**The assurance and exhortation of the Holy Supper (K. Schilder)**

*(sermon held on July 13/1941 at Rotterdam-Delfshaven, Preken deel 3)*

Lord’s Day 28 ~ Read John 6: 41-57

Congregation, for a few weeks we will speak about the Holy Supper of the Lord. Lord’s Day 28 is engaged in opening this discussion. Lord’s Days 29 and 30 subsequently follow up in the doctrine of church discipline, the power of the keys and by this the second part of the catechism ends and we come to the doctrine of thankfulness.

The question is often posed, why the church still speaks so long and detailed about the Holy Supper today. Some say: oh, we understand well enough, that in the past, in a time of all kinds of church quarreling the meaning of the Holy Supper is given in a wide and detailed exposition, for then there were all sorts of contentious questions about the meaning, the nature, etc. of the Holy Supper. However since the Reformation has come to rest and the struggle with Rome and Luther over the Lord’s Supper is settled and we are far removed from Rome and have no need to fight Luther so wouldn’t it be better that rather than three chapters on the Holy Supper to have only one ? Who would expend so much prose on a simple symbolic discourse about eating and drinking. We should not go into such a detailed description, it depends on feelings of the heart, of placing your heart on Christ’s sacrifice, on which your celebration is founded, the rest is good for theologians.

Yet, that the Supper is extensively discussed is not something new, the battle flares up especially and exactly when the dots are put on the I’s. The Apostle John, the Evangelist, is certainly not the man, we would say, who has an extraordinary understanding of letter choice, and his powerful style differentiates him from all the other evangelists. He is the man of tender words and thoughts, in whom love so often comes to the fore and whose line of thinking absolutely does not seem to relate to the church’s struggle over this and over that. Except for the institution of the Lord’s Supper itself this Evangelist has written the most about the meaning and significance of this supper and has let Christ speak for Himself, not just as He serves and begins to institute it in the Passover room, but as He already had discussed it when He addressed the Jews about the issue and immediately gave an explanation.

John, or Christ rather, spends an entire chapter on the subject of eating His flesh and drinking His blood. And it is noteworthy that division started to show up in the circle of Jesus’ followers at that time, after the sermon on the Lord’s Supper. This is what follows this remarkable sermon about eating and drinking Christ’s flesh and blood: hearing this many of His disciples said: ‘these are hard words, who can hear it? Who can keep it up with such a Rabbi who dares say such rude things? With a Rabbi who says: you must eat my flesh and drink my blood? The Jews find this offensive language: the eating of human flesh and the drinking of human blood. And hearing this Jesus asks: Does this offend you? Is it a stone on the road, over which you must fall? If on account of this question, you are offended. Everyone answers for himself, one speaking, the other silent, then Jesus says: Therefore I Said to you no one can come to me, unless it is given him from the Father. For Jesus knew from the beginning who those were who did not believe, and who it was who would betray Him. According to His own counsel the offensive message of eating His flesh and drinking His blood also had to cause a sifting amongst His followers. And when a mass of disciples take leave to the outside, when Christ’s school empties out, when the multitude dwindles, just after the Lord’s Supper sermon, then He continues with the remnant and asks: will you go too? Then Peter comes foreword and says : to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life; also when You speak of eating Your flesh and drinking Your blood.

In other words: the first time Christ dealt with that which we are now discussing, the split came in the church of old Israel and the old Israel is separated from the new. And now the question comes also to us whether we want to go and leave after that difficult Lord’s Supper word, for the essence of the issue of this spiritual eating and drinking, is that it is an offence to the Jews and a foolishness to the Greeks, but it is for those who believe power of God and wisdom of God. (I speak of) we will hear about the confession of our church regarding the Holy Supper, and following the text of the first question hear about:

***The (assurance and exhortation) sign and seal of the Holy Supper.***

First: the fact

Second: the manner

Third: the operation

Fourth: the authority of the sign and seal of the Holy Supper. Psalm 138: 2, 3

**ONE**

Our attention is requested in the first place for the fact of the assurance and exhortation (sign and seal) enclosed in the Holy Supper. I proceed from the single fact which the catechism itself assumes and actually lays as the basis to everything that follows. For the first question reads: how are you assured and exhorted (how is it signed and sealed to you) in the Holy Supper that the only sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross, benefits you? In other words: the manner in which it happens is in order first, but that it happens is actually the initial presumption. And the Holy Supper itself is exhortation and assurance according to this simple announcement. Naturally this observation goes back to what was already said earlier, when the question was: what are the sacraments. It was said there also that sacraments are holy signs and seals deployed by God to give us some understanding thereby and to seal it. In other words: the foundational consideration of the sacraments as such continues this afternoon and is maintained and the main point therefore, also of the Holy Supper, is that the exhortation happens and the assurance is accomplished.

