

THE MASS,
AND THE DOCTRINE OF
THE REAL PRESENCE
IN THE
HOLY COMMUNION,
EXAMINED BY SCRIPTURE

BY C. S.

LONDON :
G. MORRISH, 20, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

EXAMINED BY SCRIPTURE.

IN this short paper, it is presumed that all who bear the name of Christian are agreed that there is no way of approach to God but by a propitiatory sacrifice—no possibility of pardon and justification by any other means than by faith in that propitiation—the substitution of all believers. Now the Romanists claim that in the Mass they have a true expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.

We propose, then, first, in dependence on the Holy Spirit, to examine—though it must be briefly in a short paper—what is a sacrifice for sins, as set forth in scripture? and, secondly, does the Mass answer to that sacrifice, or is it a total mistake, and in every particular contrary to scripture?

Woe be to us if the Mass is God's appointed sacrifice for our sins, and we despise and reject it. Let us, then, approach this subject in the fear of the Lord, and not in the spirit of mere party controversy.

That statement in Hebrews ix. 22, "and without shedding of blood is no remission," is a truth that is found shadowed in all the types and offerings of old.

The offering of Cain was a bloodless one. He did not understand or recognise what sin was, or the need of the death of a substitute. Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. In Cain's there was only offering—no suffering of the death of a substitute. "By faith Abel offered to God a sacrifice exceeding that of Cain," &c. It exceeded Cain's, as his was only an offering, not a sacrifice at all. God

could not accept such an offering without sacrifice. Abel's was both an offering and also a sacrifice. There was actual death, shedding of blood. Abel's was a true type of Christ. He not only offered Himself, but He endured the atoning death of the cross. But more of this in its place.

Examine each of the sacrifices of Genesis—Noah's, Abraham's, Isaac's and Jacob's. Do we not find the actual death of the victim—the shedding of blood? Now we see Israel in the cruel bondage of Egypt. God comes down in love to deliver them. Heavier tasks are given them, and they labour to make bricks without straw—like an awakened soul trying to keep the law without strength. Then sweetest promises are given them, then the most wonderful providential dealings, in sparing them from the plagues of Egypt; but still they are in bondage. The lamb must be offered, and the lamb must be slain. It is the blood. They were sinners, and there is no shelter or refuge from divine judgment but the shed and sprinkled blood of the lamb! Thus must Jesus not only offer Himself, but He must needs suffer. (John iii.) Is it not equally so in all the many offerings of the law? True, those repeated offerings could never take away sins. (Heb. x.) But when they were brought to remembrance every year, on the day of atonement, the victim must be slain—it must die, its blood must be brought before God. Without shedding of blood there is no remission.

In Leviticus iv. we find, if an Israelite sinned, there could be no forgiveness but by the death of a substitute. The blood must be shed, and be sprinkled seven times before the Lord. Without shedding of blood is no remission. In the case of that loathsome figure of sin—leprosy—the poor leper was brought to the priest for his cleansing. There must be death. Two birds had to be taken alive. One of the birds had to be killed, the other had to be dipped in its blood, and that blood sprinkled on the leper. He was then pronounced clean, and the living bird let loose. Jesus must die for

our sins—yea, be made sin ; and God has raised Him from the dead, declaring that all who believe are justified from all things. (Acts xiii. 38, 39.)

Yes, whilst the meat-offering and the incense set forth the adorable Person of the incarnate Son of God, Son of man, yet every sacrifice must be killed—its blood must be shed. So we find Jesus not only offered Himself, but He actually became a sacrifice for sins. This seems to have been overlooked by Roman Catholic writers. In John xii. 26, 27, we see Jesus offering Himself. The sacrifice was before Him ; none but He knew its tremendous character. He only knew how God had been dishonoured by the creature's sin. His soul was filled with trouble at the prospect, yet He says, "for this cause came I unto this hour." Then He said, "Father, glorify thy name." Wondrous love ! yet this was not the sacrifice, it was the offering. So in the garden of Gethsemane, still offering Himself. What, then, was the atoning sacrifice ? Hearken to these words : "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ?" "Made sin for us." "Being made a curse for us." "Delivered for our iniquities." "Wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities." "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." "For the transgression of my people was he stricken." "He bare the sin of many." These, and many other scriptures, shew not only the offering of Jesus, but the true, solemn character of the atoning sacrifice for sins. And more, not only the shedding of His blood as true expiation for sins, so as to glorify God, but the blessed truth that He died the Substitute of His people. By that death of the cross God is glorified, and all the believer's sins have been borne by the Substitute. This is the scriptural ground of peace with God, for God "raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. iv., v.) There is also

another question that the Roman Catholic writers seem to have overlooked—that all the sins of believers were atoned for by this one sacrifice of Jesus upon the cross. Clearly all our sins, from birth to falling asleep, or the coming of the Lord, were future then. This, then, is the question for every believer, Did that one infinite sacrifice, the atoning death of Jesus, make full expiation for all our sins; or, if we should sin again, do we need another expiatory sacrifice? This lies at the root of the whole question. Before, however, we carefully examine scripture as to this point, we would inquire what is the true character of expiation? The heathen had the thought that their gods were hateful and hating beings, that they required sacrifices, in order to avoid their gods' hatred, or to reconcile them so that they might become favourable. We would ask our Roman Catholic readers if this is not something like their thought of God. Have you not thought that God hated you because of your sins, and that the many sacrifices which are constantly offered are to reconcile God to you, and make Him favourable unto you? A reconciled Father is common in theology. No such thought is in scripture. The infinite sacrifice of Christ is never thus spoken of. The least calm reflection will shew that great numbers are totally mistaken as to this. Did not God so love the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son? Sin must be judged, or the sinner, however God might love him, could never be brought into His presence, or be happy there. But who gave the spotless Victim to bear man's sins? Thus the eternal love of God to man reigns through righteousness in the gift and atoning death of Jesus. It is not man reconciling a hating God by sacrifice to Him, but God, in infinite love, reconciling us to Himself by the very death of the cross. We do not say that many have got entirely clear of this false thought of God. Jesus bore our sins on the cross, not that God might love us, and be favourable to us, but because He did love us. Many scriptures declare this. "God commendeth his love

toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." (Rom. v. 8.)

