

for it in our churches, and receive a general idea of its purpose and origin before we are old enough to read intelligently the accounts in the Gospels. The ordinance has always been thus administered. This is the account which we all have received from our fathers, and they from theirs; and it must, therefore, be true.

Could we, if we had never before heard of the Lord's Supper, or seen it administered, be induced by any assurances to believe that we had known and participated in such an ordinance, and had been familiar with it from our childhood? And is it more probable that our ancestors, two or ten generations since, were thus deceived? — that they could be made to believe that an altar which was raised in their very sight was a time-honored memorial-altar which they had known from infancy? At what time was this mighty fraud effected? History answers not. There is no trace in her records of any period, since the time of Christ, when an attempt was made to introduce, or to revive, the observance of the Supper. That observance, therefore, we conclude, has been held continually in the Christian Church, from the days of its Divine founder.

But could such an institution have been fraudulently introduced at a period soon after the death of the Saviour? Could the Christian community, ten or twenty years after that event, have been persuaded that their Master in a solemn manner instituted this rite, if they had never heard of it before? Or, to go back the single step that remains, could one of the Apostles have persuaded the rest that their Master had, in the presence of them all, established such an ordinance, when they had no remembrance of such a scene? If not, the conclusion irresistibly follows,