

assumes as taken for granted; that in the Lord's Supper all the communicants had fellowship together.

"One of the grand expedients by which not a few attempt to quiet their consciences, and to vindicate their conduct in eating the Lord's Supper with visible unbelievers, is to maintain that they have nothing to do with fellow-partakers—that they have to do with God *only*, it being a transaction *entirely* between God and the soul!! This sentiment is found so very convenient, that even public teachers have employed it to quiet the minds of Christ's disciples, when they begin to question the lawfulness of being yoked together in fellowship with unbelievers! The parable of the tares among the wheat, Matt. xiii. 24–31, compare vs. 36–44, has been also wrested, and pressed into this service. It has been employed to teach the disciples of Christ, that it is the will of their Lord that the holy and profane should be united together in religious society, till he comes at last to separate them.* But if, in eating the Lord's Supper, Christians have nothing to do with fellow worshippers, why were the Corinthians reprov'd and punished for eating it *in parties*?—why were they commanded to tarry one for another?—why should we not administer it in public to each individual separately, and in private to the sick and the dying?—why should not the Christian edify himself by eating it in his closet? To these questions no answer can be given, except that it is an institution *entirely social*—a fellowship, that it is not intended for individuals, as such, but for associated bodies. But did the Lord intend that the holy and the profane—his friends and his enemies, should hold fellowship together in this feast of love? Certainly not! The Christian's mind revolts from the idea! What disciple would not shrink with horror from the thought of *holding fellowship* with the open enemies of his Lord in the sacred institution of the Supper! Yet the distinction between joining with the ungodly at the table of the Lord, and having fellowship with them, is of their own, not of God's making! If there be any meaning in the passage under review,—if there be any conclusiveness in the Apostle's reasoning, we hold fellowship with those with whom we eat the Lord's Supper, with those with whom we are associated in church fellowship. It may be thought, however, a matter of complete indifference, to have fellowship, even with unbelievers, in eating a little bread and tasting a little wine. And no doubt, apart from the nature and design of the fellowship, it is so. But it is not fellowship in a common meal. It is the fellowship of the body and blood of the Lord. It is by Christ's appointment, a visible symbolical representation, and on the part of communicants a public declaration of their fellowship together in all the blessings of Redemption by his death. Hence it followed, that when any of the Christians in Corinth went to feast with idolaters in the Idol's Temple, they by their conduct declared, that they had fellowship with them in the participation of those blessings, supposed to be derived from the Idol, through the medium of the sacrifices on which they

* Any one who will take the Redeemer's explanation of his own language will see, that this parable was not intended to prohibit the separation of believers from the world in church fellowship. The field is the world as such, and not the church as distinct from the world. The prohibition refers to the well-known practice of rooting heretics out of the world, in place of simply putting them away from the church. In this view of the subject, the history of the church shews the vast importance of the prohibition. I would ask the reader if he thinks it possible, that Paul, when he says, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person," meant to overturn the precept of his Lord, when he says, "Let both grow together until harvest."