

gymnastic antics, such as is peculiar to their species, but all to no avail, they quarrelled and they still quarrelled.

At last, however, they formulated a plan on which they could all agree; and that was that they should all go to school and study history, philosophy theology, and everything else that would enable them to pull to pieces and then reconstruct the book so as to offer to the public a Bible which all the brotherhood could indorse, and which would be a credit to the literary world of the twentieth century.

After a number of years of study, many of them became eminent as scholars, and quite a few of them received the degrees of D. D. and Ph. D. The time had now arrived for them to make their appearance before the public as 'The Reformers of the Christian religion.' They were fully prepared; in fact, they were quite anxious to make an impression.

They set to work in real earnest. They erected for themselves a very high and broad platform upon which they all climbed and took their seats, and they began to put on many airs. Then, one of the most dignified, a sage of twenty-nine years next birthday, who was chosen as the mouth-piece of the Brotherhood, said: "O ye vast world of Bible-students and philosophers; know ye that, from this time forth and forever, we, the great scholars and profound thinkers, are to be known and recognized as the 'Higher Critics'; and the rest of the Brotherhood said, 'Amen, so mote it be'."

After studying Paulus and Strauss and Baur and Renan and Ingersoll, these higher critics began to write many books and papers; they also gave lectures entitled "The New Apologetic." In these books, papers and lectures they asked many profound questions, but they never answered one.

As years rolled by these great scholars became more dignified. One day, while they were giving orations before the ministers of all denominations, they made, what they called, a very modest and reasonable request; it was that the sun and the moon and the earth should stand still; and that there should be no more gospel preaching, and no more Bible reading, and no more divine worship until they, the great scholars and profound thinkers, had given to the world a Bible that would be a credit to the wise and prudent.

The Christian world waited patiently and long. And, though men and women were sick and dying, there was no voice from the high and mighty platform. The millions were now growing impatient and restless; their souls were hungering after spiritual food, but the critics had none for them.

Suddenly, there was a great cry which sounded throughout the length and the breadth of the land; it came from the hearts of human beings, asking for and demanding the wonderful Bible which was promised by the great scholars and profound thinkers. So great was the cry that it actually reached the ears of the Brotherhood and made them tremble. Then they began to realize that something must be done; so they appointed a meeting to discuss the matter.

At that meeting, one of the members a doctor of science, said that he had a plan which, if carried out would settle the whole question. He had studied the art of photography. He had moreover invented a camera by which he had thrown the whole contents of the Bible on a plain surface, so that everything in it could be seen at a single glance. He had a number of proofs already. "To make this Bible perfect," he said, "it must be put through the scientific process of retouching." To do this satisfactorily to the Brotherhood, he proposed that each member should take one and study it carefully and then mark the passages or subjects that he wanted to be erased.

This pleased the Brotherhood immensely. They then began to study the old books on Pantheism and Materialism, and Rationalism and Positivism and many other isms. They also consulted the Gnostics, the Sabellians, the Socinians, the Arians, and a host of other higher critics of the old and defunct schools. In the course of a few more years they finished marking their proofs and sent them in to the artist to guide him in the retouching process.

The long-looked-for day came at last. There was a great sounding of trumpets. Millions of people had gathered. There were telegraph agents standing, ready to wire the glad tidings to the uttermost parts of the earth. On the high and broad platform, where the dignified Brotherhood were seated, there was a large camera such as had never been seen before. The artist had just finished his work of retouching. The great Bible-picture which was veiled with needlework of gold, was placed where all could see it. The Brotherhood had not seen it as yet, but they were quite sure that it would be a great success.

"This," said their leader, "is the day which has been set apart for the unveiling of the greatest piece of literary work that has ever been placed before the eyes of human beings! This day will witness the rising of a sun that will never set. The Bible, which is now to appear before your eyes, is absolutely perfect. All that was obnoxious to the up-to-date scholars has been taken away by the

scientific process of retouching. Our great and learned Brotherhood, who are very broad and liberal in their views, have questioned, the Creation, the 'Origin of man,' 'Divine Inspiration,' the 'Divinity of Christ' and 'Bible Miracles.' They have also questioned the doctrines of 'the Atonement,' 'Regeneration,' 'Future Punishment' and many others too numerous to mention, therefore they have been wisely removed."