Propitiation, then, was the death of Christ glorifying God by making full expiation for sin. Substitution was Christ bearing all our sins as our Substitute. They were, as before God, transferred to Him, the Substitute. The two goats on the day of atonement illustrate, or typify, this. The blood of the one was brought before God. All the year's sins of Israel were laid on the other, the substitute. Both pointed to Christ, the gift of the love of God. He has met the whole question of God's glory and man's need. What a place He took for us! The infinite wrath of God against sin has been borne by Him, that the infinite love of God might flow out to the sinner. Truly thus to know God is eternal life. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." "And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love."

We would further ask, When God in love gave His beloved Son to be the sacrifice for sins, did He provide an inadequate expiation for sins? Did it make nothing perfect, so that it had to be continued, or often offered again?

It is quite certain this was the exact case with all the sacrifices of the law. "The law made nothing perfect." (Heb. vii. 19.) These were "a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience." (Heb. ix. 9.) "For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." (Chap. x. 4.) "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins." (Ver. 11.) All this is clear enough. And such was the love of God to us poor sinners, that He could take no pleasure in those oft-repeated sacrifices, *because* they could not take away sins. (Chap. x.

3-9.) Thus they "can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because the worshippers, once purged, should have had no more conscience of sins." It was because God could have no pleasure in that system of repeated sacrifices, that never could take away sins, that Jesus said, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." Note this well, it was the will of God that our sins should be put away. "Therefore he taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." He taketh away the whole system of the law's many sacrifices, that He may establish—what? Some other system of repeated sacrifices often offered, and that can never take away sins? The thought would be a denial of and an insult to Christ. No, the many repeated sacrifices are taken away, and the ONE sacrifice of Christ abides, and is established.

Let us, then, carefully note the effect of that *one* sacrifice. The sacrifice of the law on the day of atonement was for a year. "But by his own blood he entered in ONCE into the holy place, having obtained ETERNAL redemption for us." (Chap. ix. 12.) The believer has thus what He obtained for him—eternal redemption, even the forgiveness of sins. Is it not sin to doubt what God thus says about the ONE sacrifice of Christ? But if you do believe God, you have eternal redemption.

If you have, then, eternal redemption, how can you need another offering for sins? And on this ground Christ is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; no need to "offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others, for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now ONCE in the end of the ages hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "Christ was ONCE offered to bear the sins of many." Thus this ONE offering, offered ONCE, is the very point of

contrast with the many repeated offerings and ineffectual sacrifices for sins, and the *one* sacrifice declared to be the will of God. “By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ ONCE for all.” And mark, Christ sitting down in heaven is a proof that this one offering is all that God requires for ever—a sacrifice never to be repeated. “But this man, after he had offered ONE SACRIFICE for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.”

What, then, is the effect of this ONE sacrifice on us? Clearly we need no other sacrifice for our sins. “For by ONE offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” This is truly wonderful. How little is it believed! How little enjoyed! Yet of this very thing “the Holy Ghost is a witness.” (Ver. 15.) Do we not grieve the Holy Spirit, then, by doubts or fears? Such is the eternal efficacy of this *one* sacrifice, that God says, “And their sins and iniquities I will remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.”

Has not the Church of Rome forgotten all this? Nay more, strange as it may seem, we believe it would be impossible to find a page in all the Fathers, so called, that clearly states the eternal efficacy of the ONE sacrifice of Christ, as stated in this scripture—Hebrews x. The worshipper’s conscience for ever purged, God remembering his sins no more, and consequently no more offering for sins. Is this your faith, your happy enjoyment? Oh, wondrous truth! our sins were laid on Jesus, they cannot be charged or imputed to us. This fills the soul with adoring worship.

To the Roman Catholic the Mass is a true expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. Some would tell us it was like the offerings of the law, often *repeated*, only without blood. Others would tell us it is the expiatory sacrifice of Christ *continued*. “The Mass is, and ought to be, considered one and the same sacrifice with that of the cross, for the victim is one and the same. . . . The bloody and unbloody are

not two, but only one, victim, whose sacrifice is daily renewed in the Eucharist. . . . The priest is also one and the same, Christ the Lord." (Catechism of the Council of Trent.) Could there be a more fearful mistake, or one more contrary to scripture? Every Mass is a true expiatory sacrifice for sins renewed, or the one sacrifice continued. Mark the consequences. We have seen in scripture that the true atoning sacrifice on the cross was Christ forsaken of God—made sin—being made a curse for us. Can any Roman Catholic say he really believes this, that true sacrifice for sins still continues? Is Christ still forsaken of God? Is He continuously a curse, made sin? Is He still on the cross? This, and this alone, was the true sacrifice. If Christ is still forsaken of God, and a curse, then so are we, for as He is, so are we in this world. This surely is the denial of Christianity—Christ still continuously, or repeatedly, forsaken of God? Does He not sit in the radiance of the glory of God? Has not God raised Him out of death for our justification? But if the Mass is a truth, all is lost. The one sacrifice did not for ever perfect—we are not justified—the awful sacrifice is still going on, and Christ is still to continue forsaken of God through all time! For this was the true expiatory sacrifice. Think of that awful hour when His soul was made an offering for sin. Now look at the Mass, the sacrifice for those, whether dead or alive, "whose sins have not been fully expiated," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Where is there one atom of true sacrifice in the Mass? Even supposing the priest really turned the bread into the body, blood, bones, &c., of Christ—suppose that wafer to be Christ—where is the sacrifice? Offering up to God alone, we have seen, is not sacrifice. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." Does the priest shed His blood in the Mass? No; this is admitted. The only thing Roman Catholic writers can find to say is, that the priest eating the wafer, or Christ, is the sacrifice. If this could be so, where is the resurrection?

If the priest swallowed Christ, we say, where is the resurrection of Christ in the Mass, the true sacrifice for sins? “But if Christ be not risen, ye are yet in your sins.” (1 Cor. xv.)

