

**CIHM
Microfiche
Series
(Monographs)**

**ICMH
Collection de
microfiches
(monographies)**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

© 1994

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
					✓						

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:

Anglican Church of Canada
General Synod Archives

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

Anglican Church of Canada
General Synod Archives

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)



1.4
1.5
1.6
1.7
1.8
1.9
2.0
2.2
2.5
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
4.5
5.0
5.6
6.3
7.1
8.0
9.0
10
11.2
12.5
14
16
18
20
22.5
25
28
32
36
40
45
50
56
63
71
80
90
100



APPLIED IMAGE Inc

1653 East Main Street
Rochester, New York 14609 USA
(716) 482-0300 - Phone
(716) 288-5989 - Fax

THE
HOLY MEMORIAL.

A BRIEF SUMMARY, HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL,
ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY THE

REV. DR. BEAUMONT,

INCUMBENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, PETROLEA, in the DIOCESE of HURON.

GRADUATE, AND MEMBER OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL, OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

M.D., L.R.C.P., EDINBURGH, &c.

PUBLISHED BY E. A. TAYLOR & CO., RICHMOND-ST.

LONDON :

ADVERTISER-STEAM PRESSES, RICHMOND STREET.

1873.



MM 53
324

THE
HOLY MEMORIAL.

A BRIEF SUMMARY, HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL,
ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY THE

REV. DR. BEAUMONT,

INCUMBENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, PETROLEA, in the DIOCESE of HURON.

GRADUATE, AND MEMBER OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL, OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S, SCOTLAND.

M.D., L.R.C.P., EDINBURGH, ETC.

PUBLISHED BY E. A. TAYLOR & CO., RICHMOND-ST.

LONDON :

ADVERTISER STEAM PRESSES, RICHMOND STREET.

1873.

PREFACE.

The design of the following pages is to show that the Doctrines of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper were utterly unknown in the Apostolic Age, in the Post-Apostolic ages, and in the Catholic (Orthodox and Universal) Church of the first eight centuries; that they were equally unknown to the early Fathers; and were the inventions of the Roman Church in her advancing career of corruption. That they must, therefore, be altogether repudiated by those who would preserve the primitive purity of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of England.

THE HOLY MEMORIAL;

OR, THE LORD'S SUPPER

HISTORICALLY AND DOCTRINALLY CONSIDERED.

—♦♦♦—
"This do in remembrance of me."—1 Cor. xi. 24.

The evils of departure from the plain teaching of the Word of God are nowhere more apparent than in the controversies which have disturbed the Christian Church during many by-gone centuries, in reference to the Lord's Supper. Opinions have been held, and doctrines have been put forth on this subject, which, on questioning the page of ecclesiastical history, seem to have had no place in the early Christian Church. Time, instead of smoothing down the acerbities of contending parties, seems only to intensify them, and now, more particularly in the mother country, the contention rages more fiercely than ever. Rome, by means of her Jesuitical agents, is forcing upon the people of England, with a spirit of true ferocity, the pernicious doctrines which are held in her own corrupt and uncatholic communion. I repeat the word uncatholic with due intent, because the doctrines of Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Real Material Presence in the Supper, were never held—never in the wildest flights of fancy conceived—by the Ancient Catholic, or Universal and Orthodox Church, during the first eight hundred years of her existence. They took their first rise in the ninth century, and were fully settled and set forth dogmatically by the Church of Rome in the sixteenth century. They are therefore comparatively modern errors, and had no place in the canons and constitutions of the Primitive Church.

4

I.—THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

St. Paul's account of the institution of the Holy Memorial strictly corroborates the testimony of the Evangelists Matthew, Mark and Luke. He wrote his record of it quite independently of them, and adds this important declaration, that it was communicated to him separately and by Divine revelation; he "neither received it of man, neither was he taught it," but had it "by the revelation of Jesus Christ."—Gal. i. 12. The words of the Apostle so plainly and so clearly show the Lord's Supper to be a *commemorative ordinance*, that I will here transcribe the whole passage, as given in his first epistle to the Corinthians. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread: and, when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you, this do in remembrance of Me." (The original Greek says, Do this for a remembrance of Me). "After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in My blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance-(for a remembrance) of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." This latter clause, "Ye do show the Lord's death," &c., is more correctly rendered, "*ye proclaim and commemorate* the Lord's death till He come." The Lord's Supper has therefore a two-fold significance.

