

was trying to get them together in order that they might stand against the efforts of the Romanists to destroy them. They met, and after several days discussion, they found there were sixteen statements they made and on fifteen-and-a-half they agreed exactly, but on the sixteenth, which dealt with the Lord's Supper, Luther and Zwingli could not get together on half of that statement because Luther denied the Romanist idea that the *priests had the power to* change~~x~~ the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ. But nevertheless he said, "This is my body. This is my blood," and Zwingli is wrong when he says it merely represents it. Luther said, "You have not our spirit." He refused to shake hands with Zwingli, and when Zwingli was killed in battle five years later, Luther said "It served him right for his wickedness." That was not Calvin's attitude - not at all. Calvin said, "Luther is right. It is the body of Christ; it is the blood of Christ, but" he said, "it is spiritually the body and blood of Christ." It is dynamically the body and blood of Christ; it is not physically. Luther said, "We actually chew with the teeth the actual body of Christ when we take communion." And yet it is not changed - it is still bread and still wine. *And he* ?

said I have never met anybody who was not a Lutheran who could understand what the Lutherans believe, *and* what they mean by this *whether even* ~~is~~ sometimes I wonder~~d~~ the Lutherans *really* understand. *Had Calvin* But ~~xxxxxxxx~~ made a statement half-way between what Zwingli said and what Luther said on this point. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ He did not feel it was ~~xxxxxx~~ a point which should divide the church of God. And Luther, when he ~~heard~~ first *had talked talked* heard Calvin's statement - he said, if they ~~taught~~ this way in the beginning, all the arguments might have been avoided. Calvin stood for main line Christianity.

do not get the sense of this

The same thing is true of **B**aptism. We stand for infant baptism. We are not alone in that. That is not any peculiarly Presbyterian attitude. The Episcopal Church has always stood for infant baptism, the Methodist Church has stood for it, the Congregational Church stood for it, the Presbyterian Church has stood for it. We believe that the Scripture teaches that the children of believers have a very special privilege. We believe that God has promised us that if we do our part, we read the Scripture with our children, we pray with them, we try to lead them to the knowledge of Christ - that if we do our part to the best of our ability, God will in His own time