

PRINCIPLES FOR
CHURCHMEN

A MANUAL OF POSITIVE STATEMENTS
ON SOME SUBJECTS OF CONTROVERSY

WITH AN

*EXPLANATORY INTRODUCTION ON THE PRESSING DANGERS
WHICH BESET THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

BY THE RIGHT REV.

BISHOP RYLE, D.D.

AUTHOR OF

"EXPOSITORY THOUGHTS ON THE GOSPELS" "OLD PATHS"
'LIGHT FROM OLD TIMES' ETC.

Fourth Edition, Revised

CONTAINING THE BISHOP'S FAREWELL LETTER TO THE DIOCESE OF LIVERPOOL

LONDON

CHAS. J. THYNNE

WYCLIFFE HOUSE, 6, GREAT QUEEN STREET,
LINCOLN'S INN, W.C.

MAY 1900

XI.

THOUGHTS ON THE SUPPER OF THE LORD.

“THE Supper of the Lord!” This is the simple name which the Church Catechism gives to the solemn ordinance which the Lord Jesus Christ appointed on the evening before He was crucified. The child is asked the question, “How many sacraments has Christ ordained in His Church?” And the answer the child is taught to give is this,—“Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.”

I propose in this little paper to say something about the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.

I know no part of the Christian religion which is so thoroughly misunderstood as the Lord’s Supper. On no point have there been so many disputes, strifes, and controversies for more than 1800 years. On no point have mistakes done so much harm as mistakes about this Sacrament. Even at this very day the battle is still raging, and Christians seem hopelessly divided. The very ordinance which was meant for our peace and profit has become the cause of discord and the occasion of sin. These things ought not so to be!

In examining the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, I shall content myself with asking four questions, and offering answers to them.

I. WHY WAS THE LORD’S SUPPER ORDAINED?

I answer that question in the words of the Church Catechism. I am sure I cannot mend them. It was ordained “for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.” The bread which is broken, given, and eaten in the Lord’s Supper is meant to remind us of Christ’s body given on the cross for our sins. The wine which is poured out and received is meant to remind us of Christ’s blood shed on the cross for our sins. He that eats that bread and drinks that wine is reminded, in the most striking and forcible manner, of the benefits Christ has obtained for his soul, and of the death of Christ as the hinge and turning-point on which all those benefits depend.

Now, is the view here stated the doctrine of the New Testament? If it is not, for ever let it be rejected, cast aside, and refused by men. If it is, let us never be ashamed to hold it fast, to profess our belief in it, to pin our faith on it, and steadfastly refuse to hold any other view, no matter by whom it is taught. In subjects like this we must call no man master. It signifies little what great Bishops and learned divines have thought fit to put forth about the Lord’s Supper. If they teach more or less than the Word of God con-

tains, they are not to be believed.

I take down my Bible and turn to the New Testament. There I find no less than four separate accounts of the first appointment of the Lord's Supper. St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, all four describe it: all four agree in telling us what our Lord did on this memorable occasion. Two only tell us the reason which our Lord assigned why His disciples were to eat the bread and drink the cup: St. Paul and St. Luke both record the remarkable words, "Do this in remembrance of Me." St. Paul adds his own inspired comment: "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show (or declare or proclaim) the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). When Scripture speaks so plainly, why cannot men be content with it? Why should we mystify and confuse a subject which in the New Testament is so simple? The "continual remembrance of Christ's death" was the one grand object for which the Lord's Supper was ordained. He that goes further than this is adding to God's Word, and does so to the great peril of his soul.

Now, is it reasonable to suppose that our Lord would appoint an ordinance for so simple a purpose as the keeping His death in remembrance? Most certainly it is. Of all the facts in His earthly ministry none are equal in importance to that of His death. It was the great satisfaction for man's sin, which had been appointed in God's everlasting covenant from the foundation of the world. It was the great atonement of almighty power, to which every sacrifice of animals, from the fall of man, continually pointed. It was the grand end and purpose for which Messiah came into the world. It was the corner-stone and foundation of all man's hopes of pardon and peace with God. In short, Christ would have lived, and taught, and preached, and prophesied, and wrought miracles in vain, if He had not crowned all by dying for our sins! His death was our life. His death was the payment of our debt to God. Without His death we should have been of all creatures most miserable. No wonder that an ordinance was specially appointed to remind us of our Saviour's death. It is that very one thing of which poor, weak, sinful man needs to be continually reminded.

Does the New Testament warrant men in saying that the Lord's Supper was ordained to be a *sacrifice*, and that in it Christ's body and blood are materially present under the forms of bread and wine? Most certainly not. When the Lord Jesus said to the disciples, "This is my Body, and this is my Blood," He evidently meant, "This bread in my hand is an emblem of my Body, and this cup of wine in my hand contains an emblem of my Blood." The disciples were accustomed to hear Him use such language. They remembered Him saying, "The field *is* the world," "The good seed *are* the children of the kingdom" (Matt. xiii. 38). It never entered into their

minds that He meant to say He was holding His own body and His own blood in His hands, and literally giving them His own literal body and blood to eat and drink. Not one of the writers of the New Testament ever speaks of the sacrament as a “sacrifice,” or calls the Lord’s table an “altar,” or even hints that a Christian minister is a sacrificing priest. The universal doctrine of the New Testament is, that after the one offering of Christ there remains no more need of sacrifice.¹ (Heb. x. 12-18).