1. It was commemorative of His first coming to suffer and die.
2. It was anticipative of His second coming, in glory.

1. The rejection of the Lord Jesus by the Jews, and the errors so fatal in their consequences to the whole Jewish nation, arose from the confusion of the passages relating to these two phases of the Redeemer's work.

These two events in the Christian dispensation were not understood by the public interpreters of the Old Testament Scriptures. The prophetic writings distinctly set forth both, but the Jewish doctors gave a partial interpretation, and expected the promised Messiah to come with all the pomp and pageantry of an earthly monarch. They expected Him as their deliverer from the domination of imperial Rome, and vainly imagined that their own nation should at once be placed in the fore-front of the nations of the earth. Their error consisted in overlooking the testimony of the prophets as to the lowliness and sufferings of the

Holy One. When, therefore, in the "fulness of time," He appeared on this earth to effect the remission of sins, "He came unto His own and His own received Him not."

It was the express purpose of His *first* advent to suffer and to die in our stead, "the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God."

Pause for a moment to think of the extreme heinousness of sin, and the costly penalty it involved. No earthly sacrifices of any nature or even of unlimited numbers, could satisfy the demands of Divine justice. Even the Mosaic sacrifices, though appointed by God, were utterly insufficient, and were only intended as types to prefigure the great sacrifice to come.

Nothing less than a Divine Victim could make effective reconciliation for us unto God. Therefore the *Son of God* Himself came down to earth, and as He could not suffer nor offer Himself in His *Divine* nature, He took upon Him our *humanity*, and in it He suffered. Jesus, the Lord, Christ, though to carnal eyes a seeming man, united in His own mysterious person the Godhood and the manhood, "for in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

The Divine Victim, "the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world," shrunk not from the awful task, but "delivered Himself up for us all." He surrendered Himself in order to undergo all those sufferings which terminated in His death; and having completed His saving work, He exclaimed, "It is finished!"

Thus was offered upon Calvary, "*once for all*," an all-sufficient *sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction* for the sins of the whole world.

2. But the act which ratified all this, and gave us a pledge of its efficacy, was the *Resurrection*, a fact well known, and at the very time of its occurrence acknowledged by foes, and rejoiced in by the followers of the Risen One. After having familiarly associated with His disciples for a period of six weeks subsequently to His resurrection, the Lord Jesus went out to Bethany, and in the presence of a large body of witnesses, after having given full instruction for the further prosecution of the gospel message, finally left this lower world. He was carried up by attendant powers from above, and made His glorious and triumphal entry into heaven, "where He ever liveth to make intercession for us."

While the disciples were still standing gazing heavenward, transfixed with wondering rapture at the sight, angelic messengers appeared upon the scene, and thus addressed them: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven."—Acts i. 11.

Shall *so come!* In His glorified body, with glorious hosts attending, and with power and splendour! In His first advent all the prophecies relating to His sufferings and death on our behalf were amply fulfilled, even to the last jot and tittle; and so in His second advent, yet *future*, all relating to His *glory* shall also be realized, for He shall wield the mighty sceptre of universal empire. The Lord's ancient and covenant people, the Jews, shall be brought in with the fulness of the Gentiles, and the Christian Church, embracing faithful believers of all nations, shall realize the full answer to their now daily prayer, "Thy kingdom come!"

This blessed event is to be kept in mind by those who participate in the Lord's Supper, for Jesus Himself concluded all by saying, "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."—1 Cor. xi. 26.

Let this prospect encourage us!

When we look around and see infidelity, indifference, error, violence, fraud and superstition hurrying away unhappy millions to perdition, let us rejoice in the fact that the day will come—perhaps ere long—when all these shall give place to piety and truth, to light and intelligence, to benevolence and good-will to men, and when heaven itself shall be begun upon earth. Pray! O! pray for the hastening of that day! "Lord, how long?"

II.—INNOVATIONS.

The observance of the Lord's Supper by the Early Christian Church.

