may easi-

(u) Qui credit in me, sicut Scriptura dicit, flumina de ventre ejus fluent aquæ viva. Atque ut magis possit esse manifestum, quia non de calice, sed de baptismo illic loquitur Dominus, addidit Scriptura, dicens: Hoc autem dixit de spiritu quem accepturi erant, qui in eum credebant. Per baptismum enim spiritus sanctus accipitur. *Ibid.*

(w) Quam vero perversum est, quamque contrarium, ut cum Dominus in nuptiis de aquâ vinum fecerit, nos de vino aquam faciamus, cum sacramentum quoque rei illius admovere & instruere nos debeat, ut in sacrificiis Dominicis vinum potius offeramus. *Pag. 153.*

ly see, he looked upon that as the only essential Part of that Species of the Sacrament. (x) *Who is more a Priest of God, than our Lord Jesus Christ? who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very same that Melchisedeck had offered, that is Bread and Wine, as much as to say, his Body and Blood.* And presently after reciting that Part of Jacob's Blessing pronounced upon his Son Judah a little before his Death, Gen. 49. 11. *He washed his Garments in Wine and his Clothes in the blood of Grapes,* he subjoins, (y) *When the Blood of the Grape is mentioned, what else is meant by it, but the Wine of the Cup of our Lord's Blood?* And immediately after this, (z) *Moreover the holy Spirit testifies the same thing by Esaias, in relation to our Lord's Passion, saying; Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the Wine vat? Can Water by any means make Garments red? Or is there any Water in the Wine-press, which is either trodden, or pressed out? The Mention of Wine is plainly intended to signify our Lord's Blood; and that what was afterwards manifested in the Lord's Cup, should be foretold by the Prophet's declaring it.* And in his Epistle to Magnus one of his Laity,

(x) Quis magis sacerdos Dei quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus? Qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedech obtulerat, id est, Panem & Vinum, suum scilicet corpus & sanguinem. *Pag. 149.*

(y) Quando autem sanguis uvæ dicitur, quid aliud quàm vinum calicis Domini sanguinis ostenditur? *P. 150.*

(z) Necnon & apud Esaiam hoc idem spiritus sanctus de Domini passione testatur, dicens; Quare rubicunda sunt vestimenta tua; & indumenta tua velut à calcatione torcularis pleni & percalcati? Nunquid rubicunda vestimenta aqua potest facere? Aut in torculari aqua est, quæ pedibus calcatur, vel prelo exprimitur? Vini utique mentio ideo ponitur, ut Domini sanguis intelligatur; & quod in calice Dominico postea manifestatum est, Prophetis annunciantibus prædicetur. *151.*

in Answer to a Letter sent to him, to beg Advice about the Admission of those to Communion, who returned from the Novatians, he has this Passage concerning our blessed Lord; (a) *He called the Wine, pressed out of many Clusters and Grapes, and forced together into one Body, his Blood.* Where he manifestly speaks of the Wine alone, without, the Mention of any Water, and such indeed as could not be supposed to have Water in it, unless water could be pressed out of Grapes, as well as Wine, and calls it our Saviour's Blood. And since nothing could be thought necessary in the Cup, but what was Sacramentally his Blood, how is it possible this Sort of Expression could come from one that believed Water to be essential to the Sacrament?

Now put these Things together, that St *Cyprian's* Pleas for a Mixture, aimed at proving the Necessity of Wine in the Sacrament, not of Water; that he tells us when Water alone is spoken of in Scripture as the Matter of a Sacrament, it is of the other Sacrament of Baptism, and not of the Eucharist; that he expressly requires to offer Wine in the Cup rather than Water, and that he often mentions nothing as belonging to the Cup but Wine, and calls that our Saviour's Blood; and then let any man judge, whether St. *Cyprian* could be of Opinion, that Water was a necessary indispensable Part of our Saviour's Institution, and the Want of it a just Cause for Breach of Communion with those that use it not; or whether (b) St. *Cyprian* is truly *decisive in this Point.* If he be, it is for the Wine, and not for the Water. And if the Answerer were induced by our

(a) Sanguinem suum vinum appellat, de botris atque acinis plurimis expressum, atque in unum coactum. *Epist.* 69. p. 182.

(b) *Reasons, &c.* p. 4.

learned Author's positive Assertions, and his own Haste and Want of due Consideration, to yield more than this comes to, it is not too late to set the Matter now in a better Light, as I think I have fully done; insomuch, that I might safely forbear the Defence of what had been said to prove, that by St. Cyprian's Time some Error might obtain in the Church, and to that degree that even so great a man as St. Cyprian might happen to be drawn into it. However since such a Disquisition may tend more clearly to evince the Uncertainty of Tradition, where we have nothing else to depend upon, I shall beg the Reader's Patience, whilst I take notice of what has been objected under this Head; though with all the brevity I can.

1. And here it is urged, that it is only said to be possible St Cyprian might have been mistaken; (c) *and can this turn the Balance, or amount to the least Disproof?* And I own it is the lowest sort of Disproof; but yet it must be granted a sufficient Evidence of the Insufficiency of that Proof against which it is brought. And the Reason is, because I can never be sure a Thing is proved to be true, whilst yet for any thing I know it may be false.

2. Whereas it is said, (d) *He might be out in his Tradition for the Mixture, no less than in the Reason he assigns for it, that it might represent the near Relation betwixt Christ and his Church;* our learned Author inquires, (e) *Does the Answerer disprove this Reasoning?* Not at all. He says no more than that 'tis possible he might be out. And if it is only possible he was in the wrong, 'tis highly probable he was in the right. Where it is observa-

(c) Defence, p. 8. (d) No Reason, p. 7. (e) Defence, p. 8.

ble his Proof aims at no more than a *high Probability*, and whether that be enough to found the absolute Necessity of a Duty upon, I leave to our Author himself to determine. But that *St. Cyprian* was out in the Reason he gives for the Mixture in the sacramental Cup, can hardly be denied, by any one that considers how different his Reason for the Institution of that Cup is from our Saviour's. Our Saviour appoints it to be *in Remembrance of himself*, and the bitter Passion he was about to undergo for our Redemption; *St. Cyprian* teaches it to be for representing the intimate Union betwixt Christ and his People, which is very far from being the Reason our Lord assigns for it.

3. The Answerer had said, (f) concerning the famous Controversy, between Pope *Victor* and the *Asiatick* Churches, about the Observation of *Easter*, *Here both Parties pleaded Tradition the one from St. John and St. Philip, the other from St. Peter and St. Paul, though in plain Contradiction to each other.* And what does our learned Author say to this? Does he at all deny it? Not in the least. On the contrary, he says, (g) *We have great Reason, to believe the two different Traditions were both true.* But then he adds, that in Matters not Necessary, *the Apostles accommodated themselves to the Notions of their Converts, and managed as the Reasons of Time and Place suggested; and as to the Time of the Paschal Solemnity they left no Decision or Command about it.* But the Question was not about what the Apostles did, but what they that lived after them; and whether Tradition had settled this Matter so surely, as that no Contentions or Strifes arose about it, to the Distur-

(f) *No Reason*, p. 7.

(g) *Defence*, p. 9.

bance of the Church, and whether great Men were not engaged on both Sides. And this is not denied.

4. We are told (b) the Millennium, or our Saviour's Reigning upon Earth for a Thousand Years, is brought as a Second Instance of an erroneous Tradition. And here Papias is cited as having received this Tradition with many others from the Apostles. Here, says our Author, is some Mistake in representing the Matter. And so indeed there is. But on which Side any one may see. For whosoever but looks into the Answerer, (i) must needs see, he never said that Papias saw, or conversed with any of the Apostles, but only that upon Inquiry, he received many Traditions as from them. Though if he had said what our Author here charges him with, he had not been without some Countenance for it from (k) Irenæus, who calls him a Hearer of St. John. It follows, (l) The Millennial Tradition was not very generally believed in those early Ages of Christianity. Though Eusebius informs us, that (m) this Tradition was entertained by most of the Clergy of those times. Justin Martyr relates the Christians were somewhat divided about it. Now here I don't think it worth our while to examine into the utmost Extent of this Tradition; it being enough for me that the Doctrine was believed for a considerable time, and many great men came into it. Which suffices to shew it not improbable, that St. Cyprian might possibly be drawn in to espouse a Tra-

(b) Pag. 11. (i) No Reason, p. 8. (k) Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουσῆς. L. v. c. 33. (l) Defence, p. 12.
 (m) Πλὴν καὶ πῶς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείοσις ὄσσις τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῆ ὁμοίας αὐτῶ δόξης παραίτιος γέγονε. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.

dition no better founded than this; and the rather if there were more to be said for it. But it seems (n) *this Tradition may be orthodox, for ought the Answerer has said to the contrary.* Yet it is not generally thought to be so, nor has been for a long time. And let our Author take it which way he will, there must be an Error on one side, and many great Men have given into it. And so much himself confesses; *They split into Partys about it, and great Abettors were ranged on either side.* He is pleased indeed to say, (o) *the Parallell fails and the Reason is inconsequential.* But if he will give himself the trouble, to cast his eye again upon the Answer, he may soon perceive, no Parallell was there designed, but only that when ill proved Traditions have appeared, Great men have been too apt to be carried away with them. And for Confirmation hereof, *Hospinian* had been quoted, for an Observation of his (p) *That whatsoever religious Customs had got admittance into the Church, they were forthwith reckoned to have proceeded from Apostolical Tradition, and the Doctrine of the Holy Ghost.* And did our Author undertake to disprove this? no; he says not a Word to it in this place: Only afterwards without regard to that Observation, which he allows to stand without contradiction, he takes occasion to speak of *Hospinian* (q) as not fit to be set in competition for an Authority equal to *Justin Martyr, Irenæus, &c.* which he cannot but know was never intended, but only this Observation was quoted for the Usefulness of it. And he does not in the least deny it to be true.

(n) *Defence*, p. 13. (o) *Pag.* 14. [(p) *Histor. Sacramentar.* l. 2. c. 2. (q) *Defence*, p. 120.

5. Mention had been made (r) of many spurious Writings, put forth under the Names, some of our Lord himself, and his blessed Mother; and many more under those of the Apostles, and others of the first Disciples. This therefore our learned Author takes notice of. (f) But he does not in the least deny the Truth of the Fact; as indeed he could not. All he says to it is, that the Spuriousness of these Writings was detected by the Church, and the ancient Fathers, who gave the World notice of them. Which might very well be, and yet the Authors of them might sow such counterfeit Traditions, as others much better than themselves might swallow without due Examination; even when all did not. It follows, *Why should we suppose them less qualified or less careful about Oral Tradition?* Yet every one knows *Oral Tradition* is much more difficultly preserved, from Corruptions and Innovations, than *Written*; and so Errors may sooner creep in that way. Oh! but in the Case of the Sacrament it could not be. *The Christians in the Primitive times received the Holy Eucharist every Day. Upon what Pretence of Argument then, can we imagine them mistaken in the Apostolical Practice?* It is true, they could not well be mistaken in the *Apostolical Practice*; that is, if the Apostles administered both Wine and Water, they could not well mistake that. Yet this did not hinder, but a Mistake might creep in as to the Reason of this Practice, and so the Water might come in time to be thought more necessary, than it really was. This I say upon Supposition; the Water had really been then accounted as necessary, as it is now represented to be. But I think I have clearly enough shewn, it was not thought

(r) *No Reason*, p. 9.(f) *Defence*, p. 14.

to be so, but rather to be used as an indifferent Rite, such as might lawfully be omitted, though the Wine might not.

