

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

forth, it is certain that they will ultimately be destructive either of our honesty and good faith, or of our reverence for the Sacred Volume, the contents of which have been shown to be incompatible with those qualities. Men cannot pin their faith on pious frauds without injuring their moral sense thereby, as the history of the Roman Communion has very plainly shown. The alternative theory which I have suggested, while recognising the possibility that there may have been a measure of human infirmity in the transmission of records from a past which is practically at an infinite distance from us, nevertheless recognises the good faith of the writers, and the substantial accuracy of the accounts they have handed down. The Scriptures were given us to instruct us in the ways of God to man. And however much on other points they may have reflected merely the belief of their age, we may be sure that they have faithfully reported to us the dispensation of God, as made known to His servants the patriarchs, Moses and the prophets, and that they have truly unfolded to us the steps of God's spiritual education of the people He had chosen.

J. J. LIAS.

NOTE.—The above paper was written before I received from the Rev. A. Kennion a copy of his interesting volume entitled "Principia." He has, I find, anticipated me in several points.



ART. II.—CONCERNING THE LORD'S SUPPER, AND THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION THEREOF.

BY whom was the Lord's Supper instituted? It was ordained by Christ Himself. What is the Lord's Supper? It is one of the two (two only) Sacraments ordained by Christ and declared to be *generally* necessary to salvation. What is the meaning of the word "Sacrament"? It means an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, *given* unto us, ordained by Christ, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof. It follows that in a Sacrament are two parts: the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace. This is the doctrine of the Church Catechism.

Two words require comment—the words "generally" and "given." "Generally" in olden times was frequently used in the sense of universally. It is therefore to some extent ambiguous; and there are some who contend that it is used in the latter sense in the Catechism. The ends of their contention are twofold: (1) They desire to maintain other five

so-called Sacraments of the Roman Church as true Sacraments, albeit not universally necessary to salvation—viz., Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction (see p. 238 of that disloyal book falsely called "The Catholic Religion"). But the Church says (Article XXV.) those five are not to be counted as Sacraments of the Gospel.

The second end is the undue exaltation of the Sacraments. They aver that the actual reception of the Sacraments is universally necessary to salvation. This is not the doctrine of the Church. The Church does teach that such reception is generally necessary to salvation, inasmuch as those who wilfully disobey any command of Christ cannot expect salvation; but the Church disclaims this universal necessity in the case of infants who die without actual sin, unbaptized, by its rejection, some three hundred years ago (1562), of an article which had stated this awful doctrine; and as regards the Lord's Supper, the Church postpones the reception of the Sacrament until after Confirmation. Does the Church condemn to perdition all who die in youth before they have been admitted to Confirmation, though they have learned to believe in their Creator, their Redeemer, and Him who sanctifieth them? We are taught by a rubric in the office for the Communion of the Sick that spiritual manducation of the Body and Blood of Christ may well be, though a man without fault of his do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth

So much for the Church doctrine; but then the adversary refers to the discourse of our Lord in St. John vi., when He says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." This does not refer to the Feast of the Last Supper; it refers to the spiritual feeding on Christ's body by means of faith, of which the Supper is a sign. Jeremy Taylor says, "It is certain that Christ here spoke of spiritual manducation, not of sacramental"; and Bishop Beveridge says, "Our Saviour hath no particular reference to the representations of His Body and Blood in the Sacrament, but only to the spiritual feeding upon Him by faith, whether in or out of the Sacrament." The feeding upon Christ is made here an absolute condition of salvation, but no such condition is connected with the Lord's Supper in the accounts of its institution given by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, nor in the references made by St. Paul. If this discourse is to be taken literally as a reference to eating the bread and drinking the wine, it follows from verse 54 that all who receive the Sacrament—*i.e.*, the Sign—have eternal life, and from verse 53, that there is no life in any man who does not receive this Sacrament. This is not the truth nor the doctrine of the Church. Our Lord then, speaking to His disciples, who

had complained of His words, refers to His ascension (verse 62), and on this Lightfoot comments: "But the expression seems very harsh when He speaks of eating His flesh and drinking His blood. He tells us, therefore, that these things must be taken in a spiritual sense. Do these things offend you? What and if you shall see the Son of man ascending up where He was before?—that is, when you shall have seen Me ascending into heaven, you will then find how impossible a thing it is to eat My flesh and drink My blood bodily; for how can you eat the flesh of one that is in heaven? You may know, therefore, that I mean eating Me spiritually. For the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