The Lord's Supper was, during the apostolic age, celebrated in the evening, as a strictly spiritual festival, and was preceded by the *Agape*, or Love-Feast, at which the wealthy brought sufficient for the joint wants both of themselves and the poor. For many centuries subsequently it was observed with all simplicity. Certain alterations were, however, made in it by Gregory the Great, who was consecrated Bishop of Rome in the year 590, and who not only augmented the ceremonial

of the church generally, but added many embellishments to the Lord's Supper in particular, in order to render it more impressive. Still it was regarded as a memorial, and as a memorial only, of the efficacious sacrifice and precious death of the Lord Jesus. The influence and popularity of the clergy at this time advanced with rapid strides, and everywhere their importance as counsellors in civil affairs, and as priests of God, was acknowledged. It is not to be marvelled at, that, with human weakness and vanity clinging to them, some should have sought out doctrinal means of still further pushing their official claims. In the 9th century a Gallican priest had the audacity to assert, that after the delivery of the words of consecration, the bread was turned into the real and material flesh of Christ, and the wine into His veritable blood. All Christendom was startled by the assertion; and many and long were the disputations which ensued.

Wordly-minded priests saw that an engine of great power would be placed in their hands—a power that would give them permanent lordship over the minds of the people—if this startling doctrine could be established. But even the increasingly corrupt Church of Rome herself hesitated for nearly 400 years before adopting this strange assertion as an article of her faith; and it was not until the 4th Lateran Council, in 1215, that this, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, was finally set forth as an established dogma of the Roman Church.

Rome has ever been remarkable for the pertinacity with which she has followed out her errors, and her course of action in reference to Transubstantiation adds another instance of the woeful blunders she has made by departing from the plain Word of God.

The Council of Trent (1545-1564), held in the very days of the great reformation of the sixteenth century, as if determined to make the breach between Protestantism and Romanism—the Bible and the Papacy—utterly impassable, went the whole length on this subject. Pope Pius IV. condensed the decisions of this Council into a creed, to which his name is given, and which thus sums up the matter: "I profess likewise that in the Mass is offered to God a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy sacrifice of the Eucharist there is truly, really and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the

body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood (of Christ), which conversion the Catholic (Roman) Church calls 'Transubstantiation.'

Can anything be conceived more gross and monstrous than the doctrines embodied in this short paragraph?

The Church at Rome of the early centuries of Christianity knew nothing of such doctrines, nor were they ever even hinted at. But the fact of their subsequent promulgation stands before the world, graven on the tablets of history. With the open Word of eternal truth before them, men pressed into the service of Jesuitism are at present fiercely propagating, in the mother country, these pernicious and revolting doctrines. Rome is getting together her forces for a series of efforts in her life or death struggle—for her days are numbered—and England is the battle-field. The next century, according to calculations based on prophetic data, will probably witness agitations unsurpassed for severity in the religious history of the world. The contest will be between the Bible and the Papacy, and can we doubt on which side the victory will be? But in view of the social and even family turmoils into which a malignant Jesuitism will plunge Protestant Christendom (and perhaps England in particular), we have a duty, and that duty is, that we should "Earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints."

Let us cherish a glowing thankfulness for the privilege of having the Word of God in our hands, and let us more devotedly and more earnestly follow its hallowed teachings than we have ever hitherto done.

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE AND THE PAPAL DOCTRINE OF THE
LORD'S SUPPER.

The meretricious splendors of the Roman Catholic Mass are as attractive to the carnal mind, even in these enlightened days, as ever. But the wonder is that men duly indoctrinated into the principles of Evangelical Protestantism should, in their eagerness after a more showy ritual, have been betrayed into the advocacy of Romish doctrine, and the very practice of Romish Ceremonial itself. Truly, there is need for an anxious inquiry after the "old paths" of the Primitive Church.

The Romish Church sets forth two propositions in reference to the Supper, which are equally unscriptural:—

1. That it embodies the *Real, Material and Bodily* PRESENCE of Christ.
2. That it is a *sacrifice*.

1. The former of these two theories originated, as we see, in the 9th century, and is the logical sequence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The Church of Rome, in order to put the matter beyond the bounds of misunderstanding, declares that after consecration the bread and wine become "really, truly and substantially the *body* and *blood* together with the *soul* and *divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ. (Creed of Pope Pius IV., 1564.) And she further declares that, "In this Sacrament are contained not only the *true body* of Christ and all the constituents of a true body, as BONE and SINEWS, but also *Christ whole and entire.*" (Trent Catechism, 1564.)

