

# WHAT IS WRITTEN

ABOUT THE

# LORD'S SUPPER?

BY THE

RIGHT REV. BISHOP RYLE, D.D.

---

DRUMMOND'S TRACT DEPÔT, STIRLING.

LONDON: S. W. PARTRIDGE & CO.

*[One Shilling per dozen.]*

## “WHAT IS WRITTEN” ABOUT THE LORD’S SUPPER.\*

---

*“The teaching of God’s Word about the Lord’s Supper.”*

I HAVE accepted the request to open this subject with much hesitation.

It seems impossible to say anything new about the Lord’s Supper. For three hundred and fifty years it has been a sorrowful bone of contention between theological opponents, until, like the body of Patroclus in the Iliad, when Greeks and Trojans fought for its possession, the blessed Sacrament has been damaged by both sides. Thousands of books have been written about the subject, and yet unanimity appears as far off as ever. I can only present old things in a new light.

The subject, moreover, in the present day, requires very careful handling, because English Churchmen are thoroughly divided about it. For such careful handling a Lancashire Bishop has very little time, and amidst incessant interruptions can only do scant justice to his theme. But if I cannot tell you all I could wish, I will try to tell you what I can.

I. First and foremost, *What is the positive teaching of the New Testament about the Lord’s Supper?* This is the special question I am asked to handle. I shall stick to my text. What is written?

The institution of the Lord’s Supper is described four times in the New Testament, once in each of the three Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and once in the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. In each place the main facts recorded are pretty much the same, with one important addition recorded by St. Luke and St. Paul. Moreover St. Luke says, “This is my body *given* for you,” and St. Paul says, “*broken* for you.” But the time, the last day of our Lord’s ministry; the presence of none but the twelve apostles, the giving of the bread and wine to all, the solemn words “this is My body” and “this is My blood,” or “the New Testament in My blood,” are details common to all the four accounts. You are all familiar with them, and I need not read the precise words in which they are written for our learning.

Beside these four narratives I can find no mention of the Lord’s Supper in the New Testament, with four exceptions. In Acts ii. 42 we are told that the Christians at Jerusalem “continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine

---

\* An Address delivered at the Annual Islington Clerical Meeting, 15th January 1889.

and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” In Acts ii. 47 we are told that the disciples, “breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness.” In Acts xx. 7 we are told that the disciples “came together to break bread.” In all these cases I have no doubt the Lord’s Supper is signified. Add to these passages the striking statement, “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” 1 Cor. x. 16. What is there in Scripture beside these passages about the Lord’s Supper? I declare I can find nothing at all; for I cannot believe that the “breaking of bread” at Emmaus was the Sacrament. Luke xxiv. 30.

I do not admit for a moment that the sixth chapter of St. John’s Gospel contains any reference to the Lord’s Supper. The favourite theory of the Romanists, adopted, I regret to say, by too many modern Churchmen, that our Lord, in that famous discourse at Capernaum, meant by “eating His flesh and drinking His blood” the reception of the consecrated bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, is utterly destitute of proof. This is the opinion of almost all the best Protestant commentators, and also of some Romish ones, such as Cardinal Cajetan, Ferus, and Jansenius of Ghent.

I maintain unhesitatingly that the “eating and drinking” there spoken of mean the spiritual eating and drinking of the heart by faith, and the “flesh and blood” mean Christ’s vicarious sacrifice of His body and blood on the cross. The penitent thief most certainly did not receive the bread and wine of the Lord’s Supper; yet it is certain that he “had eternal life,” and went to “paradise” when he died. Judas Iscariot did most probably eat the bread and drink the wine, but he did “not have eternal life,” and died in his sins. The Prayer-book Service for the Communion of the Sick contains the following statement in one of its concluding rubrics: “If the sick man do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death on the cross for him, and shed His blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefor, he *doth eat and drink the body and blood of Christ* profitably to his soul’s health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.”

I suspect the plain truth is that few persons see the mischievous and dangerous consequences which result from applying the sixth chapter of St. John to the Lord’s Supper. They should read the whole passage carefully, and ask themselves the following questions:—Is it really true that every communicant who receives the bread and wine “has eternal life” and will be raised to glory at the last day?—Is it really true that no one has eternal life who does not receive the Lord’s Supper?—Does not this application of the sixth chapter of St. John condemn to eternal death myriads of our fel-

low-Christians, who, from one cause or another, have never become communicants?—Does it not condemn the whole body of the Quakers, who allow no sacraments?—He that can hold such doctrine must be in a strange state of mind. Surely such questions as these can receive only one answer. The fact is that the Lord's Supper was meant to lead back the mind of believers to the great doctrine of the sixth chapter of St. John; but that chapter was intended to mean something far higher, greater, deeper, and more important than the mere eating and drinking of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper.

II. In the second place, *What was the object and purpose for which our Lord Jesus Christ instituted the Lord's Supper?* What does the New Testament teach us? What is written?

The best answer to that question is to be found in the remarkable words which St. Luke and St. Paul alone were inspired to record, "This do in remembrance of Me." Coming from the lips of Him who was about to leave his little flock, like orphans, alone in a cold, wicked world, and to be crucified the next day, there is a grand simplicity and pathos about the expression, "In remembrance of Me."

The best comment on this deep phrase is to be found in the words of our well-known Church Catechism. Wanting in simplicity as that famous formulary certainly is, and sadly too full of hard words and scholastic metaphysical terms, it is worthy of all honour for its statements about the sacraments. Our Sunday-school teachers may fail to understand the Catechism, and complain justly that it needs another Catechism to explain it. But, after all, there is a logical preciseness and theological accuracy in its definitions about the Lord's Supper, which every well-read divine must acknowledge and appreciate.

The very first question in the Catechism about the Lord's Supper is as follows:—"Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?" The answer supplied is this: "For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby." This is sound speech, that cannot be condemned. Founded on plain language of Holy Scripture, it contains the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. (Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24.)

The Lord Jesus Christ intended the Lord's Supper to be a continual *remembrancer* to the Church of His atoning death on the cross. The bread broken, given, and eaten, was intended to remind Christians of His body given for our sins. The wine poured out, and received with our lips, was intended to remind Christians of His blood shed for our sins.

The Lord Jesus Christ "knew what was in man." (John ii. 25.) He knew full well the darkness, slowness, coldness, hardness, stupidity, pride, self-

conceit, self-righteousness, slothfulness, of human nature in spiritual things. Therefore He took care that His vicarious death for sinners should not merely be written in the Bible,—for then it might have been locked up in libraries; or left to the ministry to proclaim in the pulpit,—for then it might soon have been kept back by false teachers;—but that it should be exhibited in visible signs and emblems, even in bread and wine at a special ordinance. The Lord’s Supper was a standing provision against man’s forgetfulness. So long as the world stands in its present order, the thing which is done at the Lord’s table “shows the Lord’s death till He come.” (1 Cor. xi. 26.)

The Lord Jesus Christ knew full well the unspeakable importance of His own death for sin, as the great corner-stone of scriptural religion. He knew that His own satisfaction for sin as our Substitute,—His suffering for sin, the Just for the unjust,—His payment of our mighty debt in His own person,—His complete redemption of us by His blood,—He knew that this was the very root of soul-saving and soul-satisfying Christianity. Without this He knew His incarnation, miracles, teaching, example, and ascension could do no good to man. Without this He knew there could be no justification, no reconciliation, no hope, no peace between God and man. Knowing all this, He took care that *His death*, at any rate, should never be forgotten. He carefully appointed an ordinance in which, by lively figures, His sacrifice on the cross should be kept in perpetual remembrance, and the souls of believers might feed on it, as a body feeds on bread and wine.

