

10TH THOUSAND.

FOND DU LAC TRACTS.

No. 2.

The Holy Eucharist
IN THE **New Testament.**

BY THE
BISHOP OF FOND DU LAC.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.:
THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.

15 CENTS EACH; 50 COPIES FOR \$3.50.

FOND DU LAC TRACTS.

No. 2.

The Holy Eucharist
IN THE New Testament.

BY THE
BISHOP OF FOND DU LAC.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.:
THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.

The Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

I.

ONE great difference between Churchmen is that some believe in the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, and others do not. The latter believe that the consecrated elements are mere symbols or pledges or signs of Christ's Body and Blood. Some of them hold that at the time of reception Christ feeds with His Body and Blood those who have faith, but they do not hold that the elements are anything more than sacred symbols or ordained signs. They would perhaps say that Christ is present "in the sacrament," *i.e.*, in the use of the sacrament. The others believe that by the act of consecration the elements or outward signs, and the inward part of the sacrament, *viz.*, the Body and Blood of Christ, are sacramentally united.

This Presence is called Real, because it is the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood. It is called an objective Presence, because it is not a mere subjective Presence in the heart of the receiver, but,



being occasioned by the act of consecration, is there before it is received. We will consider in this tract, which is the truer view, according to the New Testament.

First, let us remove some popular misunderstandings or objections. Some have tried to puzzle simple Christians by asking, With which Body do you communicate; the Body on the cross, or the glorified Body of our Lord? The answer is, that Christ had only one Body, and that the Body which is now in a glorified condition is the same Body that hung on the cross. We are to be incorporated into that one Sacred Humanity, whose Blood was shed for our redemption, and which rose for our justification.

Others, when doubting, have puzzled themselves with questions concerning the character of the change wrought in the elements or the mode of union between the inward and the outward parts. We content ourselves with saying that the change is not after any natural law, or like any change that takes place in the material world. For the whole transaction takes place in the new kingdom or creation which has laws of its own. It takes place in that spiritual organism which is the Church, the mystical Body of Christ. Everything connected with that organism, priests, elements, people, are partakers of its spiritual character, and are governed by its spiritual laws.

“How,” it is asked again, “if the doctrine of the Real Presence be the true one, can Christ’s Body be in Heaven and at the same time be on

earth and on so many altars at the same time?" The answer is, our Lord does not need to move, to do this. He is the center of the spiritual organism which is His Body, the Church. His own Body is not ubiquitous, but by reason of its union with His omnipresent Divine Nature, He can make It manifest in His Church where He will and at many altars at the same time. He gave us a proof of this after His ascension to the Right Hand of the Father, where He permanently abides by appearing and talking to St. Paul in the roadway.

It is sometimes asked by loyal Churchmen, Wherein does our doctrine differ from Transubstantiation? The answer is that that word has meant different things at different times. The kind of Transubstantiation which is repudiated in our Articles, viz., the change of bread and wine into flesh and blood, happily was repudiated by the Council of Trent. The present doctrine of Rome was formulated after our Article was written. We hold the ancient faith of the Real Presence. The Anglican Church asserts it as a fact. The Roman tries to explain it. It puts the statement of it in the terms of the Aristotelian philosophy which makes a distinction between accidents and substance. Our Church does not teach the Roman view, but we do believe in a Real Objective Presence.

Another difficulty has presented itself to some minds rightly jealous of the one, full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice and oblation made on Calvary.

They say that Christ made one offering on the cross, and this doctrine of the Real Presence involves that of altar and sacrifice. So it does. But it in nowise impairs or detracts from the one Sacrifice offered once for all. Christ on the cross offered a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice for all mankind. He offered it for humanity. He took away, by His act of reparation on behalf of humanity which He represented, the barrier which hindered the full, free action of God's Love to His creature man. He took upon Himself our sins. "He became sin," *i.e.*, the sin victim, for us. He became our substitute. The chastisement of our peace was laid upon Him. He made an atonement for us. That atoning work is done. "It is finished." But does not every individual need to plead, in the way Christ has ordained, that sacrifice to make it avail for his own sins and his own personal acceptance? As at the end of every prayer by saying "through Jesus Christ our Lord," we plead by word this sacrifice and its merits, so by the breaking of the Bread and the blessing of the Cup, we set it forth and plead it by the Act He has ordained.

Another difficulty sometimes presents itself to devout believers. They fear, and rightly, a mechanical religion. They fear what seems like a judæizing spirit, a reliance on externals or forms of any kind. They know that a living faith is necessary to a saving union with Christ. They may have seen Church members who gave no sign of an evangelical spirit, persons who were resting on the

fact of their Baptism or Confirmation; nominal Christians, who had never seemingly corresponded to the convicting and converting power of the Holy Spirit; in whom the seed-principle implanted in Baptism had lain dormant and who had never been consciously born again; or if once with God, had ceased to walk with him, and whose life was one of mere outward conformity to certain Church requirements. Need we say that we agree with the spirit of this objection? Sacraments are means by which God offers to us His gifts of grace. They will, however, do us no good, but increase our condemnation, unless we receive them with faith and love.

We have stated the above as preparatory to the consideration of the truth of Christ's Objective Presence in the Sacrament under the visible forms of Bread and Wine. If the faithful of the Anglican Church would only grasp and realize this, not as a speculative belief and giving it a mere intellectual assent, but as a heartfelt and practical conviction, the lives of her children would develop into most fruitful sanctity. Indeed, there would be kindled such a fire of enthusiastic love for Jesus as would energetically advance the Master's Kingdom. Jesus would be our all, and our all for Jesus.

We purpose to consider this great fact of Christ's Presence only in the light of Holy Scripture. Much that we may say will be taken from others. We do not claim to be original. We only ask our readers sincerely to pray for Divine guid-

ance and humbly submit themselves to the Holy Word of God. We pray Him to arouse the Episcopal Church as He did the luke-warm Israelites at the time of Ezra, and set its members on fire with Divine love and zeal for the advancement of His Kingdom.

II.

THE EUCHARIST IN ST. JOHN.

LET us now consider together, with the aid of the Holy Spirit,

What Holy Scripture says about the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

First we will examine the account as given in St. John's gospel.

St. John is the acknowledged evangelist of the Incarnation. He begins with, "the Word was God" and "the Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us." He especially bears witness to the Incarnation and the extension of its grace through the Sacraments. The other evangelists record the institution of the two great sacraments. But St. John's gospel, being written after the "Revelation," and coming to the established Church, records for its benefit, not the institution of the sacraments, for this had been done, but our Lord's discourses explaining them. Thus we find in this gospel our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus explaining Christian Baptism, and that on the Eucharist after the feeding of the five thousand. This latter discourse is recorded in the sixth chapter.

Opponents to the belief of the Real Presence

have held that this chapter does not refer to the Eucharist. Among these are Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Beza, Bullinger, Barnes and others of modern times. Their arguments are these: first, that at the time our Lord pronounced these words, the Holy Communion was not instituted, and so He could not be understood as referring to it. The same argument, however, would apply to our Lord's discourse on Baptism to Nicodemus which most admit relates to that Sacrament. Also this objection would seemingly apply as well to our Lord's crucifixion, to which these opponents claim our Lord's words refer. It must be allowed that those who heard our Lord could not then understand the means by which Christ was to give them His Body to eat. It does not follow, however, that the discourse was not intended to teach the doctrine. The means were to be revealed afterwards by the Last Supper. Whether there is reference to the sacrament in this discourse must be determined by internal evidence.

A second objection raised is, that no conditions concerning the reception are given, so that no matter with what dispositions one would eat the Flesh and drink the Blood, he would be saved. Hence it is argued there can be no reference here to the Eucharist, but to Christ's death in which we must have evangelical faith, in order to be benefited. Undoubtedly it is true, one must have an evangelical faith in Christ's death to be profited by it; but the text says nothing about a "true evangelical faith" as the condition of a saving appropriation

of Christ's death, any more than it gives the proper disposition for a worthy reception. The fact being that the proper conditions for the reception of Christ's gifts are necessarily implied and are stated elsewhere in their proper place in God's Word. It is the same with Baptism as with the Eucharist.

A third argument is based on the different words used in the discourse and in the institution. Here, Christ says we must eat of His *Flesh* and drink His Blood. There, our Lord says, "This is My *Body*." He uses the word "Flesh" in the one case and "Body" in the other. The argument will no doubt seem weak and trivial to our readers, we state it because we wish them to know all that is said on that side. The answer indeed is a very simple and easy one. Our Lord in the upper chamber referring to His death in which His Body, as one whole thing, was to be broken, says appropriately of the bread in His hand, "This is My Body." But in teaching the sacramental feeding, He as appropriately does not say "eat My Body," but My "Flesh." True in eating Christ's Flesh we receive Christ wholly. But Christ properly uses the word "Flesh" when referring to reception, and "Body" when referring to His death.

Fourthly it is said that the chapter could not refer to the Communion because its reception would then be made an absolute condition for salvation for all men. No one could be saved, it is argued, save those who received it. The answer is that the same objection might be raised against Bap-

tism. For it is written, "Whoso believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." But Christ in regard to each sacrament is speaking to His disciples; not to those under the law, or in heathen lands. And does not our Prayer Book directly answer the objection when, referring to the necessity of Baptism, it says, "where it may be had"? So, too, it speaks of our reception of the Communion, when by reason of any just impediment one is unable to receive the consecrated elements, yet if he do truly repent and believe, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of His Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health.

There is another set of commentators, who, while holding that the chapter refers to the spiritual union with the Saviour by faith, as we also do, yet hold that indirectly it refers to the Sacrament. Among these are Doddridge, Alford, Bengel, Stier, Godet, Dr. Schaff. Dean Alford says: "The question whether there is any reference to the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper has been inaccurately put. When cleared of inaccuracy in terms it will mean, Is the subject here dwelt upon, the same as that which is set forth in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper? And of this there can surely be no doubt." Another of these commentators thus states this position: "What our Lord said at this time He afterwards expressed in a permanent form by the Sacrament of His Body and Blood."

