

visible sacrifice, and they constantly cast in the teeth of Christians, "that they must be atheists because they had no sacrifices."

How did the Christians answer this objection?—The Church of Rome would have known how to answer it had she been then what she is now, for that is the very question with which she seeks to silence *us*; "You have no Priest, no altar, no sacrifice, and therefore no Church." All she would have had to do would have been to explain, that in the Mass there was a true propitiatory sacrifice of the God-man, Christ Jesus, continually made upon the altars of the Churches. If Rome had been then what she is now, it is evident that such an objection never could have been thought of; Priests, altars and sacrifices, being the most prominent part of her religious system.

But how did the early Christians answer the objection?—They answered it just exactly as we, my brethren, answer the Romanists now, by asserting that they had sacrifices, true sacrifices, and far better and more acceptable to God than any mere material sacrifices, namely, *spiritual* sacrifices—the sacrifices of prayer and praise, and alms-giving, and pure hearts and holy lives. This was their answer to the Pagans—but of the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass we find not a word among them.\*

The Ancients did all of them speak of the Holy Eucharist as an offering and a sacrifice—but then it was always in such a way as to show plainly that they knew nothing of the Romanish sacrifice of the Mass. They spoke of it as a sacrifice of praise—as a sacrifice of alms and thanksgivings—as a *commemorative sacrifice*, a memorial of the one sacrifice of Christ on the Cross—but never as a repetition or renewal of the one great sacrifice; and they never spoke of it as *propitiatory*.

\* See this proved at length in *Waterland*, on the Euch., cap. xii, and his *Distinctions of Sacrifice*, sect. 5.