So in a real sense the exhortation is charged to us and the assurance, by which we hear proclaimed beyond all doubt, is a present reality in us.

We can never be thankful enough for the fact, that this understanding of the Lord’s Supper as action and assurance is still held before the church in our confession, for when that is tampered with every Holy Supper concept must irretrievably founder. I will stand still for a moment with the fact of the exhortation (sign) and assurance (seal) of the Lord’s Supper in order to oppose the fact of a (mis)understanding rising more and more of late. An exhortation is actually, without consideration of the way it happens, a common thing, which occurs with words. Without words I cannot recognize an exhortation. Sometimes something is added to give it extra power, but no on can exhort with just a gesture or sign, without a word said. It is the same with assurance. There can be no assurance without the word. I can add a sign to the spoken word, and when I have understood the word I can immediately comprehend the sign. But although assurances can happen through symbols, gestures, signs and seals, nevertheless no sign and seal has any meaning or any opportunity to say something without words preceding them. That word is fastened to it, comes with it, sticks to it and nothing is clear without the word, clearly exhorting and assuring.

Why is all this brought out this afternoon? Because also in recent times the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper has been brought into sharp debate and lately one theory in particular about the meaning and origin of the Holy Supper has won many adherents. This theory about the origin and maintenance of the Lord’s Supper proceeds from the idea that it is actually nothing more than a so called ‘chaburah’, a meal for people who together belong to a group. We can all recognize a comrade nowadays. In our days a comrade is someone, whether in a party, or in an order or country, who feels himself grouped with others by an idea, and who see this one idea and this one doctrine as a principle, which binds and keeps; and so form together a holy order, or intending so at least, or an unholy order; together they form a camaraderie, a society, a club or a state. Such friendship groups have been there from time of old, philosophical or otherwise, whose intention was that also something religious could be presented there. They were also present in Jewry, therefore the Jewish word ‘charubah’. They were there in the days of early Christianity. Later they were also with the free-masons, etc, who fought against the church and against whom the church fought. And they are again there in every circle, who see the camaraderie principle as the real expression of a community of people, who have thought up a particular secret teaching, which you must feel, and who want to live together from it. Well, they say then, such a fellowship, such a group of buddies, pledges to gather, and when they gather it is a society of initiates, who are gripped by an idea; and to express the joy and communion they eat and drink together. It is a meal, not just an act of someone who wants to keep death at bay, no it was a solemn business by which the spirit (lower case) cemented the spirit of comradeship and of being initiated together into a band of those, who hung onto the same idea, which idea enthralls and governs the whole assembly.

Now (it might be expected that) Jesus of Nazareth and His twelve disciples would also have formed such a ’chaburah’. He also understood that the Kingdom of Heaven was something different than what the scribes taught, who had obscured everything. And opposite the broad toga wearing masses of the church, Caiaphas and Annas etc, opposite all those with the sacraments, known officially, Passover and circumcision, opposite those officially knowledgeable and opposite the earthly kingdom and the state and the church, Jesus of Nazareth would have as initiator established a society of comrades. They had their own separate secret, for the Kingdom of Heaven was not there just for the taking, they were animated by one idea which the masses did not comprehend, their secret which bound them together, actually taking them out of the world and binding them together. And in the night when Jesus knew, there will come a conflict, I will be betrayed, when He understood that a clash must come between the Counsel of Caiaphas and His own group, then, in that night, He came together with His fellows sitting down at table as their leader. He took bread and wine and said: brothers, comrades, we are going to celebrate with a meal together, a meal of ‘chaburah’ for we are going to celebrate our togetherness and the feast of our sharing in a separate divine secret.

And they say then, as far as it goes today, everyone who knows the secret of Jesus of Nazareth, and who wants to and dares to and must contest the official church and (church) groups, and who have understood the secret, which is spiritual, who also can see behind the partitions, and so is also initiated into the circle of the mystical church, they also may go to today’s ’chaburah’, called the Holy Supper. But the masses, also the church masses, cannot understand it, because it is the secret of those who are energized by one spirit. Holy Supper, the great memorial-meal of the ‘chaburah’ of Jesus of Nazareth! The society of Jesus of Nazareth rises in a great glory parade as often as the supper is celebrated in this sense.

