

mand, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," which we associate generally with the beneficent teachings of our Saviour, is but a quotation from the Mosaic law,¹ and we think the case is established. The Mosaic, so far from being a "barbarous and bloody code," surpasses beyond comparison every other code of the world ever known, for delicate, thoughtful, and beneficent humaneness.

ARTICLE VI.

THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY REV. DR. WILLIAM NAST, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

As there were two sacraments divinely ordained under the Old Testament dispensation, so Christ instituted also two for his church. The sacraments of the New Testament, *Christian Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, perfectly correspond to those of the Old Testament, *Circumcision* and *the Passover*. Though differing in form, they were designed to express the same fundamental ideas. To prove the relation between the rite of 'circumcision and Christian baptism is not the object of the present investigation. We take it for granted, and start with the proposition, that the Lord's supper, instituted at the celebration of the passover, sustains the same relation to the passover, that the sacrament of Christian baptism does to the Old Testament sacrament of circumcision.

To obtain a right apprehension of the significance and design of the Lord's supper, we must, therefore, first enter into an investigation of the significance and design of the passover. While the previously ordained rite of circumcision had given to the Israelites a general title to the blessings of the covenant, the passover, afterwards instituted in

¹ Lev. xix. 18.

connection with their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, was evidently designed to point them to the foundation of that covenant, i. e. to the atonement for the guilt incurred by sin. Its first celebration was enjoined upon the Israelites as a condition of their deliverance. They were to make thereby an actual confession of their death-deserving guilt, and at the same time express their believing trust that the destroying angel would spare them, on account of the blood of the sacrificial lamb. As the deliverance from the Egyptian servitude was to be to God's people a type of their deliverance from the bondage and guilt of sin, so the slaying of that sacrificial lamb without blemish was a type of the atoning death of the sinless lamb of God on Calvary, by which alone guilty man can be spared. But the typical significance of the passover did not end there. The slaying of the lamb was not sufficient; its atoning efficacy lay in its being appropriated by them as food; it was to be eaten and assimilated, and this appropriation and assimilation was to typify the personal and vital union between Christ, the true atoning sacrifice and the recipient of the atonement. The eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine in the new covenant is, as was also the eating of the lamb in the Old Testament, a divinely ordained sign and pledge of our appropriation of the atonement, — a *sign* or expression on *our* part, a *pledge* on the part of *God*.

To these general preliminary remarks, which we shall in the contemplation of the institution of the Lord's supper further explain and substantiate, we add one more. In the entire Old Testament the deliverance from Egypt appears as the highest proof of the covenanted grace. Even when God first entered into a covenant with Abraham, the promise of the deliverance of his descendants from a servitude of over three hundred years, was the type and pledge of the mercy and grace implied in the promise of the Messiah. The Lord appealed to this event, when he gave to the Israelites the decalogue (Exod. xx. 2.), when he reproved them, or gave them new commandments and new promises. Indeed, with the prophets, the hope of the coming Messianic

salvation appears ever under the image of the exodus from Egypt (Amos ix. 14; Hos. ix. 10; xi. 1-11; Mic. vi. 3, 4; viii. 15; Isai. xi. 11, 15). Before eating of the paschal lamb, the following significant words were to be uttered: "*This is the passover of the Lord.*" What else could this mean than "This is a *pledge* and *condition* of your deliverance; he who eats of this lamb will be spared?" Thus, the paschal lamb was to the Israelites, not only a *remembrance* of their deliverance from Egypt, but, at the same time, a *confession* of their need of salvation, and of their faith in it, and in consequence of it a *pledge* and *seal*, that the atoning and pardoning grace would be bestowed upon them. This significance the passover retained until the true paschal lamb appeared, thus typifying the personal appropriation of the benefits of the atonement made by Christ.