It will be sufficiently convincing to Churchmen

to know that for the most part the ancient fathers, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, and all that cohort of holy men, who to our Church are dear, refer this discourse to the Holy Eucharist. It is so referred to in the third General Council held at Ephesus, A. D. 431. In the Epistle of St. Cyril to Nestorius he quotes this chapter: "When the Son of God became united to His Flesh, He made it also to be Life-giving, as also He said to us: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man and drink His Blood.'" Our own Anglican Church likewise did this in her old form of exhortation to receive the Holy Communion, where she quoted this sixth chapter of St. John as applicable to it.

For us the question seems to be settled, by the prayer of Humble Access, in which the words of this chapter are quoted as referring to the Sacrament: "Grant us so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood." We here apply the most crucial words of our Lord in this chapter, the eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood, to the Communion. We quote also His very words, "dwelleth in Me and I in him," praying that "we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us."

Our great Anglican Divines, Hooker, Andrewes, Wordsworth, and many others, hold this view. Keble, whose saintliness and balanced wisdom is recognized by all, said: "I assume that the sixth chapter of St. John really and primarily relates to the sacrament of Holy Communion; ac-

ording to the well-known interpretation of Hooker, which is the interpretation of all antiquity, and lies so obviously on the surface of Scripture, that one can hardly conceive a simple, unlearned reader giving any other turn to the discourse in that chapter, unless he were prepossessed by a theory."

III.

THE TWO PARTS OF CHRIST'S DISCOURSE.

OUR Lord was wont to give a setting or frame to His discourses by some circumstance or miracle which would be illustrative of them. He connects His teaching of Himself as the Resurrection and the Life, with the raising of Lazarus. He restores the man born blind and then reproves the blindness of the Pharisees who will not come to Him for light. He tells Nicodemus of the new birth by the Spirit, which is to take us out of our natural state of darkness, as the Ruler comes to Him by night, and the wind coming and going as it will is heard surging without. It is at Samaria's well, to the sin-convicted heart-sore woman He declares Himself the Living Water. In like manner He lays the foundation of His teaching concerning Himself as the Bread of Life. He gives the blessed loaves into the hands of the Apostles and the bread lessens not in their hands as they distribute it to the multitude. It grows as they give. He comes walking upon the waves and joins His disciples in the ship and the ship is immediately at land. Christ thus declares how His bodily Presence with His disciples in the ship of the Church is not controlled by natural laws.

Bishop Wordsworth has embalmed this truth for us in one of his poems :

“Lord, in Thy Sacraments
Thou walkest on the sea ;
Let us not ask—how dost Thou come ?
But gladly welcome Thee.

“Then will the winds be hushed,
The waves no longer roar ;
When Christ is with us in the ship,
The ship is at the shore.”

These miracles are not only a proof of Christ's ability to be present in the Eucharist, but are moreover one proof of His Presence. For if the consecrated elements are only empty symbols, there is nothing of a supernatural character about them, and so these miracles, which form the framework of our Lord's teaching on the Eucharist, would be inappropriate and unmeaning. These miracles, so full of the sovereignty of Christ over the natural world, are full of joy and assurance to the believer's heart. Christ's blessed Body is not controlled as ours are by the conditions of space and time, but is capable for moral purposes of dominating them. Within the spiritual organism of His Church we sit, as famishing children at His feet, and are being fed with Himself as the Living Bread from Heaven.

The first and most important thing to notice concerning the discourse itself in the sixth chapter of St. John is that it is divided into two parts.

It was delivered in the Synagogue at Caper-

naum. The remains of the beautiful white Synagogue built of white limestone, show that there was a large pot of manna sculptured on it. Doubtless excitedly pointing to this, His hearers said, "What sign shewest Thou then, that we may see, and believe Thee?—Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from Heaven to eat." Jesus then began His instruction with this powerful exordium: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread *from Heaven*; but *My Father* giveth you the true Bread *from Heaven*. For the Bread of God is He which cometh down from Heaven and giveth life unto the world."

Having thus begun His great discourse, He lays down His basic proposition: "And Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life."

It would be well for our readers here to take their New Testaments, and mark the 32nd verse with the figure *one*. It will help them much to have their New Testaments before them and to read this section. This part ends probably with the 47th verse. It ends with this very appropriate peroration: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth in Me hath everlasting life."

The second part begins with verse 48. It would be well to mark this with the figure *two* in Roman numerals. It is not without interest in examining our Lord's discourses to find that He not unfrequently makes such a division. Thus in St. John xv. He begins: "I am the true vine," and states the consequences of not abiding in Him-

self. Then He begins the second part (v. 5), and repeating nearly the same words, "I am the vine," declares the fruits that ensue from abiding in Him.

So in His discourse on Himself as the Good Shepherd we find Him (ch. x. v. 11) saying "I am the Good Shepherd," and of His laying down His life for the sheep, and then (v. 14) repeating His text, "I am the Good Shepherd," going on to state the relation existing between the sheep and Himself.

So we find Him here in the sixth chapter of St. John, saying in an early part of the first division of His discourse, "I am the Bread of life," and bringing out one set of truths, and then beginning the second part at v. 48 with the very same words, "I am the Bread of life," and bringing out another and quite different set of truths. "Christ," says an able writer, "speaks of two things in this chapter; first of the general fact of His Mediation and that His Humanity was the medium through which Divine graces found their way to mankind; secondly, that the eating His Body and drinking His Blood was the method in which this gift was to be participated in by individuals."

Now it is from persons not noticing this division that most of the misunderstanding about this discourse has come. Not seeing that entirely different truths are treated of in each portion of the discourse, persons have arbitrarily applied texts in the first part to the interpretation of those in the second, and so have failed of the right

meaning. Let us therefore analyze these two parts and learn the differences between them.

In each there are three points. The Donor of a great gift, the Gift itself, and then the exhortation and practical Duty enjoined in respect of it.

In the first part the Donor is the Eternal Father. It is said (v. 32) "*My Father* giveth you the true Bread from Heaven." Six times the Father is mentioned; and our Lord twice declares, that it is the Father who hath sent Him.

The Gift in this part is Christ Himself. "For the bread of God is He which cometh down from Heaven and giveth life unto the world."

The Duty inculcated is to believe in Him. "Verily, verily, he that believeth in Me hath everlasting life."

In the second part all this is changed. Now it is not the Father who is the Donor, but Christ. The Giver is seen to be another person. Christ says again, "I am the Bread of Life." Previously He had said this, and then shown how He was this Bread of Life *as sent from Heaven*. Now He says, "I am the Bread of Life," as having Life in Himself and capable of communicating It. "I am the Living (or Live-giving) Bread." But, notice the change of Donor of the gift: "The Bread that *I will give* is My Flesh." Not only is the Donor a different person, but so is the Gift a different thing. The Gift in the first place was Christ, given or sent by the Father. Now it is Christ's Flesh and Blood, given by Himself. Again, the duty first inculcated was that of faith, to believe in Him

whom the Father had sent. The duty in the second is to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. Of this nothing was previously said. It presents a new and unique duty. "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." "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood dwelleth in Me and I in him." "He that eateth Me, even He shall live by Me."

Again a fourth difference is this: The duty first declared, was one immediately to be performed. Then and there they were called on to believe in Him. The duty in the second place was remote. "The Bread that I *will give* is My Flesh for the life of the world." "The participation," says the Speakers Commentary, "is spoken of as still future, since it followed in its fullness on the completed work of Christ." Dean Alford also declares "it is His Flesh which He *will give* on behalf of the world." "Thrice had it been said," says Stier, "I am Myself the Bread, and now is added with a change—the bread which He *will give*. He distinguishes from Himself who is Bread, the Bread which he *will give*." In the first part there is an immediate duty to be performed, in the second it is future and remote.

Moreover a fifth difference is to be seen in that the effects produced in the two cases are of a different character. Christ's hearers were first called on to come to Him, to believe in Him. Yet as Stier well says: "With all the believing of those

who believed in Him, *He came not as yet unto their souls*. So that the Apostles could only avow, standing as yet without and as it were over against Him, *Thou hast the words of Eternal Life.*" But the fruit of the faithful reception of His Flesh was that He would come *into* them and abide with them. He that eateth Me shall live by Me. He speaks in the last section of that wonderful incorporation into His Humanity by which we are made partakers of the divine Nature.

A further proof that the subject has been changed is thus seen in the different effects assigned to the respective gifts. To each is attributed (vv. 40, 44, 47, 54, 58) ,in general, the being raised at the last day, and eternal life. But while resurrection and life are the result of our union with Christ, we are united to Him both by faith and sacramental grace. By faith we lay hold of Him, by sacramental grace He lays hold of us. In the first part of the discourse, we are called on to come to Christ and believe in Him whom the Father hath sent. We lay hold of Him. In the second part, we are to eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, that He may abide in us and we in Him. The effects assigned to the respective gifts are thus seen to be different, and the division in the discourse yet more clearly marked.

Lastly, it must be noticed that in the first division of His sermon, Christ never uses the word, "eat." Although He uses the metaphor of Bread, and says He is the Bread that came down from heaven, yet He never says, "Eat this Bread." He

might have done so conformably to the duty He sought to inculcate. If He had used this word and figure in the first part, we should have understood Him *of faith*. The receiving of wisdom, under the figure of eating Bread, as we shall presently show, was a common one. The disciples would have readily understood this figure of speech. But it is very significant that our Lord there avoids using it. Even when His hearers, on His proclaiming Himself to be the true Bread given by the Father from heaven, said, "Lord, evermore give us this Bread," He avoids bidding them "eat" of this Bread. He will only repeat again and again the duty of believing in Him. Now the contrast between this careful avoidance of the word *eat* in the first part, and the continued repetition of this injunction to *eat* in the second part, shows again that the subject is changed.

