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There was a literal eating of manna: why not again ?  
Christians are perpetually forgetting the resurrection of  
THE Bopy. And though it may not, after that great  
change, need any supply of food, still it may be a plea-  
sure to partake of it. Did not the Lord Jesus eat  
and drink more than once with His disciples, after He  
rose from the dead? The manna is the food of the  
tabernacle, while the Lord’s people are still in the wilder-  
ness, ere yet the new heavens and earth are reached.  
The fruit is the food of the city, after earth is destroyed,  
and the new earth is tenanted by its nations.  
Here then we establish a very important difference  
between the Gospel of John, and his Apocalypse. Our  
Lord while on earth, arguing with the faithless Jews,  
presents to them Himself as the spiritual manna.  
In the Gospel, Jesus is offering Himself to the un-  
believer, that he may have eternal life. The manna is  
spiritually taken. In the Revelation, Jesus is offering  
reward to those who are beltevers, already possessed of  
Himself as their everlasting life. The promise now is to  
be fulfilled, not to every believer, and not to be received  
now by faith, but to be enjoyed only by the conquering  
believer, after resurrection. We cannot then understand  
it, in the same sense as in the Gospel.  
\*Tis literally to be taken then! It stands as the Lord’s  
antagonist promise to the Gnostic enticements to sin.  
They offered a place at the idol feasts ; both at Ephesus  
and at Pergamos. To each Church Jesus exhibits the  
promise of a better food. He promises the hid manna, as  
the High Priest, having the right of entrance into the  
Holiest, and having power over its ark. What were  
the idol-banquets in the temples of the heathens to  
this ?  
We arrive at the second promise.  
Jesus would give a white stone, on which should be  
engraven a new name.