

Christ's heart first yearn in pity over all human creatures? At five years old, or ten—or does He defer His love until they are twenty-one? I contend that His interest relates to *life*, not to *age*—to birth, not to birth-days. As soon as a child is born, that great redeeming heart yearns with pitying love.”

“I hold it as an enrapturing thought that Christ interests Himself in us, and yearns to make us heirs of immortality; and that our names were written in His heart, ere they fell from our mothers' lips, and before our fathers knew the mystery and pride of parental life.”

The reader will observe that this argument (?) is also based on the writer's Arminianism.

7. The followers of William Huntington, or Calvinistic Independents, have no denominational organization, and no authenticated Creed or Confession of Faith. Their views are, therefore, difficult to ascertain. Some practise neither of the Ordinances; their reason seeming to be that these things interfere with Christian fellowship. Thus in a book published in 1876, it was contended that the Apostles were mistaken in baptising after the Lord's resurrection. Its title was, “The Sacred Bond of Unity.”

The majority, however, baptise infants by sprinkling, and their views may probably be gathered from “Jazer,” by Rev. Joseph Irons, and the authentic Report of his administering the ordinance of Baptism shortly before his death. “Grove Chapel Pulpit, No. 195.” From these the following quotations are made.

“This child, named Eliza, I baptise ‘in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:’ imploring special grace from above, to baptise her with love Divine, and to give her a new nature, even the life of God in her soul.”

Our brethren, therefore, do not regard Infant Baptism as Christening or Christenising; for the preacher says—

“The water which I applied to these babes has not made them Christians. I did not Christen them; but I baptised them, with the hope and prayer that the Holy Ghost will baptise them with His mighty unction from above, and so bring them to His feet.”\*

\*These words define the difference between our Brethren's view and ours. With us the significance of Baptism is retrospective. We regard it as a recognition of what God has been pleased to do for an elect, redeemed and converted person—whether a child or an adult. With them its signifi-

Calvinistic Independents thus hold that “the obvious design of water Baptism is to represent and prefigure the Baptism of the Spirit. It is absurd to suppose that it represents the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. Then *two* ordinances would represent *one* leading feature in our salvation, and there would be none to instruct us in the other. [The atoning work of Christ] is set forth in the Lord's Supper: Baptism is the emblem of the purifying influence of the Holy Ghost.”

Again, Mr. Irons regarded Rom. vi. 4, 5, as perverted when applied to the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and our spiritual death, burial and resurrection with Him, and the act of Baptism as expressing these facts. “‘Buried with Him in baptism,’ has no reference to water Baptism, but points to the Baptism of the Spirit, which separates us from the world as those that are dead to it.” (Pages 155, 165, and 171.)

We have thus reviewed the different tenets of good men, all practising Infant Sprinkling with the conviction that it is the form of Baptism ordained by Christ, but regarding its significance in such varied aspects. It is not contended that these diversities of views militate against the scripturalness of their practice. This would be poor logic. The facts advanced, though not arguments, are, however, suggestive of questions to which replies should be sought.

## Article XX.—Baptism should be preceded by Confession. Page 20.

NOTE 1.—Christians who restrict Baptism to saved sinners, and plead for Immersion as its only scriptural mode, practise the Ordinance on two classes of their fellow-believers.

Those who belong to a Church of another Denomination which they have no intention of quitting; or Christians who are not enrolled members of any religious community. And

Those who wish to be baptised as a pre-requisite to their joining the Church, by whose Pastor or other person duly appointed by its Members, they are thus immersed.

An instance of the first is the Baptism of the Eunuch by Philip, (Acts viii. 36—39.) Of the three branches of the baptismal command, the Evangelist was here called to observe the first two only. He, therefore, (instrumentally by his in-

cance is prospective. It is an admission of the natural depravity of the infants that are baptised, and the expression of hope that they may hereafter be saved by grace.

struction, efficiently by God's grace) made the man a disciple; and then he baptised him. Duty led him no further; and the work of "teaching him to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded" was left to others in the future.

We submit, however, that before baptising such persons, we should ascertain that they have spiritual life; that their motive is pure; that Faith and loyalty to Christ actuate them; that their views of Divine truth, though perhaps, dim and imperfect, accord with the Bible; and that their general conduct adorns the gospel. Were the account of what occurred given in verse 37 authentic, its value would be great. We have, however, conceded that its authority is doubtful; but our note, page 84, is worthy of attention.

The majority of persons whom we baptise, however, receive the ordinance as a prelude and pre-requisite to their associating in fellowship with a particular Church.\* To these our Article exclusively refers. Indisputably such should make an open confession of faith before receiving Baptism at our hands.

#### Confession before Baptism.

NOTE 2.—The practice of Free Churches as to the Admission of Members differs greatly. Some are content to receive all persons, who in an often hurried interview with the Minister or other official, express their wish to join. Others require applicants to satisfy their Minister only, orally or by letter, that they have been made partakers of grace. Some delegate the inquiry to Messengers, who privately examine the candidate, and report their impressions to the Church *assembled as such*.

It is our contention, as Strict and Particular Baptists, that

\*It should be remembered that when a Church is convened for the admission of Members from the world, or from a Denomination which does not baptise believers by immersion, its business is two-fold.

First, assurance should be sought and obtained, that the candidates are spiritual persons, truly trusting in the Son of God as a personal Saviour; and *therefore* eligible for Baptism.

Secondly, That their views of Divine truth are in sufficient accord with the principles of the Church as to admit of their cordially uniting in all its acts of worship and work, and holding loving and unrestrained communion with the rest.

In a word, such should be sincere believers, and in heart, according to their measure of light, Particular and Strict Baptists.

neither of these methods fully complies with the requirements of the New Testament; and that a person desiring to join a Church should, before Baptism, be privately interviewed by (at least) two members, who, if satisfied, with his (or her) testimony, should introduce and commend him (or her) to the whole Church when convened for this purpose. The Candidate is then expected, in a clear and audible voice, to express his (or her) personal Faith in the Lord Jesus, and his (or her) motives for wishing to become a member of this particular Christian Community.

In support of this, it may be urged that it harmonises with the practice of the Churches of God delineated in the New Testament. We do not contend that there is a direct text in support of every custom observed in our Assemblies. "All things" are to "be done decently (becomingly) and in order." (1 Cor. xiv. 40; see page 9.) This is the *principle*. Its exemplification is left to the collective conscience of each spiritual Congregation. And we, following the precedent set by our Fathers, *deem this practice to be becoming* to the ideal Church which *ours* should as far as possible resemble.

It accords with several portions which (it is admitted) do not expressly inculcate it. Psa. lxvi. 16: "Come and hear, all ye that fear God; and I will declare what He hath done for my soul." Psa. cxix. 74: "They that fear Thee will be glad when they see me; because I have hoped in Thy word." etc.

