



## The Feill: The Lord's Supper as Feast

*Donald Macleod*

Some time towards the end of the nineteenth century a young Lewisman by the name of John Macleod (Iain Thormoid Mhor, to give him his Gaelic name) followed the course forced on so many of his fellow islanders and set sail for Canada. As the ship sailed up the east coast of Lewis before turning west into the Atlantic, Macleod stood on deck watching the contours of his native island recede from sight until, finally, the last landmark was eclipsed by the darkness. He later recorded his emotions in one of the most poignant songs of Gaelic exile, “*An t-Eilean mu Thuath*” (“The Island in the North”). As befits one who would become a distinguished lay preacher in his adopted Quebec, the song is shot through with religious allusions. Macleod recalls the peace of the Lewis Sabbath, when the stillness was never shattered by the sound of hammer or axe. But he recalls, too, how he used to long for the Communion Seasons:

*The cuimhn' agam fhein mo chridh'a bhith leum  
Troimh fheadainn 's troimh eigein garbha.  
Rachain chun Fheill mar iolair air sgeith  
'S cha b'aithreach leam fhein gun do dh'fhalbh mi.*

I myself remember my heart leaping  
As I crossed streams and other tough obstacles.  
I would fly to the Feast like an eagle on the wing  
And I never regretted my going.

The key word here is ‘Feast’, and its meaning was very specific. It was the Communion Season; and Macleod was registering the sense of anticipation with which he and his fellow believers looked forward to such occasions. The idea of the Communion as a Holy Fair was not, of course, unique to the Highlands. Like almost every other feature of Gaelic Evangelicalism it had made its way north from the Lowlands,<sup>1</sup> where Burns had subjected it to biting satire. The abuses highlighted

by Burns were by no means unknown in northern presbyteries, but the nineteenth-century revivals had brought a new solemnity and decorum even to the great open-air gatherings.

Gaelic usage was heavily influenced by the words of John 11:56, ‘What think ye, that he will not come to the feast?’ These words were constantly quoted in the preparatory services and prayer-meetings which preceded the administration of the sacrament, reflecting the fact that the paramount concern of Communion-goers was whether Christ himself would be present at the Feast. In their original context the words referred to the Passover, but their application to the Christian sacrament is justified by the fact that the Last Supper began as a Passover Meal. The Passover link could sometimes be used as a rationale for the infrequency of Communion, but its main contribution was to highlight the status of the sacrament as a feast, a festival and, above all, an ‘occasion’. This, after all, was a world without Christmas, Easter or annual holidays; and a Christian of John Macleod’s outlook would look forward to the Feast with all the eagerness with which a modern Scot might look forward to a major cup-final. This attitude survived into the second half of the twentieth century, eventually disappearing only when capitalism overwhelmed Calvinism, and made the historic religious practices of Scotland’s Protestant peasantry unsustainable.



### **A surfeit**

A feast, by definition, offers a surfeit: more than anyone can eat. To our modern taste this was certainly true of the amount of preaching on offer at a traditional Scottish Communion Service. Indeed, even the non-modern taste sometimes found it too much. When the Cambridge evangelical, Charles Simeon, visited James Haldane at Airthrey in 1796 he welcomed the privilege of sitting as a communicant at the Lord’s Table, but complained bitterly of the length of the Saturday Preparatory Service. It lasted four-and-a-half hours, including two lengthy sermons, and Simeon commented that it ‘seemed as if turtle and venison had been served after he had dined well on roast beef and plum-pudding.’<sup>2</sup> The following day, the Communion Service went on

till eight o'clock in the evening, which is not surprising considering that there were a thousand communicants, innumerable sittings, a fresh exhortation at each and a sermon to conclude. Simeon himself communicated at the second table, departed for home immediately afterwards, and later recorded in his diary, 'Those who could stay there from beginning to end, with any profit to their souls, must be made of different materials from me.'<sup>3</sup>

These excesses reflect the woeful lack of liturgical sensitivity which overtook Scottish Presbyterianism in the eighteenth century. They also reflect the endemic legalism which delights in multiplying religious observances, and buries the soul under mountains of guilt should it dare to find them wearisome. Yet wearisome they sometimes were, even to the eighteenth-century palate, which is why evangelicals such as John Erskine made strenuous efforts to have them curtailed.<sup>4</sup> We should not forget, however, that the inordinate length of the actual Communion Service was a direct result of adhering to the rubric, laid down in Knox's *Book of Common Order*, that communicants must sit around a table. In a congregation of any size this meant multiple sittings and long services. Only in the 1820s did the practice emerge of designating the front pews of the church as 'the Table' (a practice still prevalent in the Highland churches).