If, then, there is neither real death nor resurrection in the Mass, there is neither a true sacrifice for sins, nor an atom of proof that God accepts it. How can there be? when God says in His word that Christ need not offer Himself often (Heb. ix. 25); that “there is no more offering for sin” (chap. x. 18); that “there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.” (Chap. x. 26.) Such is the immutable and eternal efficacy of the one sacrifice of Christ, once offered, that there can be no other; all the believer’s sins forgiven, to be remembered no more; his conscience for ever purged—for ever perfected—no charge of sins against him possible, since Jesus has borne them all, and God declares, all who believe ARE justified from all things. (Acts xiii. 39.) As to all charge of sin or sins, absolutely God declares, “There is therefore NOW no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.” (Rom. viii. 1.) Nay more, God has raised Jesus from the dead for our very justification, made Him to be our ever-subsisting righteousness. “Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Rom. v. 1.) Thus has God shewn His acceptance of the true, only, one sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, once offered, and thus does He declare, “There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.”

It is a terrible thing to fight against God. “For if WE sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain looking for of judgment,” &c. For a Jew who had professed to be a Christian, sanctified by the one offering of Jesus, to go back to the many sacrifices of the law, was to sin wilfully. Is it not the same in principle to deny that the *one* sacrifice of Christ fully purges, or expiates, our sins, and that we must again have priests to offer up sacrifices which

never can take away sins? And that, as we have seen, is the flattest possible contradiction of the word of God. Is not this to sin wilfully beyond all hope of mercy? It is said, But Christ instituted this continual or repeated sacrifice. Where is there a syllable to shew He did? Would you charge Him with instituting that which is no sacrifice? and the word of God declares there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin. When we compare the Mass with the true sacrifice of Christ, it is amazing that Satan can so deceive men. Look at that Russian priest; he takes a cake with a seal upon it—mark, before it is consecrated. Then he takes a spear, and pierces the right side of the cake; then stabs it above, then below, then again the right side; then the deacon holds it up, and says, “Slay, sir.” He then cuts across it, and says, “The Lamb is slain.” *After this*—as it is still allowed to be only a cake of bread—he invokes the Holy Ghost to change it into the body of Christ. Thus he slays Christ before he makes Him. The Roman Catholic priest does not ask the Holy Ghost to change the bread into Christ, but chews the wafer, and says it is Christ!!

And is this the awful blasphemy that is spreading, and fast displacing all true faith in the only one true sacrifice of Christ on the cross? Reader, it is a solemn question for you: Are you resting in the finished work of Christ, or turning to this great masterpiece of Satan? We do not say, Have you found rest there?—how can you find rest in a falsehood? It may be asked, But what did Jesus mean by these words, “This is my body”? We hope to inquire in our next paper.

For a fuller examination of this subject, we commend the reader to “Familiar Conversations on Romanism,” by J. N. D. London: G. Morrish.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION EXAMINED BY SCRIPTURE.

WE have seen that the distinct teaching of scripture is, that the one sacrifice of Christ has brought in eternal redemption; that it perfects for ever; that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. (Heb. ix., x.)

We would now inquire, Is there any ground in scripture for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or the change of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper into the real body and blood of Christ; or, as others express it, the doctrine of the Real Presence in the holy Eucharist?

We will turn to all the scriptures quoted as supposed proof. John vi. is quoted by some, though many ancient writers did not believe it referred to the Lord's Supper. We will examine whether it does so, or not, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him," &c. (Read the whole context, vers. 27-63.) The question is simply this—Is the Lord Jesus speaking figuratively or literally in this chapter? And in answering this question, we would take this ground: in every instance in scripture, where it is intended to be a figure, it cannot be understood to be literal. "Except a man be born again;" "I am the vine, ye are the branches;" "that rock was Christ;" and hundreds more, could not possibly be meant to be literal. The manna was evidently real food, as we learn in Exodus. But when Jesus says, "I am the bread which came down from heaven," it could not possibly mean that He was literally a loaf of bread from heaven. Was not bread used here as a

figure of Jesus sent from heaven, as seen incarnate amongst men? He says, "I am the bread of life." This He says whilst He was here a living Man. No change into bread, or bread into Himself, but "I am the bread of life." Then He says, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever : and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." To take this literally, then, would be without any change, to say Jesus was then a piece of bread that might be eaten!! and *that bread* would become flesh—His flesh—and be given for the life of the world. Would it not be just as true to say that He was literally a vine, as to say "I am *the bread*", was intended to be literal?

As a figure of the incarnate Jesus, bread was very striking. As we receive bread for the nourishment of the body, so we by faith receive the Person of Christ as the incarnate word. But, not only so, we must also receive Him offered on the cross for the life of the world. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." We will look at this literally, and what would follow? If eating the flesh and drinking the blood means eating the wafer, or the wafer, turned into, or changed into, the body and blood of the Lord Jesus in the Eucharist, then what would the following words mean: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day"? Mark, these words are absolute, without any conditions whatever. "*Whoso*" would teach that any wicked man, unrepentant, or unbelieving, living in sin, yet, if he only ate the Eucharist, had eternal life, and was sure to be raised up by the Lord.

We need not say no Christian can believe this to be the meaning. Therefore the words cannot be intended to be literal, but spiritual, as Jesus says, "What and if ye see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh pro-

fiteth nothing : the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life.”

Now take them spiritually. We thus see Jesus come down to earth, the incarnate Son of God. He would give Himself the sacrifice, the shedding of His blood, for the life of the world, and then ascend up again on high ; and that he who thus receiveth Himself, according to this revelation, hath eternal life. All is perfectly clear, and in this way no Christian would have a shadow of a difficulty—indeed, this is in perfect harmony with all scripture. “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath eternal life,” &c. (John v. 24.) But we must not only by faith receive Him as the bread, but drink His blood. We must receive the solemn word of His atoning death—the shedding of His blood, for “ without shedding of blood is no remission.” Thus, the more we study this scripture, the more we see the impossibility of, as in every other figure, applying the words in a carnal, or literal way. To put the Eucharist, then, in the place of receiving Christ Himself, by faith, would be a fatal mistake. “ I am the bread ” meant Himself surely ; and so, “ my flesh,” “ my blood,” meant Himself offered the sacrifice for sins—then to be offered—“ I will give for the life of the world.”