"This newly revised Bible will be a foundation upon which a great universal church may be built; a religion that will satisfy all the great scholars of the earth." At this stage of the ceremony the speaker touched a bell which was the signal for the unveiling of the great Bible of the twentieth century. "Behold! behold!" cried the proud speaker, "the wonder of the ages!"

There was a moment of breathless silence. The veil was drawn aside. But something had happened. There was a murmur of disappointment which sounded like the rolling of distant thunder. There were hisses and groans; then followed loud threats. The higher critics came forward and looked at the photograph, then turned deathly pale. There was no Bible—the retouching process had taken every word out of it—all that was left of it were the covers. This was more than the people's patience could bear. The Christians had been outrageously duped. They would have no more of such tom foolery. The exasperated millions moved forward. It was as the su-ging of mighty billows. The massive framework of the high and broad platform could not stand against it; it swayed to and fro and then down it came with a fearful crash.

What became of the renowned monkey-men is not known. Some writers tell us that they fled to the forests. Many hunters have scoured the thickest of the woods but as yet no traces of them have been discovered.

At the conclusion of this lecture, a committee, appointed by the governors of the college, presented the lecturer with the degree of 'D. Lit.' for the splendid addition which he had made to church history. Dr. Orthodox, in a few suitable words, thanked them, and then, amidst great applause from the delighted audience, bowed himself off the platform. I joined in with the cheering and then I awoke shouting "Long live Dr. Orthodox!"

New Canada, Lun. Co., N. S.

## The Eucharist.

When Jesus instituted what to us is known as the Lord's Supper, he "took bread and blessed it"; he "took a cup and gave thanks." So both Matthew and Mark. According to Luke he "gave thanks" over both the bread and the cup. For this reason—because the thanksgiving was so prominent a part of the institution in each case—what we are accustomed to call the Lord's Supper was by the early Christians called "the Eucharist." Happy were it for us all, today, if the ancient custom were continued. As it is, we are confused in our thinking as well as in our practice. Once only (1 Cor. xi. 23) is it called "the Lord's Supper," and nowhere is the ordinance, as a whole, denominated "the communion." And yet, nine-tenths of the Christian world is accustomed to speak of the ordinance as "the communion," and the other tenth is as much accustomed to call it "the Lord's Supper."

The language of Matthew, literally rendered, is: "And they eating, Jesus, taking bread and blessing, brake and giving to the disciples, said: 'Take, eat; this is my body.' And taking a cup and giving thanks, he gave to them saying, 'Drink ye all of it.'" Evidently meaning that all were to drink of the one cup. In Mark (xiv. 22, 23) it is said: "And they eating, taking bread, blessing, he brake and gave to them, and said: 'Take, this is my body.' And taking a cup, giving thanks, he gave to them, and all drank of it." In Luke (xxii. 19, 20) it is said: "And taking bread, giving thanks, he brake and gave to them saying, 'This is my body given in behalf of you; this do in my remembrance.'" And in like manner the cup, after having supped, saying: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood that poured out in behalf of you." Thus it is made evident that, though Jesus, as was his wont in eating, pronounced a blessing upon that which he ate, or which he gave to others, the chief thought in the institution of the ordinance under consideration was thanksgiving. The blessing was pronounced at the breaking of the bread, but thanksgiving was the feature of the passing of the cup. The word in the Greek signifying thanks, or thanksgiving, is "eucharistia"; and so the common usage of the early Christians was to designate the ordinance as "the eucharist."

The occasion of the institution of the eucharist was the passover "supper," a feast observed in the night, and therefore called a supper rather than a dinner. So in 1 Cor. xi. 20, it is evident that the phrase, "supper of the Lord," has reference to that which was subsequently known as "the eucharist." In 1 Cor. x. 16, we find another word used, but not to designate the observance as a whole, but each particular part of it. The bread is "the communion of the body of Christ," and the cup is "the communion of the blood of Christ." The word "koinonia," translated "communion," means a fellowship, and a mutual participation, a common interest; and as there used, it means that one partaking of the bread in the eucharist was a participant in the body of Christ, while

he who partook of the cup was a participant in the blood of Christ. It was not one communion, but two communions, and, if the word "communion" is to be used at all, it should be in the plural number, and the ordinance should be called "the communions," rather than "the communion."