But the abuses should not blind us to the fact that our spiritual forebears did actually enjoy such Communion services; looked forward to them with eager anticipation; and frequented not only those of their own parishes, but also those of the parishes around them. Nor can there be any doubt that these 'seasons' were regularly times of spiritual renewal for congregations, not least through the addition of new converts (even though the sacrament itself was not seen as a converting ordinance).



## Structure

The structure of the Communion Season emerged only gradually, and the Highland pattern simply replicated (except in one particular) an order which was already established in the south by the middle of

the seventeenth century. Thursday was the Fast Day, highlighting the need for personal repentance; Saturday was the Day of Preparation; Sunday was the Day of Communion (the evening service usually being evangelistic, aimed at uncommitted adherents); and Monday was the Day of Thanksgiving. The one peculiarity of the Highland order was the introduction of a Friday service, variously described as Men's Day, the Fellowship Meeting or the Question Meeting (the *Coinneimh Cheisd*, or simply the *Ceisd*, in Gaelic). This first appeared in Sutherland around 1737 (when the Synod of Caithness and Sutherland attempted to ban it as 'inconvenient to the ministers'), but its origins lay in the earlier practice of Thomas Hog of Kiltearn (1628–92), which in turn arose out of Hog's own experience in Aberdeen.<sup>5</sup>

With the exception of the Fellowship Meeting (at which the Men would be rebuked if their contributions approached a sermonic form) all these services involved a feast of preaching. This reflected both the Reformed emphasis on a 'liturgy of listening' and the classic Augustinian insistence that without the word there is no sacrament: 'Take away the word, and the water is neither more nor less than water. The word is added to the element, and there results the Sacrament, as if itself also a kind of visible word.'<sup>6</sup> This sentiment is quoted with approval by Robert Bruce, who comments, 'Therefore the Word alone cannot be a Sacrament, nor the element alone, but Word and element must together make a Sacrament.'<sup>7</sup>

In principle, though not always in practice, the various courses of this preaching feast were carefully regulated, each day being allocated its own proper theme. The Fast Day would highlight the shortcomings of the Christian life, basing its message on such texts as the penitential psalms. Friday, Men's Day, focused, perhaps excessively, on self-examination. Saturday was the day of encouragement, aimed at weak believers and prospective new communicants. On Sunday, the sermon focused very specifically on the death of Christ and the doctrine of the atonement. On Monday, the Day of Thanksgiving, the theme would generally be eschatological, majoring on the believer's eternal rest.



## The Action Sermon

The climax of this preaching feast was the sermon preceding Communion on the Sabbath morning. This was the Action Sermon: a phrase which highlights not the sacramental ‘actions’, so called, but the Eucharistic nature of the ordinance. The background to this is that the Latin for thanksgiving is *gratiarum actio*. This is clearly reflected in the Vulgate’s renderings of the narratives of institution. In Luke 22:19, for example, the clause, ‘when he had given thanks’ is rendered, *cum gratias egisset*. In 1 Corinthians 11:24 the Greek participle *eucharistēsas* is translated *gratiis actis*. In accordance with this, the Action Sermon was simply the Thanksgiving or Eucharistic Sermon, and its clear aim was to instil in communicants a sense of gratitude: a gratitude focused specifically on the death of Christ, and closely linked to both *remembrance* and *proclamation*. This dominated the whole Order of Communion. The psalms which were sung, the scriptures which were read and the sermon which was preached were all designed to evoke *eucharist* by reminding the congregation of what Christ had done for them on the cross of Calvary.

