

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



Cornell University Library
BX2230 .P39

Sacrificium missaticum : mysterium iniqu



3 1924 029 398 629

oIn



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

SACRIFICIUM MISSATICUM,
MYSTERIUM INIQUITATIS:

O R,

A T R E A T I S E

CONCERNING THE

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

(NEVER BEFORE PRINTED)

By the Reverend and Learned
Mr. HENRY PENDLEBURY, M. A.
OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;

A U T H O R O F

A Tract on Transubstantiation,

PUBLISHED BY ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON,

And some other VALUABLE PIECES.

A short Account of the AUTHOR'S LIFE is prefixed;
and the whole is earnestly recommended to the
particular Attention both of the Protestants and Papists
of these Kingdoms.

MONSTRUM HORRENDUM

L O N D O N:

Printed for W. GRIFFIN, in Catharine-Street, Strand.

MDCCLXVIII.

T H E

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE Editor's principal view in this Publication, is to serve the interests of PROTESTANT RELIGION, by erecting a barrier against the incurfion of Popery. Every one knows that there have of late been feveral loud complaints of the reftlefs endeavours of the Papiſts in theſe Kingdoms, to make Profelytes; and of the too great ſucceſs they have met with. Some foundation, it is to be feared, there may be

for such Complaints. One Fact, however, it is said, is indisputable, viz. That a great Number of *Jesuits*, banished even from Popish Countries, for execrable Crimes, have taken refuge among us; and, if that is the case, we may be almost certain, they will not be long unemployed.

The Editor being no stranger to these things, and having had the Original Authentic Manuscript of the valuable Treatise, he now offers to the Public, a considerable time in his hands; he was induced to peruse it with a more particular attention; and, finding it to contain, in his opinion at least, a clear and solid refutation of the MAIN POINT of genuine Popery, he thought it no less than his Duty to publish it.

Some

EDITOR'S PREFACE. v

Some persons notwithstanding, may perhaps too hastily judge such a Publication needless ; and urge,
 “ That in these happy days of me-
 “ ridian light and liberty, all Pro-
 “ testants have as strong an *instinc-*
 “ *tive* Abhorrence of Popery, as that
 “ which seems to be naturally im-
 “ planted in the human breast against
 “ a Serpent ; and that the only use of
 “ a discourse of this kind *now*, must
 “ be to convert Papists, in which
 “ there is little hope of success.”

The true answer to all such reason-
 ing is this, *viz.* that, supposing the
 truth of the Premises (which, how-
 ever, is far from being self-evident) the
 Conclusion is by no means necessary.
 For who can be ignorant that *mere*
Instincts and Impressions of this sort
 are changeable and transient ; and

that it were much better to be armed at all points, with solid Reason and Judgment, which are everlasting and immutable? and such Armour, it is presumed, may be had from the following Treatise.

THE EDITOR has nothing more at heart, than that young persons especially, would carefully study the Sacrifice of the Mass. Who sees not the happy consequences to our *Civil* as well as Religious concerns, of their being thoroughly established in PROTESTANTISM? Indeed this is an important part of Education, but too much neglected in the present age. Thousands, even in these enlightened nations, can give no other reason for their being Protestants, than that they were educated as such: nay, strange as it may appear,

appear, it is most certain, they do not even understand the name Protestant ; much less, the Thing.

The following treatise may be of great Service in confirming such as these in the Principles of Protestant Religion, upon the surest and best grounds. Nor need they shudder at being called upon to read so uncouth a Subject: if they read with a good disposition, they may perhaps with surprize find the *useful* and the *agreeable* happily conjoined: and if this, in any degree, should cool their affection for trifling Romances, and vain Books of mere amusement, and give them some relish for more solid Compositions; none, it is hoped, will have any just cause to regret it.

The following Treatise exhibits an Example of grave reasoning, on

viii EDITOR'S PREFACE.

an argument which some may think scarce worthy of it, and fitter for Ridicule, than to be handled seriously. But these persons would do well to consider, that, however ridiculous Popery is in itself; it has had, and still continues to have very *serious* effects: and as it's Advocates (besides the dream of the Infallibility of their Church) pretend to support it upon the sure foundations of Reason and Scripture; it is necessary to shew the Weakness and Insufficiency of the arguments they draw from thence, and to fight them with their own Weapons: and few, perhaps, are to be found better qualified than our Author for the task. He had thoroughly studied his subject, and appears to be perfect

fect master of it: He had all the advantages both of natural Genius and acquired Erudition; and, above all, a pious and good heart, and a deep concern for the Simplicity and Purity of Divine Worship. With these noble Qualifications, we shall not wonder to find him writing with all the generous Freedom and Spirit of a CHILLINGWORTH; and at the same time, with the Sedateness and graceful Dignity of a HOOKER, both whose distinguishing Excellencies seem in this Treatise to be happily united.

The Language is elegantly plain and simple; and such an Air of Purity, Sincerity, and unaffected Integrity, the very Picture of the Author's own mind, runs thro' the whole Piece, as cannot fail of pleasing every person

fon of Sense. The chief Excellency of all, is the REASONING, which is clear, strong, and irresistible; every Syllable stamps conviction: and however little Success is to be expected, yet it were devoutly to be wished, that those of the *Roman Catholic* Communion among us, that are not utterly abandoned to Delusion, would peruse this Piece with the attention it deserves. Who knows what happy Effects, through the Blessing of God, it might produce?

The Editor pretends to no other share of merit in the following Performance, than as a faithful Transcriber and Translator of several Passages of Latin, for the benefit of the English Reader. He has also digested it, he thinks, in a better order than in the original, and rendered

dered the several transitions from one Argument to another more easy; changed some few obsolete words, for others exactly synonymous, that are in more frequent use; and carefully revised and corrected the whole. Had the Author finished it himself, it would doubtless have appeared with greater advantage; but the Editor has spared no pains nor expence to render it as exact and accurate as a Posthumous Work of this kind can reasonably be expected to be: And he has nothing more to add by way of Preface, than to pray and beseech the Reader not to go over the following Sheets too cursorily, but with strict attention. He may assure himself, it will amply repay all his pains. And now may the
Blessing

Blessing of Almighty God attend
this well-meant endeavour to pro-
mote his Glory, and the Good of
his universal Church! *Amen.*



Namptwich,
Dec. 5th, 1767.

A LIST

A

L I S T

O F T H E

S U B S C R I B E R S ' N A M E S .

A

THE Reverend Mr. Law. Adams, Vicar of
St. John Baptist's, Chester.
Mr. Adams ditto.
The Reverend Mr. Stephen Addington, Har-
borough, *three Books.*
James Ainslie, M. D. Kendall.
Mr. Robert Aldersey, Chester.
Mr. Ebenezer Aldred, Wakefield.
The Reverend J. Allen, Rector of Tarporley.
Mr. Allen, Southampton Buildings, London.
Robert Amory, M. D. Wakefield.
Mr. Robert Anderson, Liverpool.
Mr. Thomas Appleby, Manchester:
John Arden, Esq. Stockport.
Samuel Armitage, Esq. *near* Wakefield.
Mr. William Armstrong, Manchester.

xiv SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES:

Francis Athby, Esq. Derby.
Mr. James Aspell, Manchester.
Mrs. Asquith, Leeds.
The Reverend Mr. Thomas Astley, Preston.
The Reverend Mr. Atkinson, Wakefield.
Mr. Audley, Attorney at Law, Namptwich.

B.

Joseph Backhouse, Esq. Leeds.
Miss Prudence Bagshaw, Chesterfield.
The Reverend Mr. Law. Bailey, M. A. Fellow
of Christ's College, Cambridge.
The Reverend Mr. Bakewell, Derby.
The Reverend J. Baldwin, Rector of North
Meols, Lancashire.
Mrs. Elizabeth Ball, Chester.
Mr. Robert Bancroft, Stockport.
Mr. William Banks, Leeds.
James Justus Barlow, Gent. Salford.
Philip Barnes, Esq. Derby.
The Reverend Roger Barnston, Prebend of
Chester.
Trafford Barnston, Esq. ditto.
Mr. Samuel Baron, Walshaw.
Samuel Barrow, Esq. Namptwich, *two Books*.
Thomas Barflow, *Town-clerk*, Leeds.
The Reverend Mr. Richard Barton, Heywood.
Mr. John Barwick, Surgeon, Leeds.
Mr. Edmund Battersbee, Manchester.
James Bayley, Esq. Chester.
Mrs. Bayley, ditto.
Mr. Samuel Bayley, ditto.
The Reverend Mr. G. Bayliff, Sheffield.
Mr. Beckett, Baddeley.
Mr. John Bedford, Junior, Leeds.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES. xv

The Reverend Mr. Thomas Beely, Manchester.
 Mr. Francis Beevor, Leeds,
 Mr. Samuel Bell, ditto.
 Mr. Joseph Berry, Manchester.
 Mr. William Bertles, Stockport.
 Mr. John Bickerton, Namptwich.
 John Peploe-Birch, Esq. Manchester.
 Mr. Josiah Birch, ditto,
 Mr. Arnold Birch, ditto.
 Mr. Samuel Birch, ditto.
 Mr. Joseph Birch, Stockport
 Miss Sarah Blackmore, Manchester:
 John Blayds, Esq. Leeds.
 James Blayds, Esq. ditto.
 Mr. William Blonk, Sheffield.
 Mr. J. Bloodworth, Derby.
 Mr. Bloomfield, Namptwich.
 The Reverend Mr. Blyth, Birmingham.
 The Reverend Mr. Booth, Stockport.
 The Reverend Mr. Boulton, Wrexham.
 Mr. William Boulton, Chester.
 Mrs. Bourn, Rowley.
 Mr. Benj. Bower, Manchester.
 The Reverend Mr. Braddock, Bury, *two Books*.
 Mr. Thomas Bradley, Leeds.
 The Reverend Mr. Brailsford, Head Master of
 the Free-School, Birmingham.
 Mr. Benj. Brett, Walfall.
 Mr. John Broadhurst, Stockport.
 The Reverend Mr. Samuel Brooke, Leeds.
 Mr. R. S. Brooke, Namptwich.
 Mr. W. Brown, Attorney at Law, Wakefield.
 Mr. Joseph Brown, Chulmundeston.
 Mr. Richard Bruce, *near* Chester.
 Mr. William Burton, Surgeon, Sheffield.
 Mr. John Burton, Chesterfield.

xvi SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

Hans Busk, Esq. Leeds.
Mr. Henry Butterfield, ditto.
Mr. Richard Buxton, Wakefield.

C.

The Right Honourable Lord Clive.
The Right Honourable Lady Clive.
Mr. James Caldwell, Namptwich.
Mr. Joseph Caldwell, Manchester.
Mr. John Calverley, Leeds.
Mr. Ralph Cappur, Namptwich,
Mr. James Card, Newcastle.
Mr. James Carr, Halifax.
Mr. William Carr, Leeds.
Mr. Carter, Middlewich.
Mrs. Carver, Chesterfield.
The Reverend Mr. Cawley, Tarvin.
Sir John Chetwode, Baronet.
The Reverend Mr. Chidlaw, Chester.
Mr. Joseph Chippindall, Attorney at Law,
Manchester.
Mr. Church, *at the Griffin*, Namptwich.
John Clarke, Esq. Walgherton.
The Reverend Mr. Clarke, Birmingham.
Mr. John Clarke, Littlewoodhouse,
Mr. William Clarkson, Leeds.
Mr. James Clegg Manchester.
Mr. John Clegg, *near Rochdale*.
Richard Clive, Esq. Stych.
William Clive, Esq. Ipswich.
The Reverend Mr. Clive, Rector of Adderley,
two Books.
Mr. Richard Clough, Manchester.
Mr. Joseph Clubbe, Chester.

Mr.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES. xvii

Mr. John Clubbe, Chester.
Major Cole, Leeds.
 Mr. Robert Coleman, Bristol.
 Mr. Richard Cooke, Merchant, Halifax.
 Mr. James Cooke, ditto.
 Mr. White Cooke, Derby.
 Mr. Joseph Cooke, Chester.
 Mr. John Cooke, ditto.
 Mr. William Cooke, Namptwich.
 John Cookson, M. D. Wakefield.
 Mr. Samuel Cooper, Attorney at Law, Stockport.
 Mr. Cooper, *Strafford-Arms*, Wakefield.
 Mr. Cooper, Namptwich.
 Mr. Edward Coppock, Stockport.
 Mr. William Cornelius, Chester.
 Mr. Luke Cotes, Manchester.
 Mr. Michael Cottam, Surgeon, Leeds.
 Mr. George Cotton, senior, Wakefield.
 Mr. George Cotton, junior, ditto.
 Mr. William Cowell, Merchant, Leeds.
 Mr. William Cowley, *Angel*, Chesterfield.
 John Crewe, Esq. Créwe.
 Joshua Crompton, Esq. Derby.
 John Crompton, Esq. ditto.
 Mr. Robert Crowther, Stockport.
 Mr. Tim. Crowther, Gummerfall.
 Mrs. Cunliffe, Chester, *two Books*.

D.

Mr. Samuel Daniel, Stockport.
 The Reverend Mr. Darwall, Walfall.
 John Dawson, Esq. Morley, *two Books*.
 Mr. Dawson, Attorney at Law, Sheffield, *two Books*.
 Mr. William Dawson, Surgeon, Leeds.

xviii SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES,

The Reverend Mr. Dean, Manchester.
Mr. Dennis, Namptwich.
William Dennison, Esq. Leeds.
Alexander Denton, M. D. Chester:
The Reverend Mr. Derbyshire, ditto.
The Reverend Mr. Dickenson, Vicar of Tarvin;
The Reverend Mr. Dickenson, Gloucester.
The Reverend Mr. Dickenson, Sheffield.
Mr. Benj. Dickenson, Merchant, Halifax.
Mr. Eben. Dix, Chester.
Mr. Samuel Dixon, Stockport.
The Reverend Mr. Docksey, Chester,
The Reverend Mr. Hen. Downes, Sheffield;
Mr. Joseph Downing, ditto.
Mr. James Drake, Halifax.
Mr. Drinkwater, Surgeon, Salford,
Maria Ducarel, Bath.
Mr. James Durden, Rochdale,

E.

The Reverend Mr. Joseph Eaton, Chester.
Mr. Eaton, Attorney at Law, ditto
The Reverend Mr. Eddowes, Rector of Wistaston;
Mr. John Eddowes, Namptwich.
Mr. John Eddowes, Chester.
The Reverend Mr. Edwards, Leeds.
Mr. William Egerton, *near* Namptwich.
Mr. Ellis, Chester.
The Reverend Mr. Ethelston, Manchester.
The Reverend Mr. Caleb Evans, Bristol.
The Reverend Mr. Thomas Evans Mixenden.
The Reverend Mr. Joseph Evans, Sheffield.
Mr. Thomas Evans, Bristol.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES. xix

F.

Mrs. Elizabeth Faulkner, Chester.
The Reverend Mr. John Fawcett, Leeds.
The Reverend Mr. Fawcett, Kidderminster,
William Fenton, Esq. near Leeds.
Thomas Fenton, Esq. ditto.
Mr. John Fenton, ditto.
Mr. H. Feilden, Manchester.
John Firth, Esq. Leeds.
Thomas Fletcher, Esq. Walthamstow.
Mr. Folliott, Merchant, Chester.
Mr. Hugh Foster, Namptwich.
Mr. William Foster, ditto.
Wr. William Fowden, Stockport.
Mr. William Fowler, Attorney at Law, Derby.
Mr. Ralph Fox, Namptwich.
Mr. Francis, Gent. Malton.
Mr. John Frur, Surgeon, Birmingham.

G.

The Right Honourable Lord Gray.
The Honourable Booth Gray.
Mr. Gallimore, Attorney at Law, Chesterfield.
Mr. Stephen Gamble, ditto.
Mrs. Gardiner, ditto.
Mr. Lawrence Gardner, Manchester.
Mr. James Gardner, ditto.
Mr. John Garland, Leeds.
Mr. Samuel Garnett, Namptwich.
Mr. George Garnett, ditto.
The Reverend Mr. Garratt, Burton.
The Reverend Mr. Curhbert Gaskarth, Bowden!

xx SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

Mr. John Gee, Stockport.
The Reverend Mr. Gentleman, Salop.
Mr. Gibbons, Attorney at Law, Namptwich.
Mr. James Gibson, Salop:
Mr. Francis Gilbert, Chester.
Mr. Gilbert, Namptwich.
Mr. Benj. Glover, Leeds.
Mr. Joshua Glover, Birmingham.
Ralph Goforth, Esq.
Mr. Gorst, Middlewich.
Mr. Robert Gorton, Manchester.
Mr. William Graham, Halifax.
Mrs. Gream, Wakefield.
Mr. James Greatrex, senior, Manchester.
Mr. Samuel Greaves, Sheffield.
Richard Green, Esq. Wakefield.
Mr. Robert Green, Leeds, *two Books*.
Mr. Greenwollers, Namptwich.
Mr. Aaron Grimshaw, De Acad. Leeds.
Mr. Samuel Grundy, Bury.
The Reverend Mr. Gummer, Hereford.
Mr. Thomas Gunning, Sheffield.
Mr. Thomas Gysbourn, Birmingham.

H.

The Honourable and Reverend Dr. Harvey,
Prebend of Ely.
Mr. John Hadfield, junior, Manchester.
Mr. Joshua Hainsworth, Leeds.
Dr. Hall, Manchester.
Mr. Hall, Surgeon, Namptwich.
Mr. Hall, Brazen Nose College, Oxford.
Mr. Samuel Hall, Manchester.
Mr. William Hall, Sheffield.
Mr. John Hamer, Rochdale.

Mr.

- Mr. George Hamer, Hamer-Hall.
 Mr. John Hamnett, Willaston.
 Mr. Joseph Hancock, Sheffield, *two Books.*
 Captain Nathaniel Hancock, London.
 Mr. Benjamin Hanson, ditto.
 Mr. Thomas Hardy, junior, Wakefield.
 Mr. J. Hargreaves, ditto.
 Samuel Harper, Esq. Leeds.
 Mr. James Harriott, London.
 Mr. James Harrison, Manchester.
 Mr. William Harrison, Derby.
 The Reverend Mr. Harrop, Wem.
 The Reverend Mr. Harrop, Ashton.
 Mr. Thomas Harrop, Chester.
 The Reverend Mr. Hart, Doncaster.
 The Reverend Mr. Harwood, Chester.
 Mr. James Haslam, Rochdale.
 The Reverend Mr. Hawkes, Birmingham.
 Mr. William Hawksford, ditto.
 Mr. Gam. Hawkins, Chester.
 Mr. John Hawkley, Surgeon, Sheffield.
 Mr. Christopher Heath, Derby, *two Books.*
 Miss Heaton, Chesterfield.
 The Reverend Charles Henschman, Vicar of St.
 Oswald's, Chester.
 Mr. Thomas Henshaw, Manchester.
 The Reverend Mr. Hesketh, Northouram.
 Mr. William Hewitt, Nantwich.
 Mr. John Hewitt, ditto, *two Books.*
 Mr. Joseph Hewitt, Stapeley.
 The Reverend Mr. James Heywood, Chesterfield.
 Mr. Robert Hibbert, Merchant, Manchester,
two Books.
 The Reverend Mr. Hinckesman, Chesterfield.
 Mr. Charles Hindley, Manchester.

xxii SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

The Reverend Mr. Hinton, Birmingham.
William Hird, M. D. Leeds.
Mr. Thomas Hobson, Birmingham.
Mr. Hockenhull, Namptwich.
C. Hodson, M. D. Wakefield.
Mr. James Hodson, Manchester.
The Reverend Mr. Francis Hodson, Bury.
Lady Hoghton, Walton.
Mr. John Holford, Manchester.
Mr. Samuel Holker, Bury.
Mr. Samuel Holland, Surgeon, Chesterfield.
Mr. Joseph Hollings, Halifax.
Mr. William Holme, Stockport.
Mr. John Holmes, Leeds.
Mr. John Hope, Manchester.
Mr. William Houghton, Merchant, Huddersfield.
Mrs. Haworth, Manchester, *two Books*.
Mr. Daniel Howell, Namptwich.
Mrs. S. Hudson, Halifax.
Mr. William Hudson, Gildersome.
Mrs. Mary Hunt, Chester.
Mr. William Hutchinson, Wine Merchant, Leeds;
Mr Samuel Hutton, ditto.
Mrs. Hyde, Chester.
Mr. Robert Hyde, Merchant, Manchester;
Mr. David Hyde, Stockport.

I.

Mr. Joseph Ibbetson, Sheffield,
Samuel Ingham, M. D. London,

J.

Mr. Joseph Jackson, *King's-Arms*, Namptwich;
Mr. Thomas Jackson, ditto.

Mr;

Mr. Thomas Jagger, Leeds.
 Mr. E. Jennings, Wakefield.
 Mrs. Joddrell, Chester, *two Books.*
 Mrs. Joddrell, Manchester.
 Mr. P. Johnson, Derby.
 Mr. Samuel Johnson, Namptwich.
 James Johnstone, M. D.
 The Reverend Mr. Jones, Walsall.
 Mr. Thomas Jyles, Namptwich.

K.

Samuel Kay, M. D. Manchester.
 Mr. Richard Kay, Bury.
 The Reverend Mr. Keay, Ash, *six Books.*
 Mr. Randle Keay, Whitchurch.
 Mr. Kennerley, Namptwich.
 James Kennion, Esq. *near Leeds.*
 Mr. Edward Kennion, Merchant, Manchester.
 Mr. Kent, Apothecary, Namptwich.
 Mr. William Kent; ditto.
 The Reverend Mr. Kent, ditto.
 Mr. Edmund Kershaw, Stockport.
 Mr. George Killer, Derby.
 Mr. John Kirby, Sheffield.
 Mr. Ralph Kirkham, Manchester.
 Mr. Thomas Kirkpatrick, Derby.
 Mr. Roger Kirkpatrick, Whitchurch.
 The Reverend Mr. Knowles, B. A. Stockport.
 The Reverend Mr. Knight, Halifax.

L.

The Reverend Mr. John Langhorne, Acton.
 Mr. William Leach, Halifax.
 Mr. William Leaper, Derby.

xxiv SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

Mr. John Leathley, Leeds.
 Thomas Lee, senior, Esq. ditto.
 Thomas Lee, junior, Esq. ditto.
 Mrs. Lee, Chester.
 John Lee, Esq. Lincoln's Inn.
 Jonathan Lee, Esq. Chesterfield.
 Mr. R. Leeke, Middlewich.
 John Lees, Esq. Platt, *six Books*,
 The Reverend George Legh, L. L. D. Vicar of
 Halifax, *three Books*.
 Mr. James Leigh, Golbourne.
 Mr. Samuel Lenox, Liverpool.
 Mr. Liversage, Namptwich.
 Mr. Robert Livesey, Manchester.
 The Reverend John Lloyd, Vicar of Rotheram,
 Edmund Lodge, Esq. Leeds, *two Books*.
 Thomas Lodge, Esq. ditto.
 Mr. Thomas Longmore, Birmingham.
 The Reverend Mr. Lord, Knutsford.
 Mr. Samuel Loynes, Walsall.
 Mrs. Theodosia Lowe, Derby.
 Mr. Solomon Lowe, Mottram.
 Robert Lowndes, Esq. Chesterfield,
 Mr. William Ludlow, Bristol.
 Mr. Christopher Ludlow, ditto.
 Mr. Isaac Ludlow, ditto.
 Mr. Robert Lumb, Leeds.
 The Reverend Mr. William Lupton, ditto.

M.

Mr. John M'Kie, Chester.
 H. Mackworth, Esq. Cavendish Square.
 The Reverend Mr. Maddock, Namptwich.
 Mr. James Maddock, ditto.
 Mr. Plant Maddock, ditto.

Mr.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES. xxv

- Mr. George Maddock, Stapeley.
 Peter Mainwaring, M. D. Manchester, *two Books.*
 Mr. R. Markham, Leeds.
 Mr. Thomas Marriott, Manchester.
 Mr. William Marriott, Stockport.
 Mr. Marriott, *Roe-Buck*, Rochdale.
 Mr. Robert Marsden, Chesterfield.
 Mr. James Marshall, Leeds.
 Mr. John Marshall, Merchant, Woolverhampton.
 Mr. William Martin, Namptwich.
 Mr. J. Martland, Manchester.
 Edmund Maskelyne, Esq. Basset-Down, Wilts.
 The Reverend Mr. Maffey, Tarporley.
 Mr. John Maffie, Namptwich.
 The Reverend Mr. Mather, Rainford.
 Mr. J. Matthewman, Sheffield.
 Mr. John Matthews, ditto, *two Books.*
 Mr. George Maudsley, Wakefield.
 Mr. John Maurice, Chester.
 The Reverend Mr. Meanley, Platt.
 Messrs. Thomas and John Medhursts, Leeds, *two Books.*
 Mr. Micklethwaite, Leeds.
 Mr. Robert Midgley, ditto.
 Mr. Jos. Midlam, Birmingham.
 ——— Milner, M. D. Leeds.
 Robert Milnes, Esq. Wakefield.
 Pemberton Milnes, Esq. ditto.
 James Milnes, Esq. ditto.
 Mr. William Milnes, Chesterfield.
 Mr. Joseph Mitchell, Sheffield.
 Mr. James Mitchell, Manchester.
 Mr. Joseph Mobberley, Walfall,

Mr.

xxvi SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES

Mr. B. Moleworth, Sheffield.
Mr. Mollyneux, Merchant, Leeds.
Mr. John Moreton, Chester.
The Reverend Mr. John Morewood, Chesterfield.
Mr. John Mort, Chowbent.
Francis Moseley, Esq. Manchester.
The Reverend Mr. Mottershead, ditto.
Mr. John Moulson, Chester.
The Reverend Mr. Moulton, Rotheram.
Mr. R. Wylde Moulton, ditto.
Mr. Robert Moulton, Manchester.
Mr. John Moulton, Surgeon, Rochdale.
Mr. Edward Murdock, Glasgow.

N.

Mr. William Nabb, Attorney at Law, Manchester.
Richard Nangreave, Esq. ditto.
Mr. John Navason, Rochdale.
Mr. J. Naylor, Attorney at Law, Wakefield.
Mr. John Naylor, ditto.
Robert Newton, Esq. Norton.
The Reverend Mr. Newton, Bristol.
Mr. William Newton, *Bookseller*, Manchester.
The Reverend Mr. Gabriel Nichols, ditto.
Mr. Richard Nutter, Rochdale.

O.

The Reverend Mr. James Oates, Betley.
Mr. George Oates, Merchant, Leeds.
Mr. Josiah Oates, Merchant, ditto.
Mr. Samuel Oates, Merchant, ditto.
Miss Mary Oates, ditto.
The Reverend Mr. Oldfield, Manchester.

Richard

Mr. Richard Oliver, junior, Attorney at Law,
Manchester.

Mr. John Orange, Chester.

Mr. Aaron Orme, senior, Manchester.

The Reverend Mr. Job Orton, Kidderminster.

Mr. Oulton, Namptwich.

P.

The Reverend Mr. Palmer, Macclesfield:

Mr. Kennion Parker, Sheffield.

Mr. Thomas Parks, Birmingham,

Mr. Parrott, Middlewich.

Mr. William Parsons, Leeds.

Mr. William Partridge, Derby.

The Reverend Mr. Partridge, Namptwich.

Mr. Payne, ditto.

Mr. Richard Peacopp, Merchant, Leeds.

The Reverend William Pendlebury, M. A.
Rector of Burythorp, *two Books.*

Mr. Penlington Namptwich.

Mr. Francis Perrott, Surgeon, Birmingham.

Mr. William Phillips, Namptwich.

Mr. J. Pickford, Derby.

Mrs. Pigott, Manchester.

—— Pilkington, Esq. Heath, *two Books.*

The Reverend Mr. Pilkington, Preston.

Mr. Robert Pilkington, Bolton, *two Books.*

Mr. Robert Plack, Stockport.

Mr. Randle Podmore, Namptwich.

Mr. George Pollard, Halifax.

Mr. William Pollard, ditto.

The Reverend Mr. Pope, Manchester.

Mr. James Potter, Merchant, ditto.

Mr. Thomas Pratchett, Namptwich.

Mr.

xxviii SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES;

Mr. Abraham Pratt, Malton.
Mr. Philip Presbury, Chester.
Colonel Prescott, Wakefield,
R. Prescott, Esq. London.
Mr. Nathaniel Priestley, Northouram,
Joseph Priestley, Field-Head.
Mr. Jonathan Priestley, Leeds.
Mr. Philip Prothero, Bristol.
The Reverend Mr. Punfield, Birmingham,
The Reverend Mr. Pye, Sheffield.

R.

Mr. Edmund Radcliffe, Manchester, *two Books*.
Mr. Radcliffe, Namptwich.
The Reverend Mr. Ralph, Halifax.
The Reverend Mr. Ratcliffe, Congleton;
Mr. Andrew Raynes, Sheffield.
Mr. John Read, Leeds.
Mrs. Rhode, Chester.
Mr. John Rhodes, Halifax.
Mr. William Rhodes, Leeds.
The Reverend Legh Richmond, Rector of
Stockport, *two Books*.
Mr. Rider, Leeds.
Mr. David Rivers, London.
Mr. Jer. Roades, Gummerfall.
Mr. Jos. Roberts, Sheffield, *two Books*.
Mr. Robert Roberts, Chester.
The Reverend Mr. Robins, Westbromich.
George Robinson, Esq. Altringham.
Mr. James Robinson, Derby.
Mr. William Rose, Leeds.
Mr. John Rose, Chester.
The Reverend Mr. Rotheram, Kendall,

Mr.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES. xxix

Mr. Roughley, Chester.
 Mr. Christopher Routh, Leeds.
 Mr. Robert Rowland, Sheffield.
 Mr. John Ruffell, Rotheram.
 Mr. Daniel Rufton, Birmingham.
 The Reverend Mr. Rylands, Huddersfield.

S.

The Right Honourable Earl of Stamford.
 The Right Honourable Countess of Stamford.
 The Honourable and Reverend John Stanley,
 Rector of Winwick.
 Mr. William Sacheverell, Wakefield.
 The Reverend Mr. Matthew Salmon, Atherton.
 The Reverend Mr. Joseph Saunders, Chesterfield.
 Mr. Joseph Scarrett, Nantwich.
 Mr. Robert Scarrett, ditto.
 Samuel Scatcherd, Esq. Morley.
 Mrs. Scott, Leeds.
 The Reverend Mr. James Scott, M. A. Fellow
 of ——— College, Cambridge.
 Mr. John Seaman, Middlewich.
 Mr. William Seaman, ditto.
 The Reverend Mr. John Seddon, Manchester.
 The Reverend Mr. John Shaw, Rochdale.
 Mr. John Shaw, Chesterfield.
 Mr. Thomas Shaw, Chester.
 Mr. John Shepley, Attorney at Law, Leeds.
 Samuel Shore, Esq. Sheffield, *two Books*.
 Mr. William Short, Leeds.
 Mr. John Shute, ditto.
 William Shuttleworth, Esq. Chesterfield.
 Mr. William Antrobus Sidebotham, Stockport.
 Mr. S. Simmons, Sheffield.
 Mr. William Simpson, Sheffield.

Mr.

xxx SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

- Mr. Richard Slater, Chesterfield.
Mr. Richard Slater, junior, Attorney at Law,
ditto.
Mr. Thomas Slater, Surgeon, ditto.
Thomas Slaughter, Esq. Chester.
The Reverend Archdeacon Smalbrooke, Litch-
field, *two Books*.
Mr. Thomas Smalley, Chesterfield.
Mr. George Smart, *Bookseller*, Walfall, *two Books*;
Book-Society, ditto.
The Reverend J. Smith, Sheffield.
Mrs. Sarah Smith, Wakefield.
Mr. William Smith, Leeds.
Mr. Nicholas Smith, Attorney at Law, ditto.
Mr. Charles Smith, Rochdale.
Mr. William Smith, Sheffield.
Mr. John Smith, ditto.
Mr. Alexander Smith, Halifax.
Mr. Peter Smith, Namptwich.
Mr. W. Snape, Derby.
The Reverend Mr. Soley, M. A. Rector of Nor-
field.
Mr. Ephraim Sorby, Sheffield.
Abraham Spooner, Esq. Birmingham.
Mr. William Sprout, Namptwich.
Mr. George Spurstow, Apothecary, Chester.
Mr. Charles Stanniforth, Surgeon, Chesterfield.
Mr. David Stansfield, Merchant, Halifax.
Mr. Thomas Starkey, Manchester.
Mr. Richard Stevenson, Leeds.
Mr. John Storrs, Stockport.
Mr. Storry, Namptwich.
Mr. Richard Stovin, Wakefield.
Benjamin Strachey, Esq. Berkley Square, Lon-
don.
Mr. Joseph Strettles, Namptwich.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES. xxxi

Mr. John Stringer, Stockport.
 Mr. James Stubbs, Chester.
 Mr. John Sutcliffe, Sheffield.
 Mrs. Swaine, *Spread-Eagle*, Manchester.
 Mr. Peter Swindell, Stockport.

T.