Does the English Prayer-book warrant any Churchman in saying that the Lord’s Supper was meant to be a sacrifice, and that Christ’s body and blood are present under the forms of bread and wine? Once more I reply, Most certainly not. Not once is the word *altar* to be found in the Prayer-book: not once is the Lord’s Supper called a *sacrifice*. Throughout the Communion Service the one idea of the ordinance continually pressed on our attention is that of a “remembrance “of Christ’s death. As to any *presence* of Christ’s natural body and blood under the forms of bread and wine, the rubric at the end of the Service gives the most flat and distinct contradiction to the idea. That rubric expressly asserts that “the natural body and blood of Christ are in heaven, and not here.” Those many Churchmen, who delight in talking of the “altar,” the “sacrifice,” the “priest,” and the “real presence” in the Lord’s Supper, would do well to remember that they are using language which is entirely unused by the Church of England. The only presence which our Church recognises is a spiritual one.

The point before us is one of vast importance. I charge every reader of this paper to lay hold upon it firmly, and never let it go. It is the very point on which our Reformers had their sharpest controversy with the Romanists, and went to the stake rather than give way. Sooner than admit that the Lord’s Supper was a *sacrifice*, they cheerfully laid down their lives. The Thirty-first Article of our Church expressly declares that “the sacrifices of the Masses were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” To bring back the doctrine of the *real presence*, and to turn the good old English communion into the Romish Mass, is to pour contempt on our Martyrs, and upset the first principles of the Protestant Reformation. Nay, rather, it is to ignore the plain teaching of God’s Word, and do dishonour to the priestly office of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Bible teaches expressly that the Lord’s Supper was ordained to be a “remembrance” of Christ’s body and blood, and not an offering. The Bible teaches that Christ’s vicarious

¹ If any one fancies that St. Paul’s words to the Hebrews, “We have an altar,” are a proof that the Lord’s Table is an altar, I advise him to read what Waterland, no mean theologian, says on the subject:—“Christians have an altar whereof they partake. That Altar is Christ our Lord, who is Altar, Priest, and Sacrifice, all in *One*.”—*Waterland’s Works*, vol. v. 268. Oxford edition.

death on the cross was the one perfect sacrifice for sin, which never needs to be repeated. Stand fast in these two great principles of the Christian faith. A clear view of the intention of the Lord's Supper is one of the soul's best safeguards against the delusions of these latter days.

II. WHAT IS THE RIGHTFUL POSITION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION?

Like the ark of God in the Old Testament, this blessed Sacrament has a proper position and rank among Christian ordinances, and, like the ark of God, it may easily be put in the wrong one. The history of that ark will readily recur to our minds. Put in the place of God, and treated like an idol, it did the Israelites no good at all. In the days of Eli, it could not save them out of the hand of the Philistine. Their armies were defeated, and the ark itself was taken.—Defiled and dishonoured by being placed in an idol's temple, it was the cause of God's wrath falling on a whole nation, till the Philistines said with one voice, "Send it away."—Treated with carelessness and levity, it brought down God's judgment on the men of Bethshemesh and on Uzza.—Treated with reverence and respect, it brought a blessing on Obed-edom and all his house. It is even so with the Lord's Supper. Placed in its right position, it is an ordinance full of blessing. The great question to be settled is, What is that position?

(1) The Lord's Supper is not in its right place *when it is made the first, foremost, principal, and most important thing* in Christian worship. That it is so in many quarters, we all must know. The well-known "masses" of the Romish Church, the increasing importance attached to "Holy Communion," as it is called, by many in our own Church, are plain evidence of what I mean. The sermon, the mode of conducting prayer, the reading of "holy Scripture," in many Churches are made second to this one thing,—the administration of the Lord's Supper. We may well ask, "What warrant of Scripture is there for this extravagant honour?" but we shall get no answer. There are at most but five books in the whole canon of the New Testament in which the Lord's Supper is even mentioned. About grace, faith, and redemption; about the work of Christ, the work of the Spirit, and the love of the Father; about man's ruin, weakness, and spiritual poverty; about justification, sanctification, and holy living;—about all these mighty subjects we find the inspired writers giving us line upon line, and precept upon precept. About the Lord's Supper, on the contrary, we may observe in the great bulk of the New Testament a speaking silence. Even the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, containing much instruction about a minister's duties, do not contain a word about it. This fact alone surely speaks volumes!

To thrust the Lord's Supper forward, till it towers over and overrides everything else in religion, is giving it a position for which there is no authority in God's Word.

