

*„If any one will to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.”*

John 7.17

---

The Will of the Lord in  
**THE LORD'S SUPPER**

---

- Booklet IV -

*„By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep His Commandments.”* 1 John 5.2

---

## **Content:**

### **1. Part I – Overview**

### **2. Part II – More details**

*A compilation of leaflets from the beginning of the last century*

- a. LEAVEN OR UNLEAVEN – WHICH SHOULD IT BE?
- b. HAVING CONFIDENCE IN THY OBEDIENCE ... – PHLM.21
- c. OF WHAT IS LEAVENED BREAD A PICTURE?
- d. A PLEA FOR CHRIST’S „THIS”
- e. ONE CUP, OR MANY.
- f. A PARALLEL
- g. THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME
- h. IF CHRIST HAD USED LEAVENED BREAD
- i. THE LORD’S SUPPER

---

Order Forms and further literature on this deeply important subject, including “The Wine in John 2.” gladly sent to exercised believers for personal perusal, and passing on to God’s glory, as He enables.

**„Ye are My friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.”**

John 15.14

# **The Lord's Supper**

This ordinance is precious to all true children of God. It is not merely a last request of our blessed Lord for He gave commandment when He said, „This do, in remembrance of Me.“ The mode of expression is very different from that of the Old Testament „Thou shalt“ but the words „with a view to My remembrance“ indicate how He values such remembrance by His people.

Nowadays it seems that the symbols of His appointment have been forsaken by many. Some have brought in a priestly administration which has no foundation in Scripture. Others profess the changing of the symbols into the actual body and blood of Christ.

After much exercise these thoughts are expressed in the hope that some may recognize the difference between their practice and the true pattern of this, the Lord's supper, as found in Scripture, and be led to loving obedience to the commandment of the Lord.

## ***Who should partake of the Lord's Supper?***

Acts 2.41,42 gives us the order when the church was established under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and from which we conclude that partakers should be true believers, baptized, holding the apostles' doctrine, and in fellowship — participating in the ministry and witness of the church.

In cases where one is conscious of having sinned it should be noted that 1 Cor. 11.28 says: „but let a man so examine himself, *and so let him eat.*“ Self examination should lead to confession and contrition and restoration so that one may not be hindered from carrying out the Lord's appointment. 1 Cor. 11.29 certainly

puts the responsibility on the one who partakes, but v. 32 makes it clear that this passage regards all partakers as being believers.

## ***The Bread***

The use of leavened bread at the Lord's Supper is without Scriptural authority and is indeed contrary to both the Scriptural pattern at the institution of the supper and also the typology of leaven.

Consider the PATTERN. In Matthew, Marc and Luke the Lord's Supper reference is made to the days of unleavened bread. At the institution of this supper there is no doubt that our Lord used unleavened bread. The Lord did not say „bread is My body.“ He said, „*This* is My body.“ „*This* do.“ By so saying He only gave authority to use the same thing as He used and we have no right to use the opposite. (The actual constituents are not in question, whether of wheat, barley or rye, etc., but only the absence of leaven.) The term „unleavened bread“ is literally „unleavened things.“ The New Testament word „bread“ is not there in the Greek, so that while other things were on the table, we know that nothing leavened was there. In 1 Cor. 11, vs. 23-28, the root word for bread is used. Nevertheless Paul was inspired to write that it was „in the night in which He was betrayed“ that He „took bread“ and said „This is My body . . . This do.“ Paul was not given a revelation to establish a new practice, it was what took place „in that night“ that was revealed to him.

Consider the TYPE. Leaven is a type of sin and is forbidden in the offerings which typify Christ. Leavened bread is typical of those in whom sin has worked but has been checked by the Holy Spirit (Lev. 23,17). Our Lord could not have said of leavened bread, „This is (a type of ) My body.“ Unleavened bread is just as essential to show the Lord's sinlessness inwardly as the lamb without blemish was to show it outwardly.

The Lord instituted this ordinance „with a view to“ His remembrance. Thus the symbols are intended to be a help to His remembrance. Those who say, „We are not occupied with the symbols, but with the Lord“ must indeed shut their eyes to the

symbols, for leavened bread and fermented wine could not help to the remembrance of His sinless body and shed blood. If a mother gave her son a portrait of herself saying, „Take this in remembrance of me,“ how would she feel if she later found that he had displaced her portrait with that of a base woman. Similarly is not leavened bread an insult to Him, Whose body was given as an offering for sin on our behalf?

## ***The Cup***

This term is obviously used for the contents and in the three Gospel records of the institution of the Lord's Supper is associated with „the fruit of the vine.“ This unusual term is significant as our Lord elsewhere spoke of „new wine“ and „old wine“, the former being unfermented, or at least relatively so.

Ferment is of the same nature as leaven, and the prohibition of the law for the days of „unleavened things“ would cover this as well. Ferment is not contained in the sound grape. It enters from the air after the grape has been crushed. Methods of storing the „fruit of the vine“ to prevent fermentation were known and used by the Jews at that time. The word „wine“, though often used in hymns, is never used in the Scriptures concerning the Lord's Supper. Leaven and ferment are both typical of sin. Our Lord said, „I am the true vine,“ John 15.1. The fruit of the vine is the juice of the grape without ferment. Is it proper to introduce that which is a type of sin into that which is intended to represent His sinless body and His shed blood?

## ***The Time***

Where mention of the time of the day is made in the Scriptures it is evening (refer the Gospels, Acts 20, 1 Cor. 11). In the latter we not only have „in the night in which He was betrayed,“ it is also called „the Lord's Supper.“ The Greek word for supper is used of the late meal of the day. It is distinguished from the „dinner“ or earlier meal. Thus the name given by the Holy Spirit witnesses against the morning practice for Breaking of Bread.

The alteration was made by Romanism and Protestantism has perpetuated it.

In many places it has been found more convenient to hold a „Sunday School“ in the morning than in the afternoon. Opportunities for witnessing to the unsaved are much better in the daytime, viz., at beaches and pleasure resorts, visiting the sick, institutional and door-to-door personal work. It is a frequent lament that we are unable to get the unsaved in to our Gospel meetings at night. Would it not be more Scriptural and practical to go out in service during the daytime and worship in the evening at the Lord’s Supper followed possibly by ministry to believers?

### ***Ministry of the Word***

There is nothing in Scripture to encourage the practice of ministry before the breaking of bread. In John the order is clearly the supper first and the ministry following (Chs. 13-16). In 1 Cor., chs. 11-14 the order is the same. But at Troas (Acts 20) „when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached . . .“ and the unhappy conclusion caused by Eutychus falling from the window suggests the Lord’s disapproval.