Mr. Thomas Tagg, Namptwich.
 John Taylor, Esq. Birmingham.
 Mr. Thomas Taylor, ditto.
 Mr. George Taylor, Sheffield, *two Books*.
 Mr. James Taylor, Merchant, Rochdale.
 Mr. Samuel Taylor, ditto.
 Mr. John Taylor, ditto.
 Mr. William Taylor, Altringham.
 Mr. John Teafdale, Rochdale.
 Mr. John Tennant, Leeds.
 The Reverend Mr. Thomas, M. A. Namptwich.
 Mr. Robert Thornley, Attorney at Law, Chesterfield.
 Mr. John Thorp, Rotheram.
 The Reverend Mr. Threlkeld, Halifax.
 Mr. William Threlkeld, ditto.
 Mr. John Tilstone, Chester.
 Miss Tilstone, ditto.
 Mr. Thomas Tinker, Manchester.
 Mr. Thomas Tipping, junior, Merchant, ditto.
 Mr. Maurice Tobin, Leeds.
 George Toller, Esq. Betley, *two Books*.
 Philip Tomlins, Esq. Worcester.
 William Tomkinson, Esq. Manchester.
 Mr. Henry Tomkinson, Attorney at Law, Dorfold.
 The Reverend Mr. Tommas Bristol.
 Mr. William Topham, Merchant, Leeds.
 Mr. Tim. Topham, *Register Office*, Wakefield.

xxxii SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

Mr. Topp, Congleton.
Colonel L. A. Tottenham, Wakefield.
Mr. Tottie, Merchant, Leeds.
Mr. James Touchett, Merchant, Manchester.
Mr. Towne, Attorney at Law, Wakefield.
Mr. Joseph Townshend, Birmingham.
Mr. Matthew Travis, Manchester.
Mr. Treacher, Namptwich.
Mr. Samuel Troughton, Birmingham.
The Reverend Mr. Turner, Wakefield.
Mr. James Turner, Rochdale.
The Reverend Mr. Twyford, Didbury.
The Reverend Mr. Tyndall, Birmingham.
Mr. Joseph Tyndall, ditto.

U.

The Reverend Mr. Urwicke, Worcester.

V.

Mr. Daniel Vaudray, Middlewich.
Mr. J. Venables, Stockport.
The Reverend Mr. Venn, Vicar of Huddersfield.
The Reverend Mr. Vicary, Bewdley.

W.

The Honourable Lady Warren, Poynton, *two*
Books.
Mr. J. Waddington, Halifax.
Mr. Haigh Walker, Leeds.
Mr. William Walker, ditto.
Mr. William Walker, junior, Wakefield.
Mr. Samuel Walker, Sheffield.

Mr.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES. xxxiii

- Mr. Andrew Walker, Warner-Street, London.
 Mr. Jarvis Walker, Namptwich.
 Mr. William Walley, ditto.
 Mr. Richard Walmley, Altringham.
 Mr. William Walmley, Manchester.
 Mr. James Walmley, Rochdale.
 Peter Walthall, Esq. Wistaston.
 Mr. Robert Ward, Manchester.
 Mr. Thomas Warren, Printer, Birmingham.
 Mr. John Waterhouse, Halifax.
 Mr. Watkiss, Attorney at Law, Namptwich.
 Mr. John Watson, Chester.
 Mr. W. Watson, Merchant, Sheffield.
 Mr. Watson, *the George*, ditto.
 Mr. E. Watson, Stockport.
 Mr. William Webb, Sutton Cold Field.
 Mr. Leonard Webster, Sheffield.
 Mrs. Sarah Webster, Chesterfield.
 Mrs. Wentworth, Wakefield.
 The Reverend Mr. Christopher Wetherhead,
 Leeds.
 Mrs. Wettenhall, Namptwich.
 Mr. James Wharton, Manchester.
 Mr. James Whawall, Stockport.
 Mr. James Wheat, Sheffield.
 The Reverend Mr. Whitaker, Leeds.
 The Reverend Mr. William Whitaker, ditto.
 Mr. James Whitaker, Attorney at Law, Man-
 chester.
 Mr. Henry Whitaker, ditto.
 Mr. John Whitaker, ditto.
 Mr. Daniel Whitaker, ditto.
 Snowden White, M. D. Derby.
 The Reverend Mr. White, ditto.
 Mr. Charles White, Surgeon, F. R. S. Man-
 chester.

xxiv SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

- Mr. John White, Chesterfield.
Mrs. Mary Whittle, Chester.
Mr. Wicksted, Namptwich.
Mr. Richard Wicksted, Surgeon, ditto.
Mrs. Mary Wilbraham, ditto.
Mr. Edward Wilkes, Leeds.
The Reverend James Wilkinson, Vicar of Sheffield, *two Books*.
Mr. Allwood Wilkinson, Merchant, Chesterfield.
Mr. Richard Wilkinson, Merchant, ditto.
Mrs. Williams, Leeds.
Mrs. Lydia Williamson, Stockport.
Richard Wilson, Esq. Recorder of Leeds.
Mrs. Wilson, Eshton.
John Wilson, Esq. Manchester.
The Reverend John Wilson, M. A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
Mr. John Wilson, Paisley.
Mr. Robert Winstanley, Preston.
The Reverend Mr. Joshua Wood, Halifax.
Mr. William Woollatt, Derby.
Mr. Hatton Woolrich, Leeds.
Mr. Edward Worthington, Stockport.
Mr. John Worthington, ditto.
The Reverend Thomas Wray, D. D. Vicar of Rochdale, *two Books*.
Mr. Wrench, Surgeon, Namptwich.
William Wright, Esq. Stockport, *two Books*.
The Reverend Mr. Thomas Wright, Bristol.
Jervas Wright, Surgeon, Sheffield.
Mr. Wroe, Bookseller, Derby.
Mr. Thomas Wroe, ditto.
Sir Rowland Wynne, Baronet:

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES. xxxv

Y.

Thomas Younge, M. D. Sheffield.

Mr. S. A. Younge, ditto.

Mr. William Yoxall, Namptwich.

Mr. William Yoxall, ditto, Attorney at Law.

Z.

Mr. Samuel Zouch, Wakefield.

A SHORT

A
SHORT ACCOUNT
OF THE
LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

BY THE
REVEREND MR. CHORLTON,

Prefixed to a TREATISE intitled

INVISIBLE REALITIES.

MR. HENRY PENDLEBURY, the Reverend Author of the ensuing Discourse, was born the sixth of May 1626, at *Jokin*, in *Bury* Parish in *Lancashire*. He was, from his youth, of a solid and sedate Spirit; there did then appear in him an averfeness to vanity, and an inclination to
seriousness;

seriousness; he had an aptness for, and love to learning, and pursued it with great closeness and diligence. There then seemed to be an early foundation laid in him, upon which afterwards a high Fabric of Learning and Goodness was to be erected. He was at several schools, but perfected for the University at *Bury* School. After he had taken his Degrees at *Cambridge*, he returned into *Lancashire*, and preached his first Sermon at *Ashworth*, in the Parish of *Middleton*, August 16th, 1648, where afterwards he spent some time as Probationer in the Ministry.

He was set apart to the Office and Work of the Ministry at *Turton* Chapel, in the Parish of *Bolton* in the Moors, October third, 1650. The Reverend Ministers that invested him in the Ministerial Office, were Mr. *John Tilsley*, Mr. *Thomas Pitts*, Mr. *Jonathan Scholesfield*, Mr. *Tobias Furness*, Mr. *Robert Bath*. They who were present, observed him to make his Ordination-Vows and Promises with great Humility of Spirit.

After his Ordination, he preached near a Year at *Horridge* Chapel, in the Parish of

Dean. From thence he removed to *Holcombe* Chapel, in the Parish of *Bury*, October 16th, 1651, where he laboured hard in his master's work, 'till he was excluded from the public performance thereof in that place, on *Bartholomew-Day* 1662, by the Act of Uniformity. The adjacent ministers and people had him in high estimation for his Life and Labours. When he was at *Holcombe*, he had a Call from the people at *Ringley*; but they at *Holcombe* being sensible what a burning and shining Light he was amongst them, would not be brought to give up their Title to him. He had a large Measure of natural Gifts and Endowments, which furnished him with great promptness and readiness for all his Ministerial Performances; but they did not render him the less studious, for he would not serve the Lord with that which cost him nothing. Much of his Time was spent in his Closet, where he gave himself to Prayer, Reading, and Meditation: this was the only place upon earth, where he took the greatest pleasure, next to his Pulpit. He did not concern himself in any secular affairs

fairs pertaining to his Family, but devolved the whole management of them upon his virtuous Consort. All his Sermons, both as to the Heads and Enlargement of them, were premeditated and penned, and afterwards preached with little variation, without the help of his Notes; which manifested, besides the strength of his memory, the vastness of his pains to fix them therein, considering the variety of the matter, and the number of the Texts contained in them.

So great was his industry, that in his weakness, when there were some small hopes of his recovery, he set himself to study a new Discourse suitable to his own and his Hearers condition. Before his exclusion from his Work in public, besides his constant Preaching every Lord's-Day at *Holcombe* among his people, he preached much to other Congregations, both far and near, in the contry, which had their monthly exercises; and after he was silenced, he continued as laborious in preaching as before. And indeed the Protestant Dissenters in all the Parishes adjacent to him,

were very desirous of his Labours amongst them; and he was free to spend, and be spent for the promoting of their Souls good. He was ever mindful of his Ordination-Vow, and could not think that any Power upon Earth could annul his Commission which he had received from Christ to Preach the Gospel. He was most eminent for humility, meekness, and self-denial; herein he shined above his Fellows.

His modesty was such, that tho' he was one of the greatest of his Brethren for ministerial Attainments and Performances, yet he did really esteem himself the least of them all: his humility cast such a Veil over all his Abilities, that *he* could not discern them, though they were very conspicuous to *others*. He was able to maintain the Truths of the Gospel committed to his Trust, against the Opposers and Subverters of them. The Controversies, both as to Faith and Worship, between the PROTESTANTS and PAPISTS, were thoroughly understood by him; his small Treatise of

TRAN-

TRANSUBSTANTIATION* is a sufficient evidence of his Ability to defend the Protestant Cause : and he has left behind him another Piece on the SACRIFICE of the MASS, not inferior to it in Worth and Excellency †.

He had a Transcript of all those divine Truths and Graces upon his own Heart, which he recommended unto others ; the Scope of all his Studies, Prayers, and Sermons, was directed by him to the saving of himself, and those that heard him. And in his Conversation were so expressed the Power and Life of all his ministerial Acts in a holy Imitation of his Lord and Master

* Doctor *Calamy* says, that this tract on Transubstantiation was carried by a friend of Mr. *Pendlebury's* to Archbishop *Tillotson*, who caused it to be published, he so much approved it. Dr. *Birch* attests, in substance, the same ; and others *now living*, who have read Mr. *Pendlebury's* Treatise on Transubstantiation, remember a recommendatory Preface prefixed to it, that was written by Archbishop *Tillotson*. The Editor of the present work did verily believe that Discourse which now appears among *Tillotson's* Works, to be Mr. *Pendlebury's*. But Doctor *Birch* expressly says, that the Archbishop was Editor of two Discourses on Transubstantiation, the one *his own*, the other Mr. *Pendlebury's*.

† That is the present Treatise,

Jesus

Jesus Christ, as did shew him to be really persuaded in his heart that there was more than ordinary care required of him to keep himself in all respects pure from the Blood of Souls : and the Lord, who is the searcher and trier of the Heart, and who loves “ Truth of Grace in the inward parts,” did crown his ministerial endeavours with great Success : he did not “ run in vain,” nor “ labour in vain, nor spend his Strength for nought ;” but he had Seals of his ministry all along, from the beginning to the close thereof ; and the Lord ordered it so wisely in his Providence, that sometimes the notice of the saving Success of his ministry was then brought unto him, when it conduced most to his inward Support and Consolation. Then (to give one instance of many) when he was banished by the *Oxford* Act, at the first House where he took up his Lodging, as a poor Exile from his own Home, the Master of the House saluted him as his spiritual Father, and related to him that he was the Instrument of his Conversion, by preaching a Lecture-sermon at *Leigh* Church. Mr.

Nathaniel

Nathaniel Hilton of *London*, gave a Stipend for a weekly Lecture at *Bolton* every Monday, of the most eminent Ministers in the County, to four in their courses, among whom this worthy Servant of Christ was chosen one. He was a great redeemer of his Time; there was not so much as a Day spent by him in Idleness; the sense of unseen Things was so deeply impressed on his spirit, as made him fill every Leaf in the Book of his Life, with those great and weighty works which were incumbent on him in his Place. When persons that had been reclaimed from Vice to Virtue by his ministry, gave notice to him thereof, he would with great humility lift up his Eyes and Hands towards Heaven, and say, "Lord, who am I, that I should be so far honoured as to be the Instrument in the converting of one Soul?"

He was eminent for contempt of the World; he never sought great places for himself, and when they were offered him, he declined them: he was content to move in an obscure and low sphere, so he might but be an Instrument of doing good to
Souls

Souls. He would not be drawn nor driven to any other Business, but continued in his laborious Course of Preaching twice every Lord's Day, and administering the Lord's Supper monthly.

He was a constant mourner for the Sins of the Nation; and was greatly concerned for the rising Generation, and bent his Discourses to establish them in the true Religion.

He welcomed his last Sickness with deep Submission to the will of God.

He expressed his contentedness, if his Lord and Master, whom he "served with his Spirit in the Gospel," had any more work for him to accomplish in the Church below; but if not, he was willing "to depart," desirous to have his own blessedness among the Saints above, "and to be with Christ, as being far better."

He had little Pain in the beginning of his Sickness, and was much in blessing God for dealing so gently with him, and carrying on his long visitation with so great ease to him. He kept his resigned frame to the will of his heavenly Father, and said, "I
have

have had more Time to work for my own, and others Souls, than I made account of when I was young; and so if God have no more work for me to do, I am free to go to my rest: I have had enough of Living, and am fully satisfied with this Life upon Earth."

There came Friends from all Places where he had preached to visit him, to whom he always dropped some word of suitable Counsel. He advised those who told him they were converted by his ministry, to give God the Glory, and to "walk worthy of the Vocation wherewith they were called."

He exhorted those who had profited, and were built up in Grace by his Labours, to go on their way rejoicing, tho' "they should see his Face no more."

He cautioned rich and trading Professors to take heed that they lost not their Souls in a Croud, and Hurry of earthly Business; he charged them to remember the Saying of Sir Thomas More; there is a great Truth in it, as well as a Scum of wit; "There is a Devil that is termed *Business*, that carrieth more Souls with him to Hell, than all the Devils in Hell besides. Oh! beware of

the Devil ; when you come to be in my condition, your full Bags, your full Shops, and full Houfes, will ftand you in no ftand.” He *freely* converfed with his Reverend Brethren in the Miniftry that vifited him, and always defired them to pray with him, as he alfo did all his other Chriftian Friends.

In the latter End of his Sicknefs, it pleafed his heavenly Father to vifit him with a complication of painful Diftempers ; under all the tortures of which, he yet glorified God with great Patience, and expreffed his hope of his future bleffednefs, faying, I am not “ fick unto Death, but unto eternal Life.” He would often fay, “ In a little while all will be well.” As to the Eftate and Condition of his Soul, he expreffed himfelf to fome Friends thus : “ I can now look back upon my way and work in the miniftry, and fay, I have been faithful ; and I can look within, and fay, I have Peace ; but after all, the Bottom I would fix upon is Chrift and his Righteoufnefs. *Him I would make all in all.*”

When his Body was brought exceeding low, yet he would be left alone fometimes
in

in the Day, that he might (as was concluded) with less Distraction enjoy Communion with God in secret Prayer and Meditation.

A little before he died, some of his Hearers coming to him, and inquiring of him how he did? He said, " I long after your Spiritual and Soul-Welfare.

He departed this Life the 18th of June 1695, about eight of the clock in the morning, and in the 70th year of his age. His pious Soul, which through the whole course of his Life had been bent towards God, did shew her readiness and preparedness for the full and eternal fruition, by the sweet and ardent breathings which it had that night and morning after him ; which were often expressed in these words ; " Father, come and take me home to thyself."

His Body was interred in *Bury Church-yard* (being the Parish Church where he lived) close by the Chancel-wall, on the South-side, June 20th, 1695. A vast concourse of people appeared at the Funeral, and made great Lamentation over him : The Reverend Mr. *Robert Seddon* of *Bolton*, preached the funeral Sermon at Mr. *Pendlebury's*

C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. IV.

	Page
<i>A Review of the Whole</i>	149

C H A P. V.

<i>Practical Reflections</i>	174
------------------------------	-----



A TREATISE

A

T R E A T I S E

CONCERNING THE

Sacrifice of the Mass.

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

- 1 Cor. xi. Verse 23. *For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took Bread :*
24. *And when he had given Thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat : this is my Body, which is broken for you : this do in Remembrance of me.*
25. *After the same Manner also he took the Cup, when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood : this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me.*
26. *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come.*

IN these Words we have a plain and full Description of the Lord's Supper, as it was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and ordained to stand and continue in the Church to

the End of Time. The Occasion of them was this; The Holy Apostle had before delivered to the *Corinthians* the naked Institution: but tho' there had not passed many Years from the Birth of this Ordinance, and but a little Time since the Foundation of the Church of *Corinth*; yet now in this Church (a Church of great Renown for Eminence of Gifts and Graces) this most sacred and solemn Ordinance was darkened and disguised by several grand Abuses and gross Corruptions, that attended the Celebration of it; as may be seen from *Verse 20*, down to the Words. And the Apostle, for the Reformation of these Abuses, and Purging out of these Corruptions, thus early crept into this Ordinance, and setting it right again among them, according to Christ's own Institution, here repeats the institution itself; leads them back to the *original* Rule; and shews them, how *Christ* instituted the Ordinance; how *Christ* celebrated it; and how *Christ* left it to be observed and administered in the Church; that so, from our Lord's own Appointment, they might see how far they had swerved: how they ought to celebrate it; and (rejecting their former Errors and Corruptions) return again to the *pure* and *primitive* Institution and Pattern. This is the Occasion of the Words. We have in them, FIRST, The Author of this Ordinance, *viz. The Lord*, together with the

Circumstance of time when it was instituted, *viz. The Night before he was betrayed*; THEN, the external visible Matter or Elements, *viz. Bread and Wine*; and LASTLY, The sacred Actions and Rites used in the celebration of it, *viz. Benediction, or Blessing the Elements; Breaking the Bread; Distribution of the Bread and Wine to the Communicants; and the Receiving of them by the Communicants.* The internal Matter or Things signified and exhibited by these sacramental Signs and Actions, are *the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*; and the End for which this Sacrament was instituted, and for which it is to be celebrated, is, to be a Memorial* of *Christ*.

This is the plain and naked Delineation of this Ordinance, which the Apostle here lays before them, “as he had received it from the Lord.”

What I intend, at this time, is, to set before you a Portraiture of the POPISH MASS, which is both a gross Prophanation of the *Lord's Table*, and a piece of the most monstrous and abominable IDOLATRY, that ever was set up in the world. And I have chosen this scripture for the Foundation of my Discourse on this Subject, because from this plain Draught of this sacred In-

* *Verses 24 and 25.*

stitution, we may most clearly, and with the best advantage, view the horrible Deformity of this POPISH IDOL. And I have chosen this Subject at this Time, for the following Reasons: *viz.* Because of the present danger of the spreading and prevailing of *Popery* amongst us; and for that (I fear) there is a great, and too general Ignorance of the Controversies between the *Papists* and Us. The long Continuance of the Reformation, with the comparative Paucity of *Romanists*, hath ministered occasion of great silence, both in Press and Pulpit, about the Differences between us and them; whence hath ensued much Unacquaintedness with these Matters: And it will be no small Advantage to these crafty Seducers, to find Persons, they have their Design upon, no better grounded in the Principles of their present Profession, no better to understand the gross Corruption of *Popish* Principles and Practices. There are Enow, that can swear readily and roundly “By the Mass;” but not over many, that know what the Mass is, in any measure, nor the Mystery of Iniquity that worketh in it: so that a Discourse of this nature is, at this day, undeniably seasonable and necessary; and till many of those who profess themselves *Protestants*, be better informed
and

and settled in their judgment, all that can be said will be little enough.*

MOREOVER, The Mass is one of the greatest and most dangerous Errors in Popery. *Calvin* truly styles it †, “The Head of the horrible Abomination.” Themselves confess, That it is the chief, and most important, of all our controversies; and wherein we are at the farthest Distance from one another.

AGAIN, This is one of the grand Pillars of Popery, and the Point that much of the Body of Popery depends on; yea, the Mass carries the Body of Popery in its Belly; and being once admitted, would soon bring in the Whole. For it immediately introduces the *absolute* Merit of Works: Saying and Hearing Masses, is esteemed meritorious. Absolute Merit of Works introduces human Satisfaction. Human Satisfaction introduce Works of Supererogation. Works of Supererogation introduce a communication of Merits. This brings in Indulgences and Pardons. These maintain the most beneficial fire of Purgatory; and Purgatory at once fills the Pope's Coffers

* What Weight there is in this Argument for the *present* Publication; must be left to others to judge; 'tis to be feared there is too much in it.

† *Horrendæ abominationis caput.*

6. SACRIFICIUM MISSATICUM

with gold, and the *Paunches* of idle Priests, Monks, and Friars, with the Fat of all the Lands where they live. Thus the Mass draws the main Body of Popery after it. It is impregnated with all these mischiefs, and will be found, when grown up and come to maturity among us, both a fruitful Mother, and kind Nurse to them all.

AGAIN, Many other points of Popery will follow the Fate of This; and, as they hang thereon, must either stand or fall with it.

MOREOVER, This is the PALLADIUM PONTIFICIUM, The Great DAGON or DIANA that the Papists make the Main Hurry about, and plant in all Places (where they have Power) by open Force of Fire and Sword, and other Barbarous and Inhuman Cruelties: The *Unbloody* Mass hath shed even Rivers of Christian *Blood*.

THIS indeed is the Point that most of our Glorious Martyrs suffered in opposition to, and went to Stakes, one after another, for Denying, and Refusing to join in; and it is possible *we* may come to be tried about it.

IN A WORD, The Knowledge hereof may be a special Antidote, not only against the Mass itself, but also against the rest of Popery; inasmuch as, by the manifest Grossness of this one Error, we may learn what to think of all the other Doctrines and Practices of *Rome*. It may
be

be helpful, in some Degree, to promote our Settlement and Establishment in Shaking Times. I am persuaded that at such a Season, it will be found a matter of no small Moment, to be bot-tomed in what we believe, profess, and practise, not merely upon human Laws, Tradition from our Fore-fathers, common Custom of the Coun-try, &c. but upon the true and proper, sure and standing Foundation: *viz.* THE WORD OF GOD. These are my Motives or Reasons.



C H A P. I.

A Delineation or Portraiture of the Mass, as it is now used in the Church of Rome:

NOW to come to that which I intend. As I have laid before you the Description of the *Lord's Supper*, as it was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, so I shall here lay the Mass before you, as it is made up and drest by the Pope; and so thrust into the room of the Lord's Supper, and used as such, in all the Synagogues of Antichrist. That we may attain to a more true, and clear Understanding of the Matter before us, I shall, on this first Head, briefly shew, What the Word or Name MASS stands for; or, What is signified by it. And then, I shall describe the Thing itself signified by this Name. As to the Name or Word MASS, I will not, at present, detain you with any Enquiry about the ETYMOLOGY of it, concerning which there are various Opinions among the *Romanists* themselves: Some will have it to be derived from the *Hebrew*, others from the *Greek*, and others from the *Latin*; and some assign one Reason of it's Imposition, some another. But it is now in the
Church

Church of *Rome* commonly used two Ways, or to denote two Things: *viz.* FIRST, Largely and generally, “ The whole Worship or Service of the Church, that consisteth in public Prayers.” (*Totam celebrationem divini officii*) Thus Mass in general signifieth the *Worship*; and so *Mass* and *Liturgy* in this sense are one and the same. Or, SECONDLY, It is used particularly, and limitedly, for a part of the Mass: *viz.* THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR, OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS: This, properly speaking, is the second part of the Mass, and begins at the Offertory: It is usually sung, and it receives its Name from the Priest offering up the Host, as a Sacrifice, to God the Father. Thus also it is a Word received and used to signify the *Celebration* of the Sacrament of the Altar, or, the sacrifice of the Mass; so that to say, or sing Mass, in the Church of *Rome*, is to Sacrifice or offer Christ. And to go to, or hear Mass, is to be present at, and to join in that Sacrifice. And in this sense it is taken here. The Thing signified by this Word, the Romanists describe thus*. “ The

* *Missa est sacrificium proprium et propitiatorium, quo Christus, e pane transubstantiato per verba, HOC EST CORPUS MEUM, factus, manibus sacerdotis offertur Deo Patri, pro vivis & mortuis, ad impetrandum remissionem peccatorum, et omnis generis beneficia.*

“ Mass is a true, proper, and propitiatory Sa-
 crifice, of the very natural Body and Blood of
 Christ, under the *Species* of Bread and Wine,
 offered by a Priest unto GOD THE FATHER,
 for the Expiation of the Sins of the Living
 and the Dead, and for the Impetration of all
 Blessings.”

In this Description we have the Nature of the Mass. It is a proper Sacrifice ; or, a Sacrifice in the true and proper notion of the word, and not improperly and metaphorically ; in which sense Many of the FATHERS used to call it so, with some Appearance of Reason ; that is, exactly in the same sense, that the Scriptures call Prayers, Praises, and Alms-giving Sacrifices*.

Indeed there are several good reasons, why it may be called a Sacrifice in this qualified sense ; namely, Because it was instituted to declare and represent the Sacrifice of the Death of our Lord : And signs ordinarily have the Names of those things which they signify. Therein we celebrate a Memorial of the Death of Christ, the only Sacrifice, Also, being duly received, it is a Pledge and Seal of the Virtue of Christ's Sacrifice, once offered, to be continually applied to us by Faith, for the Remission of our sins. A solemn Sacri-

* See 1 *Pet.* ii. 5. *Heb.* xiii. 15. 16. *Phil.* iv. 18.

fice of Prayers, Praises and Thanksgivings is offered up, at the Celebration of this Sacrament, to God the Father, for the Redemption and Salvation by Christ. And Gifts and Presents were wont to be brought in the primitive Times, and placed on the Table, by every Communicant, which were called *Oblations* or *Offerings*. But the *Romanists* make it a Sacrifice, not in any of these senses, but in a true and proper sense.

MOREOVER, according to them, as it is a true and proper Sacrifice; so it is truly, and properly, a propitiatory and expiatory Sacrifice, and not Eucharistical, and of Thanksgiving. The *Levitical* Sacrifices were of two kinds: *viz.* *ἰλαστικά*, *Expiatoria*, For the Expiation of Sin, and *ὑψαριστικά*, *Gratulatoria*, For the Testification of Thankfulness for Mercies.

Now this Sacrifice of the Mass is of the former Kind. A Sacrifice of Propitiation, Expiation, and Redemption.

AGAIN, Here is the Oblation or Offering: In every Sacrifice there is * “ something to be offered.” And this is here the very Body and Blood of Christ, or, Jesus Christ our Lord, as he was born of the Virgin, and as he is in Heaven; the very Body and Blood of Christ

* *Certa res in eo offerenda.*

under the *Species* of Bread and Wine; the Bread being, by TRANSUBSTANTIATION, turned into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of Christ. This is the Oblation, *viz.* *Jesus Christ himself*; who is offered up in this Sacrifice, a Sacrifice.

FARTHER, The offerer, or Person by whom Jesus Christ is thus offered, as a propitiatory Sacrifice, is a Priest: And this is the Work that the Priests are ordained for: *viz.* to be Sacrificers of the Body and Blood of Christ; as the Manner of their Ordination shews. When a Person is to Receive the Order of Priesthood, the Bishop delivers into his Hands the Chalice with the Wine, and the Patine with the Host, saying, *Receive power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to say Masses for the Living and the Dead.*

AGAIN, The Object of this Sacrifice is GOD THE FATHER. The Priest offereth Jesus Christ personally and corporally, under the Species of Bread and Wine, a Sacrifice unto GOD THE FATHER. The *Canon* of the Mass, at the offering of this oblation, appoints this Prayer, *Look Mercifully upon these Things* (*viz.* the Body and Blood of Christ) *and accept of them, as thou didst accept of the Sacrifice of Abel, of Abraham, and of Melchisedeck.*

The Persons for whom, Jesus Christ is thus offered by the Priest to God the Father, are the *Living* and the *Dead*. The Bishop Consecrates Priests with this Form: “ Receive Power to offer Sacrifice in the Church of God, for the Living and the Dead*.” And when the Priest offers the Host upon the Altar, he prays, *Receive, Holy Father, this Immaculate Sacrifice which I offer unto thee, for my own Sins, and for the Sins of all the Faithful, both Living and Dead, that it may profit me and them to Salvation and Everlasting Life.* And when he offers the Chalice upon the Altar, he prays, “ That it may ascend in the Presence of the Divine Majesty, for the Salvation of himself, and of all the World.” Thus it is offered for the Living, absent as well as present; for Mariners, Soldiers, and such as are sick † on their Beds, or shut up in Prisons, or gone on Pilgrimages, &c. who can none of them (according to Christ’s Institution and Command) either *Take, Eat, or Drink.* And it is offered for the *Dead, i. e.* in Purgatory. The Great Host in the Mass, is broken into three

* *Accipite potestatem offerendi sacrificium in ecclesiâ dei pro vivis et mortuis.*

† The Priest carries the Host to the Sick with these Words, “ Behold, My Friend, GOD THE CREATOR, which I have brought unto you.”

parts, for the Church *Triumphant*, for the Church *Militant*, and for the Church *in Purgatory*. And the greatest Part of Masses are thus daily said for the Dead; tho' Christ instituted his Supper for the Living only, commanding them *to Take*, and *to Eat*, which the Dead cannot do.

The Ends for which Christ is thus offered a Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead are,

The Pacification of God, or the Appeasing of his Wrath. The Council of *Trent* Calls it a *true propitiatory Sacrifice*. And they teach that the Mass is one in Substance with the Sacrifice of the Cross, and that it produceth the self same Effects; and particularly, *The Appeasing of God's Wrath**. Hence, in times of Fire, Famine, Pestilence, Tempests, they fly to their *Massings*.

The Remission of Sins is another End. Pope *Innocent de Missa*, saith, "That the Sacrifice of
" the Mass is offered for *original, venial, and*
" *mortal Sins.*" By this Sacrifice daily Sins are remitted and purged. "It is a Sacrifice by
" which our Sins are purged and remitted,
" and by which we may be delivered from
" our daily Offences †." *Boniface* the Sixth

* See *Gabr. Biel. Lec. 85. in Explicat. Canon.*

† *Sacrificium per quod purgantur et remittuntur peccata, et quo liberamur à culpis quotidianis.*

hath given Pardon of 3000 Years to them that devoutly say the Mass that is stiled *The Mass for the Name of Jesus*. Another End is the Redemption of Souls, or the Delivering of them from the dreadful Pains of Purgatory. In the Canon of the Mass the Priest saith*, “ That he
 “ offereth this Sacrifice for the Redemption of
 “ Souls.” And this is the principal End of such frequent Masses in the Church of *Rome*.

And hence it is, that Masses have built and endowed many Churches; founded and erected many Monasteries and Abbies; maintained innumerable Priests, Monks, and Friars; and brought in a vast Revenue to the Church. For from hence have come the greatest part of her Donations: And People have spared neither Gold nor Silver, nor Houses, nor Lands, nor Heritages, to have Masses said for their Souls when Dead, and to help the Souls of their Progenitors, Parents, and Friends.

Hence Chantries had their Rise, which consisted of Salaries allowed to one, two, three, or more Priests to say Daily Mass for the Souls of their deceased Founders and their Friends. They were commonly united to some Parochial, Collegiate, or Cathedral Church. Of these before their

* *Se offerre hoc sacrificium pro redemptione animarum.*

Dissolution by *Henry VIII.* there were founded in *St. Paul's* forty-seven, and throughout *England* almost an incredible Number. Free Chapels and Colleges were of the same Nature, and for the same use; but more considerable in Bigness, Building, Number of Priests, and Endowments.

Hereby the Clergy engrossed to themselves almost the whole Substance of Christendom, and the Laity were cheated out of their Estates and Patrimonies. This was one of the Grievances represented by the *Bohemians* desiring Reformation. “ The Pope (*say they*) with his Priests, by
 “ his Purgatory, hath deceived, despoiled, and
 “ disinherited Kings, Princes, Lords, Knights,
 “ and Good Housholders, and many others, of
 “ their lawful Inheritances, because their An-
 “ cestors and Progenitors gave them away to
 “ Colleges, Monasteries and Churches, to make
 “ Memorials of them, and to sing or say Masses
 “ for their Souls, that they might be redeemed
 “ out of Purgatory.”

ANOTHER End of the Mass is the Impetration of Blessings. “ As it is a *propitiatory* Sacrifice offered up for the Remission of Sins; so it is also *impetratory*, and offered up for the Procuring of every Kind of Blessings. The Mass is a Service by which, the Priest who offereth Christ, and the rest, who join in that Oblation, even merit

merit of the Almighty.' Hence all spiritual Graces and Blessings, and eternal Salvation may be obtained by Saying or Hearing Masses *.

LASTLY. The Mass is celebrated for the Procuring of all other Necessaries for Dead or Living, Absent or Present, Body or Soul, Man or Beast. And therefore (which is horrible to say) they celebrate Masses for Horses, and other Animals, when under Diseases; yea, even (as one affirms) for "a poor Wife's Hen," if it be lost or sick.

THUS we have the Ends, whereunto I may add, that the Sacrifice they dream of may be applied, by the *Intention* of the Priest Sacrificing, to any particular Persons whether Alive or Dead; and thereby they to whom it is so applied, may obtain "Remission both from Sin and Punishment, and other temporal and spiritual Blessings †." But the sacred Scriptures mention no other way of the effectual Application of Christ's Sacrifice upon the Cross to particular Persons,

* *Ut sacrificium propitiatorium est, et oblatum pro remissione peccatorum, ita est impetratorium, et oblatum pro adeptione omnis generis beneficiorum: Missa est opus quo sacerdos qui christum offert, et alii qui in oblatione participant, Deum promerentur.*

† *Remissionem et à pœnis et culpis, aliaque spiritualia et temporalia beneficia.*

for the Remission of their Sins, than *Principally* by the operation of the Holy Spirit, begetting and exciting Faith in their Hearts; and, *Instrumentally*, by the Preaching of the Gospel, and Administration of the Sacraments, by Means of the same Faith*, not by celebrating Masses in their Name.

