

of the universe. Once again man's current understanding of the cosmos is found to be acutely deficient.

Amazing complexity

Other mysteries listed in the article that are still baffling scientists include the appearance of very high-energy cosmic rays with no obvious source; the presence of methane in the atmosphere of Mars; the detection of atomic particles, consisting of four neutrons bound together, which should not exist; and the renewed interest in 'cold fusion', the supposed ability of atoms to fuse together in palladium metal at room temperature, releasing energy—something which is deemed impossible by current scientific theory. We could ourselves add many examples of amazing complexity in the living world which are glibly described by

scientists as being the results of evolution but which in fact deny any logical explanation other than design by an intelligent Mind.

Of course, all science proceeds by seeking explanations for facts that are not encompassed by current theories. And no doubt many of the above mysteries will eventually give way to satisfactory explanations. But the present state of uncertainty in these areas demonstrates that many of the confident stories about science that are presented to the public as fact are really no more than guesswork. To those scientists who believe wholly naturalistic explanations can account for all things in the cosmos, and in effect "cast away" the Divine hand of the Creator, the words of the Second Psalm seem highly appropriate: "He That sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision" (vv. 3,4).

Bread and wine as symbols of the old and new covenants (2)

Sam Alexander

In [the first article](#) we suggested that the emblem of bread can be taken as a symbol of the old covenant in the same way that wine is a symbol of the new covenant. Breaking bread is thus symbolic of breaking our former way of life under the old covenant; drinking wine reminds us of our new life under the new covenant. This article will present further evidence that adds weight to these ideas.

THE LONGEVITY of the two emblems of bread and wine stand in stark contrast; bread goes mouldy within several days, but wine actually gets better with age. This is just like the old and new covenants; the old covenant, like bread, passed away, but the new covenant, like wine, lasts (*cf.* Heb. 1:11; 8:13).

The manna

During the wilderness wanderings, when God made the old covenant with Israel, the Israelites ate manna that God provided for them. It is noteworthy that Israel received bread from heaven, not wine.

However, when the manna ceased, Israel ate the fruit of the Promised Land, notably represented by a branch with one cluster of grapes

so big that it was carried on a staff between two (Num. 13:23). We can only enter our promised land through the new covenant (*cf.* Heb. 4:8), which we remember in the emblem of the "fruit of the vine" (Mt. 26:29). Like Israel's manna in the wilderness, our bread—our flesh under the old covenant—must pass away, to be superseded by grapes. The grapes were a symbol of the fruitfulness of their promised life in the Land.

The former inhabitants of the Land, like the manna, represent our former way of life under the old covenant, which must be completely replaced by a new way of life under the new covenant; thus the Canaanites were to be completely destroyed by Israel. How appropriate, then, was the faithful spies' choice of metaphor: "rebel not ye against the LORD, neither fear ye the people of the land; for they are *bread* for us" (Num. 14:9)!

If the two spies carrying the finest trophy of the Promised Land were also the two spies who believed in God's power to give them the Land according to His promise, then one was Joshua and the other Caleb. If Caleb, a Gentile who had joined Israel, bore one end of the staff after Joshua, a clear type of Christ, then Caleb would be a very appropriate type of Simon of Cyrene, who helped Jesus bear the staff that literally carried the "blood of the covenant" that we remember

in the fruit of the vine. If this is so, then the link between the emblem of wine and the grapes from the Promised Land is further reinforced.

Meat and drink offerings

Under the Law, the meat and drink offerings always went together (Ex. 29:41; Num. 15:4,5). The meat offerings were generally a kind of bread (see, for example, Leviticus 2:4) and the drink offerings were wine (Num. 15:5), which is a notable link to the memorial emblems. However, although priests ate the meat offerings (Lev. 2:3), the wine was always poured out at the altar (Num. 28:7). Under the old covenant it was appropriate to eat bread but not to drink wine, as the new covenant was as that time still in the future.

Fascinatingly, the emblems were also prefigured on the table of shewbread, upon which not only the shewbread, but also the flagons and bowls for drink offerings, were kept: "Make [the table of shewbread's] dishes and saucers, and its flagons and bowls from which drink-offerings may be poured" (Ex. 25:29, NEB). However, although priests could eat the shewbread (Lev. 24:9), they were never to drink the wine, on pain of death (10:9). So, while both emblems were foreshadowed on the table of shewbread, the separation of the wine stood as an abiding witness to the fact that the days of the new covenant were yet to come.

Eating animals

Provided that an animal was clean, Israelites could eat it, but the flesh only; not a drop of blood was to be eaten (Lev. 17:12). Flesh and blood are analogous to the emblems of bread and wine, of which Jesus said, "this is my body" and "this is my blood" (Mt. 26:26,28). It was appropriate to eat flesh under the Law of Moses, because this was the period of life under the old covenant. However, it was not appropriate to eat blood, because this spoke of the new covenant, which still lay in the future. As was the case with drink offerings, "the life of all flesh" was denied to those under the old covenant (Lev. 17:14), but is appropriate for those under the new.

The baker and the butler

The emblems of the bread and wine are also foreshadowed by the baker and butler, who asked Joseph to interpret their dreams. After three days (compare Christ in the grave) the baker was put to death by Pharaoh, but the butler lived (Gen. 40:21,22). This illustrates that, although flesh un-

der the old covenant (represented by bread) was to pass away, the new covenant (represented by wine) symbolises life. The baker was hanged from a tree, which is what happened to Christ's body. Figuratively, we too "[crucify] the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. 5:24). Furthermore, it is specifically noted that the baker's *flesh* was destroyed by being eaten by birds (Gen. 40:19), which doubly emphasises the fate of our old man under the old covenant.