Let us now proceed to the examination of the circumstances attending the institution of the Lord's supper. It was instituted in immediate connection with the eating of the paschal lamb. It is not necessary to enter into a detailed description of all the complicated ceremonies which were observed, according to the Rabbinic writings, for they do not agree among themselves, and we know not how many of them were observed, and it is not probable that our Lord bound himself to those superstitious customs, adopted without divine authority. It is sufficient that we mention the principal points observed during the paschal meal, to which the evangelists themselves refer. 1. At the beginning of the meal, the head of the family, taking a cup of wine (*red* wine mixed with a little water was used, giving it the color of blood), pronounced the benediction, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast created the fruit of the vine," drank first of it, passed it around to all sitting at the table, who also drank. Of this first cup Luke evidently speaks (chap. xxii. 17). 2. Then followed the eating of bitter herbs dipped in vinegar or salt water, as a remembrance of the bitterness their fathers suffered in Egypt. Then the festive viands were served up, among which was a dish of spiced sauce, called *charoset*, into which the guests dipped their

bread. To this part of the feast seems to refer what is narrated by Matthew (chap. xxvi. 21 – 25). During the drinking of the first cup the history of the first passover was related, and its significance explained. Psalms cxiii. and cxiv. were read, and the second cup was passed round. 3. Immediately after this began the meal proper. The head of the family took two unleavened, round, and thin cakes, broke one of them, laid the broken pieces upon the unbroken cake, and pronounced the benediction, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, that thou bringest forth bread from the earth." After this they ate of the lamb, and of the other viands. Then they drank of the *third* cup, called the "cup of blessing," while they sang Psalms cxv.–cxviii. Afterward they drank of the *fourth* cup, singing Psalms cxxix.–cxxxvi., then followed the *fifth* and last cup, which closed the festival. The question now is, whether our Lord observed all the usual ceremonies of the passover (including the third cup), and whether he broke the bread *once more*, after the drinking of the third cup, in order to institute the eucharist of the New Testament; or whether at the customary breaking of the bread he instituted the New Testament sacrament in place of the old one, and instead of using the words, "This is the bread of misery, which our fathers ate in Egypt" (which words God never ordained), with reference to the positive precept in Exodus xxii. 27, "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover" (for which the significant words were often substituted, "this is the *body* of the Lord's passover"), he said: "This is *my* body," thereby declaring that they should no longer eat of the paschal lamb as a remembrance of their deliverance from Egypt, but that he instituted the bread as a symbol of his body (typified by the paschal lamb), which is now to be given to procure the spiritual deliverance and eternal salvation for his people. We give the latter view decidedly the preference, and it is confirmed by the account of Luke and Paul, according to which the cup was taken *after* supper. For doubtless it was the *third* cup—"the cup of blessing"—which Jesus gave to his disciples as the cup of the new testament, and which was given only after the

lamb had been entirely consumed, and no one was allowed to eat any more. After Christ had spoken of the shed blood, the disciples ceased drinking of the fourth and fifth cup; hence the usual ceremonies after the third cup were dispensed with, and his sublime farewell discourses, recorded by John, were substituted, which very likely continued till night.

Why our Lord did not make the flesh and blood of the paschal lamb (which properly typified his atoning sacrifice) the symbols of his broken body and shed blood, but bread and wine, may easily be conceived. We are thereby taught, 1. That in the new covenant all typical sacrifices of animals were to cease. Even the Jewish rabbins seemed to anticipate this, when they said: "When the Messiah shall have appeared as a priest after the order of Melchisedec, all sacrifices of animals will cease, and the offering of bread and wine only will remain." 2. That our Lord's supper is neither a repetition of the once offered atoning sacrifice of Christ, nor a carnal eating of the flesh of his broken body — as the Roman Catholic teaches — but an appropriation of the merits of Christ's death, and therefore a spiritual union with the living Christ. Besides, bread and wine constituted a part of the paschal supper, and fully answered to the significance of the sacrament of the new covenant. As the red wine strikingly represents Christ's blood, shed for the remission of our sins, so bread — this universal and indispensable food for man — is the most appropriate symbol of his flesh, of which our Lord said: "*I will give it for the life of the world*" (John vi. 51). For, as the common bread satisfies the wants of our mortal bodies, and gives them life and strength, so Christ's atoning death — his broken body — alone can give life to, and satisfy the longings of, the immortal soul after salvation.

