

No.
113.

"IF YE THEN BE RISEN WITH CHRIST, SEEK THOSE THINGS
WHICH ARE ABOVE, WHERE CHRIST SITTETH ON THE
RIGHT HAND OF GOD." COL. 3. 1.

THOUGHTS ON THE LORD'S WILL

AS TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.

An Address (revised) at

Forest Gate.

30th March, 1918.

by

PERCY W. HEWARD.

MEETING ROOM, 61, Upton Lane,
FOREST GATE, LONDON, E. 7.

THOUGHTS ON THE LORD'S WILL

AS TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.

An Address by Mr. P. W. Heward,
At Forest Gate.
30th March, 1918.

Passages read:-

Matthew 26. 26-29; Mark 14. 22-25; Luke 22.
19-20; (the preparatory words moreover, will
help us to understand the parallels and
contrasts). 1 Corinthians 11. 23-28.

Beloved friends, I take it that our desire is simply and heartily and obediently to know and do the mind of the Lord. It should matter very little to us what people say, and what people think. The mind of the Lord is altogether precious. I take it that we are of one heart in connection with the danger of a merely mental grasp of truth. We do NOT want to centre our thoughts around a THING. A Person must be before us. "Knowledge puffeth up, but love buildeth up". Love leads to true knowledge, as Phil. 1. 9, 10 would suggest; and it is written, "If ye love Me, keep My commandments". This love is not only a sentiment; it is practical, it is active, because it is vital. The Lord has given certain commands to His people. "If ye love Me, keep My commandments" would include the Lord's Supper. If, as some Scriptures seem to imply, the Lord Jesus spoke in Hebrew, the exact word for "commandments"

in Hebrew is as to its letters the word "Unleavened loaves", - there is not a letter different, - and UNDERLYING thoughts are often hinted by the Scripture. But that is not the first suggestion I want to bring before you. "If ye love Me, keep My commandments". Unless we keep any of His commandments out from heart-love, we do not keep them at all. It is quite possible to become one-sided even in a verse of Scripture, and to print "love" in large type, and "commandments" in small type; or to print "commandments" with a very heavy-faced letter, and to print "love" in the faintest way. We want rather to see that we cannot keep commandments without love, and that unloving obedience is not obedience. There are some who say "We do not want to emphasize obedience too much, it is a matter of love". They speak against the thought of the law of Christ, and lay a stress upon love; but love is the fulfilling of the law. If the action is not done with love, it is not obedience. We must not divide a verse. We would grow up to Christ in all things. "If ye LOVE, keep My COMMANDMENTS". "If ye love ME, keep MY COMMANDMENTS", - the "ME" and the "MY COMMANDMENTS", - the "loving" and the "keeping", must all be emphasized in their true connection, order and forcefulness.

The Lord's Supper is called by precious names. It is the LORD'S, and His authority is ever in front of

3.

us. It is the breaking of the bread, or of the loaf, indicative of simplicity, fellowship, and also of a covenant relationship, - as eating so often implied among those who were brought up in Palestine. We also have other precious words that have some relationship to this subject, - "The Table of the Lord", "The cup of blessing", "The communion, (or having in common)", - all these expressions have a meaning; and the Holy Spirit has not repeated the record four times without some special definite stress upon every believing heart, - a stress which contains this suggestion, "You will easily forget; you will readily make a mistake, unless you are spiritually on your guard". The Lord's repetition is always an encouragement and a reproof.

The time when the Lord ordained this simple act of devoted obedience was not accidental. 1 Corinthians 11 tells us it was in the NIGHT WHEN HE WAS BETRAYED. Oh how deeply suggestive to us of His wondrous love. The very night when He was being "given aside", as the word is, He GAVE to His disciples that which was a picture of His great giving; - "The Son of God Who loved me, and gave Himself for me". Furthermore, not only was it in the night of His betrayal, but it was just before even the privileged disciples forsook Him and fled, and yet more closely followed by their strife who should be the greatest. Everything was against such a display of love - everything except His love, and THAT overcame everything against. The order is important.

