

**The Body Given, But to Whom?**

*The Heresy of C. S. Lewis*

By John Pittman Hey

**Bible Text:** Luke 22:19; 1 Corinthians 11:24

**Preached on:** Sunday, September 14, 2008

**Grace Bible Church**

801 Sycamore Avenue  
Greenwood, MS 38930

**Website:** [www.gracebiblechurch-greenwood.org](http://www.gracebiblechurch-greenwood.org)

**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/gracebiblechurch](http://www.sermonaudio.com/gracebiblechurch)

In considering the Lord's Table two Sundays ago, we talked about Christ's statement that this cup represents his blood of the new covenant shed for many for the remission of sins, and how clear a statement of the gospel that little, short sentence gives—especially when you couple it with the text of the new covenant, the promise made by God all those years ago to Jeremiah the prophet. And then you top it off with the statements of the writer of Hebrews, which make it very clear that it was the death of Christ that executes that new covenant and that is the means by which the promise of the new covenant is fulfilled: that he will remember our sins against us no more.

But surely just as important is the statement by Christ about the bread, what he said in Luke 22 and verse 19, "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me... This is my body which is given for you."<sup>1</sup>

Now, you notice it doesn't say it is given *to* you. It is given *for* you. The idea of something being given *for* you means that it is given for your benefit, for example, for your use. But in the case where a sacrifice is being discussed—and most definitely at the Lord's Supper a sacrifice was being discussed—then the question comes up: could the "body given for us" also mean "given in the place of us," in our place, as our substitute? And surely that meaning can be found in this phrase, "This is my body which is given for you."<sup>2</sup>

And the reason we know that it is being given as a sacrifice is because in the next verse Christ makes it clear that his blood is being shed for the remission of sins. It is not that his body has been given for some other use, some other unspecified use, but the use is clearly specified by Christ when he makes clear that it is being given as a sacrifice for you and for no other, no lesser reason.

---

<sup>1</sup> Luke 22:19

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

So Christ makes it clear that the Lord's Table is to remind us, the bread is to remind us of his body given for us as a sacrifice.

And the question might be asked, "Well, who gave it?"

Well, obviously, the Lord Jesus gave it when he laid down his life for his friends. But his body also could be said to have been given by the Father, couldn't it? What did Jesus tell Nicodemus? "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son."<sup>3</sup>

Now without Christ's death, we might think that meant he sent his Son. It means more than that. He delivered him up as a sacrifice for the sins of his people. That is why when Jesus said that to Nicodemus, he knew more than Nicodemus knew how greatly it expressed the love that God had for his people—not just that he had compassion on us to send us someone who could give us some explanations or tell us some truths or give us an example to follow. No, the Lord Jesus knew when he said it, that it meant that God loved us so much that he delivered up his own Son the Lord Jesus himself to be made a sacrifice. And here at the Lord's Table he is drawing back to that remembrance again, that he is about to lay down his life for his friends, and that his body is being given by himself and by the Father in the place of lost men at the cross. It is being given as a sacrifice to be killed for us, to be killed in our place, in the place of our judgment.

And Paul makes this even more clear when he relates the Lord's Table and quotes Jesus as saying, "This is my body which is broken for you,"<sup>4</sup> because, of course, in the breaking of the bread there was a physical picture of what was about to happen to the body of Christ, which the bread signified when it was being given for us, that it would be broken, that it would be marred or that it would be pierced, that the crown of thorns would be pressed upon his brow, the spear would tear open his side, and the nails would pierce his hands and his feet.

Then when you go further to answer the question: Well, if the body of Christ is given for us as a sacrifice, who is the sacrifice toward? Well, the text doesn't tell us that, does it, directly, not this text.

However, there is a danger, there is a very grave danger that intelligent people often fall into, of trying to reason out the purpose of the Lord's death, rather than to believe what God's Word clearly teaches about the Lord's death.

[It is a mistake to try] to reason the method or the mechanism by which his giving of his body for us as a sacrifice worked, to try to reason out what makes sense to us and what is agreeable to us, to try to reason out how this sacrifice might have operated, rather than to believe what God's Word tells us about how it operated.