(2) Again, the Lord's Supper is not in its right place *when it is administered with an extravagant degree of outward ceremony and veneration*. In saying this I should be sorry to be misunderstood. God forbid that I should countenance anything like carelessness or irreverence in the use of any ordinance of Christ. By all means let us give honour where honour is due. But I ask all who read this paper, whether there is not something painfully suspicious about the enormous amount of pomp and bodily reverence with which the Lord's Supper is now administered in many of our Churches? The ostentatious treatment of the Communion table as an altar,—the lights, ornaments, flowers, millinery, gestures, postures, bowings, crossings, incensing, processions, which are connected with the so-called altar,—the mysterious and obsequious veneration with which the bread and wine are consecrated, given, taken, and received,—what does it all mean?² Where is there in all this the simplicity of the first institution, as we find it recorded in the Bible? Where is the simplicity which our Protestant Reformers both preached and practised? Where is the simplicity which any plain reader of the English Prayer-book might justly expect? We may well ask—Where? The true Lord's Supper is no longer there. The whole thing savours of Romanism. A plain man can only see in it an attempt to introduce into our worship the doctrine of sacrifice, the “blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit” of the mass, the Popish real presence, and transubstantiation. It is impossible to avoid feeling that a deadly heresy underlies this pompous ceremonial, and that we have not to do merely with a childish love of show and form, but with a deep-laid design to bring back Popery into the Church of England, and to subvert the Gospel of Christ. One thing at any rate is very plain to my mind: the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, administered as it is now in many places, is not in its rightful position. It is so disguised, and painted, and daubed, and overlaid, and bloated, and swollen, and

² It is truly lamentable to observe how many young men and women of whom better things might have been expected, fall away into semi-Romanism in the present day, under the attraction of a highly ornamental and sensuous ceremonial. Flowers, crucifixes, processions, banners, incense, gorgeous vestments, and the like, never fail to draw such young persons together, just as honey attracts flies. I will not insult the common sense of those who find these things attractive, by asking them whether they really believe they get any food from them for heart, and conscience, and soul. But I should like them to consider seriously what these things mean. Do they really know that the doctrines of the mass and transubstantiation are the root of the whole system? Are they prepared to swallow these awful heresies? I suspect many are playing with Ritualism in these times without the least idea what unscriptural errors it covers over.

changed by this new treatment, that I can hardly see in it any Lord's Supper at all.

(3) Again, the Lord's Supper is not in its right place *when it is pressed on all worshippers indiscriminately*, as a means of grace, which all as a matter of course ought to use. Once more I ask that no one will misunderstand me. I feel as strongly as anyone, that to go to a Church as a worshipper, and yet not be a communicant, is to be a most inconsistent Christian, and that to be unfit for the Lord's Table is to be unfit to die. But it is one thing to teach this, and quite another to urge all men to receive the Sacrament as a matter of course, whether they are qualified to receive it or not. I should be sorry to raise a false accusation. I do not for a moment suppose that any High Church clergyman recommends, in naked language, wicked people to come to the Lord's Supper that they may be made good. But I cannot forget that from many pulpits people are constantly taught that they are born again, and have grace, by virtue of their baptism; and that if they want to stir up the grace within them, and get more religion, they must use all means of grace, and specially the Lord's Supper! And I cannot help fearing that thousands in the present day are practically substituting attendance at the Lord's Supper for repentance, faith, and vital union with Christ, and flattering themselves that the more often they receive the Sacrament, the more they are justified, and the more fit they are to die. My own firm conviction is that the Lord's Supper should on no account be placed before Christ, and that men should always be taught to come to Christ by faith *before* they draw near to the Lord's Table. I believe that this order can never be inverted without bringing in gross superstition, and doing immense harm to men's souls. Those parts of Christendom where "the mass" is made everything, and the Word of God hardly ever preached, are precisely those parts where there is the most entire absence of vital Christianity. I wish I could say there was no fear of our coming to this state of things in our own land. But when we hear of hundreds crowding the Lord's Table on Sundays, and then plunging into every dissipation on week-days, there is grave reason for suspecting that the Lord's Supper is pressed on many congregations in a manner utterly unwarranted by Scripture.

Does anyone ask now what is the rightful position of the Lord's Supper? I answer that question without any hesitation. I believe its rightful position, like that of holiness, is between grace and glory, between justification and heaven, between faith and paradise, between conversion and the final rest, between the wicket-gate and the celestial city. It is not Christ; it is not conversion; it is not a passport to heaven. It is for the strengthening and refreshing of those who have come to Christ already, who know something of conversion, who are already in the narrow way, and have fled

from the city of destruction.

III. WHO OUGHT TO BE COMMUNICANTS?

It will clear the ground if I first show who ought not to be partakers of the Lord's Supper. The ignorance which prevails on this, as well as on every part of the subject, is vast, lamentable, and appalling. If I can contribute anything that may throw light upon it, I shall feel very thankful. The giants whom John Bunyan describes, in *Pilgrim's Progress*, as dangerous to Christian pilgrims, were only two—Pope and Pagan. If the good old Puritan had foreseen the times we live in, he would have said something about the giant Ignorance.

(a) Not all baptized persons ought to be urged to become communicants as a matter of course. There is such a thing as fitness and preparedness for the Sacrament. It does not work like a medicine, independently of the state of mind of those who receive it. The Twenty-fifth Article of our Church declares, that "in such only as worthily receive the Sacraments they have a wholesome operation." The teaching of those who press all their congregation to come to the Lord's Table, as if the coming *must* necessarily do every one good, is entirely without warrant of Scripture. Nay, rather, it is teaching which is calculated to do immense harm to men's souls, and to turn the reception of the Sacrament into a mere form. Ignorance can never be the mother of acceptable worship, and an ignorant communicant who comes to the Lord's Table without knowing why he comes is altogether in the wrong place. "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." "To discern the Lord's body,"—that is, to understand what the elements of bread and wine represent, and why they are appointed, and what is the particular use of remembering Christ's death,—is an essential qualification of a true communicant (1 Cor. xi. 28, 29). God commands all men everywhere to repent and believe the Gospel; but He does not in the same way, or in the same manner, command everybody to come to the Lord's Table. No; this thing is not to be taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly, or carelessly! It is a solemn ordinance, and solemnly it ought to be used.