The Lord said, „This do with a view to My remembrance,“ and as this is the purpose of the gathering, the partaking of the symbols should have first place followed by ministry as the Spirit of God leads. Although the symbols intentionally set forth the offering of the Lord’s body and blood, He did not say, „Do this with a view to the remembrance of My death,“ but „with a view to the remembrance of Me.“ While there should be a prominence given to His sufferings other aspects of His glory should be before us. His precreation glory, His „emptying“ of Himself, His devotion to His Father, His walk on earth, all enhance His vicarious death. His resurrection and ascension and His coming again attest the Father’s acceptance and delight in His glorious atoning death, and are part of our worshipful remembrance of Him before the Father.

## ***Some Objections Considered***

***„That the Lord used the common food and drink of His day and we should do likewise.“*** This is incorrect since unleavened bread was not the usual food but special food for a special feast, the Passover. „The fruit of the vine“ was different from the wine which was the common drink of the people, and the term is used only in passages referring to the Lord’s Supper. If we substituted the commonest food of our day possibly it would be tea and toast, but surely plain bread and wine does not constitute the common food of Christians today.

***„That unleavened bread and the fruit of the vine was used because nothing else was available at the time.“*** Precisely so. In the purposes of God His death coincided with the Passover celebrations. Leavened bread and fermented wine could not represent His sinless body and shed blood.

***„That if we were intended to use exactly what our Lord used we should also need to partake whilst reclining on couches in an upper room in Jerusalem.“*** This is ridiculously impracticable. Our Lord did not state the position of our bodies or the place in which we should celebrate the Lord’s Supper, but emphasized what He was doing, breaking bread and drinking of the cup. „This do,“ He said, not „in this place“ or „in this position.“ The Scriptures give ample evidence that the Supper was not only celebrated in Jerusalem but in Corinth and at Troas. Unleavened bread is not impracticable, it is more easily baked than the leavened. Unfermented grape-juice likewise is readily obtainable either bottled or from the freshly pressed grapes.

***„That unleavened bread is not specifically stated in the Gospel records or in 1 Cor. 11.“*** While this is so it must not be inferred that the word for leavened bread is used. „Artos“, the root word for bread is used but from the context in the Gospels the „artos“ was unleavened. The Greek word „azumos“ translated „unleavened bread“ means really „an unleavened thing“ (Young’s Concordance) and the „artos“ indicates that bread was what our Lord referred to. If the word „azumos“ had been used here there might have been some doubt as to what our Lord actually used, as

it would then read, „Jesus took an unleavened thing, and blessed and brake ...“ In 1 Cor. 11, the emphasis on *this* „artos“ vs.- 26, 27, 28, would suggest that He referred to the unleavened artos which our Lord used, „the same night in which He was betrayed.“

***„That the use of unleavened symbols at the breaking of bread is introducing ritual into what is intended to be a simple remembrance feast.“*** Reference to any dictionary as to the meaning of „ritual“ would surely make it clear that the use of leavened symbols is just as much a ritual as the use of unleavened. Baptisms and celebrations of the Lord’s Supper are Scriptural rituals.

***„That leaven was actually ordered in the feast of wave-loaves, Lev. 23.17.“*** One might emphasize that this is the only feast in which leaven is used. It should be observed that both the sheaf of first fruits and the wave-loaves are „waved“ before the Lord as they represent believers. Only that which typifies the Lord Jesus Christ could be offered upon the altar. The sheaf typifies the church in resurrection, quickened, and seated together in Christ, Eph. 2.5-7. The two wave-loaves typify the church on earth composed of Jews and Gentiles, and in actual experience sin is still present. The two wave-loaves certainly do not represent Christ as evil never permeated His blessed person (and for the same reason they do not represent the Holy Spirit). It is unsound to justify the use of leaven by reference to this one feast which typifies believers and is in no way identified with the Lord’s Supper in which the bread is (a sign, type or) a memorial of Him. The Passover (in which leaven was strictly forbidden) was the memorial feast of the Old Testament. The Lord’s Supper (with unleavened symbols) is the Remembrance Feast of the New Testament.

***„That the use of unleavened bread puts a Christian under the law.“*** This is false. The evidence for the use of unleavened bread is contained only in the New Testament. We would not accuse the early brethren of the last century of „putting us under the law“ because they insisted on our present mode of gathering for Scriptural reasons. Why should believers be considered legalistic who use unleavened symbols because of their desire to practice the

Scriptural pattern for the Remembrance Feast. *We do not compel* others to do this but would appeal for a return to the pattern.

***„That, ordinary leavened bread is not prohibited for believers now.“*** We must not justify the use of leaven simply because it is not forbidden. Some might say, „Infant sprinkling is not forbidden.“ Why should it be? The lord’s command of believers immersion should be sufficient for disciples and likewise for the symbols which He used when He said „This do.“

***„That the Corinthians used fermented wine because some were drunk, 1 Cor. 11.21, and we should do like wise.“*** This use of strong wine at the Lord’s table is not for our example. It was rebuked by the apostle and certainly had no commendation from him, v. 22. He referred them back to the bread and cup which our Lord used the same night in which He was betrayed. In effect he points out that the eating and drinking at the Lord’s table (using unleavened symbols) is quite different to the usual eating and drinking at home.

***„That there is nothing wrong with wine as our Lord made water into wine at the marriage feast.“*** The generic term for wine is used in John 2. Let us not assume that our Lord made old or fermented wine. Fermentation is a change parallel with souring and even putrefaction. In view of such Scriptures as Lev.10. 9; Prov.20.1; 23.29,30, would fermented wine manifest His glory? John 2.11.

***„That unfermented wine is not true to its label but merely wine in which the process of fermentation has been arrested and is therefore not a true type of Christ.“*** The term unfermented wine has been purposely avoided. We suggest grape-juice rather than port wine or similar intoxicating liquors. We know that the mould responsible for fermentation is ubiquitous and operates effectively in dead not living cells. Most of the food we eat is not pure in the sense of being sterile if exposed to the atmosphere, so that no substance is a perfect type of our pure and sinless Saviour. However, we simply advocate what our Lord Himself used. It is not God-glorifying to substitute something else, as leavened bread and intoxicating wines which are commonly used.

**„That we are not occupied with the symbols but with the Lord.“** Then why have symbols at all? Surely they are merely intended to aid our remembrance of Him. We must neither over-emphasize them nor ignore them.

**„That I have no conscience about using leavened symbols and see no reason to change.“** We do not understand the vehement and uncharitable attitude of those who *insist* on leavened symbols and hurt the consciences of those who are exercised. There are many individuals and assemblies of believers who are not in fellowship with „Open Brethren“ because of this practice. What is the objection to using unleavened symbols? Unleavened bread is the simplest and easiest to prepare and unfermented grape-juice is readily obtainable.

May I suggest that we make a change to unleavened symbols for the glory of Him Whom we seek to honour and worship at our Remembrance meetings, for the obedience to Scriptural principles and pattern, and for the sake of our brethren whose consciences are so exercised.

These thoughts have been expressed in print with a desire to stir the Lord’s people to break the shackles of conventionality and custom when opposed to His word. We have no law saying, „Ye must do this,“ but adherence to Scriptural principles and patterns is not impracticable and a loving obedience, to His Word will enable us to live and worship better for His glory.