FINALLY, This Sacrifice is an oblation meritorious for the Quick and the Dead, *ex opere operato*; that is, not on Account of the Faith and Devotion of him that Says or Hears Mass; but merely for its own sake, and on Account of the Dignity of the work. The WORK DONE (secluding all moral Goodness in the Doer) is available for the forementioned Ends †.

Gabriel Biel tells us, “ That the Mass is
 “ available in *one* respect, *ex opere operantis*; that
 “ is, on account of the personal Merit of him
 “ that celebrates it, for which God confers
 “ those things that are asked by the Priest,
 “ on them to whom the Priest applies the
 “ Sacrifice of Prayers, and of the Mass: And
 “ in *another* respect, *ex opere operato, i. e.*
 “ from the bare Consecration, Oblation and
 “ Participation, without any regard had to the

* *Eadem fide mediante.*

† *Non ex fide et devotione operantis, sed ex se, ex dignitate operis.*

“ personal

“ personal Sanctity or Merit of the Priest *.”
 And, *Bellarmino* says, “ Tho’ the Mass, as a
 Sacrament, may not profit them that are not
duly prepared; yet, as a Sacrifice, it may †.”
 Thus our presence alone, when this Sacrifice is
 offered, or Mass said (tho’ we neither eat nor
 drink) is a Work available for Pacification, Re-
 mission, &c.

This is MISSATICUM SACRIFICIUM, or, THE
 SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR, wherein you have
 the Nature, Kind, Oblation, Offerer, Object to
 whom, the Persons for whom, and the Ends for
 which this Sacrament is used in the Church of
Rome. Yet, for a clearer understanding of it, and
 the *Mystery of Iniquity* bound up in it, I shall
 more distinctly shew what Things concur to
 the making up of this (as they call it) *ineffable*
 Mystery, or what is wont to be done in the Ce-
 lebration of it ‡. *Lactimer* reckoned up four
 Things which he used to call the *marrow-bones*

* *Biel in Can. Miss. Lect. 26. Missa valet uno modo,
 ex opere operantis, hoc est, ex Merito personali personæ
 Celebrantis, propter quod confert Deus petita a sacerdote eis,
 quibus orationum et Missæ sacrificium applicatur: Alio modo,
 ex opere operato, hoc est, ex ipsâ consecratione, oblatione, et
 sumptione, non habendo respectum ad Personalem Sanctitatem aut
 meritum Sacerdotis.*

† *Bellarmino de Effect. Sacrament. L. ii. C. 1.*

‡ *Quæ fieri solent in Celebrations Missæ.*

of the Mass: viz. The *Consecration*, *Transubstantiation*, *Oblation*, and *Adoration* of the Host.

I shall here take notice of ten in the Celebration of the Mass.

When it is to be celebrated, there is first the Altar of Stone, which is covered with a fair linen Cloth, called *Corporale*, or *Palla*; then the Deacon presenteth the *Patine* with the Round Host upon it, and the *Chalice* with the mixed Wine and Water, to the Priest or Bishop, who placeth them on the Altar.

Then the Priest fumeth the Altar, and the Sacrifice with Incense three times, in Manner of a Cross, to chase away the Devil.

Then begins the *Prefatio*.

Then Divers Prayers for the Church, for the Pope, for Bishops, and Kings; for those in particular for whom the Sacrifice is to be offered, whose Names are rehearsed; for those also that be present at the Mass.

THEN comes in the Consecration (whereby the Elements are transubstantiated) which *Lati-mer* calls a *God's Body making*. This begins with many Crossings* of the Host and Chalice, twenty-

* The Mass is full of Crossings from one End to the other: Sometimes with *two* at once to save both Body and Soul, or to change both Bread and Wine: Sometimes with *three* together, in Worship of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: Sometimes with *five* at once in Reverence of the five wounds of Christ Jesus. *Beehive*, L. iv. C. 3.

five in all, to drive away evil Spirits, lest they should prevail against the Priest, or against the Sacrifice (*i. e.* against Jesus Christ) as *Innocent* the Third instituted*. The Consecration is performed by the Priests Mumbling these words of Christ, *Hoc est enim Corpus meum*, over the Elements in a low Voice, and their Backs turned on the People, the more to amuse them, with an Addition of many vain, idle, ludicrous, and superstitious Ceremonies, that (as one observes) have neither Command nor Example of Christ's Institution or Action; nor of the Apostles Doctrine or Practice in the Scripture of God; but look like a *Charming* of the Elements, after the manner of Sorcerers in doing their Feats, with a set Number and Order of Words and Signs.

AFTER this follows the Elevation of the Host by the Priest, who lifts it up on high, that all the People who are present may adore and worship it, after the most solemn, devout, and religious manner; which is accordingly most devoutly performed by All.

ANOTHER, and a main thing, is the Oblation, or, *Actio Sacrificandi*, whereby Jesus Christ himself is offered, under the *Species* of Bread and Wine, unto GOD THE FATHER, a Sacrifice, for the Living and the Dead. IN THIS the Sacrifice

* See Lib. ii. of the Mysteries of the Mass, Cap. 58.

of the Mass properly stands; and I bring it in here in order, though I will not say that I hit on setting it in the Place that belongs to it: For their own great Rabbies are not yet agreed amongst themselves (tho' they agree that Christ is sacrificed in the Mass, and sacrificed every day, God only knows how often over) in what Action, or Part of the Mass, the Sacrifice *formally* consisteth. Here is a Priest which offers, a Host which is offered, God to whom it is offered, the Church for which it is offered, and an Altar whereon it is offered: But the time *when*, and the Action *wherein* it is offered, is hard to be known, and they are at a very great loss about it. Some make it stand in the Placing of it on the Altar. Some in the Consecration of the Elements. Some in the Elevation of the Host. Some in the Breaking of the Host. And some in the *Eating* of the Host. *Bellarminæ* † ingenuously confesses, That the Action of Offering cannot be easily distinguished and separated from the other Actions that are done conjointly therewith, by the Words of Institution. Yet having set aside the Opinions of others, as unsatisfactory to him, He delivers his Own, which is this: “ That the Action of sacrificing Christ's Body
“ and Blood, standeth in these three together*;

† *De missâ** *Conjunctim,**viz.*

“ viz. In the Consecration, in the Placing of the Eu-
 “ charist on the Altar, and in the Manducation of
 “ the Host. In the Consecration, because, says he,
 “ by this, a thing that before was common or
 “ profane, is made sacred. For Bread, a terrene
 “ thing, is by sacerdotal Consecration made the
 “ Body of Christ.” But the Sacrifice cannot
 (either wholly, as Some, or in part, as Bellar-
 mine) formally consist in the Consecration of the
 Eucharist. For, the making of a common thing
 sacred by Consecration, is nothing to the Es-
 sence of a Sacrifice, unless That *self same thing*
 that was common before, be offered to God
 after that it is so made sacred. But now they sa-
 crifice not the *same* thing, but *another*; not *com-*
mon Bread by Consecration changed into *sacred*,
 but the *very Body* of Christ: A quite different
 thing in Nature, Essence and Substance.

AGAIN, No *consecrated* thing is offered to
 God in the Mass; and therefore the Action of
 Sacrificing cannot consist in the *Consecration*.
 That Nothing consecrated is offered to God is
 evident; for, if there be any such thing offered,
 it must be either the Bread, the Accidents of
 the Bread, or, the Body of Christ: But it is
 none of these. Not the Bread, for there is no
 more Substance of Bread (*they say*) after the
 Words of Consecration are pronounced. Not

the accidents of the Bread, as *Colour, Roundness, Breadth, &c.* for *these (they say)* are not offered to God, but only *That* which is contained under them. Not the Body of Jesus Christ, for can Christ be consecrated by Us? The Apostle tells us*, That he hath SANCTIFIED, or CONSECRATED US; but that He should be CONSECRATED by Us is horrible to say. So that here is nothing *consecrated* in the Mass, which the Priest can offer up unto God. Therefore,

LASTLY, The Action of Sacrificing cannot consist in the Consecration; For, they generally agree, that the Consecration is performed by Pronouncing these Words over the Elements, THIS IS MY BODY: Now these Words are not Words of Oblation; for, they were not directed by our Saviour to GOD, but to the APOSTLES; they therefore offer *Nothing* to God; but to offer *Something* is essential to all Sacrifices. Therefore the Sacrifice cannot consist in the Consecration. Thus we have taken off the *First* of *Bellarmino's* Ingredients, or, Actions wherein he makes the Sacrifice to consist. We shall pass on to the *Second*, and see if That will hold. It is *the Placing of the Eucharist on the Altar.* “ That “ Sacred Host, *says he*, is offered unto God, “ while, by the Virtue of Consecration, it is

* *Hebrews*, x. 14.

“ placed

“ placed on the Altar ; For, to put the Victim
 “ on the Altar, is really to offer it unto God.”
 But against This also it may be urged, That
 Christ is put upon the Altar, as a Victim (the
 Bread being turned by Consecration into his
 very Body, and the Wine into his very Blood)
 doth suppose TRANSUBSTANTIATION, which
 (as shewn elsewhere *) is a horrible Fiction. Yet
 if such a *Transubstantiation* were granted them,
 their Placing of Christ’s Body and Blood, made
 (in the Act of Consecration) of Bread and Wine,
 upon the Altar, would not import a sacrificing,
 but a Miraculous Action. BESIDES, The Host
 is placed on the Altar *before* the Act of Consecration,
 and while it is mere Bread, as they themselves
 confess ; so that if the Act of offering stand
 in Placing the Host on the Altar, then it must
 follow, That the Victim which is offered is
 not *Christ* (as they say) but only *a Cake of Bread*.
 Nor are the *Placing* of the Victim on the Altar,
 and *Sacrificing* It, both One, as *Bellarmino* would
 have them be ; for *That* is but a previous Action
 to *This*, and may be where *This* is not †.
 The victim being placed on the Altar, unless an
 Offering up of the Victim so placed on the Altar

* See our Author’s excellent Discourse on *Transubstantiation*, published by Archbishop *Tillotson*.

† *Ea positâ nisi maceratio fit, nullum est sacrificium.*

do follow, there is no real and true Sacrifice. There must then be some farther Act to complete this Sacrifice, for these two will by no means make it One. And this is the Manducation of the Host. “ The action of sacrificing (*says he*) consists in this, “ That the Thing which, “ is offered be designed to be a true, real, external Destruction ; and this is done, when after “ the Consecration, the Body of Christ *is eaten* “ by the Priest. For, in this Eating, the Body “ of Christ loseth its sacramental Being, and “ ceases to be really on the Altar.” And now on This *Bellarmino* fixes, and concludes, “ That “ the Action of sacrificing, stands chiefly in “ This ;” and thinks he has *hit the White*; and the Truth is, if he have not hit on it in this, or at least opened a Way to it, we are still in the Dark, and may despair of ever finding it. And has he done this ? Nay, for hardly Any Thing could have been invented by him that would have been more unscriptural, irrational, and absurd than this is. Where will he find any colour of Scripture for this, “ *That God hath appointed his Son to be sacrificed to himself by their Eating of him.*” And what is more absurd and irrational than to say, “ *That to eat a human Body, and to offer it (at the same time and in the same action) to God, are both the same Thing ?* What

is more absurd than to say, "*The Act of sacrificing stands in Manducating,*" whilst it is most evident that the Priest, when he *is eating* the host, is *sending* it down into his own Stomach instead of *offering* it up unto God?

FINALLY, If this were so, then the Priest's Mouth would be the Altar on which the Sacrifice is offered; and all the Communicants would be Offerers and Sacrificers, as well as the Priest; and every one indeed would be both Altar and Priest. AND this is the eighth Thing done in the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Oblation of Christ. And from what has been hinted you may see, That the Priests who offer up this Sacrifice, many times over every day, in the celebration of the Mass, cannot yet tell, *How, When, or in What Act* of their's they do it. I may say as *Davenant Determ. 13**. An admirable Priest indeed, who understands not when he offers his Sacrifice!

After the Oblation follows the Communion, or Participation of the Eucharist: For we must know, That this ineffable Mystery of the Eucharist is both a Sacrifice and a Sacrament, and therefore they give it these two Styles, "*The Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Sacrament of the Altar.*" *A Sacrifice, for the Living and Dead,*

* *Mirus profecto sacerdos est, qui non intelligit, quando sacrificium suum offerat.*

“ as before. *A Sacrament*, as ordained to be
 “ receiyed into our Bodies, and to feed the
 “ same to Resurrection and Immortality; and
 “ to give Grace and Salvation to our Souls,
 “ if we worthily receive it*.” FIRST, (*say they*)
 Christ made the Elements his Body and Blood;
 THEN he offered Himself for them; and,
 LASTLY, he gave the *same* Body and Blood to his
 Apostles to be *eaten*: thus at once instituting
 both a Sacrifice and a Sacrament. As a Sacri-
 fice, they offer it unto God; as a Sacrament,
 they eat and drink it themselves: And this is
 to communicate. And this communicating in
 the Church of *Rome* is either by the Priest alone,
 who celebrates, says, sings or chants the Mass
 in the Presence of the People assembled at Mass;
 or, by the Priest and People together. The
 ordinary Manner of communicating, or, cele-
 brating the Sacrament of the Altar, is by the
 Priest alone; who (after the Consecration, Ele-
 vation, Adoration, and Oblation) eats and drinks
 all himself; the Multitude that are present, in
 the mean time, only looking on as idle Specta-
 tors. Yet he does this in the Name of the
 People. “ The Priest alone receives without
 “ Distribution, but then he does it in the Name

* *Rhemist. on Matthew xxvi. 26.*

“ of the whole Church, and for the Advantage of
 “ the Spectators*.” Thus it is a Sacrament with-
 out Communicants, wherein those that are pre-
 sent do not *eat* or *drink*, but are only BEHOLDERS
 of the Priest eating and drinking *All* himself alone.
 Nevertheless they call this the Communion and
 Communicating, because tho’ the People indeed
 do not *eat* or *drink*, yet in and by *hearing* and *seeing*,
 they do communicate, and “ join in Unity and
 “ perfect Fellowship of one body, with all true
 “ Christian Men in the world.” And the Priest’s
 thus receiving for them is as available to them,
 as if they received themselves; and by this Hear-
 ing and Seeing of Masses, they are armed (as
 they think) against the Devil; and, *seu Amuleto*
Alexipharmaco, made safe from all dangers.
 “ Those (say the *Rhem.* on *John* vi. 53.) that de-
 “ voutly hear Mass, and adore, in presence, the
 “ Body and Blood of Christ, joining in heart
 “ with the Priest, receive Life and Fruit of the
 “ Sacrament, tho’ they receive not *sacramental-*
 “ *ly* in one or both kinds.” THIS now is the
 ordinary Manner of communicating in the Syna-
 gogues of Antichrist; and it is a most gross,
 palpable, and abominable Perversion of, and

* *Unus sine distributione accipit, at ille unus totius ecclesie nomine facit. Et ut spectatoribus in commodum, sacerdos pro aliis sacramentum sumit.*

Departure from, the Institution, Example and Command of Christ: His *Institution*, who took and blessed the Elements in Order to the Distributing and Giving them to the Disciples; as is plain from the Words of Institution, *Matthew xxvi. 26. 27.* His *Example*, who not only took and blessed the Elements, but actually gave them to the Disciples. *The Bread, Matthew xxvi, 26; The Cup, Matthew, xxvi, 27.*

It is a Departure from, and Perversion of, the *Command* of Christ both to the Dispensers and Receivers. To the *Dispensers*, on whom he lays this Command: *HOC FACITE; THIS DO**. Wherein he charges them that administer, to do as he did in the first Administration; *i. e.* to take the Elements, to bless them, and to give them to the Communicants: To the *Receivers*, whom he commands *to take †, to eat ‡, and to drink §, and not to look on only as idle Spectators.* *THIS* was our Saviour's Institution: And, therefore, to consecrate the Bread and Wine, and not to distribute them among the Communicants, is not to celebrate the Lord's

* *Luke xxii. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24.*

† *Matthew xxvi. 26.*

‡ *Matthew xxvi. 26.*

§ *Matthew xxvi. 27.*

Supper, for there is an Omission therein of a special and essential part or action of the Supper.

MOREOVER, It is contrary to the Practice of the Apostles, who, in the Administration of the Supper, did not receive the Bread and Wine themselves only, and in the Name of others, (a thing unknown to them) but gave them to the communicants. This was St. Paul's Practice at *Corinth**, and he blames the *Corinthians* for the great disorder they had fallen into, in not staying for one another, to celebrate the Lord's Supper together, at the same time, in the public Assembly of the Church †.

LASTLY, It is most absurd and irrational in itself. We should say it were a very absurd thing, if one Man baptized himself in the Name of a great multitude of unbaptized Men, both Present and Absent; and pretended, that this Deed of his, was no less available to them, than if *They* were all actually baptized. Or, if when a great number of guests were invited to, and assembled at, a solemn feast, being set down at the table, One only of the Company should eat and drink for all the rest, assuring them, that his Eating and Drinking (if they did but look on him when so doing) would avail as much

* See *Cor.* xi. 23, 24, 25, and *Verses* 20, 21, 22.

† See also *Acts* ii. 41, 42. *Acts* xx. 7.

to their Comfort, full refection and satisfaction; as if they all ate and drank with him. Would Lunaticks and Bedlams believe him? And is This any better? Oh the monstrous Blindness of those Poor People who can *down* with such Work as this! But, besides These, they have almost an infinite Number of *private* Masses in their Churches, celebrated by single Priests alone; none either of the Clergy or Laity being present. As in the Masses for the Dead wherein one Priest,* in one Corner, at one altar, chants his Mass, for the Soul of such a One; and another Priest in another Corner, at another Altar, at the same time, mumbles over a Mass for such a Soul; and a third in the same Manner, in the same Temple.

We now come to the second Way of communicating; which is by the Priest and People together; or, wherein the Laity and Congregation receive. And this (tho' they hear and see Masses almost every Day) is but ordinarily done † *once* in the Year; according to the Constitution of *Innocent* the Third, who ‡ confined the Receiving of the Sacrament to *Easter*, when all of both

* *Unus in uno angulo ad unum altare, &c. in eodem templo.*

† *Semel in anno.*

‡ *Coenæ usum ad Pascha astrinxit, ubi omnis utriusque sexus &c.*

sexes must receive it. And this indeed looks something more like the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, than when the Priest alone eats and drinks, and the People only look on: Yet even This is really nothing, but an open Violation of our Saviour's Institution, and a gross Profanation of his Ordinance: For, when they administer the Sacrament of the Altar to the People, they celebrate it in a Language which the People understand not; and so keep the Whole of the Service from their Knowledge, who neither apprehend What is said, nor What is done in it, but stand there like so many senseless images. A practice contrary to the express Words and Direction of Scripture*, to the common Sense and Reason of Mankind, and to the plain Example of Antiquity; yea, even the *Lateran* Council under *Innocent* the Third, about 1215, decreed, Cap. ix. " That for as much as in many Places within
 " the same City and Diocese, there be Nations
 " mingled of divers *Tongues*, having divers
 " Rites and Manners, under one Faith, we
 " straightly command, That the Bishops of such
 " Cities or Diocesses, provide meet Men; who,
 " according to the Diversity of their Rites and
 " *Tongues*, may celebrate the divine Service, and
 " administer the Sacraments of the Church unto

* See 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 3, 4.

“ them.” So that it is not very long since the Church of *Rome* herself was for having both Service and Sacraments in a *known* Tongue. But now she is of another Mind, and all must be performed in *Latin*, “ That the secret Mysteries of “ the dreadful Sacrament may not be profaned:” it should have been rather said, “ That the “ Abominable Superstitions of the Mass may not “ be understood by the ignorant Vulgar.”

The Council of *Trent*, Sess. xxii. Can. 8. decrees * : “ Tho’ the Mass contain excellent In- “ struction for the Faithful People, yet the “ FATHERS judge it not to be expedient, that “ It should every where be celebrated in the “ vulgar tongue ;” and therefore, Can. 9. they thunder out †, “ whoever contradicts this De- “ cree let him be accursed.”

MOREOVER, They deny the Cup to the Laity; and so most sacrilegiously (contrary to the plain Institution of Christ) rob them, in taking away one Half of the Sacrament from them, and destroy one main End of the Sacrament, which is to shew the Lord’s Death, and the Separation of

* *Etsi Missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut vulgari linguâ passim celebretur.*

† *Si quis dixerit, linguâ tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere, anathema sit.*

his Blood from his Body, or, his Blood-shedding, 'till he come*.

They say, the Priest performing Mass must always receive in both Kinds; "because he must express in a lively Manner the Passion of Christ, and the Separation of his Blood from his Body in the same:" And for this reason the People surely ought to receive in both Kinds also. Yet this is denied to all Lay-People, excepting only *Kings* and *Princes*, whom the Priests admit to be their Companions. A very gross Violation of the sacred Ordinance: For Nothing is plainer, than that Christ instituted Both to be received; distributed Both to the Disciples; commanded *Both* to be done; but more expressly and particularly commanded all *to drink* †. In the former *Verse*, when he speaks of the Bread, he does not say, "Eat ye *All*;" but in this, when he speaks of the Cup, he says, "Drink ye *All*:" So that they might have taken away the *Bread* with more colour, than they have for taking away the *Cup*. Yet they have this vain and frivolous Pretence for their horrid Violation of this plain Institution of Christ, *viz.* That Christ administered the Sacrament to none, but the Apostles; and they were all *Priests* or *Pastors* of the Church.

* 1 Cor. xi. 26. † See Mat. xxvi. 27.

But this will not avail them: For, in this act they were in the People's Room, not as Shepherds, but as Sheep and Disciples. But if we grant them that Christ did administer the Sacrament to the Disciples, as Pastors or Priests, I would still ask them the following Questions; Did not Christ then command them, as Priests, to do what he had done; *i. e.* to take, and to give Bread and Wine to Priests only? What Warrant then have they to give the *Bread* to Lay-men any more than the *Cup*; for the Command of Eating and Drinking belongs to the same Persons?

Now, if Lay-men have no right to the *Cup*, because those to whom Christ gave it were Clergymen; then, by the same reason, they have no right to the *Bread*, nor indeed to partake of the Sacrament at all. Why then is it given them? If it be said, *That* was instituted to be received by them, but not *This*, *i. e.* the *Bread*, but not the *Wine*; then I would ask farther, how they will ever make it appear that those Words of our Saviour *Take, Eat*, are directed both to Clergymen and Laymen, or, Priests and People; but that these Words *Drink ye All*, are directed to Clergymen only? And, why they give the Cup to *Kings* and *Princes*, who are mere Laymen?

But

But the Apostle clears the Matter beyond Exception; for he delivered the Institution of the Eucharist to the *Corinthians*, as he had received it of the Lord: See *1 Cor.* xi. 23. where we may observe, “that he wrote that Epistle not only to the *Pastors*; but to the *Church*,” (See *Chap.* i. *Ver.* 2.) “that he mentions no Exclusion of any from the Cup; and, that he expressly commands all to *drink*.” (See also *Ver.* 25. and 28.) Here the Command to *examine* is made to all the Faithful, and the Command to *eat* and to *drink* is made to the *same*.

AGAIN, As Christ instituted, so his Apostles, and their Successors, for above a thousand Years after Christ, administered the Sacrament, in both Kinds, to *all* the Communicants. It were easy to give a Multitude of Instances*. Indeed this Abuse began to creep in, in Pope *Gelasius's* time, who sat in 495, against which he pronounced

* *Gir. de Coena* 29. 30. 31.

Est ubi nihil differt sacerdos à subdito; ut, quando fruedum est mysteriis: *Similiter enim omnes, ut illa participamus, digni habemur.* Sometimes a Priest differs not from a Layman, as when the Holy Mysteries are to be celebrated: *For we are all alike accounted worthy to partake of them.* *Chrysostom*, Hom. 18. in *2 Corinth.* And a Council held at Antioch about the Year 353 decreed, that all that were present at service should communicate, or otherwise depart. Tom. 1. Concil.

3

D 3

this

this Sentence: “ We have been advertised that
 “ some Persons, having only taken a Piece of
 “ the sacred Body, do abstain from the Cup of
 “ the sacred Blood ; who, without Doubt, ought
 “ to receive the *Whole* Sacrament, or, be *wholly*
 “ excluded from Communicating, because the
 “ Division of a Sacrament cannot be made,
 “ without gross Sacrilege.” Yea, the Council
 of *Constance*, which is the first Council that made
 a Canon against the Communion in both Kinds,
 upon Pain of Heresy, and Punishment to be
 imposed by the *Secular*, in the very Canon made
 against the Cup, (Sess. 13. *Anno* 1415) con-
 fesseth, That Jesus Christ did institute and ad-
 minister to his Disciples the venerable Sacrament
 under the *Species* of Bread and Wine ; and like-
 wise, That, in the primitive Church, it was re-
 ceived by the Faithful, under both Kinds* ; and
 yet, in the same Canon, they establish the con-
 trary Custom ; and declare all those to be Here-
 tics ; and, that they are to be *grievously* punish-
 ed, who contradict it. But, doubtless, Christ’s
 Blood, as well as his Body, belongs equally to
 all Believers †. Yet that they may put some
 Cloak and Excuse upon so palpable an Abuse,

* *Molin.* 529.

† *Mensa dominica omnibus ex æquo est proposita. Theodoret*
in 1 Cor. xi.

they

they have invented the Fiction of *Concomitancy*, and they say that the taking away the Cup from the Lay-people, doth not exclude them from the Participation of the Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, Because Christ's Whole Person, both Humanity and Divinity, both Flesh and Blood, are in each Form; and are *wholly* received *no less* in the first, than in the second, or in both. Under the Form of Bread they receive the Body of Christ with his Blood, by Concomitancy, seeing his Body cannot be separated from his Blood. But this Concomitancy supposeth *Transubstantiation*, and is built upon it: And it is repugnant to the Words of Christ, who, by way of Distinction from each other, calls the Bread, his Body; and the Wine, his Blood; and exhibits them *distinctly*, the Bread to be *eaten*, and the Wine to be *drunk*.

BESIDES, If this were so, neither have the Clergy Need of the Cup, any more than the Laity; because, without it, they receive a *Whole* Christ. And indeed Christ's Institution of the Cup, upon this Supposition, was needless; for there is Nothing added therein, that was not before in the Bread: So that it was done in vain, which is absurd. But if we grant them this Concomitancy, yet it will no way justify their denying the Laity the Cup; for hereby they separate

those things which Christ hath inseparably joined together in this Institution, *viz.* The *Bread* and *Wine*. And tho' there were a Concomitancy, yet *Eating* is no *Drinking*; but we are commanded *to drink*. If I take a Piece of Bread and dip it in Wine, and then eat it, I do not thereby *drink*, tho' some of the Wine be received by Concomitancy. Neither can there be a Sacramental Participation of the *Blood* of Christ by Partaking of the Bread, but of the Cup; for Christ made not the Bread, but the Cup, the Sacrament of his Blood; and under the Bread, Nothing is sacramentally received, but the Body of Christ.

FURTHER, They take away the *Breaking of Bread* in the Communion of the Lay-people. As they utterly deny the Cup to them, so they deprive them of the sacramental Action representing the Passion and Crucifixion of Christ. Indeed it is broken in the Priest's Communion*; but in the Communion of the Laity, instead of broken Bread, they have little round Wafers with the Image of Christ on them†; and they administer them, distributing to every Communicant one of them *Whole*, contrary to the Example and Command of Jesus Christ, who *brake* the

* *Missâ sacerdotis.*

† *Placentæ orbiculares.*

Bread, and said, *HOC FACITE, THIS DO*: contrary to the Practice of the Apostles*, and contrary to the Practice of the Church in the first Ages; as were easy to shew. Yea, from this very Action of our Saviour, in the Institution and Administration of this Ordinance, the Sacrament took the Name of *Breaking of Bread*†.

AGAIN, They do not deliver the Wafer into the Hands, but put it into the Mouths of the several Communicants. “The Eucharist is not
 “to be given into the Hands of any Layman or
 “Woman, but only to be put into their
 “Mouth‡.” And this is done not without much Superstition, and a false Opinion, “that it is unlawful for any Layman to touch the venerable Sacrament with his Hands; that it is more reverently and devoutly received, when taken into the Mouth, than into the Hand; that the Hands of the Priests are holier than the Hands of the People; and that the Mouths of the Communicants are holier than their Hands; so that they may take into their Mouths *That* which they may not touch with one of their Hands, or take between two of their Fingers.”

* 1 Cor. x. 16.

† Acts ii. 42. Chap. xx. 7.

‡ *Nulli laico aut foeminæ Eucharistia in manus ponenda, sed tantum in os ejus.*

But

But the Manner of sitting at the Table, speaks it to have been anciently received into the *Hands* of the Communicants. And in the primitive Church, when *Transubstantiation* was not yet born, nor once known, or heard of, as a thing that was to come into the World, then “ it was “ no Impiety to touch the holy Symbols*,” but they were given into the Hands of the Communicants. See the *Epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria* in *Eusebius*, L. vii. C. 8. where it appears that the Priest did not thrust the Bread into the Mouths of the Communicants, but the Communicants stretched forth their Hands (as his Words are) to receive the holy Food. The same is also evident from the Words of *Ambrose* to *Theodosius the Great*, after the Slaughter of the Thessalonians; “ How dare you stretch forth “ those Hands which are yet reeking with innocent Blood, and with the same receive the “ holy Sacrament of Christ’s Body † ?

LASTLY, The People must not eat the Wafer after all, by Chewing it with their Teeth, but they must hold it in their Mouth till it dis-

* *Sacra symbola tangere non erat nefas.*

† *Quomodo manus extends, de quibus adhuc sanguis innocens stillat? quo modo hujusmodi manibus suscipies sancti Domini corpus? Theodoret, L. v. C. 8.*

See the *Rhemist. on 1 Cor. xi. p. 530.*

olve and melt away. Our Saviour used common, ordinary, and household Bread, such as he took off the Table, and gave it to the Communicants, with a Command to *eat* it*. But, instead of ordinary Bread, they have brought in their *Wafers*, that have little of the Substance of Bread in them; and instead of giving them to be *eaten*, forbid the Eating of them; and so take away not only *Drinking*, but *Eating* too (in a proper sense) in the Sacrament.

You have now the Lay-people's Communion, in which you see That they administer to them in a strange Language; take away the Cup, take away the Breaking of Bread, thrust the Eucharist into their Mouths, as if they were children, or Idiots †; take away true Bread, and true *Eating*; and so, do nothing less, than administer the Lord's Supper. This is the 9th Thing done in the Mass; After which, follows the *Post-communion*, consisting of Prayers, Thanksgivings, and Blessing the People; then the Deacon concludes all with an *ite missa est, &c. Go in Peace, the Host is sent to God the Father, to pacify his*

* Matt. xxvi. 26. *Φαγέτε comedite.*

† This taking of the Eucharist in their Mouth resembles more the manner of the brutes, which generally take their Meat with Mouth or Beak, than of Men. *Chamier de Eucharist.*

Anger. I might farther give you an Account of many other Fopperies that Superstition and Idolatry have foisted in, and made Companions of the Mass; such as the following: *viz.*

Breaking the Host over the Chalice; Breaking it into three Pieces; Putting one Piece into the Wine; Mixing Water with the Wine; Receiving it fasting; Candles burning on the high Altar, before the Host; Vestments wherein the Priest is dressed; Frequent Washings, Crossings, Blessings, Censings; Kissings of the Amice, Altar, Book, Pax; Frequent smiting and knocking of the Breast; Cringings and Bowings of the Body; with many other Actions and Gestures, so strange, various, and ridiculous, that they make it look more like a *Stage-Play*, than the Worship of God, and may amaze a Man that is not out of his Wits.

And this is a true Delineation of the Mass, both as a Sacrifice, and as a Sacrament.

It is called *Mass*, according to some, Because, “it is *sent* from the Father to Us, that Christ’s Body and Blood may be with us*.” And also because Christ is *sent back* from Us to the Father, that he may intercede for us with the Father. This is *Durandus’s* Opinion. Others think

* *Christus est hostia nobis missa à Deo.*

it so called, "Because the People, by the ministry of the Priest (who herein is Mediator between God and Men) *send up* Prayers, Vows, and Oblations to God*." Others again, "Because an Angel is *sent* from God, to be present at the Sacrifice, and to carry it to God †." Hence the Priest prays, "That the Oblation may be carried to Heaven by the Hand of the Angel;" as if Christ needed the help of an Angel, to carry him to Heaven.

A fourth Opinion is, "That the Mass is so called from *Sending out*; and this in two respects. There is the Mass of the Catechumens, and the Mass of the Faithful. The former is, when the Priest begins to consecrate the Eucharist; for then the Catechumens are *sent out* of the Church ‡." The Mass of the Faithful is, from the Offertory even

* *Ex quod populus per ministerium sacerdotis, qui mediatoris vice fungitur inter Deum et homines, preces, vota, et oblationes, transmittit Deo.*

† *Quod Angelus à Deo mittatur qui sacrificio assistat, et illud ad Deum deferat.*

‡ *Missæ ab emittendo dicitur, et duplex est. Una, catechumenarum; altera fidelium. Missæ catechumenorum est, quando sacerdos incipit consecrare eucharistiam; tunc enim catechumeni foris de ecclesiâ mittuntur. Missæ fidelium est ab offertorio usque ad post-communionem, et dicitur missa illa à dimittendo; quia, eâ expletâ, ad propria quisque fidelium dimittitur. See Durand. in naturâ div. off. L. iv. C. 1.*

to the Post-communion ; and is so called from *Sending away* ; because, it being ended, all the faithful are *sent away* to their own Homes .