And C. S. Lewis is an excellent example of someone who falls into this trap of trying to reason out the meaning and purpose of the Lord's sacrifice, rather than embrace what the

---

<sup>3</sup> John 3:16

<sup>4</sup> 1 Corinthians 11:24

Bible says about the meaning and purpose of the sacrifice of Christ. He has many theories that he liked to talk about, because his belief was that the theory didn't really matter, that there were rational objections to all the theories, and you should just pick one that you like and go with it. He said as much, in so many words, in some of his writings.

One of his most famous presentations of one of his theories of atonement is, of course, found in the allegorical *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* book, the first book in the *Narnia Chronicles*, in which he lays out a story of a white witch, who represents Satan, who tempted the young Edmond with Turkish Delight (which is some sort of very sweet pastry) that she offered to him, and drew him into her confidence; whereupon she inveigled him into betraying his brethren, his brothers and sisters, in the cause with which they had aligned themselves in this mythical land of Narnia. And so he was a traitor. And so under the theory of the story, he belongs to the white witch. She can dispose of him any way she wants, because he is a traitor.

And Aslan engages in these confidential negotiations with the white witch, and agrees to exchange his body for the body of Edmund. Everyone is wondrously sad, but of course, he does deliver himself up to her, and she executes him on the stone table, only for him to rise from the dead the next morning. And he joyously tells his people that this was a deeper magic that she didn't understand.

This is Lewis' presentation of the crucifixion of Christ, and the means by which the atonement might have worked in his theory—or in one of his theories. Again, in other writings, he outlines a number of different theories—almost all of them just as bad as that one—and then goes on to offer a different theory, which was his favorite, which really was so far removed from the actual plan of redemption and the actual means of the atonement that it can hardly be recognized as Christian at all.

Victor Reppert is a writer who wrote, *C.S. Lewis' Dangerous Idea: In Defense of the Argument from Reason* which was published by Intervarsity Press, and he has a few things to say about Lewis' theories on the atonement. He says this.

In *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* Lewis employs a picture which, in theology, is often called the *Christus Victus* model. According to this picture Christ's death pays a ransom to Satan, the white witch, who has a right to punish us. However Christ escapes the clutches of Satan through resurrection. In the traditional substitutionary picture, God has an obligation based on his own holiness to punish humans. In the *Christus Victus* picture, Satan has the right to punish humans.

Well, you can see how far afield Lewis' presentation of the atonement is in this story.

In other places in Lewis' writing, he makes it clear that he believes that good works—if done with the right intention and done in earnestness and in seeking after God—that good works will be counted towards the righteousness of people to be allowed into heaven. In fact, he has, in his last book *The Last Battle* in the *Narnia* series, a pagan lost soldier who

hates the true God and who worships what he finds out too late to be Satan, to be a demon—Lewis has him coming into heaven because God tells him—or Aslan tells him, as it were—that all those works that he did for his pagan god he counted them as works toward the true God—as if somehow it is our works that need to be toted up to determine whether we’ll be allowed into the kingdom of heaven!

The gospel that he presents in that book is a complete works salvation, garnished with a view that a person’s intention and desire towards God sanctifies his works, so that God can accept them and thereby accept the sinner.

There is no clue, no concept in these books, of a sin debt that must be discharged to a righteous and holy God.

So Victor Reppert describes this as the *Christus Victus* model. Also some people call it the ransom theory of the atonement—that Christ died to ransom us from Satan, that Satan gained title to us on account of our sin, and we had to be redeemed by the death of the innocent victim to satisfy the devil’s blood lust for the people whom God would redeem.

Another British philosopher J.R. Lucas has this to say, in a review of different theories of the atonement from a secular point of view.

For some Christians the salvation secured by the cross is liberation. They know themselves to be in bondage to sin and find freedom in the cross. If I am freed from slavery it is natural to think of myself as ransomed or redeemed, literally bought back. A ransom theory, then, makes sense. I was enthralled to sin and if I am freed by Jesus’ death on the cross, it was the price he paid for my release. There was no other good enough to pay the price of sin. Jesus paid a terrible price and I am, in consequence, liberated from my previous state. These two facts the ransom theory expresses powerfully, but it has other implications that are not easy to accept. To whom was the price paid? Why did it have to be paid? Why could not God just liberate me by *force majeure*? Answers are available, but themselves raise further awkward questions. The price was paid to the devil because he had, by reason of human sin, become legitimate owner of the sinners’ souls. God would have been acting immorally if he had just snatched what was properly the property of the devil. A moral God must respect the rights of every one, even of the devil itself. But the hypothesis of a personal devil with rights sits uneasily with the sovereignty of God.