What follows concerning the Authentickness and Authority of Tradition, has been already considered; and therefore I pass it by here, and proceed to the Reasons offered, (u) *Why the Revival of some truly apostolical Usages are not insisted upon*, rather than these of which the Apostles appear not to have ever said any thing. The Reason given for not insisting upon the Revival of these, is said to be, that *though mentioned in Scripture, they are not mentioned as Commands and binding Rules for Practice*. Yet is this no Reason, why these Practices should not have at least as much Respect paid them, as others that are never mentioned in it at all. But more particularly,

(w) *As to the saluting with a Kiss*, it is urged that, *though St. Paul recommends it, he does not oblige them to practise this Ceremony, just before their proceeding to the Holy Eucharist*. If he had, we should not have needed Tradition for it; such an Injunction in Scripture would have put the Obligation out of Dispute. But as it is; as St. PAUL declares it to be an Usage in his Time, *Rom. 16. 16.* and *Justin Martyr* tells us it continued in Use in his Days, at their approaching to the Holy Eucharist; *Tertullian* in his Time, at the Hours (x) of Prayer, and the Sacrifice; and a long Time after this *St. Cyril of Jerusalem* Teaches, that in his Time the Deacon made Proclamation, (y) calling upon them,
to

(u) *Defence*, p. 20. (w) *Ibid.* (x) *Quæ oratio cum divortio sancti osculi integra? Quale Sacrificium à quo sine pace receditur? Tertul. de Orat. c. 14.*

(y) Ἐπίστα βοῶν ὁ Διάκονος ἀλλήλους ἀπολαμβάνει, ἀλλήλους ἀσπάζομεθα. Μὴ ὑπολάβῃς τὸ σίλημα ἐκείνο σύνθετος εἶναι τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ γινομένοις, ὑπὸ τῆς κοινῶν φωνῆς ἐκ ἑστ. τῶν τοῖσιν

to embrace and kiss one another. Which Kifs, says he, was not to be looked upon as like those of common Usage, but as a Token of mutual Reconciliation, and Forgetfulness of past Injuries or Affronts. And I suppose our learned Author will not except to the Authority of the Apostolical Constitutions, (z) ordering the Deacon to say, salute one another with a holy Kifs; and then declaring that the Clergy were to salute the Bishop, the Lay-men their Brethren, and the Women the Women. As it is, I say, it has much more to be said for it, than these other unscriptural Usages. But says our learned Author, (a) I have prov'd by unquestionable Authority, that our Lord not only drank of the mix'd Cup himself, but commanded his Disciples to do the same in Remembrance of him, till his coming again. But it is one thing to prove, and another to say I have proved. It is certain the one of these is mentioned in Scripture, and continued accordingly in the Church for some considerable Time after, And it is as certain, the other is never so much as once named, either by our Saviour or his Apostles. Nor is it any way proved, that our Saviour, either drank of a mix'd Cup himself, or so much as once commanded, either his Apostles, or any one else, to drink of one.

As for the Love-Feasts before the Eucharistick Communion, they were only Practise without Precept, as far as it Appears. And as for the Mixture, it has neither Precept, nor Practise, so far as appears from any Evidence in the Apostolical Age, nor

τοῦτον τὸ φίλημα ἀνακίρησι τὰς ψυχὰς ἀλλήλαις, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀμνησικακίαν αὐτῶς μνησεύειαι. Catech. Mystag. v.

(z) Ὁ διάκος ἔπιβη πᾶσιν ἄσπίσαδε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ καὶ ἀσπαζέτωσαν οἱ τῆς κλήρου ἢ ἐπίσκοπον, οἱ λαϊκοὶ ἀνδρες τοὺς λαϊκοὺς, οἱ γυναῖκες τὰς γυναῖκας. Ap. Const. l. 2. c. 11.

(a) Defence, p. 20.

any good Evidence for the Necessity of the Water-part of it afterwards.

Lastly, As for *Deaconesses*, (b) *their main Business*, says our Author, *was to bring the Women to the Fonts, where they undressed, stood about them, immersed them in the Water, and then received and dressed them. Which Office of theirs being since made in a manner useless, the Reason of the Custom expiring, no wonder the Practice should cease with it. Their main Business*, says he, *was to bring the Women to the Fonts, and assist at their Baptism. But was it all their Office required of them? He does not say it was; and for a very good Reason, because he knew very well it was not. (c) They were employed besides, in instructing the ignorant Sort of Women, and teaching them their Religion; (d) in attending upon them where Men could not be admitted without Offence; and otherwhiles, says Dr. Cave, (e) in visiting and attending upon Women that were Sick, in conveying Messages, Counsels, Consolutions, Relief, (especially in Times of Persecution, when it was dangerous for the Officers of the Church) to the Martyrs, and them that were in Prison. So that there might still be Work enough for them. But I am not pleading for the restoring them; but only to shew, that they have much more to be said for them than the Mixture; and yet are not thought necessary to be restored; and by consequence much less is That. Which will certainly hold good, notwithstanding our learned Author's Flourish about*

(b) *Defence*, p. 20. (c) Δι' ὧν καὶ ἡς τὴν γυναικῶσιν ἀδιὰ βλήτως παρεσιδύετο ἢ τῶν κυρίων διδασκαλία. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* l. 2. p. 536. (d) Ἐστὶ γὰρ ὁπόταν ἐν πονηρίαις ἀνδρῶν διάκονον γυναιξὶν ἢ δὲ αὐταὶ πέμπωσιν διὰ τῶν ἀπίστων ἀποσελῆς ἐν γυναῖκα διάκονον. *Constit. Apost.* l. 3. c. 15.

(e) *Primitive Christianity*, Part 1. Chapter 8.

the *Matter* and Force of a Sacrament, which can no way be proved to belong to the Water. Here by our Author's own (g) Confession, our Duty is to *keep close to the Institution*. And this is all we desire of him; that we may be allowed to communicate in the *Fruit of the Vine*, as our Blessed Lord did.

His next Exception about St. Cyprian's Rule, *that only Christ is to be hearkned to*, is, This Proposition was (b) brought to prove the *Necessity of the Mixture*. But since I have shewn, that what he insisted upon in the Mixture, as of Necessity to the Sacrament, was the Wine, and not the Water, I need say nothing more to what is urged here.

The Answerer had argued, (i) that since our Saviour had instituted the Eucharist after Supper, but had made no mention of any Water, but only of the *Fruit of the Vine*; therefore supposing either of them were to be revived, he should think that to be preferred, of which is most undoubted Evidence. And indeed who would not? However, let us see what our learned Author replies to this.

1. He says it has been proved, that (k) the *Fruit of the Vine* does imply a *Mixture of Water*. It had need have very good Evidence to prove so odd and unaccountable a Proposition. How is it proved then. From Scripture? Nothing like it. From Apostolical Tradition? No. We have no Tradition about it of so long standing. Do the Fathers all unanimously testify it? Not that neither that I can find. How is it then? Why, the Jewish *Talmud* written several hundred Years after our Sa-

(g) *Defence*, Page 21.

(b) Page 23.

(i) *No Reason*, Page 13.

(k) *Defence*, Page 25.

viour, and compos'd (l) with great Indiscretion and Want of Judgment, (and perhaps not more remarkably so in any other Instance, than in its odd unaccountable Distinction between the *Fruit of the Vine and of the Tree*) asserts it. And must

(l) *The Emperor Justinian condemns the Mishna, that is the Text of the Talmud, of which the other Part, the Gemara, is the Commentary or Exposition, as the Invention of Men, who spake only from the Earth, and had nothing Divine in them. 'Εξ' υφ' εσιν ἔσαν ἀνθρώπων ἐκ μόνης λαλῆσιων τῆ γῆς, κ) θεῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐχθρίων εἰδ' ἐν, Novel. Const. 146. Sixtus Senensis speaking of the Compilers of the Talmud, and their Work, says, Cum— non solum contumelias & blasphemias multas & execrables adversus Christum Deum nostrum collegissent, verem etiam Sanctiones & praecepta plurima conscripissent, contra ipsam quam profitentur Moſis legem, & contra omne jus Gentium, atque omnem naturam legem, quam ipsi, utpote homines, servare tenentur; visum est summis Pontificibus, & aliis Christianis Principibus, ut tam nefarie doctrine lesio, atque usus, omnibus Judaeis, qui sub ditione Christianorum vivunt interdiceretur. Biblioth. Sanct. l. 2. p. 125. Bishop Walton charges it with many foolish Traditions. Nec in se ineptae sunt, quales plurimae hujusmodi Talmudicae. In Bibl. Proleg. viii. n. 30. Mr. Simonville testifies of the Talmud, that it abounds with great Numbers of unprofitable Questions and Histories, or rather Tales framed at Pleasure, which simple People believe to be true, but one of little Judgment may easily see, they are Allegories invented by Persons of little Ingenuity, and serve only to expose the Jews. There are also manifest Falsities in it. Elle est remplie d'une infinité des questions inutiles, & d'histoires, ou plutôt de contes faites à plaisir, que les simples croient estre véritable, mais pour peu de jugement qu'on ait, il est aisé de voir, que ces sont des allegories inventées par des personnes qui n'avoient nul esprit, & qui ne peuvent servir qu'à rendre les Juifs ridicules. Il y a même des fautesz manifestes dans ce Talmud. Supplem. aux ceremonies des Juifs, Ch 2. And the present learned Dean of Norwich, Dr. Prideaux, testifies of this Talmud, that howsoever it is now the Alcoran of the Jews, into which they have resolved all their Faith and all their Religion, yet it is framed (almost with the same Imposture as that of Mahomet) out of Doctrines falsely pretended to be brought from Heaven.*

must this be more Authentick with us, than our Saviour's own exprefs Words? It will be a very hard Task to prove our Saviour intended it to be so. Besides, were not our Saviour's own Words clear enough to need no Explication, I must own I should have more regard for St. *Chrysoftom's* Authority, than that of the *Talmud*. Now this eloquent Father is apparently of a contrary Opinion, and declares in as plain Terms as may be, that *the Fruit of the Vine* spoken of by our Saviour, was *Wine without Water*. His Words are these, (m) *When he delivered the Mysteries, he delivered Wine, and when after his Resurrection he spread an ordinary Table without the Mysteries, he made use of Wine, he says of the Fruit of the Vine: BUT THE VINE PRODUCES WINE, NOT WATER.* Which is a Doctrine so plain and full in behalf of our Saviour's Institution, that I may venture to say of it, as our learned Author

Heaven. *Old and New Testament comected. pt. i. B. v. p. 328.* And it is surprizing that this should come at length, to be the only certain Key, for letting us into the true Sense of our Saviour's Words, and of Power enough to over-rule the plain Intent and Meaning of them. So unaccountable a Discovery needs extraordinary Authority to support it. And instead of pinning our Faith upon such an unreasonable Distinction as is recommended to us from thence; I cannot but think it much safer and better, to follow St. Paul's Advice to Titus, not to give heed to Jewish Fables, and Commandments of Men that turn from the Truth. *Tt. i. 14* Not to add, that the Oxford Annotator upon St. Cyprian's Sixty Third Epistle, has observed that it was all one with the Jews, whether their Wine were pure or dilated, and cites the Author of the *Tosephos* for his Assertion, telling us moreover, that from hence it was Tho. Aquinas and Bonaventure taught, that the Mixture of Water was not of Necessity or the Integrity of the Sacrament.

