

~~BAP~~  
~~T739 of~~



SCB  
10416

OF THE  
SACRAMENTS  
IN  
GENERAL,

In Pursuance of an  
EXPLICATION  
OF THE  
CATECHISM  
OF THE  
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

---

BY  
GABRIEL TOWERSON, D.D.  
and Rector of *Welwynne* in *Hartfordshire*.

---

LONDON,  
Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the *Rose and Crown* in  
*St. Paul's Church-yard*. MDC LXXXVI.

STYBENIA

LAJENIA

COLETON

MSINONIA

CHORONIA

TOWNSHIP

...

...



TO THE  
Right Reverend  
FATHER in GOD  
FRANCIS  
Lord Bishop of ELY,  
AND  
LORD ALMONER  
TO  
His Majesty.

*My Lord,*

**T**HOUGH I am almost  
ashamed to make  
my Address to your  
Lordship with so small a  
Treatise as this, yet having  
no more of it finished, and  
this little being the Founda-  
tion of the rest, I hope

A 3 your

*The Epistle Dedicatory.*

your Lordship will accept of it as some acknowledgement of those great Condescensions with which your Lordship hath been pleas'd to honour so mean a Person as my self.

I might indeed, if I had conceived it better so to do, have kept it by me, till it had grown more complete, and so have made it a more suitable Present to a Person of your Lordship's Character in the Church and in the Court: But I considered that what I now humbly offer to your Lordship and the Publick, must

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

must be my Measure in the following Tracts, and so may need the advice of others as well as my own thoughts to perfect it, and I may gain this advantage by the separate Edition of it, to know from some of my Friends what in it is weak or imperfect : In which if your Lordship will further vouchsafe your admonition, it will make what remains the more fit to be presented to your Lordship, by

Your Most Obliged,

Welwynne,  
Nov. 26.  
1685.

Most Obedient, and

Most humble Servant,

*Gabriel Toverfon.*

The Office Secretary

It will be my Measure in the  
following Tracts, and to  
my mind the advice of  
others as well as my own  
thoughts to perfect it, and  
I may gain this advantage  
by the separate Edition of  
it to know from time to  
time my Friends what it is  
and on imperfect  
which if your friendship  
will further vouchsafe  
attention, it will  
were remain as the more fit  
to be presented to you  
I am, Sir, your Obedient  
and Affectionate Servant

Your Most Obedient

and Affectionate Servant

John M. O'Connell

John M. O'Connell

PROFITABLE  
LAIN C. B. T. G.  
REC. APR 1881  
THEOLOGICAL

---

The Contents of the First Part.

---

*Of the Signification of the Word*  
S A C R A M E N T .

**T**HE *Word Sacrament, in the primitive notion of it, the name of the Military Oath, as well that, which came to be afterwards impos'd, as that which was at first voluntarily taken by the Souldiers. Which denomination it had both from the sacredness of an Oath in its own Nature, and from those Sacred Ceremonies, wherewith that, and other Oaths were attended. The Word Sacrament, in the Christian sense of it, translated from thence into the Church, and applied to those Institutions of it, which now go under that name. As is made*

## The Contents.

*made appear from the footing the former signification had gotten in the World; From the Scriptures, and the Ancient Christians representing the Life and Institution of a Christian under the notion of a Military one; And, in fine, from the same Antients making use of that Word in the Military sense. Evidence of this last from general applications of it, and an account given thereupon of the particular instances, which they gave of the likeness of the Christian Sacrament to the purely Military one.*

pag. 1.

---

### The Contents of the second Part.

#### Of the Nature of a SACRAMENT.

**A** Sacrament shewn to be a Relative thing, more particularly such a Relative thing, as hath the relation of an outward, and visible sign of that, of which it is a Sacrament. That therefore assign'd as the Genus of a Sacrament, and enquiry thereupon made after those essential attributes, which difference it from other outward

## The Contents.

*outward and visible signs. Which is endeavour'd to be evinc'd from the several things to which a Sacrament relates, the manner of its relation to each of them, and the foundation of that relation. The things, to which a Sacrament relates, shewn in the general to be Sacred, or Divine, more particularly, divine Graces, and humane Duties, that New Covenant, which connects them together, and that body of men, which is confederated by it. To the first of which a Sacrament relates in the nature of a sign, a means of conveyance, and a pledge; To the second in the nature of a simple sign, or declaration, and (by means of that Covenant, which it conciliates) as an Obligation to them; To the third in the nature of such a sign, as serves also to give being to, or renew it; And to the fourth, and last in the nature of a Discriminative sign, or badge, and as a means of bringing particular men into it, or continuing them in it. The foundation of all these relations shewn to be the Institution of Christ, as that again, not so much as delivered by him, as applied to those elements, in  
which*

## The Contents.

*which they are subjected, by a declaration of the purport of the Institution, and by doing such other things to them, as either the general precepts of Christianity, or the more particular precepts of the institution oblige to the performance of. A brief recollection made of all the forementioned particulars, and the essential attributes of a Sacrament deduced from thence, and exemplified in several definitions of it. pag. 25.*

---

### The Contents of the Third Part.

A farther Explication of the Nature of a Sacrament, with a resolution of several Questions belonging thereunto, or depending more immediately upon it.

**T**HE Nature of a Sacrament brought again under consideration, and enquiry accordingly made concerning that inward and Spiritual Grace, to which it relates, the manner of its relation to it, and the foundation of that relation. This last more particularly insisted upon, and as it was before resolv'd to be the Institution of Christ,



## The Contents.

Christ, so a more ample account given thereupon of that Institution of his, and of those Commands, and Promises, whereof it doth consist. Those Commands again considered with reference to the sacramental Elements, before they put on that relation, or after they are invested with it. The former whereof are shewn in the general to enjoyn the setting them apart for that purpose, or Consecrating them, and enquiry thereupon made by whom they ought to be set apart, and whether their intention, or good disposition be requisite to give force unto it: The latter the Consecrators dispensing them as the Institutor thereof hath prescrib'd, and the peoples receiving them from them, with the Manner of it. Upon occasion whereof Enquiry is made, concerning the necessity of Sacraments, and in what sort, or degree they ought to be accounted such. A like particular account given of the Promises of the Institution, which are shewn in the general to assure Christ's making what is done both by the Consecrators, and Receivers to be available for those ends, for which they were enjoyn'd;

More

## The Contents.

*More particularly his converting that into a Sacrament, which is by the former set apart to be so (and which how it is done is, upon that account, enquir'd into) and, where the Receivers are rightly dispos'd, accompanying the dispensation of the Sacramental Elements with the Dispensation of the Divine Graces. An application of the whole to the business in hand, and Enquiry accordingly made, how the former Commands, and Promises contribute toward the Founding a Sacramental Relation, and how also to the efficacy of the elements, after that Relation is produced in them. pag. 95.*

---

### *The Contents of the fourth Part.*

*Of the Jewish Sacraments, and the Number of the Christian.*

**T**HE *Doctrin*e of the Sacraments drawn down to particulars, and enquiry first made concerning the Jewish Sacraments, and then concerning the Christian ones. As to the former whereof is shewn first, that there were indeed such Sacraments among

## The Contents.

*mong them, and evidence made thereof, from their enjoying the same Saving Graces, which our Sacraments pretend to convey, from their being furnished alike with External Symbols to convey them, and those Symbols of God, and Christ's institution: Secondly, that those Sacraments of theirs were either the extraordinary ones they had in their passage from Ægypt to Canaan, as their Baptism in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and the Eucharist of Manna, and the Water of the Rock, or the ordinary ones of Circumcision, and the Passover; Thirdly, That, though they were of the same general nature with the Christian, yet they differ'd from them, both as to the manner of their representing the Divine Graces, which was not so clear, and as to the measure of conveyance of them, which was not so full, as in the Christian Sacraments. Those Christian Sacraments, in the next place, brought under consideration, and evidence made of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper being the only true, and proper ones, or of general necessity to Salvation.*

ERRATA.

In the Text.

**P**ag. 23. l. antep. r. *tended.* p. 80. l. 2. r. *to it.* p. 109. l. 9. for  
*under r. on.* p. 156. l. 11. r. *As appears.* p. 157. l. 11. *thy*  
*antient.* p. 168. l. antep. for *with r. in*

In the Margent.

Pag. 5. l. 8. *dimist.* p. 7. l. 3. *pr. cedes.* p. 48. l. 16. *li. 5.* p. 153.  
l. 3. *exp. 3.* p. 165. l. 3. 2 *Tim. 1. 6.*

OF

---

---

OF THE  
SACRAMENTS  
IN  
GENERAL.

---

PART I.

*Of the Signification of the Word*  
SACRAMENT.

---

The Contents.

*The Word Sacrament, in the primitive notion of it, the name of the Military Oath, as well that, which came to be afterwards impos'd, as that which was at first voluntarily taken by the Souldiers. Which denomination it had both from the sacredness of an Oath in its own Nature,*

B

## Of the Signification

ture, and from those Sacred Ceremonies, wherewith that, and other Oaths were attended. The Word Sacrament, in the Christian sense, of it, translated from thence into the Church, and applied to those Institutions of it, which now go under that name. As is made appear from the footing the former signification had gotten in the World; From the Scriptures, and the Ancient Christians representing the Life and Institution of a Christian under the notion of a Military one; And, in fine, from the same Antients making use of that Word in the Military sense. Evidence of this last from general applications of it, and an account given thereupon of the particular instances, which they gave of the likeness of the Christian Sacrament to the purely Military one.

Question.  
How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?

**I**F it shall please that God, by whom I have been carried on thus far, to continue to me the same Health, and Leisure, and Assistances, which I have met with in composing the three foregoing parts

parts of this *Explication*, I will endeavour to inform my self, and then others concerning the *Sacraments* of our Religion, more particularly concerning those *two*, which (in the opinion of our Church) are the only either *proper* (a), or *generally necessary* (b) ones. Those, as they are the Argument of the *fourth* and *last* Part of our Churches Catechism; so being accordingly to be the matter of this *fourth* and *last* Part of my *Explication* of it.

I will begin, for that purpose, with the *signification* of the word *Sacrament*, and which, though it will not clear up to us the full Nature of the things intended by it, yet will serve to discover to us a considerable part thereof, and help toward the finding out of the other. Now the word *Sacrament*, in the *Antient* intendment of it, signified an *Oath*, and particularly that *Oath*, which *Souldiers* took to be faithful to their Generals, and to do all those other things which the duty of their place, or the Discipline of War required of them: With this only difference in point of time (which is wont either

Answer.  
Two only, as generally necessary to Salvation, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

(a) Art. of Rel. 25.

(b) Catech. ubi supra.

to contract, or enlarge the signification of words) that as that Oath was at first *voluntarily* taken by the Souldiers, so the word *Sacrament* was some time set to denote such *voluntary* ones in contradistinction to those, which were afterwards *impos'd*. We have an illustrious proof of all this in a passage of *Livy*\*, which therefore I shall here subjoyn.

\* Hist. lib. 22. *Milites tunc, quod nunquam antea factum erat, jurejurando à Tribunis militum adacli, jussu Consulum conventuros, neque injussu abituros. Nam ad eam diem nil præter Sacramentum fuerat, & ubi ad decuriatum, aut centuriatum convenissent, sua voluntate ipsi inter se equites decuriati, centuriati pedites conjurabant, sese fugæ, atque formidinis ergo, non abituros, neque ex ordine recessuros, nisi teli sumendi, aut petendi, aut hostis feriendi, aut civis servandi causa. Id ex voluntario inter ipsos fœdere ad legitimam jurisjurandi adactionem translatum.*

Then first (even in the Consulship of *L. Æmilius Paulus*, and *Terentius Varro*) were the Souldiers oblig'd by their Tribunes under an Oath to meet together at the command of their Consuls, and not to depart without their leave. For till that time there had been nothing but a *Sacrament*, and when they were met together by Tens, or by Hundreds, the Horse-

men, who met by Tens, and the Footmen, who met by Hundreds, did, of their own proper motion, take an Oath among themselves, that they would not depart out of fear, or cowardice, nor quit their ranks at any time, unless



it were to take up their Weapon, to dart at, or strike the Enemy, or to save a Citizen. But that which proceeded at first from a voluntary Covenant among themselves, was by the Tribunes altered into a prescribed, and imposed Oath, and the Souldiers forc'd to take it from them. Where we have not only the word *Sacrament* set to denote a Souldier's Oath, but such an Oath, as was voluntarily taken by them, and had rather their own free consent, than the Command of their General to give being to it. But as we find by the same passage, that what was at first but voluntary, came afterwards to be imposed upon the Souldiers; so we find also that the word *Sacrament* came afterwards to signifie those imposed Oaths, as well as the former voluntary ones.

For thus it is plain, *Cicero* † used it in the account he gives of *Cato's* writing to *Popillius* a General of the

† De Officiis  
li. 1. *M. Popillius* Imperator  
tenebat provin-  
ciam, in cujus

*exercitu Catonis filius tiro militabat. Quum autem Popillio videretur unam dimittere legionem, Catonis quoque filium, qui in eadem legione militabat, demisit. Sed quum amore pugnandi in exercitu remansisset, Cato ad Popillium scripsit, ut si eum pateretur in exercitu remanere, secundo eum obligaret Militiæ Sacramento, quia, priore amisso, jure pugnare eum hostibus non poterat.*

Romans, to lift his Son anew, if he thought good to continue him in his Army; His words, as *Tully* recites them, being, that if *Popilius*, who had before dismiss'd the Legion, wherein he serv'd, thought good to suffer young *Cato* to abide in his Army, he should oblige, or bind him by a second military Sacrament, because the former being made void, he could not lawfully fight with the Enemy. Which passage plainly imports the military Sacrament to be of the Generals Imposing, yea so necessarily, that had not the General, in whom the right of making War was, given it to young *Cato*, he could not, in the opinion of his Father have struck a stroke against the Enemy. Thus the use of the word *Sacrament* stood in the days immediately preceding our Saviour; And as the thing intended by it, even the Military Oath, was continued in the succeeding Ages, as is manifest from the frequent mention there is in *Suetonius* (a), and others of the Souldiers swearing to their Generals, so it continu'd to be represented under the title of a *Sacrament*, even to late posterity. As

appears,

(a) Suet. in  
Claud. c. 9. in  
Othone c. 8.  
& alibi passim.

appears, among other things, from *Horace's* telling † his *Mecenas*, that he had not taken a perfidious *Sacrament*, because (as it there follows) he was resolv'd to follow him, where ever he led, which we know \* to have been a great part of a *Souldiers Oath*: From *Juvenal's* describing *Souldiers* † themselves under the title of *Sacramenta*; As in fine from the *Antients* describing *Souldiers* either departing, or being freed from their former service, by a departure, or freedom from their *Sacrament*. Of which beside other proofs (d), we have a *Law of Theodosius*, and *Honorius*, and which as it is under the title *de Veteranis*, or such as, by reason of their being superannuated, were dismiss'd from their former service, so expresseth the same *Veteranes* under the title of those who have ceased \* to be entangled by their former *Sacraments*. Other instances I doubt not might be produced, if these were not

† ----- non ego perfidum  
Dixi Sacramentum, ibimus, ibimus  
Utique procedes.  
Carm. li. 2. Od. 17.

\* Dionys. Halicarnass. li. 11.  
Ὁ γὰρ ὄρκος ὁ στρατιωτικὸς, ὃν ἀπάντων μάλιστα ἐπιπέδον Ῥωμαῖοι τοῖς στρατηγῶσι, ἀκολουθεῖν κελεύει τῶς στρατευόμενος ὅπως ποτ' ἀνάρως.

† *Premia nunc alia, atque alia emolumenta notemus Sacramentorum*— Sat. 16.  
(d) *Ammianus Marcellinus* li. 24. *Residuos duos tribunos Sacramento solvit, ut desides, & ignavos.* Idem li. 26. *Et Serenianus, olim Sacramento digressus, recinctus est.*

\* Cod. li. 12. tit. 47. l. 4. *Nullus eorum qui Sacramentis inharere desierit, &c.*

(e) Varro de  
lingua Lat.

enough, to shew the word *Sacrament* to have had for its most usual sense that of a military Oath. But I shall only add, that though it were set to denote also *a piece of money left by each of the Litigants (e) in Court*; Yet as that was in a thing less known, than the Oaths of Souldiers were, and so the less likely to have any influence upon the framing of that mode of Speech, which was afterwards so much in use among the Christians; so it had this in common with the Military Sacrament, that it was an *Obligation* upon the parties, that deposited it, to prosecute that suit which they had commenced.

But because whatever the usual sense of the word *Sacrament* might antiently be, yet it is certain that it did not receive that sense from the *literal* notation of it, but rather from something of *Sacredness*, wherewith those Oaths were attended: And because the discovery of that *Sacredness* may help yet more to discover the true nature of those *Sacraments* of ours, to which that name is now applied; therefore enquire we in the next place what there was in them of

*Sacred*

*Sacred* to occasion that denomination of them. Now as *Sacred* is nothing else than what tends to the honour of God, whether in its own nature, or by institution; so there were two things of that quality in those Oaths, whereof we speak, and from whence therefore they may be suppos'd to have receiv'd that denomination. First their being in themselves an acknowledgment of Gods glorious Attributes, and particularly of his Knowledge, Truth, Justice, and Power; He who appeals to God as a Witness, and a Judge (as every man, that sweareth doth) implying his believing him to be a competent witness, and so both Knowing, and True, and one too, who both can, and will assert the cause of truth in the punishment of the party swearing, if he swear any other, than what he intends, or means. And in this sense as it was that *Cicero*\* entitled an Oath a *Religious Affirmation*, because an Affirmation under the testimony of God; so I no way doubt it was in a great measure, that Oaths came to have the name of *Sacraments*, and particularly all *Military*

\* De Offic. l. 3. Est enim jusjurandum Affirmatio religiosa. Quod autem affirmatè, quasi Deo teste, promiseris, id tenendum est.

tary ones. But besides that Sacredness which is intrinsecal to all Oaths, and therefore also to those, whereof we are now discoursing; They had a further sacredness from those religious *Rites*, wherewith they were attended, and which under the veil of sensible things, and such as were sometime contemptible enough, were intended to insinuate more valuable, and spiritual ones. Of this nature among the *Romans* was their laying their hands † upon the Altars of their Gods, or, which was yet more sacred than that, their taking a Stone \* into their hand, and then throwing it from them, withall praying, that if they falsified in the Oath they then took, *Jupiter* would throw them out of all, as they themselves did that Stone from them: By the former whereof they design'd to express the reverence they themselves bare even to things dedicated to them, as well as a belief of their Gods taking care to preserve them from all pollution; By the latter the quick apprehension they had of the power of their Gods over them, and particularly as to the spoiling them of their fortunes. And though

† *Falsus erit testis, vendet perjuriam summam Exiguam, Cerevis tangens aramq; pedemq;*  
*Juv. Sat. 14.*  
 \* *Festus. Lapidem silecem tenebant, juraturi per Jovem, hac verba dicentes, Si sciens fallo, tum me Diespiter, salvam urbe, arceque, bonis ejiciat, uti ego hunc lapidem.*

though I am not able to say, what were the particular rites of the Military Oath, at least among the Antient Romans; yet as there is reason enough to believe, that so signal an Oath was not without them, and which was upon the matter the foundation of all the Roman greatness, so there is this farther reason to believe it, that the Antients (f) made use of the word *Sacramentum* to express the Greek *μυστήριον*, and which as we know to have had a peculiar reference to those Rites, and Ceremonies, which were in use in the service of the Gods, so must consequently imply the like sense of that word, which was made use of to express it, and the like ceremoniousness of those Military Oaths, upon which it was impos'd. I may not forget to add, though appli'd by some (g) to another sense, that *Herodian* \* brings in the Emperor *Maximus* representing the Military Oath as the *Venerable mysterie of the Roman Empire*. For

(f) *Vulgar.*  
*Lat. in Eph.*  
5. 32. & *aiibi.*  
*Tertull. de*  
*Animã c. 20.*  
*ubi recitat d.*  
*l. ad Ephesios.*

(g) *Il. Ca-*  
*saub. Exercit.*  
16. c. 43.  
\* ὅσον μὲν  
ἡμᾶς ἀνησε  
μεταγνώντας  
τε, καὶ τὰ

Ῥωμαίων φρονήσαντας, πείρα μεμαθήκατε, ἀντὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰρήνης ἔχοντες πρὸς θεὸν ὡς ὁμαμόνατε, καὶ νῦν φυλάσσοντες τὸ στρατιωτικὸν ὄρκον, ὃς ἐστὶ τῶ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς σεμνὸν μυστήριον.  
*Herod. l. 8.*

as that is a farther evidence, that that Oath was not without its Sacred Rites, because *mysterics* properly so called were no other, than such ; so I know nothing to take off the force of it, but a presumption of the word's *μυστήριον* admitting a lower sense, and accordingly denoting no more than an *Arcanum*, or *Secret* of the Roman State, and by which the Founders thereof cunningly rais'd it to that greatness, to which it afterwards arriv'd. But how ill that notion agrees with the intention of him, who so entitled the Military Oath, will need no other proof than his prompting the Souldiers in the words before to look upon the Gods, by whom they had sworn, as the Authors of their present peace. For what was this but to intimate, that it was the religious observation of their Oaths, which was the cause of their prosperity, and consequently, that if those Oaths were also the foundation, and prop of the Roman greatness, it was not so much by the *politick* imposition of them, as by the sacredness thereof, and by the religious observation of which the Gods were



were induc'd to bless them with that ample dominion, which they had attain'd? In this sense yet more agreeably to the receiv'd opinion † of the *Romans*, because attributing their success, not so much to their own Wit, and Valour as to their religious veneration of the Gods, and those Gods as having a favourable regard to them because of it. If they look'd upon the *Military Sacrament*, and the Souldiers religious observation of it as contributing more especially to the advancing of their greatness, it is the less to be wondred at, because it was more immediately by the Arms of their Souldiers, that the Romans became masters of the World. The result of the premises is this; The word *Sacrament*, in its *Original* intendment, had the signification of a *Military Oath*, it had the signification of *such* a Military Oath, as was attended with *Sacred Rites*, and such as led men by sensible resemblances to things of a higher

† Cicero Orat. de Harusp. Resp. —Etenim quis est tam vecors, qui aut, cum suspexerit in cœlum, deos esse non sentiat, &c. Aut, cum deos esse intellexerit, non intelligat eorum numine hoc totum Imperium esse natum, & auctum, & retentum? Quàm volumus licet P. C. ipsi nos amemus, tamen nec numero Hispanos, nec robore Gallos, nec calliditate Pœnos, nec artibus Græcos, nec denique hoc ipso ejus gentis, ac terræ domestico, nativoque sensu Italos ipsos, ac Latinos, sed pietate, ac religione, &c. omnes gentes, nationesque superavimus.

higher nature. But whether or no, and how far it is to be look'd upon as of the like signification, in the *Christian* intendment of it, doth not as yet appear, but will be worth our labour to enquire.