Remember, this is a lost person talking.

Jesus himself talks of Satan, but only in a metaphorical way.

Right.

The metaphor of the sinner being enslaved and hence presumably enslaved to someone is more telling, but it is much more a matter of fact than of rights. The rights of the evil one seem perilously close to a contradiction in terms. Moreover, in many versions, most accessibly in the story of Aslan and the white witch in C. S. Lewis' *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, there is an element of deceit in God's tricking the devil into accepting the offer of Jesus' life in exchange for that of the sinner, a trickiness which sits ill with our faith in God the non-deceiver. The ransom theory expresses the great cost of the crucifixion and the great benefit obtained for us, but fails to give an adequate account of how the two are connected.

So, you see, there is a great deal of back and forth, and a great deal of hole-poking in the various theories that people offer for how the atonement works. Again, Lewis didn't seem to be wedded to this particular *Christus Victor* model of the atonement.

He wrote this in *Mere Christianity*.

On my view, the theories are not what you are asked to accept. Many of you, no doubt, have read Jeans or Eddington [who were popular science writers in the 30s or 40s]. What they do when they want to explain the atom or something of the sort is to give you a description out of which you can make a mental picture. But then they warn you that this picture is not what the scientists believe. What the scientists believe is a mathematical formula. The pictures are only there to help you understand the formula. They are not really true in the way that the formula is. They do not give you the real thing, but only something more or less like it. They are only meant to help. And if they do not help you can drop them. The thing itself cannot be pictured. It can only be expressed mathematically.

We are in the same boat here. We believe that the death of Christ is just that point at which something absolutely unimaginable from outside shows through into our own world and if we cannot picture even the atoms of which our own world is built, of course, we are not going to be able to picture this [that is, the atonement]. Indeed, if we found we could fully understand it, that very fact would show that it was not what it professes to be, the inconceivable, the uncreated, the thing from beyond nature striking down into nature like lightning. A man may eat his dinner without understanding exactly how food nourishes him. A man can accept what Christ has done without knowing how it works. Indeed, he certainly would not know how it works until he has accepted it.

This is a very chilling statement by Lewis—all the more so because he has latched on to the fatal flaw of modern physics and modern science. And that is, that we ought to just give up being able to understand how nature works and take refuge in obscenely complicated mathematical formulae, and believe that they are the reality—when in the

olden days the physicists and the chemists never thought that the math was the reality. The math was only a logical system to model and describe the reality. But in the 20s and 30s and in the time since then, the physicists have gone over to a speculation, flights of fancy, imagination, irrationality—and they have hidden themselves behind this idea that the math is the reality, and it doesn't have to make physical sense. There doesn't have to be a model that we can understand. The model can be incomprehensible and nonsensical, and yet they will embrace it as if it "explains" the observable facts around us.

And for Lewis to embrace all that as a legitimate expression of modern theories of knowledge is very, very revealing. As he said, "No one really can understand the atonement," according to his theory, so therefore it doesn't really matter how you think it works. You just have to believe it. Just believe it. Just have faith in it. Just grab a hold of it, whatever it is, and it will work for you.

Well, you can see that a lot of his writing is targeted towards trying to smooth over intellectual objections of people who don't take the Bible literally, and who don't want to take God at his word, but want to reason themselves into the kingdom of God. And it appears that many, many people are enamored of Lewis precisely because they can quote him, and he sounds so erudite and literate, rather than having to quote the Bible which seems so dogmatic and so unforgiving and so objective in its statements. And we want to be able to think highly of our intellectual abilities, and reason ourselves and satisfy ourselves with our own knowledge.

What a terrible thing it is for Lewis to embrace this irrational view of knowledge and irrational view of the atonement! Rather than trying to look at these things from the point of view of the rational skeptic, we would be better to read God's Word and to discover what God says about it.

After all, the atonement is his invention, isn't it? It is his plan. It is his conception. It works the way he intends it to work, not the way we would like it to work, or think it ought to work. And whatever objections we might have to it are either answered in the Scriptures, or we have to leave them to God's own mind and heart to reveal in glory as he will or as he will not.