We will now turn to the institution of the supper. Let us dismiss every preconceived thought, and look simply at what we do find in scripture. Turn to Matthew xxvi. 26–29. Jesus was here sitting with His disciples, eating the passover—the commemoration really of the passover, the slaying of that lamb, and the sprinkling of its blood, which shielded Israel from divine judgment. Did not that passover point forward to the death of the Lamb of God, which has brought in eternal redemption for all who believe ? In a few hours that great redemption would be accomplished.

“ And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it [or, gave thanks], and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, ‘ Take, eat ; this is my body.’ ”

There can be no mistake that He took literal bread—that He gave thanks, and brake *IT*, and gave *IT*. Then can the words, “this is my body,” be intended to be literal? If so, would not the Holy Ghost have said, He changed it—the bread—into His body? But there is no such statement, no such thought. He took bread, brake *it*, and gave *it*, and then said, This is my body, meaning either as a figure, or that it was so literally. Mark, He held it in His hands after giving thanks. He could not mean that He held Himself—His body—in His hands, or that He brake His own body. But more. “And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink of **THIS** fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom.” Now He could not possibly mean that this was His literal blood, for it was not yet shed. And mark, He positively set aside the thought that it—the wine—was changed or turned into His blood literally; for He says, after, “this fruit of the vine.” So that, just as it is impossible for such a sentence as this, “that rock was Christ,” and many like it, to be literal, so these words of Christ, “This is my blood . . . which is shed,” could not possibly mean His precious real blood, as that blood was then in His body, and not shed at all yet. It was the constant manner of Christ to speak in figures, as He said in John xvi. 25. Hear the breathings of His sorrows to the Father in dark Gethsemane: “O my Father, if this **CUP** may not pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.” Was that a literal cup? Yet he uses the same figure in Luke xxii. 20: “Likewise the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.” It is evident the Lord had no thought of meaning His very blood, but used the cup, and the wine poured into it, as a figure of that death in which His own blood must be shed.

Mark, in each of the Gospels there is no mention of the bread or wine being changed into the body and blood ; and not a word about giving His apostles, or their successors, power to do so ; if there be, let it be shewn.

If we look at the Lord's supper as taking the place of the passover, nothing could be more touching or instructive. It was no longer the paschal lamb that had to be eaten, but the Lord was now just about to give Himself. His own blood was about to be the fulfilment of every type and sacrifice that had been offered. That the Lord only meant the words, "This is my body," and "This is the cup of the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you," as figurative instruction is evident, for it was not shed yet out of His body. Figuratively it set forth that great truth, that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. Neither can there be a question as to whether the Lord intended the institution of a continuous sacrifice, or the *commemoration* of His one sacrifice, as He settles that question by the words, "This do in *remembrance* of me." (Luke xxii. 19.) Plainly it cannot both be the sacrifice and the remembrance of it. Nothing could be more dissimilar than a sacrifice for our sins, and the remembrance of that one sacrifice which has purged and cleansed us from all our sins.

If the Lord's supper be a sacrifice for sins for the living and the dead, then undoubtedly it will be the one great thing set forth in the Acts and the Epistles, just as it is the one great thing with Ritualists and Romanists. Holy Communion, or the Mass, is the great sum and substance of both. Millions are trusting in it for forgiveness of sins and eternal life—in the real presence in the Eucharist, and as a true sacrifice for sins.

Now, where in the Acts did the apostles once preach the Eucharist for remission of sins, or as a sacrifice? Where is it once put as a means of salvation?

At Pentecost Christ was preached—His death, His resurrection, repentance, and remission of sins, preached

in His name ; and we find those saved “breaking of bread from house to house.” But Peter gives not the most distant hint that this is the true body and blood of Christ, or a propitiatory sacrifice for sins ; and Luke simply records it, “breaking of bread.” Why should we add to the word of God ?

Search through the preachings of Stephen, Paul, Peter, Philip, in every place. Not a word about this sacrifice for sins, or the real blood or body of Christ. Did it never strike a Roman Catholic that Peter never said a word about the Mass : or the Ritualist, that Peter, or any other, in all their preachings never once preached the Eucharist, never as a means of salvation ? Not a word either about a priest offering the sacrifice. Nay, the only one place in which the Lord’s supper is named in the Acts, after chapter ii., is in chapter xx. 7 ; and though Paul, and many other servants of Christ, happened to be there, at Troas, yet we find all that is said is, that “Upon the first day of the week, when *the disciples came together to break bread*, Paul preached unto them.” No priestly act, but the disciples came together to *break bread*. No thought of its being anything but bread—no hint whatever of its being a sacrifice for sins. How could it be, when we are assured there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins ?

But surely, if it be what the Church of Rome believes, we shall find it in the Epistle to the Romans. There the righteousness of God, in justifying and saving the sinner, is fully explained, but positively not a word in the whole epistle about the Mass, or the real presence in the Eucharist !! Not a word in that epistle which specially treats of God’s great salvation—God’s way of bringing the sinner to Himself. And in the epistles to the young converts in the assembly at Thessalonica, not a word ; in the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, not a word ; to Timothy or Titus, not a word. Is it not strange that neither Peter nor John should once name it in their epistles ? But

there is one epistle devoted to the questions of priesthood, and offerings, and sacrifices for sins. Surely, then, if there be continual sacrifices for sins instituted for the church, we must find them in the Epistle to the Hebrews ; but not one word about either the real presence in the Eucharist, or that it is a continual sacrifice for sins—nay, over and over again, the assurance that there is no such thing, that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.

As there is, then, only one epistle in which the subject of the Lord's supper is explained, let us give it our most careful attention. The question is this—Is it a commemoration of the death of Christ, or is there a thought that it is a continual, or repeated, sacrifice for sins ?