Now this prodigious Monster of all Abomination, Impiety, and Idolatry, is the great DAGON, or, DIANA of the *Romanists* : 'tis what they have the greatest Veneration for, and set the highest Value upon, styling it

THE INEFFABLE MYSTERY ;

THE IMMACULATE HOST ;

THE PURE OBLATION ;

THE UNBLOODY VICTIM ;

THE NEW OFFERING OF THE NEW LAW ;

THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ;

THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH ;

THE SACRIFICE OF OUR MEDIATOR ;

THE ONE ONLY INCORRUPTIBLE SACRIFICE,
WITHOUT WHICH THERE IS NO RELIGION.

THIS they are the hottest for, contending for it with Fire and Sword. “ Yea, they contend more warmly for the Mass, than for all the other Articles of their Faith*.” Hence it is *Bellarmino's* Resolution, “ That were all other Controversies made up ; yet there could be no Reconciliation between Protestants and Papists, be-

* *Pro hac missâ acrius depugnant quam pro omnibus aliis fidei suæ capitibus.*

cause we judge the Mass to be shocking Idolatry, which they esteem the divinest part of their Worship*.”

For THIS they have raised innumerable Broils ; shed Rivers of Protestant Blood ; and constantly anathematize, curse, and damn us. THIS they are most wedded to, and bewitched with. “ ’Tis even the golden Cup in the Whore’s
 “ hand, full of Abominations, wherewith the
 “ Kings of the Earth, and the People †, from the
 “ highest to the lowest, are so drunk, intoxicated,
 “ and stupified, that, being more insensible than
 “ brutes, they place their Salvation in it §:” and it hath taken, by Continuance, such deep root in their Minds, that the clearest Light of Reason, and the keenest Edge of God’s Word, cannot eradicate it. IN A WORD, THIS they make the Mark of the *papal* Religion. Going to Mass, and hearing Mass, is as a Symbol or token, by which the *Papists* are distinguished from *Protestants* ‡. They place the sum of their Re-

* *Si cæteræ omnes controversiæ componerentur, tamen inter protestantes et papistas pacem conciliari non posse, quod illi mis- sam, suum divinissimum dei cultum, nos horrendam idololatriam judicamus.* Tom. 1. de Laic. L. iii. c. 19.

† *Calv. Inst.* 296. 5. 18.

§ *A summo usque ad novissimum.*

‡ *Instar symboli et tessaræ est quâ distinguuntur Romanenses à protestantibus.*

ligion in it. Indeed the Mass is the chief Part of the Service and Worship, which they give to God, in the Church; and the Whole Practice of their Religion stands principally in Saying and Hearing Mass. “ In the Sacrifice of the
 “ Altar consisteth the external Religion, and
 “ proper Service of the New Testament, no
 “ less, than the sovereign Worship of the Old
 “ Law consisted in the Sacrifices of the same*.”

“ The Mass is commanded, not Preach-
 “ ing †.” Agreeable thereunto, The Hearing of Mass is the only public Worship enjoined the People, on any of their Days of public Worship. So that for the Sanctifying of the Lord's Day, or any other which they account holy, *All* that is necessary is the *Worship* of the Mass, with abstaining from servile Works; and this is enough for the avoiding of mortal Sin. Thus the Whole of their Religion and Salvation stands in going to Mass, as it has been now described.

* *Rhemist.* on *Luke* xxii. 20.

† *Audire missam est in præcepto, audire autem conditionem non ita* (*Suarez*: Tom. 3. disp. 88. f. 1. And so *Billarmino* (de *Missâ* C. 1. p. 679.) *Sola missa communiter est in præcepto.*

C H A P. II.

A View of the Foundations upon which the Romanists endeavour to establish the Mass, with Answers to their Arguments.

WE shall now proceed from the Delineation, Draught, or Portraiture of the Mass, in the several parts and members of it, as it is used in the Church of *Rome*, to a View of the foundations whereupon the *Romanists* endeavour to establish it. And as there never hath been any Opinion, Doctrine, or Practice (among them that own the Scriptures) forged and published, of so *prodigious* a nature, but the Authors and Patrons of it have pretended to produce the Testimony and Authority of the *Oracles* of God for it, seeking to found and father it on the WORD OF GOD; so the *Romanists* pretend to bring the Sacred Scriptures for the Patronage and Maintenance of this

E

monstrous

monstrous Fiction of their's, the Sacrifice of the Mass, as before represented.

Thus they argue for it from *Melchisedeck*, who was a Type or Figure of Christ. The Scriptures tell us, "That *Melchisedeck*, King of *Salem*,
" brought forth Bread and Wine; and that he
" was the Priest of the Most high God *;" and
" that *Jesus Christ* was a Priest after the Order of
" *Melchisedeck*, and not after the Order of *Aaron* †."

Now from hence they form this Argument.
" *Melchisedeck*, who was the Priest of the MOST
" HIGH GOD, offered Bread and Wine in *sacri-*
" *fice* unto God. *Christ* is a Priest after the Or-
" der of *Melchisedeck*; therefore he instituted a
" *Sacrifice* under the *Species* of Bread and Wine,
" which is the *Sacrifice* of the Mass."

To pass by several Animadversions that might be made on this Argument, I shall only say in Answer to it, That the whole strength of it stands upon two Suppositions, both of which are false: *viz.* That *Melchisedeck* offered a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice unto God; or, that the Bread and Wine were offered unto God " as a *true*
" and *proper* Sacrifice †;" and that the chief Thing wherein *Melchisedeck*'s Priesthood consisted, and in which he was a Type of Christ, was

* *Gen.* xiv. 18. *Heb.* vii. 1. † *Heb.* vii. 21, 17, 21.

‡ *In verum et proprium sacrificium.*

the *Offering* of Bread and Wine to God; and that Christ is called a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, chiefly with respect to the daily Sacrifice that is offered unto God under the *Species* of Bread and Wine, which was typified by *Melchisedeck's* Offering.

FIRST, That the Bread and Wine which *Melchisedeck* offered, were a true and proper Sacrifice.

Bellarmino, *Gregory de Valentia*, *Vasquez*, and others, contend vehemently for *This*. But, I say, that *this* is most false. *Melchisedeck* did not offer Bread and Wine, as a Sacrifice unto God; but only *brought forth* and *presented* Bread and Wine to Abraham and his Soldiers. There is no mention of any Offering to God, nor any colour for such an Interpretation. The word is מציח et, *Ario Montano* interprete, significat *eduxit*; et *Buxtorfio*, *exire fecit, eduxit, produxit, protulit, deprompsit* †. Et, teste *Pagnino*, מצ, ejus radix in conjugatione *Hiphil* significat *proferre*. And *Bellarmino* himself confesseth, that the Verb doth signify no more than *proferre* seu *adducere*. And *Pererius*, another Jesuit, is, by the Evidence of the Truth, forced to say: * “ Nothing is here written

* *Nihil hic scribitur de oblatione, sed prolatione panis et vini.*

† See *Buxtorf's Lexicon*.

“ concerning *Offering* Bread and Wine, but only
 “ that Bread and Wine were *brought forth*.”

But, say they, tho’ the Word properly signifies no more than to *bring forth*, as in our Bibles: yet the Words that do immediately follow, carry it to their Sense; and speak it to be meant of a proper Sacrifice: for it follows immediately, *For he was the Priest of the most high God* *.

To this I answer, that the *Romish* Bible hath falsified and corrupted this Place in putting *Enim* for *Et*; and translating, “ *For he was the Priest*” (as tho’ the *Bringing forth* of Bread and Wine had been an Act of his Priesthood) instead of, “ *And he was the Priest*,” according to the Hebrew, where the Copulative is *Vau* †, and this Clause is not annexed as a Reason of the former; viz. *his Bringing forth Bread and Wine*; but plainly relates to, and is to be joined with that which follows †, as the same Copula-

* That *Melchisedeck* offered not bread and wine unto God, but unto *Abraham*, is affirmed by *Aug.* Quæst. V. et N. Testam. Q. 109. by *Ambrose*, L. 4. de sacr. c. 3. by *Damasen.* L. 4. de orthodox. fid. c. 14. and by *Lombard*, Sent. L. 4. distinct 8.

† *Hebræa lætio latine ad verbum conversa, sic expressit hunc locum* “ *Et Melchisedeck Rex Salem protulit panem et vinum.*” *Et ipse erat sacerdos Deo altissimo.* *Pereius* in loc. *And so Cajetan.* *Quod in vulgata editione subditur ut causa oblationis,* “ *erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi,*” *in Hebræa non habeatur ut causa, sed ut separata clausula.*

† V. 19. 20.

tive sheweth. And it was not the *Bringing forth of bread and wine*, but *the Blessing of Abraham*, that was here the proper Act of *Melchisedeck's* Priesthood; and in relation whereunto he is stiled the Priest of the most high God.

Thus, in the first place, the *Popish* Supposition upon which this Argument is bottomed, is false. But if it were true, that *Melchisedeck* did offer Bread and Wine to God in sacrifice; yet it would not follow that therefore *Christ* must and did institute such a kind of Sacrifice as *Melchisedeck* offered. I say, this will never follow by necessary consequence; nor can the Sacrifice of the Mass be inferred hence any where, but in the Schools of the Jesuits, who have a known and famous Faculty of proving and inferring *Quidlibet. á Quolibet.*

Melchisedeck sacrificed *Bread and Wine*; Grant it; What then? Why, therefore the *Priest* in the Mass sacrificeth the *Body and Blood of Christ*. Who seeth not the Absurdity and Ridiculousness of this Inference? Nay, if we grant them, that *Melchisedeck* offered a *proper* Sacrifice of Bread and Wine; yet, instead of doing them any Service, it will cut asunder the Sinews of their own Argument: for be it so, what then? Why, say they, *Christ* being a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, was obliged to offer the same

kind of Sacrifice that Melchisedeck offered: Well, and what follows on this? Why, it will follow, that because Melchisedeck sacrificed *Bread* and *Wine*, therefore Christ sacrificed the same; and the Priest now sacrificeth *Bread* and *Wine* in the Mass, as *Melchisedeck* did.

THIS, I say, (if any thing) will follow, That the *Massing Priest* now sacrificeth *Bread* and *Wine*, the same kind of Sacrifice that Melchisedeck offered, and not the *true* and *proper Body* and *Blood of Christ*, which is quite another kind of Sacrifice. So that their own Argument is both *felo de se* and *jugulator causæ*; destroying the daily Sacrifice of the real *Body* and *Blood of Christ*, which they contend for, and would establish by it.

We have now the first Supposition that this Argument depends upon; which is, in the first place, false; and, if true, would not bestead them, but quite overthrow the cause that it is brought in to defend.

Let us now take a view of the Arguments whereby they would prove that Melchisedeck sacrificed *Bread* and *Wine*; and these following Arguments are brought to prove this.

Gab. Vasquez, the Jesuit, argues thus: *Melchisedeck* is brought in Giving *Bread* and *Wine* to the *Soldiers*, and Blessing them, “ as with his
“ own

“ own Hand*.” for the Scripture saith, He brought forth Bread and Wine, *For* he was the Priest of the most high God, and he blessed him; where he observes that *Melchisedeck* at once brought forth Bread and Wine, and in Bringing them forth, blessed *Them*; whence, *saith* he, “ it seemeth it may be inferred †,” that the Bread and Wine were consecrated into a Sacrifice, and so distributed by the Priest with his own Hands. In answer, the Jesuit inserts that of *Melchisedeck* giving the Bread and Wine, *with his own Hands*, of his own Head; for it is neither in the Text, nor can be collected from it. So that this is a bold Presumption of the Jesuit. Nor is there any thing in the Text of *Melchisedeck*’s Blessing the Bread and Wine, nor of his Distributing them to the Soldiers, nor of his Blessing the Soldiers: It is said he blessed Abraham, but of the others there is neither Jot nor Tittle in the Text ‡; they are all *Jesuitical* Additions that will never pass with *Protestants* upon the bare Word of the *whole Tribe* without better proof, which yet they have not produced, nor ever can. But let us suppose that which the Jesuit takes for granted: *viz.* that *Melchisedeck* having brought forth Bread and Wine, *first* blessed *them*, and *then* distributed

* *Tanquam propria manu.* † *Videtur colligi.*

‡ *Nec vola nec vestigium.*

them to the Soldiers; yet what is this to the purpose? Will this prove a Sacrifice? Then it will be no Difficulty to prove any Thing whatsoever. We bless our Tables when we sit down to eat, and distribute the Meat to our Families, or Friends, that sit down with us. Do we therefore sacrifice? The *Popish* Priests (some of them at least) *bless* the Meat before they eat and drink at their ordinary Meals; but do they therefore, and thereby, *consecrate* and *offer* the pretended Sacrifice of the Altar as often as they eat and drink? I suppose they will not say so. In short, this is meer Trifling, instead of Reasoning with any Shew or Colour of Truth; and the *Jesuit* himself is not over confident of the Strength of his Argument, as appears by his “It seemeth that it may be inferred,” which (as one justly observes) is answered by “Another it seemeth that it may not be inferred*.”

In the next place, *Pererius*, another Jesuit, will say Something, but it is to as little purpose. His Argument is,

“That in this Place we have mention made of Three Acts of Melchisedeck; That he brought forth Bread and Wine; That he blessed Abraham, and that he received Tithes.

* “*Vidatur colligi,*” quod solvitur, “*per aliud videtur non colligi.*”

“Now

“ Now the two last of these Acts were certainly
 “ *sacerdotal*; and therefore the first Act, *to bring*
 “ *forth Bread and Wine*, was also sacerdotal, and
 “ appertained to his sacrificing Office.”

I answer, The Consequence will not hold ; the two last Acts are sacerdotal; therefore the first is so too. I say, the Consequence is not good, for it is inferred upon a false Supposition : *viz.* that because these three Acts are joined together they are therefore all of the same nature. Now this is false, for “ Things that are joined in the
 “ same Series or Sentence of Scripture, are not
 “ always of the same nature* ;” but there is a frequent Conjunction both of things unequal and Things unlike †, as might be shewn in many Examples ‡. We have three Acts of our Saviour, one following another in the same Series, as those of Melchisedeck’s do, and performed at the same time as Melchisedeck’s were; and yet they are not therefore the same, nor Acts of the same Office, but belong unto several offices : He cast the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple § : He preached || : and he Healed the Blind and the Lame ¶.

* *Quæ unâ sententiâ conjunguntur non continuo inde eadem sunt.*

† *Imparium et disparium.* ‡ *Mat. xxi. 12, 13, 14.*

§ *V. 12.* || *V. 13. cum Mark xi. 17.* ¶ *V. 14.*

Now of these the first was an Act of his *Regal* Office; the second an Act of his *prophetical* Office; and the third (I conceive) an Act of his *sacerdotal* Office. So, it is said of Christ, “ He “ is made unto us *Righteousness* and *Sanctifica-
“ tion* * ;” but not *Righteousness*, in the same sense, and respect, that he is made unto ^{us} *Sanctification*. So that the Jesuit’s Argument is a mere τὸ ἐν ἀπειρῇ †, and will never do them any Service, till they prove (which he should first have done if he would have had a solid foundation) *Illā omnia ejusdem ordinis et naturæ esse, quæ sæpe conjunguntur*; and this they can never do.

AGAIN, *Melchisedeck* sustained a double Person: *viz.* That of a King, and That of a Priest; and was not only the *Priest* of the most high God, but also the *King* of Salem: And here as a *King* He entertained *Abraham* with a magnificent Feast described by *Bringing forth* Bread and Wine; and as a *Priest* he blessed *Abraham*, and received Tithes of him. “ For Bread and Wine are not specified *exclusively*, but by them are to be understood, as is usual in Scripture, all other kinds of Entertainment ‡.”

* 1 Cor. i. 30.

† Vide *Job*. iii. 5. 1 *Cor.* iii. 22, 23. *Phil.* i. 19. *ubi conjunguntur quæ non sunt ejusdem naturæ.*

‡ *Illā enim non specificantur exclusivè ad alia, sed quia præcipua sunt alimenta, more scripturæ usitato, reliqua omnia sub se comprehendunt.*

A third Argument of the *Romanists* is this, namely, That there was no need for *Melchisedeck* to bring forth Bread and Wine to Abraham, for a Refection or Repast of his Men; and therefore he brought them for another End or Use: *i. e.* as a Sacrifice unto God. This is *Bellarmino's* Argument. The Antecedent, *viz.* that there was no Need of them for Food, he takes for granted; because Abraham returned from the Battle with a great Prey, wherein there was Plenty of Necessaries for Refreshing*; and Abraham's Men *had refreshed* themselves with the Spoil which they had recovered before *Melchisedeck* came out to meet him †.

But, by *Bellarmino's* favour, we may justly question his Antecedent notwithstanding what he alledges for the proof of it. Indeed, that they had eaten of the Provisions taken from the *Sodemites*, and recovered by *Abraham*, is declared in the Text; but that this was *before Melchisedeck* met *Abraham* cannot be proved from the Text quoted by *Bellarmino*. Or, if it could, yet all the Victuals might be spent by the time that *Melchisedeck* met *Abraham*. It is true that the Kings took away with them the Victuals of *Sodem* and *Gomorrab* ‡; yet I say, it is not im-

* *V.* 16.† *V.* 24.‡ *V.* 11.

probable that they might be spent, partly by the *four Kings* and their Company, and partly by *Abraham* and his Men. So that the *Jesuit's* Antecedent is merely precarious, and very dubious.

But, though this were certainly true which he supposeth; *viz.* that *Abraham* needed no victuals; yet the Collection is not true; *viz.* that *Melchisedeck* brought forth Bread and Wine to offer unto God; This will not follow. There is little Strength in this Reasoning, as *Pererius*, his Brother Jesuit, confesseth, who shall answer *Bellarmino* here for me. His Answer is, “ That
 “ if *Abraham* wanted no Provisions, yet *Mel-*
 “ *chisedeck* might not know so much, but rather
 “ suppose the contrary: Or, if he knew this,
 “ yet he would, by this Present brought unto
 “ *Abraham*, declare and testify his Humanity
 “ and Benignity towards *Abraham*, together
 “ with his joyful Resentment of *Abraham's* Vic-
 “ tory over the four Kings*.” This is the Sum of *Pererius's* Reply to this Argument, and

* *Parum in hac confutatione videtur esse roboris; dicat enim quispiam nescisse id Melchisedeck, imo putasse eos propter laborem dimicationis, et fatigationem itineris recentibus cibis refici et recreari debuisse: Ac licet id sciisset, Melchisedeck voluisset tamen eo munere suam erga Abrahamum benevolentiam, et ex victoriâ ejus singularem lætitiâ suæ voluptatem declarare. Peter.*

we need add no more in answer to *Bellarmino* than what is thus retorted by his Brother. Let all be granted that he supposes, yet his Consequence will not hold, till he can prove that *None* in those Times and Places, were ever entertained with liberal Provisions or Feasts, by Princes or Others, upon any Occasion, but *such* only as were utterly destitute, and had Nothing of their own to supply their Necessities. And this is plainly repugnant to the common Custom and Practice of all past Times and Nations; so far as their Customs have come to our Knowledge. Yea, if there were Need, it would be easy to shew, in many Instances, that this was an ordinary Practice, in those eastern Countries, even in those times; and *Moses* excludes the *Moabites* and *Ammonites* from the Congregation of the Lord, for a Neglect of this friendly Office towards the *Israelites* *. “ It is an universal Custom to take Strangers to the Table, even tho’ they want no Meat †.”

Another Argument of theirs is, That whereas the Scripture doth in so many places describe the Priesthood of *Melchisedeck*, as distinct from the *Aaronical*, and like unto the Priesthood of

* See Deut. xxiii. 3, 4.

† *Moris est ubique hospites etiam non egentes cibo ad mensam continuo deducere. Ribera in Heb. Chap. vii. V. 15, 16.*

Christ; it ought somewhere to declare *what*, or, of *what kind*, the Sacrifice of *Melchisedeck* was: but there is no mention *any where* of any Sacrifice offered by *Melchisedeck*, unless it be in this Place: Therefore by Bread and Wine we must understand not *common Food*, but *consecrated*, and such as was first offered unto God. This again is *Bellarmino's Reasoning*; To which I answer, *Debile fundamentum fallit opus*. The Jesuit supposes, but proves not; that the Scriptures ought to declare, and describe unto us the Kind and Nature of *Melchisedeck's* Sacrifice.

Who has told him this? or, of whom did he receive authority of prescribing to the HOLY ONE what ought to be done? It is certainly, to say no worse, an unwarrantable Presumption for a mortal Man, tho' a *Jesuit*, and a *Cardinal* too, to make himself wiser than God; and to say, *This* or *That* ought to be, if God have not said it. The *Scripture* no where ascribes any *proper* and *special* Sacrifice to the Order of *Melchisedeck*, distinct from other Kinds of Sacrifices; and we are yet to learn how a *Papist* can do it. Though it be necessary that every Priest have Something to offer, yet it is not necessary to the Description of a *sacerdotal Order*, that there be an *express* and *distinct* Specification and Nomination of the Sacrifice; for the Order may be *special*, and yet the

Oblation *common*. There were Priests before the Institution of the *Levitical* Priesthood, who were neither of *Melchisedeck's* nor of *Aaron's* Order, as is evident from *Exod. xix. 22, 24.*

This was before the Institution of the *Aaronical* Priesthood, and Restriction of it to the Tribe of *Levi*; and these Priests are called *Young Men* of the Children of Israel, *Exod. xxiv. 5. i. e.* the *First-born* (as the *Chaldee* translateth it) which God had sanctified to himself*; and in whose place he afterwards took the Tribe of *Levi* †. Thus the *Father* of the Family or the *Eldest Son* was a Priest to the whole Family, and executed the priestly Office therein.

MOREOVER, That there was a Priesthood before the *Levitical*, different both from *It* and *That* of *Melchisedeck*, is manifest from the Examples of *Cain, Abel, Noah, Abraham, Jacob,* and *Job*, who is conceived to have lived before the Law, &c. Now tho' these were not of *Aaron's* Order, yet most of them offered the same kind of Sacrifices that were offered by the *Levitical* Order ‡. And so might *Melchisedeck* also, tho' he was of *another* Order. Besides, tho' *Jacob*

* *Exod. xiii. 2.*

† *Numb. iii. 12*; and *Chap. viii. 14, 15, 16.*

‡ *Gen. iv. 3, 4. Gen. viii. 20. Gen. xxii. 13. Exod. xxiv. 5.*

and *Job* were both Priests, and sacrificed to the Lord; yet there is no *express* and *distinct* Specification of their Sacrifices*. So that *Bellarmino's* peremptory *Oportet, Ought* or *Must*, is but a mere "Crack" of the Jesuit, and soon answered with a *Non oportet: i. e.* That there is no necessity of an *express* Specification of *Melchisedeck's* Sacrifice, because he was of another Order than *Aaron's*; and therefore the *Apostle*, discussing and shewing at large wherein the Difference of *Melchisedeck's* Order consisted †, altogether omitteth the Matter and Manner of *Melchisedeck's* Sacrifice as needless to be mentioned by him: And indeed it is abundantly sufficient to evidence and establish the Distinction bewteen *Melchisedeck's* Priesthood and *Aaron's*, that *Melchisedeck* was both a King and a Priest; but so were not the *Aaronical* Priests. *Melchisedeck* was without Successor: He neither received his Priesthood from any Other; nor passed it over to any Other: but so were not the *Levitical*; they truly were many Priests (one succeeding another) because they were not suffered to continue by Reason of Death ‡. *Melchisedeck* was without Descent §; *i. e.* his Pedigree was not known, or, not recorded in

* *Gen.* xxxi. 54. *Job*, i. 5.† *Heb.* vii.‡ *Heb.* vii. 22.§ *Heb.* vii. 3.

Scripture; but so were not the *Levitical*; for their Pedigrees are declared distinctly, after their Families, by the House of their Fathers. Yea, after the Captivity, those who could not make out their Descent were put from the Priesthood*.

These particulars make a Distinction plain enough (without *Bellarmino's* *εὐρημασίον*) between the *Melchisedechian* and the *Aaronical* Priesthoods. And these are the most considerable Things which I have met with, that are pleaded to prove that *Melchisedeck* sacrificed Bread and Wine; and I leave it to any rational and sober Person to judge what weight there is in them, when fairly examined.

We come now to the second Supposition, upon the Validity and Truth whereof their Argument doth depend: *viz.* 'That the chief Thing wherein *Melchisedeck's* Priesthood consisted, and wherein he was a Type of Christ, was the *Offering* of Bread and Wine to God: and that Christ is called a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, chiefly with respect to the daily Sacrifice that is offered unto God under the *Species* of Bread and Wine, which was typified by *Melchisedeck's* offering.'

* *Nehem.* vii, 63, 64.

Now the Falshood of *this* is sufficiently evident from the Falshood of the *former* Supposition, “ that Melchisedeck offered Bread and Wine,” which is *πρωτον ψευδος*, the first Falshood; and so *This* also falls with it. For, if *Melchisedeck did not offer* Bread and Wine; then his *Offering* Bread and Wine cannot (as is here supposed) be the *chief* and *principal* Thing (nor any thing at all) in respect of which Christ is a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*; or, wherein the Similitude of *Christ’s* and *Melchisedeck’s* Priesthood principally consists.

Besides, *Bellarmino* builds this Supposition upon another that is notoriously false: *viz.* that there was Nothing in the Priesthood of *Melchisedeck* that was peculiar or proper to *Melchisedeck*, but only this pretended Oblation of Bread and Wine; and instances in all the things mentioned by the *Apostle**, contending that they were common to other Priests: Which is a plain contradiction of the *Apostle*, and so grossly absurd, that another great *Jesuit*, *viz.* *Gabriel Vasquez*, doth largely refute it †, and plainly proves it to be most false and erroneous. So that I need not dwell any longer on the Refutation of this; yet,

* *Heb.* vii.

† *Vasquez* Tom. 1. Disp. in 3 part. tom. Disp. 86. quæst. 21. Art. 4. C. 4. Num. 33.

because, *Bellarmino*, and others, insist so much on it, I shall add Something further, and prove that This was not the Thing wherein *Melchisedeck's* Priesthood chiefly consisted, and wherein it principally represented the Priesthood of *Christ*. For the *Apostle* speaks not one Word of this in all his Dissertation on the subject; nor once names it in the Comparison he makes between *Christ* and *Melchisedeck*. The Epistle to the *Hebrews* is very large, it is *mainly* and *mostly* spent about the Priesthood of *Christ*, and the Priesthood of *Melchisedeck*; and, in comparing *Christ* and *Melchisedeck*, and their Priesthoods together, and in picking up the least Circumstances; yet in the whole Epistle he saith not a Syllable of *Melchisedeck's* Sacrifice of Bread and Wine, nor of the Sacrifice of the *Eucharist* represented thereby; much less, of *Christ's* offering himself under the *Species* of Bread and Wine, nor of any other Sacrificer than JESUS CHRIST, nor yet of any other Sacrifice than *That* of the Cross. Of all these there is not one Word in all the *Epistle*. But how can it be imagined, either that the *Apostle* could quite forget, or, would, in so exact a Disquisition, totally omit That which (*they say*) is the *chief, most proper, and only* Thing; and which, therefore, of all other Things, ought not to have been omitted?

The *Apostle*, according to this Divinity, is as much overseen, as if a Man, that undertook to draw the Picture of a Massing-Priest *in act of Oblation*, should represent him without a Wafer in his Hand; or, as if one who designed to draw an exact Picture of a *Man*, should perfectly represent his Hands, Feet, and other Parts, but forget or omit his Face and Head.

This Argument pinches the *Jesuit* and his Friends, but they never want their little Shifts and Evasions. And so the *Jesuit* tells us, That the *Apostle* omitted this *special Act of Melchisedeck's Priesthood*, wherein he represented Christ, and the unbloody Sacrifice of the *Eucharist*, because the *Hebrews* were yet incapable of understanding *this great Mystery*.

To this I answer, That the *Apostle* here writes not to the *infidel* but to the *converted and believing Hebrews* *. Neither can it be questioned but that *these Hebrews* had already participated of the *Eucharist*; and therefore it was necessary that they should understand what they did therein; especially, if (as the *Romanists* say) the main external Religion, and proper Worship of the New Testament, consist in this Sacrifice; so that the *Apostle* was under a *special Obligation*

* Chap. iii. 1,

not *purposely* to conceal this Mystery from them, but to explain it to them.

MOREOVER, It is evident, that these *Hebrews*, to whom the *Apostle* writes, were such as had *so firmly* believed in Christ, as to “ bear great
“ Persecutions for his Name, and to take joy-
“ fully the Spoiling of their Goods, &c.” Now whence was it that such *real* Christians, *constant* Confessors, and *invincible* Sufferers, were altogether unworthy, or unmeet to be given to understand any thing, little or much, of the *great* and *only* Sacrifice (as the *Romanists* call it) of the Church? Is not this an unaccountable Matter? And it is yet more strange, that the *Apostle* should leave this untouched, because of their *Incapacity*, when in the same *Epistle* he treats of Matters far more arduous, and hard to be understood; as, *the eternal Generation of Christ, his Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, Intercession, and Session at the Father’s right hand, the Resurrection of the dead, &c.* Were they capable of These matters but *incapable* of the Other? Yea, was it not more difficult to understand, how *Melchisedeck* was *without Father, without Mother, without Descent, having neither Beginning of Days nor End of Life*, than if he had openly declared to them, “ That *Melchisedeck* offered
“ Bread and Wine to God, as a Prefiguration

“ of the Oblation of consecrated Bread and
 “ Wine in the then (as they suppose) daily Sa-
 “ crifice of the Church ?”

MOREOVER, It is not a matter very credible, that *their* Incapacity should divert the *Apostle* from this Subject, when we find him instructing the *Corinthians* about it: Were these *Corinthians* newly converted from gross Paganism to Christianity *more capable* of receiving Instruction about the *Eucharist*, than *the Hebrews*, who were converted from Judaism? Then truly the *Apostle's* “ Much every way,” and “ Chiefly*” were nothing at all. The Jew had no Advantage.

But the *Jesuit* hath yet another Evasion, and tells us, “ That the *Apostle* passed over This in silence, because it was impertinent, and did not make for his present purpose. And why so? Why, because the Scope of the *Apostle* here was to shew the Excellency of *Christ's* Priesthood above the *Levitical*; and so it would have been impertinent to make mention of *Melchisedeck's* Sacrifice of Bread and Wine.”

To this I answer, That it is false that the Scope of the *Apostle* was *only* to shew the Excellency of *Christ's* Priesthood above the *Levitical*. For it was also and as much his Design to

* See *Rom.* iii. 1.

shew “ why *Christ* is called a Priest after the “ Order of *Melchisedeck*, and wherein that Order stood;” as will be unquestionably evident to any one that reads the Apostle’s Dissertation. And this being undeniably so, it is as undeniable, that if there had been any such thing as a *Melchisedeckian* Sacrifice of Bread and Wine, Nothing could have been more proper, apposite, and to the purpose, than the mention of it.

BUT to proceed with my Argument. The thing wherein *Melchisedeck*’s Priesthood chiefly consisted, and wherein he was a Type of *Christ*, was, according to their Hypothesis, diverse from, and of another kind than the Offerings and Sacrifices of the *Levitical* Priesthood: But the Priests of *Aaron*’s Order offered Bread and Wine; therefore *Melchisedeck*’s Priesthood consisted not in the Oblation of Bread and Wine. This (if they will stand to their tackling) cannot be denied by them: for that it was not proper and peculiar to *Melchisedeck*, but pertained also to the *Levitical* Order, to offer Bread and Wine, is most certain and undeniable*.

AGAIN, If the proper Reason of the Order of *Melchisedeck* stand in This, “ that he offered Bread and Wine, then *Christ* must offer the *Same*

* *Lev. ii. ver. 1, 2, 3, &c. Numb. xxviii. 1, 2, 3.*

to God, that *Melchisedeck* offered: but true and proper Bread and Wine (as they confess) were offered by *Melchisedeck*. Therefore *Christ* offered true and proper Bread and Wine. Now they cannot grant this that *Christ* offered true and proper Bread and Wine, but they must quite evert their Sacrifice of the Mass. And they cannot deny this, That *Christ* offered true and proper Bread and Wine, but they must (according to their own Principles) deny that *Christ* is a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, because he offered not the *same* Sacrifice.

But if they would creep out by a Distinction, viz. That *Christ* was not to offer the same Kind of Sacrifice, that (as they pretend) *Melchisedeck* did, i. e. true Bread and Wine, but his own natural Body and Blood under the *Species* of Bread and Wine; then they plainly forsake their own Argument here, standing on this bottom, That the Order of *Melchisedeck* (which *Christ* is of) consists chiefly and (according to *Bellarmino*) only in the Rite or Matter of the Sacrifice offered by *Melchisedeck*.

MOREOVER, *Melchisedeck*'s pretended Sacrifice was not a *propitiatory*, but a *gratulatory* Sacrifice. This they acknowledge: And therefore neither the Sacrifice, which they pretend to have been offered by *Christ*, nor That, which is
daily

daily offered by the *Massing Priest*, can be a *propitiatory* Sacrifice. “ For *Christ* (say they) with respect to the Sacrifice instituted in the *Eucharist*, is a Priest of the same Order, and *his* Sacrifice is a Sacrifice of the same Order, and therefore must be a *gratulatory* Sacrifice; for if *Melchisedeck’s* was *Gratulatory*, and *Christ’s* *Propitiatory*, then *Melchisedeck’s* was of one kind and nature, and *Christ’s* of another; so that they must either give up their *propitiatory* Sacrifice, or, that wherein they place the Similitude between *Melchisedeck* and *Christ* *.”