Now that the word *Sacrament*, in the *Christian* intendment of it, is to be look'd upon as of like signification to what it had before acquir'd, will appear if we consider *first*, what footing the former signification had gotten in the minds of men, before there was any appearance of the latter. For as considering the footing the former signification had gotten, we cannot but think that it would be apt to suggest it self, as oft as the word *Sacrament* was made use of; so neither therefore but that it would form a like conceit of the *Christian* Sacraments, and consequently, if that were such, an erroneous one. Which it being not to be thought, that they would give occasion to, who first appli'd the word to the *Christian* Sacraments; especially when they might have had other words to express their conception of them: It is but reasonable to think that they  
made

made use of it upon occasion of some likeness between the one and the other Sacraments, and consequently that they intended it a like signification with the other. I deny not indeed (which is the answer Mr. *Calvin* (h) makes to this Argument in another instance) I deny not, I say, but that religion may, and doth very often strangely alter words from their pristine signification; I deny not farther (which is the instance he assigns) that the word *fides*, in the Christian use of it, is both a very apt, and pregnant proof of such a change. But as it doth not appear to me, that Religion did ever (unless in a long tract of time) so alter the known signification of words, as not to make them bear some analogy to the former signification of them; so the *Word*, in which that Learned man instanceth, is not so transform'd by Christianity, but that we may as yet see upon it the impress of its old signification, and be thereby therefore induced to believe, that they, who first used it in a Christian sense, took their measures from the former one. For, as the afore-

said

(h) *Instit. li.*  
4. cap. 14.  
Sect. 13.

said persons name-like (even *John Calvin* the Lawyer) hath observ'd (i),

(i) *Lex. Juridic. in Verbo fides.*

\* *Virgil. Æneid. li. 4. v. 12.*

*Credo equidem, nec vana fides,  
genus esse deorum.*

*Liv. Hist. li. 1.*

*Hæc ferme, Romulo regnante,  
domi, militi. eque gesta: quorum  
nil absonum fidei divinæ originis,  
divinitatisque post mortem cre-  
ditæ fuit, i. e. quæ creditus est  
natus fuisse ex Marte.*

*Idem Liv. paulo post.*

*Mirum quantum illi viro nunci-  
anti hæc fides fuerit.*

the word *fides*, among the Latins, signified *belief*\*, as well as *veracity*, or *fidelity*, and so was not at all removed from one great sense of it in Christianity: And though it was more usually set to denote the other, yet if we may judge ought by the words *fido*, and *confido*,

which are at least of the same lineage with it, the word *fides* came to signify *veracity*, and *fidelity*, not so much from any other reason, as because those vertues are the just object of mens *trust*, which is another, and no less usual signification of it in Christianity. Which notion I am the more confirmed in, because

† *De Offic. li.*

*1. Ex quo*

*(quanquam  
hoc videbitur  
fortasse cuiuspiam  
durius)*

*tamen audeamus  
imitari Stoicos,*

*qui studiose inquirunt unde verba sint ducta; credamusque quia fiat quod dictum est, appellatam fidem.*

though *Tully* do in one place † represent it as having its name from *fit quod dicitur*, yet as he doth even there intimate it to be a harsh *etymology*, and rather a piece of *Stoical*

confidence

confidence, than a well grounded conjecture : So he himself elsewhere † useth the word *Fides* for that trust we repose in another upon the account of his wisdom, and justice. For ought therefore that doth as yet appear, there is not any reason to believe,

but that Christianity had a respect, in it's words to the Antient signification of them ; And consequently but that it had so in the use of the word *Sacrament*, and intended it a like signification with that, which it before had, and was now very prevalent in the world. But beside the footing that signification of it had gotten, and by which therefore we may reasonably imagine, that the first Christians guided themselves in the use of the same word in Christianity, it is as certain that the same persons, led thereto by the language of the Scripture, did both conceive of, and represent the *life*, and institution of a Christian under the notion of a *Military* one. For if so, it is yet more reasonable to think, that they

† *Fides autem ut habeatur, duabus rebus effici potest, si existimabimur adepti conjunctam cum justitiâ prudentiam. Nam & iis fidem habemus, quos plus intelligere, quam nos arbitramur. Justis autem, & fidis hominibus, id est viris bonis, ita fides habetur, ut nulla sit in his fraudis, injuriæque suspicio. De Offic. 2.*

C

made

made use of their *Sacrament* to express some of their own Institutions by. Now that the first Christians, led thereto by the language of the Scripture, did both conceive of, and represent the Christian state as a *Military* one, will soon appear if we look either into those Scriptures, or the Antient Writers. Witness for the former, St. Paul's speaking in one (k) place of his *fighting as one, that did not beat the air*, and in another (l) of his having *fought a good fight*; his calling upon Timothy in a third (m) to *fight the good fight of Faith*, as, in fine, upon the generality of Christians (n) to prepare themselves for that fight, by putting on the whole Armour of God, which therefore he doth there reckon up, and prompts them to buckle on. For these, and other expressions of the like nature, show plainly enough, that even the Penmen of the New Testament had that opinion of a Christian state, and that accordingly they represented it under the notion of a *military* one. The like evidence there is of their opinion of it, who took upon them to hand down that doctrine,

(k) 1 Cor. 9.  
26.

(l) 2 Tim. 4.  
7<sup>h</sup>

(m) 1 Tim. 6.  
12.

(n) Eph. 6.  
11, &c.

doctrine, which they receiv'd from the other: Witness *Tertullian's* representing the Christians in general as the *Militia* of God (o), and affirming the *Stations*, that were in use among them, to have had their original from the *Military* ones; His representing that Souldier, who refused to put on his Crown, as *more the Souldier of God* (p), than of the *Emperor*; His afterwards describing the same person (q) as one clad all in red with the hope of his own blood, shod with the preparation of the Gospel, girt with the sharper Word of God, armed Cap-a-pe out of the *Apostle*, and in a short time to be crowned with the *Crown of Martyrdom*, and to receive the donative of *Christ in prison*. For what are these but pregnant proofs of the likeness they conceived between a Christian, and a Military state, and consequently that, in agreement thereto they spake of their own *Sacraments* in the same Military strain? Though if neither that will suffice, we have their own *express* applications of the word to warrant us, and accordingly either making the *Sacraments* a badge

(o) *De orat.*  
c. 14.

(p) *De coronat.*  
c. 1.

(q) *Ibid.*

of their military state, or arguing from mens taking upon them the Sacraments of *Christ's* warfare, the unlawfulness of obliging themselves by a *humane* one. For, agreeably to the former of these, we find the fore-quoted *Tertullian* affirming †, that *we were called even then to the Militia of God, when we answered to the words of the Sacrament*, meaning that of Baptism; As *Arnobius* yet more plainly \*, where he represents one, *who denies the Faith, as one who deposits the Sacraments of the saving Militia of God*. For what was this but to say, that, in respect to that warfare, which Christianity commands us to take up, they call'd the principal institutions of it by the name of *Sacraments*, and consequently that they made use of the word in a sense analogous to that, in which it had been formerly taken? On the other side, when the forementioned *Tertullian* \*, where he goes about to

† *Vocati sumus ad militiam Dei viri, jam tunc cum in Sacramenti verba respondimus. Ad Martyr. c. 3.*

\* *Adv. Gentes li. 2. Quod ab dominis se servi cruciatus affici, quibus statuerunt, malunt, solvi conjuges Matrimonii, exheredari à parentibus liberos, quam fidem rumpere Christianam, & salutarem militiæ Sacramenta deponere.*

\* *De Coronâ. c. 11. Etenim, ut ipsam causam coronæ militaris aggrediar, puto prius conquiendum, an in totum Christianis militiæ conveniat. Quis est alioquin de accidentibus retractare, cum à precedentibus culpa sit? Credimusne humanum Sacramentum divino superinduci licere, & in alium Dominum respondere post Christum?*



prove the unlawfulness of a Christians taking upon him a Military life, demands *whether any man can think it lawful to superinduce a humane, or Military Sacrament upon a divine one, and to answer to another Master after Christ* ; What other can he be thought to mean, than that the *divine*, and *humane* Sacraments were of one, and the same general nature, that the divine Sacraments had therefore the name of the humane ones impos'd upon them, and so the word *Sacrament* of like signification in them both. The only thing to be farther enquired into is *how far* this likeness of signification may be supposed to prevail in the divine or Christian intendment of it.

And here in the first place it is easie to observe, that the word *Sacrament*, in the Christian intendment of it, did equally imply the thing, to which it was attributed to lay an *Obligation* upon him, that took it, to intend those things, to which it related. For besides that otherwise it could have had little affinity with the *Military Sacrament*, the principal design whereof was to lay an *Obligation*

gation upon those, that took it; The first time we find any mention made of a Christian Sacrament, we find mention also made † of the Christians *obliging themselves* by it, to the doing of those things, that are there remembred. It is no less easie to see, secondly, by the account we before gave of the Symbolizing of our Sacraments with the Military one, and particularly by a passage before remembred out of *Tertullian*, that the same word, in the Christian sense of it, did equally imply the things, to which it was attributed, to lay an Obligation upon those, that took them, to intend that warfare, to which Christianity called them. I add thirdly, as no less evident from the premises, the same words implying the things, to which it was attributed, to oblige the party, that took them, to be faithful to their General Christ, and who was the Captain, as well as the Author of our Spiritual warfare. As is evident, among other things, from *Tertullian's* making the divine Sacrament to be accompanied with a profession of our obedience

unto

† Plin. Epist.  
li. 10. ep. 97.

unto *Christ our Master*, and accordingly arguing from thence the unlawfulness of taking upon us the *Military* one, and so *answering to another Master* after him. I say Fourthly, that as the *Military* Sacrament did, among other things, oblige the party, that took it, to the avoiding of several things, which were inconsistent with the orderly management of an Army, and particularly to the avoiding of *theft*, and other such like *injustices*, as appears by the form of it in *Gellius* (r), so the word *Sacrament*, in the Christian intendment of it, did equally imply that, to which it was attributed, to oblige the persons, that took it, *not to commit Theft, or Robberies* \*, *or Adulteries, not to falsifie their trusts, or, when they were called upon to restore, to deny any thing that was committed to their custody.* I observe lastly, that as the *Military* Sacrament was attend with religious rites, yea received both its denomination, and a great deal of its force from them;

(r) Noct.  
Attic. li. 16.  
c. 4.

\* Plin. Ep. li. 10. ep. 97. *Adfirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpe suae, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, &c. seque Sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellatinegarent.*

so the word *Sacrament*, in the Christian intendment of it, was meant to denote the like Religious Rites, and the Obligation of those, that took the Sacrament, by them. Which is so true, that in *Tertullian* first, and afterwards in other Christian Writers, the word *Sacrament* came especially to be applied to the *ritual* part thereof, yea to such things, as had little of a *Sacrament* properly so called beside the ceremonies thereof.

Of what use these Observations may be, will then more clearly appear, when I proceed (as I mean to do in the following Discourse) from the signification of the word *Sacrament* to the unfolding of the *nature* of the *things* intended by it. The only use I shall make of them at present, is, that if we will consider the nature of a *Sacrament* in its full latitude, we ought to consider it as well with respect to *our selves*, and those Obligations it lays upon us, as with relation to *God*, and *Christ*, and those *Graces*, which it was intended, *on their part*, to *signifie*, or *convey* to the worthy receiver of it.

---



---

## PART II.

### *Of the Nature of a* SACRAMENT.

---

#### The Contents.

*A Sacrament shewn to be a Relative thing, more particularly such a Relative thing, as hath the relation of an outward, and visible sign of that, of which it is a Sacrament. That therefore assign'd as the Genus of a Sacrament, and enquiry thereupon made after those essential attributes, which difference it from other outward and visible signs. Which is endeavour'd to be evinc'd from the several things to which a Sacrament relates, the manner of its relation to each of them, and the foundation*

tion of that relation. The things, to which a Sacrament relates, shewn in the general to be Sacred, or Divine, more particularly, divine Graces, and humane Duties, that New Covenant, which connects them together, and that body of men, which is confederated by it. To the first of which a Sacrament relates in the nature of a sign, a means of conveyance, and a pledge; To the second in the nature of a simple sign, or declaration, and (by means of that Covenant, which it conciliates) as an Obligation to them; To the third in the nature of such a sign, as serves also to give being to, or renew it; And to the fourth, and last in the nature of a Discriminative sign, or badge, and as a means of bringing particular men into it, or continuing them in it. The foundation of all these relations shewn to be the Institution of Christ, as that again, not so much as delivered by him, as applied to those elements, in which they are subjected, by a declaration of the purport of the Institution, and by doing such other things to them, as either the general precepts

precepts of Christianity, or the more particular precepts of the institution oblige to the performance of. A brief recollection made of all the forementioned particulars, and the essential attributes of a Sacrament deduced from thence, and exemplified in several definitions of it.

**I** Have hitherto entreated of the signification of the word *Sacrament*, I have shewn what they meant by it, who first made use of it, and what they also intended, who first applied it to those *Christian Institutions*, which are now commonly known by that *name*. But because no names are so expressive of the nature of things, as to bring men to a clear, and perfect understanding of them: And because, though some names should be thought to be so expressive, yet we cannot well conceive so of this by any thing that hath hitherto appeared concerning the signification of it; Therefore to satisfy our selves yet more fully concerning the *nature* of the thing intended by it, we must take another course, and particularly by finding out

Question  
What  
meaneſt  
thou by this  
word Sacra-  
ment?

Answer.  
I mean an  
outward,  
and viſible  
ſign of an  
inward, and  
ſpiritual  
Grace  
given unto  
us, ordain-  
ed by Chriſt  
himſelf as a  
means,  
whereby we  
receive the  
ſame, and  
a pledge to  
aſſure us  
thereof.

out under what *head* of things it ought to be placed, and what are the *essential attributes* thereof: Whereof the former among the Learned hath the name of its *Genus*, the latter of the *specific difference* thereof.

(a) Eccl. Pol.  
li. 5. sect. 57.

It is the observation of the Judicious *Hooker* (a), where he entreats of the nature, and necessity of the *Sacraments*, that as *no one part of religion hath been more diversly interpreted, or disputed of, so that diversity hath especially arisen from the mixedness of their natures, and from that variety of properties, which flow from it.* Which therefore whilst they, who handled this Argument, have but imperfectly considered, they have not only taken up different notions of a *Sacrament*, but thought themselves obliged to combat those, who have assigned it other properties, than what they themselves had taken notice of. I find no reason to question the truth of that Observation of his, either as to the *variety* of mens conceits concerning a *Sacrament*, or that *mixt nature* of a *Sacrament*, to which he entitles the variety of the other. But neither  
the



the one, nor the other will hinder us from discovering, under what *head* of things to place it, which is that we are first of all to intend. For whether we consider a Sacrament, as to *Christ*, or to *our selves*, as a means in his hands to profit us, or in ours to declare our piety toward him; Whether again we consider it, in the hands of *Christ*, as a means whereby he *signifies*, and *seals* his own graces, or as a means whereby he *conveys*, as well as either *signifies*, or *seals* them; Yet still it will be found to be in the number of *relative* things, or such, whose very being consists in the respect they bear unto another: Because, whatever it may be in it self, yet it is not considered as such, but with respect to that *Grace* of *Christ*, which it so signifies, or seals, or exhibits, or with respect to that piety, which it is intended on our part to declare. But so the Scriptures themselves will oblige us to consider a Sacrament, as is evident from what they teach concerning Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, which are, if not the only, yet the most undoubted Sacraments  
of

of our Religion. For, agreeably thereto, they prompt us to consider the water of Baptism (b), not as *putting away the filth of the Flesh* (which is the proper consideration of water, as such) but as *washing us from* (c) *our sins*, and *purifying* those *consciences* (d), wherein they are; As, on the other side, the Bread, and Wine of the Lord's Supper, not as intended to *satisfie* (e) *our hunger*, but as (f) *the body, and blood of Christ*, or rather the *communication* (g) of it. For well may we look upon those things as *relative* ones, which we are not only forbidden to consider in their natural properties, but prompted to attribute to them the properties of others, yea to consider in the same notion with them. I say secondly, that as a Sacrament is a *relative* thing, and that therefore to be reputed as the remote *Genus* of it, so it is of the number of *those* relative ones, which are *signs*, or *representations* of what they so relate unto. As is evident in part from what we were before taught concerning the water of Baptism, and will be yet more, when I come to shew the

Analogy

(b) 1 Pet. 3.  
21.

(c) Act. 22.  
16.

(d) 1 Pet. 3.  
21.

(e) 1 Cor. 11.  
34.

(f) Matt. 26.  
26. &c.

(g) 1 Cor. 10.  
16.

Analogy there is between the elements of each Sacrament, and that, to which they do relate. For if the water of Baptism, (though not to be considered as to any proper purification, yet) is to be considered under the notion of a *Laver* <sup>(b)</sup>, and accordingly as *washing* <sup>(i)</sup> those who are sprinkled with it, from their sins, then ought it to be look'd upon under the notion of a *sign* of that, to which it doth so relate. Because whatever force the Baptismal water may have toward the doing away our sins, yet it cannot be supposed, because sin is no corporal spot, to wash us from them; And that term of *washing* therefore attributed to it upon the account of the Analogy there is between the property of water considered in its own nature, and that of the same water as consecrated into a Sacrament. Which will consequently make the water of Baptism, (and, by proportion thereto, the elements of other Sacraments) not only to have a relation to something of another nature, but also to be a *sign*, or representation of it. I say nothing at present of a Sacrament's being

(b) Tit. 3. 5.

(i) Act. 22. 16.

being a *means of conveying* something to us, as well as a *sign* of it, and a *pledge to assure* us of it, as well as either; Partly, because that, which hath the nature of a *sign*, may also be made use of as a *means* of conveyance, and a pledge; And partly because the first intention of a Sacrament is to signify that, of which it is so, and that therefore by which it comes to do so, more commodiously assigned as the *Genus* of it. And I shall only add, that forasmuch as a *sign* is nothing else, than that, *which offers it self* to the *senses*, and *that*, of which it is a sign, *to the understanding*; Forasmuch therefore as it must be subjected in some sensible being, and (if it be also a formal sign, or that which represents the thing, of which it is so) in such a being, as is apparent to the eyes; Forasmuch lastly as Baptism, and the Lords Supper (which are, at least, the most considerable Sacraments of our Religion) are subjected in such sensible, yea visible beings; It cannot but be deemed reasonable, for the more clear declaring of the nature

ture

ture of a Sacrament, to represent it (as our *Catechism* doth) as an *outward, and visible* one.

That therefore being to be looked upon as the *Genus* of a Sacrament, or that general head of things, under which we are to conceive of it; Enquire we in the next place after the *essential attributes* thereof, and by which it will not only be more perfectly known what it is, but also be more clearly discriminated from those things, which are of the same general nature. Now as the essence of a relative thing consists in the relation it bears to another, and that relative thing therefore, whereof we speak, in the relation which it bears to that, of which it is a sign; So the essential attributes of a Sacrament cannot therefore be better learned, than by the knowledge of *those things*, to which it doth relate, the *manner* of its relation to them, and the *foundation* of it.

I. In the *General* I observe, that that, to which a Sacrament relates, must be something *Sacred*, or *Divine*, as both the term of *Sacrament*,

D

and

and the known nature of *Baptism*, and the Lord's Supper perswade. Which is the rather to be remarked, to distinguish it from such *signs*, as relate to *civil* matters, and particularly from the purely *military* Sacrament. For though even that had a relation to God, as whose name it did invoke, and to whose truth, and justice it did appeal; yet it refer'd to God rather as a *witness* of what it affirmed, than as to the *object* of it. For the object of a Military Sacrament was no other than the being faithful to those Generals, under which the Souldiers, that took that Sacrament, were.

I observe more particularly, that as that may be termed Sacred, or Divine, which hath God either for its principle, or object, and accordingly *flows from him to us*, or *passeth from us to him*; so a Sacrament relates both to the one, and the other, and ought to be looked upon as such. That a Sacrament relates to that, which *flows from God to us*, is a thing neither denyed, nor forgotten by any, and is evident from what the Scriptures teach concerning

cerning Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. Witness, for the former, their representing Baptism as the *laver* (k) of *Regeneration*, which is a thing we must have from God (l), and as a thing, by which we must obtain *forgiveness of sins* (m); which is as undoubtedly (n) another. For the latter, the same Scriptures requiring us to look upon the elements thereof, as that *body of Christ, which was* (o) *given for us*, and that blood which was shed for many (p), for the forgiveness of sins. For as these, and the former benefits are such as manifestly come from God, so they are alike manifestly represented as the consequents of the former Sacraments, and a Sacrament therefore, as such, to be looked upon as having a relation to that, which *flows from God to us*. The only difficulty, in my opinion, is to shew a Sacrament to relate equally to that, which *passeth from us to God*, and imports our duty, and service. But besides that the Antients apprehended no such difficulty in it, because giving it the title of a *Sacrament*, in respect of that *Obligation* \*, which it lays upon the

(k) Tit. 3. 5.

(l) Joh. 3. 5.

(m) Act. 2. 38.

(n) Expl. of the Lords Pr. *forgive us, &c.*

(o) Luk. 22.

19.

(p) Matt. 26.

28.

\* See the prec. Disc.

Receivers of it ; The Scriptures have said enough concerning Baptism, and the Lords Supper, to confirm us in the belief of this relation of them. Only because I would not too much anticipate my Discourse concerning those Sacraments, and, beside that, may have another occasion to speak more largely to this Argument, I will content my self at present with what *St. Peter* hath observ'd of Baptism (*q*), and which I have elsewhere (*r*) given a more particular account of. For if, as that Apostle insinuates, and hath accordingly been more largely confirmed, the *stipulation or answer of a good conscience toward God* be a considerable part of Baptism ; If it be so considerable a part of it, as to give it much of that *savingness* which it hath ; Then must that Sacrament be thought (because the stipulation of a good Conscience is of that nature) to relate to something, that must come from us, as well as to those things, which flow from God to us. It is true indeed that our Church, where it sets it self to define a Sacrament, takes no notice of this object of it ; Whether it were through a simple, inad-

(*q*) 1 Pet. 3.  
21.