(m) Δεσκνύς ὅτι καὶ ἠνίχα τὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν, ὄνον παρέδωκε, καὶ ἠνίχα ἀνασῆς χωρὶς μυστηρίων ψιλὸν τρέπεζαν παρέβηθελο, ἐνῶ ἐκέχρητο. ἐκ τῶ γεννήματος, φησι, τὸ ἀμπέλου ἢ ἀμπέλου δὲ ὄνον, ἔχ' ὕδωρ γεννᾷ. In St. *Matt.* xxvi. 29.

does of St. Cyprian, that (n) it is *decisive in this Point*. Farther, this Phrase, *the Fruit of the Vine*, I think to be synonymous with the *Blood of the Grape*. And this Expression we meet with, *Gen. xlix. 11.* without any the least Appearance of a Mixture. *He washed his Garments in Wine, and his Clothes in the Blood of Grapes*. And again more plainly, *Deut xxxii. 14.* *Thou didst drink the pure Blood of the Grape*, and therefore unmixed. So it is in the Original, which the Seventy Translate, *αἶμα σταφυλῆς ἔμεν οἶνον*, *he drank Wine the Blood of the Grape*.

2. Our learned Author undertakes to prove it not necessary to receive the Sacrament after Supper. Which if he had pleased he might have forborn, for it was easy to have seen that the Answerer (o) supposed it, and only inferred from it, that if this Circumstance, though particularly related in Scripture were not however of perpetual Obligation, much less was the Water of which the Scripture makes not the least mention; and that therefore if one of them *were to be revived he should rather think that to be preferred, of which there is most undoubted Evidence*. And is not this highly reasonable?

We come now to the Custom of *Communicating Infants*, which St. Cyprian informs us was in Use in his Time, and is shewn to have obtained (p) in the Western Church, till at least the Twelfth Century, and is still amongst the Greeks. And St. Augustin pleads an ancient, and he conceives an Apostolical Tradition for it. And it is owned by the Eleventh Council of Toledo. And Scripture was pleaded for it, and with more Appearance of Reason

(n) *Reasons for restoring, &c.* p. 4.

(o) *No Reason, p. 12.*

(p) *Page 15. 16.*

than can be for the Mixture. Here we are told there is a Threefold Difference between these Two Usages; and all in favour of the Mixture, as being elder, taught to be more necessary, and which continued longer in general Use. I own we hear the Mixture spoke of sooner than this, but we do not hear of it from the Beginning; and we hear of this in the very next Age after we do of that, and about the Middle of it, and if we hear the Wine pleaded for as necessary in the Mixture, we do not hear the like of the Water, so that here the Advantage is over-ruled; and if the Church of *Rome* laid aside this in the Twelfth Century, I believe our Author will not undertake to prove that what they did in that Age, or for some Time before was a Precedent of any Moment. So that if the Mixture had any little Advantage in these Respects, the slender Appearance of Scripture that was urged for the other may fairly be allowed to outweigh it. And could the Application of what is said from Scripture to Children have been clearly proved to belong to them, it would have done it beyond all Dispute.

It was objected, and with very good Reason, (q) *That our Blessed Saviour gives not the least hint of anything more in the Cup, than the Fruit of the Vine, nay that in St. Matt. xxvi. 29. he says, THIS Fruit of the Vine; as if he had designed purposely to acquaint us, that what he had just given his Disciples to drink, was purely the Fruit of the Vine, Wine and nothing else. And hereupon was argued, that had our Saviour said upon giving the Cup, I will drink no more of this Water, till I drink it New with you in my Father's Kingdom, every one would have immediately understood the Cup, to be filled with Water, and to have no Wine in it. Why then, when he says, he*

(q) *No Reason*, p. 19.

will drink no more of this Fruit of the Vine, this Wine, why should we not likewise understand him to mean that it was Wine without Water? That our Saviour administered in pure Wine, is undoubtedly the plainest and most natural Sense of his own Words, which are the best and most sure Guide we have to go by. And this I should think were enough to decide the Case; inasmuch as it must needs imply, either that there was no Water in our Saviour's Eucharistical Cup; or that if there were, he did not look upon it of that Consequence, as to make it a necessary standing Part of his Institution. This I apprehend to be plain and clear arguing, and which might justly require a direct Answer. But our learned Author happened to overlook it all; and so it lies yet upon his hand for one.

It was objected farther, (r) That supposing the Paschal Cups to be mixt, yet our Saviour's was not necessarily so; inasmuch as he did not institute his Eucharist, till the Paschal supper was over; and so what Cup he used cannot be inferred from what had gone before. Whereto is returned for answer, (s) that 'Tis most reasonable to suppose it the Remainder of what was prepared for the Passover. And is this the undeniable Proof of it we were to expect? It is most reasonable to suppose, that is to say, our Author judges it most probable. No one can take this for a certain Proof; and yet unless we will be so forward as to acquiesce in this, we meet with no other.

Next (t) our Author is pleased to expatiate upon St. Paul's divine Inspiration, as if he had a Mind to insinuate, that the Answerer had taught the contrary. To which End he has thought fit to mutilate the Sentence, and stop at

(r) *No Reason*, p. 22. (s) *Defence*, p. 30. (t) *Ibid.*
these

these Words, *but only the Apostle St. Paul calls it Jo.* Whereas every one must see the Answerer's Argument lay wholly in the following Words, which had he recited in their proper Place, there could have been no Pretence for this needless Reflection. The whole Sentence is this. (u) *And yet after all, I do not find that our Saviour ever gave this Name [of the Cup of Blessing] to his Cup; but only the Apostle St. Paul CALLS IT SO FROM THE BLESSING PRONOUNCED UPON IT, AND NOT WITH RESPECT TO ANY MIXTURE OF WHAT WAS CONTAINED IN IT.*

Now if any one besides our Author can find any Thing in the whole Sentence derogatory from *St. Paul's* Apostolical Authority, or his Veracity as a Divine Writer, the Answerer submits to any Penalty he shall be thought fit to have inflicted upon him for it. But this he is in no Fear of. And as to his Argument, what does our learned Author say? Without at all mincing the Matter he grants it to be true. His words are (w) *Granting this.* But is this all? No, he proceeds to another Argument, which the Answerer had nothing to do with in this Place; *Granting this,* says he, *his Conclusion will not follow.* What then was the Conclusion? Nothing else but that *St. Paul's* Words did not prove our Saviour's Cup to be the Third Paschal Cup, which has been already granted. So that the Answerer's Conclusion does certainly hold. What then is the Conclusion that does not follow? It is one of our Author's own framing, and I will give it in his own Words. *If the Eucharistick Cup answered to the Jewish Cup of Blessing, which has been made good by sufficient Authority, to which we add that of the*

(u) *No Reason*, p. 24.

(w) *Defence*, p. 30.
learned

learned (x) Hammond, If it was a Remainder of the Paschal Provision, and the Paschal Cup of Blessing was not without Mixture; 'twill follow of course, that the Eucharistick Cup was mixt likewise. And therefore it's being called the Cup of Blessing, from the Hymn or Blessing pronounced, and not from the Mixture, can do the Answerer no Service.

Where are several Particulars to be noted.
For

1. It is said, It has been made good by sufficient Authority, that the Eucharistick Cup answered to the Jewish Cup of Blessing. But by what Authority? Not by St. Paul's, for that is given up: But (y) because the learned Dr. Lightfoot observes, that the Third Cup of Wine, was called the Cup of Blessing, and St. Paul calls our Lord's Cup by the same name: Though it is already acknowledged to have been upon a quite different Account. If this be Proof, what is it a Man may not prove at any time, or by whatsoever Sort of Argument?

2. Dr. Hammond is cited to prove that our Saviour's Eucharistick Cup answered to the foresaid Jewish Cup of Blessing. Now besides that this very learned Writer's Authority is not enough to prove any thing essentially necessary to Salvation, that does not manifestly appear to be so by other good Evidence, with submission I conceive our learned Author has been a little too hasty in appealing to Dr. Hammond, at least (z) if the Place referred to in his Margin be what he Depends upon. I shall give the Reader the whole Note, in the Doctor's own Words, and then leave him to judge whether he can

(x) On 1 Cor. x. Annot. E. (y) Reasons, p. 6.
(z) Annot. E. 1 Cor. x.

infern any more from hence, than that our Saviour is here supposed to have called his Cup a Cup of Blessing, giving it the same Name or Title, the Jews had given their's, *The Jews*, says the Doctor, *used to conclude the Feast wherein the Paschal Lamb was eaten, with a Cup of Wine. This they called* כּוּפּ הַשִּׁיר, ποθήριον ὑμνήσεως, the Cup of Praising, *because they sang an Hymn at that time, see Matt. xxvi. 30. and* εὐλογίας, of Blessing; and from thence the receiving the Wine in the Sacrament, being by Christ instituted after his Paschal Supper, is here called by that Title. Of the Word εὐλογέω, to bless, see Note on Matt. xiv. c. Here is the whole Note, as I said, and now let the Reader judge, whether there be any thing in it that tends to prove the Necessity of a Mixture, even supposing the Jewish Cup to have been Mixt, and whether it does not rather represent our Saviour's Cup to have been a different one from that of the Jews, though called by the same Name, the Dr expressly declaring that it was not instituted 'till after Supper. And yet farther, the Dr is here cited somewhat unluckily for our Author, because he plainly declares against him, that *the Cup of Blessing* was so called, [not with any regard to the Mixture, but only] upon account of the Hymn sung at that Time.

3. The Eucharistick Cup is supposed to be a Remainder of the Paschal Provision. And if it were most probably so, and if that were supposed to be certainly mixed, which will not easily be proved, since even your own Dr. *Lightfoot* acknowledges, as was remarked before, (a) that *if a man drinks Wine pure* [in the Passover] *he has performed his Duty*, yet the most that can be pre

(a) *No Reason*, p. 40.

tended to follow from hence, is only a rational Conjecture, which our learned Author may call a certain Proof, if he pleases, but can never shew it to be so.

4. In the last Place it is said, *It's being called the Cup of Blessing from the Hymn, or Blessing pronounced, and not from the Mixture, can do the Answerer no service.* Which is even harder upon our Author, than his citing Dr. Hamond against himself, for he plainly gives up the Point in debate, which was, that *the Apostle calls the Sacramental Cup the Cup of Blessing, from the Blessing pronounced upon it, and not with respect to any Mixture;* only he adds that *it will do the Answerer no Service.* Though I am apt to believe, the Answerer that thinks freely acknowledging the truth of what he was contending for, and giving up the Citation from St. Paul, as not to the purpose it was produced for, is granting him all that he did, or could desire in that respect. But I proceed.

The Answerer had urged in relation to Melchizedeck, that (b) *our Saviour being an Antitype to him, who offered Bread and Wine* (AND (c) NOTHING ELSE, AS FAR AS WE KNOW) *was more likely to conform to him herein, than to the Customs of the Jews, Supposing their Cup in his time to have been mixed, which, says he, I am not sure it was; and though he had instituted his Eucharist, before they had done Eating, which the Scripture assures us he did not.* And to the latter Part of these Words nothing is replied. But as to Melchizedeck it is said, *His offering nothing but Bread and Wine, as far as*

(b) No Reason, p. 24.