The real presence of Christ in the Supper was, even in its simplest form, never imagined by the divines of the early Christian Church. Before the close of the first century divers errors had crept in and marred the doctrines promulgated by the Apostles, and for several centuries afterwards, various errors had to be considered and formally put down by general councils of the Church. The *divinity* of our Lord was by materialists called in question, while on the other hand His *humanity* itself was also denied, there having been a class of disputants who maintained that the body of Jesus was not real and substantial, but only seeming; that indeed He had dwelt on earth in His divine and spiritual nature, but that His apparent body was a mere phantom! Each and every doctrine of the Christian faith was in these early days subjected to the most minute and searching criticism, but no such notion as that of Transubstantiation was ever even hinted at; nor do the writings of the Fathers of the first four or five centuries contain anything that favours the doctrine of the Real Presence. Such a doctrine, then, though an essential one of the modern *Roman* Church was most certainly never held by the early Catholic or Orthodox Church. Much stress has been laid by Roman writers, in their defence of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, on the words of our Lord, "This IS my body," and these words are held by them to be conclusive. But here again is another blunder added to the heap already standing at the door of Rome, as the consequence of her open departure from the Word of God. The ordinary reader of the sacred page is familiar with many such dogmatic phrases, which however are only *symbolical*. Our Lord Jesus also said, "I am the *vine*, ye are the branches." "I am the *way*." "I am the *door*." In Deut. xvi. 3, the unleavened bread is called "the bread of affliction," and the head of the Jewish family at

the Supper of the Passover, broke it and gave to each a piece of it, with the words, "*This is* (signifies, represents, commemorates) the bread of affliction which your fathers did eat in the land of Egypt." The prophet Ezekiel was commanded to shave his head as representative of the desolation of Jerusalem; then it is written, "Thus saith the Lord, *this is Jerusalem.*" What! the prophet's shaven head? St. Paul in Gal. iv. 25, writing of Agar, says: "This Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia;" and our Lord who said, "*This is My body,*" said also, "*This Cup is the New Testament in My blood.*" And when, on another occasion He significantly said, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me," He by no means meant that His labor was the material sustenance of His body.

Our venerable Church, in her xxviii. article, sets forth very clearly the spiritual character of the Supper in these words: "The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is *Faith.*"

The following note, first inserted in 1552, subsequently omitted and then again restored in a remodelled form in 1662, is appended to the Communion Service, and runs thus:

"Whereas, it is ordained in this office for the administration of the Communion, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling: It is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural 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 for Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

To these two quotations from our Formularies many more might be adduced to show beyond all doubt that the teaching of our church is directly against the doctrines of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, and uncompromisingly opposed to them. This in some measure accounts for the bitterness and rage of the Jesuit party who have been smuggled into the Church, and who therefore labor so furiously to change her constitution, and to subvert her eminently Scriptural character. The

Roman Church is thus clearly in antagonism with the Church of England, and with the early Catholic Church, of which the British Church was from the very first century a true and Orthodox branch. Her antagonism to these is owing to her irremediable opposition to the Word of God itself.

2. The second error in reference to the Holy Supper is that it is a *Sacrifice*. This notion arises from that of the Presence. If the officiant be a *Sacerdotal* priest gifted with power to change the emblems into the real body and blood of the Lord Jesus, he has also power to offer them. This is the doctrine of Rome and the doctrine which the Jesuits are disseminating in the Church of England in the mother country. Both maintain, in accordance with the Creed of Pope Pius IV. (1564), that, "In the Mass is offered unto God a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, the same that Christ offered on the cross."

Height of blasphemy! What? Was the sacrifice made on Calvary *insufficient*, that it needs to be *supplemented* in order to make it *efficacious*? Was it *imperfect*, so that it needs something further to make it *complete*? If so, then truly Jesus "died in vain."

Well might it require the lapse of 1500 years before a doctrine so monstrous could find an established place in any section, however fallen, of the Christian Church! When the "Apostles and disciples came together to break bread" (Acts xx. 7.), in accordance with our Lord's last act in the Supper, they took it and ate it *memorially*, but who amongst them would not have recoiled in horror at the notion of a sacrifice? Nothing can be more explicit on this point than the language of the Apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews. Even the Jewish sacrifices, though divinely appointed in the first covenant, were inefficacious because of the necessity of repeating them, for "every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifice, which can never take away sin: but this man (*priest*; see the original Greek, where the word *man* does not occur), after He had offered *one* sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." (Heb. x. 11-12.) We are "sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all*." (v. 10.) "For by *one* offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." (v. 14.) St. Peter confirms the doctrine of the efficacy of the one sacrifice made by Jesus, where (1 Peter iii. 18) he declares that "Christ hath *once* suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God."