AGAIN, If *Melchisedeck’s* Priesthood did properly stand in the Oblation of Bread and Wine, then every *Priest* that sacrificeth in the *Mass* would also be a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, but this is *Christ’s* Peculiar †.

AGAIN, The *Mass* and *Melchisedeck’s* Oblation are nothing like. *Melchisedeck* offered Bread and Wine in substance: In the *Mass* they pretend to offer *Christ* himself under the *Species* of Bread and Wine. *Melchisedeck* presented his

* *Sine dubio sentiendum et dicendum est cum omnibus orthodoxis scriptoribus, Melchisedeck panem et vinum in sacrificium obtulisse Deo in gratiarum actionem pro Victoriâ Abrahami. Ribera in Hebr. c. vii. v. 15.* Without Doubt we ought to think and say with all orthodox Writers, that *Melchisedeck* offered Bread and Wine a *gratulatory* Sacrifice to God for *Abraham’s* Victory.

† *Pf. cx. 4.*

Oblation to *Abraham*: They offer their's to GOD. *Melchisedeck* worshipped not the Bread and Wine: In the *Mass* the *Priest* adoreth them. *Abraham* and his Men did eat of *Melchisedeck*'s Provisions: In the *Mass* the *Priest* eateth and drinketh *All* alone; there is no social Eating nor Drinking.

LASTLY, (as was hinted before) The *Apostle* compareth *Melchisedeck* with *Christ* not in *This* that he offered Bread and Wine (for he never names it) but in *This*, " that he was a King and
 " a Priest, without Father, without Mother,
 " &c. blessed Abraham, took Tythes as his
 " Superior, was without Successor, &c."

This may suffice to shew the Falsity of the second Supposition which their Argument drawn from *Melchisedeck* depends upon. I have now done with it, and am very sensible that I have been prolix in it; but it may be some excuse for me, That this Argument is the great ATLAS, whereupon they lay the main Strength of their Cause; yet you see it sinks * under the Weight

* Is there not a striking resemblance between this and the following passage: *viz.* " Tho' some of their
 " greatest Wits have undertaken the defence of it, *i. e.*
 " *Transubstantiation*, in great Volumes; yet it is an Absur-
 " dity of that monstrous and massy Weight, that no hu-
 " man Authority or Wit is able to support it. *It will*
 " *make the very Pillars of St. Peter's crack, and requires*
 " *more Volumes to make it good than would fill the Vatican.*"
 See Discourse on *Transubstantiation* in Tillotson's works, V. 1.

of it, and the Example of *Melchisedeck* maketh Nothing for the POPISH MASS-SACRIFICE, but altogether against it.

THEY have another Argument taken from the *Passover* of the *Jewish Church*, whereby they endeavour to prove that the *Eucharist* is a proper Sacrifice. *Bellarmino* reasons thus: "The Celebration of the *Passover* was an express Figure of the Celebration of the *Eucharist*: but *that* was the Offering of a Sacrifice to God. Therefore the Celebration of the *Eucharist*, must be the Oblation of a Sacrifice to God*."

To this I answer, That the First Proposition is false: for the *Passover* was a Figure of *Christ* himself, and not of the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*. And the Second is doubtful; for tho' the *Passover* be called a Sacrifice †, and indeed was so, in a large Signification; because the Lamb was killed, and for that it was a Figure of the Sacrifice of *Christ*; yet whether it was a true and proper Sacrifice, in a strict Sense, may be a Question, upon the following Grounds ‡: viz.

True.

* L. I. de Missâ. Cap. vii.

† Exod. xii. 27. Mark xiv. 12.

‡ Ille agnus futuri agni fuit typus, et ille sanguis dominici sanguinis monstrabat adventum; et ovis illa fuit spiritualis ovis exemplum; ille agnus umbra fuit, hic veritas Chrysost. Hom. de Prod. Jud. Gabriel Vasquez etiam disertè scribit, agnum

True and proper Sacrifices were offered by the Priests only: but the *Passover* might be killed not only by the Priests, but by the People also; as the first Celebration shews *, “and not only *Jewish* Writers, but learned *Romanists* themselves witness. The *Paschal Lamb* was sacrificed in any private family, and therefore by the Master of the family †. “According to the Law, neither Priest, nor Levite was required to sacrifice the *Passover*, but the Master of each Family killed the Lamb himself ‡.”

Bellarmino also confesses, “That the Master of the Family sacrificed in Person, and the rest of the Family by him §.”

agnum illum fuisse præcipuè figuram sacrificii Christi cruenti.
Tom. 3. in 3 thom. quæst. 74. Disp. 172. Art. 4. Cap. 10.

Sic *Ribera*, *Immolatio agni, Christi in cruce immolandi apertus typus fuit.* *Rib.* de festis diebus *Ebræorum*, L. 5. C. 4. Et postea, *Agnus immolatus figura fuit passionis Christi.* These Authorities prove that it has been the general Opinion of the learned, that the *Paschal Lamb* was a Type of the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross.

* *Exod.* xii. 3. &c.

† *Immolatio agni fiebat in quâlibet domo, et ideo fiebat à paterfamiliâs.* *Lyrand.* ad L. 2. paral. c. 30.

‡ *Juxta legis ritum, nec sacerdos nec Levita requirebatur ad immolandum pascha, sed paterfamilias jugulabat agnum.* *Cajetan.*

§ *Bellarminus etiam L. 1. de missâ, cap. vii. ait, Patremfamiliâs per se immolasse; reliquos familiæ, per patremfamiliâs.*

AGAIN, True and proper Sacrifices were offered upon the Altar of the Lord; but we do not find that ever the *Passover*, or *Paschal Lamb*, was brought to the Altar to be offered. They were also either totally, or, in part, offered unto God, and destroyed by the sacrificing act. *Bellarmino* himself asserts this, "That it is essential to a true Sacrifice, that that which is sacrificed be quite destroyed in the Act of Sacrificing*." From whence we may infer that the *Passover* was not a proper Sacrifice; for as therein Nothing was offered unto God, so neither was the Whole, nor any Part of it, consumed in Offering; but it was entirely roasted and eaten by the *Israelites*. These things may create a Doubt of *Bellarmino's* Minor Proposition †.

I add, that if Both the Premises were most true, yet the Conclusion inferred from them, leaves the Matter in question quite behind it. For if it follow from his Premises, that the Celebration of the *Eucharist* is an Oblation of a Sacrifice to God, Doth this prove, that the *true* and *proper* Body and Blood of *Christ* is this Sacrifice? Why not rather *Bread* and *Wine*? *Non concludit quod est in questione.*

* *Ad verum sacrificium requiritur, ut id, quod offertur Deo in sacrificium, plane destruat, L. 1. de missâ, C. 1.*

† See *Vines* on the Sacrament, iv. 5.

But he will still prove this, and that the Figure of the *Passover* was properly fulfilled in the Institution and Celebration of the *Eucharist* by the Oblation of Christ himself therein, from Part of *St. Paul's* Epistle to the Corinthians *. *Purge out therefore the old Leaven, that ye may be a new Lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the Feast, &c.*

Whence he argues thus, "It is certain that the Apostles ate the *Body* of Christ, before his Passion, in his last Supper: And therefore ate the true *Passover*, whereunto the Apostle exhorts, when he says, *Therefore let us keep the Feast, &c.* But the Feast follows the Sacrifice; the Sacrifice is first offered, then eaten, and not contrary-wise. Therefore the Oblation of Christ ought to precede that Manducation of the Apostles, at the first Celebration, before his Passion: Therefore the Passion alone is not the Sacrifice whereof the Apostle speaks, but also the Consecration, and Oblation of the *Eucharist*, are the Sacrifice figured by the Immolation of the Paschal Lamb."

Here the Jesuit, by his *Therefore's* (which are mere Ropes of Sand) ties one thing to another,

1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

unto a great Length of a Team, that he may draw the Mass out of the *Passover*; but All will not do; for it happens unluckily, that the Apostle doth not treat of the *Eucharist* in these Words; Either in the *Former*, when he saith *Christ our Passover, &c.* which is meant of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and was fulfilled in his *true* and *real* Passion thereon, which indeed is expressly asserted by *Thomas Aquinas* their own Angelical Doctor: Or, in the *Following Part*, when he saith, *Therefore Let us keep the Feast &c. **, which doth, in no wise, *directly* and *properly*, refer unto, or respect the Feast of the *Lord's Supper*, the Receiving of the *Eucharist*, nor yet the *spiritual* Manducation of Christ; but the

* Cum dicit, *Etenim pascha nostrum, &c.* assignat rationem ejus quod dixerat, scilicet, *quare fideles debent esse Azymi*, quæ quidem ratio sumitur ex mysterio passionis Christi. Dicit ergo apostolus, *ideo debetis esse azymi etenim.* i. e. *Quia* ut figurale pascha veteris populi est agnus immolatus, ita pascha nostrum, i. e. novi populi, est Christus immolatus.

When he saith, "*For Christ our Passover, &c.*" he assigns a reason for what he had said, *viz. Why* the Faithful ought to keep themselves free from Leaven, which reason is taken from the Mystery of Christ's Passion. The Apostle then says, *Therefore ye ought to be unleavened, Because* as the figurative Passover of the ancient *Jewish* Church, was a *sacrificed* or *slain* Lamb; so our Passover, or, the *Christian* Passover, is a *sacrificed* or *slain* Christ. See *Aquin* in loc.

Christian's whole Life, figuratively represented by the Feast of unleavened Bread, whereunto the *Apostle* manifestly alludes, q. d. Since *Christ* our *Passover* is sacrificed for us, let us pass our Lives (which ought to be a perpetual Celebration and Commemoration of our Redemption by *Christ*) not in the Practice of our old Sins, but in Righteousness and true Holiness. The Words then are a general Exhortation, “ to Purity and Newness of Life *.”

Thus *Augustine*, Therefore let us keep Holy-day, not for one day only, but for our whole Life; not with the old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of Malice, &c. And thus also several Others of the *Roman Church*, as great Men as *Bellarmino*, do expound the *Apostle* †.

AGAIN

* *Ad vitæ novitatem et puritatem.*

† *Sensus apostoli est, meritò vitam azymam à vobis exigo, quandoquidem agnus noster paschalis immolatus est, nempe, Christus, pro nobis in arâ crucis oblatus. Ipse verò est agnus qui abstulit peccata mundi: Quare sicut Judæi fermento abstinebant quamdiu Pascha celebrabant; ita et vos, christianum & perpetuum pascha agentes, semper oportet, abstinere à fermento veteris & pravæ conversationis.*

The Meaning of the *Apostle* is, “ I justly require of you an *Unleavened Life*, seeing our *Paschal Lamb* is sacrificed: *viz.* *Christ*, offered up for Us on the Altar of the Cross. HE is truly the Lamb, who hath taken away the Sins of the World. Wherefore, as the Jews abstained from Leaven, during

AGAIN, When *Bellarmino* saith, It is certain that the *Apostles* ate the Body of Christ before his Passion, in his last supper; we do fully assent, if it be meant of *sacramental* Eating, or of *spiritual* Eating. They ate the *Sacrament* of his Body, and they ate his Body *spiritually* by faith, before his actual passion. But if he mean it in the *Papish* sense, *viz.* that they ate the *true, proper, natural* Body of Christ corporally, we say it is absurd, incredible, monstrous; and, so far from being certain, that it is impossible to be true, as elsewhere hath been proved*.

FURTHER, We deny that it was necessary that the Sacrifice of Christ's Body should go before the Eating of it, in his last Supper; or, that, in the first Celebration of the *Eucharist* with his Disciples, the *Offering* of his Body was to precede the *Eating* of it: for he then gave it to them *sacramentally* and *spiritually*, not as being *already* offered, but as *ready* to be offered presently upon the Cross; and they received it not as *sacrificed*, but as *to be shortly sacrificed* for them.

during the Celebration of their Passover; so also you, keeping the Christian and Perpetual Passover, ought continually to abstain from the Leaven of your old sinful Conversation," *Estius* in loc.

* See *Treatise on Transubstantiation*.

It is true the *Passover* was killed before it was eaten; and *now* the Manducation of Christ in the Eucharist *follows* the Sacrificing of Christ, the Sacrifice of the Cross being past. But it could not be so in the first Supper with the Disciples; for then *Christ* must have suffered Death in the Celebration of the *Eucharist*, before he suffered on the Cross; and so must have been, at the same time, both *alive* at the Table and *dead* under the *Species* of Bread and Wine.

The *Jesuit* is still loath to leave the *Passover* till he has tried his utmost skill in endeavouring to press and wring the Mass out of it; and therefore proceeds from this to some other Arguments drawn from it: but they are so very light and trifling, that (to avoid needless Tedioufness) I shall pass them over; and conclude this Argument with a short Advertisement to the *Romanists*; *viz.* That if they will have the Figure of the *Passover* fulfilled in their Sacrifice of the Mass, Then the Mass must be a bloody Sacrifice: for in the Immolation of the Paschal Lamb there was always a *true* and *real* Effusion of *true* and *proper* Blood. Christ must also be killed as often as the Mass is celebrated: For in every *Passover* there was a *real* and *actual* Mactation of the Lamb. And there must be no Reservation of the consecrated Host, nor of any

Part thereof: Nothing of the Paschal Lamb was to be reserved *.

LASTLY, All the people that are present (and not the Priest alone) must eat as often as the Mass is celebrated. The *Passover* was eaten by all the Congregation of Israel †.

They draw a third Argument from the Eternity of *Christ's Priesthood*, *Thou art a Priest for ever* ‡.

Hence they argue, “ The Priesthood of *Christ* “ is to continue for ever, therefore it is necessary “ that he have a Sacrifice which shall continue “ for ever.” “ But this cannot be the Sacrifice “ of the Cross, for that was but once done, and “ is ended for ever; therefore it must be ano- “ ther Sacrifice that is to be offered daily, and “ this can be no other than the Sacrifice of the “ Mass §.”

To which I answer, That the pretended Sacrifice of the Mass cannot be the Sacrifice that is to continue for ever; for the Mass (by their own Confession) is to determine with the *Militant* State of the Church on Earth, and therefore cannot be eternal.

* *Exod.* xii. 10.

† *Exod.* xii. 3. &c.

‡ *Pf.* cx. 4.

§ This is the Argument of *Bellarmino* and *Pererius*, disp. 7. in *Gen.* 14, &c.

But, says *Bellarmino*, the Priesthood of Christ is said to be eternal, not because it shall never end, but because it shall continue to the Consummation and End of the World.

To this it may be answered, that some things indeed are said to be *for ever*, not Because they shall never have an end, but Because they are to continue a long time. Thus *for ever* is applied to the Passover *, and to the *Levitical Ordinances* †, which were to expire at the Coming of *Christ*; but then the Everlasting Priesthood and Sacrifice of *Christ* cannot be interpreted into this sense; for so it would plainly contradict the *Apostle*, who, from *the Eternity* of Christ's Person, inferreth *the Eternity* of his Priesthood, as inseparable from his Person ‡; and when it is here said that *He* continueth *for ever*, we may as well expound it that *He* shall continue only to the End of the world, (which is not only false but blasphemous) as interpret the Other so: *viz.* That his *Priesthood* shall only continue to the End of the World §. Well then, the pretended
Sacrifice.

* *Exod.* xii, 14, 24.

† *Num.* x. 10; 8; xv. 15; xviii. 8, &c.

‡ *Heb.* vii. 24.

§ *Christus quia æternus est, semper manet, et semper officio suo fungitur: hic autem sacerdos æternus est, et ideo æternum habet sacerdotium.*

Sacrifice of the Mass being to determine (as they confess) with the World, cannot be the Sacrifice that is to continue for ever.

AGAIN, The real Sacrifice of the Cross, or, the *once* Offering of the Body of Christ on the Cross, is the everlasting Sacrifice of our eternal High Priest. This, according to the Scripture, is Christ's *everlasting* Sacrifice. He hath given Himself for us, an Offering and a Sacrifice to God *. And this Sacrifice is *One for ever*. (Heb. x. 12.) And, *Once for all*. Heb. x. 10 †. And by this *one only*, and *only once* offered Sacrifice, he hath perfected *for ever* (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές) them that are sanctified ‡ : that is, he hath perfectly redeemed them ; perfectly satisfied the Father for them ; expiated all their Sins, and purchased all they have need of §.

AGAIN,

Christ, because he is eternal, always continues, and always discharges his Office. AND, *He* is an eternal Priest, and therefore hath an eternal Priesthood. *Ribera in Heb.* vii. ver. 24, 25.

* *Eph.* v. 2.

† *μια θυσία ἱφάπαξ.*

‡ *Heb.* x. 14.

§ *Magna est hoc loco hujus adverbii emphasi ; significat enim quod semel factum est, ita absolutum fuisse, ut repetere minima sit necesse, imo vero sit nefas.*

AGAIN, The Priesthood and Sacrifice of Christ are eternal; not Because He is daily offered unto God in the *popish* pretended Sacrifice of the Mass, which is (as we shall see) most injurious both to his Priesthood and Sacrifice; but Because he liveth for ever to appear in the Presence of God for us, as our great High Priest; and Because the *Virtue* of his Sacrifice on the Cross is eternal.

First, Christ ever liveth to make intercession for us*. It is a Saying of *Gurnel*, an eminent Divine, “ He that ordained him a Priest to die for Sinners, did not then strip him of his priestly Garments (as Aaron) but appointed him to ascend in them to Heaven, where he sits a Priest *for ever* by God’s Oath; and by his Death he did but begin the Execution of his Office; in Heaven he ends it. His eternal Priesthood in Heaven, and intercession there, is the Applying Cause of our eternal Salvation †.”

Against

Great is the Emphasis of the *Adverb* *ἐφ’ ἑαυτῆς* in this Place; for it signifies, That what was then *Once* done, was so absolutely perfect, that there was not the least Necessity to repeat it; nay, that it would be the greatest IMPIETY so to do.

* *Heb.* vii. 25.

† *Christ. Arm.* c. 4. f. 1. p. 33.

Goodwin’s Triumph of Faith, c. 2. p. 124. *Ib.* c. 3. p. 132;

Against this *Bellarmino* objects, " That *Christ* liveth for ever, is not enough; for then all the *Levitical* Priests would also have an eternal Priesthood; for, after the Resurrection, they shall also live for ever, and they have had a Priesthood."

I answer, This is a Piece of the old Roman Courage and Confidence, that steels the *Jesuit* to a bold Contradiction of the Apostle, who * makes this a great Difference between the *Levitical* Priests and *Christ*: viz. That they were not suffered to continue by reason of Death, and by Death lost their Priesthood †; but *Christ*, because He continueth for ever, hath an unchangeable Priesthood. In his very Death, he performed the Office of Priest, which Office he never afterwards laid down ‡.

He objects again, *Christ* cannot be a Priest, unless he have Something to offer. *Every High Priest is ordained to offer Gifts and Sacrifices*;

Sacerdotem si requiras super cœlos est ubi interpellat pro te, qui in terrâ mortuus est pro te. Aug. in Pf. 94.

If you enquire after *Christ* your Priest, he is above the Heavens; where he who died on earth for you, now intercedes for you.

* Ch. vii. 23, 24.

† *Per mortem amiserunt sacerdotium.*

‡ *In ipsa morte functus est officio sacerdotis, quod postea nunquam deposuit.*

whereon^{fore} it is of necessity that this Man have Something also to offer *. Hence he makes this Collection, “ That Christ cannot be a Priest, unless he daily offer Somewhat on Earth.” i. e. the Sacrifice of Bread and Wine transubstantiated.

I answer, For the Sense of the *Apostle's* Words, whereon he would bottom this Objection, I shall send him unto *Vasquez*, one of his own Society, who will inform him that all the *Greek* Fathers refer this Place of the *Apostle* to the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross; none of them, to the unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar; neither is it the Design of the *Apostle* to prove that *Christ* hath Somewhat now to offer in Heaven; but it is evident that he speaks of the one only Sacrifice, that *Christ*, by shedding his Blood, offered on the Cross †, &c.

And, for a full Answer to this Objection, I shall send him unto *Ribera*, another of the same Society, Professor at *Salamanca*, who in his Com-

* *Heb.* viii. 3.

† *Ad locum regerit, locum illum patres omnes Græcos retulisse, ad sacrificium crucis Christi cruentum, nullum ad incruentum, neque hunc esse Pauli scopum ut probet Christum nunc habere aliquid quod frequenter offerat in cælis; sed constare, ipsum plane loqui de unico sacrificio, quod cruento modo in cruce Christus obtulit, quin loquitur de sacrificio, cum quo, sequenti capite, ostendit, Christum ingredi in sancta sanctorum sc. cælum, æternâ redemptione inventâ. Vasq. disp. 85, q. 22.*

mentary on this Epistle, which he composed and dictated to his Auditors in that famous University, the last Year of his Life, who (*ut ætate, ita et sapientiâ grandior*) when he comes to these Words, tells us That the Apostle had before said three things of Christ *: *viz.* 1. That he was an High Priest. 2. That he sat at the Right Hand of the Father. 3. That he was a Minister of the Sanctuary, *i. e.* that he executed the Office of an High Priest in Heaven.

This which he said last, he now (*saitb Ribera*) proveth in this Manner. If he be a Minister of the Sanctuary and an High Priest, he must have ~~some~~ some Sacrifice or Gift to offer for us. For every High Priest *is ordained to offer Gifts and Sacrifices*: but what that is which he should offer, he doth not now declare; being to open This,

* *Tria de Christo dixerat, ipsum esse pontificem, sedere ad dextram patris, ministrum esse sanctorum, i. e. adhuc pontificis officio fungi in cælo. Quod tertio atque extremo loco dixerat, nunc sic probat, si sanctorum minister est, et pontifex, hostiam aut munus aliquod offert pro nobis. Omnis enim pontifex constituitur, ut munera et hostias offerat, quid autem offerat nunc tacet, explicaturus cap. ix. v. 24. cum dicet, non enim in manufacta sancta Jesus introivit, exemplaria verorum, sed in ipsum cælum ut appareat nunc vultui Dei pro nobis, id est, ut se patri ostendat, et per illam hostiam quam jam in terrâ obtulit, nobis omnia bona impetret, et pro nobis interpellat, donec omnes electi salutem æternam consecuti fuerint.*

chap. ix. when he saith, *for Christ is not entered into the holy places, which are the Figures of the true; but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us**, i. e. to present himself before the Father, and, by that Sacrifice which he had offered upon Earth, to impetrate all Blessings for us; and to intercede in our behalf, till all the Faithful have obtained eternal Salvation.

FARTHER, The Virtue of Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross is eternal. This is the Second: And it is owned by *Vasquez*; 'Christ's Priesthood is said to continue *for ever*, with respect to the Perfection and Fruit of his Sacrifice †.'

Yet this is no way satisfactory to *Bellarminè*, who here again objects, 'That the Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacrifice on the Cross continueth *for ever*, is not sufficient to prove the *eternal* continuance of his Priesthood; for the Fruit and Efficacy of *Noab's* Sacrifice remaineth still in keeping the World from being destroyed by Water; yet *Noab's* Priesthood is not therefore eternal.'

I Answer, It was no *spiritual* or *eternal*, but only a *temporal* Benefit that followed *Noab's* Sa-

* Chap ix. 24.

† Si consideres consummationem et fructum oblationis Christi, sacerdotium ejus dicitur manere in æternum. *Vasquez*, Disput. 85. q. 22. Art. 5.

crifice. And *Noah's* Sacrifice was not the proper Cause of the Benefit which followed it. The Efficacy was not in himself, or in his Sacrifice; but in *Christ*, whose Sacrifice probably gave that durable Effect to *Noah's*. And *Noah* having offered his Sacrifice did not enter into Heaven to intercede by the Virtue of it for the World, as *Christ* did*.

But he objects again, *Christ* is not a Priest if he do not *now* really and actually offer Some *true* and *proper* Sacrifice for us.

I Answer, According to this Divinity, *Christ* is not now a Priest upon any other Account, than Because he daily, by the hands of *massing* Priests, offers up himself to the Father, under the *Species* of Bread and Wine; nor hath he of himself an Eternal Priesthood, but by the Priests' sacrificing him here on Earth; so that if they should cease to offer Bread and Wine, he would also cease to be a Priest; and could not continue without the Consent and Concurrence of the Priests of the Church of *Rome*; tho' the Scriptures tell us, *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, "Thou art a Priest for ever †."*

Nay, from this *Hypothesis* (according to the Sentiments of many *Papists*) it will follow, That

* *Heb.* ix. 11, 12, with 24.

† *Pf.* cx. 4.

Christ's Priesthood not only may, but certainly shall expire before the End of the World. For they expound those places that foretell the Taking away of the daily Sacrifice, of the Sacrifice of the Mass *; and when *This* goes, *Christ's* Priesthood must necessarily go with it, and abide the same Fate.

But there is no more necessary to the Perpetuating of his Priesthood, than that having *once* offered his Sacrifice of *eternal* Efficacy (which is *already* done, none of them denying) he continue to make intercession, by virtue of that Sacrifice so offered by him, for all them for whom it is offered. And *this* we are most sure he now doth, and ever will do for them.

And in this again *Ribera* is clear and full against *Bellarmino*. 'Christ *even now* executeth the Office of our High Priest; and, by virtue of that Sacrifice which he hath offered for us, bringeth us to eternal Life †.'

ANOTHER

* *Dan.* viii. 11, xii, 11.

† *Christus etiam nunc officium pontificis facit, et virtute hostiæ quam pro nobis obtulit, nos ad vitam æternam perducit, Ribera* in *Heb.* c. vii. v. 25.

Duplici ratione dicitur sacerdos in æternum; quia ipse æternus est, nec moritur, ut alii sacerdotes, qui dum vixerunt, potuerunt hostias offerre, sed morte impediuntur. At *Christus* etsi mortuus est, cum sacrificium suum obtulit; resurrexit,

ANOTHER Argument is taken from the Prophecy of *Malachi*: *For from the Rising of the Sun, even to the Going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and, in every Place, Incense shall be offered unto my Name, and a pure Offering* *.

Hence they argue thus: “ It was foretold by
 “ the Prophet, that there should be a *true* and
 “ *proper* Sacrifice in the Church of Christ. Now
 “ this cannot be meant of any *Jewish* Sacrifice,
 “ because the Prophet speaks of a Sacrifice that
 “ is to be offered by the *Gentiles*.” “ Nor can
 “ it be meant of the Godly among the *Gentiles*
 “ who lived before Christ, and sacrificed unto the
 “ true God: as, *Job*, &c. for they were but a very
 “ small number, and all the *Gentile* Nations

surrexit, et vivit in æternum. Deinde, non est finita virtus ejus sacrificii cum ejus morte, *nunc etiam illud patri representat*, et res nostras apud patrem agit, ut omnes electi vitam æternam consequantur. CHRIST is said to be a Priest for ever, in two respects: *viz.* 1. As he himself is eternal, and dieth not, like other Priests, who, whilst they live, can offer Sacrifices, but are hindered by Death. But Christ, tho’ he died when he offered his Sacrifice, yet rose again, and liveth for ever. And, 2dly, the Virtue of his sacrifice was not destroyed by his Death; *even now he presents it to the Father*, and manages our affairs in Heaven, so that all the Elect may attain eternal Life. *Ribera* in *Heb.* Chap. vii. 17.

* Ch. i. v. 11.

“ were then open Idolaters.” “ Nor of the
 “ Sacrifices of the *Gentiles* that were offered un-
 “ to strange Gods.” “ Nor of the Sacrifice of
 “ the Cross ; for That was offered only *Once* ;
 “ and in *one* Place only ; not among the *Gentiles* ;
 “ but at *Jerusalem* : Therefore it is the Sacrifice
 “ of the Mass *.”

I answer, Tho' this Argument be set up by their sacred Council, and backed with the Authority of their greatest Champions, yet it is a mere *non sequitur*, utterly false and inconsequent. For, they argue here affirmatively *à genere ad speciem*, from a General to a Special or Particular. A Sacrifice is to be offered, therefore the Sacrifice of the Mass, *Nil magis insulsum vel puerile*. It is as if one should argue thus, ‘ The King hath declared that he will stamp a new Piece of coin, different in matter and value from any that is now current ; therefore this new Coin must be of leather, and of a double value to a *Broad Piece* ; whenas it may be of any one of an Hundred other Materials ; or, of a far less, or greater value.’ Or, as if one should conclude thus, ‘ The Pope will preach upon a Scripture Theme, the next *Corpus Christi* ; therefore it must be on *Gen. i. 1.* when it may as well be

* Concil *Trident.* ses. 22. c. 1. *Bellarmino* de miss. c. 10. *Suarez, Valentia, Maldonat, Salmero, &c.*

on any Other between That and the Last of Revelations.' For, the Enumeration made by them is imperfect, and doth not take in all the Kinds of sacrifices, that are mentioned in the Scriptures. " It is not the *Jewish* Sacrifice, nor the " Sacrifice of the Godly *Gentiles*, nor of the " *Gentile* Idolaters, nor yet of the *Cross*, that the " Prophet means; therefore it is the *Mafs*." But hold! it may be None of these, and yet, for all that, not the *Mafs*; but the *spiritual* Sacrifices of Christians which they are to offer in all places; and so this Argument stands on a rotten foundation, being built not upon the Text, but upon a plain Misinterpretation of the Text, which contains a Prophecy of the *Gentiles* Conversion under the Messiah, and of their true *Gospel* Worship, which is here figured by the *Legal*. A thing most frequent in the Scriptures of the Prophets, where the Worship of the New Testament is set forth under the Names of that which belonged to the Old*; and so here the Prophet applies the *old* Name to the *new* Offices to be performed under the *Gospel*†; and gives

* See *Isa.* lxvi. 23. *Joel.* ii. 28. *Zech.* xiv. 16. *Mal.* iii. 4.

Prophetis in more positum, de rebus Novi Testamenti uti phrasibus V. T. et de cultu N. T. verbis legalibus.

† Propheta, sub typis ætati suæ congruentibus, de spirituali dei cultu in totum orbem propagando, vaticinatur. *Cal.* in loc.

the Title of Offerings and Incense unto the Prayers, Praises, and spiritual Oblations, that should begin to be offered unto God from the Rising to the Going down of the Sun, by the Vocation of the *Gentiles*. And they are so called likewise in the New Testament *, where Offices of Charity are called *Sacrifices*. These Sacrifices may, and should be offered by all Christians †; and it is with respect unto these Sacrifices that we are said to be made Priests unto God ‡, and are stiled a *Holy Priesthood* to offer up *spiritual Sacrifices*, &c. §.

Thus Malachi means the *spiritual Offerings* of Christians, the Oblations that should be offered

* See *Heb.* xiii. 15, 16. *Phil.* iv. 18.

† Si nos sumus dei templum, et ara dei anima nostra est, sacrificium Dei quid est? imponimus in arâ sacrificium quando Deum laudamus.

• If we be the Temple of God, and our Soul the Altar of God, what is the Sacrifice of God? Answer, We lay the Sacrifice upon the Altar, when we praise God.' *Aug.* in *Pf.* xciv.

Ab hoc sacrificandi munere regale sacerdotium nuncupamur, quod per Christum offerimus illam, de quâ apostolus loquitur, hostiam laudis Deo.

• We are called a ROYAL PRIESTHOOD from this Office of Sacrificing, because through Christ we offer up that Sacrifice of Praise to God, of which the Apostle is speaking.' *Cal. Instit.* L. 4. c. 18. parag. 17.

‡. *Apos.* i. 6.

§ 1 *Pet.* ii. 5, 9.

by

by the converted Gentiles under the Gospel in all places. And *what* Malachi (*more prophetarum*) spake *improperly, metaphorically, or allegorically, that* they vainly understand *properly*, and confidently expound of the *special, real, and external* Oblation of the Body of Christ in the Mass, without any Shew or Appearance of Truth. For, while they make a Noise with this Place, here's not one Syllable of Sacrificing the Body and Blood of Christ in the *Eucharist*, nor a Tittle of making a *Propitiatory* Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead.

If because there is mention made of an *Oblation* in this Prophecy, there must therefore needs be an *external* Sacrifice in the Christian Church; then, by a Parity of reason, there must be also in the Christian Church, whatsoever any of the Prophets foretold, by and under the Names of all the externals that were in the Church of the Jews; as an external, true, and proper *Jerusalem; Mount Sion; Temple; Feast of Tabernacles, &c.* *. But this they will not allow.

AGAIN, The Eucharist is not a *proper* Sacrifice, but a Sacrament, and Commemoration of the Sacrifice of our Lord upon the Cross,

Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18i

H

which

which is the one only proper Sacrifice of the New Testament. “The Eucharist is a Sacrament, not
 “ a Sacrifice properly so called. We *receive* in it,
 “ we do not *offer*, unless the spiritual Sacrifices of
 “ Prayers and Praises *.”

But here again they object, “That the Pro-
 “ phesy of *Malachi* cannot mean *our* Sacrifices of
 “ prayer and praise, Because *That* is called a
 “ *pure* Offering; and therein the Prophet op-
 “ poseth the *pure* Offerings of the Christian
 “ Church to the *impure* Oblations of the Jews;
 “ but *Our's* are not *pure*, but *imperfect*, and
 “ *impure*.”

I Answer, It is false that the Sacrifices of the
 Jews, which were of divine Institution, were in
 themselves *impure* and *unclean* †. Yea, The
 Mincha, which is the Offering that *Malachi* here
 alludes unto, is a thing most holy ‡. And it is
 no less false that the Ordinances and Institutions
 of the Gospel are *impure* and *unclean*; or, that
 the *Purity* of them dependeth upon the *Purity*
 of those that administer them. And tho' the
 Performances of Christians (who are an *Holy*

* *Eucharistia sacramentum est, non sacrificium propriè die-
 tum; recipimus in eo, non offerimus, nisi sacrificia spiritualia
 precum et laudum. Spanh.*

† *Exod. xxviii. 38. xxix. 33, 34, xxx. 25, 26, 27, 28,
 29. Num. vi. 20, xxxi. 6, &c.*

‡ *Lev. ii. 3. vi. 17.*

Priesthood) be in themselves *imperfect*, and partly *impure*, as they proceed from them; yet as they are offered unto God in Christ, they are *clean*, and Sacrifices *acceptable* to God by Jesus Christ*. And sure the pretended Sacrifice of the Mass, is so far from being a *pure* Oblation, that it is the *foulest* Abomination that ever was in the world.