Our practice is supported by definite and decisive texts. The Baptism of John was preceded by oral confession of sin. Matt. iii. 6. The Baptisms recorded in Acts ii. 41, and viii. 36—38, were administered after vocal avowal of Faith in Christ. (See note, page 84.) Rom. x. 10: "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The salvation which has been realised through the belief of the heart ought to be confessed with the mouth—that is vocally or orally—by an open public act. 1 Tim. vi. 12: "Thou.....hast professed a good profession before many witnesses."—better, "thou didst (once and for all, definitely and finally) confess the good confession before many witnesses, even as "Christ witnessed the good confession," verse 13. 1 Pet. iii. 21, enforces (page 158) that they only, in Peter's time, were baptised who had been questioned, and had satisfactorily replied as to their religion.\*

\*The word *eperōtēma* rendered "the [or an] answer" of a good conscience, is the cognate noun to the verb, *eperōtāō*, to "ask a question," Matt. xxiii. 35, or "questions," verse 46.

1 Cor. xv. 34: "For some have not the knowledge of God (or, have ignorance of God); I speak this to (or, in order to) your shame"—to excite you to shame. Some had been baptised, and received into the Church at Corinth, who were ignorant of God and His truth. They had not previously been duly examined, but accepted in a careless and cursory manner. This was a scandal, for which Paul desired the Corinthian Christians might be ashamed.

#### Objections Answered.

To this practice, objections have been raised.

It is pleaded that it is unseemly for persons, especially females, thus to parade before a number of people, many of whom are strangers, the most private and delicate secrets of their hearts.

It is again urged that by our insisting on so trying an ordeal, we keep many out of the church who otherwise would gladly join.

In reply, we plead that

As a matter of fact, experience shows that there is nothing unbecoming in a Christian's giving a review of his (or her) Christian life, *in confidence*, before an assembly of spiritually minded and sympathetic persons.

It is to be questioned whether the ordeal is so formidable as our opponents represent it.\* If it, however, were, Christians

"It is spoken of a question, or rather of the whole series of questions put to a convert at his Baptism, and his answers."—BARNES'S NOTES, *in loco*.

\*The positions of this Article are finely illustrated in the "Pilgrim's Progress." It is admitted that the Palace Beautiful stands for a visible Church of Christ on earth. (Cheever's Lectures on the Life and Times of Bunyan, No. IX.) The Porter, Watchful, is its faithful and affectionate Pastor. Piety, Prudence, and Charity are the Members, collectively considered, with their varying gifts of grace, judgment and love; and their questioning Christian and receiving his replies, answer to our requiring and receiving the "good confession" for which we are pleading. The "two lions in the way" which at first filled him with fear, but which, being chained, did him no harm, represent what often seem so formidable, giving testimony before the Church only, and being baptised publicly in the presence of the whole congregation. Two trials—two lions. Why placed where they were? "For trial of faith, and for discovery of those that have none."

declining to join the Church in the way the Master ordains, are not worthy to be received, and had better, till more grace is given them, remain without.

The practice is fraught with benefits.

It is most profitable to those who hear the testimony. We have, not infrequently, seen brethren and sisters moved to tears by the broken words to which they were listening, whom pathetic sermons often failed to touch.

It is profitable to those who publicly confess their Faith. It surely tends to overcome their natural timidity. It arouses kindly interest in those whom they address, and prevents the too common complaint that though they are members of the Church, no one knows them, and no one speaks to them. Confession before admission is their formal introduction to their future friends.

The practice tends to prevent Baptism from becoming a hollow form. Baptism is the outward and visible expression of an inward and spiritual fact; and how can we with confidence express a fact of which we are not assured.

Baptism is a burial (Rom. vi. 4, page 165.) Nothing is more tragic and gruesome than the burial of living persons, which all precautions are taken to prevent. How terrible, however, is it symbolically to bury a man as if he were dead in Christ, to the law, and to the world, (Rom. vi. 8—17) when he is really alive to them, and finds his most congenial pleasures in what is wholly out of touch and sympathy with the Master and spiritual things. See John xv. 18, 19; James iv. 4.

Such, too often, draw "back unto perdition," proving the most abandoned characters; so that their "last state becometh worse than the first," Matt. xii. 43—45. (See a Sermon on this text by Thomas Adams. Works:—Nichol's Puritan Divines, vol. ii., page 36.)

#### Advantages Realised.

An open confession of experience and Faith is a most profitable preparation for giving "to every man," that asks for it, "a reason for the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear." 1 Pet. iii. 15. Its prayerful anticipation is a means of grace. The fact that we have to tell our life-story before others, clarifies thought, quickens memory, and induces reflection and meditation. The question, "What can I truthfully say?" stirs the conscience; and the solicitude which is sure to be aroused, though perhaps painful, is fraught with blessing.

Thus, in spite of objections, we maintain a practice which has so evidently the sanction and smile of God.

### Suffolk's Weighty Testimony.

In their Circular Letter for 1862 (written by Charles Hill, and "approved and adopted" by all the Ministers and Messengers present,) "The Suffolk and Norfolk Association of Particular Baptist Churches," thus deliver their judgment on this subject.

"It is the duty of Churches to ascertain as fully as they can the moral character and spiritual qualifications of those who propose themselves for fellowship. We deem the government and discipline exceedingly lax, when Churches are satisfied with a simple and unattested profession of Christianity as all sufficient for such an end.

The union is to be formed with the *entire* Church, meeting and worshipping in a given place. The *entire* Church has, therefore, a right to require and to receive, in connection with a Candidate's profession of faith, a recital of the *work of the Lord* in his soul—the *means* employed in his reclamation from the ways of sin and death—the *motives* by which he is actuated—and the *object* he seeks to accomplish in being united with a Church of the Lord.

"Such information can be furnished by the individual himself only, and it is but just that he should appear before the Church and testify to what God has done for him.

"It is false charity—a spurious pretension of affection—which would dispense with this ancient mode of receiving members, and substitute for it a Statement by letter, or from the lips of the parties who were deputed to visit and confer with the candidate. This is merging the right of the entire Body in a few privileged individuals, on whose judgment and Report the whole Church acts in one of the most important matters entrusted to it in administering the laws of the House.

"The religion which declines to be publicly confessed, may fairly be questioned. However feeble a person's faith and love are, if love to God and to His people be a living principle in his heart, it must inspire him with the desire to be found walking in all the Master's commandments blameless, and also to render to all "a reason for the hope that is in him," and to bear witness to the grace that is come unto him.

"If it be alleged that we have no scriptural authority to demand an oral confession of Faith, it will suffice in reply to ask where the New Testament gives authority to receive members from the world, by letter or by proxy.

"It is easy, as a rule, for individuals with designing minds, and for hypocrites to concoct such statements, or to gather

them from the recorded experiences of others. It would, however, prove difficult for such to appear before a Church with 'a lie in their right hand,' (Isa. xlv. 20) and, without detection, relate matters with which they were unacquainted.

"The custom referred to, therefore, becomes a means of safety to a Church as a preventative to the introduction of those who *can do it no good*, but must prove "roots of bitterness" within it. (Heb. xii. 15.)"