The second word that I noted for comment is "given." What is given? It is the sign, not the grace signified. Clearness requires a stop after "grace," but the omission is a printer's mistake. The MS. book, annexed to the Act of Uniformity, now in the Public Record Office, Dublin, has a comma after "grace." The meaning is made clear in Durel's Latin version (1660), where "given" is translated *quod nobis datur*, the neuter *quod* necessarily referring to the neuter substantive *signum*, a sign given, a sign ordained by Christ, a sign, a means, and a pledge. The sign in both Sacraments is necessarily given to every person who receives it, but the grace offered to all is not received by all; it is not received *ex opere operato* by any, for it is only offered on the condition of faith, and, as we shall see, in the Lord's Supper the grace is only received by the means of faith.

Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? Again I refer to the Church Catechism, because, as Bishop Davidson has well said in a recent Charge, "we find in our Church Catechism the best compendium in Christendom of our Divine Master's teaching, and of His legacy of Word and Sacrament." It was ordained by Christ for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of His death, and of the benefits which we receive thereby. To the same effect we read in the prayer of consecration: Jesus Christ did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of His precious death until His coming again. And such are our Lord's words of institution quoted in this prayer from the writings of St. Luke and St. Paul: "Take, eat, do this in remembrance—drink ye all of this in remembrance of Me;" and in the words of administration commanded by our Church we have, "Eat this in remembrance, drink this in remembrance." This perpetual remembrance, to secure this remembrance in faith, is the reason *why* the Lord's Supper was ordained; and the mental law of the association of ideas, by the continued

use of the appointed sign, has doubtless been a means by which Christ has preserved in His Church a faithful remembrance of His perfect sacrifice. Such, then, being the doctrine of Scripture and the ordinance of our Church, is it not deplorable that some Anglican ministers, in administering this Sacrament, should dare to use only one part of the prescribed forms, omitting and ignoring the remembrance? Bishop Davidson, in the Charge quoted above, calls the attention of the clergy of Rochester to the fact that a minister "in so doing is not merely disobeying the letter of the Prayer-Book, but is disregarding one of the most significant and important portions of its history." Is not such conduct disloyal to the Church?—nay, disloyal to the Head of the Church, who had used the very words thus treated with contempt?

Three names are given to this Sacrament. The primary name in the order, the only name used in the Catechism and Articles, is "The Lord's Supper"—a name given because the Sacrament was instituted by our Lord during a feast in the upper chamber, begun "as they were eating," and completed immediately after supper, "when He had supped." This Sacrament is also named "Holy Communion"; for when the Lord's Supper is received by the faithful, then these members of the mystical body of Christ, the Catholic Church, have in a special sense union with Christ their Head and fellowship one with another—the communion of saints. This Sacrament is also sometimes called the "Eucharist": not, indeed, either in Scripture or the Prayer-Book; nevertheless, it does not seem to be a misnomer. "Eucharist" signifies thanksgiving, and the Sacrament is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving wherein the partakers offer themselves, their souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. For myself, I prefer the first of these names.

The outward part of this Sacrament is bread and wine; the thing signified is the Body and Blood of Christ. Our Church, following St. Paul, speaks of the sign as bread and wine after their consecration. The Body and Blood of Christ are verily taken and received in the Sacrament: not, indeed by all who may receive the bread and wine, but only by the faithful. It is a heavenly and spiritual reception, and the means—the only means—by which it is received is faith. Christ, very God, of very God, is present at the administration of the Lord's Supper, for God is omnipresent. Christ the Saviour is present at the Lord's Supper, for He has assured His presence wherever two or three are gathered together in His name, whether for the Eucharist or for confession, for prayer or praise. Any other presence of Christ in or at the Lord's Supper we know not nor believe. Doubtless the Divine presence of Christ

may be realized more confidently, with more profit to the soul of a receiver, at the Sacrament than on any other occasion. By this heavenly and spiritual food the souls of the faithful are strengthened and refreshed, for their hearts' faith is increased, spiritual life fostered, union with Christ more fully realized, and love cherished or revived. Ussher writes thus: "The Lord's Supper is a monument for the memory, a support of faith, a provocation of love, a quickening to obedience, the signet-seal of all God's mercies to us in Christ Jesus."