From what has been said, the fact is now easily recognized by our readers, that our Lord's discourse is divided into two parts. There could hardly be internal evidence more decisive or complete. There are five differences between the two sections, and these affect their whole character and meaning. The Donors of the separate Gifts, the Gifts themselves, their modes of appropriation, the times when they are to be made ours, and the spiritual effects of either, are all unlike. However cautious in giving our assent, we may, therefore, accept this division of the discourse as now demonstrated.

There are two corollaries, or consequences,

that follow from this fact. Our readers can now see for themselves how those miss the correct meaning, who, not discerning the division, apply texts from the first part, which most properly inculcate faith in Christ as our duty, to the command in the second part to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. Yet how often have we heard or read of such a strange mixture of texts to elucidate the meaning. A preacher will take for his text, "The bread that I will give is My Flesh," or "except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood ye have no life in you," and then give, as an explanation, a passage from the first discourse: "He that believeth in Me hath everlasting life!" We all know we are to believe in Him, and so by the uncritical ear and mind, the explanation passes and is accepted, without examination. When we do pause to think, we see that the preacher is stringing texts together, taken out of their context, and which, though found in the same discourse, have no real connection with one another. It is just as illogical, and the result just as absurd, as if we combined any other two diverse texts together. It would be equally convincing if we should say: It is written, "Judas went out and hanged himself," and then quote the text, "Go thou and do likewise."

The other deduction from the fact that the discourse is a dual one, is, that the last section relates to the Eucharist and declares the Real Presence in a most solemn and emphatic manner. Convinced that here we have Christ's own teaching

about His Sacrament, we can but be awed in the presence of His divine utterances and plainness of speech. Who are we, specks of dust, upon a planetary speck, and where all is marvelous, to stumble at a marvel? Without good reason none should change their opinions, but not to change on fair showing, is to be most unreasonable. The wise man rectifies his opinions by the wisdom of the wise. Let us sit at the feet of no human masters nor make idols of times or men. We must not exalt reformers into deities, nor take mediævalism as a model. Let us go back to Christ. Let us accept His word in all its plainness and literal meaning. "What the Truth hath spoken, that for Truth I hold."

"Christ was the Word who spake it.
He took the Bread and brake it,
And what that Word did make it,
That I believe and take it."

IV.

THE TWO METAPHORS.

THE popular argument for disbelief in the Real Presence is that since our Lord, in the thirty-fifth verse, says, "I am the Bread of Life; he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst," He means nothing different when He subsequently says, "The Bread that I will give is My Flesh," and "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you."

In the first instance Christ calls on us to believe in Him whom the Father has sent, and so it is assumed very superficially that all that is intended by the second injunction is to do the same thing. Now we have destroyed any logical force that might belong to such an argument, by proving that the discourse consists of two distinct parts; the Giver, and the Gift, and the Duty in each case being different, consequently what is said in one part cannot be applied to the other.

But in addition to all these arguments there is a further one which we think must be convincing to every reasonable mind. The two parts of the discourse are separated by a very remarkable change of language. If, for the sake of argument, we re-

gard them both as metaphors, as we are obliged to do, if we deny that our Lord's words in the latter part of His discourse are to be taken literally, we must also take into account the fact that these two figures of speech are absolutely unlike and have two different significations. And yet this is so seldom pointed out in our popular commentaries that it is but little known. It is not often dwelt upon in sermons. Very few of our communicants have had the opportunity given them of considering it. This is one cause of the ignorance of the Church's children on the subject.

The two expressions used by our Lord are these: In the one case He speaks of Himself as the Bread of Life and says, "He that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst." In the other case He speaks of "eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood." Now these, regarded as metaphors, were, as such, well known to the Jews to whom Christ was speaking, and they meant two entirely different and distinct things.

Under the first metaphor our Lord speaks of Himself, who was the Eternal Wisdom, as bread or food. This figure of speech is found in Isaiah (LV: 1, 2): "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk, without money and without price; Hearken diligently unto Me and eat ye that which is good." The same image is found in Jeremiah (xv. 16): "Thy words were found and I did eat

them; and Thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart." In Proverbs (ix. 5), we have wisdom personified saying, "Come eat of My bread and drink of the wine which I have mingled." So in Ecclesiasticus (xv. 3): "With the bread of understanding she shall feed him, and give him the water of wisdom to drink." The same figure is used by the prophet Amos (viii. 11): "Behold, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord." These examples show that it was a common and well understood figure of speech to represent truths or doctrines under the image of bread.

This was the figure used by our Lord in the first part of His instruction. He asserted that He was the Bread from heaven, but made it particularly plain that what He called on the Jews to do, was to believe in Him. It is also evident that His hearers had no difficulty in so understanding Him. They raised no objection to this figure, which presented no difficulty to their minds or hearts. What they did object to was the claim He made of having Himself been sent by the Father and of "coming down from heaven." "Is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that He saith, I came down from heaven?"

But our Lord, having summed up that portion of His sermon with a solemn "Verily, Verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on Me hath ever-

lasting life," proceeded to change the language, and now says, "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life."

Let us now consider the meaning of His new phrase.

It is a sound rule in the interpretation of a speaker's language, to consider how he would necessarily be understood by those whom he addressed. Now just as wisdom might be called bread, and acceptance be regarded as feeding, the figures of "eating one's flesh," "drinking one's blood," had, at the time of our Lord, to the Jews, a recognized and established meaning. This metaphor, assuming it to be such, had its own signification, just as the other had. It was indelibly stamped upon it by Jewish literature and common use. What was it?

"To eat one's flesh," meant to do an injury to a person.

"In every instance," says Dr. Cleaver, formerly Bishop of Chester (Sermon, p. 29) "in which to eat a person's flesh is spoken of in scripture, to injure or destroy the party referred to, is the idea conveyed. So it is in Psalm xxvii. 2: 'When the wicked came upon me to eat up my flesh, they stumbled and fell.' And so does St. James use it: 'The rust of them shall eat your flesh, as it were fire.' No single case can be produced either from classical or oriental sources in which this phrase is used in any other sense than that of consuming or preying on the person spoken of. Gesenius, who was a great authority in Semitic languages,

gives these as the sole interpretation of the phrase, 'to eat any one's flesh.' Nor is this extraordinary; for metaphorical language is the language of nature, and must have a counterpart in those realities of which it is the expression. Now to ruminare upon and digest the instructions of another is an easy and obvious metaphor, but to *eat* the body and *drink* the blood of your teacher bears no conceivable analogy to any benefit to be received from thence."

We will quote one other learned authority, Dr. Wiseman, noted for his oriental learning: "The expression in the twenty-seventh psalm, *eat My flesh,*' describes the violent rage of David's enemies and the lengths they were ready to go against him. Again in Micah iii. 3, we have, 'Who also eat the flesh of *My* people.' In Ecc. iv. 5, we find the mischief which a foolish man does to himself described by the same figurative phrase: 'The fool foldeth his arms together and eateth his own flesh.' . . . 'Among the Arabs to this day and from time immemorial, to eat the flesh of a person means figuratively to calumniate him.' We find the same meaning in the language which our Saviour Himself spoke and which was vernacular among the Jews whom He addressed. In Chaldaic the most common expression to accuse falsely or calumniate, is to eat a morsel of the flesh of a person. In Syriac it is exactly the same. Whether, therefore, we consult the phraseology of Scripture, the spirit and ideas of the Semitic nations, or the current use of language employed by our Saviour,

we find the expression to eat the flesh of a person had an established metaphorical meaning.”

The argument to be drawn from the change of language in the two parts of the discourse we submit is most clear and convincing. For while in the first part we find our Lord using a phrase perfectly adapted to convey the idea that His hearers were to believe in Him, in the second part, if faith is still his subject, He is found needlessly changing the metaphor. He brings in an entirely new one. Why should He do this if His meaning in the second part was only the same as, or an amplification of, the first? He had clearly and urgently taught them the duty of accepting and believing in Him. Why, if the same duty of faith was, in both parts of His discourse, being inculcated, did he change the metaphor? Having once made His meaning perfectly clear, as their reply to Him showed, why should He obscure it? No earthly teacher possessed of common sense would commit such a rhetorical blunder. “The Lord never explained,” says the Protestant, Stier, “any more than any reasonable man among ourselves, a figurative saying by a new figure.”

And why, moreover, would He take a metaphor which would be so misleading? The metaphor to eat a person’s flesh had a fixed, determinate significance. His hearers were therefore forced to do one of two things. They were forced either to understand Christ—who just before was telling them that He was sent by the Father, sent from Heaven itself, sent to give life to the world, and

who was pleading with them with all the force of a divine entreaty, to come to Him and believe—they were forced now to understand Him as saying they must reject Him, and hate Him, and calumniate Him, with the rage of those who, in their bitterest language, would eat His flesh! or, they must take His words in their plain, literal sense. So evident is this that Stier says: “By the words ‘My flesh,’ Christ does not mean, My Person, My power and influence, My Spirit, yea not even My Body, but absolutely and no other than what it says, ‘My Flesh.’”

Can we Churchmen doubt which of the alternatives Christ intended His hearers or us to take? Consider this further fact. The idea of drinking blood was something abhorrent to the Jewish mind. It was something criminal, forbidden by God’s express command. “Whatever man there be of the house of Israel that eateth any manner of blood, I will set My face against that soul and will cut him off from among his people.” It was not only an abhorrent idea, but a criminal act of the greatest magnitude. Can we then suppose that our Lord, having stated one of His most beneficent doctrines, that of coming to Himself by faith, should now turn round and put it in the most revolting form possible, and that in a way that involved the committing of crime? You exclaim, Impossible!