Congregation, this *sounds* so tremendously edifying. An that this so easily also finds a place in the church, I will explain in that we, Reformed, have (in the past) made it a matter for a few insiders. There are still groups, who think it fine, when only a few initiate come up and let the rest stay away. But isn’t that completely opposite of what it says, that is that it is no secret cultus, but that there is exhortation and assurance. Therefore if (any) support to the administration of the Word occurs; the exhortation and assurance are essential. Yet this idea, which connects the supper with the administration of the word, is actually robbed it of its essence whenever the word of exhortation and assurance does not come *first* in order to explain it all. Whoever accepts the ‘chaburah’-theory deviates greatly from this concept.

The differences are easy to grasp. I will name them. In the first place “chaburah’ has more to do with eating together than with eating. The fellows come together, have a little togetherness, and that togetherness is arcing the spark of secret holy fire from one to the other, eating together is more than eating.

In the Holy Supper eating is the main point, and eating together is included, but it is not the essential point. For where the Holy Supper pulls the congregation together in assuring and exhorting the way of Christ, there the Supper may distinguish itself in the Word-administration, that it follows a different course here of eating and drinking and therefore eating and drinking are indispensable, but eating together is not the secret. What happens here, is also arcing of a spark from the one to the other, yet in the first place the arcing of one spark from Him, who goes before and sits in front and in clear language gives Himself as sacrifice for sin and only then establishes communion with each other.

Furthermore in a (as mentioned above) meal of camaraderie again the main issue is that it involves natural food. We may bring up choice foods, but they are foods from nature. And that people come together is actually the main issue for which the natural food receives its real character and meaning. The food is sanctified and receives its function in the eating together, sanctified on account of those, who are sitting there, because they give the natural food a holy function.

That is not the case with the Holy Supper, for the natural food is bread and wine, but the bread and wine point to the body of Christ; Who sits for the first time at the table as host and gives Himself away. A chairman of a camaraderie meal will never do so. He (Christ) Himself gives Himself away. And eating and drinking does not mean to say something in general about holy bonding, but it means in this instance, that they are able to do nothing, unless through Jesus; Whom they all must take in; that is why they speak of eating and drinking.

The deciding factor is this: at the ‘chaburah’ there is the initiator, who has a mystery and understands what others can not and may not approach. They always sit with their backs to the world. It is a special secret of a few initiate, who keep their secret high and aristocratic. Now I will admit that the Holy Supper is indeed something possible and attainable for only a specific group of people. It is for you and not for someone else. One drinks and eats judgment for himself when he comes and another eats and drinks the Lord’s will. But the line of separation of coming or not coming together is not a matter of whether you know the secret, which another misses. For the Holy Supper has only one dividing line, belief or unbelief. Whoever believes, may and must come and whoever does not believe must remain outside. Beyond that the supper knows of no one class, and no single race or distinction by blood. It is no mystery service. It cuts off every thread of apartheid between man and fellowman, for it says, that the bread which we break here, is the bread of the world. It reads, I am the bread of the world. And when I say: unbelievers, leave it alone, that does not mean to say, don’t touch it because you don’t know the secret, but because you reject it knowingly. For oh, if you would come and believe. We beg you for Christ’s will: partake, for you will die if you don’t.

And if therefore the Supper gives an impression of calling together those exhorted and assured in Christ’s way, I put away the thought that it is a meal for the ‘initiated‘. The Supper is also not in a separate upper chamber, where it says ‘entry forbidden’ for non-initiated. For precisely the church is given the public secret from Jesus Christ. And I say that no secret happens as far as the Lord’s Supper itself is concerned, because the prose of God’s Word precedes it, which is turned on by the loudspeakers of the Holy Supper. This tells us that there remain outside only those, who knowing the clear language of the Holy Supper, say I will not, I do not chose it and I say ‘no’ to what I have understood in the transparent message of the Holy Supper. There is a mystery in that ‘yes’, spoken through grace, to the clear message of the Lord’s Supper. The mystery is in the saying ‘yes’ itself, but the preaching of the Supper is equally as clear as when the bible is opened, the confessions underwritten, and the form is read.