We are now prepared to consider the words of the institution. Three evangelists and the apostle Paul give us an account of these words. If we collate them, they read as follows: "*Take, eat* (Matthew, Mark, and Paul); "*this is my body*" (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul); "*which is*

given for you" (Luke); "*which is broken for you*" (Paul); "*this do in remembrance of me*" (Luke and Paul); "*drink ye all of it*" (Matthew); "*this is my blood of the new testament*" (Matthew and Mark); "*this cup is the new testament in my blood*" (Luke and Paul); "*which is shed for many, for the remission of sins*" (Matthew); Mark omits "*for the remission of sins*;" Luke says: "*which is shed for you,*" (Paul omits this clause entirely); "*this do ye in remembrance of me*" (Paul). How are we to explain this verbal discrepancy? It seems to us one of the strongest proofs against the theory of verbal dictation by the Holy Spirit. For, if ever the inspired penmen wrote what the Holy Spirit verbally dictated to them, it is certainly to be expected with reference to the solemn words uttered by our Lord at the institution of this sacrament of the new covenant. The advocates of the verbal inspiration suppose that our Lord *probably* repeated these words several times, and now turning to John, and then to Peter, changed or modified them, as the occasion required it. But this interpretation appears to us as forced as it is unnecessary. As omissions and abridgments of events and discourses by one or the other of the sacred penmen are by no means opposed to the idea of inspiration, it is much more natural to suppose the Holy Spirit did not verbally dictate the words, but recalled only to their memory their true meaning. They do not contradict each other in the manner of quoting or stating the words. This difference serves only to explain their true meaning fully, and is attributable to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

That the Lord's supper, designed as it is to unite all true believers, has been the occasion of the most violent contention, is certainly one of the saddest phenomena in the history of the Christian church. Nowhere does the apple of discord produce a sadder impression than when it is thrown upon the table of love. The only consoling reflection is the truth that the blessing of the Lord's supper does not altogether depend upon the interpretation of the words of its institution. With reference to these we have to place ourselves

at the disciples' point of view, and ask: How did *they* probably understand their master? An infidel author is not entirely wrong, when he says, with more impartiality than many dogmatists: "To the authors of the Gospels the bread in the eucharist *was* the body of Christ; but had they been asked whether the bread had been transubstantiated, they would have denied it; had they been told that Christ's body was eaten *in* or *under* the form of bread, they would not have understood it; had it been said that the bread and wine only signify his flesh and blood, they would not have been satisfied." O, that all Christians would agree with each other in realizing that in partaking of this sacrament, they have not only a symbolic representation of Christ's death, but a real communication of Christ himself to them in all the fulness of his redeeming love!

Let us, then, in their successive order, carefully examine the words, by which our Saviour instituted this sacrament. "TAKE, EAT." As bread is the symbol of Christ's body, given for us as an atoning sacrifice, so the eating of it is the symbol of the reception and appropriation of that atonement. Recognizing in his disciples all his future followers, our Lord says, "TAKE, EAT," thereby designating the act of eating as a moral act, dependent upon individual volition.

"THIS IS." The copula "IS" has been the occasion of the most violent and tedious theological controversies. Without laying any stress upon the fact that, in the Aramaean language spoken no doubt by our Lord at the institution of the eucharist, no copula was used, and the mode of connecting subject and predicate in the Greek and Hebrew, and indeed in many of the modern languages, often denotes mere comparison (Gen. xi. 12; Exod. xii. 11; Luke xii. 1; John xv. 1; Galat. iv. 24; Hebr. x. 20, etc.); we shall, in the first place, thoroughly examine the various meanings that the laws of language admit of being attached to the copula "IS."