What then are we to conclude? Either our Lord intended here to teach that actual feeding involved in the doctrine of His Real Presence in

the Sacrament, or He did not. If He did not, He violated all the laws that govern intelligible teaching. He put unnecessary obstacles in the way of His hearers' understanding Him. He put His most loving doctrine of faith in a most repulsive form. He acted also contrary to the known principles of His character. He never repelled nor drove away any whom He could reach. Most loving invitations again and again had He issued to poor, and sick, and halt, and blind, and heavy laden, and sin-bound, to come to Him and only believe. Now, according to this theory, He is no longer the consistent Teacher and loving Shepherd; He is by a harsh and unnecessary metaphor putting a stumbling-block in the way of belief, when, on belief, His hearers' everlasting life depended!

Against such a conclusion every Christian instinct revolts. We must all say, It is impossible! If He changed from the earlier metaphor, He does so because the truth He had to teach compelled Him to do so; because in the supreme interests of truth and men's souls, He must declare in plain language the necessity of an actual incorporation into His humanity, that we might thereby be partakers of His divine nature, and rise through union with Him into the Eternal Life.

V.

HOW CHRIST MEANT TO BE UNDERSTOOD.

WE NOW proceed to another and most decisive proof that our Lord in the latter part of His discourse spoke of the gift of His Body and Blood to be partaken of in the Eucharist. We have in the discourse itself a most certain proof as to how our Lord intended His words to be understood. Let us see what the proof is.

The object of any teacher is to convey his meaning as lucidly as possible, and he will be careful according to the importance of his subject not to be misunderstood. When a body of earnest listeners all agree as to what a speaker has taught, there is little doubt as to what he said. But when the speaker is a Divine Teacher and knows perfectly what He wants to convey, and is possessed of the best possible means of making it clear and intelligible, and moreover sees into the minds of His hearers and is thus aware of the impression given, then their agreement as to His teaching shows what most probably He purposed to teach. But further, when the hearers publicly declare to the Teacher Himself the sense in which they have understood Him, we can arrive at a demonstration as to what He taught and meant by His words.

For either they have understood Him rightly, or they have not. And the Teacher has then the opportunity either of correcting them if they have misunderstood His doctrine, or of confirming their impression regarding it.

Now in the present case we find that the Jews had perfectly understood our Lord in the first part of His discourse. They found no difficulty in the common metaphor which made wisdom to be bread. Their objection, then, was that Christ claimed to have been sent by the Father and to have come from heaven. But now He has said He would give them His Flesh to eat. They, understanding Him literally, now ask this question: "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" It is plain, therefore, how they understood Him. They understood Him to speak literally and to refer to an actual manducation. The question, then, is whether they were right or wrong in so doing. This question is answered by Christ Himself. Let us see how He answered it.

Every teacher has his own methods of conveying his instruction, and so had Christ. Let us in the interest of truth examine His general method of teaching and see if we can extract any rule from it that will guide us here to a solution. How then did He act in similar circumstances? When He meant to be taken figuratively and His hearers misunderstood Him as speaking literally, how did He ordinarily reply? When, on the other hand, He meant to be taken literally, and they took Him figuratively or objected to the literal

meaning; how then was He wont to act? If we can find any rule that governs His teaching in such cases, it will greatly help us to determine the question how Christ intended to be understood.

Now it appears, that when our Lord intended to be understood figuratively and His hearers gave a literal meaning to His words, His custom was, like that of any wise teacher, to explain them. One example of this is found in the case of Lazarus. Christ said to His apostles, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth." The apostles, mistaking His meaning and taking Him literally, replied, "Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well." Then our Lord corrected them. It was not of natural bodily sleep He spoke. Then said Jesus plainly unto them, "Lazarus is dead." Again our Lord said to His disciples, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." They supposed He was speaking literally and "thought within themselves saying, Because we have taken no bread." Then our Lord explained His meaning. It was not of natural food He was speaking. "Why do ye not understand that it is not concerning bread I said to you, Beware, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees?" At the Samaria well, our Lord said, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of." Here again the disciples took His words literally. They asked one another, "Hath any man brought Him aught to eat"? Then Jesus corrected their error and put the moral truth involved in His figurative language before them. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me and to finish

His work." When on another occasion Jesus said, "Whither I go ye cannot come," the Jews fell into the same mistake. They took His words as implying that He would "kill Himself." Then Christ removes their gross material conception of His words. "You are from beneath; I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world."

Again, our Lord said to Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Taking Him literally, the ruler replied, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" Then Christ did away with the mistaken literal sense and answered, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." From these and other like examples we see that when our Lord speaking in a figurative sense, was taken in a literal one, He removed the mistake by explaining His meaning.

Now let us consider the other class of cases. We will suppose Him to have spoken literally and meant to be so understood. How does He now act when objection is made? We shall find that His ordinary rule is to state the truth right over again and even in more forcible language. The following examples are illustrative of this.

Christ had said to the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad." Taking His words literally and declarative of his being coeval with their great patriarch, they

scornfully replied, "Thou art not fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?" Our Lord had not meant that Abraham only in prophetic vision had gazed down the ages and seen His advent. He meant to assert what His auditors understood Him to claim, that He was contemporaneous with Abraham. He therefore does not explain, as He does when His words have been misunderstood. But with solemn grandeur declares what, if not true, would be blasphemy, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am."

Again, when the roof had been removed and the palsied man let down before Him, Jesus said, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." The Jews were shocked at the tremendous claim this utterance involved. They very naturally said, "This man blasphemeth." In what sense was He uttering those words? What was the explanation of them? Our Lord meant what He literally said. He therefore repeated the obnoxious language as it was: "Which is easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Rise up and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith He to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thine house."

When our Lord purified the Temple, they asked Him, "What sign showest Thou unto us?" Our Lord referred to the one Jonah-like sign of His Resurrection. Pointing perhaps to His Body which by a common figure He called a temple, He said, "Destroy this temple and in three days

I will raise it up," for "He spake of the temple of His Body." They said perversely, it took forty and six years to erect that building before them. But our Lord makes no explanation. He meant concerning His Resurrection to be taken literally.

We have another instance of our Lord's method in the very discourse before us. He had asserted that He "came down from heaven." Literally taken, the Jews said this was impossible and untrue. "Is not this Jesus, the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" How is it then that He saith, "I came down from heaven"? Our Lord bids them not murmur at this. He asserts again and again that He is "the living Bread which came down from heaven," and that as a proof of it, "Ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before."

We have discovered Christ's method of teaching. Let us apply it to the present case. He has asserted that He will give His Flesh for the life of the world. The Jews, taking Him literally, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us His flesh to eat? What was the Lord's reply? Did He say, Do not understand Me literally? Did He put His teaching in some other less objectionable form? Did He act as He did in all those other cases where His hearers, taking Him literally, made a mistake in so doing? Or did He act as in those cases where, having spoken literally and objection being made, He intended to be taken literally? He replied, as in these latter cases. He answered, saying, "Verily, verily, I say

unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.”

Put the following three parallel cases side by side. They illustrate our Lord’s method. They leave no doubt of our Lord’s meaning in the present case.

St. John iii. 3.

“Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.”

St. John viii. 56.

“Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it and was glad.”

St. John vi. 51.

“If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.”

In each of these cases, objections were raised.

In the first, Nicodemus understood our Lord literally. Verse 4: “Nicodemus saith to Him, How can a man be born again when he is old?”

In the second case, “then said the Jews unto Him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?”

In the third, “the Jews therefore strove among themselves saying, How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?”

In the first case where our Lord’s words were taken literally, and He meant to be taken otherwise, He explained: “Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto you except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.”

In the second case, where His words were taken literally and He meant them so to be taken, He repeated His statement: "Jesus said to them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am."

In the third case, in answer to the objection, like as in the second, He repeated His teaching and in the most solemn way: "Then Jesus said to them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you."

There are three other points that may be noticed in regard to His reply.

First, Christ not only asserts the literal meaning, but confirms it with a solemn asseveration, or as some commentators call it, an oath, by a twice repeated Verily, verily.

Secondly, He enforces the literal meaning and the necessity of an actual reception of His Body and Blood in both a negative and positive form. One can but be struck by the similarity of this double negative and positive form of precept with that given in respect to the other great sacrament of Baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." So in regard to the Eucharist, first, the injunction is put negatively: "Except ye eat the Flesh and drink the Blood, ye have no life in you." There is thus first stated the awful loss of not doing so. Then there is positively stated the benefits ensuing on reception: "Whoso eateth My

Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

Thirdly, We must notice that Christ not only repeats and re-affirms His words and does it with a Verily, verily, but declares that His Flesh is true meat and His Blood true drink: "For My Flesh is meat indeed and My Blood is drink indeed." Could any re-assertion be possibly more distinct or more emphatic?

Tested, therefore, by the divine Master's own method of teaching, we find that the Jews understood Him rightly as proposing to give them His very Flesh for food, and by His answer He confirmed them in their belief. He meant to be thus understood by them.

And so too, within the Church He founded and which His Spirit guides, for all these centuries, His words have been so received by the great majority of all His followers. It is a terrible dilemma, but a decisive one, that here presents itself to us. He could not have been a Teacher sent from God, if He so badly taught His doctrine as to lead so great a number of His disciples into serious error! Again, there is no Holy Spirit, if He has not safeguarded the words of Christ and guided the Church into the right understanding of them. Between the multitudinous and conflicting opinions of human wisdom, the trembling magnet of Catholic consent points securely to the pole-fixed star of Truth. The result of Christ's teaching shows how Christ intended to be understood.

VI.

THE REAL ISSUE.