They further object, " That the Prophet speaks
 " of a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice, and not of an
 " *improper* and *metaphorical* One; such as Prayers
 " and Thanksgiving; for the Word translated
 " *Oblation* or *Offering*, is מנחה, and signifieth a
 " *Meat-offering of fine Flour, Oil, and Frankin-*
 " *cense*, (as it is described in *Lev. ii. 1, 2, 3, and*
 " *vi. 14, 15.*) which was offered daily on the
 " Altar of the Lord. And this kind of Sacrifice
 " represents Ours of the Mass; for as the
 " *Mincha* was a Cake made of fine Flour, with
 " an Asperision of Oil and Frankincense, and
 " in that manner offered unto God; so *Ours* is
 " made of the finest Flour, and contains the
 " Frankincense of the *Divinity*, and the Oil of
 " the Spirit, wherewith the Soul of *Christ* there-
 " in contained, is sprinkled, and is offered daily
 " unto God by the Hands of the Priests †."

* 1 Pet. ii. 5. *Per Christi intercessionem.*

† *Salmero*, tract 36, tom. 5.

To this I answer : *Mincha* here is used, and is to be taken, either *properly* or *improperly* ; but neither way is it at all pertinent, nor doth it speak Home to the Business.

If they take it *properly*, as used for a *proper* Sacrifice of the New Testament, then that Sacrifice ought to be of fine *Flour*, *Oil*, and *Frankincense*, like the old *Mincha* ; and therefore cannot be the *Mafs* : for that, (according to them) is the *true* and *proper* *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* : An Oblation of *Christ* himself, and not of a *Mincha* : and, if they take it *improperly*, as used to signify the *Mafs*, then the *Mafs* is an *improper* and *metaphorical* Sacrifice ; and therefore not an *external*, *true*, and *real* Sacrifice, unless *proper* and *improper* be both one. But indeed the *Mincha* was not strictly and properly a Sacrifice, but a Gift or Oblation. A Sacrifice, in a strict and proper Sense, is *rerum animatarum*, of *Things with Life* ; as *Sheep*, *Oxen*, &c. and stands in *animalium mactatione, et oblatione*, in Killing and Offering them ; the *Mincha* (*i. e. Munus*) was *rerum inanimatarum* of Things without Life ; as *Flour*, *Cakes*, &c. *i. e.* an Offering made of the Fruits of the Earth.

The Scripture therefore distinguisheth between a *Sacrifice* and an Oblation. “ The Lord sware that the Sin of *Eli*’s House should not be purged.

purged with Sacrifice nor *Offering* for ever *.”
 “ He shall cause the Sacrifice and the *Oblation* to
 cease †;” so that the Prophet here could not
 have respect to the *Popish* Mass, which (they say)
 is a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice ‡.

AGAIN, The *Mincha* was not offered as an
expiatory or *propitiatory* Sacrifice; but as a *Thank-*
offering unto God §. But the *Popish* Mass is
 with them, a true and proper *propitiatory* Sacri-
 fice, both for the Living and the Dead; so that
 there is no Conformity between the *Mincha* that
Malachi speaks of, and the *Mass* as it is now ce-
 lebrated in the Church of *Rome*: For, as you see,
 the *Mincha* was an Offering of something with-
 out Life; the *Mass* is an Offering of a Living
Christ.

The *Mincha* was an *Eucharistical* Oblation; the
 Mass is a *Propitiatory* Sacrifice.

The *Mincha* was brought by all the Israelites;
 the *Mass* is offered by Priests alone.

The *Mass* is offered for the Dead; so was not
 the *Mincha*.

* 1 Sam. iii. 14. The word is מִנְחָה, Meat-offering.

† Dan. ix. 27. The words are וּמִנְחָה וְזֶבֶחַ, *Sacrificium*
et munus.

‡ *Victima cruenta erat, munus incruentum*.

It was a bloody Sacrifice; the *Mincha* an unbloody one.

§ *Offerebatur ad declarandam gratitudinem pro victu et vitæ*
sustentatione.

Neither will *Salmero's* Comment make up any Agreement: viz. That the Sacrifice of the Eucharist being made of fine Flour, contains the Frankincense of the Deity, the Oil of the Holy Ghost, and the Whole Humanity of Christ, "which are all," *αλογα*, irrational and absurd Inventions; for if the Sacrifice of the Eucharist be made of Flour, as the *Mincha* was, THEN, either a Cake or Wafer made of Flour is offered unto God; which is denied by them all; or, that is not offered unto God which is made the Sacrifice, or whereof the Sacrifice is made. And so likewise it is most absurd and portentous to say, that the Flour, or Wafer made of Flour, contains the Divinity of Christ, the Holy Ghost, and the Soul and Whole Humanity of Christ, in the same manner, as the *Mincha* of fine Flour contained Oil and Frankincense.

In truth, the *Mincha* of the Church of the Jews, figured and analogically referred to the Fruits of Grace and good Works, that Christians are to perform, both towards God and Men; Towards God, by Prayer and Thanksgiving offered unto him. "Let my Prayer, saith David *, be set forth before thee as Incense, and the Lifting up of my Hands, as the evening Sa-

* Ps. cxli. 2.

crifice, or as the Evening *Mincha*, or *Meat-offering*. Towards Men, by all acts of Charity and Beneficence.

So, when the Lord here told the Jews, v. 10. ' I will not accept a *Mincha* or an *Offering* at your hands ;' he added, ' for from the Rising of the Sun to the Going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place *Incense* shall be offered unto my Name, and a *pure Offering* *.' Which is fulfilled, when men pray every where, ' lifting up Holy Hands without Wrath and Doubting †.'

There are yet more Places of the Old Testament which they bring to prove the Sacrifice of the Mafs: as, 1 *Sam.* ii. 35. *Prov.* ix. 1, 2, 3. *If.* xix. 21. *Jer.* xxxiii. 18. *Dan.* xii. 11. But it is needless to spend precious time, and to blot paper, in confuting such senseless and ridiculous Arguments, as they draw from a violent Wrestling of these Scriptures, for the supporting of their

* *Durante templo, solebant sacrificia offerre quæ vocantur mincha, cessante templo et sacrificiis, viri magnæ synagogæ substituerunt eis preces. Buxt, Lex. in voce Mincha.*

While the Temple stood, the Jews were wont to offer Sacrifices, which were called MINCHA ; but when the Temple and Sacrifices were no more, the Men of the great Synagogue substituted *Prayers* in the room of them.

† 1 *Tim.* ii. 8. See *Ainsworth* on *Levit.* ch. ii. v. 1.

Mafs. There was a Time when it was easy to impose upon the blind and credulous World, and at that Time, these passed for irrefragable and evident Demonstrations : viz,

Christ said unto Peter, Pay that for me and thee *. Therefore the *Pope* is the Head of the Church.

Here are two Swords † ; therefore the *Pope* hath Power of both Swords.

The spiritual Man is judged of no Man ‡ ; therefore no Man may judge the *Pope*.

God made Man in his own Image § ; therefore there must be Images in the Churches.

No Man lighteth a Candle to put it under a Bushel, but on a Candlestick || ; therefore Images must be placed on the Altar.

As we have heard, so have we seen in the City of the Lord of Hosts ¶ ; therefore we are instructed not only by the Hearing of the word, but also by the Sight of Images.

We will worship at his Footstool ** ; therefore Images must be worshipped.

Let every Thing that hath Breath praise the Lord †† ; therefore there must be Organs in Churches.

* *Mat.* xvii. 27. † *Luke* xxii. 38. ‡ *1 Cor.* ii. 15.

§ *Gen.* i. 27. || *Mat.* v. 15. ¶ *Pf.* lxxviii. 8.

** *Pf.* cxxxii. 7. †† *Pf.* cl. 6.

Pilate washed his Hands before he delivered Christ to be crucified * ; therefore the Priest must wash his Hands at Mass.

Babylon was a golden Cup in the Lord's Hand † ; therefore the Communion Cup must be of *Silver* or *Gold*.

The Pieces of Money for which Judas sold Christ were *round*, therefore the Communion Bread or Host must be *round*.

I say, when these and a thousand such other were current, as most firm and apposite Proofs, then also the Arguments for the Mass fetched from the forementioned Scriptures, were apodictical and plain proofs. But I think they will hardly have a face, to bring them abroad at this time of day ; and where the light of the Gospel hath shined above these hundred Years : Or, if they should, the Answer to all is short, *viz.* that all those places speak either of *legal* Sacrifices, or of *improper* and *spiritual* Sacrifices and Oblations under the New Testament ; and to prove the Mass by them is all one as to go into the Dark that they may see.

We now proceed to their New Testament Proofs, which we may pass over very briefly, they being only taken from Scriptures, pitifully

* *Mat.* xxvii. 24.

† *Jer.* li. 7.

wrested,

wrested, and grounded on Suppositions, without proof, or any shew thereof.

Thus they argue from the Institution; *This is my Body, which is broken for you**. *This is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many†*.

Whence they infer, That seeing these Words were spoken of the Present Time, it must needs be, That Jesus Christ, at that *present* time, was given as a Sacrifice. As the former Words, *viz. This is my Body ‡*, make and prove his Body *present*; so these words, *Which is given*, plainly signify that It is present as *given, offered, or sacrificed* for us. And being uttered in the *present* tense, they signify not only that it should afterwards be given or offered on the Cross, but that it was *then* also in the Sacrament given, or offered for us §. So *Maldonat* will have our Saviour's Meaning in the Words concerning the Bread, *viz. This is my Body, which is given for you ||*; to be, *which is sacrificed for you*; and so the Words of the Cup, *viz. which is shed*, to be, *which is offered, or sacrificed ¶*.

To this I answer, That the present tense that is here pleaded, is but a weak Foot for an Ar-

* *Luke xxii. 19.* and *1 Cor. xi. 24.* † *Mat. xxvi. 28.*

‡ *Luke xxii. 19.* § *Rhem. on Luke xxii. 19.*

|| *Mat. xxvi. 28.*

¶ *Datur, i. e. sacrificatur, funditur, i. e. offertur, sacrificatur.*

gument to stand upon that is to support so weighty a Cause: for nothing is more frequent in Scripture, than to put the Present tense for the Future, when the thing spoken of is at hand *. Christ saith, *The Son of Man is betrayed*, before they had laid any hand on him †. *I lay down my Life for my Sheep ‡*, i. e. I will lay it down shortly: And again, v. 17, *I leave the World, and go to the Father §*; i. e. I shall go quickly. *I am no more in the World ||*; i. e. I shall shortly leave the World.

Thus, this Form of speech was usual with our Saviour; and that when he was speaking of his approaching Death; and therefore, he might well speak now of his Death, as *present*, when it was but the Evening before he died. And so our Saviour in these Words speaketh of giving his Body to die for us upon the Cross; and useth the present tense for the future, to signify that his Passion was even at hand, and his Body ready to be offered on the Cross. And to this Sense three great Jesuits (among other Romanists) do fully agree. *Emman. Sa*, upon the Words of *Mat. ch. xxvi, 28*, saith, 'In the Greek it is said,

* Tempus præsens accipi solet in scriptura ad significandum id quod citò futurum est.

† *Mat. xxvi. 45.*

‡ *John x. 15.*

§ *John xvi. 28.*

|| *John xvii. 11.*

Which is shed, the time present for the time to come :’ And *Barradius*, “ The Lord useth the “ time present for the future time, which then “ was at hand. For the words must be under- “ stood of his Future passion, which then drew “ nigh ; in this sense, *This is my Body, which “ shall shortly be given to suffer and die for you.*” And *Cajetan*, on *Luke xxii. 19, 20*, saith, “ Even “ as the Evangelists by the time present, have “ signified the future Effusion of Blood ; say- “ ing, *Is shed* ; so *Paul* likewise expresseth the “ Breaking of his Body, which was after to be “ done upon the Cross, by the present time, “ saying, *Is broken* * : and, which is yet more, the vulgar *Latin*, or *Roman Translation* (which with them is authentic) gives the Words both of the Evangelists and the Apostle in the Future tense, according to the true sense. Thus the Vulgar Interpreter renders these Words of the Cup, *Which is shed*, by *Effundetur*, both in *Mat-*

* Utitur dominus præsentî pro paulo post futuro ; de futurâ enim et propinqua passione sunt verba intelligenda, hoc sensu, *hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis passioni et morti paulo post dabitur.* *Barrad.* tom. 4. *Harm. Evân.* L. 3. c. 4.

Eadem ratione, quâ Evangelistæ futuram in cruce effusionem sanguinis significaverunt in præsentî *effunditur*, eadem ratione *Paulus* futuram in cruce fractionem carnis Christi significat in præsentî dicendo *frangitur.* *Cajet.*

thew, Mark, and Luke *. And the *English* Translation of *Rhemes* renders them accordingly, *Which shall be shed*, in all the three Evangelists. And so likewise the Word concerning the Bread in *1 Cor. xi. 24. Which is broken*, in the vulgar is *Tradetur*, and in the English of *Rhemes, Which shall be delivered for you* : And thus also the *Mass* hath it. All which imply, that our Lord spake not of any Breaking of his Body, or Effusion of his Blood *then* made, but of that which *should* be made, the next day, upon the Cross. They go from hence to the next words, *This do in remembrance of me* †; *HOC FACITE* : And will have *THIS DO*, to signify, *Sacrifice my Body and Blood* ; and say, that here *Christ* gave Commission and Authority to the *Apostles*, and to all Priests that be their Successors, *to sacrifice his Body and Blood, really*, under the *Species* of Bread and Wine, as a *propitiatory* Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead.

Where, by the Way, we may observe, that, in these two Words, *HOC FACITE*, they find the Institution of *two* Sacraments, and one Sacrifice : *viz.*

The sacrament of Orders, that makes Priests *to offer*, and *to sacrifice* ; the Sacrament of

* *Mat. xxvi. 28. Mar. xiv. 24. Luk. xxii. 20.]*

† *Luk. xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.*

the *Eucharist*; and the Sacrifice of the *Mafs* (appointed in the Institution of the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*) wherein *Christ* is offered, as a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice; so that these Words *ordain* both Priest and Sacrifice. Oh! portentous Sagacity:

But to the matter in hand: From these Words an Argument for the *Mafs* is thus formed: “ Christ, in his last Supper, truly and properly
 “ offered up Himself to his Father, under the
 “ *Species* of Bread and Wine; and commanded
 “ the same to be done by the Apostles and their
 “ Successors; but that was to offer a *true* and
 “ *proper* Sacrifice himself, and to institute the
 “ Offering of the *same* by them; therefore the
 “ Celebration of the *Eucharist* is a *proper* Sacri-
 “ fice, wherein the Body and Blood of *Christ*
 “ are *truly* sacrificed.”

This Argument is so clear and full, that the Council of *Trent** thunders out her EXCOMMUNICATIONS and CURSES against all that deny it. But, however, we deny that our Saviour sacrificed Himself under the *Species* of Bread and Wine; and say, that this is τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ, et πάντως ψευδός. *Christ* offered Himself but once, and that was on the Cross †. Nor is there in all this

* Sess. 22. c. 9. can. 2. 3.

† *Heb.* ix. 28.

Action of his last Supper any Shew of a Sacrifice. For he never mentions any such thing, nor speaketh unto the Father, but unto his Disciples; nor offereth any thing unto the Father, but unto the Disciples, saying, *Take, Eat*; not *Lift up* the Bread and Wine; nor doth he command them to adore the Host. Of all these there is not one Syllable, nor of any other thing that has the least Appearance of a Sacrifice in this action from first to last.

And we also deny that our Saviour instituted a Sacrifice in this Action. There are no Footsteps of any such Institution in what he appointed and commanded to be afterwards done by his Disciples.

But, say the *Romanists*, he said, ‘*Hoc FACITE*, and *Facere est Sacrificare*,’ therefore he sacrificed himself, and commanded them to sacrifice:

To this I answer, This Confirmation is taken from the Signification of the Latin Word *FACERE*; which, when joined with an Ablative case, sometimes signifieth *to sacrifice*; i. e. when they speak *concisely*, *et facere pro rem divinam facere* ponunt; as in that of *Virgil*, *Eclog. 3. cum faciam vitulâ pro frugibus ipse venito*. But this is of no Weight at all; for, tho’ this were the ordinary and proper signification of the Latin Verb

Verb *Facio*; yet, neither did our Saviour, nor the Evangelists, use *that* Language: but the *Original*, wherein this Matter was delivered, is Greek, and the Words are τὸ ποιεῖτε, and ποιεῖν hath no such signification; so that this Allegation *planè ineptum est*, is wholly impertinent and frivolous.

AGAIN, Christ said not simply *Facite, Do*, but *Hoc facite, This do*; and the Relative particle *This*, plainly referreth to that which Christ commanded them to do; *viz. That* only which he then did; who, did not sacrifice Himself under the *Species* of Bread and Wine, but took Bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it, &c. Thus, *This do* signifieth to do that which was *then* done in the first Supper, &c. *Bucan. Loc. 48, q. 30**.

AGAIN, Our Saviour directs his, *This do*, to the Communicants, pointing therein at that which they are to do in the Use and Celebration of his last Supper; and which concerns them as much, if not more, than the Ministers †. And therefore,

* *Significat agere hoc quod tunc in prima cœna agebatur; tam quoad dispensationem quam quoad receptionem cœnæ attinet.*

† *Hæc commemoratio neque ad Deum patrem, neque ad Christum refertur, quasi sit illi repræsentanda filii passio, vel filius rursus offerendus; sed credentium cœtum respicit; cum*

fore, the Apostle *Paul* applies these Words of our Lord, not to the Ministers only, but also to the Whole Church of *Corinth*; and commands that the Communicants *first* receive, and *then* eat the Bread, and drink the Wine; and having said, *This do in Remembrance of me*; he immediately, for an Exposition of these Words, addeth, *for as often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come**, q. d. To do this in Remembrance of Him, is to eat the Bread and drink the Cup, in Remembrance of him, and to shew his Death.

AGAIN, *This do*, being addressed to all *Christians*, that can eat and drink in Remembrance of *Jesus Christ*, cannot be meant of *Sacrificing Christ*. (as they would have it) unless *all* Christians be Priests, ordained to offer a proper Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ to the Father in the *Eucharist*. And this they will by no means allow.

FINALLY, If the Meaning of these Words, *This do*, were *Sacrifice me*, then the Meaning of our Saviour's Speech must be, *Sacrifice me in remembrance of me*, which is most absurd: How can we sacrifice *Christ* in remembrance of *Christ*?

quo et apud quem, celebrandi hujus beneficii et profitendæ communis fidei causâ, hæc instituta est: actio. Beza in Luc. xxii. 19.

* 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, 26.

If he be sacrificed, he must be present; if the *Eucharist* be a Memorial of him, he must be absent*.

The next Proof is from *Acts* xiii. 2. *As they ministered to the Lord.* i. e. as they served the Lord in their Ministry. The Word is λειτουργεῖσαν. It signifieth nothing else but Ministering, and Executing a public Work, Service, or Office †. Now this Service they will have to be the Mass. The Rhemists translate it, *As they were Ministering*; but in their Annotations say, We might have translated for *Ministering, Sacrificing*; for so the *Greek* doth signify, and *Erasmus* did translate it: Yea, we might have translated it, *Saying Mass*, for so they did, *Rhem.* in loc. And *Ribera* takes it for certain, that the *Apostles* offered this Sacrifice of the Mass, and quoteth this Place to prove it. *Bellarmino* and *Baronius, &c.* also make use of this Text, as proving it beyond Contradiction.

But there is neither reason nor colour for it: For, the Greek Word is of a general Use, and signifieth *To minister, or Serve in any public*

* *Memoria est vel præteritorum, vel absentium.*

† Constat Apostolos, uti à domino acceperunt, obtulisse hoc sacrificium et hanc hostiam incruentam; idemque sacerdotibus ecclesiæ præcipisse ut facerent. *Act.* xiii. scriptum est. *Ministrantibus, &c. Rib.* in *Heb.* x. See Cartwright on the *Rhem. Test.*

Function or Office, sacred or civil, i. e. Ministering in general. The civil Magistrate is λειτουργός, *the Minister of God* *. *The minister of the Gospel* †, who serves in any religious Ministration, is also λειτουργός. Beneficence to the Poor is λειτουργεία. The Contribution made by the *Macedonians* and *Achaïans* for the poor Saints at *Jerusalem* was λειτουργία, *to minister* ‡. The *Administration* of this λειτουργεία §.

FURTHER, The *Ministering* meant in this Place, was the Preaching of the Gospel, and other Religious Exercises, which they were then employed in. Thus *Chrysoſtom* translates the Word *Preaching*. Syrus et Arabs, *Praying*. Others both *Preaching* and *Praying*. But this, says *Bellarmino*, cannot be the Meaning, for they were *ministering* to the *Lord*; but *preaching* is to the *people*, not to *God*. Nothing can be more frivolous than this, for *Preaching* is also to *God*; i. e. being performed to the *Glory of God*, and in obedience to the *Command of God*.

AGAIN, From this Argument it will follow, that the Holy Angels are Priests, and ordained to sing *Mass*, or to sacrifice *Jesus Christ*; for they are all λειτουργικά πνεύματα, *Ministering Spirits* ||.

* Rom. xiii. 6.

† Rom. xv. 16.

‡ Rom. xv. 27; and 2 Cor. ix. 12.

§ Phil. ii. 25.

|| Heb. i. 14.

But, though we grant what they assume, *viz.* that the Apostles and Believers were assembled to sing *Mass*, or, to offer Sacrifice; yet will this prove that this Sacrifice was the *Sacrifice* of *Christ's* Body and Blood? They sacrificed; therefore they sacrificed the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. If this will hold, it will be easy to prove any thing. But we may see their Way; and how grossly they abuse the Scriptures.

The word that signifieth *Ministering* in general, they translate to a *Special* kind of ministering: *viz.* *Sacrificing*.

This *Special* kind of ministering, i. e. *Sacrificing*, they again translate to a *special* or *particular* kind of sacrificing: *viz.* the *Sacrificing* of the *true* and *proper* *Body* and *Blood* of *Jesus Christ*; and so the Argument is unanswerable. They *ministered*, therefore they sacrificed; they *sacrificed*, therefore they sacrificed *Christ**; RISUM TENEATIS?

In the next place, they draw in *Heb. xiii. 10.* *We have an Altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle* †. By this Altar they

* *Verum ut illis detur quod postulant, ridiculè tamen in suæ missæ patrocinium Antiochenos doctores sacrificasse obtendunt, &c. Calv. in Loc. Argumentatio infirma affirmativè à genere ad speciem.*

† *Ad execrandæ suæ missæ βδιδωγµα transferunt.*

will have the Apostle to understand the Sacrifice of the Mass. He putteth them in mind, by these words, that, in following too much their old *Jewish* Rites, they deprived themselves of a more excellent Sacrifice and Meat, meaning the Holy Altar and *Christ's* own Blessed Body offered, and eaten there; of which, they that continued in the Figures of the old Law, could not be partakers. And the *Greek* Word, as also the *Hebrew*, answering thereunto, in the seventh verse, signifieth *properly* an Altar to sacrifice on, and not a *metaphorical* and *spiritual* Altar, whereby we prove against the Hereticks, that we have not a *Common Table* or *Profane* Communion-board to eat mere Bread upon, but a *very* Altar, in the *proper* Sense, to sacrifice *Christ's* Body upon. *Rhemists* on the Words. And so also *Stapleton* in *Antid. Evang. Mat. v. 23*, insisteth upon this place. Yet *Bellarmino*, (who is otherwise hardy enough) gives up and forsakes this Argument as indefensible. *De Miss. L. 1. c. 6*. And he knew what he did; for, this Plea is built upon a gross Misinterpretation of the Text; for the *θυσιαστηριον* *Altar* here is not the Table whereon the Lord's supper is administered, or *Altar*, as the *Romanists* term it; but *Christ*, who is both *Priest*, *Sacrifice*, and *Altar*. And the Apostle here speaketh of the Death of *Christ* upon the

Cross, without the Gate, as is manifest from the two next following Verses* : And by *Eating of this Altar*, he meaneth the Participation of the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, or the saving Benefits of his Passion, from which they are excluded, who serve the Tabernacle †, i. e. who pertinaciouſly adhere to the *Levitical Service* and Sacrifices. This Interpretation is followed by their own *Angelical Doctor* and *Prince of the Schools*, who, in his Comment on these Words, saith expressly, This Altar is either the *Cross* of Christ, on which he was offered for us ; or *Christ himself*, in whom, and by whom, we offer our Prayers ; and this is that *golden Altar* spoken of, *Apoc. 8.* Of this *Altar*, therefore they have no right to eat [i. e. to partake of the Fruit of Christ's Passion, and to be incorporated into him as their Head] who serve the Tabernacle: i. e. adhere to the *legal Rites* ‡. But the *Rhemists* object, that the

* *Christ* alone is the *golden altar*, *Rev. viii. 3.* under which the souls of the martyrs are, *Rev. vi. 9.* And he is set out by this title, because he is the thing signified by the ancient *altar*, by the Sacrifice, and by all the *legal ceremonies*.

† *Metonymia hic subjecti pro adjuncto, et continentis pro contento, altare pro victimâ.*

‡ *Habemus altare. Isud altare vel est crux Christi in qua Christus pro nobis immolatus est, vel ipse Christus in quo, et per quem, preces nostras offerimus ; et hoc est altare aureum de quo*

the *Fathers* interpret the Words into their sense, and call the Communion Table an *Altar*, in respect of the *Body* of Christ, which is sacrificed thereon,

To this I answer, That some of the *Fathers* calling the Table an *Altar*, was not with respect to the *Body* of Christ sacrificed thereon, but, in an improper sense, with respect to the Commemoration of the Sacrifice of *Christ* on the Cross in the Celebration of his last Supper; and with respect to the Gifts and Offerings then brought by the Communicants, and placed on the Table, whereof that Part which remained, after the Celebration of the Sacrament, was distributed to the Poor. But, that the Primitive Christians, for some time after Christ, had no material Altars, is certain and evident, even from the common and ordinary Objection of the Pagans against the Christians; which was, That the Christians had no Temples, no *Altars*, and therefore no Religion; For they took it for granted, that no Religion could consist without Temples, Altars, and Sacrifices. This may be read frequently in the Writings of *Origen*, *Arna-*
bis, *Minutius Fælix*, &c. who lived in the se-

quo dicitur Apoc. 8. De isto ergo altari non habent potestatem edere, i. e. fructum passionis Christi percipere, et ipsi tanquam capiti incorporari, qui tabernaculo legalium deseruiunt, Aquinas in locum.

cond and third Centuries. *Orig. contra Celsum; Arnob. adver. Gent. L. 6. Minutius Felix ad Cæcilium.*

But, if we should grant them this *: *viz.* That the Word ALTAR here is used *properly*, and signifieth an *external* and *material* Altar; yet it would be impertinent, and not come home to the business; for it could only be inferred, that the Church *now* hath *one* Altar, and that the *same* in all Ages. The Apostle speaketh of but *One*; but the *Romanists* have not *one*, but *many*; yea, *innumerable* Altars †.

This is the profound Reasoning of our great Masters.

We have an Altar, therefore innumerable Altars.

We have an Altar, therefore an external and material Altar.

We have an Altar, therefore it is instituted for the Sacrifice of the *Mafs*.

We have now their chief Proofs out of the New Testament; which are so weak, precarious, and ridiculous, that, instead of strengthening and supporting their tottering Cause, they are a mighty Discredit to it, and a convincing Evi-

* *Quod in quæstione est, et το κρινόμενον.*

† They had fourteen in one Temple: as in St. Paul's, London, in the Days of Hen. VIII. See Fuller's Eccles. History, p. 352.

dence of its Weakness, since they can find no better Arguments for it, when they have laid their best Heads together; Yet, good Men, they are not to be blamed for it, for how can they bring forth any other than such *Stuff* as they have? Can any Man bring out *Broad pieces* who hath nothing but *Brass Farthings* in his Bag? We need not question, but, if they could find out any thing more apposite and cogent, either in the Old or New Testament, we should soon hear of it from them; but that is not like to be found in either, which the Bible is shut against, and whereof there is not one Syllable in all the Book of God.

Yet, tho' the Scripture cannot defend their Cause, the Holy Church of *Rome* hath FATHERS and COUNCILS that will defend It against all the *damm'd* Hereticks; Or, when THESE will not do her Business, She hath *great Troops* of other Arguments ever in readiness, stronger and harder to withstand and overcome, than all the rest: *viz.* THUNDERING EXCOMMUNICATIONS, ROARING BULLS, DELIVERING TO THE SECULAR POWER, CONFISCATIONS, BANISHMENTS, INQUISITIONS, WHIPS, RACKS, PRISONS, HALTERS, FAGGOTS, DRAGOONS, and an infinite number of the like CLUB ARGUMENTS and CARNAL WEAPONS, which are mighty and formidable. And as the *Martial* Pope *Julius* the Second threw

threw his Keys into the *Tyber*, saying, “ Forasmuch as *St. Peter’s* Keys will not, *St. Paul’s* “ SWORD shall defend us ;” so the Holy Mother Church of *Rome*, when utterly deserted by Reason and Scripture, hath ever fled unto This Defence, and supported Herself, and her *unbloody* Sacrifice, by shedding the *Blood*, and sacrificing the *Lives* of MILLIONS of poor Innocents from Time to Time ; as GERMANY, BOHEMIA, BELGIA, FRANCE, SPAIN, ITALY, ENGLAND, &c. can witness ; and FRANCE is a tremendous instance at this Day *. And these (though the *Scripture* be a perfect Stranger to them, and *Christ* absolutely against them) are very shrewd Arguments, that by their invincible Strength have forced multitudes (with *gainsaying* and *condemning* Consciences) to yield a *feigned* Assent and Consent ; and, by their insupportable Weight, have pressed MYRIADS with Groans, Tears, and Blood, into the Dust ; whose Souls, now under the Altar, cry with a loud Voice, saying, *How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our Blood on them that dwell on the Earth ?*]

* This may help us nearly to fix the time when this Treatise was written ; which must be betwixt the Years 1685 and 1695. For *France* being here specified as a *tremendous instance* of the *Popish* Cruelty at that time, shews us that it was after the Revocation of the famous Edict of *Nants*, which happened in 1685, and our Author died in 1695.

C H A P. III.

Positive Arguments against the Popish Doctrine of the Mass.

WE have gone over the Arguments of the *Romanists* for the Sacrifice of the Mass, and shall now, in the next Place, shew, that it is no *true* and *proper* Sacrifice. And,

1st. Every true and proper Sacrifice hath a divine Institution, and is prescribed in the Scriptures; but the *Popish* Sacrifice of the Mass hath no divine Institution, nor is it prescribed in the Scriptures; therefore it is no *true* and *proper* Sacrifice. In Matters of so great concernment as this, we must bottom and ground upon the WORD OF GOD, if we would keep on safe Ground; but here, I say, the *Mass* hath no Ground to set a foot on; nor doth it stand upon any express Command, formal Institution, or single Word of Christ; but is a mere human Inven-

tion

tion. That it is bottomed on no Scripture, no where instituted of God, nor appointed by Christ, is most evident, in that, the Scriptures they produce for it, and would bottom it upon, prove no such thing; but when they have, by *Forcing, Wresting,* and *Racking* those Scriptures, drawn them forth to speak for them; yet they cannot for their very Lives compel them to speak any thing to the business; no, nor yet any thing but what (if a little sifted) is a plain Contradiction unto, or Condemnation of, the *Mafs*. This we have seen before, in the Scanning of the several Scriptures brought for that purpose.

FARTHER, There is no mention of a Sacrifice in the Institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper: Nothing of this can be found in our Saviour's Institution, as is shewn in the Answer to their second Argument from *Luke xxii. 19* *.

Neither are there any of those things contained in the Institution of the Lord's Supper, that are necessary to the making up of a *true, proper,* and *propitiatory* Sacrifice. In every such Sacrifice there must be

A Priest who is to offer,

A Victim which is to be offered,

An Altar whereon this Victim is to be offered,

* See page ~~79~~ 80. 110. 111.

And

And an Offering of this victim by the Priest upon this Altar.

But there are none of THESE in the Institution of the Sacrament ; and, therefore, there can be no Sacrifice.

In the first Place, there is no Priest ordained to offer. The *Pöpish* Mass Priests who are ordained to be Sacrificers of the Body of *Jesus Christ*, and Celebrators of Masses both for the Living and the Dead, have no divine Institution, nor were they ever called of God to this Office. It is an Office that *Christ* never instituted ; a thing that there is not the least mention of in the Institution of the Gospel-ministry, in any of those *many* Places of the New Testament, wherein their Office and Work are plainly, fully, distinctly, and particularly described. Yea, tho' we find *all* Christians called *Priests* in several places ; yet we have not one place in all the New Testament, where Pastors of the Churches are called *Sacrificers*, or wherein this Act of Sacrificing Christ is hinted at as a part, much less, as the chief and principal Part (as it is esteemed in the church of *Rome*) of their Office.

But here our Great Masters wonder that we poor *Hereticks* are so very blind, that we cannot see that this Office was instituted by *Christ*, and that the *Apostles* received the Order of Priesthood,

hood, or were made Sacrificers, when he said to them, THIS DO *. For, by these Words, (as the Holy and Venerable Council of *Trent* determines) he instituted the *Sacrificing* Priesthood of the New Testament, and established the *Sacrificers* of his Body.