### John Hazelton's Conviction.

"From my heart, I believe," says John Hazelton, "in the expediency of oral confession on the part of those that wish to join a Church. Their Membership will mean communion, and there can be no communion without union, and no union without knowledge. A good confession before the Church imparts the knowledge which is the basis of the union, and from which the communion springs."

### Article XXI.—The Lord's Supper. Page 11.

NOTE 1.—The Lord's Supper is a "repast"—not a meal intended to satisfy hunger and nourish our physical frames.

It is a symbolical repast, representing and recalling by certain prescribed objects and actions, Divine and gracious acts and facts, in which we are eternally interested.

We are, in the main, in accord with the majority of Non-conformists as to the manner in which it should be observed, and the truths it expresses. Some of our convictions may, however, be stated.

#### Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation disclaimed.

NOTE 2.—We deny that it is a Sacrament, and generally necessary to salvation. Were this true, infants, and persons who never partook of it, must be eternally lost.\*

As no special order of Christians should be styled and considered Priests, we deny that the administration of the Lord's Supper is a sacerdotal or Priestly function, (page 137) or that

\*"A Sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us.....as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."—CHURCH CATECHISM.

"GENERALLY NECESSARY TO SALVATION," does not mean "in most instances," but in all cases, without restriction or limitation, page 152.

men ordained to the ministerial office have authority or power to effect any change in the elements, or the bread and wine employed. These remain unaltered by their religious use. The bread is still bread, and the wine, wine; and no one is commissioned to effect a change in them.

We therefore repudiate the Popish doctrine of **Transubstantiation**—namely, that when the Priest pronounces the words of consecration, the bread and wine really become the body and blood of Christ, which are actually imparted to all who partake of them, on the ground of the benediction of the Priest, irrespectively of *his* moral character, and apart from *their* Faith.

Thus the Church of Rome holds that the consecrated elements used in the Eucharist (or rather, the bread or wafer only—the wine being reserved for Priests) are Divine, and should as such be worshipped. Hence the Pyx, or box containing the Host, or consecrated wafer, is held up in the sight of the congregation, who are required to kneel and do it homage, as to the Son of God.

This the Reformers hated. "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of the Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot," they said, "be proved by Holy Writ: but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." ("Articles of Religion," of the Church of England, No. xxviii.)

Luther perceived that Transubstantiation was an evil—lacking Scriptural authority, giving awful power to so-called Priests, solemnly perverting an Ordinance of Christ's, gravely deluding men, and leading to gross superstition, and even a dangerous form of idolatry. He, therefore, repudiated it, and taught the tenet commonly called, **Impanation** or **Consubstantiation**.\*

In this he denied that the substance of the bread and wine were changed; but insisted that after consecration the body and blood of Christ were really but spiritually present, together with the material substance of the bread and wine. He assigned no virtue or grace to the consecrated elements as such, and regarded the recipient's personal Faith as essential to, and the

\*Impanation (*im*, "in," and *panis* "bread," was the favourite term of Luther and his followers, to describe their view that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful *in* the Lord's Supper."

instrumentality whereby, worshippers become partakers of inward and spiritual grace.

This is identical with the teaching of the Liturgy, which states that "the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper, (but) only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," (Article xxviii.) in which sense it is "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful," or those that believe—elsewhere styled "all that be religiously and devoutly disposed"—since "the mean," or instrument, "by which the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith," (Article xxviii.)

To this we are also opposed; for **Consubstantiation** cannot be proved by Holy Writ. No text asserts that while the elements remain unaltered, *with* them or *in* them, in some unexplained way, the body and blood of Christ are mysteriously so conjoined as to be taken and received by those that believe.

The dogma also depends on the alleged supremacy and power of the officiating Minister, who acts at the Communion in the character and capacity of a Priest. Without ordination to this office, he could not, according to the Prayer Book, "dispense" this "holy Sacrament." He, in every act which concerns the Eucharist, as such, is styled the Priest, the word occurring twenty-four times in the service. He places the bread and wine upon the table. He invites the people to "draw near with faith." He pronounces the Absolution. He offers "the Prayer of Consecration." He takes the paten (or plate) and breaks and lays his hand upon all the bread. He takes the cup, and lays his hand upon "every vessel in which there is wine to be consecrated." He delivers the bread and wine into the hands of the people, all meekly kneeling. All this is unscriptural and sacerdotal, not only in sentiment but in act; and as such to be repudiated.\*

#### The Lord's Supper—a Commemoration.

NOTE 3.—While denying Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, we as Evangelical Dissenters, believe in the main with Ulric Zuingli, the Swiss Reformer, (1484—1531) that the Divine

\*Administering the Lord's Supper, as most Dissenters phrase it, is neither the act of a Priest nor of a Pastor *as such*, but the fraternal act of a brother towards his brethren. No thought of an officiating Minister is found in the New Testament. Christ has not delegated His high position as Lord of the feast to any. *The disciples came together to break bread,* Acts. xx. 7. "The cup that we bless—the bread that we break." 1 Cor. x. 16.

intention in the Lord's Supper is not **Communication** but **Commemoration**; in other words, that no special blessing is conveyed to those who partake of it, either through any efficacy possessed by the actual elements when consecrated, or by some peculiar form of grace connected with them; but that it is designed to recall to remembrance, for our soul's profit, what its symbols and ritual suggest. This forms the burden of many of our favourite hymns.\*

#### Figurative Language.

NOTE 4.—When each word in a sentence occurs in its ordinary sense, we say that it is to be understood *literally*, as “Moses kept the flock of Jethro.” Ex. iii. 1. “The mother of Jesus was there.” John ii. 1. “Joseph went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus.” Matt. xxvii. 58.

A writer who wishes to explain the property of a thing, or the manner of an action, often does so by means of a direct comparison, introduced by the words “as” or “like,” or the comparative degree followed by “than.” This mode of expression is called a Simile: from *similis*, “like,” because it expresses resemblance between one object or action and another. Examples: “They sank as lead in the mighty waters.” Ex. xv. 10. “As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you.” Isa. lxvi. 13. “We were like them that dream.” Psa. cxxvi. 1. “They were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions.” 2 Sam. i. 23. “The kingdom of heaven is like,” Matt. xiii. 31, etc. “He that wavereth (doubteth, R.V.) is like a wave (the surge, R.V.) of the sea.” James i. 6.

Very frequently, however, the words, “as” and “like,” are omitted; as the resemblance, though implied, is not stated. In this case the figure of speech called Metaphor is employed, and the phrase or sentence is not understood literally, but in a figurative sense. Examples.—“Unto Thee will I cry, O LORD, my rock,” Psa. xxviii. 1. “Behold, O God our shield,” Psa. lxxxiv. 9. “Our God is a consuming fire,” Heb. xii. 29. “Ye are the salt of the earth,” Matt. v. 13. “[John] was a burning and a shining light [the lamp that burneth and shineth, R.V.]” John v. 35. “I am the light of the world,”—“the door,”—“the good shepherd,” John ix. 5: x. 9, 14. “We,

\*D. Sedgwick, the hymnologist, complained that Dr. Watts's hymn, “How condescending and how kind,” prepared for the Lord's Supper, was altered by some early Editor to suit the taste of Arminians, and that verse 5 should read:—

“Well *He* remembers Calvary, nor lets *His saints* forget.”

being many, are one [loaf of] bread,” 1 Cor. x. 17. “This is my body,”—“This cup is the new covenant,” 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

“This is My Body”—“This Cup is the New Covenant.”

