

**THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST:
CONSIDERED AS IT IS THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY
SCRIPTURE, EMBRACED BY THE UNIVERSAL
CHURCH OF THE FIRST AND PUREST TIMES, BY
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND BY THE
EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649548323

The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist: Considered as It Is the Doctrine of Holy Scripture,
Embraced by the Universal Church of the First and Purest Times, by the Church of England,
and by the Episcopal Church in Scotland by Alexander Jolly

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

ALEXANDER JOLLY

**THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST:
CONSIDERED AS IT IS THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY
SCRIPTURE, EMBRACED BY THE UNIVERSAL
CHURCH OF THE FIRST AND PUREST TIMES, BY
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND BY THE
EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND**

WITH the most profound veneration, and with the warmest feelings of my heart, I venture to inscribe this little Work, with the wish that it were more worthy of such dedication, to the Memory of a Man, whom, in my mind, I have uniformly classed with those righteous men, who, as divinely declared, shall be had in everlasting remembrance; and whose condescending friendship, of the most edifying description, was to me a source of the purest religious enjoyment. His character for every Christian virtue was universally acknowledged, and the recollection of it will ever be an excitement to man's whole duty. In public, his hand was in every good work, dispersing abroad, and giving to the poor. But his private munificence, in charities, which, to secure the purity of his love to his Saviour, he kept closely concealed from the eye of the world, kept pace with his public distributions.

I was for years, and year after year, one of his private almoners, to a great amount, under repeated charges of the strictest secrecy: From which, however, I now feel myself absolved by his lamented death; and which I mention to illustrate his Christian character, and as an encouragement to others to do good, for the glory of God.

In the pious recollection of that amiable worth which I witnessed, I now, in the last stage of my mortal life, with humble hope in Christ of a happy re-union, trembling as such hope ought to be on my side, but with firm trust in that merciful Redeemer, who is our only Hope, presume, in all humility, to associate my mean and obscure name, with the name of one of the best of Christians, and most benevolent men, whom I have ever known.

With these warm emotions of my heart, which embraces most affectionately his whole numerous Posterity, among whom the amiable example of his virtues HAS BEEN and is perpetuated in the paths that lead to bliss, THIS VOLUME IS SOLEMNLY INSCRIBED TO THE MEMORY OF SIR WILLIAM FORBES, BARRONET, OF PITKESLOE, who, with the lamentation of all who know him, died in the year 1896,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

P R E F A C E.

In the school of Christ, meekness and humility are primary lessons. But in the disputations, which diversity of opinion with regard to the Articles of His religion—in itself the parent of love and peace and unity—has occasioned, those first lessons are apt to be forgotten, although both meekness and fear are expressly commanded to attend them, (1 St. Pet. iii. 15). The detection of error, on the one side, frequently transports men, in their too passionate, however just and necessary opposition to it, into an error on the other extreme.

This has been particularly exemplified in the deplorably-dangerous controversies upon the most sublime Institution of our divine religion, ordained by Christ to commemorate His death, the source of our life, and to consign the benefits of it to all His faithful followers, consolidated thereby into the closest unity, until he shall come again from heaven to judge the quick and the dead.

The Church of Rome, in the progress of dark ages, first dreamed and then maintained the *commemoration* to be the substantial *repetition* of the original sacrifice, which once only could be offered, and that only by the One Priest Himself, God and Man in one Person. This astonishing doctrine, which, to the horror of the enlightened mind, pretends to sa-

crifice in the Mass the very substantial flesh and blood of Christ, a sacrifice in itself, and by its own inherent merit and virtue, propitiatory, which had usurped the place of the truly scriptural and primitive memorial of bread and wine, representative of the body and blood of Christ, has excited, in many very worthy persons, a strong prejudice against the genuine and truly Catholic doctrine and practice of the commemorative sacrifice, which the other had supplanted. But this, while it prevailed, and where it prevails, as it speaks plainly in all the ancient Liturgies, and in the writings of all the early Fathers, plants the strongest bulwark against the error (a very appalling error!) which was stamped upon the words of the Roman Liturgy, but which the first reformed Liturgy of the Church of England, returning to the primitive standard, perfectly overthrew.