(c) *So it is declared, Reasons, &c.* p. 28.

we know, means we don't read that he offered any Bloody Sacrifice. And doubtless we do not. But is this all that is naturally implied in the Expression? And does it not as plainly exclude Water or any Sort of Mixture, as Bloody Sacrifices? If it does not, let some Exception be shewn in the Words, for till that is done, it is an unquestionable Truth, that he offered *nothing but Bread and Wine, as far as we know, not even so much as a little Water, for I am sure I read of none in either the Old or the New Testament.* Nevertheless to make this Exposition of the Words the more plausible, St. *Jerome* is cited in the Margin, saying to *Evagrius*, not in the 87th, but his 126th Epistle, *Neque carnis & sanguinis victimas immolaverit Melchisedeck*, neither did he offer Sacrifices of Flesh and Blood. But if our Author had pleased to have given us the whole Sentence, it would have immediately appeared not at all, to his purpose. For thus says St. *Jerome*, (d) *Neither did he offer Sacrifices of Flesh and Blood, nor take in his right Hand the blood of brute Beasts, but dedicated the Sacrifice of Christ, IN BREAD AND WINE, a simple and pure Sacrifice.* And to make his Sense yet more plain, he says (e) *Therefore the Lord says, he will drink no more of this Vineyard, unless in his Father's Kingdom.* And again, at another time, (f) *As Melchisedeck the King of Salem offered Bread and Wine : so thou also shalt offer*

(d) *Neque carnis & sanguinis victimas immolaverit, & brutorum animalium sanguinem dextra susceperit, sed pane & vino simplici puroque sacrificio Christi dedicaverit Sacramentum.*

(e) *Dicit ergo se Dominus de hac vineâ nequaquam esse bibiturum, nisi regno Patris sui. Com. in Matt. xxvi.*

(f) *Quomodo enim Melchisedeck rex salem obrulit panem & vinum : sic & tu offeres corpus tuum & sanguinem, verum panem & verum vinum. In Psal. cix. And after the same manner he speaks again in his Epistle, De virginitate ad Demetriadem.*

by Body and Blood, the true Bread and true Wine. In all which Places is not any Word of any Water. This Type therefore appears not to have consisted of any Thing but pure Wine. But it follows, 'Tis most probable, Melchisedeck offered what was generally drunk in those warm Climates, which was, and is still, Wine diluted. This at best is but Conjecture; and I should be glad to be taught how a bare Conjecture can be a Sufficient Foundation for a Necessary Duty, as this Mixture is asserted to be. However here is a Reason given for it; but such as makes no more to the purpose than the Conjecture it self. *Because those who assisted at the Sacrifice refreshed themselves with the consecrated Entertainment.* For it has never been proved, nor I suppose so much as pretended, that People cannot refresh themselves with Wine, unless it have Water mixt among it. I am sure when the Psalmist affirms, that (g) *Wine maketh glad the Heart of Man,* he says not one Word of any Mixture necessary to that purpose. And I appeal to any one who has ever drunk a Glass of Wine, whether it has not at least as much Refreshment in it without Water as with it. This Reason therefore, if I may call it a Reason, will never hold. Besides, it is not certain that diluted Wine was so constantly drunk amongst the Jews as it is here supposed to be. This very Instance of *Melchisedeck's offering Bread and Wine,* is a considerable Proof of it. And we have another remarkable one in the New Testament, at the Marriage-Feast in *Cana of Galilee,* where our Saviour turned the Water into Wine. For we not only hear nothing of any Water mixt with it; but the Master of the Feast's calling for the Bridegroom, and telling him he had *kept the good*

(g) Psalm civ. 15.

Wine to the End of the Feast, St. *Joh.* ii. 13. seems to imply, that he drank his Wine pure and unmixed, inasmuch as otherwise he would not have been so sensible of the Excellency of it. It follows again, *Supposing, which can never be proved.* What, not when the Scripture plainly declares it was Wine, without hinting at any Mixture? But what is it we are to suppose? Only that the Scripture spake plainly, and *Melchisedeck* sacrificed in undiluted Wine. This I confess is a very easy Supposition, and what I can most readily come into; but what is to be inferred from it? 'Tis this; *There is no Necessity the Type and Antitype should agree, or be the same in every Particular.* Suppose this too, yet we are as much at a Loss for the Necessity of the Mixture as ever. I thought it was to have been clearly *proved*, that the Antitype did not answer the Type in all Particulars; and this I am sure ought in Reason to have been done. But instead of this we are only taught it is not necessary that it should. Which if I should likewise suppose, it will never follow from hence that the one did not really and in fact answer to the other. The short of the Matter is, that though Types don't answer like Tallies, that is in every Particular, as our Author justly (b) argues, yet the main fundamental Point, or Particular, wherein they are necessarily designed to agree, can admit of no Addition of any other Typical Symbol, to make them differ in that, nor is the Antitype any way to differ from the Type in this respect. And so *Melchisedeck's* Bread and Wine did most emphatically typify the Eucharistick Elements. And

(b) *Defence*, p. 32.

what if *Joshua* were a Type of our Blessed Saviour, in bringing the *Israelites* into *Canaan*, in like manner as our Saviour procured a far better Inheritance for all his faithful Disciples, and in nothing else? For we are not told of any Thing else wherein our Saviour was typified by him. And if our Saviour did not answer to him in any other respect, wherein he was not typified by him, can any one think this an Argument to prove that our Saviour, as Antitype to *Melchisedeck*, was not to answer him, in what he was peculiarly intended to typify? This would be thought an unusual way of arguing in any other Case. For if *Melchisedeck* did not typify our Lord in any other respect, there is not the least Pretence to question, but he did in this; nor by consequence, but that our Saviour was a true Antitype of him in it. Though this is more than was incumbent upon me to prove, it being enough for my purpose, if there were no more in it, than that I could say the contrary could not be proved. So that here is a Failure on both hands, inasmuch as *Melchisedeck* plainly appears to have been a Type of our Saviour as to the Cup; and besides it would answer my End, if it had been only that it could not be proved he was not. ~~It is proved~~ *Joseph pag. 3.*

St. *Cyprian* mentions *Noah* likewise (i) as a Type of our Saviour, and says of him in so many words, that he represented our Lord's Passion in drinking, not Water but Wine. That he should

(i) *Ep. ad Cæcil. 63.* Invenimus enim & in Genesi circa Sacramentum in Noe hoc idem præcurrisse, & figuram Dominicæ passionis illic exitisse, quod vinum bibit. Et paulo post, Quod Noe typum futuræ veritatis ostendens, non aquam, sed vinum biberit, & sic imaginem Dominicæ passionis expressit.

drink not Water, but pure Wine was necessary to the End, for which he was drawn in to drink at all. And that it was Wine only that he drank, appears too plainly from the unhappy Effect it had upon him.

Again, when it is said (k) *He washed his Garments in Wine, and his Cloaths in the Blood of the Grape*; and again, (l) *Tby Garments like him that treadeth in the Winefat. I have troden the Wine-press alone*; these and other the like Types must necessarily sink in their mystical Importance, (m) if the Cup represented by them, together with the Blood shed upon the Cross, could not be duly expressed without diluted Wine. And so much the rather still, since the particular Element it must be diluted with, was peculiarly separated by the divine Author of all our Christian Mysteries, for the Matter of the other Sacrament of Baptism; as has. been noted before.

Had the *Drink-offering* amongst the *Jews* been used to be drunk, I should have thought it the liveliest Type of our Saviour's Blood, and of his Cup, of any that we have. And though I do not observe in Scripture that any of it was ever drunk; and Dr. *Lightfoot* teaches that it was (n) *poured upon the Foundation of the Altar*, yet this being a necessary attendant (o) upon a Burnt or a Peace-Offering, the Cup in the Eucharist seems not improperly to succeed in the room of it. And we all know Wine is as expressly specified, in simple and plain terms, to be the Liquor in-

(k) *Gen. xlix. 11.*

(l) *Is. lxiii. 2, 3.*

(m) *Nanquid rubicunda vestimenta aqua potest facere? aut in torculari aqua est, que pedibus calcatur, vel prelo exprimitur? B. Cypr. Epist. 62.*

(n) *Temple Service, c. 8. §. 5.* (o) *Numb. xv, 4, &c.*

joyned for these *Drink-offerings*, as that there should be any *Drink-Offerings* at all. And can we imagine that the Divine Wisdom, which explains the Nature of God's Worship, in so punctual a manner as it did all along to that People, would have such a reserved Meaning as that Water of which there is no more mention than there is of the *Jesuit's Bark*, should be put into it? Or how should such a dull People as the *Jews* are always represented to be, be expected to find it out, if it had been so? And if no Water belonged to the Institution of the Drink-Offerings in their other Sacrifices, how can it be conceived that our Saviour would not have more regard, in the Institution of the Eucharist, to God's own Appointment, than to the Paschal Cup, which was of the Jews own Invention? and if not the same with this must imply, either that the Water was a Matter of Indifference, or else that they kept to God's known Ordinance, to offer as he had commanded them. And by consequence the Paschal Cup must have been perfect to all Intents and Purposes in its own Nature without any Mixture in it, because directly agreeable to the general Institution of all Offerings of that kind. And if that were sufficient to answer the End of it's Use without a Mixture, why not the Eucharistical Cup too?

So that as far as we may argue from the Types that occur in the old Testament, they appear plainly to be against the Necessity of any Mixture in this sacred Cup.

(p) *The next Attack*, says our Author, *is upon the Apostolical Constitutions*. But as to what was said about them, I cannot apprehend he has offered any

Thing that invalidates the Answerer's Objection; and therefore I might leave That to shift for it self, till a more satisfactory Reply can be made to it. But I will take leave to observe, what the Answerer should have before taken notice of, from the *Reasons for Restoring*, &c. (q) that it is there freely owned, these *Constitutions wont answer quite up to the Title* (that is that they cannot be proved to be written till at least two, perhaps three hundred years after the time of the Apostles;) yet that they contain a great Part of the *Worship and Discipline of the primitive Church, is beyond Question.* (Which they might very well do, and yet be out in the Matter of the Mixture; or at least without being able to prove it essential.) *And that their Antiquity is considerable,* (but far from the Beginning.) And what now can be made of this? These Constitutions come a great while after the times of the Apostles; and I may justly add, the Authority of them has been always disputed; and at best they only contain a great Part of the *Worship and Discipline of the Primitive Church.* And must not he now be very dull, that cannot see here a plain Proof of the absolute Necessity of the Mixture? I am sure he must be exceedingly quick-sighted that can.

But if these will not do, perhaps what comes next may prove more effectual; which is this, (r) *To the Authority for the Mixture, cited from the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, the Answerer takes notice that Dr. Cave complains of them as interpolated, and Du Pin reckons them either spurious or doubtful.* Is this all then that he complains of? Our Author does not say this; for every one knows, he complains, that they

(q) *Reasons*, p. 6.(r) *Defence*, p. 33.

come too late to prove the Necessity of an Usage said to have been taught, some hundreds of Years before them; especially considering what countenance some Doctrines, not duly founded, had gained in much less time, But suppose there had been no other complaint, than of the Interpolation or Spuriousness of them; does our learned Author disprove this? He does not attempt it; but only says, *this supposes the greater Part of them to be genuine.* Their being *Spurious or Doubtful*, I am much afraid will never prove, or so much as suppose, any Part of them, much less the greater Part *to be genuine.* But now suppose them only *interpolated*, what are we to infer from hence? Why, only that *the greater Part of them must be genuine.* But what if the greater Part should prove interpolated, or at least be thought to be so? This will never admit of most of them as genuine. And yet if we should be so yielding, as to suppose this too for the present; does it prove that any Thing, and particularly that the Mixture, can be proved from them to be of indispensable Necessity? I doubt, not. But the Genuine Parts of them *may be distinguished easily enough, by the Doctrine and Practice of the Church in St. Basil and St. Chrysostom's Time.* These Liturgies, have been already considered and shewn not to answer. But here I would ask farther; can we have a better way to judge of *St. Basil's* Liturgy than by *St. Chrysostom's*, or of *St. Chrysostom's*, than by his own Words upon another Occasion? I mean in the Place cited before, where he positively declares that our Saviour, both at the Eucharist, and again after his Resurrection made use of *Wine the Fruit of the Vine*, ἡ δὲ ἀμπέλως οἶνον, ἐκ ὕλης κενῆς, but it is *Wine* AND NOT WATER that is produced of the Vine, in *St. Matt. 26. 29.* How to reconcile this Assertion to the Necessity
of

of the Mixture, will need more Skill than I can pretend to; or to his Liturgy if supposed to teach any such thing.

