



SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS



DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

sp
cc

DO

LIB

QUE
AT I

KINGE

A
VINDICATION

OF THE

Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of

WINCHESTER,

Against the Malicious Aspersions of those who uncharitably ascribe the Book, Intituled, *A plain Account of the Nature and End of the SACRAMENT of the LORD'S-SUPPER*, to his Lordship.

By the Author of the Proposal for the Revival of Christianity.

Who is this that darkneth Counsel by Words without Knowledge?
Job. xxxviii. 2.

— *Indignum! Scelerato profuit Ara.*

Ovid. Metam.

Quo teneam cultus mutantem Prosa Noto?

Hor.

DUBLIN Printed,
LONDON, Re-printed for T. COOPER,
at the Globe in *Pater-noster-Row*.

MDCCXXXVI.

(Price One Shilling.)

A. 1. 136. 25

pe
cc

O
B

IEI
k

NGE



A
 VINDICATION
 OF THE

Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of
WINCHESTER, &c.



APPENING lately to make a
 Visit to an Acquaintance, who is
 one of those few Gentlemen that
 still retain some faint Sense of
 Religion, and would willingly
 be thought Christians; I found him perusing
 a Book, the Title of which is *A plain Account
 of the Nature and End of the LORD'S SUPPER.*
 He seem'd to be extremely pleas'd with the
 Performance, and recommended it to me as
 the best Treatise on that Subject that he had

ever seen. I took it home with me, and read it over with Attention; but perceived that it cou'd no otherwise be called a plain Account, than as the generality of Quakers may be called plain Men. It is true there is a superficial Simplicity, a plainness of Dress and Language; but in the Matter and Tendency of the Book there is a world of Cunning, Ambiguity, and Diffimulation. I likewise soon perceived my Friend's Reason for approving so highly of it. He is one of your easy Men, who is satisfied to profess and practice just so much of Religion as will not be troublesome to him, nor thwart either his Interest or Recreation. Now nothing could be more exactly adapted to his Purpose, than this plain Account, as the Author figuratively entitles it; because, according to the Promise it makes its Reader in the Preface, it represents the Duty of receiving this Sacrament in such a Manner, that there is no body so indolent, so lukewarm, nor indeed so profligate in his Life and Conversation, but may safely Communicate at any time. Nay, and for the greater Ease and Convenience of all Persons indisposed to strictness of Principle or Practice, or weary of attending at Church, or perhaps disgusted at the Parson, the Laity, for any thing I can see in this Book to the contrary, may consecrate and receive this Sacrament

crament any where, any time, or in any manner they please.

I may safely say that there never was a Book more likely to please, nor less likely to reform the present Times. There were two Ordinances that, till Thirty or Forty Years ago, did jointly contribute to keep Religion alive among us; namely, the Sabbath and the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper. People of any tolerable Fashion have quite gone over the Sabbath; I mean as to the Intention of its Institution, and have converted it into a mere Day of Pleasure. The Eucharist has kept its ground longer, and preserved some share of the Respect that is due to an Institution so sacred and so necessary, even in spite of all the Levity and Disregard with which the Ordinances of Religion have been treated of late. But this Book, if Providence doth not prevent, and its own Impiety and Absurdity subvert its evil Effects, may soon relax the little religious Strictness, and quench the last spark of Christian Zeal that is left among us.

I know not what part of the World its Author lives in; but by the Tendency and Design of his Book one would imagine he had always lived in the midst of a People who were inclinable to carry Religion to Extremes, and lay too scrupulous a Stress on the Observation of its Ordinances. I

am

am sure my Countrymen need no Preservatives against Excesses of this kind. In receiving the Sacrament particularly, unless my Observation fail me very much, there seems to be such a lack of Ardour and Piety as may make it needless to dissuade us from the small Degrees of Reverence and Care that are still employed about this important Institution. It wou'd be ne'er a whit more absurd to dissuade an inveterate Miser from Prodigality, or earnestly to exhort a Spendthrift to be Profuse. The Author of this Book must certainly have had the Propagation of Irreligion and Vice prodigiously at Heart; and yet tho' no Principles can tend more strongly to his Purpose than his own, I think he has lost his Labour in a good Measure, since it is evident that what he preaches, has been for some time generally practis'd. Where is the need of sinking this Sacrament still lower in the esteem of the World, when so little regard is shewn to it already? To what purpose is it to shew us the Folly of Devotion on this Occasion, even supposing our Devotion were never so supererogatory, since we are no way disposed to be devout? His Book contains a parcel of very ill-timed Errors, inasmuch as it has reduced the most pernicious Practise to Theory, and furnish'd it with pretended Principles, at a Time when there is

no Scruple made of the Practice without any Pretences whatsoever. I can't for my Life imagine what his end in publishing such a Performance could be, unless it was to get himself a Name of some Sort or other, by writing in direct Opposition to the Spirit and Intention of all Christian Writers from *Moses* down to the present Times.

Next to the Wickedness and Folly of its Author is the Malice of those who would make us think it the Work of so great and excellent a Man as the Bishop of *Winchester*. What a scandalous and uncharitable Age is this, that can ascribe such a Work of Darkness to an Apostolical Messenger of Light! To a Bishop! To a Servant and Successor of our Saviour! How is it possible that one who subscribes our Articles, who engages to inculcate our Catechism, to administer in the Church according to our Canons, and the Sacrament according to our Rubrick, should write one Sentence of such a Book? It is impossible he should vindicate his Conduct in so doing to his Conscience by pleading the superior Authority of Scripture in favour of his Principles, since he holds his Bishoprick by subscribing to the Consonancy between the Holy Scriptures and the very Reverse of this Author's Doctrine, as set forth in our Rubrick, Articles, and Homilies? Far be it from me therefore to join in such a ground-
less

less and uncharitable Imputation; an Impu-
tation that would fix one of the worst Books
that ever was wrote on one of the best Bi-
shops that ever adorned ours or any other
Church, a Bishop so learned and judicious,
a Bishop so sincere and ingenuous, a Bishop
so sound and orthodox, a Bishop in short so
pious, so repleat with the greatest Abilities
and the highest Virtues, so inspired, so fired,
so almost consumed with Christian Zeal!

It was to do Justice to the Character of
this distinguish'd Prelate, that I undertook
to write and publish this little Paper, in
which my Design is to point out a few of
those notorious Errors, and pernicious Prin-
ciples that are so inconsistent with the short
Sketch I have given of the Bishop's Chara-
cter, in which I have imitated the Sincerity,
and spoke with the same love of Truth
that appears in all the Actions and Writ-
ings of this incomparable Father of our
Church.

To proceed then, as his Lordship is in-
disputably the most learned, judicious, and
pious Prelate that ever was (as for the pre-
sent Times I have nothing to say to them)
or ever will be, it is by no means to be sup-
posed he could have run into the absurd and
irreligious Doctrines on which this Book is
founded, which Doctrines I shall lay before
the Reader in a few Propositions, and direct
him

him to the Pages in the plain Account where they may be found.

But before I proceed to this, it will be necessary to premise, that the Author recommends his Book to the World, not only as a plain, but also as a full Account of the Lord's-Supper. He tells us that he has explained every Passage that is to be found in Holy Scripture relating to this Institution; and that if any one shall take upon him to have other Notions of, or form higher expectations from it than those Passages of Scripture, under the Discipline of his Explication, set forth, he must be guilty of Sin and Presumption. If therefore he shall be entirely silent about any received Notion in relation to this Sacrament, we are to conclude that he is so for no other Reason, but because he takes it to be a Notion not warranted by Scripture. Now as he has made no mention of consecrating the Elements, let the first Proposition be,

I. That Consecration, as practised by ours, or any other Church, is without scriptural Precept or Example, and an Addition to the Institution of those ' who alone had any Authority to declare the Nature of it.

It is true, our Author has not any where, that I remember, mentioned the word Consecration, except in Page 121. but without often using the Term, which might have

given offence, he has struck at the Thing, as may be seen in Page the 11th, &c. where he endeavours to give such a Sense to that Word on which he supposes the Notion of Consecration to be founded, as may remove all Foundation for such a Practice.