D. J. B.

Ye Saints of God *more noble* be  
And search the Scriptures, there to see  
What God has willed, and willingly  
Comply with His Commands.

He is our Saviour and our Lord  
Then act according to His word  
And keep the Feast with one accord  
Sincerely and in Truth.

His People also are His Bride  
Then keep the Feast with Holy Pride  
His Holy Spirit dwells inside  
They are His dwelling place.

# THE LORD'S SUPPER — LEAVEN OR UNLEAVEN WHICH SHOULD IT BE • ?

In these latter days when there is evidence of an earnest effort on the part of organised churches to find ways in which they can be more closely associated with the Church of Rome, it is extremely important for the people of God in smaller assemblies to take stock of their own ways and practices.

There is a movement now active, called “Back to the Bible”; should there not, however, be an earnest effort on the part of all sincere believers in the Lord Jesus Christ to return to the “Will of God”? To do this a profitable beginning could be made by restoring the Lord’s Supper to its original pattern as recorded in the 3 Gospels and as instituted by our Lord Himself. At the present time the Roman Church holds Mass and teaches trans-substantiation. The Anglican Church has the Eucharist, many of the Protestant Churches have *Leaven* bread cut up into small squares, also have individual cups. Open and Exclusive brethren have an ugly *Leaven* loaf broken, from which each of the members pluck a small portion. The

Salvation Army do not have the Lord's Supper at all. These and other methods show confusion where there should be *harmony*. The one and only way to hold the Lord's Supper is that in which the Lord Jesus instituted it with the proper (unleavened) bread and "Fruit of the Vine". A careful examination of the records in the 3 Gospels will prove this. The account in 1 Cor. 11 is based on the patterns in the Gospels. It states "The Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed He took Bread". The account therefore of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 11 was received from the Lord by the writer and based on the Gospel's pattern.

If the reader will patiently refer to the following quoted scriptures he will clearly see that on no occasion is *leaven* used in anything offered to God, but is forbidden and the only bread available in Passover Week was unleavened—*Motzas*—and up till the present time no bread except "unleavened"—*Motzas*—can be found in any orthodox Jewish home. The first time *unleavened*—*Motzas*—is mentioned is Gen. 19: 3, when Lot provided food for the angels that came to him. Following this of course is Exodus 12 where it is prescribed for the Redeemed Israelites. In this 12th chapter *Leaven* is forbidden 3 times vs. 15, 19, 20, and *Unleavened* is commanded 3 times vs. 15, 17, 18, and again in Exodus 13: 6, 7. Leaven was forbidden and not even to be seen in their habitation for one complete week. The Israelites were not

only commanded to have *unleavened*, but were compelled by circumstances so to do. Exodus 12: 38 states they were thrust out before their dough was leavened and from then onwards they had no *Leaven* for 40 years, see Joshua 5: 10 - 12 when their own supplies were exhausted they had Manna until they entered the promised land. In Leviticus 2 the meal offering, which of course was brought to the Lord must not have *leaven* vs. 4, 5, 11.

In the Peace offerings of chap. 7: 11 - 18, there are both *Leaven* and *unleavened* commanded. This is because the offerer of the Peace offering shared in eating together with God and the Priest. The *unleavened* for God, and the shoulder and the breast for the Priest and the remainder for the offerer. Read Leviticus 7: 11 - 18.

When the Priest—Aaron—was first installed into the Priestly office *unleavened* alone was prescribed, Lev. 8: 23. In Leviticus 23: 6, one complete week with *unleavened*—*Motzas*—at Passover was commanded.

At Pentecost—50th day—Leviticus 23: 15 - 22. Two omers=Two tenth deals baked with *Leaven* and as they are baked, the fire brings the operation of the spreading effect of the *leaven* to an end. This of course has its fulfilment in Acts 2 and in Acts 10. In Acts 2 the Holy Spirit—“The promise of the Father”, came upon Israelites. The saints in the upper room then were given power and these included The Lord’s mother and brethren, Acts 1: 14. In Acts 10: 44 - 48 a Gentile house-

hold was blessed in a similar manner (see Acts 11: 15 - 18) and Peter who was God's instrument in each of these instances for the first time in his life dwelt in a Gentile's house. Jew and Gentile united in one glorious Lord and His Gospel. A Jew—Peter—in a Gentile house and eating with them Acts 11: 3; Gal. 2: 14.

The Shewbread—the bread of God's face—had no leaven 12 loaves=24 omers Jew and Gentile in Christ before the Lord. These were on a *pure* table lighted from a *pure* lampstand with *pure* oil covered with *pure* incense (Lev. 24: 5 - 9) See also Numbers 9: 9 - 14; 28: 17. When Hezekiah reopened the temple and recommenced worship therein. He proceeded according to that prescribed in Exodus 12, and God blessed him and the people abundantly and all rejoiced greatly and the Lord healed the people and the priests blessed the people and their voice came into God's Holy dwelling place into heaven. And if only the Lord's people would return to His Will to do that which He appointed much blessing would also come to them as a result now (Read 2 Chron. 30).

Josiah the king also later kept the Passover in God's appointed way and was much blessed. Read 2 Chron. 35: 16 - 20; Deut. 16: 1 - 8.

*Leaven* was used at Bethel which was a centre of idolatry and Golden Calf worship—God re-proved them and punished them for so doing. (See Amos 4: 4 - 9). It is evident therefore that when the Lord Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper

there was no leaven present.

Is that not the reason why there is the emphasis on *This* bread, *This* cup, an Especial Bread and an Especial Cup for an especial purpose. 1 Cor. 11: 25, 26?

The day on which the Lord's Supper should be taken is the first day of the week (Acts 20: 6 - 12; 1 Cor. 16: 2). The Lord's day, not yearly, but weekly as possible. "*As oft*" is frequency, 1 Cor. 11: 26. How should it be taken? Worthily. Those who eat unworthily are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. Self examination is therefore needful before eating. Eating unworthily can mean eating judgement=Chastising by the Lord and bodily weakness and even early death.

The passage on the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 11: vs. 23, 24 is particularly severe and if blessing is to follow partaking, then great care to be in the right condition is exceedingly needful.

In Cor. 5 *Leaven* is particularly called malice and wickedness and in another scripture hypocrisy. Anything picturing these bad traits of character must be repulsive to our glorious Lord. "Let us therefore keep the Feast not with the *Old Leaven* neither with the *leaven* of malice and wickedness. But with the unleavened of Sincerity and Truth." Let not the Lord's people follow traditional practices, but like the Bereans. Search the Scriptures *daily* whether these things were so. They were *more noble* than those of Thessalonica. Acts 17: 11 - 12.

C. P. BENNETT

## “Having Confidence in Thy Obedience I Wrote unto Thee.” Phlm. 21.

With Thoughts on the *Mode* of the Lord's Command as to the

### THE BREAKING OF BREAD.

THE above words describing *confidence in obedience*, express the beautiful love of the apostle, and occur in a letter which is throughout a model of brotherly love, and of true encouragement to further love.

