

The Church Times.

J. C. Cochran—Editor.

“Evangelical Truth—Apostolic Order.”

W. Goswami—Publisher.

No. VII. HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, AUGUST 10, 1854. NO. 83.

Calendar.

CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

DATE	MORNING.	EVENING.
20	10. S. An. Tris.	1 King 21
21	11. S. An. Tris.	21. Danel 4
22	12. S. An. Tris.	22. Danel 6
23	13. S. An. Tris.	23. Danel 8
24	14. S. An. Tris.	24. Danel 10
25	15. S. An. Tris.	25. Danel 12
26	16. S. An. Tris.	26. Danel 14
27	17. S. An. Tris.	27. Danel 16
28	18. S. An. Tris.	28. Danel 18
29	19. S. An. Tris.	29. Danel 20
30	20. S. An. Tris.	30. Danel 22

Poetry.

GOD IS LOVE.

With doubts and cares, and fears oppress,
Man's wayward thoughts descending rove:
Where shall the troubled soul find rest?
O fly to God, for God is Love.

When bowed beneath afflictions sent,
Thy frequent wanderings to reprove,
Call them as Heaven's kind mercies meant
For thy soul's good, for God is Love.

When sinful pangs thy soul annoy,
With tears and prayers God's mercy prove,
From Him seek pardon, peace, and joy,
Seek, you shall find, for God is Love.

Jesus, hear His mercy speak;
Hear Him who reigns in Heaven above,
From Heaven He came, the lost to seek;
Jesus is God, and God is Love.

Trust, trust in Him—for you He died,
By works of love thy faith approve,
Thy soul shall find in peace abide,
And know and feel that God is Love.

As may I live, thus let me die,
That when the summons calls—“Remove,”
Thy soul, redeemed, to Heaven may fly,
To sing with saints—our God is Love.

—Lord Teignmouth.

Religious Miscellany.

“A Charge,” delivered by the Bishop of Worcester, July 1854.

REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST—SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENTS.

learned dignity of the Church,* and one whose opinions derive additional weight, not only from the name he bears, but from his own acknowledged piety and attainments, has laid down the two following propositions:—first, that the Man Christ Jesus is really present in the holy eucharist by reason of the presence of his body and blood; and secondly, that the holy eucharist is as much a sacrament as the bread and wine. We have it then asserted by an authority which we must all respect, that the actual corporeal body of Christ is present by the act of consecration in the elements of the Lord's Supper; and consequently, that those who partake of those elements partake of His body and blood. I shall endeavour to show, in the course of this charge, that this doctrine, with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is inconsistent with the Articles and Rubrics of our Church. Before I do so I will briefly consider whether it receives any countenance from Scripture. Now a wonderful mystery cannot be imagined than that should be ascribed to the learned divine to whom I have alluded. If indeed, those who partake of this sacrament actually partake of the real body and blood of Christ, not figuratively or spiritually, but really and verily, in what terms should we expect the inspired writers of the New Testament to have spoken of this wonderful mystery? We have every reason to believe that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was first instituted in the very infancy of the Church. We find frequent mention of it in the Acts of the Apostles; but such mention is unaccompanied with those expressions of veneration which the participation of the real body and blood of their Saviour must have evoked from His early disciples. Thus, in the Acts chapter we are told that they who gladly received the word “were baptized, and continued stedfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in

breaking of bread and in prayers;” and again, “They continuing daily with one accord in the temple and breaking of bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people.” There can be no doubt that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is here referred to, and is it credible that it would have been so referred to in the simple terms of “breaking of bread” if it was believed to be such an awful and incomprehensible mystery? So when the account is given in St. Luke's Gospel of the interview between our blessed Saviour and the disciples at Emmaus, we are told that he became known to them, not by administering to them His body and blood, but simply that He became known to them in the breaking of bread. To my mind this argument from Scripture is conclusive, for I never can believe that a mystery, such as the Lord's Supper is represented to be by the author to whom I have referred, would have been thus slightly mentioned, coupled with prayers and other religious duties, but without one word in reference to so awful a doctrine as that those who were thus engaged, in the “breaking of bread from house to house,” were participators of the body and blood of their Lord and Master Jesus Christ. But, secondly, the very time at which the Lord's Supper was instituted, is conclusive against our author's hypothesis. Our blessed Saviour was then alive. When He held the bread in His hands and said—“This is my body;” and in like manner when He held the cup and said—“This is my blood.” He could not have intended to express that He held His body and blood in His own hand, nor could His disciples have so understood Him. They were used to the figurative language so generally adopted among Oriental nations, and no doubt understood that when they were directed to eat His body and drink His blood they should, by partaking of what represented His body and blood, feed upon Him spiritually in their minds, so as to become one with Him and He one with them. There is a passage in the Prophet Ezekiel which has always appeared to me as an apt illustration of the matter. When his commission was given to this prophet, it was given in these words:—“Son of Man eat this roll; and go speak unto the house of Israel. So I opened my mouth, and he caused me to eat the roll. And he said unto me, Son of Man cause thy belly to eat, and fill thy bowels with this roll that I give thee. Then did I eat it, and it was in my mouth as honey for sweetness.” It is obvious by these words was intended to be expressed, not that the prophet should literally eat the book which was presented to him—but that his mind should be so deeply penetrated with its contents, that he should so take in, retain and digest them, as he digested animal food with his bodily organs. In like manner when we are told that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper we eat His body and drink His blood, nothing more is intended to be expressed than that our souls should be strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ as our bodies are by bread and wine.