I. The Lutheran Church no less than the Roman Catholic Church ascribed to the copula "IS" the meaning of *real substantiality*;—although the Lutheran Church, respecting

the *mode* of this subsistency, differs as much from the Roman Church as those who give the copula only a figurative meaning. The Roman Church asserts that Christ distinctly predicated of the bread he gave his disciples that *it is* his body, and hence draws the inference that it has ceased *to be bread*. But as this inference directly contradicts 1 Cor. x. 16, and xi. 26-28; where "the bread which we break," is still called bread, so it is equally inconceivable that our Lord meant the *elements distributed* by him to be the *material parts* of his living body. Such a misapprehension, on the part of the disciples, was not only impossible at the institution of this sacrament, but our Lord obviated it with reference to every subsequent celebration by adding, "which is given or broken for you." Upon this strictly literal interpretation the Roman Church based the monstrous doctrines: 1. That the priest has the power, by means of the consecrating formula, to change the substance of bread and wine into the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ, although the accidents, such as color, form, taste, etc., remain unchanged. 2. That the body and blood of Christ once presented upon the cross, is again presented by the priest in the mass, under the form of wine, as a propitiatory sacrifice. 3. That the body of our Lord is indissolubly joined to the consecrated *hostia* (wafer), and is therefore to be worshipped independently of the sacramental act.

Luther protested against the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, but he likewise contended that the copula "is" must be understood to express *real substantiality*, with this difference, that Christ predicates of the subject — the bread, — that *it is* his body; hence, what he gave his disciples, *was at the same time* bread and a part of his body; or, in other words, the flesh and blood of Christ are substantially present in the eucharist (although in a glorified state), and are received by the communicants *in, with, or under* the form of bread and wine. This is called consubstantiation. But this interpretation, viewed from a purely exegetical point of view, is untenable, because it involves a direct self-contradiction; for we cannot predicate of a definite concrete that

it is *another* definite concrete, unless we mentally supply the words, "at the same time" (the bread is at the same time bread, and at the same time the body of Christ), which the text does not justify, and whereby the strictly literal sense is relinquished. It is to be observed that the point in question is not whether the thesis, that Christ is substantially present in the bread and wine, is reconcilable with reason, but whether *we are at liberty, according to the laws of language, to attribute this meaning to the words of Christ.* It is an indisputable law of language that the copula *never* declares two different existing things as identical; and this law is recognized even by those who maintain that the elements are at the same time bread and wine and the flesh and blood of Christ, assuming only a juxta-position of the bread and flesh, instead of an identity of both. To assert that the copula must be presumed to identify the subject and predicate, where no metaphor is used, is entirely illogical. The premise of this conclusion is not only not proved, but refuted by an indisputable law of thought and language. We see, then, that, apart from any other reasons, the copula "is," in its grammatical and logical relation, cannot be understood in its strictly literal meaning; hence the question arises:

II. What other meaning can be attached to the copula "is?" It may have a twofold meaning: 1. This (bread) *signifies* my body — is a symbol of my broken body, of my propitiatory death. This is Zuingli's interpretation. 2. This (bread) *is a pledge of my body*, that is, he who receives the elements, receives with them all the blessings flowing from my atoning death. This is Calvin's interpretation. Both these interpretations lead us to a closer investigation of the question: What are we to understand under the predicate?