And the principle of such words still applies very widely. God has *written* to us, knowing that we are His children,—IF so be we are born again. And this explains the *character* of the New Testament. Many ask “Why is not *this* command expressed in a more definite way?”—“Why do we not read, as to the Lord's Supper, ‘Use unleavened bread, leavened bread is forbidden’?”—“Why are we not told that infant baptism *breaks* the Lord's appointment for disciples?” The answer is simple. Such questions show a tendency to

#### LEGALISM OF HEART.

The question “Why?” is so often wrongly asked. It is abundantly shown in Scripture that Christ used unleavened bread, if He was the Obedient One, and who will dare to say ought else? It is equally clear that *without* putting His people under the Mosaic law as to the passover, yea, in the very passage which implied they would not be under this, He expressly put them in *His* own law, by saying “*This* do” as to the bread He used. Who would understand *one* narrative of the Resurrection day without the *others*? Who would know that the bullock must be *clean* from Lev. 16 only? As to *everything else*, we COMPARE Scripture with Scripture, but as to the Lord's Supper many plead *against* this prayerful study, and ask for another mode of teaching. But there is no reason for such a standpoint.

The Lord's writing is meant for those who want to be obedient. Hence He does not write as an Act of Parliament, which is arranged

to prevent would-be offenders from finding a loophole. Beloved brethren in Christ, whoever you are, is it not a degrading and legalistic view of the believer's HEAVENLY calling which *demand*s instruction on the Lord's Supper in *this* way? Indeed, is not the whole attitude which says, "The Lord *would* have spoken thus!" Or "*Why* did He not use some other word?"—out of harmony with reverence?

What should we think if Philemon had construed the letter thus, "I am *not* commanded to receive Onesimus, because it is written, 'Though I might be much more bold in Christ to enjoin thee that which is convenient, *yet for love's sake I rather beseech thee!*'" Love perceives the wishes of Him Who loves. THERE IS A TEST. Oh that we may not be contentious.

Hence in verse 21 we read "knowing that thou wilt also do

### **MORE THAN I SAY."**

The apostle expected more than a quibbling attempt to reduce obedience below a frigid minimum. He expected a desire to carry out the *principles* as well as the words of guidance, and *not* the principles *instead of* the words, even if this were possible. He expected a loving desire to do this spiritually and happily, not mechanically and sullenly. And he had a right to expect this, and has not the Lord Jesus a right to expect yet more from His people, whom He has loved and loves so much? But it may be replied, "More than He has said: how is this possible?" His words SAY much directly, AND IMPLY more. Hence love sees the thought which leads to and underlies them, and seeks to obey His principles through and through. This is the only approved attitude, in the power of the Holy Spirit. Shall it be ours?

No one can find any appointment for *leavened* bread at the Lord's Supper, or any Scriptural use of the *generic* word "wine" as to the memorial feast. The introduction of either may be *with* earnest intentions, but it is *traditional*, and is not tradition *a legalism to human customs*? Will not some who own the Lord welcome this affectionate invitation to leave such bondage and to keep to *His language*, and to speak of "the fruit of the vine," in this connexion, and acknowledge His "THIS DO," and refuse anything else,—SIMPLY BECAUSE OF LOVE TO HIMSELF!

PERCY W. HEWARD

# **Of What is Leavened Bread a Picture?**

## **Scriptural Meditations for Believers who would Obey their Lord.**

**T**HERE is clear Scriptural evidence that leaven is **INVARIABLY** a type of sin (see e.g. Ex. 12. 15; 13. 3, 7; 23. 18; Lev. 2. 11; Matt. 13. 33,\* 16. 6, 11, 12; 1 Cor. 5. 6-8; Gal. 5. 9). Nor, surely, can there be any real objection (i.e. Scriptural objection) to the precious thought that unleavened bread, picturing holiness and affliction, was not only used at Passover time, but by the Lord Himself, in the Lord's Supper, as symbolic of the Sinless One.† Fermented wine implies the ungodly ("dyed" is "leavened," or "fermented" in Isaiah 63. 1). But what is God's teaching through leavened bread? May our hearts be ever open to His instruction.

I have heard the suggestion that the ungodly are symbolized, but I do not know **SCRIPTURE** for this. There is a plain difference between a fermented liquor, and the leavened bread, in which the leaven has been made to cease its progress-working, by fire, so that the **EFFECT** of partaking is very different. We have striking words of the Holy Spirit as to wine being a mocker, but **NOTHING** comparable as to leavened bread.

At first the problem seems very real. The reminder of leaven is painful, but leavened bread is **NOT** leaven, nor leavening. There is, rather, an "after-condition."

To me it seems that Leviticus 23. 17 gives a Divinely appointed key. Here we have the Pentecost firstfruits, accepted with the sacrifice. "Two" is the number of fellowship and witness: the Lord sent the

---

\* The woman and ephah (3 measures), as in Zechariah 5. Mark the corruption of sound doctrine in Christendom's "kingdom of the heavens" (Matthew 25. 1, shows that the kingdom is not necessarily viewed as **REAL** saints only: we recollect description by profession in Luke 15. 7).

† "THIS do" is definite. Literature on this subject will be gladly sent to any enquiring believers, who want to follow their **LORD'S** will **SIMPLY AND CHEERFULLY**, and who dread even unintentional traditions, for His glory's sake

disciples forth by "twos." When the day of Pentecost was fulfilled, in Acts 2, the Holy Spirit descended as Fire, (contrast the likeness to a Dove on Christ, the Sinless One), dealing with and equipping God's dear people. Believers **HAVE** the flesh in them, and in their flesh dwelleth no good thing, but they should **WALK** in the Spirit and not in the flesh, for to the flesh they owe nothing (Rom. 8 12, see the whole chapter, also 7. 12-25 and Gal. 5). Is there anything against this interpretation? I think not. Leviticus 2. 11, 12 would confirm it. Christ **ALONE** was on the altar in His perfect service. Mark in Leviticus 7. 13 leavened bread connected with the peace-offering (**AFTER** verse 12). And believers can now enjoy friendship with God because of Christ (1 John 1. 7) and He delights in them. Viewed **IN** Him, as **ONE** company, they are "all fair, there is no spot," but in their fellowship and service, though they want to please God, they cannot boast. But the enjoyment is as sin is judged and, accordingly, kept **UNDER**. We are **CHANGED** from what we once were. The leaven is **NOT** working as of old, and sin must not have dominion over us, else we "take," if only for a few moments, the place of ungodly ones: hence when we appear before our gracious God, we judge ourselves, or rather, have judged (1 Cor. 11. 28 lit., 31). **THAT** is the **CONDITION** set forth by leavened bread.