We read in Luke 22 of the Passover first. The Lord's Supper is not part of the Passover in one aspect of that expression. We read as to the cup, - "After having supped", or after having supper. Yes, the Lord's Supper is distinguished from the Passover. That it was not BEFORE the Passover lamb is also full of deepest meaning. Further, we do well to notice the relationship to Gethsemane. In a garden, almost immediately afterwards, Christ met Satan's temptation, and resisted victoriously, and acknowledged the contrasted cup that was given Him by the Father. Almost at once He was arrested by men, and cast out from the garden. We recollect the result was He was slain, - His garments were taken from Him. It is easy to see the contrast. Adam in the garden failed as to food, - as to fruit. Satan caused a temptation there, and fruit was wrongly eaten. Christ rightly in the garden won the victory, and refused to alter the Father's appointment of a bitter cup. Adam was cast out from the garden, though clothed with coats of skin, by God, but he died. Christ was cast out of the garden BY MAN. He died for sinners. His robe, (picturing perfect merits and obedience) was stolen from Him. The contrasts are clear ~~thought~~ throughout. The spiritual teaching of the Lord's Supper is very great. I am afraid that we easily fall into forgetfulness because of frequency. This is no argument for irregularity or omission (if we can partake Scripturally) any more than for forgetting regular supplication unto God

but it is an argument for special concern lest that which is common should become unholy, lest we should go through as a mere form that which we experience day after day, or week after week. If there is something in our lives "now and then" we prepare for it. We are apt to take "usual" mercies as a matter of course. But nothing is common place in Christ. The Lord's Supper pictures as to Christ that ALL of our precious Lord in His humanity was perfect. We have the setting forth of His body and blood as alike perfect. He did no sin. In Him was no sin. His spotlessness of character, not only in His Deity or His glory, but in His humanity and humiliation, are definitely in front of us. Further, if the Lord's Supper reminds us of what He is, it sets forth also what He did. We notice the words, "This is My ~~Body~~ - for you". - The body AND the blood are BOTH pictured, and the thought is evident- He gave the WHOLE of Himself in utter selflessness, for His selfish and undeserving people, that He might save them from their selfishness as well as their deserved doom. The Scripture record shows in type what He DID in reality; but further, the Lord's Supper indicates what and HOW He SUFFERED. It pictures to us real death, - with body and blood separated. The meeting of wrath is impressed, for the bread speaks of the fire. The POURING out of blood is emphasized and this suggests a JUDGMENT entering within.

Solemnly the intensity of Christ's suffering as the Perfect Sacrifice is seen in the Lord's Supper.

Next we go beyond what He is, did, and suffered, to consider what the breaking of bread pictures as to ourselves. It pictures our need. It brings in front of us that if in His love we are those for whom He gave Himself in the new covenant, we have a responsibility to please Him. "THIS DO with a view to MY remembrance" comes very beautifully in response to "THIS IS My ^{body} ~~blood~~ which is given for you", - "Mine for you, DO YE this for ME". Since I am for you, let your life be toward Me. The Lord's Supper is a call to daily devotedness; it is a call to worship; it is a call to memory of Christ; it is a call to obedience; it is a call to fellowship, since the word "Do" is not only in the present tense to imply continuance and repetition, but in the PLURAL to imply that a believer CANNOT carry out this Divine arrangement by himself. Observe again that God gives His people in symbolic food the whole of Christ, and nothing but Christ. May it be our privilege to be brought to value Him the more, in loving fellowship with one another.

But WHAT are we commanded to do when we keep the Lord's Supper? We want to obey His appointment. are My friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you". "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I

7.

