living things, in this largest sense, *to live,  
is Christ.* And all our nourishment and  
means of upholding are Christ. In this  
sense *his Body is the Life of the world.*  
Thus the fitness of the symbol for the  
thing now to be signified is shewn, not  
merely by analogy, but by the deep verities of Redemption. And this general and  
lower sense, underlying, as it does, all the  
spiritual and higher senses in John vi.,  
brings us to the *symbolic* meaning, which  
the Lord now first and expressly attaches  
to this sacramental bread.

Rising  
into the higher region of spiritual things,—*in and by the same Body of the Lord*,  
standing before the Father in accepted  
righteousness, is all *spiritual being upheld*,  
but by the *inward and spiritual process  
of feeding upon Him by faith:* of making  
that Body our own, causing it to pass  
into and nourish our souls, even as the  
substance of the bread into and  
nourishes our bodies. Of this *feeding  
upon Christ in the spirit* by faith, is the  
sacramental bread the *symbol* to us. When  
the faithful in the Lord’s Supper press  
with their teeth that sustenance, which is,  
even to the animal life of their bodies,  
*the Body of Christ*, whereby alone all  
animated being is upheld,—*they feed in  
their souls on that Body of righteousness  
and acceptance, by partaking of which  
alone the body and soul are nourished  
unto everlasting life*. And as, in the more  
general and natural sense, all that nourishes the body is the Body of Christ  
given for *all*,—so to *them*, in the *inner  
spiritual sense*, is the sacramental bread  
symbolic of that Body given for *them*,—their standing in which, in the adoption  
of sons, is witnessed by the sending abroad  
of the Spirit in their hearts. This last  
leads us to the important addition in Luke  
and 1 Cor. (but omitted here and in Mark)  
*which is* (*being given*, Luke,—omitted in 1  
Cor.) *for you*,*—this do in remembrance of  
me*. On these words we may remark (1)  
that the participle in the original is *present*;  
and, rendered with reference to the time  
when it was spoken, would be **which is being  
given**. The Passion had already  
begun; in fact the whole life on earth  
was this giving and breaking, consummated by his death: (2) that the *commemorative* part of the rite here enjoined  
strictly depends upon the *symbolic* meaning, and that, for its fitness, upon the  
*literal* meaning. The commemoration is  
of Him, in so far as He has come down  
into Time, and enacted the great acts of  
Redemption on this our world,—and shewn  
himself to us as living and speaking *Man*,  
an object of our personal love and affectionate remembrance:—but the other and  
higher parts of the Sacrament have regard  
to the *results* of those same acts of Redemption, as they are *eternized* in the  
counsels of the Father,—as the Lamb is  
slain *from the foundation of the world*(Rev. xiii. 8).

**27. gave it]** **He**  
gave, not to each, but once for all: in remarkable coincidence with Luke xxii. 17.  
*take this and divide it amongst yourselves.*  
This was *after the meal was ended*: *likewise also the cup after supper.* (Luke  
and 1 Cor.) As remarked above, it is quite uncertain whether our Lord followed minutely the Jewish practices, and we cannot therefore say whether the cup was one  
of wine and water mixed. It hardly follows from the expression of ver. 29, of this  
*fruit of the vine*, that it was of unmixed  
wine. The word **likewise** (in Luke and  
1 Cor.) contains our details of *taking and  
giving thanks* in it. **Drink ye all of  
it**] Peculiar to Matthew, preserved however in substance by Mark’s “*and they all  
drank of it*.” The **all** is remarkable, especially with reference to the practice of the  
Church of Rome, which forbids the cup to  
the laity. Calvin remarks: “*Why did He  
simply command them to eat the bread,  
while of the cup He commanded them all  
to drink?* It is as if He had intended to  
anticipate the craft of Satan.” It is on  
all accounts probable, and this command  
confirms the probability, that Judas *was  
present*, and *partook of both parts* of this  
first communion. The expressions are such  
throughout as to lead us to suppose that  
the same persons, *the Twelve*, were present.  
On the circumstance mentioned John xiii.  
30, which has mainly contributed to the  
other opinion, see note there.

**28. for  
this is my blood of the [new] testament]**  
So St. Mark also, omitting *for* and *new.*  
In Luke and 1 Cor. there is an important  
verbal difference. *This cup is the new  
testament in my blood*. But if we consider the matter closely, the *real* difference  
is but trifling, if any, Let us recur to the  
paschal rite. The lamb (*Christ our passover*) being killed, the blood (the blood of  
the covenant [testament], Exod. xxiv.  
8) is sprinkled on the doorposts, and is  
a sign to the destroying angel to spare  
the house. The *blood of the covenant* is  
the blood of the lamb. So also in the