(*r*) Explic.  
of the 1<sup>st</sup> rel.  
Quest. and  
Answers, &c.



inadvertency, and from which our Church doth no where pretend it self to be free, or (which I rather think) that it might give so much the more particular an account of that other, and more considerable object of it, even that inward, and Spiritual Grace, which it was intended to signify, and exhibit, and assure. For that our Church did not wholly forget this second object of a Sacrament (even that duty, and service of ours, which it doth equally signify, and prompt us to declare) is evident from its before minding the Catechumen of his Baptifmal vow (*f*), and from the declaration it elfewhere (*t*) makes; that they who are to be baptized must also *for their parts* promise the renouncing of the Devil, and his works, and both Faith and Piety toward God: That, as it shews her to have looked upon Baptifm as a *federal rite*, or ceremony, fo that she equally believed it to relate to our duty, and service, as well as to those divine benefits, we receive from the Author of it. Let it remain therefore for an undoubted truth, and the acknowledged Do-

(*f*) Prelim. Quest. and Answ. of the Cat.

(*t*) Office of Publ. Baptr.

ctrine of our Church, that a Sacrament relates as well to what is to *pass from us to God*, as to what is to *come from God to us*, and that accordingly it may be so far forth defined, such an outward, and visible sign, whereby we make a declaration of our piety toward God, as Mr. Calvin (u) hath very well observed.

(u) Instit. li.  
4. c. 14. §. 1.

I may not forget to add, for the farther clearing of this head, that as a Sacrament relates first, and chiefly to that, which *passeth from God to us*; so we are to conceive of that, to which it so relates, under the notion of a *Grace given unto us*, yea of an *inward, and spiritual one*. That we ought to conceive of it under the notion of a *grace given unto us*, is evident from those Texts, which I but now made use of to shew, that a Sacrament relates to *that* which *passeth from God to us*. For instancing in such things, as have the nature of *benefits*, and, so far forth therefore, are to be looked upon as *Graces, or Favours*, instancing moreover in such benefits, as are manifestly *the issues of the Divine Goodness*, yea which the Scripture expressly affirms

firms to be *given* to us by him (for so it doth as to that *(w)* *Body of* *(w)* Luk. 22. *Christ*, which is the foundation of them all) they must consequently oblige us to conceive of that, to which a Sacrament relates, as a *Grace given unto us*. But neither will there be less evidence from thence, if those Texts be well considered, that that *Grace*, to which a Sacrament relates, *is an inward and Spiritual one*. For as our Church means no other by an *inward and Spiritual Grace*, than that which conduceth in an especial manner to the welfare of our inward man, or Spirit, (as is evident from its making the *Body and Blood of Christ* the inward, and Spiritual Grace of the Lords Supper, and which it cannot be in any other sense, than that it hath such an effect upon us) so the Texts before alledged attribute such Graces to the Sacraments, as are, in that sense at least, *inward and Spiritual ones*: Witness their attributing to them the Graces of *regeneration, and forgiveness*, which are as it were the formal causes of our welfare, and the grace of *Christs Body, and Blood*,

D 4                      which

which is the meritorious cause thereof, and under God, and by his acceptance, in the place of an Efficient also.

I observe farther, that as a Sacrament relates to such things, as have the nature of divine *Graces*, or *humane duties*; so those graces, and duties being parts of the *New Covenant*, and receiving all their force from it, a Sacrament must consequently relate to that *New Covenant*, to which they do belong, and from which they receive all their force. Of which yet if there remain any doubt, it will not be difficult to clear it from what the Scripture assures us concerning Baptism, and the Lords Supper; St. Peter (x) representing the former under the notion of a *Stipulation*, or *Contract*, as our Saviour the Cup of the other (y) as the *New Covenant in his Blood for the remission of those sins*, for which it was shed. For that that is in truth the meaning of the words *καινη διαθηκη*, and not (as we usually render it) the *New Testament* in it, is not only evident from the word *διαθηκη* being alway so used by the *Greek Translatours* of the Old Testament, and

(x) 1 Pet. 3.

21.

(y) Luk. 22.

20.

Matt. 26. 28.

and whom the Writers of the New Testament generally follow, but from the opposition, which the Scriptures of both Testaments (2) make between the *καινή διαθήκη*, and the *παλαιά* even where \* there is the greatest appearance of its being to be translated a *Testament*. For the *παλαιά διαθήκη* being certainly a *Covenant*, and accordingly expressed by the *Hebrews*, by the word *ברית*, which is never used in any other sense, it is but reasonable to believe, that that *καινή διαθήκη*, which is opposed to it, is of the same nature: Because as it hath the same word to express it, and is therefore in reason to be looked upon as so far the same; so it would otherwise be different from the *Old* as to its general nature, as well as particular quality, which the sole mention of its *newness* forbids us to believe; Oppositions (like exceptions from a general rule) supposing an identity there, where no opposition is taken notice of. And indeed, though the word *διαθήκη* may seem in one place to require a different rendering, even there †, where mention is made of

(2) Jer. 3, 31.

&amp;c.

Heb. 8.8, &amp;c.

\* Heb. 9. 15-

18.

† Heb. 9. 17.

its

its being of no force till he, by whom it was made, was dead; Yet as even that did not hinder our Translatours from rendering it a *Covenant* both in the foregoing \*, and following (a) Chapters, so that place will not only admit of the notion of a *Covenant*, but be found (all things considered) to require it of us. For with what sense first of all can our Saviour be said to be the *Mediatour of the New* (b) *Testament*, upon the sense of which expression the following periods do depend. *And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that, by means of death for the redemption of the Transgressions, that were under the first Testament, they, which are called, might receive the promise of an eternal inheritance.* For shall we say that Christ may be stiled the *Mediator of the New Testament*, because interposing himself between two persons, that concur to the making of it? But as a Testament is the Act of one, and not of more, and therefore admitteth not of any such mediation; so the New Testament is supposed to be the Act of Christ, and he therefore rather

\*—8. 9, &c.

(a) — 10.  
29.

(b) — 9.  
15.

ther the Maker, than the *Mediatour* of it. Shall we then say, that Christ is the Mediator of the New Testament, because interposing between the maker of that Testament, and those who are the Legatees in it? But by this means God the Father shall become the Testator, which, if death be required to make him such, he can by no means be. Shall we say lastly, that Christ may be looked upon as a Mediator of the New Testament, because by means of that Testament of his taking up the difference between God, and Man? But that is rather to make him a Mediator *by a Testament*, than of *one*, which Christ is here affirmed to be. So difficult will it be found to make any tolerable sense of those words, if we understand them (as our Translators prompt us) of the *Mediator of a Testament*: Whereas, if we understand them of the *Mediator of a Covenant*, the sense will be clear, and plain; Because as there are two parties required to the making of a Covenant, and such who do, for the most part, need a Mediator to bring them to it, so God, and  
Man

Man are manifestly the Parties of the New Covenant, and brought to enter into it by the mediation of Christ. If it be also said, as it is, that the Mediator of the New Covenant brings the Parties concerned to it *by his death*, it is no more than will be found to be agreeable to the *Eastern* mode of making Covenants, and particularly to the manner of making that Covenant, which was of old between God, and the Israelites. For as that Covenant (and indeed all the kindness that passed between them) was brought about by the mediation of Sacrifices (c), and the blood of those Sacrifices therefore stiled *the blood of the Covenant* (d), so Christ, by the *blood* (e) of his Cross brought about this New Covenant between God, and us, and so, as the *Author to the Hebrews* speaks, became the *Mediator* of it. If it be said yet farther, that Christ became the Mediator of the New Covenant, *that they, who were called might receive the promise of an eternal inheritance*; That also will be found to be as agreeable to the notion of a Covenant, as it is to that of a Testament: Because,

(c) Exo. 24.

5.

(d) — 8.

(e) Col. 1. 19.



cause, as an inheritance may pass by other means beside that of a Testament, so the Children of *Israel* came to the inheritance of the Land of *Canaan* by a Covenant (f) between God, and their Progenitor *Abraham*, yea by such a Covenant, as was conciliated by the mediation (g) of a Sacrifice. That therefore being the sense of those words of the Apostle, and so, as I think, evinced to be by no contemptible proofs, it will be but reasonable to give a like sense to the following ones (h), because but a proof of the former, if it may be made appear, that they are capable of it. Which that they are, will appear from the Translation I shall now subjoyn, and which, if it be duly considered, will be found to be no forced one. For \* where a Covenant is, there must of necessity [even by that necessity which arose from the Antient mode of making Covenants] be the death of that Mediator, that made it. For a Covenant becomes firm after those Media-

(f) Gen. 15.  
7, 8, 18.

(g) Gen. 15.  
9.

(h) Heb. 9,  
16, 17, 18.

\* Ὅτι ὅπου ἔστι  
διαθήκη θάνατος ἀνάγκη φέρειται  
τὸ διαδέμενον.  
Διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βε-

βαία, ἐπὶ μὴποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῆ ὁ διαδέμενος ὅθεν ἐδ' ἢ πρῶτον χρεῖς αἱματός συγκαίνισται, &c.

tors,

tors, that made it, are dead, for it is never of force, whilst he, who so makes it, lives. Whereupon neither the first Covenant was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the Law, he took the blood of Calves, and of Goats with water, and scarlet Wool, and Hyssop, and sprinkled both the Book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the Covenant (i), which God hath enjoined unto you. That I render the words *δαίνατον τῆς διαδεξιῶν*, the death of the Mediator, that makes the Covenant, is because the Apostle speaks in the verse before of him, who makes the Covenant, not as a Party, but as a Mediator, and what is here said therefore of the Maker of a Covenant to be understood of such a Maker of it. That I render those words *διαδίκην ἣν ἔτι νεκροῖς βεβαία*, for a Covenant becomes firm, after those Mediators, who made it, are dead, is because those words are intended as a confirmation of the former ones, and so in reason to be understood of the death of the same Mediators. In fine, that I render the words *ἐπι*

*μνήποτε*

(i) Exo. 24.  
8.

*μὴ ποτε ἰχθῆι, ὅτε ᾧ ὁ διαθέμενος, for it is never of force, whilst he, who so makes it, lives, is because those words, as the former, are a continuation, and confirmation of the foregoing Argument, and so still to be understood with reference to the same Mediator. All which things I have laid together, not so much out of a desire of being thought the Author of a new Interpretation (from which no man is more averse, where there is not some kind of necessity for it) but to clear up an acknowledged, and important truth, and which the Text, I have so long insisted upon, hath helped, more than any thing, to obscure. For as there is nothing more certain from the Scripture, nor more attested to by our own Translators, than that the dispensation of the Gospel ought to be looked upon under the notion of a Covenant; As there is nothing, in like manner, of more importance to us to know, and consider, because it will prompt us to the doing of our part in the Covenant, if we mean that God should do his; so, setting aside this Text of the Hebrews, there is not one, where*

where this *διαθήκη* is mentioned, which will not as commodiously, or more be interpreted of a *Covenant*, than it can be thought to be of a *Testament*. Only, if some men swayed by their former prejudices, or by the *Latins* giving the *Codex* of the *Old*,

and *New Law* the title of the *Old*, and *New Testament* † (though they also give them the more general title of *Instrumenta* \*.) But if some men, I say, swayed by the one, or the other, think fit to continue to the former Text, and some others the notion of a *Testament*; As I shall not contend with them about

it, for the reverence I my self bear to the judgment of the Antients, so I shall ask, as is but reason, their acknowledging in like manner that the words *καινή διαθήκη* do equally import a *new Covenant*, and particularly, where mention is made of the *Cup* of the Lords Supper being the *blood* of that *διαθήκη*, or a *διαθήκη* in it. Particularly, because that old *διαθήκη*, to which it  
was

† Tertull. de jejun. c. 11. *Secundum utriusque Testamenti paraturam.*

\* Idem Apol. c. 19. *Primum Instrumentis istis auctoritatem summa Antiquitas vindicat.* Ib. c. 21. *Sed quoniam edidimus antiquissimis Judæorum Instrumentis sectam istam esse suffultam.* Adv. Marc. li. 1. c. 13. *Quantas autem foveas in ista vel maxime epistola [ad Romanos nempe] Marcion fecerit auferendo quæ voluit, de nostri Instrumenti integritate parebit.*

was opposed, had the nature of a Covenant, and could not, unless very improperly, be stiled a *Testament*; And partly, because it was not only sealed with *blood*, but that *blood* also stiled the *blood of (k) the Covenant.* (k) Exo. 24. 8. For that is enough to perswade (especially, when we otherwise know, that the dispensation of the Gospel is undoubtedly a Covenant) that our Saviour, when he represented the *Cup* of his Last Supper as the *blood of the new Testament*, meant the *blood of the New Covenant*, and consequently that that Sacrament, and the other have a relation to it.

I will conclude what I have to say concerning those *things*, to which a Sacrament relates, when I have taken notice of its relating to that *body of men*, with whom this New Covenant is made, as well as to the Covenant it self. For that it doth so, we have the former instances of Baptism, and the Lords Supper to assure us, or rather what we learn from the Scriptures concerning them: St. *Paul* giving us to understand, that it is into that *body*, that we are

E                      baptized

(*l*) 1 Cor. 12. baptized (*l*), as, in like manner, that  
 though *we be many, yet we become one*  
 (*m*)—10. 17. bread, and that one body (*m*) by  
 partaking of the *bread* of the other  
 Sacrament.

II. It appearing from the premises, what those *things* are, to which a Sacrament relates, and the way therefore so far plained toward the discovery of the properties thereof, enquire we in the next place into the *nature* of that *relation*, which I have affirmed it to bear unto the other. For my more advantageous discovery whereof I will resume each of those *things*, to which it doth relate, and shew *what kind of relation* it beareth to them.

Now as the *first* of those things is an *inward and Spiritual Grace*, that is to say, such a one as conduceth in an especial manner to the welfare of our inward man, or spirit; so we shall find a Sacrament, as to it, to have the nature of a *sign*, or *visible representation* of it. A thing so acknowledged by all, by whom the Sacraments are acknowledged in any measure, that it will hardly be  
 worth

worth our while to insist upon it. It may suffice here to say, that as a *sign* is so much of the Essence of a Sacrament, that it is the very *Genus* of it; and must therefore be supposed to be *such*, as to all those things to which it relates; so we shall find the Sacraments of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper to represent even to our eyes those inward and spiritual graces, which are attributed to them. For thus the *water* of Baptism doth by that *cleansing* quality, which is natural to it; and which, as such, is a representation of that spiritual Grace, which *purgeth* (n) the *Conscience from dead works*, which are, as it were, the *filth* (o), and *pollution* of it. And thus too the Elements of the Lord's Supper do, as by other ways, and means, so by that which is done unto them; The *breaking* of the one serving to set forth the *breaking of Christs body* upon the Cross, as the pouring out of the other doth the *shedding* of his blood at those passages, which were made for it by the Nails, and Spear, that pierced him.

(n) Heb. 9. 14.

(o) 2 Cor. 7. 1.

But beside that a Sacrament hath

the relation of a *sign* to that inward, and spiritual Grace, which belongeth to it, it hath also the relation of *such* a sign, as is moreover an apt instrument to convey that grace, which is signified by it. I instance, for the proof hereof, in the Scriptures attributing such effects to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as are the immediate issues of those graces, which are signified by them. For if it attribute such effects to them, it must consequently intimate them to be the conveyers of those Graces, from whence they result, as which otherwise they could not be in a condition to produce. Now that the Scriptures attribute such effects to the Sacraments before remembred, as are the immediate issues of those graces, which are signified by them, will appear, as to *Baptism*, by their attributing to it a power of *washing away* (p) *the sins of men*. For whether we understand thereby the washing away their *guilt*, or washing away the *pollution* of them, we shall still find it to be the immediate issue of an inward, and spiritual Grace!;

(p) Acts 22.  
16.



Grace ; It being the blood of Jesus Christ (as the Scriptures (q) every where declare) that washeth us from sin in the former sense, and the sanctifying Graces of God's spirit (r), which *purifie us from it* in the other. If therefore the Sacrament of Baptism may be said so to *wash*, and *purifie*, it must be as it is an Instrument, whereby it conveys to us those graces, to which that purification doth belong. But so the same Scriptures do yet more expressly declare, as to that other Sacrament of our Religion, even the *Supper of the Lord* ; St. Paul telling us (s) of the *bread* of it, that it is the *Communion*, or *Communication of Christ's body*, as of the *Cup* that goes along with it, that it is the *Communion of his blood*. For what other can we well understand by that *expression* of his, than that they are an instrument, whereby God conveys, and we accordingly come to partake of that body, and blood of Christ, which is signified by them? This only would be added, for the clearer Explication of it, that when we represent the Sacrament as an instrument,

(q) Explic. of the Creed in the word Dead.

(r) Expl. of the Creed, in the words, I believe in the Holy Ghost,

(s) 1 Cor. 10. 16.

(t) Eccl. Pol.  
li. 5. sect. 57.

whereby God conveys to us that grace, which is signified by it, we do not mean thereby that it is a *natural* one, or such as contains that grace in it, as a Vessel doth liquor, or a cause its effect, but rather ( as the Judicious *Hooker* (t) speaks ) as a *moral* instrument thereof; That is to say, as such a one, to the use whereof God hath made a promise of his grace, and which accordingly he will accompany with the exhibition of the other.

I deny not indeed but there are, who are otherwise perswaded, and who accordingly either attribute a greater efficacy to a Sacrament, or deny even that, which we have attributed to it. Of the former sort are they, who not contented to affirm that a Sacrament is an instrument, whereby God conveys grace to the worthy receiver of it, do moreover represent it under the notion of a *Physical* one, yea of *such* a *Physical* one, as contains grace in it, as a cause doth its effect, and accordingly contributes by its own internal force to the producing of it, as well

as

as to the possessing us thereof. Even as a Chisel (for so they (u) explain themselves) contributes to the formation of a Statue, or as a Hatchet to that Bed, (w) which is shaped by it. But as it appears by *Aquinas* (x), who was it may be the first framer of it, that that conceit had its original from the fear of making a Sacrament to be nothing but a *bare sign* of grace, contrary to the opinion of the *Holy Fathers*; so nothing more therefore can be necessary toward the overthrowing of it, than to shew the groundlesness of that fear, which the doctrine before deliver'd will sufficiently evince. For if it be but a *moral instrument*, whereby God conveys his own graces, it is certainly more than a *sign*, yea it may, in some sense, be said to be a cause, as well as the instrument thereof. For as they, who attribute to a Sacrament the *efficacy* of a *cause*, make it to be no farther a cause of grace, than that it produceth in the Soul a disposition (y) to receive it (by which means it is not so much the cause of grace, as of our recei-

(u) Hist. of  
Counc. of  
Trent li. 2.

(w) *Aquin.*  
*sum. Part. 3.*  
*Qu. 62. Art. 1.*  
(x) *Ibid.*

(y) Hist. of  
Counc. of  
Trent li. 2.

ving it) so such a kind of causality will be found to belong to it, though we make a Sacrament to be no other than a means whereby we attain it : Because it is so far forth by the force of a Sacrament, that grace comes to be in us, that without that we cannot ordinarily hope to attain it, nor fear to fail of it, where the other is duly receiv'd. The only difference as to this particular between the one, and the other opinion, is, that whereas the former makes a Sacrament to dispose us to the reception of Grace, as well as to convey it ; The latter supposeth that disposition already produc'd, and consequently leaves no place for the former operation. In that respect yet more agreeably to the Doctrine of the Scriptures, because not only pre-requiring certain qualifications (z) of those, that are to receive it, but assuring them, that if they come so qualifi'd, they shall not fail \* of that grace, which the Sacrament was intended to convey ; These and the like assertions, as they suppose the Soul to be before dispos'd, so leaving no place for

(z) Act. 8.

36, 37.

I Cor. 11. 20.

\* Mark. 16.

16.

Act. 2. 38.

for any other causality in a Sacrament, than its serving to us as a means of conveying that grace, which we are so disposed to receive. And indeed as it doth not appear by any thing that Schoolman hath alledg'd, that the Antients ever attributed any other causality to a Sacrament (for though St. *Augustine*, as he is quoted by him, affirms the power of God to work by a Sacrament, yet he doth not affirm it to do so as by a Physical instrument) As it appears farther, even from that Schoolman, that St. *Bernard* was of opinion, that *Grace is no otherwise conveyed by a Sacrament, than a Canonry in his time was by a Book, or a Bishoprick by Ring*; so there is no defect in the Instances of that *Father*, supposing a Book or a Ring to have been as much a means of conveying of those preferments, as we affirm a Sacrament to be of the divine Grace. For in that case the delivery of a Ring, or a Book, would not only have been a *sign*, whereby the delivery of those preferments was declar'd, as *Aquinas* argues in the place before, but

but a ceremony by which they were actually made over, and without which they could not have been Canonically invested in them. I conclude therefore, that if a Sacrament be an instrument of Grace, it is a moral one, and such as contributes no farther toward our partaking of it, than as it is a means to which God hath annex'd the promise of it, and which accordingly he will not fail (where the receiver is rightly dispos'd) to accompany with the exhibition of the other.