have commanded you". Such expressions make us feel a longing of heart to be led by the Holy Spirit that we may DO WHATSOEVER the Lord has ordained. There are several commands with respect to the breaking of bread. One command is "Take", another is "Eat", another is "This do with a view to My remembrance". Linked with the command to eat is another - "Drink". These are the Divine instructions. We cannot fulfil the Lord's pleasure unless we "Take", "Eat", "Drink", and "This do with a view to His remembrance". Four important commands. And we do not know WHAT we are to take, WHAT we are to eat, WHAT we are to drink, or WHAT we are to do, except from the context. Not one of the commands gives full instruction in itself. We must look to OTHER words of God; and some of us feel that EVERY word of Scripture is, in one sense, the context of every other word. Let me put it like this, that we have no authority to limit the Divine statement "This do" if God has shown us in Scripture what the Lord Jesus DID. If we GUESS what He did, we cannot make this a matter of authority over our brethren; but if God has shown us anywhere in Scripture what Christ did, it is our responsibility to include all His own unveiling in the word "This", unless the Holy Spirit has Himself told us it is not included. That the Holy Spirit does explain in such a case seems to me evident. "As they were eating Jesus took bread". Some might therefore feel that "This do" would include the introduction of the Lord's Supper

8.

in the middle of other eating. The Holy Spirit knew that there would be believers who would be strictly concerned to carry out the mind of Christ. He therefore wrote to PREVENT any thing which was not intended, and in 1 Corinthians 11 He informs us that "While they were eating" is not part of the "This do", - for the believers at Corinth were told NOT to have their eating together first. Thus everywhere God provides against mistakes. My mind travels back to Genesis 3. Here also we have a garden in the immediate context, and we read in the 11th verse, God says, "Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou EATEN of the tree whereof I commanded thee thou shouldest not eat?" We look back to see what had just taken place. In verse 6 we find that when the woman "saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she TOOK of the fruit thereof, and did EAT, and GAVE also to her husband with her, and he did EAT". Thus we have the taking and the eating. How did Adam answer God's question? "And the man said, The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she GAVE me of the tree and I did EAT". The Lord Jesus GAVE it unto them, and said, TAKE, EAT. And the Lord God said to the woman, "What is THIS that thou hast DONE?" Surely every believer must realise that the whole of the language is MEANT to imply a comparison of Scripture with Scripture. Here we have the first case, I suppose, of the commonly repeated link of the word "this"

with the word "do", in forceful meaning. "What is this that thou hast done?" The woman blames the serpent, and the Lord God said unto the serpent, "Because thou hast DONE THIS, thou art cursed above all cattle"; and the only hope set forth is that the Seed of the woman should come, even Christ, in verse 15; and that there would be encouragement in connection with His victory over the serpent. In the fulness of time the Lord Jesus DID come, and He gave bread to His people. Now you will notice in the 13th chapter of Matthew that we have two parables linked, which are repeated together in Luke 13. The kingdom of heaven is likened to a man who sowed a tiny seed. God appointed in Genesis the herb and the tree, but here the least among herbs is among the now permitted anomalies of nature and BECOMES a tree, and the fowls of the air, which are explained as SATAN, lodge in the branches. Genesis 1 is attacked to-day and the Holy Spirit seems to allude to this in the change to a tree. The devil, identified with his evil agents, lodges in the branches. How does the devil act next? The next parable indicates. The kingdom of heaven is likened to leaven which a woman took. "Because thou hast done this" is first the work of the devil, and the result is we have brought before us a woman who also did a "this" against the doing of the Lord. And what did the woman do? She put leaven in the three measures, which make an ephah. Now here is a deeply solemn thought, because we remember how when visitation was made to Abraham by

heavenly visitors, the woman Sarah was COMMANDED by her husband - it was not Abraham hearkening unto the voice of Sarah, - to make ready quickly three measures of fine meal. Now the statement of making ready quickly, and the parallel passage as to Lot, would indicate that unleavened bread was a necessity in this sudden preparation. Sarah, who is an example for believing women according to 1 Peter 3, makes ready quickly, and the food is brought forth. But in Zechariah 5 a woman is again with three measures, the ephah, and alas! the woman herself is in the midst of the ephah, and the statement is "This is wickedness". The woman puts herself into the ephah (compare Genesis 40. 17, 19 the bakemeats are self, the flesh; contrast verse 10 the vine). The leaven is self. Observe what has been done by nominal Christianity. The so-called priest claims to change the bread, he claims to be able to make it into the body of Christ. He puts something of his own work into it, - himself. "Zion's Watchtowerism", and other false religions, emphasize that the Lord's people have some share in sufferings to bring blessing to others. They put themselves into the position of Christ; and there are many of the Lord's people it seems who will dare to tell us that in the Lord's Supper we have a feasting upon that which pictures the Lord's people. This is deeply perilous. It is a terrible thing to put oneSELF, - to put leaven, - into the place where Christ is. The woman of Christendom leavens