Whether he has rightly explain'd the word εὐχαρίσας or not, perhaps the Reader will be better able to judge when he considers that he would have the Sense of that Word, which is used by two of the Evangelists determined by εὐχαριστήσας that is used only by one; that his Reason for this Determination is because St. Paul makes use of the latter upon the same Occasion; and that it is applied by all the four to the Cup, which must be supposed to be blessed, if at all, in no other Sense than the Bread. But if St. Paul may be allowed to be as good an Interpreter of his own Meaning as of St. Matthew's or of St. Mark's, then he may be understood to mean a Blessing when he says εὐχαριστήσας, in the same Sense that our Interpreters have put upon εὐλογήσας in St. Matthew; because in the 10th of his first Epistle to the *Corinthians* and at the 16th Verse he applies the same Word (*viz.* εὐλογῆσον) to the Cup in such a Manner that it is impossible for even this Author, with any shew of Sense or Reason, to apply it to any thing else. His words are, τὸ ποτήριον εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογῆσον. I will only observe two

or three Things on these Words The first is that *παράγωγον* is the Antecedent to *ὃ* and that consequently whatsoever is applied to the latter is thereby applied to the former. The second is that *εὐλογεῖν* being here applied to *παράγωγον* cannot signify, we give thanks, and therefore must signify we bless or consecrate. The third is, that it cannot signify, as our Author wrests it, over which we pronounce good Words of Praise, because then the Words would have been *ὑπὲρ* or *διὰ* ἔ, or at least *εὐλογίας ἢ εὐλογεῖν*. The last Thing I shall observe upon the Words is, that *εὐλογεῖν* is the first Person plural of the present Tense, from which I conclude that St. *Paul*, and others his Contemporaries, did, after our Saviour's Death, actually bless the Cup; and if the Cup, by our Author's own Way of Reasoning, the Bread also. The Word being applied in this Place to the Cup, may shew us that the same Word was probably intended to be applied to the Bread in St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*. The Rules of Grammar will lead us a Step further in this Probability. The Participle of an Active Verb, without an Accusative Case after itself, agreeing with the Nominative Case to another Verb is applied as a Transitive to the Accusative Case of that other Verb; as for Example in this very Word, *Genesis* the 22^d and 17th according to the

Septuagint εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε. Here σε is the Accusative Case to εὐλογῶν as well as εὐλογήσω. The Author insinuates, that our Translators were conscious to themselves that they had put in the Particle *it* after εὐλογήσας in St. *Matthew's* Gospel without Warrant, and therefore omitted it in St. *Mark's*. But in this he deals very disingenuously by them, because tho' they have not put in the Particle *it* in St. *Mark's* Gospel, yet they have rendered it in the same Sense as if they had, as may be seen by any candid Reader; the Words are, *And Jesus took Bread, and blessed, and brake it*; here the Copulative *and* applies all the Verbs to the Accusative Case governed by the first.

The candid Reader will probably agree with me, that this Author has not sufficiently invalidated the Necessity of Consecration, by his Manner of interpreting this Word of Scripture, even supposing there was nothing else in the New Testament to countenance it; but it is not on this Word chiefly that the Notion or Practice of Consecration is founded. At least, our Church has not thought so, as appears by the Directions given in the Rubrick to the Minister, to apply his Hands to the Bread at the Words, *Brake, and, This is my Body*; and to the Cup, at the Words, *This is my Blood*. And that these are the proper Words for that Purpose,

Purpose, will appear to any one who considers, that they are the very Words of Consecration used by our Saviour. The Bread was not his Body, tho' he had given Thanks, or blessed it, till he affirmed it to be so; nor the Cup, his Blood, till he called it by that Name. It was by those Words that he set apart and appropriated the Elements to the Ends and Uses of the Sacrament. Our Author should therefore have found out some ingenious Method of proving, that the Institution of this Sacrament, and the Appropriation of Bread and Wine to the Remembrance of our Saviour's Death, are not contained in the aforesaid Words. I make no question but he would have shewn Abundance of Learning on this very Point, if he had been aware of it. But he has attacked Consecration, just as *Mutius Scevola*, in a better Cause, did the King of *Etruria*. He has aim'd his Blow at the wrong Place, and offered Violence, if not committed Murder, on a Word of less Importance in the present Controversy than he imagined.

Before our Saviour instituted this Sacrament, Bread and Wine were no more the Representatives of his Body and Blood, than any other Materials, but were made so entirely by his Appointment; since which, the Elements for this Purpose must be no other than Bread and Wine. However, all
Bread

Bread and Wine were not consecrated by this Institution, for then it had been a De-secration to have used them at a common Meal, or on any other Occasion. If all therefore was not consecrated, it follows that none was actually consecrated, but what was then on the Table before our Saviour; so that it is necessary some Consecration of the same Nature should still be used, in order to restrain that to an holy Use, which is left at large for all Uses, by our Saviour's Consecration. But our Author will say, the receiving Bread and Wine in remembrance of our Saviour, is a sufficient and effectual Consecration. If that were the Case, how could the *Corinthians* profane the Sacrament, since they did not apply it to the Memory of our Saviour, but eat it as a common Meal. Without such an Application, according to our Author, there can be no Sacrament, and consequently no Prophanation, because the Bread and Wine are still common and unconsecrated. Neither can the *Test-Act*, by his Way of Reasoning, possibly occasion any Prophanation; because the taking Bread and Wine in remembrance of Christ, being according to him the only Consecration, he that takes them in order to qualify himself for a beneficial Post, takes them unconsecrated, and consequently cannot be guilty of a Prophanation. It is for this Reason,

Reason, that I cannot suppose the Bishop of *Winchester* could have been the Author of this Book; because his Lordship, if I remember right, in his incomparable Performances against the *Test-Act*, shews that Law to be a Profanation of the Holy Sacrament to worldly Uses, which it never could be, unless the Elements were supposed to be separated and dedicated to a sacred Use before. But this Author will have it, that they are never so dedicated, but when they are taken in remembrance of Christ; so that he who takes them with any other View or Intention, does not receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at all, because he eats and drinks not in commemoration of Christ, but for his own Promotion, and therefore does no more than he who feeds on Bread and Wine for his Nourishment.

The next Doctrine I shall take notice of in this Writer, is that which relates to the End of the Lord's Supper. If the Reader will please to lay Proposition the 8th of our Author, and all the Pages from the 153d to the End of the Book, together, he will perceive that the following Proposition is fairly drawn from not only the general Tendency, but the express Words of his Treatise.

Secondly, The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a Rite purely commemorative,
 " so that the Duty of receiving it is (strict-
 " ly

“ ly speaking) comprehended within the
 “ Limits of eating and drinking with a due
 “ Remembrance of Christ’s Death.”

Our Author tells us, Page 54th, that the Nature and Effence of this Sacrament consists in its being done in remembrance of Christ’s Death; from which we must infer, that where there is no Remembrance of his Death, there can be no Sacrament. He argues from this Doctrine against Transubstantiation, and a corporal Sacrifice in the Mass; insisting, that to suppose a real Presence, when there is only a Memorial instituted, would be absurd; from which we must infer, that in the Presence of our Saviour this Sacrament could retain neither its Nature nor Effence, *i. e.* could not be.

From which two Inferences put together, it appears plainly, by our Author’s Way of Reasoning, that our Saviour could not have instituted, nor his Disciples received this Sacrament, till after his Death. For, says our Author, Page 24. “ The doing any Act in
 “ remembrance of a Person, implies his bodily
 “ Absence; and if he is corporally present, we
 “ are never said, nor can we be said, to perform
 “ that Action in remembrance of him. And
 “ again, Page 30. They (that is, our Savi-
 “ our’s Disciples) could not do the Actions
 “ here named (*i. e.* eat and drink the Me-
 “ morials of his Body and Blood) in remem-
 “ brance

“ brance of him, whilst he himself was cor-
 “ porally present with them, nor in remem-
 “ brance of any thing done, which was not
 “ then done and past.” All this is very true,
 and therefore the Effence of this Sacrament
 cannot consist in mere Commemoration, ac-
 cording to our Author elsewhere. To re-
 member a future Event is much the same
 with foreseeing what is past.

However, since *St. Matthew*, *St. Mark*,
St. Luke, and *St. Paul*, will needs have it,
 that this Sacrament was instituted and re-
 ceived before our Saviour’s Death, much to
 the Discredit of this Author, we must look
 out for somewhat else in the Institution, on
 account of which it was consistent with the
 infinite wisdom of our Saviour, to ordain it
 before his Death.

Let us, in order to this, consider the Pas-
 sages in Scripture that relate to the last Sup-
 per. And here it is observable, that there
 is no mention made of commemoration in
 the Account given by *St. Matthew* and *St.*
Mark. It is not unlikely that their Reason
 for so doing was, because they intended to
 state the Nature of the Sacrament, as it was
 before our Saviour’s Death. But as *St. Luke*
 and *St. Paul* have given us a more full Ac-
 count of it, by adding the Precept for do-
 ing it in remembrance of Christ’s Death,
 we will suppose for the present, that *St. Paul’s*
 C Account,

Account, in which the Memorial is twice mentioned, is the only Historical Narrative of this Affair extant.

Every one who reads St. *Paul's* Words, must perceive, that we are always to commemorate our Saviour's Death in this Sacrament. The Words therefore that contain the Precept for Commemoration, being agreed upon, may be set aside; after which we shall find these other Words, *This is my Body which is broken for you, and this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood.* These Words cannot mean the same with those relating to Commemoration, for if they did, the Apostle must have been guilty of a Tautology: and if they mean any thing else, then this Institution must have something more in it than a bare Memorial. But be their meaning what it will, it must be essential to the Institution, not only because, as I observ'd before, these are the very Words of Consecration, but because in these Words, or in none, we must look for the Reason of celebrating this Sacrament before our Saviour's Death.

It must therefore be a Matter of high import to all Christians, to know what is meant by these Words. Our Author has treated them with such contempt that he takes little or no Notice of them. The most he vouchsafes is a Paraphrase of them, in which he obliges

obliges them to speak according to the Drift of his Doctrines, without giving us any Reason for so doing. The Words *Body* and *Blood* must either be understood Literally and Corporeally, or else in a Figurative and Spiritual Sense. They cannot be understood Literally nor Corporeally, because common Sense is against it. A Figurative or Spiritual Interpretation must therefore be found, before they can be rationally or rightly understood; because we may presume to say that they ought to be allow'd some Meaning. Now if nothing else is intimated to us by these Words, but that the Bread and Wine are Memorials of Christ's Death, then they signify only just the same thing with, *This do in remembrance of me*; by which our Saviour, and his Historians must be supposed guilty of multiplying Words, without enlarging the Sense, and that in the very form of a most sacred Institution, when, if ever, both Brevity and Striçtness are necessary.