The Catechism concludes with the inquiry: "What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper?" Repentance and a steadfast purpose to lead a new life, faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of His death and charity. The faith of confidence and trust—"the faith which worketh by love," noted thus by Bengel "*In his stat totus Christianismus.*" This faith is a condition precedent to the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ, not to that of the elements of bread and wine (Article XXIX.), and necessarily so, for, as we have seen, the means of reception is faith. And, accordingly, the invitation of the Church is, "Draw near with faith."

May I refer to the summary of the "Consensus Tigurinus," given in an appendix to Principal Moule's valuable edition of Bishop Ridley's "Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper"?

The order may be divided, for the purpose of discussion, into two parts, viz., 1. The Introduction; 2. The Consecration, Administration, and Sacrifice.

Ecclesiastical discipline is the first subject of the introduction. Discipline in the Church of Ireland is expressed in the rubrics and Canons 49 to 53, which are incorporated with the rubrics and printed in our Prayer-Book. The exercise of discipline is so rare that its importance is not appreciated. Discipline is the authority of every Church to excommunicate scandalous offenders, and upon repentance to restore them to communion. It is the power of the keys, given by Christ to His visible Churches. It is mentioned in the second Homily for Whitsunday as one of the three notes of a true Church, the others being pure doctrine and the due administration of the Sacraments; and to the same effect are the Catechism of King Edward VI., Noel's Catechism, and Rydley's definition quoted by Bishop Browne on the Articles. In St. Matt. xviii. 18 and 1 Cor. v. 5, 2 Cor. ii. 10, we find illustrations. Then follow, in the order, the Commandments, with prayers for grace to keep them; the Creed, with its words of belief and trust; the offertory, expressive of love to God and our neighbours. Compare these with the conditions of the invitation,

given a little further on in the introduction, "Draw near with faith," etc.

We now come to the comprehensive prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth. It is not a prayer for the holy Catholic Church, the mystical Body of Christ; it is a prayer for that part of the Catholic Church which here on earth fights under the banner of the Cross against sin, the world, and the devil. It contains no petition for that part of the Catholic Church which with Christ in Paradise rests from its labours. In this prayer is an appropriate petition that Bishops and curates may rightly and duly administer the Sacraments—rightly and duly, "with unfeigned use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him," as expressed in the resolution of the Lambeth Conference; rightly and duly rejecting idle and Roman ceremonies forbidden by the Church, and finding no sanction therefore in the Divine institution. Such are prostrations, crossings, bowings, elevation of the vessels, back-turnings, incense.

Then exhortations follow, with precious words to encourage and warn, to comfort and help broken and contrite hearts by the ministry of God's holy Word. Public confession to God of sin comes next after the invitation already mentioned, and then "the Absolution." The Absolution so called; for our Prayer-Books do not contain any formula in which any minister professes to forgive any sin against God, or to convey forgiveness to the sinner, or to pronounce a sentence of judicial acquittal of such sins. The formula in the visitation of the sick relates to ecclesiastical offences. Cf. the following collects. In this form, as well as in the forms given for Morning and Evening Service, the minister preaches the Gospel, proclaiming God's pardon to all who truly repent and unfeignedly believe, and offers up intercessory prayer for the people, to whom the comfortable words of Christ and His Apostles are then addressed. Then comes the appeal: "Lift up your hearts" (*Sursum corda*). "We lift them up unto the Lord." And then the glorious words, not surpassed in literature for holy sublimity: "Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord most High." The introduction of the order concludes with the prayer of humble access: Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, at this Thy table, "so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through

His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us." And such, says the exhortation, is the great benefit, if with a true, penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament; for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us.