The Lord Jesus Christ well knew the weakness and infirmity even of the holiest believers. He knew the absolute necessity of keeping them in intimate communion with His own vicarious sacrifice, as the Fountain of their inward and spiritual life. Therefore, He did not merely leave them promises on which their memories might feed, and words which they might call to mind. He mercifully provided an ordinance in which true faith might be quickened by seeing lively emblems of His body and blood, and in the use of which true Christians might be “strengthened and refreshed,” as the Catechism says, and realize closer communion with their Saviour in heaven. The strengthening of the faith of believers in Christ’s atonement was one great purpose of the Lord’s Supper. Well says the 28th Article of our Church, “To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.”\*

---

\* The following extract from Archbishop Cranmer’s writings deserves attention:—

“The first Catholic Christian faith is most *plain*, *clear*, and *comfortable*, without any difficulty, scruple, or doubt: that is to say, that our Saviour Christ, although He be sitting in heaven, in equality with His Father, is our life, strength, food, and sustenance, who by His death delivered us from death, and daily nourishes and increases us to eternal life. And in

I cannot leave this branch of the subject without reminding you that the doctrine of our Communion Service, in the Prayer Book, is in precise harmony with that of the Catechism. Let us mark the following expressions:—

“To the end that we should always *remember* the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His blood-shedding He hath obtained to us; He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries as pledges of His love, and for a continual *remembrance* of His death, to our great and endless comfort.”— Again, “He did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual *memory* of that His precious death until His coming again.”—“Take and eat this in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee.”—“Drink this in *remembrance* that Christ’s blood was shed for thee.” In both formularies the great purpose of the Lord’s Supper is declared to be, to keep us in remembrance of Christ and His atoning death, in conformity with His command.

III. In the third place, let me turn to the negative side of our subject. *What does the New Testament not teach us about the Lord’s Supper? What is not written?*

This is a painful and delicate inquiry, because I cannot possibly discuss it without touching opinions and practices which prevail widely among many zealous Churchmen in the present day. Nevertheless, I am asked to say what the teaching of the New Testament is. It is my plain duty to stick to that point. If I err in handling it, I shall be thankful to any one who will show me in what I am wrong.

(a) For one thing, *I cannot find it written that the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is the chief, principal, and most important part of the Christian religion.* I need not remind you that we are continually told in these days that it is so. The well-known “masses” of the Romish Church, the increasing importance attached to “Holy Communion” 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

---

token hereof, He hath prepared bread to be eaten, and wine to be drunk for us in His Holy Supper, to put us in remembrance of His said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and of all the benefits which we have thereby: which *benefits*, through *faith* and the *Holy Ghost*, are exhibited and given unto all that *worthily* receive the said Holy Supper. This the husbandman at his plough, the weaver at his loom, and the wife at her rocking cradle, can remember, and give thanks unto God for the same; this is the very doctrine of the Gospel, *with the consent wholly of all the old ecclesiastical doctors.*”— (*Cranmer’s Reply to Bishop Gardiner*, p. 396. First Edition.) See *Dean Goode on the Eucharist*, p. 971.

of small account and second to this one thing,—the administration of the Lord's Supper. But I cannot find this in the Scriptures. It is not written.

I assert that the proportionate value and importance of any doctrine or ordinance in our religion must be measured by the frequency with which it is mentioned in Scripture, and especially in the Epistles. Apply that test to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and see what the result will be. 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. You will find that blessed ordinance in only one single Epistle, the First of Corinthians. In all the remaining twenty it is not so much as named! Even in the pastoral Epistles to Timothy and Titus, where the work of a minister is specially handled, and you might have expected instructions about the Lord's Supper—that Sacrament is conspicuously absent. Now I cannot get over this fact. The silence of Scripture is just as teaching as its voice.

(b) For another thing, *I cannot find it written that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper confers grace "ex opere operato,"* and that by receiving the consecrated bread and wine, a man, without repentance and faith, may at once obtain forgiveness of sins. I fear that this idea is sadly prevalent in many quarters. To this you may trace the too common practice of sending for a clergyman in time of sickness to visit a dying man, in order that he may 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.

Now I contend that there is not a text of Scripture to show that the Lord's Supper was given to be a means either of obtaining forgiveness of sins, or of justification, or of conversion. We were not intended to believe that it does good to any but those who receive it with faith, and knowledge, and a right heart. It is not a medicine which acts mechanically, irrespectively of the state of mind in which it is received. It was never meant to give saving 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 toward God, and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ. It is an ordinance not for the dead but the living—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. To urge the crowds who attend a very high ceremonial, or are excited by some eloquent mission-preacher, to become communicants without repentance and faith is most unwise. Nay, more, it does them positive harm. Well says the Homily of the Sacrament, “The unbelieving and the faithless cannot feed upon that precious body.” The Master of the feast desires to see at His table not dead guests, but living ones,—not the dead service of formal eating and drinking, but the spiritual service of feeling and loving hearts. The Word of God testifies distinctly that a man may go to the Lord’s table, and “eat and drink unworthily,”—may “eat and drink damnation to himself.” (1 Cor. xi. 27, 29.) And this, remember, is the doctrine of the Church Catechism. Its very last question and answer teach that it is required of those who come to the Lord’s Supper, that they “repent, believe, and have charity.” To crown all, the 29th Article of our Church expressly declares that communicants who are “void of a lively faith are *in nowise* partakers of Christ” when they receive the Lord’s Supper.

(c) For another thing, *I cannot find it written that there is any real or substantial change in the elements of bread and wine after their consecration in the Lord's Supper.* It is needless to say that this view is held in many quarters of Christendom. I wish I could say it does not appear to be held by some members of the Church of England. Yet the painfully-extravagant veneration which is given to the chancel, to the holy table, to the least crumb of consecrated bread and the least drop of consecrated wine, in some churches, seems to admit of only one interpretation.

Now what saith the Scripture? I contend there is nothing in the four accounts of the institution of the Lord’s Supper to show that the twelve disciples regarded the bread as anything but bread, and the wine as anything but wine, when they received them from their Master’s hands. They showed no awe or surprise. They retained their posture at the table for anything that is recorded. They did not fall down, worship, or adore the elements. As godly Jews they would have been revolted at the idea of drinking literal blood. Those famous words—“This is My body; This is My blood”—appear to have fallen on their ears as simply meaning, “This bread represents My body, and this cup of wine represents My blood.” They were lively emblems and figures, and nothing more, to the minds of the disciples. They were accustomed to hear their Master use such language. They remembered His saying, “The field *is* the world,” “The good seed *are* the children of the

kingdom.” (Matthew xiii. 38.) It never entered into their minds that He meant to say He was literally giving them His literal body and blood to eat and drink.

Some, I have heard, think fit to reply to all this, that when the Lord’s Supper was first instituted the disciples were only half instructed, and did not fully understand what our Lord’s words meant when He said, “This is My body, and this is My blood.” That argument will not do. The fourth account of the institution was written to the Corinthians at least twenty-five years later by the apostle St. Paul, a man fully instructed by the Holy Ghost. In that account three times over he speaks of the consecrated elements as “the bread and the cup,” and not as “the body and blood.” That simple fact appears to me to settle the question.