Since then neither a bodily Prefence, nor a bare Memorial is intended by these Words, since the Sacrament was fully instituted by these Words alone, as appears from its being instituted before our Saviour's Death, and consequently before the possibility of a Commemoration, and since St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* have given us an Account of the In-

stitution, without taking the least Notice of the Commemoration, we must conclude that to eat our Saviour's Body and drink his Blood is to partake of all those Benefits that were procured to us by his Death, among which Faith and Grace are chiefly to be reckoned; for,

To what purpose do we eat and drink, unless in order to our nourishment? But as in this eating and drinking there is no bodily Nourishment intended, some Spiritual food must be intended. Now our Souls can be strengthened, refresh'd, or fed, no otherwise than by Faith and Grace, I mean in a religious or christian Sense; it follows therefore, that if we eat, drink, or are fed at all by this Institution, it must be by the most comfortable and reviving Motions of God's Holy Spirit, that answer to the devout Disposition of our Hearts, as material Food does to our bodily Hunger. Our Saviour in the *6th* of *St. John*, speaks of his Flesh and Blood in this very Sense. I am the Bread of Life, says he, I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever, and the Bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World. Verily verily I say unto you, except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no Life in you. Whoso eateth

eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last Day. For my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. The Jews had cavil'd at these Expressions before, but as soon as our Saviour perceived that his Disciples also murmured at them, he explained them to them, by telling them that it is the Spirit that quickeneth, that the Flesh profiteth nothing, and that the Words which he spake unto them are Spirit and Life.

As in *St. Paul's* Account of the Institution, we are commanded to eat the Body and drink the Blood of Christ, so *St. John* tells us, that unless we do so, we have no Life in us; and lest we shou'd either reject his Doctrine with abhorrence at the Thoughts of eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood literally or corporally, or to avoid that, should fix some other unworthy Interpretation on his Words, he tells us that we are to understand him in a Spiritual Sense, that it is the Spirit that quickeneth, and that the Words which he speaketh unto them, are the Spirit which quickens, and that Life, which is thereby quickened.

It

It is observable, that after our Saviour had often spoke of eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood, he comes in the 57th Verse, to speak of eating himself; by which is meant according to his Explanation at the End, his Spirit, as well as his Flesh and Blood, which without that could not be personally call'd him, nor of any Avail towards the procuring eternal Life to us. What are we to conclude from eating Christ's Flesh and drinking his Blood, nay from eating Christ himself, but that we are to feed on some Representations of his Flesh and Blood, under which, to make Them, in some Sense Him, is conveyed his Spirit, which works in us by his Words, and nourishes by his Precepts to eternal Life?

From this Passage of St. *John* it appears plainly in what Sense the Bread and Wine are call'd our Saviour's Body and Blood. Christ here, calls his Flesh the Food or Bread of Life, and in St. *Paul's* Account, calls the Sacramental Bread his Body; he tells us in both Places that we must Eat it, from whence we cannot but conclude that some kind of Nourishment is to be communicated by it. What that is, he shews us by the Opposition between Manna which could not prevent temporal Death, and this Meat indeed, which secures to us eternal Life.

Now

Now if we suppose the two Passages of St. *John* and St. *Paul* laid together, the Sense of both may be expressed in the Person of Christ, thus, “ Endeavour not to procure
 “ to yourselves that perishable kind of Food,
 “ which can only support you for a short
 “ Time here, but endeavour to come to me
 “ by Faith, who am the true Food, with-
 “ out which you must perish everlastingly.
 “ I intend my Flesh for your Meat, and my
 “ Blood for your Drink. But that you may
 “ not be shock’d at such a kind of Food,
 “ I appoint Bread to represent my Body,
 “ and Wine my Blood, under which (that
 “ you may not have only the dead unpro-
 “ fitable Flesh) I shall signify and impart
 “ to you my Spirit, in order that, by its
 “ powerful Impulse, the Principles of eter-
 “ ternal Life contain’d in my Word, and
 “ the saving Efficacy of my Dispensation
 “ may be apply’d to your Souls. Having
 “ thus made provision for your immortal
 “ Part, I desire, that hereafter as often as
 “ you feast on, and refresh your Souls with,
 “ this Spiritual Nourishment, you do grate-
 “ fully remember me, who have given up
 “ my Body to be torn, and my Blood to
 “ be shed for the remission of your Sins,
 “ and the eternal Preservation of your Souls.

But our Author will not allow this Pas-
 sage of St. *John* to be meant of the LORD’S-

SUPPER

SUPPER at all. Let us examine his Reason. He begins with telling us that it hath been applied to the LORD'S-SUPPER, especially since the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, by some who have laboured hard to make the Application. In this he says what is very true; but those who labour'd that point for that Purpose were guilty of a great oversight in so doing, because the Explanation of the whole Passage subjoyn'd by our Saviour, is the plainest and most direct Argument that is to be found in Holy Writ against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. It is not an Argument by Deduction and Consequence; but in express Terms. Besides, we find the Sacrament necessary in both kinds from the 53d Verse of this Chapter. Nor were the Protestant Commentators guilty of a less Oversight in denying it to be meant of the LORD'S-SUPPER, for the very same Reasons. Had they rightly understood it, they had in all likelihood exchanged Opinions.

He says again, that it could not relate to the Duty of the LORD'S-SUPPER, because it was not then instituted, nor so much as hinted at to his Disciples. This Consequence does not follow. Cou'd not Christ have spoken of an Institution which he intended? And why should he have hinted it to his Disciples before? Was not that itself a timely and a sufficient Hint? Was it however impossible

possible that he shou'd speak then of a future Institution, and without previous Intimation given to his Disciples?

But further, he tells us that there is such a Difference of Expression in the two Cases as may shew that they are not to be applied to the same Thing. Our Saviour says in the Form of Institution, the Bread which you are to eat is *my* Body, not, *my* Body; is your Bread or your Food, &c. But when our Saviour said, this Bread is my Body and bid them eat it, he intended they shou'd feed on it, and then it must have been their Bread or Food, according to what he tells them in the 6th of *St. John*.

He observes likewise, that there is no mention in this Passage of Eating and Drinking in Remembrance of Christ after he shou'd be taken from his Disciples; from whence he argues that it cou'd not be meant of the LORD'S-SUPPER, which is a Memorial of his Sufferings along Time afterwards, and cou'd not be put in Practice during his Presence with them. By this way of Arguing *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark*, in their Accounts of the Institution cou'd not have spoke of the LORD'S-SUPPER, for neither of them have mentioned the Commemoration; nay by the very same way of Reasoning, our Saviour cou'd not have given this Sacrament to his Disciples before his own Death; for

D

how

how cou'd they commemorate him present? These are all the Blunders offer'd by our Author on this Head; what follows is only a modest Endeavour to help our Saviour and St. *John* to express in the Author's Sense what they have attempted to speak in their own Words.

I shall therefore lay him aside for a while, and try if I can offer any Satisfactory Reasons, why this Passage ought to be understood of the LORD'S-SUPPER; besides such as may be deduced from the Explication already given of it.

It is generally allowed that St. *John* wrote his Gospel after the other three gospels and the writings of St. *Paul* had been all published; nay it is commonly supposed to have been wrote the last of all the Scriptural Canon. His end for writing it is known to have been no other, than that of perpetuating certain Particulars in our Saviour's History, which had been either omitted, or not fully related by those who had handled the Subject before, in order to rectify some Errors and Abuses that had by that means crept into the Church. The *Cerinthian* Heresy was the chief of these. But before he wrote his Gospel, the *Heathens* had accused the Christians of certain horrible Rites, particularly Feasting on human Flesh and Blood. It seems therefore very probable that the
aforesaid

aforesaid Passage was intended as an Explanation of the LORD'S-SUPPER, on which this Charge had been fixed. The whole Discourse is admirably well fitted to this Purpose, because in it is shewn the Abhorrence with which both the Jews and Disciples received the Doctrine of feeding on Christ's Body and Blood, while they understood it in a literal Sense, and then the true Spiritual Sense is immediately subjoyned. Now St. *John* having clear'd up this Difficulty about the Sacrament, had no occasion to say any thing of the Institution. It was enough for him to explain the Nature of the Mystery; as for the Time, and Manner, and End of its Appointment, they were all sufficiently related before.

It cannot be denied but that St. *John* recounts many incidents in our Saviour's Life, which had been wrote by the other Evangelists before him, particularly the Celebration of the Passover that very Night in which he instituted his last Supper. But he says not one Word in that Place of this Institution; and the Reason in all probability was, because he had said as much as was needful on that Subject before, in the Discourse about spiritual Food.

But again, we find in this Passage that Christ mentions his Flesh and Blood separately, four times over, from which we

must conclude that when they come to be interpreted spiritually, they must intimate to us two distinct Ideas; but unless they be apply'd to the sacramental Body, by which our Souls are fed in order to eternal Life, and the sacramental Blood, thro' which we have Remission of Sins, they cannot represent more than one Idea; which is no way consonant to the Care our Saviour takes to speak of them distinctly.