The blessings of this one sacrifice are realized to us by Faith, but Rome holds up her priestly sacrifice in the Mass as part of her man-invented system of justification by works and acts of our own doing. While Rome teaches us that man can offer to God in Christ's stead, the awakened penitent comes to Jesus with the words—

"Nothing in my hand I bring,
Simply to Thy cross I cling."

Our Church is as clear on this important doctrine as on all others relating to the Christian Faith, and in her Communion Service proclaims that the Lord Jesus Christ, when He suffered death upon the cross, "made there, by his *one* oblation of Himself *once* offered, a full, perfect and *sufficient sacrifice*, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." The xxxi. article sums up the whole as follows: "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of Masses in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Our Church and the Word of God are ranged on one side, to do battle with Romish error and Sacerdotalism on the other. On which side in the conflict shall we engage ourselves? Our position must be clear, unmistakable and decisive. There is no middle way; Israel is on one side and the Philistines are on the other. Our duty is to point sinners to Jesus, the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." He is the all-sufficient sacrifice, and we need no other! While he is the sacrifice, He mysteriously combines in His Divine Person the character of the Priest. Our "prophet," to show us the divinely appointed way of salvation; our "Priest," to plead "at the right hand of God" His offering for us, and our "King," to rule over us in heart and mind. He is our Great High Priest who has passed into the heavens and "who ever liveth to make intercession for us."

To pretend to repeat His sacrifice were to "crucify Him afresh and put Him to an open shame." To suppose His *Bodily Presence* necessary in the Holy Supper were to view Him carnally, and lose sight of the fact that He is a risen, living, ascended and glorified Intercessor, whose ears are ever open to the petitions of His people on earth. But the sacrifice of the Mass is a human invention and a sacrilegious act of theatrical mimicry!

If the Lord's Supper were indeed a sacrifice, it would be no longer a *Sacrament*. A Sacrament is a visible sign, or symbol by which something invisible is signified. The Body of Jesus offered on Calvary was the *object* signified, and the Supper—the bread and wine—merely the *Sacramental Memorial*.

The Supper, instead of embodying the *presence* of Jesus, is to signify His *ABSENCE*. It is because the Lord was about to finish His saintly work and return to the throne of His Father that He instituted it. It was that which, according to His divine design, was to keep us "*in remembrance*" of Him. It was to remind us of the great offering on Calvary; to strengthen our faith, and to cherish our hope of His second coming, when with power and glory He shall come to complete the defeat of Satan, and embrace all nations under His own sovereign sway! The question now occurs,—

IS THERE A PRESENCE OF ANY KIND IN THE LORD'S SUPPER?
IF SO, WHAT IS THE NATURE OF IT?

By the teaching of the Word of God; by the doctrine of the Universal Church for the first eight centuries; by the doctrine of our own church; and by the common consent of all Protestant Christendom, we reply that there is *no material and bodily presence* of Christ in this holy ordinance. The Bread and the Wine after consecration, remain in the same state chemically and naturally as before. The Lord's Supper is, however, that Memorial which brings under our pious contemplation more closely than any other service in the whole Christian Church, the amazing love of Him who poured out His soul unto death, even the death of the cross, and who thus not only died for our sins, but rose again for our justification. The more we are impressed with a feeling of our guilt before God, and of the penalty due to our sins, the more overwhelming is the sense of our condemnation by justice and our happy acquittal by the mercy of God in Christ Jesus—what we are by nature, and what we become by divine grace! Added to this thought comes the parting promise of Jesus, "Lo! I *am with you* always, even to the end of the world." In such a holy frame of mind, the Christian feels, in partaking of the memorials of the death of Jesus, that He is indeed *verily and truly present*, healing the infirmities of the soul and cheering it with His own life-giving power! But, Christian brother! be not misled as to this hallowed *presence*. It is not in the bread, neither is it in the wine. It is in thy **OWN HEART!** It is the

Spirit of Christ by which the soul, in partaking of the Holy Supper, is animated. Materially and bodily Jesus is *absent*, but the presence of the Holy Spirit which He sends, conjointly from the Father, is that which fills the heart with its hallowed glow. The heart is the *temple* of the Spirit, and the Spirit is the life-giving power *within*. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. iii. 16.) This divinely announced fact, though felt with more or less power, "according to the measure of faith," by every true disciple of Jesus, and though more especially felt in the act of meditation and worship, is most powerfully felt in the participation of the Holy Supper. It is in this pre-eminently spiritual service that the glory of the God-hood of Jesus—the wonders of His condescending love—the all-sufficiency of His mysterious sufferings and vicarious death, and the absolute completeness of His redeeming work, crowd in upon the prostrate soul of the true communicant, and make him *feel* as if Jesus were within his very sight.