But what say the Scriptures about who the body of Christ was given to in the place of his people?

Well, first of all, there is the context, of course, the context of the Lord making this statement, "This is my body which is given for you."<sup>5</sup> Or, as Paul said, "This is my body which is broken for you."<sup>6</sup> It is a sacrifice made for you, made for your sin. The context, of course, is that it is announced during the Passover celebration, and there is an analogy to be made there. There is a type that Christ is fulfilling. He is announcing the fulfillment of the type of the Passover lamb.

---

<sup>5</sup> Luke 22:19

<sup>6</sup> 1 Corinthians 11:24

Well, who was the Passover lamb given for? It was given for the salvation of the people. From what? From the judgment of what? From the judgment of Satan? No! From the judgment of God.

God said his death angel would pass through all the land and kill all the first born of men and beasts. “But when I see the blood” of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, “I will pass over you” and the death angel shall not come into thine house.

You see the type that Christ is fulfilling in this institution of the Lord’s Table, and the type that he is replacing, the Passover feast with the Lord’s Table, is a replacement of a sacrifice of a substitute against the wrath of God and the judgment of God.

It was not the devil that was angry with the Egyptians for enslaving God’s people. It wasn’t the devil coming through and destroying all the first born of his own allies and cohorts in the enslavement of the people of Israel. No, it was God that was angry and brought down judgment on all the land. And it was to substitute in that judgment the death of a lamb, by which the judgment might be discharged in a substitute, and the judgment might be lifted off of God’s people.

So, you see, his people were set free by a judgment, by a judgment that poured onto the whole land, but which they were exempt from on account of the substitute, on account of the sacrifice whose blood was displayed on the doorposts.

Then when you step back from the context in which Christ announces that he is giving his body for his people, you step back into the context of the entire sacrificial system, of which Christ’s sacrifice of his body is a fulfillment, you come to find in all cases that the sacrifice is a substitute in the place of a sinner for God’s judgment, not for the judgment of the devil, not for the judgment of Satan. It is always God who is offended. The penitent sinner has broken God’s law, and he brings the sacrifice to the door of the tabernacle, and he lays his hands upon that lamb as an atonement.

What does God say in Leviticus one? “I will accept that lamb as an atonement in the place of the sinner.”<sup>7</sup>

So the whole sacrificial system displays and describes in great detail and in great imagery and symbology the fact that the sacrifice is in the place of the sinner before the judgment of God. The devil has nothing to do with it, is not brought into it at all.

And, of course, the first and best example of this is the great sacrifice of Isaac at the Word of God by his father Abraham. It was God that required the death of Isaac. And it was God who provided the substitute, wasn’t it, in fulfillment of that prophecy that Abraham told his son Isaac. “Where is the lamb,” he asked. And Abraham said, “God himself will provide a lamb.”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See Leviticus 1:4

<sup>8</sup> See Genesis 22:7-8

And—praise God—he did provide a lamb. And so the wrath that God had required to be rained down on Isaac, instead was rained down on that substitute which God provided.

So, you see, the context of the Lord’s table—that is, being instituted during the Passover feast, fulfilling the Passover—the context of the whole sacrificial system and the example, the premier example of the substitute provided by God to save Isaac from the judgment ordained by God—all point to the fact that the substitution of the Lord Jesus for his people is to satisfy the judgment of God that we ought to have received on account of our sin and rebellion against him.

And if it were not to be any plainer than that, surely the prophet Isaiah in his great 53<sup>rd</sup> chapter makes it clear on many occasions. In verse four, “Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.”<sup>9</sup> And you notice that the writer doesn’t dispute that the suffering servant was smitten and stricken by God and afflicted, because he was. He was stricken by God. He was smitten by God.

The assumption that the writer of this prophecy refutes is the assumption that it was on account of his own wickedness and sin that he was smitten and destroyed by God. But he makes it clear, verse five, “But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities.”<sup>10</sup> You see, this text stands for the proposition that the Lord Jesus was smitten by God and afflicted not for his own sin, but for the sins of his people.

And then in verse six, “The LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,”<sup>11</sup> not so the devil could punish our sin in Christ, but so God could punish our sin in the body of the Lord Jesus.