Therefore Christ did not come to the Jews in the night of betrayal in order to say: We will establish a camaraderie, because He gives Himself in death for their sakes, and they live from Him. It is not an enjoyment of what lives and is between them, but it is an entrance into death and exclusion from life of the One for all. The others may enjoy joy and salvation. What the One does for the others, not what moves itself amongst those 12 people, is decisive here. The church sings of this with its language of praise and celebrates a remembrance by the Holy Supper.

**TWO**

Therefore only now comes to the light of day the manner by which I go to eat and drink, by which I am exhorted and assured. In the sermon the exhortation and assurance is that of the ordinary word. With the Lord’s Supper comes the act of eating and drinking. I must eat of the bread and drink of the cup and with it I must remember the promise, which says, that that eating is symbolic and that drinking is symbolic, that the breaking of the bread represents Jesus’ own death and the wine His blood and that it comes like this for our assurance. For as real and as ordinary and true every act of receiving the cup and taking the bread is, so real it is also that God firmly guarantees to accept me in grace and as certainly takes me up in the church, in the new mankind, the city which is above, namely in heaven with His glory and His fellowship. Therefore eating and drinking is not the only exhortation and assurance, for the breaking of the bread and the pouring of the wine occurred first as exhortation and assurance.

And what the guest may do here besides is to concentrate on the idea of togetherness. Eating cannot occur here without the preceding act of breaking the bread and pouring the wine. That goes first, because that is the essential point. That I eat is not the main thing, for then the accent was again laid on our action, again there would be the religious society, which aligns and clarifies its belief-function in the supper. No, it says here, we will eat the broken bread and drink the poured wine, take it, take, broken and poured out. The enterprise does not proceed when no bread is broken; then it is actually no Lord’s Supper; and when no wine is poured, then it is no Lord’s Supper. And only when that action has passed, God breaking apart the bread before our eyes, only after that can I come with the others and eat that particular bread and drink the poured wine.

In other words: God’s action precedes and ours follows. His activity signifies this breaking of bread as pointing to Christ’s body, to His violent death. It is not a natural death but a payment for sin. His death as sacrifice is the main thing drawn out for me. Therefore also the pouring of wine, reminding me of the violent out pouring of His blood. Therefore the picturing before my eyes of Christ’s death is of first importance and thereby God guarantees that the fact really happened. And only after that, by the power that the Holy Spirit carries into my heart, first by the Word and also by the sacrament, comes our act of eating and drinking, and what we do with it. God’s deed from His side, which we participate in; His flock eats there. And like a flock of sheep, a congregation of sheep brought to pasture by the shepherd and finding the pasture which he choose, so it is here with the Shepherd of the sheep.

On His part he lets us eat and makes us an eating congregation during the hour of the holy Supper. But as sheep, who by a inborn urge set their feet on a field of grass and tear at the grass and eat of it naturally, so with us also. The congregation which must eat by the Lord’s appointment, also begin to eat according to the natural appetite. And what I receive now is that the desire of my faith to be together with others is strengthened, but also that my own desire to live with Christ may be exercised to the full. I do feel the pull of the coetus, the gathering of the church, but I have much more than a ‘chaburah’, for my Host is offering and offerer. He is the breaker of bread and the Broken-one Himself , who offers a libation and is poured out Himself on the altar of atonement. Therefore God’s action and mine come together here and the simple and ordinary means of exhortation and assurance is truly according to the New Testament order. Think for a moment about the commotion at Passover, when the animal is killed, the family comes together and there is a solemn ceremony.

Consider how simple the Holy Supper is in comparison; an uncomplicated gesture, bloodless bread and wine, which have nothing frightful and there is no act of slaughter, all very basic. But the simplicity of the New Testament belongs to its richness. The sign has been simplified in comparison with the Old Testament. But the more the sign is simplified, as far as it concerns the horror, the more the church will flow over in the knowledge of the thing that is signified. The place of the elaboration of this exhortation and assurance comes via the sign.

**THREE**

Now it comes, that I, in eating Christ’s broken body by faith, and through faith annexing to myself His poured out blood, receive these fruits: by my own action I take on His suffering and death afresh and by that I receive anew in time, today, forgiveness of sins. I am again justified in time, in and by faith. Furthermore I receive fellowship with Christ by His Spirit. And I also have this effect, that He and I, being divided between two worlds, He above and I below, still are pulled together by one bond, because, although He is killed, yet he stands at table and sits there; and he, who is known in the church as servant of the Word and of the sacraments, has the duty and the privilege to represent Him and to be in His name; leader, who is officially called and to distribute the signs.