ADDITIONAL SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENTS.

In considering, however, the argument from Scripture, it would certainly be unfair entirely to pass over the expressions used by St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, which have been frequently quoted in favour of the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist:—“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? Now I fully agree with Archbishop Sharpe that the proper interpretation of these words is—“The partaking of the bread and the cup is the means which God hath appointed for our partaking of the benefits of Christ's body that was broken, and of His blood that was shed for us—that is to say, the forgiveness of our sins and all the other fruits and advantages of His passion;” but this will further appear if we attentively consider the whole scope and argument of that portion of the epistle. The apostle's object was to caution the Corinthians against partaking of the feasts then usually celebrated by the heathens when they offered sacrifices to their idols. He therefore places in juxtaposition the Lord's Supper with those feasts, and reminds them that, as by the former they enter into a communion with Christ, so by the latter they enter into a like communion with devils, concluding by

saying, “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils.” The antithesis here is so marked that, of necessity, we must understand both clauses of the antithesis in the same sense, and, as it cannot be contended that the Corinthians, when they partook of the sacrifices offered to idols, became thereby participators of the very substance of such idols, so there is no ground for inferring from this passage of St. Paul that by the term, partaking of the Lord's table, he intended to express a participation in the actual body and blood of Christ. It is, indeed, so obvious that in the institution of the Lord's Supper the figure was adopted so usual in all nations, but especially among oriental nations, of substituting the sign for the thing signified, that it would be difficult to account for a controversy which has now lasted above three hundred years, if we did not know that it is the natural tendency of the human mind, more especially in religious matters, to delight in giving to the most plain and simple words some dark and mysterious interpretation.

DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

But, after all, the main question is not what may have been the opinion of this or that father, as what is the doctrine of our own Church upon this much disputed question. I think that no one can attentively consider the Articles and Liturgy of our Church without being satisfied that the corporeal human presence of Christ in the Lord's supper is in no degree recognised by them. For what saith our twenty-eighth Article—“The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Lord's Supper, only after a heavenly or spiritual manner, and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten is faith.” Is it in the nature of the words to be more distinct and explicit? If when we receive the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper we have faith in the atonement once made by Him for our sins, He becomes the aliment of our souls, we spiritually feed upon Him; we become one with Him and He one with us; but we approach the verge of Romanism when we hold with the ven. author to whom I have referred, that in any sense He is made humbly or corporeally present by the act of consecration. But it is not merely by the Articles of our Church that we are brought to this conclusion—the whole tenour of the communion service confirms the interpretation which I have put on the twenty-eighth Article. Thus, in the exhortation, the people are told that by means of this sacrament they spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, and, to prevent the possibility of any false impression being derived from the adoption in the service of the figure used in Scripture of representing the sign as the thing signified, we have a rubric at the conclusion distinctly stating that by the practice of kneeling during the reception of the Lord's Supper no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ's flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine 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. Such is the language of our Church; but how is this consistent with that of our author who states “that Christ is present in the holy eucharist by His body and blood—that there is not only that presence of the Godhead which attends upon His gifts, but also that presence of His flesh and blood which is bestowed through the consecrated elements.” If once we adopt this doctrine, I see not how we can consistently abstain from the adoration of the eucharistic elements practised in the Roman Catholic Church. For if, indeed, the actual body of Christ be present in the creatures of bread and wine which we consecrate in commemoration of His precious death until His coming again, who would not bow down with reverence in the presence of his crucified Saviour! And yet we are distinctly told in the twenty-eighth Article of our Church, that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not to be carried about, hated up, or worshipped

* Archbishop Wilberforce.