But because there are some, who are so far from owning a Sacrament to be a *physical* instrument of grace, that they will not so much as allow it to be a *moral one*; And because such a conceit may tend as much to the depretiating of a Sacrament, as the other seems to tend to the overvaluing of it; Therefore consider we in the next place the pretensions of those, that entertain it, and the strength, or rather weakness of those pretensions. There are who have thought (and it were to be wish'd that many more did not, who do  
not

not perhaps speak it out) that a Sacrament, as to this particular is a bare sign of the Divine Grace, and accordingly intended by God, only to awaken mens minds to conceive it, and their hearts to the embracing of it. What induced them so to opine, I am not able to say, unless it were, on the one hand an Universal acknowledgment of its being a sign; and a fear, on the other, lest if they made it any thing more, they should approach too near to those excesses, into which the former had cast themselves. But as it is a very ill way of choosing opinions in Religion by the distance, which they bear to the excesses of other men; so the fondness of this cannot better be made appear, than by those glorious effects, which are attributed to a Sacrament, and which, in strictness of speech, are the proper, and immediate issues of that which is signified by it. For that which is only a *sign* being no way capable of producing such effects, nor therefore with any reason of having such effects attributed to it, we are in reason, where the  
thing

thing will bear it, to conceive it under such a notion, as will make those effects yet more proper to it. Which we shall then, and then only do, when we make it such a sign, whereby (as was before said) God conveys to us that Grace, by which those effects are produc'd. Only as there are, who think all this may be salv'd, by making a Sacrament a *seal*, as well as a *sign* of Grace, or rather a seal of that *New Covenant*, by which we are intituled to it; so it may not therefore be amiss to examine that pretension also, and enquire into the validity thereof. What relation a Sacrament bears to the *New Covenant*, and how far the notion of a seal is competible to it, shall be examin'd in another place, and I will not therefore at present engage my self in that dispute. But I shall not stick to affirm, that how legitimate soever that notion of a Sacrament may be, yet it is no adequate one; As will appear in part from the insufficiency of those grounds upon which it is built, and in part also from the nature of that *Covenant*,  
whereof



whereof they speak, and of which they represent it as a seal. For the evidencing the former whereof we are to know, that as the ground upon which it is built is a passage of *St. Paul* (a), where he represents the *Circumcision of Abraham* as a seal of that *righteousness of faith, which he had yet being uncircumcis'd*; so that Text, if it be well examin'd, will not be found to be a sufficient proof of that, for which it is alledg'd. For not to require those that urge that Text (which yet they seldom do) to make it appear that the *Christian Sacraments* are of the same nature with *Circumcision*, and consequently that what is said concerning *Circumcision* ought to be alike understood of the other; Neither is what is there affirm'd concerning *Circumcision* affirm'd concerning *Circumcision in the general*, but only of the *Circumcision of Abraham*, neither is it affirm'd concerning his, that it was a seal of that *Covenant*, to which it did more immediately relate, but of that *righteousness, which he had before he enter'd into it*. Things, which  
if

(a) Rom. 4. 11.

if duly consider'd, will render that testimony perfectly ineffectual, as to what it is designed to establish. For as if *Abraham's* case were different from that of other Circumcised persons, what may have been to him a seal of the righteousness of Faith, may not yet have been such to them; so that *Abraham's* case was so far different from that of the generality of Circumcised persons, may appear from his having *before* had that righteousness of Faith, which the other, because Infants, could not be supposed to have had, or, at least, not till they had it by the sign of Circumcision. And indeed, whosoever shall consider what the Apostles design in that place is, even to shew that the righteousness of Faith is not annexed to Circumcision, because *Abraham* had it before he was Circumcised, must consequently believe that when he afterwards makes that Circumcision of his a seal of that righteousness in him, his meaning was only to say, that it was a testimony from God to him, and others, that he allowed of the former righteousness,

ness,

ness, as which if he had not done, he would not thus have entred with him into that other Covenant, of which Circumcision was a sign. By which way of arguing, what is here said concerning Circumcisions being a *seal*, must not be understood of it, as it was in it self, and so in a notion common to all that receiv'd it, but with respect to that righteousness of *Abraham's*, which it followed after in time, and which it could not but be look'd upon as some Confirmation from God of, because a sign of that New Covenant which God then enter'd into with him. As for that New Covenant, or any righteousness of Faith accruing to *Abraham* by it; This *St. Paul* is so far from affirming his Circumcision to have been a seal of, that he may seem rather to intimate, that it had no such relation to it: Because affirming it to have been a seal of that righteousness, which he had before it, and which therefore he derived not from the Covenant of Circumcision, or was under any necessity of having it seal'd to him by the sign of it. I conclude

clude therefore, that how true soever it may be, that a Christian Sacrament is a seal of the New Covenant; Yet the Text before mention'd conferrs not at all to the proving of it, and much less toward the shewing, that it hath no other relation than that of a *seal* either to that Covenant, or the graces of it. But beside that the single notion of a seal, how plausible soever it may appear, hath no countenance from that Text, which is usually produced for it; It will be found to have as little from the nature of that Covenant, of which it is represented as a seal. For that Covenant importing as well the conferring of present benefits, as a promise of future ones, it must consequently if it be transacted by any visible ceremony, make use of that ceremony to convey those present benefits, as well as to ascertain the exhibition of future ones; The former whereof a seal being no way proper for, or at least not in the usual notion of it, we are in reason to give the respective Sacraments of that Covenant another, and a more  
 esse

effectual notion, even that of a *means*, whereby Christ; who is the Author of them, conveys his graces to mankind.

One only relation there is besides, which a Sacrament bears to the Divine Grace, even that of a *pledge to assure us thereof* (as our *Catechism* expresseth it) or (as the *25th Article* of our Church hath it) a *certain sure witness of it*. A relation, which stands sufficiently confirm'd by the *imperceptibleness* of the Divine Grace in it self, and the *aptness of a Sacrament* to manifest its approaches to us: For as the *imperceptibleness* of the Divine Grace in it self makes it but necessary, for the comfort of mankind, to have its approaches manifested to them by some other ways, and means; so a Sacrament as before describ'd, is an apt means to notifie it to us, yea assure us of the approaches of it: Partly, because a means to which God hath annexed the exhibition of his grace, and partly because such a means, as is apparent to mens senses, and which therefore whilst they are so assured of, they can as

little doubt of that Grace, which by the Decree of God is annexed to it.

Of the relation a Sacrament bears to the *Divine Grace* I have spoken hitherto, and shewn what *kind*, or kinds of relation it beareth to it; I come now, according to the method before laid down, to entreat of its relation to *our selves*, and of that *piety*, and *service*, which we owe to the giver of it. For the understanding whereof we are to know, that as a Sacrament is undoubtedly a sign of that, of which it is such, so if it hath a relation to our piety (as I have before shewn it to have, and as the very *title* of a *Sacrament*, in the *Original* notion of it, obligeth us to conceive) it must be look'd upon as such a sign, whereby we may make a *declaration of that piety of ours*, as was before observ'd out of *Mr. Calvin*. But so we do in Baptism, as by other ways, and means, so especially by our receipt of it, as a mark of our present acknowledgment of those *Divine Persons*, into whose names we are baptized,  
and

and a resolution for ever after to keep a good Conscience to them: In the Eucharist, by the grateful commemoration we there make of the death of Christ, by a declaration of our intimate union with those, who partake with us thereof, and a resolvedness to maintain it by all the offices of love, and kindness. Which things I do now only mention, because I must insist upon them more largely elsewhere, and whither it will be more proper to deferr the particular explication of them. Only as a *Sacrament* appears to have receiv'd its *Name* from the obligation it layes upon us to the performance of religious duties; so I cannot forbear to add, that as it is a declaration of that piety we owe to God, so it is also an obligation to the continuance of it: Because (as I shall afterwards shew) it serves to conciliate, or renew that *New Covenant*, by which we are obliged to them.

From that *second* thing, to which a Sacrament relates, pass we to the *third*, even that *New Covenant*, in which both the former are founded,

and to which I shall not stick to affirm: *First*, that a Sacrament hath the relation of a *sign*, because at once representing the concernments of each party, what God obligeth himself to conferr, and what we make profession of performing. But neither shall I stick to affirm, that it hath *moreover* the relation of *such* a sign, whereby the parties concern'd declare their *consent* to it, and so make that, which was before but in a disposition, to become a *Covenant*, or, at most, but in a weak, and tottering condition, to become actually, and firmly such. Which if any man shall give the title of a *Seal* unto, I for my part shall not be at all displeas'd, because *seals* were sometime (b) made use of, for the declaration of such a consent. But I have myself avoided to make use of the expression, because there may be some Ambiguity in it; And because they, who have lately employ'd it, seem to look upon it as a thing, which rather adds strength to mens faith concerning it, than to the Covenant it self, and much less doth either give being

(b) Neh. 9.  
38.



ing to it, or renew it. Whereas *Baptism*, in my opinion, is that, which first strikes the Covenant between God, and man, and the Eucharist, that which continues, or renews it after it hath been shatter'd by our miscarriages; As is evident, as to the *former*, by its being the means of (c) *making Disciples*, and the *laver of our* (d) *new birth*, and, as to the latter, by our Saviour's entitling it the *New Covenant* (e) *in his blood*, and *remitting* men to it for that *remission of* (f) *sin*, which had been made over to them by the other. This I take to be the true relation of a Sacrament to the *New Covenant*, and so I shall continue to do, till I come to be better enlightned in it. For which cause I shall only add, that as the consent, we now speak of, is in a Sacrament declar'd by both parties; so he, who administers it, is in that case in the place of God, and declares his consent to the Covenant; Because doing what he doth by vertue of that Commission (g), which empower'd the Apostles, and their Successors to *Baptize* all, that

(c) Matt. 28.

19.  
(d) Tit. 3. 5.(e) Luk. 22.  
20.(f) Matt. 26.  
28.(g) Matt. 28.  
19.

(h) 1 Cor. 4.  
7.

should offer themselves unto it, and made them the *dispensers* of that, and the other (h) *mysteries* of our Religion,

The *fourth* and *last thing*, to which I affirm'd a Sacrament to relate, is the *body of Christ*, even that *mystical* one, which is made up by those, that believe in him, and adore him. Now to this *Body* it relates, in the *general*, as a *discriminative sign* of the profession of it, and by which the several members thereof may both know, and be known by one another, and accordingly joyn in such *acts*, as God exacts of their body. For because God, who made men sociable Creatures, was willing they should worship him in society also, as for other reasons, so to make him an apt return (i) of praise for that blessing, which they receiv'd by God's disposing them to a sociable life; And because (as St. *Augustine* (k) speaks) *men cannot be associated into any Religious body*, nor indeed into any other, but by a *community of visible signs, and Sacraments* (of which, beside the thus confederating of men of all  
Reli-

(i) Expl. of  
the fourth  
Com. Part 1.

(k) Aug. contr.  
Faust. Mani-  
cha. li. 19. c.  
11.

Religions, we have a proof in men's general inability to judge of the profession of their Associates by any other way, than by such outward notes, or characters) therefore, I say, God, and Christ, when they meant to erect a Christian body, gave it such signs, and notes also; Partly, to give beginning to it, and the several members of it, and partly to continue them in those joynt Offices, and services, which they requir'd the performance of. The former whereof is done by the Sacrament of Baptism, the latter by the Sacrament of the Eucharist. And how much these two Sacraments conferr toward the keeping up the profession of Christianity, will appear, on the one hand, from those miserable *Christians*, who live under the *Turks*; and, on the other, from those much more miserable persons the *Quakers*, who live among our selves. For as the poor *Greeks*, by reason of the *ignorance of their Priests*, and the *unintelligibleness*, as well as the *huddling up* of their *Liturgies*, have little other means beside those Sacraments, and

other such symbolical rites to keep up the profession of Christianity among them (which yet, it may be, they are more tenacious of, than those who are better instructed among us, would be under the like circumstances) so those much more miserable persons the *Quakers*, having thrown off the visible signs of Christianity, have upon the matter come to throw off Christianity it self, and whatsoever it obligeth us either to believe, or do in order to our obtaining the salvation promised by it. If they have made a shift to rear, or keep up so much as their own *Profession*, it was owing in the beginning to that *Quaking*, which gave denomination to them, and, since that, to their *affected looks*, and *habits*, and behaviour, which are, if I may so speak, the *visible signs*, or *Sacraments* thereof. And, if once they fall off from these, as we see they begin to do, we shall soon find their profession to fail together with it, and to be buried in the same grave. But to return to that more *sacred body*, of which I but now entreated, and to which as I affirm'd

a Sacrament to have the relation of a general badge, or discriminative sign of the profession of it, so I must also to be a *means* of bringing particular men into it, or continuing them in the communion of it: It being into this body (as was before observ'd out of St. Paul) that all Christians are baptiz'd, and so therefore first entred by that Sacrament; And in that body too that they continue by the receipt of the other Sacrament, because it is, by their *partaking of the bread* of it, that the same St. Paul affirms, that they become that *one Bread, and Body*. For being members of that body by the former Sacrament, they cannot otherwise be said to make it up by the partaking of the latter, than as that may serve to keep them within the communion of it.

III. An account being thus given of the *things*, to which a Sacrament relates, together with the *nature of that relation* it beareth to them; It remains that I enquire what the *foundation* of that relation is, which is the only thing farther to be known toward

toward the discovery of the properties of a Sacrament. For the understanding whereof we are to know, that as the relation, whereof we speak, is of different sorts, to wit the relation of a *sign*, of a *means of conveyance*, and of a *pledge* (for such I have shewn a Sacrament to be, as to that grace of God, to which it principally refers) so it may have different foundations, agreeably to that diversity, which I have said to be in the nature of the relation. For, as a *sign*, it is founded in part in the *resemblance*, which it bears to the things signified by it (for so all signs of *representation* are) and in part also in the *Institution* of him, whose the Sacrament is: Because as the former resemblance is not so apparent, as by its own force to have suggested to us the things signified by it, so it could not without his institution, whose the Sacrament is, have laid any obligation upon us to consider it in that relation of it. I say not the same concerning that relation of a Sacrament, whereby it becomes a *means of conveying* to us the  
 Divine

Divine grace, or a pledge to assure us thereof : Because each of these relations is founded *simply*, and *only* in the *Institution* of him, whose the Sacrament is. For a Sacrament having no natural aptitude either to convey the Divine Grace to us, or to assure us, that if we receive that Sacrament, we shall receive the other also ; It must consequently (if it become such a *means*, or *pledge*) become so by the *Institution* of him, by whom it is suggested to us. But because I have said nothing hitherto, *whose* that *Institution* is, by virtue of which a Sacrament puts on the fore-mentioned relations ; And because it is alike certain, that whosoever's that *Institution* is, yet it produceth not those effects by its own immediate force, but by the intervention of some Act, or Acts of those, whom he hath intrusted with the dispensation of them ; Therefore, to satisfy our selves yet farther concerning the *foundation* of those relations, enquire we in the next place *whose* that *Institution* is, upon which they are founded, and *how* that *Institution* ought

ought to be *appli'd* to enable it to produce them.

As concerning the *Person*, whose that Institution is, little needs to be said, considering what the Scripture hath said concerning Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, which are the only clear Sacraments of our Religion. For Baptism, and the Lord's Supper being apparently *Christ's* own Institutions, and so declared to be by those Scriptures, which give an account of them; Whatsoever hath the relation of a Sacrament, must have him for its *Author*, or (as our Church hath expressed it) be *ordained* by him. Besides, a Sacrament, as such, being both a conveyer, and a pledge of *Grace*, the dispensation whereof is entrusted unto Christ (1); either that, which pretends to be a Sacrament, must have him for its Author, or it must not be look'd upon under that relation. And thus far we find even those of *Rome* to go, because not only representing *all the Sacraments of the New Law* as instituted by *Jesus Christ* our Lord, but pronouncing an *Anathema*

(1) Eph. 4, 7.  
— 15, 16.



nathema also (*m*) upon those, that shall deny it.

(*m*) Conc.  
Trid. Sess. 7.  
Can. 1. de  
Sac.

It being therefore not at all to be doubted, *whose* that *Institution* is, upon which the relations of a Sacrament are founded; enquire we in the next place *how* that institution ought to be appli'd, to enable it to produce those relations. Which must be first by a declaration of the purport thereof, and secondly by doing those things to the elements, which either the *general tenour of the Christian Religion*, or the *particular precepts of the Institution* prompt us to the performance of. That I represent the *first* of these as one of those things, which makes the Institution of Christ to become effectual toward the producing of the former relations, or (as it is more commonly expressed) toward the consecration of those Elements, which are to put them on, is partly upon the account of the necessity of such a declaration, and partly upon the account of the Commands of him, by whom the Sacraments were instituted. For a Sacrament being not so clear a representation of  
*that,*

*that*, of which it is so, as by its own force to suggest it to the minds of those, for whom it was intended; Being much less so clear a representation of it, as to invite those to reflect upon it, who are either slow of understanding, or otherwise indisposed to contemplate it, such as are the generality of men; It cannot but be thought necessary, even upon that account, to call in the assistance of such words, as may declare to those, that are concern'd, for what ends, and purposes it was appointed. Otherwise men may either look upon the whole as a purely civil action, or (if the Person that administers it, and other such like circumstances prompt them to conceive of it, as a religious one) yet fancy to themselves such ends, and purposes, as are either different from, or contrary to the true intendment of it. Agreeable hereto is the command of the Author of our respective Sacraments, as is evident from what he enjoyns concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper; His own express injunction concerning the former being,

ing, that his Disciples should baptize men *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, which could not be done without a *rehearsal* of those *names* at least; As concerning the latter, that they should do what they had seen, and heard him do, as oft as that Sacrament was administered, and therefore also make a verbal declaration concerning it. For though that be not so clear from those words of our Saviour, *Do this in remembrance of me*, I mean as they lie in St. Luke (n); yet will it be found to be so, if we take in the Comment of St. Paul (o), where he gives a like account of the Institution of it. For representing what was then said, and done as a prescription for future (p) Sacraments, as well as for that of Christ's *own immediate consecration*; Representing it moreover as such upon the account of what Christ then enjoyn'd concerning their doing the same things in remembrance of him, he must consequently (because he brings in our Saviour making a *verbal declaration* concerning the purport of that Sacra-

(n) Luk. 22.  
19.

(o) 1 Cor.  
11, 20. &c.

(p) — 23.  
25, 26.

Sacrament, and subjoyns the former injunction of it) be thought to represent it as our Saviour's mind, that they, who consecrated that Sacrament, should use the same declarations concerning it. But beside a *declaration of the purport of the Institution*, and which the Church hath generally kept so close to, as to make that declaration by the very *words (q) of the Institution*, it is no doubt alike necessary, if not more toward the producing of the former relations, to do those things to the Elements, which either the general tenour of Christianity, or the particular precepts of the Institution prompt us to the performance of. For if Prayer be so generally necessary toward the procuring of any favour, that it becomes such as to the obtaining of common, and ordinary ones; If it be so far necessary toward them, as to become such even to the blessing of our ordinary repast (r), though that be not without a natural aptitude to nourish, and sustain us; How much more may we think it to be necessary, as to the making of those

(q) Confit.  
Apost. li. 8. c.  
12.

(r) 1. Tim. 4.  
4. 5.

those elements, which are in no disposition to it, to become the conveyers of the Divine Grace to those, who are to partake of them. But so the perpetual practice of the Church will oblige us to believe, and act, as to the one, and other Sacrament, of our Religion. For though there be not any particular injunction concerning consecrating the water of Baptism, and I suppose because the necessity thereof was sufficiently known by what the Scripture hath said concerning the general necessity thereof; Yet as we find *Ananias* admonishing *St. Paul* (f) *to wash away his sins* by Baptism calling upon the name of the Lord, and which, no doubt, because he Baptiz'd him, the same *Ananias* went before him in; As we find farther by *Justin Martyr* (t), that they, who were to be baptiz'd, were admonished to *fast, and pray, the Brethren praying, and fasting for, and with them* (for these are sufficient proofs, that some sort of *Prayers* did alway precede it) so we find by those, who have given a more particular account of the Of-

(f) Act. 22;  
16.

(t) Apolog. 27

(u) Conſtit.  
Apoſt. lib. 7. c.  
43.  
Dionyf. A-  
reop. Eccl.  
Hier. c. 2.

ſices of the Church, that the Prieſt did pray particularly (u), that God would look down from Heaven, and ſanctifie that water, wherein they were to be Baptized by him. The caſe is yet more plain as to the Sacrament of the Eucharift, as ſhall be made appear, when I come to entreat purpoſely concerning it. And therefore I ſhall only add, that as the Inſtitution of our reſpective Sacraments cannot obtain its effect, without doing thoſe things to the Elements thereof, which the general tenour of Chriſtiani-ty obligeth us to perform, ſo much leſs without the doing of thoſe things, which *the particular* precepts of the Inſtitution oblige to the practice of. For the force of a Sacrament depending more immediately upon the Inſtitution of him, whoſe the Sacrament is, it muſt conſequently, as to the application of that Inſtitution, depend more upon the doing of thoſe things, which the particular precepts of the Inſtitution oblige to the practice of, than upon thoſe, which the more general, and therefore remoter precepts of Chriſtiani-ty oblige unto.

The

The consequence whereof, as to the Eucharist, will be, among other things, a necessity of giving God thanks for those gracious boons, which that Sacrament was intended both to convey, and assure. The result of the premises is this; A Sacrament, as such, is a relative thing, it is so in an especial manner as to the Divine Grace, as which it signifies, and conveys, and assures. But as those relations thereof are *found- ed*, rather in the institution of the Author of it, than in the vertue of those elements, in which they are subjected; so in *that* again, not so much as delivered by our Saviour, as applied to the elements by a declaration of the purport of it, and by such other Acts as the general tenour of Christianity, or the particular precepts of the Institution oblige those, who are the dispensers of a Sacrament, to do to the elements thereof.

I do not at all find the relations of a Sacrament in such Act, or Acts, as are requir'd of those, that partake of it; Yea though without such Act,

or Acts, they cannot partake of the Graces of it: Partly, because a Sacrament being an institution of Christ, it must rather depend upon his appointment, and the facts of those, who act in his behalf, than upon the disposition of such as are to partake of it; And partly, because a Sacrament, though not conveying, or assuring the Divine Grace to any, but the worthy Receivers of it, yet is as really and truly a Sacrament to those, who are otherwise dispos'd, as it is to the most worthy ones. As is evident among other things from St. Paul's affirming the unworthy receiver of the Eucharist to be *guilty of the Body (w), and Blood of Christ, and again to eat, and drink Damnation to himself, for not discerning (x) the Lord's Body.* For how come they to be *guilty of the Body, and Blood of Christ* by the meer reception of the elements, if those elements be not even to them a *Sacrament* of his Body, and Blood? Or how faulty for not *discerning* in them the Lord's Body, and Blood, if those elements, which they receive, have not the

(w) I Cor. II.  
27.