Again, if we take away our Saviour's human Nature, that is, his Flesh and his Blood, he can neither be Food nor Life to us, because it is necessary to his being either, that he shou'd obtain Remission of our Sins; but without shedding of Blood there is no Remission of Sins. It follows therefore that the Food of eternal Life mentioned in this Passage can be no other than the Body and Blood of Christ which he sacrificed for us, and which are applyed to our Souls by Faith in the Sacrament of his last Supper.

Again, if our Saviour had not spoke in this Place of the same Food which he afterwards calls his Body and his Blood, he had not said that he himself was that Bread or Food. If he had spoken of his Precepts as ordinarily deliver'd in Discourse, he cou'd not have called them in any Propriety himself. He might have said indeed, I will give you the Bread of Life. But he could not

not have said, I am the Bread of Life. Such an Expression is as absurd, as if an Ambassador, who is sent with Articles of Peace to a neighbouring Prince, should say, I am Articles of Peace. Or as if an Husbandman should deliver a System of Agriculture to the World, and upon the Strength of the Rules laid down in it, should tell the Publick, that he himself is Corn, and Wine, and Oil.

Lastly, if this Discourse is not to be understood of the Lord's-Supper, it must appear to contradict it self: because our Saviour, who so often calls his Flesh and his Blood Drink indeed, and the Food of Life in the former Part of it, in the latter End says, that the Flesh profiteth nothing. But if we understand what he says, of the Lord's-Supper, the Difficulty will clear up, as may appear by this Paraphrase; Except you eat my Flesh and drink my Blood, you have no Life in you, because you cannot receive the Grace and Principles which I have annexed to them alone. But if you receive the Symbols appointed by me to represent my Flesh and Blood unworthily, they will profit you nothing, they will to you, be my Body and Blood in no other Sense than to make you guilty of commemorating my Death without renouncing those Sins for which I died, which is a kind of consenting to my Death.

Other

Other Reasons might be offered, but I hope these will suffice to shew, that this Discourse is scarce intelligible to us, if not understood, of the Lord's-Supper. No plain Reader ever put any other Interpretation on it; and such Readers usually fall in with the true and natural Sense of plain Passages, provided they be faithfully rendered, more readily than Commentators do. The Reason for it is this; the ~~plain~~ honest Man searches his Bible for such Information as is necessary to the saving of his Soul, with an Eye to no Controversies, but that between himself and the Adversary of his Salvation, so that with all the Understanding he has, he goes directly on to the true Construction, God's Grace in the mean Time directing and assisting his honest Enquiry. Whereas your Commentators, who are always deeply engaged in Disputes and learned Prejudices, lay the byas of their own Prepossessions on the Scriptures, and suffer them to speak nothing but their own Opinions.

If any one will needs suppose, after all, that the LORD'S-SUPPER is a purely Commemorative Rite, let him consider with himself to what Purpose such a Rite cou'd have been instituted. Let him consider that barely remembering our Saviour's Death, which is all our Author seems to make absolutely necessary,

necessary,

necessary, can have no Effect, nor be of any use at all. But then our Author will say, that he speaks of a grateful and thankful Remembrance. If he does, he wou'd do well to consider that such a Remembrance is altogether impossible without Repentance for past Sins, without Faith in God's Word and Promises, and without Charity towards our Fellow-Christians: so that allowing that to be the sole End of the Sacrament, yet still it cannot be purely Commemorative, since the Whole of a Christians Duty necessarily results from thence.

Drinking to the Glorious Memory of King *William* the III. has been thought by some to have a prophane Resemblance of this sacred Institution. However neither the Party-Warmth with which the Memory of that Prince was drank, nor the Party-Spirit with which that Practice was rail'd at, cou'd ever raise it so high, as to give it any offensive Resemblance to our Lord's-Supper, till the Publication of this Book, which has brought down the Sacrament to a Level with that or any other honorary Commemoration. Nay, if we consider the Matter well, we shall find that our Author has sunk the Sacrament a good Deal lower than the Glorious Memory. When a Company drinks to the Memory of King *William*, they can't be supposed

supposed to do it without an hearty Abhorrence of Popery and Tyranny, without a Resolution to oppose both to the uttermost of their Power, and without a firm Adherence to the political Principles on which the late Revolution turned. But if you will believe our Author, it is only necessary to remember the Death of Christ. Repentance, Faith and Charity are according to him by no means necessarily connected with the Duty of eating and drinking in Remembrance of our blessed Saviour. To profess our Faith in Christ's Promises, to re-kindle our Zeal for those Principles by which he wrought the great Revolution from a State of Sin to a State of Salvation, or to renew our religious Engagement to him, may be, in the Opinion of our Author, no useles Work; but he thinks they are not necessary when we meet to Commemorate the Death of our Divine and Glorious Redeemer. If this does not sink the Memory of our Saviour lower in a religious, than the common Practice does that of King *William* in a political Sense, I am under a very gross Mistake.

I have dwelt the longer on this Head, because the following Errors of our Author are so artfully interwoven with this, that it wou'd be difficult to get clear of them if this one were admitted. But his Art will now be turn'd against himself, inasmuch as the
Demoli-

Demolition of his Foundation must be attended with the Ruin of the whole erroneous Fabrick which he has erected on it. Besides, to expose his fundamental Absurdities and Falsehoods under this Proposition was the most effectual Way of demonstrating that this Book cou'd never have been the Work of so learn'd, so ingenious, and in short so great a Man as the Bishop of *Winchester*. If the Reader will be pleas'd to consult the 12th 13th 14th 15th and 16th Propositions of our Author, he will find that the following Proposition is rightly and fairly drawn from thence.

Thirdly, There is no other Preparation necessary to the worthy Reception of the Lord's-Supper, than a serious Remembrance of our Saviour's Death, so that Persons who lead Lives unworthy of Christians both before and after it, may nevertheless be worthy Communicants.

This wou'd be very true, if the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper were merely commemorative, for then we might without the smallest Trouble or Preparation examine ourselves, whether we remembered that Christ died for us. But I hope it appears pretty plain from what was said under the foregoing Proposition, that there must be something more intended by this Institution than a bare Commemoration.

E

But

But let us be determined by Scripture, and the Nature of the Institution it self. We find in the 11th Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians* St. Paul telling that Church, that whosoever shou'd eat this Bread or drink this Cup unworthily, shou'd be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and shou'd eat and drink Damnation to himself. From these Words so alarming, notwithstanding the Softenings of our Author, it appears very plainly, that we ought to be exceedingly careful to know in what a worthy Reception consists. This we may find by the other Admonitions there given. St. Paul reproves the *Corinthians* for three Vices, *viz.* Drunkenness, despising the Church of God, and uncharitably shaming their poor Brethren; which Vices rendered their Celebration of the Lord's-Supper unworthy. Now it appears that they were not guilty of these Vices at the very Time of receiving, but at their love Feasts which they celebrated according to our Author before, but according to others, after the Sacrament; which may serve to shew us that our Behaviour either before or after communicating ought to be virtuous, devout, and decent, or else we must be unworthy Communicants. It is not at the Time of receiving only, that we are oblig'd to live and act like Christians, but at all other Times, under the Penalties

nalties of an unworthy Reception. Perhaps our Author will say, not at all other Times, but only immediately before or after, only while we are in the usual Place of Communion. This is, as if it was not the heinousness of Vice that made the Action unworthy, but the nearness of Time. But Vice is Vice, and as such, offensive in the Sight of God, to whom a thousand Years are as one Day, at all Times. Nor is it these Vices only that are here mentioned, but all others, for the same Reason, that make an unworthy Reception of the Lord's-Supper. If this were so, our Author will say, why did not *St. Paul* tell us so? How can we conclude all this from the Passage now under Consideration? I answer, that *St. Paul* in the Words already cited reproves the Abuses of the *Corinthians*, for no other Reason but because they were offensive in the Sight of God; which is a Reason as good against all manner of Vices and Abuses whatsoever, whether committed before, at, or after the Sacrament, tho' never so geographically or chronologically distinguished.

But it happens unluckily for our Author, that *St. Paul* after reproving the *Corinthians* by applying directly to them and their particular Abuses, in the 20th, 21st, and 22d Verses, at the 27th Verse says in general,

neral, that whosoever shall eat and drink unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and then immediately sub-joins, *Let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat and drink.* This is applied to all Mankind, and ought to be understood as a Barr laid against all kinds of Sin and Unworthiness. To what End is a Man to examine himself? Is it only to try whether he remembers the Death of Christ or not? Surely that can require no Examination. Or is it in order only to consider the Difference between our Lord's Body and a common Meal? Surely that is not to examine himself, but to examine the Institution.

It seems to me a little hard, that while all other Affairs or Undertakings, necessarily require, according to their Importance, certain Degrees of Preparation, this most sacred and solemn Ordinance, in which not only the Body and Blood of our Redeemer are represented, but his Spirit conveyed, shou'd be approach'd in an abrupt and irreverent Manner. Is there no Decency of Dress, no wedding Garment required when we are to be entertained at the Table of the Lord? Shall we set off our Bodies in our best Apparel, when we are to dine with a Prince or a great Man, and yet go covered with all the foul Rags of our unrepented Sins to sup with the Lord of Hosts
and

and the King of Kings? This is not only not to discern the Lord's Body from a common Meal, but to treat it with infinitely more Indignity. Surely a Wretch polluted, corrupted, and altogether impenitent, is utterly unfit for the Performance of any Christian Duty, but most especially, of the most awful and important Institutions. Surely to a Soul void of Faith in God's merciful Promises thro' Christ, this Sacrament must be Impertinence, and his taking it Prophanation. Surely to an Heart embittered with Malice, and at Enmity with its Fellow-members in Christ, this Feast of Love must be extremely opposite and repugnant. Is it not then necessary that we shou'd consider well whether we possess our Souls in a Spirit of Repentance, Faith and Benevolence, before we approach the Lord's Table? And can we form to ourselves these Dispositions in an Instant, without either exerting ourselves in Meditation, or imploring the Assistance of Almighty God by Prayer?