Now the Truth is, we do acknowledge that this is a very deep and profound secret, which we are not able to understand; a mystery which Christ himself never thought of, which those two Penmen of the Holy Ghost, *Matthew* and *Mark*, never dreamed of; for if they had, certainly they would in no wise have omitted those Formal Words, whereby their *Lord* instituted the Office of the *Great Sacrificers* of the New Testament. Nor doth it come within the Comprehension of our shallow Understandings, how our Lord by the same Words, and by one and the same Action, could institute two things so different as a Sacrament and a Sacrificer. Can the same Words and the same Actions serve for both these? We may as well say that the Sacrament of BAPTISM, and the Sacrament of the EUCHARIST were instituted, and may now be administered by one and the same Form of words and actions. But the Institution of the *Sacrificer* by these Words, is the same with the Institu-

* *Luke* xxii. 19.

tion of the *Sacrifice* by them; and what this is we have seen before, in the Answer to their second Argument from *Luke xxii. 19* *.

MOREOVER, We affirm, that Jesus Christ is the only Priest of the New Testament; and this the Apostle doth plainly prove in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, wherein he opposeth *Christ alone* to the *Legal Priests*; and shews, that by the *one Sacrifice once* offered by him, the Shadows of the *Levitical Sacrifices and Priesthood* are accomplished, and all other Priesthoods abolished.

But, *say they*, it is true that Jesus Christ alone is our *Great High Priest*, but yet there are other *secondary and succedaneous Priests* now in the Christian Church.

To this I answer, There were no *secondary or Succedaneous Priests* in the Priesthood of *Melchisedeck*, which was a type of *Christ's*; much less, in *Christ's*, which is the true Priesthood.

AGAIN, Christ hath left no Need of, or Work for, any Successors in this Office †. There is no Need of them either to shadow forth what he was to do, or to represent what he hath done, or to do that which he did, which would be unprofitable, if it could be done, and which is impossible to be done ‡.

AGAIN,

* See p. 112, 113. † *Heb. vii. 23, 24.*

‡ *Jesus Christus est solus et æternus, neque successorum neque vicariorum indigus, Novi Testamenti sacerdos. Quæro enim,*

AGAIN, There is no Victim or Sacrifice to be offered. This is another Thing that is necessary to the constituting of a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice, *viz.* An external and visible Victim to be offered. But here is Nothing to be sacrificed. For the Body and Blood of Christ (which they pretend to sacrifice) are neither visible, nor present, nor can surely be offered to God by a *Popish* Priest. AND, even the Body and Blood of Christ themselves do not fall under the Name or Notion of a Sacrifice, but only as they were offered unto God, according to that Form, which

enim, cui bono alii sacerdotes substituerentur ipsi Christo? Non ut sacrificium ejus adumbrent tanquam futurum: est enim olim Deo exhibitum, non hodie exhibendum. Non ut significant tanquam factum; nam repræsentare illud ut factum, est sacramentum celebrare, non sacrificium offerre. Non denique ut agant quod actum fuit ab ipso Christo seipsum offerente; nam hoc et inutile esset, si fieret; et planè impossibile est ut fiat.

Christ is the *only* and eternal Priest of the New Testament, wanting neither Successor nor Vicar. For, I ask what End such Successor or Vicar could serve? There is no need of them to *shadow forth* Christ's Sacrifice, as future: For, It has *long since* been offered to God, and is not *now* to be offered. Neither is there need of them to *signify* the Sacrifice, as offered: For, *to represent* it, as offered, is to celebrate a Sacrament, and not to offer a Sacrifice. Nor, lastly, are they wanted to do that, which was performed by Christ himself; For, This would be altogether useless, could it be done; and it is utterly impossible to be done.

Deum Determinat

he himself prescribed from all Eternity. Now God ordained that his Son should be offered as a Sacrifice *once* by himself, and that on the *Altar* of the Cross; when therefore he is offered *often*, by the Hands of Priests never called to this Office, and without any Effusion of Blood, it can surely in no wise be a *true* and *propitiatory* Sacrifice*.

AGAIN, When the *Apostles* speak of the *Sacrifices* of Christians now in the times of the New Testament, they only make mention of *spiritual* Sacrifices, *viz. the Offering of themselves unto God*, and *their whole spiritual Service and Duties of all sorts* †. These are Sacrifices which God himself hath prescribed, whereby he is truly honoured; and *Christ* hath made us all *Priests* unto God and his Father, to offer them daily unto him: But as for this Sacrifice of the *Mass* in the Church of *Rome*, the Scripture is altogether silent about it, never once mentions it, nor any other *real*, *proper*, and *propitiatory* Sacrifice, that Christians are *now* to offer unto God ‡.

FURTHER,

* *Daven. Determ.* q. 13.

† *Rom.* xii. 1. *Rom.* xv. 16. *Phil.* ii. 17. *Phil.* iv. 18. *Hebr.* xiii. 15. 1 *Pet.* ii. 5.

‡ *Quamvis* in sanctis Christianorum operibus, ut in elemosynâ, et reliquis ejusmodi, est aliquid externum; tamen dicuntur sacrificia, non propter id quod externum est, sed

FURTHER, There is no Altar to offer a Sacrifice upon*. A *material* and *real* Sacrifice requires a *material* Altar: But we have no such Altar of divine Erection, as hath been shewn in Answer to their fourth Argument from *Hebr. xiii. 10* †.

AGAIN, There is no offering made to God. As there must be a Priest, a Victim, and an Altar; so there must be an Offering made. But here is no *Actio sacrificandi*, as also hath been shewn before, in the Description of the Mass ‡. This is the first Argument.

TO PROCEED, The Patrons of this Sacrifice can pretend no other Reason or End of their Offering Christ in the *Mass*, but either to satisfy for the Sins of the Living and the Dead, or to apply unto them the Satisfaction that was made upon the Cross. But Christ is not to be offered

propter interiorem affectum animi: ac proinde non externa dicuntur, sed spiritualia sacrificia, propter quæ fideles omnes dicuntur sacerdotes. *Buchan. Loc. 46. q. 45.*

Tho', in the Holy Works of Christians, as Alms, and the rest of that kind, there be something external; yet they are called Sacrifices, not on account of that which is external, but on account of the inward affection of the Mind; and therefore, they are not called external, but spiritual sacrifices, for which all the Faithful are called Priests.

* *Nulla est grata Deo, nisi Christus filius, Ara.*

† See page 117, 118.

‡ *Partic. 8, . p. 21, 22, 27.*

for either of these Ends; and therefore, is not to be offered at all. He is not to be offered to make Satisfaction: For, if by one Offering upon the Cross he made a *plenary* and *perfect* Satisfaction, then ought he not to be offered any more*. The Reason of the Iteration or Repetition of the *Legal* Sacrifices, was their Imperfection †; but where the sacrifice is *perfect*, there is no Need of, nor ought there to be any Repetition. But now, by offering himself once upon the Cross, he satisfied, and that perfectly, for all our Sins ‡; therefore he ought to be offered no more. Here §, the Apostle gives this as a Reason, why Christ hath now no further Offering to make; *viz.* because by that *one* Offering upon the Cross, made before he sat down on the right Hand of God, he perfectly satisfied for all them for whom he died, and expiated all their Sins; and when that is *once* done, there is no Use for any further Sacrifice.

But, *say they*, It is true that Christ offered himself but once in a *bloody* Sacrifice, but he is offered often in an *unbloody* Sacrifice: *viz.* this Sacrifice of the *Mass*, which is *Sacrificium incruentum*.

* *Heb.* x. 18.

† *Heb.* x. 11.

‡ *Heb.* i. 3; and x. 14.

§ *V.* 12, 13, 14.

To which I answer, In this they expressly contradict the Apostle; for if Christ offer himself now daily by the Hands of *Massing Priests* (tho' without Blood) he is often offered; but the Apostle denies and excludes the Iteration of his Sacrifice, asserting, that it never was offered, nor ever shall be offered more than once*.

AGAIN, The *unbloody* Sacrifice is a mere *Chimera*, or *Popish* Fiction, no where to be found in the Scriptures. We may look our Eyes out before we find a Distinction of *Christ's* Sacrifice into One that is *bloody*, and Another that is *unbloody*, any where, but in the Acts of the *Tridentine* Fathers, and others of the same Race.

AGAIN, This unbloody Sacrifice is not only a very Fiction, but such an ill contrived Machine, as falls foul upon itself, and lies bleeding under it's own mortal Wound; for it is their constant Tenet, that the Mass is a *propitiatory* Sacrifice for the Sins of the Quick and the Dead: But this it is not at all, nor can be, if it be true that it is *Sacrificium incruentum*; for without SHEDDING OF BLOOD, there is no Remission †. This is the *Apostle's* plain and positive Determination, that whatsoever Sacrifice is offered for Obtaining Remission of Sins, it must be, with *Shedding of*

* Heb. ix. 25, 26, 27; Heb. x. 12.

† Heb. ix. 22.

Blood, or else that Sacrifice is wholly in vain, and will never in the least answer the End for which it is offered. Either therefore the *Romanists* (who pretend to offer Christ daily, to obtain Remission of Sins for the Quick and the Dead) must grant that his Blood is daily shed by them in their pretended Sacrifice, or else that it is no *propitiatory* Sacrifice, nor obtaineth any Remission either for Quick or Dead, when offered ten thousand times over for that purpose. So that, in short, if the Mass be a truly *propitiatory* Sacrifice, then it must be a *bloody* Sacrifice. And if it be an *unbloody* Sacrifice, then it is not at all a *propitiatory* Sacrifice. Thus their beloved Tenets are contradictory, and utterly inconsistent one with another. While they go about to prove, that the Mass is a *propitiatory* Sacrifice, they overturn this other Tenet of theirs, that it is an *unbloody* Sacrifice; and when they go about to establish this Tenet, that it is a Sacrifice *without Blood*, they contradict and condemn themselves in asserting that it is a *propitiatory* Sacrifice. A *propitiatory* and *unbloody* Sacrifice, are repugnant terms; and the one is utterly overturned by the other*. They are like two Buckets in a Well; if one go up, the other

* *Pugnant inter se et alterum ab altero evertitur.*

goes down : And an *unbloody* Sacrifice is a plain Contradiction *.

AGAIN, If Christ be daily offered in the Sacrifice of the Mass to make Satisfaction, then it must follow, That Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross was imperfect, and like the *Legal* Sacrifices which were often repeated : And that Christ is yet daily making Satisfaction for the Sins both of the Living and of the Dead, by Offering himself to the Father every day ; and this in innumerable places, and on an infinite Number of Altars ; both of which are contrary to the Scriptures †. This is the *first* thing ; Christ is not offered to make Satisfaction : Nor, secondly, To apply the Satisfaction made upon the Cross to the Living or the Dead for the Remission of Sins. This is their ordinary Subterfuge ; *viz.* That *Jesus Christ* is offered in the Sacrament of the Altar, to apply the Satisfaction made by the Sacrifice of the Cross, and that in it the Death of Christ is applied to us.

* *Sacrificium incruentum est contradictio in adjecto, vel oppositum in appposito, ut ignis frigidus, atramentum album, nix atra, Ecclesia catholica Romana, quod enim Romanum est, non est Catholicum.*

An unbloody Sacrifice is a Contradiction *in adjecto*, or *oppositum in appposito*, as *cold Fire, white Ink, black Snow, Catholic Roman Church* ; for because it is *Roman*, therefore it is not *Catholic*.

† *Heb. x. 14.*

But

But this is a most absurd and senseless Device: To make the Application of a Sacrifice already offered, by a new Oblation of it, is as if one should say, The Way to make Application of a *Plaster* made and fitted for a Sore, is, to make a *new* and *second* Plaster like the first; or to make Payment of a debt, by Paying it over again, after it hath been once paid, and a Discharge given in; or to apply a Ransom already fully discharged, by discharging it again, a second, a third, and a thousand times over*. What can be more absurd and inconsonant? Yet this is the Way of the *Romish* Church, in applying to Herself the Sacrifice of the Cross, or the Death of Christ; namely, by Offering the same Sacrifice again. *Modus fictitius.*

THIS also is repugnant to, and inconsistent with their other Sentiments and *Hypotheses*; for they teach and maintain, That the Mass is a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice †. This is a principal Point of the *Roman* Faith. But if it be the Application of the Sacrifice of Christ, then it cannot be the Sacrifice of Christ itself ‡; for the Application

* *Absurdum sacrificium applicari per sacrificium; solutionem, per solutionem.*

† Inter *xpianas doctas Ecclesiæ Romanæ.*

‡ Obtendunt satisfactionem olim in cruce præstitam, in missæ sacrificio non iterari, sed applicari: unde Papistæ non

of a Sacrifice is not the Sacrifice itself. These are two distinct things; *viz.* Application, and that which is applied; as a *Plaster* is one thing, and the *Application* of it to a sore is another. A *Gift* is one thing, and the *Donation* or Applying it is another. Neither can these two be confounded, or taken one for the other, without a manifest Contradiction.

AGAIN,

nulli negant missam esse sacrificium *propitiatorium*, et asserunt tamen esse sacrificium *applicatorium*. At hoc etiam considerasse oportuit, aliud planè esse applicationem sacrificii olim exhibiti, aliud ipsum sacrificium, quod non novâ sacrificiatione, sed fideli apprehensione his aut illis particularibus personis restat applicandum. *Daven. Determ. 13.*

They contend that the Satisfaction formerly made on the Cross, is not repeated in the sacrifice of the Mass, but applied. Whence some Papists deny that the Mass is a Propitiatory sacrifice, and assert that it is an Applicatory sacrifice. But these ought to have considered, that the Application of a Sacrifice long since offered, is a very different thing from the sacrifice itself, which remains to be applied to Any particular persons, not by a new sacrificing, but by a faithful apprehension of the real sacrifice.

Applicatio sacrificii non est ipsum sacrificium (ut donatio rei non est ipsum donum) aliud enim est applicatio rei, aliud id quod applicatur.

Nec enim applicatio rei confundi potest cum re, vel res ipsa censerit potest sine contradictione in adjecto, et quin statuatut oppositum in appposito. Habent enim se ut antecedens et consequens, ut res et adjunctum rei. Spanh. Dub. Evan. par. 3. Dub. 142, 143; p. 840.

The

AGAIN, They teach that the Mass is a *propitiatory* Sacrifice, whereby Satisfaction is made for Sins. This is another fixed Doctrine of the *Romish* Church; but here again is a mortal Feud*; for if it be true, that this Sacrifice is offered to apply the Satisfaction to Us, then this cannot be true, That it is offered to make Satisfaction †, because Application pre-supposeth Satisfaction: And it is Contradictious to say, that it is both *made*, and *to be made*. *Made*, as

The Application of a Sacrifice is not the sacrifice itself (as the Giving of a thing is not the Gift) for the Application is one thing, and that which is applied is another. Nor indeed can the Application of a thing be confounded with the thing applied; nor the thing itself be thought to be in that which is added to it, without a Contradiction, and making the *Appositum* into the *Oppositum*. For the Application of a thing, and the thing applied, bear the same respect to each other, as the Antecedent and the Consequent, or, as a thing and its adjunct.

* *Internecina pugna rerum.*

† The Editor is under no concern lest any sensible person should be offended at the Expressions *satisfy* and *Satisfaction* so often used in this Argument. For though these be no scriptural modes of Expression, and may have been used in a very absurd sense by inferior Writers; yet it is certain, our Author affixed no such ideas to them; and it were easy to change them wherever they occur, for *redeem* and *Redemption*, which cannot justly be objected against by any Christian of any Denomination whatever.

Application

Application supposeth (a Plaister must be made before it can be applied) and yet *to be made*, as the Title of a propitiatory Sacrifice, plainly imports, and necessarily implies*.

They also maintain, That in the Mass *Jesus Christ* is offered unto God for the Living and the Dead. This is another undoubted Truth with them, but yet it stands not in Conjunction with, but in direct Opposition to, this other Doctrine, that is also as firmly believed, and without any Wavering. For to make an Oblation to God in Heaven, and an Application to Men on Earth, are two things, two different things, and two contrary things. THAT is an Application, or Presentation of it unto God, not unto us: THIS is an Application of it unto Us, not unto God. If by offering this Sacrifice, the *Romanists* pretend to make an Application of Christ to Men, then they do what is directly

* *Applicatio præsupponit satisfactionem primùm factam.*

Si illo nobis applicetur redemptio, non acquiritur, sed acquisita præsupponitur, pugnant enim idem esse factum et faciendum.

Application presupposes the Satisfaction to be first made: If the redemption be applied to us, it is not acquired, but presupposed to have been acquired. For that the same thing should be *already done*, and yet *to be done*, is a Contradiction.

contrary

contrary to what they pretend to do*. For to offer him to God the Father, is a very different Thing from applying him to Men. Yea, there is as much Difference between these two, as there is between the Surgeon's Application of a healing Plaister to his Patient's Sore, or Wound, and Sending it quite away to another, that He may never see it more.

AGAIN, They hold that the Sacrifice of the *Mafs* is the same for Substance with the Sacrifice of the Cross. This again is a Maxim of the *Romish* Church; but neither is this true, if it be offered to make Application of Redemption to Us: For the Sacrifice of the Cross, was offered to *obtain* Redemption for Us; now the *Impetration* and *Application* of Redemption are not both one and the same thing.

Thus, this Glos is repugnant to their own Text in several particulars; and when our wise Masters have brought these particulars together, and composed their Disagreement one with another, we

* *Si in sacrificio illo applicatio sacrificii domini, nulla ibi oblatio fit Deo, sed nobis, quippe quibus sacrificium illud applicandum, non Deo.*

If in that Sacrifice there be an application of the Lord's Sacrifice; there is no Oblation made to God, but to Us; the Sacrifice being to be applied to Us, and not to God.

Spanh. 3. p. Dub. 142.

shall

shall become more reconcileable unto this new and strange Doctrine of applying the Sacrifice of Christ to others, by Sacrificing him again to God the Father.

TO PROCEED, If Christ must be daily sacrificed on an Altar, to apply the Sacrifice of the Cross unto us, then, by a Parity of Reason, he must also be born, die, and rise again, that the Benefits of his Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection, may thereby be applied unto us; and we must, to apply his Death to us, make him die again for us. And if the Death of Christ be applied to us by the *Popish* Sacrifice of the *Mass*, then the Passion, Redemption, and Satisfaction of Christ could not profit us, if the *Romish* Priests would not give them unto us; who (by this Doctrine) have his Passion committed to their Custody, put into their Power, and left to their sole Disposal, to apply it at their Pleasure, when, and to whomsoever they will; and also to deny it to whomsoever they please. Now this to us is a very wonderful matter, that our Dear Lord should, out of his infinite Love to us, wade through such unknown Sufferings to obtain Redemption for us; and when all is done, put this Eternal Redemption into the Hands of a SORRY MASSING PRIEST, and
leave

leave it wholly to his Pleasure, whether we shall ever receive the benefit of it or not *.

But leaving the Church of *Rome* to her own fictitious Way of applying the Sacrifice of Christ to particular Persons by sacrificing him over again every day, we say that the Sacrifice of Christ is effectually applied to particular Persons, for the Remission of Sins:

First, *Externally*, by the Preaching of the Gospel, and Administration of the Sacraments according to *Christ's* Institution.

And secondly, *Internally* by the Spirit of God and Faith. *Principally* by the Efficacy and Operation of the Holy Spirit of God, exciting Faith in the Hearts of Believers; and *Instrumentally* by the Acts of Faith, apprehending and applying the Virtue and Fruit of his Death unto the Souls of the Faithful †. This is the second Argument;

* *Privilegium plusquam humanum. Nam qui fontem vitæ potest particularibus personis applicare prout ipsi visum fuerit, is potest iisdem gratiam et vitam æternam infallibiliter comparare. Daven. Determ. q. 13.*

A Priviledge surely more than human. For, whoever can apply the Fountain of Life to particular Persons, according to his own Pleasure, may infallibly procure for the same Persons GRACE and ETERNAL LIFE.

† *Quoties prædicatur Evangelium, administrantur sacramenta ex instituto Christi, toties Christus offertur, non Deo, sed nobis,*

Argument, viz. That the *Popish* Mass-Sacrifice is a fictitious, needless, useless Sacrifice; a Sacrifice that can neither make any Satisfaction, nor any Application of the Satisfaction that is made.

The third Argument is, If the Mass be a Sacrifice (and so *they* will have it to be, whether *Christ* will or no) then it is either the Same, and all one with That which *Christ* made and offered on the Cross, or Another; but it is neither the Same, nor Another; therefore it is no Sacrifice at all. It is not the Same with that which he offered on the Cross; for if so, then it would follow:

nobis, ut ipsum vera fide receptum totis animis amplectamur.
Buc. de Sacram. q. 46.

Per opus autem operatum cujuscunque sacrificuli posse illud vivificum sacrificium applicari presentibus vel absentibus, penitentibus vel impenitentibus, vivis denique vel mortuis, soli audent asserere qui frontem habent ferream, soli possunt credere qui cor habent plumbeum. Daven. Determ. 13.

As often as the Gospel is preached, and the Sacraments administered, according to the Institution of *Christ*, so often is *Christ* offered, not to *God*, but to *Us*; we embracing Him with all our Heart, having received him by true Faith. But, That *that* Life-giving Sacrifice should be applied by the *Opus operatum* of any Priest whatsoever, to the Present or Absent, Penitent or Impenitent, Quick or Dead, They only dare assert whose Front is Brass, They only can believe whose Brains are Lead.

1st, That

1st, That Jesus Christ is yet to suffer and satisfy for our Sins; but this is repugnant to *Heb.* ix. 26, 28; 1 *Pet.* iii. 18. Yea, our Lord himself left the world with a *Consummatum est* *, as having finished the Work which his Father had given him to do †.

2dly, That Christ Jesus is killed daily (for so he was upon the Cross) by the Sacrificing Priests in offering up a *real* Sacrifice of his Death and Bloodshed; but this is contrary to St. Paul ‡.

3dly, That the Mass is a *bloody* Sacrifice, for so was the Sacrifice on the Cross; but as the other two are directly opposite to Scripture, so this is most expressly contrary to their own Doctrine and Belief. For tho' they hold it to be a Sacrifice; yet they tell us with one consent (and there are not many things wherein they do agree) that it is a Sacrifice *without Blood*.

And, 4thly, That the Blood of Christ is of a finite value and virtue. It is true, that in words they acknowledge and confess the infinite value of his Blood, but by this Work of Sacrificing him over and over again, they plainly deny it; for the Priests, while they chant over *innumerable Masses*, for one and the same Man, thereby openly declare, that the most precious Blood of

* *John* xix. 20.

† *John* xvii. 4.

‡ *Rom.* vi. 9.

Christ *oftentimes* applied to the same Person, is scarce sufficient at last, and after many such Applications, to acquit and discharge the poor Man, (whether alive or dead) from all Guilt and Punishment*.

AGAIN, It is not another different from that which Christ offered on the Cross: For the Scripture mentions no *real* Sacrifice, between the Sacrifice *once* offered on the Cross, and his second coming to Judgment. Besides *this* propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, and the *Eucharistical* and *Spiritual* Sacrifices of Christians, we have no other Sacrifices commanded or mentioned in the New Testament; and therefore the Sacrifice of the Mass, is a mere Human Invention †.

AGAIN, If it be another, then the Sacrifice of Christ was imperfect; for whoever will maintain another Sacrifice after *Christ's*, must deny the Perfection of *Christ's* Offering ‡: And if there be another propitiatory

* *Sacrificuli dum pro uno et eodem homine innumeras missas decantant, aperte profitentur pretiosissimum Christi sanguinem particulari personæ sæpenumerò applicatum, vix tandem illum posse ab omni culpâ et pœna absolvere. Quam benè hæc inter se conveniant, ut sacrificium infinitæ virtutis designatæ personæ applicetur, et eadem tamen persona non protinùs à peccatis suis liberetur, ego fateor me tardiozem quam ut possim intelligere. Daven. Determ. 13.*

† *Humanum et commentitium est.*

‡ *Heb. x. 18.*

Sacrifice

Sacrifice besides that which Christ offered, then there is another Redemption, and another Propitiation for our Souls besides the Death of Christ; and so *two* Redemptions, and *two* Propitiations; and we must seek Redemption and Remission other where than in the Death of Christ; but it is Christ, Christ alone, who hath “obtained Redemption *.” “In whom we have Redemption †.” “Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation ‡.” And “He is the Propitiation for our Sins §.” Well then, the Sacrifice which the *Romish* Priests offer, is neither the same with That which Christ offered, nor another; and so is nothing but a mere Delusion and notorious piece of *Legerdemain* ||.

Argument fourth: The Mass is a new and late Invention, excogitated and brought in since the *Apostles*’ Times, by the Popes of *Rome*, who have one after another patched it together, and by sewing Piece to Piece (as they thought most conducive to the beautifying of it) wrought it at last into that Shape and Fashion wherein it is now set up. That from the Beginning it was not so, and that the whole Fabrick of the Mass is of a late date, is most evident, from our

* *Heb.* ix. 12.

† *Eph.* i. 7.

‡ *Rom.* iii. 25.

§ *1 John*, ii. 2.

|| *Deridiculum vel præstigium.*

Saviour's Institution, who plainly instituted a Sacrament to be given to us, and received by us, and not a Sacrifice to be offered unto the Father for us.

From the Practice of his Apostles, who celebrated a Sacrament, by Blessing and Distributing Bread and Wine *; and not a Sacrifice by Offering up unto God an Oblation of Flesh and Blood.

From the Example of the Fathers and primitive Christians, in the Ages next after the Apostles, who acknowledge no other Sacrifice for the Sins of Men, but *That* once offered upon the Cross by Christ. If this Doctrine of the Church present of *Rome*, had been then received, and this Practice of sacrificing the *true* and *proper* Body and Blood of Christ set up in all Places, how would both the Jews and Heathens, who made it their Business to expose the Doctrine and Worship of Christians, and charged them with manifest Falshoods; as the *Eating of Children*, and *Thyestean Feasts*, &c. I say, how would they have run them down, and rendered them odious to Mankind, by this celebrating of their Masses with Man's Flesh and Blood, Making a Wafer their God, and Devouring and Eating their God every Day? Oh! this would have made Work

* 1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 23, 24, 25; and *Acts*, xx. 7.

for a *Porphyrius*, a *Libanius*, a *Lucianus*, a *Celsus*, and a *Julianus*, who employed all the great Wits of their Times to traduce Christianity, and by Scoffs and Calumnies to render Christians both ridiculous and execrable to the World. Yet none of them (among the infinite other Slanders cast upon the Christians) ever once brought this in Charge against them. A great Evidence that this was in those days neither practised, believed, nor once dreamed of by Christians. Nay, that the Mass is of a late Date, is evident from the Confession of our Adversaries themselves in the Account given by them of the Original and Progress of the Mass; as *Polydor. Virg. De Rerum Inventione*, c. xi. *Durand. Rationale. Platina In Vitâ Sixti. Cassand. In Liturg. &c.* out of whom it were most easy to shew and prove by Particulars, That the Mass was not fabricated all at once, and in one intire piece, but piece-meal, at several times, and by several degrees, now one Patch, then another, and after that a third, &c. * That almost every Particular piece had a particular *Pope*, which did artificially join it to the rest; and if any be desirous to know who

* *Per aliquot secula laboratum fuit, donec tandem infelix ille partus missaticus formaretur.*

It was the Labour of Ages to form this unhappy Birth of the Mass.

were the *Inventors* of the several Pieces, if they will consult the forenamed Authors (for it is not my Business to do it here) they may receive good Satisfaction :

And finally, That the Rites and Ceremonies of it, together with the other Trinkets that are its Appurtenances, were for the most part borrowed partly from the Jews, and partly from the Heathens. And all these speak it to be a Novelty of yesterday.

I shall add no more Arguments but draw towards a Conclusion.



C H A P. IV.

A Review of the Whole.

WE have now seen what the *so much* celebrated Mass of the Church of *Rome* is, and that there is not the least Shew or Colour of a Foundation for it in Scripture: Nay, that the Scripture is clearly and fully against it, as no Institution of Christ, but a late Invention of Antichrist. And now, from a Review of the Whole, we may be fully convinced, That the Mass of the *Romish* Synagogue is a horrible Prophanation of the *Lord's Supper*, and a Heap of most monstrous and prodigious Abominations. They call it an *ineffable Mystery*, and so indeed it is, but of Iniquity, of Impiety, of Blasphemy. As Mr. *Wisehart* the Martyr *, “ The Ministry of the Mass is a Mystery of Iniquity.” And if we set aside all its Appurtenances, Appendices,

* *Misse ministerium est mysterium Iniquitatis.*

and Abuses; such as the *Selling of Masses for Money*, (which is a great Trade in *Rome*, and in all other Countries under her Jurisdiction) the *Saying of them for proving a Person's Innocency, for the Confirmation of human Contracts and Covenants; for the Success of Journeys and Enterprises; for finding Things that are lost; for Corn that is blasted,* and a thousand such like. As also, *Offering it to the Holy Trinity*, wherein the Son is offered to himself, *Celebrating Masses in Memory of Saints departed, and to obtain their Intercession;* as they have the Mass of our *Lady*, of *Saint Michael*, *Saint Anthony*, *Saint Margaret*, and a hundred more both *He* and *She* Saints; and say them one for one thing, another for another thing; one against *Pestilence*, another against *Tempests*, another against *Fire*, another for a *Woman with child*, another for a *Horse*, or a *Hen*, &c. Joining to them the *Invocation of Saints and Angels*, and *Mingling with them the imaginary Merits of the Blessed Mary, and All Saints*: I say, if we set aside all these, we may say of it with *Calvin*, “The Mass, when taken in its best Dress, is, from the very Roots to the top Branch, full of all Manner of *Impiety, Blasphemy, Idolatry, and Sacrilege* *.”

This

* *Missa in selectissimâ suâ et quâ maxime venditari potest, integritate accepta, sine suis appendicibus, à radicè ad fastigium*

This is so evident from what hath been already said, that even Children may plainly see it; and it will yet be more evident from these few following Particulars; namely, The Mass which hath now for several Ages been held in great Veneration, frequented with great Devotion by all Ranks and Degrees, and made the Sum of the *Papal* Religion, is a very Abomination of Desolation, most repugnant to the *Lord's Supper*, and standing in a direct opposition to it in many respects,

The Holy Supper was instituted by *Christ*; the mass was introduced by *Antichrist*.

The Holy Supper was instituted for the *Living* only; the Mass is celebrated for the *Dead* also.

The Holy Supper is a *Sacrament*; the Mass is a pretended *Sacrifice*. That was instituted to be celebrated in Remembrance of the Sacrifice of *Christ* offered once for ever: *This* is invented as a Sacrifice wherein *Christ* is daily offered.

In the Holy Supper *true* and *real* Bread and Wine are given and received: In the Mass the *true* and *real* Body and Blood of Jesus Christ (as is pretended) are given and received under the *Species* of Bread and Wine; so that instead of

omni genere impietatis, blasphemiarum, idololatriarum, sacrilegii, scelerum.
Calv. Inst. L. 4. Calv. 18. Sec. 18.

Bread and Wine, there is very *Flesh, Blood, and Bones*; the Eating of Bread is turned into the Devouring of a living Man, and a Cup of Wine into a Draught of Man's Blood.

In the Holy Supper the Body of *Jesus Christ*, which was conceived by the *Holy Ghost*, and born of the Virgin *Mary*, is sacramentally exhibited to us, to be spiritually received by us; In the Mass a fictitious Body of *Christ*, created by a *Man*, and made of Bread and Wine, is corporally exhibited to be received and eaten; so that *There* Christ is locally and corporally in Heaven; *Here* he is brought down to the Earth.

There we have the Body that was made by the Power of the Holy Ghost; *Here* we have a Body that is made by the Power of a Priest.

There we have the same Body that was born of the Virgin Mary, and hanged on the Cross; *Here* we have a Body that was but the Moment before a Bit of Bread.

There Christ's Body is eaten spiritually, and by Faith; *Here* corporally and with the Mouth.

In the *Holy Supper*, by Christ's Institution and Command, All must drink of the Cup; In the *Mass*, by the *Pope's* Constitution, the Cup is denied to the Lay-people, and they must neither taste nor touch.

In the *Holy Supper* all must both eat and drink; In the *Mass* the *Priest* alone eats and drinks All, and the Congregation present is entertained with an EMPTY SHEW in the room of SACRED FEAST.

In the *Holy Supper* Christ is offered to us by the Father, to be received with Thanksgiving; In the *Mass* Christ is offered as a Sacrifice to the Father, to be received from us for Satisfaction. In *That* the Father offers Christ to us; In *This* we offer Christ to the Father.

In the *Holy Supper* Christ lifted up Nothing to be adored by his Disciples; In the *Mass* the Priest lifts up a Host or Wafer to be adored by the People.

In the *Holy Supper* there was no Adoration used. They all ate. In the *Mass* there is an universal and devout Adoration of the Host, and the Remembrance of *Christ's* Death, is turned into an idolatrous Worshipping of Bread and Wine.

I might yet add many more particulars, but these are sufficient to represent the Repugnance of the *Popish* Mass unto the *Holy Supper* of our Lord; and that it is as opposite thereunto as *Midnight* unto *Noonday*.

AGAIN, It is an Abomination that destroys the Nature of a Sacrament, and takes away the Name.