NOTE 5.—“This is My Body.” On these words the figment of Transubstantiation is based. Popish divines interpret them literally, while Protestants understand them figuratively. These, though their interpretations may differ as to details, are agreed that the expression is a Metaphor, and simply expresses that there is a resemblance between the loaf and the Lord's body.

“This cup is the new Covenant,” (R.V.) This also is a Metaphor. The cup *symbolises* the new Covenant. The material cup is not a Covenant, nor is it transmuted into one. It is an outward and visible emblem or sign of the blood by which the new Covenant was ratified or confirmed.\*

#### A Repast Symbolising the Plan of Salvation.

NOTE 6.—A Symbol is an object, unimportant in itself; but owing its interest and influence to what is past, distant, invisible, or difficult of apprehension, with which the mind naturally and involuntarily associates it.†

A Symbolical Act is one that has distinct relation to a Symbol as such.

In the Lord's Supper the bread and wine (if it should be wine) are symbols; and taking and eating the bread, and drinking (of the contents of) the cup are symbolical actions.

The ordinance is a *repast*, in which the worshippers *eat and drink*. Among the Orientals, doing this had a far higher import

\*See pages 25 to 32 and Note, pages 26 and 27.

†A Symbol differs from a Type, the latter being a prophetic emblem—a figure of what is to come.

‡“If it should be wine.” The New Testament in no place calls the liquid contained in the cup, “wine.” Matthew and Mark both style it “this,” or “the fruit of the vine,” (Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25)—while Luke and Paul simply speak of the cup, without specifying its contents, whether fermented grape-juice or not, though the word, *oinos*, “wine,” was in common use. Both Abstainers and Non-abstainers are, therefore, at liberty to carry out their convictions, provided that they do not make the question a cause of discussion and dissension, and so destroy the unity, peace, and concord of the church. (Rom. xvi. 17, 18; 1 Cor. i. 10; xi. 18, etc.)

than with ourselves, and expressed friendship and fellowship. No Arab will injure a man, or suffer him to be harmed by others, if he has partaken of his hospitality. Friendship is sealed by the act.

The Elements at the Lord's Supper are Symbols, as they consist of food and drink, which being essential to *physical* life, naturally suggest Christ as the strength and sustenance of *spiritual* life. His "flesh is meat indeed," is truly food, and His "blood is drink indeed," is truly drink; that is, food and drink in the highest sense. John vi. 48—58 do not, refer to the Lord's supper, as what is therein recorded was spoken some time before the institution of the great Christian Feast—but the truths they teach are those which this suggests and enforces.

The propriety of regarding the elements as Symbols thus appears in the nature of the bread and wine themselves. They are not merely arbitrary signs, but fraught with suggestiveness to the thoughtful and spiritual.

Bread, though unique in its life-sustaining value, is a universal food, essential to prince and peasant alike. It is wheat, grown in ordinary soil, and fostered by the common forces of Nature—light, air, and rain. To fit it for human use, it must be bruised, (ground) and subjected to the action of fire—the constant emblem of Divine wrath. In the Communion it must first be broken for the benefit of those that are to partake of it.

The truths taught are obvious. Bread is "the staff of life." Christ is essential to all heaven-born men, (John vi. 53.) "The Word was made flesh," assuming by incarnation (though in sinless form, page 22) our common humanity—being made "in all things like unto His brethren," and taking the "same" "flesh and blood" as those of all God's children. (Heb. iv. 15.) He became our Saviour, not by His incarnation only, but by suffering and death (Heb. v. 8, 9) meekly borne under the wrath of God (Isa. liii. 7, 10.) This He did, not for the world, but for the elect "you," (1 Cor. xi. 24) who then represented those who constitute God's family.

The Cup, considered in connection with its contents, is symbolical of that precious blood by which, not only was the New Covenant ratified, but which was "shed for many" unto [namely, with the purpose and intention of] the remission of [their] sins."\* R.V. Pages 49—52.

\*Thus both Baptism and the Lord's Supper attest to the Forgiveness of sins. The former, however, refers to the full and free pardon granted to sinners when they first believe:—

The Symbolism of the wine, as such, is also obvious and striking. The grapes must be crushed ere their juice can be obtained. So, through Christ's broken heart, blessing comes to us. Wine not only quenches thirst, but is invigorating, especially to "those that are ready to perish." (Prov. xxxi. 6.) So Christ is not only like water to the thirsty, but is the highest, sweetest joy to those that have communion with Him.

#### Supper, the Rest-Meal.

NOTE 7.—The meals of the Orientals, both ancient and modern, may be compared to our *dinner* and *supper*. (Luke xiv. 12,) though the former might better be styled "breakfast," as it is a light meal, taken early. The latter, the principal, is substantial, and is taken after the heat and labour of the day.

See the original. *Aristāō*, "I take an early meal," or "break my fast." Luke xi. 37, R.V., *margin*. John xxi. 12—15, R.V. The *Ariston*, was "an early meal" or "breakfast." Luke xiv. 12.—"dinner" conveying an inaccurate idea. *Deipnon*, "supper," was the chief or evening meal.

Thus the Symbolism of the Lord's Supper is suggestive. Rest of soul is a present blessing of the Gospel, Matt. xi. 28—30; Heb. iv. 3. Our legal strivings and penal apprehensions are at an end. To this the Lord's Supper—the holy Rest-meal of true Christians—bears silent but expressive testimony.

#### Taking the Lord's Supper—a Symbolical Act.

NOTE 8.—On page 185 Symbolical Actions are defined. That our partaking of the Communion is such is clear from 1 Cor. xi. 26, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come," R.V. The Lord's Supper is thus an acted discourse—a silent sermon.

Our posture is significant. We neither kneel to implore

"The sinner that truly believes,  
And trusts in his crucified God,  
His justification receives,  
Redemption in full through His blood."

The latter reminds us of God's continuous acts of pardon. (1 John i. 9.)