If, as our Author will have it, the whole Nature and Essence of the Lord's-Supper consist in the Commemoration of Christ's Death, we ought certainly to commemorate that inestimable Mercy in such a Manner as may redound to the Honour and Glory of our divine Benefactor and Master. But this can never be done without a strict
Adherence

Adherence to his Precepts, or at least a deep and sorrowful Repentance for having transgressed them. He that is obstinate in his Wickedness dishonours the Saviour of Mankind, because he caresses and courts those Sins for which He was put to open Shame; he is at Enmity with Christ, because he is in Amity with those Vices which Christ came into the World to combat and subdue; he crucifies Christ afresh, because he cherishes and encourages those Impieties that nailed our dear Redeemer to the Cross, and pushed the Spear into his Side. Now is it possible for such an one to honour Christ by receiving Bread and Wine in his remembrance? If he remembers him at all, must it not be as an Enemy, or as a Person whose Memory he would disgrace?

Let the Reader now consider, whether it is with Sense or Charity to be supposed, that an Ambassador of Christ, and a Pastor of his Flock, should, against Scripture, against the Nature of the Sacrament, against the Interest of Christ's Kingdom, and against the Salvation of his Subjects, whom he has bought with his Blood, labour to make the Hearts of those who come to the Lord's Table as impenitent, as faithless, as uncharitable, and as devotionless every way as he can. When the Reader has done this, if he will turn to the 18th Proposition of the plain Account,
and

and peruse that with what is said under it, particularly in Page the 143, 153, 156, 164, 173, and 174, he will find that the following Proposition is truly and fairly extracted.

Fourthly, There are no Privileges peculiarly annexed to the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper, no concomitant Grace, no spiritual Benefits, nor Communion with God. It is no Renewal of our Baptismal Vow, nor Seal of the Christian Covenant.

Our Author owns indeed at the 155th Page, "That the Sacrament, by its natural and
 " reasonable Tendency, leads us to Thank-
 " fulness, to the Profession of our Depen-
 " dence on, and Obligations due to God, and
 " our Duty towards our Neighbours, and
 " that it is therefore an effectual Acknow-
 " ledgement of our strict Obligation to all
 " Instances of Piety and Virtue, &c.

It is easy to see, that this contains a flat Denial of what the 4th Proposition sets forth, which Proposition is nevertheless faithfully collected from the Pages refer'd to. But besides, the Matter of this Concession made by our Author is manifestly impossible, if it be true, that the Lord's Supper is a Rite purely commemorative, and that there is no Preparation necessary to the worthy receiving of it. If it be merely a Memorial, how can it be reasonably expected, that it should
 lead

lead the Thoughts of those to the whole System of Christian Duties, who are not necessarily required to make any Preparations for it, further than a bare and instantaneous Recollection of our Saviour's Death? The Thoughts themselves may take what Hints, and steer what Course they please; but this, according to our Author's Doctrine, is no necessary Effect of the Lord's Supper, the Duty of receiving which is, if we will believe him, "contained within the Limits of eating and drinking in remembrance of Christ's Death;" so that if we should make any devout or pious Reflections on what we are about, it seems, they must be more owing to our own Goodness, than God's Injunction. And yet I can't see of what Use such Reflections, if they were made, could be towards the Improvement of our Lives, since without Time and Preparation, and Attention, they must be too transient to have any Effect upon our Manners.

This Doctrine of his concerning the Benefits of the Sacrament, directly contradicts what he lays down in his four first Propositions, where he tells us, "That the Duty of partaking of the Lord's Supper, is not a Duty of itself, or apparent to us from the Nature of Things, but made such to Christians by the positive Institution of Jesus Christ." The Performance of all natural Duties

Duties is useful and beneficial to us, and the Omission hurtful. If this were a natural Duty, it would be beneficial by its own natural Tendency, not otherwise. Now our Author denies it to be a natural Duty under his four first Propositions, and yet, Page the 154th, tells us, "That in its natural and reasonable Tendency we ought to found our main Expectations" of the Benefits which he enumerates, Page the 155th. These Sentiments are very inconsistent, but then they lie at the Distance of 153 Pages from each other, and what Occasion for Connection or Consistence between Principles so remote? There are Leaves enough between to keep the Peace, tho' they were never so strongly disposed to Jarr.

If our Author had not ascribed these Benefits to the Sacrament, tho' in opposition to the Principles he set out upon, some one perhaps might have asked, Where is the Good of such a Rite? Why did Christ institute what is of no use to us? If in answer to these Questions, which he could not but fore-see, he had said that Christ has annexed scriptural Benefits to it, which by its own Nature, it could not convey, being merely positive, he had contradicted the Tenor of his whole Book, and particularly the very Beginning of the same Paragraph, see Page the 154th, where he speaks of these Benefits. This had

been too palpable; so he chose rather to let his Answer to these Questions give the Lie to his very fundamental Principle, hoping that the Reader would not so easily perceive it.

Since then this Answer of his can never satisfy, and since no natural Benefits are to be expected from an Institution purely positive, ~~either than what~~ our own Reflections could have derived from the Action itself, tho' it had never been instituted; it follows, that it must either be a useless Right, an empty and idle Ceremony, or else there must be some spiritual Benefits preternaturally annexed to it, and conveyed by it to a worthy Communicant. To eat Bread and drink Wine can never tend, by their own Nature, to any moral Improvement of our Minds; not even when they are applied to the Memory of Christ, if according to our Author, there is no other Preparation necessary, than barely to remember. The most that can be said of this Sacrament, upon his Principles, is, that it is an useful Thing to our Thoughts, as applied by Christ, if seriously received.

Had our Saviour intended no more than this by it, what Occasion was there for all the Solemnity with which it is so often treated of in Scripture. If he had designed it only for a mere Memorandum of his Death, he would not have said, *This Bread is my Body,*

Body, nor, This Wine is my Blood; but, This Bread and Wine shall put you in mind of my Body and Blood.

But our Author tells us, that whatever Benefits we are to expect from this Institution, they are only such as are the common Effect of all Christian Duties, and not peculiarly annexed to this single Duty. If this be so, then this Sacrament can be of no Use, unless all other Christian Duties be performed as well as it, which is directly contrary to what our Author labours under his 16th Proposition; the Sum of which is to shew, that this Sacrament may be worthily received, tho' other Duties be never so much neglected. He that doubles and goes about for Arguments, is extremely apt at one Time to cross and thwart what he maintained at another. But no more of this now. I shall have an Opportunity of speaking more fully on this Subject under the next Proposition.

The Author of the plain Account endeavours to prove, that there is no Grace nor divine Assistance communicated in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To know whether this be so or not, we must first consider what is to be understood by the Word *Grace*; and then, whether there is any Grounds in Scripture to hope for that Grace

in the worthy Participation of this Holy Institution.

By *Grace* is sometimes meant the divine Favour, or, God's good Disposition to protect and succour his Servants; in this Sense, it signifies the *Cause*. But it more usually implies the *Effect* of God's Goodness towards us, and signifies the actual Assistances of his Holy Spirit, working in the ordinary Way, with our weak Endeavours to subdue our Passions, resist Temptations and strengthen our Resolutions against the Trials we are to encounter.

Grace taken in this latter Sense must be supposed to be communicated in the Lord's-Supper, if we will not charge our Saviour with speaking Words without Meaning, or running into Tautology; for in what other Sense can, *Eat my Body and drink my Blood*, be taken? Besides, if there be any Similitude implied in these words (and except we suppose a Similitude they must be utterly unmeaning) they can be interpreted in no other Sense, than that of Refreshing and Feeding our Souls, as ordinary Bread and Wine do our Bodies.

Christ, in the 6th of St. *John's* Gospel, gives them this very Interpretation; he calls his Flesh and Blood the Food of eternal Life, but shews us in the close of his Discourse that we are not to expect Life from
the

the Flesh itself, but from the Spirit represented by it, and conveyed with it. The Body and Blood of Christ, in the Holy Communion, represent his Divine Person to us, as may appear from these Expressions where our Saviour speaks of Eating *him* personally. I am the Bread of Life; he that eateth me even he shall live by me. Now there was in the Person of Christ not only a Body to be rent, and Blood to be spilt for us in order to remission of Sins, but also an holy and lively Spirit, by which he uttered his most excellent Revelation, in order to the amendment of our Lives. As therefore in this sacred Ordinance we commemorate his Sufferings for us, by spiritually eating his Body and drinking his Blood, so we must also be supposed to receive his Holy Spirit, which is, to write his Law in our Hearts, because without that, his Flesh profiteth not, tho' never so duly commemorated; without that we eat not Christ, Christ dwelleth not in us, nor we in Christ; we rather crucify him a-new by those Sins that hinder us from participating of his Spirit, and like Persons a sinking, instead of assisting ourselves by his infallible Directions, only desperately cling to his Body, as if we rather intended to sink him with us, than save ourselves.