“The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread [or loaf] and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.” (1 Cor. x. 16.) Here it is the cup which is blest, and the bread that is broken, but no intimation of any change. Would it not be quite as consistent to say all Christians are changed into bread—“For we, being many, are one bread”—as to say that bread is changed into the whole Christ, body, blood, soul, and divinity? As a figure it is most striking. As the twelve loaves signified the twelve tribes of Israel, so the one loaf is a striking figure of the one body of Christ, every particle of that bread forming one loaf, so every Christian forming the one body of Christ.

What, then, is the *communion* of the body and blood of Christ? The context explains this. Just as those who ate the sacrifices, that is, that part which was not consumed on the altar, whether Jewish sacrifices to God, or of the heathens to demons, became identified with the sacrifice, partakers of it; so we, by this act at the table of the Lord, shew that we have fellowship, communion, or identification with the death of Christ.

The Jew did not surely eat Jehovah, or the Gentile eat a demon. No, it was left for a darkened Christendom to give birth to such an absurdity.

It is impossible, then, that this communion, or fellowship, can mean either literally eating Christ, or eating devils, but eating that which shews identification with Christ or with demons. "Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils." Surely the Lord's table would teach us separation from a world that lieth in the wicked one.

We will now turn to the principal explanation in the scriptures of the Lord's table. (1 Cor. xi. 20-34.)

There is not a thought here of the assembly at Corinth coming to offer a sacrifice, but simply to eat the Lord's supper. That which gave occasion to these remarks and explanations was a most sad sin, even drunkenness at the Lord's supper. Mark, then, what would be involved in the gross blunder of supposing that the wine was changed into the blood of Christ? Could anything more distinctly prove that it remains wine, than this—that it still intoxicates? Not the most distant thought is there of any change of the elements. "For I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took *bread*; and when he had given thanks, he brake *it*, and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you." Now, we have seen that this could not be literally true, as His body had not yet been pierced—His blood had not yet been shed. He did not take His own body in His hands, and break His body, but He took bread, and three times it is shewn to be unchanged bread. "For as often as ye eat this bread" (ver. 26); "Whosoever shall eat this bread" (ver. 27); "So let him eat of this bread." (Ver. 28.) This, mark, is after the words, "This is my body," therefore, since it thus remained unchanged, and was to be, not offered a sacrifice for sins, but eaten—literal bread—by all believers, it follows that these words, "This is my body," could

not mean literally so, but as a figure, taking the place of the flesh of the paschal lamb at the old passover. And mark further, "THIS CUP is the new testament in my blood." The Lord did not say, this blood, or this wine, is the blood, but *this cup*. Evidently this is figurative; call it chalice, or what we may, it is, without a question, figurative, as the Lord used the same expression when speaking to the Father—"If it be possible, let this *cup* pass from me."

If we were to pervert the figures of scripture as men have perverted this, it would turn the whole scriptures into ridicule. Could any man be so blind as to say that Christ meant that He was a true loaf of bread that came down from heaven, or that He was literally a rock in the wilderness?—"and that rock was Christ." Would any man say that Christ was literally a rock, and Peter a literal stone, or rock, if you wish? The slain Christ taking the place of the paschal lamb is a fact, and the words, "this is my body," contain a most impressive figure of it. And so the wine, as separate from the loaf, shews the absolute necessity of His blood being once and for ever shed—never, never, surely to be shed again.

Then the only question that remains is this: Did the Lord institute this supper as a sacrifice for sins; or for a remembrance of His death? Could the answer be more distinct, both as to the bread, and as to the cup? "This do in remembrance of me;" "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." This is the plain teaching of Christ. All Christians are to do this in remembrance of Himself; they are not to do it for a sacrifice for sins, but to shew forth that death which has made an infinite sacrifice for sins, and which cannot be repeated, for He dieth no more. (Rom. vi. 9.) And He assures us there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. But some may say, If you believe Christ, that it is a memorial, and not a true sacrifice for sins, the Council of Trent will curse you, and does curse you, in its canons I., II., III. It

is even so ; and we prefer to be cursed, believing Christ, rather than blest, believing the Council of Trent. It is exactly so : the plain teaching of the word of God is the *bread* is to be eaten, the wine drunk, simply in remembrance of Christ, the shewing forth of that death by which we have eternal redemption ; that Christ dieth no more ; that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. Crowds of men are now teaching the very opposite of this—that the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross for sins does not for ever purge the conscience—that it did not fully expiate for sins, and that the Eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice for those whose sins were not fully expiated. Thus souls are persuaded to give up the infinite and eternal efficacy of the one sacrifice, and taught to believe in the many sacrifices offered by men, which never can take away sins. Oh, reader, take heed that you are not deceived to everlasting destruction. If we wilfully sin by rejecting the one sacrifice of Christ, there remaineth no other, no more sacrifice for sins ; there can be nothing but everlasting judgment. (Heb. x. 26.)

Do you say, We do not reject the one sacrifice for sins, but we believe that that same Jesus is offered continually, the same sacrifice, on the altar ; that the bread is changed by the priest into the whole Christ,—body, blood, humanity, and divinity—and that He is still offered the true propitiatory sacrifice for sins? You cannot possibly have reflected that this would entirely destroy the gospel of God. If this were true, no soul could be saved. “If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain ; ye are yet in your sins.” Now it must be acknowledged that in the modern doctrine of the Eucharist—the real body and blood of Christ, the true Christ still offered—there is no resurrection. If Jesus is still on the cross, He is still bearing the wrath of God due to sins—for that is expiation—still made sin. Did He make a mistake, then, when He said, “It is finished”? Is it true, or

false, that He made peace by the blood of the cross? If He did, it cannot be made again. If He did not, it never can be made. Has God raised Him from the dead to deceive us, or for our justification?

But it is said the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist, and its being a sacrifice for sins, has been the doctrine held by all the Fathers and the whole church, until a few hundred years ago. If this were the case, would this be a sufficient reason why we should reject the distinct statements of scripture? Surely not. We will, however, in our next paper inquire whether this has been so, or not. In the meantime we commend every anxious inquirer to read carefully Hebrews ix., x.