Name, Substance, and Circumstances of the *Lord's Supper* out of the Church. This is another Thing, wherein we may see the Wickedness of the Mass. It doth not only disguise and disfigure, corrupt and profane the *Lord's Table*; but so metamorphoses *All*, that there is scarce any Shadow of the *Lord's Holy Institution* left. All is so perverted with fond, impious, ridiculous, and blasphemous Devices, that the Institution is lost, the nature of the Action is changed, and Nothing of a Sacrament is left, but all is turned quite into another thing. This is evident enough from the foregoing Description of it, and from the Instances in the last Particular. Who can see any thing of our *Lord's Holy Institution*, while he only seeth (as in the *Papish Mass*) a sacrificing Priest, with his shorn Crown, and dressed in his sacred, solemn massing Vestments (as his *Albe or Surplice, Stole* about his Neck, and hanging cross-wise on his Breast, his *Amictus, Amice* or *Vail* over his Head, his *Girdle* wherewith he tucketh up his Cloaths, his *Maniple*, with the rest of his *consecrated* trinkets)

First, *Standing* at an Altar of Stone very gorgeously adorned with *Images, Crosses, Candles, &c.*

Secondly, *Consecrating* a round Wafer or Piece of Bread, with *Conjurings, Crossings, Blessings, Censings, and Actions and Gestures* so strange, various, and ridiculous,

ridiculous, that they are enough to astonish any Man, who hath no other Acquaintance with the *Mafs*, than what the Institution of the *Lord's Supper* doth lead him unto :

Thirdly, *Offering* up a Piece of Bread to God the Father, as a *propitiatory* Sacrifice for the Sins both of Quick and Dead :

Fourthly, *Lifting* it up to be worshipped and adored, as God our Creator and Redeemer, with the greatest Reverence and Devotion :

And then, for a Close, *Eating* all up alone, while a Company of poor deluded People stand gazing on him; with Cringings and Bowings of their Bodies, Knockings and Smitings on their Breasts, &c.

I say again, who can see any thing of our Lord's holy Institution in all this? "IS THIS TO CELEBRATE AND EAT THE LORD'S SUPPER?" Or is it possible to see any thing of it in this Work, that the *Priest* makes? No, no, the scene is plainly changed, and a Man acquainted only with the Scripture Notion of the *Lord's Supper*, can understand little (tho' he understand *Latin* as well as the *Priest*) of what is now done in the Papacy in singing *Mafs*.

AGAIN, It is an Abomination that introduceth a new and daily Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*. This is another thing, the *Popish*
Mafs

Mass takes away the *Lord's Supper* (as it was instituted by Christ) out of the Church, and in the room thereof brings into the Church a fictitious Sacrifice. A Sacrifice that is

Contrary to the Scriptures ;

Contumelious to Christ ;

And Injurious to Christians.

It is directly contrary to the Scriptures. For the Scriptures hold forth only *one* Sacrifice of Christ, offered only *once* for ever on the Cross ; and not *many* Sacrifices of Christ *often* offered : I say, the Scriptures plainly hold this out concerning the Sacrifice of Christ, that it never was offered but *once*, nor shall ever be offered again *.

How could the Scripture speak either more plainly, or fully, than we see it doth in this Case ? It tells us that Christ was *once* offered, and *once for all* ; that there was *one* Offering, and *One* for ever. Where is there any room for *another* Offerer than Himself alone, or *another* Time of offering than that *Once* on the Cross ? The Scripture is wholly shut against it, and we must not believe them when they tell us of any

* Heb. ix. 26.	now <i>once</i> ,	ἅπαξ,
ix. 28.	Christ was <i>once</i> ,	ἅπαξ,
x. 10.	<i>once for all</i> ,	ἑφάπαξ,
x. 14.	<i>one offering</i> ,	μία προσφορά,
x. 12.	<i>one for ever</i> ,	μία θυσία.

other

other Sacrifice of Christ, than that of the Cross, except we will disbelieve and deny the plain and express Words of Scripture. Christ's Sacrifice cannot be iterated: The Salvo of an *unbloody* Sacrifice is a pitiful Shift and Self-contradiction, as before.

The Scripture mentions no *proper* and *propitiatory* Sacrifice betwixt that which Christ offered on the Cross, and his second Coming to Judgment; but only teacheth that Christ, by virtue of That Sacrifice makes continual Intercession for us.

The Scripture acknowledgeth no Sacrifice of Christ, but such as is accompanied with his bodily Appearance for that End *. *Now once, once only hath He appeared, and once only He hath sacrificed Himself.*

The Scripture positively asserteth the Perfection of that one Sacrifice once offered on the Cross, and thereby utterly excludes all new Sacrifices as altogether needless, useless, and to no Purpose †.

Thus it is contrary to the Scriptures. It is also highly contumelious to Jesus Christ, both to his Person, Priesthood, and Passion or Sacrifice.

* *Heb. ix. 26.*

† See before *Arg. 2.* against the *Mafs.*

This pretended Sacrifice is horribly contumelious unto, and a great Blasphemy against the Person of Christ. For it brings Christ's glorious Person from Heaven unto the Earth, and into a State repugnant to, and inconsistent with the State of Glory whereunto he is "exalted far above all Principalities and Powers*," &c. What can be more inconsistent with the glorious State of *Jesus Christ*, than to lie hid under the *Species* of Bread and Wine, or to appear in the Likeness of a Piece of Bread? The Scripture speaks of this as a very low Degree of Humiliation, *that he was found in Fashion as a Man*†. But here is a far lower Degree, *to be found in Fashion as a Piece of Bread*, and to humble himself, *to be torn by Man's Teeth*; yea, by *Dogs, Mice, Rats*, and other *Vermin*‡.

FURTHER, It brings Christ, who suffered once on the Cross, to suffer again and again, even many thousand times every day upon their Altars. They deny this indeed, *viz.* That Christ suffers in this their pretended Sacrifice, which therefore they call an *unbloody* Sacrifice, because (*say they*) *without his Passion, or Bloodshed*. But, however they would palliate the Matter, this (as is before shewn) is certain, that either they

* *Eph. i. 21.*† *Phil. ii. 8.*‡ *Hinc tot cauteia missæ.*

must confess, that this their Sacrifice of the Mass is to no purpose, of no use or efficacy, can obtain no Remission (and this they will by no means do) or grant, that it is a *bloody* Sacrifice, wherein Christ is killed daily by them, and his Blood shed afresh on every Altar; thus it must be, if there be any Worth in it *; therefore †, the *Apostle* proves that *Christ* cannot be often offered by this Argument, *viz.* because that then he should suffer often, there being no *Sacrifice* of Christ without the *Suffering* of Christ; so that the *Popish* Sacrifice supposeth Christ to *suffer often*.

AGAIN, It ascribeth a Power to a priest to make *Christ's* Body. Yea, this he is feigned to do in every *Mass*, and looked on as *Creator sui creatoris*; "THE CREATOR OF HIS CREATOR." Is not this highly derogatory to the Person of Christ ‡?

Moreover, it supposeth the Body of Christ to be made of a Piece of bread; of that which was but a little before baked in the Oven, and a sorry Wafer, that a Mouse might have carried away §.

* *Heb.* ix. 22.

† *Heb.* ix. 26.

‡ *Unde horrendum illud qui me creavit sine me, jam creator, mediante me. Et iste qui creavit me, dedit mihi creare se.*

And in the book called *Stella Clericorum*, all the Priests are named *CREATORES CREATORIS*; Creators of the Creator of all things.

§ *Fit tibus, ex pane caro, Deus ex elemento.*

It likewise implies, that *Worms* may breed in, and feed upon the Body of *Christ*; and that it may grow mouldy and rot, or fall into the Mire; LIE IN A VOMIT; go into the Draught; (for all these happen unto the consecrated host) and be cast on the Dunghill; with many other things too horrible and monstrous to be mentioned. YEA, It makes *Christ* subject to the Power and Pleasure of every *filthy* massing Priest, who (by this Doctrine) may make Him *when* he will, carry him *whither* he will, keep him *where* he will, and do with him *what* he will; tread him under foot, throw him unto the Dogs or Hogs, into Fire, or Water, &c. What greater Blasphemy? Thus it is most contumelious and opprobrious to the sacred Person of our Lord *Jesus Christ*.

It is no less opprobrious to the Priesthood of Christ. He is constituted a Priest for ever by the Father*. This is Christ's Prerogative, to be our only Priest†; but this pretended Sacrifice makes an Invasion, and insufferable Encroachment upon his Prerogative, while it Brings in, and adjoins an innumerable Company of *Massing*

* *Heb. v. 10; vii. 17, 21; ix. 11; x. 21.*

† *Nobis Jesus Christus est solus et æternus, neque successorum neque vicariorum indigus, Novi Testamenti sacerdos. Daven. deter. 13.*

Priests unto him, as successors to, and Vicars of Christ, and so robbing him of This Honour, to confer it on sinful mortal Men. It sets up those *made* Creatures to sacrifice and offer *Christ* himself unto the Father, which the *Holy Ghost* makes *Christ's* own personal work *. A work that no one else may do, that no one else can do. None can offer *Christ*, but *Christ* Himself †. It also puts more Honour on their pretended Priesthood, than on Christ's; as being able to do that with *their* Offerings, which *Jesus Christ* either could not, or would not do with *his* Offering. It is no less derogatory to the Passion, or Sacrifice of Christ. The *Romish* Altar throws down the *Cross* of Christ; inasmuch as this repeating of *Christ's* Sacrifice on *that* Altar makes the Sacrifice of Christ on the *Cross* imperfect, insufficient, and indeed no better than the *Levitical* Offerings. This is given as a Reason (as was observed before) of the frequent Repetition of those Sacrifices, "That they could never perfect the Worshippers," i. e. *perfectly take away Sin* ‡. Could they have done this, then they should have ceased §. So here,

* *Heb. ix. 25.*† *Heb. ix. 14.*‡ *Hoc quidem certissimum est, everti Christi crucem simul ac erigitur altare. Calv. Instit. L. 4. C. 15, 5, 3.*§ *Heb. x. 1, 2, 3.*

if a *frequent* Offering of Christ be necessary, then his *once* Offering himself on the Cross was not perfect and sufficient : So that this *Popish* Sacrifice throws the greatest Reproach on *Christ's* Passion that can be, making it weak, imperfect, and insufficient for Man's Redemption.

It is also extremely injurious unto Christians, redeemed by the precious Blood of Christ. It takes away from them the holy Ordinance of his *Supper*, instituted by him just when he was going to the Cross for them, to signify and represent, exhibit and offer, pass and convey, seal and confirm unto them the Benefits of his Passion, and most necessary for the Establishing of their Faith, the Strengthening and Quickening of their Graces, the Weakening of their Corruptions, the Renovation of their Repentance, the Raising of their Affections, the Increasing of their Comfort ; In a word, for the Inducing and Engaging them to all Acts of Obedience and Thankfulness. I say, the *Lord's Table* is taken away, the *Lord's Supper* is banished out of the Church, and the *Lord's People* deprived of this last Institution and Ordinance of their Lord, by the fictitious and blasphemous Sacrifice of the Mass. Yea, they are wholly taken off from looking unto Jesus, and are put upon looking unto this new Sacrifice of the Altar, for the Remission

mission of their Sins, and for the Salvation of their Souls. Thus the superlative Wickedness of the *Popish* Mass appears in that it introduces a new Sacrifice.

I add, that it sets up the most contemptible, detestable, and abominable *Idol* that ever was in the World: *viz.* a pitiful Wafer, or Piece of bread, not only as a *true* and *perfect* Man, but as the *True* and *Living* God, who made Heaven and Earth. This is their constant Doctrine, Belief, and Persuasion; that in the Mass the Wafer, or *singing* Cake, is by Consecration transubstantiated into the very Person of Jesus Christ; as he was born of the blessed Virgin, and as he is now in Heaven; so that here is a *God* made by a Creature, a *paltry* Priest; made of a Creature, a Morfel of Bread; and made by a Magical Muttering over of five Words; *viz.* HOC ENIM EST CORPUS MEUM.

This God made of Bread, and rising out of the Womb of *Transubstantiation*, is the *Idol* set up in the Mass; and, I say, it is the most absurd, horrible, abominable, and monstrous *Idol* that ever was in the World: An *Idol* that makes the Christian Name and Profession contemptible, yea, a very Ridicule and Scorn, and a Matter of greatest Distaste and execration both to Jews, Mathometans, and Heathens; and confirms them

in an invincible Enmity against it: as well it may, when they take Christianity to be such a Religion as this Idol makes it. Can Men possibly (if they set their Invention upon the rack) excogitate or conceive of a more gross and palpable Error, than to set up such a God as this *Breaden* God is? A God that neither sees, nor hears, nor speaks, nor breathes, nor moves; a God that cannot save himself from Thieves and Enemies; no, nor from *Dogs, Rats, Mice, or Worms*; in a Word, a God that is made a thousand Times over, in a thousand Places, every Day, and as often fairly devoured and eaten up by his makers?

MOREOVER, As a Consequence of the former, the Sacrifice of the Mass brings in and maintains the Practice of the most stupid, damnable, and destructive *Idolatry* that ever was in the World: *viz.* the Adoration and Worship of this Idol, or Paying divine Honours to this *Breaden* God. This monstrous Idol is universally adored and worshipped; yea, the most absolute, sovereign, and highest Degree of religious Adoration is paid unto it. For the *Romanists* (tho' contrary to Scripture) distinguish religious Worship into three Kinds: *viz.* into what they call *λατρεία*, i. e. *Worship* in the strict Sense, which, they say, is proper to God only; and which, to
give

give to any Creature were plain Idolatry : ΔΟΥΛΕΙΑ, i. e. *Service*, which may be paid to Creatures : It is a Veneration due to Persons and Things, according to their Dignity, and the Degree of Honour which God hath called them unto. This is paid to Saints departed, to Holy *Things*, and to Holy *Places*.

THIRDLY, They have what they call ΥΠΕΡΔΟΥΛΕΙΑ, i. e. *a Service above* what they pay to mere Saints ; This is an Honour due (as they say) to the *Humanity* of Christ, and to the blessed Virgin his Mother *, &c.

These are their corrupt Distinctions of religious Worship ; for all *Religious* Veneration surely belongs to God, and to God alone. To give it therefore in any Kind, or in any Degree, to any Creature wheresoever, or whatsoever, is plain Idolatry †. But what I mention this Distinction for here is this, *viz.* That the Church of Rome doth farther say, declare, and pronounce, that the Host is to be worshipped with the first and highest Degree of Δουλεία, which she acknow-

* “ God alone with his Images, and the holy Cross, must be honoured with Δουλεία. The Saints and their Images with Δεχλεία. Our Lady with all the Images that appertain to her, and all the Reliques of the right and holy Cross, with Υπερδουλεία.” Beehive L. 4. C. 5.

† See *Bellarmino* de Beat. Sanct. L. 1. C. 12.

ledgeth to be due to God alone. This is the exprefs Determination of the Council of *Trent*, with an *Anathema* againſt all that ſhall deny it. “ If any ſhall ſay, that Chriſt, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the outward Worſhip of *λατρεία* in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharift, let him be accuſed *.” And the ſame Council farther ſays: ‘ That there is no room for Doubt, but that all faithful Chriſtians, according to the Cuſtom always received in the catholic Church, ought to give the Worſhip of *λατρεία*, which is due to the true God, to the moſt Holy Sacrament with humble Venerations; for it is not the leſs to be adored, becauſe it was inſtituted by Chriſt our Lord *to be received,* i. e. *to be eaten* †. Thus the Church of Rome holds for certain, That the Hoſt is to be worſhipped with the ſame Adoration, which is due to God only; and accordingly, ſhe makes her higheſt Addreſſes to it; adoring It by Bøwing,

* *Si quis dixerit in ſancto Euchariftiæ ſacramento Chriſtum unigenitum Dei filium non eſſe cultu λατρείας etiam externo adorandum, anathema fit.* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 13. Can. 6.

† *Nullus dubitandi locus relinquitur quim omnes Chriſti fideles, pro more in catholicâ eccleſiâ ſemper recepto, λατρείας cultum qui vero Deo debetur, huic ſanctiſſimo ſacramento in veneratione adhibeant; neque enim minus eſt adorandum, quod fuerit à Chriſto domino ut ſumatur, inſtitutum.*

Kneeling,

Kneeling, and the most humble, reverent, and devout Prostration, by lighting Candles and burning Incense before It; by praying devoutly unto It. The *massing* Priest, as soon as he has consecrated the Elements, forthwith adores and worships the Sacrament most reverently upon his bended Knees*. Then he prays to it, as to Christ; or, as if Christ were visibly and personally present: For, directing his Prayer immediately to it, He prays: *Lamb of God that takest away the Sins of the World, have mercy upon us, &c.* as the Roman Missal directs. And in the middle of the Prayer, entitled, *Deus pater, fons et origo totius bonitatis, &c.* is this Rubrick; ‘*Here let the Priest bow Himself to the Host, saying, I adore thee, I glorify thee, I praise thee with all the Powers of my Mind and Heart, and I pray thee not to forsake thy Servants, but forgive us our Sins.*’ Then the Priest, after he has finished his Adorations and Devotions, rising from his Knees, elevates the Host as high as he can over his Head, and shews it to the People, to be reverently adored by them; who as soon as they see it, do all with one Consent adore, By falling down in devoutest Veneration to it, as very God †; and by praying to it in these, and the

* See Canon of the Mass, p. 162.

† *Panem magicè incantatum attollunt, agitant, et ut Deum adorant.*

like Forms. *O saving Host, O most blessed Sacrament, which openest the Door of Heaven, Give me Strength and Power against Dangers, and against all mine Enemies. And again, Make me to believe more in Thee, to place my hope in Thee, and to love Thee; and many such like, as may be read in the Roman Breviary, &c.*

Indeed, these are Things which the *Romanists* do not deny; nor, in the least disown; but most confidently maintain, and continually practise, in the Celebration of all their Masses, and in their solemn Processions, when the Host is carried about in a most ludicrous and ridiculous Manner*. Hence it is most clear, that they adore the Host, not as God's Representative (which is the Fig-leaf borrowed of the Pagans, whereby they would cover their Idolatry in worshipping Images) but as very God himself. And this, I say, is a Piece of the most gross and abominable Idolatry, and not to be paralleled by any Instance of the most barbarous People in the World; being far worse than the Idolatry of those Pagans, who worshipped Stocks and Stones, not for themselves, as if they were Gods, but as Representations, Symbols, and

* *Scenico et histrionico ornatu, gestu, boatu, murmure, sibilis, gemitibus, cantu et alijs modis, tanquam orgia sacra, aut Bacchanalia.*

Images of their Gods, who were worshipped in them. This was not so gross as to worship a Piece of Bread (for it is nothing else) for itself, and as very God. YEA, The Worship of a Stock, or a Stone (shaped into an Image) as very God himself, was more tolerable (if ever there were any so sottish as to use it) in *Pagans*, than this *Popish* Worship of a Bit of Bread, as God, 'the Creator of Heaven and Earth,' whom they devour and eat up, as soon as they have done worshipping. For this is their constant Practice, *viz.* After they have done their Honours to their God, by bowing their Heads, bending their Knees, prostrating their Bodies, elevating their Hands, knocking their Breasts, and worshipping Him with all their Souls; then for a Conclusion, they put him, whole and entire as he is (Flesh, Blood, and Bones) into their Mouths, and eat him clean up at once. Can this be paralleled *?

To PROCEED, The Mass is an Abomination, that draws Perdition on the Souls of Men, not only as it engages the Persons who live in the

* When they have played with him a good while, he suffereth them to eat him up. Thus they deal with him as the Cat with the Mouse. Beehive, L. 2. C. 7. May we not say, Oh! what mad Gowns have swayed the Roman State!

Roman Communion to the Practice of gross Idolatry (as we have seen) which is a most deadly destructive, and damning Sin, but also as it causes them to place the Main of Religion in *Mass-worship*, and to depend on Hearing and Seeing *Masses* for the Remission of their Sins. Their Holy Mother, the Church, teaches them that, by Hearing or Seeing *Masses*, they may make full amends for their Offences, and sufficiently satisfy for their Sins; yea, both they that celebrate *Masses*; and they that are present at them, have their Minds possessed with a fond Opinion or Persuasion, that by the Strength and Power of those *Masses*, they depart from them with a great deal of Sanctity; tho' they never amend their Lives, but return to their former Iniquities: and however a Man lives, in whatsoever Immoralities and Impurities, he has still a present Remedy, *toties quoties*; it is but going to *Mass*, and hearing *Mass*, and he is as whole again as if he had never offended. This is the great and sovereign Remedy both for the Living and the Dead; and therefore, when Men are Dying, their ghostly Fathers put them *first* upon Confession, and *then* to receive their God; and to make all sure, persuade them to appoint and provide *Masses* to be said for their Souls; which, among the other means of refreshing, cooling, easing,

easing, and ending the Pains of Purgatory (as *Candles, Incense, Offerings, Indulgences, Holy Water, &c.*) is the best and most effectual of all, and draws them with greatest Expedition out of that Place of Torment to Heaven. By these Fictions and Fopperies (which are the Nets of the Church of Rome, whereby she draws incredible Treasures to herself) Multitudes of poor deluded and besotted Souls are ruined and lost for ever.

FINALLY, The Sacrifice of the Mass is founded upon, and rises out of TRANSUBSTANTIATION, which is a supposed Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of Christ's Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine, into the Substance of Christ's Blood, by the Words of Consecration; so that there remaineth Nothing of the Substance of Bread and Wine after the Consecration, but they are changed into the Whole Humanity, and Divinity of Christ hypostatically united to his Humanity. And if this Doctrine be not true, they freely confess that the Mass is great Idolatry. The Testimony of *Coster* is very plain and full in this point. His Words are: ' If the Doctrine of Transubstantiation be not true, then we are found in such an Error and Idolatry, as was never seen or heard of in the World: For, their Error would
be

be more tolerable, who worship a golden or silver Statue for God, or any other Image; as the *Gentiles* worshipped their Gods: or, a red Cloth, as the *Laplanders* are reported to do; or, some living Animals, as the ancient *Ægyptians*; than the Error of those, who worship a Piece of Bread *.' Thus the Jesuit. And our *Fisher* (who was one of the *Pope's* Martyrs) confesseth, that if there be nothing but Bread in the *Eucharist*, then are they all Idolators †. NAY, *Bellarmino* himself grants no less ‡.

It is upon account of *Transubstantiation*, both that they adore the Host in the Sacrament, and that they offer it unto God as a Sacrifice. *Transubstantiation* is the great foundation of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and therefore the Mass must necessarily be most abominable; for the Foundation which it stands upon, is not only false, but one of the most absurd, monstrous, and

* *In tali errore atque idololatriâ qualis in orbe terrarum nunquam vel visus vel auditus fuit. Tolerabilior enim est error eorum qui pro Deo colunt statuum auttam aut argenteam, aut alterius materiæ imaginem, quomodo Gentiles Deos suos venerabantur, vel pannum rubrum in bastâ elevatum, quod narratur de Lappis, vel viva animalia ut quondam Ægyptiis, quam eorum, qui frustum panis.* Cost. Enchir. C. 8. de Euchar. f. 10. p. 308.

† *Fisher* contr. O'Écolamp. L. 1. C. 2.

‡ De Euchar. L. 4. C. 29.

portentous Falsehoods that ever appeared in the World: As hath been sufficiently shewn in a Discourse on that Subject *. And tho' they may rack, torture, banish, burn and massacre Us (as they have done many MILLIONS of faithful Christians, whose Souls now under the Altar, are crying, " O Lord, how long † ?") for this cause ; yet It will (we are in no Doubt thereof) be found (to their eternal Shame and Confusion) A GREAT TRUTH, when that great Day of the Lord, shall bring Them and Us together, on the open Stage, before Angels and Men.

* See our Author's Treatise on Transubstantiation, as above.

† Rev. ix. 10.



C H A P. V.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS.

THEREFORE have nothing to do with
Rome. Flee from *Papery*, and especially
 from their abominable *Mass*, which is the chief
 Part of their Worship. This, *Sirs*, is the End
 of all that I have endeavoured on this subject.
 What I have mainly designed and aimed at, in
 the whole foregoing Discourse, hath been to set
 Something before you that may conduce, in
 some Degree, to prevent your Deception, Se-
 duction, and Defection into this most pernici-
 ous Error; to promote your Settlement and
 Establishment in the present Truth; and to for-
 tify your Minds for a resolute, constant, and pa-
 tient Bearing of Persecutions in Defence thereof,
 and in opposition to this great Mystery of Ini-
 quity. This, I say, hath been my Design:
 And now, *My Beloved*, if you recollect your
 Thoughts,

Thoughts, and reflect on what has been done, you may see Enough to give you a just Distaste for their Religion, and to fill you with Horror and Trembling, even to think of their Mass, as it is daily used.

In the foregoing Description given at the Entrance, you may view the Monstrousness and Abominableness of it. In the Arguments produced for it (which are the strongest they have) you may see what a sandy, or airy Foundation it stands upon; and indeed, no Foundation of the Word of God, at all.

In the Arguments produced against it, you may see what Warrant you have to oppose, and utterly renounce it for ever, as having no divine Institution, being perfectly needless, and useless to all Intents and Purposes; as neither the same Sacrifice, that Christ offered once on the Cross, nor another, but a new and late Invention of Antichrist. And the several Considerations laid before you under the last Head; *viz.* That it is repugnant to the Lord's Supper; that it destroys the Nature of the Sacrament, and introduces a new Sacrifice, contrary to Scripture, contumelious to Christ, and injurious to Christians; that it sets up a most contemptible Idol; establishes damnable Idolatry; draws Perdition on the Souls of Men, by directing them to false dependances;

dependances; and *lastly*, that it is founded on a monstrous Fiction: these Considerations, I say, carry in them Motive and Inducement enough to an everlasting Detestation of it.

Now, *Brethren*, will you think of these Things, meditate on them, give yourselves to them. It hath cost me some Time and Study; and I tell you again, my Motive hereunto was an unfeigned Desire to do some Service (by a Word in Season) to the Truth of God, and the Souls of Men; and in particular (for this is not like to go much farther) to *your* Souls: Oh! mind it therefore! If I had not thought it seasonable, useful, and needful, and as needful (in the circumstances we are fallen into) as any other Subject I could have taken up, you had not had it. But I think, and say, it is needful to be spoken of, needful to be minded, by all those that have any Care of their Soul's Health. It is needful both for You and Me, to be well informed, settled, and fixed in this Point. For should we live to see (which Heaven prevent) such a terrible Storm and Tempest, as that which the miserable *French* Protestants have suffered by Imprisonments in dark and noisome Dungeons; by various and grievous Torments and Tortures, Starving with Hunger and Nakedness; Confiscations of their whole Estates, Deprivation of their Children,

Impoverish-

Impoverishing of their Families, and other horrid Treatment and unheard of Insolencies, Barbarities and Inhumanities; No Villainy nor Violence having been omitted that might either force them to yield, or utterly ruin them *; I say, should such an Hour of Temptation come upon this Generation (and never more like) it may be feared, that not only Many will readily fall in and comply with this abominable Mass in all Places, without any great Difficulty; but, that Many also will endeavour to palliate an outward Compliance with such Thoughts as these, *viz.*

“ That reserving their Consciences to themselves, they may with all Safety, and without Sin, be present at the Mass; and that there is Nothing of Danger, nor of Crime, in such Presence, especially when it is involuntary (and forced by Threatenings and rigorous Treatment) *so that the Mind keep up a just Detestation and abhorrence of that gross Idolatry.*” NAY, there is Reason to fear, that all will be little

* This doubtless refers to the persecution of the Protestants by *Lewis the XIVth*, after the Revocation of the Edict of *Nantes*. This famous Edict in favour of the Protestants, was made by *Henry the IVth*, in the year 1595; it was registered in the Parliament of *Paris*, and confirmed and sworn to by *Henry's* Successors, *Lewis XIIIth* and *Lewis XIVth*. Notwithstanding which, the latter repealed it in the year 1685, and most cruelly persecuted his Protestant-subjects, as it is here related.

N

enough,

enough, even with those amongst us that are most resolute, and who think themselves most secure, to keep them from warping, to fix their Resolutions, and to enable them with Constancy to wade thro' to the End. I therefore exhort you again to settle These Things in your Hearts, and to apply yourselves unto, and to improve all other means of your Establishment. And if you have a Mind to preserve yourselves in a safe Condition for your Souls, and Eternal Estate, Keep out of *Babylon*, Have nothing to do with *Rome*; Bow not a Knee to *Baal*, Fly the abominable *Mafs*, as you would *have no Fellowship with the Works of Darknefs*: Step not into the Way of making *Shipswreck of Faith*, and of a good *Conscience*: Defile not yourselves by partaking of *Rome's Sins*, nor receive of her *Plagues*.

I shall conclude with the Charge that *Moses* gave to the Congregation of *Israel* concerning *Korab*: *Depart, I pray you, from the Tents of these wicked Men, and touch Nothing of their's, lest you be consumed in all their Sins**: and with the Command of our *Saviour*, Who, foretelling that there should arise dangerous *Impostors*, who should shew great *Signs and Wonders*; and say, "Lo, here is *Christ*," or, "there," "He is in the *Desert*," or, "He is in the secret Cham-

* *Numb*, xvi. 26.

bers;" warns and charges them not to give any Heed or Credit thereto*.

This Prediction of our Saviour is even literally fulfilled in these grand *Popish* Impostors, the massing Priests; whose Work it is to seduce Men every where to a Belief of *Christ's* corporal and personal Presence *here* and *there*, and in many hundred thousand Places at once, telling great Stories of Wonders done by the *Host*. Thus, *they say*, "Lo, here is Christ" on the Altar. Lo, "there is Christ" lifted up above the Priest's Head. *Here* he goeth thro' the open Streets, in the solemn Procession: *There* he is in the secret Chamber, shut up in a little Box. He is *here* and *there* in the Mass, where he may be seen and adored; yea, touched and eaten every Day. Thus the Prediction is fulfilled in *Them*; and the Charge remains to be kept by *Us*, viz. *Believe it not. Go not forth*. Nay, instead of believing, or going forth, when they say, *Lo, here is Christ*; say unto them as the Prophet taught the Jews †: *Thus shall ye say unto them, the Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, even they shall perish from the Earth, and from under these Heavens*. The Jews were now shortly to go into *Babylon* among the *Idoltrous Chaldeans*, where a great Variety of impious Rites was daily practised, and Nothing else.

* *Mat. xxiv. 23, 24, 25, 26.*

† *Jer. x. 11.*

The Prophet therefore, having in the foregoing Verses described the Vanity of Idols, and the infinite Dissimilitude between them and the God of Heaven; for the fortifying of this People against those gross Idolatries they were not only to see, but to be tempted unto in *Babylon*, he also subjoins this Verse, and puts it into their Mouths in the *Chaldaic* Tongue (that they might speak to them in their *own* Language) as an Answer to be given to the *Chaldeans*, when they should tempt, invite, or offer to force the Jews to embrace the Worship of their Idols: *Thus shall ye say unto them*, i. e. when they call you to the Worship of their *Gods*, you shall thus answer, *The Gods, &c.* And this now, *My beloved*, may be our Answer; and it is enough, if there were no other Answer to be given to these Worshippers of a *Breaden* God in their Masses. *The Gods, &c.* And we will not worship Gods that cannot save themselves from total Destruction out of the Earth, and from under the Heavens; much less, will we worship that God, that is daily devoured by his Worshippers, as the *Breaden* Mass-God is; For the *Shaveling* first makes his God, then adores him, then lifts him up on high, to be adored by the People; and then eats him openly before all the Company: And all this is performed in less than Half an Hour's Time.

A
L I S T
O F T H E

Authorities referred to, or mentioned
in this Work.

A Insworth	Cartwright
Ambrose	Cassandus
Aquinas	Chamier
Arabic Version of the	Chrysoftom
Bible	Coster
Arnobius	Damascenus
Baronius	Davenant
Barradius	Durandus
Beehive of the <i>Roman</i>	Erasmus
Church	Estius
Bellarmino	Eusebius
Beza	Minutius Felix
Gabriel Biel	Bishop Fisher
Buchanan	Fuller
Buxtorf	Pope Gelasius
Cajetan	Girandus de Cœnâ
Calvin	Goodwin

Gurnel

Gregory de Valentiâ	Spanhemii Dubia E-
Gurnel	vangelica
Innocent III.	Salmero
Julius II.	Syriac Version
Lombard	Suarez
Lyrandus	Theodoret
Maldonat	Gabriel Vasquez
Molin.	Vines
Arius Montanus	Polydore Virgil
Origen	Valentia
Pagninus	Wifchart the Martyr.
Pererius	The Council of Con-
Platina	stance
Rhemish Version	The Lateran Council
Ribera	The Council of Trent
Emmanuel Samaurez	The Roman Missal,
Stapleton	&c. &c. &c.

T H E E N D.

E R R A T A.

- Page 24, Line 10, from the Top, for Therefore, read
Therefore, &c.
- 26, 7, dele *be*
- 35, 3, for performing, read performing
- 51, 18, for Butorfio, read Buxtorfio
- 52, 3, for signifies, read signifies
- 52, last, for *seperata*, read *separata*
- 58, 7, for *unto Sanctification*, read *unto us
Sanctification*
- 63, last but one, for Melschifedeck, read Mel-
chifedeck
- 66, 19, for Apostles, read Apostle
- 74, 6, from the bottom, for Transubstanta-
tion read Transubstantiation
- 88, 1, for whereof, read wherefore
- 89, 14, Dele some
- 103, The note, for *sacrificis* read *sacrificiis*
- 115, for *λειβρησαι* read *λειβρησσαι*
- 120, the Note, for Day read Days
- 129, 5, for calling read called
- 124, last line, for p. 79, 80, read p. 110, 111, &c.
- 130, last but one, for p. 17, 18, read 117, 118.
- ibid. last line, dele 15
- 141 The note, for Priviledge read Privilege.

Lately published (for the Use of Schools) Price 1 s.

A T A

NEW INTRODUCTION

T O

ENGLISH GRAMMAR

IN THE EASIEST METHOD POSSIBLE.

By J. HOUGHTON of NAMPTWICH,

THE EDITOR OF THE ABOVE.

Sold by W. COOKE, near the Royal Exchange,
LONDON.