As

As the Body and Blood of Christ can be rationally called so in no Sense but this; So this, if it be well considered, will appear to be founded on a most strong and beautiful Similitude. By Bread and Wine our Bodies are nourished and our Lives preserved; by the Spiritual or Sacramental Food our Virtue is fed and strengthened, and eternal Life secured. Bread and Wine rather enfeeble our Bodies and endanger our Lives, than support the one by nourishing the other, if our Stomachs be distempered, or our Constitutions already infected; in like manner the Sacramental Food is rather baneful, than nutritious to our Souls, if they be not properly prepared for its Reception. Bread and Wine cannot begin health or produce Life, but they can renew and revive both; the Grace communicated in the Sacrament, as it does not prevent, but attend that Ordinance, cannot inspire Virtue where there was none before, nor plant eternal Life in the midst of dead Works and Sins, but it can feed a virtuous Disposition, it can perfect good Works, it can cherish the Principles of eternal Life, and bring them to Maturity. Bread is the Strength of Man's Heart, and the Staff of his Life; Grace is the Support of the Conscience, and the vital Principle of eternal Salvation: Wine maketh a glad Heart, and a glad Heart, like a Medicine,

dicine, prolongs our Days; so the Grace of God infuses comfortable hopes into the Soul, by which eternal Life is assured to us; for we are saved by hope.

Our Author denies, that in the Nature of the Sacrament there is any Communion with God necessarily imply'd; and yet according to him the Nature of the Sacrament consists in a thankful Remembrance of Christ's Death. Now is not Thanksgiving an act of Worship? And is there not some Communion or intercourse with God in every act of Worship? But he will say there is no extraordinary or peculiar Communion with the Divine Nature, further than what is common to all other acts of Worship. Here every rational and candid Interpreter of Scripture must differ from him. We have but just now proved that some participation of God's Grace must be supposed in this Institution. Now is there no Communion, when on the one Side Grace is imparted, and on the other the most grateful Acknowledgments render'd? When God assists his Servants, and they at the same time gratefully bless their good and bountiful Benefactor, is there no intercourse to be supposed?

Does not Christ invite us to approach and unite ourselves to his divine Nature, when he bids us eat his Body and drink his Blood?

There

There is Communion among those who only eat together; shall there be none between him that affords himself for our Nourishment, and us who feed on him? Our Saviour tells us in the 6th of St. *John*, that he who eateth his Flesh and drinketh his Blood dwelleth in him, and that he reciprocally dwelleth in that Person. They that dwell together are said to have Fellowship and Communion with each other, and shall there be no Communion supposed between those, who dwell mutually in one another? Now it is in the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper that Christ and the Faithful Soul partake of each other, and spiritually enter upon this joint In-dwelling, as appears from the Words of the Institution, as well as from Christ's express Declarations in the aforesaid Chapter of St. *John*.

Well but then *The Author of the plain Account* will say, if Christ and the Communicant unite so closely in the Celebration of this Rite, how can it be in any Sense Commemorative? If Christ be present to us, how can we be said to remember him? I answer, that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament represent to us Christ's Body torn, and his Blood spilt; that they are therefore Memorials of his Death which is past, and of his real Body and Blood that are now in Heaven; and that notwithstanding this, they
are

are the Pledges and Vehicles of his Favour and Grace to all worthy Communicants. Is it impossible that the same thing shou'd serve to convey a Bounty, and also preserve the Memory of our Benefactor? He that holds an Estate by the last Will and Testament of his Father, can make use of the Deed both to secure Possession, and perpetuate in him a grateful Sense of his Father's Goodness. This Instance does not come fully up to the Case in Hand, but it serves to shew that there is no Inconsistency in making the same thing both a Means of communicating a Favour, and at the same Time a standing Token and Remembrancer of him to whom we owe it. I think it cannot be denied but that we may remember Christ absent in the Flesh, tho' at the same time we feel him present in Spirit, and communicate with him by Thanksgivings on our Part, and Spiritual Benefits on his. Why may we not by one and the same Act commemorate those Sufferings, by which Remission of our Sins was procured, and obtain Assistance to resist Temptations?

Our Author denies likewise that the Lord's-Supper is either a Renewal of our Baptismal Vow, or a Seal of the Christian Covenant. Before we can determine upon the Merits of this Doctrine, we must consider the Nature of our Covenant with God, and of the Parties contracting. Whosoever is baptised into

the Christian Religion, solemnly promises or vows to God, that he will conform to the Articles proposed by Christ Jesus. On the other Side, God promises, that if he does so, he will apply to him the Merits of Christ's Sufferings and Death, by Virtue of which he shall be intitled to an Inheritance in Heaven. A Violation of this Covenant in any of its Articles, on our Part, must discharge Almighty God of his Obligation to perform what was stipulated on his:

Now such is the Nature of Man, that he no sooner comes to the use of his Thoughts, his Tongue, and his Hands, but he employs them all in the daily Transgression of some Article or other of this Covenant; by which Means the Covenant must be render'd of no Effect, and the whole Work of Contracting thro' Christ come to nothing. But our Covenant is not purely a Covenant of Works, like that of *Moses*, but of Mercy also. The Divine Person we have to deal with is not only just to perform what he has promised, but is ready also, in Compassion to our Infirmities, which he knew before he contracted with us, to pardon the particular Transgressions of our Covenant, which we may happen to be betrayed into by our Nature prone to Evil. But this Pardon is only to be expected on our sincerely repenting and resolving to be more strict and careful how
we

we transgress for the Future. Yet it cannot be sufficient barely to repent and resolve; we must also confess what we have done with Sorrow; and some way or other solemnly renew the Covenant which we have by our Sins annull'd; and the religious Act of Renewal ought, since there is the same Reason for it, to be as publick and as solemn as that of our first Contract. It is treating God's Goodness, in proposing Articles of Peace, ungratefully, and trifling with his Majesty, to violate our Contract with him, and yet expect the Performance of his glorious Promises, without doing any thing more to re-instate ourselves than barely repenting.

However, let the seeming Necessity of a sacred and solemn Act of Renewal be never so great, we can have no right to it, nor warrant for it, but from the Word of God. Now if we search the whole New Testament, we shall find but two Federal Acts solemnly instituted by Christ, namely Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. The Renewal cannot be effected by a Repetition of Baptism, which is purely initiatory; it follows therefore that the Act appointed for that Purpose, if any, must be the Supper of the Lord.

Let us now see whether this last Institution of our Saviour carries with it any Federal Characters that may further shew us, that it was intended to be applied to this Purpose.

First, Then, it is to be observ'd that it was substituted in the Room of the Passover, which was a Type of it, as the Lamb sacrificed therein, was of our Saviour. Now it appears from *Exodus* xii. 19. that the Passover was not only entirely a Federal Act at the first Performance of it in *Egypt*, but so in some Measure afterwards, since that Soul was to be cut off from the Congregation of *Israel*, *i. e.* to be put out of the *Mosaick* Covenant, who shou'd celebrate it with Leavened Bread.

But what puts it out of Dispute that it is a Federal Act is, our Saviour's calling the Cup *the new Covenant* in his Blood, which Expression will not bear the Gloss our Author gives it, when he calls it only the *Memorial of the new Covenant*. Our Saviour expressly calls it the new Covenant, and afterwards desires it to be drank in Remembrance of him. If we take these Words of our Saviour in the Sense our Author wou'd impose on them, we shall make them signify only the same with the Words that follow. To avoid this we must understand them in some other Sense; and what Sense can we so rationally interpret them in, as that which they plainly and naturally intimate? It is true, neither the Cup nor the Wine contain'd in it, can, strictly and properly speaking, be a Covenant. Nor can the

the Blood of Christ, if our Author will insist on that. But the Blood of Christ can be the Means of procuring this Covenant between God and his People, it can ratify and seal that Covenant; and the Cup, that represents it to us, can be the Sign of this Ratification on God's Part, can be a Means whereby we receive the same, and a Pledge to assure us thereof.

It will appear still plainer that the Lord's Supper is a Means of applying God's covenanted Mercies to us, and of renewing our Engagements to him; if we first consider, that it is a Representation of Christ's Death, and then reflect on those Passages of Scripture, in which his Death is said to be the Means of the new Covenant, in which we are said to be justified, and to have Peace and Redemption thro' his Blood. In whatsoever solemn Act the Merits of Christ's Death are applied to us, in that very Act we must be suppos'd to covenant with God in some Sense; because there is no uncovenanted Application of God's Mercies, or Christ's Merits. Now the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a solemn Act instituted by Christ, commanded to be kept up till his coming again, and often repeated; so that it exactly answers the Character required, in order to make it a solemn and authorized Form, to renew our baptismal Vow by.

In the 6th of the Epistle to the *Romans*, we are said to be *baptized into* Christ's *Death*. Here that Institution, by which we first covenant with God, is directly applyed to the Death of our Saviour, to represent and apply which the Lord's-Supper was appointed; by which it appears that Baptism and the Lord's-Supper are so far of the same Nature and intended for the same Purpose, inasmuch as the Merits of that Death which we covenant to receive in Baptism, are again stipulated to us by the express Mention of a Covenant in the Supper of the Lord.