the fine flour of sound doctrine. That which is done in fact has also been strikingly done in type. Eve was altogether on wrong lines, and in a wrong position. Christ, the Seed of the woman, is contrasted. Adam ventured to call his wife, "Eve", after the Lord God said "death". If you get out the Greek Translation you will find it is exactly the Name of Christ - the Life; and we know how Romanistic translations have ventured so to tamper with that third chapter of Genesis, and say, "SHE shall bruise". They put the woman in where it ought to be Christ only; and that is the whole principle throughout, - for what does the woman Eve picture? She brings before us those who are, or those who PROFESS to belong to the Lord. Now if we who are really belonging to the Lord put ourselves into His place, everything goes wrong; and if that which professes to be His, the so-called church, takes the position of Christ, we have a serious error. What does ritualism say by a caricature and misrepresentation of Matthew 18. "Hear the church". It is hearkening to the voice of the wife, instead of remembering the command, "This is My Beloved Son, hear Him". (So quickly is this added by the Lord in Matthew 17. 5). I need hardly say we know very well that the wife in the counterpart of this thought in Genesis 3 is not the bride but the harlot of Revelation 17. But it is the principle of setting aside the authority of the Lord. Now I am sure that there are some of God's dear people present who can see how these subjects fringe off into

a number of deeply important aspects of truth, showing how parts of Scripture are united; but to everyone there must be clear teaching that with the words, Give, Take, Eat, This Do, in Genesis 3, and with regard to the Lord's Supper, the Holy Spirit means a comparison. It seemed a small matter, comparatively, to eat that which was not appointed. In each case a plant was concerned. Eve might have said, "This is a tree with fruit, as much as the others are trees for fruit, and we were told at the outset 'Of every tree thou shalt eat". She MIGHT therefore have argued, "Why not apply these words 'Of every tree" without the one exception given afterwards? It is a tree, it has fruit". Such reasonings have sad parallels to-day. Sin is ingenious. We know the simple and solemn Divine record, - Adam hearkened to the voice of his wife, and ruin came in powerfully. This seemingly small matter brought separation from God, death and trouble all through the ages.

It would be solemnly and refreshingly interesting at some time to consider the Lord's Supper and the language used, in the light of Exodus 12. Possibly some have observed that there we have Divine expressions about TAKING the lamb, EATING the lamb, a stress on the word "This" and an emphasis on "Remember" The language of God is not accidental. The thought of "DOING" is also prominent, for, at the end of the 12th chapter, where we have keeping the Passover, it is rendered by the Greek word before us "Do". It is a serious thing that when the Lord Jesus Christ took a loaf, and the Holy Spirit tells us when it was

taken, is it a serious thing, or is it not, to shut our eyes to the comparing of Scripture with Scripture, and to say ANOTHER kind of loaf will do? Is it a serious thing to CUT the bread instead of breaking the bread? to have PART of a loaf instead of a loaf? Is it a serious thing to have fermented wine, instead of the fruit of the vine which along He commanded? Is it a serious thing to have cups instead of a cup? Is it, or is it not? We have to face such questions. As to many parts of doctrine we may apparently keep the point in suspense. I do not say it is healthy for our Christian lives so to hesitate, but we may; but as to the Lord's Supper we cannot be neutral, we either partake or we do not partake. If we partake wrongly, we break His commandment, if we do not partake rightly when we can, we omit His appointment. We cannot be neutral. We must act or grieve the Lord. I do not doubt that there are certain positions in which a believer is placed, and he does not know which way to act. When I say a child of God must act in this matter, I do not mean he is to rush forward unknowingly, but he is to be deeply concerned not to CONTINUE restfully in a state of inactivity. The Lord's will is to be paramount in the life. I have been impressed to-day once more with the solemnity of this subject, and how much is connected with it. Perhaps someone will think there is a difference in Genesis, for the Lord says, "Of every tree shalt thou eat, but of the tree of knowledge thou shalt not eat". He gives the appointment "This do" in Luke,