In the third and fourth centuries the word "koinonia," communion, was used, but usually in the phrase "koinonia misterion," communion of the mysteries, or the mysteries of the assembly. Justin Martyr tells us that, in his time (the latter part of the second century), he who presided at the observance of the ordinance offered prayers and thanksgiving, "And after the president has given thanks and the people responded, those who are called among us deacons give to each of those who are present to partake of the bread and wine and water over which thanks have been given, and carry them to those not present. And this meal is called by us the 'eucharistia,' of which none is permitted to partake, except one who believes that the things taught by us are true, and who has passed through the washing for the remission of sins and new birth, and so lives as Christ commanded." And that famous book, "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," tells us that no one is to receive the eucharist except those who have been baptized.

From the account of the eucharist as given in the gospels these things become evident, namely: First, it was a common participation. It was not given to one man alone, but to the "disciples" as a body. True, there were other devout followers of Jesus within a few miles of the place, where the ordinance was instituted, and yet only eleven partook at the hands of their Master. Second, one loaf of bread and one cup sufficed for all who were present. There were only twelve of them, at most, and the loaf was not large. It was the hard, unleavened cracker, or "loaf," which had been provided for the passover. The word "artos" sometimes meant loaf, but at other times, and more commonly, it signified bread, without respect to its form or amount. The use of the word does not compel us to use only one loaf, when a hundred, or two hundred, or a thousand people are to participate. So the use of one cup does not compel the use of only one when a great many people are to be served. But no more does the language used justify us in seeking to avoid contact the one with the other, or to avoid partaking from the same loaf, or the same cup from which another has partaken. The fact that the eucharist is a social institution forbids us to seek an individual loaf or an individual cup. Convenience is one thing, but sedulous effort to avoid contact is another thing. Third, the eucharist is not in itself a communion. The idea most prominent in it is not expressed in the word "communion." That is incidental, rather than prominent. The communion is not so much one participating with another as each with his Lord. The bread is "the communion of the body of Christ"; the cup "the communion of the blood of Christ." Fourth, the idea of thanksgiving is most prominent in the administration of the ordinance. Blessing (eulogizing) to be sure, is mentioned, but always in connection with the bread, while in each case thanksgiving is associated with the administration of the cup. Fifth, the word "wine" is in no case used as indicating the passover feast; but it is remarkable that it is not so called in any account of the eucharist. It is always "the cup" or "a cup." And this suggests the impropriety of the mention of wine in connection with the administration of the ordinance. The cup, not the wine, is made prominent both in the gospels and in Corinthians, where the eucharist is spoken of and described. We do not here raise the question as to the quality of the wine or of the contents of the cup. It was certainly "the fruit of the vine," but whether it was fermented or not is not here discussed. It seems quite certain, however, that, so long as the fruit of the vine is used, whether pure or diluted with water, it fulfills all that is required in the observance of the eucharist.

The writer ventures to express the opinion that a good deal of improvement is possible in the manner of administering the eucharist. The usual slipshod method is not conducive to the best effect in the hearts of the participants.—Ex.

\*\*\*

To work fearlessly, to follow earnestly after truth, to rest with a childlike confidence in God's guidance, to leave one's lot willingly and heartily to him—this is my sermon to myself. If we could live more in sight of heaven, we should care less for the turmoil of earth.—From the Letters of John Richard Green.

It is curious, if it were not so sad, to notice how many years of fruitful youth we spend less in learning than in wondering why we are compelled to learn.—Dinah Mulock Craik

Make use of time, if thou valuest eternity. Yesterday can not be recalled; to-morrow can not be assured.—Jeremy Taylor.

Life creeps because its hinges grate on self.

He who is taken up with the King's business has no time to meddle with his neighbor's.