We should possibly have expected a symbol of **EVIL**, and good acting upon it. Why is the fine flour **FIRST**, then the leaven, and next (immediately) the judging fire? The problem is full of heavenly teaching. The leavened bread does **NOT** deal with our "acceptance," that is the work of Christ alone. Hence it does not bring in our old life, but **STARTS** with the moment of our **NEW** life, when the truth came (the fine flour). Even then the flesh in us sought to change the truth and fire was necessary,—sanctification began as a painful, yet blessed experience (cf. Isa. 6. 6). But there is not only the thought of the **PAST**. **EACH TIME** we come before God we are conscious of the importance of self-judgment: since we **LAST** came the leaven has been seeking to hinder, the flesh has **NOT** become holy: we have needed the warfare, needed the fire, and we thank God for chastening.

Hence we see this striking, and humbling, view of believers, appearing before God, with sin condemned.

Thus our Lord Jesus, Whose Name we bear, is seen as the One Contrasted with His people, in the unleavened bread, and as the One Contrasted with the ungodly, in the fruit of the vine. Thus He is twice exalted, and all theories which suggest believers are viewed, in symbol, on the Table of the Lord, miss the precious teaching, though there is the glorious fact that we are made the righteousness of God in Him, and this oneness and perfectness are portrayed after we HAVE partaken of this one loaf (1 Cor. 10. 17). But at the Lord's Supper we FIRST behold a beautiful setting forth of Christ for His people and His perfect work ALONE ! WE have, by grace, the fine flour of sound doctrine, though our perception and illustration of it are marred by the flesh, and the effects of its old-time power,\*. Yet would we never excuse one sin, but long, in the Holy Spirit, for the day when we shall be perfected in our experience also, and with our loving Lord for ever.

\* The "texture" of leavened bread is very different from unleavened. It reminds us of the past. Hence we can see the inappropriateness as a symbol of Christ, as well as the (unconscious) alteration of HIS command.

PERCY W. HEWARD

## A Plea for Christ's "This."

**T**WELVE times does the HOLY SPIRIT record the stress our LORD JESUS laid on the word "this," with regard to the breaking of bread.\* And it was on the same night that He said "If ye LOVE Me, keep MY COMMANDMENTS" (John 14. 15). Yet many who bear His precious Name have not only altered His appointment, but defend their action. It is so easy to be influenced by traditions and our own previous actions, and still to think we are right! Beloved friends, let us be simple and loyal enough to accept His Word, and open-hearted to His Will.

A young and earnest believer, having the Scriptures *alone*, asked to notice the LORD'S language, and reminded that the word "this"

---

\* Matt: 26. 26, 28, 29; Mark 14. 22, 24; Luke 22. 19 (twice), 20; 1 Cor: 11. 24 (twice), 25 (twice).

points out something which the context will explain, would readily see that He took a loaf, and, since following participation of the Passover, a loaf of unleavened bread. At once the inference of love would be "I will gladly use THIS." Confirmation would be found in the *invariable* use of leaven as a type of evil, ‡ and inasmuch as the LORD'S Supper affords a *type* ("This is My Body"), prayerful exactness would be emphasized. Nor need this hinder true enjoyment of the added words "In remembrance of Me." Beloved fellow saved ones, the LORD'S love invites simple obedience: the escape from "legalism" is not *disobedience*, or man-made "variety." CHRIST prayed for His people's manifest oneness—yet to be SEEN, because of His own precious finished work. How dear to our hearts should this be.

Alas, alas, many who seem to have desires of heart to please *Him* use leavened bread, many ignoring the thought of one loaf, and even having it *cut* up in small pieces. You say "These are *small* points." Remember Matt: 5. 19. Surely love will not make light of *any* hint of CHRIST. Let us value His "this," else we grieve Him, disobey His words, act without His authority, afford a loophole for tradition, and hide His symbolic teaching. "Every word of GOD is pure": do not deny the precious "this" of these verses for the sake of *human* unity, as it must become if His own wishes are ignored. §

*"If ye love Me, keep My Commandments."*

*"Ye are My friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."*

*John 14. 15; 15. 14.*

---

‡ Linked with fine flour, and no longer working as before, it pictures the child of God in the peace offering (Lev: 7. 13, *cf.* Lev: 23. 17: so the Holy Spirit came down on the saints as *Fire*, but on Christ as a Dove: *we* have failure within). In Matt: 13. 33. we have the unchecked corrupting work of the woman of Zech: 5 and Rev: 17.

§ One would thankfully testify that the Lord blesses His unwittingly disobedient people, and that many, while using leavened bread, do, in heart, love and remember Him fervently. But surely such should be the first to welcome any help, to and in, the fuller understanding and fulfilling of His own gracious purpose.

PERCY W. HEWARD

# One Cup, or Many.

**E**VERY arrangement of Christ is perfect. Human reasoning may object to many things, but human reasoning often misleads. **ONE** word of God is sufficient to silence **EVERY** other voice. Faith can trust Him,—trust Him simply and gladly. The Holy Spirit always leads to such faith.

At the outset, a prayerful glance at Matthew, Mark and Luke seems to imply only one cup. “ Drink ye all **OUT OF IT** ” (Matt. 26. 27) is deeply suggestive. And Mark 14. 23, “ And they all drank **OUT OF IT** ” is confirmatory. He gave them the cup : they did not fill separate cups for themselves.

Inasmuch as the Lord Jesus expressly distinguishes Himself from His disciples, we cannot interpret His taking the cup as merely lifting a cup, to set them the example of drinking. He did not personally partake (Mark 14. 25). Hence we infer He gave one cup to all.

“ This cup is the new covenant in My blood.” Thus **ONE LOAF** and **ONE CUP** are fittingly before us. And now we understand more fully **WHY** He did not partake. He needed not redemption: He was the Redeemer. How wondrous His love.

1 Corinthians 10. 16 helps us—“ a having in common ” is beautifully typified. May the spiritual meaning be more and more realized.

Hygienic objections seem out of place, if we have His **WORDS**. Cannot He Who knew the frame, prevent contagion? And if believers try and protect themselves in their own way, is it not possible they will fall into the very difficulty? Surely some can record the Lord’s preservation hitherto on this line of faith in Him. Can instances **OTHERWISE** be readily found? A dear child of God may, when feeling that he has a heavy cold, choose to partake **LAST**, and loving discretion honours God, but a fear that alters the Lord’s commandments is not the fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom.

PERCY W. HEWARD

# A PARALLEL.

CONCERNING THE LORD'S WILL IN THE BREAKING OF BREAD.