"MY BODY?" That our Lord did not mean his *natural* body, as the Roman Church teaches, has already been shown. The Lutheran dogma is that our Lord speaks here of his body with reference to its glorified state. But this interpretation is not compatible with the additional remark, "which is given for you" (Luke), or "which is broken for you"

(Paul). For, 1. The foundation of the remission of sins is Christ's sacrificial death, not the reception of his glorified body. 2. Jesus could not have spoken of his glorified body, because it was not yet glorified, and the disciples could not have understood him. The idea of a twofold material body of Christ — the one sitting opposite them unchanged, the other being eaten by them — would certainly have been new and strange to them; and had the words of our Lord produced this idea in their minds, they would, doubtless, have expressed their astonishment, and, as it was their custom, asked their master for an explanation. 3. If our Lord spoke of his glorified body, how are we to understand the words: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins"? What are we to understand under the glorified blood? The glorified blood would certainly be included in the glorified body. Hence, we see that the expression, "this is my body," cannot mean the literal body of Christ, whether glorified or natural, and we are forced to take the words in a figurative sense?

In order to arrive at the correct understanding of the words in question, we must return once more to the consideration of the passover. As the paschal lamb was only a type of "the lamb of God," and the "*passing over*" of the destroying angel a type of the New Testament pardon and justification; so Christ, contrasting himself with the paschal lamb, declares his death to be *the true and real atoning sacrifice*. That he would give his life as a ransom for the sins of the world, that he would be violently put to death, and that his death would be a sacrificial death, — this our Lord had often intimated to his disciples, but they were not able fully to comprehend it; and it is an undeniable fact that during his public ministry he did not make the doctrine of his propitiatory death as prominent as his disciples did after his death and ascension, for in the apostolic writings it is presented to us as the centre of the entire doctrinal system of Christianity. But now the time had come when he desired clearly and solemnly to disclose to them the fun-

damental doctrine of the atonement through his death, and to impress it indelibly not only upon their own minds, but upon the minds of those who through their preaching would believe in him unto the end of the world. As the disciples well understood the typical significance of the passover, he declared at its last celebration his death to be the fulfilment of what was typified by the paschal lamb. He showed them how his body was to be delivered unto death once for all.

The key for the correct understanding of *the nature and design of the Lord's supper is, therefore, to be found in the atonement through the death of Christ.* With reference to this, our Lord declares : " This is my body, which is given for you ; " that is, " This (bread) signifies my body " (typified by the paschal lamb). The bread is a symbol of Christ, the bread of life (John vi. 35, 41); the broken bread is a symbol of the broken body of Christ, and the wine is a symbol of the shed blood of Christ. The act of eating and drinking is a symbolic act, signifying *that the participation in an atonement can be obtained only through an essential union with the atoning sacrifice.* This idea lay typically in the passover, for the death of the paschal lamb was not sufficient; the slain lamb *was to be eaten.* The life of every Israelite was spared at the first celebration of the passover; and at every subsequent celebration he was made a partaker of all the blessings of the covenant by means of *eating and assimilating the lamb,* whose blood was shed for his atonement. As the death of the paschal lamb was only a type of Christ's death, so the eating of the lamb was a type of that vital union which is to subsist between the believer and Christ who died for him. The typical lamb entered, as material food, into a mere bodily union with the Israelite; Christ, the true propitiatory sacrifice, on the other hand, enters into a *personal, spiritual union with the soul,* so that he becomes our head, and we his members. That our Lord does not mean, by the partaking of bread and wine, an actual eating and drinking of his glorified blood and body, but an appropriation of the benefits of the atonement made by him, he had

declared before, in his discourse at Capernaum (John vi). But as the passover was not only a type of the future redemption through Christ, but a *pledge* and *seal* of the mercy of the old covenant; so *bread* and *wine* are not merely symbols of Christ's broken body and shed blood, but the *pledges* and *seals* of the New Testament redemption, which consists in a *personal and vital union with Christ*, who is the sacrifice for our sins, and the food for our souls. Just as in the words, "*It (the lamb) is the Lord's passover*" (Exod. xii. 11), the typical redemption is figuratively predicated of the lamb; so Christ predicates of his body, figuratively represented by bread and wine, the actual or real deliverance from sin through his death. The lamb was not the act of the Lord's passing over, but its pledge and seal; so bread and wine are not Christ's real body and blood, but a *pledge* and *seal* of the atonement made by his death. This interpretation is confirmed by the inspired authority of Luke and Paul, who explain the words, "this is my blood of the New Testament," by the phrase, "*This is the New Testament in my blood*" (i. e. the New Testament made *in* and *by* my blood, and not through the blood of the Old Testament sacrifices).