(x) -----29.



the relation of a *Sacrament* to them? Neither will it avail to say, that such persons may become *guilty* of *Christ's Body, and Blood*, because receiving not as they ought, those elements, which are the *signs* of them. For as it will follow from thence, that those elements, which they receive, are so far, at least, a *Sacrament* of *Christ's Body, and Blood*, I mean as that is a sign of them; so there is reason enough to believe from the way the *Apostle* takes to prove the foremention'd charge, that those elements were as really a *Sacrament* to them in all other respects, as they were in the notion of a *sign*: Because he founds that charge of his upon *Christ's* making those elements the *Sacrament* of his *Body, and Blood* (y), and which therefore he must suppose them to be as much to them, as they are to any person whatsoever. That which I conceive hath occasion'd men to be otherwise opinionated, was their conceiving of a *Sacrament*, not as a means *fitted* by *Christ* to convey, or assure the *Divine Grace*, and which accordingly,

(y) -----27;

where it is duly receiv'd, actually doth so ; but as a thing, which is not only in a disposition to it, but, where it is really a Sacrament, *infallibly* doth so to all, that partake of it. Which conceit, it may be, they were the more easily betray'd into by the Scriptures representing it rather as a thing, which actually *sanctifies*, and *saves*, than as a thing, which is only fitted for it. But as there might be ground enough for such *expressions*, as those, whether upon the account of the persons, whom it is so said to *sanctifie*, and *save*, or upon the account of there being enough in a Sacrament to do it, where the parties, that partake of it, are duly qualified for it ; so the Scripture hath sometimes so qualified its own assertions by making the due disposition of the party receiving it to be necessary to procure the other, that we cannot but look upon a Sacrament, rather as a thing fitted to produce such effects, than as actually, and infallibly producing them. And indeed, as there is therefore but reason to conceive so of a Sacrament, even as a

means

means fitted by God, and Christ to produce those effects, which are attributed to it; so, by thus stating it, a way is opened to distinguish between the *Efficacy of a Sacrament*, and of the *Receiver's faith*, and accordingly to assign each its proper interest in the procuring of those Graces, which are attributed to it. For by this means we shall make a *Sacrament*, with that blessing of God, which attends it, to be the sole conferrer, and assurer of those Graces, which is but agreeable to it as an *instrument in the hand of God*; And the *faith* of the party receiving only the receiver, and applier of the other, which is as agreeable to that *hand of man*. For as, if a Sacrament be a means fitted by God for the forementioned purposes, the conferring, and assuring of those Graces will belong to it, and that blessing of God, which doth accompany it; so nothing therefore will remain to the faith of the party receiving, but to receive, and apply what the other doth so conferr, and assure. I say, secondly, that as by this means a due

distinction will be made between the efficacy of a *Sacrament*, and that of the receiver's *faith*; so a way will be opened in like manner (without detracting, in the least, from the efficacy of a *Sacrament*) to return an answer to what is advanc'd, on the one hand, for the *opus operatum* of all *Sacraments*, and, on the other, for making the *elements* of the *Eucharist* to be *that very Body, and Blood* of Christ, which it was intended to convey. For whereas it is pretended (z), in the behalf of the former, and accordingly alledged as a proof of it, that the efficacy of a *Sacrament* depends upon the institution of God, and not upon the dignity of him, that administers it, or the faith of the receiver; I answer, that that is indeed true, and agreeable enough to our stating the nature of a *Sacrament*, but of no force at all to shew that *opus operatum*, whereof they speak. For as, if a *Sacrament* be a means fitted by Christ for the conferring of his Graces, the conferring of those Graces will belong wholly to it, and that blessing of God, which goes along with it; so

(z) Vid. Chemnit. Exam. Conc. Trid. Part. 2. in Can. 7, 8. de Sacram.

so if it be a means rather fitted for the conferring of them, than that, which actually, and infallibly doth, any otherwise than as it is receiv'd, and appli'd, as Christianity admonisheth, there will be a like necessity of the *opus operantis*, even of that faith, and repentance, which are requir'd in order to the reception of them. And it may not unfitly be illustrated by the natural quality of those elements, which are by Christ made use of for the Sacrament of his own Body, and Blood. For as of what force soever those elements may be either to sustain, or refresh us, yet they cannot be expected to do either, unless they be receiv'd, and well digested; so how well fitted soever by the Institution of God the same elements may be to conferr to higher purposes, yet there is as little reason to expect they should, unless they be applied by us, as he, who so instituted them, hath admonish'd. Inlike manner, where- as it is pretended \* from unworthy receivers of the *Eucharist* being *guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ*, that therefore those elements, which they

\* *Esth. Com.*  
*in locum.*

they do so receive, are *really* that Body, and Blood, and accordingly are actually partook of; That also is taken away by what we have before said concerning the Eucharists being a means fitted by Christ for the conveying of them: Because, if it be only such, there will be place for that guilt, yea though that Body, and Blood of Christ be not in it, nor receiv'd by those, who are partakers of the other; In as much as he offers a sufficient affront to them, who receives those elements unworthily, which were by God, and Christ intended, and fitted for the conveying of them. I may not omit to add, if it were only for that hint, which the former observation affords us, that we shall, by thus stating the nature of a Sacrament, imprint also in the minds of men a just apprehension of that guilt, which ariseth from an unworthy reception of it For as, if it be fitted by Christ to convey, or assure the Divine Grace, it must make those, that partake unworthily thereof, guilty of an equal affront to that Grace, which it is so fitted to convey, or assure;

sure; so if it be not so fitted, the crime will still be the less, by how much the less relation it hath to that Grace, which is pretended to be violated by the unworthy reception of it. In fine, by stating the nature of a Sacrament, as is before describ'd, we shall make our account thereof agree so much the more exactly with that, which our own Catechism presents us withall; That, though it represent a Sacrament as a means of Grace, and a pledge of it, yet representing it not as *actually*, and infallibly such, but only as ordained by God to be so, and which accordingly, in the event, may prove such, or not, as it shall be found to be receiv'd, and appli'd.

For the applying of all which to the business, that is now before us, even the making up of that *Definition*, which we have been hitherto making way to, I cannot but admonish, that a Sacrament referring to so many several things, and referring to them also with so many different relations, it will be hard, or rather impossible to furnish out any one definition

finition of it, which shall with any exactness answer to its several properties. For considering a Sacrament with respect to the *Divine Grace*, and to which of all others it seems more especially to relate; so it may, and ought to be defin'd to be such an outward, and visible sign thereof, as is moreover ordained, and fitted by Christ to be a means of conveying it to us, and a pledge to assure us thereof. Considering it again, with relation to *our own piety*, and to which no doubt it was also intended to administer; so it will be such an outward and visible sign thereof, as is by Christ ordained, and fitted for us to make a declaration of it by, and an obligation to the continuance of it. Considering it Thirdly, with relation to that *New Covenant*, by which the Divine Grace, and our piety are ty'd together; so it will be such an outward, and visible sign as is ordained, and fitted by the same Christ, for God, and Man to declare their consent unto it by, and either first enter into that Covenant by it, or to renew it. Considering it lastly, with respect



respect to *those*, who are joyn'd together in the same Covenant, and so connected to Christ, and to one another; so it will be such an outward, and visible sign, as is by Christ ordained, and fitted for a general badge of their common profession, and a means of bringing particular men into their Society, or continuing them in the Communion of it. Only if any man desire a more simple definition of it, and which though it will not answer to all the properties thereof, yet will at least answer the more especial ones; so it may not inconveniently be defin'd to be such an outward, and visible sign, as is ordained and fitted by Christ to signify, and convey, and assure the Divine Grace to us, and, on our part, to declare the duty we owe to God, and Christ, and oblige our selves to the continual practice of it.



---



---

## PART III.

A farther Explication of the Nature of a Sacrament, with a resolution of several Questions belonging thereunto, or depending more immediately upon it.

---

### The Contents.

*The Nature of a Sacrament brought again under consideration, and enquiry accordingly made concerning that inward and Spiritual Grace, to which it relates, the manner of its relation to it, and the foundation of that relation. This last more particularly insisted upon, and as it was before resolv'd to be the Institution*

*Institution of Christ, so a more ample account given thereupon of that Institution of his, and of those Commands, and Promises, whereof it doth consist. Those Commands again considered with reference to the sacramental Elements, before they put on that relation, or after they are invested with it. The former whereof are shewn in the general to enjoyn the setting them a part for that purpose, or Consecrating them, and enquiry thereupon made by whom they ought to be set apart, and whether their intention, or good disposition be requisite to give force unto it: The latter the Consecrators dispensing them as the Institutor thereof hath prescrib'd, and the peoples receiving them from them, with the Manner of it. Upon occasion whereof Enquiry is made, concerning the necessity of Sacraments, and in what sort, or degree they ought to be accounted such. A like particular account given of the Promises of the Institution, which are shewn in the general to assure Christ's making what is done both by the*  
*Conse-*

Consecrators; and Receivers to be available for those ends, for which they were enjoyn'd; More particularly his converting that into a Sacrament; which is by the former set apart to be so (and which how it is done is, upon that account, enquir'd into) and, where the receivers are rightly dispos'd, accompanying the dispensation of the Sacramental Elements with the Dispensation of the Divine Graces. An application of the whole to the business in hand, and Enquiry accordingly made, how the former Commands, and Promises contribute toward the Founding a Sacramental Relation, and how also to the efficacy of the elements, after that Relation is produced in them.

**N**OW though from what hath been said it be competently evident, what the Nature of a Sacrament is, and we thereby at liberty to go on to other considerations concerning it; Yet because there are some things in it, which may require a farther Explication, and others, which depend

H

more

Question.  
How many parts are there in a Sacrament?

Answer.  
Two; the outward visible sign; and the inward Spiritual Grace.

more immediately upon the due understanding of it, I purpose to go over the definition of it again, or, at least, over so much of it, as may require a farther Explication, or Help toward the clearing of the other.

In the general I observe, that as it appears by our own Catechism, and the definition before given, that a Sacrament consists of an outward, and visible Sign, and an inward Spiritual Grace; so that more general notion of it stands confirm'd to us by the suffrage of *Irenæus* (a), though by him delivered under another form: He representing the Eucharist, even after the Invocation of God hath past upon it, as consisting of two things, to wit, an *Earthly*, and a *Heavenly* one. And I shall only add, that they seem not to be over mindful of it, who make the Sign, or *Earthly* part of the Eucharist to vanish, as soon as the thing signified by it, or the *Heavenly* one approacheth: A Sign in the common understanding of it, together with that *relation* whereby it becomes so, and those accidents, wherein it is immediately founded,

(a) Adv. hæ. l. 4. c. 34.

founded, connoting the *Subject* of them both, and therefore not with reason to be predicated of that Sacrament, which hath no such *Subject* to uphold them.

But because there is otherwise no great Controversie concerning the general notion of a Sacrament, nor yet so far, concerning that particular one I before gave, as to its being an outward, and visible Sign of that, of which it is a Sacrament; Therefore pass we both from the one, and the other, to that *Heavenly* thing, to which it relates, the *manner* of its relation to it, and the foundation of that relation.

Now as the first of these hath been before defin'd to be an *inward*, and *Spiritual Grace*, as that again declar'd to be such a Grace, or favour of God, as conduceth in an especial manner to the welfare of our inward Man, or Spirit; so I must now add, for the farther Explication of it, that it is moreover such a Grace, as conduceth *immediately* to the welfare of it: Whether as purifying the soul from the filth of sin, and introducing the contrary

affections, or as delivering it from that guilt, which the filth of sin had brought upon it. A notion, which stands confirm'd to us, not only by the Doctrine of our own *Catechism*, but by the account the *Scripture* gives us both of Baptism and the Eucharist, and the confessions of the *Romanists* themselves. Witness for the *first*, its declaring the *inward*, and *Spiritual Grace* of Baptism to be a *death unto sin*, and a *new birth unto Righteousness*, as the *inward grace* of the Eucharist to be the *Body*, and *Blood of Christ*, and by which (as it afterward follows) our Souls are *strengthened*, and *refreshed*, as our bodies are by the outward elements thereof; Witness, for the *second*, its representing Baptism as a thing, which *sanctifies* (b), and *saves* (c), and both that (d), and the Eucharist (e) as things, which tend to the remission of Sins; Witness, for the *third*, their great Schoolman *Aquinas* (f) representing a Sacrament as a sign of such a Sacred thing, as procures the *sanctification* of us. Which is the rather to be noted, because of the use it will hereafter

(b) Eph. 5.

26.

(c) 1 Pet. 3.

21.

(d) Act. 2.

38.

(e) Matt. 26.

28.

(f) Sum. 3.

Part. quæst.

60. Art. 2.



hereafter be of toward the determining the *Number* of those things, which are to be accounted of as *Sacraments* of our Religion.

Concerning the *relation* a Sacrament bears to the object of it, and particularly to that Grace, to which it especially refers, I have nothing to add, and shall not therefore bring it again under consideration. I shall only observe, from what hath been before said concerning it, that it is an *instrument* of Grace, as well as a *pledge* of it, that it is a *moral* instrument thereof, and not a *physical* one, that it is *such* a moral instrument thereof, as is rather *apt* to convey, or produce it, than that which *actually*, and *infallibly* doth; The actual conveying of that Grace depending upon the due disposition of the party receiving it, and who (as *St. Paul* speaks) if he be not rightly qualified for it, will rather reap *Damnation* by it, than either the *Divine Graces*, or the rewards of them. Which things I have this second time made mention of, not because they were not before sufficiently clear'd, but because they

lay dispersedly in my former account of this *relation*, and so would have been less useful toward the forming a distinct conception of it.

That, which will especially require our second thoughts, is the *foundation* of that, and other the relations of a Sacrament; The which as I have affirm'd *in the general* to be the institution of Christ, so the farther consideration of that Institution will both lead us to a more distinct knowledge of the nature of a Sacrament, and inform us concerning the *necessity*, and *efficacy* thereof. Now as there are two things, which that Institution doth manifestly import, that is to say a *Command*, and a *Promise*; so that *Command* again respects the *elements* of a Sacrament, either as being *to put on* that relation, or as actually *invested with it*. In the former of these regards it commands the setting them apart for that purpose, but more especially (because that is the principal design of a Sacrament) for their becoming a means of conveying the Divine Graces to us. Which, as was before observ'd,

it either prescribes particular rules for, or remits men for them to the general precepts of Christianity, so far as they are applicable thereto. And I shall only add (because those rules were before declar'd) that, to make the elements put on the relation of a Sacrament, there is a necessity of applying that part of the Institution to them by the execution of those Commands, which it enjoyns: Because the setting them apart for that purpose is, by the Institution it self, put into the hands of men. But of what men, and how qualified, I have not as yet declar'd, and shall therefore now set my self to enquire.

And here in the first place it is easie to see, by what is deliver'd in the general concerning the *power of remitting sins*, or in particular concerning the *power of Baptism*, that the Separation or Consecration of the elements is the proper work of the Ministers of the Gospel, and ought accordingly to be left to them to perform: Because as both the one, and the other were by Christ committed to his Apostles, so none can there-

fore pretend to the power of either, but those who deriv'd it from them, which none but the Ministers of the Gospel have. It is no less easie to see secondly, that as the Separation, or Consecration of the elements is the proper work of the Ministers of the Gospel, even by the Institution of Christ; so it cannot therefore, ordinarily at least, be attempted without sin by others, because a deviation from his Institution. And thus far all, who acknowledge a Ministerial Function, are at an accord in this particular, and the farther prosecution thereof no way necessary to be intended. I say therefore thirdly, that as the Separation, or Consecration of the elements cannot, ordinarily at least, be attempted without sin by other than the Ministers of the Gospel; so there is reason enough to believe, even from thence, that those elements cannot ordinarily have the relation of a Sacrament by any others Consecration, than theirs. For beside that the Promise of Christ is not to be suppos'd to extend any farther, than those Commands; to which it is annexed,

annexed, are observ'd; Neither can we think he will vouchsafe his benediction to that Action, which without any necessity at all varies from his own Institution: This being to encourage men to go against his own Institution, which no wise Institutor can be suppos'd to give way to. All therefore, that can be suppos'd to admit of a dispute in this affair, is, whether in extraordinary Cases (and where a lawful Minister cannot be had) other Persons may take upon them to Consecrate, and Administer it; And whether, if they do so, what they do is so far valid, as to make that, which they pretend to Consecrate, and Administer, to have the relation of a Sacrament. But as it would be consider'd whether it were not equally advisible for such Persons to let alone altogether the Consecration, and Administration thereof; Because Christ may as well supply to men the want of the Sacraments themselves, as the defects of those, who pretend to Consecrate, and Administer them: As it would be considered farther, whether it  
were

were not much more advisable to do so, because he, who omits the Consecration, or Administration of a Sacrament, that belongs not properly to him, is certainly guilty of a far less error, than he who arrogates to himself that, which doth not appear to appertain unto him; so if a Sacrament so Consecrated, or Administred, be either lawful, or valid (as I will not be very forward to deny it, considering the Authorities *(b)* it hath for it) it must become so by the either expresse, or tacit allowance of those, to whom the Administration of it is regularly committed. For the Institutor of a Sacrament, and by whom alone it can become such, having put into their hands the preparation of it, I see not how any thing can become such, which is not either mediately, or immediately set apart by their Authority, and Ministry.

It appearing from the Premises, to whom the separation, or Consecration of the elements doth belong, and so far therefore also the producing of a sacramental relation in them; Enquire

*(b)* Vid. Tert. de Bapt.c. 7. & quæ annotavit Hookerius noster Eccl. Pol. l. 5. Sect. 62.

quire we in the next place how those persons ought to be farther qualified, to enable them to make that Separation, or Consecration; Which I shall not stick to affirm to be simply, and only by keeping, as to the outward work, to the Institution of our Saviour. For though much more may be requir'd of them, yea undoubtedly is, to make that Act of theirs available to their own welfare, and acceptance; Even the intending what they are about, not only with a present mind, but with a sound, and religious one; Yet cannot the like be supposed to be requir'd, to make that Act of theirs available toward the Consecrating of those elements into a Sacrament: Partly because if such an intention were requir'd in those, that Consecrate, no man could have any tolerable assurance of his receiving a valid Sacrament, because having no such assurance of their intention; And partly, because that Act of theirs is a *Ministerial Act*, and must not therefore depend for its force, upon the *personal* intentions or qualifications of those, that exercise it, but upon that

that *Authority*, from which it proceeds, and upon its serving the *ends*, and *intentions* of those principal Agents, to which it is appointed to minister. Which ends, and intentions if it can serve in this affair by an outward conformity to the rules of Christ's Institution, nothing more can be suppos'd to be requir'd either of it, or those, that exercise it, to give it that force, whereof we speak. That therefore would in the next place be enquir'd into, which accordingly I will now set my self to do.

For the clearing whereof we are first to know, that as of old the Priests under the Law were *ordained* \* by God for men in things pertaining to God, partly to offer up to him, in their names, Gifts, and Sacrifices for sin, and partly to convey from God to them

graces, and benefits; so we are, in like manner, to conceive of the Priests under the Gospel, as being not only the Ministers of God, and Christ, but

\* Heb. 1. 5. & Philo de special. leg Βέλεται γδ' αὐτὸν ὑ νόμῳ μείζον μείζοναί φύσεως, ἢ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἵνα διὰ μέσε πνεύματος ἀνθρώπων μὴ ἰλάσκωνται θεόν, θεὸς δὲ τὰς χάριτας ὀρέγῃ, καὶ χορηγῇ.



but appointed too, on the one hand, to dispense their *mysteries* (k), and *graces* to the Church, and, on the other hand, to offer up the *Churches Prayers*, and *Services* to them. From whence as it will follow, that those *principal Agents*, to which they minister, are *God*, and *Christ*, on the one hand, and *Christ's Church*, and *People* under the other; so that the end of the *former* is to convey, by their means, their own *graces*, and  *blessings*, of the *latter* to offer up those *Prayers*, and other *Services*, which are due from the Church to them. Those therefore being the *Principal Agents*, to which the *Evangelical Priesthood* ministers, and those their respective ends, and intentions; the next thing to be enquir'd into is, which of those *Principal Agents* it is, to which the *Evangelical Priesthood* ministers in those acts which respect the *Consecration* of a *Sacrament*. Which I shall not stick to affirm, from what was before said concerning those Acts, to be the *Church*, and *People of God*. For that, which the *Minister* doth toward the *Consecration* of a *Sacrament*, being

(k) 1 Cor. 4.  
1.

ing principally, at least, the offering up of Prayers and Praises, he must consequently (because those are the duties of the Church to God, and Christ) be thought to minister to the *Church* in them, and so have that for his *Principal Agent*. From whence as it will follow thirdly, that the end to which he is to serve, is the offering up, in the behalf of the Church, such Prayers, and Praises, as are by the Institution of Christ impos'd upon it (because that is the end of the Church in all such Administrations); so he shall sufficiently serve that end, who shall only rehearse such Prayers and Praises, wherever, or whatsoever his intention be: Because the Church may as well offer up its Prayers, and Praises by the voice of him, that intends them not, as by the voice of him, that doth. And I have been the more particular in the Explication of this affair, partly to make it farther evident, that the validity of a Sacrament depends not upon the intention of the Minister, but much more to shew from thence, that those acts, which are done by him toward the Consecration

cration of the Sacramental elements, do not, by the either absence, or perverseness of his intention, cease to be religious, and so incapable of inducing God to consider of them, or give force unto them: Because as those Acts are rather the Churches, than his (the Minister being in this affair but the Instrument thereof) so his want of Intention, and Devotion, may be abundantly supply'd by the others, and those Acts thereby become both Religious and valid.

From that Command, which respects the elements, before they put on the relation of a Sacrament, pass we on to that Command, which considers them as invested with it; Which again we shall find to have a double reference. For it may either concern *those, in special,* who have so set apart, or Consecrated them, or both *them* (if they are also to be the receivers of them) and *all others*, for whose sanctification they are intended. Upon the *former* of these it enjoyns the dispensing, or bestowing of what they have so Consecrated, as that too in such a manner, and with such solemnities,

nities, as the Institutor thereof hath prescrib'd. It enjoyns upon them farther, for their own souls health, to dispense them with a futable intention, and devotion of soul; As without which what they do cannot otherwise be profitable to themselves. But it doth not so injoyn that intention, and devotion, that what they dispense, shall, for the want thereof, be in like manner unprofitable to others: Because, as we already suppose the elements to have put on the relation of a Sacrament, and so far therefore to be in a capacity to profit those, to whom they are dispens'd; so it is Christ, and not the Minister, who must dispense the Graces of the Sacrament, and the effect of that Sacrament therefore depend, not upon the Minister's intention, and purpose, but upon the intention, and purpose of Christ, whose Instrument, and Minister he is. As will appear yet more clearly, when I come to consider the *Promises* of the Institution, the second thing, whereof I affirmed it to consist. Only, as that Command of it, which I am now entreating of, doth

doth as well respect those, for whose sanctification the Sacraments were intended, as those who are the Consecraters, and Dispensers of them; so I must therefore admonish first of all, that as that part of the Institution of Christ enjoyns upon his Ministers the dispensation of the Sacraments, so it must consequently enjoyn the receipt, or use of them by all that are capable thereof, as without which the former injunction would be vain. I say, secondly, that as it enjoyns upon all, that are capable thereof, the receipt, or use of the Sacraments; so it enjoyns their receipt, or use of them under the relation of Sacraments, and particularly (because that is the principal relation of a Sacrament) as a means appointed by Christ for the conveying of the Divine Graces. Which is so true as to those Sacraments, which are the only clear, and undoubted ones, and by which, if there be any such, the other are to be judg'd, that men are expressly call'd upon to be *Baptiz'd* (k) *for the remission of sins*, and as expressly admonish'd by our Saviour to take the elements of the Eucharist (l), as that *Body which was given*

I  
for

(k) Act. 2. 38.