The Prayer of Consecration.—The law of our Churches requires that this prayer should be read only by priests or presbyters. That is to say, the statute called the Act of Uniformity so enacts. The law is not founded upon the use of the word "priest" in the rubric, for in the rubrics throughout the Prayer-Book the words "priest," "minister," "curate" are used indifferently to denote the officiating clergyman, whether priest or deacon.¹ For instance, the word "priest" is used in the rubrics of the Baptismal Service, and yet it is undoubted that a deacon may administer this Sacrament. The law was within the authority of the Church, for every particular Church has a right to allocate amongst its officers special ministerial functions as it shall think proper. The *Prayer of Consecration*—not an incantation, not the formula of a physical miracle, but a prayer. A prayer of *consecration*. What does consecration mean? Not change, but dedication. It is the setting apart of the elements of bread and wine for the service of God in the celebration of His Supper. Selden says by consecrating any we only set it apart to God's service; and so in Heb. x. 20 the Authorized "consecrated" is rendered in the Revised Version by the equivalent "dedicated." In this prayer the minister proclaims the perfect sacrifice which Christ once—once for all—offered on the cross. He narrates the institution of this Sacrament, to be observed in remembrance of Christ's death and passion until His coming again; he sets apart by pious words and gestures the bread and wine thus dedicated to the celebration; and he prays that "we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood."

In the Roman Church this Sacrament is called a Mass, and represented as a Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood offered upon an altar by a sacrificing priest; and ever since the Reformation, and especially during the last half-century, efforts have been made by Anglican clergymen—alas! not a few—to pervert the true signification of this prayer, and invest it with the character of a sacrificial incantation. Some say

¹ "In general, the words 'priest,' 'minister,' and 'curate' seem indiscriminately to be applied throughout the Liturgy to denote the clergyman who is officiating, whether he be rector, vicar, assistant-curate, priest or deacon."—Phillimore, "Eccl. Law," p. 109, ed. 1895.

that in this prayer we plead with God the death of His Son, and that this may be called a sacrifice; but such pleading cannot naturally be called a sacrifice. Who pretends that the pathetic pleadings of the Litany, "By Thine Agony and bloody Sweat; by Thy Cross and Passion; by Thy precious Death and Burial . . . good Lord, deliver us," is a sacrificial ceremony? Others allege that the Greek words translated "Do this" mean, "Offer (or sacrifice) this," and ought to be so translated. Professor Abbott has shown that this assertion will not stand the test of sound criticism; but for Churchmen it is a sufficient answer that the translators of the New Testament, in both the Authorized and Revised Versions, and the writers of the Prayer-Book, rejected the words "Offer this," and used the words "Do this." Now, the word "do" has no sacrificial tendency. Another answer is well expressed by the learned Archdeacon Quarry; he says: "The repetition of the words 'do this,' as in 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, with the delivery of each of the elements, shows plainly that the doing specially intended was the eating and drinking. It was not to offer or sacrifice Christ, our Passover, but to partake of the Paschal Lamb already sacrificed. He bids us to *do*." Neither in this prayer nor in the formulas of administration does the word "sacrifice" occur except in express reference to the Sacrifice upon the cross. Moreover, the Reformers and our Church, as already noticed, rejected altars necessary for sacrifice, and substituted tables proper for feasts.

The Roman Church says that the elements, by the word and intentions of a man, are changed into the very Body and Blood of Christ, the separation of bread and wine denoting the separation of Body and Blood, and thus mystically the death of Christ. This is transubstantiation, but our order by its final rubric declares: "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." Irving in his "Discourses on Daniel" says forcibly: This invention maketh void incarnation, sacrifice, faith, spirit, worship; a wafer at the will of a man is at once a morsel for a bird to peck at or a mouse to nibble, and the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of the King of kings—is Emmanuel.

A doctrine taught in some Anglican Churches — that after the words of consecration our Lord Himself enters into the bread and wine, and so in receiving them we receive that same Body He had on earth, and which is now in heaven (Usher's "Simple Church Teaching," p. 11, Ventnor). This rivals transubstantiation in absurdity, and has no countenance in our order.