In accordance with this view, our Lord, by uttering the words, "this is my body which is broken for you," doubtless intended to say, "*This is the new covenant, made in or by my broken body, and not by the body of the Old Testament sacrifices.*" Considering, as we do, the Lord's supper as well as the passover *an act of covenant*, it ought, nevertheless, to be remembered that both ordinances were designed for those *only who were already in a covenant relation with God, and desired a continual renewal of this covenant*. As he only could partake of the passover who, through circumcision, had been received into the old covenant; so in the new covenant, the communicant ought not only to have become a member of Christ's body, the church, by the rite of baptism, but also *by faith*. Even the words "*for you,*" imply that the proper recipients of this sacrament are such as trust in the death of Christ, as the only ground of their reconciliation with God. The Lord's supper is a pledge and seal of the

new covenant only to those who are actually in covenant relation with God. As regards those who have never been convicted of their sins; or those who *once* knew Christ as their Redeemer, but have now apostatized, and yet presume to partake of the Lord's supper with an impenitent and unbelieving heart; these receive nothing else but bread and wine; and the apostle declares that he who does not discern the Lord's body from common food, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord (1 Cor. xi. 27, 29); that is, that he, so long as he remains in this impenitent state, is adding to his innumerable sins the guilt of rejecting the only atoning sacrifice, and therefore "eateth and drinketh damnation to himself;" just as to him who rejects the gospel, that which is, in itself, a savor of life unto life, becomes a savor of death unto death.

We have now seen that the sacrament of the Lord's supper is not only a symbolic rite, commemorative of Christ's sacrificial death, but a covenant act by which we appropriate to ourselves all the benefits of the atonement, and enter into a personal, vital union with Christ (which union is symbolically represented by eating bread and drinking wine). The partaking of the Lord's supper ought not merely to remind us of Christ, as though he was *absent*; for then it would only be a means of strengthening the Christian's faith and of renewing his love to him, and would have no greater importance than the hearing of a gospel sermon. According to this view, it would not be Christ meeting the believer and imparting himself to him, but the believer ascending, as it were, into heaven, and bringing Christ down. Hence faith would not merely be the condition but the *cause* of the union with Christ, and thus the ordinance would lose the nature and design of a *sacrament*.

This is the defective side of Zuingli's view, and *Luther* was right in objecting to it. But he went to the other extreme, when he asserted that the sacramental union with Christ takes place independently of the co-operation of man, and only by means of the consecrating words, once uttered by Christ, and repeated in the consecration of the elements.

This view ascribes to the elements the power of imparting to the communicant Christ's body and blood the moment he receives them, whether he be a believer or not. According to this view, the reception of Christ's body and blood is unconditionally made the consequence of the partaking of the consecrated elements ; but whether the eating of Christ's body and blood will have a saving or damning effect, is said to depend upon the character of the communicant. The truth lies between Zuingli's and Luther's views, and is to be deduced from the proposition, that Christ manifests his actual presence in the eucharist, and imparts his own self to the communicant.