This may suffice, instead of a great deal more that might be said, to prove the Opinions of this Author, contain'd in my 4th Proposition, to be groundless, erroneous, and pernicious, and consequently to shew, that such a Performance as this *plain Account* can never, without the greatest Violence done to Charity and Truth, be ascribed to such a Person as the Bishop of *Winchester*.

If the Reader will be at the Pains to peruse the Preface and Page 90, 91, 92, 106, 178, 179, and 180. he will perceive that the Substance of the following Proposition is contain'd therein.

Fifthly, The Duty of partaking in the Lord's-Supper is not so connected with other Christian Duties, but that it may be well performed without them, or they without it.

it. If this were universally admitted, it would make our People more truly and practically Christians than they are, and greatly encrease the Number of Communicants.

I agree with our Author, that all Duties ought to be distinguish'd from each other, that the Reward of performing all may not be expected from the Performance of one only. But nevertheless there may be a Duty; of which we cannot rightly acquit ourselves, without either performing the rest, or at least, setting our Minds in such a Frame as to have some tolerable Assurance of performing them for the Future. Such I take the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper to be, for Reasons already assign'd.

Tho' all the moral Duties which are required of us by the Christian Religion be distinguish'd from, yet they are so connect-ed with one another, that there is no Transgressing one, without being guilty of violating all the rest. It is therefore to no purpose to observe those which we have perhaps no Temptation to omit, if we indulge ourselves in the Contempt and Transgression of others. There are two Reasons for this. One is, because the Committal of one Crime naturally leads to that of another, not only by corrupting and disposing the Mind to Evil; but by Means of a natural Connection
among

among Vices. The other is, because no one Commandment of God can be broke, without being done in a Denial or Defiance of that Authority by which the whole System of Duties is imposed.

Whosoever therefore shall teach, that the Performance of one single Duty is acceptable to God and capable of conciliating his Favour, as our Author does, without a strict Observation of all other Duties, must be guilty of a great Sin against the Souls of his Fellow-Christians; and if, like our Author, he does this with a Design to hinder Mankind from placing their Hopes of the divine Favour in the Performance of one single Duty, when others are neglected, he sins most intolerably against Reason and common Sense. Our Author tells us, that we may do this Duty worthily, and so as that it shall be acceptable to God in itself, tho' in the rest of our Lives we be very blameable. God does not speak so of the Ordinances of the Jewish Law, between which and the moral Duties there was not so necessary a Connection intended, as under Christianity. In the 1st. of *Isaiab*, he says thus to the Jews, *Your new Moons and your appointed Feasts my Soul hateth, they are a Trouble unto me, I am weary to bear them*; and the Reason why they were so, was, because their Hands, as he tells them
in

in the next Verse, were full of Blood. So let a Christian never so seriously remember the Death of Christ, while he receives the Sacrament, yet it shall be an Abomination to the Lord, if he do not put away the Evil of his Doings from before those all-seeing Eyes, that are too pure to behold Iniquity. But supposing it were otherwise, and that Duties, like Men, shall be judged of, and accepted singly by Almighty God, can a Duty confin'd within the narrow Limits of eating and drinking in Remembrance of Christ's Death, have any Vertue in it, or merit any Reward?

No, tho' this, and all other positive Duties are made so merely by divine Appointment, without any thing in their own Nature to oblige, yet must God be supposed to have had a previous Inducement to the Institution of them, as our Author himself confesses, or else it had been inconsistent with his Wisdom and Goodness to have imposed them. Now this Inducement or End proposed by them all (I mean under the Christian Dispensation) cou'd have been no other than the Advancement of the true Religion and the Promotion of Virtue. This is the common End of both the Sacraments, and that in which all other positive Institutions, howsoever distinguished by their particular Ends, must concenter. No Notion

H

therefore

therefore of the Lord's-Supper can be a right one, that represents it to us as not tending, thro' its own peculiar End, to this general one. Let the Reader judge now, whether our Author's Notion is conform'd to this Rule, whether a Rite purely Commemorative, for which there is no Preparation previously required, by which there is no divine Grace communicated, and between which and our other Christian Duties there is no Connection, can possibly tend to the Advancement of Religion and the Promotion of Virtue. To what Purpose are positive Duties, unless they support and enforce the Moral? And how can they do this, unless they be necessarily connected with them?

If these Doctrines of our Author were once universally received, I know not but for some Time they might induce People to go oftener to the Sacrament, than they do, inasmuch as they wou'd remove all Fears of going unworthily from all kinds of People, tho' never so wicked, and make it the most easily perform'd Duty in the whole Christian Catalogue. But I'm fully perswaded, that they wou'd at Length bring it into such Contempt, as an empty and useles Ceremony, that it wou'd not be thought worthy the going to. It is true, there wou'd be no Barr against going directly from a Stews to the Table of the Lord; yet as there wou'd appear

pear to be no good in going, People would not trouble themselves with it, if they had any thing else to do.

But tho' these Doctrines shou'd continue to crowd Christ's Table to the very End of the World, yet still, as they must diminish the Devotion, faster than they cou'd possibly encrease the Number of the Communicants, they could never answer any religious End, nor tend either to the Improvement of Mens Lives, the Salvation of Souls, or the Glory of God. Christ, we may presume reckons his Guests, not by the Head, but the Heart, and counts no Hearts his but such as are clean from Sin, or averse to it, and warm'd with the Love of God, and the Beauty of Christian Holiness. But if these Doctrines shou'd obtain, they wou'd not only bring in Guests from the Streets and common Roads, but from the common Shores and Dunghills too. Wou'd not the Death of Christ be gloriously commemorated by an Herd of Thieves, Whores, and Bullies; of Panders, Sharpers, and Perjurers; by a Rable of Drunkards, Adulterers, and Murtherers?

If my Reader be not one of those Libertines, who are always ready to suppose the worst of a Parson, he will never ascribe such a System of Doctrines to a Bishop; and if he have the least Mite of common Sense, he will never suppose that the Bishop of *Win-*

chester, whose Conscience was so tender that he cou'd not bear to have this Sacrament prostituted to the temporal End of the *Test-Act*, cou'd think of laying open such a divine Mystery to the Familiarity and Intrusion of the worst of Men.

There are still behind many other Absurdities, false Expositions of Scripture, of our Communion Service, and our Catechism; and a World of Art used to intersperse such Expressions as may help to make the Performance less shocking to the Orthodox, but unwary Reader. I have not Leisure however to animadvert on them all. What I have noted and censured may serve in some Measure to prevent the mischievous Effects of this Work of Darkeness, this Mystery of Iniquity, that recommends Falshood under the Shew of Truth, and sanctifies Sin. It may shew, what I chiefly intended, that it cannot be the Work of an Apostle.

Let us now take the same Liberty with our Author, whosoever he is, that he has taken with Christ, and suppose him summing up, and paraphrasing his whole Performance to his Readers, thus,

My dear Fellow-Christians, I have long observed, with Concern, the Apprehensions you labour under, and the vast Trouble you are at, in preparing yourselves for a certain Rite called the Lord's Supper. All this is
owing

owing to Prejudice, and groundless Notions infused into your Minds by superstitious Teachers, who have taught you to imagine, that there is some spiritual Benefit annexed to it when worthily received, who have taught you to apprehend some Danger in receiving it carelessly, and in the midst of your Sins; who, in short, have taught you to be a great deal too good on this Occasion. Now to rid you of all these Hopes and Fears, and to discharge you from all fancied Duty or Tie to these Works of Supererogation, I will give you a plain Account of the Nature and End of this Rite. Not to amuse and detain you with many Words, you have nothing else to do, but just to eat some Bread, and drink a little Wine, and exactly as it is going down, remember the Death of Christ. This is all, take my Word for it. As for whining for your Sins a long Time before, or praying, or resolving to lead a new Life, or putting yourselves under a severe Examination, you may be at the Trouble of so doing, if you please, and have nothing else to do; but I tell you, Christ has laid no such Burthen on you; I tell you, he will accept very well of your eating and drinking in remembrance of him without all this Coil. You have, for this long Time, been obliged to go to Church in order to perform this Rite, and placed with a great deal of Formality

mality upon your Knees about a Table; but there is nothing of all this in Scripture; nay, and common Sense is against it. What can People mean by eating, and praying, and drinking, and kneeling all at once? You have a Notion, that you cannot receive it, unless your Minister consecrate it for you. Why will you be so Priest-ridden? It is the Receiver himself that consecrates it; so that you may take it without the Help of a Parson, any where, any Time, any Way. So you do it in remembrance of Christ, you may be sure you have done it according to the End and Manner of its Institution, there is no going Wrong. Your Parsons are a Kind of Fellows of narrow Education, and narrow Notions, or else they would never restrain this Rite to the Penitent, the Faithful, and the Meek, as they do. I grant you, such devout Persons ought not to be excluded from this Rite, nor ought those either who are not so disposed. To confine it to your pious Folks only is to leave our Lord a thin Table. There is no Warrant in Scripture for such a Restraint; and for Man to presume to set Bounds, where Christ has set none, is Impiety, and Arrogance, and Uncharitableness, and Narrow-heartedness. I tell you, Christ keeps open House, and his Table is free to all. Nor is he so nice about the Dress you are to appear in when you visit him, as your ceremonious
Parsons