(b) But this is not all. *Sinners living in open sin*, and not determined to give it up, ought on no account to come to the Lord's Table. To do so is a positive insult to Christ, and to pour contempt on His Gospel. It is nonsense to profess we desire to remember Christ's death, while we cling to the accursed thing which made it needful for Christ to die. The mere fact that a man is continuing in sin is plain evidence that he does not care for Christ, and feels no gratitude for redemption. The ignorant Romanist who

goes to the priest's confessional and receives absolution may think he is fit to go to the Mass, and after Mass may return to his sins. He never reads the Bible, and knows no better. But the English Churchman who habitually breaks any of God's commandments, and yet goes to the Sacrament, as if it would do him good, is very guilty indeed. So long as he chooses to continue his wicked habits, he cannot receive the slightest benefit from Christ's ordinances, and is only adding sin to sin. To carry unrepented sin up to the communion rail, and there receive the bread and wine, knowing in our own hearts that we and wickedness are yet friends, is one of the worst things a man can do, and one of the most hardening to conscience. If a man must have his sins, and cannot give them up, let him by all means stay away from the Lord's Supper. There is such a thing as "eating and drinking unworthily," and to our own "condemnation." To no one do these words apply so thoroughly as to an open sinner.

(c) But one thing more remains. *Self-righteous people*, who think that they are to be saved by their own works, have no business to come to the Lord's Table. Strange as it may sound at first, these persons are the least qualified of all to receive the Sacrament. They may be outwardly correct, moral, and respectable in their lives; but so long as they trust in their own goodness for salvation, they are entirely in the wrong place at the Lord's Supper. For what do we declare at the Lord's Supper? We publicly profess that we have no goodness, righteousness, or worthiness of our own, and that all our hope is in Christ. We publicly profess that we are guilty, sinful, and corrupt, and naturally deserve God's wrath and condemnation. We publicly profess that Christ's merit and not ours, Christ's righteousness and not ours, is the alone cause why we look for acceptance with God. Now what has a self-righteous man to do with an ordinance like this? Clearly nothing at all. One thing, at any rate, is very plain: a self-righteous man has no business to receive the Sacrament in the Church of England. The Communion Service of the Church bids all communicants declare that "they do not presume to come to the table trusting in their own righteousness, but in God's manifold and great mercies." It tells them to say, "We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy table,"—"the remembrance of our sins is grievous unto us; the burden of them is intolerable." How any self-righteous Churchman can ever go to the Lord's Table and take these words into his mouth passes my understanding! It only shows that many professing Christians use excellent forms of worship without taking the trouble to consider what they mean.

The plain truth is, that the Lord's Supper was not meant for dead souls, but for living ones. The careless, the ignorant, the wilfully wicked, the self-righteous, are no more fit to come to the Communion rail than a dead

corpse is fit to sit down at a king's feast. To enjoy a spiritual feast we must have a spiritual heart, and taste, and appetite. To suppose that Christ's ordinances can do good to an unspiritual man is as foolish as to put bread and wine into the mouth of a dead person! The careless, the ignorant, and the wilfully wicked, so long as they continue in that state, are utterly unfit to be communicants. To urge them to attend is not to do them good, but harm.

But after all, the ground having been cleared of error, the question still remains to be answered, Who are the sort of persons who ought to be communicants? I answer that question, once more, in the words of the Church Catechism. I there find the inquiry made, "What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper?" In reply I find it taught that people should "examine themselves whether they repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life; whether they have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of His death; and whether they are in charity with all men." In a word, I find that a worthy communicant is one who possesses three simple marks and qualifications,—repentance, faith, and charity. Does a man truly repent of sin and hate it? Does a man put his trust in Jesus Christ as his only hope of salvation? Does a man live in charity towards others? He that can truly, and with a good conscience, reply to each of these questions, "I do," he is a man that is scripturally qualified for the Lord's Supper. Let him come boldly. Let no barrier be put in his way. He comes up to the Bible standard of communicants. He may draw near with confidence, and feel assured that the great Master of the banquet is not displeased.

Such a man's repentance may be very imperfect. Never mind! Is it real? Does he truly repent at all? His faith in Christ may be very weak. Never mind! Is it real? A penny is as truly the current coin of the realm, and as really stamped with the Queen's image, as a sovereign. His charity may be very defective in quantity and degree. Never mind! Is it genuine? The grand test of a man's Christianity is not the quantity of grace he has got, but whether he has any grace at all. The first communicants, when Christ Himself gave the bread and wine, were weak indeed,—weak in knowledge, weak in faith, weak in courage, weak in patience, weak in love! But they had that about them which outweighed all defects: they were real, genuine, sincere, and true.