OUR LORD was struggling with all the intensity of His divine love to win those whom He addressed. He needed to win them to a complete surrender to Himself if their conversion was to be worth anything. Simply to gain their intellectual assent to any truths He might promulgate would be of no spiritual profit unless there was the submission of their whole nature. It will be of no profit to us, to believe in Christ's life and death as if they were mere facts of history, or in the scheme of redemption as we might accept a theory of light or sound. Such belief can never unite to Christ nor save a soul.

Nor will it save us to try and be Christ-like. The copyist of Christ does not thereby become a Christian. Oh, the folly of this self-improvement religion, with Christ for a model only! He must be the Moulder and we the clay in His hands. Christ seeks to bring our whole being into this entire captivity to Himself. To be savingly His, we must on our part surrender ourselves wholly to Him, and believe all He says, because He says it. We must be ready to do all He calls us to do, because He bids it. To be savingly His, on His

part, we must be incorporated into Him by His gifts of grace. He is the Head and Beginning of a New Creation. We must, to share in it, be in Him and He in us. We in Him, and so saved by Him. He in us, and we re-made by Him.

Now Christ in this contest for His hearers' souls, was struggling first to bring them to the submissive temper of heart and mind that would accept Him. If saving faith was to be developed within them, He must not demonstrate His truths beyond the possibility of a mental rejection. But He must so teach and with all His suggestive wisdom as to compel them to make a choice. They must, in the presence of the difficulty as to how He could perform His promise, choose or reject Him. They must, as we all must, to become His, make a venture of faith. They must surrender heart and mind and will to Him and let Him own them wholly. The issue He now presented was either to reject Him, or to accept Him by believing what He said.

We know what the result was. All the apostles, save Judas, a most significant and dreadful warning, believed. They heard Christ's promise to give them to eat of His Flesh and to drink His Blood. Mysterious words indeed, but clearly understood. When our Lord turned in Love's great anxiety and put the final test: "Will ye also go away?" Simon Peter, their spokesman, answered for them and said: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life." They could not understand how it could

be, but they were ready to believe everything and anything He said. Oh! what joy thrilled the heart of Jesus as they reached this triumphant act of faith.

With Judas and others it was not so. That they understood Him literally is clear. It is clear also that He meant so to be understood. Turning, however, away from the Christ, they said: "This is a hard saying." It was not hard in the sense that they could not understand what He said, but hard as being repulsive, harsh, revolting. Yet our Lord, with all His persistent tenderness, will not thus let them depart. He will yet strive, and to the utmost, to win them to a self-surrendering trust in Himself. He knows in Himself how they are murmuring at His teaching. He will make a final effort to overcome their deep-rooted objections. Let us see how He does this.

In this final effort, Jesus in His conclusion deals with their two great objections made during the progress of this whole discourse. The objection they raised to the claim made under the first head of this discourse was that He had come down from heaven; and the objection made to His statement, under the second head, that having so come He could give them His Flesh to eat, was its seeming impossibility.

Replying in His summary to both, Jesus said: "Doth this offend you?" Then He takes up their objections *seriatim*. He replies to their first objection by saying He will give them an ocular demonstration of His coming down from heaven.

“What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?”

He here by this statement asserts His pre-existence, “where He was before.” And He states that He will prove His descent from that position or condition by a visible return to it. They did not believe He had entered the world in any manner different from their own. “Is not this Jesus, the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that He saith, I came down from heaven?” To have previously existed and have come down from heaven was to make claim to a supernatural entrance into this world. To be also the Son of Man implied a supernatural human birth. All that our Lord’s words involved they did not comprehend, but the bare claim to have come down from heaven was what troubled them. Our Lord, therefore, says He will remove their difficulty by giving them an ocular proof and visibly ascend in the presence of His disciples. His supernatural exit would thus be a proof of His claim to a supernatural entrance. When they saw it, what would they then say? Then they would assuredly say what He desired them to believe now; that He had come from heaven.

To their second objection, “How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?” our Lord replies, “It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.”

There are three interpretations proposed for the text, and it is but fair to give them all.

The one given by those who deny the Real

Presence is that this text shows our Lord's words are to be taken spiritually, not literally. It is true that "the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." It is true that Christians "are not under the letter, but serve in newness of spirit." But the term *flesh*, which is the word here to be interpreted, never in Holy Scripture means the letter or literal sense of words. There are thus two fatal objections to the exegesis. The word *flesh* is never employed as synonymous for the literal meaning, and again our Lord does here refer to His flesh. Our Lord, to quote Alford, does not say "My Flesh profiteth nothing, but the flesh. To make Him say My Flesh as the anti-sacramentalists do is to make Him contradict His own words."

The second interpretation is given by a number of Protestant and Catholic commentators. Flesh and spirit when opposed in Holy Scripture are found referring to our unregenerate human nature, and our spiritually enlightened one. Our Lord discriminates between the two: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." These are opposed to each other. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, and they are contrary the one to the other." There is the mind of the flesh, "Ye judge after the flesh," says our Lord. There is the mind of the spirit, by which alone spiritual things are discerned. The result of the two operations is thus contrasted: "To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." Our Lord, according to this

interpretation is telling His auditors that His words cannot be understood by the dim light of human reason, but only by it as it is spiritually enlightened. This interpretation is consistent with belief in the Real Presence.

The third interpretation is more simple, and it is far better designed to meet the objection raised. By the word "flesh," Christ means human flesh, just such as His hearers had. By "spirit" He refers to man's spirit. Elsewhere in Holy Scripture (II. Cor. vii. 1) the two, "flesh and spirit," are joined together. Christ thus bases His reply on a fact of which they are cognizant: They are composed of flesh and spirit, and He says it is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The flesh by itself, as they knew, had no quickening or life-communicating power. Without the spirit within it, it would be lifeless or dead. It is the spirit that makes flesh, living flesh, and capable of communicating, in the natural order, life.

It is the same He asserts in regard to His nature. Only My nature, He would say to them, is not like yours. I came from heaven. Your mistake arises from not believing what I had first to teach you. You take Me for a man like one of yourselves. But My Flesh is united to My divine Spiritual Nature. Just as your ordinary human flesh is made life-giving in the natural order, because of the soul or spirit with which it is connected, so My Flesh and Blood can communicate life of a higher and spiritual order, on account

of the Eternal Spiritual Nature with which they are connected. St. Cyril says: "For after the Life-giving Word of God made His dwelling in our flesh, He transformed it to His own Virtue, that is, Life. Thereupon the Body of Christ quickens those who partake in it."

And here let us point out a common mistake which has been the occasion of much misunderstanding. In our English version we have the phrase, "The words that I speak unto you are spirit and life." It is to be noted that the Greek has two uses, *logos*, a word, and *ta remata*, things spoken or done. The use here is not *logos*, but *ta remata*, the things about which I have been speaking.

This makes plain our Lord's response and shows how completely and fully He met His hearers' objections. He said, The things that I have been speaking about to you, viz., My Body and My Blood, by virtue of their connection with My Divine Spiritual Nature, They are spirit and They are life. The first man, as St. Paul tells us, is of the earth, earthy. The second man, the Head of the New Creation, is the Lord from heaven. "The first man Adam was made a living soul" and could only communicate natural life. "The last Adam" by virtue of union with Divinity, "was made a quickening Spirit," capable of communicating to us divine spiritual life.

We can now better understand why Christ laid such emphasis on receiving both the Flesh and Blood. If faith was all He wished to form within

us, it could have been developed by an act of reception in one kind. But if we are to be incorporated into Him who both died and rose again, the fitness of a reception in both kinds is manifest.

It may not be deemed prolix if we dwell on this blessing so lovingly preserved to us in our communion. Under the law the Israelite was forbidden to taste of blood. For the blood was, he was told, associated with the animal life principle. "The blood is the life thereof." Man being by transgression under the law of sin and death, was forbidden to take of that which was the symbol of grace and life. But when Christ, the Life, came, the command was changed. Now it is, "Drink ye all of it." For the Blood of Christ by its union with His Eternal Spiritual Nature is possessed of a quickening power. He, through His own "Eternal Spirit," (which does not here mean the Holy Spirit), "offered Himself without spot to God." His Blood therefore was by reason of its union with His Spiritual Nature, endued with a spiritual power. Its power is capable of penetrating, as we read, to the innermost portion of man's spiritual nature. It can purge his conscience from dead works, works done without grace, and make it serve acceptably the Living God. Such is its mighty and spiritual power! May we not be thankful that we can separately partake both of that Blessed Blood that was shed and that Flesh that was triumphant over death?

We can in conclusion draw a comparison be-

tween the character and conduct of our Lord as presented to us by the two views we have been considering. In Christ all virtues are wonderfully blended. None are wanting in their highest excellency. None but what is balanced by other excellencies. As a Teacher He is the most wonderful the world has seen, for He is Wisdom Itself. He is the Truth inflexible in His condemnation of error, most tenderly skilful in enlightening the ignorant. He is the Good Shepherd who will leave naught untried that love can suggest to win the sinners' heart and mind.

We have seen Him, if His object was to teach the reception of His very Body and Blood, acting consistently with the usual method of His teaching and with His character. With what clearness, what firm reiteration, what solemn asseveration, what merciful severity, He declares His doctrine! How wisely He stoops to His hearers' infirmities and meets their real objections. How majestically He prophesies His coming Ascension as the demonstration of His heavenly descent. How convincingly He declares His Body to be unlike common flesh (which would profit nothing), because it is possessed of Spirit and Life.

His loving toil was successful. Many might go back whom He did not win. But the great heart of St. Peter stood rock-like and firm, and the apostles were with him. The foundation of belief in that transcendent gift of Christ to the Church, her joy and treasure, the support of her children in their warfare and toil, their comfort and viaticum in

the hour of death, was then securely and forever laid.