Tables of stone

The tables of stone that Moses brought down from the mountain are a symbol of the old covenant, as opposed to the "tables of the heart" of the new covenant (2 Cor. 3:3; cf. Jer. 31:33; Heb. 8:10; Ezek. 11:19; 36:26). It is interesting to note that the first thing that Moses did with the tables of stone was to *break* them (Ex. 32:19), thus demonstrating the inefficacy of the Law to save, and prefiguring the putting to death of our flesh that frees us from its dominion. Moses breaking the tables of stone is like Jesus and ourselves breaking bread, because both the tables of stone and the bread are symbols of our old way of life under the old covenant. Both these symbols of the old covenant were/are literally broken to illustrate how we must figuratively break with our former way of life and embrace the new covenant.

The torn veil

We are told in Hebrews that the veil in the temple that divided the most holy place from the holy place was a type of Jesus' flesh (10:20). Therefore the veil symbolises the same thing as the emblem of bread, as this too represents the flesh of Jesus (1 Cor. 11:24), and thus life under the old covenant.

The veil was torn in two when Jesus died (Mt. 27:51), which was a powerful demonstration that the power of the old covenant over flesh had been broken. This tearing of the veil is like breaking bread; both are symbols of the passing of life under the old covenant.

The old garment/new bottles parables

The parables told by Jesus about the torn old garment and the new bottles are given in Mark 2: "No man also seweth a piece of new cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made worse. And no man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be

marred: but new wine must be put into new bottles" (vv. 21,22).

Old garments in Scripture are also a symbol of the old covenant (Heb. 1:11; 8:13), and so, like the veil, they also symbolise the same as the emblem of bread. Also like the veil, the garment in the parable is already torn, hence the need for a new piece of cloth. As old garments and bread are both symbols of the old covenant, this torn old garment is like broken bread.

The parable of the old garment is directly followed by the parable of the new bottles, and this sequence parallels the order of the two emblems of bread and wine. Furthermore, it is fascinating to note the subtle difference between the two parables; there is no equivalent phrase to "new wine must be put into new bottles" in the parable of the old garment. In fact, the only scenario actually presented for the torn old garment is that the rent would be made even worse, yet Jesus specifically tells us that new wine *does* last when it is put into new bottles. Hence these parables emphasise both the passing of the old garment and the endurance of the new wine. This is like the picture that we have painted of the two emblems; breaking bread emphasises putting to death our old way of life, like the torn old garment, while the wine represents the positive side of our enduring new life in Christ, like the new wine in the new bottles.

Caiaphas's torn garments

Some of these 'torn old garments' were worn by the high priest Caiaphas, for we read that he rent his garments at Christ's trial (Mt. 26:65). The tearing of his garments is, like the tearing of the veil (27:51) and the torn old cloth (Mk. 2:21), a symbol of the removal of the old covenant. (One would struggle to find anything much more emblematic of the old covenant than the very garments of the high priest.) Thus breaking bread is also like the tearing of the high priest's garments; both indicate the passing of the old man under the old covenant. On the other hand, it is specifically noted that Jesus' garment was *not* rent (Jno. 19:24). Jesus' clothes not being torn is like the new cloth of the garment parable (Mk. 2:21); Jesus is the *new* high priest under the new covenant (Heb. 4:15).

Incidentally, there is possibly also a link here to Joseph, whose coat was bloodied but apparently not rent (Gen. 37:31-33). Reuben, however, like Caiaphas, did rend his clothes, on discovering that Joseph was no longer in the pit (v. 29). Being possibly the original priest as the first-born

of Jacob's family, Reuben, corresponding to the Law, lost his priesthood. The real mediator between Israel and God (represented by Pharaoh in the story) turned out to be Joseph, corresponding to Jesus. Perhaps this too parallels the passing of the dominion of the old covenant, and salvation in the new covenant through Christ.

Catholic communion

In the light of the significance that we have seen in drinking the wine of the new covenant, there is irony in the way that many Catholics traditionally celebrate mass. For centuries lay Catholics took only the bread at mass, and many still do. This was decreed at the Council of Constance in 1415, and only recently relaxed by the Second Vatican Council in 1963. Sadly, not celebrating Christ and the new covenant in wine demonstrates that they are "yet in [their] sins" (1 Cor. 15:17).

Implications for us

At the outset of these articles we asked the question, Why are there two emblems? The answer suggested is that there are two emblems because there are two covenants; as the wine represents new life under the new covenant, so bread represents old life under the old covenant.

One aspect of breaking bread is to remember how Jesus overcame his fleshly body, the old man, and broke the power of the old covenant. This has its counterpart in the wine, which symbolises the new covenant and new life in Christ.

At baptism, as well, we each put our old man to death, releasing us from the old covenant that because of our own weakness could never save us, and made a new covenant with God. Now we have to strive to "[crucify] the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. 5:24), to serve with our mind the law of God after first breaking the law of sin and death (Rom. 7:25; 8:2).

Therefore breaking bread serves as a powerful reminder for us to break with the things of this world before we dedicate ourselves to God in taking the wine, the symbol of life under the new covenant that we each have come under. We have in Jesus the perfect example of a complete and utter breaking of the bond with the things of this world, with fleshly life under the old covenant. Let us thank God that there are two emblems, and not one, and that in taking the wine we can commemorate "the new covenant in [Christ's] blood" that gives us both purpose and hope: "but now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:13).