For ever let this great principle be rooted in your mind,—the only worthy communicant is the one who is experimentally acquainted with repentance toward God, faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, and practical love toward others. Are you that one? Then you may draw near to the table, and take the Sacrament to your comfort. Lower than this I dare not pitch my

standard of a communicant. I will never help to crowd a communion rail with careless, ignorant, self-righteous attendants. Higher than this I will not pitch my standard. I will never tell anyone to keep away till he is perfect, and to wait till his heart is as unruffled as an angel's. I will not do so, because I believe that neither my Master nor His Apostles would have done so. Show me one that really feels his sins, really leans on Christ, really struggles to be holy, and I will bid him welcome in my Master's name. He may feel weak, erring, empty, feeble, doubting, wretched, and poor. What matter St. Paul, I believe, would have received him as a right communicant, and I will do likewise.

IV. WHAT MAY COMMUNICANTS EXPECT FROM THE LORD'S SUPPER?

This is a point of grave importance, and one on which vast mistakes abound. On no point, perhaps, connected with this ordinance are the views of Christians so vague and misty and undefined.

One common idea among men is, that "taking the Sacrament must do them good." Why, they cannot explain. What good, they cannot exactly say. But they have a loose general notion that it is the right thing to be a communicant, and that somehow or other it is of service to their souls! This is, of course, nothing better than ignorance. It is unreasonable to suppose that such communicants can please Christ, or receive any real benefit from what they do. If there is any principle clearly laid down in the Bible about any act of religious worship, it is this,—that it must be *intelligent*. The worshipper must at least understand something about what he is doing. Mere bodily worship, unaccompanied by mind or heart, is utterly worthless. The man who walks up to a communion rail, and eats the bread and drinks the wine as a mere matter of form, because his minister tells him to come there, without any clear idea of what it all means, derives no benefit. He might just as well stay at home.

Another common idea among men is that "taking the Sacrament will help them to heaven, and take away their sins." To this delusive idea you may trace up the habit in some parishes of going to the Sacrament once a year, in order, as an old farmer once said, "to wipe off the year's sins." To this idea, again, you may trace the sadly common practice of sending for a minister in time of sickness, in order to receive the Sacrament before death. Alas, how many take comfort about their relatives, after they have lived a most ungodly life, for no better reason than this,—that *they took the Sacrament* when they were dying! Whether they repented and believed and had new hearts, they neither seem to know nor care. All they know is that

“they took the Sacrament before they died!” My heart sinks within me when I hear people resting on such evidence as this.

Ideas like these are mournful proofs of the ignorance that fills the minds of men about the Lord’s Supper. They are ideas for which there is not the slightest warrant either in Scripture or the Prayer-book. The sooner they are cast aside and given up, the better for the Church and the world.

Let us settle it firmly in our minds that the Lord’s Supper was not given to be a means either of justification or of conversion. It was never meant to give grace where there is no grace already, or to provide pardon when pardon is not already enjoyed. It cannot possibly supply the absence of repentance to God, and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ. It is an ordinance for the penitent, not for the impenitent,—for the believing, not for the unbelieving,—for the converted, not for the unconverted. The unconverted man, who fancies that he can find a short-cut road to heaven by taking the Sacrament, without treading the well-worn steps of repentance and faith, will find to his cost one day that he is totally deceived. The Lord’s Supper was meant to increase and help the grace that a man has, but not to impart grace that he has not. It was certainly never intended to make our peace with God, to justify, or to convert.

The simplest statement of the benefit which a true-hearted communicant may expect to receive from the Lord’s Supper is that which is supplied by the Church Catechism,—“The strengthening and refreshing of our souls.” Clearer views of Christ and His atonement, clearer views of all the offices which Christ fills as our Mediator and Advocate, clearer views of the complete redemption Christ has obtained for us by His vicarious death on the cross, clearer views of our full and perfect acceptance in Christ before God, fresh reasons for deep repentance for sin, fresh reasons for lively faith, fresh reasons for living a holy, consecrated, Christ-like life,—these are among the leading returns which a believer may confidently expect to get from his attendance at the Lord’s Table. He that eats the bread and drinks the wine in a right spirit will find himself drawn into closer communion with Christ, and will feel to know Him more, and understand Him better. Well says the Communion Office of our Prayer-book, “The benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament; for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us.”

(a) Right reception of the Lord’s Supper has a *humbling* effect on the soul. The sight of the emblems of Christ’s body and blood, reminds us how sinful sin must be, if nothing less than the death of God’s own Son could make satisfaction for it, or redeem us from its guilt. Never, surely, ought

we to be so “clothed with humility,” as when we kneel at the Communion rail.

(b) Right reception of the Lord’s Supper has a *cheering* effect on the soul. The sight of the bread broken, and the wine poured out, reminds us how full, perfect, and complete is our salvation. Those lively emblems remind us what an enormous price has been paid for our redemption. They press on us the mighty truth that, believing on Christ, we have nothing to fear, because a sufficient payment has been made for our debt. The “precious blood of Christ” answers every charge that can be brought against us. God can be a just God, and yet the justifier of every one that believeth on Him.

(c) Right reception of the Lord’s Supper has a *sanctifying* effect on the soul. The bread and wine remind us how great is our debt of gratitude to our Lord, and how thoroughly we are bound to live for Him who died for our sins. They seem to say to us, “Remember what Christ has done for you, and ask yourself whether there is anything too great to do for Him.”