After all there remains the unanswerable argument, that if the body of Him who was born of the Virgin Mary can be present materially in the bread and wine on the Lord’s table, it cannot be a true human body. In short, if our Lord was actually holding His own body in His hands, when He said of the bread, “This is My body,” His body must have been a different body to that of ordinary men. Of course, if His body was not a body exactly like ours, His real and proper humanity is at an end. He was not a real man, which is what the Eutychian, Docetic, and Apollinarian heretics maintained in ancient days. At this rate the blessed and comfortable doctrine of Christ’s entire sympathy with His people, as very man, would be completely overthrown, and fall to the ground.

I need not remind you, before leaving this point, that the view I have set before you is the doctrine of the Church of England. The 28th Article says, “Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.”

The rubric at the end of the Communion Service, which has not yet been cast out of the Prayer-book, contains these emphatic words: “The sacramental bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.” If that rubric does not flatly condemn the teaching of many modern divines about the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, under the forms of bread and wine, I am very certain that words have no meaning at all.

(d) In the next place, *I cannot find it written that there is any sacrifice in the Lord’s Supper* except that of praise and thanksgiving. That it is a sacrifice, that the minister who consecrates is a sacrificing priest, that the

Lord's table is an altar and not a table, and that the Supper of the Lord is rightly called the Eucharistic Sacrifice—all these are such common and widely spread opinions that I shall not waste your time in order to prove their existence, but simply state them.

But what foundation is there for all this view of the Lord's Supper in Scripture? There is nothing in the four accounts of the great transaction in the upper chamber to show that our Lord meant to institute a sacrifice and not a commemoration, or that the disciples understood His words in that way. The weak struggling effort made by some to prove that the Greek words of St. Luke and St. Paul translated "do this" should be rendered "sacrifice this," receives no support from the best lexicographers, or from the best commentators on the Greek Testament, such as Bengel, Kay, Dean Alford, and Bishop Wordsworth. The plain meaning is, "Do what I am now doing, after I leave the world, in remembrance of Me." There is not a text in the New Testament in which the Christian minister is called a "Hiericus," or sacrificing priest. There is only one text in the Epistles in which it is said "We have an altar," and, curiously enough, that occurs in the very Epistle of which the main purpose is to show that priests and sacrifices are completely done away by the "one offering" of Christ! The "altar" in this text in Heb. xiii. 10, means, in my private opinion, not the Lord's table but Christ Himself. The immediate context seems to show this. Only four verses after come the words, "By Him (not by the table), by Him, even Christ, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually." And again, "To do good and communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." (Heb. xiii. 10, 15, 16.) Even Estius, one of the best and most learned Romish commentators, is obliged to confess that this is the true meaning of the passage. After all, it is useless to talk of a sacrifice when there are no priests to offer it; and so long as the Epistle to the Hebrews stands in the Bible, so long you will never find that there is any real sacrificing priest but Christ under the Gospel dispensation. Well and rightly says the Homily of the Sacrament, "We must take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a Sacrifice."\*

I trust I need not remind you that your Prayer-book Communion Office never once calls the Lord's Supper a sacrifice. The "oblations" it speaks of in one place are the offering of money in the offertory. The only "sacrifice" it mentions is that of "praise and thanksgiving;" and the only "offering" it mentions is that of "ourselves, souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy,

---

\* Waterland says, "No one has any authority or right to offer Christ as a sacrifice, whether really or symbolically, but Christ Himself. Such a sacrifice is His sacrifice, not ours, offered for us, and not by us, to God the Father. He is not the matter or subject of our sacrifices, but the Mediator. We offer not Him, but by Him."—(*Waterland's Works*, vol. iv. p. 753.)

and lively sacrifice” unto God. Those who call the Sacrament a sacrifice cannot possibly prove what they say to be the doctrine of the liturgy. Nor is the Lord’s table ever called an “altar” in the English Prayer-book. The Reformers of our Church ordered altars everywhere to be pulled down and removed, and wooden tables to be set up. Those Churchmen who carelessly call the Lord’s table an “altar,” and talk of “altar services,” and brides being “led to the altar” at weddings, are doing immense harm, ignorantly borrowing the language of the corrupt Church of Rome, and countenancing a mischievous error. Of course I know that the Coronation Service uses the word “altar.” But that Service is no part of the Prayer-book, and is destitute of authority. If St. Paul rose from the grave, and was shown an “altar “in a Christian Church, he would not understand what it meant.\*

(e) In the next place, *I cannot find it written that it is either necessary, or desirable, or useful, for communicants to confess their sins privately to a clergyman, and receive absolution before they come to the Lord’s table.* That this practice has crept into our Church in these latter days, and is spreading extensively, there is too much reason to believe. I regard it as so deeply objectionable that I cannot altogether pass it by.

I maintain that there is not a single verse in the New Testament to show that the apostles recommended such confession, or that the first Christians practised it. Desirable or useful it certainly is not. The habit of private or auricular confession to a minister, under any circumstances, is one of the most mischievous and dangerous inventions of the corrupt Church of Rome, and has been the cause of enormous immorality and wickedness. Moreover, it is so expressly condemned in the “Homily of Repentance,” that no minister of the Church of England has any right to recommend, encourage, or permit it, if he is faithful to his Ordination vows.

Of course I am aware that habitual confession is thought by some to be sanctioned by the exhortation in our Communion Service, in which the minister says: “*If any of you cannot quiet his own conscience, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned minister of God’s Word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of God’s Word he may receive the benefit of absolution.*” I reply to all who use this argument that it is impossible with any fairness to extract auricular confession and sacramental absolution out of this passage. The simple meaning is, that people who are troubled in mind with some *special* difficulties of conscience, are advised to go to some minister and talk privately

---

\* The words of Bishop Jewell on this point are worth notice. He is replying to the common Romish argument that the Fathers often spoke of sacrifices and altars in the Christian Church. He says, “The old learned Fathers delighted themselves oftentimes with the words sacrifice and altar, notwithstanding the use thereof was then *clearly expired*, only because the ears of the people, as well of the Jews as of the Gentiles, had been long associated with the same.”—(*Jewell’s Reply to Harding. Works*, Ed. 1611, p. 410.)

with him about them, and to get them cleared up and resolved by texts of Scripture, that is, “by the ministry of God’s Word.” This is exactly what many clergymen, conducting mission services in the present day, do with those who wait for an “after-meeting” at the end of the sermon. But this is as utterly unlike the mischievous practice of habitual confession before communion, as wholesome medicine is unlike opium-eating, and water is unlike poison.

I must be allowed to support what I have just said on this point by the words of a man of great ability and shrewdness, with whom unhappily I did not always agree while he lived. I mean the late Bishop Wilberforce. I take them from the last address which he ever delivered, only a few days before his sudden death. You will find them in Dean Burgon’s *Lives of Twelve Good Men*. Bishop Wilberforce says: “This system of confession is one of the worst developments of Popery. In the first place, as regards *the Penitent*, it is a system of unnatural excitement, a sort of spiritual dram-drinking, fraught with evil to the whole spiritual constitution. It is nothing short of the renunciation of the great charge of a conscience which God has committed to every man,—the substitution of confession to man for the opening of the heart to God,—the adopting in *every* case of a remedy only adapted to *extreme* cases which can find relief in no other way.