(l) Matt. 26.  
26, &c.  
Luk. 22. 19.

for them, and as that Blood, which was shed for them, and others, for the same remission of sins. From whence as it will follow, that those Sacraments are of *necessary use*, as which both the *one*, and the *other injunction* oblige us to believe; so they are also *so necessary* by vertue of the former, that *they cannot be neglected* without sin, and by the latter, if not the former, that men *cannot hope for the graces of them*, where those Sacraments are in like manner *neglected*. For beside that every neglect of a Command is, as such, a sin against the imposer of it, and must consequently not only despoil us of his favour, but expose us also to his Wrath, and Vengeance; Beside that that neglect must be yet more sinful, and dangerous, which is a neglect of such a Command, as is enjoynd for the Subjects profit; He, who commands this, or that particular for such, or such an end, must thereby be presum'd to declare, that he will not give it in any other way, than that, which is prescribed by him: Because otherwise a gap would be open to the Violation of his Authority, which every wise Lawgiver must

must be suppos'd to provide against. Neither will it avail to say, that there are other *means*, beside Sacraments, for the attaining of the Divine Graces, and such as God hath promis'd to reward with the bestowing of them; Of which nature are our attendance to the *word*, and Prayer. For as it doth not appear, that these are any where represented as sufficient of themselves for that purpose, and therefore the Divine Graces not to be expected by them alone; so they can however be no farther represented as such, than as made use of by men out of a due regard to his Authority, and wisdom, by whom they are imposed on them: Which cannot be suppos'd to be there, where any one prescribed mean is neglected, because the same Authority, and Wisdom will lead to the observation of it. As little will it avail to say, that the Divine Graces have been sometime bestow'd without them, and the Sacraments therefore not to be accounted as necessary to the attaining of them. For as the question is not now, Whether Sacraments are so necessary, that the graces thereof can, in no case, be hop'd for without them, but

whether they can be hoped for, where the Sacraments are neglected; so that they are *so far* necessary will need no other proof, than the enjoying of Baptism to those, who may seem, if any, to have attain'd the graces thereof without it. For so we find St. Peter to have done as to *Cornelius* (m), and his company; Yea though *Cornelius* had before his Preaching, receiv'd a Divine approbation of his *Prayers*, and *Alms*, and, after that, that *gift of the Holy Ghost*, for the procuring whereof we find Baptism to have been especially (n) ordain'd. For well may we look upon that Sacrament as so far necessary to obtain the Divine Graces, the use whereof was commanded even to those men, who had in a great measure before attain'd them. The only thing, that seems to me to admit of any doubt, is whether Sacraments be so far necessary, that the Divine Graces cannot be had without them, or at least cannot with any assurance be expected by us. But as the single example of the Thief upon the Cross (to say nothing now of that of *Cornelius*) may suffice to perswade, that

(m) A&t. 10.  
48.

(n) A&t. 2. 38.



no Sacrament is so necessary, but that the Graces thereof may be had without it: As the benignity of the Divine nature, and those Graces God hath sometime given even to unbaptized persons, may serve in like manner to persuade men, that if that, or any other Sacrament be wanting without their fault, it shall be otherwise supplied to them; So I cannot forbear to say, that such persons have not the same Assurance with that, which Baptized persons have. Partly, because they have no promise to bottom their assurance on, and partly, because God, who may annex what conditions he pleaseth to his own favours, hath made those Sacraments, whereof we speak, the standing means of obtaining them. I will conclude what I have to say concerning that part of the Institution, which enjoyns the receipt, or use of the Sacraments, when I have admonished in the third place, that it requires our coming to it with certain *previous qualifications* in order to our receiving the benefit thereof. Which is so notorious as to Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and will hereafter be so largely insisted on, that I

shall content my self with the bare mention of it. All that I at present aim at, is to give a general account of what it enjoyns, and which having now in some measure done, I shall proceed to consider of what it *promiseth*, which is the *second* thing whereof I affirmed the Institution of a Sacrament to consist.

For the clearing whereof we are *first* to know, that though those *Promises*, whereof we speak, are not always so exprefs, as its *Commands* must be acknowledged to have been; Yet will it not be difficult for us to evince the being of *such* Promises, nor, after that, to shew *what things* it makes a promise of. For supposing, as we now may (because I have heretofore evinced it) that the Institution of Christ enjoyns the Administration, and use of the Sacraments for the bringing about those gracious purposes, which they have no natural aptness to produce, and we must also suppose it to make a promise of Christ's making them effectual for those purposes, for which they were so enjoyned by him. Because otherwise those *Commands* of his would give hope of such things, as were not likely to accrue by the obser-

observation of them, and so ( which is not to be suppos'd of the Commands of Christ ) prove delusory ones. Only as he, who instituted those Sacraments for our benefit, cannot well be thought to omit any thing, which may encourage our expectation of it; so we find both him, and his Apostles sometime to make express promises of those things, which the Sacraments were intended to convey. For thus after our Saviour had commanded the Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism to all, whom they could dispose to the reception of it, the more to encourage them to intend the doing of it, he makes a promise of being (o) with them in it, and consequently that their ministry, at least, should not fail of its intended effect in the Consecration, and Administration of it. In like manner, after St. Peter had call'd upon those to be Baptiz'd, whom God had stirr'd up by his precedent Preaching, to enquire after the means of Salvation; He doth not only insinuate their obtaining remission of sins by it, by calling upon them to be Baptiz'd in order

(o) Matt. 28. 19, 20.

(p) Act. 2.38.

der to it, but assure them also in expresse terms (p), which he could not have done without a promise from Christ, that, if they were so Baptiz'd, they should receive the *gift of the Holy Ghost*.

It appearing from the Premises, that the Institution of Christ is not without its promises, and such too, as are sometime deliver'd in expresse terms; Enquire we in the next place what those promises are, or rather what things they make a promise of. Which, in the *general*, will be found to be, Christ's making what is done both by Minister, and People, in obedience to his Commands, to be available to those ends, for which they were enjoyn'd. For neither otherwise could he have said, that he would be with the *former* in those Acts of theirs, and much less could St. *Peter* have assur'd to the latter the receiving of those Graces, which Baptism was intended to convey. But from thence it will follow more particularly, that the Institution of Christ makes a promise to the Minister, that he will convert that into a Sacrament, which is by him set apart to be so, and where  
the

the party, that is to receive it, is duly qualified for it, accompany his Dispensation of it with the Dispensation of the Divine Graces; To such of the People again, as receive the Sacrament as they ought, that they shall receive together with it, those Graces which it was intended to convey: Those being the ends, for which the former Acts were enjoy'd, and the Promise of Christ therefore supposed to assure, that, if those Acts be perform'd, they shall become available for them. It will follow lastly, that, as there is a promise of the things before remembred, answerably to the several Acts, which the Commanding part of the Institution enjoyns; so that Promise being the Promise of him, who hath power enough to accomplish it, and is of too much fidelity, and truth not to fulfill, what he may, it is as little to be doubted, but what he hath so promis'd he will not fail to accomplish, as often as what he enjoyns is perform'd. Which last particular I have the rather remark'd, because as the Commands of the Institution cannot make way

f)

for the blessings of a Sacrament, till they come to be fulfill'd by those, on whom they are impos'd; so neither can the promises thereof help us to them, till they come to be executed, and appli'd by him, whose those Promises are: A Promise, (because importing only a will to conferr a favour) requiring the reducing of that will to Act, in order to the availableness thereof.

An account being thus given of that *Institution* of Christ, which I have said to be the *foundation* of the relation of a Sacrament, it will not be difficult to shew first, how *that*, and *each part* thereof contribute to the founding of it. For as that Institution of Christ may be consider'd under a double notion, to wit either as *simply such*, or as *executed, and appli'd*; so the Institution of Christ, in the *former* notion of it, is the more *remote* foundation of it; in the *latter* the more *near*, and immediate. For it being by vertue of Christ's Command, as *such*, that the elements come to be set apart by men for the purpose of a Sacrament, and by vertue  
of

of his own Promise, that he himself gives them the relation of one; That Institution, which is made up of them, must, as such, be thought a *remote* foundation of it, because the foundation of those Acts, which are done by men, and Christ toward the producing of it. Again, it being more immediately by what is done by men, that the elements come to be so set apart, and by what is done, on the other side by Christ, that they come to have the relation of a Sacrament, the more *near*, and immediate foundation of it must be the same Institution not consider'd as such, but as executed, and appli'd by those, to whom it appertains. From whence as it will follow, that the Institution of Christ, and the several parts thereof contribute to the founding of this relation by that obedience, which is paid to its commands, and by that completion, which is given to its promises, because it is by those means that they are executed, and appli'd; so nothing more therefore can be requir'd toward the clearing of it, than to shew at once what those **Commands and Promises**

mises import, because that will let us know what obedience is due to the one, and what completion, or fulfilling to the other.

Of the *Commands* of the Institution I have already sufficiently entreated, and shall therefore need only briefly to recapitulate what I have said concerning them. Which, so far, as concerns our present purpose, may be done by saying, that they enjoyn in the *general* the Ministers setting apart the elements in order to their becoming a Sacrament, more *particularly* by imploring the blessing of God, and Christ upon them, or (as the Church hath us'd to express it) the *sanctification* of them. Which Commands, as they tend rather to prepare the elements to be a Sacrament, than to produce that relation in them (for he, who begs of another the doing of this, or that particular, shews the doing of that thing not to belong unto himself) so will make the Minister's compliance with, and execution of them to contribute no farther to the founding of that relation, than as that is, by the Institution of Christ, to make way for  
some



some other Act, or Acts, whereby that relation is to be produc'd.

From the *Commands* of the Institution therefore, and that obedience which is due to them, pass we to the Promises thereof, and of which also I have before given no contemptible account. For which cause I shall only observe here, that there is, among those Promises, a Promise from Christ to the Minister, that he will be with him in his ministration, and therefore also make what he doth, available for those ends, for which it was enjoyn'd; That he will consequently (because that is the end of his ministration in the Consecration of a Sacrament) make those elements to be a Sacrament, which were by the Minister set apart to be so; But by what way, and means, as I have not as yet taken upon me to shew, so I know not whether I ought to be over positive in defining. I shall only represent as a thing, which seems most probable to me, That as God *sanctifies* our ordinary repast by his own word (*q*), even by that word of *command*, by which he *made* the creatures to be (*r*) at first, and by which he

(*q*) 1 Tim. 4.  
5.

(*r*) Gen. 1. 3.  
&c.

(*f*) Heb. 1.3. he doth as yet *uphold* (*f*) them, so when the elements of a Sacrament are before prepar'd by Prayer, and such other means as Christ himself hath prescrib'd, the same God, or rather *Christ*, by his appointment, passeth his *word of power* upon them, and thereby commands them, not to become actually the conveyers of his Grace (for that requires *another* word of power, or rather his accompanying the Dispensation of them with the Dispensation of his Grace) but to be in a readiness to be so. By which means (as was before said) they are fitted for that gracious purpose, and accordingly, if they prove not effectual for it, it is not, because *they* were not before ordained and fitted for it, but because the *persons*, to whom those Sacramental elements are dispens'd, being not duly prepar'd for such a favour, He, who commanded the Sacramental elements to be in a readiness for it, doth not make use of them for it, nor accompany the Dispensation of them with the Dispensation of his Grace. This I take to be that *Act*, whereby the Institutor of the Christi-  
an

an Sacraments produceth in the elements thereof that Sacramental relation, whereof we speak; But as *whatever* the Act be, by which that relation is produc'd, most certain it is that it cannot be any Act of man, so it is evident from thence, and from the promises of the Institution, that it must be some *Act* of *Christ* in pursuance of them, and which whilst he doth so fulfill, he gives birth to that Sacramental relation, which the Act, or Acts of the Minister did only make way for, as that too by the sole force of *Christ's* Commands.

The elements being thus invested with the relation of a Sacrament, and so fitted, *in particular*, to convey the Divine Graces; It remains that the Minister dispense them to Gods People in that way and manner, which he hath prescrib'd, and that they accordingly receive them with those qualifications, which are by the same *Christ* required of them. As without the *former* whereof there can be no hope of the Ministers approving himself unto *Christ*, nor can the people, without *both*, expect to reap that benefit  
by

by them, which they were so fitted to convey. For the validity, and efficacy of Sacraments depending upon the good will of him, that instituted them, and not upon any vertue of their own, or the power of him that consecrates them, neither can men expect any benefit thereby, where there is not a due compliance with his *Laws*, by whom they were so instituted, and ordain'd. But as if those *Laws* be compli'd with, there can be no doubt of a happy issue, considering the Promises of Christ to the due Administration, and Reception of them; so that is enough to shew the *efficacy* thereof, where they are so administr'd, and receiv'd: There being no doubt of the efficacy of those things, which have the Promises of Christ to assure them, because no doubt at all of his fulfilling those Promises, and so giving efficacy to the other. And I shall only add, that as what is done by the Minister toward the producing of a Sacramental relation, doth rather make way for it, than actually produce it; (this being the proper work of the Institutor of a Sacrament in pursuance of his own Promises:)

mises :) So the like is to be said, as to the efficacy of the elements, after that relation is produced in them. For though those elements become not effectual for the ends, for which they were appointed, unless they be both dispensed, and received as they ought; yet doth that dispensation, and reception rather make way for, than give them their respective efficacy; It being *God* (*t*), or rather *Christ*, by his appointment (and not either the Minister, or our selves) *which saveth us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and the same Christ* (*u*), who *sanctifieth, and cleanseth his Church, by the washing of water through the word.* Which will consequently oblige us to look upon God, and Christ as the Authors of the efficacy of Sacraments, as well as of the Sacraments themselves, and accordingly depend upon them for it, and return them thanks, when we have obtained it.

(*t*) Tit. 3. 5.

(*u*) Eph. 5.  
26.



---



---

## PART IV.

### Of the *Jewish* Sacraments, and the *Number* of the *Chri-* *stian*.

---

#### The Contents.

*The Doctrine of the Sacraments drawn down to particulars, and enquiry first made concerning the Jewish Sacraments, and then concerning the Christian ones. As to the former whereof is shewn first, that there were indeed such Sacraments among them, and evidence made thereof, from their enjoying the same saving Graces; which our Sacraments pretend to convey; from their being furnished alike with external symbols to convey them, and those symbols*

## Of the Jewish Sacraments.

of God, and Christ's institution Secondly, that those Sacraments of theirs were either the extraordinary ones they had in their passage from Egypt to Canaan, as their Baptism in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and the Eucharist of Manna, and the water of the Rock, or the ordinary ones of Circumcision, and the Passover; Thirdly, That, though they were of the same general nature with the Christian, yet they differ'd from them, both as to the manner of their representing the Divine Graces, which was not so clear, and as to the measure of conveyance of them, which was not so full, as in the Christian Sacraments. Those Christian Sacraments, in the next place, brought under consideration, and evidence made of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper being the only true, and proper ones, or of general necessity to Salvation.

**T**HE Nature of a Sacrament being thus explain'd, and a resolution given of such questions, as belong to it, or depend more immediately



ately on it ; It will be but time for us to descend to *Particular* ones, whether they be such, as preceded *Christianity*, and have the name of *Jewish*, or such as were enjoyn'd by it, and may therefore more properly be termed *Christian*. This only would be premis'd concerning the *former* Sacraments, that as we make them to have their birth before *Christianity*, so we must therefore suppose them not to have had the Author of it for their *immediate Institutor*, or, at least, not as *God-Man*, which is the notion, wherein *Christianity* considers him : He, to whom we give the title of *Christ*, becoming not *God-Man*, till long after the Institution of those Sacraments, and when indeed they were to be abolished. Which will consequently oblige us to consider those Sacraments, (if there were any such) rather as to those purposes, for which we have affirm'd all Sacraments to have been ordain'd, than as to the immediate ordainer of them ; Or, if also as to the immediate ordainer of them, yet not in the same capacity, wherein *Christi-*

anity considers him, but only as appointed by God to be so, when the time of his *Manifestation* should appear.

Now there are *three* things to be enquir'd into, as concerning *those* Sacraments, which are to be the subject of our present consideration; *First*, Whether there were *any such* among the *Jews*, *Secondly*, *What* those Sacraments were, *Thirdly*, *Wherein* they differed from *ours*.

I. That there were *such* things, as *Sacraments* among the *Jews*, will appear if these *three* things be consider'd; *First*, that the *same* *Graces*, which Sacraments profess to convey, prevail'd among them, as well as us, *Secondly*, That they had external *signs*, or *symbols* to convey those *Graces* to them, *Thirdly*, that those external signs, or symbols were *instituted* by *God*, and *Christ*.

Of the *first* of these I have given an account elsewhere \*, and shall therefore refer my *Reader* thither, for his farther satisfaction. All I shall observe from thence is, that they partook of *Christ*, as well as we, and must therefore be suppos'd to have partaken  
of

\* Expl. of  
the *Creed*, in  
the words,  
*Our Lord*.

of *his Graces*, which are the *Graces* all Sacraments were intended to convey.

But neither will there be less evidence concerning their being furnish'd with certain *external signs*, to convey from God to them the foremention'd graces. For *St. Paul* †, where he affirms the *Jews* to have partaken of *Christ*, and his Graces, affirming in like manner that they did it, as by a *Baptism* on the one hand, so by *eating*, and *drinking* on the other, must consequently be supposed to affirm, that they did it by the means of such *symbols*, as *our* Sacraments are, and therefore also, that they were not unfurnished with them. Otherwise there could have been no place for giving the *former* means the name of *Baptism*, and much less for expressing the *latter* by the terms of *eating*, and *drinking*, or that *drinking* again by *drinking of that Rock*, which followed them. For as the foregoing mention of *Baptism*, which was one of the Christian Sacraments, could not but incline the *Corinthians* to interpret what followed concerning the *Jews eating*, and *drinking*, of a Sa-

† 1 Cor. 10.  
1, &c.

*cramental* one, especially, when it is also affirm'd that they partook of Christ by it; so much more, when they saw the Apostle expressing that *drinking* by *drinking of that Rock, that followed them*, or rather of the *Water*, that flowed from it. For that being manifestly an allusion to the *Water*, that flowed out of that *Rock* which was sometime smitten † by *Moses*, and by the drinking whereof the *Jews* were a long time sustained; Neither could the *Corinthians* look upon that *Rock*, to which he alluded, as other than a *figure of Christ*; Nor therefore (considering their own Sacraments, as such, which did also convey what they were figures of) as other, than such a figure of *Christ*, as convey'd to the believing *Jews* Christ's *graces*, and *benefits*, which are the *spiritual waters*, that flow from him. Two things only there are, that may seem to prejudice this notion, and which therefore it may not be amiss to consider; *First*, That the former *Baptism* is affirmed by *St. Paul* himself (a) to have been a *Baptism into Moses*, and not into *Christ*, and his *Graces*; *Secondly*,

† Numb. 20.

II.

(a) 1 Cor. 10.

2.

Secondly, That what is affirm'd to have been to the *Jews spiritual meat*, and *drink*, was also their constant *temporal* one, and which therefore if we affirm to have been a Sacrament of Christ's graces, and benefits, must have made that Sacrament to have been as ordinary, as their Meals: Which how the *Jews* should be always in a disposition for, is not easie to imagine, and therefore as difficult to believe the Institution of. As touching the former of these, even that *Baptism's* being stil'd a *Baptism into Moses*, it would not be easie to give an account, were it not that the Verses, which follow, perswade the design of the Apostle to have been to shew the *Jews* to have enjoyed the same Christian Graces with our selves: Because the *Baptizing into Moses* seems most naturally to denote the baptizing into his Religion, as that may seem to have been *distinguish'd from*, and *oppos'd to* that of *Christ*; For so we know the *Oeconomy of Moses* is generally taken by the Scriptures (b), and ought therefore, if there were nothing to hinder it,

(b) Joh. 1. 17.

it, to be alike interpreted here. But as the same is not to be said, where the design of the Apostle is to shew, that the *Jews* partook with us of the same Graces, and Benefits; So nothing therefore can hinder our affixing a like sense to the former Baptism, if we can give a tolerable account of its being said to be a *Baptism into Moses*. Which may be done by representing it as a Baptism into that Oeconomy of our Redemption, which prevailed *under Moses*, and of which he was the Minister of God unto the people, as well as of the Law. For thus the Baptism, which *John* administered, is represented as (c) *his* Baptism, even when it is intimated by our Saviour to have been a Baptism *from Heaven*, and so more the Baptism *of that*, than of the *other*. If therefore there lie any just exception against the being of these Jewish Sacraments, it must be upon the account of their supposed *Eucharist's* being also their *constant temporal* food, and which it is not easie to imagine they should be always in a disposition for, or therefore believe it was  
 ever

(c) Matt. 21.  
25.

ever intended by God as such. But as it appears from the *Acts* of the Apostles (d), that our Eucharist was almost of the same ordinary usage at the first, which may take off in some measure from the force of that Objection ; So nothing hinders us from believing, that that Meat, and Drink of the *Jews* being design'd for a temporal, as well as a Spiritual refreshment, it might be sometime, yea, for the most part, appointed only for the former (to wit, when the satisfying of their bodily necessities call'd for their regard) but at other times, though less frequently, appointed, and used for the latter, and accordingly accompanied with such Prayers, and Praises, as were proper for that consideration of it, and receiv'd with alike religious preparations, and dispositions. For even the elements of our Eucharist, though appointed by Christ as the Sacrament of his Body, and Blood, yet are not always us'd as such ; But only, when they are by God's Priests set apart for that purpose, and his spiritual *Benediction*, and *Grace* invoked on them.

(d) Act. 2.46.

I will

I will conclude what I have to say concerning the being of the former Sacraments, when I have added thereto their being ordained by *God*, and *Christ*, for the gracious purposes before remembred. Of the *former* whereof as we cannot reasonably doubt, because nothing less than a Divine Institution could make them the conveyers of *Christ's* Graces ; so as little of the *latter*, if we consider what hath been elsewhere (e) said concerning *Christ's* governing *even then*, and the Apostles exhorting the *Corinthians*, immediately after (f), not to tempt *Christ*, as the *Israelites* did, and were *destroy'd* by *Serpents* for it. For as it is not to be imagin'd, how the *Israelites* could tempt *Christ*, unless they had been even then under his conduct ; So if *Christ* had the conduct of them, there is as little doubt of *his* being the Institutor of their Sacraments, because that was a considerable part of it.

II. There being therefore no doubt of the *Being* of *Sacraments* among the *Jews*, which was the first thing we propos'd to consider ; Enquire we in  
the

(e) Expl. of  
the Creed, in  
the words,  
Our Lord.

(f) 1 Cor.  
10. 9.



the next place, *what* those their Sacraments were, and which we shall find to be either *Extraordinary*, or *Ordinary*. *Extraordinary* those which were just before recited, even their being baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and their partaking of *Manna*, and of the Water of the Rock; *Manna* being no doubt the spiritual meat St. Paul speaks of, both because their only repast, and *the bread* (g), *that came down from Heaven*; As the water of the *Rock* their spiritual Drink, and so yet more plainly declared by him. And I have the rather given to them the name of *Extraordinary* Sacraments, because as they had them only, during their passage through the Wilderness; so they had them too, when their ordinary Sacraments ceased, which is the proper season for extraordinary ones. As will appear if we can shew (what I shall by and by endeavour) that *Circumcision*, and the *Pasover* were their ordinary ones; It being certain from the Book of *Joshua* (h), that, from the time of the Israelites going out of *Aegypt*, till their coming to *Gilgal*, none of the Israelites

(g) Exod. 16.  
4.