"Tis He, my soul, that sent His Son  
To die for crimes which thou hast done;  
He owns the ransom, and forgives  
The hourly follies of our lives."

mercy, nor stand as if hoping to obtain it. At the institution of the Lord's Supper both the Master and His disciples reclined. We, therefore, sit, as those to whom toil is over, and who consciously and joyously "receive the end of our faith, even the salvation of our souls." 1 Pet. i. 9. We rest in His finished work. How appropriate is this to the guests at the Lord's Rest-meal!\*

Every act is significant. "Taking," points to Faith's reception of Jesus Christ as her own Saviour. (Col. ii. 6.) "Eating" indicates the benefits flowing from the breaking of His body—pardon, peace, and joy—of which we as really partake, as we masticate the bread. "Drinking," (as *all* are to)—to our delight in the blood by which He has ratified the Covenant of redemption and grace, and conveyed its blessings to us. While apostates "count the blood of the covenant an unholy (or better, "a common") thing," (Heb. x. 29); to us (as we here declare) it is incomparable in its preciousness.

Thus, by all our acts combined, we proclaim His death, and make known our belief that He will come again. The Lord's Supper is His "Forget ME not." Our response is:—

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

#### Fellowship and Communion.

NOTE 9.—The subject of Fellowship with God is discussed in the Author's Manual, page 279.

Here it suffices to observe that the terms "fellowship" and "communion" represent but one word, *koinōnia*, in the Greek Testament. It means joint possession; common ownership; the participation by many in one object, or privilege—all concerned having their due share. In 1 Cor. x. 16 (twice); 2 Cor. vi. 14, and xiii. 14, † it is translated "*communion*." In Acts ii. 42; 1 Cor. i. 9; 2 Cor. viii. 4; Gal. ii. 9; Eph. iii. 9; Phil. i. 5; ii. 1, and iii. 10; 1 John i. 3 (twice), 6, 7, it is rendered "fellowship."

As employed by inspired writers, it stands for either an ob-

\*The Established Church in requiring her Communicants to rise and kneel before the Communion rails, not only acts unscripturally, but destroys much of the designed beauty of the symbolism.

† "*Fellowship*" here stands for *metoche*, participation. In Eph. iii. 9, read "*dispensation*," or "*stewardship*," (R. V.)

jective reality or for a subjective realisation; or for a fact, and the knowledge and enjoyment of it.

God has originated gracious facts in which His people have an equal right and a common share. (Psa. cxlix. 9.) This common share would be expressed by *koinōnia*, in its *objective sense*, in which it appears in Phil. i. 5: "Your *fellowship* in (the blessings of) the Gospel." This accorded with Divine and sovereign arrangement, and was a gracious *fact*, independently of their cognisance or faith.

The apprehension and appreciation of these facts by us, in common with others similarly favoured, would also be expressed by *koinōnia*, but in its *subjective sense*. Phil. iii. 10: "That I may know the fellowship (participation, ALFORD.) of His sufferings,"—namely that I may have gracious sympathy with Him who suffered for me.

Judging from the usage of approved writers on theology, *koinōnia* should be rendered "*fellowship*," when employed in an *objective sense*, and "*communion*," when occurring in a *subjective* one.

It sets forth our Union and Communion with Him.

NOTE 10.—As a fact, we have Fellowship with Christ, and hence are called His fellows, (Psa. xlv. 7.) It is a Fellowship of *relationship*, for His God and Father is also ours. (John xx. 17; Heb. ii. 11, 12.) A Fellowship of *nature*, He having assumed ours, (Heb. ii. 14) in which He suffered, and in which He exists in glory. A Fellowship in His acquired possessions, (Rom. viii. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 21.) A Fellowship in His atoning work, for all believers have an equal interest in His cross, (2 Cor. v. 14, 15.) A Fellowship in His covenant engagements as the Surety and Saviour of His people. And a Fellowship or joint participation in the benefits which flow from His present offices as our ever-living Priest, Advocate, and Shepherd.

Our Fellowship with Christ in these facts is set forth at His Table. We are not asked to admire the Unitarian's Christ, the perfect Man, the great Exemplar, the Model Teacher, the supreme Witness for God (though we honour Him in all these characters); but as the Lord who was crucified, (1 Cor. xi. 24, 26), who, by dying for us, and ever living and pleading for us, has emancipated us, and so dignified us as to invite us to sup with Him. (Rev. iii. 20.)

The Lord's Supper, however, does more than witness to these facts. It should bring us, in a special way, into living and loving Communion with Himself. The memory of His betrayal



should quicken holy fear lest we should prove false to Him. The broken bread portrays His broken body, and the thought melts the heart. The world diverts our thoughts from Him; this brings our truant spirits back to Him. The whole simple ritual tends to minister to Communion with Him in His sufferings; to impart a tender, contrite and grateful sense of His sorrows. His personal feelings in relation to His cross and passion *must*, in their fulness, be unknown to any. Favoured saints, however, share *them in measure* as they sympathise with Him.

“A faithful friend of grief partakes; but union can be none,  
Betwixt a heart like melting wax and hearts as hard as stone;  
Betwixt a Head diffusing blood and members sound and whole;  
Betwixt an agonising God and an unfeeling soul.”

#### The Lord's Supper symbolises Church Fellowship.

NOTE 11.—As a fact, all Christians have Fellowship with each other, all having joint and equal participation, through Christ, in the blessings of the New Covenant. This is especially true of the members of the same Church.

We have the same Father, (John xx. 17); the same Saviour, (1 Cor. i. 2); the same Divine Comforter. We are members of one “Body,” and one “family,” (Eph. i. 22, 23, and iii. 15.) As all the members of the human frame have their own functions, and are essential to its welfare, so all Christians have their allotted spheres of service, (1 Cor. xii. 12—27.)

These facts the Lord's Supper recalls to the spiritual mind. We gather at the family table. We partake of the same food. The act of eating together is significant, (page 185.) The world is full of social distinctions. The rich are esteemed for their wealth; the learned, for their knowledge; the influential, for their power. Here “the rich and poor meet together.” We assemble as brethren, Matt. xxiii. 8, 9. All should be honoured and loved alike.

Seldom, alas, is this Fellowship realised in actual Communion. We talk, sing, and pray about it; but how few feel it, yet how desirable that we should! John never refers to the “breaking of bread,” but 1 John i. 3, 7, expresses this aspect of its holy influence. “Our desire is that ye also may have Communion (or conscious fellowship) with us; and truly our fellowship rises to living communion with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.” If we say that we have (conscious fellowship or) communion with Him, and (live in sin or) walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not (practise) the truth: but if we walk in

the light, as He is in the light, we enjoy Communion one with another, etc.—that mutual interchange of thought and feeling to which John desired they might attain.\* To aid this “consummation” so “devoutly to be wished” is one purpose which the Lord's Supper is designed to effect.

In social life persons are invited to eat together, that friendship may be formed or increased. So Christ invites us to His Supper that our Fellowship with each other may be grasped, and living and loving Communion realised.

The sin of the Corinthians consisted not only in making the holy season an occasion of revelry, but of overlooking the equality in Christ of all that were present. In their pride and ostentation, the rich put the poor to shame, by bringing their own costly provisions with them; and commencing to eat before their humbler brethren were present. (1 Cor. xi. 20, 21, 22, R.V.) It was not possible that the Lord's Supper could be truly taken in this way.