“In *Families* it introduces untold mischief. It supersedes God’s appointment of intimacy between husband and wife, father and children; substituting another influence for that which ought to be the nearest and closest, and producing reserve and estrangement where there ought to be perfect freedom and openness. Lastly, as regards *the Priest* to whom confession is made, it brings in a wretched system of casuistry. But far worse than this, it necessitates the terrible evil of familiar dealing with sin, and especially the sin of uncleanness.”—(Vol. ii. p. 55.)

I can add nothing to that. I only express my earnest hope that the practice of confession before communion will always meet with your most strenuous and uncompromising opposition.

(f) In the next place, *I cannot find it written that it is necessary, useful, edifying, or desirable to receive the Lord’s Supper fasting*. I fear there are many strange views in some minds on this subject. You will distinctly understand that I have not the least objection to early administrations, if people prefer them. That is not the question. The ground I take up is of a very different kind.

I contend that the practice of fasting communion is neither commanded nor recommended in Scripture. It is perfectly clear that at the first institution of the Sacrament, the apostles could not have received the elements fasting, because they had just eaten the passover. There cannot, therefore, be anything very important in this point, and every believer may use his

liberty, and do what he finds edifying to himself, without condemning others. But it may be feared that there lies in the minds of many who attach immense value to fasting communion, a vague belief that the consecrated bread and wine which we receive are in some mysterious way not real bread and wine, and ought not therefore to be mixed with other food in our bodies! Such a belief cannot be praised. Moreover, those who teach that fasting communion is a rule obligatory on all persons, take up a position which is not only unscriptural, but even cruel. To go fasting to an early morning communion is likely to cause the death of delicate persons.

Once more I invite your attention to the weighty words of Bishop Wilberforce on this very subject. They were spoken on the same occasion to which I have already referred, a few days before his death. He says: "It is not in a light sense that I say this new doctrine of fasting communion is dangerous. The practice is not advocated because a man comes in a clearer spirit and less disturbed body and mind, able to give himself entirely to prayer and communion with his God; but on a miserable degraded notion that the consecrated elements will meet with other food in the stomach. It is a detestable materialism. Philosophically it is a contradiction: because, when the celebration is over, you may hurry away to a meal, and the process about which you were so scrupulous immediately follows. The whole notion is simply disgusting."—(*Burton's "Lives of Twelve Good Men."* Vol. ii. p. 56.)

(g) For another thing, *I cannot find it written that any one ought to be advised to be present at the Lord's Supper who is not going to be a communicant.*

Many of you may not be aware that this novelty is creeping into the Church of England, and you may hear of it with surprise. I believe, however, that it is a growing evil, and a thing that ought to be firmly resisted. It originates in the mischievous idea that the Lord's Supper is *a sacrifice offered up by a priest*, and not a commemorative ordinance of which all present ought to partake. In short, it is a direct step toward the Romish sacrifices of the Mass, of which your Thirty-first Article declares that they are "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." That there was nothing of the kind at the first institution, that all present were communicants, and all received the bread and wine, that none were merely spectators, that there is not a jot of evidence in the Acts or Epistles that non-communicating attendance was recognised or permitted,—all these things are as clear as noonday, and I will not waste your time by dwelling on the subject. Well and wisely says the Homily of the Sacrament, "We must be ourselves partakers of this table, and not beholders of others."

But I ask you again to mark the words of Bishop Wilberforce. He says: "Non-communicating attendance brings us back to the great abuse of com-

ing to the Sacrament to non-partake instead of partaking: and so we have the condition of things arising in our Communion which already prevails in the Church of Rome.

“That this custom is creeping into our Church is not an accident; neither is it brought in for the purpose of making children better acquainted with our service. It is, remember, under quite a different impression. It is with the idea that prayer is more acceptable at this time of the sacrifice;—that you can get benefit from being within sight of the Sacrament when it is being administered. It is the substitution of a semi-materialistic presence for the actual presence of Christ in the soul of the faithful communicant. It is an abomination, this teaching of non-communicating attendance as a common habit.”—(*Burton's Lives*, vol. ii. p. 57.)

To this testimony I will only add the words of a greater bishop still, I mean Bishop Jewell. He says in the *Apology*: “If any one, before the private Mass was introduced, would only be a spectator, and would abstain from the Holy Communion, the Bishop of Rome in the primitive times, or the ancient Fathers would have excommunicated him as a wicked man and a pagan; nor was there any Christian man in these times who communicated alone in the presence of spectators.”—(*Jewell's Apology*, chap. ii. p. 14.)

(h) In the next place, *I cannot find it written that it is wrong, improper, and undesirable, to celebrate the Lord's Supper in the evening.* This is a point, you all know, about which there is an amazing difference of opinion. Some men almost lose their tempers about it, use violent language, and denounce evening Communion as wicked, irreverent, profane, and of evil tendency! Yet, after all, what saith the Scripture? I declare I see no disputed point in connection with the Lord's Supper on which the arguments and evidence are so entirely on one side.

It cannot possibly be sinful to follow the example of Christ and His apostles. Every reader of the New Testament must know that the institution of the Lord's Supper took place in the evening. It is certain that no special hour is recommended to us in the Acts or Epistles. The Lord's Supper at Troas must have been in the evening. It is equally certain that the Prayer-book leaves the matter to the discretion of every clergyman, and allows him to do what is best for his congregation, and wisely lays down no hard and fast rule about the time. To forbid evening Communion would completely shut out many persons in large town parishes from the Lord's Table. The mothers of many families among the working classes cannot possibly leave home in the morning. The very name “supper” seems to point to the evening of a day rather than the morning. In the face of these facts, to denounce evening Communion as irreverent, wicked, and profane, is neither reasonable nor wise, and I cannot advise any of my brethren who find them use-

ful, to give way to pressure from any quarter, and give up the practice. Remember the great fact that the Bible is on your side, and stand firm.

(i) *In the last place, I cannot find it written that it is necessary or useful for the clergyman in the celebration of the Lord's Supper to wear a peculiar dress not used at other times,—to mix water with the sacramental wine,—to have candles burning on the Communion table in broad daylight,—or to burn incense during the Communion service.* These things are so common in the present day, that I need not do more than name them.

Now there is not a word about any of these practices in the New Testament, unless we press into the service the “cloak” which St. Paul left at Troas with Carpus, and call it a “chasuble,”—or the “lights” which were burned at the Troas Communion, which, however, were burned in the evening and not in the daytime. In short, God's Word is silent about them all. Not one of them is prescribed or ordered in the Prayer-book, and the best English lawyers pronounce them illegal. They are borrowed from the corrupt Church of Rome; and not a few clergymen, after beginning by using them, have ended by believing the sacrifice of the Mass, and joining the Romish Communion. Such things, no doubt, “have a show of wisdom,” and “satisfy the flesh.” They suit the many people who like a mere outward religion. But it is vain to suppose that they please God. In the nature of things they tend to distract and divert the minds of communicants from the true, scriptural, and simple view of the Lord's Supper. No one in his senses can dare to say that they are essential to the validity of the Sacrament, or that our Lord or His apostles ever used them. They are neither more nor less than “will-worship,” and the invention of man. (Coloss. ii. 23.)