(d) Right reception of the Lord’s Supper has a *restraining* effect on the soul. Every time a believer goes up to the Communion rail he is reminded what a serious thing it is to be a Christian, and what an obligation is laid on him to lead a consistent life. Bought with such a price as that bread and wine call to his recollection, ought he not to glorify Christ in body and spirit, which are His? The man that goes regularly and intelligently to the Lord’s Table finds it increasingly hard to yield to sin and conform to the world.

Such is a brief account of the benefits which a right-hearted communicant may expect to receive from the Lord’s Supper. In eating that bread and drinking that cup, such a one will have his repentance deepened, his faith increased, his knowledge enlarged, his habit of holy living strengthened. He will realise more of the “real presence” of Christ in his heart. Eating that bread by faith, he will feel closer communion with the body of Christ. Drinking that wine by faith, he will feel closer communion with the blood of Christ. He will see more clearly what Christ is to him, and what he is to Christ. He will understand more thoroughly what it is to be “one with Christ, and Christ one with him.” He will feel the roots of his soul’s spiritual life watered, and the work of grace in his heart established, built up, and carried forward. All these things may seem and sound foolishness to a natural man; but to a true Christian these things are light, and health, and life, and peace. No wonder that a true Christian finds the Lord’s Supper a source of blessing!

Remember, I do not pretend to say that all Christians experience the full blessing of the Lord’s Supper, which I have just attempted to describe. Nor

yet do I say that the same believer will always find his soul in the same spiritual frame, and always receive the same amount of benefit from the Sacrament. But this I will boldly say,—you will rarely find a true believer who will not say that he reckons the Lord’s Supper one of his best helps and highest privileges. He will tell you that if he were deprived of the Lord’s Supper he should find the loss of it a great drawback to his soul. There are some things of which we never know the value till they are taken from us. So I believe it is with the Lord’s Supper. The weakest and humblest of God’s children gets a blessing from this Sacrament, to an extent of which he is not aware.

V. WHY DO MANY SO-CALLED CHRISTIANS NEVER ATTEND THE LORD’S SUPPER?

It is a simple matter of fact that myriads of baptized persons never come to the Table of the Lord. They would not endure to be told that they deny the faith, and are practically not in communion with Christ. When they worship, they attend a place of Christian worship; when they hear religious teaching, it is the teaching of Christianity; when they are married, they use a Christian service; when their children are baptized, they ask for the Sacrament of Baptism. Yet all this time they never come to the Lord’s Supper! They live on in this state of mind for many years, and to all appearance are not ashamed. They often die in this condition without ever having received the Sacrament, and yet profess to feel hope at the last, and their friends express a hope about them. And yet they live and die in open disobedience to a plain command of Christ! These are simple facts. Let anyone look around him, and deny them if he can. I challenge anyone to deny that the non-communicants in almost all English congregations form the large majority, and the communicants the small minority of the worshippers.

Now how is this? What account can we give of it? Our Lord Jesus Christ’s last injunctions to His disciples are clear, plain, and unmistakable. He says to all, “Eat, drink! do this in remembrance of Me.” Did He leave it to our discretion whether we would attend to His injunction or not? Did He mean that it did not signify whether His disciples did or did not keep up the ordinance He had just established? Certainly not. The very idea is absurd, and one which was certainly never dreamed of in apostolic times. St. Paul evidently takes it for granted that every Christian was a communicant. A class of Christian worshippers who never came to the Table was a class whose existence was unknown to him. What, then, are we to say of that large multitude of non-communicants which walks out of our churches every Sacrament Sunday, unabashed, unhumbled, not afraid, not the least ashamed? Why is it? How is it? What does it all mean? Let us look these

questions fairly in the face, and endeavour to give an answer to them.

(1) For one thing, many are not communicants because they are utterly careless and thoughtless about religion, and ignorant of the very first principles of Christianity. They go to church as a matter of form, because other people go; but they neither know nor care anything about what is done at church! The faith of Christ has no place either in their hearts, or heads, or consciences, or wills, or understandings. It is a mere affair of “words and names,” about which they know no more than Festus or Gallio, of whom we read in the Acts. There were very few such Christians in St. Paul’s times, if indeed there were any. There are far too many in these last days of the world, when everything seems to be wearing out and running to seed. They are the dead-weight of the Churches, and the scandal of Christianity. What such people need is light, knowledge, grace, a renewed conscience, a changed heart. In their present state they have no part or lot in Christ; and dying in this state they are unfit for heaven. Do I wish them to come to the Lord’s Supper? Certainly not, till they are converted. “Except a man be converted, and become as a little child, he will never enter the kingdom of heaven.” (Matt. xviii. 3).