It would seem as if there were then but a step from the material to the spiritual, and from the spiritual to the material; and without doubt the notion of the real and bodily presence of Jesus in the holy communion, however gross in its origin, has been received and cherished in the Anglican communion by over-devotion and by an excessive spirituality of mind. Let charity then temper our judgment, but let the love of Christ constrain us to uphold the truth. Jesus is bodily present in His glorified state in heaven, but *spiritually present* in the *hearts* of His people on earth. The paschal supper which He instituted, like the pass-over which it supplanted, was a *Memorial*, and was to be kept "in remembrance" of the death which terminated His first coming, and in anticipation of the glory which shall inaugurate His *second* coming. Then shall He "see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied," then shall the powers of hell be annihilated, then shall all delusions, all superstition, all error, all evil cease, and "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord" Christ—the establishment of His universal empire—"and He shall reign for ever and ever!"

PRACTICAL SUMMARY.

1. The Lord's Supper is the *Holy Memorial* of the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the atonement made on Calvary for sin, for our reconciliation to God, and for our attainment to the

"inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and that fadeth not away." We observe it "in *remembrance*" of the glorious work of redemption.

2. It cannot be a *Sacrifice*, because then it would cease to be a *Sacrament*. It cannot be a *Sacrifice*, because there is no offering of blood, and "without shedding of *blood* there is no remission" of sins. (Heb. ix. 22.) It cannot be a *Sacrifice*, for that would imply that the sacrifice of Jesus Himself as the Lamb of God was *insufficient* or *imperfect*. Such a notion is dishonoring to God, insulting to Jesus, and subversive of the entire plan of salvation.

3. The repetition of the sacrifice of the Mass, or of the Holy Eucharist, is *antagonistic* to the Holy Scriptures, which declare Jesus to have made *one* sacrifice of Himself *once* offered, and "*once* for all," on Calvary.

4. The Lord's Supper as a "*remembrance*" implies the bodily *ABSENCE* of Him who appointed it; and the supposed *presence* of Jesus *materially* in the bread and wine is an idea contrary to reason, to Scripture, to apostolic teaching, and to the doctrine of the Holy Universal (Catholic) Church for the first eight centuries.

5. The *true presence* of Jesus at the Supper is in the *HEART* of the believer; and if not there, He is not present at all!

If the foregoing pages be read by those who *mistake the nature* of the Memorial Supper, and look upon it as a *sacrifice*, let me entreat them to ponder and think of the dishonor done to Jesus in setting up a mimic and a sham sacrifice of their own offering, unauthorized and unacceptable to God. The one great sacrifice made on Calvary is all-sufficient, and its benefits are realizable to all those who look to it with a sound faith. If, however, they meet the eye of those who *neglect* the Holy Communion, let me remind them of its hallowed effects as a means of grace. The further you go in life, Christian reader, the greater will be your need of Jesus, and it is when celebrating the *HOLY MEMORIAL* that He draws near in *SPIRIT*, and broods over the *HEART* of His true disciple, sanctifying, comforting, strengthening, and *sealing* him unto everlasting life!

Be ever ready to avail yourself of the opportunities afforded to you of *commemorating* the dying love of Jesus, and with alacrity adopt the sentiments set forth in that sublime hymn by Montgomery, prepared for the sacramental occasion:—

" According Thy gracious word,
In meek humility
This will I do my dying Lord,
I will remember Thee.

Thy body broken for my sake,
My bread from heaven shall be,
Thy testamental cup I take,
And thus remember Thee.

When to the cross I turn mine eyes,
And rest on Calvary,
O! Lamb of God, my Sacrifice,
I must remember Thee.

And when these falling lips grow dumb,
And mind and memory flee,
When Thou shalt in Thy Kingdom come,
Jesus! remember me."