Now we come to the two Councils insisted upon; and the first is (*f*) of *Carthage*, commonly called the *Third*. Which orders, that *Nothing should be offered, but Bread and Wine mixt with Water*, quam ipse Dominus tradidit, as our Lord himself appointed, says our learned Author; but which is in truth, *which our Lord himself DELIVERED*; which is of far less Importance, and does not imply an Appointment, unless it can be proved that our Lord used the Water as a Matter of Necessity, not of Indifference. But he proceeds, *Is not so unanimous a Resolution for the Necessity of the Mixture, is not the Testimony of a whole Synod, considerable Evidence?* Be it so, yet I always thought *considerable*, and sufficient Evidence, had been very different. In our own Laws, the Testimony of one Man of good Understanding, and unquestionable Credit and Reputation, cannot be denied to be *considerable Evidence*, but yet it is out of doubt that it is not sufficient to convict another of Treason. And this learned Gentleman knows very well we are seeking after, not *considerable*, but *sufficient Evidence*; which he does not profess this to be.

The other is the Council in *Trullo*, held at *Constantinople* near seven hundred Years after our Saviour. And I am persuaded he will not say all the Determinations of Councils made before this are right and necessarily obliging, and especially that they are so to all People. But to come to the Canon as it lies before us, the *Thirty Second*,

(t) If I were to take the latter definitive Part of this Canon alone, says the Answerer I should, and so I suppose would any one else, take it to be an undoubted Prohibition of the Use of Water in the holy Cup. And then he puts down the Words; *If any Bishop or Priest does not officiate according to the Apostles Appointment, and having mixed Water with the Wine, does thus offer the unblemished Sacrifice, let him be deposed, as one that represents the Mystery imperfectly, and innovates upon what was delivered.* And does our Author now say, that the Words of the Canon are not rightly quoted? No, nothing of this. Or that they are not rightly translated by the Answerer? Not that neither. How then! Giving an Account of this Part of the Canon he says, (u) *Therefore if any Bishop or Priest HAVING MIXT (AS THE ANSWERER INTERPRETS) Water with the Wine, does thus offer the unblemished Sacrifice, &c. that is, If any Bishop or Priest stands off from the Armenian Heterodoxy; if they presume to govern themselves by the Practice and Authority of St. Chryostom and St. Basil, of all the famous Bishops of the World, and particularly of St. James first Bishop of Jerusalem; If they are thus bold to follow these Authorities, and mix Water with the Wine, let them be deposed, &c. What is this but to make the Definitive Part to contradict all the Reasons for forming it; and fly in the Face of the noble Authorities alledged? This is in effect no better than to put up the Council in a dark Room &c, But now to lay aside the Oratory and Rhetorick of this florid Paragraph, and come to the Question; Is here one Word of Exception against the Answerer's Account of this Part of the Canon? I cannot find the least Intimation of his not giving a true State of the Words as*

(t) *No Reason*, p. 28.(u) *Defence*, p. 29.

they

they are transmitted down to us. He says indeed, **HAVING MIXT**, as the *Answerer* interprets, as if he were willing his Reader should think there was Artifice in the Translation of the Word *Μίγνυς*, yet he does not say there is, and he certainly knows there is not. But it follows, *This is in effect no better than to put up the Council in a dark Room, and expound them into Nonsense and Distraction. This is Riding at full speed out of their Wits; what Fever or Phrensy can exceed it? And yet the Answerer is pleased to say, that forbidding the MIXTURE, is the natural and genuine Translation of the Words.* And I refer it to our Author's own Conscience, whether what the *Answerer* says, be not unquestionably true, and do desire him to give a more exact Translation of the Words, than he has done. And if our Author cannot do this, I must beg of him to consider how little the *Answerer* has deserved all the Rhetorick that is bestowed upon him. Which I persuade my self he would not have met with, but for want of a better Answer. And yet after all I cannot see that here is any Thing like an Answer to what had been proposed. The *Answerer* had owned he could not make the Canon rightly consistent with it self. Here therefore he wanted to be helped out; and might accordingly have expected that our learned Author would have done it for him. But he finds his Hopes fail him. He had inquired farther, upon Supposition of the Canon's happening to be inconsistent with it self, *What Use can be made of it? Or what will you infer from the former Part of it, the contrary to which may not be as naturally deduced from the latter?* And it is no Resolution of either of these Inquiries, nor will he find himself ever the wiser for being told, that (x) *These two Hundred Bishops broke out of*

(x) *Defence*; p. 40.

some Madhouse, and ran into the Emperor's Palace, where His Majesty was so kind as to let them sit with the Character of a Council.

The Argument from *Nicephorus* was only offered to be considered of ; and if it be not satisfactory, it will not be wanted.

Next, the *Answerer* is desired to remember (y), we have the Authority of this Council to prove the Passages for the Mixture in St. Basil's and St. Chrysostom's Liturgies not interpolated. That is to say, the Council's citing them for their Use in the Year DCLXXX, proves that no Alteration had been made in them, from the Time that those two Fathers lived. And who can stand out against such Proof. Thus it had been said before from the Canon, that St. (z) James's Liturgy was on their side ; but if our learned Author be really of Opinion that this Liturgy was composed by that Apostle, I would beg of him to give himself the Trouble of answering the Exceptions brought against it by Dr. Cave, Mr. Du Pin, and other learned Men, to shew that it was not compiled 'till several Hundreds of Years after the Apostles Age. The Council's appealing to this Liturgy, as made by St. James, I take to be a good Evidence that they did not act infallibly.

The last Inquiry about this Council is, (a) how this XXXII Canon comes to be so much more insisted upon, than several others that have the same Authority, and yet are not thought necessary to be reduced to Practice. And hereto our learned Author replies (b) in several Particulars.

1. Others breaking one Canon will not be a Licence for our breaking another. Which I conceive to be quite besides the Mark ; inasmuch as the *Answerer* did not any way speak of breaking

(y) P. 42. (z) P. 39. (a) No Reason, p. 32. (b) Def. p. 42. them,

them, but only he looked upon them as antiquated, and yet not thought necessary to be revived. As I believe our Author will agree they are not. And then the Question falls naturally in, How comes this to be so much more obligatory than any of those, though Enacted by the same Authority? Besides, that this Part of the Church has nothing to do with them.

2. *These Restraints point only upon Branches of Discipline.* It I thought it worth the while, it were easy to shew, that *This Canon* points upon Discipline as much as some of them.

3. *'Tis not impossible, but that these Trullan Fathers may have laid their Hands upon some natural Rights, some unalienable Privileges.* And is it then more impossible that they should have exceeded their Bounds in relation to the *Mixture*?

4. *This Council is cited only for Evidence, not for binding Authority.* So we are told now, but no one could have collected it from what was said in the (c) *Reasons*. Where the Council of Carthage is cited, not as testifying, but decreeing. And then follows this Canon just in the same manner; and after some Account of the preceding Part of it, the definitive Part is noted with a particular Mark, from whence any one would naturally conclude it to be cited for the sake of that. But now the Scene is changed, and it is not the Authority of the Council, but it's Testimony, that is to be attended to; *And 'tis hoped the Testimony of 200 Bishops is good Proof of Matter of Fact, and may be allowed to pass in a Christian Court.* Most certainly in a Matter they were Eye-witnesses of. But if twice two Hundred were to appear in *Westminster-Hall*; to testify for a Matter of Fact done six Hundred Years before any of them were born, they could never expect to carry the Cause.

Yet these, I hope, are Christian Courts. Or if our Author is for appealing rather to an Ecclesiastical Assembly, I believe he will not deny, that in all Councils, Matters are carried by a Majority of Votes, and sometimes by a very small Majority; and withal, that the Majority are not always the best, the honestest and learnedest Men. And when they are not, it cannot be avoided, but both their Canons, and Testimony too, will be in great Danger of being sometimes found erroneous. I will give but one Instance, and leave it to our learned Author himself to be the Judge. In the very next Age after that wherein the Council sate in *Trullo*, another was convened of 367 Bishops, a much larger Number than those at *Constantinople*; I mean, the second Council at *Nice*. Which consisting of so many Fathers, nevertheless not only (d) decreed the Worship of Images, and anathematized such as refused to admit of them; but taught (e) the Honour paid to our Blessed Saviour's Image to terminate in himself; and pleaded for it *the Traditions of the Apostles and Fathers, and the Declarations of the Holy Oracles themselves*; Here therefore I ask; whether the Testimony of these, near twice two Hundred Bishops, be good Proof for Matter of Fact, and may be allowed to pass in a Christian Court? Here our Author must grant, either that the Worship of Images is derived from our Saviour and his Apostles, or that the Evidence of this much greater Number of Fathers is not good, and will not pass in a Christian Court.

(d) Act. iii.

(e) Τὴν δὲ εἰκόνα χειρῶν τῆ ἀληθινῆ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, κατὰ τὰς ἀνάγκαις ἀποστολικῆς τε καὶ πατερικῆς ᾠδοδοξίας, καὶ τὰς εἰς ἐξῆς λογίων ἐκφρασεως, ὅτι τιμὴ καὶ σεβασμιότητι τῶ εἰκονιζομένῳ, προσκυνεῖσθαι καὶ τιμᾶσθαι, ἢ ἡμοῖς ἀπάσαις ἐπεκύρωσέ τε καὶ ἐπεσφραγίσαι. Πρωτ. Νομοσ. Synod. vii. apud Justell. Ccd. Can. p. 1153.