The prayer of consecration is followed by the administration of the bread and wine; when the minister delivers the dedicated bread unto the receiver, he proclaims that the Body of Jesus Christ was given for him, he prays for his everlasting life, and adds, "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." So plain are these concluding words, so futile all attempts to explain away the doctrine of Scripture and our Church—to wit, that Christ ordained the Lord's Supper as a remembrance of His sacrifice—that, as a last resort, and, as it were, in despair, Romanizing and disloyal Anglican clergymen presume to omit these words.

In this Sacrament there is not a sacrifice of Christ; there is no sacrifice offered by a priest sacerdotally, intervening between God and man; but, still, there is a sacrifice—a sacrifice by minister and people in unison, all alike joining in this sacrifice, priests to God and His Father (Rev. i. 6). The sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the sacrifice of our souls and bodies, the true Eucharistic sacrifice, culminating in that glorious song of praise, the *Gloria in Excelsis*: "Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good will towards men. We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty." Finally, the minister closes the order with intercession, prayer for peace and blessing—a prayer, not a gift. Clergymen, by the ministry of God's holy Word, may assist and guide men into the way of peace and blessing; they can pray for, but they cannot give either. Put not your trust in priests. Peace and all spiritual blessings are the direct gift of God, and of God alone.

I conclude this paper with some notes on Prayers for the Dead, Auricular Confession, Fasting Communion, and Non-communicating Attendance. All these are Roman practices, and supported by Romanizing Anglicans. Are they sanctioned by the Reformed Churches of Ireland and England in their order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or elsewhere? These are questions upon the construction of the words of the order, assisted by reference to other services and the history of their composition.

The subject of Prayers for the Dead, in its legal aspect, was discussed in 1893, in an English Ecclesiastical Court (*Egerton v. All of Ould*, L.R., 1894, Probate 15), when the erection of a window in a parish church, with a Latin inscription, including words translated "Of your charity pray for the soul of F. H., deceased, and for the soul of L. C., deceased," was not permitted. The Church of England discourages such prayers, but does not expressly prohibit them.

forms of such prayers, which were found in the first English Prayer-Book, 1549, were withdrawn in 1552, and not restored in the revisions of 1559, 1603, 1661." The reason for caution is clear. Out of the ancient prayers for the departed grew the notion that they need to be succoured by the prayers of the living; hence that they are undergoing sufferings and torments; and so by rapid steps we reach the Romish doctrine, condemned by Article XXII.

No direct or personal prayer for the dead is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer. It is childish to assert that the petition, "Remember not, Lord, the offences of our forefathers," is a prayer for the dead—no, we entreat God not to visit the sins of fathers upon their children (see second Commandment); so also it is childish to say that in the prayer for Christ's Church militant a place is left to be filled up by the supplicant with prayer for the dead. It is a prayer for a Church here on earth; it includes thanksgiving, not prayer for departed saints.

But while our Church gives no sanction to prayer for blessings for the departed during the interval between death and resurrection, or any countenance to the notion that during the intermediate state those who rest with the Lord in Paradise suffer want or torment, or could there derive benefit from the prayer of the living, our Church, and all its members do pray for departed saints. The Burial Service is the place where *a priori* such prayer might be expected, and accordingly there we find those beautiful words: "Almighty-God, with whom do live the spirits of those that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are *in joy and felicity* We beseech thee of Thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, *and to hasten Thy kingdom*; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may *have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul*, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory." This is not a prayer for the suffering, or a prayer for improvement in the intermediate state of saints; it recognises their present state as one of felicity, and would hasten for all Christ's Church perfect bliss, when His kingdom comes; and so in the order itself, immediately after the administration of the bread and wine, we find the petition, "Thy kingdom come." In the next prayer of the order we humbly beseech our heavenly Father "that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion." Doubtless this cumulative expression was intended to include both the living and the dead, but it must be read distribu-

tively. Our Church does not pray for the remission of the sins of saints in joy; for them she prays for speedy perfect bliss, the consummation of the benefits of Christ's Passion.