These sermons were often profoundly moving, but they were also rigorously didactic. Just how didactic appears from one preached by Dr Charles Calder Mackintosh, a minister in the rural Scottish Highlands between 1828 and 1868.<sup>8</sup> The sermon, based on 2 Corinthians 8:9, is entitled, “The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ” and quickly focuses on the statement that he ‘became poor’. Almost unconsciously, the preacher invokes the idea of *kenosis* (Philippians 2:7), and proceeds to expound it in classic Calvinian terms as a veiling or *krupsis*:

We are not to think of the words, ‘he became poor,’ as though they implied that He ceased to be what He was, very and eternal God; for in Him when incarnate ‘dwelt all the fullness of the godhead bodily.’ But He came to be that which He had not been; He became the opposite of all that He had been; and, to all outward appearance, to the eye of flesh and blood, He was poor. Though unchangeably rich in all the glories of Divinity, He emptied Himself of them as to their outward manifestation and cast a veil upon their brightness

... and appeared among His creatures and subjects not ‘in the form of God’, but ‘in the form of a servant;’ and though some rays of His divinity broke forth in His mighty works, though its glory broke forth on the mount of transfiguration, and though the eye of faith ‘saw His glory,’ yet outwardly and to the eye of sense He seemed but as a man, as if He were one of us; and He was content to appear so.<sup>9</sup>

The congregation, remember, were peasants, but it was in remembrance of *this* Christ that they kept the sacrament; and it was for *this* Christ they gave thanks.

Even more remarkable is the collection, *Fourteen Communion Sermons by the Rev. Samuel Rutherford*.<sup>10</sup> Though these sermons were preached in the seventeenth century they reflect the ideal to which the Action Sermon would have aspired well into the twentieth century in the conservative Presbyterian tradition. They glean from the text every detail it can yield as to the sufferings of Christ; and they bring home the gleanings in language that often glows with passionate, epigrammatic eloquence.

Take, for example, the following passage on Christ’s cry of dereliction, a subject of perennial fascination to Presbyterian preachers: ‘Christ could not get a blink or word of His Father. Christ cried, Is there not a word, dear Father, not a look? And He answers, No, not a look for a world. But Christ got God’s helping mercy: the sweet shadow of His Almighty hand covered Him. For God sent His angel to comfort Him, but would not come Himself.’ (p. 124)

Another passage reflects on the fact that Christ on the cross could not enjoy the certainty as to the outcome which we enjoy today with the benefit of hindsight: ‘Indeed, though it was not possible that Christ should miscarry; yet to our appearance, our salvation was in a venture. If Christ had gotten a wrong cast, and gone a wrong step; then adieu to our salvation. But God be thanked, it was not a loose matter, nor loose hung. God had, all this time, Christ and our heaven in the hollow of His hand.’ (p. 125)

In a quite extraordinary sermon preached at a Communion Service in London in 1643, Rutherford reflects on the darkness that came over the land as the Saviour suffered on the cross: ‘And why? Because the Candle that lighted the sun and the moon was blown out. The Godhead was eclipsed; and the world’s eye was put out. He took away the sun with Him, as it were, to another world, when He that was the world’s sun was put out. When He went out of the earth, the sun would not stay behind Him. Sun, what ails thee? “I have not will to shine when my Lord is going to another world.”’ (p. 287)

In that same sermon there occurs, too, a passage which is scarcely compatible with the then all-prevailing notion of divine impassibility: ‘O what a fray was there! God weeping, God sobbing under the water!’ (p. 287) But its most remarkable feature is a series of apostrophes drawn out of the preacher by two statements in the Passion narrative. One is the Lord’s own words, ‘I thirst’: ‘O wells! O lochs! O running streams! Where were you all when my Lord could not get a drink? ... The wells and lochs answer, “Alas! We dare not know Him; the Lord hath laid a fence upon us; we are arrested; we dare not serve our Master.”’ (p. 289)

The other is the statement, ‘he gave up the ghost’: ‘O Life! wouldst thou not bear that blessed Body no longer company? O Life of Life! wouldst thou be death’s taken prisoner? Oh! to see that blessed Head fall to the one side! Oh! to see Life wanting life! To see Life lying dead! To see that blessed mouth silent!’ (p. 289)

The sermon concludes by addressing the paradox of Calvary, where the sinless one receives the wages of sin, and the divine Son is sacrificed by the divine Father: ‘O Father, what ails thee at Thy dear and only Son? O what evil way went these feet, that they are pierced? What evil hath these hands done that they are pierced? O what evil, and what vanity, did these eyes behold, that death has closed them? O what sin hath that fair face done that is spitted on? O what did these hands steal, that are bound? O what evil has that blessed Head done, that it is crowned with thorns?’ (p. 290)

Today, almost four hundred years later, we should be saying things differently. But should we be saying different things? If the infant church at Ephesus could cope with the Epistle to the Ephesians, surely ours can cope with Action Sermons which make a serious attempt to explore the mysteries of cross and kenosis? The more we emphasise the centrality of the sacrament the more we have to emphasise Eucharistic preaching which probes and expounds the mysteries of Calvary. From this point of view, the word is not the antithesis or enemy of mystery, but its very vehicle.