(h) Josh. 5. 5.

lites

(i) — 10.

lites were circumcised, and as certain too from the same place (i), that they had not till then any *Pasover*; That, as it is the first time wherein the observation of it is mention'd after their coming out of *Ægypt*, so being the first time also, wherein they were in a capacity to observe it, because not till then furnished, or at least not ordinarily; with that earthly Bread, wherewith their *Pasover* was required to be observ'd.

(k) Rom. 4.  
11.(l) *Supra*  
Part II.

From those their Extraordinary Sacraments therefore pass we to their Ordinary ones, and which as I have already intimated to be *Circumcision*, and the *Pasover*, so I must now manifest to be so, but it must be by other Arguments, than are commonly alledged for it. For as for what is alledged from St. Paul's representing the *Circumcision of Abraham* (k) as a *Seal of that righteousness, which he had being yet uncircumcised*, it seems to me to make nothing at all for it; Because (as was before (l) shewn) rather intended to denote God's approbation of his particular Righteousness,

ness, than any declaration of the nature of the thing it self. But as therefore I cannot see, what can be argued from thence toward proving Circumcision to have been a Sacrament; So I shall chuse rather to evince it from the Institution of it, as where, if any where, the design thereof is most clearly set down. Now the first thing observable from thence is, that Circumcision was a *Sign*, as our Sacraments are, and *so far* therefore of the nature of them. For *this* (saith God) *shall be a sign, or token* (m) *of the Covenant between me and you;* That is to say, as was before (n) express'd, between God on the one hand, and Abraham, and his Seed on the other. It is alike observable, secondly, that as Circumcision was a sign, yea a sign of that Covenant, which God then propos'd between himself, and the foremention'd persons; So it was such a sign too, as was also of the Essence of it, and till the passing whereof it was not to be look'd upon as struck. Which I gather not only from its being stil'd a *Covenant* (o), as well as a sign of it, yea more often

(m) Gen. 17.  
10.

(n) — 7.

(o) Gen. 17.  
10.

(p) Ibid.

\* — 14.

a *Covenant*, than the other, but from God's affirming it to be *that* Covenant, which ought to be kept (p) between him, and them, and accordingly representing the neglecters of it, as those which had *broken* \* *his* *Covenant*. From whence as it will follow, that it had a more intimate relation to the *Covenant*, than that of a bare sign, or token; So it must be either that, which was to strike the *Covenant* between them, and so make it actually such as to those persons that receiv'd it, or one of those things, which were to be observ'd after the *Covenant* was struck between them, and for which it was enter'd into. But as it appears from those words of God, which usher in the mention of this *Covenant*, that the thing so agreed upon was a matter of much more weight, even their *walking before God, and being perfect*; So we are therefore in reason to resolve *Circumcision* to be that, which was to strike the *Covenant* between God, and them, and make it actually such, as to those persons that receiv'd it. From whence as it will

will follow farther, because striking the Covenant between God, and them, that it enfur'd to those, that receiv'd it, the future Blessings of it, and so might not unreasonably be represented as a *Seal* or a *Pledge* of them; So that it put them into actual possession of such Blessings, as were presently to be bestow'd, if there were really any such, and accordingly was no less a *means of conveying* them. Which will consequently leave nothing more to enquire, than whether that Covenant assur'd the same Blessings with the Christian, and whether any of those Blessings were to be immediately bestow'd by vertue of it. For if that Covenant assur'd the same Blessings with the Christian, then had the sign thereof relation to the same inward Graces with ours, and so far forth therefore agreed with them; And if any of those Blessings were to be immediately bestow'd, it was also a conveyer of them, and so yet more perfectly the same. Now that that Covenant, of which Circumcision was a sign, assur'd the same Blessings with the Christian seems to me to be suffi-

L . . . ciently

[q] — 7.

ciently evident from it's being affirmed (q) to import, that *God would be a God to Abraham, and to his Seed after him.* For that implying at least, that he would be as gracious to him, as he was before, and consequently (because God dealt with him so before) that he would *count his Faith to him for Righteousness*, it must also be thought to import his assuring the same Blessings with the Christian Covenant, because that is the sum, and substance of them all. All therefore, that we have farther to shew, is, That some at least of those Blessings were, by vertue of the Covenant it self, to be immediately bestow'd on those, who entred into it, which will be no hard matter to evince. For thus much at least it must be thought to import, that if the party to be Circumcised receiv'd his Circumcision with that Faith, which God required of him, that Faith of his should from that very instant be accounted to him for Righteousness: Because, the Covenant being so far perform'd on his part, there must ensue a like completion on the part of God, as which otherwise  
 he

he could not have been said to be punctual to, nor approv'd himself a God to the party in Covenant with him. And tho' we cannot make the like Inference upon the part of Children, because there was nothing of Faith in them to procure them such an Imputation; Yet in as much as they were admitted into the same Covenant with their believing Parents, and, as they could bring nothing more toward the procuring the Blessings of it, than their external Circumcision, so they had nothing more required of them, It is but reasonable to believe, that they receiv'd the same Benefits by it, and had their Circumcision imputed to them for it. Such Evidence there is for Circumcision's being a Sacrament, yea of the same general nature with the Christian ones; And I no way doubt we ought to think the same of the Feast of the *Passover*, if not also of many of their other Sacrifices: Not, it may be, for any particular evidence there is from the Institution of it, or them, but from the relation they bore to Christ's Sacrifice upon the Cross, and the care it appears

God took to convey the Benefits of Christ's Sacrifice by those extraordinary Sacraments, which he gave them in the Wilderness. For the Sacrifices before mention'd being equally signs of that of Christ, yea intended by God to remit men (†) to him; It is but reasonable to believe, that God made the same use of them, and conveyed Christ, and his Benefits by them. Otherwise their condition in the Land of *Canaan* would have been worse, than in the Wilderness, because as soon as they entred that, their extraordinary Sacraments ceased.

(†) See Expl. of the *Creed*, in the word, *Dead*.

III. Only as it is not to be thought, that those Sacraments, tho' the same in substance with ours, did yet agree with them in all other particulars, because belonging to a Dispensation, which was manifestly inferiour to the Christian; So there are two things, wherein they differ'd from ours, and by which they will appear to have fallen short of them: First, That they did not so clearly represent the things they were intended to signify, Secondly, That they did not convey, what they so signified, in so ample a manner.



manner. For beside that those significations of theirs were rather hinted, than plainly expressed, and much less so plainly express'd, as the designs of the Christian Sacraments; Those significations were not a little obscur'd by the concomitancy of others, and which they were equally obliged to intend. For thus *Circumcision*, because a sign of that Covenant, by which God did equally oblige himself to possess *Abraham*, and his natural Seed of the Land of *Canaan*, was a sign of God's giving them that promised Land, as well as the righteousness of Faith, and that Heavenly *Canaan*, which belonged to it. And thus too the Passover was a sign of that People's *Ægyptian* Servitude, and God's delivering them from it, as well as Christ's delivering them from the slavery of Sin, and Satan, by the shedding of his Blood. By which means it is easie to see, that these latter, and more noble significations of them must have been yet more obscured to them, and so administer less Spiritual Consolation to them. This I take to be one signal difference be-

tween the Jewish Sacraments, and ours, and wherein therefore they must be thought to fall far short of what we now enjoy. But that it is not the only material difference between them, will appear if we consider the preference the Scripture gives to that Dispensation, under which we are, above that of *Moses*, or *Abraham*; And that exuberance of Grace, which was poured out upon the embracers of the Christian Dispensation, and of which we find no footsteps under the other. For that is enough to shew, that though the Jewish Sacraments convey'd the same Spiritual Benefits; yet they did not do it in that proportion, wherein the Christian did, and so fell yet shorter of them. Which will not only oblige us to set so much the greater value upon *our own* Sacraments, but be the more curious in enquiring, what ought to be look'd upon as such, which is that I am in the next place to intend.

For the resolution whereof we are to know (what we need go no farther than our own Homilies (x) for the understanding) that the word *Sacrament*

(x) Hom. of  
Com. Tray.  
and Sacram.

crament may be taken either in a more *lax* and *general*, or in a more *strict* and *particular* acceptation. If we take it in the former of these, so the number of the Christian Sacraments will be found to be much greater, than even the Romanists themselves have made it: Because (as our Homily observes) *in a general acceptation the name of a Sacrament may, and hath been attributed to any thing, whereby an holy thing is signifi'd.* Whence it is (as the same Homily goes on) that *Ancient Writers have given that Name, not only to those Five, which have been added by the Papists, but also to divers, and sundry Ceremonies, as to Oyl, washing of Feet, and such like.* But as the Question between us, and the Papists, even in their own (*s*) way of stating it, is not what may in a more *lax*, and *general* sense be look'd upon as Sacraments, but what are *strictly*, and *properly* such, so that Question cannot better be voided, than by examining those things, which pretend to that dignity by the account we have before given of the Nature of a Sacrament.

(*s*) Conc. Trid.  
Sess. 7. can. 1.

Of *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper* I shall say nothing at present, partly because there is no Controversie at all concerning their being truly, and properly Sacraments, and partly because we have no other certain means of judging of the Nature of Sacraments, but by that, which is observable concerning *them*. Our business must therefore be to examin the other Five by them, and by what we have before observ'd, concerning the Nature of a Sacrament, from them.

To begin with *Confirmation*, because the first Religious Rite after Baptism, and because of all the *Five* best deserving the name of a Sacrament. A Rite, which as our Church receives, and enjoyns, so the more sober sort of Protestants allow to have been an Institution of the Apostles, and such as is of signal use to those, who were baptiz'd in their Infancy, by that examination, which is to precede it, and those solemn Prayers, that do attend it. But as the thing it self doth not appear to me to have been instituted by Christ, which, even by the Doctrine of  
the

the *Trent* Council (r) is made a Character of a Sacrament, so there is yet less appearance of its having any outward sign, to which the blessings thereof may be supposed to have been annex'd, which is of the very Essence of a Sacrament: That, which was at first administred by a bare Imposition of hands, and afterwards by the addition of the Chrism, coming at length to be perform'd by the sole ceremony of *Uñction*, as the practice of the Greek, and Latine Church declares. Of which variation what account can be given, but that the Church it self did at first look upon the Rites of Confirmation as arbitrary, and consequently not of the same nature with the signs of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. For whatever additions, or variations came afterwards to be made in these, the Water of the one, and the Bread, and Wine in the other were ever preserved in them.

The next supposed Sacrament is that of *Penance*, or rather (because the form thereof is by themselves (u) made to consist in *Ego ab-*

*solvo*

(u) Conc. Trid.  
Sess. 14. c. 13.

*solvo te, &c.*) the Sacrament of Absolution. An Institution, which we willingly acknowledge to be an Institution of Christ, and which our Church moreover confesseth (*n*) to have the promise of the forgiveness of sins. But differs from a Sacrament in this, that it hath not that promise annexed, and tyed to the usual visible sign thereof, even Imposition of hands. For for the use of any such visible sign in it we find no Command, and much less any declaration from Christ, that it should not be available, unless it were convey'd by it, or made to depend upon the usage of it.

But it may be much more may be said for that, which they call the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, because affirmed by the Council of *Trent* (*x*) to have been instituted by our Lord, and published to the World by *St. James*. And I no way doubt, that when our Saviour sent forth his Disciples by two, and two (*y*), he gave them power to *anoint sick persons*, as well as to cast out unclean Spirits, and, it may be too, commanded them,

for

(*n*) Hom. of  
Com. Pray.  
and Sacr.

(*x*) Sess. 14.  
can. 1.

(*y*) Mark 6.  
7, &c.

for that time, to make use of that particular ceremony toward the healing of them. I as little doubt, for the mention that is made of it in St. *James* (z), that the same ceremony of *Unction* was continued in the Church, and perhaps prescrib'd by other Apostles, as well as by him, to the Governours of the Church. But it doth not appear to me to have been intended by Christ for perpetual use, and much less for those purposes, for which it is alledged. For if it were intended by Christ for perpetual use, how came the same Christ to promise to those that believe, that if they only *laid hands* \* on the sick they should recover? How came he to give his Apostles power to cure diseases by the use of that *only ceremony*, as in the case of *Publius* †, by *taking infirm people by the hand* \*, yea by their bare (a) word? This being to give encouragement to the neglect of his own Commands, if the ceremony of *Unction* were to be look'd upon as such. Though granting that Ceremony to have been intended for perpetual use, what appearance

(z) James 5.  
14.

\* Mark 16.  
18.

† Act. 28. 8.  
\*-----3. 5.

(a)---9. 34.

(b) Mark 6.  
13.

pearance is there of its having been intended for the purposes of a Sacrament, yea to procure, in an especial manner, the forgiveness of sins? For all that St. *Mark* says concerning the Apostles anointing with Oyl is, that they thereby healed (b) those they did so anoint; Yea it is, if not the only, yet the principal thing St. *James* assures to those, whom he enjoyn'd the use of it. As it appears by his ushering it in as an application to be made to sick persons, his promising that that Prayer, which went along with it, should save the sick, and procure God's raising of them, in fine by his exhorting men to confess their faults one to another, that they might be healed. For these things shew plainly, that if the healing of sick persons was not the only thing intended, yet it was at least the principal one. But so the Church it self appears to have understood this ceremony, as is evident, among other things, from that Prayer, which did accompany it: That, as *Cassander* (c) informs us, being, *I anoint thee with the holy Oyl in the name of the Father, Son,*

(c) Consult.  
de Artic. Rel.  
&c. ubi de  
Unctione in-  
firm. agit.



Son, and Holy Ghost, imploring the mercy of that one Lord, and our God, that all the griefs and incommodities of thy body being driven away; there may be recovered in thee vertue [or strength] and health, that so being cured by the operation of this mysterie, and this Unction of the Sacred Oyl, and our prayer, through the vertue of the Sacred Trinity, thou mayest deserve to receive this antient, yea more robust health through our Lord. Which though it do not so directly oppose the *εὐχέλαιον* of the Greeks, because design'd against Corporal (d), as well as Spiritual evils, yet doth perfectly overthrow the *Extreme Unction* of the Papists, as which is so far from designing the recovery of the sick person, that it is not allow'd to be administred to any, who seem not perfectly desperate. One only passage there is in St. James, which may seem to give this Ceremony of anointing a higher, and a far better design; even his affirming, that that prayer, which did accompany it, should procure for the sick person also, that if he had committed sins (e), they should be forgiven him. But be-  
side

(d) See Ricaut  
Pref. State of  
the Greek  
Church c. 12.

(e) James 5.  
15.

side that St. *James* doth not attribute that forgiveness to the ceremony of *Uction*, but to the prayer that attended, or followed it; The design of the *Elders* visitation of the *Sick* being no doubt to procure as well their *Spiritual*, as *Corporal* health, it is not unreasonable to think, that that very *Prayer*, which they made over them, did not only aim at *God's* accompanying the former ceremony with the blessing, for which it was intended, but extend farther to the imploring for them all those *spiritual* blessings, which they wanted, and particularly perfect remission, and forgiveness. Which if it did, as is but reasonable to believe, that *Oyl* cannot be thought to have had any interest in it, and much less to have been especially intended as the *Sacrament* thereof. And indeed, as there are no footsteps in that *Antiquity*, which is truly primitive, of any such *Uction* of sick persons in order to their *spiritual* welfare; As there is mention moreover in it of another kind of treatment, and particularly of the *Elders* of the *Church* giving

giving unto those, that were under penance the Sacrament of Christ's Body, and Blood, as their last, and necessary *Viaticum*; So I see not what necessity there is of any such Sacrament as *Extreme Unction* to confer upon sick persons the remission of sins, or other such like graces, as they may stand in need of; There being place, even in them, for the Absolution of the Church, and the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. In fine, so far is that *Unction*, of which St. James speaks, from being any standing Sacrament of our Religion, that it may seem to have been only an Appendage of that extraordinary gift of healing (g), which was sometime deposited in the Church, and which therefore was to cease, when that, and other such like operations vanished. As appears in part from its being joyned in St. Mark (h) with the *casting out of Devils*, but more from our Saviours ranking the *laying on of hands* upon the sick (which was but another way of administering it) with (i) the same *casting out of Devils, speaking new tongues*, and

Dionys.  
Alex. apud  
Euseb. Eccl.  
Hist. li. 6. c.  
44. item  
Conc. Nic.  
can. 13.

(g) 1 Cor.  
12. 9.

(h) Mark 6.  
13.

(i) Mark 16.  
17, 18.

the

*the taking up of Serpents.* For if these be to be look'd upon as extraordinary gifts, there is equal reason to believe, the *anointing*, or laying on of hands upon the sick to have been of the same order. Sure I am *Tertulian* (k) doth not only rank the gift of *healing*, even in his time, with the *casting out of Devils*, but makes mention of one *Proculus* a Christian administering this supposed Sacrament to *Severus* the Emperor, yea curing him by the Oyl of it.

From *Extreme Unction* therefore pass we to that, which they call the Sacrament of *Orders*, and which is not only affirm'd by the *Trent Council* to be a true (l), and proper Sacrament, but as certainly to confer (m) grace, as the most undoubted Sacraments do. It is not my purpose, nor was it ever the purpose of the Church of *England* to detract in the least from the force of that, which they entitle the Sacrament of *Orders*. But that it hath not the nature of a true, and proper Sacrament, will appear in the first place from its not having by the Institution of Christ any external

(k) Tert. ad Scapulam cap. 4.

(l) Sess. 13. Can. 3.  
(m) *Ib.* cap. 3.

external sign, to which the grace thereof may be supposed to be annexed. For if it had, it must have been the external sign, or ceremony of *breathing on* the persons to be ordain'd; This being the only one, which our Saviour (n) made use of, when he confer'd the power of *Order* upon his Apostles. But so far were the Apostles, or the succeeding Church from making use of that, that we find them, on the contrary, to have made use of Imposition of Hands, yea to have entitl'd the *grace of Orders* (o) in a more especial manner to it. Whether it were, that they took their pattern therein from the known usage of the *Jews*, and which we find our Saviour himself to have followed in other instances; or (which I rather think) that they were directed to it by that spirit of God, which guided them in all their actions, and to whose guidance, and instruction our Saviour had left them after his being taken from them. Sure I am there are no footsteps of that external sign in the first Institution of it (as there was, in the Institution of

(n) Joh. 20.

22.

(o) 1 Tim. 4.

14.

2 Tim. 1. 6.

M

Baptism,

*Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*, of their *proper* ones) nor any appearance from Scripture of any after command of Christ concerning it. But because the external sign of Ordination, though none of our Saviours Institution, yet is confessed by our selves to have had a legitimate one; Therefore enquire we in the second place, whether, after the manner of other Sacraments, it be a *means* of Grace, or (as the *Romanists* love to speak) have the *power of conferring* it. A thing, which seems to them sufficiently evident, not only from that form of words (*p*), wherewith by the prescript of Christ it hath been always attended, even *receive ye the Holy Ghost*, but from St. Paul's willing *Timothy* in one place (*q*) *not to neglect that gift*, or grace, *which was given* with it, and in another (*r*) *to stir up that gift*, or *Grace of God*, *which was in him by the laying on of his hands*. And thus much I willingly yield to the force of the foremention'd Texts, that the *Holy Ghost* ever was, and still is conferr'd upon those men, who are rightly ordain'd by the Governours of the Church

(p) Joh. 20.  
22.

(q) 1 Tim. 4.  
14.

(r) 2 Tim. 1.  
6.

Church. But in what measure, and to what purposes is the thing in question between us, and particularly whether it is conferr'd, as to its *sanctifying*, and *saving* Graces, which I have shewn elsewhere (f) to be the proper graces of a Sacrament. Now what is there in any, or all the foremention'd Texts, to evince that, which they call the Sacrament of *Orders* to confer such graces upon the person Ordain'd? If we enquire, as to the first of them (t), even that Text which makes Orders to exhibit the *Holy Ghost*, the utmost that can be inferr'd from thence is such an exhibition of it, as may be requisite for the party ordain'd to *remit*, or *retain sins*, as for which (u), and which alone it is professed to be bestow'd. But so sure the person ordain'd may be qualifi'd to do, without the sanctifying graces of God's Spirit, even in the opinion of the *Tridentine* Fathers themselves: It being their opinion (w), as well as ours (x), that the personal qualifications of the Minister do neither add to, nor detract from the force of the Sacraments they dispense.

(f) *Supra*,  
Part 3.

(t) Joh. 20:  
22.

(u) — 23.

(w) *Sess.* 7.  
*can.* 12.

(x) *Art.* of  
*Rel.* 26.

But as therefore no such sanctifying graces can be suppos'd to be design'd, though we make the Text to import such an exhibition of the Holy Ghost, as is requisite for the remitting, or retaining of sins; so much less, if nothing more were meant by *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*, than receive ye Authority from him so to do. Which that there was not is at least probable from his referring them to another time (y) for the *other powers* of the Holy Ghost, yea bidding them not to expect them, till after his ascension (z) into Heaven. For that supposeth them to have been as yet without those powers of the Holy Ghost, and consequently that Christ meant no more by *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*, than receive ye of his *Authority*, to whom the power of the Church is committed under me, as ye shall in due time of such abilities, and gifts, as may fit you for the exercise thereof. And if that were the sense, yea only sense of those words of Christ, which contain both the Exemplar, and Institution of Ordination, I know not why we should suppose that, which they call

(y) Act. 1.4.  
&c.

(z) Joh. 16.7.



call the Sacrament of Orders, to have a farther design in it self, than to communicate a Ghostly Authority to those, on whom it is bestow'd. But let us suppose, that something more was meant by these words, than *Receive ye a Ghostly Authority*, or, at least, that it was the intention of our Saviour (because of what we read \* concerning *Timothy*) that something more should be afterwards intended by them, when no Apostolical *Pentecost* was to ensue, even the communicating of gifts and graces, as well as a Ghostly Authority. Yet even so it will not follow, that an exhibition of *Sanctifying*, and *Saving* Graces was intended, or that even *Timothy* receiv'd any such graces by it. For who knows not that there are *Gratia gratis datae*, as well as *Gratum facientes*, yea that the word † *χάρισμα*, is as often, if not more often the title of the former? Who knows not, that those *Gratia gratis datae* are more proper for the Ministerial Function, than the other can be suppos'd to be, yea that they may avail for those spiritual purposes, for which that Function was

\* 1 Tim. 4.  
14.  
2 Tim. 1. 16

† Rom. 12. 6.  
1 Cor. 1. 7.  
— 12. 4.  
— 9.  
— 28.  
— 30.