(2) For another thing, many are not communicants because they know they are living in the habitual practice of some sin, or in the habitual neglect of some Christian duty. Their conscience tells them that so long as they live in this state, and do not break off from their sins, they are unfit to come to the Table of the Lord. Well, they are so far quite right! I wish no man to be a communicant if he cannot give up his sins. But I warn these people not to forget that if they are unfit for the Lord’s Supper they are *unfit to die*, and that if they die in their present condition they will be lost eternally. The same sins which disqualify them for the Sacrament, most certainly disqualify them for heaven. Do I want them to come to the Lord’s Supper as they are? Certainly not! But I do want them to repent and be converted, to cease to do evil, and to break off from their sins. For ever let it be remembered that the man who is unfit for the Lord’s Supper is unfit to die

(3) For another thing, some are not communicants because they fancy it will add to their responsibility. They are not, as many, ignorant and careless about religion. They even attend regularly on the means of grace, and like the preaching of the Gospel. But they say they dread coming forward and making a profession. They fear that they might afterwards fall away, and bring scandal on the cause of Christianity. They think it wisest to be on the safe side, and not commit themselves at all. Such people would do well

to remember that if they avoid responsibility of one kind by not coming to the Lord's Table, they incur responsibility of another kind, quite as grave, and quite as injurious to the soul. They are responsible for open disobedience to a command of Christ. They are shrinking from doing that which their Master continually enjoins on His disciples,—from confessing Him before men. No doubt it is a serious step to come forward and receive the Sacrament. It is a step that none should take lightly and without self-examination. But it is no less a serious step to walk away and refuse the ordinance, when we remember Who invites us to receive it, and for what purpose it was appointed. I warn the people I am now dealing with to take heed what they are doing. Let them not flatter themselves that it can ever be a wise, a prudent, a safe line of conduct to neglect a plain command of Christ. They may find at length, to their cost, that they have only increased their guilt and forsaken their own mercies.

(4) For another thing, some are not communicants because they fancy they are not yet worthy. They wait and stand still, under the mistaken notion that no one is qualified for the Lord's Supper unless he feels within him something like perfection. They pitch their idea of a communicant so high that they despair of attaining to it. Waiting for inward perfection they live, and waiting for it too often they die. Now such persons would do well to understand that they are completely mistaken in their estimate of what "worthiness" really is. They are forgetting that the Lord's Supper was not intended for unsinning angels, but for men and women compassed with infirmity, dwelling in a world full of temptations, and needing mercy and grace every day they live. A sense of our own utter unworthiness is the best worthiness we can bring to the Communion rail. A deep feeling of our own entire indebtedness to Christ for all we have and hope for, is the best feeling we can bring with us. The people I now have in view ought to consider seriously whether the ground they have taken up is tenable, and whether they are not standing in their own light. If they are waiting till they feel in themselves perfect hearts, perfect motives, perfect feelings, perfect repentance, perfect love, perfect faith, they will wait for ever. There never were such communicants in any age,—certainly not in the days of our Lord and of the Apostles; there never will be as long as the world stands. Nay, rather, the very thought that we feel literally worthy, is a symptom of secret self-righteousness, and proves us unfit for Communion in God's sight. Sinners we are when we first come to the throne of grace,—sinners we shall be till we die; converted, changed, renewed, sanctified, but sinners still. In short, no man is a really worthy communicant who does not deeply feel that he is a "miserable sinner."

(5) In the last place, some object to be communicants because they see others coming to the Lord's Table who are not worthy, and not in a right state of mind. Because others eat and drink unworthily, they refuse to eat and drink at all. Of all the grounds taken up by non-communicants to justify their own neglect of Christ's ordinance, I must plainly say, I know none which seems to me so foolish, so weak, so unreasonable, and so unscriptural as this. It is as good as saying that we will never receive the Lord's Supper at all! When shall we ever find a body of communicants on earth of which all the members are converted? It is setting up ourselves in the most unhealthy attitude of judging others. "Who art thou that judgest another?" "What is that to thee? Follow thou me." It is depriving ourselves of a great privilege merely because others profane it and make a bad use of it. It is pretending to be wiser than our Master Himself. If the words of St. Luke mean anything, Judas Iscariot was present at the first Communion, and received the bread and wine among others. It is taking up ground for which there is no warrant in Scripture. St. Paul rebukes the Corinthians sharply for the irreverent behaviour of some of the communicants; but I cannot find him giving a single hint that when some came to the Table unworthily, others ought to walk off or stay away. Let me advise the non-communicants I have now in view to beware of being wise above that which is written. Let them study the parable of the wheat and tares, and mark how both were to "grow together till the harvest." Perfect Churches, perfect congregations, perfect bodies of communicants, are all unattainable in this world of confusion and sin. Let us covet the best gifts, and do all we can to check sin in others; but let us not starve our own selves because others are ignorant sinners, and turn their meat into poison. If others are foolish enough to "eat and drink unworthily," let us not turn our backs on Christ's ordinance, and refuse to eat and drink at all.

Such are the five common excuses why myriads in the present day, though professing themselves Christians, never come to the Lord's Supper. One common remark may be made about them: there is not a single reason among the five which deserves to be called "good," and which does not condemn the man who gives it. I challenge anyone to deny this. I have said repeatedly that I want no one to be a communicant who is not properly qualified. But I ask those who stay away never to forget that the very reasons they assign for their conduct are their condemnation. I tell them that they stand convicted before God of either being very ignorant of what a communicant is, and what the Lord's Supper is; or else of being persons who are not living rightly, and are unfit to die. In short, to say "I am a non-communicant," is as good as saying one of three things:—"I am living in

sin, and cannot come; I know Christ commands me, but I will not obey Him; I am an ignorant man, and do not understand what the Lord's Supper means."