And then in verse eight, “For the transgression of my people was he stricken.”<sup>12</sup>

And then in verse 10, “Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him.”<sup>13</sup> It was the Lord that was doing the judging upon the Lord Jesus. It was God himself that was striking and smiting and bruising that body that he gave for us. He, that is the Lord God, the judge, “hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin.”<sup>14</sup>

So, you see, the Scriptures are crystal clear about who the sacrifice is given up for—it is given up in the place of sinners—and who the ransom is paid to, who bears the judgment of the substitute and from whence that judgment falls, not from the devil, but from God Almighty himself, an offended God. And Jesus describes the offering of his body for the sin of his people at the Lord’s Table when he says, “My body which is given for you.”<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Isaiah 53:4

<sup>10</sup> Isaiah 53:4

<sup>11</sup> Isaiah 53:6

<sup>12</sup> Isaiah 53:8

<sup>13</sup> Isaiah 53:10

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Luke 22:19



And in Hebrews chapter 10, of course, this description of Christ's body being given in the place of his people is made quite clear. "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, [that is, the Lord Jesus] Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me."<sup>16</sup>

You see, God prepared for the Lord Jesus a body as a replacement, as a fulfillment and as a satisfactory substitute for those sacrifices and offerings that went before as types and shadows. He is no longer satisfied with the types and shadows. He wants the reality of the real sacrifice, the real substitute sacrifice in the place of sinners, not just sacrifices and offerings, but the body of the substitute God prepares for him.

And then in verse 10 the offering of that body sanctifies us once and for all. It says so there in black and white. "I delight to do thy will,"<sup>17</sup> the Lord Jesus said, "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all...once for all."<sup>18</sup> He gave his body for us, an offering for sin one time and we are sanctified by it for all time.

Peter makes this same point very plainly in the text we read this morning. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree."<sup>19</sup>

The question might arise: Why do men try to come up with such aberrant explanations for how the atonement works, such aberrant explanations as we see in the writings of people like C. S. Lewis?

I can't speak for him personally, but it seems that it is the case that such men often trip up on the fact that they do not comprehend the true holiness of Almighty God. And so therefore they cannot understand how it is our sins must deeply offend him and why it is that his holiness and his justice demand that the law's penalty be carried out, that sin be punished, that wickedness be atoned for.

The Lord told Adam and Eve, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."<sup>20</sup> He set the penalty for the breaking of his commandments. And mule headed as they were and unbelieving as they were, they went right into it, not believing his Word.

And it seems to me that it is that unbelief, refusing to believe the righteousness and holiness of God, that he really means that he really opposes actions against him, and that he actually intends to impose the ultimate punishment, death, eternal death and destruction upon sinners who offend him against his righteousness and his holiness.

---

<sup>16</sup> Hebrews 10:5

<sup>17</sup> Psalm 40:8

<sup>18</sup> Hebrews 10:10

<sup>19</sup> 1 Peter 2:24

<sup>20</sup> Genesis 2:17

They still refuse to believe it. They can't conceive of it and they trot out all these objections how it makes God look petty. "It makes him look mean, so we will just discard that. We won't believe that part of the Bible."

You see, they are really just like Eve was. She didn't believe the promise of the judgment. And they can't wrap their minds around the promise of the judgment and that it must be satisfied. It can't just be waived. It can't just be set aside. God is not just going to let everybody by in the end. He is not going to take their good works and say, "Well, we will just let bygones be bygones and wipe the slate clean." He is not going to do that. He has been offended. Death is his judgment for sin. His justice must be satisfied.

And so therefore they like to believe that all the trouble that we face in death is really just due to the mean old devil. "You see, God would let us by, but the devil has his grips on us and won't let us go."

And so they go off into these false views of the atonement, whereby the body of Christ is given up in judgment to satisfy the devil's claims, instead of the righteous and holy God's claims.

Truth is, the devil really doesn't have a personal claim on any sinner. All of his accusations and all of his tauntings are really taunting the holiness of God, aren't they? They are really seeing, "Aha, you see that? That is one of those people you claim to love who's gone and done that. What are you going to do about it?" Satan thinks God is caught between his love for his people and his absolute holiness and justice.

And so, you see, the death of Christ in the place of his people isn't to satisfy the devil, it is silence the devil. It is to shut his mouth forever, because God has thereby shown that he can be just and the justifier of them that trust in Jesus.