The Roman Catholic reader is earnestly requested to read the Rheims translation of those chapters.

“By his own blood, entered once into the holies, having obtained ETERNAL redemption.” “And without shedding of blood there is no remission.” “Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holies every year with the blood of others.” “In the which will we are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ.” “For by *one* oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” “There is no more an oblation for sin.” “There is now left no sacrifice for sins.” (Heb. ix. 12, 22, 25: x. 10, 14, 18, 26.)

THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST.

HAS THE CHURCH OR HAVE THE FATHERS ALWAYS
HELD THIS DOCTRINE?

WE have seen that there is no such teaching in the word of God, either that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are the true, literal body and blood of Christ, or that the Lord's supper is a true sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead; that when the Lord said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." (John vi. 53, 54.) This could no more be understood literally His flesh and blood, than when He said, "Except a man be *born again*," &c., or when He said, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." In every such case the words cannot be intended to be understood literally, but figuratively. We must admit it is impossible for these statements to be true in a literal sense. Could Christ be a rock of stone, and at the same time a piece of paste, or bread? and at the same time a vine, &c.? And if He were bread, the priest could not change bread into bread. It is amazing that the mind of man should be so dark as to pervert these precious scriptures in such a literal manner.

But has not the church always held these doctrines as now held by Rome, and being introduced into the Church of England by the clergy? Have we not the unanimous consent of the Fathers that the bread is changed into the body and blood of Christ? and also that it is offered a true sacrifice for sins?

We challenge the most searching examination of scripture to find the least evidence that either the

church in the beginning, or the apostles, held either of these doctrines. After the blessing the bread is still called bread, and the wine is still called the fruit of the vine. And as to all the pretensions of the Mass being a sacrifice for sins, there is not only not such a thought, but it is utterly impossible, and utterly unneeded. The conscience of the believer is purged from sins, and perfected for ever, by the one offering of Christ, and there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins—there needs no other—the Holy Ghost bears witness. “And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.” (Heb. x. 17, 18.) “There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.” (Ver. 26.) Far be it from us to appeal to what is called the church—that is, the clergy—or to the Fathers, for *authority*. God speaks to us in His word, “There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.” He assures us He will remember our sins no more. It is enough, our souls can rest in perfect repose, believing the word of God.

An *honest* inquiry, however, will convince any one who can examine the Fathers, so called, that the pretended consent of the Fathers to these doctrines is utterly false. We would not for a moment refer to the Fathers to establish any doctrine, but merely to shew from history that transubstantiation, or the change of the elements into the true body, blood, &c., of Christ was not the doctrine of the early church.

Many passages have been misquoted, and sentences may be taken from their contexts, and made to mean the opposite of the context, but others which have not been tampered with are sufficiently clear.

Take this from Origen on John vi. : “Acknowledge some things which are written in the inspired volume to be figures, and therefore as spiritual, and not carnal, persons examine and understand what is said; for if as carnal persons you understand them, they injure, and do not nourish you. For there is in the Gospels also a letter which kills; a killing letter is not found in

the Old Testament alone. There is also in the New Testament a letter which kills him who does not understand spiritually the things which are spoken. *For if, according to the letter, thou followest the very thing which is said, 'Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood,' this letter kills.*" (John vi. 54.)—R. Pope's "Roman Misquotations," page 120.

Now it is evident that Origen not only understood these words spiritually and figuratively, but he does not seem to be aware of any that read them literally, as he only supposes the case.

Tertullian, in writing against the Marcionites (v. 40), says: "Having taken bread, and distributed it to His disciples, He made that His body, saying, This is my body, that is, the figure of my body. But it could not have been a figure unless the body had been a truth."

This was a striking argument against those who denied that Christ had a real body. The bread could not be a figure of His body if He had not one. Nothing could more clearly explain what the Fathers meant when they spoke of the bread being made the body: they evidently meant it was made a figure of it. But is it not most certain that Tertullian never held the doctrine of the bread being changed into the real body of Christ? It could not be the figure of a thing and the very thing itself. A living horse is not the figure of a horse.

In dialogues against the Marcionites—said to be Origen's, but not certain: "But if, as they say, He was without flesh and blood, of what flesh and what body, or of what blood, giving *both the bread and the cup as images*, did He command His disciples to remember Him?"

Now, whoever wrote these dialogues, they prove that, in those ancient days, both the bread and the cup were not understood or held to be the true body and blood of Christ, but ONLY THE IMAGES of the same, or figures; and that there was no thought of propitiatory sacrifices, but simply done in *remembrance* of Him.

Cyprian also speaks of it as done in remembrance : “That the cup which is offered in *remembrance* of Him, is offered mixed with wine.” “The blood of Christ is *shewn forth*, which is preached by the sacrament and testimony of all scriptures.” “That it was wine which He called His blood.” He could not possibly speak thus, if He had believed the wine was really changed into the blood of Christ.

Cyril of Jerusalem also distinctly speaks of the bread and wine as figures of the spiritual truth, Christ received by the soul. “For in the figure of bread His body is given unto you, and in the figure of wine, His blood.” It is the unchanged bread and wine that are thus figures. (Cat. xxii., Myst. iii., iv.) Nothing could be plainer than the words of Theodoret. (Dialogue i., vol. iv.) Pages might be quoted to shew that he regarded the bread and wine as symbols of the body and blood, not real, as he compares them to the symbols of the vine, &c. He says, “Of what thinkest thou that all-holy food to be the symbol and figure—the divinity of Christ the Lord, or of His body and blood?” Could any person speak thus that believed the bread and wine were changed into the true real body and blood of Christ?

Augustine presses the fact, that, just as the “rock was Christ’s,” so the Lord speaks of the sign of His body as “this is my body.” He insists on this—it does not say the rock signified Christ, it was Christ. In like manner He did not say, This signifies my body, but is my body; yet in both cases the figure was used for the thing signified. (See Can. Ad. xii. 5, &c.)