I commend the nine points I have gone through to your serious attention. In leaving them, I will only beg you to mark well, and clearly understand, the object of my contention. Remember, I do not deny that the nine points about the Lord's Supper which I have gone through may possibly be ancient, and primitive, and catholic, and patristic, and as such may be honestly defended by some who think them edifying. That is not the question. What I do say is simply this. *Not one of them can be found in the New Testament, and therefore not one of them is essential to the validity of the Sacrament.* Not one of them, moreover, is to be found in the Prayer-book Communion Service, or Catechism, except by strained and unnatural interpretation. Yet the Bible and the Prayer-book are the two books which we are continually striving to teach, and to have recognised, in all our first and second grade schools, through which our middle and lower classes are continually passing! Whether it is just cause for surprise that the vast majority of the middle and lower classes, with nothing but Bibles and Prayer-books in their hands, and totally unacquainted with Fathers, primitive church, and tradition, dislike cordially the nine points I have mentioned, and often rebel

violently against them, is a question I leave you to answer. Whether it is kind and fair to the Church of England to break the peace, to refuse to obey Ecclesiastical Courts, to decline to recognise the Royal supremacy, to multiply our unhappy divisions, and to keep dioceses and bishops in constant hot water, on account of theories and practices which are not to be found in the Bible, is a hard knot which I shall not attempt to untie.

IV. The fourth and last question which I propose to handle in this paper, is a somewhat peculiar and speculative one. I wish to show *the probable reasons why views of the Lord's Supper which certainly cannot be found in God's Word have got such a hold on many Churchmen in these latter days*. The inquiry is a delicate and difficult one, but I think it may be useful to us all. It is one secret of safe navigation to know the currents, reefs, and rocks which cause shipwrecks.

I hold strongly that, on the subject of the Lord's Supper, the Church of England is in very great danger. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that doctrines and practices about this Sacrament are advocated which Jewell, and Hooker, and Hall, and Davenant, and Beveridge, and a host of other departed divines, never sanctioned for a moment, and that a fog of novelties has arisen and spread over the whole land, and becomes thicker every year. At the same time we cannot deny that many who advocate or practise these novelties are zealous, hard-working, self-denying, devout clergymen. Whatever their principles may be, their lives are exemplary and blameless. They profess to love the Church of England quite as much as ourselves; and yet, on the doctrine and ritual of the Lord's Supper, we are as the poles asunder. It is a state of things which puzzles and perplexes young men; and I should like to point out to what it may be traced.\*

(1) I believe the principal cause of the "present distress" is the *gradual departure of many of our clergy, during the last fifty years, from the old Church of England doctrine about the rule of faith*. It is no longer "the Bible and the Bible only" with many, but the Bible and tradition, the Bible and primitive antiquity, the Bible and the voice of the ancient Church. I believe the beginning of the whole mischief was Keble's famous "Sermon on Tradition," and the principle therein contained, that the rule of faith is made up of Scripture and tradition together. That mischievous principle was diligently taught and spread broadcast by the famous *Tracts for the Times*. The Tract 78, p. 2, for example, says plainly, "Scripture and tradition taken to-

---

\* The words of the Bishop of Gloucester on this point are well worth noticing. He says: "It is utterly irrelevant to bring forward the goodness and *devoutness* of the Catholic school. Thank God, there are very many good and devoted Roman Catholics in this world; but this goodness and devotion do not make their principles a whit different from what they are, or render their doctrines in the faintest degree more reconcilable with the teachings and principles of the Reformation."—(Charge. "Guardian," January 16th. 1888.)

gether are the joint rule of faith.” I suspect that principle has been accepted and imbibed by hundreds of English clergymen during the last half-century, and the result has been exactly what might have been expected. They have left the King’s high road of truth, and have lost their way in a pathless jungle. Once admit the mischievous principle that the Bible alone is not the rule of faith about the doctrine and ritual of the Lord’s Supper, and any amount of strange doctrines and superstitious novelties may be brought into the Church. The flood-gates are thrown open, and nothing will keep out a perfect deluge of rubbish. It is useless to say to a clergyman, “Your teachings and proceedings are such as I cannot find in the New Testament or Prayer-book,” when he coolly replies, “Very likely! but they are proceedings sanctioned by Catholic usage, by primitive tradition, by the judgment of the early Fathers, and by the voice of the Church!” We shall never right the ship until we get the supremacy and sufficiency of Scripture once more duly recognised by all Churchmen. Once admit tradition to a seat in the rule of faith, and you have sold the pass to the enemy.

Now I trust I need not remind my younger brethren that the authority of tradition as any part of the rule of faith is not recognised by the Church of England. It entirely denies that there is any other guide for man’s soul that can be placed side by side, or on the same platform, with the Bible. The supreme authority of Scripture, in short, is one of the corner-stones of the Church of England. Here, it would have its members know, is rock: all else is sand. Seven times over that great principle is laid down in our grand Confession of Faith, the Thirty-nine Articles.

The Sixth Article declares that “Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.”

The Eighth Article says that “the three Creeds ought thoroughly to be believed and received, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.”

The Twentieth Article says, “It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.”

The Twenty-first Article says that “things ordained by General Councils as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.”

The Twenty-second Article condemns certain Romish doctrines and practices, “because they are grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.”

The Twenty-eighth Article condemns Transubstantiation, because it cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.

The Thirty-fourth Article says that “traditions and ceremonies may be changed, so that nothing is ordained contrary to God’s Word.”

Time will not allow me to dwell longer on this subject. Dean Goode’s unanswerable volumes on the *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice* should be studied by every one, as well as his works on *Infant Baptism* and *The Lord’s Supper*, They are a perfect treasure-house of arguments. But I must add one quotation from Hooker: “Although ten thousand General Councils would set down one and the same definite sentence concerning any point of religion whatsoever, yet one demonstrative reason adopted on one manifest testimony cited from the mouth of God Himself to the contrary could not but overweigh them all.”—*Hooker*, ii. ch. 7.\*

(2) I believe another cause of the “present distress” is *the extravagant spirit of liberality and toleration which prevails among laymen in the upper classes* about matters of doctrine in the present day. There is a growing disposition to think every earnest, laborious clergyman must be right and cannot be wrong, and that it does not matter one jot what doctrines he holds or teaches, provided he is what is called “a worker.” If this “worker” is only amiable and devout he ought to be let alone, and allowed to teach and do exactly what he likes! In short, the tendency of the public mind in this age is to ignore all differences, and to tolerate anything and everything in religion. Now all this sounds very charitable, and generous, and noble. Yet