but He does not say, "Thou shalt not use leavened bread". Let us recollect that God dealt with Adam and Eve as His subjects. He deals with His people now as those who are brought into an intimate union. The whole character of the present dispensation is to leave, (or rather encourage), our love to follow His appointment, without needing to be told "Thou shalt not do the opposite". Of the ten commandments nine were negatives. In the Lord's arrangements we rather have the positive. Love to Him will not want a negative to hedge it in. Love to Him will not wish to go back to the legalism of negatives; Love sufficiently near to Him to see His will and obey Him promptly, (Psalm 40. 6-8). If the Lord says, "This do", love realises that to do anything else is NOT to "This do". The first commandment with promise in Exodus, is the commandment that is POSITIVE, "Honour thy Father and thy Mother". The Lord emphasizes the peculiar privilege of obedience to POSITIVE commands. Moreover, in 1 Corinthians 2 where the spiritual man is brought before us we are told that he compares spiritual things with spiritual, but that the carnal man is unable to be treated as one who pleases God in the same way. The carnal man, the fleshly immature believer says, "I want to see it all in one verse, and if I cannot see it there I do not accept it". But the spiritual man says, "If I find it all in one Bible it is sufficient for me, because God has given me the whole Scripture to compare spiritual things with spiritual". Observe, I do not mean that all who break bread Scripturally are therefore spiritual persons

in spiritual growth. I DREAD lest we should become self-satisfied. I dread lest we should think because we do ONE act to please the Lord THEREFORE we do other acts. I am persuaded that in my own life, and in the lives of many others, formalism always seeks to make its attack when we seek to please the Lord, and we ever need to be on our guard, for Satan is not only subtle to alter the "Tnis" but to alter the "Thus". We need the right motive and manner as well as the right matter. Oh that we may be led by the Holy Spirit.

Very definitely Leviticus 10 has been before me. There we read of Nadab and Abihu, two sons of Aaron, the older ones, the right persons, - that they took their censers, put fire therein, and incense, and offered strange fire before the Lord WHICH HE COMMANDED THEM NOT. They ought to have drawn the right INFERENCE from the preceding passage. But instead of learning His will, they did that which He commanded them not. The Scripture does NOT say "Which He forbade them". Those in the priest's family ought not to have needed the negative, "Thou shalt NOT use strange fire". It was enough for them that the Lord had given an arrangement. Every pleading for more definite statement than God has given in "This do" is a pleading for God to put us back in Judaism, and to rob us of our privilege in the true High Priest's family. It is, moreover, to risk a parallel sin with the sin of Nadab and Abihu. The Lord dealt very sternly with such self-choosing. Doubtless there were many failures afterwards,

yet He did not always act with severity. He dealt sternly with Ananias and Sapphira, though many have done likewise since that day. Many will tell us that the proof of a thing is right is "The Lord blesses it". Rather, He blesses AMID it. He blessed Israel in the wilderness when circumcision was omitted. He blessed when the rock was wrongly smitten. He is sovereign. We are not to be those who simply argue from a blessing to a commandment, but from a commandment to a blessing. His will is our law. The Lord can bless when and where He pleases. He will not be tied down to our conception of what He should do.