I know not in what state of mind the reader of this paper may be, or what his opinions may be about the Lord's Supper. But I will conclude the whole subject by offering

SOME WARNINGS,

which I venture to think are peculiarly required by the times.

(1) In the first place, *do not neglect* the Lord's Supper. The man who coolly and deliberately refuses to use an ordinance which the Lord Jesus Christ appointed for his profit, may be very sure that his soul is in a very wrong state. There is a judgment yet to come; there is an account to be rendered of all our conduct on earth. How anyone can look forward to that day, and expect to meet Christ with comfort and in peace, if he has refused all his life to meet Christ in His own ordinance, is a thing that I cannot understand. Reader, does this come home to you? Mind what you are doing.

(2) In the second place, *do not receive the Lord's Supper carelessly*, irreverently, and as a matter of form. The man who walks up to the Communion rail, and eats the bread and drinks the wine, while his heart is far away, is committing a great sin, and robbing himself of a great blessing. In this, as in every other means of grace, everything depends on the state of mind in which the ordinance is used. He that draws near without repentance, faith, and love, and with a heart full of sin and the world, will certainly be nothing better, but rather worse. Reader, does this come home to you? Mind what you are about.

(3) In the third place, *do not make an idol* of the Lord's Supper. The man who tells you that it is the first, foremost, chief, and principal ordinance in Christianity, is telling you that which he will find it hard to prove. In the great majority of the books of the New Testament the Lord's Supper is not even named. In the letter to Timothy and Titus, about a minister's duties, the subject is not even mentioned. To repent and be converted, to believe and be holy, to be born again and have grace in our hearts,—all these things are of far more importance than to be a communicant. Without them we cannot be saved. Without the Lord's Supper we can. The penitent thief was not a communicant, and Judas Iscariot was. Reader, are you tempted to make the Lord's Supper override and overshadow everything in

Christianity, and place it above prayer and preaching? Take care. Mind what you are about.

(4) In the fourth place, *do not use the Lord's Supper irregularly*. Never be absent when this ordinance is administered. Make every sacrifice to be in your place. Regular habits are essential to the maintenance of the health of our bodies. Regular use of every means of grace is essential to the prosperity of our souls. The man who finds it a weariness to attend on every occasion when the Lord's Table is spread, may well doubt whether all is right within him, and whether he is ready for the Marriage Supper of the Lamb. If Thomas had not been absent when the Lord appeared the first time to the assembled disciples, he would not have said the foolish things he did. Absence made him miss a blessing (John xx. 19-29). Reader, does this come home to you? Mind what you are about.

(5) In the fifth place, *do not do anything to bring discredit* on your profession as a communicant. The man who after attending the Lord's Table runs into sin, does more harm perhaps than any sinner. He is a walking sermon on behalf of the devil. He gives occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme. He helps to keep people away from Christ. Lying, drinking, adulterous, dishonest, passionate communicants are the helpers of the devil, and the worst enemies of the Gospel. Reader, does this come home to you? Mind what you are about.

(6) In the last place, *do not despond* and be cast down, if, with all your desires, you do not feel to get great good from the Lord's Supper. Very likely you are expecting too much. Very likely you are a poor judge of your own state. Your soul's roots may be strengthening and growing, while you think you are not getting on. Very likely you are forgetting that earth is not heaven, and that here we walk by faith and not by sight, and must expect nothing perfect. Lay these things to heart. Do not write bitter things against yourself without cause.

To any reader into whose hands this book may fall, I commend the whole subject of it as deserving of serious and solemn consideration. I am nothing better than a weak fallible man myself. But if I have made up my mind on any point it is this,—that there is no truth which demands such plain speaking as truth about the Lord's Supper.

I pause here. I trust I have said enough to make clear the views I hold of the true intention and rightful position of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. If, in expounding these views, I have said anything that grates on the feelings of any reader, I can assure him that I am unfeignedly sorry. Noth-

ing could be further from my desire than to hurt the feelings of a brother.

But it is my firm conviction that the state of the Church of England requires great plainness of speech and distinctness of statement about the Sacraments. There is nothing, I am persuaded, which the times so imperatively demand of Evangelical Churchmen, as a bold, manly and explicit assertion of the great principles held by our forefathers, and specially about Baptism and the Lord's Supper. If we would strengthen the things that remain which are ready to die, we must resolutely go back to the old paths, and maintain old truths in the old way. We must give up the vain idea that we can ever make the cross of Christ acceptable by polishing, and varnishing, and painting, and gilding it, and sawing off its corners. We must cease to suppose that we can ever lure men into being Evangelical by a trimming, temporizing, half and half, milk and water mode of exhibiting the doctrines of the Gospel; or by wearing borrowed plumes, and dabbling with High-Churchism; or by loudly proclaiming that we are not "party men;" or by laying aside plain Scriptural phrases, and praising up "earnestness;" or by adroitly keeping back truths that are likely to give offence. The plan is an utter delusion. It wins no enemy. It disgusts many a true friend. It makes the worldly bystander sneer, and fills him with scorn. We may rest assured that the right line and the wisest course for the Evangelical body to pursue, is to adhere steadily to the old plan of maintaining the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth as it is in Jesus, and specially the truth about the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Let us be courteous, amiable, charitable, affable, considerate for the feelings of others by all means, but let no consideration make us keep back any part of God's truth.