There

There were (f) also two farther Assertions in relation to this Council. *First*, That *whatsoever the Doctrine of the Council were in this Point, it cannot outweigh our Saviour's Institution.* To which no Answer is made. The other, That *Wine was the proper Representative of our Saviour's Blood, which was to be denoted by the Cup, but could not with any Propriety be expressed by Water, because having no Resemblance of it.* Whereto it is replied, (g) that *since Wine is the main Ingredient—the Representation is as lively, as if the Cup had been uncompounded.* Where it is not so much as insinuated, that the Blood is the better represented by the Mixture. Indeed it is somewhat the worse; because the paler and thinner the Liquor grows, the less like it is to Blood, though the Resemblance may not be totally destroyed. It is added, (h) that both St. Cyprian and the Trullan Council give us to understand, That *the Mixture has a farther Significance, and represents the Blood and Water that flowed from our Saviour's Side.* But it is certain our Saviour himself says nothing like this. As he mentions no Mixture, it is not imaginable, he should mention any Signification of it; and accordingly he speaks of nothing, but the *Fruit of the Vine*, nor of any Thing else to be represented by it, but his Blood, which is best shewn forth without a Mixture. But this is not all. *Over and above,* says he, *the Council tells us from St. Chrysostom, that administering without the Mixture was a direct Contradiction to Apostolical Tradition.* By which Words I understood, and I submit to the Reader's Judgment, whether any one else would not understand, that the Council said St. Chrysostom had taught that not to put Water into the Wine was

(f) *No Reason*, p. 33 (g) *Defence*, p. 44. (h) *Ibid.*

to contradict Apostolical Tradition. But here I must take the Liberty to say I find my self doubly mistaken. For *First*, nothing can be plainer than that St. *Chrysofom* is here affirmed to have taught, that the *Contradiction to Apostolical Tradition* complained of, was the Practice of the *Hydroparastate*, in administering without Wine. Which is very different from teaching the Administring without Water to be a Contradiction to Apostolical Tradition; though that is what our Author's Words most naturally import; and is indeed what is here contended for. But besides, *Secondly*, Neither does the Council in the following Words, where it speaks more plainly of the Water, declaring that St. *Chrysofom* taught his Church to mix Water with the Wine, hereby intimating the Mixture of Blood and Water that came from our Saviour's Sides; neither here, I say, does the Council affirm that St. *Chrysofom* declared the Mixture to be necessary by Virtue of *Apostolical Tradition*, but only that he shewed it, that is, themselves collected it from his Practice (*i*). So that by this time it is apparent, the Water-Mixture is not taught by St. *Chrysofom* to be necessary, and the Neglect of it to be contrary to Apostolical Tradition as our Author's Words teach it to be.

(*i*) The Words of the Council are these; Τῆς γὰρ πονηρᾶς οὐδ' ὕδροπαραστατῶν αἱρέσεως παλαιᾶς ὑπαρχούσης, οἱ ἀντὶ οὗτοι μόνον τῷ ὕδατι ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ δυσίᾳ κεχρησῆται, ἀνασκευάζων ἕπως ὁ Θεοτόκος ἄτης τῶν ἀφάνομων τ' πιαύτης αἱρέσεως διαδοχῆν, καὶ δεκνύς ὡς ἐξ ἐναντίας τ' Ἀποστολικῆς ἰνάλαι ὕδατοδότησεως, τ' εἰρημίον κατέσκευάσε λόγον. Ἐπει δὲ καὶ τῆ κατ' αὐτὴν ἐκκλησίᾳ, εἶθα τὴν ποιμαντικὴν ἐνεχειρίσθη ἡγεμονίαν, ὕδατος οἴνου μίγνυται παρέδωκεν, ἠνίκα τὴν ἀναίμακτον δυσίαν ὀπιληθεῖσαι δεήσασεν, τὴν ἐκ τῆς πλευρῆς τοῦ λυρωθεῖ ἡμῶν, καὶ σπληνός γευσθὲ τὸ θεῖον, ὡς αἷματός καὶ ὕδατος κρασίου ἀφαιδεκνύς, ἥτις εἰς ζωοποίησιν παλῆς τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἀμαρτιῶν ἐξεχούθη ἀπτελύρωσι.

Farther,

Farther, the Author of the *Reasons* having said, That *Wine is only mentioned in Scripture, because it was the principal Ingredient*, the Answerer complained that this was a *begging the Question*, (k) and gave this Reason of his Assertion, that it is *strange to think, that all the necessary Ingredients of the Institution should not be declared, for the Information of those that were to be concerned in it, but could not be expected to perform it aright, without being first taught all Things that necessarily pertain to it.* And really I cannot but think this to be a great Truth. Yet now we are taught, That

1. (l) *There might be something concealed at the Institution, which was afterwards communicated at the sending of the Holy Ghost.* A Pretence so far as concerns the Mixture for which I cannot possibly imagine any Sort of Ground. And indeed, had our Saviour designed to suppress any Part of his Institution, 'till the Coming of the Holy Ghost, we may be sure it would have been declared then, that we might know it. Which since it was not, there is no Room to doubt but he himself plainly declared all that was necessary. It is true, our Saviour tells his Disciples, *St. Job. xvi. 12. I have yet many Things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now*; namely, because of the Difference that was between these designed Revelations, and what had been taught and practised under the *Jewish Law*. But sure the Mixing a little Water with the Sacramental Wine was no such confounding Mystery, as they might not be intrusted with it. Especially, if they had been so constantly accustomed to a mixt Cup in the Paschal Feast, as is here over and over positively affirmed. We are asked,

(k) *No Reason*, p. 34.

(l) *Defence*, p. 45.

2. (m) Did not the Disciples bring in the Provision, and make ready the Passover? Were they not all present at the Entertainment, and received Part of it? How then could they be unacquainted with what passed before them, and be ignorant of the Ingredients in the Sacramental Cup? This by the way is a full Declaration, that the supposed Mixture was not one of those significant Discoveries that they could not then bear; because they are here presumed to be perfectly acquainted with it. But farther, Does our learned Author really believe, that the Eucharist was instituted for none of our Lord's Disciples, but those only that lived and conversed with him, and were present at his last Supper? If he does not, he must needs see, there were others that in all the Succeeding Ages of the Church would need to be informed of the Rites required of them in this sacred Ordinance. And I must still say, it is strange to think that all the necessary Ingredients of it should not be declared for Their Instruction. And I beg our learned Author himself to tell me if it be not. The short of the Matter is this, and I pray a clear Answer to it, (n) *There is all the Reason in the World to believe, that had our Saviour designed, his Followers should celebrate the Eucharist in Water, as well as Wine, he would have told them so. And since he has not thought fit to do it, it may justly be concluded he either used no Water in the Eucharistical Cup, or at least not as any necessary Part of it.*

But what comes now is very much to the purpose, and deserves to be well attended to, if it be any way made out. And it is that (o) *the Mixture is not without Authority from Scripture.* This I should be glad to see well proved; but how is it to be done? Why, *the Cup*

(m) Defence, p. 45. (n) No Reason, p. 35. (o) Defence, p. 46.

our Saviour drank is called the Fruit of the Vine. I grant it; but this will never prove there was any thing in the Cup but Wine. Yes, the Jews at their Passover called it the Fruit of the Vine, tho' 'twas mixed with Water. How is this proved? It needs no Proof, according to our Author; for he says the Answerer grants it. Though I doubt this is running too fast; for the Answerer does not grant it, but only supposes it for Argument sake. And what can be reasonably inferred from such a Supposition, were there Reason for it? Why, Our Saviour was a Jew, and did he not speak the Language of his own Country? Did he not institute the Holy Eucharist, upon a Resemblance with the Paschal Solemnity? Have we not then great Reason, to conclude that what our Saviour calls the Fruit of the Vine, had a Mixture of Water in it? Now here it is my Turn to put Questions, and I would therefore desire to know; Did our Saviour Institute this holy Ordinance for the Jews only, and not for the Gentiles too? And would he not do it then in Language plainly intelligible by them as well as the Jews? Did he institute the holy Eucharist, upon a Conformity to the Paschal Solemnity in every thing? Particularly did he make it unlawful for Christians to have *Leaven in their Houses* at the time of Communicating; or require them to eat *bitter Herbs* together with the Eucharist? Did he order it to be eaten by our Families or Houses, and only at *Jerusalem*? At one only certain time of Year, and of the Day too? If not, how then can it be any more proved, that he enjoyned us a *mixt Cup* even upon the Supposition of their having always used one? If this be all the Authority the *Mixture* has from Scripture, it will be long enough before the Essentiality of it can be shewn from thence.

The

The Answerer had asserted a great (p) Difference between reporting the Use of a Rite, and the first Institution of it, where Direction is to be given for perpetual Performance of it. Here says our learned Author, (q) our Answerer seems somewhat dark and involved. But how dark and involved? Are not the Words plain and easily intelligible? Especially of those that next follow be added to them. Here the whole of it is necessary to be plainly and clearly described, and the several Branches of it particularized, that each one may know, how he is to behave himself in relation to it. Howsoever in the other Case, it may sometimes suffice, to speak only of some principal Part of it, passing by the rest, when well known to belong to it. This I think is plain enough, and perhaps too plain to be answered. Why else does our learned Author not make a just Reply to it? He undertakes indeed to set open the Meaning somewhat farther to the Reader. But in what manner has he done it? He says nothing more to it, but goes off to the fore-mentioned Questions. Which how much they are to the purpose, I beg of him a little to consider.

The Water, he says, is not EXPRESSLY mentioned by the Evangelists. But if he please to look again into the Answerer, he will find that he does not own them to have given any manner of Hint concerning it; which is a different Thing from saying it is not expressly mentioned by the Evangelists. For this looks as if it might be fairly inferred from their Doctrine, though not expressly mentioned in it. But where the Words are from which it may be thus inferred, is a great Secret, and like to continue so.

(p) No Reason, p. 35.

(q) Defence, p. 46.

But

But to proceed, (r) *This Objection*, says he, (namely of the Water's not being mentioned in *Scripture*, for so it should have been, and not by the *Evangelists* only) *being foreseen by the Author of the Reasons*, he replied, *That when Moses sprinkled the People with the Blood of the Covenant, there is no Mention of Water being mix'd with it ; And the Apostle assures us, that Moses took the Blood with Water, Heb. ix. 19. Yes, and not only with Water, but with Scarlet Wooll and Hyssop, and sprinkled the Book and all the People.* So that here is as much said for the Scarlet Wooll and the Hyssop, as for the Water, but nothing for any of them to our purpose. For I would very gladly be informed ; Were these things ever publicly enjoyned by Almighty God ? Or were they given privately in Charge to *Moses* ? Or did he use them of his own Head, as indifferent uncommanded Rites ? When these Questions are resolved, it will be time enough to consider what is urged from this Text. And in the mean while I am sure, nothing can be collected from it, that can be of any Service to our Author, or his Cause.

But says our Author, (s) *That our Saviour has declared his Appointment, that the Apostles saw and practised it, and that the Church has all along understood this Appointment for the Mixture, I have already proved.* And whether I have not more fully proved the contrary, I submit to the Readers Determination. And as to the Flourishes that follow, about the Inspiration of the Fathers, who lived so long as Prophecy and Miracles lasted, all I have to say is, that either those Fathers were infallibly inspired, or they were not. If they were, why are not their Writings allowed to be of equal Au-

(r) *Defence, Page 47.*

(s) *Page 48.*

thority with the Holy Scripture? If they were not intallibly inspired, why should as great Strefs be laid upon their Sayings, as if they had been so? Supposing they had been as pressing for the Mixture, as they are pretended to have been, either their Doctrines must have been as Authentick in all respects as those of Scripture, and then they ought to have been put into the Canon, and the Church is highly to blame for not doing it. Or else those must be highly to blame now, who go off from the Rule of Scripture, and set them up as a sufficient Foundation for such Duties as the Scripture knows nothing off.

Yet if we have not sufficient Christian Authorities for the Mixture, we must go to the *Jews* for it, rather than be without so necessary a Part of our Religion, and must learn from their *Talmud*, and from an absurd Distinction in it, what we cannot learn from the Bible, and all the Directions there given us. But what Sort of Evidence the *Talmud* is, I have (t) already observed; and what Weight can any way be laid upon so senseless a Distinction, as that betwixt the *Fruit of the Tree and of the Vine*, I leave to every one to consider.

But our Author tells us, (u) *the Answerer is willing to admit the Talmud*, that is, though he had just before excepted to it as not a competent Evidence in the Case, he is willing however for Argument sake, to suppose it *for the present*, to be good Authority. And what Advantage can be hoped for from such a Supposal? Especially since it follows, that the *Talmud's calling the mix'd Cup the Fruit of the Vine, is no Proof our Saviour did so too*. And does he shew it is? He only tells us, *This Proof in concurrence with the rest, I take to be*

(t) Page 74.