But if Christ made no such promise of a veiled but abiding Presence, if the Church is to wander through the world's wilderness without even Israel's shekinah, if Christ's words are not to be taken in their plain, literal sense, how does His conduct conform to the otherwise known features of His character? We find Him endeavoring to teach His followers that He has come from heaven and is the Bread of Life. They make no objection to the metaphor. But then to their astonishment He needlessly changes it. He substitutes one of a most revolting and criminal kind. When they naturally object, He, but in more painful terms, reiterates it. He leaves them in their misunderstanding of His teaching and lets them go away from Him. Is such conduct consistent with His Mission as the Light of the World? With His method as the "Great Prophet and Teacher"? With His character as the Good Shepherd?

Which then of the two interpretations shall we take? That which is consistent with the course of any wise teacher, or that which contradicts ordinary common sense? That which is consistent with the whole life of our beloved Lord and Master, or that which convicts Him of having led, not only those who heard Him, but the great proportion of His followers, into a fatal, if not idolatrous, error?

The real issue to-day is just what it was when Christ spoke this discourse. It is: Do we believe

in Him and all He says, because He says it? Or, do we reject Him in rejecting His words? Shall we go away and continue in our misbelief, or shall we submit with blessed St. Peter and the apostles? Bending from His throne on high, Jesus puts the question to each one of us. Belief in the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood is now the test of a living faith. What shall be our answer to the Lord? May the response go up from our whole Church, like the sound of mighty waters, gladdening the Divine Heart of our dear Master and Lord, "O Lord! we believe in Thee, and Thy Sacramental Presence with us, for Thou hast the words of Eternal Life."

VII.

THE CORROBORATIVE TESTIMONY OF ST. PAUL.

IN THE Gospel of St. John we have the teaching concerning the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist before its formal institution. We naturally ask how it was regarded by the Apostles after Christ's Ascension. At Pentecost they received the abiding gift of the Holy Spirit, who was to bring to their remembrance all things that they had heard of Christ and to lead them into all truth. Of the importance they assigned to the Eucharist and its recognized position as the great act of Christian worship, there can be no question. We find the Apostles at the founding of the Church, in that fair upper chamber "in the house" (not from house to house), celebrating daily. At Antioch, the next prominent centre after Jerusalem, the great missionary movement towards the Gentile world is inaugurated by a special manifestation of the Holy Ghost, "as they ministered unto the Lord," or were celebrating the Holy Communion.

Very soon the Eucharistic liturgy began to be developed and the first day of the week came to be

called the Lord's Day, and was solemnized by this act of worship. Upon the first day of the week we read that the disciples came together "to break bread," and the "Breaking of Bread" was one of the earliest titles of the Sacrament.

For the received belief of the Apostles we have concerning it the remarkable testimony of St. Paul. It is remarkable because, not being one of the original Twelve, he is an independent witness. To him the ascended Lord appeared on the Damascus highway, and as He had called and commissioned the others, called and commissioned him to be an apostle. As upon the Twelve the Holy Ghost at Pentecost came and consecrated those previously called, so did the Holy Ghost specially manifest Himself at Antioch, and said: "Separate Me Barnabas and Saul." Thus St. Paul, not as an apostle of men or as empowered by man, but as called and commissioned by Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, was set apart with laying on of hands and received into the apostolic fellowship.

To him our Lord made a special communication concerning the Holy Communion. He must have learned from the other apostles how to baptize with water and in the Name of the Blessed Trinity, for we know on occasions he did so. But the ascended Lord did not reveal this unto him; and perhaps to this he alludes when he says, "The Lord sent me not to baptize." But so transcendent was the divine institution of the Blessed Sacrament, that Christ after His Ascension made a special revelation concerning it. Just as Christ

and the Holy Ghost had called an apostle after Pentecost to show that They abode in the Church, and that the apostolic order was to be continued, for like reasons Christ made a revelation concerning the Eucharist. Christ would ever abide in His Church, and He would abide in it in that human nature which He had assumed and from which He would never be separated. If He had laid aside that nature, it would not have been possible for His priests to continue to say, "This is My Body"; for that Body would have ceased to exist. The Church after the Ascension was by these words to bear witness to the continuance of the Incarnation, and of Christ's Body and Blood being the source of His people's life.

Again, the Communion was not something instituted for a loving remembrance of Himself by those who had been with Him when visible in the flesh. It was to be continued. It was to be a solemn memorial made before God by all Christians and for all time, to show forth the Lord's death "till He come."

St. Paul declares with great solemnity the command he had received from Christ: "For I have received of the Lord that which also 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; this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in

My Blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it 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."

Here we have an independent testimony of our Lord's fulfilment of His promise in St. John, to give to all the disciples to the end of time His Flesh to eat and His Blood to drink. The account of the institution of the Communion agrees with that given in St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke. We will fully consider the words of Institution later. Here let us note three most helpful statements that are peculiar to St. Paul.

First, we note with interest that while evidently referring to the consecrated element, he speaks of it as "this bread." He says, "as often as ye eat of this Bread." We thus find him calling the Sacrament *bread*. This agrees with the teaching of Christendom. The elements are not destroyed or annihilated by the consecration. If they were, the character of a sacrament would be gone. There is an outward sign, as well as an inward part. They both truly exist. The assertion of the existence of the one does not imply the non-existence of the other. Speaking of the Sacrament we may say with the Fathers, It is the Body and Blood of Christ, or we may say referring to it, "This Bread," or "This Cup." It does not, however, follow from this ordinary use of language that no change has been effected by the consecration and that our Lord's Body and Blood are not

sacramentally identified with the outward and visible signs.

No better proof of this can be found than in the Roman Liturgy itself. No one questions but that the Roman Church believes in the Real Presence. It states that doctrine in the strongest possible way. "Yet it is their custom," says Cardinal Wiseman, "to call the sacred elements by the names of their appearances after the consecration. In the canon of the Mass, we call them '*Panem sanctum via aeternae, et calicem salutis perpetuae.*' Again we say, '*panem coelestem accipiani.*' Now would any one seriously argue that we do not believe in the Real Presence and in Transubstantiation, because we speak of bread being still upon the altar after the consecration? Certainly not; for it is natural to call by this name the sacred Gift, both from its appearance and its properties. It can therefore be no more inferred from similar phraseology in St. Paul that he excluded our belief."

It may be further observed, that this usage is to be found in Holy Scripture which, in our tract, is our standard of appeal. In the ninth chapter of St. John we have a very full account given of our Lord's miracle in opening the eyes of one born blind. After his eyes were opened, he was brought before the Sanhedrim, and the judges, we read after his account, "say again to the blind man." Who would argue, because he was still called "blind," that no change had taken place and his eyes were not opened? Again, after our Lord had

changed the water into wine, we find it still called water. "When the ruler of the feast had tasted the *water that was made wine*, and knew not whence it was; but the servants which drew the *water* knew." No one, because it was called water after the miracle, doubts but that it became wine. In like manner St. Paul may designate the Sacrament as "This Bread," while at the same time he affirms it to be the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Another most instructive peculiarity in St. Paul's account is, that he implies that the change wrought is due to the act of consecration. If no change was wrought we should expect that it could be made evident by some explanatory words that the elements were symbols or signs only. But not only is it affirmed that what we eat is the Body of Christ, and what we drink is the new covenant in Christ's Blood, but the cause is given. It is not referred to the faith of the receiver. It is not said to be a Presence merely in the heart of the communicant. St. Paul says: "The Cup of Blessing which we bless," "the bread which we break," is it not the communion (or partaking) of the Blood and the Body of Christ? It is by the act of consecration the change is effected.

But more clearly yet does St. Paul teach the truth of Christ's Real Presence. Occasion arose at Corinth for the Apostle most severely to animadvert on the order of the celebration. Uniting the Agape or Love Feast along with the Sacrament, some had behaved disorderly and been drunken. This profanation of the sacred mystery

had been most signally rebuked by a punishment sent directly by Almighty God. A grievous sickness had broken out among them. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you and some sleep," *i. e.*, or had died. This is the interpretation given of sleep by many commentators of the thirtieth verse. It is indeed noticeable that in the New Dispensation as well as in the Old, first transgressions are severely punished. If the two witnesses spoken of in Rev. xi. 3 are the Ministry and Sacraments, we read that if any man wrong them "fire proceedeth out of their mouth." Ananias and Sapphira and Elymas and Simon Magnus and these Corinthians sinned against holy Persons and holy things and their punishment came.

Now what was the nature of the sin of the unworthy Corinthian communicants? So far as the Agape was concerned, it had been no love feast at all. Persons had brought, as in heathen times to their temples, their own provisions, and feasted on them apart or shared them with their own social circle to the neglect of others. The element of Christian fellowship, of brotherhood and charity among all, rich and poor, had been wanting. In eating every one had taken before other his own supper, and one was hungry and another drunken. "What!" says the Apostle in scorching rebuke; "have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the Church of God?" Then he turns to the other and far more serious matter, the profanation of the Blessed Sacrament. It was

“for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.” Let the punishment have been whatever it may have been, there is no question as to the sin they had committed. These are St. Paul’s words concerning it. “Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.” “He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or condemnation) to himself, not discerning the Lord’s Body.”

If our Lord’s Body was not present, St. Paul might have arraigned them, as he did above, for their want of reverence to the holy symbols. He might have censured them for not respecting the church building, or for their committing an offense against God’s condescension. He might have reproved them for their want of apprehension of the death of Christ of which the Sacrament was but a memorial. But no; their sin was of another and more heinous nature. They had received unworthily because they had “not discerned the Lord’s Body,” and receiving unworthily, had been “guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.” It was so grievous an offense, because it was an offense against Christ’s own Person. The Body and Blood are stated as the object against which the wrong has been committed. By not discerning the Lord’s Body, the unworthy communicant commits, St. Paul says, a personal offense. He is “guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.” It is a transgres-

sion like that in the civil law known as *Lesé Majesté*, a sin against majesty. In this case it is so terrible a degree of that crime in the Apostle's estimation, because it is a personal insult to Christ. This is St. Paul's account of the nature of their sin.