And these, congregation, are tremendous fruits, for here it is eating and drinking after God’s own action of breaking and pouring of the bread and the wine, indeed a function appearing from faith, which is now assured and encouraged. It is accepting with the whole heart, with a believing heart, the heart being central in a person, in and of his whole existence. For as eating means taking in food, which is from outside of me, by which the blood flow is sustained and the food becomes interwoven into my own existence, so it is also here. I annex Christ through my own action and say, it is not a fact outside of me, not a doctrine I can accept by my own understanding, but the Holy Spirit went into me. I have a doctrine about it, but that doctrine comes on account of the fact that I have part in it. I live from it, I take it up and accept it, not only with my understanding but with my whole personality, meaning: all what is crucial. From this, everything that is affected by it: my will, my mood, my natural existence. The young man is sanctified by it and the old woman is cheered up. My entire humanity, also my natural humanity, has a share to it, for I have heard the Word through the microphone of the Holy Supper, and that is what I live from. I am connected to the fundamental. This eating is blessed, not because you move your tongue, but that God, by His own act and by your own act of eating, links you into the great process of preserving and governing the world.

At the same time another blessing comes along with the first effect of eating and drinking, the blessing that you again receive justification from sin and eternal life. The justification of the saints, who have the decision of God behind them from all eternity, is bound in time to faith. By its doctrine the church says that faith takes on justification in time and by that we receive justification, bound to that faith.

Therefore I go home, justified after the Lord’s Supper, not for the first time, for it happens when I have accepted the Word and received along with it the prophetic role. As often, also here, as I afterwards in time, perform the act of faith by answering the sermon with ‘amen’ every Sunday. I go home justified, sins are forgiven anew, so that the person, who comes to the Holy Supper and prays everyday: forgive our trespasses, also gets a hearing at the Holy Supper.

It is actually foolish and unheard of to pray: forgives us our trespasses everyday, and to not let this be sealed by a believing acceptance of the sermon and sitting at the Holy Supper in faith. But whoever combines them together: the question for forgiveness of sins and it being done by the preaching about this and with the Supper in such a manner, does go home justified indeed. And the mighty act of justification is clearly taught here in the church. We may not say that our justification does not happen in time or through faith.

Then comes the last fruit of the mystical union. The word ‘mystique’ is a dangerous term in so far as the ‘chaburah’ that comes with it. ‘Chaburah’ says: we are once more mystic, the freemason logic etc. The power of action is our strength. Our friendship is holy order. Our ideas are gripping slogans, dynamic and certainly not static. We are the society of mystics, because we understand the new life, not by our mental facilities but by the reaching for the ideal, which has gripped and energized us.

As I said before already, we bypass that teaching as far as it concerns its fundamental trait and its poverty, but now we say after the foregoing,

now we say, after the administration of the Word and by engaging with that preceding administration of the Word,

now we say, after God has gone up first in the church assembly, in giving to eat and to drink,

now we say: there is also a mystique with us.

Not ‘mystique’ as an independent noun, not that, but a mystical union, in which ‘mystique’ is an adjective, in the sense of ‘hidden’. There is still a secretive texture, withdrawn from the senses that can see and taste, which is also essential at the Supper. Now the Spirit comes, not with a small ‘s’, not the spirit of ‘chaburah’, of our own idea, but the Holy Spirit with a large ‘S’, God Himself, unreachable, who goes in advance, Who commands, Who speaks and it is there. And that Spirit, whom I know by the Word and also must know at the Lord’s Supper according to the Word, this Spirit has said: Now, I, almighty God, bind together in one act, Christ, who is above according to the flesh, with the flock of sheep, which is below. And that one Spirit binds them and Him together. He also belongs to it, to the fellowship, which he made Himself, and draws us to Him. And that Spirit can now use the powerful language, which is used here, and which I would never dare use if it was not written with the introduction included: bone of His bone, flesh of His flesh.

