

kernel of the Apostle's argument. If we are to represent this *εστιν* represents, or symbolizes, the argument is made void." The other text is: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning [*διακρίνων*, literally discriminating] the Lord's body." This text, which asserts the participation even of the unbelieving and unworthy, is the seal and capstone of all the other passages. Stronger phraseology language could not employ to show that the Lord's Supper was not considered by the apostles to be mere bread and wine, and that he who partook of them received nothing else. But so positively did they consider that the objective elements were the true body and blood of Christ, that the communicant, even entirely apart from his spiritual state, could not but receive them.

Another argument for the literal interpretation arises from the *purpose* Christ manifestly had in view, viz., to establish a great Christian ordinance, taking the place in the Christian Church of the Passover in the Jewish Church. This is evident from the declaration: "This is my blood of the New Testament" (Mark iv. 24). The Lord's Supper was to be the great visible rite or seal of the new covenant established in the Son of God. So Paul says of it: "Christ our Passover (*πασχα*, i.e., paschal lamb) is sacrificed for us." Now, Paul argues in Hebrews that the Old Testament rites were a "shadow" of which the New were to be the substance." But if in the Old Covenant the paschal lamb was really present and eaten in the Jewish Passover, would not the sacrificial lamb in the Christian Passover be really present and partaken of likewise? If the type was real, would the thing which is typified be but figurative? If the "shadow" was a true lamb, would the "substance" be but the semblance of one? This would be to make the sign greater than the thing signified, and the shadow greater than the substance. If this sacrament, then, be the Christian Passover, it must have a veritable Paschal Lamb; and if it be a "supper" indeed, it must feed the soul upon something more than empty pictures and signs. So much for the Scriptural words of institution and their significance to the inspired epistles.

Now, let us see their meaning as *interpreted by the historic Church of Christ*. Upon this point there can be no question. IGNATIUS says: "The Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ." JUSTIN MARTYR: "The food over which the Eucharistic prayer has been made is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus." IRENEUS: "When the mingled cup and the broken bread receive the words of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ." AMBROSE: "We, receiving of one bread and of one cup, are receivers and partakers of the body of the Lord." CHRYSOSTOM: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" JEROME: "Is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? As the Saviour himself saith: 'He who eateth My flesh and drinketh My