What is the natural inference? If the Lord's Body and Blood were not actually there by the act of consecration, then that special sin could not have been committed. If the elements are simply symbols or signs, with whatever irreverence they might be treated, it could not be called a sin against Christ's Person. Defacing the statue of a King may, in monarchical countries, be a treasonable action, but it is not of like enormity as a personal insult. The Arians tried to arouse the Emperor's anger by pointing to his statue whose face his enemies had disfigured. Passing his hand quietly over his face, Constantine soberly observed, "I do not feel anything." If the Lord Himself was not really present in the Eucharist and the elements were but symbols, He could not by the Corinthians have been personally wronged. He was indeed there, but because His Presence was so humbly veiled and hidden, He was not honored or discerned.

Alas! how often this is so now. Hidden, God is in nature. "Thou art a God that hidest Thyself." Hidden is He in His Providence, that guides us from the cradle to the grave. Hidden was His divine nature behind the garment of His humanity. Hidden is He in His operations of

grace in the soul, and hidden is He in the Blessed Sacrament of His Love. We stumble most at the greatness of God's condescensions and the miracles of His loving kindness. Therefore we fail to discover His Presence in the Blessed Sacrament and fail to give Him the honor that is His due. The same punishment indeed does not now ensue as broke out upon the guilty Corinthians. God speaks but once in punishment, that we may see how great the sin is, but He forbears in love that His mercy may win us to repentance.

We conclude then that the language of St. Paul, who is here the organ of the Holy Spirit, tells us that Christ's Body and Blood are really present, not by the act of reception, but by virtue of the Breaking and Blessing, and objectively so present, that the non-recognition with due reverence and faith is a grievous sin against that Body and Blood. O Blessed Jesus, forgive and spare us for our coldness, unbelief, and irreverence! We know not what we have done. Kindle within us, priests and laymen, a desire to make some worthy reparation for our neglect and that of our Church. May it be by more worshipful and better prepared receptions and by bearing witness by advancing holiness to Thy abiding Presence.

On the golden stairway reaching heavenward, Christ has left the footprints of His pierced Feet, and life is our one opportunity of doing that for Him which costs us something. What, dear Christian soul, shall it be?

VIII.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

HAVING considered our Lord's prophetic discourse delivered before His Ascension, on the great gift He was to bestow, and His revelation of it made subsequently to St. Paul, let us now turn to the Institution itself. It is recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, in almost identically the same words. It may be well to have the English texts before us. This is the record in chapter xxvi. 26-28 of St. Matthew :

“And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; This is My Body. 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.”

In St. Mark xiv. 22-24 we read :

“And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: This is My Body. And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And He said unto

them, This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many.”

In St. Luke xxii. 19, 20, the record runs thus: “And He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is My Body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of Me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which is shed for you.”

The accounts in St. Matthew and St. Mark are practically identical. The same may be said of that in St. Luke, but as he gives us some helpful and suggestive additions, we will first consider them. It is not necessary for us to enter into the disputed question whether Christ spoke the words of Institution over the third paschal cup—that of blessing—or not. St. Luke carefully discriminates between the cup of the paschal supper and that of the sacrament. This is clearly recorded:

“And He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come.”

This evidently was the cup of the paschal supper.

Our Lord says He will not drink of it. He will not drink till the type be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. He does away with the type and pro-

ceeds to its fulfilment. For St. Luke goes on to say that He took the cup *after supper* and pronounced the sacred words over it, saying, "This cup" (in contrast with the other) "is the New Testament or Covenant in My Blood." The former covenant was in the blood of animals. It was animal blood. The new covenant was in His blood. "And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, Behold the blood of the Covenant" (Ex. xxiv. 8). "He sprinkled all the people, saying, This is the blood of the Testament" (Heb. ix. 19, 20). The blood, we may observe, of the original paschal lamb, was sprinkled on the lintel and doorposts, and real lambs were slain at every yearly renewal of the great observance. Now Christ, the true Paschal Lamb, says, This is My Blood. My Blood is the Blood of the New Covenant. In both cases, under the old and new covenants, it is real blood. Under the Old Dispensation it could only be put on the houses or sprinkled upon the people. Now they could receive It into themselves.

We do not know in what way the saying in St. Matthew xxvi. 29 is best harmonized with this fuller account given by St. Luke. In St. Matthew, following the words of Institution, our Lord says: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's Kingdom." This general statement in St. Matthew may be interpreted by the more full and particular one in

St. Luke and so refer, as that in St. Luke, to the paschal supper and its cup. If so, this remark of our Lord^s has no bearing on the question of the Real Presence.

On the other hand, the difference in language ascribed to our Lord may show that the words do refer to two different things; one being the paschal cup, spoken of as the fruit of the vine, the other to the cup of the sacrament, spoken of as *This Fruit* of the Vine. Christ had, in His discourse that night to the disciples, declared Himself to be the true and real Vine. "This fruit of the Vine," would consequently signify His own Blood. And in His Father's Kingdom and at the marriage supper of the Lamb, Christ is said, by His mystical body the Church, to feed with His beloved on that that He imparts.

To the Twelve spake Truth eternal,
 To the branches spake the Vine:
 "Never more from this day forward
 Shall I taste again this wine,
 Till I drink it in the Kingdom
 Of My Father, and with Mine."

While we give both of the above interpretations of the verse in St. Matthew, we do not insist on either. The investigation we are pursuing does not require the acceptance of either exegesis. Our readers must make their own selection. It is possible to take the words in St. Matthew as referring to the consecrated chalice, yet be speaking of it as the fruit of the vine. We have, however, previously shown that to call the Sacrament bread or

wine after the consecration, does not imply that it is not Christ's Body and Blood, any more than calling the man whose eyes were opened, the blind man, proves Christ had not worked a miracle. This disposes of any objection to the Real Presence arising from the saying, I will not drink of this fruit of the vine.

Let us notice another peculiarity in St. Luke's record. He alone of the Evangelists records the words: "This do in remembrance of Me." St. Paul, from whom he probably learned them, also adds the words of the command given for the continuance of the Sacrament: "For thereby ye do show the Lord's death till He come." It is interesting to observe why these words "This do" are to be found in the gospel according to St. Luke. While it was the province of St. John in his gospel to set forth especially the Divinity of Christ, and that of St. Mark, His Manhood, St. Matthew does the same for the Kingdom and the King, while St. Luke is fuller of the temple and the priesthood and Christ as the victim and the priest. In conformity with this spirit that runs throughout his gospel, St. Luke records Christ's command to the Apostles, "This do in remembrance of Me." For the word which is here rendered "do," is the same word that in the Old Testament in a sacrificial connection is translated, "offer." Here we have our Lord as the High Priest after the order of Melchisedec with the mystical oblation of bread and wine. Here we have the breaking of the bread and the separate blessing of the cup, with

the sacrificial words, My Body and My Blood. Here, too, is the sacrificial term of Remembrance or Memorial to be made before God. Thus this expression which is connected with the idea of sacrifice and priest, is most fittingly recorded by St. Luke.

It will probably be helpful to some of our readers to give a further explanation of the word *remembrance*. The word *remembrance* means calling to mind of oneself or another. It had to Jewish ears a liturgical signification. It was associated with the blowing of trumpets over the sacrifices "that they be to you for a Memorial before God" (Num. x. 10). It was connected with the incense placed on the Shew Bread (Lev. xxiv. 7) "for a Memorial, an offering made by fire unto the Lord." It was the portion of the meat offering burned on the altar by the priest to bring the offerer into remembrance before God (Lev. vi. 15). "When therefore," says Bishop John Wordsworth, "our Lord said 'Do this for My Memorial,' He spoke words which fell certainly upon no unprepared or inattentive ears. Those who heard Him knew the sense of the Hebrew intuitively. They knew He did not mean 'Do (or offer) this to remind yourselves of Me,' but 'by this make a solemn commemoration of Me to God.'"

Our own Church puts this interpretation on the words of the Institution and incorporates them into her Communion service. "Wherefore O Lord and Heavenly Father, *according to the Institution* of Thy dearly beloved Son Our Saviour

Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the *Memorial* Thy Son hath commanded us to make." The words "This do" mean then, to make this as a Memorial of Me before God and also, as was commanded through St. Paul, "Show forth My death till I come."

And now notice the difference in our Lord's language in His discourse to the people, given in the sixth chapter of St. John and at the time of the Institution. When He was speaking to those who were to be His followers, He commanded them to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. They were to be receivers. Speaking to them in this their character of communicants He bade them eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. He said nothing to them about their making a Memorial of Him. He did not say to them, "This do." He said nothing to them about their remembering Him in any way. They were addressed as receivers of a gift. That is clearly His teaching.

But when He instituted the Sacrament, it must be observed, no laymen were present. There were no women and no laymen. He never said to any layman, "Do this in remembrance of Me." Save as sharers in the priesthood, and so participating in offering the sacrifice, these words cannot be quoted or claimed by them. No layman can say, in denial of the Real Presence, that our Lord bade us receive in remembrance of Him. In the first place He never uttered such words to anyone.

What He said to His Apostles, as His representatives, was, Do this as a Memorial of Me. What He said to all as receivers was, "My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed;" and "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood ye have no life in you."