The language of mystique, which has (often) become heretical to the extreme, may stand here and can stand here, because it is stripped of its man made mystique, and prepared by Christ. Bone of His bone, that means: in my act of faith I have so truly eaten by the Word, not that Jesus, but that Jesus *Christ* takes form in me. When I say: Jesus came to take shape in me, He is still man. When I say Jesus as historic person, then one can think of the past and another about the bridegroom above. But when I say Jesus Christ, then I say it right. Jesus, yes, the historical person, but qualified in His office, preaching, gathering the church by the office, never outside of the office nor by circumventing His Word. And that Jesus Christ now goes and receives form and becomes one body, He the head and we the body. One Spirit energizes them, one Spirit, not coming from men, animistic, but one Spirit, who risks the offense and foolishness of the preaching, who appoints elders and deacons, who calls together the church, who lets the Word be preached ten times for every Supper celebration. The Spirit Who comes with the letter and uses that and gives the hidden work of testing to small children, to the testing by the Scriptures, saying: Everything that is in you not in accord with the Word, I cast off, disapprove, and only what is deep within you which agrees with the written Word you may accept as exhortation and assurance on the basis of the Word, understandable by children, though it be deeper then they are.

**FOUR**

Which authority must there be to bring this about? The authority, not of the members of the ‘chaburah’, but from Jesus Christ’s own spoken Word and from Paul’s official and apostolic authority. Where does it say that? asks the catechism. Then comes the answer: it hails from the institution of the Supper and in Paul’s letters to Corinth. Christ conveys it to us in the institution of the Holy Supper, when He assembled (them) together, to live, not from what they had together as eleven, twelve or thirteen members of a fellowship, but from what He said when he was about to die according to the Scriptures, both priest and lamb at the same time.

That authority was not that from a dying person. We often say: over there is grandfather’s chair, he died, let it stand, the old man lives on in our thoughts. This is also what the members of a fellowship say, the Supper is holy, for Jesus was about to die and His last wish is law to us. But that is not authoritative! No one is made holy by dying. A person is made holy by Word and prayer. And the authority behind the Lord’s Supper was not that Jesus was dying, for He who would die says: soon I will live anew. And in anticipation of receiving life he says; eat and drink, till I come, and indeed I will come to you every Sunday. Not the authority of a dying man, but of one Man, who had lived and lives, and was dead. The authority of the one Sent of the Father, of the Messiah, who is in the Holy Supper and comes with it. Therefore Paul can come and say, apostolically: I say it, I, I a called apostle, servant of the church, witness of Jesus, a picked child of man, I order you, church people, to do so as the Supper prescribes.

Therefore we end today, not with a sentimental look into the garden, where a man-child prayed, even if it was Jesus Himself, for whoever would get it from that, will actually never receive it from the Lord’s Supper, but will leave with a feeling that it has come to a dead end and separated from the Word. Whoever knows the authority of Jesus Christ, Who is God and man in one person, whoever trembles before the holy Supper, as they tremble for the Word, and does not find the command to eat and drink less than the ten commandments, that person can come before the Supper and say; I tremble before the authority of Thy command, for the whole law, which speaks with thunder and lightning, although coming with peaceful intent, is also there at the Lord’s Supper. Not in a quiet chamber where the masses cannot come, but in the place of Horeb’s power and Golgotha’s terror, that is where the Supper of the Lord is set. You shall not steal, but celebrate the Supper, you shall not commit adultery, you will celebrate the Holy Supper; honor your father and mother, proclaim my death; remember the Sabbath day, celebrate My Supper, never use My name in vain, administer the Holy Supper, etc. Every command with authority ties itself close and as one to the command of the Holy Supper. When it is only accusatory this command terrifies me, but when this command also comes with evangelical intent then I can go home in peace. And in this command the authority of Christ and His apostles and the love of Him, who gave Himself in death, being the host, come together. He Himself washes the feet of the guests and He pours himself out according to the nature of the covenant of grace.

It is a great joy to see this covenant. We do not create a fellowship, but do strengthen the communion of saints. That one republic of those who are called by God’s Word we will place anew in the church covenant of Him who leads to that other Supper, which is above, where He also gives His place as prize to the One Who is first, and God Himself gives entrance into the communion of the new Jerusalem, so that God is all in all.

That is the God who used the letter of credentials of Christ Jesus, so as to establish His kingdom in the realm of time, which is out of and from and to all eternity.

**Amen**

Sing ~ Ps. 23:3; Ps. 95: 1; Ps. 138: 2, 3; Ps. 65: 2, 3 Ps. 95: 3 (BoP)