OFTEN has the writer's heart been exercised as to the Lord's loving will in "the breaking of bread," and the joy of keeping to *His* symbols,—not for *their* sakes, but for *His*! The desire to please *Him*, and not to alter, is deeply important. But much tactful love is needed, lest one should seem to exclude those that are beloved,—yet who, in their turn, actually, though unconsciously,—rather exclude any child of God feeling himself called, and bound by love, to the simplicity of the Lord's "*This*." So many, alas, have thought that their Lord's arrangements are *not* decisive, but any EARTHLY parallel would surely help to prevent such a misunderstanding. Let us think for a few moments of such a parallel in daily business. A master in a large provision firm may give instructions to his employees, before journeying away,—"*This* is my speciality, put *this* to the front," and refer to the *fresh* butter, which, it is *known*, he has used at his own table. Afterwards the employees may be earnestly carrying on his business, and yet one may put some *salt* butter to the front; or be indifferent if it is salt *or* fresh. The other may keep definitely to his master's will. They meet together in the shop where the *latter* is working. The former remarks, "It is not always so easy to get fresh butter, and, besides, our master did not say '*fresh* butter' but only '*this*,' and it is *all* butter: I *feel* sure he only meant '*butter*' in general, but *happened* to have one variety before him." The other replies, "It is not for us to decide, but to obey: it is not for us to use the word '*happened*'; we *know* what he had on his table, and I do not feel free to vary

from his words." Inasmuch as it was well known that, years before, the master once commanded *another* servant to emphasize the fresh butter, with a rather *different* object, the former replies, "You are too much held to the letter of the law, or rather to what the master told *another* servant long ago." Quickly the reply comes, "Did he not speak to us also? HE said, 'This is my speciality, put *this* to the front,' and though I believe you want to work rightly in his business, I should not be honourable if I asked you to serve in this shop, and, if, when any enquired, 'What is the speciality?', you picked out the fresh butter here, but *elsewhere* acted otherwise: I should be helping you to a self-contradictory position." Both employees may really wish to be honourable, hence we can conceive that the one from another shop responds, "You exclude me, but we should not exclude you at our branch." "No," is the loving, but plain, reply, "I am sure you would still welcome, and I do not doubt your sincerity, yet *your action decisively excludes me*, for if I came to your counter I should have to sell as the 'speciality' that about which my master said *nothing*, and, though you misunderstand us, we cannot venture to break *his will* here. This would grieve him. Rather let us seek to be of one mind as to *his will*, BEFORE he comes back." Is the suggestion clear to beloved children of God? Is it not important to seek this oneness of heart and mind, in the enabling of the Holy Spirit, Who *never* contradicts Himself, before our loving Lord comes again?

PERCY W. HEWARD

# “This Do in Remembrance of Me.”

1 Corinthians, 11, 24, 25.

---

IT is not often that we find the same sentence repeated by the Holy Spirit in adjoining verses. But here He lovingly emphasizes on us what the Lord Jesus by repetition lovingly emphasized upon the disciples. As far as we know in the record, our Lord did not frequently double the same precious command, but we do well to feel the force of this, for the help of our memory, and the encouragement of our devotion, though ONE syllable from Him, Who gave Himself for us, is enough.

It is a privilege to remember the stress on “every word” in Matthew 4. 4 and Luke 4. 4. The enemy left out, it seems clear, certain words when he quoted or, rather, misquoted (Matt. 4. 6, Luke 4. 10). “In all thy ways” is vital, and the omission changes the whole standpoint. Promises were never given to please the flesh, but to help the obedient heart. This Divine limitation has a parallel with regard to prayer. The human tendency to universalize, whether in the matter of salvation, or the exercise of faith, is against the sovereignty and glory of God.

If we are humble minded believers, we shall find true spiritual help in the five points to which our one sentence fittingly divides.

First, we have the subject of the action “This,” then the holy activity “do,” thirdly “in” or “with a view to,” i.e. the godly direction and intention, followed by the inner attitude, “remembrance,” and fifthly the Person to Whom our hearts are attached, even the “Me” of our beloved Lord, the One Who asks, yea, claims and has love’s right to receive, our loyal obedience.

Some believers may possibly be divided into two classes, those who emphasize “This do,” and those who lay stress on

“In remembrance of Me.” Both are right, yet both are incomplete: perhaps we ourselves are among such, and therefore it is to God’s glory that we seek His grace in growing up into Christ in all things. If any tell us that the “this” is unimportant, and that we can use any symbols, or emblems, we choose, our hearts are pained. Nothing but the simple bread our Lord used, (and only an erroneous reading of Luke 22 can doubt its unleavened character), can be called direct obedience to His gracious command. It may be said,—it often IS said,—that the heart’s intention is the important matter, and that this is VERY IMPORTANT our hearts agree; but to say “THE important matter” is to cast a slur on our beloved Lord’s wisdom, for He could have EASILY said, “Take bread,” or “Take any symbol you have at hand,” but He was pleased to say “This.” It is not for His disciples at any time to ask “Why?” any more than it is for a created being to ask why our Creator has given us two eyes and ears, it is for us to be thankful, and obey. “This” means “this,” and nothing can make it mean something else. The contention that the heart’s purpose is deeply important has a beautiful bearing on the loving wish of a believer who does not know, but it has no application to the one who uses this point after he knows what his Lord did. This stress on intention thus actually involves intention to alter His revealed will. Possibly one has met some who are desirous of showing love in their own way, but who will antagonise if their own way is rejected. Beloved fellow believers, we cannot deal with the Lord thus.

To use “In remembrance of Me” against “This do” is as sinful as to use “This do” against “In remembrance of Me.” Both parts of the verse are meant by the Holy Spirit to be our Lord’s own loving command to us. “Do” is by no means legalistic: it is one of the very words used in the Greek for bringing forth fruit (Matt. 7. 17-19), and it is a word graciously helpful to those who know the music of Matthew 12. 50 with John 15. 14 and Hebrews 13. 21.

“Do” speaks of the persons who are attached to the Person of their Lord, for it is plural, and the tense implies a continuance with the frequency that wearies not.

If, on the other hand, any are found and, alas, they are, who emphasize the “This do,” but thereby minimise “with a view to remembrance of Me,” they also need the Holy Spirit’s gracious ministry of reproof. If the writer knows his own heart, and may, without fleshly judgment, seek to help his brethren, he feels it is sadly possible to have the two errors quickly alternating in one’s own experience, and sometimes to forget, in the matter of various commandments, “This do,” and sometimes to make secondary “In remembrance of Me.” But what do we desire? Is it not the all-round growth in grace that obeys exactly yet has no confidence in self? And that keeps Himself in memory, yet never forgets that it is not to be our idea of His will, but His own revealed will which we are to follow? The words of Himself have ever a message, “If a man love ME, he will keep MY WORDS,” and again “If ye love Me, keep My commandments.” We cannot, and would not, separate the two. Shall we not seek the breaking of bread in love’s gratitude with the unleavened and unfermented symbols of His choice and His appointment, yet ever seek grace that these may remind of Himself, and lead to Himself, and that we may never have confidence in OUR obedience, but ever seek the devoted attachment which thinks of Him, and pleases Him in doing HIS own will, with HIS pleasure ever in view?