(u) Defence, p. 51.

a good one; and shall refer the Reader to what has been said already. And if the Reader can find any Satisfaction in what has been said, much Good may it do him. I heartily wish I could find Satisfaction in it too. But as yet I have not done it, and am pretty sure I never shall. But the Answerer had argued, *Perhaps the Jews might not call a mix'd Cup the Fruit of the Vine.* And does he disprove this? He only says, (w) *Maimonides and the Talmud*, (meaning *Maimonides from the Talmud*) *that is, as he proceeds, the best Jewish Authority, say they did.* As much as to say, if a Man resolves to take it upon Trust from the *Talmud*, he may. But if he will not do this, there is no elder, or more authentick Evidence to convince him. And who can help it, if there be no sufficient Authority to convince him? What follows from hence is very obvious, namely that he ought to desist, and not press for the Mixture, till he meet with such Conviction. *Perhaps our Saviour might not have his Cup mix'd.* And perhaps, if our Saviour's Cup was mix'd, he might not design to enjoyn it as such. Hereto our Author replies, *That our Saviour designed to enjoyn his own Institution.* And who doubts it? *And that the Mixture was Part of the Institution has been shewn already.* But where, I pray? I am sure I can find nothing like a Proof of it. However for a Conclusion of these Suppositions, our Author objects, that *here is nothing but Conjecture upon Conjecture against the Mixture.* As much as to say here is nothing but several Particulars, wherein our Author's Proofs want to be made out more fully. And if any one of these Conjectures prove true, his whole Scheme falls by it. Which makes it incumbent on him to prove very plainly

that the Answerer is mistaken in them all. Because till this is first done his Conclusion for the Mixture is very precarious. I add, that this Objection of proceeding upon Conjecture, were those Conjectures much less to the purpose than they are, comes from our learned Author with the worst Grace that can be; because a great Part of both his Books are built only upon Conjectures; a plentiful Collection whereof might easily be made. But I forbear, and shall content my self only to direct the Reader to the 63d and 64th Pages of his Defence; where I am much mistaken, if he do not find as many Conjectures one upon another, as ever were met with in so little a Compass in any Author that ever was. Besides that it is to be remembered, a probable Objection is not to be slighted, but answered; but an Evidence that is no more than Probable and Conjectural, will never serve to prove a necessary Duty.

Again, here is another Objection started by the Answerer, namely that according to Dr. Lightfoot's Doctrine, *If a Man drinks Wine not mingled, he has performed his Duty. And why then has not a Christian performed his, when only in Wine?* Yet says our Author, *This is but a lame Performance.* But if it were a sufficient one, as it must be, or else he has not performed his Duty; if it be a sufficient Performance he need not much concern himself for any hard Words that may be given it. Our Author says farther, *The Mixture seems, (and indeed it more than seems, for it really was) uncommanded by the Mosaick Institution. But as I have proved, 'tis enjoyed by the Christian. This makes a sufficient Difference, and bars Liberty in the latter Case.* In good Truth, it would make a sufficient Difference, and put a final Conclusion to this Debate, could it but be once made out, and it is only for want of the Proof of such a Difference, that

that I am not already, nor am ever like to be his Profelyte.

It follows, (x) *Dr. Lightfoot affirms, That the Wine our Saviour made use of at the Institution was mix'd with Water, if our Lord conformed to the Custom of that Nation.* Which is arguing barely upon Supposition; and, so, very far from proving that he did so. But then the Doctor adds, in Corroboration of his Supposition, that *we have no Reason to question it.* Which is still but arguing upon what he takes to be a rational Conjecture; too weak a Foundation, as was but now said, to build a necessary Duty upon. As it certainly is, notwithstanding what he cites there from *Bab. Berachoth*; which aims only at proving that the *Jews* Cup of Blessing was mix'd, but says nothing of our Saviour's. Nor does the Doctor, or *R. Eliezer*, or any of the *learned Jews* pretend to say, that our Saviour enjoin'd the Water as a necessary Part of this Institution. Which is the Point that should have been proved, but cannot. And therefore give me leave to ask again, and I desire a fair Answer to it. If a *Jew* might perform his Duty in an unmix'd Cup, why may not a Christian perform his in like manner? This is such an invincible Rubb in the way, that I do not see how it could be got over, though I should suppose the *Talmud* to be the best Evidence in the World, and the Distinction betwixt the *Fruit of the Vine and of the Tree*, to be as just a Distinction as ever was. But this I can by no means assent to, till what the Answerer had urged against it be fully cleared. (y) *By this*, says he, *one would think it was a common Distinction in our Saviour's Time, and that his Institution was to be explained by it.* But if we look into *Dr. Lightfoot*

(x) *Defence*, p. 53.

(y) *No Reason*, p. 41.

from whom it is cited, he says no such Thing. He only tells us that there is such a Tradition of the Rab- bins, but not how many Ages after our Saviour it might come into their Heads. And yet had it been a Tradition of the Jews in our Saviour's Time, to what Use would it have served? If the Jews would talk impertinently, I cannot think it necessary our Lord should do so too. What Tree can Grapes grow upon? Or of what Tree can Wine be produced, but the Vine only? Or what Vine ever produced Wine and Water? What the Jews therefore can mean by so unaccountable a Distinction, is to me so very Mystical, that I must beg to be excused, if I cannot imagine our Blessed Sa- viour would ever take up with it; and especially in so solemn an Institution as this of the Blessed Eucharist; or in truth that any manner of Regard is to be had to it. Whereto our learned Author makes Two Re- plies, but how Satisfactory, I leave to the Reader's Observation. First, (x) That this Distinction was Ancient and Common too, appears from Dr. Lightfoot; neither has the Answerer offered any thing to the con- trary. As to the Antiquity of it, the Answerer had desired it might be clearly shewn as Ancient as the Time, at least, of our Saviour. And for a very good Reason, because otherwise it is not at all to the Purpose. However, our Author has not so much as attempted this; though of such abso- lute Necessity to have been done. And as to the Commonness of it, Dr. Lightfoot does not say how many, or how few, they were that had any way made use of it. Nor does our Author say it for him, or any one else. Secondly, He says *His next Effort is somewhat extraordinary*. If the Jews, says he, would talk impertinently, I cannot think it necessary our Lord should do so too. This Turn

(x) Defence, p. 56.

is a little too strong : I am sorry to see him venture so far. But pray good Sir, where does his mighty Fault lie ? I must own, I have carefully perused the Words, and am not able to discover it. Is it that the *Rabbins* never talked impertinently ? This I will Answer for our learned Author, that he will not affirm. Or is it that he would have our Saviour to have talked impertinently with them, and more particularly in his Institution of the Eucharist ? The least Suspicion of this can never enter into my Thoughts. Where is it then that *the Turn* is so over strong ? This is beyond my Ability to explain. He asks, *Wont the Answerer give the Jews leave to settle their Language, to assign the Notes of Distinction, and mark their Thoughts as they please ?* And I will undertake for him that he will ; and not only so, but when they have settled their Language to their Mind, he will give them leave to use it as impertinently as they please too. Only it is desired, that if at any Time they make an improper Use of it, our Blessed Saviour may not be brought into the scrape with them. Which is sure a most reasonable Request in it self. But is more manifestly so in our Case, since as I said before, it has not so much as been attempted to be proved, nor ever can it be proved, that this famous Distinction had been ever heard, or thought of, in our Saviour's Days.

It follows, (a) *The Phraseology of Nations is extremely different, especially the Eastern and the Western :* And the Idiom of calling a great Mountain, or Tree, or River, &c. a Mountain, or Tree, or River of God, is brought to prove it. But what Service can be expected from this Observation, is yet to be explained. This was certainly a known Idiom of the

(a) *Defence*, p. 55.

Jews, and used as such in Scripture. But what Relation has this to *the Fruit of the Tree*? Or what Evidence is there of That being an Idiom with them too? The Scripture never once mentions this, though it oftendoes the other. Nor will the Proof of this being an Idiom ever prove, that the other was so likewise. The Honourable and Ingenious Mr. *Boyl* observes, that in our own Tongue, there are Five or Six Expressions relating to *the Birth of Infants*, that would sound very odly in another Language. Namely that (b) *Such a Woman has looked every Hour these Ten Days*; *Yesterday she cried out*; *She had a quick and easy Labour*. *Last Night she was brought a Bed*; *Now she lies in*; *Let us remember the Lady in the Straw*. These are purely *Englisch* Idioms; but it will never follow from any or all of them, that we call a Horse a Mountain, or a Fish a Fowl. Nor again was that of the *Tree* properly an Idiom, but a Distinction. Nor again does it appear to have been a constant general Distinction amongst that Nation, but only a Saying of some of the *Rabbins*, of which the Doctor tells us they had a Tradition. And it is too much to require that I should depend more upon such a Tradition, than upon the plain Words of our Saviour at the Institution; Words so plain and clear that I never thought any Dispute could arise about them, till I found this present Controversy unhappily set on Foot.

Before I proceed any farther, I will beg leave to remind the Reader, that the Answerer had taken occasion to observe what (c) *Buxtorf* had testified concerning the *Jews*, that they had Four Cups at their Passover, and that *they all consisted of Wine*; but said withal he was *willing to suppose for the*

(b) *Style of the Holy Scriptures*, p. 13. (c) *No Reason*, p. 20.
present,

present, that the *Talmudists* were not mistaken, and to inquire whether their Evidence would answer Expectation, even upon such a Supposition. This our learned Author is pleased to take for a total giving up of *Buxtorf*, or in his own Expression, (d) *in ordering him to withdraw*, and professes he cannot take it as any Point of *Courtesy*. Though after all I cannot but think *Buxtorf*, to have been as well acquainted with the *Jewish*, both Language, and Customs, as Dr. *Lightfoot*, whom he constantly reckons upon as of unquestionable Authority; nor do I see why he should not be as deservedly *ordered to withdraw* as *Buxtorf*. And possibly it may be thought convenient to give him this Order, when I shall have told the Reader, that they both say the same Thing. For what *Buxtorf* had taught before, Dr. *Lightfoot* teaches afterwards, on St. *Matt.* xxvi. 27. that *Four Cups of Wine were to be drunk up by every one.* N. II. and that they were to consist of *red Wine.* N. IV.

I will not trouble either our Author or the Reader, with a farther Inquiry, whether St. *Luke's*, or the other Evangelists Account of the Eucharistick Institution is the longest, both because it is of no Consequence in the present Debate, and because moreover every One's own Eyes are sufficient Evidence, that St. *Luke's* is the shortest.

The Answerer having (e) said, that what *Plutarch* says of the *νεῦμα* imports no more, than that such a Mixture may sometimes be termed *Wine*, our learned Author affirms it imports more: It imports that such a Mixture is commonly called *Wine*. But whereas the Answerer explained his Meaning by what follows, *Not that Wine necessarily imports a Mixture, which were necessary for proving our Savi-*

(d) *Defence*, p. 29.(e) *No Reason*, p. 45.

our enjoined one, nor so much as that pure Wine was ever called *νεῖμα*; to this he replies, That though Wine does not always import a Mixture, *νεῖμα* does. Which is a plain Confession, that the Exception to this Testimony of *Justin Martyr* is well grounded, even according to his own Doctrine.