### ***Agapē*: a feast of fellowship**

But more was involved than a feast of preaching. There was also a feast of fellowship, and it would be hard to overestimate the importance of this in the sight of those who longed for the *Feill*. Scottish Presbyterians had, and still have, their own brands of asceticism, but they were very far from being solitaries. They relished the social side of religion. It is interesting to put this in the context of the life of such a man as John Macleod. In his early years he had gladly trekked for three hours across bog-strewn moorland just to get a glimpse of the girl he loved. The same ardour filled his heart as he headed for the Feast. Not only was there no public transport: there were no roads, and the only route between parishes was across miles of heath. The reward was not merely hours of great preaching (as he saw it), but days and nights spent in the company of friends, enjoying hospitality, engaging in banter, exchanging (and debating) spiritual and theological insights, and sharing in times of prayer and praise. Of course, you had to be a special kind of person to enjoy it, but only the sort of special person delineated in the First Psalm: someone who loved the Torah and meditated on it day and night; but someone, too, who loved those who loved the Torah.

From this point of view, the Communion Season was a true *agape*. There was, of course, the sacramental eating and drinking, but there was also a great deal of non-sacramental eating and drinking. Indeed, the wonder is not only the zeal of those who went off to the Feast, but the generosity of the parishes on which they descended, and

where they were given unquestioning hospitality from Thursday to Monday. The hosts might be poor, and the accommodation Spartan (often consisting only of the barn), but there always seemed to be food in abundance. The manses in particular were expected to keep open table at Communion-time, and Donald Sage recalled that during his childhood in Kildonan ‘the whole of the preceding week was occupied in receiving presents of mutton, butter and cheese’, all donated to meet the needs of the expected visitors. This liberality itself amounted to a surfeit: ‘On these occasions I have seen the whole range of a large cellar so closely laid with mutton carcasses that the floor was literally paved with them, and the gifts, like the offerings of ancient Israel, far exceeded the purpose for which they were intended.’<sup>11</sup> When the Feast was over, the surplus would be distributed among the most needy in the parish.

The phenomenon described by Sage was by no means confined to the north of Scotland. Thomas Boston, recording the Communion at Ettrick in 1731, noted that there had been 777 communicants, and that one household had entertained no fewer than fourscore ‘strangers’. To provide for them, they had bought in half a boll of meal, killed three lambs etc. (*sic*) and made thirty beds. Boston comments: ‘This I record once for all, for a swatch of the hospitality of the parish: for God hath given this people a largeness of heart, to communicate of their substance, on these and other occasions also.’ He adds, ‘Those within a mile of the church still had the far greater weight on solemn occasions.’<sup>12</sup>

By the time the communicants sat at the Feast, then, they had already shared many feasts together. All this was driven, quite self-consciously, by *agape*, and it was therefore hardly surprising that the most popular text for discussion on Men’s Days was 1 John 3:14, ‘We know that we have passed from death to life because we love the brethren.’ This is why, when it came to Monday morning and time to return home, there was genuine pain in the parting. They knew that like the disciples in the Upper Room their Feast was bounded by the words, ‘Rise, let us go hence’ (John 14:31); and they comforted each other with the hope of a coming day when friends would part no more.



## The presence of Christ

Yet, however lavish the physical nourishment (and it was lavish, particularly in a social context of prevailing poverty), and however enjoyable the socialising and fraternising, the real concern of the Feast was with spiritual nourishment, and that takes us back to the question posed by the Jews in John 11:56, 'What think ye, that he will not come to the feast?' The very fact that they applied this text to the Communion Season indicates that the understanding which Highland evangelicals brought to the Sacrament was far removed from mere memorialism. Without the presence of the Lord there could be no Feast.