Parsons would persuade you. He will not take Offence at such Trifles as your Sins, when you come in a civil and neighbourly Manner to sup with him: fear not, he is not so captious. What your Parsons prate to you on the Subject of Preparation for this Rite, is a mere Bugbear, nothing but a Scarecrow. As vain also are those Expectations of Grace, and spiritual Infusions, which they have so often inculcated to you. But Christ is not obliged to make good their large Promises. Believe me, you have nothing to fear, and as little to hope for, from this Rite. Your Teachers have huddled all the Christian Duties together, and confounded them one with another; so that by their Way of managing the Matter, you are given to understand, that no one Duty can be well performed without all the rest; as much as to say, you cannot say your Prayers, without giving Money to the Poor; nor keep the Sabbath, without visiting the Sick; nor perform this Rite of the Lord's Supper, as it is called, without doing I know not how many other Duties, that have nothing to say to it, at the same Time. This is all a Jest. One Thing at once, and it will be the better done. You know what too much Cooking does. Upon the whole therefore, come all of you to the Performance of this Rite, howsoever distinguished by your Vices. There

is no Respect of Persons here. You are all welcome. But as you are exempted from all Trouble both before and after, the least you can do is to come seriously. Compose therefore your Gestures, and the Muscles of your Faces. Put on a serious Look, and a serious Air. And as for the future, you are to celebrate this Rite in a Tavern, or any where else, on any Occasion, I think it the more necessary to caution you against a jocosé or ludicrous Behaviour at the Time of Receiving. I tell you therefore, that unless you be very serious, unless you eat seriously, and drink seriously, you had as good not do it at all. It is a religious Rite, and you must be serious at it. Some of you perhaps may imagine, that I am not strictly Orthodox in relation to this Rite; but if he will shew me one Sentence in my whole Book, that I cannot reconcile with the Bible, nay, and with the Communion Service of the Church of *England*, and its Catechism, I will give him Leave to call me *Schismatick*, or *Heretick*, or what he will. Indeed, I had been worse than a Lunatick, if I had not always provided a Saving against all Imputations of that Kind. I love you very well, my dear Readers, as you may plainly perceive; but not so well as to run the Hazard of losing an handsome Livelihood for your Sakes. Besides, Truth, at its first
Appear-

Appearance, must not glare upon weak Eyes. It ought first to be insinuated with a nice and delicate Address, and as soon as the World is grown a little familiar with it, it may then go naked. If any of you should take it into his Head to think, that I am not over zealous for Christian Piety and Devotion, let him cast his Eye towards the End of my Book, where he will find a Specimen of my Devotion. He will there see Prayers in their full pathetick Perfection, and in a genteel and polite Stile, contrary to the vulgar Custom. He will there see a Spirit of Piety strong enough to keep up an Ejaculation for the Length of thirty Pages, which will fully convince him, that notwithstanding all the Appearances in my Book upon the Lord's Supper, I am no Enemy to Devotion. I will take my Leave of you, my gentle Readers, with one Piece of Advice, which was never so much needed as in these too too religious Times, *Be not righteous above measure.*

Having thus epitomized our Author's Performance, I shall now acquaint the Reader with the Substance of a Conversation that turned on the Subject of this Book, at which I happened to be present some Time ago. The Company was made up mostly of Men of Letters, who had all seen and read *The plain Account*. After many Remarks, some critical, and some theological, they came at
 I length

length to guess at the Author; but they could not agree among themselves upon any particular Church to which they could give him. They observed, that he insinuates, at the Beginning of his Preface, that he is a Clergyman of the Church of *England*, by saying, that he had once the Care of a Parish; but this was generally regarded, as said with a Design to conceal himself, and recommend his Principles. To the like Artifice they ascribed his Attempt to reconcile his Doctrines to our Communion Service, and all the guarded Expressions he makes use of to elude the Imputation of Impiety and Error, with which, after all, he is manifestly chargeable.

There was one who took him to be a *Quaker*; his Reason for being of that Opinion was, because he endeavours to debase the Nature of the Sacrament, and give the World a low Notion of it, as a dead Rite, consisting entirely in a mere outward Act. I'll warrant you, said he, if the Author could once bring the World to think with this Book of his, we should immediately have another to shew the Emptiness and Vanity of such an idle Ceremony, and the Folly of performing it externally any longer. But I believe he might save himself the Trouble; because if it were come to that, no sober Christian could think it a Duty to observe it.

There

There was another who would needs have it to be the Work of a *Corkian* Jacobite, as he expressed it; because, according to him, the Arguments of the late Bishop of *Cork* against drinking of Memories had been undeniable, had there not been a Concommunicant Grace supposed in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; which alone can difference it from drinking in Memory of any other Person. Now said he, could this Author bring the Sacrament to a Level with the Glorious Memory, the latter would then appear a Prophanation, and so must be laid aside. But, I hope, Things will never come to that Pass. I hope, no Artifices of his, or any Body's else, will ever be able to make us forget our great Benefactor King *William*.

This Gentleman seem'd to speak from a Spirit of Party, so his Conjecture was received with little Regard.

A third Person insisted, that the Author must be a *Jesuite*. You see, said he, with what Art and Chicanry he manages his Arguments, how he wrests the Scriptures, how he winds and doubles, and throws out ambiguous Expressions; but above all, what Pains he takes to represent the Protestant Notions of the Sacrament, and especially those of the Church of *England*, as inclinable to the Error of vilifying this Holy Institution.

stitution. If this Book could once prevail among us, what might not Papists then say? Besides, you see he makes the Sacrament consist in a mere *opus operatum*, but does it as covertly as he can, that after we have refined away all our true and orthodox Notions of this Institution, Popery may be found at the Bottom.

There was a fourth, who delivered it as his Opinion, that the Author, be he of whatsoever Church, must have published the Book with a Design to encrease the Number of occasional Conformists, by shewing *Dissenters* of all Kinds, that they are in the wrong to make a Difficulty of conforming to a Rite so indifferent in its own Nature, when a Place of Profit may be thereby obtained. If this Sacrament, said he, be supposed to be purely commemorative, to need the Consecration of no Kind of Clergy, to require no Preparation in order to it, and to have no spiritual Benefits conveyed by it, I cannot see how even a Heathen could think of refusing it, provided there were any Thing to be got by receiving it. The Elements would, in that case, be as common as Beef or Water.

I subscribe to your Opinion, said one who sat next him; but I must add, that I look upon the Author to be a *Socinian*. His Notions of the Sacrament are the very same
with

with those of that Heresy. As they sink the Person of Christ to mere Humanity, they likewise bring his Ordinances proportionably low; accordingly, throughout *The whole plain Account*, there is no Mention of Christ's Merit as a Means of our Salvation, tho' his Subject required it, not a Syllable said of his Divinity. The Author places no Relation between Christ and his Church, but that of Master and Servant, or Disciple.

This Hint was no sooner given, than the whole Company unanimously gave into his Opinion. When they recollected the Tendency of the Work, they were still further confirmed in it. Since this, they have ascribed it to one or other of the new-light Hereticks; but none of them could ever think of attributing it to the Bishop of *Winchester*.

If however, it be still imagined, that this Sink of Heresy and Immorality could possibly have flowed from a Church of *England* Pen, I cannot but condole with that Church upon producing a Treatise against the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as well as with her Protestant Sister, the Church of *Scotland*, upon producing another in favour of Fornication. We live in strange Times indeed, when there is only just so much Religion and Virtue among us, as can afford Bread or a Name, by being wrote against.

I hope,

I hope, since it is at present inconvenient for our Clergy to meet in Convocation, that they will endeavour each of them to find out the execrable Author; and if be a Clergyman, drive him from their Body with a just Zeal for Religion; or, if that can't be done, refuse all Communion with him. Whom can it be more necessary to excommunicate, than him who has laboured to pervert and vilify the most sacred Ordinance of our Religion, the very Seal of our Saviour's last Will and Testament, and the very Act of Communion itself?

But if the Author cannot be discovered, I hope Christ and the Christian Church may expect so much from the Pious Zeal of our Bishops, that they will not suffer the Book to go uncensured, but will at their Visitations publicly condemn its Doctrines, and give a strict Charge to their Clergy to drive this Wolf in Sheep's Cloathing from among their respective Flocks. While the false Friends of Religion shew so much Art and Industry to destroy it, shall its true Friends shew no Zeal in its Defence, but stand by with a cool prudential Indifference, and calmly see its Ruin? Shall our Religion have many cunning and vigilant Opposers, and none but luke-warm and inactive Asserters? Shall it be thought Enthusiasm or a Breach of Christian Charity, to stand up in Defence
of

of Christianity? Open Enemies the Church of Christ may boldly defy. Against such it can oppose Reason enough to overthrow all their Forces. But covert Enemies and pretended Friends are to be sought out, and treated in another Manner. They shou'd be dragg'd from their dark Corners and exposed to the Light, that they may be proved by the Light; and when it is found by Examination that they have been dealing in Works of Darkness, they shou'd be put to open Shame, and kept at a proper Distance, to prevent Infection; at least, till by a thorough Quarantine, they have purg'd themselves of those pestilent Principles, that make it unsafe for other Christians to come near them.

F. I. N. I. S.



Just Published,
By the same Author,
Some Proposals for the Revival of
Christianity.
(Price Six Pence.)