PERCY W. HEWARD

## IF CHRIST HAD USED LEAVENED BREAD—

**W**HEN He appointed the LORD'S Supper, what would be the solemn inferences? Some tell us "This is a small matter." *Love regards nothing of obedience as small.* Others say, "We do not want to be occupied with symbols"—why then *imply* that others are, when you do *not* know their hearts? If you find them harsh, criticising, bad-tempered, unspiritual, lacking in love, and *only* talking on this subject, you may well reprove these sins, but what if the act of "becoming cross" is on *your* side? What if you are the one who is SO insistent on *materialism* that you are unwilling to change *your* material to that which the LORD used? If you really find others "Judaistic," reprove this sin according to Scripture; but what if you yourself, beloved friend, are so *Judaistic* that you make the LORD'S Word of none effect by compelling the usual *traditional* bread, of which the *only* basis is tradition. Is not this Judaism? Do not use the word "Judaistic" of others to comfort yourself in disobedience, or to hide the real issue. What *if CHRIST had used Leavened Bread* in Matthew 26. 26, and Luke 22. 19, would it have mattered much?

A reply is simple. If He had used leavened bread, the Scripture would be misleading, after Luke 22. 1, 7. This is suggestive. Some say, "Where does it say He used unleavened bread?" If Scripture order means *anything*, the whole passage would be confusing *unless* CHRIST had unleavened bread. Thus any argument that the word ought to be used in verse 19 falters. Moreover, the shewbread was marked out as unleavened, and yet the "word" is not employed. GOD treats His people as spiritually minded enough to compare Scripture with Scripture, and many who object are so gladly willing to do this as to *other* parts of His precious truth.

But further, if CHRIST had used leavened bread *His obedience* unto death would have been broken, and thus His salvation destroyed. Some lightly say, "We do not know that He had this bread." Beloved reader, the truthfulness of the LORD is at issue. Ah, the answer comes, "He was obedient *under law*: that is the whole matter." Stay, *He was* obedient under law, and therefore used unleavened bread. Is obedience under grace more careless? "Nay," you reply, "but what has the unleavened bread to do with the new covenant?" Very much. We do not have the ONLY bread of which He spoke because of Moses, but *because of Him Who died for us*. If He gave a new covenant command, shall the fact that unleavened bread was ALSO used under the old covenant hinder us from *HIS* will now? Because John baptized *before* Pentecost, shall we refuse baptism *after*? Because *the law* appointed honour to a father and mother, shall we call *the will of CHRIST* in this matter "legalism?" *Must* the new covenant commands be an entire contrast with everything appointed before? Is our LORD to be thus limited? Nay, if CHRIST had used leavened bread He would have broken the Scripture: if we use it in the LORD'S Supper, we break His commandment! We are as much *outside His own word* "This," as the "Strange fire" of Lev: 10 was outside the LORD'S appointment, though our HEARTS may want to please Him, and *He accepts such love* and forgives (2 Chron. 30. 18), but is there not forgiveness with Him that there may be service with godly fear (Ps. 130. 4, Heb. 12. 28)! He says "If ye love ME, keep MY commandments" (John 14. 15). Here is the simple test. Shall we venture to say "No," dear believing reader?

PERCY W. HEWARD

# THE LORD'S SUPPER.

---

1. "Why," the question may be asked, "should there be so great an emphasis on the Lord's Supper? The present is not a dispensation of types and shadows." But surely the **believer** regards everything as important which the Lord has said, and if "types" are **fewer** now, those included become more uniquely emphasized. Is not baptism put **first** by the Lord Jesus Himself as an expression of living faith, and can all the alterations and misunderstandings of ritualists, and others, change **His** own stress upon this command? So is it with the Lord's Supper which has a peculiarly significant appointment, as His gracious and tender word, revealed "on the night in which He was betrayed," just before His death, and associated with the affecting words "**In remembrance of Me.**" Can we overlook this, without serious spiritual loss, dear fellow believer?

2. Nor is it strange that the enemy has made a special attack on **this** commandment of the Lord. Let us call to mind some striking reasons for such a constant evil activity:—

In Eden Satan did **not** urge an act of outward wickedness. He came, deceivingly, **just to alter a type.** "The tree of the knowledge of good and evil," being a real and material tree, had its moral power in connexion with the **typical** teaching God marked out. It was therefore an attack on a symbol with which Satan began his deadly warfare.

Thus he still seeks to take us off our guard. The Holy Spirit sums this up in striking words, "The serpent beguiled Eve through his **subtlety,**" and what if the **application** is to us, regarding any type, "So your minds should be corrupted from the **simplicity** that is in Christ"? What if we too have been thus led astray from simplicity, to sprinkling instead of immersion, or to **any** unrealized change in the Lord's Supper? Let us not assume the error will always be manifest. For in this same chapter we read, "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of **light**" (2 Cor. 11. 14), and "light" appears positively **good**, to "appeal" to those who are children of God. Do not

expect all sin to be labelled sin: it will claim to be holy again and again.

3. May we continue our meditations? Is it not true that varied dispensations **begin** with God's declaration concerning "food," and a "covenant" is thus set before us. It was so with Adam in Genesis 1. 29, and with Noah also in Genesis 9. 1-7, and again with Israel in Exodus 12. Is there not therefore a parallel when we find our Lord's arrangement for the bread and fruit of the vine? This is just as definite and central as Israel's passover, and in connexion with the cup He Himself mentions the **new covenant**. We can hardly expect this will escape Satan's direct attack. But are we prepared for it? We repeat that to Israel the Passover was central, and it was at this time, and in this connexion, the Lord ordained the suspension of that **sacrifice**, and showed that which was to take its place for the church without any limitation to once a year (cf. Acts 20). Can we view this as a minor matter? We have no more authority to vary than Israel had, or have, to modify the Passover. The fact that we are not threatened with punishment never makes a loving heart careless. Nor can we overlook the fact that in the **one** incident in which Melchisedec's priesthood is before us, there is a parallel foreshadowing of the Lord's Supper, and Abraham is blessed by the "greater." God had a deep purpose in this. It suggests the importance of the Lord's Supper, in preparation for our meeting the world, of which the King of Sodom in Genesis 14 affords a picture.

4. The **time** of Christ's appointment was just after Satan entered into Judas (John 13. 27), and just before he, the prince of this world, came and had nothing in our Lord (John 14. 30). Would not this awaken the enemy's bitterness? Impressive indeed was the moment chosen for the institution. Let us not view anything as a mere chance, the date and circumstances were a Divine choice. Nothing is purposeless. It was then that He not only said, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another" but also, "If ye love Me, keep My commandments"—a significant plural,—with the linked words, "He that loveth Me not keepeth not My sayings" (John 14. 15, 24). O that we may heed all His words, with childlike simplicity. Let us not forget the mode of attack on the Lord Himself in the wilderness. It was in connexion with (a) appointed food, (b) the exact words of God, and (c) the wrong time for an action,

quite as much as (d) the wicked desire of worship. Was this accidental? The tactics of Satan are often the same. Moreover, he quoted part of Scripture, but left out part. O that we may not thus act with the commandments of the Lord!

5. With some beloved children of God, rightly feeling the deep meaning of inward devotion, there may still remain the underlying thought, "But is it not after all a **little** thing? A physical action is small, and a type is nothing **in itself**?" Should we not rather say, "The **size** of the action is not primary, but the glory of the **Person** commanding," and "the smaller the action the fuller may be the test for simple discipleship"? It does not need spirituality to see the wrong of a great crime. The beauty of a **type** is that, being nothing in itself, the claim on obedience is only the will of the Lord. It may seem at first to have no reason, **except** love to Him. But that is reason enough for one who altogether **belongs to Him**, and it appeals to no one else.