But what form could such a presence take? There was, of course, no distinctive Scottish answer to this question. It had occupied the best minds of the Reformation, most notably Calvin and Zanchius, and the doctrine set forth in such classic Scottish statements as Robert Bruce's *Sermons on the Sacraments* merely reflected the position of these masters, with, it has to be said, all their remaining uncertainty and confusion.<sup>13</sup> The vast majority of participants in the Feast would, no doubt, have found it difficult to give a precise answer if asked in what sense they expected Christ to be present. But the imprecision would have been set within the framework of some clear certainties.

The first of these was a general working experience of the presence of Christ: an experience which was by no means confined to the sacrament. They certainly expected Christ to be present at the Table, but they also expected him to be present in their ordinary Sunday services, in their weekly prayer-meetings, in their informal gatherings, in their family worship, in private prayer and even in their daily business. Any suggested 'sacramental presence' could not be different from this normal daily presence. They received nothing in the sacrament which they did not also receive in the preaching of the word, though they might certainly receive it more vividly. Indeed, what the sacrament 'sealed' was that the Lord went with them wherever they went, and would continue with them even when they left the Table: even, indeed, when the Communion Season came to an end and they returned to their daily chores.

But they certainly did expect Christ to be at the Feast with them, though that expectation has to be circumscribed with some clear negatives. There could be no bodily presence of Christ because, as Zanchius and the other Reformers insisted (arguing from such passages as Colossians 3:1), that body was ‘above’, at the right hand of God; and when communicants sat at the Table, they had to set their hearts on that very ‘above’, not on things below.<sup>14</sup> These ‘things below’ included the elements. Christ was not in them. He was not in them substantially as alleged by the doctrine of transubstantiation, where the bread and wine ceased to be bread and wine and became instead the body, soul and divinity of Christ. Nor was he in them by conjunction, physically joined to the elements as in the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. But he was there, at the Feast and at the Table. This followed partly from his deity. As a divine person, Christ was omnipresent and as such constantly near to his people. But he was not only a divine person, but a divine person incarnate, and it was as such that he was expected at the Feast. He would not be present in the flesh; but he would be present as the En-fleshed One who had dwelt among us and shared our human experiences.

But where is he present, if not in the bread and wine? He is present in the hearts of his people. ‘Christ lives in me’, declared the Apostle Paul (Galatians 2:20). The life of God is in our souls, to use the language of Henry Scougal.<sup>15</sup> This means that every believer brings Christ with her to the Feast and to the Table. Yet this must be set in the context of the larger promise, ‘Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.’ (Matthew 18:20). In public worship we come to the general assembly of the church of the firstborn (Hebrews 12:23), and rich as are the promises of God to individuals, his promises to his gathered people are richer still. At the Feast there is a critical mass of presences of Christ, the Holy Spirit residing in each believer, and each expectant heart lifted up to ‘above’. Here, Christ speaks through his word. Here Christ represents himself in the signs. Here Christ says, ‘Take, eat.’ Here, he personally touches our hearts. Here, he says he will go with us when we leave.

How do we know he is present? It is tempting to suggest that it would be known from its emotional impact, and there can be no doubt that on many occasions the *Feill* was accompanied by overwhelming feeling (and, being Scots, we expressed it in not in Hallelujahs, but in sobbings and weepings). But it would be perilous to argue that such feeling was always a sign of the divine presence; and equally perilous to argue from its absence that there was no presence. God can be in a place and we not know it (Genesis 28:16). It is faith that knows that Christ is present: present, however high or low the emotional register; present, however impressive or unimpressive the actual service. He is present because he has promised to be present, and the conduct of everyone present must be modified and controlled by this fact. For the preachers, Christ is at their elbows. For the communicant, Christ is in her heart, in the heart of the person beside her, and in all the spaces between.



### **Himself the Feast**

But not only is Christ at the Feast with us. He is himself the Feast. He is our Passover Lamb; and the Lord's Supper, like the Passover, is a feast upon a sacrifice. This accords with Jesus' own claim in John 6:55 that his flesh is real food and his blood is real drink. It is highly unlikely that such language had any specific reference to the sacrament, but the general principle is unmistakable. The Christian soul feeds on Christ; the Supper signifies and seals that fact; and at the same time it reminds us that the Christian life is festal. We live, not on bread and water, but on bread and wine, blessed with every spiritual blessing (Ephesians 1:3) and filled with all the fullness of God (Ephesians 3:18).