---

\* The uselessness and unworkableness of the plausible theory that the voice of the Church and of General Councils ought to be our guide in matters of faith are ably shown in the following passage from Archbishop Tenison:—“This guide could not be the Church *diffuse of the first ages*. For the suffrages of every Christian were never gathered; and if we will have their sense, they must rise from the dead and give it us.—This guide cannot be the faith as such of all the governors of all the primitive Churches. The sense of it was never collected. There were anciently general creeds, but such as especially related to the heresies then on foot; and who can affirm upon grounds of certainty that each bishop in the world consented to each Article, or to each so expressed!—This guide is not a council perfectly free and universal. For a guide which cannot be had is none. If such a council could assemble, it would not err in the necessities of faith. But there never was yet an universal council properly so called. In the councils called general, if we speak comparatively, there were not many southern or western bishops present at them. It was thus at that first oecumenical Council, the Council of Nice, though in one sacred place, Eusebius hath noted there were assembled Syrians and Cilicians, Phoenicians and Arabians, Palestinians, Egyptians, Thebeans, Libyans, Mesopotamians, a Persian, a Scythian bishop, and many others from other countries; but there was but one bishop for Africa, one for Spain, one for Gaul, two priests as deputies for the infirm and aged bishop of Rome; whilst, for instance sake, there were seventeen bishops for the small province of Isauria.—This guide is not the present Church declaring to particular Christians the sense of the Church of former ages. How can this declaration be made, seeing Churches differ, and each Church calls itself the true one, and pretendeth to the primitive pattern?”—(See Goode’s “*Rule of Faith*,” vol. i. p.. 182.)

common sense points out that the extreme of liberty is lawlessness. In every well-ordered Church, while a certain amount of liberty is allowed, there ought to be limits both of doctrine and ritual, and within those limits her ministers ought to walk. But this is precisely what many clergymen refuse to do in the Lord's Supper. They persist in doing and teaching things, in the matter of its doctrine and ritual, which cannot be reconciled either with the New Testament or the Prayer-book, and they ignore all limits but their own will. And nothing encourages them so much in this course as the apparent apathy, or unwillingness to interfere, of the laity. That apathy, I believe, is digging the grave of the Church of England.

I know nothing that will cure this state of things but an increase of Bible-reading among the upper classes of the laity. It is my firm conviction that many of them hardly ever read the New Testament, and are consequently unable to understand the very serious nature of the questions about the Lord's Supper, which are now dividing the clergy, and the doctrinal consequences which are bound up with them. I suspect that very few laymen have ever read the Thirty-nine Articles, or know anything of their contents. Most lay Churchmen can only see that the service in some churches is more ornamental and musical than in others, and that in some there is more importance attached to the Lord's table, and to flowers, decorations, gestures, dress, and postures, than in others. But they can see no further. They cannot, or will not, perceive that the ceremonial actions in administering the Lord's Supper, about which the clergy disagree, are not mere ornamental trifles, as some suppose. So far from being "trifles," they are the outward and visible expressions of a most mischievous doctrine, which strikes at one of the first principles of the Reformed Church of England. They think all earnest, eloquent, zealous, hard-working clergymen cannot be far wrong. And when you tell them that there is an avowed determination among many clergymen to unprotestantize the Established Church, to get behind the Protestant Reformation, and to bring back the Romish Mass and the Confessional, you are too often smiled at as an alarmist, and are not believed. It is my deliberate conviction, that unless English lay Churchmen can be awakened to see the real nature of the existing differences about the Lord's Supper, there will come in a few years the disestablishment, the disendowment, and the disruption of the Church of England.

(3) I believe one more cause of the "present distress" is *the unmistakable desire of many Churchmen to get behind the Reformation, to get as near as possible to the Church of Rome, and to imitate the Romish Mass, as far as possible, in celebrating the Lord's Supper,*

It is useless to deny that there is an immense change in the public mind about Romanism during the last fifty years. Whatever the cause may be,

there is no longer the instinctive shrinking from Popery, and dislike to its distinctive doctrines, which prevailed two hundred years ago when the nation threw off James II. There is a strong disposition to undervalue the Protestant Reformation. Time has a wonderful power of dimming men's eyes, and deadening their recollection of benefits, and making them thankless and ungrateful. Three busy centuries have slipped away since England broke with Rome, and a generation has arisen which, like Israel under the Judges, knows little of the days of the Protestant Exodus, and of the struggles in the wilderness. Partly, too, from a cowardly dislike to religious controversy, partly from a secret desire to appear liberal and condemn nobody's opinions, the Reformation period of English History is sadly slurred over both in Universities and Public Schools. It seems an inconvenient subject, and men give it the cold shoulder. For some reason or other, the Reformation period is too often shunted on a siding, and has not that prominent place in the education of Young England which such a character-forming period most richly deserves. The whole result is that few people seem to understand either the evils from which the Reformation delivered us, or the blessings which the Reformation brought in. In short, many nowadays regard the subject of Popery as a "bore." They blindly persuade themselves that there is no mighty difference between Protestants and Papists at bottom. They say in their hearts, "A plague on both your houses. It is six of one and half-a-dozen of another. It matters little whether you give your allegiance to Canterbury or to Rome."

I ask your attention to the following fact as a proof of what I am saying. I find that at the annual meeting of the English Church Union, in June 1885, Lord Halifax, the president, at the conclusion of a long and carefully prepared speech, used the following words: "*We must strive for union, especially with the great Latin Church, from which we were separated by the sins of the sixteenth century*"—I quote these words from the report of the *Church Times*, which was probably revised. The report of another paper differs slightly, and is as follows: "The restoration of visible unity with the members of the Church abroad, east and west alike, but above all with the great Apostolic See of the West, with the holy Roman Church, which has done so much to guard the true faith—these surely should be our objects, and the objects nearest our hearts." Whichever report you take, I call that very ominous and painful language indeed. I have no doubt that Lord Halifax, who spoke these words, is a devout and honourable man, and believes that he is doing God service, though he is not like the Lord Halifax who led the cheering when the Seven Bishops were acquitted in Westminster Hall two hundred years ago. But, of course, we all know that "the Latin Church" means the Church of Rome, and the "sins of the sixteenth century" mean the Protestant Reformation. Now, I find that the Society which he ad-

dressed, the English Church Union, includes among its members no less than 3,200 clergy and 20,000 laymen, and has branches and ramifications from one end of the land to the other. I find, moreover, that the noble president, who used this language, and is, of course, the mouthpiece and representative of these 3,200 clergy, was heard without the slightest objection being made, and I cannot find that his sentiments have been repudiated or disavowed by the members of the Union down to the present day. I commend that fact to your notice.

The re-union of Christendom is a beautiful thing to talk about, but it is practically unattainable. Gold may be bought too dearly. At any rate there can be no re-union between our Church and Rome, unless we are prepared to sacrifice and throw overboard some of the distinctive principles of our religion. Rome never changes, and will make no concessions on her side. That able man, Dr. Salmon, the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, says in his book on Infallibility: "As the Roman Church is at present disposed, there can be no union with her except on the terms of absolute submission; that submission, moreover, involving an acknowledgment that we, from our hearts, believe things to be true, which we have good reason for knowing to be false." I cannot yet believe that English Churchmen will tamely consent to pass under a yoke as bad as that which was imposed at the Caudine Forks, and submit to such an abject surrender as reunion would require.

I have not the least desire to rekindle the flames of the Popish controversy. It is a controversy which has been fought out a hundred times in the last three centuries, and nothing new can be said. But I do desire to remind my younger brethren that it is no light matter to tamper with Romanism, and that flirtation with the Church of Rome is utterly inconsistent with faithfulness to our own Church. Look at your Thirty-nine Articles. Nine times over those Articles condemn in plain and explicit language certain leading doctrines of the Church of Rome, and especially the doctrine of the Mass.\* Remember that, and beware of the growing tendency to copy and imitate Romish practices in the Lord's Supper. Speaking generally, I regard this morbid anxiety to rejoin a communion of which our Whit-Sunday Homily says, "Nothing can be so far from the nature of the true Church," as one of the most unhealthy symptoms of these latter days. Depend on it, we had better be disestablished and disendowed than bring back the Mass into our Communion, or give up our Protestant principles, and return to that Italian yoke which our forefathers nobly cast off three hundred years ago.