All, therefore, are to partake of the Cup. “Drink ye all of it,” (Matt. xxvi. 27.) This does not mean (as ordinary Bibles have led some to suppose) that its whole contents are to be there and then drunk; but that, since all that love and are loyal to Christ, have an interest in His covenant love, all present, whatever their light or experience, are to share in what the Cup contains.

#### The Lord's Supper—an Experience.

NOTE 12.—Peculiar blessing often attends the “breaking of bread.” This all Christians admit, and many long-loved hymns attest. Christians, however, differ as to its cause—whether it arises solely from the nature of the service and the unique character of the Assembly; or proceeds from some special form of grace inseparable from the bread and the wine, and their reception by those who thus wait on the Lord.

1. Those who, with Zuingle, page 185, regard the Lord's Supper as a Memorial, and believe that its great object is Commemoration, not Communication, (page 183,) explain the fact on psychological grounds,† or on the recognised laws and prin-

\*So Alford—though some regard it as meaning communion between our souls and the Saviour.

†Our authority for these statements is a Sermon, “THE LORD'S SUPPER, A COMMEMORATION,” by J. Guinness Rogers, B.A., D.D. CHRISTIAN WORLD PULPIT, No. 1409. Nov. 2nd, 1898.

ciples which regulate the passions and actions of the human mind. Cowper was stirred to deep feeling by his mother's picture, many years after her death. Objects, once belonging to deceased children, have moved their parents to tears. A withered flower, a marked passage in a book, a lock of hair; often bring the past vividly back. So the emblems of our Lord's body and blood have a subtle power to call Him, whom our soul loveth, to mind.

Again, when long-sundered friends meet, hearts grow tender as memory reviews the past, and Love joys in re-union. So Christians must rejoice in the company of their "best friends and kindred" at this solemn Assembly.

The interest and value of a Memorial necessarily depend upon what it commemorates. This, though *only* a Memorial, is associated with objects and actions which heaven-born men hold most sacred and dear, and hence possesses unparalleled power, with the Spirit's blessing, to stimulate the soul to trust, assurance, and ecstasy.

The promised presence of the Master when and where "two or three are gathered together in His name," and the assurance that "in keeping His commandments there is great reward, (Matt. xviii. 20; Psa. xix. 11) likewise ensure His special sanction and smile.

2. Others,\* though repudiating the priesthood of Christian ministers, and denying Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, explain the blessing attending the Lord's Supper, by the alleged fact that "*in it*" "Christ communicates to the Church whatever is represented by the bread and the wine."—Dale's MANUAL, page 142.

They thus hark back to the "Westminster Assembly's Confession," (1647) and the "Declaration of Faith and Order issued by the Savoy Conference of Congregational Elders and Messengers," (1658.)

"Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements of this Sacrament, do then also inwardly by Faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all the benefits of His death: the Body and Blood of Christ being then,

\*Prominent among whom was R. W. Dale, LL.D., from whose MANUAL OF CONGREGATIONAL PRINCIPLES. (pages 148, 157,) and ECCLESIA, First Series; Article on THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE AND OF THE LORD'S SUPPER—much of the above is taken.

not carnally or corporally in, with or under the bread and wine, (*in denial of Consubstantiation,*) yet as really but spiritually present to the Faith of believers, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses in this Ordinance," Confession of Faith, xxix. 7. The Savoy Declaration, and the Baptist Confession of Faith, Article 30, are almost verbally the same.

The proof-text relied on by Dr. Dale is 1 Cor. x. 16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of [or participation in] the Body of Christ: the bread which we break, is it not a communion of [or participation in] the Body of Christ?"

"So, when Christ gives us bread, and says, 'This is My Body,' it is not a mere dramatic ceremony, deriving all its worth from its 'didactic' meaning, or its 'impressive' power. His Body is actually given."

If this is true, Christ's flesh and blood are communicated to, and partaken by, His people at His Table, in a way, or to an extent in which they are not and cannot be, elsewhere. There is an indivisible connection between the elements and what they signify, and partaking of the former is essential to participating in the latter; while the physical act, if performed in Faith, secures this peculiar form of grace and blessing. Thus our Brethren account for the ecstasy experienced by believers at the Ordinance.

To this we object, that religious emotion of the most joyous character is often experienced by Christians apart from the Lord's Supper.

If it *were* true, Christians who have not the opportunity to attend the Holy Supper, would be debarred from the fulness of joy which John desired for his brethren, Paul enjoined on the Philippians, and the Master referred to in His intercessory prayer (1 John i. 4; 1 Thess. v. 16; John xvii. 13.)

It makes a high Spiritual privilege depend on an act of Ritual.

It dangerously resembles Sacramentalism—any approach to which should be earnestly resisted.

It convicts those who deny the Lord's Supper to any consistent Believer, of spiritual unkindness of a most serious character.

#### The View of Strict Baptists.

NOTE 13.—The books of the Articles of the Faith of numerous Strict and Particular Baptist Churches (in the writer's possession) when examined, attest that our view of the Lord's Supper is practically identical with the first, given above, neither stating that grace is conveyed by means of the bread and the wine.

One of the clearest of these asserts that, "We believe that the Lord's Supper is a Gospel Ordinance, instituted by Christ, to be kept up in His churches till His second coming—as a remembrance and representation of His body broken, and His blood shed for the remission of sin—together with our Communion with Him, and our Fellowship with each other."

This accords with Scripture and spiritual experience, and accounts for the rich pleasure the sacred Feast imparts.

#### Its Practical Influence.

NOTE 14.—In 1 Cor. x. 20, 21, the Apostle insists that the Lord's Table should not only be regarded as a source of joy at the time, but should lead to holiness and unworldliness. On the ground that the Corinthians had sat around it, Paul insists that joining with heathens in *their* acts of worship would be a solecism and a sin of the most solemn character. In verse 21, read "the Cup" and "the Table of Demons."\*

#### Unworthy Receiving.

NOTE 15.—Privilege and responsibility go together, and the latter is often connected with peril. It is dangerous to approach the Lord's Table in a thoughtless and undevout spirit. For which see 1 Cor. xi. 27, 34.

"Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." "Wherefore," since the body and blood of Christ are symbolised by the bread and wine, and our partaking of these signifies our personal relation to Him, as saved sinners through His death: "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily:" referring, not to the character of the Communicants, or the unworthiness which they may feel and deplore, but to the unseemly way in which the elements may be received—for instance, in a perfunctory manner, in forgetfulness of Jesus and His love, and with the heart fondly clinging to the Christ-hating world,— "shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord"—will, by his callous and apathetic unmindfulness of the Master, and the

\*Many think that the term Demons stood for the disembodied spirits of men who had died in sin, and were at that very time doomed and damned. None who partake of the Lord's Supper should attend spiritualistic seances. This is "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines (teachings) of Demons," (1 Tim. iv. 1), a sin specially predicted of the last days.

death which he should now proclaim with a sorrowful yet grateful heart, be guilty of profaning the holy emblems, and sharing, in measure at least, the sin of those who crucified that body and shed that blood.