POPE Gelasius, A.D. 492, speaking of the Eucharist, says, “It does not cease to be the substance or nature of bread and wine, and certainly the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries. . . .” Could anything be more clear than this? Here we have a pope teaching the exact opposite of the Council of Trent!! Procopius of Gaza: “For He gave the image of His

own body to His disciples.” Clearly the image is not the thing of which it is an image.

Eusebius is perfectly clear. (Lib i. 10. Paris, 1628.) He speaks of daily celebrating the *remembrance* of His body and His blood. “Christ having offered for us all an offering and sacrifice, as slain, and given to us a *memorial* for [or instead of] a sacrifice, to offer continually to God.” “As, therefore, we have received to celebrate the memorial of this sacrifice on a table by SYMBOLS both of His body and His blood.” The doctrine of Eusebius was a memorial, instead of a propitiatory sacrifice—the modern doctrine of Rome, the exact opposite. He says further, “For by the wine, which is the symbol of His blood, those who are baptised to His death, and believe in His blood, are purged from their old evils,” and much of the same character. He clearly looked upon the bread and wine as symbols only.

Now we might go on quoting similar passages from the Fathers, and the Romanist might find others chiefly spurious, or interpolations, or, if he found some genuine passages which contradict the above, what would he prove? Why, just this—that there is no unanimous consent of the Fathers on this subject.

Ambrose is often quoted. Let it be noticed, however, that on the fundamental question of eternal redemption he is directly opposed to scripture. We are taught in Hebrews ix., x. that Christ by His own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. “And without shedding of blood there is no remission.” That He is now in the presence of God for us. No need to offer Himself often, for then must He often have suffered. That He appeared once to put away sins by the sacrifice of Himself. That He was once offered to bear the sins of many. That by the will of God we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once—in contrast to the priests standing and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away

sins. Yes, in contrast with all this, Christ having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God : and that the effect of this is, by *one* offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified, so that God says He will remember their sins no more. Now where, or since, remission of sins is so complete, "there is no more offering for sin." Now read Hebrews ix., x., and say, is not this the distinct and blessed truth, foundation-truth of scripture? How completely this was lost, unknown, or denied by Ambrose, let his own words declare: "As often as we receive, we announce the Lord's death. If we announce death, we announce remission of sins. If, as often as the blood is shed, it is shed for the remission of sins, I ought always to receive it, that my sins may be always forgiven. I who always sin, ought always to have the medicine." (Lib. iv., cap. 7, p. 372.) We learn from scripture, through one sacrifice, never to be repeated, our sins are fully and for ever forgiven. Ambrose says the very contrary, and implies that the blood of Christ has to be shed again every time he sins. Could anything be more contrary to the foundation-truth of the one sacrifice of the cross? Yet the whole doctrine of the Mass rests on the supposition that the atoning death of Christ was a failure, and therefore has to be repeated, or continued. It is, however, probable that these writings, said to be Ambrose's, are not genuine; but still the Council of Trent founds its doctrine on them, and Roman Catholic writers quote them.

We give the passage as important, shewing the distinct contrast and issue between truth and error, darkness and light: and it is remarkable, no Ritualist or Romanist can be found who believes Hebrews ix., x. In fact, if they did, instead of the falsehood of many sacrifices for sins, many sheddings of the blood of Christ, and, after all, unknown sufferings in purgatory, they would enjoy the abiding certainty that God would remember their sins no more; they would have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. The

Church of Rome has no conception what she has lost in giving up the infinite value of the one sacrifice of Christ, and putting in its place the falsehood of her many sacrifices, which can never take away sins. Let it be also clearly understood that this is the one object of the ritualist movement. When we once pointed out the truth of Hebrews x. to a ritualist clergyman, he said it could not be true that the one sacrifice of Christ for ever perfected the conscience, for, if that were the case, there could be no future judgment of the believer for his sins; so ignorant was he that that is just what the Lord Jesus declares. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, *hath eternal life, and shall not come into judgment*, but is passed from death unto life." (John v. 24.) The believer is justified now from all things. There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ—God will remember their sins no more. Has not our Substitute been judged in our place? We are washed in His blood. What is there left to judge? Then He who washed us from our sins is the Judge. Will He condemn His own work? Nay, when He appears, we appear with Him. (Col. iii. 4.) We shall be like Him. (1 John iii. 2.) When He comes to judge others, we shall come with Him in glory. (1 Thess. iii. 13; iv. 14; Jude 14, 15.) We can therefore look forward with joy and delight to meet the Lord in the air before He comes to judge. (1 Thess. iv. 15–18.) We can give thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. . . . We have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins. (Col. i. 12–14.) But the false doctrine of the many sheddings of blood, or unbloody sacrifices, robs us of the whole of a bright and glorious Christianity. And then these men in darkness would tell us they are the church! It would be great humility to believe them, and be left in darkness and uncertainty; but it is great presumption to believe God, and enjoy the present and everlasting forgiveness of sins!

But we are getting away from the consent of the Fathers. No one can honestly read Augustine, but must admit that he utterly rejected the doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and understood it spiritually, as all Christians do.

Fecundus, about the sixth century, says, "The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, consecrated in the bread and wine, is said to be His body and His blood ; not that His body be bread, or His blood wine, but because the bread and wine are the sacrament of His body and blood, and therefore *so called* by Christ when He gave them to His disciples." Bede, in the eighth century, speaks of "the most sacred supper in which He delivered to His disciples the *figure* of His most holy body and blood." We might go on giving quotations. If the reader would see how history proves that the doctrine of the corporeal presence was introduced into the west in the ninth century, and what conflict it caused, and how Berengarius resisted it, and stood for the ancient doctrine of the Fathers, that it was a figure, &c., we commend the tracts of the late J. N. D. on the Mass and 'Transubstantiation.* He will there also find the authorities for many of the above quotations. It is very difficult to ascertain what the Fathers did say, as they have been so mangled and altered, as may be seen in Pope's "Roman Misquotations." It is very easy to alter the whole meaning of a passage by adding a word or two. As an instance, Fulbert of Chartres, in his works published in Paris, referring to eating Christ's flesh, says, "It seems to command a crime, or atrocity. It is therefore a figure, *saith the heretic*, commanding only communion with the passion of the Lord." The words, "saith the heretic," were not in the manuscript, but added by the publisher ! Now read the sentence without them. The words were acknowledged afterwards, in errata, to have been added. It might weary both writer and reader to follow the

* London : G. Morrish, 20, Paternoster Square.

discussions and contentions in the Church of Rome on this subject. Berengarius was silenced, through fear, in the eleventh century, though he could certainly quote the great doctors in opposing the new doctrine of the real presence. It was not, however, until 1215 that it was received as a dogma by the church—by that very man, Innocent III., who established the Inquisition.