Once more I ask you to hear some of the last words of Bishop Wilberforce: "There is a growing desire to introduce novelties such as incense, a multitude of lights in the chancel, and so on. Now these and such things are

---

\* See Note at the end.

*honestly and truly alien to the Church of England.* Do not hesitate to treat them as such. All this appears to me to indicate a fidgety anxiety to make everything in our churches assimilate to a foreign usage. There is a growing feeling, which I can only describe as ‘ashamedness’ of the Anglican Church, as if our grand old Anglican Communion contrasted unfavourably with the Church of Rome. The habitual language held by many men sounds as if they were *ashamed* of our Church and its position; it is a sort of apology for the Church of England, as compared with the Church of Rome. Why, I would as soon think of apologising for the virtue of my mother. I have no sympathy in the world with such a feeling. I abhor this fidgety desire to make everything un-Anglican. This is not a grand development, as some seem to think. It is a decrepitude. It is not something very sublime and impressive, but something very feeble and contemptible.”—(*Burton’s Twelve Lives*, vol. ii. p. 58.)

Allow me now to conclude this over-long paper with a few words of practical advice to the many younger brethren whom I have the great pleasure of seeing before me. I have been young like yourselves, and now am old. I have tried in my poor way to fight the battle of evangelical truth for forty-five years, and I cannot expect to fight much longer. But looking back on that long period, I thank God that I have never changed my opinions. I take you to record this day that I am not ashamed of the flag under which I have fought. Bear with me while, as an old witness, I offer you a few friendly parting counsels.

You live in perilous times. There are within our Church two opposing views of the Lord’s Supper, and I fail to see how they can be reconciled. It is useless to appeal to Old Church Courts about them, because their decisions are not obeyed. It is useless, apparently, to expect New Courts, as there is no attempt to create them. Hope deferred makes the heart sick. Ecclesiastical discipline seems to have died out, and in place of it there is such a reign of anarchy, chaos, and confusion, that every clergyman does what is right in his own eyes. Such are the days in which your lot is cast. Bear with me while I offer a few hints about your line of duty.

(1) First and foremost, *stand fast in the old paths of evangelical truth about the Sacraments, and especially about the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.* As in Bloody Mary’s days, so now it is “*articulus mortis aut vitæ.*” Never be tempted to leave these paths for the sake of pretended unity. Unity purchased at the expense of truth is not worth having. Peace at any price is not to be desired either by a church or a nation. Never sacrifice principle to peace. Never mind being in a minority. So was Elijah; so was Athanasius; so was Wycliffe; so was Luther; so were Romaine, and Venn, and Grimshaw, and Berridge in the last century. So were the hundred and twen-

ty disciples in the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem. Majorities do not always win in the long run. As a general rule, it is minorities that shake the world.

(2) In the second place, *never be ashamed of your principles, and never take up a timid apologetic tone, as if you thought yourselves mere tolerated heretics. Quit you like men—be strong.*

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 especially 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 Church-ism,—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 always speaking out, and 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.

The good old Evangelical flag which our Reformers re-hoisted three hundred years ago and refused to strike, though refusal cost their lives, is doubtless no longer fashionable. But it is the flag under which our fathers held the fort and kept the bridge in the dark days of Laud and James II. It is the flag under which Romaine and his companions fought the good fight in the gloomy era of last century, when even Bishop Butler refused the primacy, saying, "It was too late to take the command of a sinking ship." It is a plain flag, perhaps, and looks poor by the side of the gaudy banners of the seventeenth century. But it is one of which we need not be ashamed.

I am bold to say that, in the matter of true, honest, conscientious membership of the Church of England, the Evangelical body need fear no comparison with any other school of thought within the Church's pale. They may safely challenge any amount of fair investigation and inquiry. Have others signed the Thirty-nine Articles "*ex animo et bona fide*"? so have

they. Have others declared their full assent to the Liturgy? so have they. Do others use the Liturgy, adding nothing and omitting nothing, reverently, solemnly, and audibly? so do they. Are others obedient to bishops? so are they. Do others labour for the prosperity of the Church of England? so do they. Do others value the privileges of the Church of England, and deprecate needless separation? so do they. Do others honour the Lord's Supper, and press it on the attention of all believing hearers? so do they. But they will not concede that a man must follow Archbishop Laud, and be half a Romanist in order to be a Churchman. They are true High Churchmen, and not Roman High Churchmen. And the best proof of their Churchmanship is the fact that for every one of *their body* who has left the Church of England and gone over to Dissent, they can point to ten High Churchmen who have left the Church of England and gone over to Rome.

(3) In the third place, *give no occasion of offence to those Churchmen who disagree with you; but strive to adorn your principles and make them beautiful in every way.* Give no occasion, by careless performance of divine services, by slovenly administration of the Lord's Supper, by dull heavy singing, by feeble unprepared sermons, by neglect of day schools and Sunday schools, by laziness and indolence in any department of pastoral work, by carelessness in looking after the sick, the poor, the aged, the young men, the candidates for confirmation and the communicants. These are the kind of things which sometimes unhappily ruin the credit of evangelical religion. And last, but not least, give no occasion by discourtesy and rudeness in dealing with Churchmen who disagree with you. Their hearts are often better than their heads. Do not drive them further away from us by cold and rough treatment. Courtesy costs little and is worth much.

(4) In the fourth place, *be prepared to endure hardship, and keep up a great stock of patience for daily use.* Be ready to bear hard words, and to hear yourself called by hard names, such as Zwinglian, Calvinist, Puritan, Dissenter, Ignorant, Unlearned, Party-spirited, and the like. Take it quietly. Abusive language is the favourite weapon of many people, when they run short of arguments. To ridicule, vilify, slander and misrepresent is part of the "plan of campaign" which Christ's soldiers in England must be prepared to meet in this day. Is it not written, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you"?—Be ready also to bear hard treatment. You may find yourself sometimes snubbed, boycotted, threatened, scolded, treated as black sheep, and passed over as unworthy of official honours and promotion. Never mind. It matters nothing to miss the praise of men if you have the praise of God. Remember that "He who is higher than the highest regardeth, and there be higher than they." (Eccles, v. 8.)

(5) Finally, I charge and beseech every one who hears me *not to forsake and leave the Church of England, not to secede, and not to gratify her ene-*

*mies by deserting her in her time of need.* I desire to offer an affectionate warning to all who are in this frame of mind. I ask them to consider well what they do, and to take the advice of the town-clerk of Ephesus,—“to do nothing rashly.” (Acts xix. 36.) I entreat them to call faith and patience into exercise, and at any rate to wait long before they secede, to pray much, to read their Bibles much, and to be very sure that they have done everything that can be done to amend what is wrong.