But let a [each] man examine [prove] himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. Worthy partaking is here contrasted with unworthy. Let each person examine, prove or test himself—enquire into the reality of his conversion, recall his recent experience, and review his conduct. This may make him sick of self, but it will endear his Master. Observe, it is not said, "let him test himself and stop away;" but humbled and heart-broken though he may be, "so,"—in that suitable frame of mind—"let him eat."

"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation [judgment] to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Unworthy communicating is further explained. Some of the Corinthians had sunk so low in their religious life, so dim and defiled had their spiritual sight become, that they failed to discern or discriminate between common food at an ordinary meal, and the bread which, by the Lord's appointment, symbolised His body, and should therefore be taken and eaten with reverence and godly fear. Their sin was grave, and would incur, not eternal damnation, but Divine and parental judgment, as in 1 Pet. iv. 17.

"For this cause, many among you are weak and sickly, and many [not a few] sleep." "For this cause"—unworthy eating, specially that mentioned in verses 21, 22—"many" among you are in feeble health, some absolutely sick, while, not a few—in number more than the others mentioned—have died.

"For if we judged [discerned—the word is the same as in verse 29] ourselves, we should not be judged: but when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world."\* The "if" here denotes supposition or hypothesis—not a condition. Self-examination is not a meritorious act, affecting the present or future conduct of God. As a fact, the Christian who impartially tries to estimate his life and conduct by God's Word, and regulates his actions accordingly, avoids solemn Parental judgment. But lest the Corinthians should over-press this teaching, for their relief and comfort, the Apostle adds, "When

\*See page 115, Note. "Judged" here is *krino*. "Condemned," *kata-krino*.

we are judged," and wince under the heavy blows of our Father's hand, He is not treating us penally. "Whom He loveth He chasteneth," and the pain and sorrow He inflicts are a sign and an assurance that we shall not be consigned to Hell on the last day, as men of the world will be.

The remainder of the passage calls for no comment.

### Article XXII.—Strict Communion. Page 11.

"Strict," is here simply an abbreviation of "restricted" (re-strict-ed), and is applied to the practice of such as welcome to the Lord's Table those only for whom they judge it is scripturally spread.

#### A Christian or a Church Ordinance ?

NOTE 1.—The Lord's Supper is commonly regarded as a general recognition of religion; and a declaration of the unity and sympathy which exist among true Christians. Thus, on "Communion Sundays," in most chapels, Ministers invite those who love Jesus to remain and join in this act of worship, and assure them that all Christians are welcome. It is also common to conclude the Sessions of religious Societies with United Communion Services, at which Ministers of all Denominations assist.\*

Such brethren regard the Lord's Supper as a **Christian Ordinance**, and conceive it to be the duty and privilege of all *professed* Christians—whether baptised or not—and whatever their religious convictions (if they have any,) thus to assemble, when opportunity serves, to show their affection towards the Lord and each other.

The text they adduce to support this is—"Do this in remembrance" (not of your having been baptised—not of your holding certain dogmas, or belonging to a particular Denomination, but) "of Me." 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

This the above Article opposes, insisting it to be a **Church Ordinance**, and rightly observed by none but the members of a Church of the New Testament Faith and Order, assembled for this purpose, and others who, for the time being, are worshipping with them.

Baptism by Immersion is often thought to be all we require as a pre-requisite to the Lord's Supper—some inadequate Confessions of our Faith countenancing the idea. Our real

\*For instance the Mildmay Gatherings, and the Pastors' College Conference.

conviction is, that not Baptism only, but Membership with a Baptised Church, and what this expresses and involves, should always precede and be conjoined with this act of devotion.

This Position WE PROVE, firstly from plain and positive Scriptures:—

#### The Threefold Commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

The Apostles, as the Founders of Christ's Church, on earth, were—Firstly: to evangelise men and women of all nations. Secondly, when any became disciples—the earliest name for Christians, Acts xi. 26—to baptise them. Thirdly, to "teach" these disciples or Christians "to observe all things whatsoever they had learned of the Master;" and, among these, the Lord's Supper must have been included. With these *precepts*, their *practice* coincided.

This appears in Acts ii. 37, 42. Through God's blessing on Peter's Pentecostal Sermon, several "were pricked in the heart," or savingly impressed; and thus became "disciples," or Christians. On their seeking guidance, Peter enjoined them to "repent"—perhaps with special reference to their Nation's murder of Jesus—"and be baptised." "Then they that received his word were baptised (page 159); and in that day about three thousand souls were added unto them,"—that is, to the Church. (verse 47.)\* Then, in accordance with their Commission, the Apostles proceeded to instruct them. Nor in vain. "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching, and in the fellowship"—namely, Church fellowship—"and in the breaking of bread" and (public and united) "prayers."

Acts viii. 6, 14—17. "A great persecution" of the Church at Jerusalem followed Stephen's death, and all but the Apostles were scattered, many fleeing to Samaria. These were joined by Philip, † who preached Christ to them. Many of "the

\* Note on verse, 42.—"In the fellowship." "Not the Apostles' fellowship as the order in our version suggests." Church fellowship is intended.

Note on verse 47.—Neither "*such as should be saved*" nor "*those that were being saved*" R.V. is happy. "Those that were in the way of Salvation," ALFORD, is preferable. The R.V. omits "to the Church" but David Brown, D.D., gives strong reasons for retaining it.

† This Philip was not the Apostle (John i. 43 and xiv. 8), but a Deacon, and subsequently "the Evangelist." (Acts vi. 5 and xxi. 8.) Thus, as such, he had authority to "make disciples"

people" (of Samaria) impressed by his discourses and miracles, (verse 6) believed; and thus became "disciples." Their Baptism followed. Peter and John subsequently visited them; instructed them; formed them into a Church; prayed that they might receive the (miraculous gifts of the) Holy Ghost: and laid their hands on them. The privilege was granted. The Lord's Supper is not indeed mentioned, but it is clear that their Church life was made paramount to all else.

That they *were*, as we state, formed into an organised Assembly *before* these supernatural favours were bestowed appears from the fact that such powers were reserved for Members of Churches. Consult 1 Cor. xii. 28, and xiv. 4, 5, 19, 23, 28, 34, 35, where the word "church" occurs no fewer than eight times.

Acts x. 48. Here again, Peter's obedience to the Master's Commission appears. Summoned by Cornelius, he *firstly* so preached as to *make disciples* of him and his household—and as they already "feared, and prayed to God alway," the Holy Ghost, who was the Author of the Grace they previously possessed—now fell on them with miraculous demonstration and power. Peter at once commanded some un-named saint (doubtless one of the six, chap. xi. 12) who was present, to baptise them—and then he formed them into the first Gentile Church.

The Communion certainly followed, for Peter was charged with "eating with them," (chap. xi. 3); not, of course, at common meals, but at the Supper of his and their Lord.