There are many other passages which should, I think, be stated in this connection. Not a few will say it is a little thing. But the Lord Jesus uses the word "this" or the word "those" in such a connection, and He emphasizes the thought I want to be impressed on our hearts. THESE ought ye to have DONE, and not to leave the others undone. "This do" in its literalness; "with a view to My remembrance" do not leave undone. Granted that "with a view to My remembrance" is the "weightier" matter, in that it concerns that which is within, why should we seek to separate ONE part of the will of the Lord from the OTHER? Many will tell us that they want the spirit of a command, not the letter. What do they mean? Do they mean to tell us that literal obedience must be unspiritual? Then they deny the whole obedience of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Do they mean to tell us that they want obedience within, and

they do not care about an obedience which is external? What does this signify? We are not to halve the Lord's commandments. "Ye are My FRIENDS, if ye do WHATSOEVER". I am somewhat impressed with Deuteronomy 24, where in verse 18 we read. "Thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God REDEEMED thee thence, therefore I COMMAND thee to DO THIS thing". A redeemed one should delight in the Lord's "this". What thing? The CONTEXT must tell. The word "This" almost invariably leads us to such pondering. Verse 22, "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt, therefore I COMMAND thee to DO THIS thing". Again we have the Divine emphasis. "Doing this", BECAUSE redeemed in wondrous love. I believe, beloved friends, that the story of Gideon will help us. He told those who were with him to do what he did. "Look on me, and do likewise". The Lord by "this" told His disciples to look, for "this" is a pointing-out word. But the natural man always misunderstands "this". "Destroy THIS temple, and in three days I will build it up". They said, Forty and six years was THIS temple in building. He spoke of the temple of His body. He pointed out the "this", but they had no eyes to see. "Thou art Peter, and upon THIS Rock I will build My church". Ah, many have said, that means Peter; but the word "Peter" and the word "Rock" are contrasted.

the Lord referred to Himself. But many are blind to Christ's "this". He points out, and they do not have eyes to see. Shall it be so with us when He says "this do"? Nay. The centurion, whose faith caused marvelling, knew the meaning of obedience. "I say unto one, 'Go', and he goeth; to another 'Come', and he cometh; and to my servant 'DO THIS!', and he doeth it". The attentive SERVANT is to know the Lord's action. You remember in the psalms we read, "As the eyes of servants unto the hands of their masters, and the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God until that He have mercy upon us". The eye watches His hand. What did He do? If a Scripture can be found which asserts what He took, and if a Scripture can be found which indicates what He brake, our eyes are upon that Scripture, even as the eyes of the disciples were thus unto the Lord's hand. And if there is to be any change we want the authority of the Lord Himself for changing, else we have a new cart borrowed from Philistia. The Lord overrulingly blessed the new cart when the Philistines ignorantly made it, and He may bless ignorant believers, as we have all been ignorant when we have broken bread wrongly; but when Israel, who should have known better, copied the cart blessed among the Philistines, they were brought unto a position of grievous danger, and Uzza died by the ark of God. If we copy that which the Lord blessed in the past, but have no authority

from Him to change, we grieve the Holy Spirit, and it may be that we shall enter into the words of Corinthians. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and some sleep".

There are many other subjects which one would desire to take in this connection. I should like to work out the occurrences of the word "this" in the Gospels, and in Corinthians. The word "for" has been somewhat helpful to me. In Matthew 26 we read, verse 27, The Lord said, "Drink ye all of it, FOR this is My blood, the blood of the new covenant that is being poured out for many". "Drink ye ALL of it" does not merely mean that they were to partake, but that EVERYONE of those present was to partake. In other words ALL who had broken bread were to partake of the fruit of the vine. Romanism has travestied that. The Lord's "all" refers to the "all" of His obedient people, and so should it be still. Every child of God should be deeply exercised till taking the necessary steps to be gathered with Scriptural believers, and including this act of obedience. Drink ye of it, ALL of you, for this is My blood. The "FOR" is linked with the word "ALL". Observe the threefold statement "My blood", "The blood of the new Covenant", "The blood poured out for many". A threefold view which appeals to our hearts. Another FOR is in 1 Corinthians 11. Verse 25 says, "This do as often as ye drink, with a view to My remembrance; FOR as often as ye eat this