Dr *Lightfoot* being said to have taught (f) the Mixture to be a convenient Rite, as being requisite for Health, and avoiding Drunkenness, his Answer is, that (g) the Jews thought their Deliverance from Egypt imperfectly represented without the Mixture. All that I am concerned in this Question is to know, whether the Answerer has cited Dr. *Lightfoot's* Words fairly and truly. That he has not, is not so much as pretended; and if he has, I hope he is not to be blamed for it. And if there be any Exception to the Words when fairly cited; let Dr. *Lightfoot* look to that; for the Answerer is no way concerned in it. All that he could desire in the Case, and which cannot be denied him, is that if Dr. *Lightfoot's* Evidence be allowed as unquestionable, when against him, it must be so likewise when on his side.

The Answerer inquires farther, (h) *If our Saviour were believed in like manner to have used it, because of the Strength of the Wine in those hot Countries, by what Argument can it be proved, that the same Mixture would be necessary in other Places where the Wine is thinner, and not more apt to intoxicate, than a mixt Cup perhaps might be amongst the Jews?* To this says he I reply, (i) that the Sacramental Cup was no where drunk in such large Proportions, as to endanger Sobriety, tho' never so generous and undiluted; And therefore this could not be the

(f) *No Reason*, p. 46. (g) *Defence*, p. 57. (h) *No Reason*, p. 46. (i) *Defence*, p. 57.

Reason of the Mixture. But our learned Author may consider first, that if the *Jews* put Water into their Cup for this Reason, the Christians might very well be at Liberty to leave it out, when the Case came to be altered, so as that there was no such Occasion for it; and again that there might be more Occasion for such an Usage in Places where the Wine was strong, than is amongst us, and especially when they met together very early, in *antelucanis catibus*, because a little Wine taken at that time of the Morning, might cloud their Heads and render them less fit to serve God, than they would otherwise have been; though without any danger of drinking to Excess. In short, if the *Jews* might, and did put Water into their Paschal Cup for Convenience, why may it not as well be left out of ours when there is no such Convenience in it?

But now comes an unhappy Question, which I heartily wish our learned Author had forborn. (k) *If Water may be omitted, why not Wine?* And another just after, *Why may not any other Liquor do as well as Wine?* And I return one short Answer to both; Because our Saviour plainly tells us, what he instituted was *the Fruit of the Vine*, but says not one word of either Water, or any other Liquor.

The Answerer is charged with (l) *a great Mistake*, in saying *We hear nothing of a Cup purposely mixt for this Use, till the Apostolical Constitutions.* And this *Mistake* is affirmed to appear plainly from *the Testimonies of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and St. Cyprian, above-cited.* Now I have again looked over that Part both of the Reasons and of the Defence wherein these Wri-

(k) *Ibid.*

(l) Page 58.

ters are cited; and find the utmost they are produced for is, to prove that our Saviour used a Mixture: Besides it is urged in the *Reasons*, (m) that *it is most reasonable to suppose, that the Wine blessed by our Saviour for the holy Eucharist was Part of that prepared for the Passover, and consequently not purposely mixed for the Eucharist.* And in the *Defence* are these Words, expressly contradictory to the Charge of *Mistake* here cast upon the Answerer; (n) *The Scripture gives not the least Hint of any new Provision, of any Change in the Entertainment for the Eucharist. 'Tis most reasonable to suppose it. the Remainder of what was prepared for the Passover.* Where then is this GREAT MISTAKE? Every one that cannot reconcile Contradictions must say, it is not in the *Answerer*, but the *Defender*.

I cannot but be much surprized at the next Assertion, it is so very strange; (o) *It does not appear our Saviour kept the Passover with unleavened Bread.* So says our Author. But I cannot persuade my self he can think our Saviour would profess to keep the Passover, and yet act in such direct contradiction to it's Institution, as it would have been to make use of *Leavened Bread*; which was not so much as to be suffered in their Houses, at the time of that Festival. As the Answerer had plainly shewn. I may infer this also from our Author's own Doctrine. He says, (p) *Our Saviour's last Supper went upon a Conformity to the Jewith Passover.* And can it be thought our Saviour would comply with the *Jews*, in injoyning Water, which was not commanded them, any more than the Bread, Unleavened Bread,

(m) Page 9.

(n) Page 30.

(o) Defence, p. 58.

(p) Page 33.

which

which had been positively commanded? From hence it must be owned that *our Saviour kept the Passover with unleavened Bread*; and for this Reason because it was forbidden to do otherwise; Were nothing more to be said for it. But I must beg leave farther, to put this Gentleman in mind, that his Assertion is a flat Contradiction to the Testimony of three of the Evangelists, who all expressly declare against him. St. *Matthew* says it was on (q) *the first day of unleavened Bread* the Disciples came, to know where they should keep the Passover. So says St. *Mark*, (r) *The first day of unleavened Bread, when they killed the Passover, his Disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare, that thou mayst eat the Passover?* And so again says St. *Luke*, (s) *Then came the day of unleavened Bread, when the Passover must be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare the Passover that we may eat.* This is undeniable Evidence, and as full as can be desired. And yet our learned Author has some Arguments to the contrary; though after such plain Testimonies from Scripture, one would think their could be no room for them. However that I may not seem to slight them, I shall briefly inquire into each of them. The first is that our Saviour kept his Passover a Night sooner than the time for eating the Lamb, and so did not eat the Paschal Lamb. But what he ate was on the thirteenth Day at Night, and so one the *first Day of unleavened Bread*. Which is all I am concerned for. *Farther*, says he, *by the Mosaick Law the Paschal Lamb was to be killed by the Levites, and sacrificed in the Temple at the Evening of the fourteenth*

(q) Ch. xxvi. 17 (r) Chap. xiv. 12. (s) Ch. xxii. 7, 8.

Day. Neither of which Regulations were practised at our Saviour's Passover. And is this a Proof that our Saviour could not keep the Passover with unleavened Bread? Or even that it does not appear he kept it so? If it be I will own my self, as the Answerer was causelessly charged before, to be in a GREAT MISTAKE. Again he says, *Besides, as the learned Hammond observes 'twas not necessary their Houses should be cleared of all Leavened Bread 'till the Evening of the fourteenth Day.* Now I cannot deny that I have a great Veneration for Dr. Hammond; but withal that if he should happen to contradict the *Evangelists* I must prefer their Authority before his. But does he say our Saviour made use of *Leavened Bread*? This cannot be pretended. Does he say, as our Author here affirms, *'twas not necessary their Houses should be cleared of all Leavened Bread, till the Evening of the fourteenth Day?* These Words are not to be found in him. Has he then any other that import as much? That I shall submit to the Reader's Judgment, when I shall have recited what he says. Speaking of the Evening of the Thirteenth Day, that is of the Beginning of the Fourteenth, he declares that *this Day of the Passover being the Eve or Preparation of the Seven days Feast of Unleavened Bread, they were that Day before Sun-set, to purge out, or remove all Remainers of Leavened Bread out of their Houses.* But does this amount to so much, as saying it was not necessary to be done at the Beginning of that Day, If it were done then, it was certainly done before the next Sun-set. But it will not necessarily follow on the other hand, that if it be done towards the latter End of the Day, it is done soon enough. And we may be sure when our Saviour set himself to keep the Passover, though he could not do it at the proper time, because

because he, the true Lamb of God, of which the Paschal was but a Type, was to be offered up before that time, yet he would do it as perfectly as was consistent with his time of doing it, and would not dispense with a Divine Institution, in a point wherein there was no Occasion for a Dispensation. But the right State of the Question is not, whether our Saviour could dispense with Leaven in the Pasover, but whether he actually did it. And this I am sure our Author will not undertake to prove. This Argument is much the same as if a Thief upon the Highway, should plead a Right to my Purse, because God could as well dispense with him in taking it, as he did with the *Israelites* in spoiling the *Egyptians*. From all which Premisses I may safely conclude the Bread our Saviour used was unleavened; and I do not see how it could be otherwise.

We are told farther, (t) *We cannot infer with any Cogency, that he took the mixt Cup only because 'twas ready at hand.* I did not expect this would have been disputed; because the Force of all the Arguments for proving our Saviour used the same Cup that was used at the Pasover, seems to rest upon it. And so it must till some other Reason can be given for his pretended Institution of a Mixture, than that he drank of, and appointed the same Cup that was then used. This therefore I looked upon as our Author's own Argument, and which he, not I, is concerned to answer, so far as it needs an Answer. But if so, *why will it not follow for the same Reason, that he made use of Wine, only because it was ready?*

(t) *Defence, p. 60.*

I cannot suppose our Saviour by any means to have acted with so little consideration as this Question insinuates. Nor is there any the least Pretence of Reason for it. Our Saviour who did nothing without the greatest Reason would not act thus unreasonably in a Matter of the highest Consequence. And this is one Argument with me against his supposed use of a Mixture. But there are other good Reasons to believe he did not make use of the Wine only because it was ready; and such as will not hold for the Supposed Water. This Answers to the Types in the Old Testament, and it most perfectly resembles his Blood; and besides it is what is mentioned as the Matter of the Cup. All which Considerations shew that a great deal may be said for the Wine that cannot be said for the Water; and besides that, it is egregiously absurd, and what therefore can never come into my Thoughts in the least to imagine, that there is *no lasting Obligation to communicate in Wine, but that any other Drink may serve as well.*

Once more, the Answerer had argued, (u) *If it is a just Conclusion, that because our Saviour mentions only Bread in the Institution, therefore any Bread whether leavened or unleavened, is the proper Matter of that Part of the Sacrament; it naturally follows, and altogether with the same Reason, that because he mentions nothing in the Cup but Wine, therefore any Wine will be sufficient, whether mixt or unmixt. But here, says our Author, (w) the Reader may, please to observe, that though Bread is the Matter of the Sacrament, and consequently necessary,*

(u) *No Reason*, p. 48.

(w) *Defence*, p. 51.

I add, and particularly taken, broken, and given by our Saviour, as the Evangelists declare, yet *the Kind of Bread is left at Liberty, Leavened or Unleavened is only an accidental Circumstance. But the Mixture constitutes the Matter and seems to enter the Essence.* But this is very strange, that a Mixture in the Cup of which the Scripture says not a Word, and which can never be proved to have been what our Saviour designed to institute, should be more essential, than such a Mixture in the Bread, as the Scripture shews he must have made use of; and that *Do this* should be of such extensive Obligation with respect to the former, of which there is no Proof, and yet signify nothing as to the other, where there appears so much more Reason for it. This is so plain, that our Author speaks but diffidently as to the Obligation to the Water. *He says it seems to enter the Essence;* Which is a doubting Expression, and intimates it not to be *certainly* Essential; which yet were necessary to prove the Obligation to restore it.

And now to shut up all in a few Words, *That the Fruit of the Vine was instituted* by our Blessed Saviour, is certain from Divine Revelation; that any Water was mixed with it is not so much as intimated in Scripture, nor taught as Necessary for some Ages after. The One was enjoined by our Lord; the other not enjoined at all. How then can this be insisted on as Necessary to Salvation, without setting Tradition, whether Christian or *Jewish* above the Word of God? And yet even upon this Supposition, the Tradition for it is so lame and imperfect, that it will never do the Business.

Thus I have gone through this First Article; and have shewn in general, that Scripture is the
only

only Rule prescribed to Christians, as able to *make them wise unto Salvation*; and more particularly as to the Mixture contended for, that the Tradition pleaded for it, is neither so Constant and Universal as is pretended, nor sufficient to prove a Necessity of this Usage where it is to be found. The natural and unavoidable Consequence of which Positions is, that as there is no Necessity for Restoring it, so neither can the Want of it any way justify a Rupture in the Church.

F I N I S.