This presence and self-communication of Christ does not consist, as Luther taught, *in that he unites himself bodily with the bread and wine, and thus communicates his body to our body ; but in that Christ, as the God-man, reveals and communicates himself to the believing soul in all his life-giving and saving power ;* just as the vine reproduces itself, its sap, juice, and strength, in every branch. It is true, that this self-communication is not confined to the sacrament, but begins as soon as we enter into a personal, vital union with Christ, through regeneration, and continues so long as we do not drive him out by hardness of heart and wilful apostasy. The difference between other manifestations of Christ's presence in the soul, and that which takes place by means of this sacrament, is simply this, that in the latter the Lord *guarantees* to the believing communicant a new communication of his full salvation so *positively* that we dare not doubt it. As the Israelite received a new assurance of the blessings of the covenant as often as he appropriated to himself the typical sacrifice by eating of the paschal lamb ; — so the personal and vital union, into which true believers have entered with Christ by appropriating the benefits of his propitiatory death, is renewed, sealed, and strengthened as often as they partake of the emblems of his broken body and shed blood. The apostle Paul expresses the same idea, when he says : “ 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?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) As there can be no appropriation of the merits of Christ's death, except through a personal and vital union with Christ, so there can be no other vital union with Christ, except through the appropriation of the benefits of his atonement. *The communion of the death of Christ and the personal, vital union with Christ, sustain a necessary reciprocal relation to each other.* This cardinal truth is the central idea of the doctrine of the Lord's supper. In the solemn moments of his last meal, which he introduced by some remarks concerning his impending bodily separation from his disciples, our Saviour intended to seal, by the sacrament, the personal, vital union, into which the believer enters with him by virtue of his atoning death and through faith.

This significance and design of the Lord's supper has not been sufficiently appreciated, as indeed all that the New Testament teaches us respecting the real, though spiritual, self-communication of Christ to the believer. Christ calls himself the vine, and the believers the branches: he says that "if a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode *with him.*" "I am in the Father, and *ye in me, and I in you.*" "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *dwelleth in me and I in him.*" The apostle Paul, speaking of the same personal, vital union of the believer with the Son of God, says: "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, of his bones," etc. (Eph. v. 30-32). He says, as man and wife are one flesh, so the believer and Christ are one. In 1 Cor. vi. 15, 17 he says: "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." Doubtless, the apostle intends to express more than a mere subjective union with Christ, when he says that "Christ dwells in your hearts by faith," that "no more he [Paul] lives, but Christ liveth in him," that "they are changed from glory to glory," that "their life is hid with Christ in God." This real, personal, and vital union of the believer with Christ is renewed, sealed, and strengthened at every celebration of the Lord's

supper. This idea is beautifully expressed in the Palatinate Catechism, in the following words : " What does it mean to eat Christ's broken body, and drink his shed blood ? It does not only mean to appropriate to ourselves, with believing hearts, the whole suffering and death of Christ, and thereby receive pardon of our sins and eternal life ; but also *to give thanks through the Holy Spirit, who dwelleth both in Christ and in us, and by whom we are more and more united with his blessed body* ; so that, though he is in heaven and we on earth, we are nevertheless flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, and are quickened and guided by one Spirit, as the members of our bodies are by the soul."

" THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME." These words, which are recorded only by Luke and Paul, contain the command, from henceforth to substitute for the passover the celebration of this ordinance ; and we clearly see that whatever objective influence, on the part of Christ, may be ascribed to this sacrament, it is, nevertheless, conditioned by the subjective act of the communicant. Those who speak so harshly and contemptuously against this sacrament as a *commemorative* rite of Christ's death, ought to consider that, according to the inspired testimony of Luke and Paul, Christ himself expressly and prominently makes the *commemoration* of his death a design of the sacrament ; hence their severe censures fall back upon its Founder. On the other hand, however, we must not forget, that even in the Old Testament it has a deep meaning of reality, when God speaks of recording his name in any place, and says of that place to his people : " I will come unto thee, and will bless thee " (Exod. xx. 24). Thus, if we remember him truly, he will surely remember us by coming to us to bless us. The same idea is expressed by the declaration of the apostle Paul : " Ye do show the Lord's death." Those approaching the table of the Lord, show forth to one another, and to the world, that they have part in the atonement by the death of Christ, and in his life ; and through them the testimony of the church is continued " till he come."