M 3 intended?

intended? In fine, who knows not, that God hath appointed other Sacraments for the conveying of his sanctifying Graces, and by the participation of which therefore they might be more reasonably expected? For these things being suppos'd, there will not only be no necessity of understanding St. Paul of the sanctifying Graces of God's Spirit, but not so much as any probable reason for it. Though granting thirdly, that there were also *some sanctifying Graces* attending it; Yet as we cannot for the reasons before mention'd understand any other sanctifying Graces, than what may serve more immediately for the discharge of the Ministerial Function, such as is a *holy Zeal* for the welfare of those Souls, which are committed to those that are of it, so we can much less (as our *Homily* \* instructs us) expect *remission of sins* by it, which is the undoubted fruit of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. From all which put together it is evident, that if judgment be to be made of Sacraments by Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, Orders will hardly pass for one of them;

\* Hom. of  
Com. Pray.  
and Sacram.

them ; As which varies so much from them both in the External Sign, and in the Graces, which are signified by it.

One only Institution remains of those, which have the name of Sacraments, and which if they, who so entitled it, would understand only in a general sense, they would not find our Church dissenting from them, because affirming *(a)* *God to have consecrated the State of Matrimony into such an excellent mystery, that in it is signified, and represented the Spiritual Marriage, and Unity, that is betwixt Christ and his Church.* But to make it a true, and proper Sacrament of the Evangelical Law, as the Council of Trent *(b)* doth, is extremely unreasonable, and neither hinted by *St. Paul* in that place *(c)*, from whence they pretend to infer it, nor, any farther than a simple representation reacheth, agreeable with those things, which have the name of Sacraments either with us, or among themselves. For neither was that, which they call a Sacrament of the Evangelical Law, instituted by *Christ*, but by *God*, nay

*(a)* The form of Solemn. of Matrim.

*(b)* Sess. 24. can. 1.

*(c)* Eph. 5. 25. &c.

St. Paul in the place before quoted finds all the Sacramentality thereof in those passages (d) which are represented by Moses (e), as declaring the Identity of Man, and Wife, and the necessity that ariseth thereupon of their adhering to one another, even to the abandoning of all other relations for it. It hath no certain external sign, as other Sacraments have; to confer that grace, which is supposed to belong to it; It hath no other promise of Grace belonging to it, than may be supposed to belong to any state of life, which a Man shall set himself to, with a due respect to the Commands of God, and use with that care, and sobriety, that becomes him. It hath much less any promise of the forgiveness of sins, and an Universal Holiness, as Baptism, and the Lord's Supper undoubtedly have. And if it hath not, nothing can oblige us to look upon it as a true, and proper Sacrament, or indeed but in the same degree, where-with their other Sacraments are. For they, though not perfectly such, have yet some more near resemblance

(d) — 30. 31.  
 (e) Gen. 2.  
 23, 24.

to those, which they pretend to rival.

But because it may be demanded, how, if there be but two strict, and proper Sacraments, several other things should come to have the same name, and honour, and particularly how the Church of Rome should at length advance them to the number of Seven (this seeming to be some prejudice against our asserting only two.) I answer first by reason of their general cognation with them, and which we know, in other things, to procure the same name to things, that are of a very different nature. Whence it is, that (as was before observ'd out of one of our own (f) Homilies) not only those five, which we but now mention'd, have obtain'd the name of Sacraments, but whatsoever, in a manner, hath been made use of to signify a holy thing. Which is so true, that Tertullian in one place (g) gives the name of Sacrament to Dreams, and Visions, and in others (h) to Parables, and Allegories. For if even Dreams, and Parables come to have the name of Sacraments

(f) Hom. of Com. Pray. and Sacram.

(g) De Anima cap. 9.

(h) De pudic. c. 9. & adv. Marcion. li. 5. c. 4.

by

by reason of their representing things of a higher nature ; How much more such Religious Institutions, as were transacted by the same visible solemnities as Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, as to be sure the Institutions before remembred were? For though, it may be, they had not the ceremonies now in use, or at least had not that number of them, wherewith they are now encumber'd, yet wanted they not some, or other, which was of the same symbolical nature, and particularly *Imposition of hands*. For that, as we learn from the Scripture, they made use of in *Confirmation* (i), in the gift of *healing* (k), *Orders* (l), and *Absolution* (m); And that too, as we learn from *Grotius* (n), they made use of toward those, who entered into Marriage, and still do in the Eastern parts. But beside that general, and external cognation, which is between Sacraments, and sacramentals (for so I shall for the future entitle those things, which are not strict, and proper ones) there is also, as to some of the latter, a more particular, and intimate cognation,

(i) Act. 8. 17.

(k) --- 28. 8.

(l) 1 Tim. 4.

14.  
(m) --- 5. 22.(n) Annot in  
Consult. Cas-  
sand. ad Art.

nation, but especially as to those, which are before remembred, and are by the Papists advanc'd into true, and proper Sacraments. For setting aside that, which they call the *Sacrament of Marriage*, and which hath, even among them, rather the name, than nature of one; There is none of the other four, which tend not to the conferring of some Divine Grace, or Benefit, as well as to the signification of it. For thus *Confirmation* tends to procure a farther addition of God's sanctifying Graces, and so to strengthen, and perfect the person, that offers himself unto it; And thus the Oyl of *Uction*, as us'd of Old, toward the procuring of the Grace of health, and the removal of the sick persons guilt so far, as was necessary for the procuring of the other. Thus *Absolution* tends to the procuring of the forgiveness of the Penitent, and *Ordination*, for the person ordain'd, of a spiritual, and ghostly Authority, if not also of such spiritual gifts, as are necessary for the exercise thereof. By which means as they approach yet nearer to the nature of true, and proper

per

per Sacraments, so it is the less to be wonder'd at, that they should obtain the name of Sacraments, yea have the reputation of such in a more eminent manner, than other Sacramentals had: Especially if we consider thirdly, that those five supposed Sacraments are upon the matter the only noted Acts, that are administred by the Church, or, at least, that are attended with such Rites, and Ceremonies. For so it is yet less difficult to believe, that they might not only come by degrees to be ranked with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, but together with them to be accounted, if not the only, yet at least the primary ones. Which *Peter Lombard* (o) taking notice of, made the Number of Christian Sacraments to be neither more, nor less than *seven*, and the Church of *Rome*, sway'd by him, did afterward Authoritatively confirm. This I take to have been the true Original of that number, to which the Sacraments are now advanc'd, and not either any cogent arguments for the being of so many, or indeed any firm belief, even in that Church it self, that

(o) Sentent.  
li. 4. Distinct.  
2.



that they ought all to be look'd upon as true, and proper ones. And I am yet more confirm'd in that belief by the silence there was (p) before *Peter Lombard* of any certain, and determinate number, and by the Authority of two of the greatest *Fathers* of the Latin Church : *St. Ambrose* in his tract *de Sacramentis*, and in another *de iis qui mysteriis initiantur*, mentioning only Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and *St. Augustine* not only resolving (q) the Sacraments to be *numero paucissima*, and mentioning none but those, but affirming elsewhere (r), that our Lord, and the Apostolical discipline had delivered *some few*; such as is the Sacrament of Baptism, and the celebration of *Christ's Body, and Blood*. For that is enough to shew, that though the *Fathers* might sometime mention the other Institutions under the notion of Sacraments, yet they look'd upon Baptism, and the Lord's Supper as the only true, and proper ones, or, at least, were not over confident of the being so of the other. If the Church of *Rome* hath since arriv'd at a greater confidence,

it

(p) Consult. *Cassandri ad Art. 13.*

(q) *Epist. 118. ad Januar.*

(r) *De Doctr. Christ. li. 3. cap. 9.*

it will concern her, rather than us to give an account of it; But however not so far concern us, as to remove us from an opinion, which seems to us to be built upon solid, and substantial grounds. For either she hath arriv'd at that confidence by the means before declar'd, and then her Authority will be very incompetent; Or she hath arriv'd at it by some other means, which we are not acquainted with, and which therefore we cannot be suppos'd to be influenced by till she shall be pleas'd to declare them.

I have insisted thus long upon the *Number* of the Christian Sacraments, not because I was oblig'd to it by my more immediate task ( for our *Catechism* contents it self to declare, that there are *two only as generally necessary to Salvation* ) but because our Church affirms elsewhere ( *f* ), that there are but two strict, and proper ones, and because the joyning of others with them in the same rank? and order of Sacraments may help in time to bring them into less repute; It being natural for men, where there are several means tending to the same end,

(*f*) Art. of  
Rel. 25. and  
Homily of  
Com. Pr. and  
Sacram.

end, either to adhere to some of them to the utter rejecting of the other, or to use those others with less preparation, and respect. And whether this be not the case of the *Eucharist*, where that, which they call the Sacrament of *Penance* is so much in vogue, may be judg'd of by the little care they take to fit themselves for the one, where they have obtain'd, as they easily may, the absolution of the other. And I shall only add, that if our Church did not distinguish in the present Catechism between proper, and improper Sacraments, it was not, as I conceive, because she had departed from her own *Articles*, and *Homilies*, but because, being to instruct those, who were no proper Auditors of higher matters, she contented her self to let them know, what was sufficient for their purpose, that there were but *two*, that were generally necessary to *Salvation*, even Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Now that there are no more than these, that are generally necessary to *Salvation*, (which is all, that remains for

for me to demonstrate ) will appear if we reflect upon those, which have been added to them by the Papists, and ranked in the same order with them. For who can think *Marriage* to be such, who believe, as the Papists do, that it is unlawful to the whole Order of Priesthood, yea who know that there are not a few, who live not long enough to desire, or need it, or are otherwise sufficiently fortified by God against any necessity of espousing it? Who can believe *Orders* to be such, when there ever was, and ever will be a greater number of those, who are to be instructed, than there was, or ever will be of those, who are to instruct them? In fine, who can believe the *Uction* of the sick to be such, when it appears by the former discourse to have had no other design, than the recovery of them from their infirmities? For well may that be look'd upon, as not generally necessary to Salvation, which appears not to have been intended to minister at all unto it. If therefore there be any of the five of that necessity, it must be *Confirmation*, and *Absolution*,

*tion,*

tion, but which how *useful* soever they may be, and are so esteemed by our selves, yet will not be found to be any more than such. I alledge as to the *former* of these the no precept there appears concerning it, which is one of those things, which induce a necessity to Salvation; And I alledge too (which is another) the no appearance there is of any tendency in it to procure some blessings, for which no other means are appointed. For the *Eucharist* having for its end the confirming and strengthening of our Graces, which is all that *Confirmation*, as now in use, professeth to intend; neither can there be any necessity of the means to oblige us to the use of the latter, or endanger our Salvation by the omission of it. In fine, I alledge, what is with me of no small moment, the no mention there is in *Justin Martyr* \* of it, even where he takes notice of their bringing the New Baptized person to

Apol. 2.

ἡμεῖς δὲ με-  
τὰ τὸ ἔτος  
λέσαι ἢ πε-

πισμένον, ἢ συγκατατεθειμένον ἐπὶ τὰς λεγόμενας ἀδελφὰς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιούμενοι ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτῶν ἢ τῶ φατιζόντων, ἢ ἄλλων πανταχῆ πάντων, &c.

the Assembly of the Faithful, and to a Communion with them in their Prayers, and Eucharist. For though that Father doth not obscurely intimate, that they had a particular regard in their Prayers to the welfare of the new Baptized person, as well as to the more general welfare of the other; Yet he takes no notice at all of any Imposition of hands upon him, or any other ceremony, that may be supposed to be analogous to it. Which in all probability he would have done, (especially when he mention'd the Kiss of Peace, as well as both the other Sacraments) if either the Church had then us'd the Sacrament of Confirmation, or he look'd upon it as a Sacrament of the same general necessity with the other. Which things I have said, not in the least to detract from the use of Confirmation (for I think this very passage of *Justin Martyr* doth sufficiently warrant the more material part of it, even prayer over the new Baptized person) but to shew that the Church did not then look upon it as a Sacrament, or, at least, not as such a one, as was generally

generally necessary for Salvation, as our Catechism hath taught us to speak.

But it may be much more may be said for *Absolution*, than *Confirmation*, and so no doubt there may, if we consider Absolution as comprehending within the compass of it the *whole power of the Priest in remitting sins*. For comprehending within it, in that sense, the Administration of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, because the most effectual means the Church hath for absolving offenders from their guilt, so far as those Sacraments, or the Priests Administration of them is necessary to Salvation (which no doubt they generally are) so far also his Absolution must be look'd upon as such. But so to consider Absolution is to make it the same with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and not (as it is here propos'd) a distinct Sacrament from them. If therefore we will speak pertinently either to our own *Catechism*, or the present Controversie, we must consider Absolution as abstracting from those Sacraments; which if we do, we shall

find it to consist either in *declaring the word of reconciliation to Offenders*, or *praying to God for their Pardon*, or *pronouncing them absolved from their guilt*, or *loosing them from the Censures of the Church*.

If we consider *Absolution* in the first of these senses, to wit as importing *the declaration of the word of reconciliation to Offenders*; so we shall not stick to affirm, that it is generally necessary to Salvation, but then we must say withall, that it is no Sacrament, nor esteemed by the Papists themselves to be so.

If we consider it in the second sense, to wit, as denoting the Priest's *praying for the Pardon of Offenders* (and in which form, as Bishop *Usher* (t) observes, Absolution was antiently wont to be made) so it will be found to have a respect to that Community, over which he presides, or to particular persons in it. In the former of these regards it is no doubt as necessary to Salvation, as it is for the Priest to celebrate, or the people to joyn with him in the publick worship of God, of which such prayers

(t) Answ. to  
the Jesuits  
Chall. p. 125.  
&c.



prayers as those are a necessary part. But as there is no presumption of that Offices being a Sacrament, so it is not the Absolution our Adversaries intend; That, which they profess to advance, being the Absolution of *particular* persons, after a confession made by them of their particular offences. And yet even here too they make a distinction, because professing to restrain that Confession, and Absolution to such sins only, as are mortal. But who taught them to distinguish in this affair between *Mortal*, and *Venial*? Or what is there in those words of Christ, which convey the power of remitting sins, which can be thought to restrain it to the former? What have they to ground the general necessity of such a Confession upon, but especially as to that form of Absolution, whereof we speak? For in praying for the pardon of Offenders the Priest is not to be considered as a Judge, but as a person appointed to mediate between God, and his People, and whom that charity, which belongs to him as such, will oblige him to look upon as penitent,

nitent, if he knows them not to be otherwise, especially if they beg his prayers for their own particular pardon. And indeed neither is this the Absolution the Papists contend for, nay they declare (u) those very Prayers, which go along with their own, not to be of the Essence of it. Which will oblige us to pass on to

(u) Conc.  
Trid. Sess. 14.  
cap. 3.

A *third* sort of Absolution, even *pronouncing offending persons to be loosed from their offences.* A thing, which though of signal use, and comfort to men of afflicted minds, and which no doubt such persons ought to seek, when they cannot otherwise satisfy themselves, yet cannot be look'd upon as generally necessary to Salvation; Partly, because none but desponding persons can be supposed to stand in need of it, and partly because such an Absolution, as that, supposeth men to be already loosed from their offences, and consequently not to want any thing, but the sense thereof. Which though it may be an infelicity, yet is no sin in it self, nor can prove so to him, in whom it is, unless it do otherwise take him off  
from

from the due performance of his duty. Though, even in that case, such an Absolution will be necessary, rather to prevent future offences, than to procure the forgiveness of former ones. And I shall only add, that I conceive that form of Absolution to be such, which occurs in our *Visitation of the Sick*; Partly, because it is ordered by our Church to be applied to men of troubled minds, and partly because it prompts the Priest to beg of God the forgiveness of the sick persons offences, before it allows him to say *I absolve thee from all thy sins*; That supposing the forgiveness of God to precede in this affair, and consequently that the Priest rather declares the person already absolved, than absolves him himself from the band of his offences.

The *fourth* sort of Absolution is that, which *looseth men from the censures of the Church*, and which I shall not stick to affirm to be generally necessary to the loosing of those, who have been before bound, even from the band of their offences before God: Partly, because God hath

promis'd to bind that in Heaven, which the Governours of the Church shall rightfully bind on Earth; And partly, because the Censures of the Church consisting especially in restraining men from its saving Offices, and particularly from the Sacrament of the Eucharist, till men are loosed from those Censures, they must be depriv'd of the ordinary means, whereby God hath appointed to transmit the pardon of offences. But as the question is not, Whether Absolution may be necessary in a particular case, or to particular persons, but whether it be generally so; So we cannot look upon this Absolution as generally necessary to Salvation, unless it were such to fall under those Censures, from which this Absolution frees. The result of the Premises is this; The Church of God is indeed invested with a power of Absolution, and such, as exerts it self in several Acts, answerably to the needs of those, with whom it hath to do: But as it is not invested with any such power of Absolution, as doth actually free the Offender from his guilt, the doing of  
that

that pertaining only unto God ; As it is not therefore invested with any other power of Absolution, than what may serve to *declare* the pardon of God, or *help toward the procuring* of it ; So what it doth toward either of these ( unless it be in Baptism, or the Lord's Supper ) is either no Sacrament at all, and so falls not under this enquiry, or is no generally necessary one. And indeed, however the Church of *Rome* may seem to advance another Absolution, even that which actually looseth the sinner from his guilt ; Though she more-over represent that Absolution of her's, as generally necessary to the Salvation of those who are under any mortal sin ; yet is there no appearance of any such Absolution, nor indeed of the necessity of any, but what is before describ'd. As is evident, as to the *former* of these, from that very Text, on which it is founded, even a promise of *loosing that in Heaven, which shall be loosed on Earth*. For if there must be a loosing in Heaven, after that on Earth, that on Earth cannot be look'd upon as actually free-  
ing

ing the Sinner from his guilt, but only as preparatory to it; With this only advantage ( which might very well occasion the so entitling it ) that that loosing shall certainly be followed by a more effectual, and heavenly one. So little reason is there to believe, that there is any Absolution among men, but what is purely preparatory to the Absolution of God; And we shall find there is as little reason to seek out any other *modes* of it, than those, which were before describ'd: As will appear if we consider, who they are, that are to be loosed, and who as they are either such, as are within the Communion of the Church, or such as are excluded from it, so, if they be of the former sort, have either done nothing to deserve an exclusion, or have committed such offences, as are worthy of it. If the persons we speak of be such Members of the Church, as have not done any thing to deserve an exclusion from it; So there cannot lye any engagement upon them to confess their sins to a Priest, or seek any other Absolution, than by  
the

the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or other the like ordinary methods of the Church: The Communion, in which they are, and which they have not done any thing to deprive themselves of, giving them a title to that Sacrament, or any other priviledge of their Religion. But then if they be such, as do really deserve to be excluded, till they have given sufficient testimonies of their repentance; Either they ought to be excluded, and afterwards loosed as Excommunicate persons, or, if they be thought fit to be continued in the Church, be look'd upon as Members of it, and allowed the common Absolutions of it: It being a kind of contradiction *in adjecto* to continue men in the Communion of the Church, and yet deny them the common priviledges thereof. All therefore, that remains to be accounted for, is the Absolution of those, who have been shut out of the Church; But concerning which as there is no great difference between us, and the Church of *Rome*, so we deny not but that it may require a peculiar *form of words*, and such as may signifie to  
the

the persons concern'd, and the Members of the Church the act of the Officers thereof in it. But that the Essence of Absolution consisteth in it, doth not appear to us, nor can indeed be reasonably affirm'd; Partly, because the very restoring Excommunicated persons to the Communion of the Church will as effectually vacate its former Censures, as any express declaration can do; And partly, because Excommunication consisting in a deprivation from those methods of Salvation, which God hath deposited in the Church, the only effectual release of it must lye in a re-admission to them, and particularly to the Sacrament of the Eucharist. But so the Antient Church appears to have understood it, as is evident both from her language, and practice; She not only expressing this *Absolution*, by (w) *bringing men to the Communion, reconciling them to it, or restoring it to them*, but taking care above all things, that no Excommunicated person generally should go out of the World (x) without partaking of the Eucharist. For what other account can be given  
of

(w) See *Usher's Answer to the Jesuites Challenge.*

pag. 132.

(x) *Dionys. Alex. apud Euseb. Eccl. Hist. li. 6. c. 44. item Conc. Nic. can. 13.*



of that both language, and practice of hers, than that she conceiv'd the Absolution of Excommunicated persons to lye in a re-admission to the common methods of Salvation, and consequently that they were rather loos'd by the use of those methods, than by any judicial sentence? This however is certain (which is enough for our present purpose) that Absolution in this sense cannot be look'd upon as generally necessary, because the peculiar refuge of such, as have been shut out of the Church. And if that be the case of Absolution, as well as of the other supposed Sacraments; *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* will continue to be the *only ones*, that are of that necessity to Salvation.

---

**FINIS.**

---

*Books lately Printed for Richard Chifwell.*

F O L I O.

**D**R. *Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus & earum Rationibus.*

Sir *James Turner's Pallas Armata*, or Military Essays of the Ancient Grecian, Roman, and Modern Art of War.

Dr. *John Lightfoot's Works* in *English*, in 2 Volumes, with his Life, and with large and useful Tables.

Mr. *Selden's Janus Anglorum* Englished, with Notes: To which is added his *Epinomis*, concerning the ancient Government and Laws of this Kingdom, never before extant.

Dr. *Allestrees Sermons.*

Dr. *Towerson's Explication of the Creed, Lords Prayer, and Ten Commandments* in 3 Parts.

Dr. *Cave's Lives of the Primitive Fathers* in two Volumes.

Sir *Tho. Brown's Vulgar Errors*, with all the rest of his Works.

Q U A R T O.

**P**atris *Simonii Disquisitiones Criticæ de Variis per diversa Loca & Tempora Bibliorum Editionibus. Accedunt Castigat. Opusc. If. Vossii de Sibyllinis Oraculis.*

Dr. *Falkner's Two Treatises of Reproaching and Censure: with His Answer to Serjeant's Surefooting*, also several occasional Sermons.

The Case of Lay-Communion with the Church of *England* considered.

A Discourse concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue.

A Discourse of the Necessity of Reformation, with respect to the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*.

O C T A V O.

**D**R. *William Cave's Dissertation concerning the Government of the Ancient Church by Bishops, Metropolitans and Patriarchs.*

Two Letters betwixt Mr. *R. Smith* and Dr. *Hen. Hammond* about Christs Descent into Hell.

Dean *Stratford's* dissuasive from Revenge.

The Life of Bishop *Bedel*.





*Library of the Theological Seminary,*  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

*Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.*.....

RL