To show this, as well as to state and illustrate the nature and gracious purpose of the divinely-instituted memorial, is the design of the following humble attempt. In the sincerity of my heart, devoting it to the glory of my Divine Redeemer, "who gave Himself an *Offering* and a *Sacrifice*" for me and for all mankind, and, in hope of His acceptance and blessing, I drew it up, after the best search that I could make. But justly distrusting my own judgment, I requested for it the perusal and opinion of a learned and judicious friend, who most obligingly sent me in return a brief historical detail of the most remarkable modern opinions upon the head. This, confidently presuming upon his permission, I will here subjoin, that it may serve by way of prefatory introduction:

"In the early part of the last century, strong prejudices were excited against this doctrine by the intemperance of

controversy, and by the suspicion that the supporters of it were really symbolizing with the Church of Rome. Of Hoadley, and his *Plain Account*, I need say nothing; for I believe he has few followers in England, and his authority is of little weight. The prevailing notion in the Church of England at present, I believe to be that of *Dr. Oudworth* in his *Discourse concerning the true notion of the Lord's Supper*; which is, 'that the Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice, but a feast upon a sacrifice.' This opinion is ably maintained also by *Dr. Waterland* in his *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity*; by *Bishop Warburton* in a *Discourse concerning the nature and end of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, preached before the University of Oxford.

"*Johnson*, in his *Unbloody Sacrifice*, maintains, that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice as well as a sacrificial feast, a sacrifice, indeed, of no value in itself, but acceptable to God, as representing, not repeating, Christ's one Sacrifice for the sins of the world. While he ably and learnedly maintains this position, he proves incontestably, that it is utterly repugnant to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and to the Popish sacrifice of the Mass. The same opinion is with great clearness and brevity maintained by *Gloucester Ridley* in *The Christian Passover—four sermons—in which the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is laid down according to the whole tenor of Scripture and the general consent of antiquity*, preached in Lent 1736. See also his *Life of Bishop Ridley*, Book iii. sect. 5.

"*Dr. Hicke*s is supposed even by *Dr. Waterland* to have been the first, after *Mr. Mede*, who maintained the doctrine

of the Sacrifice; and Dr. Hickee was a marked and obnoxious man, against whom, as well as his associates, prejudice was in that age almost overwhelming. Yet at the very same time, *Dr. Potter*, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, maintained the very same doctrine without reproach. But *Hickee* was not the first after *Mede*; while we have from the Reformation downward, the most illustrious names both before and after *Mede*, who maintained the same as the true and genuine doctrine of the Church of England, agreeably to all antiquity; such as *Poinet, Jewell, Bilson, Andrews, Hooker, Morton, Cosins, Laud, Wake, Patrick, Bull, and Potter*, with *Mede, Hammond, Comber, Nichols, Bingham, Grabe, Hickee, Brett, Wheatly, Johnson, Scandaret, Bowyer*; to whom may be added, Archbishop *Bramhall*, Bishop *Fell*, Bishop *Beveridge*, Mr. *Thorndike*, and many others, who all maintained this opinion not only without offence or censure, but with approbation, with the simple exception of those, who, like Dr. Hickee, were personally obnoxious men. Bishop *Andrews* pointedly says, 'Some indeed to avoid *Est*, in the Church of Rome's sense, fall to be all for *significat*, and nothing for *Est* at all; and whatever goes farther than *significat*, they take to savour of the carnal presence. But this is the doctrine of Zuinglius, and not of our Church.'

"It has been asked, and the question is certainly important, how can there be a feast upon a sacrifice, if there is no sacrifice even in symbol? They who contend that it is a feast upon a sacrifice, and a federal act, without recognising the symbolical sacrifice on which the feast is made, certainly take an imperfect and inaccurate view of the subject, which is inconsistent even with the language which they use, to which I

am persuaded that they are induced by a dread of the pernicious errors of the Church of Rome. He, who in the most solemn service of the altar, (where prevarication would be hideous impiety) acknowledges, that 'Almighty God, our heavenly Father, did give His only son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who (by His own oblation of Himself once offered) made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,' cannot easily be suspected of believing the pernicious impiety of a sacrifice propitiatory in the sense of the Romish Mass, however strenuously he may maintain, as the Church of England maintains—' But, before all things, this we must be sure of especially, that this Supper be in such wise done and ministered, as our Lord did, and commanded to be done, as His holy Apostles used it, and the good Fathers in the primitive Church frequented it.—But this much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord, there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent, &c.'—*Homily of the worthy receiving and reverend esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.*"