Paul's conversion also exemplifies the carrying out of the great Commission, though his case was exceptional, as he became a Disciple or Christian, "not from men, neither through a man" (Gal. i. 1.) Then he was baptised by Ananias (Acts ix. 18.) He subsequently remained "certain days with the Disciples at Damascus," not as the guest of one, but in fellowship with all—namely, he here first joined a Christian Church, worshipping with its members at the Supper of the Lord.—From "Strict Communion Vindicated," by J. C. PHILPOT.

Our Position is further substantiated by these considerations;—

(1) "The Lord's Supper is a social and not, like Baptism, an individual act. (2) It does not lie, like Baptism, between the giver and the receiver, or between the Pastor, and the

and to "baptise;" but to found Churches was the exclusive work of the Apostles.

Church. (3) It is not, like Baptism, an *individual testimony* to the Truth; but the *collective testimony* of the Church. (4) It was designed for the Church, and not, like Baptism, for individual believers. At Jerusalem we find the Church observing it (Acts ii. 42.) At Troas, upon the evening of the first day of the week, the Disciples (or the Church) came together to break bread (Acts xx. 7.)\*

At Corinth, the Christians "came together to eat" (1 Cor. i. 2, and xi. 33) as a Church.

The sin of the schismatics who split up their Assembly into parties, when convened for the Lord's Supper, is described as 'despising the CHURCH of God' or treating the solemn Assembly with contempt (1 Cor. xi. 18, 22) a further proof that it was a Church act."—WILLIAM PALMER, "Free Communion," page 47.

The case of the Eunuch is also in point (Acts viii. 27—39). To him, Philip preached Jesus, demonstrating that His character and life answered to what the Prophet wrote concerning the Christ or Messiah. He must also have given a compendium of the Master's commands—as he explained and enforced Baptism. Its sister Ordinance must also have claimed notice. To the *first*, prompt obedience was yielded; what, then, was more appropriate than that they should at once attend to the *second* Rite of the Gospel? Such a traveller must have been provided with bread and wine. The occasion was important. They might never meet on earth again. But no. To prevent the possibility of surmising what did not occur, we are told that "when (*as soon as*, see Luke xv. 30) they were come up out of the water, the Spirit caught away Philip, etc. (verse 39.)

The Ordinance which is incumbent on Members of Churches only, would here have been incongruous and unscriptural. The

\* The literal translation of the most correct text would be:— "And on the first day of the week, *we* having been gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with *them*."—On the Lord's day, "*we*," namely the Church at Troas, as the regular Worshippers, and Luke, with Paul and the seven brethren mentioned in verse 4, as transient Communicants, "having been gathered together" (the same word in the same form is found in verse 7 and Matt. xviii. 20), Paul discoursed with *them*, that is the members of the Church to whom his remarks were specially addressed. The word rendered "discoursed" is *dialegomai* (page 61) *perhaps* meaning that he encouraged those, to whom he spoke, to state difficulties or ask questions—clearing up these points as he proceeded.

Eunuch, therefore, went his way—a baptised believer—doubtless to connect himself in due course with an organised Christian Community. (See also pages, 84, 154, 175, and 197.)

The accumulated testimony of the passages we have cited surely amounts to absolute demonstration of our position.

NOTE 2.—We prove our case from the consensus of all Baptist Communities—whether Open or Strict, General or Particular—whose final act of admitting new Members into Fellowship, invariably occurs at the Lord's Table, when such receive the "right hand of Fellowship" (Gal. ii., 9; 2 Kings x. 15.) This surely expresses the conviction that those present appear on this occasion, in their proper character as members of the family of God, associated as such by common agreement, to witness to their Christian unanimity, confidence, and love, in the most striking and solemn manner. In a word, it is only when assembled AS A CHURCH, that they receive brethren into FELLOWSHIP, that these may observe the Ordinance which is appropriate to a CHURCH convened as such. They thus, we submit, tacitly admit the principle here advanced.

NOTE 3.—It is clear from the New Testament that Church Life was the only form of Christian Life known in the Apostolic age, which set a pattern and a precedent to all Churches to the end of time. Isolated Christians there were none, and the Lord's Supper was perforce confined to such as were in Church fellowship.

NOTE 4.—Our position is established by the Nature of the Lord's Supper itself, which, we submit, can be observed in accordance with its high design by no congregation but a Church. When such an Assembly as is described on pages 9, and 131—134, is gathered together for the "breaking of bread" then only does this Ordinance receive Scriptural and consistent attention.

Its Members are banded together as heaven-born persons, and are spiritually related; they have all been baptised; and have all received the teaching of the Holy Spirit. They all love the Truth; share the same vital experience; and are all confidently persuaded that sympathetic affection for all the rest, exists in every heart. Their mutual remembrance of Christ and their confidence in each other, thus *ritually* expressed, can then be sincere and hearty; seeing that they "who are many are one (loaf of) bread, one body"; in token of which they "all" consistently "partake of the one (loaf of) bread." (1 Cor. x. 17, R. V.)

Under no other circumstances is this practicable. At a "united Communion Service," it is impossible for those present to be sure of the above facts. Fellowship is doubtful; Communion is impossible. The whole affair is simply an interchange of religious congratulations and compliments, in Christ's name, by means of a perverted Ordinance.

"This is not" really "to eat the Lord's Supper" which must be the act of a Baptised Church as such.

Ritual without reality is a farce—an empty show, expressing what has no actual existence. With the objects symbolised, the dispositions implied, and the actions signified, no Assembly of men and women can have a full Spiritual acquaintance, save such as are truly joined together in Church Fellowship.

NOTE 5.—We argue from Church discipline, which the Lord's Supper is an important factor in maintaining. Trouble will be caused, offences given, schisms originated, errors promulgated, and sins be committed by those in nominal Fellowship. These must first be dealt with privately—but the formal and final judgment of the united Members is to be expressed at the Lord's Table.

Personal Offences will be given (Matt. xviii. 15—17). Should private remonstrance, and the pleading of two or three witnesses fail, and the man remain recalcitrant, a final appeal is to be made to the Church (here for the second time mentioned), which, if he neglect to hear, he is to be denied the privileges of Christian fellowship, of course including the Lord's Supper, and treated as "an heathen man, and a publican."

Schisms or divisions in the Church will be originated. These Paul deprecates (1 Cor. xii. 25), and blames the Corinthians for their existence (1 Cor. i. 10.) Those who cause them are to be marked and avoided, and, promptly, excluded from the holy Rite which expressly testifies to the unity of the Body. (Rom. xvi. 17, 18.)\*

\* The word here is not *schisma*, as in 1 Cor. i. 10, which denotes an open and evident rent in the Church—and the actual separation of some; but *dicho-stasia*, "a standing apart," and indicates the first stage of this form of evil. One or two malcontents hold themselves aloof, in surly and selfish isolation. This is the sin of *dichostasia*. Others sympathise with and follow them as sheep a bell-wether. Thus "by good words and fair speeches" they "deceive the hearts of the simple." A breach or schism (*schisma*) is made, and a "split" occurs.