6. And, further, are we not right in saying that the Lord's Supper is the **only** type portraying **the Lord Jesus Himself**, in the present dispensation? Baptism, indeed, pictures His death, and His burial, but not Himself. The attack of Satan is always on Christ and His glory as the name antichrist and the travesties in Revelation indicate. Are we then surprised at an attempt to counterfeit here? And may there not be introduced that which would be "**like**" the revealed will of the Lord in many particulars? The tares were awhile "**like**" to wheat. The leavening of the fine flour is not a sudden drastic alteration (Matt. 13. 33). The adoption of the **language** of the Lord, and yet a gradual change, would be in harmony with the purpose of deceiving the **elect**. O that we may not be ignorant of Satan's devices. against which we are thus Divinely protected. Let us not be off our guard, because there may be a proportion right: let us follow the Lord in all.

7. And with regard to an assembly. Although the unity which pleases the Lord should always be felt and manifested, is it not true that the participation of the Lord's Supper is the **one** and only repeated act in which **all essentially** share, and that **omission** ought to be quite out of the question? Nothing must be allowed to shut out one who is obedient. Baptism is personal. In prayer and praise, one brother leads, and others should delight in the "Amen." But if one prayer is, alas, out of harmony with the will of the Lord, there are many others to which

all can say this precious word,—a name of the Lord Jesus. So is it with singing: if one line is not clearly Scriptural to my heart, I can be silent for that alone and there are many lines which I can sing. But there is **nothing** to take the place of the Lord's Supper, if I am debarred a share in that, through any departure from the Lord's will being permitted. Moreover, in this case the appointment is His own, in each particular, which cannot be said for each verse of a hymn or sentence in prayer.

8. Hence if anything here is changed, however slight, there will be the cleverest and **most far-reaching** attack on the manifested unity of believers, in a local expression of the one body of Christ. "Division" will be secured. Hence we should not be surprised at a systematic attempt to change here. And we find it. Romanism, with its gorgeous "mass," and "priestly" ritual, shows the extreme, the climax of the enemy. But some, thank God, are quite undeceived by this glaring sin. Hence there are **graded** departures:—For example, in one case there is nothing elaborate, but merely the ordinance is "administered" and the bread used is "cut"; in another there are "individual communion cups," and so we find quite a variety of variations, associated with a much closer return to the appointed pattern in some cases than others, because of the love of the Lord's redeemed who would instinctively refuse the more open alterations. Yet is it not possible **something** remains that has not yet been realized, but that is not exactly in accord with that which our beloved Lord took, and of which alone He spoke? Do not our hearts say, "If there is such a mistake in my action, O that I may know, that I may not unconsciously be misled, or hinder others, for I want, indeed, to do my Lord's will in all." Thanks be unto God for this attitude of love. If we are willing, He will teach. Are we expecting this? Let us wait on Him. We do desire to be unlike David who condemned evil in others, till the words came, "Thou art the man."

9. The slighter and less evident the change, the more generally will it be unnoticed. And the longer it has remained the more it has become natural, and it will be done with a desire to please God. And if, apparently, a good reason can be given for it, the more definitely will true and earnest believers hesitate to "change back" to their Lord's own usage and appointment. The possible misunderstanding of a "change back," and the

thought of division will be added " reasons " for retaining the variation, but we must not do even a little evil that good may come. It is in such a context that each of our hearts needs to be searched, and to **feel** the words " as an angel of **light**," and then the loving question, " Lovest thou Me more than these?"

What if the apparently good reason is that it is quite incredible so many godly believers have erred? We **should** honour them, and rejoice in all that is of their Lord in their lives, but must we not confess differences among such, in many other things? Do we deny their godliness? Surely not, but we must see thereby that Only One was perfect, and such verses as 2 Chronicles 35. 18 and Nehemiah 8. 17 remind us how many holy men omitted commandments of the Lord even in times of reviving. How few of the honoured Reformers and devoted Puritans were immersed as believers! Or the good reason may be a fear lest that which is symbolized should be partly forgotten through emphasis on the symbol itself, or lest there become a tincture of Judaism or ritual. The fear is right. Yet the remedy is not making our Lord's own appointment secondary, either in baptism or in the Lord's Supper, but rather a simple obedience, just as He said, and that obedience **in the power of the Holy Spirit**. He causes a right proportion. Can it be wrong to do what He did, and therefore about which He spoke? Is it **necessarily** unspiritual to keep to this? And as to **time** of happy observance, the " good reason " for the mornings may be a right and precious emphasis " on putting the Lord first," but, as we remember He said " Me and My words." our hearts must feel that we should put Him **first** in **every** meeting, and when alone also, and long, long before eleven or twelve o'clock, but that this does not mean the early saints failed when they had " the Lord's **Supper** " in the evening. The thought for all our hearts is His revealed will for all.

Humbly and earnestly, in the light of our beloved Lord's " **This** is My body " (describing the type only by the " this " He used), and " **This** do in remembrance of Me," we leave it now for believers themselves to search and see, and say if there has been, and is, any unappointed change, in symbols, or in time, departing from His language, or that of the Holy Spirit. And may we not also leave it with such, whose opened hearts are willing for His will at all costs, to find if any of us are perpetuat-

ing the change, or not. It is not my will, nor your will, but His will. " If I am wrong show me, in view of the Judgment Seat of Christ " should be my attitude and yours, in true love. The Lord Himself grant that these meditations may embitter none, but help to the enjoyment of Psalm 133.

If two believers differ, that which they alike acknowledge as unquestionably within their Lord's will must be followed, not that which only **one** feels to be within that will. And, in like manner, that which is **certainly** approved by the wording of the Holy Spirit must take precedence over that which seems to some " probably " or " possibly " permitted thereby. And let all be with love, lest we wound those for whom Christ died.

## THE TABLE OF THE LORD.

A simple Table, nothing more,  
One loaf of simple bread,  
Because of Him Whom we adore,  
Our absent, glorious Head.  
No priestly rites, no altar great,  
No vestments can we own,  
No choral sounds, no silver plate—  
Christ's simple will alone.  
No breaking of the bread by *one*,  
And not a cup for *each*,  
Our Saviour's wish alone be done,  
As Him alone we preach.  
Traditions do not ever weigh  
Against His weighty Word,  
Shall we, assembled on this day,  
Let human plans be heard?

Nay, gathered by His changeless grace,  
A people of God's choice,  
Redeemed by Blood, to see His face,  
We in His will rejoice.  
And so the plain unleavened bread  
Speaks of our sinless Lord,  
The fruit tells of the Blood once shed,  
And both His love record.  
And thus we gather by His grace,  
As those who watch alway,  
In fellowship we seek His face  
Until—until that Day!

PERCY W. HEWARD