I have not discussed the objection felt by many to prayers limited to an affectionate remembrance of a dear departed relative or friend. Mr. Collette says (CHURCHMAN, 1894, p. 366): "As a sentimental and pious custom, there would appear to be no objections to the practice;" and the Judge in Egerton's case refers to natural sympathy "with sentiments of affectionate respect in the bereaved, fired as they often are by a strong realizing of the truth of the communion of saints." But I venture to suggest that these sentiments of pious emotion and affectionate respect may find adequate expression in the prayer quoted from the Burial Service, and those quoted from the order, and such-like prayers for a speedy union in consummated bliss; and that the practice of prayers for the dead, in a sense not recognised by our Church or Holy Scripture, requires caution almost equivalent to actual abstention, when we recall the history of the doctrines of purgatory, indulgences, and Masses for the dead. Dr. Wiseman once observed: "I have no hesitation in saying that the doctrines—praying for the dead and purgatory—go so completely together that if we succeed in demonstrating the one, *the other necessarily follows.*"

Auricular Confession has been defined as "the systematic enumeration of individual sins to a priest for the purpose of absolution." In the Roman Church absolution means the forgiveness of sins. We read in Furness' "What every Christian ought to Know," with the imprimatur of Cardinal Cullen: "Remember that in the moment when the priest says over you the great words of pardon and absolution, your sins are forgiven, the pains of hell are taken away, your soul is made bright and beautiful, like an angel of God." The Anglo-Roman notion of absolution may be found in such books as "How to make a Good Confession." The form is this: "I confess to Almighty God, to the whole company of heaven, and to our Father," etc. And then, when the priest says, "I absolve thee," the precious Blood of Jesus Christ flows sacramentally upon your soul, and cleanses you from all your sins. It is this Blood alone which cleanses you, and *no one but the priest has the power of applying it to your soul.*

What is the character of the auricular confession which is to precede this absolution? It is to be found in the Roman manuals of Dennis and Sanchez, in Anglican manuals such as the "Priest in Confession," and in Law Reports. I dare not quote the unspeakable abominations which are to be found in these manuals. They are such that Archbishop

Magee once described them as "a museum of spiritual iniquity at which fiends may shudder and blush, where murderers may learn cruelty, where hoary-headed convicts may be taught fraud and satyrs impurity—an infernal catechism of iniquity;" a system of which Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin, declared in public synod, "I abhor auricular confession."

These shocking characteristics are not accidents. They are of its essence, involved in the theory of auricular confession. For by this theory confession of a sin must precede absolution for the sin, and it is the duty of the confessor to quicken at once the conscience and the memory of the penitent by cross-examination.

Is auricular confession in connection with sacerdotal absolution taught by the Church of Ireland? Is it recognised in this order? No formula for any sacerdotal absolution is to be found in the formularies of the Church of Ireland. The Church recognises the advantage to men whose consciences are troubled with any weighty matter to open their grief to some *discreet and learned minister* of God's Word, that by the *ministering* of God's *holy Word* he may receive the benefit of absolution. What a contrast this view of the relation between the troubled man and the discreet minister presents to that of the priest habitually confessing his parishioners, and by sacerdotal power pretending to confer or convey the benefit of Christ's Passion to the soul of man!

But the absence of recognition in our Prayer-Book proves conclusively that auricular confession is opposed to the doctrine of the Church, when this book is compared with those which preceded it. In the first book of King Edward we read: "Let him come to us, or to some other discreet and learned *priest* taught in the law of God, and *confess* and open his sin and grief *secretly*, that of *us*, as of the ministers of God and of His Church, he may receive comfort and absolution."

This historical comparison is important, and might, did space permit, be presented in startling and interesting aspects. Permit me to refer to a valuable paper on the subject in the *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1894, p. 69, by the Rev. Canon T. Shore. The formulas of absolution given by our Church are declarations of the direct forgiveness of God of the penitent and believing. What need of a priest for that? Can a priest forgive the impenitent? Can a priest retain the sin of the believer? The visitation formulary relates to Church discipline.