And so we come this Lord's Day to remember how Jesus told us the bread represents his body which is broken for us. How well we love the words of that song?

The holy one who knew no sin,  
God made him sin for us.  
The Savior died our souls to win  
upon the shameful cross.  
His precious blood alone availed  
to wash our sins away.

That is what we come to celebrate, the Lord Jesus' body given to pay the awful penalty of sin that we deserve to pay before a righteous and a holy God, and his blood poured out to wash away our guiltiness, to take away our every stain, to make us clean and bright and new again in the presence of a perfect, holy and righteous God.

And—praise God—he was raised on account of our justification, and not some foolish notion that he tricked the devil into taking his life only to be raised again and to cheat

Satan out of his just rewards. No, no, he was raised because the sacrifice did the job of taking away and expurgating our sins completely. And so the sacrifice raised in power and glory, death defeated, the penalty forever discharged, and we are raised again in that body of the Lord, raised after it was given for us at the cross.

Do you know the reason the Lord Jesus left us the Lord's Table, left us these symbols to remind us of how he gave his life and shed his blood for us? You know, you think about it. Anybody else, any martyr that dies, any person that gives his life up for his friends or his country or some cause, you don't have to specify some special feast, some special image to remember. You just go to his grave, don't you?

But the Lord Jesus left the Lord's Table because he knew the tomb would be empty, we would not be able to go to a place and weep and mourn and say, "Here lies the body of the one who gave his body for the salvation of his people." But, no, everywhere we can celebrate our Savior who is alive forevermore. We can only remember his death by these symbols, for there is no corpse left in the ground for us to consider over or to gather around. We have this bread and this wine to remind us of a body laid down for us and raised in power and glory and seated at the right hand of the Father on high.

Let's give thanks for the Lord's Table and for the body that he laid down for us and for the blood that he poured out to purchase our salvation and pardon on Calvary's tree.

I would like to ask Bro. Whitten if he would give thanks for the bread.

*[Prayer]*

And the Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed, he took the bread and he blessed it and he broke it and he said, "Take and eat. This is my body which is broken for you. This do in remembrance of me."

Now let's give thanks for the cup that reminds us of his blood poured out for us on the cross.

*Oh God our Father, we rejoice that we can come into your presence this Lord's Day, and lift high the mighty name of Jesus who laid down his life for his people, who went to the cross to satisfy the last portion of divine justice, that you might be just and the justifier of all those who trust in Jesus. We think of the words of that song by old Bro. Horatius Bonar:*

*No blood, no altar now.  
The sacrifice is o'er.  
No flame, no smoke ascends on high,  
the lamb is slain no more.  
But richer blood has flowed from nobler veins  
to purge the soul from guilt and cleans the reddest stains.*

*We thank thee for the blood,  
the blood of Christ our Lord,  
the blood by which our peace is made,  
our victory is won.  
Great victory o'er hell and sin and woe.*

*And we thank you that the Lord Jesus was faithful unto death. He went to the cross despising the shame and he submitted himself to even the death of the cross for his people, for us here in this room. He took upon himself our guiltiness and he laid down his life for his people and he shed his precious blood by which all our sins are expunged forever, and we are made clean and new and bright, and we can come boldly into your presence knowing that you see in us a perfection and beauty of your blessed Son, not a stain of sin adheres to us. It has all been taken away by the body and blood of the Savior.*

*We thank you that he left us these symbols to awaken our feeble hearts and minds, to remind us what he did for us. And we thank you that you have brought us to gather around this table to celebrate what Christ did. We pray that our worship will be pleasing in your sight and that all the angels will sit and marvel at the love you have displayed toward sinners, and marvel at the grace you have bestowed upon us, and that they might rejoice to see your saved saints rejoicing in so great a salvation that you wrought for us in the Lord Jesus. We pray these things in Jesus' name. Amen.*

And the Scripture says that he took the cup, and he blessed it and he said, "Drink ye all of it. This cup is the new covenant in my blood for the remission of sins. Do it as often as ye do it in remembrance of me."

And the Scriptures tell us as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup we do preach the Lord's death until he comes.

Let us sing No. 37, "Behold the Lamb with glory crowned, to him all power is given. No place too high for him is found, no place too high in heaven."