It is a cheap and easy course of action to secede from a Church when we see evils around us, but it is not always the wisest one. To pull down a house because the chimney smokes, to chop off a hand because we have cut our finger, to forsake a ship because she has sprung a leak,—all this we know is childish impatience. But is it a wise man’s duty to forsake a Church because many things around him are unsatisfactory and wrong? I answer decidedly and unhesitatingly, No! Romaine, and Venn, and Grimshaw, and Berridge, and Hervey, and Toplady did not forsake the Church of England, though they stood alone a hundred times more than we do. Are we better than they? Like them, let us stand fast. The God who supported them is not dead but alive. To launch the longboat when a ship is in distress, and leave the passengers to sink, is not the action of a good British seaman. Our Liverpool captains would scorn to do such a thing. Have we less courage than they? So long as we have truth, liberty to preach, and an unaltered Confession of Faith in the Church of England, so long I am convinced that the way of patience is much better than the way of secession.

When the Thirty-nine Articles are altered, or cancelled and thrown aside altogether—when the Gorham decision is ignored or reversed,—when the Prayer-book is revised on Romish principles and filled with Popery,—when the Bible is withdrawn from the reading-desk,—when the pulpit is shut against the Gospel,—when the Mass is formally restored in every parish church by Act of Parliament,—when, in short, our present order of things in the Church of England is altered by statute, and Queen, Lords, and Commons command that our parish churches shall be given over to processions, incense, crosses, images, banners, gorgeous vestments, idolatrous veneration of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, histrionic gestures and postures, bowings, crossings, and the like,—when these things come to pass by law and rule,—then it will be time for us all to leave the Church of England. Then we may arise and say with one voice, “Let us depart, for God is not here.”

But till that time—and God forbid it should ever come; till that time,—and when it does come, there will be a good many seceders, and the Church will go to pieces,—till that time, let us stand fast and fight for the truth. Till that time, let us not despair of our republic any more than the Roman general of old. Let us not desert our post to save trouble, or move out to please

our adversaries, or spike our guns to avoid a battle. No! in the name of God let us fight on, even if we are like the three hundred at Thermopylae,—few with us, many against us, and traitors on every side. Let us fight on, and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

The good ship of the Church of England may have some rotten planks about her. The crew may, some of them, be useless and mutinous, and not trustworthy. But there are still some faithful ones among them. There is still hope for the good old craft. The Great Pilot has not yet left her. Let us therefore stick by the ship.\*

---

\* The following extract from the last Charge of the late Dr. Longley, Archbishop of Canterbury, appears to me to deserve special attention in the present day.

The office held by the Archbishop, the remarkable gentleness and mildness of his character, the fact that this Charge contains his last sentiments, and that it was not made public till after his death,—all this appears to me to invest this passage about the Lord's Supper with peculiar interest.

He says: "It is far from my intention to impute to all those who have taken the ill-advised step of adopting the sacrificial vestments (in administering the Lord's Supper) any sympathy with Roman error; but I am constrained to avow that there are plain indications in some of the publications which have been issued as manifestoes of the opinions of that section of our Church, that some of its professed members, yea, even of her ministers, think themselves at liberty to hold the doctrines of the Church of Rome in relation to the Sacrifice of the Mass, and yet retain their position within the pale of the Anglican Church with the avowed purpose of eliminating from its formularies every trace of the Reformation, as regards its protest against Romish error. The language they hold with respect to it is entirely incompatible with loyalty to the Church to which they profess to belong. They call it 'a communion deeply tainted with Protestant heresy:' 'Our duty,' they say, 'is the expulsion of the evil, not flight from it.' It is no want of charity, therefore, to declare that they remain with us in order that they may substitute the Mass for the Communion; the obvious aim of our Reformers having been to substitute the Communion for the Mass. Doubtless the Church of England admits of considerable latitude in the views that may be taken of that most mysterious of all mysteries, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. And so long as those solemn words of its original institution, 'This is my Body,' 'This is my Blood,' shall remain in the sentence of consecration (and they never can be erased from it), so long will there be varieties of interpretation of these words, all of which may be consistent with a true allegiance to our Church, provided these three conditions be observed:—

"1. That they be not construed to signify that the Natural Body of Christ is present in the Sacrament:

"2. Nor to admit of any adoration either of the Sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or of any corporal presence of Christ's Natural Body and Blood:

"3. Nor to justify the belief that the Body and Blood are again offered as a satisfaction for sin; seeing that the offering of Christ once made was a perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, original and actual.

"These are the limits which our Church imposes upon the liberty of interpretation of the words of our Blessed Lord.

"The use of these sacrificial vestments is in the minds of many intimately connected with the idea that an essential element in the Holy Communion is the offering to God a

*Note referred to in page 21.*

What says the Nineteenth Article? “The Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.”

---

Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, which abide with the elements in a mysterious manner after the act of consecration. The minister wears the vestments at that time as a sacrificing priest. According to this view, it would seem that the most important of this Holy Sacrament is what we offer to God, not what we receive from Him.

“This view is not recognised by the Church of England in her formularies. The general definition in the XXVth Article states that Sacraments are ‘certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, by the which [God] doth work invisibly in us;’ and it is said specially of the Lord’s Supper (Art. XXVIII.), that it ‘is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ? The idea of the Sacrifice of that Body and Blood finds no place in either of these strict definitions. The Catechism speaks the same language whom it defines a Sacrament to be ‘an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us.’ Nor will an examination of the Office of the Holy Communion itself give any countenance to the idea in question. The Only distinct oblation or offering mentioned in that Office is previous to the consecration of the elements, in the Prayer for the Church Militant, and therefore cannot be an offering or sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ; and the only sacrifice which we are spoken of as making, is the offering of ‘ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice.’ Our Church seems most studiously to have avoided any expression which could countenance the notion of a perpetual sacrifice of Christ; while, on the other hand, it speaks of Christ’s death upon the cross as ‘His one oblation of Himself once offered as a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.’ No room is left for the repetition of that sacrifice, or for the admission of any other sacrifice for sin.

“The Romish notion of a true, real, and substantial Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, as it is called in the Council of Trent, entailed the use of the term *altar*. But this term appears nowhere in the Book of Common Prayer, and was no doubt omitted lest any countenance should be given to the sacrificial view. The notion, therefore, of making in the material elements a perpetual offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, is as foreign to the spirit and the letter of our Service as I hold it to be to the doctrine of the early Fathers, as well as of the leading divines of our Church. This latter point also I shall endeavour to establish hereafter.

“ Meanwhile it cannot be denied, on the other hand, that the doctrine of the Real Presence is, in one sense, the doctrine of the Church of England. She asserts that the Body and Blood of Christ are ‘verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.’ And she asserts equally that such presence is not material or corporal; but that Christ’s Body is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. (Art. XXVIII.) Christ’s presence is effectual for all those intents and purposes for which His Body was broken and His Blood shed. As to a presence elsewhere than in the heart of the believer, the Church of England is silent, and the words of Hooker therefore represent her views: ‘The real presence of Christ’s most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.’”

What says the Twenty-second Article? “The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images and Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.”

What says the Twenty-fourth Article? It forbids the Romish custom of having public prayers, and ministering the sacraments in Latin, as “repugnant to the Word of God.”

What says the Twenty-fifth Article? It declares that the five Romish sacraments of Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be accounted sacraments of the Gospel.

What says the Twenty-eighth Article? It declares that “Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.” It also declares that “the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.”

What says the Thirtieth Article? “The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people.”

What says the Thirty-first Article? “The sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.”

What says the Thirty-second Article? “Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God’s law to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.”

What says the Thirty-seventh Article? “The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.”