We now come to the words of Institution. Our Lord knew of the struggle in the Apostles' minds when He had announced His doctrine and forced them to accept it or break with Him. Had any mistake been made, now was the time to correct it. If His words then did not necessarily imply His Real Presence in the Eucharist, now was the time to make manifest His true meaning. It would have been such a simple and easy thing to do. Surely He would not have left His Apostles and a greater part of the Church in grievous error, when it could so readily and lovingly have been avoided. But what did he do? In a manner most solemn and significant, after the type of the paschal supper with its religious accompaniments were over, our Lord, whose every action was instinct with divine meaning, prepares Himself for the celebration. "And supper being ended," or if as some think this be a mis-translation, at some point in it, "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His Hands, and that He was come from God, and went to God; He riseth from supper, and laid aside His garments; and took a towel, and girded Himself. After that He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet,

and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded."

He was hereby gathering the Apostles into union with His own priestly office as He had before united them by commission to His prophetic one, and would after His Resurrection with His kingly. This washing of their feet was part of the ceremony of their ordination, who were to break and bless the bread and offer the Memorial of Christ's Body and Blood. Very solemn and significant are the actions of Christ in laying aside His garments, symbolizing thereby His laying aside the glory He had with the Father before the world was, and the girding Himself with the towel of our human nature by His Incarnation. In most loving manner He washes the disciples' feet, and, symbolizing thereby the means of their inward purification, wipes them with the towel with which He is girded. We must not pause on the great liturgical prayer He uttered, as our great High Priest.

When we come to the Institution itself, the words are without ambiguity, or metaphor, or figure:

"Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake and gave it to His disciples, and said, Take, eat; THIS IS MY BODY. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

What, we may ask, could be more confirma-

tory of His former teaching, what more clear, what more absolutely affirmative? That which He takes in His hands He declares to be His Body. This, He says of the Cup, is My Blood. He is the Omnipotent God and all things exist by His power and are what the Lord declares them to be. He is the Truth itself and cannot err, neither can He deceive nor be deceived. He declares that which He designates, to be His Body and Blood.

While the vast majority of Churchmen from the earliest times have so held and found in it their greatest comfort and highest joy, there are some in these latter and darker days who have lost faith in Christ's objective Presence. They have not followed the traditions of the Church as Christ bade us to do, saying, "Hear the Church," but have been made the unconscious victims of the traditions of men. They have followed some great man, like Luther or Calvin or Wesley or Channing. They have made him their guide and master, which is what Christ forbade us to do. They have taken for granted the forced and manufactured arguments of those wise in their own wisdom, who have broken with the wisdom that speaks through the consent of the Church.

But with all love to those who oppose the ancient faith, let us fairly consider their argument. They admit that Christ says "This is My Body," but they reply the word "is" must sometimes be taken as meaning "represents"; so that all Christ meant was "This represents My Body."

We must, therefore, examine the alleged cases

where the word "is" has the sense of *represents*, and see if they are parallel to the case of the Institution. For we might reply, there are ten thousand more instances where the word "is" has its positive meaning, and why should the few cases it has not, govern our interpretation here? It will be at once admitted that it is not sufficient for our friends to find some cases where the word "is" may be taken as synonymous for meaning "represent," but the cases must be parallel to the one we are honestly seeking to interpret. We will make this clearer as we go on.

But first let us look at the cases cited. Here are most of them. "The seven good kine are seven years" (Gen. xii. 26, 27). "The ten horns are ten kingdoms" (Dan. vii. 24). "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the Kingdom; the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy is the devil; the reapers are the angels" (St. Matt. xiii. 38-39). "The Rock was Christ" (I. Cor. v. 4). "For these are the two covenants" (Gal. iv. 24).

Now in these instances it is granted the word "is" may be taken to mean *represent*. But then none of these cases are similar to that of the words of Institution, and so in no way affects its interpretation. They are all, as a child may see, explanations of visions, or an allegory, or a parable.

In Genesis the king has a vision of seven lean cattle and seven fat cattle. Joseph interprets the vision picture and says the seven good kine are seven years. The beast seen in the vision picture

in Daniel has ten horns, and the explanation is, that the ten horns are ten kingdoms. In St. Matthew our Lord gives us some word pictures or parables, and then points out what the things in them stand for, *i.e.*, the field is the world, the reapers are the angels. St. Paul declares that he is relating an allegory, and when he says the Rock was Christ, he is careful to explain that it was a spiritual rock whereof he spoke.

Now the difference between explaining an allegory or vision or parable, and the case in hand is obvious. If any one, for example, should point to a picture and say that is George Washington, it would be perfectly well understood that the speaker meant that it was a portrait of him. So when any word picture, by way of allegory, or parable, or vision is explained, the word "is" in the explanation means *represents*. The field in the parable is or represents the world. But except in these cases of parable, vision, or allegory, the word "is" has its ordinary signification, and connects the subject and predicate together by way of identity. It was on that solemn night that the Apostles said, "Now Thou speakest plainly and speakest no parable"; so when our Lord said, This is My Body, the phrase must be taken in its literal signification and must mean it is His Body.

Again, some have tried to explain away the plain meaning of our Lord's words by quoting such texts as these: "I am the Door," "I am the Vine." But these are not parallel constructions. Nor does the verb in either case signify *represent*.

Our Lord is not saying that He represents the Door or the Vine; nor that He is like a Door. Nor is He pointing to any particular door or vine, and saying, "It is I." But He is saying that He Himself, in His humanity, is the Way or the Door. He is the Door through which we must pass by partaking of that humanity. As it is written, "He has opened a new and living way through the veil, that is, His Flesh." Again He is saying, not that He represents a vine, or that a vine is like Himself, but that He is indeed the True Vine, and with His Humanity we must be united, that the life-giving sap of His Divine Nature may flow into us.

So also the very foolish attempt to parallel our Lord's words in the Institution by the phrase, "This is the Lord's passover," has ceased to deceive anyone. In the phrase, "This is the Lord's passover," the word *passover* may here mean the feast or day, as when we say, This is Easter, or it may by a common Jewish usage of speech mean the paschal lamb. In either case the word does not mean *represent*. We are, therefore, now obliged, all these futile objections the product of old controversy being swept away, to rest on the plain, literal meaning of Christ's words. He said, This is My Body and My Blood; and what He said must be true.

Before leaving the Institution, let us point to one further confirmatory argument. Our Lord did not, in the words used by Himself, compare together or contrast two things. He did not name

the two things of Bread and Wine. He carefully avoided this construction. He did not say this Bread is My Body, this Wine is My Blood. If He had done so, it had then been open to argument, that the word "is" might have had a representative signification. But our Lord did not do this. He took bread and the cup into His Hands and said, referring to that He so held and the cup contained, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood of the New Testament." In other words, *our Lord simply named that to which He referred.* The Greek, by the use of the neuter pronoun, makes this clear. He named each in turn, saying, This is My Body, this is My Blood. Now when Almighty God names anything, it is different from a man's doing so. All that we men can do when we name things is to classify them. We paste a label on them. We put them into a class. But when Almighty God names anything, it becomes what He names it. His word does not classify nor put things into a category, but it makes them what they are. So when He said, "This is My Body" and "This is My Blood," they became what His words declared them to be. The first test of man's obedience was given in the simple command, "Eat not." To eat was to die. He was to obey, though his reason could not fathom the mystery. The test of obedience to-day is given in the command to "Eat"; though the mystery be great, let us believe and eat and live.

We must here leave the matter with our readers, asking for them the Spirit's guidance, and for

ourselves their prayers. The chains of prejudice are hard to break. Our inherited traditions hold us as the Jews, in their iron grasp. The old are most unwilling to receive new truths. Few have the courage to achieve the freedom of faith. The spirit of the age is impatient of aught that requires acceptance of the supernatural. The fear of a dreaded Romanism warps the understanding. Party spirit is seemingly stronger with many than the Holy Spirit. The name of an advocate, however humble, is allowed to prejudice Christ's cause. Yet how can we brother Churchmen defend ourselves against the Unitarian if we reject the literal meaning of Christ's words? Christ says, This is My Body, and we explain it away, saying it only means This represents My Body. We turn to the Unitarian and quote to him the text, "The Word was God." And on our own lines of argument he replies, That does not mean that the Word was actually God and one with Him, but only that He represents Him. Consistency adds its strength to the argument for accepting the literal meaning of our Lord's words.

It is not only for the honor of our dear Lord we write, nor merely that His great act of love should be recognized. Our Church is just now under the lash of partisans like a troubled sea. The peril is that good men of all sides do not understand and trust each other. If a wider acceptance of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist could obtain among us, the waves of this controversial sea would subside in obedience to

Christ's word of Peace. The disputes over Ritual would dwindle into small and manageable quantities. Not that one party would triumph over another, but all would be willing that our Lord's Presence should be honored by a reverent ritual, while but very few would desire an excess which would take from the honor due Him by an attention attracted to itself.

If this great central truth of Christ's Presence were more widely and practically accepted, it would be the rallying point of the devout and earnest minded. Christ with us could unite us. The differences which seem like widening gaps between us would be considered of less importance in contrast with the great vital bond of faith in the Eucharist which would bind us together.

If the belief that our Lord is really present filled our hearts, how would not our churches be full again with devoted worshippers! Can we overestimate, either, the development of the spiritual life that would ensue? For as of old the prophet stretched himself on the body of the dead child, and put his hands on the child's hands and his feet on the child's feet, so does our Blessed Lord come in contact with our bodies, souls, and spirits. The virtues in Him as we open our minds and hearts by faith and love, pass into us. We are no longer striving to copy Him, but He is in us, extending the virtues of His own life. The meekness, humility, unselfishness, faith, fortitude, zeal of Christ, is extended into the lives of those who

believe in His Presence in the Sacrament, and make room for Him in their hearts.

“O Jesu, pierced for love of me,
How can this poor heart grateful be?
Would that my burning heart might be
Even as is Thy love to me.

“I cannot love Thee as I would
Yet pardon me, O highest Good ;
My life and all I call mine own
I lay before Thine Altar-throne.”