Fasting Communion, Non-communicating Attendance.—In the Roman Church the rule is absolute: no communion after food. And so the Anglo-Romanist (see Usher's "Church-teaching," pp. 14-16) says: "What else is required of those who come to the Blessed Sacrament? To be fasting from

midnight before!" It is quite *evident* that anybody who wishes to obey his Church and be reverent to our Lord could never receive the Blessed Sacrament non-fasting." The pretended reason of this rule is that it is irreverent to receive the Body and Blood of Christ after ordinary food—a reason disgusting in the reference to digestion; foolish, as if it did not come to the same thing to partake of ordinary food after Communion.

Now, it is certain that our Church does not forbid evening Communion or direct fasting Communion; the fourth paragraph of the note which precedes the order of morning and evening prayer of the Church of Ireland expressly declares that evening prayer and the administration of the Lord's Supper may be used in combination at the discretion of the minister, subject to the control of the ordinary; and this practice has the highest sanction, the example of our Lord, who instituted the Sacrament in the evening after supper, while they were eating, whence the name "the Lord's Supper." This usage continued through the times of the Apostles, as, *e.g.*, at Troas; and though the practice was afterwards changed, we have no reason to think the change was due to any intrinsic objection. It rather must be ascribed to abuses which resulted from the combination of the Lord's Supper with the Love-feast. I do not dispute the authority of a particular Church to make a rule for itself on this subject, nor the right of a minister of the Church of Ireland to exercise his discretion therein, subject to the control of the Bishop.

But I think evening Communion at stated times, more or less frequent, is expedient for most congregations, especially in cities. In many houses there are servants who cannot leave their domestic duties before breakfast, and who are obliged to return to their duties and their own meals after the morning service without waiting for the Administration, and who are thus practically excommunicated.

For the practice of non-communicating attendance no excuse can be found in the Book of Common Prayer. Everything points to actual reception, and in the Irish book there is an express rubric which provides an opportunity to withdraw for those who do not intend to communicate—*i.e.*, to receive and partake of the Lord's Supper. I conclude this paper with a quotation from Archdeacon Quarry's "Analysis Eucharistica," p. 25. Speaking of the Roman practice of attending Mass without Communion, he says: "This seems as much at variance with our Lord's words, 'Drink ye all of this,' as withholding the cup from the laity; for if the rite was to be for all Christians, these words imply that all present were to receive the Sacramental elements. And so in the primitive Church non-com-

municating were punished by temporary excommunication." It is to be regretted that some amongst ourselves are disposed to encourage this practice.

ROBERT R. WARREN.



ART. III.—COUNT TOLSTOI ON CHRIST'S CHRISTIANITY.

I SHALL make no attempt to criticise the literary work of Tolstoi as a whole. I am too slightly acquainted with his performances in fiction to warrant any such attempt. I have read him only in translations; but even through this disguise it is possible to discern the brilliancy, animation, and variety of his writing, and the audacious extensiveness of his speculative ideas. I propose to myself a more restricted task. Even here I shall not offer an exhaustive account of the single book before me.

It is scarcely possible to judge of the real merits of a book when read in a translation. Contrary to the absurdly shallow doctrine that you can read any author as well in your own tongue as in his, I freely avow myself disqualified through not knowing Russian from criticising a Russian work.

But the ideas which this book embodies for the English public ought not to circulate without a challenge. Tolstoi's is a name to conjure with. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, imbibe his spirit and his ideas, and feel that in doing so they are putting themselves in touch with what is quite the thing. Some, moreover, proclaim him with ostentatious clamour as one of the prophets. The old question has returned to my mind in reading this book, and in reflecting upon the many who run after Tolstoi, "What went ye out into the wilderness for to see?" Merely to raise such a question will in some quarters be regarded as a token of obstinate inability to discern the signs of the times. The reader must judge as to the propriety of the question, and as to the answer which is conveyed in this article.

Russia shows signs of awakening. The Stundists are a living force; they thrive under the blessing of persecution. Though their form of piety lacks strength and definition, they plainly possess both life and godliness. The agitation is hopeful; it may portend the awakening from slumber of an empire and a Church. What Evangelical Christian can forbear to pray that these Russian Lollards may initiate a rich but regulated Reformation?

The vast and sluggish Oriental Church must surely have a