We do not profess to be able to read through these Fathers, nor do we possess them, but we give extracts from the writings of one who had them before him, and who diligently read them—now departed to be with the Lord he loved to serve—and as we write this, every extract could be verified in his library. R. Pope, A.M., also gives lengthy extracts from the Fathers, so that the context may be examined.

Every Roman Catholic writer should know, if he has read his own historians, that it is utterly false to say the church has always held the real presence in the Eucharist, or that it was a true propitiatory sacrifice for sins, continued, or repeated. We would, in conclusion, ask the reader, Can the Lord's supper be possibly eucharistic to you? For what do you give thanks? We beg you will answer that question. Have you ever understood what the atoning sacrifice was? What His soul endured when made sin for us—when forsaken of God—that bitter cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" There, on the cross, His soul was made an offering for sin. Do you know the scriptures, that He said, "It is finished"? Do you know that God has accepted that one sacrifice, never to be repeated, and received Him up to glory? Do you know that that sacrifice is infinite and everlasting, in contrast to the sacrifices of the law, which had to be often repeated? Can you say, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood"? (Rev. i. 5.) Can you sit at the Lord's table, and give thanks because you have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins? Nothing on

earth can be more blessed than thus to break bread, remembering Him.

The Mass is the denial of all this. It practically says the sacrifice of Christ is of no more value than the death of a goat. Since you sin again, it must be repeated. It says His work is not finished, but must be continued. It practically denies His resurrection and ascension to glory, for the same sacrifice is still continued. If so, He is still forsaken of God—made sin. Thus there is no Saviour who hath delivered us from the wrath to come; there is no salvation possible, if Jesus is still beneath the wrath of God for sins. Your sins are not forgiven, if He is still on the cross, or a propitiatory sacrifice, it is clear, if He has not finished the work once for all. God cannot have raised Him up from the dead for our justification, and if He be not risen, ye are yet in your sins. Thus the Mass entirely destroys Christianity, and then calls itself Eucharist (thanksgiving).

Is it possible for man to go so far astray? Yes, and then call it the only true church! and then declare that these errors have been the truth held by the church in all ages. How thankful we ought to be for the scriptures! We can turn to them, and they at once declare that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. Yes, in the light of scripture the Mass is seen to be a vast falsehood—a soul-destroying falsehood. As a learned Hindoo observed, there is no idolatry like it on earth—to make a god of paste, to worship it as the true God, and then to eat him. Is not this the strong delusion of these last days? We would not dwell on the revolting discussions of the learned of Rome, as to what becomes of God if a mouse should eat Him; or what becomes of Christ in the sewer after the priest has eaten Him. Surely such thoughts are the lowest point of human degradation and darkness.

But what shall we say of the host of Ritualist clergymen, with the Bible in their hands, teaching these

soul-destroying errors of Rome! In many a parish of Protestant England no prayer is more needed, than that God may be pleased to deliver them from the clergyman! Is it nothing that Christianity, the true doctrine of the one sacrifice once offered, should be supplanted by the many sacrifices that never can take away sins? If we walk in the dark, these many sacrifices will suit us; but, "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (John i. 7.) Death is no more possible to Him, and sin is no more imputed to us.

C. S.



Orders to the amount of One Shilling sent Post Free.

“ C. S. ” TRACTS.

- The Coming of the Lord. With Diagram. ½d.
A few Words to the Children of God. ¼d.
The Grace of God to a Roman Catholic Priest. ½d.
Ruth : or Blessing and Rest. 1d.
Mephibosheth : or, Lame on Both Feet. 1d.
Joseph : Type of the Risen Christ. 1d.
“ Awake, Awake ! Behold the Bridegroom cometh ! ” 1d.
Great Stones and Costly. 1d. Victory. 1d.
Justification in the Risen Christ. 1d.
Full Redemption. 1d. Lessons in the Wilderness. 1d.
Ritualism : and what will be the end of it. 1d.
The Oaks Explosion. 1d. Do you believe God ? 1d.
Jonathan : or, One Thing Lacking. 1d.
What is the Gospel of God ? 1d.
Job’s Conversion : or, God the Justifier. 2d.
What God hath said on the Second Coming of Christ and
the End of the Present age 2d.
Millennial Reign of Christ. A Sequel to the above. 2d.
Doors Shut and Lamps put Out. 2d.
Mount Ararat : or, Noah raised up in the Ark. 2d.
Nehemiah : or, The Building of the Wall. 2d.
The Two Husbands. 2d.
Christ the Centre : or, Why do you meet in His name
alone ? 2d
The Church of God as found in the Scriptures. 3d.
Perfection. Where is it ? what is it ? 3d.
The Cambridge Chamber of Darkness. 3d.
What was the Sabbath, and what was the First Day of
the Week. 2d. Baptismal Regeneration. 2d.
Rahab : or the seige of Jericho. 2d.
Cleansed by Blood, and Washed by Water. 3d.
The Revelation of Jesus Christ. 6d.
Plain Tracts for the Times, 4 pages, Nos. 1-4. 1s. per 100.
The “ C.S ” Tracts. Vols. i. ii. iii. iv., 1s. 6d. each.
The Railway Tracts in a volume. 1s.
The Mass, and the Doctrine of the Real Presence in the
Holy Communion, examined by scripture. 2d.
The Riband of Blue, and the Lace of Blue. 2d.

London : G. Morrish, 20, Paternoster Square, E C.