Is it possible to give some cognitive precision to this idea of feeding on Christ? It may be helpful to invoke here the principle famously laid down by Melancthon in the Preface to his *Loci Communes*: 'to know Christ means to know his benefits'.<sup>16</sup> To feed on Christ means, therefore, to receive his benefits.

But what benefits? One possible answer is offered by the Shorter Catechism, where one of the key sections, Answers 32–38, has a

curiously Melancthonian ring, being built entirely around the concept of the ‘benefits’ of redemption. These are clustered in three main phases: the benefits we receive in this life, the benefits we receive at death and the benefits we receive at the resurrection. The three we receive in this life, immediately on being united to Christ, are justification, adoption and sanctification, but what is particularly interesting is the cluster of benefits which ‘accompany or flow from’ these three majors. These are enumerated as follows: ‘assurance of God’s love, peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, increase of grace, and perseverance therein to the end.’

This is a brilliant summary of what it means to know Christ and to receive his benefits; and for that reason it is an admirable presentation of what is on offer at the Lord’s Table. The benefits are not simply signified by the sacrament. They are communicated, conveyed and applied. Here, through word and symbol, Christ instils in us the assurance that God loves us. Here he whispers that God is at peace with us. Here his Spirit fills our hearts with joy. Here we grow in faith and hope and love. Here we get the strength to keep on going.

It matters supremely, of course, that these are not *qualifications* for admission to the Table. They are what we come to *get*, not what we must have before we may come. Indeed, the Larger Catechism answers with an emphatic, ‘Yes!’ the question (172), ‘May one who doubteth of his being in Christ, or of his due preparation, come to the Lord’s supper?’ Everyone who came to the *Feill* knew the great ‘Rabbi’ Duncan story: serving one day at the Table in Free St Luke’s (Edinburgh), hearing a sob behind him and turning round to see a woman tremble as she hesitated to take the cup: ‘Tak it, woman,’ he said, ‘it’s for sinners.’<sup>17</sup>

Yet everyone also knew the words of St Paul: ‘Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat.’ (1 Corinthians 11:28). Such self-examination must be controlled by the nature of the sacrament itself, and that means, from our present perspective, that it must be controlled by the fact that we are going to a spiritual feast. The one thing that matters, then, is we be hungry and thirsty: ‘Blessed are those



- in A.D. 1589* (trans. and ed. Thomas F. Torrance; London: James Clarke, 1958), 41–2.
- <sup>8</sup> William Taylor, *Memorials of the Life and Ministry of Charles Calder Mackintosh, D.D. of Tain and Dunoon* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition; Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1871), 76–87.
- <sup>9</sup> Cf. Calvin’s comment on Philippians 2:7: ‘Christ, indeed, could not renounce His divinity, but He kept it concealed for a time, that under the weakness of the flesh it might not be seen. Hence He laid aside His glory in the view of men, not by lessening, but by concealing (*supprimendo*) it.’ (*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians*, trans. T. H. L. Parker [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965], 248).
- <sup>10</sup> *Fourteen Communion Sermons by the Rev. Samuel Rutherford, With a Preface and Notes by Rev. Andrew Bonar* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Glasgow: Charles Glass & Co., 1876).
- <sup>11</sup> Donald Sage, *Memorabilia Domestica: Or, Parish Life in the North of Scotland* (Wick: William Rae, 1899), 97.
- <sup>12</sup> *Memoirs of the Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Boston, of Ettrick. Written by Himself* (Glasgow: John McNeilage, 1899), 455.
- <sup>13</sup> ‘I will say,’ wrote Bruce, ‘it is a secret and spiritual conjunction, with a mutual relation between the bread and the Body of Christ, and between the wine and the Blood of Christ.’ (*The Mystery of the Lord’s Supper*, p. 80). Sometimes this seems to amount to no more than metonymy: a conjunction of mental association.
- <sup>14</sup> See John L. Farthing, “Patristics, Exegesis and the Eucharist in the Theology of Girolamo Zanchi” in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), 79–95.
- <sup>15</sup> Henry Scougal, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man: Or the Nature and the Excellency of the Christian Religion*. First published in 1677. Many subsequent editions.
- <sup>16</sup> Wilhelm Pauck, ed., *Melancthon and Bucer* (Library of Christian Classics, vol. 19; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 21.
- <sup>17</sup> A. Moody Stuart, *Recollections of the Late John Duncan, LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages, New College, Edinburgh* (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872), 100.