

## CONFESSION OF FAITH.

### CHAPTER 29.-*Of the Lords Supper.*

IV. Private Masses or receiving this Sacrament by a Priest or any other, alone<sup>1</sup>, as likewise, the denial of the Cup to the People<sup>2</sup>, worshiping the Elements, the lifting them up or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use, are all contrary to the nature of this Sacrament, and to the Institution of Christ<sup>3</sup>.

---

Question 1.—*Are private masses, or receiving the sacrament of the Lord's supper by a priest or any other alone, contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ?*

*Answer.*—Yes. 1 Cor. 10:16. Thus does the Romish church err, whose mass priest standing at the altar, celebrate private masses (the people either being absent, or standing idle). So, too, those do grievously err that administer the Lord's supper privately to sick persons, and the bedridden. They are confuted for the following reasons: 1.) Because Christ did institute the supper, not for one apart, but for many together, Matt. 26:27, 28. 2.) Because Christ in celebrating the supper, did not eat and drink himself alone, but the disciples did also eat and drink with him, Matt. 26:27, 23. 3.) Because the apostle commands the Corinthians, that when they come together to eat, they tarry one for another, 1 Cor. 11:33. 4.) Because the Lord's supper is a sacrament of brotherhood, and communion of the saints, 1 Cor. 10:16, 17; 11:33. 5.) Because in the days of the apostles, the disciples and brethren met together for breaking of bread, Acts 20:7.

Protestants deny the propriety of private communions, because they deny that the Supper is a sacrifice. It is a commemoration of Christ's death, and shows forth His death. There should therefore be fellow communicants to whom to show it forth, or at least spectators. It is a communion, representing our membership in the common body of Christ. Hence to celebrate it when no members are present to participate is an abuse. The motive for desiring private communion is usually superstitious, and therefore our Church does wisely in refusing it.

Question 2.—*Is the denial of the cup to the people contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ?*

*Answer.*—Yes. Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:25-29. Thus do the Papists err who take the cup to themselves only, and drink thereof; and who teach to administer the communion to laicks, under both forms of bread and wine, is not only not necessary, but unlawful. Likewise, they err that "deny" the cup by refusing to use the proper element of wine. They are confuted for the following reasons: 1.) Because Christ when he had taken bread and distributed it, is said to have likewise taken the cup, 1 Cor. 11:23-27. 2.) Because it is expressly said, and commanded (Christ foreseeing this black error, which is now in their churches), Drink ye all of it, Matt. 26:27. 3.) Because the common people, which are communicants, gather more fruit from both the forms, than from one only, 1 Cor. 10:16;

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 10:16.

<sup>2</sup> Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:25-29.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. 15:9.

11:26. 4.) Because the blood of Christ, the sign whereof is the wine in the cup, is not only shed for apostles, preachers and pastors, but also for “lay-men”, and those who are not of the “clergy”, as the Popish church speaks, John 3:16. 5.) Because the apostles and Christians of the primitive church, did communicate under both forms, Mark 14:22, 23; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:25-27. 6.) Because it is a villainy to detract and withdraw any thing from Christ’s testament; and therefore the cup (which is left to us by legacy), Matt. 26:27, 28, is not to be denied to any communicant, Gal. 3:15.

It is enough to say that the assertion that the bread by itself is a whole sacrament, because the blood is in the body, is false. There is also a significance the taking of the wine after the bread, in a distinct act of reception; because it is the blood as separated from the body by death, that we commemorate. Hence the soaking of the bread in the cup is improper, as well as the plea by which Rome justifies communion in one kind; that as the blood is in the body, the bread conveys alone a complete sacrament. As we should commemorate it, the blood is not in the body, but poured out, Heb. 9:12. For it is the very nature of the Lord’s Supper to signify, that the blood is not in the body, having been poured out from it in death, Luke 22:20. We might justly ask: Why is not the bread alone sufficient for the priests also, if it is a whole sacrament? The outrage upon Christ’s institute is peculiarly glaring, because the injunction to give the cup to the communicants is as clear and positive as to observe the sacrament at all, Matt. 26:27.

Question 3.—*Is the worshipping the Elements, the lifting them up or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use, contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ?*

Answer.—Yes. Matt. 15:9. Thus do the Papists err who teach that for adoration, the elements are to be lifted up, and carried about, and reserved for religious uses. They are confuted for the following reasons: 1.) Because Christ did not institute any adoration of the elements; therefore this adoration is to be condemned as will-worship, Matt. 15:9. 2.) Because the adoration is founded upon the corporal presence of Christ’s body in the sacrament, which is blasphemous, seeing Christ is now at the right hand of God, Heb. 1:3. 3.) Because this Popish adoration of the elements, is a worshipping of the creature, together with the Creator, a most abominable idolatry, Dan. 11:38; Matt. 23:16-23. 4.) Because if the elements ought to be adored, because Christ is sacramentally present in them, then ought believers, in whom Christ dwelleth, John 14:20, to be adored, which is absurd. Also the water in baptism ought to be worshipped, seeing the whole Trinity is no less present there, than in the supper. 5.) The worshipping of the bread, since no man, as the adversaries confess, is able to know certainly that the host is consecrated, is a work done without faith, and therefore a sin, Rom. 14:23. 6.) Because Christ commanded the element of bread to be broken, eaten and distributed. But no where does Christ command the bread to be reserved, 1 Cor. 11:23, 24. 7.) Because the bread, which is the communion of the body of Christ, is the bread which we break, 1 Cor. 10:16. 8.) Because the bread and wine are not sacramental symbols, but in the very action, 1 Cor. 11:26. Note that Paul does not say as often as ye reserve this bread. 9.) Because God commanded, that nothing should be reserved of the paschal lamb (to which bread and wine in the Lord’s supper have succeeded) till the morning, Ex. 12:10. That it might not be put to any other use, whether for idolatry, or common food.