bread, and drink the cup, the death of the Lord ye announce until He shall have come". This do, with a view to My remembrance, FOR you announce the death of the Lord. At once we see that the idea of remembrance is not only our remembering, but a glad memorial before the Father, FOR we announce the death of the Lord. Again, one would like to notice the "until's" in this context. Two words are used, but with a similar thought. "UNTIL I drink it new with you". "UNTIL He shall come". It is still the night. Instituted in the night in which He was betrayed, it is still enjoyed amid that which is morally the night. He has not yet come. "The kingdom" is strikingly seen in Luke 22. We have the statement as to the Passover "Until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God". I am glad of that. The PASSOVER is to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. We are told when that feast will be fulfilled, and Acts 2 tells us that the day of Pentecost was then fulfilled. Here is plain evidence that the feasts are types, and that they are to be fulfilled. So the Sabbath, in Colossians 2 is said to have a shadow of good things to come. These divine arrangements are full of types. Pentecost has been fulfilled, and in Ezekiel Pentecost is not kept again, but Passover and Tabernacles will be. But whereas the Lord Jesus Christ said at the Passover, "Until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God", He used a different expression as to the Lord's Supper. He spoke of drinking

new with His people in the kingdom of God, and in His Father's Kingdom, - a different aspect to the fulfilling, but both are associated with the twofold future kingdom. The Passover has its fulfilment in the kingdom. There will be animal sacrifices, an earthly aspect. The drinking of the fruit of the vine is to be new in the kingdom, - the Father's Kingdom. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. The Father's Kingdom seems to emphasize that which is above the earth, and we have the very precious thought of sitting down to eat and drink with Him in the marriage supper of the Lamb, in the air. The wording used and applied by the Holy Spirit, is beautifully suggestive; "Until He shall have come" gives the same view. "Eat and drink with Me at My table in My kingdom" is what the Lord Jesus goes on to say. But do you observe that He links the drinking of the fruit of the vine with the kingdom of God? What about the bread of which Deuteronomy says, "The bread of affliction"? Does He say that His people will share that with Him in their Father's kingdom? No, beloved friends, there is a contrast. The fruit of the vine is in the kingdom, for THAT speaks of glory. No humiliation then, no suffering then. Now we have the two linked; then the glory in its completeness. Many are the subjects which we could work out, and for which our hearts would praise God in the Holy Spirit. We thank our Lord for

all that He has told us. We are thankful for what He has NOT told us. He has not told us the size of the loaf. We are therefore willing to be ignorant. He has told us the nature of the loaf, and therefore we are not willing to be ignorant. We dread any attitude but that of disciple likeness, we dread lest even in symbol we wander from the Lord's own appointment. We have just been noticing that words often make "doctrine" and so do symbols. The alteration of baptism in water to sprinkling of an infant has been associated with the erroneous doctrine that man is not so bad after all, but needs rather a part washing than a birth; has been associated with the theory of a mere savability in the work of Christ, and a universalism, The error of altering the bread and the fruit of the vine at the Lord's Supper is a most remarkable error, inasmuch as it deals with the very two materials which are in COMMON use, and which can be so EASILY procured in both a fermented or unfermented state; and it sets forth in front of us that if a man does that which is so easily a change from the Lord's appointment, he introduces himself, and "typically" though unintentionally, sets on one side the absolute perfectness of the Lord Jesus. We find in a passage already noticed, in Leviticus 10, that Moses added, "This is it which the Lord spake saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh Me - (I will be set apart as the One Who arranged all in My worship), - and before all the people

will I be glorified". Those who arranged for themselves did not sanctify the Name of the Lord. So is it in Numbers 20. Moses was told to take the rod, and he went out, and when he was there with the people he smote the rock twice. He might have said, I was not told to omit smiting the rock, I was told to take the rod, naturally I should draw my inference how I should use it. But the Lord says, "Because ye believed Me not to sanctify Me". He did what he was not commanded, - in measure as Nadab and Abihu. Such an action is not sanctifying the Lord. We are not to wait till the command is given "Do not do this", but we are to accept commandments which have been graciously given. Nadab and Abihu lost their lives at once, and Aaron lost his life and Moses lost his life, and never entered the land, because of failure to sanctify the Lord. The first petition of the still-appointed prayer is "Our Father Who art in heaven, LET THY NAME BE SANCTIFIED". God grant this may be so, increasingly so, in our hearts and lives and meetings! So shall He be glorified as we wait for our Coming Lord.
