

confuse the whole system of Scripture, and resolve all its truths and doctrines into tropes, metaphors, and visionary ideas. Now, while our Lord did often speak in parables, there is not the slightest ground to believe that He did so here. "To suppose that at such a holy time as this He spoke in metaphor is contrary to the solemnity of the occasion, the meaning of the institution, and the short, precise phrases employed."\* That our Lord did not mean by *ἐστί*, is, but represents, is argued from such symbolical sayings as "I am the door," "vine," "light," etc. But in regard to these illustrations Dr. Schaff makes the sensible admission that the figure lies here (not in the copula is, but in the predicate). Christ *is* really—not in a literal and physical, but in a higher spiritual sense—the rock of ages, the lamb of God, the bread of eternal life."† But there cannot possibly be any metaphor here in the predicates body and blood, as there is nothing that they could symbolize. Moreover a type should have some correspondence or fitness for that which it typifies; but bread and wine are the last symbols one would select as the types of a crucified body. All the members of the sentences of institution are real, and indicate a real transaction. The body is that "given," "broken," for you, viz., the real body that hung upon the cross. The blood is that which is "shed," viz., that poured out on the cross. The eating and drinking are certainly not meant to be symbolical. Why should the rest be? The Friends here are logical, who, interpreting one part as figurative, view the whole transaction as such, and consequently decline the outward observance of the supper. Everything, then, points to the natural interpretation, viz., that "is" means is, and not represents. The command "This do in remembrance of me" refers only to the perpetual celebration of the sacrament as a memorial, but not to the objective character of the sacrament itself. That had been constituted by the preceding words of institution.

St. Paul has left us two invaluable passages attesting his view as to whether our Lord's words were to be taken in a literal or symbolical sense, and as to whether the Lord's Supper was a veritable feast of Divine grace, or but a mere memorial. The one runs: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16). Here the figurative interpretation is distinctly repudiated in precise terms, and the supper is declared a *κοινωνία* "communion," or, more literally, as the revised version has it in the margin, and as Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Bishop's Bible rendered it, "participation in" the body and blood of Christ. The critical Greek scholar Alford, commenting on this passage, says: "*κοινωνία*, the participation of the body and blood of Christ, the strong literal sense must here be held fast, as constituting the very

\* "Lord's Supper," Von Burger, Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, vol. ii., p. 1345.

† Lange's Commentary on Matt. xxvi. 26, p. 471.