

tuted by our Lord immediately before his crucifixion, and designed to commemorate that *atoning* death by which he achieved the redemption of the world, of less importance and significance than the rite of Baptism? Let it be remembered, that the Eucharist was not only appointed by our Saviour, during the time of his sojourn upon earth, but was made the subject of a special and immediate revelation by him to the Apostle of the Gentiles, after his ascension. "For," says Paul, "I have received of the Lord" that which I also 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.*" 1 Cor. xi: 23, 24.

Now it is worthy of remark, that the *circumstances* of the first celebration of this commemorative Institute, are detailed in the gospel with a *minuteness*, to which there is not *the most distant approximation* in any recorded case of the administration of Baptism. When our Lord instituted and kept the feast with his Disciples,—they were in an *upper* room,—it was *night*,—they kept it with *unleavened* bread, for the houses of the Jews furnished no other at the time of the passover,—they drank the wine of *Palestine*,—and *reclined* upon *couches*, or *tricliniums*, according to the oriental custom.

If then—admitting for a moment that baptism was originally practiced by immersion—the principle for which our Baptist brethren so strenuously contend in relation to the initiatory rite of Christianity is a just one, why do they not recognize it as equally imperious in its application to the Lord's Supper?—"I ask now," says Prof. Stuart, "all the advocates for the *literal* sense of BAPTIZO, who urge upon the churches the original *mode* of this rite, why they do not urge upon them, in the same manner, and for the same reason, the *literal* doing of what Christ commanded, as to the sacrament? Is that ordinance, which is a symbol of the blood of Jesus shed for the remission of sins—of that blood which taketh away sin, and without which there is no salvation—is that ordinance of less significance and importance than the rite of Baptism? This cannot be pretended. Why then do you not plead for its celebration by night; and this too in a reclining posture, in an upper chamber, with unleavened bread, with the dress, furniture, and attendance that originally were exhibited? You regard not one of all these circumstances; not even a single one. How then do you obey the command of Jesus, *This do in remembrance*